

SEPTEMBER 1971

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

LIGHT AND SHADE OF THE TRUTH'S HISTORY (2)

SIGNS OF HIS COMING AND OF THE END OF THE WORLD

CORRESPONDENCE

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

### “WHATSOEVER THINGS WERE WRITTEN AFORETIME”

**WE ARE AGAIN PRIVILEGED** to listen to the Apostle Paul's words to our brethren in Rome. He wrote to comfort and strengthen as they faced the trials and temptations this life brings to those who are struggling to obey God, to get the victory over their flesh and its lusts ; for we find that the struggle is as difficult today as it was in Paul's day ; indeed, as it has been since Adam. It is severe—a matter of life and death for us. To help, we can go back to Moses, speaking to Israel, Deuteronomy 30 : 14, 15 :

“But the word is very nigh unto thee, in thy mouth, and in thy heart, that thou mayest do it. See, I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil.”

His Word *is* very near unto us. His Word is that which in His love and mercy reveals for us the way of life. It is given of God for those who seek to please Him. He said to Israel, it is “very nigh.” Is it close to us, brethren and sisters, near enough to our heart so that in difficult circumstances we turn to it for instruction and strength ? In verse 19, we read further :

“I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing : therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live.”

Are we not helped to choose life by the Word if it is nigh unto us ? This was true in Moses' day, in Paul's day, as it is in our day. Is it not a marvellous thing that God has not only set before us a choice, indeed a chance of life, but also grants His Word as well as a source of strength so near for us, that helps us choose and attain life. We must realise it is not a matter of choosing once and that is the end of the matter ; but rather a life of struggle to escape death, of choosing each day, which way ? How great is His provision that His Word is “very nigh” to help in this daily struggle.

### “WERE WRITTEN FOR OUR LEARNING”

With the grace of God in this provision in mind, let us turn to Paul's words in Romans 15 : 4 :

“For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope.”

God knows how needful hope is in our unending struggle to choose life. At times, the effort seems hopeless, for we fail so often. We may ask “How can we find hope ?” The answer is given through Paul's words, “through patience and comfort of the scriptures.”

They were caused to be written aforetime in God's mercy, in His knowledge of how much we need that hope.

As an example, we read in I. Corinthians 8 : 9, 10 :

“For it is written in the law of Moses. Thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn. Doth God take care for oxen ? Or saith he it altogether for our sakes ? *For our sakes, no doubt, this is written* : that he that ploweth should plow in hope ; and that he that thresheth in hope should be partaker of his hope.”

*For our sakes*, brethren and sisters. The ox was not muzzled so that he might eat of the corn he was threshing, that he might know there was reward for which he was labouring. God's mercy is like that. He gives us hope ; He lets us look unto the end of His purpose and gives us the inspiration and incentive to partake of that purpose.

As we read, therefore, “Thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn,” we are helped as we learn of God's mercy. The things written aforetime are for our learning. Do we learn ? Are we instructed ? Do these things teach us ? If so, we will grow in the joy of our hope.

To further help, Paul writes in II. Timothy 3 : 14, words which are very familiar to us ; but as we are instructed in God's mercy, perhaps they take on greater meaning. Paul wrote to his beloved Timothy :

“But continue thou in the things which thou hast learned and hast been assured of, knowing of whom thou hast learned them.”

They were learned of God, by His Spirit. For what purpose ? That we might profit, for verses 16 and 17 tell us :

“All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness : That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.”

This is God's desire—that those seeking to serve Him may become perfect. It is our hope and we are helped toward it by those things “written aforetime.” They are profitable, Paul tells us, in several ways.

**FOR DOCTRINE** : “*Doctrine*”, we find, is used as “*to learn*”, “*to teach*”, and is the same word used in Romans 15 : 4, “written for our *learning*”. We have never finished learning. If we feel we have learned enough, we have failed to be instructed by the

scriptures. We have the example of our brethren of old who were caused to profit throughout all their lives in their struggling to be perfect—through these same scriptures we are reading.

**FOR REPROOF:** “*Reproof*” means “*to correct*”, “*to convince*”, “*to tell a fault*”. How often we need reproof, and in God’s wisdom and Fatherly love, He tells us our faults. For what reason? That we may perceive the need for change from our ways which do not please Him. Sadly, He must often tell us again and again, sometimes with great sorrow and prolonged tribulation, for we are loathe to condemn ourselves and to search out the darkness. How blessed we are, brethren and sisters, that we have a patient Father who loves us enough to reprove through His Word.

