

AN ADDRESS
Delivered in 1961 to the Brethren and Sisters meeting in San
Gabriel, relating to
The Present Danger Confronting the Central Group
On matters concerning the "One Truth," and how it concerns them regarding "The Fellowship of the Father and Son."

WRITTEN IN FOUR SECTIONS

- Section 1** *Scriptural Fellowship*
- Section 2** *Scriptural Withdrawal*
- Section 3** *Events Relating to Fellowship, 1835 to 1910*
- Section 4** *Events Relating to Fellowship, and the Departure of the Majority from the Standards Once Adhered to, 1910 to the Present*

There is no need to apologize for Sections 1 & 2 because it is testified -

"But exhorting one another; and SO MUCH THE MORE as ye see the Day approaching"— Hebrews 10:25
"This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come"—2 Timothy 3:1

The necessity of unity and understanding on scriptural fellowship and withdrawal is an integral part of the whole picture of the history of "THE TRUTH" in the Last Days.

SECTION I

SCRIPTURAL FELLOWSHIP

Does it matter what we believe? Every Christadelphian will answer, Yes, The Scriptures reveal God as the God of Truth. Who is very concerned that His servants should know and believe "The Truth" in its fulness.

We find it plainly taught in the Word of God that even if we have a large portion of "The Truth," that this is profitless if along with it we are in error, on one or more of the vital first principles.

The measure of acceptance with God is not in ourselves; neither can it be found in any group. If we depend on a group to formulate the measure of acceptance, we would be out of step with the Word of God.

The measure of acceptance with God is "THE TRUTH." We should not have any antipathies to any, neither should we have any favored ones. We all stand alike in the sight of God, Who shows no partiality.

The measure is not in ourselves, nor in any other man; it can only be found in "The Truth." Therefore every matter must be measured by the scriptural laws and commands; these laws should govern any situation. God demands alike from all without exception, and that is that we should be fundamentally sound in "The Truth."

DOCTRINE MUST BE PURE

It is a common failing in human beings to follow the customs, ways, thoughts, etc., of the greater number. This can-not be done relative to fundamentals or principles of "The Truth,"

Any false doctrine or teaching that would subvert a first principle is evil. We are told in Scripture to "eschew evil." that is, to avoid or shun it. It is very easy to give in to the greater number, but it is very hard to resist. But

Scripture commands us plainly—

Titus 2:7 "In doctrine and showing uncorruptness."

1 Timothy 1:3 – "That thou mightest charge them that they teach no other doctrine. Neither gave the heed to fables."

Acts 2: 42 – "And they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship."

This quotation (Acts 2:42) speaks off the apostles doctrine, and fellowship, and breaking of bread." It is with this fellowship that we are concerned. We read in 1 Cor. 1:9 –

"God is faithful, by Whom we were called into the fellow-ship of His Son Jesus Christ our Lord."

And in John 15:4—"Abide in me, and I in you."

There are all kinds of fellowships: the Oddfellows, Masons, so-called Churches, and many others. We find the dictionary explains the word to mean "association, communion, intimacy, and society."

It can be then stated, that where a group of people are gathered for a single purpose, and enjoy one another's company, they have "fellowship."

THE TRUE FELLOWSHIP

Brethren and sisters, we cannot and must not refer to true scriptural fellowship loosely.

To abide in Christ, and have fellowship with him and the Father in heaven, is indeed a lofty and holy and inspiring thing,

This is the ONLY fellowship we as Christadelphians should be concerned with, and follow. All others have nothing to do with this divine institution as explained in the Word of God.

God has invited us to have fellowship with Him and with His Son Jesus Christ. We must not lower this communion to human standards, but we must be LIFTED UP, as John records the word of Christ (17.23)

"I in them, and Thou in me, that they may be made PERFECT IN ONE."

Heb. 3:1 — "Wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of the HEAVENLY CALLING."

Eph. 1:3 — "Blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ."

Phil. 1:5 — "For your fellowship in the Gospel."

Phil. 3:10 — "That I might KNOW HIM . . . and the fellowship of his suffering; being made conformable unto his death."

1 John 1:6 — "If we say we have fellowship with him, and walk in darkness, WE LIE, and, do not the Truth.

"But IF we walk in the Light, as He is in the Light, we have fellowship one with another."

A DIVINE INSTITUTION

Therefore we are not to be concerned with an ordinary human fellowship, or relationship; we are expected to be concerned with scriptural fellowship in Christ Jesus. This is a divine institution, and not a man's; we have absolutely no rights in setting its requirements.

We cannot depend on the reasoning or, statements of any man, for they are fallible; but GOD'S statements and requirements are infallible, are divine, and are not refutable.

Bro. R. Roberts.—(writing on the quotation found in 2 John 10: "If there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him Godspeed")—has this to say:

"John's declaration reveals the mind of the Spirit. John's commandment is: Receive him not into your house, neither bid him Godspeed. This commandment we can no more evade than any other commandment delivered to us.

"The obedience to it may cost us something. It is crucifying to the flesh to refuse friends—some of them are excellent people as nature goes—who in one way or another have been seduced from their allegiance to the doctrine of Christ, but there is no alternative.

"Friends are but for a moment; the Truth is forever; and if we sacrifice our duty to the latter from regard to the

former, the latter will sacrifice us in the day of its glory, and hand us over to the destiny of the flesh which, as the grass, will pass away.

"He that biddeth him God-speed is partaker of his evil deeds.' This applies to all without distinction, and erects a barrier to fellowship with even some who hold the Truth; for though they may hold the doctrine of Christ themselves, yet if they keep up a 'Godspeed' connection with those who don't, by John's rule they make themselves partakers with them, and therefore cut themselves off from those who stand for the doctrine of Christ." (End of quotation from Bro. Roberts).

In this article by Bro. R. Roberts, he goes on to tell us the epistle of John justifies us in our course (of withdrawal) both as regards those who have , departed from the doctrine of Christ. and those who—while holding on to it themselves—see not their way to break con. nection with those who have departed.

BRO. ROBERTS' STAND

In another place, when the Household was faced with a situation where some had departed from the first principles on just one point, bro. Roberts was placed in a problem by the fact that perhaps the brethren would not uphold him in the s c r i p t u r a l requirements as stated by John and Paul. Bro. Roberts said

"If I am left alone on top of a mountain — if all the brethren and sisters forsake me —I will stand alone, waiting for the coming of the Lord."

We are thankful to God above, that in that day many brethren did stand firmly with bro. Roberts, on the scriptural standard relating to fellowship.

WE MUST PLEASE GOD

Scriptural fellowship must be understood in regard to the basic principle that it must be for GOD's pleasure. We remember how Isaiah shows in ch. 1 that Israel were offering sacrifices and oblations to the Lord, but the Lord said

"To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto Me? It is iniquity, even the solemn meeting."

It is an apostolic teaching to "Behold the goodness AND severity of God." We most recognize both these sides of the divine character. God is indeed good to those who approach in the correct way.

God will draw nigh to those who draw nigh to Him; but this drawing nigh in fellowship must be with complete faith, and SUBMISSION TO THE DIVINE LAW AND COMMANDMENT.

To do them, and obey them, is required without exception. God is severe, and will punish those who say they will obey, but do not.

This becomes an INDIVIADUAL responsibility. That is the reason bro. Roberts said he would stand alone if necessary. We cannot be saved by belonging to any particular group, or because we are a member of a majority or a minority.

MUST BE UNITY IN TRUTH

We must recognize the requirements of God. This includes the divine law as applied to scriptural fellowship. Then we MUST OBEY this divine law, and only seek the fellowship of those who are thus minded and believe the same things. This is scriptural unity.

"That there should be no schism (division) in the Body." Paul had in this 12th ch, of 1 Cor. taught—"For as the Body is One."

There is only "One Body" of Christ, and Christ himself is at the head, and in all things he must have the preeminence. All the Body is knit together, therefore there must be this unity on the essential doctrines of the "One Truth."

Since fellowship is a communion together, then how necessary it is that those who are in fellowship with the Father and the Son Jesus must speak the same things, must not have any differences or division on essential things, for saith Paul (2 Cor. 6)

"What communion hath light with darkness? What fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness?"

"Wherefore come out from among them and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing."

This passage is often quoted concerning the world. This is correct. But note Paul's application of this principle to the Corinthians themselves, as in 1 Cor_ 5. Actually any who do not bring the true doctrine have entered into the way of darkness-

"God is Light, and in Him is no darkness at all" (1 John 1:5).

Therefore anything that comes under the heading of darkness is not of the Truth, therefore not of the Father.

ERROR VOIDS FELLOWSHIP

"In doctrine showing uncorruptness" (Tit. 2:7).

How can we have fellowship with God, Who is Light, if there be any darkness in us or among us?

"God hath shined in our hearts to give the Light of the Knowledge of the Glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ" (2 Cor. 2:6).

This Light is the Glory of God, and rests in HIS TRUTH, as a basis upon which we have access to the Father in the face of the Lord Jesus Christ. Therefore this Light or Truth is the basis of fellowship.

Anything that would change or distort that knowledge (The Truth or essential doctrines) would bar us from that fellowship we are in communion with, we must follow the scriptural commandments relating to withdrawal.

SECTION 2

SCRIPTURAL WITHDRAWAL

There can only be the one answer, and that is the answer God has revealed in HIS Word. The Scriptures alone can provide us with the requirements on when we should withdraw. Bro. Roberts wrote

"It is the duty of the friends of the Truth to unhold it as a basis of union among themselves, by refusing to receive either those who deny any part of it, or those who would receive those so denying."

For the first consideration, we want to go back into the Past. There is nothing new under the sun, what is happening now, has happened before. Men are addicted to certain patterns, (and we are talking about men, are we not?) and although we are concerned about God and His Truth as revealed in the Scriptures., yet we should never underestimate the frailties of the flesh, for we are creatures of the dust, and are so naturally prompted in falling away from Divine standards. Paul said

"But to be SPIRITUALLY-minded is life and peace" (Rom. 7:6). This is what we should seek after, to be thus minded can only come by obeying ALL God requires of us.

However, God coerces no one in obeying Him. God lays down His laws, and expects us to make these laws known to ourselves, and of our own free will to obey them. We cannot assume God will drive or push us into following the pattern of The Truth. We have the clear commands. We must on our initiative obey them, regardless of where they lead—with many or few. That is living Faith. Paul also said –

"For to be CARNALLY minded is death" (Rom. 7:6). Yes, men are addicted to certain patterns, and those patterns are usually of a fleshly or carnal mind. They follow many forms, but basically the results are the same. Men have sought after many inventions (Ecc. 7:29). These have always led them into pathways that are not of the Lord. We all need to be reminded of Jer. 6:16 -

"Thus saith the Lord, stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls."

APOSTACY FROM BEGINNING

God's arm of salvation has been extended repeatedly to the peoples of the earth, for nearly 6000 years; and as repeatedly men, after having been drawn by God to that salvation, have after several generations, apostated from "His Ways."

