

* For private circulation.

H. A.
to Daniel.

Is not a True Judgment of the Independence at Ryde, and the Conduct of Kennington essential to discovering a Right Path as to Ramsgate?

There would have been no division amongst us, on this matter surely, if we had been adequately sensible of the real character of the attack made three years ago on the testimony of God as to the "one Body—one Spirit," and if there had been faithfulness to Christ in dealing with the offender. How many of us were not clear about it. Strange to say, the attack was not merely schismatic (in this case, fellowship with a meeting not recognised), it was also the usurpation by a single brother (in a place far removed from the sphere of his local responsibilities) of the Lord's authority (only rightly exercised) in and by the Assembly. (Matt. xviii. 18—20; 1 Cor. v. 4, &c.)

The attempt was virtually to excommunicate a whole Assembly gathered on divine ground, with which brethren were avowedly in fellowship, and have remained in fellowship to this hour; and, in the same town, to form another Assembly in opposition, without the fellowship of brethren.

the approval of his brethren. He admit'ed this himself. He knew he was acting in direct opposition to the principles of God for the rule of the Church of God, owned by brethren, and ultimately said that, according to their principles, he ought to be declared out of fellowship. On his return from Ryde, after his first breaking bread with the new meeting on the 9th and 16th February, 1879, brethren in London remonstrated with him; but he told the brethren at Kennington, on the 10th March, that he knew he had acted contrary to brethren's rules, but he did not own the cordon of brethren! At a meeting of brothers at Kennington on the 13th March, 1879, it was unanimously decided that they had no fellowship with Dr. C.'s act in setting up a Table at Ryde. Dr. C. had, in the meantime, again gone down to Ryde, so on the 14th March a leading and elder brother at K. wrote him and told him of the judgment of the brothers at K., and entreated him not to break bread again at Ryde, but he did so, in spite of this letter and of the judgment of his brethren. Again, when he called on Mr. F., at Ryde, on 8th February, preparatory to breaking bread with his meeting next day, he said, "I've come, *without any letter*, to be with you to-morrow." Further, in his written statement of his proceedings at Ryde, prepared for a few brethren on his return, he says, "I felt free to cast my lot in with them, *disorderly as it must have seemed, and disowned as it may be.*" But he went to Ryde on 8th February for the express purpose of breaking bread with Mr. F.'s meeting, having beforehand written him that he should, if in Ryde, ask to break

bread with his meeting, and he inquired the direction of the John-street Room, where he thought Mr. F. was breaking bread. He had also previously written to Mr. F. to encourage him in starting the new meeting, whilst at the same time the Assemblies in the Isle of Wight and elsewhere still owned the Ryde Assembly, and they told Mr. F. that they had no confidence in his independent action. Individual brethren also wrote and warned him (Mr. F.) in the strongest way as to the result of independency. In Dr. C.'s letter to Mr. F. of 17th December, 1878, he says, "I have made a note of the direction of the Upper Room." There were other painful features attending this matter, to dwell upon which would make this paper too long. No amount of gracious waiting and entreaty subsequently to confess the wrongness of his (Dr. C.'s) course—not the heartrending state of things consequent upon it, not even the condemnation of his act by Kennington brothers on 13th March had any real weight with him.

It was therefore a deliberate intentional act, expressive for him of a principle, held at all cost, for which he claimed divine guidance and sanction.

A year ago he scorned the suggestion that he should confess his act as wrong with a view to restoration, and (to adopt his own recent phrase) he does not consider himself as "excommunicate of God." That is what he thinks of the solemn judgments of Assemblies everywhere excluding him. Those most friendly (if there is any difference amongst us towards him) say in extenuation that "he never saw the truth of the 'one Body.'" Well,

if so, 1 Cor. xiv. 38 is surely the Word for us in such a case. Let us be clear at all cost.

But why dwell upon this now?

For two reasons:—

1. Because it is needful still to be clear as to the origin of our deplorable division, on account of the activities known to be going on to undermine the action of 1879.

2. Because much observation and long, anxious consideration has produced the deep conviction that, in proportion as we are now clear as to the Ryde attack *in conscience before God* (not an assent merely to the judgment of others), shall we be *helped* to a right judgment as to the Ramsgate sorrow. There is only one test. How does the Lord—the Head of the Body—the Church—view all this?

Do we consider the point involved *vital*, necessitating a faithful stand?

Without controversy, the cause of the present division lies here. But this is not said to ignore concurrent causes on which others have dwelt, though they have been sometimes referred to, as if this matter were not enough to demand a decisive judgment.

Have we the slightest doubt that what has been and is going on is a *deadly assault of Satan on the precious truth of God*—“*One Body—One Spirit*”? These words are often uttered as a formula, but alas how feebly held! That which is most precious to Christ in this world will be the object of the special malice of Satan. “It [a work of Satan] will be ever founded on practi-

cally setting aside the power of that truth which has been in any given case, the gathering principle, and the testimony of God to the world." (J. N. D. copied in Bible Treasury, Jan. 7, 1882, p. 7.) Do we think we escaped by our course in 1879? No:—Satan is our persistent foe. There is a continuity in the assault from 1879 to 1881.

The Lord's prerogative in the Assembly, the "two or three gathered to His Name" is also again lightly called in question in another form. Hence confusion and every evil work, with a view to disintegrate and scatter that which we trusted the Lord had gathered. Surely what we are going through is unmistakably an attack of Satan.

