

MAY 1957

A Monthly Magazine issued by

The Remnant of Christ's Ecclesia

in opposition to the Dogmas of
Papal and Protestant Christendom

A WITNESS TO THE TRUTH

and a warning against the deception in the last days
foretold by Christ

"Take heed ye be not deceived"

AT THE TABLE OF THE LORD

THE HISTORY OF THE TRUTH IN THE LATTER DAYS

SIGNS OF HIS COMING AND OF THE END OF THE WORLD

NEWS FROM THE ECCLESIAS

All Communications

W. V. Butterfield
16 Westfield Road,
Cheadle Hulme
Stockport, England

J. A. DeFries
R.D.1.
Forestville
New York, U.S.A.

At the Table of the Lord

“Is Anything Too Hard for the Lord?”

The record concerning Abraham is that he was a “friend of God.” By considering and striving to enter into his experiences, we can find help as we seek for this same relationship with the Almighty God. Let us try to see what moved Him, and what he learned through each experience.

It is known that he was greatly blessed on account of his faith—a faith which caused him to forsake much at the command of God. In Genesis 12, we are told that the Almighty called him out of Ur of the Chaldees, and that he moved faithfully, leaving that place and taking all his possessions with him. He was seventy-five years old, and the journey to Canaan was close to 700 miles. He went without questions, taking Lot with him. If we were in Abraham’s place, should we be as ready to leave our established home, moving hundreds of miles to a place of which we knew nothing? At the age of seventy-five, should we willingly pull up roots deep grown as his were? All this because the Lord commanded. Abraham did this, and so the record concerning him is, Hebrews 11 : 8—

“By faith Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance, obeyed : and he went out, not knowing whither he went.”

Brethren and sisters, could we rise up to such an example of faith?

Dwelling in Tabernacles

The record in Genesis 18 : 1, is that Abraham dwelt in tents—this being a recognition on his part that he was a sojourner, in God’s hand, and always subject to His Will. Hebrews 11 : 9, 10—

“By faith he sojourned in the land of promise as in a strange country, dwelling in tabernacles with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same promise : For he looked for a city which hath foundations whose builder and maker is God.”

How surely he believed; his mode of living showed that his city was a continuing one, the one for which all the faithful wait.

Therefore, he put down no roots in this life, and so was able to move at the behest of his Father.

“Is Anything Too Hard?”

Another circumstance in Abraham’s life, from which we can benefit, is that surrounding the birth of Isaac. Can we imagine Abraham’s longing for a son, Sarah being barren? Then Ishmael was born to him of Hagar; Abraham did grow to love him. But, then a promise was given to Abraham, Genesis 17 : 15-17, that Sarah should bear a son. Both were aged and Abraham, when he

heard it, laughed, saying—

“Shall a child be born unto him that is an hundred years old ? And shall Sarah that is 90 years old bear ?”

It seemed impossible, and Sarah, too, laughed, Genesis 18 : 12—

“ . . . Sarah laughed within herself, saying, After I am waxed old, shall I have pleasure, my lord being old also ?”

But the angel's rebuke was, “Is anything too hard for the Lord ?” Here was a doubting by Sarah and Abraham, that this could come about. They were reminded that with God nothing is impossible, and that a son should be born, and his name was to be Isaac. How fitting that name, for in Hebrew, it means “laughter”, coming from the same root, “to laugh”, as used in connection with Abraham and Sarah's doubting laughter. At the birth of Isaac, Sarah said, “. . . God hath made me to laugh, so that all that hear will laugh with me.” Genesis 21 : 6. Would these two people, now blessed with a son, of promise, always remember their doubting laughter, reminded by the son's very name ? How powerfully the words would speak— “Is anything too hard for the Lord ?” Would not their faith be greatly built up by this evidence of God's hand in their lives, changing their laughter from doubting to rejoicing ?

Sarah and Abraham were our brother and sister. They had faith and yet, upon occasion, it wavered and they doubted. We, who strive to rise up to this faith, often doubt and fail in so doing. Do we need to get hold of the angel's words, entering into Abraham's experience, “Is anything too hard for the Lord ?” God's promises may, because we lack so, seem impossible of fulfilment, but He will not, indeed cannot, fail.

Let It Not Be Grievous

Abraham had yet a further test to his faith. In Genesis 21 : 9 we read—

“Sarah saw the son of Hagar the Egyptian, which she had born to Abraham, mocking.”