**FOR INSTRUCTION IN RIGHTEOUSNESS:** “Instruction gives the thought of “to chasten”, “to train up a child”, “to nurture”. God knows that we, as children need nurturing in righteousness. He knows there is “none righteous, no not one” naturally, and so to help us, He instructs through the things “written aforetime”. There, we perceive the reward of those striving to be righteous and the punishment of those turning their backs upon righteousness. We see, too, those like Abraham, whose faith was accounted unto him for righteousness. It gives us hope that we, too, can be accounted righteous if our faith is strong, if, in present circumstances, we can apply His Word for instruction in righteousness.

### **“THAT THE MAN OF GOD MAY BE PERFECT”**

All this, Paul tells us is granted to us “that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.” “Furnished”, we find, means “equipped”. God *alone* knows what is needed to make each of us a perfect man, and so is working through His Word to give us what is required. He opens up to us from His Word all that is needed in our struggle to overcome our natural man and grow toward the image of the perfect man, Christ.

Can we see why Paul writes to us in Romans 15 : 4 :

“For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope.”

Do we know the patience and comfort of the scriptures? Are they close to us, alive in our heart, real in our living? If so, we can have hope. *Patience*, we know, involves an enduring under whatever God places upon us. How difficult it is to endure under trial; naturally we want to throw it off as a grievous burden. But, if we learn through the patience taught in the scriptures, we can bear much in the

searching and waiting for God to reveal His purpose in the trial upon us.

“*Comfort*”, we find, comes from a root meaning “*to call near*”, and is used, also, as consolation. In II. Corinthians 1 :3, 4, Paul writes of our Father :

“ . . . *the God of all comfort* ; who comforteth us in all our tribulation, that we may be able to comfort them which are in any trouble, by the comfort wherewith we ourselves are comforted of God.”

As we know the comfort of God from the Scriptures, from His Hand working on our behalf, we are strengthened in our struggle to overcome.

Let us go back once more to Paul’s words in Romans 15 : 4, where he shows us that all those things were written aforetime “that we . . . might have hope.” If we read these Scriptures each day with a seeking heart, they become alive, filling our hearts with resolve and hope for the fulfilment of the promises given of a gracious God—“the Hope of Israel”—the only Hope in this world which is sure.

Let us, then, lift up our heads for the redemption, which is our Hope, “draweth nigh.”

J. A. DeF.

---

## “Light and Shade of the Truth’s History”

*Published by the Dawn Christadelphians*

### Part 2

IT IS PROPOSED in this article to examine the above booklet in more detail as promised in our previous issue : to point out the many incorrect statements and to answer the criticisms which have been made against us.

Before doing so may the thought be repeated that the booklet is condemned by its own title : “Light and Shade of the Truth’s History.” The Scriptures never speak in this way but only of *light* and *darkness*. Those who will not repent of error “walk in darkness”, wherein is no hope unless they do repent. To suggest they may be in the “*shade*”, shows there is no conviction on the part of the author that error is *darkness* in contrast to *the Truth* which is *light*. How inconsistent is the author when in the booklet, in the first part which was written by another author, it is clearly stated :

“Error, or *darkness*, and practice which is contrary to his mind, alienates from God’s fellowship.”

We would invite the present author to reconsider his position, and to state clearly whether he believes that error *is darkness* and alienates from God’s fellowship. We need not ask him if this deprives such an one of hope !

The general reader may feel that to publish these matters is of no particular interest and perhaps tedious, but if he is alerted to the importance of the doctrine of fellowship, and how the Truth has been lost through failure to observe this doctrine, then much good will result. To this end we would invite him to consider carefully the booklets which we publish : “The History of the Truth in the Latter Days”, and “The Doctrine of Fellowship.”

Now may we invite attention to five major errors of incorrect statements which appear in the booklet as careful examination will show.

### ERROR NUMBER ONE

#### THE ERROR OF STATING THE FIRST DECLENSION WAS THAT CAUSED BY THE “CLEAN FLESH” HERESY

It is surprising that a booklet which claims to be dealing with the Truth’s history should have left out a previous division that had such an important bearing on the upholding of the doctrine of fellowship.

The first division was caused by the failure on the part of the Ecclesia in Edinburgh in 1865 to withdraw from those who had come to advocate the doctrine of eternal torments, and also were not definite as to whether man possessed an immortal soul. Robert Roberts was only young at the time (age 25) and this was his first experience in dealing with error on a major scale. He hesitated, but not so Dr. Thomas. Indeed, there was a danger of a breach between them. Relationship was so strained that a son born to Robert Roberts should have been called John Thomas Roberts but was given another name. It is refreshing and spiritually invigorating to see how this matter was finally settled by the powerful and trenchant writing of Dr. Thomas to Robert Roberts. Excerpts will show his decisive and definite stand. He persuaded Robert Roberts to take up a similar position against the Dowieites in Edinburgh—called by this name because of their following a leader by the name of George Dowie—

“I, for one, know no one in this warfare as a *brother* and friend who is neutral or not gathering.