Need we speak of the days of Noah, of the time after the flood, until Abraham; of the repeated returns to God by the Israelites. then as repeatedly turning into other pathways again?

When God sent unto them His Own Son, they crucified Him; but as a result of the preaching and ministry of Jesus, many turned to the true Way. Ecclesias were established and men turned unto the Lord; seeking after the salvation of our God.

These brethren and sisters, called Christians, had what is termed in Rev. 2, a "First Love," that is, they not only held The Truth in its purity, but they upheld it in practice.

Sad to relate, however, the pattern of human weakness again raised its ugly head. Paul by the Spirit foresaw that an apostacy from the "good way" would set in, in fact he stated it had already begun to work in his own day.

This germ which Paul mentioned, is spoken of in the Revelation, when it matured, as the "doctrine of the Nicolaitaines; and by John in 2 John 7 thus

"This is a deceiver and an anti-Christ."

John is very explicit about the answer of the Spirit on what we should do if any come unto us, and bring not the doctrine of Christ: "RECEIVE HIM NOT."

"AS THE DAYS OF NOAH WERE"

There are two classes who deceive: (1) those who bring false doctrine, and (2) those who uphold them by accepting them into fellowship Therefore the innocent as regard to wrong belief, can become the guilty in accepting those who teach or believe' wrong doctrine.

Paul also is very explicit in writing to the Galatians (1:9)

"If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that you have received, let him be accursed."

Does not this mean that Paul is stating to the Galatian ecclesia, that these Judaizers that were troubling them should be dealt with in the scriptural way?

This is indicated by the teaching of Paul in Galatians 5. He had given a very clear exposition of the question under consideration. Then he said (5:7-12 —Diaglott rendering)

"You were running well, who hindered you from confiding in the Truth? This persuasion is not from Him inviting you."

"A little leaven ferments the whole mass."

"I have confidence in you, that you will not regard any other thing."

"But those who are subverting you SHALL BE CUT OFF."

As we know, the greater number of Christians (Israelites, Jews, Christadelphians) later were deceived and were led away into other ways, they became known as "The Synagogue of Satan" or "Those who say they are Jews but are not" (Rev. 2:9), or as Christ would speak of them as "scattered sheep", (or "lost sheep." The command of the Spirit is very clear

"Remember from whence thou are fallen and do the first works, or else I will come unto thee quickly, and remove thy candlestick" (Rev. 2:5).

The result appears in Rev. 3:16:

"So because thou are lukewarm, and neither hot or cold. I will spue thee out of my mouth."

This then shows the same pattern as before, the straying sons of God in Noah's day, to the straying brethren and sisters of Christ in the first century of the year of our Lord.

Jesus was crucified in A.D. 33. 120 years later the Synagogue of Satan was fully established and the deceiver had entered in.

Noah preached the Gospel for 120 years to a straying people who were supposed to be the Sons of God. And Christ said -

"As the days of Noah were, so shall the day of the coming of the Son of Man be" (Matt 24:37).

OUR DAY IS NO DIFFERENT

We are without question in the days predicted by Christ. Brethren and sisters, let us not deceive ourselves, the deceiver and the Anti-Christ comes in our midst. Our day is no different to the times gone by; the pattern of deviating comes from within. As Jude says in v4 -

"There are certain men crept in unawares."

And Paul adds his voice, in Acts 20:30 -

"Also of your own selves shall men arise speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them."

"For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock" (v. 29).

In Christ's parable of the sheepfold we are told that "I am the door" and "I am the good shepherd." In this parable we have four kinds of state or conditions mentioned: (1) the sheep, (2) "he that entereth not by the door", (3) the hireling, and (4) the wolves.

The teaching of Scripture is plain, there is only one way we can enter righteously into the sheepfold, that is through the door (Christ). Those who do so are the sheep, and Christ becomes their shepherd.

As long as we hear his voice and obey the commandments we need have no fear. The Shepherd's voice is the voice of the Almighty reposing in His Son: therefore we must obey, to remain safely in the sheepfold.

Those who climb into the sheepfold another way are those who come among the flock and appear to be one of them, yet they are not

"Those who say they are' Jews but are not" (Rev. 2:9).

These do not always become known except when a time of test comes: then they do not hear the voice of the Shepherd.

The Hireling: Bro. Roberts stated in his writing on this parable -

"An hireling is one who goes along with wandering sheep. He is a paid worker, one who works in the sheepfold or among wandering sheep for money."

"A spiritual hireling is revealed in the priest, minister and clergy. Also in those who work in the vineyard for personal glory or profit."

The Wolves: Bro. Roberts stated -

"A spiritual wolf is one who comes in with a fleece, who is hard to recognize, because he hides himself under a fleece or cloak of pretended humility and piousness."

The Pharisees were of this type. The Israelites who were called by Jesus, 'Lost Sheep' were deceived by them into believing that they were godly men. So the Lost Sheep were led by their false teachers (wolves) into crucifying their promised Savior, whom actually they were' looking for. According to the Scripture it is possible to still do the same

"Seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame."

We must beware of wolves in fleece or sheep's clothing; we too can be led into a position of forsaking the shepherd and becoming scattered.

The hireling leaves the sheepfold when he see's the wolves come, he flees and the sheep are scattered. The hireling, however, is still for hire, and to whom? To the "Lost Sheep" as in Israel, who retained their hirelings.

We are happy however that God has reserved for Himself a remnant who will hear their Master's voice, remaining in the sheepfold. In Matt 7:15 Christ said

."Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly are ravening wolves."

A ravenous wolf is a destroyer of the divine commandment, he tells the sheep of another way, which if they walk in will cause them to become "Lost Sheep."

What is the scriptural command on what to do when we know and identify these wolves?

"That ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the traditions which he received from us" (2 Thess. 3:6).

"If any man preach any other gospel unto you than ye have received, let him be accursed" (Gal. 1:9).

"This know also that in the last days perilous times shall come. . . . Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof; from such turn away" (2 Tim. 3:1)

"A man that is an heretic after the first and second admonition reject. Know that he that is such is subverted" (Tit. 3:10).

Note the EXPRESS COMMAND: "Withdraw thyself"—"Let him be accursed"—"From such turn away"—"Reject."

* * *

You may ask, how about a situation where the majority refuse to withdraw from such, are we then to leave the majority? We can only take the scriptural answer. He that allows these wolves to remain in the fold or "in the house", is therefore accepting them, and "bidding them God Speed". Therefore scripturally they are partakers of the evil deeds. Study again the 2 Epistle of John. Also the Scripture -

"What fellowship hath light with darkness . . . COME OUT from among them."

Paul and John had the Spirit, therefore we cannot question the divine command, because God has placed the Spirit Word into our keeping. In the Spirit Word we have the answer to all problems. We are bound to obey; not our will, but the Lord's will, is to be obeyed.

Without question then the Lord has told us what to do and how to conduct ourselves in relation to the "Fellowship of the Father and His Son Jesus Christ."

"AVOID THEM"

We have left an important passage out of the list above and now quote therefrom (Rom. 16:17)

"Mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and AVOID THEM." Let us understand this correctly as intended by Paul. We are to "avoid" certain ones. Certainly this is not referring specifically to those who have nothing to do with the Truth. Those who we are told to mark and avoid are those who, being contrary to the doctrine which we have learned, cause divisions and offenses.

In other words, they are false teachers and believers, wolves in sheep's clothing; who lead the flock astray, compromisers of the doctrine who also cause the sheep to become scattered and lost.

How can we do this, if we allow them to remain in fellowship, or association? The Spirit's answer is simple. and if we rightly divide the Word of God, dovetailing Scripture with Scripture, we will have no problem in understanding the desire and command of God.

OUR PIONEERS WERE RIGHT

There are many today in the group called Christadelphians, who teach differently from the above. Brethren and sisters, The Truth never changes, only men change. The understanding the pioneers of the Faith had on scriptural fellowship and withdrawal was RIGHT, and if right then we should also defend the same course, and not deviate from it in any way.

You say, perhaps they could have been wrong, being human. Well, I for one wholeheartedly accept the teachings of bro. John Thomas, bro. R. Roberts, and others who manifest their fruits as being of the Lord.

I am astounded at some of the brethren of today who say we are still "searching" for truth. We HAD The Truth (or should have had) when we were baptized. We were asked

"Do you believe the things concerning the Kingdom of God, and the Name of Jesus Christ?"

On this basis, we HAD The Truth, therefore we are no longer searchers for it. Certainly we are under command to walk therein, and to grow thereby, to become deeper and more imbedded into it. Having The Truth, we came under the statement in Heb. 3:6 -

"Whose House we ARE, IF we hold fast the confidence and rejoicing of THE HOPE firm unto the end."

"AT ONE" WITH GOD

In conclusion of this section, we would like to emphasize a teaching in Scripture that stands out plainly all through, from Genesis to Revelation—that is the requirement of God to be "at one" with Him.

Adam in the garden prior to his fall was in unity with divine things, and if he had remained obedient he would undoubtedly been allowed to partake of the "Tree of Life" and so live for ever. Sin severed this connection of being at one, and ever since the purpose of God has been to reconcile or rebind; and to bring about that relation between God and men that had been lost.

The meaning of the word "religion" is to "rebind." The whole meaning of the efficacy of the acceptable sacrifice of Christ, is that He, Christ was "at one" with the Father: "I and My Father are one." In John 17:21-23 he prays -

"That they all may be one: as Thou Father, are in me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in us."

"And the glory which Thou gavest me I have given them; that they may be one even as we are one."

"I in them, and Thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one."

When do we become "at one" with God? When we have believed all of the first principles of the Truth, ..and have confessed this in the waters of baptism into the death of Christ, and have recognized that this body of sin must be destroyed and crucified. Upon "The Truth" then we can be bound to "the Father of Lights with Whom there is no shadow of turning."

It is true that after this event, we do sin, and we can lose this relationship; but

"We have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the Righteous" (John 2:1).

Paul in writing to Timothy said "KEEP that which is committed to thy trust." The Truth then which has been committed to our trust, will be the means by which we can be united with the Father through our Lord Jesus Christ.

A departure from any one element of "The Truth" will cause a separation or a disunity; for the very means by which God has redeemed us by Christ's blood, would be assailed; and like Adam there would be a usurpation, or a seeking to grasp by another way that which is not ours, for it is not in man to show the way in any sense.

There must be a complete obliteration of self, an emptying of ourselves, or our own way, or beliefs; and a declaration of God's righteousness. A declaration that only in HIS Way can we find life. only by humbling ourselves in complete obedience to all of the elements of The Truth as it is in Jesus.

A TIME TO SEPARATE

What is our duty then in regard to others who may assail that which has been "committed to our trust"? There are two classes mentioned in Scripture: Light and Darkness. God is light. All men's inventions are darkness to the Lord. Therefore any—even some who may claim to be in The Truth—if they assail or if they associate with those so 'assailing The Truth, we can do no other than to "mark them, and avoid them" (Rom. 16:17); to "be separate and touch not the unclean thing" (2 Cor. 6).