—and so she told Abraham that the bondwoman and her son, Ishmael, must be cast out, for he could not be heir with her son, Isaac. Here, in Ishmael, was one who mocked and Sarah recognised the wrong. Yet, because of his love for the boy, it was “very grievous in Abraham's sight”. God said, then, to Abraham,

“Let it not be grievous in thy sight, because of the lad, and because of thy bondwoman . . . for in Isaac shall thy seed be called.”

By this painful experience, Abraham learned that only the true heirs and never one who mocks, might share the promised inheritance. All others must be cut off. Such is still necessary today, and is often as painful. Loved ones, because of their refusal to seek God's ways, must be left, bringing pain and grief ; yet, can it be any other way ? For in truth, they often are mockers of the

faithful, and of The Faith. Surely, such are not the seed of promise, and would only cause the inheritance to be lost to all who associate. Even as to Abraham, the command of God is for all who desire to be the "friends of God"—

"Let it not be grievous in thy sight."

The Supreme Test

As Abraham passed through all these experiences, his trust and fear of God increased. Then came the greatest test, Genesis 22 : 1—

"It came to pass after these things, that God did tempt Abraham, and said unto him, . . . Take now thy son, thine only son Isaac, whom thou lovest, and get thee into the land of Moriah; and offer him there for a burnt offering . . ."

Can we imagine the impact of this command! Offer up Isaac, his son in whom all the promises were to be fulfilled! But had he not experienced that nothing is too hard for the Lord, and so, "Abraham rose up early in the morning, and saddled his ass, and took . . . Isaac his son, and . . . went unto the place of which God had told him." No hesitation or holding back, no pleading, but an instant obedience, in faith. This trust is revealed in response to his son, "My son, God will provide himself a lamb for a burnt offering." He foresaw God's provision of a Lamb who would be The burnt offering, and the means of redeeming all the faithful. Was this the result of a long time of pondering the question, "Is anything too hard for the Lord"? We know of his absolute obedience, even to the raising of the knife to slay his son. Then, a message from God—

" . . . Lay not thine hand upon the lad, neither do anything unto him : for now I know that thou fearest God, seeing that thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son from me."

A ram was provided, and Abraham in rejoicing, called the name of that place Jehovah-jireh, God will see or provide. Was this the outpouring of his faith and trust? Thus was his conviction justified and further strengthened.

Paul speaks of this great faith in Hebrews 11 : 17-19—

"By faith Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac . . . of whom it was said, That in Isaac shall thy seed be called, accounting that God was able to raise him up, even from the dead . . ."

Because of this faith, the Apostle James writes,

"Was not Abraham our father, justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar? . . . And the scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness, and he was called the Friend of God."

Having been given, through the Word, such an insight into the mind of Abraham, how he at one time doubted, even laughed,

and how through the hand of God working with him in many experiences, he grew to such implicit faith, can we, brethren and sisters, partake of this mind? We, too, are tested. We, too, are, naturally speaking, inclined to doubt, to laugh. But can we, as did Abraham, find help, if we will keep before us the question asked by the messenger of God,

“Is there anything too hard for the Lord?”

Surely nothing is—for He has created all things. Can we grow, then, brethren and sisters, to this mind of Abraham, to the conviction embodied in the name, Jehovah-jireh—GOD WILL PROVIDE?

J. A. DeF.

The History of the Truth in the Latter Days (8)

Christadelphians and Re-union

It is important in considering the history of the Truth, as “Division” follows “Division”, to understand why God allows “Division” and why God allows the introduction of error which causes “Division”. It would be easy for the Almighty to prevent the cause of “Division” arising.

Error when introduced is a test to all professing the Name. The faithful show their zeal for God by a patient reasoning with those who are in error, followed by righteous action when these efforts have failed. To tolerate error when there is refusal to “hear” after the “first and second admonition” is condoning a denial of God. Continuance in fellowship under the guise of charity, makes all partakers of the evil. The divine command where there is a refusal to “hear” and repent is simple and explicit: “After the first and second admonition reject”. During the stages of admonishing this must be done with every effort to “gain”; as says the Apostle “admonish as a brother”. If no progress is made during the two admonitive stages, the continuance of appeals first by one and then another, amounts to trifling with divine commands, the only result of which will be a “watering down” of divine requirements and a lowering of the standard of Truth. It is clear both from the Old Testament and the New that where one refuses “to hear” and therefore is a rebel, he must be “cut off”—that “all Israel may hear and fear”.