“They may virtually acquiesce in the theory of the truth, but can we call them friends and *brethren*? Are they Christ’s *brethren*? How can they be seeing Christ is the truth? If they were Christ’s brethren, they would love the zealous and disinterested advocates of the Truth, and would be careful to do nothing that would embarrass them.

Shall I call such enemies of Christ my friends and *brethren*? I tell you, *nay*.”

Let it be remembered that these had been in fellowship with those in the Truth, and were ultimately withdrawn from by an ecclesial resolution in Birmingham, which in due time was communicated to the said George Dowie. According to Dr. Thomas they were not to be regarded any more as “*brethren*”. Quite contrary to the contention put forward by the author of the above booklet and his colleagues. May it be asked on which side is the *Dawn*, with Dr. Thomas or against him in this matter?

## ERROR NUMBER TWO

### THE ERROR OF SAYING PEMBERTON’S REPENTANCE OF THEIR WICKED RESOLUTION WAS SINCERE

The Pemberton Ecclesia in 1933 passed a resolution that sisters could speak at Business Meetings, and “ask questions at the Bible Class through the medium of paper.” This manifest defiance of the teaching of the Spirit caused a Division. Following a visit of two from Clapham (then the leading Ecclesia of the *Bereans* subsequently known as the *Dawn*) and the gift of “ten pounds from a brother who desired to remain anonymous”, they were persuaded to rescind this wicked resolution as follows:

“As so much trouble has been caused on the question of Sisters speaking in the assemblies of the saints, We, the Pemberton Ecclesia, having carefully weighed over all the evidence brought to our notice, and desiring to obey the Word, wish to express ourselves as follows:

Whatever may have been our position in the past, and whatever ideas may have been advanced, in interviews with brethren at any time, we now believe that the Scriptural command of the Apostle Paul forbids Sisters speaking in the mixed assemblies of the Saints, including Business Meetings, and Bible Classes, but questions and suggestions may be submitted through a brother, and this we are prepared to uphold.”

The booklet makes the claim that this expressed “sincerity of repentance” page 42.

But where is the evidence of such "*sincerity of repentance*" ?

Was the resolution a sin ?

Where is the confession of such a grievous sin ? Where the sorrow ?

Where the evidence of true repentance as required by the Scriptures in confessing of a wrong done, and upholding of the right, and a vindication of those who stood for the right at the time of the Division ?

There is not a shred of evidence of this kind. As G. W. Park of the *Dawn* wrote recently, it was a "form of repentance", but such is not godly repentance. A form is merely the letter ; not the Spirit. Where so great a sin as a denial of God's Word has been committed repentance requires as the Apostle Paul says in writing to the brethren in Corinth :

"For behold this selfsame thing, that ye sorrowed after a godly sort, what *carefulness* it wrought in you, yea, what *clearing* of yourselves, yea, what *indignation*, yea, what *fear*, yea what *vehement desire*, what *zeal*, yea, what *revenge!* In all things ye have approved yourselves to be clear in this matter." (II. Corinthians 7 : 11).

Instead of such a godly "clearing" of their sin, Pemberton were induced by Clapham to do nothing more than make a "form" of repentance, which was like daubing the wall protecting the Truth with untempered mortar. It could not stand examination. It will not stand examination now.

If we have overlooked any proof that there was sincerity of repentance then let it be produced for all to see.

### ERROR NUMBER THREE

#### THE ERROR OF CLAIMING THAT CLAPHAM (DAWN) HAS ALWAYS BEEN CONSISTENT

The booklet states that the leader of Clapham (F.G.J. on page 43) :

"Believed it possible that those on the 'right hand' in the Day of Judgment will include some from each of the divisions which have taken place in the brotherhood, notwithstanding their present separation.

"Now Bro. Jannaway, during a long probation contended earnestly for the faith . . . He never failed to discharge the duty of withdrawing fellowship from teachers of error . . .

But he was not prepared to pass final judgment on the position of such in the day of account. This is the prerogative of the Lord himself."

Yet as shown in the previous article the same leader had just said the opposite on a previous occasion. The omitted part of his statement was :

"When I first embraced the Truth in 1875 . . . the community was known as Christadelphians . . . In those far off days, to withdraw, or be withdrawn from that community whose headquarters were in Birmingham was in the mind of the writer to be outside the One Body of Christ.

"This division of the original Body has led me to take a *wider* view than I did in 1875."

