

FEBRUARY 1993

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"

"TO HIM THAT... TREMBLETH AT MY WORD"

"THE ORDINATION OF WOMEN PRIESTS"

**FELLOWSHIP... A PUBLICATION OF THE
APOSTOLIC FELLOWSHIP"**

"TRADITIONAL SHIELD AND OTHERS VV CENTRAL"

**"SIGNS OF HIS COMING AND OF THE END OF THE
WORLD"**

"NEWS FROM ECCLESIAS"

"PARTIAL INSPIRATION—THE TROUBLE OF 1885"

(continued) (left over while next month)

All Communications

W. G. Butterfield,
72 Thames Drive,
Biddulph,
Staffs.
ST8 7JF

J. A. DeFries,
2335 Route 39
Forestville,
New York 14062
U.S.A.

"AT THE TABLE OF THE LORD"

"...MAKE US A KING..."

This morning we have been with Samuel as Israel demanded of him:

"... Now make us a king to judge us like all the nations."
I Samuel 8:5.

Samuel was their judge and priest:

"And all Israel from Dan even to Beer-Sheba knew that Samuel was established to be a prophet of the LORD."
I Samuel 3:20.

As Samuel heard Israel's demand for a king, he would feel that his judging of Israel was being rejected. Possibly he would not have agreed to do this for his people; however, God intervened and instructed His prophet:

"... Hearken unto the voice of the people in all that they say unto thee: for they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should not reign over them."
I Samuel 8:7.

The people's reasoning for demanding a king was that Samuel's sons were corrupt, that he himself was growing old, and his sons would not be good rulers. When he remonstrated with them they continued their demand:

"... Nay; but we will have a king over us;
That we also may be like all the nations; and that our king may judge us, and go out before us, and fight our battles."
I Samuel 8:19-20.

Here was the real key to their dissatisfaction: the desire to be like the nations which surrounded them. The Hebrew for "nations" is *goya*, used as Gentiles or heathen as well as nations. To an orthodox Jew today, *goya* means all that is not of Israel; Gentiles, with whom they would have no association, maintaining at least a token separation. Indeed God separated Israel unto Himself by a covenant at Sinai:

"Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagle's wings, and brought you unto myself.

Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people:
And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation. . . .”
Exodus 19:4-6.

Israel’s willing response, as their part of this covenant was forthright:

“ . . . All that the LORD hath spoken we will do. . . .”
Exodus 19:8.

By this covenant, God’s rule over them as King was established. Now, about four hundred years later, in wanting a king like all the nations, they had forgotten or disregarded the covenant. Their human yearnings were allowed to reign. Perhaps they were tired of their separated position, wanting a tangible king, one whose glory they could see and revel in, rather than a Heavenly ruler whom they could not see. It took faith, a trusting that He was there to lead them, that indeed it was He who had enabled them to overcome other nations and their kings. Did Israel lack under God’s rule? Let us look at their circumstances leading up to their rejection of God’s rulership.

Some short time prior to this, Israel’s army had gone up to fight against the Philistines and was defeated with four thousand slain. Looking for help they asked:

“ . . . Wherefore hath the LORD smitten us to day before the Philistines?”
1 Samuel 4:3.

However, they did not wait for God’s guidance but moved in their own thinking, thereby showing their lack of perception of God’s holiness. They cried:

“ . . . Let us fetch the ark of the covenant of the LORD out of Shiloh unto us, that, when it cometh among us, it may save us out of the hand of our enemies.”
I Samuel 4:3.

And when the ark was brought into the camp, they shouted with a great shout. The Philistines, hearing this, feared. Yet:

“... Israel was smitten, ... for there fell of Israel thirty thousand footmen.”

I Samuel 4:10.

The Philistines captured the ark of God and slew the evil sons of Eli, the priest. Why this disaster; why did their God appear to fail them? Was it because they did not truly honor Him and did not want to wait for Him, taking matters into their own hands? Even so, the Philistines knew no triumph, for the ark brought disaster to them, confounding their god Dagon and causing great affliction on the people. They soon sent the ark back to Israel, to Beth-shemesh upon a cart pulled by “milch kine”. When they of Beth-shemesh saw the returned ark, they rejoiced and the Levites took it from the cart and offered the kine as a sacrifice. However, then disaster once again struck the Israelites as God:

“... smote the men of Beth-shemesh, because they had looked into the ark of the LORD, even he smote of the people fifty thousand and threescore and ten men: ...”

