

“JUDGES IN THE LAND”

An Open Letter to

S. A. WHITE and S. RIDOUT

I Samuel Chapter 3, Verses 11, 12 and 13.

“And the Lord said to Samuel, Behold, I will do a thing in Israel, at which both the ears of every one that heareth it shall tingle.

“In that day I will perform against Eli all things which I have spoken concerning his house: when I begin, I will also make an end.

“For I have told him that I will judge his house for ever for the iniquity *which he knoweth*; because his sons made themselves vile, *and he restrained them not.*”

II Samuel, Chapter 15, Verses 2 to 6, inclusive.

“And Absalom rose up early, and stood beside the way of the gate: and it was so, that when any man that had a controversy came to the king for judgment, then Absalom called unto him, and said, Of what city are thou? And he said, Thy servant is of one of the tribes of Israel.

“And Absalom said unto him, See, thy matters are good and right; but there is no man deputed of the king to hear thee.

“Absalom said moreover, *Oh that I were made judge in the land*, that every man which hath any suit or cause might come unto me, and I will do him justice!

“And it was so, that when any man came nigh to him to do him obeisance, he put forth his hand, and took him, and kissed him.

“And *on this manner* did Absalom to all Israel that came to the king for judgment: so Absalom stole the hearts of the men of Israel.”

"JUDGES IN THE LAND"
AN OPEN LETTER TO S. A. WHITE
AND S. RIDOUT

PHILADELPHIA, PA., January 3, 1928.

MR. S. A. WHITE,
18 Denwood Avenue,
Takoma Park, D. C.

Dear brother:

When I wrote you under date of November 30th, I "deferred answering you in detail at that time", for the reason that I wished you to have sufficient time to "broadcast your November 26th letter to me as far as my Hamite methods had gone".

I assume you have received copy of my letter of December 28, 1927, addressed to brother Ridout, copy to brother P. D. Loizeaux.

It is not even now my purpose to answer you "in detail", for to do so would necessitate a veritable trading in "many words" profitable to no one.

In respect to what you accuse me of, and also lay accusation to brethren Wallace, Gottshall and Herrmann, I feel quite sure that the letter addressed to you under date of December 7, 1927, by brother Wallace would in itself "put to shame", one to whom the right and wrong of a matter is open as you claim it to be to you. You should not have any trouble in discerning the "truth" of what brother Wallace brings before you, if you are indeed the "spiritual" you claim to be, never taking things for granted, but as *direct from God*, proving all things."

What you *claim* to be “spiritually” and what you at the same time *write* “carnally”, reveal indeed a “divided house”, and that the One Spirit which you claim to guide you, does not and especially *did not* guide you in writing such an “un-christian” and “unbrotherly” letter as you *admit* having written.

In your letter of November 26th, you had much to say concerning “Job scraping himself withal with the potsherd”, and its application to me and incidently to the other three brethren named.

You say, “God rebuked Job’s three friends, who would scrape the walls of the Patriarch’s house”.

Yes, that is true, God did rebuke them saying, “My *wrath* is kindled against thee”. Have you noticed that these “three friends” of Job were “*elder brethren*”, who as God said, “had *not* spoken of me *the thing that is right*”?

Have you also noticed that *before* even God rebuked these “three friends”, that they had *already* been “rebuked in righteous wrath” by a “younger brother” named Elihu? (See Job 32 verses 2, 4 and 6.)

May I also call your attention to the fact that this “younger brother” had listened and “waited long” until “Job and his three elder brethren” had “spoken”? It can be said for the “three friends” of Job, however, that they recognized the truth of what Elihu was bringing to them, and before he had fairly begun, “they were amazed, they answered no more; they left off speaking.”

It is also noticeable that one of the first sayings of this “younger brother”, who would probably come under your brand of “*Novitiatism*”, is—“Great men are not always wise, neither do the aged understand judgment”.

We find the “sayings” of this “younger brother” in Chapters 32 to 37 inclusive, and it is also worthy of note that God did *not* have one word of “rebuke” to direct at any thing

that he had spoken, but for that which had been spoken by the "three elder friends" of Job, God demands a "burnt offering from them" to stay his "wrath and dealing with them after their folly".

Thus we find a "younger brother" whose "righteous wrath was kindled against three elder brethren" and whose words did *not* lack "wisdom and truth", else God would have also "rebuked him".