The omitted part of his statement as shown in the foregoing, shows how false is the author's claim that the *Dawn* in its history has been consistent. Clearly the leader of whom he speaks "during a long probation contended earnestly for the Faith" obviously changed his mind. If he were correct in his first view of fellowship then obviously he was wrong in the second. The claim to consistency is false.

Again the same applies to the author's quotation of Robert Roberts who on one occasion said, when asked why he refused to call those "brethren" guilty at the time of the division over the heresy of "clean flesh" said :

"We have no wish to be harsh or discourteous. The men referred to have had a certain standing in the Truth by their former profession. 'Mr.' would conceal this. Yet their present position being one of 'renunciation' of what they believe, they cannot be called brother without implying that the doctrine of the sacrifice of Christ is of no importance. We take the middle ground of simply using their natural names when there is occasion to refer to them, after the apostolic fashion illustrated in Paul's allusion to Phygellus and Hermogenes."

And this is precisely our stand. Perhaps the author will now acknowledge that his criticism of us, is precisely the same as made by the adversary against Robert Roberts. The statement which he makes on page 46 :

"Our position was and is one that we have always maintained. It is the same position exactly as Bro. Roberts and those who stood with him through divisions maintained."

Clearly this is not true. Perhaps the author will consider what we have written and make a suitable correction.

ERROR NUMBER FOUR

THE ERROR OF SAYING THE REBEL MUST STILL BE CALLED  
"BROTHER", OR ELSE HOW COULD HE RETURN TO THE  
BODY IF HE REPENTED. (PAGE 46)

The author states :

"When someone from whom they have withdrawn (that is ourselves) goes back to them, how do they get into Christ again? There is only one Scriptural means of getting into Christ, that is by baptism following a good confession of the faith."

This is a plausible argument but not a correct one. Let us look at the words Jesus uses in dealing with transgressors :

"Moreover if thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone : if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother.

"But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established.

"And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the Ecclesia; but if he neglect to hear the Ecclesia, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican." (Matthew 18 : 15-17).

It is clear that when a rebel has refused the three appeals to repent, including two admonitions first by the "witnesses" and then by the "Ecclesia", he must be withdrawn from. Then he is to be regarded as "an heathen man and a publican." The author should know that the unrepentant transgressor is in *darkness* and not in the *shade*, whatever this means. In such a position there is no hope. You cannot address "heathen men and publicans" as brethren without doing exactly what Robert Roberts says, that is, by implying that their wrong doctrine or practice is of no importance. Only those can be spoken of as "brethren", Jesus says, "who do the will of my Father which is in heaven". Such transgressors are in the same position as those in the days of Israel who were put outside the camp, where they knew that there was no hope unless they were allowed to return. Withdrawal, where the correct steps have been followed, is a suspended sentence ; to be ratified by Jesus at His return unless there is repentance. They are still responsible to the Judgment, and as Robert Roberts says "a brother is always a brother, in the technical sense, till the Lord cut him off at the Judgment Seat ; but if he depart from the faith, *the term ceases to be a convenient description of him.*" Such is our stand as it was with the original Christadelphian teaching. If a transgressor

in this case is permitted to return to the Body by showing true repentance then, and only then, does the term "brother" become a scriptural means of addressing him. It is hoped these remarks will show clearly that there is no problem of how one who is withdrawn from and no longer addressed as "brother" may "get into Christ again."

It really should not have been necessary to expound such a simple matter to those claiming to have the Truth; who say they believe in the commands given by Jesus for dealing with transgressors, yet with complete impunity dismiss the last of them. The author should either accept the whole of what Jesus says in this connection, or like the *Advocate* and *Suffolk Street Groups* of Christadelphians reject all these commands and say that they will not withdraw from anyone. It is sad to see that those who once stood so strongly for the Truth should have become victims of their previous leader's false idea that there could be *division without death*.

Further, looking at the words of Jesus it is clear, that although we have not the Holy Spirit in these days to do miracles, Ecclesias who are faithful will be given guidance in the "binding and loosing". God will never allow anyone who desires to be right to perish.

If we are right in assuming who is referred to by the author as a "brother" and his wife who were wrongly withdrawn from in 1954, we would advise him to consult them when he will see how clearly the foregoing statement was proved to be true in their case.

Also in the other case referred to of a "sister" who is alleged to have been unfaithfully withdrawn from, if this should be the only point in any reader's mind wherein we have failed, we should be pleased to give more facts than the author would seem to know.

Much has been made of those who fall away from the Truth and desire to take the edge off the sword of the Spirit at the time of withdrawal, by saying :

"Yet count him not as an enemy but admonish him as a brother." (II. Thessalonians 3 : 15).