Truly the appearance of error tests the faith of the righteous, and the ensuing “Division” which may be necessary removes those elements which have a leavening tendency. This twofold purpose has been seen in respect of those “Divisions” which have already been considered: in 1864 the Doweite Division, in 1873 the Renunciationist Division, and in 1885 the Inspiration Division.

“Who is on the Lord’s side?” (Exod. 32 v. 26).

When Moses delayed coming down from the mount the Ecclesia fell to idolatry. “Surprising and disgraceful,” it may be remarked by those who are soon self-satisfied, forgetting how easy it is to profess the Name and yet have an idol in the heart. The fact that there is little or no worship of carved wood and graven stone today does not remove the possibility of idolatry. What befell Israel is intended as a warning, and not to give supine complacency any cause for self-satisfaction.

Moses stood in the gate of the camp and cried, “Who is on the Lord’s side?”—a cry occasioned, be it noted, by the introduction of sin. The whole of the tribe of Levi responded, and fulfilled what must have been a painful mission—the slaying of about three thousand brethren.

The coming of sin tested all. It showed who were righteous, which was memorialised by Levi being given the most honourable office in the Ecclesia, the care of God’s dwelling: and it showed who were the wicked and must be “cut off.” The three thousand who perished were not “cut off” by chance. God does not slay the innocent. No! These were guilty. Their removal cleansed the Ecclesia, and all Israel were made to “hear and fear.” When “hearing and fearing” cease, corruption quickly takes place, and ere long the fellowship of the Father and the Son will be lost.

“I will be sanctified in them that come nigh me”

(Lev. 10 v. 3)

Coming down to a later time in the Ecclesia’s history in the wilderness, only a matter of about forty years, a similar experience was necessary to preserve the Truth.

It was at Baal-peor that the Ecclesia was seduced by the counsel of Baalam. This false prophet, unable to bring condemnation on God’s people even though offered the high “wages of unrighteousness” realised that they might be brought into condemnation by alliance with the alien. His wicked counsel was successful, viewed by the adversary. Union with the alien, the daughters of Moab, made a great appeal to Israel. As always happens in “unequal yoking” those in the Truth departed from worshipping the true God and began serving “strange gods”. God’s anger was kindled against His people whom He had saved from Egypt.

Moses again made the same righteous appeal—“Slay ye every one his men that were joined unto Baal-peor”. Let it be carefully noted that here there was no excuse, no pleading for those supposedly “weak”, no asking that such should be received. Oh how mistaken and wicked are these parleyings with those who dishonour God! True, a brother’s frailty must be considered, but there is only one divine way of removing sin, and therefore of removing

death in consequence of that sin, that is by sincere confession and repentance. This means a forsaking of the sin, and the bringing forth of "fruits meet for repentance;" a work which is easy for the man of the spirit, but nigh to impossible for the man of the flesh. The godly man will incline the ear, and bow the neck. What a travesty of truth to excuse such stiff-neckedness as being "weak in the faith", a favourite gambit of "Suffolk Street" for retaining those from whom withdrawal is divinely required.

How plausible it sounds to talk of reasoning with those "weak in the faith"; of "sitting with Bible on knee", of allowing such to remain in the Ecclesia on promise of not propogating their views. If a brother will not receive what God has spoken it is not "weakness in the faith"; it is rebellion. Those in Suffolk Street who speak much of love of brethren and consideration of the "weak in the faith" would do well to visit Baal-peor, and from what happened there learn afresh that sin is sin, and that it is nigh to blasphemy to excuse rebellion against God as "weakness". Let such have a look at the action of Brother Phinehas. He did not go along with smooth phrases and talk about "love of brethren"; he took a javelin and thrust through the brother and the Moabite he had taken. Of this brother there is no criticism for his action in the crisis, for his having acted unwisely in the heat of the moment, but of this brother it is said (let Suffolk Street note):

"He . . . hath turned my wrath away from the children of Israel, while he was zealous for my sake among them, that I consumed not the children of Israel in my jealousy."