Where there has been so much divergence, it is often a material help to a judgment to get back to where it began, and view the divergent streams from that standpoint.

Our judgment as to the original attack will in great measure form our judgment as to the Ramsgate sorrow.

It is still urged that this occasion is not so very important after all. There is evidently not much difference between the views sought to be imposed on Kennington in April, 1879 (see W. K.'s letter to Mr. B.), and those published Nov. 1881 (see Blackheath circular).

A strong illustration of the view here sought to be presented will also be found in a paper recently issued "from the country," which has been actively circulated.

We have it plainly stated (page 12) that "Dr. C. had not been guilty of wickedness or unsound doctrine such as the Word authorised to be so dealt with," and

this seems to be the key to its 24 pages. The author also condemns the course which *he thinks* was pursued towards Dr. C. He *accordingly* persuades himself that Guildford Hall brethren were worse than Dr. C.! He cannot find Scripture to condemn Dr. C.'s attack "as wicked or wrong doctrine," but he has no difficulty in bringing Guildford Hall brethren within the scope of scriptural condemnation of the deepest character.

This grievously mistaken view of the real nature of the original attack deprives the writer of not only every particle of sympathy with G. H. brethren in their local difficulties before division, and with their deep conscientiousness and intelligence as to the issues at stake; but (in a letter disclosing his difficulties and pleading for further time to come to a judgment which he is most reluctant to pronounce) it leads him to pass *at once* the severest judgment on G. H.—far worse than even that of Abbot's Hill brethren on them. He deprecates the course pursued towards Dr. C. (which was really six months waiting, and no exclusion, if he had only judged and confessed his course as wrong), and insists on the instant exclusion of *six* of G. H. leaders who separated from Dr. C.'s evil (virtually sixty to seventy saints) *without notice*, as being "scriptural," "righteous," and indeed "imperative."

If A. H. had given G. H. about as many days, as months were given Dr. C. by "London," there might have been reunion.

If A. H. had had even the sense of the solemn dignity due to themselves *if an Assembly of God* (let alone what

was due to G. H.) they would have given notice at their Table to take into consideration the case of *seventy saints who had just left them*, especially as they did not know who formed their meeting (tested by a first breaking of bread); and this delay would have produced healing. They communicated their intentions to a London brother, Mr. H., who entreated them to abandon such action; but they gave no heed. Well, A. H. after long justifying had at last to own their exclusion "wrong" and "uncalled for!" The author's view of the original attack, therefore, leads him to write a paper more Abbot's Hill, than Abbot's Hill itself! Hence too, this view, coupled with the *author's opinion* of the *feeling* of Park-street towards Dr. C. in 1879 (quite mistaken), leads him to attempt to bring into contempt the Park-street Assembly, and also its recent judgment.

Again, Were not the views of many as to Dr. C.'s course the cause of the division at Ramsgate—that which provoked G. H. brethren to act to prevent the Ramsgate Assembly being further demoralised? Let the Ramsgate correspondence, and the whole course of A. H. answer the question. We give two or three extracts:—

August 11th, 1879.—"For three hours we (G. H.) sought to show those who opposed and sympathised with Dr. C. and K. the character of Dr. C.'s act and course, which they refused to accept as wicked."

August 13th.—"We then remained for two hours, conversing and seeking to help brethren to a true judgment, which was continued privately in the intervening days."

August 19th.—"Our object was to inform saints of the facts, in order to exercise their consciences as to this great evil which threatened to overthrow the testimony of God confided to brethren." . . . "These brethren still refused to see the act as wickedness."

August 22nd.—"The four brothers judged Dr. C. to be without, but refused to judge K." (See Rams. Corr., pp 21, 22.)*

It is sadly significant too, that in so many recent notices and papers there is a protest against a question of discipline being made a test of fellowship, as if it must not always be the case if discipline by one Assembly is to be the discipline of all gathered on the ground of the "One Body," failing a disowning of the Assembly acting. It is already even called contemptuously "ecclesiasticism," "intellectualism."

This spirit, if allowed, *must* lead to independent meetings, to which Dr. C.'s claim and principle would have led us.

It is nothing else than "Bethesdaism."

This spirit of independency, has already sought to set aside judgment by an Assembly, by so readily disowning that of Park-street, adopted by so many London meetings.

In some cases this is sought to be done on the most frivolous pretences; such as having acted on a phase of the question two years ago (as if that would relieve from present responsibility); the manner in which their judgment was drawn up (unfairly represented), and

* Mr. Pettman said Dr. C. ought not to have been allowed to return to the Lord's table after his return from Ryde, yet Mr. F. refused to join with his brethren in judging those who refused to excommunicate him long afterwards.

because they did not exact adequate confession from G. H. (Could not Park-street be trusted on that point? See their judgment of G. H.)

We shall have to rue this course.

Surely no meeting will ever have the same advantages for coming to a judgment as Park-street had. Three meetings were held, about 400 or more were present, including those who had practically borne the burden of the Ramsgate sorrow from the beginning; also many from other meetings in London, and from the country, and the leaders from A. H. and G. H. with their written statements. Some intelligent brethren, who went there with a judgment in favour of A. H., felt the case against them too strong to resist.

If subsequent facts came out showing that *a vita mistake through misapprehension* had been made as to the character of G. H.'s confession, why was it not formally represented to Park-street and they asked to reconsider their judgment before so readily casting it aside, and disseminating every passing phase of this question to prejudice others against Park-street?