This contention can easily be proved to be wrong. Does the author feel it would be right to continue to admonish those who once had the Truth, who become magistrates, J.P.'s, join the Police Force and the Army, Catholics, etc. ? How dishonouring this would be to God ! The explanation to what appears to be a difficulty is that if the commands of Christ in Matthew 18 be carefully considered there are two admonitions—first by the witnesses, and secondly by the Ecclesia. Where these have failed to gain the brother, then in the words of Jesus he is to be regarded as the outsider, confirmed

by the Apostle Paul who says :

“A man that is an heretick after the *first* and *second* admonition reject.” (Titus 3 : 10).

The Spirit does not approve of those who have come to hate God as being worthy of “admonition”. David expresses the mind of God in this respect when he says :

“I hate them with perfect hatred : I count them mine enemies.” (Psalm 139 : 22).

Those who are the enemies of God should be our enemies, as long as, and until they of their own account begin to make an approach in a truly repentant spirit.

### ERROR NUMBER FIVE

#### THE ERROR OF ALLEGING THAT WE ARE INCONSISTENT IN CERTAIN MATTERS, PARTICULARLY IN THE DOCTRINE OF FELLOWSHIP

From the foregoing it should be clear whether we are trying to uphold the original Christadelphian position that withdrawal means a return of the one who is in error to darkness unless he repents. Also to address such an one as “brother” only leads to increasing apostasy, and finally to the re-uniting of those who have been separated with the condoning of all the errors which previous divisions have purged from the Body.

Those who left the Truth in 1865 over the Dowieite division, which, as we have seen, really involved the doctrine of fellowship on very important matters, were received with open arms by those who departed in 1873 over the nature of Christ. Later in 1885 in the Inspiration Division, remnants of these amalgamated and became known as Suffolk Street. Again in 1894 when there was the division over resurrectional responsibility a large number in the States who came to be known as the *Advocate Christadelphians* were prepared to receive any from the previous divisions without question. Most of these major groups of Christadelphians, comprising in the main Christadelphia today, openly state they do not believe in withdrawal. While professing in some instances to be followers of Robert Roberts they refute what they call “mass divisions”. Yet, it has only been by this means that the Truth has been preserved in these latter days. It will be clear to the discerning that what has happened to Christadelphia is but a repetition of that which took place shortly after the days of the Apostles.

By regarding all as *brethren* who have adopted the name of Christadelphian, and in some cases those that have not, it will be

seen that Christadelphia in one section or another embrace most of the errors of Christendom, so that apostasy has become complete.

In a town in the Midlands in England, one Christadelphian has become a J.P. and a Magistrate, and has co-operated in the development of a youth centre with Catholics, Presbyterians, Quakers and one other denomination. He has appeared on television in connection with this movement. Are these to be regarded as Christ's brethren? If so, then all in Christendom might as well be so regarded.

Amongst these Groups will be found all kinds of errors, contrary to the doctrine of Christ.

Belief in eternal torment ;

A supernatural devil as was upheld by the Dowieites ;

Christ not of our nature ;

The Bible not wholly inspired and infallible, but containing a human element liable to err.

Belief that those who had become responsible and were not baptised would never be raised.

Departure in doctrine always brings with it a worldliness, so that taken as a whole Christadelphia allows :

Alliance with the alien in commercial partnerships, marriage, shareholding ;

Divorce ;

Going to Law for the recovery of debts ;

Becoming Freemasons ;

Police Officers ;

Councillors ;

Soldiers ;

Worldly pleasures such as smoking, movies, theatres, Christmas festivities are prevalent, and honouring the dead with wreaths and flowers ;

Women in their dress and the "well set hair", and make up, show how far there has been departure from those who were the original Christadelphians.

The Scriptures make clear that once leaven is allowed to remain in the Body, then the whole will become leavened, and so it is not surprising that added to the foregoing dreadful list of things in which departure from the Truth is seen there has been in recent years still further evidence of this :

That the Creation account is only figurative, and that Adam was "only one of an existing multitude of peoples living at the time covered by the Creation narrative";

That the serpent was not literal.

It may be argued by some of the more strict groups that because they have withdrawn they do not partake of the evil seen in the above. Yet the tenuous connection is obvious by speaking of any in these various groups as "brethren". Our stand is with the original pioneers; with Dr. Thomas who said as we have seen:

"They may virtually acquiesce in the theory of the Truth, but can we call them friends and brethren? Are they Christ's brethren? How can they be, seeing Christ is the Truth? If they were Christ's brethren, they would love the zealous disinterested advocate of the Truth, and will be careful to do nothing that will embarrass them. Shall I call such enemies of Christ my friends and my brethren? I tell you nay."