Bro. Roberts in Clause 40 of the Ecclesia Guide, "A TIME TO SEPARATE, AND HOW TO GO ABOUT IT," says "Suppose the majority decided upon something that involves the denial of the Truth, or a violation of the commandments. The minority might have to consider whether continued fellowship with the majority would not be inconsistent with their duty to Christ. There is a time to separate, as well as a time to hold together."

Bro. Roberts again on our Duty toward Errorists -

"Places will change and persons will die, but the Truth and duty are the same as ever. The Truth of God at all hazards is the only course open to men with open eyes."

"You believe the right thing yourself, but you receive another who is in fellowship with those everywhere who believe the wrong, and are leagued in opposition to the right."

"In this you take part with the wrong. It would be pleasant if we were at liberty to make personal goodwill the rule of fellowship; but no man can act on this principle who accepts the apostolic writings as a Rule of Conduct."

SECTION 3

EVENTS RELATING TO FELLOWSHIP

From 1835 to 1910

(To be illustrated with a chart at the proposed meeting)

In God's Grace "The Truth as it is in Jesus" was allowed to shine into men's hearts again, in these latter years of Gentile times. Let us not be under any delusion on this. Christ said (John 17)

"Sanctify them through Thy Truth. Thy Word is Truth."

The word "sanctify" indicates the process of being changed from evil to good, or to be set apart from the world as it now is. Therefore the act of baptism after receiving The Truth, accomplished this (Rom. 6:4)

"Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into his death."

And v. 6—"Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed."

In this position, then, we have "The Truth," so that we can be sanctified in it. This is an important point, because as Christ said, the Word of God is Truth, therefore we become sanctified BY IT—The Truth, The Word.

We cannot take away from it; neither can we add to it. The Truth of the Gospel must remain intact in us as we received it in baptism.

The Truth was revealed to Dr. John Thomas about 125 years ago, who devoted his life to becoming firmly implanted into it.

Bro. R. Roberts followed in the steps of bro. Thomas: and working together for many years prior to the death of bro. Thomas, they built on the foundation of the prophets and apostles, Jesus Christ being the Rock of their conviction.

In the work of the brethren in these early years we had the unfolding of God's Word revealed to us by the Grace of God. These brethren fought a good fight of faith and maintained for the purity of the Truth. They recognized the scriptural c o m i n a n d, "FIRST pure. then peaceable."

Human nature and the proneness to stray soon however, as in the days gone by, entered into the picture. The Truth was again assailed by perverters. As Christ and the apostles foretold, the wolves entered in, to destroy the flock.

THE DOWIEITES

In the 1860's a group called the Dowieites had entered and were teaching some form of immortal-soulism, also other combining elements of false teaching. The brethren dealt with these who brought another doctrine, and the false believers were disfellowshipped, and the Truth was preserved for us.

RENUNCIATIONISM

In the 1870's we had the Truth again assailed, this time touching on the very nature of Jesus. They taught that the death of Jesus was not in any sense necessary to his own salvation, that he offered an "unforfeited" life in payment of the penalty incurred by Adam.

These false brethren, led by sward Turney, were dealt with scripturally and put out of fellowship, and the Truth was preserved in its soundness to continue to shed its light.

PARTIAL INSPIRATION

In the following decade, the 1890's, there arose another trial to disturb (and test) the Household. The latterday, scientific theory of Partial Inspiration of the Scriptures found root among some of the brethren. Some taught that the Bible was only partially inspired.

As usual with error, there was a wide range of degree of the application of this false principle, some at the edges seeming quite innocent and close to the Truth, but all was dangerous and part of the basic error.

Brethren who upheld The Truth in its purity acted and cut off the false teachers and believers and all who tolerated them. Those who were cut off became known as the Suffolk Street group.

RESPONSIBILITY

The next situation of test for the Household was the Responsibility trouble. We pause here a little because' some groundwork is in order to understand later developments.

Among other basic wrong teachings, certain ones taught that the enlightened, unbaptized rejector of the Truth would not be raised for judgment at the return of Christ to the earth.

Bro. R. Roberts and bro. John Thomas taught very plainly that the rejectors WOULD be raised to judgment at the judgment seat of Christ, prior to the establishment of the Kingdom, as the Scripture plainly teaches and as also Clause_ 24 of the , Birmingham Amended Statement of Faith specifically upholds. This latter point is very significant in light of recent developments).

For several years after the death of bro. Roberts, even , though the clarifying amendment had been made to prevent any misunderstanding or misinterpreting of Clause 24, there were still some remaining in fellowship who were causing trouble on this issue. They were called "Honest Doubters"; they doubted the clear statement that ALL who are responsible through enlightenment are to be judged at Christ's judgment seat.

Bro. C. C. Walker, then editor of the Christadelphian Magazine, came out with a clear statement, and wrote a pamphlet, because certain brethren who were troubled by the presence of the false leaven were abstaining from the Table of the Lord.

Bro. C. C. Walker assured these brethren that some action would be taken. The brethren abstaining from the Table resumed fellowship, and since then where do we find these so-called "honest doubters"? Why, in the Suffolk Group. They became obscure because there was no question of their acceptance in the Suffolk Group, and no objections to their doubts.

What about the other brethren and sisters who were forced out of fellowship by the application of the amendment of Clause 24? They first were known as Andrewites, and in the U.S. and Canada as followers of Thomas Williams. Later those who were with bro. Andrews united with the Suffolk group, whilst the followers of Thomas Williams in this country became known as Advocates.

"CLEAN FLESH"

We now come to the early years of the 1900's—to 1910. In these years another trial came upon the scene. In Australia a certain bro. Bell started teaching the "Clean Flesh" error. The faithful brethren in Australia acted against this brother and those who would tolerate his teaching,

'Bro. C. C. Walker and the English brethren upheld these faithful ones, and upheld their separation from the Bell teachings. Notice was given in the Christadelphian Magazine that bro. Bell and his adherents would he refused in fellowship.

However, here we ran into a different situation. Up until this time those who became not of us had other statements of faith than the BASF. But the Bell group PROFESSED to still meet on the BASF. This group be-came known later as the "Shield" group, and became the largest group in Australia under the name of Christadelphian.

We now make an important point. Five group have been considered relative to division. This means that separation resulted in many being cut off.

Also there were other disturbances where one or a few would be put out of fellowship. For instance, the "Immortal Emergence" group; these were disfellowshipped in harmony with scriptural command. And also the Andrewites later united with the Suffolk group.

The point we want to emphasize is this. In every one of the divisions considered there were those who were not in agreement with the error itself, yet sympathized with, or tolerated, the teachers of the error.

Also there were in each case some who could not make up their minds, spoken of as "fence-sitters."
Both of these groups were refused fellowship by the faithful brethren, in keeping with the scriptural teaching of fellowship in 2 John.

THE OUTLOOK CHANGES

From that time (1910 or thereabouts) we find a change developing in the main group (Temperance Hall group, now Central). They ceased to take action against the teachers or believers of false doctrines.

True, they still stated that scripturally this was required. Even today they still state that scriptural withdrawal is sometimes necessary, and you will find some individual cases on absence from the Table and marriage out of the Truth where this is done.

But never since has there been any group acted against where disfellowship was necessary.

This should give us pause. False teachers and believers, from Adam until now, have continuously entered the sheepfold, to try to test the flock, as to whether they will stand firmly for the Truth.

We have been made ambassadors for the Truth, or custodians. God will require of us a reckoning of what we have done with His Truth. Surely all of a sudden wolves would not stop bothering the sheep, or entering the sheepfold. We know this could not be so. The sheep are to be tested now, as in any other period. Many times as a result of this testing they have become scattered and lost.

It is for us to beware, and to remain in the true sheepfold, looking unto our Shepherd for the right way.

LATTERDAY TREND TO UNION

Take a quick look at the Central group today. Instead of fighting against the error, as in the past, they have gone on a crusade to bring back and unite with all of those groups that were disfellowshipped because of error.

Instead of keeping the Truth pure, and upholding the scriptural teaching on fellowship, they are busy bringing about what some speak of as a "United Household."

This is not in accordance with the history of the Truth, and the actions of faithful brethren of the past. It has been the very reverse. In fact, the very act of seeking to unite with a group of people who have been, and still are, astray, in itself is contrary to the wisdom of God.

The Scriptures do not predict a revival, or a uniting of all claiming to be Jews or spiritual Israelites. But the scriptures DO state on the other hand, in Jesus' own words

"Nevertheless, when the Son of Man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?"

They DO state it shall be as in the days of Noah, when the sons of God went astray. They DO state that—"In the last days, perilous times shall come."

This time of peril in the last days is a message to the Household itself. God at present is not concerned with the wicked outside His plan. He is concerned about His children, and warns them of this great peril in the last days, when some will profess to godliness but deny the power t h e r e o f. "From such TURN AWAY." is the command of God.

In these last, perilous days just before our Lord's return, we need to lift ourselves up to a closer and purer association with God above, rather than lower our standards and broaden the way to include compromisers and toleration of false teaching, against which faithful brethren have defended and preserved the Truth in the past, so that we have it intact.

"Humble yourselves in the sight of God, and He shall LIFT YOU UP" (James 4:10).

And Paul exhorts (1 Cor. 14:20) -

"Brethren, be not children in understanding. Howbeit in malice be ye children, but in understanding be men."

"Lean not to thine own understanding" (Prov. 3:5).

SECTION 4

EVENTS RELATING TO FELLOWSHIP

*And the Departure of the Majority from the Standard once adhered to.
1910 to the Present (1961) (Also illustrated with chart)*

It is usual for departures from the Truth to start slowly and be concealed. This was so in the 1910 to 1920 period. While some recognized the slippage, most had their eyes diverted, and were not aware of the danger they were being led into.

Suddenly the great test was placed before the Temperance Hall (Central) group. For several years in the U. S. a bro. A. D. Strickler had been teaching errors on the nature of man, and the sacrifice of Christ.

In the early 1920's the brethren in the U. S. and Canada had to act against the error. As before, and true to human nature, there were those who sympathized and tolerated the Strickler false teachings.

In conjunction with this situation the brethren in England were having their problem. A division took place there on the constabulary question, also other questionable conditions in the Temperance Hall (Central) fellowship.

The test had come as it had so many times before. The Temperance (Central) fellowship refused to act against the errorists and tolerators. Disfellowship against false teachers and those who bid them Godspeed had been taken by the Brotherhood from 1835 to 1910 but now bro. C. C. Walker and the other adherents to the Christadelphian Magazine policy refused to take action against the perversion in their days.

The result of this situation was the forming of the Berean Christadelphian fellowship, contenders for "The Truth," upheld in the apostolic days, and in the years 1835 to 1910.

All of the brethren and sisters in the San Gabriel ecclesia (except those who have been baptized since 1953) were members, and fellowshipped in the Berean fellowship; as did the Santa Barbara, Glendale, Los Angeles and Pomona ecclesias.

WERE WE RIGHT THEN?