You say, "I made no allowance for anything; the confusion of an attack, the heat of argument; the sayings which reconsideration would wish for modification; the evident change of attitude upon reconsideration, all are used craftily as so much evidence against them".

It would seem to me that *you* especially would be careful as to making such accusations against *another*.

Were your accusations against brother Ridout "made in the heat of argument", or are they your conclusions, *after* due time is allowed for "reconsideration and modification"?

We at least did not wait for "35 years" before warning the saints as to the "conditions amongst us".

Shame upon you for claiming such a "high office" as a "spiritual" and yet setting such an example before your brethren, especially the "younger brethren". You must not forget that you sent your "other manuscripts" containing your accusation against brother Ridout and others—to *me!*

We at least brought our grievances against brother Ridout, brother Booth, brother McCandless, brother Greenman and others, *direct to them*.

And from the time that their "mis-leading" and "turning aside from the written word" was "certain" and "true", we did not *as you have*, hold the charge of "overlording" and "Nicolaitanism" against them, *and at the same time* lend any "unholy alliance" efforts to their "workings" and "conduct".

Especially in view of what *you* say has been the "work-

ings” and “conduct” of brother S. Ridout for “the past 35 years” and the resultant “carrying away by the dissimulation of his advice and counsel”, you should have been more successful during a period “of 35 years” in convincing brother Ridout of his guilt in that respect, and have “gained your brother”.

How is it that one who claims to be a “spiritual” and endowed with the ability to give “an exposition of the words used by the Holy Spirit in speaking of the Humanity of Our Lord Jesus Christ”, and also able to “give *advanced* instructions”, was so unsuccessful in “gaining” or impressing brother Ridout as you have been?

As I have brought to brother Ridout’s attention, you begin your letter of November 26th to me by “accusing me falsely”, in that a statement “originating with brother Ridout, is attributed to me” and I am the recipient of your, shall I say, “*advanced* wrath”?

Even in your letter of December 3d, you accuse me of “misleading, unfairness, and unrighteousness”, because you conclude that I did not send brethren Gottshall, Wallace and Herrmann “your letter of November 26th along with my answer to you of November 30th”. This is another example of the “folly” and false conclusions with which your letters are filled.

With the copy of my letter to you of November 30th, and in the *same envelope* with it, I *did* send to these three brethren, “yours of November 26th in full”, so, my brother, they were in a position to “read your qualifying words, which I did not leave out”. Brother Wallace’s letter of December 7, 1927, to you reveals that he “read all your words, including the ones you say are qualifying”!

There seems no doubt in the minds of many that the words of Elihu, the “younger brother” as found in Job 34, verses

24 to 27 inclusive, have a potent meaning for this day in which we live. They are as follows:

“He shall break in pieces mighty men without number, and set others in their stead.

“Therefore he knoweth their works, and he over turneth them in the night, so that they are destroyed.

“He striketh them as wicked men in the open sight of others;

“Because they turned back from him, and would not consider any of his ways.”

I hold no malice nor bitterness against you nor against those other “elder brethren” whose “workings” and “conduct” I have and still protest against. I, instead, pray God for your “recovery to righteousness and truth”, from which you and they have unquestionably “fallen”.

Your brother in Christ, Our Lord,

W. R. NELSON,

6138 Nassau Road.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., December 28, 1927

Plainfield, N. J.

Dear brother Ridout:

Some three weeks ago, I mailed you an open letter, bearing the title, “From Craig Street to Chestnut Street”. Since writing you that letter, more recent developments bring about the necessity of again addressing you, and calling your attention to certain challenging statements, that not only affect you, but the fellowship of the saints at large.

In certain letters which we have received, there have been expressions, “Let us lay aside our pens”, or, “Let us drop the sword”.

The ones who write thus, have *first* used “many words” in presenting their “judgments”, which in the main have

been derogatory to ourselves, and to the defending of Chestnut Street in their unenviable position, and also the position you have taken in the matter, which, unless a different attitude has been taken by you, is truthfully portrayed in "From Craig Street to Chestnut Street."

More, the present issue of Field and Work, just out, gives a concise example, and not inconsistent with its past history, of denying access to its columns of relative answers to what the paper itself endorses through its Editor.

