

# The Birmingham Trouble

**The substance of an address delivered to the Clapham Ecclesia, at the Avondale Hall, on 19th Nov., 1931.**

Between eight and nine years ago, the Clapham ecclesia, after very prolonged and patient efforts to effect a change in the mind of the Birmingham (Temperance Hall) ecclesia, felt compelled, in obedience to the commandments of Christ, to withdraw its fellowship from that ecclesia, and to use its influence to induce other ecclesias to adopt the same attitude.

At the date of the division (June 1923) the Clapham ecclesia numbered over five hundred brethren and sisters, of whom about three hundred supported the proposition for withdrawal, and the minority of about two hundred formed a separate ecclesia, and remained in fellowship with the Temperance Hall ecclesia.

Since the division occurred, one hundred and seventy-five candidates have been immersed by the Clapham ecclesia alone: all of whom are without personal contact with the circumstances which led up to this great, but we are sure, necessary ecclesial trouble.

As time goes on (in the absence of the return of Christ) the proportion of brethren and sisters without this personal knowledge of the circumstances will inevitably increase. To-day, they number nearly one-half of the ecclesia. A few years hence they will of necessity be a considerable majority of the members of this meeting. Of the brethren who spoke at the Essex Hall in 1923, in support of the proposition, there are but seven remaining in our ecclesia to-day.

It is therefore that we wish to say to these one hundred and seventy-five, or such of their number as remain to this present time, if Christ comes not in the next few years, upon you will very largely devolve the duty, not only of maintaining the scriptural attitude we then adopted, but also of instructing others in regard to it. If you are uncertain of the facts of the case, you will not be equipped for that duty. Therefore our appeal to you is, that you will make yourselves acquainted with all the facts pertaining to it. Read all that has been written on the subject: examine very carefully all that has been said and done, in the light of the teaching of the scriptures, and then, "be strong and of good courage": defend what you know to be right: uphold the Truth: never be false to it, and God will undoubtedly bless both you and the ecclesia to which you belong.

## WHAT WAS THE DIVISION ABOUT?

An ecclesia is a community of "called out ones". God has called us out from the present evil world to be a holy or separate people unto Himself. Upon each one thus called there rests an obligation to maintain this position of separateness from all that belongs to the world, or this constitution of things, described by Dr. Thomas, "the constitution of sin".

These are facts recognized by all of us. Therefore, a brother or sister, for it applies to both in these days, cannot under any circumstances, join any section of the army or navy, become a constable, or take part in the world's politics. All these things, and there are many others, are essentially of the world, and they are forbidden by Christ.

"Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath

righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness?

And what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel?

And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? for ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people.

Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you.

And will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty"—II Cor. vi. 14-18.

"Ye have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth; But I say unto you, That ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also.

And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloke also"—Matt. v. 38-40.

In these two passages is to be found in the clearest possible language, the duty of a true Christadelphian towards the world and its institutions. "Separateness from the world", and "non-resistance to evil", are emphatically enjoined upon us. Attention was here directed to the simple but convincing utterances of brother R. Roberts concerning these commandments, to be found in Christendom Astray, Lecture xviii, which all are exhorted to read and study.

We shall endeavor presently to show that the cause of the division in 1923 was a failure on the part of the Temperance Hall ecclesia to uphold these Divine obligations.

## Misrepresentation of the Facts

Before proceeding further, let us endeavor to dispose of some untrue statements and unfair charges made against the Clapham brethren, in connection with the origin of the trouble.

We are, however, not concerned with justifying ourselves in the sight of men; that is merely one of the ways of the flesh, from which we are commanded to be separate. We are nevertheless anxious that truth on the matter shall prevail.

It has been said, that the division in 1923 was deliberately planned by the Clapham brethren: that for years previously Clapham had been "watching for an opportunity to break away from Birmingham": and that "Clapham did not want peace" (see Birmingham Frictions, page 31).

We have no hesitation in saying that is deliberately untrue; it is a cruel misrepresentation of Clapham brethren, some of whom are now asleep, and some others who are unfortunately not now with us. On behalf of all of these brethren, we say that there is not the slightest justification for these charges. For years the Clapham Presiding and Managing brethren worked hard for peace; not peace at any price, but peace on the basis of purity, was what they diligently strove for.