Was the action in the early 1920's against the Strickler doctrine and the Central as tolerators right? Is there any question of the righteousness of the separation? And were we justified in taking action against those who upheld the Strickler doctrine, and the majority in England who refused to take action?

We took the same stand and acted in the same way as the previous 5 aforementioned major divisions. To say we were wrong on the Strickler division, would also say bro. C. C. Walker and Central did wrong on the Belt division; bro. Roberts would have been wrong, and his supporters, on the Responsibility, Partial Inspiration, Free life, and Dowieite divisions.

On the other hand if the right action (scripturally) was taken in those previous major divisions, then the Berean Christadelphian stand against Stricklerism, and other departures, was right and justified.

Let us be assured of this, because on this point hangs all of the right and the wrong of the history of the Truth from 1923 to 1961 (i.e, the present).

SOUND REUNION IMPOSSIBLE

Read again the scriptural commands on withdrawal, and how the brethren acted from 1860 to 1910 against all dangers that threatened the Household.

We will have to agree the Berean Christadelphian position in 1923 followed the same course, and therefore they were right in their stand against the false doctrines. This test in the Brotherhood revealed there had been a departure from Scriptural standards by many in the U, S. and Canada, also by the, majority in the British Isles.

Not only a departure by some on doctrine, but also by many on the right application of Scriptural fellowship. Bro. C. C. Walker and others winked at the Strickler error, and allowed it to remain in their house.

This placed them on the other side of the line of demarcation between Scriptural fellowship and a group that had departed from the scriptural way.

During the following years there were several attempts to unite the Berean fellowship with the Central group. These attempts failed several times, until in the later 40's many of the Berean group in England, united with Central on a compromise, and become absorbed in what up to that time had been considered by them (Bereans) a departed group.

GOING TO LAW AGAINST

In these attempts at Reunion, an error in the Central group became very pronounced. We refer to the Going to Law Against Another question. In the March 1927 Berean, pg. 127, it was stated

"The same principles are seen operative in respect of 'Going to Law Before the Unjust.' The saint must not do this, because such is of the same nature as killing; it is a species of vengeance."

The result of the revealing of the Central group's error on the Going to Law question caused the Berean fellowship to bring out a "Final Statement" in which it is stated (No. 5)

"That the commandments of Christ prohibit a brother or sister going to law against another person for the redress of any grievance whatsoever. Our governing apostolic principle is to 'Rather take wrong, and suffer yourselves to be defrauded.' "

This statement is taken from the 1947 Berean Reunion Report, and CENTRAL WOULD NOT ACCEPT THIS. The Final Berean Report declared Reunion impossible

"In view of the unsatisfactory reply of the Central Committee in their letter of March, 1947, in which going to law against another before the unjust to obtain legal divorce is strongly defended."

DETROIT CHANGES ITS BELIEF

In the Berean Magazine, 1947, a statement was issued by the Detroit ecclesia relative to going to law against another before the unjust. They state

"The Detroit ecclesia has not changed—and sees no reason or possibility of changing—from the foregoing scriptural position."

Yet six years later the majority of the then Detroit ecclesia DID change, because in 1953 this majority united with a group (Central) which gave no assurance, nor intimated in any way that they had changed from their position of toleration of many in their midst who would go to law against another before the unjust for certain causes.

At the time of the reunion, it was proposed in the Detroit ecclesia that they reaffirm their long-held scriptural position on going to law. In the discussion of this proposition they were told by a brother who was a leader in the Reunion movement that if they did so they could not join Central. The proposition to reaffirm their earlier position failed overwhelmingly.

These matters are on record, and there can be no doubt of the dependability of the evidence of this condition of error that has resided in the Central position for many years, and still does.

At no time has there been any indication that the Central group are now sound on the matter of going to law before the unjust, but rather the reverse.

But there is a great deal of evidence to be found in the Christadelphian Magazine in the years 1878 to 1910 that at that time bro. Roberts and the defenders of the Truth were definitely and uncompromisingly against going to law against another for ANY cause. Therefore again is revealed the Berean position to be the same as when the Truth was upheld and defended.

AT THE DOOR FELLOWSHIP

As before stated, the majority in the South California ecclesias were in the Berean fellowship during the period from 1923 to 1953—30 years. We believe that the brethren of that period would state that

"The separation in 1923 against Strickler and his followers was scriptural and necessary."

Bro. C. C. Walker stated that bro. Strickler was "crotchety, but fundamentally sound." Birmingham ecclesia stated "Until the Buffalo brother (Strickler) comes to our doors we will take no action. We will continue to fellowship visitors from Buffalo and all other ecclesias which support him in fellowship."

This act of "at-the-door fellowship" was a deviation from the former understanding on when to act; also it was a deviation from scriptural commands.

CENTRAL UNREPENTANT

Many years after this, bro. Walker gave up the editorship and it passed into the hands of bro. John Carter. In 1947 bro. Carter wrote

"There never was cause for separation . . . There is no need for us to repent."

Six years later, even though this had been stated, the majority of the Bereans in the U.S. and Canada joined the Central group, and this bro. Carter—who had made such a statement—presided over the conference to bring the union to pass.

The brethren and sisters of the Central group never did repent of the action they took on the Strickler errors. They never did change. Their understanding of fellowship in 1953 was the same as in 1923. Many in Central today will still state

"There never was cause for separation ... There is no need for us to repent."

WAS THE FORMER STAND RIGHT?

It is time to repeat a former statement: if the Central position on fellowship is scripturally right now, then the separation from Central by the Berean brethren was a wrong action and unscriptural, and therefore the 5 aforesaid major divisions were also unscriptural.

But on the other hand, if the 5 major separations in the past were scripturally right and justified, then this would show that the Central group were wrong, that the Reunion in 1953 was also wrong, and that since then, all of the other reunions are an evidence of this fact.

All of the brethren and sisters who have become associated with these departed groups have therefore placed themselves on the other side of the line of demarcation in scriptural fellowship.

CENTRAL DID NOT CHANGE

In 1947 an attempt was made in this country to bring about a union between Central and Berean. This attempt headed up into the "Detroit" Conference.

As a result of this conference, we found that without a doubt the evidence conclusively showed the Central group had not changed. Not only did all of the then Berean ecclesias settle back into a conviction of the rightness of their stand in separation from Central, but several ecclesias who had weakened their position and returned to Central realized their mistake and re-established themselves with the Berean group.

We would here like to emphasize that the S. Calif. ecclesias all reiterated their firm stand on the Berean position, and several brethren of experience stated it would be impossible to unite with Central unless they changed, and indicated so to us.

We would like to ask: "When DID they change, and when did bro. J. Carter himself indicate or state he had changed his mind on his statement--"

"There never was any cause for separation . . . There is no need for us to repent."

We ask again: "When did the toleraters, compromisers, and upholders of the Strickler doctrine ever admit they had changed their views on scriptural fellowship?"

Were then, the California brethren wrong in 1947 when they said Central would have to change? Certainly they were not. Yet what happened?

As we all know, 3 years later in 1950 a movement started in California to investigate the possibility of reunion with the Central group.

After much negotiation and meetings of reunion committees, a plan was developed and a conference was planned. This conference became known as the Jersey City Conference.

To present a picture of the unsoundness of this Jersey City conference. and the resulting reunion, I would like to quote from another brother's letter, written in 1953

JERSEY CITY CONFERENCE

(Start of 1953 Letter Extract)

The reunion movement has been a Berean movement to go back to Central. not a Central movement to correct a wrong position.

To join them on this basis is to concede that this is true and Bereans were wrong for separating in the first place.

Now as to the JC "Conference." My view on the wisdom of "Conferences" to settle doctrinal matters is exactly as stated in the Ecclesial Guide:

"Fraternal Gatherings are beneficial when restricted to purely spiritual objects that is, let the brethren assemble anywhere from anywhere, and exhort, or worship, or have social intercourse together: but they become sources of evil if allowed to acquire a legislative character in the least degree."

It cannot be denied that the JC Conf. comes under the latter heading. Brethren met to devise legislation for the body. and ever since tremendous effort has been made to impose this legislation on the brotherhood.

The strange and sad thing - and bro Carter had to be pressured to consent to the conference, and they agreed to it only on their own terms—that any discussion of the past be prohibited.

--Bro. Johnston, secretary of the movement in Calif., says that this basis (the "Pomona" resolution) was not favored by most of the brethren in California, but they had to accept Central's terms in order to get the conference at all.

Looking at it from the viewpoint that the Berean action in separating from Stricklerism and its supporters was the faithful and correct course (and I am still among those who believe this), it seems to be utterly absurd that a reunion conference should be arranged according to the dictates of the side that was in error, and that they should be permitted to legislate that the facts of the separation should be ruled out of the discussion.

And then even stranger still —the chairman of the conference—the one with the direction and control of the whole movement in his hands—with power and authority (and he did, too) to rule out any Berean brethren who are not satisfied and who wish to get to the truth of the matter—the chairman is chosen from the side in error in the separation!

Can anything be more unbelievable? Truly, it is all like a nightmare. A strong delusion—an irresistible compulsion — seems to have swept over the Berean brotherhood.

BEREANS RULED DOWN

So the conference is arranged with a brother for the erring side in full charge and ecclesias are invited to send "delegates" if they are prepared to completely ignore the past 30 years' struggle of the Truth against error and toleration and loose fellowship.

The Bereans present meet the night before. They solemnly agree that the Ten Point Statement shall be a part of any basis of reunion. This is a covenant among them.

This was the stand the Berean fellowship had taken generally (in happier days)—that the Truth had been undermined by errorists and tolerators who persistently declared that they accepted and insisted upon the acceptance of the BASF.

Bereans were agreed that this Ten Point Statement had been specifically prepared in a faithful attempt to pin down and disarm this error, and that all who were truly zealous for the Truth against this error would gladly support it.

The conference meets. The chairman completely controls the course of events—has more to say than everyone else put together — and rules out of order faithful Berean brethren who have nobly fought this issue from the beginning.

Bereans are ruled out because they want to ask bro Carter about a letter he wrote in 1944, but bro Carter can himself speak without limit. He goes back to 1870 (though Bereans couldn't refer to 1944) and he talks about every division EXCEPT the one the conference has met to straighten out!

UN SOUND COMMITTEE

The conference chooses a committee to draw up a basis for reunion. Who is chosen? Stalwart Berean brethren who have stood firm and fought this matter? Central brethren who (though necessarily weak on fellowship) at least have been sound on Stricklerism?

Oh, how can anyone regard this reunion movement as anything but unsound—as a dreadful delusion that swept over our once happy and zealously united body?

The committee is chosen—4 from the side that was in error, 3 from the side that stood out faithfully for the Truth. And again the chairman is chosen, of course, from the erring side —the side that has always considered the Berean action wrong and unjustified.

Who is on the committee for Central — the committee to draw up a sound, scriptural basis for the suppression of the Strickler error and the defence of the Truth. (I still find this almost impossible to believe.)

Two of Central's committee members are brethren who have long been unsound themselves on the very question.