(Numbers 25 v. 11)

"Then stood up Phinehas, and executed judgment: and so the plague was stayed.

And that was counted unto him for righteousness unto all generations for evermore." (Psalm 106 vv. 30 31).

The action of this righteous brother, says God, prevented the consumption of Israel by divine wrath! Even so, many had been consumed—more in number than all the "Christadelphians" in the world today—24,000. There was no consideration allowed as to the effect on the reputation of the Truth in the surrounding nations, no coaxing of those described as "weak", but who at heart were rebels. Only one consideration prevailed; only one consideration saved Israel—the upholding of the honour of God and His truth by the resolute destruction of the wicked. This is written for our learning. What is the lesson for the present? Surely that if there is to be a preservation of the Truth only one consideration must weigh—the upholding of God's honour by removing from the camp, all those who are rebels at heart, whether they be many or few. In this cleansing of the camp, those who sympathise with the rebels will also go, carried away by the "consuming" determined of

God—"for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds."

Those who are being carried away by the smooth words of those who speak much about "love of brethren" would do well to notice how seldom they refer to the lessons which God's Ecclesia in the wilderness had to learn, and which are undoubtedly recorded for our learning. Like present-day clerics they talk of "love and good works" among brethren but fail to discover the "length and breadth, the height and depth" of God's true love, which can only be comprehended by a wholesome acceptance of all that He has preserved for our learning. In consequence their "love of brethren" is found even amongst their followers to be a very hollow thing, and nothing to be compared with that true love between brethren engendered by a grateful acceptance of all that God has done in showing what the flesh is really like, and how it must at all times be subdued in self and in the Ecclesia. Only then can there be true peace, and true love: a love quite unknown to the world who talk much of love but never experience it, a love which as Jesus promised provides "fathers, mothers, sisters and brothers a hundredfold." There is no wonder that Christadelphians complain of the coldness and formality of their meetings and the lack of love. If they did but consider, they know not the way of love, having departed from Him who is the God of love. If they were with Him then their ways would be His ways; but no! He has been forsaken, and He has forsaken them. Hence their "love" and their "love-making" is no different, intrinsically, than that of the Churches and Chapels, much talk about love, but no sincere feeling of love, and a bitter complaint especially by the older ones that love has departed from the "ecclesias" and only the coldness of formality remains. These may sound hard words to receive. There is no denying the symptoms, at least if the volume of complaints received is any criterion. Let the devout mind then turn to find the cause, and in finding the cause he will find God in a way he has never before understood and also the place where He chooses to dwell.

"I will be sanctified in them that come nigh me, and before all people I will be glorified" (Lev. 10 v. 3).

In the Inspiration Division of 1885 those in Temperance Hall led by Robert Roberts had this principle clear. They hated divisions but realised that division was the only means of sanctifying God by delivering the Ecclesias from the defiling doctrine of partial inspiration. T. Turner, late Editor of the Suffolk Street Magazine, refused to recognise the part played by faithful men like Robert Roberts at the time of this Division and previous ones. In writing in 1939 on the subject of "Divisions—Their cause and cure", he says:

“In our divisions the two causes operated : personalities and doctrine. Bro. E. Turney and Bro. R. Roberts already had personal differences before the Renunciationist division occurred. Bro. Ashcroft (the writer of the attack on the inspiration of the Bible) had already left the Christadelphian office before the Inspiration trouble began. And in more recent times the same has been true. I know of no case where a division has occurred, on what are alleged to be doctrinal grounds, where there has not already been a previous incompatibility of temper. And brethren everywhere are asked, or rather compelled to take sides, when kindly intercourse, with Bible on knee, would have either settled the difficulty, or have led to the quiet withdrawal of the disputants.”

It is shocking that the Phinehas-like qualities of Robert Roberts should be so misrepresented, and he should be held to be guilty of dividing the Brotherhood over nothing more than “incompatibility of temperament” with another brother. The facts have already been considered—that Robert Roberts went faithfully through the “Bible on knee” stage but to no purpose. The rebels refused to repent of their attack on God’s Word, and those sympathising with the rebels refused to expel them. It is not a question of differing temperaments, or disputants retiring after a quiet talk, but one requiring vigorous action like that of Phinehas that God’s anger against Israel might be turned away and Israel saved, and above all else that by this means God might be sanctified in His dwelling and the Truth be preserved. For this great righteous work at the time of the Inspiration Division there must always be a sense of gratitude to Robert Roberts by every right-thinking person for self-less, unequivocal, and forthright action for the salvation of Israel and the Truth.

