

**THE CONFRONTATION OF
JAMES TAYLOR JUNIOR**
(Leader of the “Exclusive Brethren”)
AND HIS SUPPORTERS

BY
H. CALVEY

**THE CONFRONTATION OF
JAMES TAYLOR JUNIOR**
(Leader of the “Exclusive Brethren”)
AND HIS SUPPORTERS

(Vol. 2)

Being nine of the further letters (revised)
addressed to James Taylor Jr. 1965-6

on

“Behaviour in the House of God”
and extract of letter of 1965 to Alfred J. Gardiner
(with appended Note)

by

H. CALVEY

—

“The collections of them as nails fastened in :
given from one shepherd.

And besides, my son, be warned by them.”

—

“To this end the Son of God has been manifested,
that He might undo the works of the devil.”



Further copies obtainable from the Publisher,
H. Calvey, 25 Cambridge Avenue, Southport, Lancs. A

PREFATORY NOTE

- 1—These further letters to J.T. Jr. were sent with the same outlook, spirit and objective as those published in Vol. 1.
- 2—The limitations on volume size is the only reason for the omission of Letters Nos. 7, 8 and 11. They are held over for a later volume, if the Lord will, which will include letters to A. C. S. Price.
- 3—Included, however, are Letter No. 12, recently written to J.T. Jr., owing to its urgent significance ; and the brief extract of letter to A.J.G. owing to its important bearing on every member of the Sect in question.
- 4—No reply has been received to any of these further letters, or the earlier ones, or to any of the specific questions raised in them, clamant as they are.
- 5—This Volume is available at the bare cost of printing, etc., plus postage. (For postal purposes, the weight is $4\frac{1}{4}$ ozs.).

HUBERT CALVEY

31st January, 1967

N.B.—Just on going to Press, we learn that in Lancashire a baby of *15 months* old is now breaking bread (with J.T. Jr.).

CONTENTS

<i>Letters to</i>			<i>Date</i>			<i>Page No.</i>
<i>J.T. Jr.</i>						
1	...	...	4th December, 1965	...		1
2	...	...	13th	„	„	17
3	...	...	27th	„	„	35
4	...	...	30th March,	1966	...	56
5	...	...	28th April	„	...	77
6	...	...	26th July,	„	...	117
9	...	...	20th August,	„	...	120
10	...	...	24th October,	„	...	157
12	...	...	8th December,	„	...	159
<i>Extr. Letter to A. J.G.</i>			20th March, 1965			171
<i>(with Note)</i>						
<i>Index</i>	...	...	...	...	...	176

BEHAVIOUR IN THE HOUSE OF GOD

25 Cambridge Avenue,
Southport, Lancs.

Mr. James Taylor Jr.,
Brooklyn,
New York, U.S.A.

4th December, 1965

Behaviour in the House of God (No. 1)

Dear Mr. Taylor,

I am constrained to write you further, and in addressing you now on this further important subject I commence by resuming my comments (following my letter of 15th July) on

Vol. 34 of your Ministry ("The bride and the glory of God")

Despite the title of the volume, the reader is repeatedly shocked by the easy lapses into idle levity. The assembly, "a habitation of God in the Spirit", is not a suited sphere for social joviality. Paul censures lightness. He commends gravity, a sound word, and the sense of having to say to the holy things of God, where lightness is always unbecoming, and particularly is it so now when there is such widespread pressure and distress, much of which is immediately

attributable to your wicked teachings. Therefore it does not favourably impress that you should be found, in leading in your holy convocations, falling so freely into drollery. Frequent lightness in *printed* ministry, would suggest it may be more prevalent than is realised—and maybe the more so if alcohol has been freely flowing.

I cite a few of your utterances in the volume, which betray lamentable lack of holy sobriety :—

p. 15 “one’s concern is not how I am going to get into France, but how I am going to get into heaven.”

p. 57 “I suppose the sisters like pearls ; I do not know whether they wear them, but they like them . . . You loved your wife when you first started with her, but is she still a pearl to you ? There are some brothers looking for pearls, why should they not ?”

p. 60 “Some people never bother to look in the mirror. It is good to look at yourself because you might become so that you scare people . . .

When you get to that idea you are helped in your natural body . . . do not expect to get a new pair of legs!”

p. 61 (Re Paul’s ‘thorn for the flesh’). “You might think your wife is a thorn and she might think you are one too.”

p. 65 Re going to the Care meeting.

p. 157 During reading re water in John’s gospel—“You need some hot water then!”.

- p. 197* Re wives being able to tell how selfish their husbands are.
- p. 206* Re washing day.
- p. 222* Re sisters ‘looking around for somebody’—“I do not blame you ; I did the same thing myself.”
- p. 236* Re taking wine—“That answers to all the pills . . . Go by Paul’s prescription . . . so you will not be buying all these expensive pills.”
- p. 272* “We have got some fine sisters, you know, amongst us, very fine, they are all pearls, are they not?”
- p. 267* Re V.C.L. personally.
- p. 308* „ „
- p. 303* “Is it right that in London you are keeping small, Mr. Lyon?”

Such remarks—there are others—seem altogether out of keeping with the consideration of the assembly as a heavenly vessel ; (I refrain from mentioning the matter of a ministry of Christ ;) they are not oracles of God ; nor apples of gold in baskets of silver. God’s dispensation is in faith. A foolish thought is but sin (those acclaimed as ‘sinless’ should remember this). Yet it has been inflexibly insisted that all must accept that whatever you say is, alone, the present voice of the Holy Spirit. But such instances give evidence of the mind being not on the things of God but on the things of men. At a critical juncture the Lord Jesus said, “that every idle word which men shall say, they shall render an account of it in judgment-day : for by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words

thou shalt be condemned.” And, indeed, it is in the light of this that I write to you.

Certain of your staunch devotees aver that they are having the very cream of ministry. It is however sour, as well as synthetic. We are increasingly thankful to be completely away from it all, through God’s delivering mercies. I continue my observations.

p. 335. “J.S.E. The opposers are baffled by what the Lord is saying.” This typical remark—a toilsome attempt to display support—was, of course, absurd, as I will show, but apparently taking up that remark you say :—

p. 342 “As you get talking to these people, they will get baffled, they will not be able to answer.”

It is indisputable that in your Vol. 34 there is certainly much that would bewilder anyone. Statements are far from lucid ; answers are not specific. Despite the manifest forced energy (in this “time of enforcement”) the remarks are so often utterly unconvincing and inconsistent. It is significant that, while *within*, not a questioning, or what might show any trace of a dissentient or doubting voice, dare be raised, yet *without*, as is well and widely known in Dorking and elsewhere, there were outside the Dorking Halls on 8th August, 1964 more than a few questions raised which *you* did not answer (though answer was demanded) and urgent challenging voices—from *wives whose husbands had left them and were inside the locked and guarded doors*. Can you explain why those wives should have been there seeing that you have stated over and over again, that you have never asserted that

husbands should leave wives! *But no one at all believes you.* How you twist matters? It is *you* that are baffled; it is *you* not able to give an answer.

But on this question of being “baffled”, may I quote for your own *sober* consideration the following (about 110 words) taken from only 15 consecutive lines (say 135 words) *as printed* (the tape record is stated to be even more extraordinarily strange) of your address at Aberdeen (the one in Aberdeenshire—not Fifeshire!) on 5th August, 1964 on “Set free in freedom” :—

p. 250 “We see what he addresses is *the assemblies* of Galatia, *not one assembly*, but *the assemblies*; so we need to see that *the assemblies* are addressed by Paul . . . that we should recognise that Paul is addressing *the assemblies*, *not just one assembly*. So it says in chapter 1 that he is addressing “*the assemblies* of Galatia”; they are what he is addressing. I trust we will get hold of that . . . It is the address of Paul to *the assemblies*—*not one assembly* but *the assemblies*; I trust we will get hold of that . . . this is *not* addressed to *one assembly*; it is addressed to *the assemblies*.”

Well, you certainly made your point, but I would estimate that most of those who read this will come to the same clear conclusion that the tape record would necessarily suggest even more impressively, and will understand why there was widespread discussion about not merely your utterance but yourself.

And the fact that Stow Hill Depot printed this sort

of thing raises questions (which too will not be answered) and signposts manifest potential dangers of a most serious character. But had they any alternative, in view of the pass to which things have been brought?

But there is even more than this to be remarked on the matter of what you say ‘ baffling the opposers ’ as your demonstrative supporter stated. For what is *any* sensible, *sober*, balanced believer—or any other kind of believer—to make of the following extract :—

p. 253 “ Do you really understand why you are a man or woman? . . . What are you a woman for? What are you a man for? What are you a man for if you cannot be a man? What are you a woman for if you cannot be a woman? . . . Can you suspend the fact that you are a man? Can you suspend the fact that you are a woman? . . . Can you do it? *That is spirituality.* When you look at a sister, she has some attraction; well, can you suspend that? . . . Paul says, ‘ I want you to be as I am ’ . . . I do not know that young people would agree with that, because I think that all young people like the opposite sex.”

There seems to be something sinister in this, to any pure mind. And your definition therein of ‘ spirituality ’ is certainly not what any man of God would delineate; and in such an *unspiritual* context. Spirituality without the Holy Spirit! And why the recurrent references to sex throughout the volume?

Similarly, we find the following superlative gem of a

rare spiritual perspicacity :—

p. 221 “ You are either a man or a woman. What else are you if you are not a man or a woman ? ”

Then again, reverting to your remark, on p. 342, quoted above, you referred to persons not being able to answer. And have you yourself not had many wholly fair and powerfully cogent questions firmly and ineluctably fastened upon you (many involving important issues of righteousness—your leader—and truth ; many, apart from the clear voice of adjuration, morally demanding an answer) to which, as yet, you have given no answer whatsoever ? *Who then are you to speak of persons “not being able to answer” ?*

p. 252 “ I say to you, you be as I am. Now what am I ? I am just free, free amongst the brethren, that is all. Would Paul not take a drink of water ? Do you think Paul would not take a drink of wine ? And who is going to say how much wine Paul is to drink ? Who is going to say ? *What do you think of me here ?* Am I able to minister Christ to you ? Be as I am ; can you judge me here ? Am I ministering Christ to you ? ”

It is most difficult to comment restrainedly—yet comment is called for—on such remarks which are put out as spiritual ministry. I know what fair-minded persons would conclude as to the sobriety of the speaker. The remarks hardly seem profitable *for God* ; the impression left could scarcely be favourable *to you*. I cannot recall any true servant of the Lord saying,

“ What do you think of *me*, here ? ” I have heard many ask, “ What think ye of Christ ? whose son is he ? ” And whoever would suggest that Paul could not take water ? That is merely an attempt to befog. And why did you bring in that question about the truly awful matter of drink ? Was there some conscience work current as you spoke ? And then—to your further discredit—the question whether you were in a fit state *at the meeting* to minister Christ ; as though it were on the same level, according to your ideas, of being able to drive a car. We do not want to descend to breath-analysers in the ministration of the holy things of God.

Again, when Paul said, “ Be as I am ”, there was someone to be *seen*, the sight of whom was outstandingly edifying and inspiring ; one whose dealings *with himself*, and his natural tastes and lusts, but made the greater room for the Lord Jesus ; one who could say, and did, “ I did not judge it well to know anything among you save *Jesus Christ*, and him crucified ” ; one who preached not himself but Christ Jesus Lord ; and one who exemplified what he ministered, the Holy Spirit manifestly being free ; and one who in setting out the suited and essential features of an overseer did not chafe at including “ not given to excesses from wine ”, “ not disorderly through wine ”, etc.

“ Can a blind man lead a blind man ? shall not both fall into the ditch ? The disciple is not above his teacher, but everyone that is perfected shall be *as his teacher* ” (Luke 6 : 39-40); like Christ.

This allusion to *perfection*, which comes to me simply as I write, leads me to refer to some of your remarks on *perfection* in Vol. 34. First of all, one's sensibilities

were again shocked when I read your remark as follows :—

p. 343 “ There was an infinite perfection in Christ in flesh and blood condition. *There was nothing at all wrong, not a thing.*”

A true priest of God would not have expressed himself in *that* way. It lacks every one of the holy coverings of the tabernacle and the ark. It was *not* protective of the glory of the Lord Jesus.

And then, in reference to John 5 : 36 where the Lord refers to “ the works which the Father has given me that I should complete them ”, we read :—

p. 291 “ We are a witness to what Christ has done in us and the works have been completed in us.”

So there is nothing now that could be added! Christ has had His full way with you and all the “Exclusivists” exclusively!—nothing deficient or out of place or proportion. The blessed Spirit need toil no longer in that quarter! And you were not speaking of the work of God abstractly—as Moses said, “ His work is perfect ”—but you were referring to what is in evidence. Well, there is a good deal in evidence and my letters to you—which are right, including that of 23rd June, 1965—cover but a feeble part of the whole repulsive complex. Your statement, like so many others in your ministry, is simply blind presumption and conceit. In Paul, even, we see the complete *antithesis*, for he said, “ *Not* that I have already obtained the prize, or am already perfected ” (Phil. 3 : 12); and the word “ perfected ” in that verse is the identical word used by the Lord in John 5 : 36, the verse on which

you based your remark. Such statements will lull the "Exclusivists" in their blind acceptance of everything you say, however foolish and untenable, even more deeply into the sleep of deadly complacency. The glory is most certainly not about to shine in there, for the thing is *not* "as Jehovah commanded Moses". Your page 1 remark predicating love as essential to the apprehension of glory, disposes of the perfection you so arrogantly claim. Are the utter public confusion, the miseries and sorrows of saints of God, and the sully of the testimony of Jesus—all of which, and much more, have followed so closely in your wake and now surround you wherever you go—the irrefutable witnesses to what *Christ* has done in you? I think not.

And, once again, how blatantly sectarian the repeated "us" in that page 291 remark, as in so many others!

And then, amongst so many other brazen assertions I bring before you but two or three further instances:—

p. 99 "Think how Paul would be delighted to-day to see the results of his ministry!"

How perfectly ridiculous! The *first* portent of a possible ray of dawn will appear when you are convicted of God, and unreservedly repudiate and condemn every single one of your distinctive (and abhorrent) teachings and practices. I have said that no recovery is conceivable under your destructive and dishonest leadership. I go further—no recovery is to be anticipated; the Spirit of God has been displaced in your establishment and God is not going to start and patch it up. Some man of God will raise a banner of truth and every honest

man and woman and child will rally to it. They will not have to put their natural relatives to death to do that. Your house is doomed. Read 2 Kings 24 : 3-4.

p. 157 “ What Paul did was ruined by the devil ”. And how did the devil accomplish his designs ? Who is he using to-day ? For we have seen nearly six years of unprecedented damage.

Then we must again rub our eyes when we read :—

p. 87 “ . . . the whole truth of the gospel . . . God has introduced amongst men His covenant and what shines out in it is grace ”.

While the statement is right yet either you are *completely dishonest* or your terminology is at complete variance with Scripture and every whit of sound ministry. Your “ time of enforcement ” means nothing less (and in plain fact a great deal more) than the unsparing (uncompromising you call it) chastisement of the saints with scorpions, and insistence on unutterable hardness and cruelties—and your callous cruelty and divine grace do not mix at all though you have made efforts (unavailing) to combine them in your allusions to John 1 : 17—any Scripture will do to justify, if you can, the tyranny which has sprung from you.

And where is the pure gospel of the grace and glory of God being preached to-day ? Almost everywhere except among the Exclusive sect. Have you read a recent issue of “ The Word Proclaimed ” ? Do you know what is current in your meeting-rooms in relation to the ‘preachings’ ? But I should not ask you this because you close your eyes deliberately to what does not suit you—and then when it suits you, you profess,

with an assumed air of innocence, that you were ignorant of the *facts* of what is current. In fact, the shining you refer to is wholly non-existent in your set-up. Yet the blessed God has not changed, nor His grace. But *you* have changed. By its fruit the tree is known.

p. 105 “Darkness is really wilfulness”.

Does not this, too, condemn you? There was a time when you were nearer than most to the light. Now you sponsor darkness and enforce it, and what “the three great ministries” all condemn unsparingly. So what weight can be given to your cordial and repetitive approbation of those ministries? How can darkness commend light (until it realises what darkness is)? As the Lord Jesus said, “How great is the darkness!” Yet you say darkness is wilfulness, while your doors are barred and windows shuttered to exclude the light; otherwise your works would be shown “as they are” for they are not “wrought in God”.

p. 251 “What do you say when you come into this country? . . . I only say when I come into this country, that I am coming here for pleasure, that is all.”

In my letter to you of 30th October, 1965, I asked whether your answer then to the authorities is really truthful. But if you came here for pleasure, how disappointed you must have been in August, 1964, when you had so precipitately and ignominiously to scuttle away from the Dorking Halls when (having gone there “for pleasure”) you were so enjoying yourself!

Yet elsewhere you remark :—

p. 132 “When we witness, if we have to, let us

tell the truth . . . we do not bring the truth into discredit in our witness, that is to witness so that the thing is right.”

and p. 257 “ Once you get in the witness-box will you witness to the truth, or will you say something that will damage the truth ? What will you do ? ”

All this is morally, as well as literally, confusing. A witness's oath in the Law Courts is that he will speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. That is perfectly clear. What you say is perfectly obscure, because, taken with other of your remarks, it could bear the interpretation—and this seems to be what you are aiming at—that no member of the “ Exclusive ” sect in giving evidence should say or admit anything, however true (and therefore which *should* be said) which might conceivably damage or reflect on what you speak of as “ the truth ”, i.e., the “ Exclusive ” brethren and their “ position ” ; in other words, if by telling *the truth* (for truth is one whole matter) the “ Exclusivists ” or your teachings and your enforcements or “ the position ” would be damaged or impugned or reflected upon, then apparently you are advising your adherents not to tell the truth but to act under pretence of speaking the truth due from them under their oath. We are familiar with double-tongued deceit in your circle, but this sounds like potential perjury. Yet the assembly is the pillar and the base of the truth. Truth cannot be manipulated and tousled in the way your remarks, as I read them, suggest. Maybe your advice is for your own protection. First, you say “ Let us tell the truth ” ;

then you say, “ Do not bring the truth into discredit ”; and then you speak of “ witnessing to the truth ”, but so as not to “ damage the truth ”. It all savours of moral turpitude. If, in a Court of law, your remarks in Vol. 34 were brought to notice, the Court and the jury would assuredly be on their guard—against what? ; against untruth ; and you would, I think, find that that guard would function rather more effectually than the “ spiritual vigilance and guard ” mentioned on page 13 of that volume. The Courts in this country are not easily hoodwinked by suppression or distortion. Mr. Taylor, tell me what you are afraid of. Do you yet really know what truth is? Do you love it? But which is ‘ the truth ’ you love?—truth according to J.T. Jr. ; or truth which is “ in Jesus ”. They are poles apart.