Yet, those who would "cancel much of that which we have distributed", or who write with similar purpose, are presenting their "judgments", and that, "from a distance", and at the same writing, they likely defend Chestnut Street's saying, "those at a distance cannot judge the matter, without having before them all the evidence and the answers"!

But neither Chestnut Street, nor Field and Work refuse the "support" of these who write their "judgments from a distance", especially that it "defends their position".

I have not been without purpose in bringing the above to your attention, and to the attention of brother P. D. Loizeaux, to whom I am sending a copy; for Help and Food, through brother S. A. White becomes involved, as does Field and Work through brother Robert Mushet.

Three letters are enclosed herewith; one dated November 26, 1927, addressed to me by brother S. A. White, of Takoma Park, D. C.; one dated November 30, 1927, written by me to brother White, and lastly, one dated December 3, 1927, from brother White to myself.

I draw your attention to the fact that brother S. A. White's condemnation of your "workings" and "conduct", was just as pronounced *as late as May, 1927*, as he says it was some twenty or thirty years ago. Also, expressed to brother S. A. White, at the time we sent out our "pamphlet", we "did not at that time know who he was", and his

“stated convictions did not add nor subtract from ours, nor do they.”

For the past five or six months, or more, brother S. A. White has been privileged to exercise his “gift” through Help and Food. It is not hard to discern that his latest article appearing in Help and Food, as “Sin, What Kind”, was written in view of the estrangement at 5917 Chestnut Street. This article, made public, together with his “other manuscripts”, which have been mailed to us, make manifest wherein his “judgment” and “sympathy” lie.

If brother S. A. White has, and from his letters it is quite indicative, held against you his accusation of your “workings” and “conduct” these past thirty-five years, and reiterates them as late *as May, 1927*, when at this time he “joins hands” in blocking and staying the truth which we have been publishing, I feel that at least on the part of brother S. A. White, this is rightly characterized as “an unholy alliance.”

Your responsibility with him in this is only eliminated or lessened, as the case may be, by your ignorance of the attitude of brother S. A. White, or his “other manuscripts”, or both.

Having brought this before you at this time, I also feel that the brethren at large should be acquainted with these three letters enclosed, and we are arranging to see that they are placed in their hands.

You will notice that brother S. A. White says:

“WE MUST NOT DENY TO OUR CHILDREN THE ANSWER OF A GOOD CONSCIENCE BY KEEPING THEM IN IGNORANCE OF OUR DOINGS IN THE PAST, WHICH MUST AFFECT THEM INDEFINITELY.”

This statement above quoted, and originating from brother White, was our conviction before we knew him or ever heard from him. Such a conviction on our part largely accounts for the good conscience I believe all of us have in having sent out the letters which we have, and prompts us to send out what I am now bringing to your attention, and which you are due to know of, provided brother White may be incorrect in stating that at Pittsburgh and elsewhere he resisted your "workings" and "conduct".

Particularly in view of brother S. A. White's "resistance" these many years, and his more recent reiteration of his above expression I have quoted, he should not object to the publication of his letter to me.

These "other manuscripts" of brother White's would, if imbibed by some "younger brethren", prove indeed to be a kind of "food, which would not masticate, but weaken the digestive organs". Can such be the "advanced instructions" which he as "a spiritual" is able to give to those "young in the faith"?

I close, drawing attention to the unstableness and utter insincerity that prompts the charge by brother White of my being guilty of "*blasphemy* or sinning against the Holy Ghost" under date of November 26th, and accompanied by "Dear Sir (?)" and "Shall I say your brother?"—and immediately after receiving my letter of November 30th, citing his "other manuscripts",—I become a "Dear brother" again, and held in "affection" by one who can make such a charge!

If brother S. A. White speaks the truth as to your "workings" and "conduct" in the past, I am constrained to refer you both to II Samuel 15, verses 2 to 6, inclusive.

I personally trust for, and pray for the blessing of our

God on our individual and collective expression of convictions when wrought before God and in the light of His Word.

Your brother in Christ our Lord.

W. R. NELSON.

Copy S. A. White.

Copy P. D. Loizeaux.

P. S.—Have you noticed that brother S. A. White opens his letter to me accusing *me* of “insinuating hypocrisy in a covert way”, by speaking of “tenderness” as being “false”? Brother White fails to discern that *you* are the author of this expression. See your book, “The Church and Its Order According to Scripture”, page 86. Will he apply to you the charge of “insinuating hypocrisy in a covert way”?