When did the Temperance Hall ecclesia come to the conclusion that "Clapham did not want peace"? Certainly they had not that conviction as late as January 1923, for on

January 4th, 1923, bro. J. F. Smith, their Recording brother, wrote to bro. H. E. Purser, the Recording brother of the Clapham ecclesia: —

"Your letter of the 31st ulto. was considered by the arranging brethren this evening. We note and welcome your evident desire to end the present trouble."

The spirit in which the Clapham Presiding and Managing brethren undertook the unpleasant task of recommending withdrawal from the Temperance Hall ecclesia, is in exact agreement with the spirit in which Paul acted on a certain similar occasion, concerning which he wrote—

"For out of much affliction and anguish of heart I wrote unto you with many tears"—11 Cor. ii. 4.

The Clapham brethren found no pleasure or gratification in this unpleasant duty, but on the contrary, it was, in our own personal knowledge, a "cause of many tears and much anguish of heart" to more than one of their number.

Instead of Clapham desiring separation from Birmingham, if only bro. C. C. Walker knew, his real friends and at that time, his most loyal supporters were in the Clapham ecclesia; whilst many of those in fellowship with him, who now make these false charges against Clapham, were then his severest critics. Numerous letters are in existence from brethren in the Temperance Hall fellowship, and mostly in the Birmingham ecclesia, complaining bitterly of the attitude of bro. C. C. Walker, and in many cases demanding the establishment of a London magazine to counteract the influence of Birmingham. Where are similar letters written by Clapham brethren? Are there any in existence anywhere? If so, let them be produced: we have no hesitation in saying there are none in existence; and yet Clapham brethren are misrepresented as having been antagonistic to bro. C. C. Walker, and the writers of these letters are foremost in making these untrue charges. We refrain from giving further particulars on this subject, but if the facts are denied, the letters can be produced.

In the face of these facts, is it fair, is it brotherly thus to seek to blame Clapham for this division? To say, Clapham desired it? It was London's jealousy of Birmingham? We are not ignorant of the worldly device of wrong-doers seeking to throw the blame onto other shoulders, but such unworthy actions and trickery should find no place in the methods of brethren.

#### RE-CREATE THE ATMOSPHERE OF 1917.

The Birmingham ecclesia has, we think, rightly recognised the necessity of an endeavour to recreate the atmosphere of the year 1917 which surrounded the events which led up to the subsequent trouble. It is necessary to do so, if we are to correctly understand what followed. For this reason, it is impossible to detach the "Birmingham Trouble" from the "Military Question", because the Military Question was the atmosphere in which the "Birmingham Trouble" was born. To get the real beginning of the trouble, we have therefore to go back to the early days of the Great War of 1914-1918, with special reference to the introduction of the Military Service Act of 1916.

Two years before the passing of that Act the Clapham ecclesia began to move in the matter of petitioning Parliament for exemption from military service in the event of this country being involved in war. The matter was first raised by our late brother J. M. Evans;

an action for which he will ever be remembered with feelings of the deepest affection, especially by the brethren who were of military age during the war.

The proposed petition was duly prepared, and signed by representatives of one hundred and fifty-four ecclesias, and presented to Parliament.

In 1916 conscription became a fact. The Military Service Act was passed, and most of our young, unmarried brethren were called upon to join the Army. Provision, however, was made in the Military Service Act for those who entertained conscientious objection to military service; they were allowed to appeal for exemption from the provisions of the Act.

The London Standing Committee advised all the brethren affected by the Act to appeal for total exemption from all forms of military service, whether combatant or non-combatant, which, beyond question, was the only course consistent with those commandments of Christ to which we have referred. The advice given by the Committee was always the same: Total exemption; no connection in any manner or in any degree with the Army, and we may all profoundly and earnestly thank God that this advice was not only given, but in nearly every case acted upon.

