

AUGUST 1988

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 that ye be not deceived"**

---

"AT THE TABLE OF THE LORD"

"A WITNESS AS SIGNIFIED BY THE LILIES"

"CHRISTADELPHIANS FOR UNITY"

"CORRESPONDENCE IN REPLY TO IS DISUNITY LOVE?"

"NEWS FROM THE ECCLESIAS"

---

**All Communications**

D. Lancaster  
227 Moston Lane East  
New Moston  
Manchester M40 3HY  
England

M. C. Steiger  
836 King Road  
Forestville  
New York 14062  
U.S.A.

AT THE TABLE OF THE LORD

*"MY PRESENCE SHALL GO WITH THEE..."*

**O**ver the past weeks we have been allowed, through our readings, to accompany Moses and Israel to Mount Sinai. It was here that Moses saw the burning bush, and God spoke out of that bush:

*"Come now therefore, and I will send thee unto Pharaoh, that thou mayest bring forth my people the children of Israel out of Egypt."*  
Exodus 3:10

As Moses seemed overwhelmed by the enormity of this work, God further encouraged him:

*"...Certainly I will be with thee;..."* Verse 12.

Here was God's purpose, His strength, His guiding help, without which Moses would be unable to do the work given. Further, our brother was given a promise to signify that it was the Almighty indeed who had sent him:

*"...When thou hast brought forth the people out of Egypt, ye shall serve God upon this mountain."*  
Exodus 3:12

And God then revealed His name: "I AM" — Yahweh, the Eternal, the One who was, who is, who will be, and will dwell in those who are His. Yahweh was indeed with Moses, with Aaron, and with His people as seen after He brought the plagues upon Egypt and blessing upon His people, putting a difference between them. He provided the passover lamb whose blood protected His people from the angel of death, and finally He brought them out of their Egyptian bondage.

Two months after this deliverance, Israel was led to Sinai. There Moses would remember with thanksgiving the Almighty's words: "... Ye shall serve God upon this mountain." Would he not rejoice in praising God, that what He had promised was fulfilled after so much anguish and turmoil? It was at Sinai that God's presence was seen in the fire, the cloud, the earthquake, thunder, and lightening, with the trumpet — all manifesting His awesome power. It was at Sinai that Moses went up into the cloud, and God again spoke, giving the law, the pattern for the tabernacle, and the two tables of testimony "written with the finger of God." How fearful, how wondrous! Yet how grateful he would feel. When God spoke just as He had promised, how carefully Moses would listen, and record the Almighty's

words which taught of His purpose to be accomplished in the Messiah to come

However, we know that when Moses came down from the mount he found that Aaron, listening to Israel's complaints, had made a golden calf saying:

"...These be thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt." Exodus 32:4

How dreadful — for they had seen with their eyes God's power bringing deliverance. How angry and discouraged Moses must have been at this idolatry, a denial of God's mercy and power on their behalf. How angry God was, ready to destroy Israel, saving only Moses. But Moses interceded, pleading for Israel and for the glory of God; in response the Almighty "repented", forgiving the people, but in righteous punishment He:

"...plagued the people, because they made the calf, which Aaron made." Exodus 32:35

To Moses He said:

"...go, lead the people...behold, mine Angel shall go before thee:..." Verse 34.

This Angel would lead as Israel resumed their journey to the land promised. Moses greatly needed this assurance after the distress and discouragement of Israel's failure.

As Moses felt, we too, Brethren and Sisters, may, upon occasion of failure and sadness, feel discouraged and overwhelmed. We could feel — "It's too much." Thus we sorely need His help and His guiding hand — His Angel with us — and are privileged to perceive this blessing at times. In the short view it may seem circumstances will never work out, but if we can see the bigger picture, as Moses had to do, we perceive His hand at work, and with trust believe that His Angel does encamp round about, and does go before to lead the way. Moses and Israel had tangible evidence of that presence twenty-four hours a day in the pillars of cloud and fire. His experience is given to establish our faith, though we do not see what Israel saw. God, however, warned Israel.

"...I will not go up in the midst of thee; for thou art a stiffnecked people: lest I consume thee in the way."

Exodus 33:3

## THE REMNANT

---

The Almighty will go before only those of a broken spirit and a tender heart — not with those who refuse to bow their heads. At this time also God said to stiffnecked Israel:

“...I will come up...and consume thee: therefore now put off thy ornaments from thee, that I may know what to do unto thee.”

Verse 5.

So the children of Israel stripped themselves of their ornaments. Why was this required? It was some of these which Aaron used to make the golden calf that they had desired. Would stripping off their ornaments be in part an acknowledgement of their failure to this idolatry and a submitting in repentance to God? After these sobering events:

“...Moses took the tabernacle, and pitched it without the camp ... and ... every one which sought the Lord went out unto the tabernacle of the congregation, which was without the camp.”