18 DENWOOD AVE.,
TAKOMA PARK, D. C.

MR. W. R. NELSON,
6138 Nassau Road,
Overbrook, Pa.

DEAR SIR (?):

As you have spoken of “tenderness” as being “false”, which is a covert way of insinuating hypocrisy; and of “mercy” as “dry rot”; and pastoral labor as “dust”; and another speaks of “love” as an emotional disease”; and as you have openly transgressed I Tim. 5:1—“Rebuke not an elder, but entreat him as a father”, and as I have not been active personally or otherwise; having been in absolute ignorance of anything in West Philadelphia, until I received your pamphlet, “Truth Concerning”; and as I can only bear witness to the misleading character of the said

pamphlet; for, not until I had read it over a number of times did I discover, and after reading the Scriptures daily with it, that Satan's "devices" were apparent in the whole distress; and as you decry "mercy", and others are urgently and clamorously voicing their demands for "righteousness", this will explain to you why I am now writing to you "*without mercy*".

"For he shall have judgment without mercy, that hath showed no mercy".—Jas. 2:13.

I am not going to "condone" your conduct, for this would be "dry rot", as you have already determined so to name it.

I am not going to make any allowance for your *Novitiatism*, for this would only be an "emotional disease".

But I do see clearly, now, from the "Minutes" of the "Conference" of May 30th, the force of the warning to Timothy, "Not a novice, lest being lifted up with pride he fall into the condemnation of the devil".—I Tim. 3:6.

You have openly rebuked your "elder" brethren who have given their lives to serve "the flock of God". Suppose they have "fallen"—did not "Christian" in Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* fall under Apolyon's assaults because he forgot to be in the constant; and instant dependence upon God? But God raised him up; this often happens; I have been there many times myself.

Job's "three friends" would scrape the walls of the Patriarch's "house", but in the end God rebuked them, and compelled them to seek Job's prayers for their restoration. But did not Job fall? but he *learned* how to use a "potsherd", as he sat in the ash heap, "to scrape *himself* withal"—*have you?* Has Herrmann, Wallace, Gottshall?

They fell then, but *who* put the stumbling block in their brother's way—who invited them into the fray? "It must needs be that offenses come (causes of stumbling); but woe to that man by whom the offense cometh".—Matt. 18:7.

In your "Truth Concerning", and in all your literature, no allowances are made for anything; the confusion of an attack, the heat of argument; the sayings which reconsideration would wish for modification; the evident *change* of attitude upon reconsideration, are all used craftily as so much evidence against them. But all your literature *accounts* for this, in that brethren discovered the readiness in you to make *use of every* thing in your power with which to criminate them, *You* are the *direct* and *immediate* cause of all the difficulty in West Philadelphia. *You* are responsible for "misleading" the saints everywhere; although in the providence of God, it *occasioned* the manifestation of other Wall Scrapers, and would-be executioners. I am using no "tact", for this would be some of the "dry rot"—the "dust" of which you speak and so strenuously deprecate!

But in order that you may be enlightened, let me say, that true *pastoral labor* has as its object, the self condemnation of each one on either side; in other words, "repentance". So, carefully, as the Surgeon with his "Scalpel", he probes the wound to locate the thing that *caused* the distress *in the individual with whom he has to do*; this makes him to appear to the other side as though "condoning"; and also to the one with whom he is personally dealing, as if he was softening his opponent's case, this puts him between two fires, so to speak. If he succeeds in his labors, the result is a "confession", which *you* would charge as being "wrung" from him. And when he, the pastor, is able to get one or the other on his knees before God, he becomes to others like a lioness in defense of her cubs—she would tear one to pieces if approaching with destructful intent. He will *defend* the humbled one, almost with his life, which is the equivalent of laying down his life "for the brethren". "Who

is made to stumble, and I burn not", says the apostle.—II Cor. XI:30 R. V.

Let me say also, that ever since the Lord in His great mercy plucked my feet out of the miry clay, *I have learned* through grace to be a "spiritual", as "pastors" are sometimes called. I know what it is to suffer all manner of accusations, and misunderstandings, and from the mistaken zeal on the part of "the younger" in the faith; for, as soon as some little "knowledge" is obtained; and the spiritual state, or growth does not keep pace with what they have "learned" (?), they become "strong", and "able defenders" (?) of the faith; and turn again and trample their instructors under their feet.—Matt. 7:6. This experience has made me slow about giving *advanced* instructions to those who are young in the faith; for, if you overfeed those who have been famished, there is danger of killing them, for they do not *masticate* the food, but swallow it whole; and their *digestive* organs being weak, they fail; but you would not like to place yourself among the "dogs" and "swine", would you? Beware!