One of them, says bro. Deakin —and I now quote from bro. Deakin's recent circular, p. 6-

"... made a grievous error (in his speech at the JC Conf) ... a denial of scriptural teaching ... the brother was obliged to retract his error ... that is the very error which leads on to, and forms the basis of, the false teaching from Buffalo which had caused the division from our Central brethren."

Incidentally, in listening carefully to the tapes of the Conf., I could not detect anywhere that this bro. retracted his error—it seemed to me that he justified it, and he used the old Strickler arguments about the word "defilement" and that "sin" means "sin offering", etc. But this is one of the brethren chosen to devise a basis for the repudiation of Stricklerism.

The other of the two lived in Detroit for some time, and our brethren (related to him) had long talks with him, and there is no doubt (from the testimony of these brethren) that there was a difference of belief between him and us on the nature and sacrifice of Christ. We have heard indefinitely, through third parties, that bro. Carter is reported to have—between his landing and the JC Conference — to have converted this brother from Stricklerism).

If the reunion movement were sound, would Central choose these two brethren as their representatives to draw up safeguards against Stricklerism?

THE BEREAN COMMITTEE

And whom do the Bereans pick? I have no wish to offend anyone, but I must say that the choice of the 3 Berean brethren certainly does not help remove my conviction that this reunion movement is not on a sound foundation.

Would the Bereans not surely pick 3 brethren outstanding and consistent in the long struggle in defense of the Truth?

One brother has been in and out of the Berean fellowship more than once before. He recently rejoined the Bereans after several years with Central. I do not say this as a reproach. It is perfectly legitimate, I believe all his moves back and forth were done sincerely, but would not a sound movement select consistent Bereans who have stood firm on the principle of fellowship with error?

Another brother on this very responsible committee has been a Berean 5 years. Previous to that he had been all his life an Advocate. Again I desire to cast no reflection, I am friendly with this brother and like him very much, but he was brought up amongst the Advocates with the Advocate outlook on fellowship, until he moved to the U.S. from England.

There was no Advocate meeting in the city in which he settled. When he moved he became Berean. Again, I am by no means inferring that there is anything wrong with what he did. And there are many earnest, sincere, and hard-working brethren among the Advocates — this brother certainly is earnest, sincere, and hard-working.

But you are doubtless aware of the Advocate outlook on fellowship. They just do not take it as seriously as we do. Would a sound reunion movement, careful to preserve the soundness of the past on fellowship, choose this brother—newly become a Berean—for the great responsibility of drawing up a basis for union?

ABANDON 10-PT. STATEMENT

But at least as this committee of 4 Central brethren and 3 Bereans meets we still have the safeguard of the Ten Point Statement which the Bereans have covenanted to stand by and insist upon. Although outnumbered, we can surely depend on the Bereans in this committee to fulfill this covenant.

But when the committee reports, we look in vain for any mention of the Ten Point Statement. (We learn later, by inquiry, that one lone Berean brother labored to save them, but he was overwhelmed by all the rest).

The committee simply comes up with a statement of what the Central ecclesias have claimed to stand for all along—a statement that bro. Strickler himself would have gladly subscribed to!

After 30 years of struggling for the Truth, we are solemnly invited to reunite on a basis that Central would have been quite willing to agree to all along. Why then have we been out 30 years?

UNITE ON A.D.S. STATEMENT!

The Buffalo ecclesia makes a statement at the Conference of how it interprets, and on what basis it accepts, the BASF. This Buffalo statement is admittedly taken from a book by bro. Allen Strickler where he is endeavouring to prove that Christ did not have to offer for himself, that no offering was required for sinful flesh.

Is it believable? — the conference agrees to reunite on the basis of a statement that is taken from the book that caused the division!

Subsequent to the JC Conf. bro. Rbt. Strickler was asked if there had been any change in Buffalo's beliefs. He said, No, and to prove it he referred to the fact the statement Buffalo made at the JC Conf., was written by bro. Allen Strickler in 1921.

In refusing to officially endorse the recent statement drawn up in Buffalo by bro. Brewis, Edwards and D. King, bro. Strickler again explained that Buffalo Central's statement at the JC Conf. is their only official statement, and that he had been told by bro. Carter not to sign the other (later) one.

PHILA. INTERPRETATION

On May 10, 1947 the Philadelphia Central ecclesia issued a statement beginning

"Because of many enquiries in recent years from divers sources as to our basis of fellowship and belief, and because of certain misrepresentations of our basis and belief . . .

We now wish to declare ourselves in no uncertain terms with respect to these controversial matters.

"Our statement, made many times, that we have not changed our basis and belief since the formation of our ecclesia, is still true."

"In reference to statements 5, 8, 10 & 12 of Doctrines to be Believed, and statement No. 27 of Doctrines to be Rejected, we accept them as interpreted by bro. Roberts ..

And then they go on to quote from bro. Roberts writings in 1869 in an attempt to prove there was no change in Adam's physical nature at the Fall.

(Note the significant connection of this with the "grievous error" that bro. Deakin reported was made at the JC Conf. by one of the Central committee brethren).

This May 10, 1947 Phila. statement is selfevidently intended as a considered declaration of a long established position of belief "on these controversial matters."

This official statement forced bro. Carter to take note, because it was clear, spontaneous evidence from a Central ecclesia that the Berean charges for 25 years had been correct and the Birmingham action in blocking the Berean action and supporting this ecclesia in fellowship, had been wrong.

Of this official Phila. statement, bro. Carter wrote in Sept. 1947 issue:

"While claiming 'unswerving loyalty and belief' of the BASF . . . it is evident a meaning is being attached to bro. Roberts' words quoted in the circular that he did not intend . . .

"The interpretation which is being imposed upon the BASF by the Phila. circular is contrary to all other statements on the subject in the writings of Dr. Thomas and bro. Roberts."

Note that throughout, Phila. claims "unswerving loyalty and belief" of the Statement of Faith—they would have had no difficulty in 1947 or any other time in accepting the JC resolution as a basis of fellowship!

In Oct., 1948 a note appeared in the Christadelphian that Phila. had agreed to a list of quotations by bre. Thomas and Roberts that bro. Carter had submitted to them:

No mention was made of any repudiation of the beliefs that bro. Carter had so strongly objected to.

PHILADELPHIA: "NO CHANGE"

It seemed very strange that the matter should be closed on just an acceptance of the quotation presented by bro. Carter, with no repudiation or correction of the error and the position so strongly laid down in their May 10, 1947 letter which they claimed was a statement in no uncertain terms of the way Phila. had always interpreted the BASF.

So a Detroit brother wrote Phila. in Nov., 1948, after the above had appeared in the Oct. magazine, and he asked them if there had been any change in their belief or ecclesial position as defined in their May 10, 1947 circular. The Philadelphia ecclesia replied -

"Our ecclesial position is exactly as represented by bro. Carter, which by the way represents no change during the last quarter century . . .

"In response to many requests we stated our position (May 10th circular) and bro. Carter subsequently asked for many further details in light of quotation given in Christadelphian."

While in Philadelphia this April, 1953, I asked bro. Cooper if this May 10, 1947 statement still represented the position of the Phila. ecclesia. He said, "Yes, together with the material submitted by bro. Carter."

As to his May 10, 1947 letter, he told me he had submitted it to bro. Carter and that bro. Carter had said, "That is all right as far as it goes, but it does not go far enough."

(That, of course, is very hard to harmonize with what bro. Carter said in the Sept., 1947 magazine).

Throughout, there has not been the slightest hint of any change or repudiation of false teaching, but rather a continual insistence that there has been NO CHANGE.

Buffalo and Phila. insist that they have always maintained "unswerving loyalty and belief of the BSAF" and have not changed.—G V G.

(End of 1953 Letter Extract)

I (JR) would like to add a few points to the letter extract, showing also that the result of the J. C. conference in reunion was a moving away from scriptural evidence that there should be a unity and oneness of belief in the One Truth.

One of the basic requirements in bringing any into the Truth, or returning to fellowship, is that there must be an individual examination, or indication of unison and harmony with the required conditions of doctrine and fellowship.

How then was the reunion brought about? The J. C. Resolution was mailed to all ecclesias, both Berean and Central. In turn this resolution was placed before the ecclesial meetings for a vote. If the majority were in favor, then the ecclesia indicated their approval to the committee, and this was accepted that the ecclesia was united with the movement.

Was this right? Would we accept an unknown group, just because we found the majority had the Truth and were baptized into it? No. We would require that all would not only know and believe all of the vital beliefs, in the Truth, but that we would require them to prove to us they were sound on the scriptural application of fellowship.

In 1953 the Central group actually were unknown to us as to their soundness. We had been apart from them for 30 years, many had during that period been immersed into their group, we had no assurance that they or the errorists were now sound and acceptable.

The minority in the heretofore unsound Central ecclesias were allowed to unite with the majority, of the Bereans, as well as the Central majority, this minority either voted against the J. C. Resolution, or did not vote at all.

Why, I ask, would they vote against or not at all? Because no doubt they had reservation to the BASF.

BROTHER HAS RESERVATIONS

This was proved conclusively to me personally when I had a conversation with a well known brother, who had remained Central all over the years, and was a known Strickler supporter. He stated to me that in the 1923 division, he had reservations to the 5th clause of the 13ASF, and that he still does now in 1955.

The bro. also told me he had never changed, yet in 1922 he was refused at one of the ecclesias I was a member of, because of his perverse teachings.

What did your J. C. Resolution state? That we must believe and teach the BASF without reservations. Also that any brother having reservations, must be dealt with by his ecclesia, and action taken if necessary. And any ecclesia who have reservations or refuse to take action must cease to be in fellowship.

BOSTON TEST CASE

All major movements are finally tested, and the Berean-Central Reunion soon had its test case. We refer to the Boston matter. Boston (Seaverns Hall ecclesia and Newbury ecclesia) was the last city to enter the Reunion . . . The main reason for this was because Boston Central (Seaverns Hall) had been known for years to support the Strickler error.

Therefore even though the Newbury ecclesia were in favor of the J. C. Resolution, they still had doubts of certain ones in S. Hall ecclesia.

Finally, on Feb, 7, 1954, recognition came, and Newbury extended fellowship to S. Hall.

On Feb. 19 one of the brethren of S. Hall met one of the Berean ecclesia members and assured the Berean member that he still had reservations to the BASF and had not changed his mind.

He argued he only accepted the BASF in the light of bro. J. Carter's talk at Jersey City. He further claimed that what bro. Carter stated at J. C. cancelled out all that he (J. Carter) had previously written.

As a result of the situation, the rec. bro. of Newbury ecclesia requested an investigation. The request was placed before S. Hall Examining Board. No action was taken. It was then read out in the minutes of the arranging brethren. Still no action was taken. The brother in question got on his feet and said,

"I do not believe there was any change in Adam's nature, nor do I believe that the sentence defiled the man."