Exodus 33:7.

This was not THE tabernacle of the congregation, for it had not yet been built, being still in pattern form. Moses would not have taken the tabernacle outside the camp on his own initiative, but must have been so directed by the Almighty to impress upon Israel His displeasure. He was outside the camp because it was defiled by Israel's idolatry!

We read that as Moses left the camp to go to the tabernacle, Joshua accompanied him. It is remembered that Joshua had been with Moses on the mount, while Aaron and Israel made the golden idol. As they had gone up into the mountain, Moses had said to the elders:

“...Tarry ye here for us, until we come again unto you: and, behold, Aaron and Hur are with you: if any man have any matters to do, let him come unto them.”

Exodus 24:14.

Aaron and Hur were given the responsibility for Israel in the absence of Moses and Joshua. They failed in that responsibility, and with Israel made the idol. Thus Joshua being with Moses, was not involved in Israel's failure, and so could go with him outside the camp to the tabernacle. As Moses entered:

“...the cloudy pillar descended, and stood at the door of the tabernacle, and the Lord talked with Moses.”

Exodus 33:9

How did He talk with Moses?

“The Lord spake unto Moses face to face, as a man speaketh unto his friend.”  
Verse 11.

Face to face (or presence to presence), and as a friend. What an assurance this would be to Moses, what blessing — and what a sign it would be to Israel as they perceived the presence of God in the cloud, outside the camp with Moses and Joshua. It smote Israel, and realizing their precarious position:

“...all the people rose up and worshipped, every man in his tent door.”  
Verse 10.

True worshipping involved a yielding heart and a bowing of the head — no longer stiffnecked, but humbled before God, submitting to Him, acknowledging failure, and repenting of it.

Moses, blessed and justified in the sight of Israel, sought further help from his God:

“...if I have found grace in thy sight, shew me now thy way, that I may know thee,...and consider that this nation is thy people.”  
Verse 13.

Realizing what a great work was still ahead, and knowing his own frailty, Moses sought guidance for himself and his people. God’s response was very clear:

“...My presence shall go with thee, and I will give thee rest.”  
Verse 14

God’s presence (or face) would be with His friend Moses to whom He had spoken “face to face”. Moses found joy and strength in God’s assurance and replied:

“...wherein shall it be known here that I and thy people have found grace in thy sight? is it not in that thou goest with us? so shall we be separated ... from all the people that are upon the face of the earth.”

Verse 16.

**Separated** means putting a difference between, and also - a showing marvellous for. For all this, Moses was filled with wonder and thanksgiving. Indeed what other people had God’s presence? What other nation was

## THE REMNANT

---

so blessed? We are a small remnant today, Brethren and Sisters. Believing He is with us, and striving to remain close to Him and to be worthy, do we take quiet time to marvel at His separating us from all else — at His towardness to us? Can we make greater effort, putting all else aside, to be His friends as was Moses?

God had talked with Moses, earlier at the burning bush, and then in the cloud at Sinai. Also at the tabernacle outside the camp He spoke to him face to face. With these wondrous circumstances in mind, perhaps we can perceive more fully that grace expressed in God's instruction to Aaron through Moses:

“...On this wise ye shall bless the children of Israel, saying unto them, The Lord bless thee, and keep thee: The Lord make his face shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee: The Lord lift up his countenance upon thee, and give thee peace.”

Numbers 6:23-26.

This is the hope of Israel to be fulfilled in God's mercy, to those who are striving to be His friends. As Moses, uplifted by his experiences at Sinai, went on in the way God required, can we not, as we feel His presence, find inspiration and thus determination to carry out what He has given us to do?

*J. A. DeF.*

A WITNESS AS SIGNIFIED BY THE LILIES

**H**ow often the titles of the psalms help us to better understand and appreciate the pruned words recorded in their text. Such is the case of Psalm 80 entitled, "To the chief Musician upon Shoshannim-Eduth, A Psalm of Asaph." Here the title reminds us of the necessity of overcoming for it is directed to the victor, or the one who overcomes, which is the translation of, "To the chief Musician." The next part of the title, "upon Shoshannim-Eduth," translates as, "to become a witness as signified by the lilies." The final portion, "A Psalm of Asaph" conveys the thought of the Gatherer and implies the importance of contemplating the longed for time when Christ Jesus will gather unto Himself those who throughout their time of probation have above all desired and labored to be united with the Bridegroom.

With these thoughts in mind we may ask, was David trying to convey the importance of one valuing his place in the sight of God as well as recognizing the means to attain unto that end as verse 3 reveals?

"Turn us again, O God, and cause thy face to shine; and we shall be saved."