To accuse those who are your seniors in years and experience; who have been taught of God through many tears and sorrows, through watchings, prayers, and burden carrying, as if they were afflicted with an "emotional disease"; and with "dry rot", and Users of "dust", may not be so very far away from *blasphemy* "against the Holy Ghost"! And yet you insist on "righteousness"!

You decry "love" and "mercy" and "tenderness"—have been doing it all along. You have been living in, and practicing this *kind* of "righteousness" until this day; ever since you entered into this distress.

There is another side; What about those who clamor loudly and persistently for "righteousness", as against those who would practice the 'love' our Lord insists on is a true

mark of “discipleship”? Can there not be some “deceit” there also? What about those who are so deeply concerned *about the Assembly*, as to come from a distance with a “Wall Scaper’s” tool to scrape the walls of what *Scripture* says, is “*the house of God*”? Is this an offense to the Son of Man who walketh in the midst of the Assemblies? Nay, is it not an insult to Him?

Satan can energize these would-be “Wall Scrapers”; men, who from a distance, or even from neighboring places, who would assume the care of another’s “house”! Read what the Holy Spirit says about this *kind* of “righteousness” in II Cor. XI: 12-15.

“The care of *all the assemblies*”—“anxiety”, literally, is apostolic. He who would become anxious for the assemblies—in the plural, except to pray for them, is assuming the *office of an apostle*, without being one; and as in that capacity, they are “false apostles, deceitful workers”, etc. This you may not have known, perhaps there are others who may need to know it. This is the force of II Cor. XI:12-15. And your broadcasted literature has brought into prominence, at least two men who are taking this place: R. Wallace and J. B. Gottshall; and you have thus strengthened them in this attitude, and are so sharing with them in this “thing”.

What *you* need is not a “Wall Scaper’s” tool, but a “potsherd” to scrape yourself “withal”! But this is very offensive to say it; but you will agree with me that it is NOT “dry rot”; nor an “emotional disease”. You will agree with me that it is NOT “merciful”, NOT “brotherly kindness”; NOT “tenderness”. It is very hard for me to say this, but is not this what you have asked for? NOT “mercy”, but “*righteousness*”.

“For he shall have judgment without mercy that hath shewed no mercy”.

“For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged, and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again”.—Matt. & 2.

“False brethren” are those who, practically, deny the family relationships; to be true, is to “love the brotherhood”, or “loving to the brethren”—no matter how far astray they may have gone. You would not wish to take rank with “false brethren”, and “false apostles”, would you?

This letter may be broadcasted as far as your Hamite methods have gone.

It is so written with the hope that I may “wring” a “confession” from you of unrighteousness, from the standpoint of our Lord’s code; and of flagrant disobedience thereto; and of “sinning against the Holy Spirit of God”.—Eph. 4:20.

Faithfully yours,

(Shall I say your brother?)

S. A. WHITE.

November 26, 1927.

P. S.—Carbon copy ran out, accounts for this being in *red*.

S. A.—White’s letter was written on the *red* typewriter ribbon.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., November 30, 1927.

MR. S. A. WHITE,
18 Denwood Avenue,
Takoma Park, Washington, D. C.
Dear brother:

Your letter, typed in red, dated November 26th, was received by me. Even though you clearly state your letter to

be “without mercy” and without brotherly kindness,” I trust you will not think that I ask or expect *either* of you and will not be thus mis-judged by you, if I defer answering your letter in detail, until after you have fulfilled what you state as follows:

“This letter may be broadcasted as far as your Hamite methods have gone”.

And may I say (though the privilege is not mine), that I have no objection whatever to you “broadcasting it”. Yea, if the saints could see in your letter sufficient to warrant them reading *the truth*, and by the Word, “rightly dividing the truth”, I would be most thankful if you would send to every one who received the pamphlet,—your letter here referred to. Even as I write this last statement, I would have in mind, Rom. 6:1, “Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound?” This comes to mind, in view of you having stated that you write me “without mercy” and “without brotherly kindness”,—both of which are contrary to the written Word and unchristian.—II Pet., Chap. I: 5-6-7.