How many used J. N. D.'s *conscience* and spiritual intelligence when exercised to *condemn* G. H.? This ought surely to have led them to ascertain how his conscience came to be satisfied. A far happier matter.

There are antipathies still existing, which are not slow to show themselves against those who, at the outset, had pre-eminently a clear conscientious divinely-given judgment, at least, as to the principle and consequences at stake. If it had become imperative through

a grievous wrong having been done, to gravely call in question the judgment of Park-street, why were not the issues confined to the question whether it was a right one or not on the facts?

Painful as is the process going on, yet it is bringing principles to light.

In a notice dated 29th November, 1881, from some brethren at Birmingham, we have Park-street's action objected to, because "*it is an attempt to display a visible unity [the previous clause says on the contrary it is a breach of London's "unity of action"], and to bring about government in an authorised way, thus assuming that which in the present ruin state of the Church only leads to confusion.*" This said of a meeting acting on the question, whether they should receive from one or neither part of a divided meeting of nearly two years' standing, from one of which it had received a letter of commendation, reunion being hopeless.

Park-street say they were "obliged to consider and come to a decision." Are they worthy of credence? Park-street acted, and sent their notice to Cheapside, as one of the London Meetings which had accepted a letter of commendation from G. H., &c.

One would surely seek to have deepened in our souls the sense of the "ruin state of the Church," but these brethren at Birmingham do not tell us the distinction they make between applying the fact as against "Park-street's action" in discipline, virtually rejecting them as an Assembly of God for it, and declaring A. H. as "the true remnant after the secession" whose action in

discipline, as such "remnant," was one of the principal causes of the division.

But what is meant by this application of the "ruin state of the Church?" Is it intended that "Park-street action," "government" through an Assembly, is not now "an authorised way?" Or, if not this, that these brethren repudiate the principle of "government," viz. discipline by one Assembly as binding on other Assemblies, because it is an attempt at "government in an authorised way," and involves the assumption of "that [*sic*] which, in the present ruin state of the Church, only leads to confusion?" Is this it?

No. It is the rejection of *God's principle of government in the Church in and by the Assembly* which "leads to confusion," and brethren are witnesses to the deplorable fact, both in 1848 (to which period these brethren refer), and in 1881. Ephesus disowning Corinth's act of discipline! Have we learned nothing by the action of 1848, and must now repeat it in 1881? If it be said that 1848 was a far more important occasion, then so much the worse for us in repeating the sad course in 1881. But it was Bethesda's course which did it in 1848. Is it not Bethesda still? It began, on this occasion, in Ryde, and the circle widens.

These brethren say, "assuming that —" "which leads to confusion." What is it that is assumed? "Visible unity," or "government in an authorised way." Do these brethren then object to a "visible unity," and what do they prefer instead? The action of the Holy Ghost in each Assembly would lead to

"unity" surely. And what is preferred instead of "government in an authorised way?" On what lines are a remnant to act? Does God's word change? What is a "remnant" for, if it is not to bear testimony to the truth forsaken by the mass? There must be no assumption of power we all know. But the "two or three" truly gathered to the Lord can always count on the presence of the Holy Spirit.

But these brethren are making use of the "ruin state of the Church" to attack an act of discipline. Now there is nothing so subtle as a misplaced truth, and the above quotation is based on a passage in a letter by J. N. D., written in 1846 as to Plymouth (Collected Writings, vol. iv. p. 288.

It is an adaptation of his phrase, as if it were the result of their own matured thought, as led of God, on a consideration of the present question. It is used *against* the author's present course, who is immediately referred to as one "highly valued:"

It is important to warn brethren that efforts are being made to apply selections of J. N. D.'s former writings to the present time, without distinguishing the circumstances (see "Bible Treasury," January, 1882)—"The Enemy's Work." No initials are given, but it is *part* of J. N. D.'s introduction to his "Narrative of the Facts." (Eccles. vol. iv. p. 7.) Doubtless the paper is important, but it is of consequence to know in what direction the "Enemy" is now at work. On this occasion, beginning with Dr. C.'s act at Ryde, it is an attempt to accomplish the exclusion of Christ's

authority in the "two or three gathered to His name," and to disown His judgment by, and through them.

But to return. The letter of J. N. D. carefully distinguishes between an "attempt at displaying position and the unity"—"carnal unity by authority in the flesh" and the reality of what rightly obtains in the "state of ruin." It states that the Holy Ghost remains, and therefore the essential principle of unity with His presence connected with two or three gathered together in Christ's Name and He in the midst, not limiting what His blessed Spirit can do for us in our low estate, but taking the place where He can do it. "Hence government of bodies in an authorised way I believe there is none; where this is assumed, there will be confusion." Meeting, according to Matt. xviii., and owning the Holy Ghost Himself, is what is seen of the visibility of the body; it connects itself with this infinitely important principle, the presence and action of the Holy Ghost on earth, in the body a living thing animated down here by its union with the Head. Christ has attached therefore its practical operation to two or three, and has provided for its maintenance. "Thus in all states of ruin it cannot cease," &c. "The visibility God will take care of, as He always did."

If J. N. D. has done anything, he has maintained the authority of "the two or three," &c. as binding on others, making all just exceptions to ensure reality, such as being within the limits laid down in the Word, being of the Spirit and "by the conscience in grace." Why

has Dr. C. been refused? Because he followed a course destructive of this truth.