I Samuel 6:19.

This was a drastic judgment, but well deserved, for the people of Beth-shemesh were descendants of Aaron, this city being one of thirteen given earlier to the sons of Aaron by Joshua (ch. 21:16,19). Being of the priesthood, they should have known God's commands concerning the ark and its holiness. For mere mortals to so intrude was unthinkable to a faithful priest. Yet they did just that, and fifty thousand and seventy men died. They may have inspected the ark only to determine if it was intact when the Philistines returned it, but their entire thinking and action was unacceptable to God, and many died for their failure to sanctify Him. The power of the Almighty was made very evident to Israel and to the Philistines as Dagon was confounded. Then over fifty thousand in Israel died. Again, His great power and mercy were evidenced as under Samuel's guidance and prayer, Israel put away their idols, and God defeated the Philistines who once more came against them:

“... but the LORD thundered with a great thunder on that day upon the Philistines, and discomfited them; and they were smitten before Israel.”

I Samuel 7:10.

On this memorable occasion, Samuel set up a great stone between Mizpeh and Shen, and called the name of it Ebenezer (stone of help), saying: "Hitherto hath the LORD helped us" (Verse 12). The Almighty did lead out Israel; the Almighty did judge Israel; the Almighty did fight Israel's battles. What striking evidence! Yet, soon thereafter came these reprehensible words from them:

"... Nay; but we will have a king over us;
That we also may be like all the nations; and that our king
may judge us, and go out before us, and fight our battles."
I Samuel 8:19-20.

Can we see, Brethren and Sisters, why the Lord told Samuel: "They have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me"? We might wonder, how could they be so blind, so oblivious and so untouched in hearts, ungrateful that the Almighty was indeed their King? The word "rejected" tells us much about their thinking, for it means to abhor, despise, loathe or refuse. How could His people loathe their God who did so much for them? What possessed their minds? Their own words reveal their thinking for us: "Make us a king to judge us like all the nations" (Verse 5). Israel did not like to be different, not comprehending or valuing the privilege and blessing, nor the honor of being the covenanted people of Yahweh. Only for Israel did God go before! Only for them did He rule and judge with perfect righteousness and justice. Israel as a people wanted what they felt was better, more tangible, more pleasing to their desires. God, at this critical time, through Samuel, warned what a mortal king would be like, concluding:

"And ye shall cry out in that day because of your king
which ye shall have chosen you; and the LORD will not
hear you in that day."
I Samuel 8:18.

Unheeding, moved by selfish wants, Israel replied: "Nay, but we will have a king." The Almighty then instructed Samuel:

"... Harken unto their voice, and make them a king."
I Samuel 8:22.

He obeyed, and Saul was chosen the first king of Israel. They had a king to rule over them for more than four hundred years: from

Saul to Zedekiah. In all that time, there were only a very few kings who were faithful, subject to God, thereby benefitting Israel: David, Hezekiah, Josiah. Many faithful prophets gave guidance to Israel—warning, foretelling the consequences of wrong, in despising God's word, but mostly to no avail.

The Almighty yet had in mind His purpose, a King to come, His Son, the Messiah. In the midst of their captivity into Babylon—one of the Gentile nations they had wished to be like—God, through His prophet Zechariah, spoke of a time to come:

“Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: behold, thy King cometh unto thee: he is just, and having salvation; lowly, and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal of an ass.”
Zechariah 9:9.

How improbable in their circumstances that there should be such a king for Israel! They were in captivity, subject to a great Gentile power. Yet, being the unchangeable divine word, this did come to pass some four centuries later. Their King came, Jesus Christ, the Messiah, Savior Anointed. He came into Jerusalem riding upon a colt (Matthew 21:4-5), fulfilling these words. As He entered the city, the multitudes cried:

“... Hosanna to the son of David: Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord; Hosanna in the highest.”
Matthew 2:9.