You should bear in mind, however, in writing this letter to me, you also lay serious charges against others, whom you are *also* not free to call “brethren”, I refer to your statement as follows:

“But did not Job fall? but he *learned* how to use a “potsherd” as he sat in the ash heap, “to scrape *himself* withal”—*have* you? Has Herrmann, Wallace, Gottshall?

Others, including the above three brethren, you also refer to in your letter as “false brethren”, “false apostles” and “deceitful workers”.

Although you do not name them in this letter to me, you will doubtless recall that since the trouble began between

Mr. Mory and Mr. Grant, you have sent me several of your "manuscripts", in which you name other brethren as "making a breach" and also "practicing Nicolatanism". Some of these statements of yours are as follows:

"We do not separate from evil on the NEGATIVE principle. . . . How came the NEGATIVE "principle". Whence its origin? It was born in the brain of the strong personality of John Nelson Darby, however much we may dislike to say it; it came into existence, as a labored justification for separation from a christian assembly"

Again you state:

"If one of the "Exclusives" should hear some one say "Mr. Darby was not clear on the seventh of Romans", at once the Atlantic Ocean is not wide enough to prevent a hasty flight across the seas to steady the ark, like Uzzah of Old Testament times, and, as then, *God made a breach!* Yet very few seem to see that this "breach" (the breach you here refer to being the occasion of Mr. Darby and Mr. B. W. Newton at Bethseda) was made because the evil of acting *as if* there was no "God of judgment"—as the equivalent of saying, "Where is the God of Judgment?"

The italics are mine in connection with your statement, "God made a breach".

Further, in direct connection with the above you state:

"Mr. Newton was misguided in his "*teaching*"; Mr. Darby was misguided in his "*deeds*".

". . . Mr. Darby, like Uzzah, in his effort to steady the ark of God by putting forth his hand, a "Breach of Uzzah" was again made! except that *Mr. Darby made the breach!*"

Again my italics in connection with your statement "Mr. Darby made the breach".

In writing under your heading, "THE 'DEEDS' PERPETRATED," you write as follows:

"Understand, that the 'deeds of the Nicolaitanes' are manifest in the practice of conquering the people by an 'argument' or an 'opinion', *without warrant from the word of God*, but by a method of force, or by threats of intimidation, to compel obedience to, the dictum of a person or persons".

"THIS WAS ACTUALLY DONE IN PITTSBURGH IN 1894, *by the advice and counsel of Mr. Samuel Ridout*, principally, 'insomuch that even', F. W. Grant, Paul J. Loizeaux, B. C. Greenman, George H. McCandless; the present writer and others, were 'carried away by their dissimulation'".

The italics are mine in connection with your statements, "without warrant from the word of God", and also, "by the advice and counsel of Mr. Samuel Ridout."

Several more statements of yours, which you sent to me, I will bring to your attention, before I close, and in doing so, I shall capitalize the first of the next ones quoted, in order that your "turning and rending us" (or me) for doing just what you here advocate, may be seen aright. You express yourself as follows:

"WE MUST NOT DENY TO OUR CHILDREN THE ANSWER OF A GOOD CONSCIENCE BY KEEPING THEM IN IGNORANCE OF OUR DOINGS IN THE PAST, WHICH MUST AFFECT THEM INDEFINITELY."

All the statements of yours that I have here quoted were written by you on a typewriter. You took time, however, to pen in your own hand to me the following:

“The writer of this paper has, for 28 years, suffered excruciating mental agony through the conduct of Mr. Ridout, John B. Gottshall and George H. McCandless, in Reading, Pa., in 1898, who, by Mr. Ridout’s counsel practically silenced a brother in the ministry, by refusing him the liberty of ministering in the assembly, without any scriptural warrant, nor proof, nor evidence of his forcing his ministry upon anyone; or of saying anything at anytime anywhere against the truth, nor of even pressing this against anyone; unless, *outside* of the assembly, he personally withstood Mr. Ridout’s course in Pittsburgh, which disrupted some of the assemblies with us.”

“If the writer had sinned, why, for 28 years has not Mr. Ridout personally sought his recovery?”

“It may be that I have sinned in keeping *silent* all these years?”