With reference to G. H.'s position, do we take into account sufficiently the state of matters in London previous to the Ramsgate division?

G. H.'s action was no isolated matter.

*W.K. } *
Ye }* The course pursued by leaders at Kennington, and the known outside powerful influences at work to prevent those who favoured Dr. C. coming to a judgment of exclusion, led many to believe (Dr. C. being unrepentant) that separation from those who remained at Kennington and would not exclude Dr. C., would be the only issue for those who would not be associated with such a course. *Division was imminent generally in London and elsewhere.* Ramsgate had specially been troubled by visits from both parties at Kennington, and earnestly desired to clear themselves, especially on account of the course pursued by some among them on this question. "London," at last, *did begin to act*, and the general sense of Ramsgate was in favour of fellowship with this action. But as all London had not acted, there was scarcely an imperative necessity to press the question at that moment. Still it is only fair to say that they had some strong evidence of London's unity having been broken up at the time.

G. H. says, "Either at that time (22nd August, 1879), or on a previous occasion it was stated that the unity of London was broken since Park-street, Finsbury-park, and about eleven other gatherings, had during the month judged the Dr. to be outside, whilst the others were either indifferent or powerless to act" (p. 21 R. C.).

G. H. did not mean that their course of action was

according to "God's principles," but that their refusing association with Dr. C.'s evil was so. They judged as wrong at the initial stage their course of individual action and "haste" (since defined as "sin"). There were no dealings in discipline with meetings in London and elsewhere acting, nor, so far as the writer is aware, a thought of it. Further, how was G. H. to get back to assembly ground in Ramsgate if there were no Assembly in Ramsgate to return to? They were for a total period of fifteen months without the Lord's Supper!

They refused to recognise the notice from a maimed K., the seventeen, with many sisters, being outside K. and others dissenting from the notice, but they ceased to break bread *the very moment* it was known that "London" would accept "Kennington's notice after it had been referred back to K. for the seventeen to join in. Was not that evidence that they had no thought beyond purging themselves of Dr. C.'s course, and of the Kennington which sheltered him? G. H. say positively that was their only object, and not "new lumpism," except that of 1 Cor. v.

Whilst we should have a distinct judgment as to infractions of a right form of procedure, even *in an endeavour to be clear of evil*, surely on those acting thus owning such departure we could not refuse them fellowship, especially where it was unintentional, done in ignorance as in G. H.'s case. (G. H. confess to ignorance. See R. Corres.) Their mistake was in not acting as an Assembly, instead of separating individually—a serious matter—for, admittedly, it deprived Ramsgate of its "Assembly." But because *four* dissented out of a meeting at which seventy were present, G. H. brethren thought

it would be more real and for the Lord's glory to act individually. They dreaded acting in a mass without an exercised conscience. Their putting a few subsequently on one side until confidence was restored, was a result of this individual action, and was based on the Assembly having been broken up 22nd August, 1879, which is now generally admitted.

If there had been Assembly action, as at Faversham, surely Ramsgate would *not* have been "outside," as has been contended. They would only have had to withdraw their notice of exclusion (as Park-street did) so far as it affected Kennington (or others owning Dr. C.) on the latter acting and being owned by "London."

G. H. not only confessed at the outset, but far more, *they took a position consistent with a true confession of having lost their position as the Assembly in Ramsgate, and they suffered deeply in consequence. Those who visited them speak of the deep godly sorrow and distress of spirit they exhibited.*

A. H. never took a position consistent with their confessions (most tardily made), and this alone prevented a reunion.

If A. H. had been a true godly remnant of a broken up Assembly entitled to confidence as such, G. H. would have returned to them on confession. Their letter for the purpose to A. H. was already written, but A. H.'s notice of exclusion led to its being dropped, the notice indicating their pretensions and spirit.

It is a fallacy to suppose that either section of a divided Assembly is, as a matter of course, entitled to be owned

as the Assembly, and it leaves out the Lord. Other Assemblies were at the time in fellowship with the Assembly in Ramsgate *as an undivided whole* gathered to His Name. A division is always a question for judgment by the other Assemblies, otherwise local action for God would be stultified. Those who would not act were really the most to blame, for they appear to have had no real sense of the evil to be judged. They had to prove their claim to be owned, not to assume it as a matter of course. But they were occupied with one subject, viz., *themselves*.

At the outset, 23rd August, 1879, one of the four dissentient brothers "supposed" that they (the four) formed "the Assembly," they knew nothing as to sisters. They deliberately and intentionally abandoned the Lord's Table in Ramsgate, 24th August, 1879. They say from "inadvertence," which means carelessness and also from "weakness," which is inconsistent with carelessness, but so far from arranging for meeting themselves they agreed to afford facilities for the so-called "schismatics" meeting, at the room of which A. H. had then the control, could have claimed, they said, a year's notice, which the landlord admitted. But *after that Lord's Day* (when it was known K. had acted) everything was made subservient to supporting their claim. Hence the lack of real conscience before God as to what had happened to the Ramsgate Assembly, and about what A. H. did and said. Would they have thought of excluding G. H. next day if K. had not acted? Would they not have been concerned to know how they stood with the Lord and their

brethren, and whether they were "inside" or "out?" But as the case stood, should they not have rather mourned at the loss of so many godly brethren who had felt obliged to separate from the evil left with A. H., and have sought opportunity for recovery?