How the blessed *Spirit of truth* is striving now to bring to you all “ God’s thoughts for us to-day ” so that the brethren might together pursue “ *the truth’s* pure light ” (see Hymns 383 and 158) ; because it would appear that there is not only cause for grave misgiving in what you have said, but also—it is impossible to avoid the conclusion—in it the inculcation of, and even incitement to, untruthfulness. And that is not all, because you also say :—

p. 134 “ Has testimony been like that (i.e., like the Lord’s “ good confession ” 1 Tim. 6 : 13) *or has the testimony reflected on the position, on the Spirit?* ”

p. 226 “ The recent testimony in the Courts is not right. Things were said that were not right. The Leader is Christ ; there is no

other leader but Christ . . . we have been humbled in the Courts . . . ”

How can truth be damaged (p. 257) by speaking truth ? Why should, in any circumstances, any criticism be raised if the actual truth is fully told ? I cannot recall any earlier “ leader in the truth ” speaking as you do. Is it because, in your sect of “ Exclusivists ”, there is so much that many are profoundly ashamed of ? But it is hardly the road that moral manhood takes ; or the stuff that martyrs are made of. And is God now served in your system by the suppression of truth, or by its crafty distortion to shelter the Supreme Leader or someone else, or something which should be brought at once to the clear light of day ?

And the term “ the position ”—so frequently used—is to be noted here (p. 134) ; and also *the awful suggestion* that persons should prevaricate or suppress or twist the *truth* so as not to ‘ reflect on ’ the Spirit, the blessed Holy Spirit of *truth*. Does He then now need the sheltering protection of the “ Exclusivists’ ” untruth ?

In my next letter, God willing, I may refer to your being “ humbled in the Courts ” but before concluding this letter there is one further matter I wish to broach now—it is not unconnected with what I have said.

*The Elimination of the Facts about and Criticism
of the “ Exclusive Brethren ”*

Some months ago a brother I well know wrote to me. His references to the “ Exclusivists’ ” system which he had just left were freely expressed, and very definite and very denunciatory. He knew the facts

and took in hand the preparation of a book for publication which, first-hand, would expose what is current in your midst, and be more revealing than anything yet published. The publication rights were to be sold in advance, and contracts with the Sunday press were contemplated. As I had heard nothing more of the projected book, I *telephoned him personally* last evening. He told me that he was not proceeding with the book, and gave me a reason which was not at all convincing, and I told him so. There was evidently a change of direction and I therefore asked him point-blank *whether he had been bribed to suppress the book*. His reply was that he was not free to comment. This told its own tale. He is now back in London district; he is now back in your 'fellowship'. I therefore ask you, Mr. Taylor, whether any approach was made by you, or on your behalf, or with your connivance or knowledge, by a leading brother in London with the holding out of a bribe or bribes to the brother to whom I refer above, to induce him not to proceed with his purposed book? Would you please openly state the facts and the amount and the terms of the bribes? Why not declare "the thing as it is" in the full light of day? God's assembly is not the place for jiggery-pokery or hole-and-corner bargains. You have referred (p. 342 of Vol. 34) to persons not being able to answer questions. Then why not answer this? What is there to be afraid of? Moreover it seems likely that, God willing, this letter, like my earlier ten, will, with others maybe, be published all over the world. I would like to be able to publish your reply with it.

Faithfully, for the truth's sake :

HUBERT CALVEY

Southport—13th December, 1965

Mr. JAMES TAYLOR JR.

Behaviour in the House of God

(No. 2)

Dear Mr. Taylor,

Vol. 34 of your Ministry ("The bride and the glory of God").

I resume my comments. The quoted remarks are yours except as stated.

p. 206 "We do not want any clergymen amongst us ; if there are any here, they had better go out now."

This remark is ill-humoured ; it lacks the spirit which becomes one who essays to minister Christ ; it demonstrates the low level of things. The Lord says, "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear". Then it says, "and all the tax-gatherers and the sinners were coming near to him to hear him". Anything received from Christ is for everyone. You cannot make a close corporation of the truth—it is as free as the air you breathe. A clergyman lives two doors from this house ; his life, his habits, his gracious outlook and availability put you wholly to shame.

And were there no clergymen, in fact, not maybe in name, on the platform of your selective and ticketed and syndicated faction ? And no room for one other, however right his exercises ?

It is *not* 'a clergyman', but 'the notion of a clergyman' which is dispensationally the sin against the Holy Spirit. And, Mr. Taylor, be assured of this, neither your quoted remark, nor the locked doors with their guards, of the halls in Macduff and Aberdeen and of the Dorking Halls, could ever suffice to exclude *that* from the "Exclusivist" sect as it exists to-day.

pp. 259, 335 etc. References to the "ministers".

In many places in Vol. 34 and elsewhere you refer to, and even address, "ministers" as a separate class. Is this another of your 'developed' ideas? We are no longer in Old Testament times. It all seems subtle, *clerical*, dangerous. To accord "ministers" a segregated official status militates against the truth of the assembly. And do you include the Phoebes?—so far as they are still with you. Are the "ministers" promoted thus merely to secure reliance on their reciprocal support in your increasing difficulties?

J.N.D. deals with this sort of thing. He says :—

"There can be but one unity ; confederacy, even for good, is not it, even if it have its form. Unity, professed to be of the church of God, *while evil exists and is not put away, is a yet more serious matter.* It will always be found to be *connected with the clerical principle because that is needed to maintain unity, when the Spirit is not its power, and in fact takes its place, guides, rules, governs in its place, under the plea of priesthood, or ministry, owned as A DISTINCT BODY, a separate institution ; IT WOULD NOT HOLD TOGETHER WITHOUT THIS.*"

(C.W., Vol. 1, p. 365)

How presently apposite all this is—as other statements of J.N.D. whom you simultaneously commend and reject!

p. 74. Here you join in commending J.N.D's C.W., Vol. 2. You may be fairly safe as that volume is concerned with Prophecy. I hope you did not skip Volume 1 which is Ecclesiastical. You will find it tests you. On page 46 of that volume, J.N.D. says, for instance:—

“ The present use of the word (‘clergy’) is precisely the sign of *THE SUBSTITUTION OF MINISTERS IN THE PLACE OF THE CHURCH OF GOD . . . NOW ALL THIS IS OF THE ESSENCE OF APOSTASY.*”

On page 115 he says—how much there is in that valuable Vol. 1 which bears prophetically on existing conditions!—

“ The greatest strength and very essence of an apostasy is to affirm of its apostate condition, in which it is the special object of judgment, the security which belongs to the elect congregation of God. It was just the ruin of Israel : it is easier, if not more fatal in Christianity.”

He also speaks of a condition of things in which *the Spirit's operations, in and by others, are regarded as disorder and schism!* That is seen clearly and widely to-day in your midst. To what a low level you have all fallen!

p. 259 “ These local jailors are not hard men, they will let you out when you are repentant, but you will not get out if you are not.”

This is evidently another contrivance, another class, the “local jailors”. Where did you get this from? Not from the New Testament or the Scriptures taken as one whole. But it is the sort of thing one is not surprised at your saying in view of your arbitrary, unrestrained outlook, Scripture being no obstacle. The remark also subtly detracts from the truth and dignity of the assembly. No authoritarian would perceive this; every assembly-minded person would. It is also related to the prevailing features of coercion, fear, penalty, servility, and much being made of persons with an artificially concocted official status, approved by J.T. Jr., regardless of spirituality; all this being so foreign to the assembly of God, but indigenous to your fabricated system which God will make short work of, very soon.

And how very wrong, as well as foolish, to put the prerogatives of the assembly once again into the individual official hands of your trusty lieutenants, with whose general characteristics we are better acquainted than we are impressed.

In brief, *the whole complex built on the quicksand of your “ministry” urgently requires to be scrapped.*

I ask you, have you *added* anything to your father’s ministry save what is destructive of it and injurious to the truth and to the beloved brethren? There is all the difference between the ‘addition’ in 1 Chron. 22 : 14 and that in 1 Kings 12 : 11-14.

p. 256 “ So I have become your enemy”
(Gal. 4 : 16)

Three times on this page you reverse or invert what Paul said. *Paul* had become the enemy of the Galatians

—by speaking the truth. What is your reaction to those who bring the truth to you?

p. 258 “ Oh! these poor politicians! Whoever gets in I would not vote for any one of them.”

Such an utterance would never have appeared in “ Purification and Life ” (the pure ministry of a heavenly-minded man of God who served in the beautiful spirit of his Master and was slain on that account). It is not the remark of one whose associations of life are in the heavens.

But there is more to say than that. Is it the case that “ you would not vote *for any one of them* ”, but, as exemplified by A. C. S. Price, you would go to lengths (never gone to before) *to get the votes of every one of them*?

pp. 260-4 “ We are here to-night family-wise, so we are amongst the family ” (*p.* 260)

“ Well, we want to be a family here to-night ” (*p.* 262)

“ Do not let us be stiff ; we want to be the family of God ” (*p.* 263)

“ We are dealing with the family of God here ” (*p.* 264)

This was in London. It is obviously artificial, and a suspicious pose.

And are you not personally, yourself, at the root of the permanent blighting of precious family affections and dear relationships in so many, many cases? It is therefore not only very suspicious, but coming from your mouth gravely and fundamentally incongruous and simply monstrous ; surface, subtle, fleshly. Sober-minded men are not taken in by such hypocritical

blandishments. They know too much of the untold (as yet) miseries so wickedly caused to many devout believers. Here, as I write (finding difficulty in expressing myself in moderation) I am surrounded by many most awful proofs of what I plainly say to you. And a heavy background of unfeeling cruelty in regard of natural relationships does not make for the understanding of family affections spiritually.

p. 295 “ We are still holding what belongs to them ” (i.e. brethren who have abandoned your camp) ; “ let them come back and get it.”

What arrant nonsense for you to talk like this in the light of what you have brought in! Those who have *left* you—and *for good*—did so because of the iniquity (2 Tim. 2) which rolled in, with you, like a flood ; the degrading of what is supremely precious ; the perversion of the truth ; and what is of man, whose breath is in his nostrils, being in the ascendant in your system. The Lord is not honoured ; the Spirit is not free ; the Scriptures are either discarded or trimmed or distorted to conform to the ideas of a man. What then have *you* got that could be of *any* value to *them* ? *They*, having left you, have found all that is precious intact and still freely available where it has always been—in Christ, in the Spirit’s grace and sympathy and power. *You have safeguarded nothing* (save your supreme leadership). *You have forfeited everything*. What is for God is being carried through where the Holy Spirit is free. You have nothing except the terms and the labels (threadbare though re-varnished), tenaciously clung on to by those who, under your lead, your

supreme lead, into unprecedented chaos, mistake name and shadow and 'position' and status, for truth and substance and glory and nearness to Christ.

Then you speak of our coming back—what for? To fall a prey again to your presumptuous and erratic caprice? Or that of your maleficent sleuths? I think not. We are humbly pursuing the straight path of righteousness. We should have to leave that path to return to you. It is for you to return to us. *For the Lord is only to be found where righteousness is*—J.T. said this (Vol. 195, p. 112, reproduced in Ministry of the Word, 1961); but you claim that the Lord *always* comes to your *every* meeting (despite the mass of unrighteousness and the maze of sectarianism); and, not only that, but *you* would *monopolize* His presence, overlooking that in your conditions Paul would tell you, "This is not to eat the Lord's supper". The Lord's presence is never automatic. You have not yet learnt this, or dishonestly you ignore it. The Lord is faithful to His every promise, but for His presence there *must* be the moral background. That cannot be by-passed. The Passover must precede the Supper. You shut your eyes to the vital matter of the moral background because to you the latter is unachievable without the full repudiation by yourself in a righteous way, the only righteous way, of the totality of your distinctive teachings and practices. You have not yet abandoned these. Therefore we have abandoned you;—in love of the truth. You are reminded each week of this, in the eloquently silent loaf and cup. What they speak of stands inviolate and eternal. We are in line with their voice. You are not. You persist in your ill-omened

leadership with nonchalant self-assurance although you know there are innumerable saints for whom Christ died but whom you and your stubborn disciples have trodden under foot (Is. 51 : 23) whereas the Lord would have expected you to have washed *their* feet. He is, therefore, deaf to your fabricated religious pretensions. And so are we. He looks at the heart. Had you listened you would have heard Him say, “Where is Abel, thy brother?”. What is there, then, that could really be regarded as safe if left in your hands? Nothing whatsoever.

Meanwhile the Lord comes to us on His terms, not yours.

p. 311 “The Lord means to impress us with Himself, saying, ‘You just keep near Me and *do not let Me go on the ship without you . . .*’ ”

More fantasy! When impressed with the Lord we soon find that He does not speak to us *in that way*; never. We do but bow low at His blessed feet, and worship. He has never said to any disciple, “Do not let Me . . .”. *Never*. The remark is derogatory—again—to the glory of the Son of God. Neither you, nor anyone else, can minister Christ until versed in holy sensibilities as to what is becoming in His presence and in the light of the glory of His Person; and then there will be no scope allowed for the unsubject and excitable natural mind of man to take liberties, in what demands a sober reverence. Until then it is better to be quiet, and to learn at the feet of Jesus, if capable of getting low enough for this.

p. 334 “There is hardly a meeting that has not

some sorrow in it, and that sorrow belongs to us all.”

I pass over the point that this is sectarian and thus partial and incomplete. The full facts are far worse than when you spoke.

But when you uttered the remark, did it not recall to your mind, as it did to mine, the anguished letters you personally received *nearly five years ago* from beloved brothers, Mr. Ernst Beck of Wupperthal, 30th March, 1961, and Mr. Oivind N. Evenson of Moss 8th June, 1961? Why did you not then express the sentiment you now voice? For you will remember how you personally treated those letters (even indeed as you have since treated mine) and the broken-hearted grief of those beloved stricken saints of God. You completely ignored the one; and you, to your shame, *despicably insulted* the other!

But sectarian sympathies—as now voiced by you—are the denial of body feelings. There is a tremendous and widespread aggregation of poignant sorrows affecting the minds and bodies of the saints as to which you still seem entirely oblivious and indifferent, notwithstanding your responsibility for the teachings and actions and the prevalent spirit of oppression which have caused and intensified those sorrows.

p. 73 “F.E.R. was an apostle”.

It seems orthodox to say this, but F.E.R. would not have worn that coat; and particularly if it had your label on it. The crucial fact is that F.E.R. was *a man of God*. There have been false apostles. There have been *no* false men of God. We hear of individual brothers

being set up by you in individual localities as the local men of God, as if that were an office that you could make appointment to. How absurd! Many of those thus promoted at your instance were and are clearly deficient in the first and essential element of a man of God—deep soul-work, the resolving of moral issues in the presence of God. No true man of God would for one moment entertain the thought of being associated however remotely (not to speak of having partnership) with what so many of these hand-made local fledglings exultingly excelled in. No man of God would put a false gloss and glamour on what is morally unsound—alcoholism for instance. How they have all been exposed ; from the great and *formerly* worthy brothers in London to the petty, imitative, local despots—the “ little J.T. Jrs ” is the sobriquet—in rural districts.

But there are further points to touch on as to F.E.R. being an apostle. First, apostleship is associated, rightly, with authority. But while you say that F.E.R. was an apostle, you do *not* accept or follow what F.E.R. ministered, save where it suits your ends. This stands out prominently. I do not enlarge on it here.

And then, in relation to the current untenable and dangerous doctrine of the authoritativeness of ministry—a favourite tool of demagogues—F.E.R. definitely asserted, only four months before the Lord took him,—

“ I am glad to seek to remove from any mind any difficulty that may have arisen from anything that I have said. But I may remark in the first instance that *no one is bound by anything I have said except myself, for no one is called on to receive it . . . my*

convictions . . . have no authority over anyone else."

(Letters of F.E.R., N.S., p. 196)

Do you agree with that? Do you agree with it as regards *all* ministry, and especially your own? For it cuts at the root of so much you have traded with (and with such disastrous results). It demolishes so much of the pretentious talk by yourself, and your supporters, as to the present voice of the Holy Spirit. And it has a grave bearing on your wholesale and unsparing enforcements and your oft-repeated—and characteristic—remark that "This is the time of enforcement". The blessed Spirit's gracious voice, so livingly heard and valued to-day, carries its own credentials (and the latter do not at all resemble yours).

Of course your Vol. 34 would never be looked at if F.E.R. were more widely read. Take, for instance, F.E.R., Vol. 14 (old edition) with its glorious addresses unfolding the things which God has purposed for His own glory. Three remarks in that Vol. 14 have always impressed me :—(i) "In regard of *high-handed sin*, there was no offering at all" ; (ii) "The heavenly colour was to come down . . . to the details that come nearest the earth, the *borders* of their garments" ; (iii) "What becomes me down here? *God's will*. What does not become me? *My will*."

F.E.R.'s ministry with its heavenly substance condemns all the legal and contemptible ramifications of your administrative specialties.

p. 226 " The recent testimony in the Courts is not right. Things were said that are not right. The Leader is Christ ; there is no other leader but Christ . . . We have been

humbled in the Courts . . . The Leader is Christ ; we should get hold of that. The Leader is Christ.”

There are two matters in this excerpt:—(a) Leadership; (b) Being humbled in the Courts.

In regard to (a), Leadership, I have already written you on this. But surely we are debarred from saying that Christ is our Leader unless we are following Him, which would involve taking character from His ways and His spirit and the tender grace that ever marked Him ; and also that as to teaching I am learning from Him so that what I say and do would remind persons of Jesus. But at present what are in evidence in your reprobate system as I have demonstrated—and will do, God willing in further letters giving extracts from communications I have received—are *not* the heavenly Manna, the ways and teachings and activities of Jesus, and the meekness and gentleness of the Christ of God.

Then, as to there being no other leader than Christ, this is the sort of untruthful and idle sophistry which altogether exposes you. I have dealt with this, too. Beloved brethren have been excommunicated for saying what you yourself—dishonestly and for appearance sake—now say. For their saying there was no leader but Christ, issue was taken with them as refusing to recognise yourself as the Supreme Universal Leader. And they are still out of your ‘fellowship’. And nothing even in righteousness has been done about it save this anaemic and insipid and insincere *assertion by yourself of what they themselves said*. Your system is altogether hopeless. In plain truth and fact what is

incontrovertible is that in the mind of every one of your adherents you are the sole Supreme Leader of the "Exclusive Brethren". What *you* say on page 226 was *not* the truth. So that it would appear that what was said in Court was the truth. Here in this very town at the Monday night prayer meetings there are those, even including quite young persons, who thank God "for our Universal Leader". Everybody knows whom they refer to.