#### THE BIRMINGHAM PETITION.

The petition to Parliament signed by one hundred and fifty-four ecclesias, to which reference has been made, was never signed by the Temperance Hall ecclesia. The following extract from The Christadelphian, January 1915, page 33, makes this perfectly clear—

"In Birmingham, the arranging brethren recommended the ecclesia, for the sake of unanimity, to authorize the signing of the petition; but after much discussion, at two special meetings, it was decided not to sign it, but to send to London a resolution expressing sympathy with the idea, and willingness to sign when conscription should actually be before the Government. There is a widespread opinion that premature presentation may do more harm than good."

Prior to this date, however, the Birmingham ecclesia had prepared a petition of its own, a copy of which is to be found in The Christadelphian September 1914, page 422. We desire to particularly notice Clause 7 of this petition, which states—

"That the conscientious objection of your petitioners does not extend to strictly non-combatant branches of National Service, but only to those which involve the bearing of arms or resort to force."

"This was for several reasons preferred by the meeting to the form of petition of 1878, which was submitted to the ecclesias by the London brethren, though not, as we understand it, as a necessary form. With regard to the foregoing petition it may be said that some objection has been taken to Clause 7 for reasons which need not now be stated. But on the main issue of taking the sword it is hoped and believed that all must be agreed; and it ought not to be difficult hereafter to agree, if necessary, on a brief form of words somewhat on the lines suggested. We shall probably do well to say no more than this at present."

This petition was never presented to Parliament. We may be sure the hand of God was in that circumstance. It would have been a terrible day for the brethren and sisters

if it had been presented. That dissatisfaction with the situation existed in the Temperance Hall ecclesia is evident from the fact that in November 1914 brother E. W. Newman, a leading brother, still in their fellowship, moved (he following amendment—

"That having further considered the Petition previously passed, and realizing the dangers attaching to Clause 7, the terms of which are a virtual approval of military service of a non-combatant nature, we, the Birmingham Temperance Hall ecclesia, renounce the principle which Clause 7 contains: and earnestly desiring unanimity of action throughout the brotherhood upon this important matter, approve of the London Petition, and request our Recording Brother to sign it on our behalf."

The mind of this Birmingham brother towards their petition is here expressed by himself—

"Our petition provides justification to those of us who have joined the non-combatant service in the army, and we have therefore no reasonable ground of action against them while our Petition remains where it is."

#### THE IMMEDIATE CAUSE OF THE TROUBLE.

We have now endeavoured to recreate the atmosphere of the Temperance Hall ecclesia during those fateful years 1914-1917. It was this unhealthy atmosphere which gave birth to the events we are now going to narrate.

We will let bro. A. Davis, of the Temperance Hall ecclesia, relate the circumstances in his own words.

In his published statement of the facts, he tells us

"The trouble was caused by the action of two brethren who joined as 'Special Constables'. One was an old policeman who rejoined the force and was serving 'as a cook'. The other had no 'Pelham' Certificate, but had obtained special exemption. This looked like being withdrawn and to protect himself he joined up as a 'special constable'. Each case, therefore, had exceptional features, and where special features exist wise men at least ask themselves whether some discrimination is not necessary. The minutes presented to the Ecclesia were to the effect 'that as Service in the Constabulary was inconsistent with the commands of Christ, we should have no alternative but to withdraw from them, unless they could obtain their release.'"

"This was objected to by a certain number of brethren for the following reasons, amongst others:—

1. The Constitution did not specifically provide for such cases.
2. The action now proposed was inconsistent with our attitude in the past, for we have fellowshipped a policeman for many years.
3. A general objection to disfellowship any brother without giving him an opportunity to be heard in his own defence.

In order to gain more time for the consideration of these points I moved the following resolution, which was seconded by brother T. E. Pearce:—

"That no action be taken at present on those parts of the Minutes which relate to the cases of brethren L. and M. and the position of constables generally."

"In moving this I said, ' My reasons for this proposition are, that while I 'think these

brethren have certainly acted indiscreetly in what they have done, nevertheless their fault is not such as to justify disfellowship, and, furthermore, there are reasons which make it expedient to postpone action, at least for the present'."

Here, then, are the facts which led up to the subsequent trouble, from the pen of a brother who is certainly fully qualified to relate them. Let us summarise them—

1. Two brethren in the Temperance Hall ecclesia joined as "special constables".
2. The Arranging brethren proposed to withdraw from these two brethren.
3. Bro. A. Davis moved a resolution to take no action at present.
4. Bro. T. E. Pearce seconded the proposition.

