

34, Woodside,

Wimbledon.

21 April 1910

Beloved Brother,

Though not surprised at the line of things adopted in your kind letter just received re our troubles in this country, I was hardly prepared for your closing remarks; while, at the same time honoring you for faithfulness to the truths we profess at all cost. Surely we have known each other long enough to believe that neither of us would lightly give up the truth, and should not that conviction lead to some mutual confidence for the Lord's sake? For what have we that is worth keeping, that we have not received from Him? And surely He alone is able to maintain us in the truth & practice of what He has graciously committed to us. I trust that

you will therefore bear with me if I crave a little patience on your part before you pronounce on a matter of which you cannot know the details; many of these have only quite lately come to light.

You begin by assuming the resemblance between this controversy & that of Montreal 25 years ago - If patiently examined, I cannot but believe you will admit that there is very little if anything in common.

With us, there has been no setting aside of assembly action, - unless indeed by Mr. Sibthorpe himself, when, on his own authority, in July 1905, he reversed the terms of the notice issued on 20<sup>th</sup> Nov. 1903. That is clearly set forth in our Wimbledon letter of remonstrance of 20<sup>th</sup> Dec<sup>r</sup> last, which was the result of quiet & careful examination of the three notices from F. Wells in 1903, 1908 & 1 July 1909, without any extraneous matter, or any letters of any kind on one side or the other. The brethren were all agreed after three meetings

for considering it, after which it was twice  
read to the assembly & time given for  
everyone to make any objection or ask  
any further explanation of the matter. All  
were of one mind & we thanked God for it.  
There has been no cutting off on our  
side, but the partisans of F. Wells have  
forced division in several places, by  
violence & methods wholly contrary to  
Scripture. And after years of patient waiting  
& remonstrance repeatedly made by  
many, the time at last arrived when  
we could not but recognise the self-will  
which was determined to carry things  
with a high hand & cover false accu-  
sations & gross slander with an abuse  
of the Lord's holy name. We are told to  
follow righteousness, 2 Tim ii. 22. I en-  
close you a copy of our Wimbledon letter.

Your account of the London Brothers'  
"action" & of those at Bournemouth is  
not correct. There was no assembly  
action in either case - nothing beyond

brotherly remonstrance. Since then  
the London gatherings have had to act  
individually because of the way in which  
the T. Wells party pushed the matter.

And I should like to ask you on what  
scriptural principle has action which  
refers only to a local assembly, as they  
themselves admitted, <sup>in Nov 1903</sup> is to be made a  
test of communion for the saints every  
where?

The matter is a distinct attack of  
Satan against the Lord's authority,  
setting up the self will of one individual  
above the Scriptures, on the plea that  
if you attach the Lord's name to it, it  
must command submission. It is  
exactly what was done in the last days  
of Judah (see Jeremiah v, 2, 3; Micah ii, iii).  
"By their fruits ye shall know them." Sibthorp  
has never been troubled by any ministry of  
C. Strange since Oct. 1903. How is it that it  
is he, of all persons, who pursues C. S. with  
vile calumny to blacken him, in order to get  
others to do what T. Wells said they had no in-  
tention of doing nor scriptural warrant for.

2) And Strange is not the only one thus treated. Two years ago they told Harbrow that he was not "in fellowship" & therefore should not break bread at J. Wells, - using "fellowship" in the sense of agreement in idea. He, being a man of peace, living at <sup>Fonbridge</sup> between J. Wells & Sevenoaks (going either to one or the other gathering as trains most suited), kept to Sevenoaks, & has never disturbed them since at J. Wells by his presence -

I cannot write more. You will probably hear from others; but mind, dear brother, that you do not partake of other men's sin (1 Tim. v. 22). There was no fresh ground for shutting Strange's mouth in Oct 1903, that had not been already three times gone over in J. Wells 1900, 1901 & 1902, - except an accusation on the authority of one solitary witness that he <sup>(C.S.)</sup> wanted to set up an opposition table at <sup>accusation</sup> Fonbridge. That was in disobedience to Deut. xix. 15 & was acknowledged <sup>in May 1905</sup> to be incorrect, by the brother who

made it. And so, other charges have fallen to the ground. Is personal irritation & jealousy of this nature, to be made an occasion of dividing the saints universally? What have we come to? The matter ought never to have got outside T. Wells, & that gathering <sup>should have been</sup> shut up as a leprous house. But Sibthorp has money & a strong personal backing. And I have no doubt the Lord has allowed the sorrow to humble us all & test us as to the reality of our being gathered to Himself.

May He have mercy & give the saints to be of one mind as to this. At T. Wells, they have never visited C.S. nor enquired of himself as to the truth of charges brought against him, nor made any reparation for what has been proved false —  
Yours affectly in the Lord N. Lowe