In regard to (b), being humbled in the Courts ; of course you have. How could it be otherwise? Can it conceivably be anticipated that in any future Court cases you will not be further gravely humbled?—I speak of the sect itself, but what is said in Court, in the future, as in the past, is certain to involve yourself. There have been quite a number of Court cases, as you know, (and it seems likely that there may be others in this Country and elsewhere) and I have not been able to trace any Court case where there has not been amazement, indignation, humbling and humiliating comment and withering observations—often from the Judge himself. Can you refer me to any exception? The story is the same all over the world. Take the Jensen case in Los Angeles, December 1962 (in fact the day after your 3-day meetings there when you reiterated that you had never said that husbands should leave wives—which makes one wonder what the Court case then current was all about!). The Judge's statements were most drastic and scathing. He could not credit that he was dealing with Christians. Maybe he wasn't!

I do not propose at the moment to go into the

eloquent details of the many cases—many have been reported in the Press (but not all). Even before the Jensen case there was the hideous case of the Bakers, Port Elizabeth, South Africa. The facts, brought out, and admitted, suffice to tell their own story. “*Exclusive Brethren*” in your ‘*fellowship*’ and acting under your general directions and leadership and in the absence of the husband and without his knowledge, abducted Mrs. Baker and her daughter about 500 miles—first to Mossel Bay and then to Cape Town—Mr. Baker being in ignorance of their whereabouts. In moral terms how would you describe such work? (On page 291 you assert that the Father’s “works have been completed in us”—see my letter to you of 4th December, 1965. Was this one of them?) Was it a righteous operation? Do you still so regard it? Were not the strictures of the Court abundantly justified? Well may you say that you “have been humbled in the Courts”—and it is because you have disgracefully humiliated yourselves *outside* the Courts, and to a degree and extent which have not as yet been brought before the Courts. The Baker case is revolting—but it is not the only one describable thus. It, and the others, are a standing disgrace to any testimony.

But that is not all—there was the aftermath. *The two principal active abductors* came separately to Mr. Baker, and with tears, and the approval of their local meetings, confessed to Mr. Baker that they had sinned in what they had done.

The only point on which I am in doubt, after studying the details, (and there is much more that could rightly, and may yet, be said) is *whether the*

two main abductors had your approval, either before or after, in those confessions. If so, then it clearly follows that you should in righteousness have repudiated your teachings and condemned your actions and yourself. Whilst if not, then for some years you have been at issue with the local assemblies in 'fellowship' with you in Port Elizabeth and Cape Town, for they disavow your teaching but you do not. How can two walk together unless they be agreed?

I do not wish to prolong this letter—much could rightly be written about these cases—but three points call for reference :—

- (i) How is it that this happened seeing you state you have never said that husbands must separate from wives?
- (ii) Although this case was so noteworthy, and is, and not only on account of the 500 miles distance of abduction, it seems characteristic of the Supreme Leader that it does not appear to have been touched on at all (so far as I can discern) in Vol. 27 of your 1963 ministrations in South Africa. (I forbear to comment on the fact that in the very locality concerned, namely Port Elizabeth, you gave an address on “The Trinity in relation to the finishing of things” on 4th September, 1963. Well, why not complete this case righteously? The blessed God would help you to finish *this* thing.)
- (iii) And then as to Cape Town your theme there in

1963 was "Communion in the Economy". How ironically appropriate! A volume could be filled with a consideration of your remarks including your references, for instance, to "the affectionate circle", in the light of the Baker case. Further, your address at Cape Town, you will recall, referred to our relationship with Governments. Well, are you yet really aware how the South African Government regard your dogmas and your doings? I may have to touch on that when I have confirmation of what I have heard.

And then there is the long-standing, disgraceful and disgusting case of Dr. T. at Johannesburg. I may comment more fully on that later, God willing. It is high time that, in this instance too, the wife should without further delay return to her husband. The finger of responsibility points clearly to you. How long will you continue to trifle with righteousness? "It is a fearful thing falling into the hands of the living God."

In the light of that accusing finger in that and other cases, the South African Government—"God's minister to thee for good"—issued their prohibition on your further entry into South Africa. Do you agree with that Government's embargo and the grounds, so substantial, on which it is based?

I must, however, add a word regarding the notable case of Mr. Brian Cowell of Merseyside (Liverpool, Birkenhead and Wallasey) which, too, involved a planned and conspiratorial abduction—consonant

with this “Exclusive” brand of Christianity—*under your leadership*, and then, as I think I have pointed out to you but do so again, *the “assembly” subsidising* (£30 per month), and simply glorying in such action, as inducement to Mrs. Brian Cowell to remain away from her husband. Do you remember the findings of the Judge? Certainly you have in very truth and in abundance (and deserved abundance) been “humbled in the Courts”. But I turn away from this grievous case—and at the moment, from the subject of the Courts—for dear Mrs. Brian Cowell, so sadly deluded in her outlook through your teachings, is now with her Lord, and *away for ever from your baneful influence*. You, J.T. Jr., wrecked that home.

In turning away—for a brother has just called to see me—I leave two matters with you :—

- (1) You have been “humbled in the Courts”—were the Courts right?
- (2) What effect has the severe and repeated “humbling” in the Courts (U.S.A., South Africa and U.K.) had on you?

Visit from a Brother.

A brother who recently withdrew (2 Tim. 2) from your system, has just called to see me, on his way elsewhere. Familiar with what is actually current in many localities, he more than abundantly demonstrated in three well-filled hours the rightness of his positive exercises and the evil and the astonishing happenings in the “Exclusive” meetings generally.

I refrain from placing before you now what he, with factual definiteness and sober judgment, told me ; of brothers insistently pressed to marry, and, simultaneously, brothers insistently pressed to abandon their wives and children ; of the shameful carryings-on—now habitual—in local meetings ; of the free and open challenging, publicly and by name, of individuals present at the meetings and even as to specific personal and family matters ; of the free fight in the Chorley meeting (in detail), and of the sequels which occurred and those which should have occurred but did not and why ; of the farcical “fellowship meetings” in Wallasey in July, 1965 under the ‘lead’ of a brash young brother, who within five minutes showed he would make the most of his little and brief (and well-lubricated) authority, and with more natural energy than sense or spirituality. *I wonder if you have ever realized what some of these young brothers whom you have put forward say when they are let loose!* The whole of the ‘ministry’ of that week-end was wholly withdrawn—and it is well that it was! Maybe you have not seen the account of it! During one of the ‘readings’ an aged, and formerly honoured, brother (I have the full details) collapsed—what was going on was too much even for him—and had to be carried out in his chair during which the loud remark was made (you must find out for yourself who uttered it, though I could tell you), “There goes a dead man! Carry the dead men out!”. I forbear ranging over it all now, as I have said—*all* the facts seemed disgusting. I simply thank God for His mighty deliverance from such a system and for the pure air and clear sunshine in

which we now rejoice.

I close now. Soon, God willing, I will write you again.

Faithfully—for the truth's sake,

HUBERT CALVEY

Southport—27th DECEMBER, 1965

Mr. JAMES TAYLOR JR.

Behaviour in the House of God

(No. 3)

Dear Mr. Taylor,

You have often asked your audiences, "How are you getting on?", and on occasion have added, "Are you filled with water?". These are the questions I ask you now, in view of the truth which in my letters I have placed, and have yet in abundant measure to continue to bring, before you. In bowing to the truth there is always glory to God.

In the present letters I write you on certain matters arising out of the Stow Hill magazines for this month.

AGENDA FOR PRAYER MEETINGS (New York

Notes pp. 414-5)

You advocate an agenda to be prepared before, and read out at, each prayer meeting ; items to be arranged in categories. At Detroit on one occasion, under this

system there was concern—how serious!—as three agenda items had not been covered by the prayers! A young brother was therefore openly told to get up and pray in relation to the three items! To inform brethren of matters is one thing but no agenda is needed for prayer to God. It is no help to or substitute for a living believer's exercises ; but a surrender to lack of exercise. It brings limitations. Hymn 305, verse 2, shows where any agenda should be, without your dead mechanical device—another instance of 'Development' ; what was not "from the beginning" ; the mind of man in God's holy matters. Is it thought for the briefest moment that Peter and Paul, who speak of "the living God", would have countenanced such a human contrivance? "As many as are led by the Spirit of God, *these are sons of God.*" Sons do not need or advocate agenda. It does not fit in with sonship. Did the disciples in Acts 4 : 23 wait for the agenda to be drafted? Such as "pray in the Holy Spirit" do not so docilely take to human notions or crutches. A pointer to the banefulness of the system you lead is the alacrity with which every whisper of an innovation by yourself is at once embraced and extravagantly elaborated by 'the faithful' of your flock, as though its acceptance was the acme of spirituality and their necessary food. The assembly is a heavenly vessel, the body of Christ, indwelt by the Spirit. This new 'development' is neither spiritual nor heavenly nor evidence of life. It is officialism and formality ; what religious flesh delights in ; outward change and novelty as the—artificial and unconvincing—sign of vitality.

And then the effort—what familiar energy and in-

genuity!—to seek to justify the innovation by saying that the Holy Scriptures “confirm the idea of an agenda”, and citing Luke 11 : 2-4, 1 Tim. 2 : 1 and Eph. 6! This is all unsound, and seems dishonest. What are needed are intelligence and spiritual exercise. How can Luke 11 be quoted as a warrant for the notion? What agenda has a son when he asks his father for bread? There is no agenda in verse 9, or verse 13.

As to 1 Tim. 2 : 1 the word “first” means the priority of prayer in the house of God, and includes vv. 1-4. What then can be item 2 on any notional agenda? Would the sequence be dislocated if we commenced with “thanksgivings”? The allusion in the reading to “first of all” in 1 Tim. 2 plainly suggested that the actual order of items on the agenda should be observed! Was Paul infringing his own “agenda” by putting chapter 1 before chapter 2? Does not “the glory of the blessed God” (ch. 1 : 11) cover everything and the life which can raise a doxology in v. 17 irrespective of any human arrangement? But the “Exclusivist” sect has degenerated into the unsuited place for life and spirituality. There is no room for them there. And how is prayer for all men to be put first and God’s glad tidings then relegated to such an insignificant place, practically in your 1961-65 scheme of things? The glorious gospel of the blessed God is practically undiscoverable in your decadent system. I wonder if you are aware of the balderdash which at times passes muster approvedly in your sect now, in its stead.

And what of Eph. 6? No one with *any* knowledge of

Ephesians would mention the idea of an agenda. He would simply *spurn* the thought. *If he did not, he would show where he stood.* The spirituality of the Ephesian epistle is too great ; the crisis too urgent. To-day there is, with you, much crisis and little, if any, spirituality. What moonshine then for you to seek support from Ephesians, which is the holy, free outpouring of the heart of a man of God, moving in liberty in the illimitable sphere of the counsels of God, and with concern before Him as to every element of the testimony—including the sphere of natural relationships (in no sense incongruous with, but on the contrary contributory to, that other sphere). What a slump then for you to insinuate an agenda or use such a scripture to seek to justify such a thought! Indeed, in ch. 6 Paul says, “praying at *all* seasons, with *all* prayer and supplication in the Spirit” ; and watching thereunto. Your agenda brainwave is shown to be a human expedient as a feeble prop for the unexercised soul. And this was in the New York reading! Every fresh ‘development’ exposes the mind of the flesh. If indeed it were a question of order, there is so much disorderliness at the doorstep of your system, and within it, that a plethora of agenda could never suffice. Much more is needed, urgently—complete prostration before God in the light of His rights and in deep humiliation and shame, and the beginnings of earnest love of the truth and for the beloved scattered saints of the Most High and the followers of the Lamb. An ambassador of that calibre “bound with a chain” would not take kindly to being bound by an agenda, nor would he need one.

THE GOSPEL OF GOD—"THE COMPASSIONS OF GOD" ("Word Proclaimed" No. 102)

This was among the September magazines loaned to me. The preaching reproduced was by J.T. in Belfast 50 years ago. It is excellent. I now quote some of J.T.'s statements and thereafter make some comments and address to you certain questions.

Statements of J.T.

Page 4. "Mothers' hearts are attacked through their children, and fathers' hearts are attacked through their children. I desire to show you *how God meets that*."

Page 6. "I passed three funerals to-day here in Belfast. It is *only neighbourly to attend a funeral*. Many sympathised with her (the widow at Nain) to the extent of attending the funeral of her son. *The Lord Jesus met her and met them*".

Page 7. "It is a great thing to be *surrounded by sympathetic hearts*".

Page 9. ". . . this young man is *given back to his mother*. *You are never fit for the assembly till you are right in every natural relationship*. God has respect to everything He has created, and we must get right at home first . . . *You must recognise every divinely instituted relationship . . . You can go to God and adjust matters with Him ; but see to it that you adjust matters here FIRST.*" (i.e., at home).

Page 10. "*The Lord Jesus having raised him up from the dead lays no claim on him, for the mother must have her right place. DO NOT PRESUME TO SERVE CHRIST TILL YOU RECOGNISE EVERY NATURAL CLAIM FIRST; GOD ADJUSTS*

EVERYTHING ON EARTH FIRST. HE . . . DELIVERED HIM TO HIS MOTHER."

Page 11. "Parents, bring the children to Christ."

Page 13. "He healed the child and gave him back to his father." "The compassion of God works out in recovery. Things are reinstated; they are set up as they came from the hand of God. Everything is adjusted, and recovered according to God."

Page 14. "The compassion of God is seen in what it worked out in Christ . . . for the restoration of human conditions as God ordered them at the beginning."

Comments and Questions addressed to you, regarding that preaching.

1.—Do you agree with your father? What he stated 50 years ago is still the truth. Truth does not change. "The voice of the Spirit" would never undermine the truth, or weaken it one whit. If you agree, how comes it about that these hundreds of families have been wrecked?

2.—If you do not agree with your father, why do you not? Do you imagine that you know the truth better than he did?

3.—And in that event, how does it come about that the preaching has been published by Stow Hill now?

4.—I would have you realise that this preaching is fully confirmatory, by J.T., of what I have brought, rightly and strongly, before you in regard to natural relationships.

5.—How positively *evil* it is for you to teach, and far worse for you to enforce, that a young man (or young woman) must leave his home and his parents (in your

‘fellowship’) simply because he is not clear (which is *perfectly understandable*) as to seeking to break bread *with you*!

6.—To bring your terribly cruel pressures to bear to force such severance is not only unrighteous it is plenary *evil*, and an affront to your father’s earnest teachings.

7.—If the young man is not converted you regard the position as worse. But there is the greater need for his remaining at home. To compel his ejection from the home is evil in every way. He has duties and obligations to his parents that only he can fulfil ; and in such fulfilment *God is honoured even if he is unconverted* and even if your evil teachings and evil methods are ignored, as they should be.

8.—J.T.’s word referred to is, in fact, diametrically opposed to your atrocious notions which dishonour God, disrupt families, break persons’ hearts, expose young people to the world, sully the testimony of the Lord, and are inimical to public well-being.

9.—At Barbados in 1963 you enjoined that members of one’s family are not to be greeted or given *any* recognition, even in the street, unless “they have the doctrine” by which you meant unless they were in your ‘fellowship’. This makes it clear that *you yourself have not abode in the doctrine of the Christ*—a most serious matter for you.

10.—So your youths now despise and hate parents and say so (Luke 14 used in this wicked way) because the wise parents have abandoned your ‘fellowship’ ; and the youths have been enjoined not to be subject to

or heedful of their parents in any matter whatsoever.

11.—Yesterday a long-devoted sister who left your 'fellowship' many months ago told me that she had telephoned her daughter (with whom she had had no contact since withdrawing) on the daughter's birthday, to greet her affectionately ; but the daughter (married to one of your hyper-zealous stooges) without addressing her as her mother, merely blurted out, "Where are you in your soul?", and rang off.

I have already told you of the heart-break of a beloved brother and his wife upon the last of their four children leaving the home because of your teachings. In another case, with similar features, the son said to his father, "You are not fit to be a father or a brother". There are numerous such cases. J.T., your father, would have utterly condemned all this. You apparently approve and inculcate it.

12.—True Christian teaching would never lead to heartlessness. A young girl, a truly attractive believer, was killed recently in a tragic road accident. Her elder sister did not attend her burial, despite the anguished pleading of the parents to whom (at their great sacrifice) she owed simply everything, save the abominable, poisonous indoctrination she had been subject to while necessarily staying away from her parents.

And who could number the cases where presents sent by parents to their sons and daughters for the grandchildren whom they had never seen, have been returned with studied indifference?

13.—Neither you, nor anyone else, could contest the fact that J.N.D., F.E.R. and C.A.C. were in the fullest accord with the statements of J.T., your father,

in the preaching mentioned. But you could not refer me to anyone at all of any standing who supports your wicked teaching. How can you have *the amazing audacity* to speak apparently so appreciatively of “the three great ministries” and yet reject them? It is dishonest.

14.—I would draw your attention expressly to the fact that in that preaching, complete as it stands, there are no idle, absurd qualifications about “unclean houses”, “unclean parents”, “unclean gateways”, etc. etc., or to persons having first to “get right”—your favourite phrase when you want them to go wrong.

15.—The clear and simple obligation to go home to the parents stands and is not weakened by any question of their attitude to your ‘fellowship’.

16.—The truth of J.T.’s preaching is what the Spirit of God is concerned to present to men to-day but you, contrary to the Spirit’s voice, are diligent to distort it or suppress it on account of your evil teachings current in your sect.

17.—The important point follows that natural affections of parents or children can not righteously be used as a lever to coerce them by pressure or threats to take a particular line of action merely because it is enjoined in your code of teaching. The question is wholly one of the work of God in the soul. J.T. said that. It would appear without question that you do not. How many are now breaking bread with you who are there through coercion and the threat of an intolerable alternative? And, further, how *many* more are nominally in your ‘fellowship of the disapproved’ because they do not feel they can face the awful upheavals of family

disruptions which you seem effectually to get away with as an adequate lever for their continuance in your wicked system?

17.—Collateral with this is the *utterly foolish* practice of influencing children of even $3\frac{1}{2}$ years of age or less to come into 'fellowship'. J.T., your father, would never have countenanced that folly. But it has now become current all over the world. You know who is responsible for it. And what sophistries are, in this matter as in everything else, resorted to in order to furnish some appearance of spiritual reason! What a story it all makes! And you are the head of it all! And thus the children are often injured!

18.—And then J.T.'s allusion to funerals (on p. 6), and (p. 7) being surrounded with sympathetic hearts. Dear Mrs. Johnston was buried here in Southport a few years ago. Her son, Charles who was a believer but not yet breaking bread, was addressed by a well-known Waterfoot brother thus, "What are you doing here? You have no right here"; to which Charles meekly replied, "This is the burial of my mother". He was clearly wiser and more spiritual than his aged but ignorant would-be teacher, the outlook of the latter being the same as your own, that is, *all wrong*. You will observe that J.T., your father, said, "The Lord met her (the mother of the raised son) and met them (the sympathisers)". The Lord Jesus met Charles that day in Southport but the brethren did not; and they did not help him.