And so say we in our endeavour to be consistent in upholding the doctrine of fellowship in its purity.

Perhaps some attention should be given to a point made against us, that at the time of the 1933 Division when Nottingham withdrew from those in Pemberton because they said sisters could speak at Business Meetings, etc., in a footnote on page 42 criticism is made of Nottingham of the senior class of the Sunday School at which sisters used to speak. The note made in the booklet is correct. It should be remembered that this class had grown out of what was originally only part of the Sunday School, but the matter was put right immediately at the time. However, there is a great deal of difference between slipping into a position like this and openly defying a commandment of Christ as did Pemberton.

While we do not wish to appear to be discounting one wrong by another, may we remind those who remember the 1923 Division that when they (Clapham) were dealing with Birmingham Temperance Hall because they condoned the fellowship of Police Constables, there was in their midst and had been for some time a Policeman!

This brings us to a very important point in connection with a division. Undoubtedly prior to it there is a departure in many respects, and the purpose of a division at any time is for the House of God to be set in order and a thorough cleansing to be made.

Those who experienced the 1923 Division will know that in America the main point was not condoning Service in the Constabulary that caused them to join the *Bereans* but, the "clean flesh"

heresy which was being promulgated in that country at that time largely in Buffalo by A. D. Strickler.

When the late Editor of the Christadelphians, C. C. Walker, visited Buffalo, he occupied the same platform as this heretic. Further at the time this same Editor said that he was "bereft on the question of fellowship." We believed him! And so there was much to put in order amongst those who stood for the right, and certainly there was not a feeling that we had always been right in all particulars. It was made clear at the time that the heresy of "Clean Flesh" must be expunged from the Body. That certain practices which had been condoned should cease, which we came to see as mentioned before, were wrong and displeasing in the sight of God.

Looking back it will be seen that God was very merciful in not cutting us all off, but by bringing about a division enabled us to remove from the Body those elements which were a denial of Him, and gave us the opportunity to put ourselves right in many particulars.

This is our answer to the point made in the booklet against us, that while prior to 1933 we spoke of those who were not in fellowship with us as "brethren", why we did not and do not regard our baptism into what was then the Body as invalid. When we were shown by the Division of how much wrong in which we had been involved, this made us determined not only to expel false doctrine but to put ourselves in order as before God.

Much capital is attempted to be made by quoting what the writer said concerning the 1954 Division in the booklet "An Appendix to the 'History of the Truth in the Latter Days'." Therein it was mentioned that there had grown up in the Nottingham Ecclesia a spirit of Nicolaitanism, and that the leader was mainly responsible for this which Jesus hates. From 1933 to 1954 is twenty one years. This leader had not always been guilty of Nicolaitanism. It was something that gradually developed over a period of time, and which was controlled to a certain extent by the efforts of those who wished to uphold the right. Finally, as in all matters that are against God, the wrong is revealed to be dealt with and that is why the 1954 Division took place.

### CONCLUSION

Apologies are made to our general readers for having taken them over a ground which may be unfamiliar to them and perhaps of little interest. However, if it helps them to see how apostasy can grow and eventually destroy the Truth, it will have certainly served a very useful purpose.

Regarding the booklet with which we are dealing, from the foregoing it will be seen clearly that mistakes and errors pervade most of its pages. So far we have heard nothing from its author. If we had his address we would make sure that he had a copy of this issue and the previous one dealing with the booklet. However, as seen in last month's issue we have been unable to obtain his address after three attempts. It is hoped that many of those who are with him, and will see the two issues that have dealt with his booklet will be stirred to take the right stand in the matter of the doctrine of fellowship, and realise the falsity that there can be *division without death*.

Further, to speak of other Groups as "fellowships" is obviously wrong as the Scriptures say there is only *one* fellowship. To regard the members of these Groups with their widespread errors as "brethren" gives the tenuous connection with them after the pattern of Christendom, wherein members of the many divided sects still look upon their fellow "Christians" as brethren and speak of them in that way. The work of Dr. Thomas under the hand of God in delivering the Truth from the darkness of the apostasy has been undermined, but as far as we are concerned we shall endeavour to uphold it even if our ranks are thinned in the process. The day of reward is near at hand when those who have suffered because of the stand taken for the upholding of the Truth will be vindicated. In this hope we go forward encouraged, trusting that our work will not be in vain in the Lord.

W.V.B.