David realised he needed God's help because of the inherent weakness of his flesh, and when he did fail, he looked to God for forgiveness knowing He was the only means of salvation. However, in order to seek this help, David knew he must turn his living around and thus openly witness that he was frail and must seek the help of his Father. This thought is evident through the aspect of the title, "becoming a witness as signified by the lily". What great help this can be to us as we too struggle to be true witnesses of the gospel in our living.

When we think of a lily we normally think of the delicate greenhouse variety, white in color that appear for sale at Easter. Yet, at the time of David, the lilies that grew wild in the region of Israel were scarlet. The Bible Dictionary describes them as growing rapidly and luxuriantly in the regions of Lake Gennesaret, the valleys of Palestine, among thorny shrubs and in pastures and deserts. Solomon confirms the color of the lilies to be reddish in hue as he says in Song of Solomon 5:13:

"His cheeks are as a bed of spices, as sweet flowers: his lips like lilies, dropping sweet smelling myrrh."

The Lord Jesus also used the lilies as an example of Solomon's rich apparel which would be scarlet and purple denoting royalty, in Matthew 6:28-29:

"And why take ye thought for raiment? Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin: And yet I say unto you, That even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these."

The radiant color and beauty of the lilies, growing abundantly over the countryside without help from man, would speak eloquently of the majesty and power of God's hand.

We remember the plans for the temple of God given as a work to Solomon, David's son. Each aspect of this building was carefully described by God — there was no room for individual artistic interpretation, for each intricate detail told the story of the hope extended of an eternal dwelling place with God, for those who had faith to perceive it. We read of the work of Hiram of Tyre who was assigned the task of making the two brass pillars for the porch of the temple. The detailed design of these pillars and their chapters is described in I Kings 7:18-19:

"And he made the pillars, and two rows round about upon the one network, to cover the chapters that were upon the top, with pomegranates: and so did he for the other chapter.

And the chapters that were upon the top of the pillars were of lily work in the porch, four cubits."

And verses 21-22

"And he set up the pillars in the porch of the temple: and he set up the right pillar, and called the name thereof Jachin: and he set up the left pillar, and called the name thereof Boaz.

And upon the top of the pillars was lily work: so was the work of the pillars finished."

The two pillars which would immediately catch the eye as one looked at the temple were engraved at the top with the likeness of the lily. These two supports were given names, the one called Jachin which translates as, "shall establish" and the other Boaz or, "in it is strength". These two great brass pillars holding up His house would speak to the faithful of Israel that God's promise of an eternal dwelling for His people would be established in strength. The lilies adorning the tops of the pillars would speak of the witnessing required by any who would seek to enter into that house.

Hosea likewise in contemplation of God's promise to Israel described how God would look upon them if they would turn again to Him:

"I will be as the dew unto Israel: he shall grow as the lily, and cast forth his roots as Lebanon." (Hosea 14:5)

## THE REMNANT

---

How does the lily grow? Arrayed in vivid scarlet color, abundantly covering the hills and valleys of Israel, growing without cultivation or care, more beautiful than anything man can do.

Only the humble shall see the hope of life offered by Yahweh as verses 32 and 36 of Psalm 69 explains:

“The humble shall see this, and be glad: and your heart shall live that seek God.

The seed also of his servants shall inherit it: and they that love his name shall dwell therein.”

David reveals how one can make his life become the dwelling place of God if there is a witness to God through one's living as signified by the lilies which were set upon high in the pillars of God's temple. As there is meekness of spirit displayed and a yielding to His hand, there can be a lifting up by God through the perfect Witness who revealed to us that ability to overcome. David speaks of that Witness, the Lord Jesus Christ, as he says in this 80th Psalm verses 17-19:

“Let thy hand be upon the man of thy right hand, upon the son of man whom thou madest strong for thyself.

So will not we go back from thee: quicken us, and we will call upon thy name.

Turn us again, O LORD God of hosts, cause thy face to shine; and we shall be saved.”

*M.C.S.*

CHRISTADELPHIANS FOR UNITY

We have to hand a circular with a heading "The One Body (The Scriptural Doctrine of Unity)." Its introduction reads as follows:-

"There presently exists in North America a serious breach between the two main communities of Christadelphians, a breach which is well-nigh 100 years old. The Continental Reunion Committees of each fellowship have, for all practical purposes, ceased their efforts toward reconciliation. It would appear from this state of affairs that irreconcilable differences exist between Amended and Unamended Christadelphians.