How like J.T., your father, it was to say, "It is a great thing to be surrounded by sympathetic hearts" (p. 7) but the temper and bearing of your 'new

ministry' are completely out of accord with this. Sympathy now has to be very, very selective! But the heart of Christ goes out to all. So did the heart of J.T., your father. But it is not so with others.

19.—How wholesome and refreshing and how true J.T.'s statement on p. 9 that being right in every natural relationship is a condition of fitness for the assembly. I well know what you would say about that word "right" but what you say should be ignored because it is wrong. The reference to the "assembly" is to be noted ; *but we must get right at home first*. Earlier in this letter I refer to agenda. Well, this is the *first* item on *this* agenda—and that order has to be observed—even though it be the complete opposite of the terms and temper and trend of your 'new teaching'.

20.—Then there is this perfectly true, though radical remark (p. 10) that we are not to presume to serve Christ until we *first* answer to every natural claim. You should know that this is *the very opposite* of the truth as regards so many of your "ministers" and zealous supporters. Are they prepared to be adjusted and to reject your teaching and be in line with the sound teaching and faithful word of J.T., your father? Or will they, conscious of your concurrence, stolidly adhere to the whole Pharisaic rigmarole and interpretation of "getting right"? I hope not. Your leading has been grievously at fault fundamentally. After all, the injunction to be prepared to "abandon" natural claims and responsibilities was *your* misguided word. You even, you will remember, but you have often said the same thing since, brought

in the atoning work of Christ in all its wondrous undimmable glory as the lever for *unrighteous action* in abandoning right natural relationships and claims and privileges. This was, and is, untruth. J.T.'s word is truth. Why not "listen to Israel your father"? He knew more than you can ever know.

21.—Then I would draw your attention to J.T.'s words on pages 13 and 14 referring to what was "at the beginning" and how things came "from the hand of God". This was *not* Development. J.T., in his own profound way, and with a clear grasp of the range of the truth, shows how God, in the gospel, is bringing things back to what was "at the beginning", in the recognition and restoration of the relationships established by God Himself in human conditions. This is all part of "the form of the house" and its "law" (Ezek. 43 : 10-12). The only disruption that would entail, would be the overdue disruption of your teachings.

22.—You approve of J.N.D. What does he say? In C.W., Vol. 12, page 140, he states :—

"A child or husband may take our heart from God, but being without affection is one of the signs of the last times. *In the last days men are not only not spiritual, they are not natural. The Lord puts His seal on every relationship. It is an awful thing, even if a child is not converted, to see it failing in affection to its parent ; and the nearer the relationship, the more dreadful it is. God owns the relationships, and it is a sign of the last days to be wanting in the affections proper to them.*"

Mr. Taylor, do you agree with J.N.D.? I can scarcely

read a page of J.N.D. without finding your teachings and practices and methods utterly condemned. The foregoing quotation is on Mark 10 : 1-46, including v. 29. J.N.D. was not trying—which would have been in vain even as your trying is completely in vain—to adjust the truth to his human notions or anyone else's. He was applying the sharp edge of the Lord's word.

I solemnly believe that your perverted teachings and doings are paving the high-road to apostasy.

THE WRECKING OF HOMES AND FAMILIES

But this further and highly-important matter arises again now, and I desire to force it home to you that the fundamental principle of righteousness, which lies at the root of what J.T. said in his preaching above referred to and now published by Stow Hill, enters with equal weight into this further matter, not now of children blessed by the Lord returning to their parents and homes, but the work of God showing itself in *the maintenance or restoration of normal family and home relationships between the parents themselves*. J.T.'s preaching alluded to, really declares your new-fangled (five years ago) doctrine of husbands leaving wives, etc., to be null and void. In view of your repeated assertion that you have never said that husbands must leave wives, etc., (though nobody believes you) what I have just pointed out must bring some relief to you. But your responsibilities are not so easily discharged ; and your problems in the matter are not so facilely solved. It calls for much more than an editorial sleight of hand which produces and publishes that preaching of J.T. after 50 years. Some clear, and I may say,

honest answer is awaited still from you personally regarding the past and present atrocities and the teachings and enforced methods which led, and are still leading to them.

Now I turn to a letter dated July, 1962, of which I have a copy which I can produce. It was written by a brother, with a sad heart, in London, to a brother in the north (who had been in your 'fellowship'). In reproducing the letter, below, I may, in my discretion, omit dates and names, but not the names of two households, as otherwise the glory they have so assiduously won might be lost and their medals (in one case, I think, the third or fourth bar to the medal) concealed. The letter reads :—

“ Now as to leaving the meeting. I went to the London care meeting, and sat with horror at what was being said. It was the worst meeting I have been at in my life. Some were going out nearly fainting. It was about “clean households”. The meeting commenced at 6 p.m.

One of the worst cases was at Lewisham, where a brother was *urged to leave his wife and eight children aged from 9 years to THREE MONTHS*. I had an awful head and stomach by this time ; and a brother went to the microphone and read in 1 Cor. 7 : 13-17. He was told by Bruce Litchfield to sit down, as ministry had been given about that matter and he was wasting the brethren's time . . .

I left the meeting at 10 p.m. (it was not over but I have an hour's journey home). I told my wife it was the worst meeting I had ever been to ;

and that I was not going any more . . . On Lord's day she wanted to take our daughter to the meeting, and I said, No. Then I wrote a letter withdrawing, as error was being practised and Scriptures ignored, and moreover there was refusal to even consider them.

At 7.45 a.m. on the Tuesday, my wife kissed me goodbye, as I left for the office. When I came home, she and our daughter had gone . . . and *I never knew where they were until a full fortnight later*, when she left word in an office where I would be calling, to 'phone her up at a Primrose Exchange number which I guessed to be Percy Lyon's . . . She had been at P.L.'s about 4 days, having spent 10 days with a family . . . Easton's by name. The prospect of Court proceedings seemed to be the main reason now for saying that "a mistake had been made" ! She now regards me as "unclean" . . . I asked to speak to Mr. Lyon when I telephoned her, but he refused . . . "

Now, Mr. Taylor, I am compelled to ask you what you have to say about this? Do you agree with what was done? If you disagree, have you so informed your disciples in London, and if not, will you not do so forthwith? Remember those words, "Urged to leave his wife and eight children aged from 9 years to THREE MONTHS", and do not overlook your remark on p. 10 of your Vol. 34 that "fathers need to be protective in regard to their children". It is a peculiar situation and one which cannot be allowed to continue when Christians and the public do not know whether

the supreme universal leader approves or disapproves of cases of this kind—which have been and are happening all over the world. All we hear is a repeated and dishonest repudiation which is obviously intended to be ignored by your adherents. Yet you are said, in your every word, to be expressing the present voice of the blessed Spirit of truth and of grace! Well the blessed Spirit has a judgment of it all. I am concerned to share His judgment. If you cannot tell me what it is, I can certainly tell you—without hesitation.—Your ‘new’ theology is to God and man, utterly revolting ; execrable ; rotten, root and branch.

And A.J.G. supports all this!

You have said, too, over and over again (in your ‘enforcement’ technique), ‘God’s claim must override every other claim.’ But then you say (e.g., Seattle, 30th May, 1964) “Where there are children neither parent can leave but separation must be maintained”. But why should any parent, in any circumstances, leave the other (and the family) if you have not, and never, said that husbands must leave wives, etc? Are you really honest? Does not your Seattle remark reveal your untruthfulness? In your Vol. 14, p. 163, a question was put to you about offering and providing accommodation “to set persons free”. That too, bears on the matter. And your answer confirms it. You clearly meant that wives would be set free by “the truth” and thus leave their husbands, and not be “slow in getting out of things”. But then again, if it is righteous (according to your peculiar terminology) for a husband to leave his wife in the circumstances you have

over and over again specified, why should you modify that because there are children if, as you state, “God’s claim involves that every other claim disappears”? You are inconsistent even in your dreadful doctrines. If your teaching is based, as you claim, on divine principles of righteousness, then your every concession, modification and retraction is unrighteous. If your teaching sets out God’s claims what is the ground on which you relax them? You are debarred from speaking of human sympathies and kindness, for you abandoned all that long ago. You said it had to go in the abandonment of Christ. You are inconsistent as well as dishonest. You are completely unreliable in your teachings. And your alleviations belie the whole of your code and prove that it is fundamentally unrighteous. I shall have more to say about that, God willing, for there are other points to be brought home to you, including your allusions to “separation must be maintained”. Five minutes’ cross-examination in a Court would reduce you to ashes.

But what have you to say about the case and the experiences of the writer of the letter quoted above? On that, too, I make no comment now though there is ever so much to say about its every aspect. I trust it will simmer into your mind and your conscience, but my thoughts revert to your question to Percy Lyon on page 303 of your 34th Volume :—

“Is it right that in London you are keeping small, Mr. Lyon?”

Well, I would say that it is just as well for both London and Mr. and Mrs. Lyon to keep small. When they, and the mass of your so easily deluded and deceived

and ever-so-timid supporters have their eyes opened to all things clearly they will unreservedly condemn themselves—and also condemn the supreme universal leader who has so easily led them by the hand into the vortex of restless and guilty confusion. “Paul then standing up in the midst of them said, Ye ought, O men, to have hearkened to me, and not have made sail from Crete and have gained this disaster and loss.”

But why should “the prospect of Court proceedings” have been, as would appear, the reason for the restitution of a wife and daughter to the husband and father if they had been righteously separated? Have you faced this important question?

In your Volume 34 you remark with that appearance of artless ingenuousness of which you are a master, “It is a great honour to be among the brethren”. Your remark is ludicrous—apart from its deep-dyed sectarianism.

I have looked again at A.J.G.’s “The Recovery and Maintenance of the Truth”. I have much more to say about it later (possibly even as regards pages 159 onwards) but it does seem, and I mention it now, an amazing thing that the book should close with two letters from C.A.C., because nothing could be clearer than that C.A.C. would have eschewed like poison the ‘new ministry’ the brethren are suffering under. “From all untruth to flee”. And then “What is required of those naming the Name of the Lord ” (pages 316-322) does not state—what is the fact—that they are expected to take to whiskey ; but has not this become virtually a test of true acceptance of ‘fellowship’ in

Manchester and elsewhere? A brother writes me from Australasia (and all the letters I mention are open to inspection—often they reveal *additional* facts) :—

“ One thing that distressed me some two or three years ago was to learn from a reliable source from one ‘In’, that some mothers amongst them were adding strong drink with the milk for their babies, and the reason given was to get them used to it. I got this confirmed from my own sister (also still ‘In’). It had to be on the table, we know, and children that could drink out of a cup were regularly given it. A few weeks ago, one of my neighbours, who is in charge of the local wine and spirits store proved to me on witness of his storeman (two men whom I have known very well for over fifty years as reliable) that the Exclusive brethren were now some of their best customers, and he added, “what is more, the books will prove it” and also prove that they are now; but mainly spirits. He added, as an aside, “Beer for the children ; wine for the sisters ; and whiskey and rum for the brothers”. In a letter from Mr. Mackertish (Persia) he mentioned that in 1961 he had received a copy of a statement composed by J.T. Jr. ; in it were (No. 5) alcohol should be served at home to show our liberty ; and (No. 6) On Lord’s day morning, a great mouthful should be taken for stimulation.”

I have already referred to the complete absence of any mention of Alcoholism in A.J.G.’s book. You say alcohol is a creature of God. So are ‘pep pills’.

And what allusion is made in that book to the

Wrecking of Homes and Families? Apart from one or two references in the earlier part of the book which almost condemn the 'new teaching' on the matter, all I can trace is—"Obedience to the truth in the matters above referred to has involved, for some, painful separation from loved ones and the actual verification of the Lord's words in Matt. 10 : 34-6". This calls for examination. First, the reference to "the truth" begs the question. A.J.G. surely understood, and has therefore turned away from, the truth as to the responsibilities attaching to natural relationships according to the Scriptures (although the book purports to be on the subject of the truth). The truth is one whole. To distort or magnify or weaken it or its bearing upon us, involves untruth. This is what has clearly happened in a wholesale way. A supreme universal leader may be able to assert and enforce his own doctrines and interpretations and applications of Scripture. That does not make truth of untruth. We have heard of dictators—to prove themselves right—asking for a dictionary and altering the spelling and the meaning of words. But such is childish folly. It but proves their self-will and conceit. Then, too, the setting of Matt. 10 has been ignored ; and even so the only words to be considered are "at variance". Do those words justify what we have witnessed and suffered under? *Assuredly not*. "A sword" is the word of God. J.T.'s ministry in Vols. 172 and 187 (both in New York) do not in any degree warrant your enforcements to-day. Nor does J.N.D. (see, e.g., C.W. Vol. 24, pp. 142-3)). It is thus not at all surprising that national Governments ("God's minister to thee for

good”) are now increasingly concerned, and likely to be more so. Then it is said that we must take account of Luke 14 which is more drastic, the word “hate” being used by the Lord. Well, it is reasonable and fair to say that if I accept, as I do, what C.A.C. says in his oft-quoted utterances and letters in “The Recovery . . . of the Truth”, are you prepared to accept and support what C.A.C. says about Luke 14? In his “Outline of Luke’s Gospel” C.A.C. says nothing whatever about husbands leaving wives, etc.—or anything like it. Nor does he say it anywhere else. He speaks of committal to the path of discipleship ; and not being diverted or influenced by “the natural”, (which I would remind you, includes the natural in oneself), “therefore we must learn to hate it from that point of view. All our natural relationships have to be *watched* in view of the tendency that is in them to divert us from *the knowledge of God in grace* . . . *Grace* . . . involves a *moral separation* from *all* that would be *naturally* one’s own life” etc. Will you—and A.J.G. incidentally—note that term “*moral separation*”? C.A.C. did not say “segregation”. What evils you have enforced in your outward Pharisaism even in regard of parents living in the same house! What unnatural and intolerable conditions you presume to prescribe and enforce! It is high time it were exposed “as it is” and pitched overboard. Is there any separation of any value other than what C.A.C. calls “moral separation”? It is the heart that God regards. In so very many ways you are on the wrong line altogether. In effect most of the Exclusivists seem to be either blackmailed into enforced subordination, or find in your awful system the opportunity for a

paltry bubble religious reputation. C.A.C. points out—what you, J.T. Jr., have still to learn—that grace is much more testing than law. In other words you have throughout the period of your existing domination gone completely the wrong way about things. And, the further your ‘new teaching’ (which undermines “the three great ministries” and C.A.C. too) with its cruel novelties is looked into, the more it is seen that there is *not a single particle of support for it*; and yet, quite unmoved you witness all the mass of suffering and anguished sorrow and family disruption all over the world *based on what is simply baseless*. To me it constitutes the very essence and extremity of callous shamefulness, first of yourself, the leader in it all, and then of all that are so utterly duped as to be guilty of following you. We had thought that A.J.G. knew all this.

Are you not fighting against God?

I have very, very much more to write to you about, Mr. Taylor. I do so.

Faithfully, through grace
in the testimony of Jesus,

HUBERT CALVEY

Southport—30th March, 1966

Mr. JAMES TAYLOR, JR.

Behaviour in the House of God
(No. 4)

Dear Mr. Taylor,

In your Volume 14 you speak of “taking issue with

Satan's introduction, enforcement and presence, in the area of God's work" (page 177). That is precisely why I continue to write you, even as now, again, on the important subject mentioned below.

In your "abandonments" you have abandoned what is truth ; and *your* introductions and enforcements have become the means *Satan* has been able to use, with some apparent success, to produce the existing havoc in God's assembly publicly.

In utter weakness but in the might of the Lord's strength ("Be it a question of strength, lo *He* is strong" Job 9 : 19) I stand for the truth in its integrity.

THE WRECKING OF HOMES AND FAMILIES

What I now have before me are your statements in the reading with you in Belfast, last November ("Ministry of the Word", January, 1966) ; and in that relation, I state in "A" below the position broadly as gathered from your previous teaching, and also other relevant matters including results of your leadership.

A—Your Teachings since 1961

I—It has been very difficult to trace any clear statement of your enforced teachings—this may have afforded you shelter and a line of retreat—but these seem to have been as follows :—

If a husband, or wife, is out, or goes out, of your 'fellowship', *the other spouse is required* (unless—since 1963—there are very young children) regardless of every other consideration, to *separate* from him or her, and, the house being 'unclean', *this necessitates one of them leaving the home.*

If this summary is inaccurate or incomplete, please let me know.

II—ENFORCEMENT

You have repeatedly said, “This is the time of enforcement”. This teaching has been enforced on your directions. *But it has never been clear as to what shred of right you have to enforce anything—and particularly what is untruth.*

III—METHODS OF ENFORCEMENT

(1)—Your enforced requirements have been applied fanatically, and executed unsparingly. Your unscrupulous and unrestrained local executives have, owing to your teachings, been unfettered by conscience, or feeling, or sense of responsibility. They took over the reins.

(2)—Certain of the cases—as you well know—involved carefully and secretly planned, and concerted, and freely financed, *abductions*, and even the *kidnapping of children*, by your wicked partners in these infamous outrages.

(3)—I fasten clearly upon you, J.T. Jr., the fact that *every one* of the *almost innumerable cases* of enforcement (not merely of abduction and kidnapping) has been simply disgraceful and shameful, in every way, in origin, in procedure and detail, and in result.

IV—ASCERTAINMENT OF FACTS

(1)—If there were *the slightest element of righteousness in your make-up* you would certainly have insisted on every single case being freely and impartially investigated—not by your adherents, in view of your wicked teachings also on that matter, and their relationship to you—but in the fairness and equity

required, such as that of a Court of law. (See Micah 3 : 9-11 ; Is. 11 : 4 ; Pss. 72 : 4, 12-14 ; 98 : 9). As governed by truth, it would be immaterial that this would have resulted in your condemnation, and that of your accomplices, and your doctrines and procedures.

(2)—Not one single case appears to have been righteously inquired into, except where Court proceedings have taken place.

(3)—You cannot plead ignorance of the judgments of the Courts, in this country and in the United States, and elsewhere, including the condemnatory judicial references to your teachings and methods in the Court proceedings.

(4)—It is a consideration which you should long ago have appreciated, and, even now, allow to dawn upon you, that your local cohorts of ruthless fanatics, with exuberance of cruel zeal, were executing, on your instigation and direction, the awful teachings with which (as also the collateral enforcements) *the name of James Taylor Junior is closely and shamefully identified throughout the world.*

V—RESULTS OF YOUR TEACHINGS AND ENFORCEMENTS

(1)—You have admitted that ministry must be adjudged by its results. Scripture says so. I have already told you of the manifest fruits of your teachings.

(2)—Abundant confirmation of what is rife constantly comes to light in additional facts (substantiated) of the widespread miseries you have caused, in *mental* and *physical* sufferings, and *collapse* physically in the homes of saints of God, all over the world. You and your adherents go on, seemingly insensible to all this.