The S. Hall group, on March 12, 1954, sent a letter to Newbury Ecclesia refusing them a meeting; later a third letter was sent to the Newbury brethren, prohibiting them from carrying out Matt. 18.

VIOLATE J. C. RESOLUTION

This situation reveals the J. C. Resolution was not upheld. First a brother in fellowship did not believe the Truth, and taught reservations to the BASF, which violates the Clause 1 of the J. C. Resolution. Because of this, the brother had departed from a principle of the One Faith.

This ecclesia refused to deal with him, which violates Clause 2. And lastly an ecclesia retained one in their midst who taught false doctrine, who did not act on the matter, and other ecclesias in fellowship did not uphold Newbury St. in this action, therefore violated Clause 3 of the J. C. Resolution.

Yes, certain things were done by other ecclesias to investigate the situation, but the condition itself was never cleaned up. Bro. J. Carter made a call to Boston, but he only went to S. Hall and talked with them; then separately to Newbury St.

He never, as he had promised, had an interview with representatives of the two ecclesias to settle the matter.

True, the Newbury ecclesia later left the Central group, but that does not take away from the fact that they had just cause to do this, since they had entered the Reunion on the J. C. Resolution, which had not been upheld.

As a test, the J. C. Resolution had proved to be a dismal failure. This is somewhat proved by a statement by a wellknown California brother, who said

"The J. C. Resolution was a means to an end."

Another brother said, "The J. C. Resolution is now voided."

PROOF OF BOSTON CASE

We would like to place before you 4 evidences that Newberry ecclesia were justified in their charge. Forgive me for laboring the point, but we feel this is important. This is a test of the rightness or not of the Berean-Central Reunion.

First: a California brother; took a trip to the East, and while there obtained a copy of the minutes of S. Hall meetings relative to the situation. This brother stated the evidence is plain in these minutes, of false teachings in the group charged.

This brother tried to make a resolution at one of the meetings of the California reunion committee, to take a c t i o n against the meeting in question, and was also willing to reveal the minutes. Not only was he refused permission to reveal the minutes, but also received no support on his resolution.

To prove this we quote from a letter from a committee composed entirely of former Central brethren.

`Your committee has evidence that photostatic copies of the minutes of your arranging brethren have been circulated in the U.S. and Canada."

As to the right or wrong of circulation of minutes, that is not relative to my point. But we do say, the fact of the strong objection shows evidence of certain things they wanted concealed. God knew what was contained in those minutes, of this we can be assured.

Second: the recording bro. of the S. Hall meeting, who went through the whole situation, not only resigned his office but left the ecclesia because, as he states himself, the Newbury ecclesia's charge was justified, and proof of their charge can be found in the minutes of meetings, as well as the Statements of individuals.

Third: A certain brother who was taught the Truth, examined and baptized by the S. Hall meeting, left Boston and came to California. This brother became a member of the Glendale ecclesia, and after some time it was found he 'believed that Ac att was created mortal; that there was no change in Adams' nature after his fall, only a moral change.

This teaching is a Strickler error, and is against Clause 5 of BASF. This brother was asked how he came to believe such a teaching, he stated that was how he was taught in the S. Hall meeting.

Fourth: A Texas ecclesia who were very much concerned about what to do on the Berean-Central Reunion, had their doubts about the Boston S. Hall, meeting. They placed a telephone call to the then recording brother. In the conversation this recording brother was asked

"Are there any in the Seaverns Hall meeting who believed Adam was created mortal, and that there was no physical change in Adam's nature after his fall?"

This recording brother told the Texas ecclesia to "mind their own business."

I personally heard this evidence.

WASHINGTON "FAITH" GROUP

We now would like to consider the case of the Washington meeting. This meeting belonged to the "Faith" group, recognized in connection with bro. Zilmer and the "Open Fellowship"—a group developed in Australia associated with the "Shield" group.

This Washington meeting were unhappy with being such a few. We quote from their letter

"Those of us identified with the 'Faith' have now for nearly a quarter of a century struggled to convince the brotherhood of our understanding of fellowship, and so bring together on a comprehensive but simple basis the several fellowships.

"We had hoped that our understanding, which we believe is a scriptural one, would grow, and. that the Lord would come to find a' united body of believers.

"As for our small group, sad to say, much weakness has set in for lack of spiritual strength that should be circulating through them from the stronger part of the Body . . .

"For we realize that we hardly are in a position to dictate terms ..."

In regard to the BASF, they state

"There are over 500 ecclesias held together by their statement; therefore adoption of it serves as an identification for fellowship.

"We were strongly prejudiced against it (BASF) for some of its phraseology has precipitated many controversies in the past. We discussed the 5th article and found our understanding of the subject to be mutual, in spite of the misleading expressions used.

"Our only obstacle, therefore, to uniting with this larger portion . . . we must adopt the Amended Statement of Faith to identify us . . .

"We are still of the same opinion concerning the Statement of Faith, AS TO ITS FAULTS, but the decision of our ecclesia was that the Central brethren were in agreement, both in doctrine and practice, with us.

"We submit to the requirement of the majority, and adopt the Statement of Faith.

This all shows that the Washington ecclesia just wanted to belong to the larger group. To do so they merely adopted the BASF, even though they did not agree to all of it, and were not asked to repudiate their previous wrong teachings and practices.

CENTRAL-SUFFOLK REUNION

In coming to the Suffolk Central reunion, it would make this too lengthy, to place before you all of its discrepancies. Going back to 1955, a 7-clause statement had been drawn up on which to unite with the Suffolk group.

Let us understand plainly that at that time the Suffolk group in England, the Shield group in Australia, and the Advocate open fellowship group in U.S. and Canada, all recognized each other when travelling as being in fellowship.

The reaction in this country to the 7-clause statement was definite. There was opposition to it. We quote from the letter the reunion committee recommended, which was mailed by most of the ecclesias in this country to the Central British Committee

"After careful consideration it was unanimously agreed these proposals are unsatisfactory as a scriptural basis for reunion, and will cause and result in much unrest and trouble in the Brotherhood."

7-CLAUSE STATEMENT

The San Gabriel ecclesia was among those complying with the committee's request to forward a letter of protest, strongly protesting clause 7 of the statement. It was on this clause 7 greatest emphasis was placed.

What happened as the mass of objections went forth from most of the former Berean ecclesias? The English committee, struck off the objected-to 7th clause, and instead, provided in clause 6 of the Final Statement a reservation which accomplished the same thing as clause 7 in the original statement.

The purpose of the BASF is to protect the Truth, so that all who unite together on it should be of one mind.

The purpose of the 7-clause statement was to unite with the Suffolk group, who did not believe the same as we do on the responsibility doctrine and other, errors of past days.

The 6-clause "Final Statement" allowed for the exact same purpose, and the end result was the same, as if the 7-clause statement had been allowed to remain.

Now, what was the basis and reason of the original very strong U.S. and Canadian objection to the statement? And what happened to this big objection? Remember what the objection was

"It was unanimously agreed these proposals are unsatisfactory as a scriptural basis for reunion."

UNSOUND MINORITY

We quote from a letter from Bro. J. Carter in answer to certain questions sent to him to answer, July 3, 1956

Question: "How do you intend to cope with the minority in the Suffolk fellowship Of those who hold questionable views, that are to be taken in with the Central fellowship?"

Bro. Carter's Answer: "Suffolk brethren and sisters have individually voted on the statement. It is possible some ecclesias will not come in at all, but provision is made where any of our ecclesias have any misgiving about Suffolk to ask the two committees to make investigation."

This is very indefinite and unsatisfactory. In the first place we state how wrong it is to negotiate a reunion with a whole group when it is known some have questionable views. This should not be. God would not be pleased with this. This is trying to fellowship light with darkness. The committee, in setting up the, means to circumvent the approved basis of previous years, are abandoned all past sound principles of fellowship.

DENY MINORITIES ACCEPTED

In the Dec., 1957 "Christadelphian under an article written to the editor called. "The Closing Year," appears the statement:

"It is simply a libellous untruth to say that minorities who have repudiated the Final Statement and the BASF have been received into fellowship. A case that has to be bolstered up with such a falsehood is condemned."

Later developments, as a result of this unjust judgment made by the Christadelphian Magazine editor, proved beyond a doubt that not only were there minorities allowed in who not only would not subscribe to Clause 24 of the BASF, but also this minority do not accept the "Final Statement" itself.

The following is a letter bro. R. W. Alderman wrote to bro. J. Carter

"Bro. F. E. Mitchell, a member of the reunion committee and also a Central group member stated there was a minority in Forest Hill who would not subscribe to Clause 2.4 of the BASF and therefore could not accept the BASF."

Forest Hill meeting were then united with Central. In a later letter from bro. Alderman we read

"If Suffolk St. ecclesias have formally accepted the "Final Statement," the facts reveal that they are harboring minorities who do not accept it, and neither Central nor Suffolk are denying these minorities fellowship."

It was also proved beyond a doubt the two committees knew of these minorities but suppressed the information until it was forced into the open.

It was then that bro. J. Carter printed a notice in the "Christadelphian" magazine March, 1958, p. 133-134, in which there is a veiled admission concerning this minority, and appealing for a two-year period during which problems that would arise should be solved.

That is four years ago and instead of cleaning up the minority problem of British Suffolk St. group they have increased the problem in uniting with the Shield group in Australia, who have an admitted 10% who do not accept Clause 5 of the BASF and who have clean flesh teachings among them with some other false doctrines.

WEST COAST MEETING

Returning to events in this country, we remember that just before the completion of the Central-Suffolk reunion, and because of the apparent danger to the Household, we held a West Coast conference in San Francisco.

At this conference a resolution was drawn up to recommend to the ecclesias on the West Coast. We do not propose to quote the whole resolution, just a portion

Clause 1: "We accept the BASF without reservation."

"Clause 6: "Fellowship be restricted to those who are in accord with the foregoing, and who agree to withhold fellowship from those who do not consent to it."

After this resolution was drawn up for the purpose of ecclesial acceptance, we received a letter from a brother in the North, and we quote,

"Now to the S. F. Resolution. I would strongly advise us to go slow in its adoption, for its acceptance will automatically put us out of fellowship with England.

"Close 1 in effect states that we will accept BASF WITHOUT reservation. Clause 6 states that fellowship will be restricted to those who are in accord with the foregoing only.

"Britain is meeting on the BASF WITH Reservations.

Do not misunderstand this quote from this brother's letter. He did not want anything to happen that would place the English ecclesias out of fellowship, and this brother is still with you in the Central group, even though he, like you, was once in the Berean fellowship because of the Central department in 1923-1953.

This brother was not questioning the rightness of the S. F. Resolution before God; he was concerned as to its effect on the English Central group.

Brethren, we should always decide on the righteousness of the act, not the consequences. The quotation from this brother's letter indicates he preferred to tolerate a condition in England rather than accept a resolution that stated what we had already accepted in the Jersey City Resolution, by which resolution we had come into fellowship with the group in question.

It also proves this brother was convinced now that the English ecclesias were not upholding the Jersey City Resolution, but he still was determined to retain association with Central.