The attitude to this great man and his work at this time by the present Editor of the “Christadelphian” is perhaps even worse than that of the late Editor of the Suffolk Street Magazine. The pages of the “Christadelphian” make continual reference to R. Roberts’ works ; the appended catalogue of books for sale contain many by him. In words he is acknowledged as a founder and a leader. The question (which it is belived is the one asked by the writer) has been ostensibly answered by the Editor of the “Christadelphian”—“What would Robert Roberts have thought of Reunion?” The reply glosses over the real issue involved, and supposes Robert Roberts would have answered as follows :

“I think the battle of 1884 was necessary and it has at any rate contributed to the community as a whole being alive to the necessity of standing firmly for a wholly inspired

Bible. It is a matter of rejoicing that over the years the Suffolk Street ecclesias have themselves adopted such a definition of their faith as is quite consistent with our own and this removes the barrier I thought to exist at the time of the division."

How unjust is this supposed answer given on behalf of the deceased Robert Roberts, and disloyal to his work at the time of the Division. To speak of the division of 1885 (not 1884) as a "battle" only serves to confuse the issue. There was no "battle" in a worldly sense, but a division between those who sanctified God in upholding His word as wholly inspired and those who refused to do so. Suffolk Street gave "a definition of their faith" at the time of the Division which in words supported a wholly inspired Bible but in fact as the evidence already considered shows, belied the profession. In these vital matters it is not what men say that is the only criterion, but how they act in interpretation of what they say.

To say the least this treatment of Robert Roberts is dishonourable, and will be recognised as such by all those familiar with the facts of the Division. Out of a deep sense of loyalty to Robert Roberts a letter was recently sent to the Editor of the "Christadelphian" asking this question :

"Was the action of Robert Roberts in supporting a division in 1885 righteous and necessary for the preservation of the of the Truth against the heresy of Partial Inspiration?"

So far there has been no answer. If an answer cannot be an unqualified "Yes", then to be consistent the name of Robert Roberts should no more be mentioned except as a trouble maker and autocrat as referred to in Suffolk Street quarters. To offer the hand of friendship, yea even of admiring love to Robert Roberts, at the same time denying and undermining his work is nothing less than treachery.

"Who is my brother?"

When Suffolk Street left the Truth in 1885 by their refusal to stand by a wholly inspired Bible were they still "brethren?" The quickly given answer today by many "Christadelphians" is "once a brother always a brother." Reference is usually made to a brother in a natural family who may become a renegade. "However great his evil he is still your brother," it is said. An important difference is overlooked. In the natural family a man is born a "brother" of any other children, but in the family of God he becomes a "brother" by "adoption." The fleshly natural tie is indissoluble, but the spiritual one is not. The tie may be preserved by faithfulness, whilst unfaithfulness breaks it. Jesus explains this :

"For whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother." (Mark 3 v. 35).

The context shows that any, at any time, refusing to do God's will, ceases to be a brother.

At the time of the Inspiration Division those in Suffolk Street were referred to by Robert Roberts as "brethren in offence." "Brethren in offence" are not true brethren but false, like those who troubled the Ecclesia at Galatia, of whom Paul wrote :

"That because of false brethren unawares brought in . . . that they might bring us again into bondage."

(Gal. 2 v. 4).

The mind that has not the difference between fleshly and spiritual ties clear, will still persist in saying "Yes, but they are still brethren." What would such think if a false half-crown were offered, and were told, "Yes, but it is still a half-crown"? "Brethren in offence" or "false brethren" are not true brethren, therefore are not, as Jesus shows, His brethren. To continue to use the term "brother" in view of the mis-use made of it in connection with false brethren is not only unwise, it is wrong. Its use may soften the effects of a "Division", which if it be a true division is a dividing between right and wrong, a dividing between "soul" (flesh) and spirit. In a Division the flesh is delivered to the adversary outside the camp. It has no further affinity with the Spirit. To continue the use of the term "brother" may be a Gentile courtesy, but it does dis-service to the Truth in masking what has really taken place—the separation of those who will stand for the right from those who refuse to do so. It is largely because of the free and unwarranted use of the term "brother" by all "Christadelphians" that all sections, including the more strict, have come to persuade themselves that they all severally make up the "brotherhood", although they are divided into twelve or more groups, and taken collectively embrace many heresies and engage nowadays in all worldly practices acceptable to the better chapel goer. Many of the older "Christadelphians" sadly confess how true this is and that the barrier between them and the world so clearly seen in former times has gone. "Re-union", because of the greater laxity of Suffolk Street in all matters will speed up the process and make the amalgamation with the world complete. How can such a people cry to their contemporaries, "Come out and be separate and touch not the unclean", when they are so much part and parcel of the present world in many of its offices and also in many of its amusements and habits ?