There are also the saddening aspects of the effects of

it all on *the children* of the parents, and *the aged* and *the infirm* who, if not in the 'fellowship', must leave their homes as, on account of their presence, the house is designated "unclean". Shame on you all!

(3)—In view of your constantly repeated disclaimers (it has been impossible to believe you) of knowledge of facts which so many outside, in addition to those within, your sect, have been well aware of, I must remind you that you have been very plainly and abundantly informed of the results of your enforced teachings (and *even from the very onset of it all five years ago*) and the disruptions (*which still continue*) of many families, and the widespread grief and distress (*which still continue*) of many beloved saints of God—and their children, "the little ones", Zech. 13 : 7—the victims, innocently, of your unrighteous and high-handed oppression and tyranny ; and the searing of precious and tender and right family affections and relationships.

(4)—In a later letter, I shall send you concrete facts of actual cases, typical of very many others. Two witnesses constitute adequate testimony. Whatever could you possibly plead, then, in the face of the cloud of witnesses, suffering saints of God, who with one voice and with a sober and sad experimental knowledge of facts, now testify against you, your teachings, enforcements, and emissaries, and whose evidence is indisputable? Indeed the half has not been told. And God will not allow you—and neither will I, God helping me—to dodge and evade, (as you ignominiously sought, to do, with the help of your bodyguards, at the Dorking Halls in 1964) with pretence of

unseeing eyes and unhearing ears, your own so heavy personal responsibilities.

(5)—Of the many letters I could cite, one is from a dear sister, prostrate with grief through her husband's enforced abandonment of her (though you dishonestly say that you have never stated that husbands must leave wives) through your teachings. She says, "I thank God that I have been spared from taking desperate action". Now you can interpret that just as well as I can ; but maybe you will have to increase the personnel of your bodyguard—the Lord is not *your* shield (Ps. 5 : 12).

(6)—In the Belfast reading you remarked, "Divided conditions (i.e., in a household) are a very, very painful matter for those involved".

Whenever did you waken up to that, with your "very, very", and its completely unreal implication of irreproachability and powerlessness? Well, as it is so "very, very painful" what have you done about it? It is outrageous effrontery for you to make such a hypocritical remark after five years—every day, in many cases, presenting a fearful prospect to lovers of Christ, and their children—of experience of the most awful and indescribable sorrow and suffering, all over the world. And when I come to comment on the statements you made in that Belfast reading, it will be obvious that the hypocrisy gets worse and worse. For *your* teachings and enforcements and procedures have caused and intensely increased the "painfulness" of it all to many saints of God, who belong to *Christ's* assembly.

(7)—A few days ago I received a letter from a brother in Malvern (all the letters I refer to can be inspected) enclosing factual notes of a number of cases, all representative of the fruits of your teachings and of what is current in your name in your disgusting system. I reproduce now the note of merely one of the cases, exactly as it is before me :—

“ Mrs. E. Walton of Malvern was a Fleming of Coniston. Her husband was put out about 1962—for eating with his daughter (an only child). The fact that Mrs. Walton was *a completely helpless Arthritic*, and either Mr. Walton or his daughter had to dress and feed her, was ignored.

Last Autumn, on medical advice, Mr. Walton wrote to Mr. Meek (the High Priest here) telling him that any pressure put on Mrs. Walton (who was still ‘In’) *would kill her. Despite this*, she was put ‘in ward’. In a few days she had to be rushed to the Infirmary at Worcester.

I attended her burial by Cheltenham ‘Outs’ on 20th October last.

What an inhuman and callous sect! ”

That note speaks for itself. It would suffice—for any reasonable human being (I do not say ‘Christian’). The cruelties of this practice (which has been instituted by you) of “putting in ward” are described in your own ministry e.g., (see your Vol. 27, pages 453-5) and in a case like that of Mrs. Walton many would call it — in the circumstances mentioned — literally ‘murder’.

I knew Mrs. Edith Walton for over 40 years. I feel the sadness and the enormity of it all. I wonder if you

do! No amends can be made by you for even one case like this ; and there are many of them. It all desperately needs to be spread out in the light of day. The sooner this takes place the better.

(9)—But, enormous as is the aggregate mass of manifest pain and grief, there is—as in the case of an iceberg—a far greater volume of sorrow that is not demonstrable. As I write this an aged sister, one of God's elect, truly—she left your unholy system a few years ago on account of its unrighteousness—has called upon me. She has been wonderfully bright, despite much personal pressure and physical weakness, over many years. And now isolated, and insulted by those she broke bread with for long years, and feeling the conditions publicly and her loneliness in her advancing years, yet rejoicing in the Lord, she opened her heart to me. Mr. Taylor, I feel that so very much of her burdens—and of the many others like her, can most surely be traced to you ; they are among “the afflicted and poor people” that “trust in the name of Jehovah” (Zeph. 3 : 11-13).

Such, in small compass, is *the sombre background* to my following comments on your statements in the Belfast reading.

B—Belfast Reading, November 1965—

Your Remarks bearing on Divided Households
(“*Ministry of Word*”, January 1966)

I—YOUR RE-STATEMENT OF YOUR TEACHING

(1)—You now say (page 24) :—

A person who, individually, is “right with God” is “clear” ; and is suitable to be in ‘fellowship’ *even though living in conditions that are “not* c

right" or "*not suitable*", for the latter point *need not be a hindrance*, as such a person being "right with God" would "act right". If one spouse does not "answer the truth" *that does not mean that the other spouse* cannot remain, or be, in 'fellowship'.

Thus a person can be "right" in conditions that are "not right" ; (as in the mixed conditions in "a great house") ; and, in such conditions, may be fully able to keep himself, or herself, "right", *and be in 'fellowship'*.

(2)—You obviously hail from the U.S.A., because it would take a Philadelphia lawyer to know what you were purporting to say. Again, the trumpet gave a *very* uncertain sound!—so *unspecific*, although the subject is so *vitaly important* to many, and your pronouncements have to be applied to *specific* cases with their own individual circumstances. You certainly excelled yourself in vagueness, sufficiently adroit to give impression of modification, yet the studied obscurity affording a way of escape (in the principle of it not unlike the drainpipe which you attempted to shin down, but unsuccessfully, at the Dorking Halls two years ago) from questions as to the righteousness of what you enjoin and enforce.

But, in the prevalent conditions of universal public assembly confusion, would you please enlighten us as to who constituted *you* the legislative authority? or conferred on *you* the triple crown? or invested *you* with the sceptre of rule? You have, in fact, no vestige of right, or indeed of qualification, to legislate as you so bumptiously take on yourself to do ; whilst, as to the holy Scriptures, you obviously cannot (with your _{cl}

vexatious habits of mind and your Scripture-twisting propensities) be relied on, even for a moment, either to interpret them or to apply them.

Consider the sequence of and the unsatisfactory position which has eventuated from, your series of abortive and disastrous legislative efforts in this very practical and important matter! It is all piece-meal and vague. It is impossible to reconcile :—

- (a) your pre-1962 statements and attitude with your Southampton 1962 ministry ;
- (b) your Southampton 1962 ministry with that at Barbados in 1963 ;
- (c) your Barbados 1963 ministry with your Seattle 1964 ministry ;
- (d) your Seattle 1964 ministry with your November, 1965 Belfast ministry.

This is manifestly extremely unsatisfactory, as it stands ; but there are other complications :—

- (i) A brother writes to tell me (I have not yet been able to confirm the detail he gives me) that *in New York* in his own personal hearing 10 or more years ago it was asserted (he tells me by whom)—as regards verse 17 of that important Scripture 1 Cor. 7, “As God has called each *so* let him walk”—that every sister is free, if she wants to leave her husband, to do so, because that verse gives her liberty to act as she feels she should ; and the brethren would therefore not stop her ;
- (ii) It all seems not only bewildering, but very muddy ; in the measure in which it is thought to be understood it seems contradictory ;

- (iii) It is gravely complicated by the repeated unprecise and indeed unintelligible (and sometimes self-contradictory) terms of verbal camouflage which you use (and maybe hide behind) e.g. “right”, “not right”, “act right”, “right with God”, “clear”, “need not be”, “answer the truth”—all truly wearisome. How many, or few, would agree with your idea of the meaning of “answer the truth” ; or “right with God”? Then you use double-negatives in an unprecise way ; and what does “maintaining separation” mean?
- (iv) Remarks in supplementary readings, etc. do not help at all.
- (v) And, beyond all this, there have been certain pending Court cases (one even now current in North America) which *seem to conflict with the whole of your assertions* ; and it may be that, for reasons not immediately apparent, diligent efforts have been or are being exerted by the local Exclusivists to avoid or prevent or delay the cases coming forward in Court (as would seem very desirable) for a public hearing with “sub-poena’d” witnesses and in the presence of the Press (who are of course greatly concerned on the ground of the public interest). There was also a case fairly recently in the South of England.

And the more it is all examined, the foggier it is seen to be. What is clear and understandable is that it is all alien to the spirit of the Lord, and foreign to Scripture.

And consider too the situation which arises through

your arrogantly insisting on *the enforcement of a code which no one can claim to understand* ! What a jumble you have made of things !

There are indications, here and there, that you may be questioning to yourself (not publicly of course) whether you may not be radically wrong, with all the dilemma that presents—but *you* have not ceased to be in ‘fellowship’ (AND NEITHER HAS YOUR HOME BEEN BROKEN UP)!

(3)—Then you say “The affections would be entering into every matter that needs attention especially where you have got divided conditions”. But “the affections” have, so far, not entered into the matter *in the very smallest degree*. (I speak to your shame). The term “the affections” has been so twisted by your sect until all that was left was hatred, naked and unashamed. And we did not hear of even a whisper of a question from J.T. Jr. One of your awful drawn-out meetings after long night hours of protracted agony to many, concluded with the singing of the last verse of Hymn 25! Even as the most unrighteous things have been perpetrated in the name of righteousness ; and untruthful things under the label of truth ; so have the most utterly despicable and hateful things been callously done under the profession of love. Your very statement implies what I state. You are pretending to bring in what has not existed. And even so, you restrict your “love” to cases ‘needing attention’!

(4)—And can operation of “the affections” be counted upon? *Not at all*. Can the local despots be relied on in this way? *Not at all*. And your words “entering into” are characteristically vague and

meaningless. "The affections" you speak of were thrown overboard in 1960 ; and they are far away now.

(5)—Your vague and feeble reference to "the affections" is thus absurd and belated. After five whole years of your terrible teachings and their being forced forward by you all over the world—with the expected results—at this hour you discover—I wonder how!—that there are affections involved which you now feel, but only in certain cases, should have some influence—but you do not say "influence". Poor Levi (which means 'united') has been cited times without number in the diligent search for some warrant for the resolute resolve to sever and to disrupt wholesome family conditions that now can never be healed—and to abduct wives (and children)—by every conceivable means, either fair or foul—IN YOUR NAME—and you do not yet realise that the malodour of it all for five long years is not dispersed by your ludicrously feeble words in the Belfast reading—a few minutes of uncertain dilution while the root cause remains. You are the root cause.

(6)—You say :—

"Here is a person that is right, maintaining separation, and fully able to keep himself or herself right. That person is, I think, suitable to follow righteousness."

There is not a single term in this statement which could be regarded as clear.

Why should the whole world wait on your fiat?

(7)—Then you say—"Of course every case needs the priest". This is an extensive and ominous reservation.

You were referring to full discretion being with your local assertive influences. Where are the *true* priests of God to-day? They have, as regards your sect, either been indoctrinated or eliminated. A priest would be a dangerous man for you to meet. Most of your local lieutenants have not the faintest resemblance to true priests. Wolves, not priests, have done, unimpeded, whatever they would. *They have ravaged "the flock of God"*, "purchased with the blood of His own". You leave us no alternative but to conclude that the many disgraceful and diabolical things perpetrated, were the normal evidences that "your priests" were assiduously at their work. And are these "little Jim Taylors" likely to change their tune? Not without different directives than you furnished at Belfast.

And how trivial a part, if any, is given in all this reading discussion to the Holy Scriptures, and to the truth, and to *divine* principles!

(8)—Then you say—"The priest would get direction from Christ". This merely means, in your set-up, that *your* local man would conform to *your* directions, and could, therefore, count on *your* support.

What is deeply distressing, is to observe how very often in your ministry and your administrative matters references to *Christ* and the *Holy Spirit* are made but you clearly mean simply *yourself*, J.T. Jr. (and everyone knows it).

(9)—The position already seen to be so indefinite and precarious is further obscured—and made worse to suit sectarian ends—by your remark on page 6—

“The centre of operations is a mysterious thing . . . every local assembly, as in touch with it, is in touch with the universal position and thus in the understanding of what *God* is doing universally.”

Here we have—similarly, I would say—allusion to *God Himself*. You really mean what *you* are doing universally, but (blasphemously it seems to me) you speak of what *God* is doing!

One can but be amazed and grieved that persons who were thought to be intelligent in the truth all over the world, have been so easily *duped* by such absurd and specious ideas. It is the carnal mind of the flesh with its subtle, shifty and crafty arrangements, “the sleight of men . . . unprincipled cunning . . . systematized error”. What real place is given to the Holy Spirit in it all, and for His sovereign movements in the body of Christ?

In this very ministry, where metropolitanism is denounced (when it suits) there is clearest evidence of unabashed Metropolitanism—and may I say, with *J.T. Jr.* on the Papal throne (the rivals having been liquidated) and a College of Cardinals but each conditionally there under sufferance of being sacked!

So there is not even the merest suspicion of daylight (it is prohibited!) but the disclosure from your own lips of how your pathetic and bedraggled loyalists are kept in line, your whims diffused, and your supremacy underpinned. It is all like the contrivancing of an astute politician, head of a party—maybe that is a true description of it.

(10)—Then (page 18) there is what you term “the secret line” which, you say, in reference to the Hales

fiasco, “maintained things”. This is not like God’s assembly but a New York Tammany Hall with its underground intrigues, and overseeing all for its own selfish ends. How alien to the pure truth! Surely it cannot stand! The saints—until your ascendancy—have not been accustomed to these murky devices. God will blow on it all.

(11)—Elsewhere you speak of “the inner circle”. This at once suggests what operates underground! But it is all subtle, obscure, dangerous ; a human idea ; contrary to the pure truth according to the blessed God. You may well speak of what is “mysterious” but no sane person would concur in your associating your devious organisation with Paul’s heavenly teaching.

What a whirlpool of dark frothy bewilderment it all is! Hardly “the truth’s pure light” (—a precious thought!). Is it the ‘spiritual ministry’ of which Mr. Ephgrave so flatteringly but foolishly said, “The opposers are baffled by what *the Lord* is saying” (Your Vol. 34, p. 335)? Bafflement certainly there is ; but I wonder whether he understands more than so many others—which is precious little, and of none of that little are they sure. But it is almost unbelievable that persons—men like A.J.G. and J.S.E., for instance—subscribe to this anti-assembly drivel. And what is anti-assembly is anti-Christ.

In the Belfast reading you refer again—pp. 8 and 20 for instance—to “three great ministries”. But no man of God who had read what I have read of your utterances would appreciate his being commended

by you. Your eulogies fall very flat ; indeed they are suspect. You refer to J.N.D., F.E.R. and J.T. *They all condemn your teachings*. One can but conjecture—but perhaps fairly reliably—what their reactions would be to the intricate maze of vague, confused and yet contradictory rubbish in your Belfast reading. Why then, if you value them, do you not fall into line with the ‘great three’? That would mean first condemning yourself and your ministry. Be assured that that is its certain fate. The pure truth will prevail. What are sorely needed to-day are not further great ministries, but one man of God, the prophetic word in power, and two or three little Hebrew maids. Have you not realised that at present you are *the worst enemy* of all the ‘great three’? Think over that soberly and you will discover that I am right.

There is the further point—if I digress, for I am writing you on Divided Houses and Wrecked Homes, primarily — whether the commendation of your father’s ministry comes suitably *in any sense* from *your* lips. Your father would not thank you for it! You fail to realize how very much you have done to prejudice it. You ought to leave to others the bracketing of your father with J.N.D. and F.E.R. and his elevation to ‘greatness’. It is not profitable to grade ministries in this way ; and particularly if you— who completely ignore righteousness in *natural* relationships as I have shown—have not lost your *natural* pride in being the son of J.T. ; and even more particularly when you do not accept what all three say, because there is not a single distinctive feature of your ministry which is

not at complete variance with their statements—and their spirit. You call F.E.R. an apostle but refuse his teachings—it is on too lofty a spiritual level to suit your taste and your ideas. O that you could make room, as they, all three, did for the saints to be engaged absorbingly with the glories of Christ (not perverted administrative foibles) and discover the unifying effect that would follow. *That* was the objective of all three ministries—and *they* were but ministers. For that result, you and your ministry would have to be jet-tisoned.

C—Further Observations

I—YOUR BEWILDERING RE-STATEMENT

(1)—A supreme leader should make himself clear. Why did you not?

(2)—You deliberately re-opened the whole subject of divided households (and the publication of the Belfast notes was hastened exceptionally) yet no one knows why ; or the import of what you stated.

(3)—It was peculiar that you did not again repeat—what is known to be completely false—that you never said that husbands should leave wives, etc.

(4)—On page 24 you refer to how things might have appeared and how some may have felt ; but you did not say what *you* meant. “The Spirit speaks expressly”. Truth does not deceive, or shuffle about in a disguise to mislead.

(5)—The fact seems to be that if at that reading you had ventured even one word of *clear explanation* it might have jeopardised the whole set-up. Truth is *not* like that ; “systematised error” is.

II—LIGHT IN GOD'S ASSEMBLY

(1)—The present teaching is *evil*. The present enforcement is *doubly evil*.

(2)—You said in the reading, “the end of unrighteousness is confusion”. Do you not see that to-day as never before? Do you not perceive your part in that result?

(3)—At Belfast, no one present dared to question what you said, or ask for the Scripture (nor did you state it) on the matter, or ask for explanation of what was said by you. All this is in line with your convenient ideas in your Vol. 34, p. 193, so that all are in greater darkness than ever. This is your version of “temple light”.

(4)—How do you explain terms used by you in the reading which suggested modification? *Any modification* would raise grave questions as to : (a) your 1961 teachings and the “Spirit’s voice” ; and (b) the results of unrighteousness taught and enforced—a very extensive matter which would have, in the detail of it, to be fully gone into, and in the light of the fact that *adequate local safeguards do not at present exist anywhere* in your organisation, to ensure this.

Is this the true reason for the obscurities in your remarks?

Does the deliberate vagueness conceal elements of deceit?

(5)—We are told to “prove all things”. If a person—whichever he is—teaches, who has been repeatedly accused of what you term “being under the influence” in fellowship meetings, etc. (see “New York Readings”

October, 1965, p. 347 for instance), then the greater need for scrutinising what he says.