The italics “*outside*” and “*silent*” are *yours*. It is plain that you commend the brother who “withstood Mr. Ridout’s course”, which, according to you, was, “*without scriptural warrant, nor proof, nor evidence.*”

Mr. Ridout’s “course at West Philadelphia” was also “WITHOUT SCRIPTURAL WARRANT, NOR PROOF, NOR EVIDENCE.” Yet you “turn and rend us.” I will not ask nor expect you to say “WHY.”

I repeat, I will welcome you sending out your letter of November 26th, to me “broadcast,” if it will *dispel* “ignorance” of the matters. Those who receive it, however, should *also* be acquainted with the contents of your “other manuscripts,” from which I have here quoted.

I shall ask of God, both wisdom and grace to deal with what you write me, and shall ask to be kept from the display of flesh *not* choosing to answer you “without mercy”

and "without brotherly kindness." And I shall not despise the counsel of my brethren, even though they have not seen fit to claim for themselves what you do, that of "being a spiritual, or pastor, ever since the Lord in His mercy plucked my feet out of the miry clay."

This expression of yours above mentioned caused me to think of your condemnation and "despising of youth." Claiming, as you do, to have been among "Exclusives" since 1878, and "being a spiritual, or pastor, ever since the Lord in His mercy plucked your feet out of the miry clay," causes you to become by self-acclamation, "a spiritual or pastor," WHEN YOU WERE NO OLDER THAN THE WRITER, AND POSSIBLY NOT AS OLD AS MYSELF."

You end your letter to me by asking, "Shall I call you brother?" No, brother White, not through my solicitation. Nor do I solicit further correspondence (nor did I solicit the "manuscripts" you did send), and from which I have quoted. You yourself wrote me, telling me of a "manuscript" which you had prepared, and which you pre-judged "would effect your final discipline." I did ask to see it, and I believe it to be the only occasion for warranting your correspondence to me and to those who have, with me, "separated from 5917 Chestnut Street."

As late as October 27, 1927, you wrote me that:

"Brother Ridout has been working for 35 years to establish a regular, federal, deliberative, representative assembly, similar to the London Saturday night meeting of overlords; but it *"shall not pass."*

Again the above italics are yours.

The main manuscript of yours that I have quoted from is not old, being dated *May, 1927*. That there be no con-

fusion, it should be said that our convictions as expressed in our "pamphlet" and "supplements" were found and published *before* I ever heard of you or knew you. No, your subsequent stated convictions that I have here quoted, which you state are "of old," did not add nor subtract from ours, nor do they.

In spite of ourselves, we are "brethren in Christ", so I will *not* ask you, "Shall I call you brother?"

Sincerely in Christ, our Lord,

W. R. NELSON.

6138 Nassau Rd.

Copy brethren Herrmann, Wallace, Gottshall.

P. S.—I notice that your writings, or some of them, are published in the recent issue of Help and Food. You are the proper one to submit these *other* writings of yours to the editor of Help and Food or even Field Work to see if they will columnize them in these periodicals.

TAKOMA PARK, D. C., December 3, 1927.

MR. W. R. NELSON,

6138 Nassau Road,

Philadelphia, Pa.

Dear brother:

In answering yours of the 30th ult., to mine of the 25th, let me say that I have not disowned you; nor can I treat you other than as my brother; my letter to you explained why it was so written. I admit that it was "unchristian"; because I *purposely* left out "mercy" as I said; because you had named all this as "dry rot", etc. In other words, I simply wrote it *in your spirit*, tactfully, which the Holy

Spirit calls, in Paul, "being crafty"; and your mutilation of it proves that you have been, and that you are even now *continuing* in an unrighteous course, I do not say "wicked", but a *sinful* course. The Revised Version renders II Tim. 2:19, last word as "unrighteousness"; and as John says, "*ALL* unrighteousness is sin".—I John 5:17; I therefore use the word "sinful".

I said my letter of the 26th "*may*" be broadcasted; I now say, it may NOT be—this remains to be seen.

The way you leave out my *qualifying* words, and cull portions to serve your purpose of *discrediting* everyone who cannot "follow with" you, is "unrighteousness". The "Minutes" of the May 30th-31st meetings, exhibit your spirit, when you were unguarded; and in this, your last, of the 30th ult., manifests it more grossly than ever; and explains, doubtless, why some of the brethren "modified" their attitude, or "judgment", knowing that you were *using* everything for an "unchristian", and "unrighteous" purpose.