“Hosanna” is two Hebrew words: Yasha—salvation (Zechariah 9:9) and Na—I pray. Yasha-na—I pray for salvation. Their promised deliverance and salvation came through the Son of God. But, listen to Israel's words when the multitude asked concerning Jesus' entry into Jerusalem. “Who is this?” Their answer:

“... This is Jesus the prophet of Nazareth. . . .”
Matthew 21:11.

They considered Him a prophet, but did they believe He was their promised King born in Bethlehem as God's prophets had foretold? It is clear they did not, except for a few. Jesus was betrayed by Judas and falsely accused by the high priests, scribes and

Pharisees. When Pilate said to the Jews: "Behold your King!"—their reply was:

"... Away with him, away with him, crucify him. Pilate saith unto them, Shall I crucify your King? The chief priest answered, We have no king but Caesar."

John 19:15.

Their King, the Savior Anointed, in whom all God's purpose was to be accomplished, was rejected, denied and crucified by those to whom God had promised this throughout their history as His people. When Jesus was crucified, Pilate put a sign upon the cross:

"JESUS OF NAZARETH THE KING OF THE JEWS."

John 19:19.

And even then the chief priests denied Him, charging Pilate:

"... Write not, The King of the Jews; but that he said, I am King of the Jews." John 19:21.

They continued their railing, rejecting God's Son as He hung on the cross, mocking Him:

"... Thou that destroyest the temple, and buildest it in three days, save thyself. If thou be the Son of God, come down from the cross."

Matthew 27:40.

Jesus died, condemned, ridiculed and rejected by His own people—those to whom the Almighty back at Sinai had extended His covenant:

"... ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people: for all the earth is mine:

And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation. ..."

Exodus 19:5-6.

Thus the hope of Israel was lost due to their strong desire and determination to be like the nations.

Nevertheless, God changes not. From the beginning there have been a few, a remnant, who have striven to live their lives in

subjection to Him, their King; and to His Son, appointed to be His King. These few, being mortal, have had natural desires to be like other people, even like the nations, for that is human nature. But they have given their lives in striving to keep that vow: "All that the Lord hath spoken we will do." Such truly may hope to find approval at Jesus' judgment seat, and so reign as kings and priests in His kingdom, as the Almighty has promised.

Brethren and Sisters, we are also few, belonging to the few through the ages, and are a people in the midst of an evil, corrupt world, struggling to be subject to our Father. To obey Him as our King makes us different from the nations, but what a hope is ours! It is that one day soon, the nations will be gone, all people will be subject to one King—God's appointed Jesus—reigning over the world-wide restored kingdom of Israel, to be covenanted and exalted people. Let us hold fast to our hope, which is to know that great blessing, unchanged since the promise in Eden.

J.A.DeF.

"TO HIM THAT . . . TREMBLETH AT MY WORD"

The words of the prophet Isaiah were given by a grieved and concerned God to admonish His people:

"Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth: for the LORD hath spoken, I have nourished and brought up children, and they have rebelled against me." Isaiah 1:2.

We may ask how could they have turned away from a loving Father who had provided for their every need? Yet this reaction is characteristic of man's carnal nature—the same nature we today must struggle against if we wish to walk in His ways. Therefore these words are preserved; they were not only for Israel's help during Isaiah's ministry, but for ours today as well.

God said He had nourished His children, what then did He look for in return? Isaiah explains:

" . . . to this man will I look, even to him that is poor and of a contrite spirit, and trembleth at my word."

Isaiah 66:2.

To tremble means to be fearful, afraid or to quake, causing one of a right spirit to be troubled and so to look deep within the heart, honestly examining his motives, trying to see as God would. This was Israel's failure—they no longer examined their living in good conscience, for their viewpoint was fleshly and not of the spirit. Having lost touch spiritually, they offered without insight or perception of the true meaning:

"He that killeth an ox is as if he slew a man; he that sacrificeth a lamb, as if he cut off a dog's neck; he that offereth an oblation, as if he offered swine's blood; he that burneth incense, as if he blessed an idol. Yea, they have chosen their own ways, and their soul delighteth in their abominations." Isaiah 66:3.

Under the law God ordained sacrifice and the burning of incense in service to Him, but there was much more required. Israel's sacrifices in Isaiah's time were amiss, given only because they were required—they lacked the personal desire and spiritual

discernment necessary to be acceptable to the Almighty. This speaks of the great importance of walking in His ways—according to the precepts He has determined and not our own, for He alone is the Author of salvation, that eternal life which is possible only by walking in the strait and narrow path He has established.