The correspondence issued by A. H. must be *studied to arrive at a moral judgment on the details of their course*, but one more fact may be referred to as showing how the *technical* part of the claim to be the "Assembly" seemed to have absorbed them, to the exclusion of what is morally essential to its existence, if one of God. Let this be weighed by those who are condemning Park-street, who really looked to own that which "God could go on with," as one of them remarked, instead of resting it on a *supposed technical claim*. This feature should be reassuring to those who are hinting that Park-street is attempting to introduce "authorised government" apart from conscience and real spiritual power.

A. H. never visited their G. H. brethren before exclusion, and neither did they afterwards, when they knew that G. H. had ceased to break bread and withdrawn their notice. But in consequence of this they considered and "discussed" among themselves for *about three months* whether they should withdraw their notice of exclusion. They could thus look quietly on at sixty to seventy saints (*so recently with them*) without the Lord's Supper until G. H. wrote their letter to A. H. of 14th November, 1879. What was the reason why A. H. did not seek their brethren, and deferred the withdrawal of their exclusion? One only. *They waited*

to be recognised. What was the recognition by G. H. which satisfied them (as claiming to be an Assembly of God) and induced them to withdraw their notice of exclusion without repentance. *This:—*

“After prayerful consideration our judgment is, that you have no claim upon us as God’s Assembly, and that your notice is invalid.”

A. H.’s reply to this letter contained such withdrawal! Was this an Assembly of God or a true “remnant” entitled to confidence?

When A. H.’s claim to be the Assembly was first challenged, they at once entered on a long, painful discussion *with those they had excluded to make it good!* They did so, in the first instance, by defending their acts and course as an Assembly, but finding eventually that these acts and course would be fatal to their claim, they then confessed them to be wrong, hoping to save their Assembly character in *that way*, for the confession was so referred to. But this confession confirmed the judgment, that they were not “the Assembly,” based on their acts and course, the pretension being the chief obstacle to reunion.

One would naturally gather from the Ramsgate correspondence that A. H. had to be aroused to a real conscience about this matter of Dr. C. by G. H. brethren. And if they came to any real moral judgment, subsequent to the exclusion, it seems to have been the result of consciences, *apart from them*, acting on theirs.

Some, who apparently are contemplating owning A. H. if possible hereafter, cannot, after more than two and

a half years' of self-assertion of A. H., recognise them *now*. That virtually cuts off A. H. in the meantime. And are we to deny the right of the Lord to regather His saints in Ramsgate, because a few falsely assume to be the Assembly of God ?

If G. H. were right in disowning A. H. as the Ramsgate Assembly, then G. H.'s offer of reconciliation contained in their letter of 18th December, 1879, is unassailable.

This A. H. persistently rejected, and so forced on us this dealing with Ramsgate. G. H. say in effect let us both own together before God our several failures, forming in the aggregate the failures of what was the Assembly in Ramsgate ; cease to break bread as a true disowning of the assumed position and all wrong acts committed in its name, as between you (A. H.) and God, and as thus purged, let us break bread once more as we left.

Happy, blessed, righteous solution if it had been accepted !

Where could you put your finger on A. H.'s course and say, "Here, at all events, we have the true marks of an Assembly of God, or of a 'remnant,' if you will ?" We speak not of them in their individual character. So far as the writer is aware, he is not personally known to any of the Ramsgate brethren.

A. H. it would seem must be wrong even on the final question of ceasing to break bread. Eventually, they were willing to do so "*in grace*" to G. H. The "supposed Assembly" in such a humiliating position as

to be willing to renounce the Lord's Supper, that which vitally characterises an Assembly, and with which all discipline is essentially associated; and this out of deference to those *not of the Assembly, even to those excluded by its discipline, and who, moreover, disowned their claim and notice!* Did not A. H. morally renounce their claim by such a proposal? How was it they had to descend to such depths? Their *start was wrong*, and no efforts of theirs could save them from the consequences. It could only be, as is always the case, by thorough repentance and a retracing of wrong steps. It was acting thus in true confession, which gave G. H. such a strong moral position. If G. H. had asked for ceasing to break bread, as due to them, it would have been shocking. The suggestion is really offensive to a spiritual mind. If it could not be done *as due to God in righteousness*, it ought not to have been conceded at all. G. H. gave up breaking bread as disowning the position they ignorantly thought would have been theirs. *They had no intention of being without the Lord's Supper, but they had mistaken their course, and subsequently they trusted to be owned by the assemblies, as there was no hope of reconciliation, but they had not been recognised when they ceased.* Their course is by no means defended, it need not be said; but an attempt is here made to state what the case was. If those left at Kennington had not acted at the last moment, in the throes of the action in London, Ramsgate, and elsewhere *just after it had commenced*, we all should have taken *morally*, in one way or another, a

position with those meetings which had acted, and with G. H.; that is to say, we should have owned the exclusion of Dr. C., and disowned the meeting which retained him—assuming we should have been consistent with what was done actually by us all, viz., the exclusion of Dr. C. The action commenced would surely have become in form, or virtually so, general.

Are we therefore shut up to the conclusion “that God had, with certain exceptions, disowned the whole body of brethren” if G. H. were not “independent”? Although hasty and sadly faulty in detail, was not the action taken as to principle the only one that could have preserved the testimony of the Lord with us? Clearly for many months we had been keeping the feast with leaven, and knew it. Is it for us now to charge with independency those who said they could do so no longer? Read G. H.’s letters, where they state that they would not have acted except in fellowship with other meetings acting. Why, it was even a charge against the meetings acting that there was a concerted arrangement. God surely used the action commenced in London and elsewhere to give Kennington to see it was imperative there should be no more delay, and that thus His saints should be mercifully relieved of the fearful strain to which they had been so long exposed.