1894. Trouble over the "Responsibility to the Judgment"

Only nine years after the Inspiration Division, the Brotherhood was troubled by the appearance of another error. One J. J. Andrew of London, a brother highly esteemed for his work in the Truth, and one who made a valiant stand for the Truth at the time of the Inspiration Division shocked the brethren by his notion

that only the baptised would be raised to be judged by Christ. He said that any who knew the Truth and knew its responsibilities would escape the Judgment of the Lord, if they were not baptised. This heresy was introduced in the following words, at a business meeting of a London Ecclesia—

“That Christ having been raised from the dead through his own blood, it necessarily follows the dead in Christ will be raised through the same blood, and, as a consequence, that the blood of Christ is not available for the resurrection of any who have died in Adam.”

Plausible words!—but all that is plausible is not true, and very often is not true. When the human mind treats the Scriptures as a book of geometry, reasoning purely on technical lines, the results produced are often fantastic in their self-contradicting conclusions. For this reason the Apostle warns that the “letter killeth” whereas it is the “Spirit which makes alive.”

Again the burden of rebutting this error fell to a large extent on Robert Roberts. During the controversy he expressed himself in his usual forthright and fearless way in defence of the Truth :

“All who endorse the new position will do so at the risk of incurring the divine displeasure and imperilling the privilege which the knowledge of the truth has conferred upon them.”

Here was not a mind relying solely on a “Statement of Faith” for the settling of right and wrong, and using it to segregate matters as vital or non-vital according to such a “Statement”. To a mind like that of Robert Roberts, as to all faithful minds, if a matter is wrong according to the Word, then it must be dealt with as error. To plead that it has not been included in the “Statement of Faith” and therefore is non-vital, and should be treated as an “open question” is exalting the Statement above the Word, and is dishonouring to the author of the Word.

In every error introduced there is greater latitude for the flesh. In the case of partial inspiration the effect was to make the Word less authoratative, and consequently there could be a broader accommodation of personal tastes and desires ; in other words the effect was to broaden the way which Jesus said was narrow.

In the present case the error of non-responsibility to Judgment of those who were enlightened but were not baptised allowed for a more merciful end of some relatives who had played about with the Truth but failed before death to take the necessary step. The grave would be their home. They would not have to be raised to be judged only to be condemned, and punished with “few or many stripes.” The “error” provided an apparent escape from divine retribution.

The truth on this matter can be simply found, without pursuing all the tortuous paths of those responsible for the error, by asking

the question, When does God demand obedience—before baptism, or only after baptism? On the day of Pentecost, when the consciences of the listeners were pricked by Peter's address, the question was asked by those who were not baptised into Christ,

“Men and brethren, what shall we do?”

The reply of Peter, was the reply of the Spirit :

“Repent and be baptised every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins.”

(Acts 2 v. 38).

This was a divine command requiring obedience. To refuse God's demand would be disobedience to His spoken word which, says Jesus, shall judge a man in the last day. Where God gives a command He knows there is responsibility sufficient to obey. Disobedience by any responsible person is sin which God will not leave unpunished, for God will not be mocked. The effects of obedience or disobedience before God are not altered by baptism ; for baptism is only one step, be it a most important step, in the walk of the obedient from the time of being “called out” of the world to be a son of God, ultimately to be declared—“called, chosen and faithful.”

There is still a fairly large group of “Christadelphians” who refuse to uphold this doctrine, and treat it as an open question. Its headquarters are in Canada and the “Advocate” is the organ of its members.

So far this group has not re-united with “Central.” Yet the April “Christadelphian” carries a letter from a leading member of this group in which these words occur :

“There has as yet been no movement to see if there could be union between Central brethren and those brethren of the Advocate fellowship. It would be wonderful if a basis could be found whereby union could be effected.”