To that man who with spiritual understanding “trembleth at my word” or troubles himself with a godly fear God said, “to this man will I look”. David was such a man and revealed the true nature of sacrifice as he said:

“For thou desirest not sacrifice; else would I give it: thou delightest not in burnt offering. The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit: a broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise.”

Psalm 51:16-17.

A broken and contrite heart is found only in one not puffed up with arrogance or self-confidence, but one who, realizing his own unworthiness, submits his living to the Father with gratitude for His overruling care. From this man will God receive communication through prayer and the mediatorship of the Lord Jesus, as He sees the proud fleshly barriers trown down and the natural thinking replaced with humility. The prophet Samuel had to learn he must look for this poor and contrite spirit in order to choose a king for Israel. His inclination was to choose Eliab, David’s eldest brother who was handsome and appealing to the eye:

“But the LORD said unto Samuel, Look not on his countenance, or on the height of his stature; because I have refused him; for the LORD seeth not as man seeth; for man looketh on the outward appearance, but the LORD looketh on the heart.”
I Samuel 16:7.

David was chosen not because he was the tallest or strongest but because in the Spirit’s eyes his heart was poor and contrite and trembled at God’s word. Does He see the same meek and quiet spirit today, as He who knows all, examines our hearts?

Isaiah’s message, though somber with warning, was sent to encourage those few tender-hearted left in Israel who could be touched, reminding them of the rest promised to Jacob’s faithful seed and now extended also to the Gentiles:

“For thus said the LORD, Behold, I will extend peace to her like a river, and the glory of the Gentiles like a flowing stream: then shall ye suck, ye shall be borne upon her sides, and be dandled upon her knees.

As one whom his mother comforteth, so will I comfort you; and ye shall be comforted in Jersusalem.”

Isaiah 66:12-13.

What a marvellous blessing granted by the Creator, He who through the power of His word alone made all we see around us. Do we fully appreciate or comprehend His majesty? The constant reminders of His greatness, which are evident every day in the changing seasons or the splendor of sun, moon and stars, should prompt us to humility, stirring thankfulness within and an eagerness to please Him for His bountiful goodness toward those who tremble at His word.

Josiah king of Judah was an example of such a man. During his reign the nearly forgotten book of the Law was found and read, moving him to remorse for all that had for years been left undone. God’s somber pronouncement against Judah was read to the king:

“Because they have forsaken me, and have burned incense unto other gods, that they might provoke me to anger with all the works of their hands; therefore my wrath shall be poured out upon this place, and shall not be quenched.”

II Chronicles 34:25.

But because Josiah had troubled himself before God, he was spared this judgment and was instead promised a blessing because of his contrite reaction:

“Because thine heart was tender, and thou didst humble thyself before God, when thou heardest his words against this place, and against the inhabitants thereof, and humbledst thyself before me, and didst rend thy clothes, and weep before me; I have even heard thee also, said the LORD: Behold, I will gather thee to thy fathers, and thou shalt be gathered to thy grave in peace, neither shall thine eyes see all the evil that I will bring upon this place, and upon the inhabitants of the same.”

II Chronicles 34:27-28.

As in Josiah's time, so today God will respond in loving care to those who hearken and embrace His word, making it a part of their living. As Josiah, we too must strive to increase in that poor and contrite spirit, to trouble ourselves in godly fear. Only so may we receive His help and be accounted acceptable at the Lord Jesus' judgment seat.

Isaiah's message was a final appeal to Israel:

"For as the new heavens and the new earth, which I will make, shall remain before me, said the LORD, so shall your seed and your name remain.

And it shall come to pass, that from one new moon to another, and from one sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, said the LORD."

Isaiah 66:22-23.

A promise given that cannot fail—for God's word will stand as spoken, establishing with might and power a new heaven and a new earth, free from the flesh's corruption. This promise was made to Israel through Isaiah's prophesy and to those today, who as brethren of the Lord Jesus, with humility tremble and look within, seeking God's mercy.

M.CS..