"However, we believe a fundamental unity exists between the two "bodies". Consider the following facts:

1. Both "bodies" call themselves "Christadelphians".
2. Both trace their Christadelphian heritage through the same man, John Thomas, and both claim to represent the fruit of his labors.
3. Both read substantially the same books and publications.
4. Both use the same hymns.
5. Their statements of faith are nearly identical.
6. Both have nearly identical ecclesial organisations and practices of worship.
7. Members of one regularly address members of the other as "brother" and "sister".
8. In some areas, members of both bodies often meet together for Bible classes, lectures, and fraternal gatherings.
9. In some areas, members of both bodies frequently pray and study the Bible together.
10. If a member of one body marries a member of the other, neither is considered to have married an unbeliever.
11. Members of the two bodies work together for their common good before governments, with respect to such issues as conscientious objection.
12. And perhaps most telling of all, a member of one body may become a member of the other without having to be rebaptized; thus each body recognises the efficacy of the other's baptism.

"In view of these undeniable facts — and present appearances notwithstanding — we conclude that the two "bodies" are effectively the same, and part of the "one body" of Christ. Despite their respective — and inevitable — internal problems, each contains true brothers and sisters in Christ.

"It is to all the members of this divided Body that we direct the following thoughts, as an exposition and exhortation concerning the Scriptural doctrine of unity. We do not wish to ignore the problems that

stand in the way of reunion; they will most certainly be dealt with at the proper time. But we should deal with them in the spirit of love, and with a real grasp of the underlying principle that compels us toward reconciliation of the One Body of Christ.

"Let there be no strife, I pray thee, between me and thee ---for we be brethren" (Genesis 13:8)

"And if a house be divided against itself, that house cannot stand." (Mark 3:25)

"Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity." (Psalm 133:1)

### WHAT DOCTOR THOMAS SAID ABOUT THE ONE BODY

"The church was associated with the apostles in the ministry of reconciliation. By "the church", I mean, not that multiform thing called "the church" by the world in these times; but that one, undivided body of disciples, collected together by the personal labours of the apostles and evangelists; and all through subsequent generations, who should believe and practice **the same truth**. To this "**one body**", energised by the "**one spirit**", and "perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment", and styled "**THE BRIDE**" — is committed the work of making known "the manifold wisdom of God," as contained in the word; and of inviting the world to be reconciled to God. No member of this body is exempt from the obligation of co-operating in this work."

Our readers will realise that the present situation, for example in North America, is a contradiction of what Dr. Thomas said in the above words. The main division in America is between those who uphold what is termed the Amended Statement of Faith, and those who stand for a previous statement because they do not believe in, or support, what was amended to it.

We will now endeavour to outline, for the benefit of our readers, what happened to cause this great schism.

### THE RESPONSIBILITY CONTROVERSY

J. J. Andrew writing to the Dundee Advertiser in 1871 said: Christadelphians "believe that only a portion of the human race will be raised from the dead — that portion which is responsible by a knowledge of God's truth. The rest of mankind, they believe, die and return to the dust of the earth, never to rise again. "They are dead, they shall not live; they are deceased, they shall not rise—."

By 1894 questions on this subject were being asked as follows: On what ground does God hold men liable to resurrectional condemnation? Since the Gospel of Christ is as much a preaching of condemnation as of salvation, the issue is an important one. Paul declares that God winks at "times of ignorance." The new contention makes Him wink at times of

knowledge as well, provided men kept out of contract (i.e. baptism). This contention is put forward publicly, aggressively, organically, and with menace of disfellowship. It is a distinct repudiation of an element of truth formulated by Dr. Thomas in all his efforts to systematise the conclusions warranted by Scripture investigation. It is in violation of the explicit declarations of the testimony: and it is an outrage on those principles of justice which God alleges Himself to be governed by. It is a change of position on the part of those upholding it, while making strenuous exertions to make it appear that the change is with those who remain faithful to the original and demonstrable truth. Under these circumstances, it is impossible to bring about a healing of the breach, unless those who have caused the trouble recede from their position, and return to the various postures of Scripture interpretation which they formerly maintained but have abandoned.

One example of a subtle change of belief was seen in the question: "If the blood of Christ was necessary to open the grave for Himself and for those in Him, how is the grave opened for those in Adam and not in Him?" The implication of the question being that without the "blood tinged waters of baptism" there can be no resurrection and therefore responsibility to judgment. In other words "the contract" (baptism) brings such responsibility. This question was answered in the following: It was not a question of "opening the grave" in the sense of restoring Christ to mortal life. This could have been done without "the blood of the everlasting covenant," for it was done in many cases before him where the subjects of resurrection had no relation to divine institutions in any shape or form. The question solved by Christ was how men under condemnation were to rise to everlasting life. God required the shedding of the blood of a spotless son of Adam as the basis of this triumph; but to say that He requires this as the condition precedent to bringing men forth to condemnation for their evil deeds — is to evince a complete misconception of the moral objects of sacrifice —.

The way to immortality is not opened at all for those not in Christ. Therefore the difficulty is imaginary.