---

## **"The Signs of His Coming and of the end of the World"**

**"TURN YOU AT MY REPROOF . . . I WILL MAKE KNOWN  
MY WORDS UNTO YOU.**

**"BECAUSE I HAVE CALLED, AND YE REFUSED; I HAVE  
STRETCHED OUT MY HAND, AND NO MAN REGARDED;  
"BUT YE HAVE SET AT NOUGHT ALL MY COUNSEL, AND  
WOULD NONE OF MY REPROOF; . . .**

**"THEREFORE SHALL THEY EAT OF THE FRUIT OF THEIR  
OWN WAY." (Proverbs 1: 23/31).**

**H**OW TRULY THE ABOVE PROPHECY is fulfilled, and the warning vindicated and justified by a changed environment accepted by the young without complaint because they have experienced nothing better.

Cobbett writing from North Shields on the 2nd October, 1832, made the following observation :

“These sides of the Tyne are very fine : corn fields, woods, pastures, villages, a church every four miles, or thereabouts, cows and sheep beautiful ; oak trees, though none very large; and, in short, a fertile and beautiful country, wanting only the gardens and the vine covered cottages that so beautify the counties in the south and west. All the buildings are of stone. Here are coal works and railways every now and then. The working people seem to be very well off ; their dwellings solid and clean, and their furniture good ; but the little gardens and orchards are wanting. The farms are all large ; and the people who work on them either live in the farm house, or in buildings appertaining to the farm house ; and they are all well fed . . . ”

(“*Cobbett in Northumberland*”—1832)

Less than one and a half centuries have elapsed since the above words were written and what a change has taken place. The leisurely pace of that age has gone for ever from the present dispensation. If the men of those times, or the men of former ages could be suddenly transported to the present how startled they would be and how affected by the lack of tranquility. Would Abraham prefer the present to the comparative peacefulness of his nomadic life as he slowly followed his grazing flocks and herds ? As he breathed in the atmosphere of the modern city would he find it bearable ?

This so-called age of advancement has brought into being sprawling built-up areas, far removed from an existence that was formally always close to the natural surroundings of the creation with simple pleasures and delights that such an existence afforded.

Fifty per cent of Britain's population is now living in the great conurbations of London, Birmingham, Glasgow, Liverpool, Manchester, Leeds and Newcastle. Conditions are crowded, made more so by the post-war skyscraper blocks of flats that have been built. Figures show that Britain has fifty per cent more people to the square mile than the so-called over populated India. In the United States a similar trend is seen in New York, Chicago, Philadelphia and San Francisco.

These man-made monstrosities are bringing about pollution in more ways than one. When Councils belatedly plant a few trees to bring a little colour, and a token of the countryside into the grey aspect of city life, very often youths and children break down or pull up the saplings by the roots. This is called “vandalism”, but the basic fact is that some among the younger generation have no appreciation whatsoever of such beautiful things. Their only hori-

zon from infancy has been red brick walls and slate or tiled roofs, the grey of the pavements, and the roar of traffic belching out its fumes. Last year in England and Wales the number of violent crimes rose by almost ten per cent. Drinking, drugs and gambling, so much an aspect of what city life offers, would be a contributing factor to such an increase.

A cry has recently been raised about the decaying environment. It reads as follows :

“Today, our environment is changing faster than ever before —for the worse. Look around you : the cities sprawl further into the countryside, eating up agricultural and recreational land. The roads are filled nose-to-tail with tin, and the air with exhaust. Holiday areas shrink, and are devalued by over use. Industrial effluents pollute our air and rivers. Wildlife disappears because it has nowhere to go. The beauty we have inherited from the past is destroyed. There is more dirt, more noise, more waste. We make feeble attempts to stem the tide, but they are piecemeal and temporary. We must realise that the problems are not isolated ; they are all symptoms of a general and accelerating decay in our physical surroundings.

“ . . . . Our expanding population demands more and more material goods. Because we are pre-occupied with an increasing Gross National Product as the be-all and end-all of national progress, the economic system seeks to satisfy this demand with scant regard to the results. It is insane to pursue material wealth without considering the effect on the environment. The combination of rising population and blind greed account for the present bleak outlook.”

Pollution *is* undoubtedly great. Recent months has seen the ruination of beaches and the deaths of thousands of seabirds by floating oil. Pollution in rivers and the excrement found on some beaches are a disgrace. One example of river pollution is the Trent, Britain's third largest river that flows in a semi-circle from Stoke through Burton, Nottingham, Newark and Gainsborough down to the Humber, draining over 4,000 square miles, collecting the rain water from seven counties. Nearly five and a half million people live along the course of this river but they cannot drink its water. It is the most polluted large river in Britain ; indeed except for the Rhine in Germany, the worst in Europe. Once beautiful and full of fish it is now a stinking open drain and virtually dead.

Man could gradually change his ways, but he is captured by his own greed and indifference, the beggarly elements of his nature, which only the higher wisdom can control.