Now when the matter was thus before the Temperance Hall ecclesia, and when the Arranging Brethren were determined to do the right thing in withdrawing from those who had become "special constables", these two brethren, A. Davis and T. E. Pearce, opposed them, and in the course of their opposition delivered two speeches, which are really the cause of the trouble.

#### THE CHARACTER OF THE SPEECHES.

Some of the brethren in this hall this evening heard bro. A. Davis re-deliver his speech in London, and had the opportunity of questioning him upon it. They have also read the speech delivered by bro. T. E. Pearce. We shall confine our attention to the speech of bro. A. Davis, because some modification has been made in the case of bro. T. E. Pearce.

The first point to be noted is the fact that the two speeches have been suppressed by the Birmingham Arranging Brethren. We have repeatedly urged them to publish the speeches, so that all may judge for themselves as to their scripturalness or otherwise. This they have repeatedly and definitely refused to do. We must therefore fall back on the expressed opinions of those who heard them, either as originally delivered in Birmingham or when re-delivered in London.

Of the brethren in the Clapham ecclesia at the time of the trouble, naturally all who supported the proposition to withdraw from the Temperance Hall ecclesia, are unanimous in describing them as "un-scriptural". Of those who heard the speech of bro. A. Davis, but who opposed the proposition of withdrawal, we select utterances of two brethren, F. W. Turner and B. R. Walker, both still in the Temperance Hall fellowship. On 2nd Jan., 1923, bro. F. W. Turner wrote a letter to bro. A. T. Jannaway, from which the following is an extract—

"It is admitted without question that the cause of the dispute between the Temperance Hall and the John Bright St. brethren was in the first instance the matter of dealing with erroneous' teaching in the Temperance Hall ecclesia. That wrong teaching was set forth in the speeches of brethren Pearce and Davis. . . . There is no need to quote them or enlarge thereon. It is admitted that they were dangerous and wrong."

Bro. B. R. Walker's comments on the speech of bro. A. Davis are equally clear and unmistakable. These are his words—

"I agreed, that, as I heard bro. Davis's speech, it was unscriptural."

"I should certainly draw the conclusion that he countenanced service in the Constabulary."

So much for the evidence of Clapham brethren. Of the brethren in the Birmingham ecclesia who heard the speeches, we have the following expressions to guide us.

We take firstly, bro. C. C. Walker's comment upon them; comment made, let it be remembered, at the time of their delivery, and therefore indicative of their true character.

"In all my thirty years' experience in the Truth, I have never heard the commandments of Christ called in question in that manner by brethren before."

Evidently bro. C. C. Walker was shocked by the nature of the speeches. What kind of speech could call forth such a rebuke from a brother of thirty years' experience, but an unscriptural speech? We submit the evidence is overwhelmingly conclusive.

We next consider the statements of bro. F. G. Ford, a Birmingham Arranging brother. After two years' consideration of the matter, he publicly stated—

"If the views of brethren Davis and Pearce were followed, I could foresee the city being policed by brethren."

Again, in a letter to bro. Viner Hall, he wrote—

"Last week we had to meet the organised attack of some biethren, who, to my mind, had departed from the elements of the Faith. This week, as good soldiers of the Lord, we also should be organised for the defence of the Truth."

Let us carefully note these expressions. "An organised attack": Who attacked? What did they attack? Who had "departed from the elements of the Truth"? These are expressions which very clearly show the true character of the speeches of these two brethren. In the estimation of this Arranging brother, they constituted an attack on the Truth, and a departure from the elements of the Faith.

Further, we may finally note the clear view expressed by the Temperance Hall ecclesia's Recording brother, J. F. Smith, who wrote to bro. Viner Hall—

"We have taken the right stand, and a good conscience with fortitude will carry us through. The opposition has not been without benefit; it has developed a clearer definition of our position." Why does bro. J. F. Smith here speak of "opposition"? Does it need to be pointed out that if these two brethren opposed the right intentions of the Arranging brethren, they must themselves of necessity have contended for what is wrong?