III—OTHER QUESTIONS

1—Do you *continue* to say and teach that if the husband is withdrawn from, or leaves your ‘fellowship’ because he cannot agree with your teachings and methods, whereas his wife and children continue in ‘fellowship’, then the wife and children must leave the husband if he does not leave them?

2—Do you now say that if, in a divided household, the husband was abandoned by his wife owing to your teaching, then the wife (in ‘fellowship’ and living away from her husband) is now free to return to him and live and eat with him in normal marital conditions, and would be regarded as righteous?

IV—AN ASSESSMENT OF THE MATTER

(1)—The whole of your teaching, and all connected with it (enforcement, etc.) is wrong.

- (i) It is not in accord with Scripture ;
- (ii) It is marked by corruption, violence and ignorance of God ;
- (iii) It is devoid of the features of Christ and the truth of the body ; room for the Holy Spirit ; and the representation of God.

(2)—Recovery can not be anticipated. There is no basis for it. God does not work that way.

(3)—What is needed is its complete repudiation and individual return to first principles ; what was from the

beginning ; the Scriptures and the sound ministries of J.N.D. and F.E.R. and what is sound in the ministry of J.T., with the complete renouncement of the false and intensely dangerous doctrines of supreme leadership and authoritative teaching, and the teachings and the practices which flowed from them.

(4)—This would involve the complete dissolution of the Exclusive sect, with its clear implications for you and all your supporters.

But God requires what is past.

LOOKING "OVER THE SURFACE OF THE WASTE"

(Num. 23 : 28)

- A. In His love for His assembly the Lord Jesus, in these last days, raised up righteous men of God, signally used in the Spirit's grace and power for recovery of the truth of Christ and the assembly.
- B. These holy servants of the Lord devoted themselves for long years to unreserved sacrificial service for Christ and His assembly. As a result, even within our time discernible features of distinctive assembly glory came clearly into view for heaven's delight and the enrichment and encouragement of the saints.
- C. Under the Lord's sovereign hand, the light became yet brighter ; there was the gain of abundant and rich spiritual ministry of Christ in the Spirit's power yielding fruit for God and reflected in the consistent and attracting walk of pious and faithful men and women in holy spiritual devotedness.

D. Love was dominant and manifest. What wondrously happy relationships of fellowship developed and were enjoyably experienced all over the world, resulting in much positive help in mutuality of faith and love and spiritual sympathies, and the further emergence of precious assembly truth and service with its choice yield for God and for men, in addition to the joy and edification of the brethren.

E. NOW YOU HAVE BROUGHT IN RUIN.

I will write you again,

Faithfully yours,

HUBERT CALVEY

Southport—28th April, 1966

MR. JAMES TAYLOR JR.

Behaviour in the House of God

(No. 5)

Dear Mr. Taylor,

“Righteousness is the assertion of God’s rights” (F.E.R.). The assembly is peculiarly the sphere of God’s rights. The time to assert God’s rights is long overdue. I therefore write you again. I am under obligation to do so.

Contending for the Faith

Thus Jude, in the presence of apostasy, says, “I

have been obliged to write to you exhorting you to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints". G.R.C. said, "What is precious to God is here, and is to be defended." This implies conflict. Over 30 years ago your father said, "The most important service I see to-day is to preserve according to God what there is." (Vol. 128 p. 63). But now we witness the most deplorable ruin; through the assertions of man's mind and will. What is precious has been perverted by false teaching, bolstered up by evil actions. There is now persistence on a self-willed course which has heaped dishonour on the Name of Jesus, and caused such shame and havoc that there would seem to be "no remedy" (2 Chron. 36:16). Meetings for ministry have been multiplied, concurrent with the elimination of the Holy Spirit from His own territory. The Lord is looking for His disciples *to abandon* such a system of manifest iniquity.

But amidst the ruin, the need exists of discerning and resisting the onrush of evil, regardless of the guise assumed or the tool Satan uses. Individuals may have to be named (as in 2 Timothy) where they constitute a centre of special danger or responsibility. Everything needs to be spread out in the light. What is nefarious is parading itself as spirituality's 'new look.' It is not what was "from the beginning." And if persons glory in their infamous exploits why should their distinctions (often amply earned) be denied them? Saints of God have to be warned. "Against whom be thou also on thy guard." We know the source of immediate danger to-day.

Moreover who can number the times that simple,

inoffensive saints have, in what spuriously arrogates to itself what belongs to Christ's assembly, been publicly arraigned personally and by name, cruelly slandered, scorned and bear-baited in your meetings during the last awful six years?

“ Is there not a cause? ”

Such considerations and the spread of the gangrene constrain me to write you again. “ It is laid upon me ”; a matter challenging every true priestly feeling—already long-enduring—and of cherishing the heritage of the saints (so imperilled) and the testimony of Jesus (now unrecognisable) and the honour of Christ (so compromised) and the truth of God (so misrepresented and manipulated “in the sleight of men”), and—in mind night and day—the prolonged and intensified sufferings of saints of God *unrighteously persecuted* and set at naught, and their *families so scattered and destroyed*.

The judgment-seat of Christ will suffice. As to how you will stand then, before *the Christ of God*, is your matter now.

I have brought before you a mere fragment of what has been perpetrated. Much of it everybody knows—except yourself!

I would welcome your reply, as I may have to publish my further letters to you.

The Doubts of your Disciples

It is astounding to find how many of your nominal adherents—sharing, in your ‘fellowship,’ your heavy responsibilities—admit privately to having serious misgivings as to your teachings and their part in it all.

“ The position ” is a cocoon of untruth. There is a fair-sized meeting with you where *not one person in it* is in agreement with you—or willingly conforms to your edicts—but they conceal this. I admire their enlightenment but deplore their unrighteousness.

A typical case, in Scotland

A brother on the Moray coast has told me that he had had in mind severing his connections with “ Bethesda ” and was attending your meeting locally. He was minded to ask for your ‘ fellowship ’; until he heard your statement that *all not breaking bread with you are “ unclean ”* and not to be eaten with. He did not go to your meeting again. When visited by two “ Exclusivist ” brothers who wished to know why, he said *your statement referred to was “ plain untruth.”* Also, as regards Eating, he was accustomed to visit his aged mother, a bright believer, in poor health, and having weekly a meal or tea with her. The two “ Exclusivists ” reassured him that to eat thus with his mother would not be a hindrance “ provided nobody was told about it.” This settled the matter for him. He “ would have nothing to do with a system of such untruth and deceit.”

Lying deceit and hypocrisy permeates your sect.

I. THE WRECKING OF HOMES AND FAMILIES

I feel I must refer again to this subject on account of the moving letters I have received, from many suffering through your wicked teachings and enforcements. How absurd for you to assert that if the husband or wife or any child of responsible age—21 years or even less has

been mentioned by you as the datum line—is not, or ceases to be, in your ‘fellowship’ then the home is unclean until such one leaves the home or is ‘abandoned’ by the others.

Even living in the same divided home (a proviso which condemns the code and its author) under the same ‘unclean’ roof, in the case of husband and wife, they must maintain a ritual separation from one another entirely and not live in normal marital or even ‘conversational’ conditions. Has anyone ever before heard of such imbecility! But it is not only ‘Taylorish tosh’ but extremely evil and cruel, especially where there are children. Not one of your “three great ministers,” or C.A.C. ever said such rubbish. They would have condemned it, in stronger terms than I use. And how you seek vainly to manipulate the word of God to subserve your wicked sectarian ends!

And you added, also without any warrant, the further foolish edict that natural relations are not to be greeted or even recognised in any circumstances unless in your ‘fellowship’—and especially if, in their wisdom, they have ‘abandoned’ it. The Lord said, “even as I have loved you,” and spoke of the testimony in “having love among yourselves,” and told us to “wash one another’s feet.” To interpret the Lord’s words in a sectarian way, as you try to do, is *the complete negation of the truth*. I admit I find great difficulty in commenting restrainedly on the leader, the teachings and the responsible doings of your sect. Did you not enjoin your adherents to let people know that there was a circle where there was love? If they listened to that they would be *criminally misled*. Who was it said that

“ With an unruly child you might have to have *a gaol in your house, with confinement all the time, and food put into the room* ” ? *It was you.* (Cincinnati, Dec., 1961). But there are *loads* of such ‘ ministry ’—only fit to be burnt, as showing the bankruptcy of love and truth, devoid of the spirit of the Master, in your barricaded sect.

It is clear that you have not gathered up much of the rich treasure in the “ three great ministries ” and C.A.C.

C.A.C. speaking of the territory east of the Jordan says it refers to the region of natural things and relationships, the sphere of responsible life, “ and it is the will of God that it should be possessed and held by His people as from Him and for Him ” (Deuteronomy pp. 22-25). God appointed three of the cities of refuge to be there—*and they are still there!* And most certainly you are in perfect ignorance of J.N.D.’s teaching as to natural relationships. You must know, though you cannot be expected to admit it, that your edicts, for which there is not one shred of sound authority, as to natural relations and “ eating ” are now widely disregarded. This intensifies the unrighteousness. Certainly the situation which increasingly confronts you from *within* is not being faced. And you can never withdraw your edicts. You neither withdraw nor modify; but varnish over. Yet the rash actions which were taken and the extravagant assertions made at the outset by your “ enforcement divisions ” are on record; already they make nonsense of much that you say to-day.

Letters from New Zealand, Scotland and elsewhere

say “ Things are much easier now; the pressure has lifted.” This simply means that your requirements, which still stand, are being wholesalely ignored. But truth does not change. Then, where does untruth lie ? A letter from Australasia adds the rider, “ but we aren’t allowed to eat with the black sheep.” This exposes the hollowness of the “ Eating ” fiasco (and what extreme things were said, many in print, when that wicked teaching was launched and with such vim by many in London, U.S.A. and elsewhere) but it also brings out further the immorality of it all and the more so as the persons even now discriminated against are true believers (too true, indeed, for your mix-up!).

Some recent cases and extracts of letters
(received by me)

I have no facilities to reproduce all I have received. I may quote others later. Those now cited constitute a minute cross-section of the universal woe. Some who have read them have been deeply moved. But the grave matter of responsibility cannot be avoided.

1. *Locality.* North of England.

Date. Two or three months ago.

Facts. A brother was subjected to persistent strong pressure, by the brethren, to get married. He withdrew. Two leading local brothers later called on him with a view to his ‘ recovery.’ He had no thought of returning, and enlarged on your awful teachings and terrible enforcements, in the matter of husbands having to leave wives, etc.; but to his astonishment the elder of the two brothers said *he did not* go with that teaching; and therefore there would be no difficulty through what the visited brother had said.

But the latter's amazement was complete when the other of the two (and who on 'Toronto' level, moves in 'ministry') stated that not only did he not go with that teaching, but in fact, he had *never* gone with it at all!

This reveals the conditions prevalent in your sect. The two brothers in 'fellowship' are, nevertheless, supporting your evil teachings; and doings; and in local 'assembly' administration take their part in the enforcement of those wicked doctrines and methods and—it clearly follows—even to *the "committal of others to Satan" on the very ground on which they admitted they stood themselves.* They are one with the whole system professedly, despite their privately expressed reservations. I know that in the past they have scathingly condemned "neutrality and compromise"—*in others!*

This is typical of the moral—or immoral—quality of "the position" of which you and they so often speak.

2. Letter, February, 1966.

"We have also here the . . . family . . . related to . . . (a leading brother in the Home Counties). *They, as a family, organised the D-Day of my daughter-in-law's abduction and the kidnapping of my granddaughter.*"

3. Letter, March, 1966.

"Impressions that Dr. T. got during his long stay in the States were also very disturbing. I am very thankful too to be away from Africa where those of my family passed me as if they did not know me."

4. Case visited Lord's day 20th March, 1966; near Manchester.

An aged and beloved sister, a bright believer, has been in hospital for some months with extremely painful sores all over her body, brought on (according to the medical specialists) by long-sustained nervous and mental pressures. Her husband, an upright Christian, has never broken bread, foreseeing the developments of the last five years. Their daughter, in London, in your ‘fellowship,’ refuses to have anything to do with her mother since the latter was withdrawn from (five years ago) *solely for refusing to leave her husband* (despite your saying that you had never said this!). The daughter in her rare and painful communications quotes you as the authority for the rightness of her ‘abandonment’ of her mother.

Strong, unrelenting pressure was put upon this dear sister by your fierce young Manchester zealots over a long period, particularly one whom you *well* know whose zeal is excelled only by his ignorance. He repeatedly said he was acting under your authority and in fact in your name. At his final visit—final owing to our sister standing firm—when at the gate of and leaving our sister’s house he called out loudly in the street, “*Mrs. . . . go and leave him,*” (referring to our sister’s husband); “go and live with a brother; that will bring him to.” (Such is the moral level of your votaries). He then again cited your name.

Is this one of the exploits you are proud of?

5. *Later* (April, 1966). Our sister’s health is causing greater concern. The sores, which overspread her body, with their painfulness night and day, are spreading to her eyes. She has had, after these five years, an unanticipated visit from her daughter who is

still in your 'fellowship.' Did the latter do wrong in disobeying your edict? What is clear is that in this case the truth did not lie with the daughter; or with the Manchester brethren. I would add that neither did it lie with you. It clearly lies where it has all along—with the dearly beloved but suffering and persecuted and mocked-at sister—*persecuted on your express directions.*

Have you any conscience at all?

6. *Letter, 21st March, 1966.*

"My own married daughter in London tells us her life has been made unbearable by this . . . teaching. Her husband is a fanatic, and although they are both in the meeting, she consulted a solicitor with a view to separation, but he advised her not to leave her husband as he doubted if she would then have enough to live on (with three children), so she has not left him yet.

My sister-in-law grieved with their hardness of heart . . . she did a little shopping for a bed-ridden old lady over 80 years (*her neighbour*) and for this was turned out of the meeting."

7. *From letters received 14th March, 1966, and 13th April, 1966.*

(Mr. Taylor—I draw your special attention to this case as *again*, it bears on your statement, so false, that you have never said that husbands should leave wives, etc.).

"I thank God that when this nonsense started about the Eating, etc., five and a half years ago, my eyes were opened and I left the sect. Life was very strained, of course, and then when further rules were made my husband walked out of a room if I walked in; he never

spoke, etc., etc. . Then I was given an ultimatum to return to "The Position"; if not, he would have to leave me, which he did four years ago. *I have now come over to England to work . . .* I have one son, quite a fanatic 'In' and two sons 'Out.'

My mother who left the sect at 80½ years old was turned out of her home. Also, my sister-in-law is not allowed to see her dear mother.

A nephew of my husband's was turned out of his home last August in Dublin, his name is . . . they lived in a little village called Ratharney.

In August, 1964, I stood outside Dorking Halls sending messages to Jim Taylor inside asking him would he see us and modify his doctrine and stop breaking up marriages. He refused to see us.

When my husband left me he made it quite clear to me that James Taylor Jr., was *the Universal Leader . . . he also made it quite clear to me that it was the ministry of Jim Taylor that he could no longer live with me.* When he left me I demanded a letter stating the reasons for his departure. On several occasions when with great difficulty I wanted to see him, more on a business basis, I asked him, "Why did you leave me?" (although I had of course the letters). He stated on one occasion that I was "*unclean*"; and it was *the 'present ministry.'* On another occasion, when I asked again, he said, "I did not leave you, you left me; when I married you, you were in "The Position," *and when you left "The Position" you automatically left me.*" My answer was, "You married me—not "The Position." "

(I omit the awful details here of rife immorality in

your Sect).

“A dear ‘ In ’ sister who is *terrified of her family being taken from her*, told me that the latest was that the partner who was ‘ In ’ had to say that the marriage was unhappy and that is why there were broken marriages. Evidently that has been ministered. So the last time I asked my husband to see me at the top of the road for a few minutes, that was *last July*, I said again, testing him, “ Why did you leave your home and me ? ” And he said, “ Because we were unhappy.” They will say and do anything to cover up their wicked actions.

Am enclosing copies of the letters my husband sent me when he first left.

There are volumes of cases I know of, of hardship and misery caused by James Taylor Jr., and his followers.”

(The essence of the three letters—witnessed by a Dublin ‘ In ’ brother—from the husband to the wife purporting to explain the reasons for his leaving her is that “ the Lord’s claims come first ” and that they did not feel that “ at present ” they were of one mind as to the truth.

A fair judgment of this case seems to be that the husband had no desire to leave his wife (in fact he says so) but he had to in order to remain in your ‘ fellowship. This *terribly sad case* demonstrates how evil your teachings are, weakening the testimony and also the marriage bond and belying the truth. But why should you be so careful to conceal what you put out as the truth of God ? Is it because you know it to be Satanic ?).

8. *From Letter, dated 9th April, 1966.*

“ Our next to youngest daughter is still ‘ In ’ and we did not have the joy of her wedding, nor, so far, have seen the three children. From this you can understand how we would desire eyes to be opened, even though this may be as regards the natural relationship standpoint. My wife’s sister and my brother . . . will have nothing to do with us; and so many we loved, and still do, are in this terrible bondage with eyes so blind that only the touch of the Lord Jesus will open them to see the ditch into which they have fallen.”

9. *What it all tends to lead to.*

Extract from letter dated 10th April, 1966.

“ You may have heard of the suicide in . . . (our brother Mr. . . . would let you have the full details) . . . A brother and his wife were both put out by the ‘ In’s.” (There was possibly *some slight difference* of temperament). “ However, the wife still wanted to get back to the ‘ In’s ” because of *her son*, who, however, was apparently one of the extremists. The ‘ In’s,’ however, would not accept her without her husband. They tolerated her attending some of their meetings for a while, but after some time even this was stopped.

Recently she went to see her son, but only the children were at home. They were completely overjoyed to see their Grannie and asked her in. *When, however, her son returned he told her that she was not to darken his door again.* Completely prostrate with grief she replied, “ I will never be back ”—and she went to her own home straightaway, took an overdose of sleeping tablets, and died.

The ‘ In’s ’ had the audacity to take on the burial.”

This sad happening is another fairly clear moral index of how evil your system has now become *in your hands*.

10. *Note of a case, March, 1966.*

A fortnight ago I was told (without my enquiring) by a near relation of a young sister—a victim of what has been perpetrated on your directions—of what exactly happened, in a case south of Lancashire. I know every one of the individuals mentioned. The sister was married, living at her home, and happily breaking bread. When commended to the local brethren to break bread she explained that she was employed by the local authority under a term contract as her work was of an essential character involving practical benevolent activities even including one day a week visiting the open prison. The brethren had no difficulty. But 4½ years ago, following your teaching, she was forbidden by the ‘Exclusivists’ to continue her employment even for the remaining few months of the contract, because she was married. She felt she must righteously honour her contract with her employers; the work was of a kind that interruption could not be allowed; desiring to act right she even advertised for someone to replace herself but in vain. A local brother then telephoned you personally in America and you replied that “*the sister could not be allowed to continue in sin* for the few remaining months.” So this dear young and devoted sister was withdrawn from, and “committed to Satan,” and “cast out of Christ’s assembly,” placed “under discipline,” etc., etc. What rubbish! One might well ask what sort of Christianity is this?