SELF-NULLIFYING RESOLUTION

When the S.F. Resolution was placed before the San Gabriel ecclesia, the following resolution was placed before the assembled brethren and sisters, and passed 11 to 8. I cannot quote it word for word, but it went something like this

"That we accept the S. F. Resolution, with the understanding we are in fellowship with all Central Ecclesias in Britain."

I can only state how this resolution affects me. It appears to me that some in the San Gabriel ecclesia, evidently thought along the same lines as the brother mentioned above. That is this:—That to be honest, the Jersey City Resolution coupled with the S. F. Resolution interpreted correctly, would put the British Ecclesias out of fellowship, when the British Central Ecclesias consummated the reunion with Suffolk Street Group.

Such a reunion allowing a dissenting minority from meetings who had heretofore been out of fellowship, to come into fellowship, is a direct violation of the Jersey City Resolution and of Clause 1 and 6 of the S. F. Resolution. Therefore the San Gabriel Resolution actually was inconsistent within itself.

I have no desire to offend you brethren and sisters in any way, only to state facts. I would love to be with you in fellowship, but only on a basis that would be acceptable to God, and would uphold the light of His glorious Truth.

The San Gabriel Resolution first stated a positive fact, which in consistent operation would bring about, if followed, a certain effect. To offset this result, the last part of the resolution defeats the very purpose of the positive statement of the first part.

It would be better not to accept a resolution at all than to find a way to defeat its purpose.

THE "FINAL STATEMENT"

A few words on the "Final Statement." We would recommend a careful study of it, because it is a means provided to defeat the purpose of the amendment made in Clause 24 of the BASF. Certain ones in the Suffolk St. group could not accept this amendment, and although the Central group have all over the years stated a reunion could only be brought about on the BASF. yet now in 1957 they departed from this procedure, and in the statement of bro. Cooper, the editor of the Fraternal Visitor, the Central Committee allowed them (Suffolk) "the concessions they had asked for."

Up to 1955, the Central group refused to concede the removing of any part of the bulwark established. The amendment made in the BSF in 1898, making it the BASF, was a safe guard to protect the Truth against errorists and compromisers. Now a means is provided to abandon the safeguard.

This "Final Statement" even concedes to them the right to retain their own statements of Faith; it then goes on to state certain statements of truth, but if you examine these statements, there is a watering down, and obscuring of the matters at issue.

To be honest, and righteous, one rather should enlighten and make plainer the true teaching on doctrine, when confronting groups who have included errorists, rather than to obscure the essential differences.

Take Clause 4 of the "Final Statement." It is supposed to take care of a doctrine which is false that caused a division 62 years ago. In 1904 bro. Thomas Williams, one of the leaders in the promulgation of this false doctrine on Scriptural Responsibility attempted to reunite the amended and unamended groups on just such a statement.

The amended fellowship would at that time have none of it. They rightly defined it as an attempt to compromise the issue. We are open to your questions on Clause 4 of the "Final Statement" at the meeting.

Just what did the "Final Statement" do? It rebound two groups into association, who had become separated years ago on several vital first principles. At the meeting assembled we will have a chart, if the Lord will, clearly showing the separations and on what doctrine separation took place.

CENTRAL-SHIELD REUNION

The Central-Shield reunion in Australia in 1958 closely followed the same pattern, and can be understood in much the same way. Let us remind ourselves of the actual situation.

In the early 1900's, resulting from the Bell teachings on Clean Flesh, a division took place. The Temperance Hall (Central) group in England took action against this false teaching, therefore all who sympathized or tolerated it were refused fellowship.

Later known as the Shield group, they became the largest group in Australia, going under the name Christadelphians.

Through the course of their history other kinds of error crept in, which resulted from their loose understanding of fellowship, such as Josephites, heaven-going, that the Devil in Scripture is sin or selfwill in the human mind, willingness to fellowship any so-called "name" Christadelphian regardless of belief.

The condition remained and was tolerated by all of the Shield group over the years, was still there in 1956 without contradiction, and there are to this day a 10 percent who hold such errors as stated.

At the united meeting of the Breaking of Bread after the reunion conference, bro. Carter requested a certain errorist not be allowed to enter; therefore he was refused at the door.

The reason given was that he was a trouble maker, yet those who supported this brother in his errors, were allowed to come into fellowship.

One ecclesia, the Broken Hill meeting, was by-passed in the Reunion. Bro. Wiggins, editor of the Australian "Herald" wherein he and others asserted Joseph was the natural father of Jesus, and that sin in the flesh is an abominable teaching, is a member of this meeting, that is, the meeting in question which was by-passed.

This was nullified however, for after the Reunion the Rec. Bro. and other members of this meeting were received and fellowshiped by others who were in the Reunion.

Reunion between Central and Shield was accomplished through the means of the "Carter - Cooper Addendum." Like the "Final Statement," it makes certain statements, but leaves out the important matter of difference. It waters down the essential Scriptural teaching on sin in the flesh and Christ's sacrifice and nature.

The Statement is written in such a way that 2 brethren believing differently can agree to its statements.

This then did not accomplish true unity, or a state that the Scriptures call being "at one." This condition only caused a compromise.

As an illustration of this, a certain ecclesia believes "The devil in Scripture is sin or self-will in the human mind." This ecclesia can accept the "C.-C. Addendum."

An ecclesia who are sound on the Scriptural teaching of the particular doctrine but are not sound on scriptural fellowship, can subscribe to this "C.-C. Addendum" by closing their eyes to what it leaves out.

Brethren, Clause 5 of the BASF, as intended by the framers, as also taught without question by the worthy brethren of the past century, if believed as intended will take care of the whole situation, and will, if followed, firmly safeguard the Truth against the errorists and their toleration.

A leading meeting (Regent St., Sidney) has its own statement of Faith in which Clause 5 of the BASF has been deleted; leaving out the words "A sentence which defiled him and became a physical law of his being!"

This ecclesia is spoken of as accepting the BASF in the light of the C.-C. Addendum, which also omits the same, and it is claimed that the C.-C. Addendum supplies the real meaning; that the above underlined phrase can be treated as though it were not there.

An English ecclesia, namely Bradford, has its own statement in which not one doctrine, but all of the doctrines to be rejected have been deleted, also clauses 4, 5, 8, 12, and 24 as appearing in the BASF are badly mutilated.

The Central then who allow their own ecclesias to mutilate and change the meaning of the BASF cannot justifiably demand that the Australian meetings cannot do the same.

REPUDIATION NECESSARY

It should be a sound principle that a repudiation of the error which has caused divisions, must be contained in any basis put forward to unite on.

It must be made clear that the group which had supported the error, no longer does so, and that any who still believe or teach error, will be excluded from the reunion.

You do not find this upheld in either the Berean-Central, Central-Suffolk, or in the Central-Shield Reunions. Rather in all three major reunions there is a glossing over of the main points of difference, or a moving away from the essentials that caused the separation.

You find nothing in the Jersey City Resolution that repudiates the error, but rather it allowed the tolerators and the false believers to come back into association as a minority group, therefore reunion from the start was unrighteous, and it only follows that the pattern of reunion will become weaker and weaker, as it certainly did in the Central-Shield reunion.

Bro. Carter stated in the "Christadelphian," 1952, p. 214:

"The brethren of Central fellowship believe their Statement of Faith (BASF) provides a scriptural basis upon which fellowship SHOULD be based.

TREMENDOUS CHANGE!

In the 1940 "Christadelphian," p, 131:

"The Suffolk group MUST accept what we impose on ourselves, and for any reunion there must be a UNANIMOUS vote of the brethren and sisters, comprising the ecclesia in the Suffolk St. fellowship.

"It is important that the necessity should be emphasized for INDIVIDUAL acceptance, and NOT a majority vote of an ecclesia of the matters under discussion."

What a tremendous change has come over Central in these few years since the above was written!

Suffolk St. would not accept the BASF as a basis of fellowship; neither would the Shield group in its true intended meaning. In each case, then, another weaker, ambiguous document had to be provided for the purpose of reunion, by which document the dissenters could come in.

WHERE DO YOU STAND?

Where do YOU stand, brethren, on all of these situations, where not only minorities are allowed in without question, but also in each case, the errors are not repudiated, neither examined?

In many cases complete ignorance of the danger is upheld, and leaders are taking advantage of this ignorance to lead the flock astray. As in Israel, instead of the laws of God being to their own salvation, they are line upon line, line upon line, precept upon precept, that they might go astray.

If this age we live in is different from every other age of the history of the Truth, where brethren not only allowed error to enter in, but finally apostated, then this age would be unique.

It has never happened before in all history that after 120 years, after fighting errors and acting against them, after erring groups have become looser and looser, that suddenly there should be a revival and all of the erring brethren should come together on a firm, pure, scriptural basis.

No, and neither is it happening today! The reunion events are not scriptural; they are not in accordance to Divine Law.

An article appeared in the "Testimony" for July and August, 1957, entitled, "Witness of History and Warning of Prophecy." After warning the brotherhood of the prophetic declarations of this present age, the writer states "This enemy is at the gate."

UNSOUND PAMPHLET

We have a pamphlet from Australia called "Fellowship." It is a definite violation of Scriptural teaching on this subject. We quote from several statements:

"The fact that they are members of any one ecclesia does not necessarily mean that they are in fellowship with all of its members."

"Those to be withdrawn from are those outside the hope of the Kingdom."

"What is the position of the faithful in relation to such people (errorists)? Do they become in effect, partakers of the error because they are present at the same meeting?" (Pause here: the Apostle John answers the question, YES, THEY DO!)

Pg. 17: "Though the breaking of Bread is such an important feature of our worship, it does not form the foundation of fellowship,"

Pg. 19: "What happens, then, if error arises in an ecclesia and the majority of brethren and sisters though holding to the right themselves, do not deal with the offenders as they should? Should the faithful few break away? . . . the duty of God's servants makes it necessary to stay."

Pg. 22: "To cut off or withdraw from an ecclesia can only be done, according to Scripture, when ALL members of the ecclesia are in the category of persons who are evil or ungodly" (End of quotation).

* * *

Brethren, this writer is a member of the Shield group now in fellowship. His teaching is the reverse of all of our past beliefs on the fellowship question upheld by bro. John Thomas, bro. R. Roberts and the Berean fellowship which you belonged to from 1923 to 1953 (still upheld by the Berean fellowship, 1953 to 1961), and above all it is a contradiction to the scriptural law of fellowship.

NOT REQUIRED TO ACCEPT BASF

A quotation from the "Fraternal Visitor" (Editor, C. C. Cooper), Pg. 172, Sept., 1957 (7 months after the Central Suffolk reunion). Commenting on the Australian situation, and with a hopeful wish that reunion would be accomplished in Australia, it stated -

"The situation prevailing amongst us is that the BASF is the statement almost unanimously accepted, only a few ecclesias have a statement of their own. Verbal acceptance of the BASF is not demanded, not even by the united ecclesias of Great Britain."

