

Sept. 26, 1881.

DEAR BROTHER,

I send a copy of the Correspondence, but Mr. Jull now takes the ground that "Brethren at Guildford Hall at a critical moment acted for God, and according to His principles," and only confesses to haste and errors of judgment.

Thus we are back again, as regards the *root* of the Guildford Hall meeting, to August 22, 24, 1879; and it is concealing the truth to say we must not go back beyond March, 1881. Mr. Jull compels us to go back by affirming that their principles were divine principles; their error was hastily going out, instead of staying in and putting out all who would not go with them in excluding Kennington, and indeed not Kennington only.

A few brothers excluded six of those who went with them, ignoring the consciences of all the rest. The expulsion of two of these saints was arranged and settled, apart from every one, at 10 o'clock at night in the street at Ramsgate, Saturday, 23rd August, 1879, by three brothers only, W. C., H. J. J., and W. J.

The first Park Street declaration was hard enough. But Guildford Hall went much farther. Park Street owned they had no ground for cutting off Kennington, *when it had acted*; but Guildford Hall, after Kennington had declared Dr. E. Cronin out, said it was "too late," "its action worthless," and excluded it.

These points are of all importance now that Mr. Jull affirms that his confession at Park Street, was only as to haste and errors in judgment, and that they acted for God and on His principles in what they did, August, 1879.

Their going out was in haste, but their action was not in haste. They had the notice from Kennington on Saturday 23rd, and refused it. They read it again on Sunday 24th at the table, and, as a *united body*, refused it; they refused Kennington, they refused six of their own. On Monday, 25th, they made application for the Hall, though Kennington notice was read over twice to the applicant, Mr. Millward. On Tuesday, 26th, they issued a public notice as to their separation. On Monday, Sept. 1, they took possession of the Hall, and have since claimed and retained most of the property of the Assembly. (Though they gave a written promise on Abbot's Hill giving up possession, to pay its value; they have not done so.)

Now all this is not confessed as wrong, but vindicated as acting for God and according to His principles at a critical moment.

Mr. Darby took the opposite course as to Kennington. He accepted the notice, got it on the paper at Cheapside, and got Park Street to drop the first declaration. Mr. Darby then acted against Guildford Hall. But Guildford Hall "acted for God and according to His principles." What, then, is the inevitable conclusion? Where are Mr. Darby and all who yielded to him on August 30, 31, 1879?

Yet more; when Mr. Jull went out of "Brethren" generally, he wrote to Mr. Darby, that he (Mr. Darby) had made a fatal mistake in forcing the acceptance of the notice from Kennington, and repeated "That which was of God was forced to accept what they did not believe in, or be outside."

What a place to give Mr. Darby! What a place for Guildford Hall to be forced into from its *birth*—acceptance of evil! (Compare 2 Cor. i. 24).

And this *force*, applied by Mr. Darby, put an end to the first table, where Guildford Hall acted for God and according to His principles, as is now affirmed.

They spread a table the second time, in June, 1880, assuring the meetings in Kent, to whom they appealed for fellowship, that in doing so "the Lord would own and protect it" (Corres. p. 22).

Mr. Darby again interfered, and, with another, advised them to abandon this table: where was the Lord?

In March last, they spread a table in Ramsgate for the third time. That this was done, if not at the advice, with the powerful support, of Mr. Darby, who can doubt that saw and heard all that was done at Park Street, last April?

Oh, how much has hung on one poor fleeting breath! Guildford Hall accepted at his bidding what they did not believe in, and have fellowship with Kennington, whom, on divine principles, they had cut off as evil. Can any "system" depend more on man?

But why must Abbott's Hill be forced into the admission, which Guildford Hall insists on (Corr. pp. 4, 9, 15, &c.), that they were *re-organised by human effort on the receipt of the Kennington notice*?

It is the insisting on this admission which has prevented all possible reunion.