You are not fair, and have not been in all this sad distress, as I now very plainly see; though at the first I did not.

Previous to my personal letter to you of the 26th ult., I had hoped that even yet, there might be recovery; and that even in that, I still had hope that you might be aroused to see and to admit the error of your course; to which *now* you seem to be unalterably committed—you cannot "repent", because you cannot see *wherein* your words have been so stoutly against—shall I say, the Lord.—Mal. 3:13? You cannot see from *what* you should "repent".

You quote, perhaps against me, you do not clearly say—Rom. 6:1—"Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound"? I do not see "*grace abounding*" in any of your words, nor course, nor in any of those who are *loudly* with you.

If we should eliminate from the Epistles of John all the words that speak of "love"; we could hear such words as "Antichrists"; "He is a liar"; etc., etc., I am not applying these words to anyone. If we could leave out such words as "even weeping" from Paul's words to the Philippians, Ch. 3:18, 19, we would hear such words as these: "For many walk, of whom I have told you often, and now tell you...that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ; whose end is destruction, whose God is their belly, and whose glory is in their shame, who mind earthly things".

The words "even weeping" do not enter into your code, for I have not seen nor heard anything from you to convince me that you know how to "weep with them that weep". This, too, I suppose, would also be that "emotional disease", of which brother Herrmann speaks?

As to "self-acclamation", I suppose that when Paul asks, "Am I not an apostle?" to claim to be that, in your code, would be "self-acclamation"? Brother A. E. Booth claims to have been engaged in "pastoral" labors for many years; this of course condemns him also. At any rate, you very plainly prove that you cannot fulfill Gal. 6:1—"Ye which are spiritual restore such an one in the spirit of meekness; considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted". Nor can R. Wallace, J. B. Gottshall, and now W. R. Stephenson, of Jacksonville, Fla., who, with three other brethren in a printed letter of the date of November 1, 1927, in which he discredits even the apostle Paul! He is not only demoralized, but he is trying to affect others in the same way, as his efforts in Charlotte, N. C., to adjust other assemblies elsewhere, in an *assumed* apostolic concern!

The terms "false brethren"; and "false apostles", as explained in mine to you, are those among us who are "false" to the *family ideals*—the family Code; and "false" in their

assumption of an apostolic *office*, without having any authority to so exercise themselves.

Nor can you seem to be able to see that "Nicolaitanism", *in its incipiency*, is nothing less than an attempt *to rule*, by the force of will, personality, or prestige; and that persons who fall into this snare *can not be disciplined*; nor be treated as "wicked", because our Lord speaks of a "thing," and a "teaching", which is not commonly regarded as "evil"; but on the contrary as highly respectable and proper! Only the presentation of the truth of what *family relationship* means; and growth in "*grace*" and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, can it be corrected. We can all easily fall into the same snare, if not ever humble in spirit. In this, too, now, I must include you; and those who are *loudly* with you; that is, those who would take *the lead* among you, and subjugate all the weaker to your will!

One brother, showing up openly the spirit that actuates, in your midst; that is, those who have been caught in the net, condemned the ministry of one brother in the Wissahickon Meeting for reading a number of Scriptures that speak of "love", etc. To refuse or to condemn this, is, *in principle*, to refuse the ministry of the Holy Spirit of God! And yet you can not do this! Who, then, is "blind"?

Copies of your letter condemning mine, sent to the three brethren H., R. W. and J. B. G., are misleading, unfair, and unrighteous; you should also let them see my letter to you in full, that they also may read the qualifying words, *which you leave out!* Who is the "author" of this?

Permit me to add, that the words have been quoted: "He that covereth his sins shall not prosper", as against the words, "Love covereth the multitude of sins"; failing to see the difference between one seeking to hide *his own* sins; and the "spiritual" brother who, in "love" seeks to hide them

from the public gaze by restoring him. But this is but a part of the quotation from Prov. 28: 13, which adds: "But who so confesseth and forsaketh them shall find *mercy*"—and shall I add—*except* in West Philadelphia?

But I must cease, it is useless to go further.

Through grace, I subscribe myself,

Affectionately your brother in Christ,

S. A. WHITE.

*Additional copies may be obtained
from
W. R. Nelson*