It is forgotten that Park-street came to a judgment 19th August, 1879, before K. had finally, viz. on 21st, and K. surely knew what was coming. *The leaders at Kennington had been blinded by others, and by their love for Dr. C., and needed help*

as against themselves even. This need not stumble us, although it may well humble us. Corinth required apostolic action to arouse them. K. knew their position was critical, or why did they send out their notices to the country the very next day following their decision of 21st August, 1879, before submitting their notice to Cheapside for adoption by all London? Was it not to save themselves? But this really further published the fact that London's unity in action was gone for the moment.

Notwithstanding A. H.'s treatment of G. H. the former has not yet found truer, more faithful friends than G. H. really were when they urged a reconciliation on the terms of their letter of 18th December, 1879.

How thankful would we have been to see A. H. delivered from the outside artificial support accorded them, and to take a place with them in really godly confession, and so to lead to a true healing.

This paper is only intended to present a few feeble words in favour of our owning Park-street judgment as a righteous path towards recovery, not of course as disclosing fully the grounds on which that meeting acted.

This is no question merely as between G. H. and A. H., but whether we are to be corrupted in our position as gathered on the ground of the "One Body—One Spirit."

If we have under-estimated the character of the original attack, may God in His mercy overrule the deep sorrow, strife, disintegration, and widening character of evil which have fallen upon us as a result of it, to open

our eyes, not only to a true judgment of the evil, but to a far deeper apprehension of the solemn, precious, and unchangeable truth of the "One Body—One Spirit," and to all that it involves, as due from each one in our solemn responsibility to "the Lord, the Head of the Body, the Church." F.

Note.—1. If the four dissentients really judged Dr. C. "out," 22 August, 1879, then in that case they disowned the "unity of London," and there was no consistency in not disowning K., which retained him (*the question before Ramsgate*), and in that case all "London," which retained Kennington.

And what becomes then of A. H.'s statement that they divided *solely* to preserve *London's unity*? Further, how did they subsequently preserve it, when they at once decided to accept K.'s notice in the then maimed state of that meeting, and before London as a whole had acknowledged those that were left? Was it not also agreed to be accepted as against those meetings which had acted?

If A. H. had only London's unity in view, all they had to do was to wait until all London had acted, and then simply to take note of their action, and not to act themselves at all.

A. H. say "going out" of G. H. was "want of faith," "unhappy." What they "resisted" was forming again outside. The six were selected because they publicly announced withdrawal (so it has been stated) that which was simply "unhappy." All formed out-

side, and broke bread, having been challenged publicly in the Assembly, 22nd August, 1879, to send in names next day. Why was the door left open to all to return without confession except six? Surely the evil could not have been so very serious in the judgment of A. H. But were all wanted back except the six?

Some of those who attended outside Guildford Hall room, 24th August, 1879, finding the door locked, went on to Almorah House where G. H. brethren were meeting. (See R. correspondence on this point.) They were mostly sisters, *not one responsible*. If this means anything, it shows A. H. leaders' intention not to break bread more clearly. They had a key. Then those who afterwards joined them adopted their acts and course, and shared their responsibility, just in the same way as those who followed G. H. leaders.

2. Objection is raised to having an individual judgment before an Assembly comes to a decision. The Assembly at Corinth knew what they had to do before they met, supposing the evidence proved clear. There is scarcely a case (whether as to doctrine or practice) for Assembly judgment in which individual brethren have not to make a preliminary inquiry and form a judgment, or why should they incur the responsibility of bringing the case before the Assembly?

"If he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the church" (Matt. xviii. 17). It would prove moral incapacity if ascertained facts did not affect the judgment. Of course the case must be made clear to the consciences of the Assembly, and all held in subjection

to the Holy Spirit as to the final issue. Some have printed and published their individual judgments before their meetings had decided, and yet they have objected to J. N. D. drawing up a paper to submit to his meeting, a draft which was altered by the Assembly.

3. It is sought to institute a comparison between Cheapside not accepting K.'s proposed "rebuke" of Dr. C., 1879, and being expected to own Park-street's judgment, 1881. In the things of God comparison of precedents are generally futile, as they deal with only what is formal, and leave out moral considerations operating, and the Lord's guidance at the time. All London and K. judged K.'s "rebuke" as insufficient. See previous remarks as to 1881.)

4. Many gatherings in Kent have from the first disowned A. H. as an assembly, including Deal, Dover, Folkestone, and Faversham. (See notice 29th April, 1881, from brothers at the meetings named.)

Park-street acted (on a letter of commendation from G. H.) as one of the meetings in the London Assembly which comprises several meetings in Kent. A. H. and G. H. owned the tribunal. This is mentioned to meet another objection (of brethren at Birmingham) which even denies the jurisdiction of Park-street! What does their objection to "authorised government" amount to, after all?

5. The following is a copy of G. H.'s offer of reconciliation, which A. H. would never accept because they claimed to be the Assembly:—

From Brethren and Sisters in Christ meeting at Guildford Hall, to Brethren and Sisters in Christ meeting at Abbot's Hill.

DEAR BRETHREN, RAMSGATE, December 18, 1879.