There is no editorial comment ! Can it be imagined that Robert Roberts would have been silent ? Union is simple where there is a willingness to submit to the Word, and it does not take five years of negotiating to discover if there is such a willingness—no, nor five hours ! The powerful and righteous pen of Robert Roberts would have quickly pointed out what was required—“Embrace the right and refute the error.” Now political considerations take the place of scriptural ones. This will undoubtedly assemble larger numbers under one banner, but where the result is a “mixed multitude” the Truth is lost, and God is no longer there.

It is clear from the fact that the “Christadelphian” publishes the letter of the Advocate member without comment there is no serious view that the Advocate group is wrong as before Christ. If there were, then duty would demand comment in the interests of the perishing. Tacitly it seems that the “Christadelphian” acknowledges

the Advocate group as part of the family of God and union with them or rather "Re-union" is only a matter of time and expediency. And so the Divisions of the past with the lessons God intended they should teach are forgotten, making the way broader and broader, until it is indistinguishable from the "broad way" along which travel the nonchalant masses—to destruction.

(to be continued . . .)

“The Signs of His Coming and of the end of the world”

“Behold, I have told you before. Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away.”

Since these words proceeded from the mouth of the Lord Jesus, many centuries have passed and now the time of their fulfilment is at hand. The “heavens and earth” as at present constituted, are shortly to pass away, and to be replaced by a “new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.”

The world is well-nigh all set, though unwittingly, for this stupendous event, and it would seem that Christ’s return cannot be long delayed. All the major “signs” are rapidly coming to fruition. Russia’s sphere of influence is stealthily extending over the nations north of Israel, identifying her still more clearly as the King of the North. On the other hand, America, with her “allies” is establishing herself as the King of the South. Her recent treaty with Saudi Arabia which granted facilities for a U.S. military base in that land is not without significance. Here, symbolised by these two kings, are the two great protagonists, of which the Prophets speak so clearly. When these join battle, then the “time of the end” has indeed come.

In considering these things the mind can easily be dulled by familiarity, so robbing the “signs” of their power. One wonders what would be the reaction of those four disciples John, Peter, James and Andrew were they able to come back to life at the present time. It was they who posed the question to Jesus—

“Tell us, what shall be the sign of thy coming and of the end of the world?”

To find that, after a long span of some 1930 years the eyes of all mankind are focussed on the lands of the Bible and that men everywhere are fearful lest a “spark” should trigger an atomic war, would be an experience filling them with awe and anticipation, recalling the words of their Master—

“For then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no nor ever shall be.

And except those days should be shortened there should no flesh be saved : but for the elect's sake those days shall be shortened."

These words have taken on a new meaning in recent times. Twenty years ago there were no atom bombs, no guided missiles and no nuclear fission : the possibility of a time of trouble wherein "there should no flesh be saved" seemed remote. Not so today ! Every nation in the world is haunted by the real fear of an atomic war with consequences too hideous to contemplate.

"The King of the South shall push"

With reference to the wars between the King of the North and the King of the South, the prophet Daniel was informed—

"At the time of the end shall the king of the south push at him (the king of the north) ; and the king of the north shall come against him like a whirlwind . . ."

(Daniel 11 v. 40).

These are significant words. They reveal what is to "trigger" the great conflict between the mighty confederacies into which the world is now divided—namely, the "pushing" of the King of the South against the King of the North, provoking the latter to invade the land like a whirlwind. To this end, the nations are now moving. The Middle East is daily assuming greater importance in the eyes of governments and their statesmen. Mutual fear is compelling each King to woo the friendship and allegiance of the Middle Eastern States. Russia offers them armaments. America responds with the "Eisenhower Doctrine"—and her powerful Sixth Fleet ! A clash is inevitable. The "pushing" of the King of the South has already started. Sooner or later, he will be moved to push in earnest—and then . . .

J.R.M.

"Let us cut them off from being a Nation"

"Let us cut them off from being a nation ; that the name of Israel may be no more in remembrance."

(Psalm 83 v. 4).