A brief extract from the speech of bro. A. Davis gives some idea of its purport. He said "The policeman, on the contrary, finds that his work is entirely good. He is engaged in restraining evil in order that freedom may live and act. In a word, his use of force is judicial, and I submit that we are to discriminate between judicial force and personal violence . . . judicial force on the other hand is a divinely appointed means for the suppression of evil and is virtuous because of its Divine sanction—it is moral and beneficent in result."

Bro. A. Davis has told us that he does not justify police service for brethren, and we must accept his statement; nevertheless in the words quoted above, as one of his own supporters has said, "the teaching is dangerous and wrong".

## BROTHER A. DAVIS' S MIND.

Having examined some of the evidence from the character of the speeches, we turn to consider some of brother A. Davis's own expressions in reference to himself and his views. These will be found to be confirmatory of what we have seen to be the true nature of his speech.

Quoting further from his published letter, we select the following—

"I have never justified service in the Constabulary, nor do I do so now. I say that any brother who joined would be very foolish. If I knew anyone who proposed doing so, I would do my utmost to dissuade him. But if, in spite of that, he still joined I would not accept the responsibility of disfellowshipping him."

Here is a clear expression of the mind of bro. Davis. It is certainly not the mind of this ecclesia (Clapham). Our view is that faithfulness to the commandments of Christ compels us to accept the responsibility of withdrawing from those who act contrary to them.

Further evidence of the mind of bro. A. Davis is furnished in his letter of April 14th, 1919, when he wrote—

"When I said last night that I would not accept the responsibility of withdrawing from a brother who joined the R.A.M.C., I used the word 'joined' in the sense I have always explained in my public speeches; namely, that he joined under Conscription, and then only after he had first obtained a Non-Combatant Certificate."

If there were no other evidence than these two expressions of his mind, surely these words of bro. A. Davis, his own words, are sufficient to justify the action we took in the year 1923. Here then, are the "reasons which necessitated our withdrawal from the Birmingham (Temperance Hall) ecclesia, and which continue to make our separation from that ecclesia and those in fellowship with it, a duty in faithfulness to the commandments of Christ".

The reasons remain to this day, eight and a half years afterwards. The speeches have never been withdrawn, and the Arranging brethren still refuse to deal with the offenders. Whilst this state of mind exists we must adhere to our determination to withhold our fellowship from that ecclesia and those in fellowship with it.

It is a matter of the greatest possible regret to have to do so, but what are the alternatives? To act the part of traitors. To betray the Truth; to know the right and to do the wrong. These we cannot do, even though it means separating from many we have loved. Let us rather be prepared to stand alone for the sake of the Truth. The day of Christ will reveal whether or not we have acted from pure motives: the day of Christ will try every man's work: it will search every heart and lay bare every thought; then, the truth on this matter, as on all others, will be revealed.

## TEMPERANCE HALL ECCLESIA'S WITHDRAWAL FROM THE JOHN BRIGHT ST. ECCLESIA.

Our review of the subject would be incomplete without reference to this action on the part of the Birmingham ecclesia. A small number of brethren and sisters in that meeting faithfully and persistently protested against the false teaching of brother Davis



and Pearce, and constantly urged the Arranging brethren to deal with the matter, but the only reply to their appeal was that the matter was "definitely closed", and that it was "out of order to be re-opened". After much patience and many efforts to bring about the disavowal of the wrong teaching, these few brethren and sisters were compelled to stand aside from the Temperance Hall ecclesia, until it dealt scripturally with the offenders. Were they wrong in so doing? Certainly they were not wrong. The teaching of the Scriptures plainly called for just such action as they took. Their object was not the establishment of a rival meeting, but by separating themselves from the ecclesia they sought to bring pressure upon the Arranging brethren to remedy the evil. Further, their action in standing aside was very definitely endorsed by clause xxxii of the Birmingham Constitution; nevertheless, because they had "established a separate meeting for the Breaking of Bread, thereby refusing to submit to the arrangements preferred by the greater number", on 9th Oct., 1919, the Temperance Hall ecclesia withdrew from the John Bright St. brethren. No charge of unscriptural conduct or of wrong doctrine has been brought against these brethren and sisters, yet they have been disfellowshipped. In our judgment that withdrawal is grossly unscriptural, and in the judgment of one of the Temperance Hall ecclesia's strongest supporters it is a "sin".