About this time a letter was written to Robert Roberts from Shire Oaks, Pa., U.S.A.:-

"Were one to judge you by the character given you by the editors of two journals, one in England and the other in America, he would deem you a reprobate concerning the truth. They both, to all appearance, seek to damage your character as a teacher of the truth by producing two series of what they call contradictory teachings, culling them from your past and your present teachings. If the construction they endeavour to put upon your words be true, then you are a reprobate relative to your past teaching. I have read both series of quotations from your sayings, past and present and it seems to me that I can easily harmonise them. They seem to forget that you are now called upon to confront a view of Adamic sin in its relation to his descendants that was not held, or

at least was not present to your mind, when writing what you did in the past. I do not understand you to repudiate your past teaching in the quotations they make therefrom. Such being the case, there must have been an urgent reason for the form of words you now employ in relation to the same features of the truth. Brotherly candour and brotherly love would say that one should search for that reason than to rise up as an accuser. Such treatment is not brotherly, on Scripture lines at least—."

"In all this talk of the death of Christ "cleansing his sin-nature of the sin of Adam," the real purpose of his death is lost sight of. "He declared His righteousness" to sinful man, and "condemns sin in the flesh." These two things combined was God's great purpose in the death of His beloved Son. To accomplish both it was necessary that Christ's flesh should be the sinful nature that has come down to all from Adam. Having done this, He was then ready to offer mercy, favour, remission of sins, immortality, rest, and glory, in the name of the one in whom His righteousness was declared to sinful man, and sin was condemned in the flesh".—

"What is the object of striving to place you in a false position before the ecclesias? Is it to destroy you as a teacher? Is it to kill the Christadelphian? They hasten with much zeal to make out against you a case of constructive treason to the truth, and, believing that they have succeeded, they then throw up their hands in horror, crying loudly unto you throughout the ecclesias to deliver yourself, the truth, and the ecclesias from diabolism of their own work."

"This effort — through journals ostensibly devoted to the truth, and circulating among the brethren — to publicly incriminate you before the ecclesias, through extracts from your past and your present teachings, has a strange and unbrotherly look to those who have closely and comprehendingly followed you in your work in the truth. Such an effort has a very ugly look, and a look from which the heart filled with brotherly love turns away in deep sorrow, refusing to canvass the motive."

This letter epitomises the troubled situation of that time, and the Remnant believes it is an important aspect of present consideration when the assertion is made by some concerning those of the "Amended Statement of Faith" and those of the "Unamended" that "—the two 'bodies' are effectively the same, and part of the 'one body' of Christ." Where was unity ninety-four years ago? Has the ugly situation of that time resulted in a more brotherly outcome after so long a period, even though the schism has been maintained? One has only to contemplate the weakness and frowardness of human nature to believe it impossible.

SCHISM AT LONDON (NORTH) 1894

The following message was sent to the ecclesias from the Islington Temperance Hall April 1894:-

At a business meeting on April 15th, the Islington Ecclesia refused to re-affirm its basis of fellowship against the false theories introduced by brother J. J. Andrew, which are embodied in his pamphlet entitled 'The Blood of the Covenant'. We, therefore, who maintain the truth as it has hitherto been held and taught in the London Meeting, have withdrawn from the meeting at Barnsbury Hall. We invite you to meet with us upon the old basis of fellowship, which is explained in the following proposition:- "That we re-affirm our belief that knowledge is the basis of responsibility to God, and that enlightened rejectors are amenable to Resurrection and Judgment, and that we, in accordance with Rule Three, withdraw from those who deny this." — "Brother Eastwood requests denial to be given to the report circulated by some — that the brethren represented by the foregoing circular believe that Christ had a free life, and that we are still only in Adam."

About the same time those in association with J. J. Andrew also sent out a communication which said:-

"The doctrine which you designate as new has been held by many brethren for the past thirty years, and was set forth in the Declaration until altered in 1893. Our basis does not contain anything explicit about 'the enlightened rebel'; the idea is imported into it, and the various sections, when taken in sequence and rightly combined, confine the resurrection to the judgment seat of Christ, to the faithful and unfaithful, the just and unjust of the household of faith."

Combating this assertion Robert Roberts wrote:- This is an illustration of the unsound reasoning by which the Scriptures themselves are forced into the service of error. We are responsible for the wording of Declaration before and after 1893. We know exactly what it means, and on this point can therefore speak with authority. Brother Owler says it means the doctrine now advocated at Barnsbury Hall. This is not true. The statement of the Proposition that Christ, at His appearing, will "summon before him for Judgment, the whole of his professing household," was directed against the contention of those who said that **not the whole**, but only a part (and that the faithful part) of the professing household, would come forth at the resurrection. The wording of the Proposition was intended to bar the door against those who denied the judgment by representing it as a mere distribution of prizes of different value. The