"THE ORDINATION OF WOMEN PRIESTS"

In November last the Synod of the Church of England, by a very small majority of the bishops, clergy and laity, allowed the proposition of women becoming, what is termed, full priests (entitled to administer communion).

The Archbishop leader of the Church had declared:-

"I believe God is calling His Church to ordain women to the priesthood."

The minority view endeavoured to halt this move for further careful consideration. But the more prominent Anglicans even went as far as insinuating that opponents of women priests were heretics. Where do such people get their authority for this measure from? Certainly not the scriptures. Their confidence in their own rightness is expressed as follows:-

"All Christians must recognise that the Church is part of the mystical body of Christ and is therefore guided by the power and wisdom of the Holy Spirit.

When it speaks collectively, it speaks with authority, and the vote, though narrow, was decisive. It should be seen as an expression of God's purpose, and accepted accordingly."

Such a doctrine, using the working of the Holy Spirit in the Church as sanction for religious rules and policies, irrespective of what the scripture declares, is evidence of the further decline in men's regard for the revealed word of God. Such an event as this forcibly underlines the need to uphold scriptural guidance from:-

"- - - the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning."

(James 1:17).

"FELLOWSHIP AND THE TRUTH"

(A publication of The Apostolic Fellowship of Christ)

We are in receipt of the above booklet and believe we have a duty of printing an explanation concerning some of the points raised therein.

The Apostolic Fellowship makes the following charges:-

1954—"The Remnant" became separated and 'went out' from the 'body', "The Ecclesia of Christ" on personal matters invoking Matthew 18:15-20, which is predicated upon 'trespass' and 'fault', which could not be defined. This trouble was not based upon any doctrinal issue.

1964—A crotchet was introduced regarding the exclusion of certain meats on the score of uncleanness which became elevated to a principle of truth essential for salvation, contrary to the doctrine of Christ. I Timothy 4:1-5.

1971—This heresy of unclean meats prevailed until a few were enlightened to the darkness of their position and cleansed themselves of the error and became known as the "Apostolic Fellowship of Christ".

1972—An unscriptural resolution was adopted as a principle of truth and used to deal with a personal matter of disobedience which erroneously defined the working of the "Spirit" in Ecclesial appointments, contrary to the doctrine of Christ.

1977—The error of this position became apparent after further efforts to exercise "authority" upon the Ecclesia was manifest which resulted in the faithful rescinding the offending resolution. Once again the unfaithful "went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us:" 1 John 2:19.

The Remnant's Comments

It is true that there were certain personal differences which some in an ecclesia in the United States sought to resolve with the editor of "The Master's Household" magazine, which was the publication for "The Ecclesia of Christ". After a series of letters which failed to achieve the unity desired, the Sister involved travelled to England hoping that face to face contact would bring about a satisfactory settlement of the matters causing anxiety and distress.

In spite of the journey undertaken and the expense incurred the editor of "The Master's Household" refused to meet the Sister to discuss the personal matters, which were questioning the editor's actions and wisdom.

Instead he declared he would place all the relevant correspondence from the States and a Brother adviser in Manchester, before the Nottingham Ecclesia.

Within less than a week a special meeting of the Nottingham Ecclesia was called to consider "something of vital importance", at which meeting "all must be present." No invitation was given to the Sister from the U.S.A., or the Brother in Manchester for this meeting, called for Wednesday, October 13th, 1954. Those in charge of the meeting were surprised when the Brother and Sister managed to gain admission, having learned of what was happening in a roundabout way.

The presiding Brother called upon one of the Arranging Brethren to read the correspondence. Extracts were then read, also remarks from the editor of "The Master's Household" who was not present because of an accident. The remarks stated that the letters were evil.

The Brother from Manchester then arose at the back of the meeting and requested to be allowed to speak in his own defence, and on behalf of the Sister from the U.S.A. who was also there. He was told definitely "no", that he must sit down.

Another Nottingham Arranging Brother then arose from the body of the hall, asking to be allowed to speak. This was according to a predetermined plan, for he had in his possession a prepared proposition, as follows:-

"The Nottingham Ecclesia having heard (in the absence of both parties) the correspondence to brother W.J. Elston from brother W.V. Butterfield and those in America, are convinced that this is a work of evil. We condemn the striving and contention over vain, hurtful, and unprofitable matters as being contrary to the Spirit of Christ and leading only to schism in the Body."