Hence motorway noise, airport disturbance, the poisoning of rivers, pollution of the sea where life has fallen by forty per cent in the last twenty years. Even remote Norwegian fjords have been affected. In the cities the air reeks with the emissions from mens' vehicles ; and this kind of pollution has been seen at its worst in the exhaust smogs experienced in Los Angeles and Tokyo. The disposal of radio active waste and of biological weapons also creates a hazard.

Even man's food is contaminated. Man is being poisoned by additives and non-essential medicines. Some have voiced the fear that if the present trend continues the next decade will see almost every person in the developed countries on daily drugs—because he is either over-anxious, over-weight or over-indulgent. Man is already consuming ever-increasing numbers of food additives and food substitutes. The long term effect of these, particularly on the cells of vital organs are not known, but this is undoubtedly internal pollution when compared with the wholesome food that could be partaken of at one time.

What does the future hold out for man, apart from the threat of war ? The answer seems to be increasing air and water pollution, traffic congestion, noise, gambling, crime, promiscuity, riot and civil commotion, racial problems and deterioration in animal and plant life. Ecological breakdowns of soil and water can be expected. As one scientist told an international conference "human life may become impossible in a decade or so." Plagues of new diseases may emerge which present medicines will not be able to cure. As one magazine expressed it, "within a generation, it may be all over for man."

Are these thoughts far fetched ? The scriptures indicate they are not, for God is to "shorten the days" to save some. Meanwhile men

“ . . . shall eat of the fruit of their own way, and be filled with their own devices.”

D.L.

## Correspondence

*Letter from J. Mansfield, New South Wales :*

“Your kindly letter directed to my Son James has been passed on to me and in accordance with your request in your letter of 22nd July, I wish to inform you that my brother Perce is the Editor of the ‘Logos’.

“From time to time I have seen your excellent Magazine and I respect the content of the articles I have read.

“If you will send a copy to the above address, same will be much appreciated.

“The Brotherhood appears to be in such a state that it is very essential in the interest of the Cause of Christ for Magazines such as yours to set the standard of Truth high to the glory of God and the well-being of His people.”

### REPLY :

Gratitude is felt for the appreciation contained in this letter. We would that our correspondent and those with him in the support of the “Logos”—a Magazine which seems to have more drive towards purity of doctrine than most—would consider the all-important question : “Who is my brother ?” And the doctrine of fellowship involved in this question. Maybe this issue will help in this matter. We hope so. W.V.B.

---

## News from the Ecclesias

*EDEN, NEW YORK :* Grange Hall, Church Street.

Sundays : Breaking of Bread 11-30 a.m. Sunday School 1-30 p.m. Bible Class : Midweek, Forestville, Buffalo, Hamburg and Orchard Park. Alternate week : Revelation Study.

The Sunday School outing is planned, God willing, for September 18 in Chestnut Ridge Park.

By the time this is in print, the blessing of personal contact with those striving to go up to Zion together will be over, having provided strength to go on in the hope of pleasing God.

J.A.DeF.

“PENTRIP”, Black Rock, Portmadoc.

Breaking of Bread : Sundays, 11-30 a.m.  
Revelation Study : Mid-week.

During the month of July we have been pleased to have the company of Bro. and Sis. G. Butterfield and Bro. J. Smith who ministered to us on July 11th. Then on July 18th Bro. S. Lancaster and Bro. and Sis. D. Lancaster with the family. Much help was received.

We were sorry that Bro. S. Lancaster was taken seriously ill suddenly during the week.

This was a time of great anxiety, but as we look back, we can see the Divine protection for His people, and we are grateful and thankful that progress is being made.

We believe that the unusually good summer weather has benefited all this month, and we now greatly anticipate the company of our American visitors.

—per J.S.

---

**MANCHESTER** : Memorial Hall, M.A.P.S. Building, Albert Sq., Manchester.

Sundays : Breaking of Bread, 11-30 a.m. Lecture, 3-30 p.m. Tuesdays : Bible Class, 7-15 p.m., Onward Hall, Deansgate.

On August 4th, brethren and sisters welcomed Bro. and Sis. DeFries from Eden, N.Y. Their much anticipated visit has already proved most beneficial ; helping in the work of comforting and correcting, so that we all might come nearer to the “fulness of the stature of manhood in Christ Jesus”. This is a blessing indeed.

Bro. DeFries gave us valuable help on August 8th, exhorting in the morning and lecturing in the afternoon.

We are looking forward to the Fraternal Gathering in our own Hall on Monday, August 30th. Meeting 2 p.m., tea 4-30 p.m.

W.V.B.