The press reports in this country do not reveal how intense is the hatred of "Edom, Moab, and Ammon" towards Israel. The following are extracts from the Arab Press :—

"Soon we'll Dance in Tel Aviv"

A delegation of Egyptian artists came to Jordan to participate in the celebration marking the termination of the treaty with England. A correspondent of "A-Difa'a" interviewed the national dancer of Egypt, Tahiya Kiryuka, who said : "God willing, we shall

dance in the near future in Tel Aviv to entertain the Arab armies, after they enter that city in triumph.”

(“A-Difa’a,” Jordan daily, 17 March)

“We retook Gaza—and we shall retake Palestine”

Gaza has returned to us. It is not America who has restored it to us, and not Russia, and not even the U.N. It is the people of Gaza themselves who returned Gaza to us. It is we who returned Gaza—by closing the Suez Canal ; by cutting off the oil supplies ; by our coolness and our stubbornness ; by the proclamations of our rulers ; by our positive neutralism. It is our neutralism that sobered America and brought Russia to our service. It is we who retook Gaza—and it is we who shall retake Palestine.

(“Falastin,” Jordan daily, 7 March).

“Arab armies ready to teach Israel a Lesson”

A Jordanian source said on 14 March that the armies of the emancipated Arab states are standing by for any order from their great commander, so as to teach Israel a lesson.

(Radio Damascus, 14 March).

Ready for all-out War

The Prime Minister of Jordan, Suleiman el-Nabulsi, said that the Arabs are ready to launch an all-out war in order to prevent the internationalisation of the Gaza Strip.

(Radio Baghdad, 16 March).

News from the Ecclesias

Beeston (Notts.): Adult School Room, Acacia Walk, Beeston. Sundays: Breaking of Bread 11.0 a.m. Sunday School, 2.0 p.m. Bible Class 3.0 p.m. Thursdays 7.45 at the People’s Hall.

A profitable time was spent at the Fraternal Gathering at Manchester on April 22nd with those also striving to uphold the purity of the Father’s House in these closing days.

We all felt uplifted, and rejoiced together in the foretaste of the joys which are to endure throughout the ages of eternity—if only we can be “victors.”

It has been our sad duty to withdraw fellowship from Bro. and Sister C. J. Miller and also from Sister L. E. Brewer for condoning their transgression.

H.J.S.

Criccieth, Pentrip, Black Rock, Portmadoc. Sundays: Breaking of Bread 11.0 a.m. Revelation Study 3.0 p.m.

We have been glad to receive the company of Brother and Sister Butterfield at our lecture in Portmadoc on March 30th and also

on the following Sunday morning. Six strangers attended the lecture, four having been to the previous lectures, and contact with two continues each week.

per J.R.M.

Eden, New York. Grange Hall, Church Street. Sundays: Breaking of Bread 11.15 a.m. Sunday School 10.0 a.m. Revelation Study 1.30 p.m. Bible Class: Midweek, alternately in Forestville and Hamburg.

Interests in Springfield, Massachusetts, continue in correspondence; there are also other responses to the invitation to write for "THE REMNANT." We are encouraged to reach out with this invitation to other localities.

Sister Dean has rejoiced in the expressions of love from the brethren and sisters, and though not well, she has undertaken contact with Christadelphians, in hope of showing them the seriousness of their position. In her many trials, she will lean heavily on the coming alongside of every one of us.

We are grateful for the encouragement known in The Body, for it especially speaks of the care of the Father.

J.A.DeF.

Manchester. Memorial Hall, Albert Square, Manchester. Sundays: Breaking of Bread 11.30 a.m. Lecture 3.15 p.m. Thursdays 7.15 p.m. at Onward Hall, Deansgate. Law of Moses Class: Second Saturday each month at 3.30 p.m.

The volume of correspondence which has arisen as a result of the articles on the "History of the Truth in the Latter Days" has been very considerable and as a result delay has occurred in dealing with some of the letters. Every endeavour is being made to satisfy from the Word all enquiries, a very onerous work and one of vital importance.

There is some promising interest in one or two quarters and every effort is being made to help those minds which are seeking Him to find Him.

Monday, April 22nd, was the occasion of the Fraternal Gathering when a most enjoyable and profitable time was spent. Visitors were present from most ecclesias. It was felt to be a privilege to be present and to have the sublime contemplation before us of—"At the name of Jesus every knee shall bow." It was heartening to receive a message of greeting from those in the States. Afterwards cables were sent in reply and also to Canada.

W.V.B.