parenthesis with which the Proposition concludes, shows this. The Proposition was never intended to exclude the resurrection of enlightened rebels, who form no part of the household. It related only to those who are mentioned in the Proposition - not to those who are not mentioned. As to the alteration in 1893 when it came to be used for the purpose of excluding the Scriptural rule of responsibility, it became necessary to make the slight verbal alteration appearing in the edition of 1893, by which it reads, "the whole of those who are responsible to his judgment." If anyone doubts the correctness of this explanation, and is of the opinion that the paragraph was intended to exclude the resurrection of enlightened rejectors, we have but to refer them to the whole current of Christadelphian literature for thirty years past (including brother Andrew's own publications). There is scarcely a volume of the Christadelphian during all that time in which the doctrine of the resurrection of enlightened rejectors is not pointedly recognised as the teaching of revelation. Let a single volume suffice. In volume 1870, page 3 (the very first one we search), Dr. Thomas, in his letter to the Rock, defining the teaching of the Christadelphians, says,— "They teach that it is knowledge that makes responsible, so that man that is in honour and understandeth not is as the beasts that perish." In the same volume, page 120, in answering a question, we ourselves speak thus: "The words quoted from John 12, on which the foregoing questions hinge, prove the resurrection of a class who are neither the faithful nor unfaithful servants of Christ, but the simple rejectors of his word, and who are therefore appropriately styled by our correspondent a third class." It would be possible to quote much in the same strain, but one quotation is as strong as twenty. It is a sufficient rejoinder to brother Owler to say that the doctrine of the non-resurrection of enlightened rejectors was not "set forth in the Declaration until altered in 1893," and that his deduction to the contrary from the Declaration recognising the presence of "the whole professing household" is on a par with the argument that extracts a similar conclusion from the command in Psalm 1, to "gather my saints together unto me." We must suppose that brother Owler honestly imagines that his impression is correct, but it is not so satisfactory to hear him say, "Our basis does not contain anything explicit about the enlightened rebel: **the idea is imported into it.**" What the basis says is this: "Resurrection affects those only who are responsible to God by a knowledge of His revealed will - that ALL THESE, just or unjust, faithful or unfaithful, will be raised from the dead." This is an "explicit" recognition of the knowledge of the revealed will of God as the ground of human responsibility. It was intended to mean this, as brother Andrew plainly teaches, in **Jesus Christ and him crucified**. It is now denied that men are made "responsible to God by a knowledge of His revealed will." It is now denied that men who know His revealed will and refuse to submit to it will be raised from the dead, unless they have been baptised. It is of course possible for honest men to change their minds, but it is not nice when they try to make it appear that they have not changed their minds, and that others have done so who have been of the same mind for forty years.

J. J. Andrew in maintaining his position declared: The charge that I called those who taught resurrection outside of the 'blood of Christ' 'liars' is untrue. I merely quoted Rev. 22:15 at the close of an address dealing with several items of the truth - not wholly relating to the point in dispute. The terms 'blasphemous' and 'fatal error' were, according to the admission of the brother who reports them, uttered upwards of two years ago. The exact circumstances I do not remember, but I know that I had, at that time, to combat some erroneous statements of an extreme character which had a nullifying effect on vital parts of the truth. Opprobrious expressions, not a few, were applied to me in connection with this conflict, but I ignored them when spoken, and I shall not now condescend to repeat them. I can patiently wait for the day of Divine vindication, when my conduct will appear in a very different light from that represented by opponents who apparently need to be reminded that misrepresentation and abuse do not constitute refutation.

The reply made to the above was that J. J. Andrew had given public and printed notice of an amendment to the constitution which in the event of its adoption would have excluded all who affirmed the resurrection of rejectors; and in the event of rejection would have compelled him in consistency to withdraw.

#### T. WILLIAMS AND THE ADVOCATE MAGAZINE (1894)

Thomas Williams of America joined in the fray when he published in his magazine an article entitled "What is the matter with you over there?" The brethren in England were accused of making J. J. Andrew the "trampled victim of a wild stampede." The Advocate went on to say, "Wait a little bit, brethren; take breath, cool off." This was after two years of endeavour to persuade J. J. Andrew to withdraw from the position he had taken.

The charge of Thomas Williams was refuted in the following terms: Let the blame, if there is to be blame, lie at the right door. If brother Williams "does not know why brother Andrew took the course he did," he knows he has taken the course, and therefore knows what the matter is. The fact that brother Andrew has veered round to the doctrine which brother Williams holds, explains why his sympathy should be with him and why the action of the brethren here who differ with him should appear in the highly coloured and tragical aspect exhibited —. It is not on the one side a case of "kicking or bruising, or stabbing" at all, nor on the other side is it a case of a brother prevailed against, who "breathes a spirit of love, the most gentle and Christ-like." The London brethren have had to withstand open assault upon an avowed and professed principle of divine truth at the hands of a brother to whom they had most reason of all to look for its defence.— Brother Williams does not sufficiently appreciate the significance of differing with Dr. Thomas on the question at issue. It is one thing to differ with Dr. Thomas as to the meaning of a particular passage, and another thing to

differ with him as to a principle of divine truth. The question of **what makes men responsible to the judgment of God** is a question of divine truth; the question of whether that principle is enunciated or not in a particular passage is a question of exegetical detail— Two... might believe one doctrine without agreeing that it was taught in the same place.