#### ADDITIONAL REASONS FOR MAINTAINING OUR WITHDRAWAL.

The A. Davis and T. E. Pearce matters already considered, although the immediate cause of our withdrawal from the Temperance Hall fellowship in 1923, are not now the only reasons for our separation from them. To-day there are additional and equally adequate reasons. The principal amongst these is undoubtedly that which has become known as the "Strickler heresy". It is impossible to go fully into that matter at the present time, but we would strongly recommend all to read what our bro. Dowling and others have written upon the subject.

The unscriptural theory concerning the atonement put forward by bro. A. D. Strickler, of Buffalo, U.S.A., is that Christ died for others, but not for himself; that Christ's human nature did not make him unclean. A few extracts from A. D. Strickler's book "Out of darkness into light" will show the character of this false theory which he advances:—

"It could not be said of Christ that he had sin dwelling in him as Paul said of himself" (page 83).

"We have no right to say that Christ's individual flesh was 'sinful flesh' " (page 84).

"God's method of salvation by the shedding of blood to make atonement did not apply to Christ, and therefore he could not have been his own better sacrifice" (page 73). "Christ's human nature did not make him unclean " (page 26).

The foregoing are but a few samples of the contention advanced by bro. A. D. Strickler; they are in direct opposition to such plain statements of Scripture as:—

"For He (God) hath made him (Christ) to be sin for us, who knew no sin "—11 Cor. v. 21.

"God sending His own son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh "—Rom. viii. 3.

"By his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption"—Heb. ix. 12.

"Who needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's: for this he did once, when he offered up himself"—Heb. vii. 27.

Many other passages might also be added to show the unscriptural character of the theory advanced. Our readers are recommended to carefully study what appeared in our pages last month from the pen of our bro. Bowling. Concerning this heresy, bro. G. F. Lake has rightly said—

"Of the corruptions of doctrine which are now prevalent in the brotherhood, the principal one is the unscriptural theory of the atonement put forward by brother A. D. Strickler, which heresy has been the cause of widespread division among the brethren in America."

Bro. C. C. Walker, the Editor of "The Christadelphian", has declared bro. Strickler to be "fundamentally sound", in spite of these manifest contradictions of Bible teaching on the subject of the atonement; and the most extraordinary fact is that these three brethren are now all in fellowship with each other, although as we have shown bro. Lake rightly charges bro. Strickler with "putting forward the principal heresy amongst those corruptions of doctrine which are now prevalent in the brotherhood".

There are some who will tell us, "A. D. Strickler is in America, and it is no concern of brethren and sisters in England ". The fallacy of this attitude is well exposed by bro. G. F. Lake, whom again we quote:—

"It is plainly against the spirit of the Word that brethren should be taught that their interests, their cares and their responsibilities are limited to the members of an ecclesia in any given place. That is plainly the recent tendency. We are told that an error in Australia, or a heresy in America, may be ignored because it is so far away!!

"It is forgotten that brethren in Australia and in America are members of the one body—holding the one hope—justified by the one faith, and 'members in particular' of the body of Christ."

This "clean flesh" heresy, and other serious matters such as the "taking of oaths" will certainly have to be put right before fellowship with the Temperance Hall ecclesia can be resumed.

Just a final word. Having separated from those who tolerate the errors to which we have referred, we make an appeal for real separation. Some of our number seem to have the idea that fellowship consists only in the act of breaking bread with each other. This is a mistaken view, as is evident from the following scripture: —

"And they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers"—Acts ii. 42. From this statement it is evident that "breaking of bread" is an act of fellowship, and that there are, in addition, other acts of fellowship. It is therefore not sufficient to abstain merely from breaking bread with the ecclesias from whom we have separated; our duty is to refrain from other acts of fellowship, such as attending lectures and fraternal gatherings. There are no doubt many

fleshly ties and attractions of that character, but let us remember we have separated ourselves from these ecclesias because of their wrong teaching. Until that false teaching is disowned, let us maintain real separation. If our action in withdrawing our fellowship was justifiable, as we are certain it was, no other course of conduct is defensible. We have taken a firm stand, let us, one and all, stand firm to the end.

Bro W. J. White.