But a week or two ago, *after 4½ years*, two leading local brothers called on their own initiative, upon this sister, and said that they had come to the conclusion that they were *wrong* in withdrawing from her; they desired her return for which the way was at once perfectly clear. It seems that, in effect, any confession was, though so feebly and privately, by the local brethren after 4½ years' "assembly conscience."

I trust the dear sister is not so deluded as to go back to you and *your* tender mercies! (2 Sam. 24 : 14). The system is unchanged, save for the worse. But the case gives rise to important questions:—

- (a) Is it righteously disposed of by such a procedure?
- (b) What about the sorrows of the 4½ years?
- (c) And the unrighteousness of the matter from beginning to end?
- (d) Is what was unrighteous 4½ years ago righteous to-day?
- (e) Is your judgment still what it was 4½ years ago? Apparently not or they would be contravening the will of their supreme leader? So you have changed!
- (f) If your telephoned directive of 4½ years ago was wrong then many deeper questions arise.
- (g) Many beloved persecuted saints have been given scarcely 4½ *minutes* to make up their mind.
- (h) God requires that which is past.
- (i) What about other parallel cases? And your attitude thereto?
- (j) *If the approach now, though belated, is right, then you cannot escape the fact that you were wrong at that critical moment (and subsequently) in Central Hall, Westminster, in July, 1959.*

- (k) Further questions arise regarding the opening statements made on p. 316 of “ The Recovery of the Truth ” (A.J.G.). See also your Vol. 14, p. 163.
- (l) I presume you now think this young disciple of Christ will go up at the Rapture? Or does it hinge on whether she is so misguided as to turn back to your contemptible camp?

11. *Letter, 8th March, 1966.*

“ Mr. . . . so far has eluded all publicity. He is a cunning coward. It is through him I was robbed of my husband. In my desperation I smashed his windows one Sunday morning simply to make him take me to . . . Police Court. He sent for the police. They asked him if he wanted to take out a summons. He said, “ She has cracked my window,” I said, “ No, I haven’t, I have smashed it.” But he would not take a summons out which I urged him to do. *He was afraid of what might be brought to light.* . . . His dear mother died of a broken heart; she knew how he was breaking up homes all over the country. He has a lot to answer for. He is a wicked man, a disciple of J.T. Jr.”

12. *Letter, March, 1966.*

“ Mr . . . came ‘ Out ’ after a terrible time, which reduced him to a mental breakdown as he was being FORCED TO RENOUNCE HIS FAMILY FOR EVER. He was so ill that he had to retire earlier than he would have done.”

Your Ministry and the Brotherly Spirit

Looking through some of your ministry I find *much* further evidence of the manipulation and ignoring of

Scripture, to support your false teachings. Protectively you have your own terminology. Often you contradict yourself. Specific matters requiring answer are bypassed. Vague terms are used.

Your Vol. 14 is replete with disarming references to “the brotherly spirit.” Mr. Taylor, you know not a thing about that, as your ministry and enforcements amply prove. Paul spoke of coming to Rome “in the fulness of the blessing of Christ.” What refreshment *he* would bring! But a trail of intense sorrows follows in your wake. You are surrounded with it in every locality you visit. Intermittently you find it politic to relax the pressure and change your tune—but such expedients add to the inconsistencies, and do but the more condemn your actions and remarks and the deceit of it all. It is all a welter of Tayloresque untruth.

You earlier said that persons withdrawn from were *committed to Satan*. In fact you went even further than this. Now (page 326) you say, “We *do not* take the ground of that, committing persons to Satan”—but you bypass the strong fact that it was a wicked thing to have said it—but then you add, “*but in result it would be the same.*” That is typical Taylorism.

And then it was a *shocking* thing for you to say that all believers throughout the world not in your ‘fellowship’ are “under discipline.” You really need to be reined in.

DIVIDED HOUSEHOLDS

I understand that on the basis of your Southampton ministry in Vol. 14 (according to a letter I received a

fortnight ago from New Zealand), Mr. Ron Deck cabled or telephoned Brian Ivory that husbands need not leave wives (and vice versa). But if that were true, which it was not, why should the matter of offers of “providing accommodation and the like” have been considered (page 163) in regard of wives contemplating or being induced to contemplate such “abandonments”?

Pages 213 to 219—so typical—of that Volume on this matter are vague and evasive, scarcely intelligible. An honest man would have stated clearly what he meant on such an important matter, if only to ensure universal uniformity (in the wickedness) and as even neutrality is peremptorily answered by harsh discipline on your directions. But if questions on those pages are vague, your replies are vaguer still. The very questions, where understandable, join with your answers in condemning your teachings and yourself. For instance, enquiry had to be made, from you, as to “the physical side” of separation of husbands and wives *where there are babies or little children or severe illnesses*. Concession seems to be granted in certain cases involving natural feelings yet, as is well-known, in other parts of your confusing and self-contradictory “authoritative ministry” you have forbidden abatement *on any grounds at all*. “God’s claims come first.” Any concessions are now attributed to “priesthood”—mere face-saving plausibility to make a show of principle. And what sort of a reply to a specific question on such a subject is your answer, “The truth would have to be worked out in us—the truth shall set you free!” *The Son* would set *all* free from

you and *the whole* weltering morass. Then you speak of the husband not being right and the wife a priest. But you completely ignore the sure fact (e.g. on pp. 214 and 219) *that the wife remains ever under her husband's headship*. In so many cases your disruptions have sprung from blandishments to wives contrary to this truth but in line with Gen. 3. Elsewhere you speak of rights when you should have referred to responsibilities. And why should Mr. McCallum have felt it necessary to obtain your ruling about the taking away of a baby from its mother's breast? Even nature has failed to teach you. In one sentence you speak of *presumed* conditions at Pentecost (you, who ignore 1 Cor. 7) and, in the next, of Malachi at the *end* of the *old* dispensation; but how you can face Malachi's prophecy I cannot understand, e.g. ch. 2: 14-17. You speak of Isaac and Rebekah typically, and ignore Paul's teaching on practical natural family relationships which God has set up. And why should you have had to say as regards little children, "*So you could not abandon a child nor could you remove it either*"? And then, to keep the matter in perspective, J.M. said (page 217), and it was not contested, and could not be, "There have been cases where young children have been taken away;" to which crystal-clear and eloquent condemning statement your reply is very unsatisfactory; so that a brother conscious of the obscurity then speaks of putting things plainly. But things have not yet been put plainly because you dare not do so. You rely on self-contradictory vagueness. It is all unsatisfactory, and unrighteous. It is evil teaching.

But there are not only the questions but the implications from the questions, four of the most revealing ones being asked by Mr. McCallum—children on mother's breasts—babes—severe illness! *Did your ministry really relate to Christianity*, and the holy teachings of the Lord Jesus?—or to what did they refer? What insensibilities! What exposure of the system! And the leader (and his dupes)! And not a challenge raised; not an effort to raise the deplorably low level, in a reading ostensibly based on John's writings! Presumably the volume and five readings are given the title "The Second Family" because the First has been scattered by carnal minds and methods—and guilty hands.

And what *relevant* references to the Scriptures are there in those five readings? *Practically nothing.*

And in those cases where husband and wife are "permitted" by the "authoritative ministry" and the 'priest' in the locality, to continue to live under the same roof, what becomes of your foolish unimpeded babblings about "unclean houses"?

And how can there be scrupulous conformity to an utterly legal code which no one understands? And where your despicable 'priests' have such latitude?

And that particular reading having been on the Saturday afternoon I wonder how you all went on with your consciences on the following 'essential occasion'?

Quite recently, Mr. McCallum, in Glasgow—how extremely submissive and servilely deferential your loyalists have to be whether from London or Detroit!—said that you had never stated that wives should leave husbands or vice versa. That again was untruth.

And he has forgotten his part in the readings at Southampton!

(a) If he were right—which he was not—what is all the world-wide distress about? Have many hundreds of homes been shipwrecked for the fun of it? Who sowed the tares! And who wrecked the homes?

(b) Has he ever *condemned* the abandonment of husbands by wives, etc., as one of the inevitable fruits, twice-dead, of your abominable teachings? How negative his remark was! *But how 'loyal'!*

(c) Did he make any effort to set Glasgow right, according to the tenor of his unfounded statement, in view of their unjudged acts and assertions in this extensive and momentous matter? If not, was he then failing to pursue righteousness and merely applying again a little oily face-cream?

Further, it is perfectly ludicrous for you to say (pp. 215,217) that everything done should be capable of being justified. Also, you still offensively and unrighteously regard any person not in your "Exclusive" set-up as necessarily having "sin upon him." And then, when you so dishonestly say (p. 215), "We cannot undermine the position that we are in, in regard to our fathers and mothers, or vice-versa. There is our responsibility there, that we cannot violate," are you not giving the lie direct to other of your directives? There are remarks on page 216 which completely cut across your other ministry, especially on 2 Tim. 2.

In the face of all this bewildering and dangerous chatter about husbands, wives and children, whatever do you really mean? But your 1961-1966 universal

actions speak louder than your 1962 Southampton words. Not far from Southampton at that time there were real and sad facts which exposed the hollowness of your words there. Those facts too have not yet been faced.

And have you modified what you said in 1963 at Barbados on this subject?

“The Position,” which so many have been decoyed into regarding as Jerusalem, shows no trace of being either “above” or “free.” There is certainly nothing resembling a crystal-like jasper stone. How is that? Because it is clearly part of “the camp.” Elevation, and liberty, and transparency, are found *outside* of it all—where Christ is. Away from man’s changeable notions and temperamental whims and baseless assertions, and his ways and his will.

“Where deceiver ne’er can enter,
Sin-soiled feet have never trod;
Free, our peaceful feet may venture
In the paradise of God.”

Even as minded to write you now I have received letters from all over the world, speaking in the same sorrowing and indignant terms of the unspeakable developments which characterise your inglorious reign—truly a “Reign of Terror.” Before going on with my observations to you I give extracts from or résumé of these further communications so received by me.

13. *Letter, 13th April, 1966, from Montreal.*

“I was withdrawn from just over five years ago, because I took issue with Jim Taylor and his son-in-law Bruce Hales. At special meetings held here in

Montreal, at the time, Bruce Hales spoke of Mr. Cowell as "a minister of Satan." I challenged this wickedness. The local brethren hounded me out of the meeting accordingly. They subsequently influenced my wife and three children to leave the house. This they did a little over two years ago, after having for a year previously refused to eat, or have any links, with me. I have instituted legal proceedings against them and am awaiting developments. This has the approval of brethren here (four neighbouring towns mentioned as included in this). I will keep you informed." (This is a case on Mr. McCallum's doorstep that he should exercise himself about).

14. *Letter, 12th April, 1966, from New Zealand.*

"Mr. C. is one who has served the Lord faithfully, and is much valued. His wife, our sister, helps him. These dear couple have suffered much at the hand of the Taylorites, or Taylorism, call it what you like. They suffered also at the hands of their son M . . . who is still in with that party, and has been a fanatic."

15. *Letter, 29th March, 1966, from South of England.*

"My husband and myself and two sons were excommunicated by the Exclusive brethren five years ago. My husband was an A.M.I.E.E. and on this single item we were banished, and despite the fact that my husband took this qualification with the *full approval* of the brethren 10 years previously. As soon as the full blast of the Jim Taylor doctrine hit the brethren we were on the carpet. My husband and I were both brought up among the brethren, and kept a path of separation; and on that one item we were excommunicated. At the time it meant a great deal, and in

my husband's case he is cut off from two of his family. They were a devoted and united family. Then this evil doctrine came."

II OTHER VITAL CONSIDERATIONS

A. Committals binding on the people of God.

An important matter arises out of Case 10 above and the last letter 15 also cited. In 2 Sam. 21 it says, "There was a famine in the days of David three years, year after year;" and, when David at last inquired of Jehovah, Jehovah said, "It is for Saul, and for his house of blood, because he slew the Gibeonites." As to that J.N.D. states, "First of all, the government of God who forgets nothing, and with whom everything has its results, is recalled to David and to his people by means of the Gibeonites . . . There is a righteous judgment, *a moral principle of God, which is above all economies . . . Saul in his formal and fleshly zeal . . . had not acted in the fear of God . . . Saul forgets the oaths . . . God remembers it and does not despise the poor Gibeonites.*"

Committals entered into by the people of God cannot be irresponsibly swept aside to conform to a formal code. God will not allow oaths to be violated. Saul had sought to slay the Gibeonites "in his zeal" which as another has said was marked by "pride, arrogance and self-will, cloaked under a zeal for God's honour and His people's welfare." J.T. says Israel's covenant was virtually God's; and that Saul's infamy against people sheltered by God should have been known by David.

All this has a very real bearing on present matters. We well know, of course, that *you* could readily trump

up reasons for cutting off people like the Gibeonites—and even Rahab for instance, or anyone else for that matter—but you would be further at issue with God in doing it, and again show that “there is no fear of God” before your eyes.

B. The Marriage Vow

Precisely the same principle arises here. Most solemn oaths have been arbitrarily violated by your deluded devotees. And in so very many really terrible and disgraceful cases you, James Taylor Junior, have a very intimate and serious responsibility. “*Dost thou too not fear God?*”

Marriage is God’s institution (Gen. 2; Matt. 19; Mk. 10). (It was not limited to Israel). It is in this connection that the Lord draws attention to what was “from the beginning.”

The relationship cannot be weakened in the slightest by subtle dogmas or novel manipulations of Scripture craftily designated “authoritative teaching” merely that you may the more effectually *coerce* husbands and wives to remain within, or venture into, your now notorious ‘fellowship.’

The beloved sister—mentioned in Case 4 above—in Bolton, who had been persecuted and harassed beyond words in order to force her to leave (“abandon” is your stronger word) her loved husband (though you untruthfully state you have never enjoined this), told her feelingless relay of persecutors, your evil local tools, that she had vowed to remain with her husband “until death us do part.” This had not the slightest effect on them. But such committals are most solemnly entered into, between the parties concerned.

They are vows to, and before, God. They are formally solemnized in the presence of believers and relations.

Paul says, “Brethren, (I speak according to man) even man’s confirmed covenant no one sets aside, or adds other dispositions to.” (Gal. 3:15—see also Rom. 4:13-14). That assertion by Paul *completely nullifies your contention* that what is introduced later can vitiate or over-rule the marriage vow; and the more so when what is introduced is found perfectly untenable in the light of the well-established import of Scripture; and found suspect as to its motive of intensified coercion through untruth; and found evil in its operation and fruits (as it must be) as contrary to God and His thoughts. The marriage vow stands. God recognises it and supports it. You have no scruples about destroying it where and when it suits you.

Your votaries, in the case mentioned, scorned and derided the beloved sister’s reply, in her nerve-racked state and shattered health (she is still in hospital* and not improving), to their harassments in regimented force. But she was right. They were wrong; even as *you* are wrong—but then you affirmed (oftener than Simon Peter’s thrice) that you never said that husbands should leave wives, etc.!

Paul used *the very argument* that the dear sister did, to demonstrate that the law of God had to yield in the light of God’s covenant already made to Abram. But, as usual, you ignore such a decisive truth, the better to get away with what is untruth—the blackmail enforcement of your sinister exactions on simple, devoted

*We buried our sister on the 22nd December 1966.

Christian wives and husbands. All this is a peak of evil—with the quotation of the Lord's Name. Your responsibility is truly great.

Moreover, it all has a bearing on the well-being of the children—and their parents' mutual obligations to them, and their relationships with their parents.

C. Abductions of Wives (and Kidnapping of Children, etc.).

What have you to say on this matter? I am satisfied that you have been made aware of the happenings. Have you condemned it all? At present, the universal impression is that you approve of it all. Moreover, the bearing of many of your remarks, and replies, in readings, in their influence on the many fanatical hustlers and ranters in your sect, has to be considered.

Jeremiah speaks of those who know not how or what it is to blush—yet there is more cause now than then. One of the many monuments of shame was the scandalous case (but they are all scandalous) where the abduction was to a place *500 miles away*. And I include, in this letter, information of a grievous and sickening case (Dr. T. of Johannesburg) showing the unconscionable lengths (from another angle) to which the Exclusive sect are going under your supreme leadership. Why do you not start to be righteous? There is but one way. I have no doubt at all that you have thought that, by your own ingenuity, in one way or another you will be able to get away, disdainfully, with anything and everything. But, Mr. Taylor, you will get away with simply nothing. Unprinted—or unprintable—ministry may be just as condemning as

that which is published, and the absence of clear answers to clear questions, or vague or evasive or equivocal replies to simple questions tell their own tale. It is all noted.

I clearly perceive, from time to time, changes in the character and tone and orientation of your remarks. What will never, however, be tolerated is any sly shuffling back from nauseousness to normality, unobserved, under a sheltering smokescreen of studiedly obscure equivocations; for, like an adept musician, how artfully you are able to improvise—with variations—on whatever thesis you find it convenient to change to! But “In Him”—the Son of God, Jesus Christ,—“is the Yea, and in Him the Amen, for glory to God by us.”

D. A few details of the outrageous case of Dr. T. of Johannesburg (*from letter, 1st February, 1966, from Dr. T.*).

(a) Dr. T. is familiar with the conditions in the New York meetings. He clearly remembers your stating in Nostrand Avenue, in the absence of your father but before his death, that only those in the “Exclusivist” fellowship would be in heaven; and a subsequent remark by you that you doubted whether other Christians were really saved, your remark being based on your statement that if a person was converted it was the work of the Spirit. The Spirit never leaves His work incomplete. Consequently the Spirit would see that a converted person gets the light of and comes into the good of the Assembly, the Assembly being your sect (the Plymouth Brethren Exclusive Sect). Hence,

if a person did not break bread with the Exclusives there was no work of the Spirit with him and hence you doubted his conversion! What faithless, sectarian quackery!

In those days you were virtually in control of the New York meetings, and the unpleasant flavour of your own brand of teaching was becoming apparent.

(b) Later, two local brothers returned from New York obsessed with your theories and notions and practices, then beginning to be propagated, and Dr. T. with others could not concur in it and withdrew from 'fellowship,' also because the brethren would not judge overt evil because the persons concerned were supporters of your doctrines. Dr. T's wife and daughter remained 'In' and the "Exclusivists" began to incite them to oppose him.

(c) In 1957, the daughter having married, stronger pressure was sought to be exerted on Dr. T. to return, and the daughter and son-in-law were persistently urged not to allow Dr. T. to call any more at their house. Dr. T. says, "In 1963 when my daughter's second child was born I was told I could not even go to see the baby in the Maternity Home, or send presents, and to this day I have never yet spoken to my two grand-children (5 years and 3 years of age) although living only 1 mile away."