Contention still continued, for example in 1896 one writing from Toronto said: While brother Andrew is forcing the Responsibility Question as a basis of fellowship, the Advocate is accusing brethren of the opposite side of doing the same thing, About the same time the question was raised: Are we right in still regarding as brethren and sisters those who are now separated from us in London on the Responsibility Question? I have great doubts in my own mind. Many of the errors they put forward are fantastical and foolish; many of them downright denials of Scriptural truths, and the facts of the case — in addition to which they slander those of the 'One Body', holding on to the 'one Faith' and the apostles and prophets as developed, in God's providence, in these latter days by the labours of Dr. Thomas. For three years has this been persevered in. They have been admonished, remonstrated with, and debated with, to no purpose: should they not now be regarded as 'publicans and sinners' as Christ said, and as such, are we right in addressing them as brethren? They deny that men who hear and understand and yet reject the words, or the gospel of Christ, will be judged by those words as Christ expressly declares. They suppress part of the 'counsel of God', which includes 'judgment to come' for the wilfully disobedient, and by so doing, they deny the record, believe not God, and 'make Him a liar'. This must be grievous sin in God's sight. Then, again, they have issued their circular accusing us of denying vital truths, and declaring they will not receive in fellowship any who disagree with them, so severing themselves from the One Body and the One Faith, and including themselves among the sects and names of Christendom. May not this last act be taken as the judicial severance of the branch from the body after having had time given for repentance and reform, according to Rev. 2 and 21. I must say that I feel great hesitation in regarding them as brethren.

Robert Roberts' remarks on this communication was as follows: There is a good deal of force in this view of matters. We have for years felt uncertain — not as to the doctrine that men who knowingly refuse to submit to Christ are responsible to His judgment-seat at the resurrection, but as to how those ought to be regarded who deny it —. We could not consent to suppress what we believe to be truth in the case, but we have never felt at liberty to object to those who do not see it, provided their faith in Christ is otherwise Scriptural. We admit it makes a difference when this error becomes aggressive, as it has recently become. In fact, we cannot now help ourselves. Its refusal of fellowship to those who cannot agree with the error simplifies the situation. We proclaim the truth that God will judge those who are without, as well as those that are within, in the day of Christ,

where His will is known. If separation is forced upon us by those who do not believe this, we can but accept it, without presuming to say what the Lord will think of those who not only limit His jurisdiction, but condemn those who recognise, and always have recognised, its fullness. We are aware that this is putting it too tenderly for some. It is not tenderness for the error, but the tenderness of uncertainty as to whether it is such an error as will exclude believers in Christ from life eternal. It is not like some errors that have struck, in time past at the very foundations of faith.

### THE DECLARATION IN CANADA 1902

Some Christadelphian ecclesias in Canada, in the above year, placed themselves on record that they identified themselves with the Birmingham, England, publication, *The Christadelphian*. They stated they had decided to co-operate for mutual assistance and encouragement in the work, by inter-visitation at the interchange of speaking brethren. Firmly stating at the same time their attitude towards the circulating controversies. They rejected as error the following propositions:-

1. That the light of the knowledge of the Gospel does not bring responsibility and amenability to the judgment seat of Christ, apart from, at least, a partial submission to its claims; in other words, that believers of the Gospel are exempt from the resurrection to condemnation and punishment so long as they refuse to render obedience in baptism.

2. That the penalty or sentence against Adam for his sin in Eden was a violent death; that the sentence was suspended in Adam's case by Edenic sacrifices, and afterwards (4,000 years afterwards) was carried out in his descendant Jesus; that this sentence of a violent death rests upon Adam's race by virtue of having his sin and guilt federally, or racially imputed to it.

3. That, federally, we are all under Adam's sin, and are **baptised to remove the condemnation that came thereby**; that is, Adam's sin placed the whole race in a state of alienation, and **baptism removes this inherited alienation**.

4. That the justification of believers is effected by the imputation of Christ's righteous actions to them when they are baptised.

"It is therefore resolved that we do hereby affirm our faith to be in harmony with the thirty propositions known as the "Birmingham Statement of Faith", inclusive of the amplification recently given to Proposition twenty five in reference to responsibility. We approve this statement, not because it is of Birmingham, but because, to our minds, it sets forth in suitable language the doctrines constituting the Christadelphian basis of association and fellowship. It is further resolved that we withhold fellowship from all who believe and teach the unscriptural doctrines referred to

above, and likewise from those who countenance such teachings, whatever may be their expressed individual convictions."