The Brother from Manchester endeavoured to protest, but was ruled out of order by the platform. Many in the Nottingham Meeting did not know what it was all about; some later confessed to this. However, those in charge of the Meeting made the charge, that the letters were evil, and unless the Brethren and Sisters voted their agreement "they would be seen as it was a matter of fellowship". However it was said that no charges were being brought

against those in America, or against the Brother in Manchester (obviously they did not have any that were valid).

Later, when a minority endeavoured to place the condemned letters in full before the Nottingham Meeting and other ecclesias for judgment, an edict went forth from Nottingham that the letters, or copies of them, were not to be accepted, as it was contention. Therefore the majority were prevented from looking at the condemned letters to see for themselves whether they were evil or not. So judgment was exercised without looking at the evidence.

Thus the leaders of the Nottingham Ecclesia, handled this situation, which they themselves caused, in a deplorable way. It was crude and domineering in its effect. Purporting to be for unity it could only be a unity of coercion and fear.

The minority, the "Remnant", were then forced into a position of either allowing this Nicolaitinism to prevail, or of making a stand against the evil. This is why there was a division, and the cause of it. Advice from an earlier time is certainly relevant in this consideration, as follows:-

"One is your master, even Christ and all ye are brethren". This feature, with many other beautiful features originally appertaining to the house of Christ, has disappeared from the religious systems around us bearing the name of Christ. Having returned to it let us hold on to it. There must be no authority, only service.

It is a maxim of universal law (divine included) that no man is to be judged without a hearing. If it is true of one man, it is true of a number of men. ---'

In conclusion we wonder why "The Apostolic Fellowship of Christ excuses that unjust and shady resolution of October 13th 1954, but in their booklet from which we quote, state that in 1972 "an unscriptural resolution was adopted as a principle of truth and used to deal with a personal matter of disobedience (which they deplore). It being revealed in 1977 that FURTHER EFFORTS TO EXERCISE "AUTHORITY" UPON THE ECCLESIA was manifest, which resulted in the faithful rescinding the resolution.

P.S. Any of our readers desiring more information may write to us for our booklet on the 1954 division entitled "An Appendix to The History of the Truth in the Latter Days."

Traditional Shield and others vv Central. Where is Unity?
(Extract from letter from Australia)

“It is apparent that the politics of the Australian Christadelphian community is becoming more and more like the politics of the nation around us. We do not doubt that a significant number of ecclesias will support these new motions, with the likely outcome that there will be further polarization in the community between the “conservatives” who adhere unquestioningly to traditional Christadelphian teaching as defined by Bro. Robert Roberts, and the “liberals” who sympathise with Bro. Spongberg and find expressions of the conservative doctrine unsatisfactory.

We believe that brethren should be able to discuss the scripture and strive to follow its teachings without being subject to unreasonable and intolerant accusations of heresy and threats of disfellowship. Brother Spongberg and the Beverly Hills ecclesia have been, and continue to be, subject to these things. If brethren believe that Brother Spongberg’s book presents teaching that is contrary to scripture, they should openly and frankly oppose it and expose its error by appeal to the scripture. But this is not what has been done. The Christadelphian editor has sought, by an appeal to tradition, to discredit Bro. Spongberg and to support his conservative opponents. The present series of motions are a continuing attempt by conservatives to establish themselves in alliance with the Christadelphian editor, as a dominant force in the Australian brotherhood.

The proposed ballot again reveals the truth that the brotherhood is divided into factions. It seems obvious that the present path, whether by the original resolution, or by its proposed reversal in the forthcoming ballot, or even by the decision of the committee, will never lead to the solution of this perennial problem. It seems most likely that it will lead to a more adamantly disunited community. What are the reasons for this divided condition?

1. A major reason lies in the unquestioning and unreasonable adherence to the cult of the pioneers, and insistence upon total acceptance of all the dogmatic pronouncements of Robert Roberts

as pure truth, especially his most objectionable "doctrine of the atonement". While this is most extreme in the areas influenced by Logos, it is very widespread in the brotherhood as a whole.