* * *

It is a known fact that in the Shield group, both before and after the reunion, many believe that the word "sin" in Scripture means transgression only, and never refers to a physical quality of human nature. Also that Clause 5 of the BASF is blasphemous.

SIN-DEFILED NATURE

Appearing in the "Christadelphian" magazine, May, 1899, was an article on Adam's Sin, as affecting us. We quote from it

"Christ Jesus was not forgiven "Adam's Sin." it is wrong to say that in relation to Christ.

He (Christ) possessed Adam's sin-defiled nature, and sin was condemned IN IT in his sacrificial death."

"Since sin brought death, the law of Adam's nature became the "Law of sin and death," this law in the nature. And all possessing that nature feel the motions of the law of sin in their members.

"The flesh and the mind of the flesh work in unison, and are therefore both defiled by the working of sin. From Adam we inherit a sin-defiled nature."

These things quoted are The Truth. The false beliefs on the subject, as found in the Strickler and the Bell errors, are still upheld by some in U.S., Canada, Britain and the Shield group, now Central in Australia.

BRO. WATSON'S LETTERS

In contradiction to the Statement of Faith quoted above, we would like to quote from two letters written by a Shield (now Central) brother of some repute.

May 2 and 31, 1958, bro. J. B. Watson to bro. C. H. King

"Bro. Carter gave us to understand that we had been misconceiving the disputed clauses of the BASF; that they did not, in the minds of the framers, really mean the idea we took from them.

"The explanations he gave us were exactly an expression of the views we have held since the beginning of the dispute, as to the nature of Adam, and that the term "sin in the flesh" is a metonymical saying—it was calling the impulses in the flesh sin because they lead (if not checked) to sin.

"He stressed sin is not literally in the flesh, but any one guided only by flesh promptings would be led to sin. The only change of mind I experienced by talks with bro. Carter or listening to his speeches, was the manner in which I understood those in "Central" fellowship to understand Clause 5 of the BASF.

He assured me that they, in England, do not look upon the wording as I thought they did, and that the framers of the Clause do not either . .

"I found bro. Carter's views almost totally agreed with my own. I am not committed to saying, or believing, that he (Jesus) literally had sin in the flesh . . .

However, there is no scripture that teaches that any ever did — or needed to — offer up for his own flesh, or his nature.

"We (bro. Carter and I) had a two-hour talk and it was found that he held practically the same beliefs as myself. He has since told others that we were in agreement . . . It was a complete surprise to find bro. Carter so much in accord with myself."

(Space does not allow the whole of the letter. It is available to be read).

* * *

Letter from bro. J. B. Watson to bro. Ken Smith, May 14, 1958

"The visit of bro. Carter was fruitful in the very way you might think almost impossible. It convinced me that his explanation of terms led to an almost complete endorsement of the views I propounded in that little pamphlet I compiled: Mortality, Sin in the Flesh, and Sin Offering.

"He (bro. Carter) maintained that the Central fellowship in Britain does not believe the views I accredited them with. He explained that as Adam was not immortal, he could not literally be other than mortal."

* * *

The above 2 letters (not quoted fully but open for view) are very disconcerting, for not only does this bro. J. B. Watson hold errors on the nature of man and Christ, but his letters reveal that he (up until 1958) believed the brethren in England believed differently from him on the question.

Bro. Carter assure him they in England do not hold the views he (bro. Watson) thought they did, and also assures him (bro. Watson) that he is all right in his teachings.

10% DO NOT ACCEPT BASF

Further evidence is shown in the following

"The recent survey by the joint committee in Melbourne reveals that 90% of the (Shield) brethren in this country accept the Statement (BASF)."

Concerning the 10% minority who do not accept the BASF, the Shield editor remarked in the same place

"The rule of the ecclesial conduct is that the majority wish must prevail. If the 10% minority in this matter is prepared not to be captious, the majority will not lightly deny the principle of love and forbearance."

The 10% minority who do not accept the BASF are now in fellowship with all of the Central group in Australia, in Britain, and in the U. S. and Canada. They were taken in with the full cognizance of those concerned, including the British brethren.

"NEW IDEAS"

In 1957, when I stood before the San Gabriel ecclesia to give my reasons for impending separation, I stated that not only is the Suffolk-Central reunion an unrighteous reunion, but also I stated that there was evidence of "New Ideas" being taught by some of the Central brethren themselves.

This was not listened to, and it was thought I was stating things I had no proof of. Bro. James Carter, brother to bro. John Carter, stated in the Testimony, concerning his own (Central) group

"The line of demarcation has been broadened and broadened until it is possible to believe wayward doctrines and still remain in fellowship."

This evidence is from within the Central group, to which bro. James Carter belongs.

LOGOS ADMISSION

Also from within, bro. Mansfield writes in the Dec., 1960, Logos

"It seems to me, after an absence of 7 years, that the standards of previous years are being gradually relaxed.

"There are practices tolerated and teachings propagated in ecclesias today such as would not be permitted in earlier times" (Has the Truth changed?—J.S.).

"There is a tendency to challenge principles and doctrines which were once accepted without question.

"Dangerous theories are being openly advocated ... These relate to the present possession of the Holy Spirit, the tendency to accept the Bible as inspired more as a matter of words than of fact, and amend it if necessary to conform to the scientific approach.

"Even such a sacred subject as the Creator Himself is not exempt from this form of (to us, indecent) scrutiny."

Also, commenting on some in Britain, the Logos editor states:

"Some are concerned in what they call the drift in ecclesial conditions. They see a lowering of standards, a coldness of outlook... They are irritated by the lukewarm, indifferent, scientific, or university approach to these things, which are matters of living, personal import" (end of Logos quotation).

"THE HIRELING"

It would appear to us this editor should take action, alter proper admonishing, as saith the Scripture. But here we have the evidence of the increasing influence of the "Shield" approach to fellowship, which is an unscriptural approach, because instead of facing up to the true teachings of Christ's beautiful parable of the Good Shepherd, this Logos editor writes an article called "The Hireling," which is a verbal tirade against those who withdraw fellowship in case of error that is persisted

Christ is the True Shepherd. We can only remain in the sheepfold by following his commands. The implication of this brother's words are that those who stand aside from error are the "hireling" who flees when the wolves come.

I would like to point out that, inasmuch as those whom he calls the "hireling" left ("fled" implied) because the Suffolk group and later the Shield group came in, then his method of interpreting this parable would indicate these groups are the "wolves" that had entered in among the flock.

No, the article "The Hireling" is not a true representation of the parable. It is the wolves that scatter the sheep, and cause them to be lost. The emphasis should be placed on these wolves, whoever they are, for Christ and the apostles tell us to beware of the wolves who come in sheep's clothing.

One has to destroy the wolf. If you allow hire to remain in, he will cause the sheep to go astray. To destroy is to ACT.

"ENDEAVOUR" MAGAZINE

Another evidence of departure is found in the new magazine called "Endeavour." A big cross (the mark of the beast) is placed on the cover. There seems to be a tendency toward the orthodox superstition of worshipping the cross. Under an article called "The Challenge of the Cross," we read -

"The Cross, of course, has become the most generally accepted symbol of the Christian Faith."

Such terms are used as, "The Cross inspires." These church leaning brethren could learn much about sound, robust, Christadelphianism from a study of bro. Thomas' clear exposition of the Mark of the Beast in Eureka.

Throughout this magazine in every place where we should clearly read "Christadelphian" (keeping the issue sharp and clear), we have the now meaningless word "Christian" - meaningless, that is, as a matter of distinction and definition, because of its utter abuse and misapplication in the world.

This magazine speaks gropingly of our "lifelong search for Truth," and I quote -

"There is a stronger feeling among us (Central) that we must be less dogmatic, less self-assured, and more humble in our life-long search for truth,

We are more ready to consider fairly, opinions which are new to us, realizing that we cannot expound Scripture with apostolic authority.

"We used to believe that truth could be tied up in a neat parcel . . .

"We were bigoted and intolerant of the views of others.

"Let us not assume a critical attitude and cross examine them for their false beliefs, but instead rejoice with them for those things which we have in common. With many, this may be quite a lot, namely the Christian life, the general principle of atonement in Christ and a life after death.

"Friendly discussion and working together in worthwhile activities will provide opportunities for exchange of views often by no means of one-sided benefit."

All of these quotations speak for themselves. They evidence a clear drift to agreement and conformity with the wishy-washy religions of the world.

CENTRAL BROTHER APPEALS

One Central brother in England writes the following letter to the editor of the Berean:

"I enclose a copy of the 'Endeavour' magazine for your critical examination in the hope that you will stir up Christadelphia against what must surely be looked on as a parish magazines of the Laodicean kind."

He states that the "Endeavour" committee are all prominent Central brethren, and he further pleads

"Please do your best to raise a cry among the 'little strength' in this community, against what must surely be the most serious departure from the 'narrow way' we have seen in recent times."

We heartily say, Amen! This appeal to the South California brethren is an endeavour to do just what this troubled Central brother asks.

Now even if this magazine is discontinued, we are still faced with this unquestionable fact:

The evidence is indisputable that there are errors, "new" ideas on doctrine and practices of The Truth, and that the proof and testimony is coming from Central brethren themselves.

INSPIRATION QUESTIONED

For instance, the following is from the "Christadelphian" magazine, April, 1961, p. 371, under the heading, The Inspired Scriptures"

"In a letter on another matter a brother writes, 'While I am writing might I express my appreciation of the timely articles by bro. Peter Watkins upon the inspiration of the Scriptures. I feel that the present problems of the Liberal wing of the Christadelphian movement, arises largely because they have abandoned the traditional faith in the Inspiration of the Bible.'"

And also from Oct., 1961, p. 465, "A Liberal Wing"

"The correspondence columns of your Sept. issue raise matters of vital importance and reveal the existence in our midst of a body of opinion which, I submit, is liberal in outlook . . .

I am convinced that some of our fellowship have manifested a liberal attitude toward those around us which is, I suggest, inconsistent with the principles of the Truth.

We live in an age of toleration and unbelief. The prevailing religious mood is one of unity."

This again is from within, this brother has struck the prevailing note, not only in the so-called religious world, but also the main appeal, amongst the main group of Christadelphians, is the same; that is, "One of unity" — that Christ may return to a "united body."

* * *

Let us beware of the subtle reasoning of those who speak pleasing words of a so-called love and unity. LET US LOVE THOSE WHO LOVE GOD'S TRUTH in its robust separateness and purity, and will uphold it regardless of consequences.

Certainly we are to love all, even our enemies. This, however, is based on the simple scriptural teaching, that we will do no harm to anyone, and that we will do our utmost to save others, but this does not allow us to fellowship them.

When Christ comes, among whom will we be identified — among the "few in number, little flock," or among the majority who would compromise "The Truth" with deteriorating influences of doctrine and practice?

There are many other matters that could be placed before you for your consideration, of the veracity of the foregoing, but this has already become longer than anticipated.

"Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, SAITH THE LORD, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you."

Sincerely your brother,

JOHN T. RANDELL