The above was followed by ecclesial action at Boston (Mass.) who declared: "Two years ago, the editor of the *Advocate* made a determined but unsuccessful effort to ventilate his unscriptural theories before this ecclesia. In his recent "up and be doing" tour through the New England States, another attempt was made by his agents and friends, and finally by letters from himself addressed to this ecclesia. To these letters the managing brethren replied that when brother Williams was ready to accept the statement of faith of this ecclesia, they would meet him. They felt convinced from his letters then before them, and also his last appeal in the April *Advocate*, that he was as far from the truth as ever —. You will realise upon reading the September *Advocate*, that this ecclesia adopted a very wise attitude towards its editor."

This latter remark was made against an *Advocate* representative condemning the scriptural teaching of a pamphlet issued by the Buffalo ecclesia in defence of its statement of faith which was in harmony with Robert Roberts. Thus the schism widened.

### THE BIRMINGHAM AMENDMENT

Proposition 24 (1897 and before) - That at the appearing of Christ prior to the establishment of the Kingdom, the responsible (faithful and unfaithful) dead and living of both classes, will be summoned before His judgment seat "to be judged according to their works", "and receive in body according to what they have done, whether it be good or bad."

Proposition 24 (1898 and onwards) — That at the appearing of Christ prior to the establishment of the Kingdom, the responsible (namely, those who know the revealed will of God, and have been called upon to submit to it), dead and living — obedient and disobedient — will be summoned before His judgment seat "to be judged according to their works"; and "receive in body according to what they have done, whether it be good or bad".

The *Advocate*, of course, would not accept the amendment of 1898. And to this day the polarisation persists, so there are those who stand to the banner termed the Unamended Statement of Faith, opposed to those who adhere to the amplified Statement of 1898, called the Birmingham Amended Statement of Faith.

The Remnant believes that this outline of former events proves to those of thoughtful mind the futility of the work which is endeavouring to bring together the two main Christadelphian communities in North America. How could it lead to sincere Unity?

## THE REMNANT

---

### CORRESPONDENCE IN REPLY TO THE REMNANT'S ARTICLE MAY 1988

#### IS DISUNITY LOVE?

"After prayerfully thinking over your article in the May issue of "The Remnant" and your letter - addressed to "Mr. —" and signed "Sincerely, W. G. Butterfield" I felt I had to write in reply to them both.

You dealt with the points of my letter to you quite fairly, for which I thank you, agreeing with me that "no ecclesia can claim perfection."

I agree with you that "—where there is divisiveness it is because of personal thinking, often pushful, and lacking in profundity which fails to submit to the Spiritual guidance — of a wise Heavenly Father."

You ask the question "Can the love of Christ flourish in a people rent by disunity?" My answer, after a long and intimate experience of Christadelphians (and I am happy to be one) is NO!! because we tend to be more concerned with doctrine, and the search for it, than the "love of Christ".

In finding, to my great sadness, that you cannot now address me as "brother—" gave me quite a shock and I wonder how this kind of treatment can make for the "love of unity in Christ."

#### THE REMNANT'S REPLY

Our referring to our correspondent as Mr. was not out of a desire to censure. Indeed our personal inclination would be to avoid causing hurt. The reason for our care in how we address those not in fellowship with us is our believed duty to make clear The Remnant's position.

It is recorded:-

"Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently."

(1 Peter 1:22)

To describe one with whom we could not fellowship or who would not fellowship with us as a brother is to reduce this appellation to a mere courtesy term which the Remnant believes causes the description to become an antithesis of what Peter exhorts the brethren to uphold.

**MAGAZINE NEWS FOR AUGUST 1988**

*HAMBURG, NEW YORK, Corner Southwestern Blvd. & Pleasant Ave.*

Sundays: Breaking of Bread 11-30 a.m.  
Sunday School 1-45 p.m.  
Bible Class: Midweek: Forestville and Hamburg  
Alternate Week: Revelation Study.

After thirty-five years in the Eden Grange hall, it has become necessary to make a change in our meeting place. This is due to the impending sale of the building. With supplications and a period of waiting, sometimes with uncertainty, we are very pleased and grateful to have obtained a new hall which appears to be suitable. The address is as above and we should be using the new location in early June.

The annual Sunday School outing always anticipated with pleasure is scheduled for August 20th, God willing.

*J. A. Def.*

---

**Manchester News.**

*Manchester. Ryecroft Hall, Audenshaw.*

Sunday: Breaking of Bread 11 a.m.  
Thursday: Bible Class 7-30 p.m.

The Fraternal Gathering is arranged for September 3rd when it is expected that not only will there be messages from across the sea, but also a representative present therefrom.