In view of the common failure, we would affectionately suggest as the true solution of the present separation from one another, and for reconciliation and reunion in the Spirit, as also for helping on the peace and unity of God's people, gathered to the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ in this time of trouble, that we should meet as we separated, seeking first to adjust differences for true reconciliation, and then coming together at Guildford Hall (the Lord willing) on the first Sunday for mutual confession and humiliation, and the next for breaking of bread (Matt. v. 23, 24).

If this suggestion does not meet your approval, we shall be pleased to consider any you may make, but we may plainly say that we can entertain no thought of restoration, but only that of reconciliation, and we beg of you, in the Lord's Name, seriously to consider this as affecting His glory, and the welfare of His beloved people. (Phil. ii. 1—5.)

Signed by GEORGE C. MILLWARD,
And six other Brothers.

PARK STREET NOTICES.*

First Notice.

A letter of commendation having been sent up to Park Street from the Meeting assembling at Guildford Hall,

* The first of these Notices was communicated to the other London Gatherings May 1st, and the second, May 8th, 1881.

Ramsgate, the Park Street Assembly was obliged to consider and come to a decision as to what assembly they recognised at Ramsgate, or if any. A meeting was called consequently for Thursday, April 21st, and met on that day, and adjourned to Thursday, April 28th, in compliance with the wishes of some, when the Assembly resolved that they did not own the Assembly meeting at Abbot's Hill, Ramsgate.

Second Notice.

In receiving the commendatory letter from Guildford Hall, Ramsgate, we feel it right to state that we do not thereby commit ourselves to the approval of all that Mr. Jull and those with him have done. There are important points in their course in which we do not think they were led by the Spirit of God, nor their path the path of Divine Wisdom; indeed, they have themselves owned they were wrong in more than one important matter. Still, as we could not ask them to go to Abbot's Hill, as to which we have declared our conviction that it cannot be recognised as an Assembly, nor expect them to be deprived of the Lord's Supper for ever, we do receive their present letter commending a brother to us, and purpose to receive those duly accredited by them in future, thereby accrediting the Meeting from which they come.

Copies may be had of "F." "Dunrobin," Cedar-road, Sutton, Surrey.

PRICE ONE PENNY.

Twelve copies post free for twelve stamps.

“unity” surely. And what is preferred instead of “government in an authorised way?” On what lines are a remnant to act? Does God’s word change? What is a “remnant” for, if it is not to bear testimony to the truth forsaken by the mass? There must be no assumption of power we all know. But the “two or three” truly gathered to the Lord can always count on the presence of the Holy Spirit.

But these brethren are making use of the “ruin state of the Church” to attack an act of discipline. Now there is nothing so subtle as a misplaced truth, and the above quotation is based on a passage in a letter by J. N. D., written in 1846 as to Plymouth (Collected Writings, vol. iv. p. 288.

It is an adaptation of his phrase, as if it were the result of their own matured thought, as led of God, on a consideration of the present question. It is used *against* the author’s present course, who is immediately referred to as one “highly valued.”

It is important to warn brethren that efforts are being made to apply selections of J. N. D.’s former writings to the present time, without distinguishing the circumstances (see “Bible Treasury,” January, 1882)—“The Enemy’s Work.” No initials are given, but it is *part* of J. N. D.’s introduction to his “Narrative of the Facts.” (Eccles. vol. iv. p. 7.) Doubtless the paper is important, but it is of consequence to know in what direction the “Enemy” is now at work. On this occasion, beginning with Dr. C.’s act at Ryde, it is an attempt to accomplish the exclusion of Christ’s

position with those meetings which had acted, and with G. H.; that is to say, we should have owned the exclusion of Dr. C., and disowned the meeting which retained him—assuming we should have been consistent with what was done actually by us all, viz., the exclusion of Dr. C. The action commenced would surely have become in form, or virtually so, general.

Are we therefore shut up to the conclusion “that God had, with certain exceptions, disowned the whole body of brethren” if G. H. were not “independent”? Although hasty and sadly faulty in detail, was not the action taken as to principle the only one that could have preserved the testimony of the Lord with us? Clearly for many months we had been keeping the feast with leaven, and knew it. Is it for us now to charge with independency those who said they could do so no longer? Read G. H.’s letters, where they state that they would not have acted except in fellowship with other meetings acting. Why, it was even a charge against the meetings acting that there was a concerted arrangement. *God surely used the action* commenced in London and elsewhere to give Kennington to see it was imperative there should be no more delay, and that thus His saints should be mercifully relieved of the fearful strain to which they had been so long exposed.

It is forgotten that Park-street came to a judgment 19th August, 1879, before K. had finally, viz. on 21st, and K. surely knew what was coming. *The leaders at Kennington had been blinded by others, and by their love for Dr. C., and needed help*

as against themselves even. This need not stumble us, although it may well humble us. Corinth required apostolic action to arouse them. K. knew their position was critical, or why did they send out their notices to the country the very next day following their decision of 21st August, 1879, before submitting their notice to Cheapside for adoption by all London? Was it not to save themselves? But this really further published the fact that London's unity in action was gone for the moment.

Notwithstanding A. H.'s treatment of G. H. the former has not yet found truer, more faithful friends than G. H. really were when they urged a reconciliation on the terms of their letter of 18th December, 1879.

How thankful would we have been to see A. H. delivered from the outside artificial support accorded them, and to take a place with them in really godly confession, and so to lead to a true healing.