There were at least four "dissentients" among those gathered to break bread at G. Hall (August 24th), but they were prevented

doing so, against their will, by locked doors. Granted that they were neglected by the dissentients who stayed till past 11 o'clock on the night of the Assembly meeting (August 22nd), when these left earlier, must these be forced to admit what was false? What *human effort* brought them to the door of the Hall? But there were more left behind by Guildford Hall than these, even if Mr. Pettman, Dr. S., Mr. Hope, &c., be judged as severely as they please. Is it possible to imagine that these others needed *human effort* to re-organise them? It would have needed no small effort to keep them from assembling as they were wont, and as Scripture enjoins. Gathered, some of them for many years, to the precious name of the Lord Jesus, who would have kept them *apart*, when the opportunity was afforded of being together? The theory of human effort gathering them is not only false but senseless. Yet Guildford Hall "affectionately suggested" this solution of the division, then insisted on it, and finally refused every appeal to allow any other. All would have been healed but for this.

Abbott's Hill have desired peace and have yielded very much to Brethren; but they cannot admit by word or act that *they were re-organised by human effort on the receipt of the Kennington notice*. It is not true. To be crushed, refused, reviled, however painful, is as nothing to owning what is false and known to be so. They were not re-organised by man. How can they own they were? It is not a day of prisons and stripes; but brethren everywhere are called on to gird on the sword against them, Ex. xxxii. 26-28. Still "Right is right, since God is God," however fierce the zeal of those whose merciless judgments really condemn themselves.

Abbott's Hill have confessed to failure fully in their own town and to their own meeting and to those concerned: not, as Mr. Jull, to a meeting eighty miles away, even if the confession had been, which it is not, adequate and thorough. They have since taken the lowest place before Guildford Hall for the sake of peace and healing, to be spurned the more.

Thus then it is. On the one hand a company who declare, even now, that when they were acting for God and according to His principles they yielded to man, when *forced* to accept what they did not believe in and had judged as evil; and again gave up to man a table they had declared the Lord would own and protect; yet they will yield, for no entreaty of their brethren, a bit to Abbott's Hill. Families may be disunited, meetings divided, hearts broken, testi-

mony ruined : what is all this so long as Abbott's Hill is forced to yield the truth of gathering or is effectually crushed?

On the other hand a few of the Lord's poor, who indeed, as Guildford Hall boasted, "had not one man of *spiritual power* sufficient to hold the ground" (Correspondence, page 18), if breaking bread, August 24th, was indispensable for this. Embarrassed and perplexed by the sudden manifestation of hostile power, which only *spiritual power* could have successfully opposed, they failed to break bread August 24th; but they have never, rapid and overwhelming as was the attack upon them, ceased to hold on to what is of God and His grace, in not only converting them and saving them, but gathering them; and they dare not admit as *true* what they are conscious in their own souls is false, that they *were re-organised* by *human effort on the receipt* of the *Kennington notice*, and, must, therefore, give up fellowship with each other. *They cannot*. God alone organised them by the truth as to the person of Christ, the preciousness of His name, in the power of the Holy Ghost. Scattered they seemed to be for a moment, by a fleshly power, which needed spiritual power to resist, and there was not one man of spiritual power to oppose by breaking of bread that one morning; but they were never disunited, they never gave up their place. A company seeking counsel of their brethren; publishing everything; welcoming Mr. Darby's fullest investigations, acting, (as far as possible) on his advice, but not yielding this truth of gathering to him a bit; desiring to honour Park-Street, though partial and unjust; and doing all to conciliate Guildford Hall, save giving up their place as gathered of God out of the ruins of Christendom to the name of His beloved Son. While re-union is impossible, my lot is cast with this company. Lam. iii. 29-36.

Dear Brother,

I am, yours affectionately in the Lord,

W. B.

To Mr. G. B.

P.S.—The things said of those who cannot yield truth to *force*, such as corruption, wickedness, sin, unrighteousness, &c., and which frighten simple souls, should be investigated thoroughly, and not received till proved. It was Rome's last weapon against the truth. —Rev. ii. 24, 25.