2. A second important reason is the inconsistency of other brethren in publicly accepting the Unity Basis and rejecting brethren and sisters who cannot accept it, while at the same time privately admitting that the traditional Christadelphian doctrine expressed by Robert Roberts is not entirely scriptural.

We believe that God will never bless the brotherhood with true Christian peace or unity while these things persist. The very persistence of the division and disunity now for well over a century should be recognized as clear evidence that a wrong path has been followed.

A solution should be sought, NOT by holding tightly to Christadelphian tradition, but by appeal to the higher authority provided in the teaching and example of Jesus and the apostles in the word of God.

Though all factions nominally accept the unity basis and the BASF, it does not hold them together. If Unity Basis Christadelphians could truly accept one another as brethren in Christ, and come together to discuss the issues, and seek a solution to the problem from the scripture, without recourse to what was taught or written by "the pioneers", then we believe that the problems could readily be solved. But given that at least one faction is totally opposed to such a course, we see little value in others striving to maintain a facade of unity on the basis of accepting a statement of doctrines which they do not clearly understand and do not wholeheartedly believe, ---

We believe that the articles under the heading "Christ our Righteousness" which are appearing in "The Christadelphian" have no special value or authority. They are an expression of traditional teaching which those who are interested should read and consider. Brethren and sisters who are familiar with the teaching of the scriptures should be well able to judge the matter for

themselves, and not be over-awed by the prestige and authority imputed to the editor of "The Christadelphian". - - -"

The Remnant's Comments

Some years ago we suggested in a publication that some of the former Shield Fellowship had not gone along with the Unity Basis in Australia. It rather seems now, from the above, that it was Central which did not really go along with members of the Shield Group in clarifying Central's position to Shield beliefs, even though it was claimed that unity had been achieved. We believe this is further evidence that Central fails in the doctrine of fellowship, even though there is argument that the present day Shield magazine supports Central's position.

"Signs of His Coming and of the End of the World"

"And whereas thou sawest iron mixed with miry clay, they shall mingle themselves with the seed of men: but they shall not cleave one to another, even as iron is not mixed with clay. And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed - - -"
(Daniel 2:43-44)

At the time of writing the British political scene is greatly disturbed. The Premier of the U.K. who is currently purportedly leading the European Community, it being Britain's turn to occupy such a position, is beset by obstacles at home that are working to prevent the U.K. from getting closer to the E.E.C. Considering the way the Tory party has dominated British politics for over twelve years, it seems incredible that the Prime Minister of the U.K., who is the leader of a Tory Government, should have any problem about his policy of closer connections with European nations in the E.E.C. The opposite however is the case. The Maastricht vote in the House of Commons in November showed the Conservative leader to be in a very vulnerable position. It was intended to be a vote of confidence in the Prime Minister's policy towards the European Community, though not announced as such. The Premier only succeeded in the vote by a margin of three, and that was after very great pressure by the cohorts of the leader on members of parliament on the government side of The House. He would have lost, with severe consequences to his leadership, except for the help of a minority party vote of M.Ps. from the opposition benches, in support of his position. The Conservative Party has almost always been staunch and loyal to its leaders, but on the occasion of what has been termed the Maastricht vote (named after the leaders of Europe had a meeting at the town of Maastricht where there was political agreement), the Party broke ranks, and some were prepared to overthrow their leader on the issue.

This political trouble, though temporarily shelved by a narrow yes-vote, is far from being settled. What will happen in the future remains to be seen. But this disruption in the British political system is a great sign, in that it affects European unity. The ancient prophecy for the last days is clear:-

"- - - they shall mingle themselves - - - but they shall not cleave one to another - - -."

NEWS FROM THE ECCLESIAS

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

The success of our sister's eye operation brings rejoicing as it allows improved vision to enjoy and benefit in every way.

As the economy continues to be, at best, sluggish world wide bringing hardship to many, gratitude is felt for the care of our heavenly Father in His generous provision for His children's needs.

J.A.DeF.

MANCHESTER, *Ryecroft Hall, Audenshaw.*

Sunday: Breaking of Bread 11 a.m.
Thursday: Bible Class 7.15 p.m.

Applications are still coming in from Scotland and Ireland for our advertised prophecy booklet. Obviously there is still a core of interest in Bible subjects in some areas of the U.K. Such response affords encouragement that our efforts are not completely ignored.