This paper is only intended to present a few feeble words in favour of our owning Park-street judgment as a righteous path towards recovery, not of course as disclosing fully the grounds on which that meeting acted.

This is no question merely as between G. H. and A. H., but whether we are to be corrupted in our position as gathered on the ground of the "One Body—One Spirit."

If we have under-estimated the character of the original attack, may God in His mercy overrule the deep sorrow, strife, disintegration, and widening character of evil which have fallen upon us as a result of it, to open

our eyes, not only to a true judgment of the evil, but to a far deeper apprehension of the solemn, precious, and unchangeable truth of the "One Body—One Spirit," and to all that it involves, as due from each one in our solemn responsibility to "the Lord, the Head of the Body, the Church." F.

Note.—1. If the four dissentients really judged Dr. C. "out," 22 August, 1879, then in that case they disowned the "unity of London," and there was no consistency in not disowning K., which retained him (*the question before Ramsgate*), and in that case all "London," which retained Kennington.

And what becomes then of A. H.'s statement that they divided *solely* to preserve *London's unity*? Further, how did they subsequently preserve it, when they at once decided to accept K.'s notice in the then maimed state of that meeting, and before London as a whole had acknowledged those that were left? Was it not also agreed to be accepted as against those meetings which had acted?

If A. H. had only London's unity in view, all they had to do was to wait until all London had acted, and then simply to take note of their action, and not to act themselves at all.

A. H. say "going out" of G. H. was "want of faith," "unhappy." What they "resisted" was forming again outside. The six were selected because they publicly announced withdrawal (so it has been stated) that which was simply "unhappy." All formed out-

side, and broke bread, having been challenged publicly in the Assembly, 22nd August, 1879, to send in names next day. Why was the door left open to all to return without confession except *six*? Surely the evil could not have been so very serious in the judgment of A. H. But were all wanted back *except the six*?

Some of those who attended outside Guildford Hall room, 24th August, 1879, finding the door locked, went on to Almorah House where G. H. brethren were meeting. (See R. correspondence on this point.) They were mostly sisters, *not one responsible*. If this means anything, it shows A. H. leaders' intention not to break bread more clearly. They had a key. Then those who afterwards joined them adopted their acts and course, and shared their responsibility, just in the same way as those who followed G. H. leaders.

2. Objection is raised to having an individual judgment before an Assembly comes to a decision. The Assembly at Corinth knew what they had to do before they met, supposing the evidence proved clear. There is scarcely a case (whether as to doctrine or practice) for Assembly judgment in which individual brethren have not to make a preliminary inquiry and form a judgment, or why should they incur the responsibility of bringing the case before the Assembly?

“If he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the church” (Matt. xviii. 17). It would prove moral incapacity if ascertained facts did not affect the judgment. Of course the case must be made clear to the consciences of the Assembly, and all held in subjection

to the Holy Spirit as to the final issue. Some have printed and published their individual judgments before their meetings had decided, and yet they have objected to J. N. D. drawing up a paper to submit to his meeting, a draft which was altered by the Assembly.

3. It is sought to institute a comparison between Cheapside not accepting K.'s proposed "rebuke" of Dr. C., 1879, and being expected to own Park-street's judgment, 1881. In the things of God comparison of precedents are generally futile, as they deal with only what is formal, and leave out moral considerations operating, and the Lord's guidance at the time. All London and K. judged K.'s "rebuke" as insufficient. See previous remarks as to 1881.)

4. Many gatherings in Kent have from the first disowned A. H. as an assembly, including Deal, Dover, Folkestone, and Faversham. (See notice 29th April, 1881, from brothers at the meetings named.)

Park-street acted (on a letter of commendation from G. H.) as one of the meetings in the London Assembly which comprises several meetings in Kent. A. H. and G. H. owned the tribunal This is mentioned to meet another objection (of brethren at Birmingham) which even denies the jurisdiction of Park-street! What does their objection to "authorised government" amount to, after all?

5. The following is a copy of G. H.'s offer of reconciliation, which A. H. would never accept because they claimed to be the Assembly :-

*Therefore a mtg^d not to be rec^d en masse
but each person must individually
be received - i.e. rec^d as individuals.
the Assen. receives.*

This is an important factor.

From Brethren and Sisters in Christ meeting at Guildford Hall, to Brethren and Sisters in Christ meeting at Abbot's Hill.

DEAR BRETHREN, RAMSGATE, December 18, 1879.

In view of the common failure, we would affectionately suggest as the true solution of the present separation from one another, and for reconciliation and reunion in the Spirit, as also for helping on the peace and unity of God's people, gathered to the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ in this time of trouble, that we should meet as we separated, seeking first to adjust differences for true reconciliation, and then coming together at Guildford Hall (the Lord willing) on the first Sunday for mutual confession and humiliation, and the next for breaking of bread (Matt. v. 23,24).

If this suggestion does not meet your approval, we shall be pleased to consider any you may make, but we may plainly say that we can entertain no thought of restoration, but only that of reconciliation, and we beg of you, in the Lord's Name, seriously to consider this as affecting His glory, and the welfare of His beloved people. (Phil. ii. 1—5.)

Signed by GEORGE C. MILLWARD,
And six other Brothers.

PARK STREET NOTICES.*

First Notice.

A letter of commendation having been sent up to Park Street from the Meeting assembling at Guildford Hall,

* The first of these Notices was communicated to the other London Gatherings May 1st, and the second, May 8th, 1881.