(d) In 1961, the Exclusivists increased the pressure further, and told his wife she was not to eat with him, but Dr. T. would not allow this as "Every man should bear rule in his own house" (Esther 1:22).

(e) On 10th October, 1962, the Exclusivists had a special reading, and Dr. T's wife was expressly told

to clear herself, otherwise she would be withdrawn from “for associating with evil!” (Some of the local brothers who did not oppose this, said privately afterwards that they did not agree with it!).

(f) Three weeks later, on Dr. T’s return home after being away on business, he found that his wife had left him, but he had no knowledge whatever of her whereabouts, or indeed as to the circumstances except that he found a note stating that she could no longer live with her husband because of “the ministry” and his non-acceptance of it.

(Note by H.C.—This action was four months after your Southampton ministry. It was and is contrary to Scripture and the truth; contrary to the words of Christ and Mrs. T’s. marriage vows. Yet you are seen as approving of it. It was done on the basis of your enforced ministry. You are responsible.

And with what subtlety you initiate and enforce such evil in all localities and then you seek to wash your stained hands and place the blame elsewhere, stressing that ministers must not interfere in local administration. What you have brought in has been interference in *every* locality. Every wicked trick is tried).

Dr. T’s wife has remained away from him since that date (5th November, 1962).

(g) As his wife had never had to work to earn her living, and was accustomed to comfortable conditions, Dr. T. sent her (when he was able to discover her whereabouts) £75 per month, freely, as she was without means of support. But after one year the Exclusivists told her that as her husband was “a wicked person”

she must no longer on any account accept any money from him.

(*Note by H.C.*—What appalling and cruel aggravation of evil! But you, so purblind, merely comment that the Father's works are seen as perfected in "*us*." Of the parties concerned, Dr. T, his wife, the local Exclusivists and yourself, in whom is the Spirit of Christ discernible?)

(h) She therefore had to go out and find work— at £40 per month *from a complete stranger*.

(*Note by H.C.*—Were Mrs. T's associations and circumstances in these enforced conditions more suited to the elevated thoughts of Christ, and your notion of righteousness, than would have been the case had she remained in her own home?)

In this month's New York Readings (29th Sept.) you yourself say, in your incomparable double-tonguedness, "The thing is that the home is a great principle with God." Please state, then, why you, like Saul, are ravaging and savaging so many homes? You say there, too, "Bringing people into bondage is not grace." You further say, "If you go to extremes in forcing a principle it is legality." But who has been more extreme than yourself and your supporters? And whose 'principles' are they that you so strenuously enforce? In that reading, Mr. Vincent Lock (with the servility which diffuses what flatters but ignores what common honesty would expose) said that you had habitually asked the Spirit every day to help you to be righteous. *Perhaps that is why He has led me to write you.* But you cannot blame this overwhelming existent mass,

and mess, of unrighteousness on the blessed Spirit. I blame it on you).

Later she worked in a dilapidated shanty for a builder (an Exclusivist). Meanwhile, the Exclusivists lost no opportunity of telling Dr. T. that he had no love for his wife in letting her live in such conditions—a perfectly typical instance of perversion of facts, distorted views, unscrupulous coercion, and effort to transfer responsibility, all in line with your wicked teachings and methods, universally the order of the day in your sect.

(i) But Dr. T. stood firm, and pointed out that your doctrines and doings are contrary to Scripture, and a dishonour to the Lord and His testimony.

(j) Dr. T. further writes:—

“About 3 months after my wife left me, for three weeks I stood outside in the street near the meeting-room gate, in sunshine or in rain, at every meeting which took place. My wife, my daughter and all the brethren walked past me. Nothing was spoken, I was ignored, except that three or four told me to repent; but I quietly replied that I was looking for my wife whom they (like David, in the matter of Uriah) had stolen from me.

On 31st May, 1965, a public holiday, hearing that my wife was spending a few days at my daughter's house, I sat in my car, outside in the street, directly in front of my daughter's house from 8 a.m. until 7 p.m. I saw my wife looking at me through the window. My son-in-law passed purposely within a yard, without any recognition. Eventually, at about 2 p.m., a covered van, belonging to an Exclusivist,

drove into my daughter's yard, and shortly afterwards it emerged and drove away. Later, I learnt that my wife was then spirited away in this van to an unknown destination, where she remained for several months, and all my attempts to trace her were fruitless. At 4 p.m. my daughter walked past my car without looking at me. Then my son-in-law and my daughter with their two children drove out in their car. When I left at 7 p.m. they had not returned. The whole day I was completely ignored.

That night I wrote an affectionate letter to my wife pleading with her to return to me and to our earlier happiness together, and the next morning I sought to deliver it in person at my daughter's house, thinking that my wife was still there. My daughter opened a side window, and I said, "Good morning, will you kindly"—holding out the letter to her—"hand this" (the window was at this point banged shut without a word from my daughter). I was going to ask her to hand it to her mother but I never had the opportunity. I waited outside for 15 minutes, but no one reappeared and I left. Later, I told three Exclusionist brothers of the incident but they merely retorted that I should bow to "the ministry"!

But I retain one precious, sweet memory of that intensely sad day, 31st May, 1965. It was an exceedingly hot day and, while waiting outside the house as I have explained, and without food or drink, a neighbour of my son-in-law came to my car and said, "I have seen you sitting here the whole day; can I do something for you or give you something to eat or drink?" We were complete strangers. I declined

his kindness, but found he was a dear believer on the Lord Jesus, and of the Methodist Church. He told me that my son-in-law had stated he could have nothing to do with him, because my son-in-law regarded him as an "unclean" person. In the deep sorrow and exercise which were mine I was impressed with the similarity of my experience with that of the wounded man on the Jericho road; and the compassions and ministrations of the Lord in Luke ch. 10 have taken on a much deeper meaning for me."

In a later letter, Dr. T. speaks of the comfort he found in Job 7:17, "What is man that Thou makest much of him and that Thou settest Thy heart upon him and that Thou visitest him every morning." He says, "How delightful to think that I had a visit from *Him* this morning, and will have every morning. His love underlies his every visitation.

I have not heard from my wife for weeks now, but I learn very indirectly that my daughter's little boy says he wants to see his other grandfather, "Mammy's Daddy," and he also wants to see the house "where Mammy grew up." All this really breaks my heart. How it proves how unnatural are the so-called Christian teachings of J.T. Jr. A young boy has right natural feelings and wants to meet his grandfather; but J.T. Jr. says such natural affections are sinful and he must be taught to disown those feelings."

The foregoing sets before you but a poignant few of the many heart-rending facts regarding the sad and scandalous case—already widely known—of Dr. T. Every one of the numerous cases condemns yourself, your teachings (so false) and the practices (so un-

speakably cruel) which you enjoin and enforce. And the more the "details" are spelt out, the greater the condemnation. In each instance there is the same tragic background and the same story of hard, relentless rigour, completely foreign to the spirit of Christ and true Christianity. In many cases of divided households and wrecked homes, the perpetuation of the existing deplorable conditions means that every day spells out for each one in the family long drawn-out hours of heartbreak, day and night. You treat it all with complete insouciance. All this is current still in your perverted and disgusting system, which wholly misrepresents God. Over against that is the surfeit of your nauseating utterances—which obviously are craftily hypocritical—such as "Grace is the character of the dispensation;" "let us be on family lines together;" "the Father's works are perfected in us;" "Paul would be delighted to see in us the fruits of his ministry;" "Christianity is being like Christ;" and constant references to "the new covenant," etc., etc.—thousands of them. In your Vol. 14, on p. 212 we read, "The brotherly spirit is what God loves;" on p. 214 we read, "So you could not abandon a child, nor could you remove it either." There must surely be mental as well as a moral deficiency somewhere, or you could not be so un-Christian and inhuman.

But I believe God is now on the move to bring to heel those responsible for what exists. For there is still ever so much which should be brought out into the open.

E. 1 Corinthians ch. 7

In "Ministry of the Word" for January, 1966,

(p. 33) you say, “ So that 1 Cor. 7 is a chapter that would make us question certain things.” It most certainly would. It makes us not only question but repudiate as wicked what you yourself have said and enforced as to divided households. You say you “ teach Scripture; ” but how adept you are at ignoring it when it suits you! I wrote you as to this very chapter on 26th October, 1965, and drew attention at some length to the wilful ignoring of it in the evils which have marked out the course of the “ Exclusivists ” under your direction over recent years. I received no reply. I told you of that disgraceful—not necessarily exceptional—care and assembly meeting at Park Street, London, in June, 1962, when a brother got up to give a prophetic word (and one, certainly, at least, was needed) and *began to read* 1 Cor. 7, but Bruce Litchfield told him to sit down as they had had ministry—that was *your* ministry—on that chapter. As though there would be nothing further that could be said when you had spoken! But God will have the last word. (Maybe He is speaking now). So we see how Scripture is treated—even at Park Street and in the presence of those who knew better—as an unnecessary and inconvenient irrelevance, even 1 Cor. 7, when it does not suit the notions and the ends of the Exclusivists. And certainly not only was a *prophetic word* needed that evening as the awful proceedings proved, but 1 Cor. 7 was abundantly needed as the more awful conclusions arrived at demonstrated.

But you cannot say anything profitable about 1 Cor. 7 until you accept it, for you have sought time and time again to explain it away. It is an awkward Scrip-

ture for you. But you say you teach Scripture!

You were right in saying that "1 Cor. 7 would make us question certain things." The number of such things has been substantially augmented by your enforced teachings. The truth of the matter is that *you have been completely wrong, and grievously injurious to righteous men and women and children, for five long years, and those persons were your brethren, and their families, whatever you may call them (and you have called them many awful and untrue things).*

And then you are sufficiently brazen-faced—I say nothing at the moment of your honesty—to get up and give an address on "How prophecy keeps us right!"

And if Bruce Litchfield was alluding, as he was indeed, to your own ministry, are you saying anything different now? And why? And what about the awful cases, such as those mentioned by me earlier in this letter, and what about the tragic cases which were "disposed of" at the Park Street meeting in June, 1962, and innumerable other cases of which such were but typical? *The whole thing is literally hideous; and you seem devoid of conscience. Righteously, it should all be impartially looked into—and it may yet be—in all its lurid and wicked and sickening detail. I challenge you personally to take steps to this end.* Your wicked teaching constitutes even a menace to the public weal in every country it contaminates.

And, as I told you, at that very meeting in Park Street the mouths of the prophets were peremptorily shut up—they should not have given way—even as to the reading of this very Scripture which you now, somehow, think it convenient (maybe as a political move)

to cite; the Scriptures being thus publicly, in Park Street, London, given an inferior place to your own completely unreliable and variable and unfruitful and often untruthful utterances although the truth has been hitting you in the face for five long years during which *you* certainly have *not* been “kept right.”

I have, indeed, wondered how and when you came to discover that there was a chapter 7 in 1 Corinthians. (Maybe you did well to stay long on chs. 1 to 5). And now that you have awakened to its existence in the inspired word of God you are under obligation to say, openly and clearly, that your teachings require adjustment.

But prophecy could never keep anyone right or commence to get you right if there were no prophets; and they all seem to be slain or muzzled or scared—of a mere man! If there were but one true prophet of God the whole of your shabby and discredited edifice would soon totter to its suited ruin. But man’s will and pride do not willingly tolerate the embarrassment of a true prophet. God, however, has ample resources. “Be it a question of strength, lo he is strong.”

It was said by a brother, now with the Lord, (your vol. 34, page 13)—

“Do the saints templewise furnish a spiritual vigilance and guard the truth when any statement foreign to it is introduced? Are the saints competent and obligated to judge?”

How is it then that your evil ministry resulting in the wrecking of homes and families has had such universal currency—a *base currency*, in truth—for five long years?

I notice that during the Belfast reading last November, on Canticles, on which I have already written you and still have much to say, G.F.G. quoted, "So is my love among the daughters" (ch. 2:12). But that dear brother did not go on to say where the daughters are. *And if anyone should have known he should.* As G.F.G. is well aware, many daughters have been absolutely forced to leave home, and father, and mother, or the whole family might have found themselves individually "committed to Satan," etc., etc., by your 'holy fellowship'—and at *your* direction. Please read again your pernicious ministry and the facts of the Malvern case in my last letter to you. Do you know how to blush for shame? I believe the Lord in His boundless grace would make your discomfiture and conscience unbearable—and, for you and others, *the sooner the better.* It is all under your supreme leadership. It is all foul and reeks. And it is being done—shocking thought!—in the precious name of the Lord Jesus.

If it is incumbent on believers to immediately withdraw from any situation marked by iniquity, why have your followers not withdrawn from your abject sect?

I close this letter to you now. I shall have to write you again.

In a letter dated 23rd April, 1966, just received, I read—

"I have read your book which contains a series of letters to James Taylor Jr., regarding the evil doctrines and deeds of those known as Taylor Exclusive Brethren.

The details in your letters should make any of us who have been associated with that body blush with shame. For the soil in which such evil doctrines, as seeds, could take root and bear such dreadful fruits could only have been prepared over a good many years. We had some part, even if unwittingly, in the preparation of the soil that has now produced fruits that have gravely dishonoured the Name of the Lord and have become a matter of public scandal in Christendom.

The seeds that have produced these fruits were the two evil doctrines of *universal leadership* and *authoritative ministry*, to which your book refers. These are obviously Romish doctrines and we cannot therefore be surprised at the dreadful results of their introduction and enforcement—evil teaching and scandalous conduct.

It is deeply comforting, dear brother, in the midst of such sad break-up, to know and prove that the foundation of God stands firm. We can retain affectionately and prayerfully in our hearts *all* “them that are His” on the one hand, and depart from iniquity in the Name of the Lord on the other. Departing from iniquity *in* His Name is the first step, gathering *to* His Name is the next. A large number could not have more than the presence of Christ. He assures us Himself that two or three gathered *to His Name* will not have less. Can we ask for more? There is no more. “Ye are *complete* in Him.”

Yours faithfully for the Lord,

HUBERT CALVEY

Southport—26th July, 1966

Mr. JAMES TAYLOR JR.

Behaviour in the House of God

(No. 6)

Dear Mr. Taylor,

Honesty and Transparency

“LETTERS OF JAMES TAYLOR”

Three days ago I received a letter, dated 20th July (all the letters to which I allude are open to inspection) from a brother, enclosing a copy of a letter dated 5th April, 1916, addressed by J.T. to Mr. Russell Besley, the copy being made from, and checked with, an old dusty but clear copy which J.T. himself had personally sent to Mr. Valentine, late, of Collooney, Eire. My correspondent discovered, however, on comparing this faithful copy of J.T.'s letter with that which appears in “Letters of James Taylor” (Vol. 1, pp. 118-19), that the two sentences reading :—

“ Beside joining the Army and Navy, some are in Trade Unions, some shareholders in corporations, some are directors in corporations. But we cannot refuse to walk with such, and so we go on, assured that the Lord has not forsaken His people.”

which followed the words “sectarianism and bondage” at the end of the first paragraph, *do not appear in the published version.*

Now, unless there is a satisfactory explanation of this omission, the deletion of the sentences quoted may evidence manipulation, for some unknown reason, or even deliberate deception.

I am writing you on this important matter as the name of the responsible Editor of the letters is not stated in the volumes, though from the Foreword it is a reasonable assumption that the major responsibility for the volumes is yours.

The two volumes were offered publicly for sale, and purchased as being, as the title states, the *Letters of J.T.* ; and they have been widely bought, and read, and referred to, on the basis of that understanding and description. But the question arises whether, instead of being a faithful reproduction of J.T.'s letters, the volumes merely give the version of what you or others consider your father *should* have said in the letters, and with the expunging of what—though he said it—you or they think he should *not* have said. In that event the volumes have been offered for sale and sold under a false description, involving misrepresentation. And in that case they are, to very many, not only worthless, but worse—not only unreliable but misleading and maybe very injurious, even to J.T. himself. Persons may, unknowingly and contrary to their wishes, be reading the statements and views and thoughts, in whole or in part, of someone other than J.T. despite the title of the volumes. In fact, they may not be reading J.T.'s letters at all!

Many have no desire to read, and, certainly, no wish to purchase, anything which has been subjected to your editorship, unless they can be adequately reassured as to the lines upon which the editing has been carried out ; and especially as it seems probable that the very matters on which reliable information is sought as to the thoughts and attitude and views of

J.T. himself, would be, in all likelihood, the close subject of your revisions.

It is not inconceivable that that may be evidenced in the letter referred to.

The whole matter is thus most unsatisfactory. It is *no answer* to plead views which J.T. may later have expressed.

Therefore certain vital questions call for answer—and those who bought the volumes are entitled to know the answers :—

1—By what authority or on what principle was the deletion made, referred to in the specific case above?

2—Who was responsible for it?

3—What is the position as regards the *other* letters?

4—If there is not verbatim agreement (without amendments, additions, or deletions by any person other than J.T.) with the originals signed by J.T., then, in the case of each letter, details should be given of the changes.

There are three further matters of importance :—

5—What is the reason for the second paragraph of the Foreword, and have any changes been made in J.T.'s letters under the 'cover' of that paragraph? Details should most certainly be given of any such changes. Otherwise there may be illicit misrepresentation of a very serious nature.

6—Was any amendment, editorial or otherwise, made in the letters (whether to or from J.T.), before publication, which were purported to be reproduced in the published correspondence in

what is generally known as “the Horace Stanley matter”? It is alleged that changes were made.

7—If any changes of any kind were made by you, or your collaborators or supporters in J.T.’s letters mentioned above, including that of 5th April, 1916, or in the correspondence mentioned in 6 above, then how does that bear on and compare with what our brother Mr. Horace Stanley was so strongly condemned for, many years ago, as you well know?

It is essential that above all in the holy things of truth there should, from the outset, be the utmost good faith and unchallengeable honesty and transparency. “If we walk in the light as He is in the light, we have fellowship with one another”. Therefore I shall hope to hear from you. The gravity of the matter calls for it, and other matters may be dependent upon it.

In that anticipation, faithfully,

HUBERT CALVEY

Southport—20th AUGUST, 1966

Mr. JAMES TAYLOR JR.

Behaviour in the House of God

(No. 9)

Dear Mr. Taylor,

I continue my letters, feeble, yet powerful, to you. On page 3 of your Volume 27 you speak in quite

supercilious and sectarian terms of “those who have fallen out of the testimony” ; and *whose* testimony is it? You then ask, “Why did they not stay in the path that had been marked out for them?” Well, *who* has “marked out the path that *we* tread”? In this letter, I place squarely before you in Section A, a few of the weighty, indeed commanding, considerations which influenced brethren in withdrawing from you and your system—withdrawing from *iniquity*. The judgments expressed are in the statements they made, mostly to their local brethren, of the grounds which required them to sever their links, so precious, with those they loved. Your question, so ostensibly sincere, but really insincere, suggests that you are astonished. Therefore what I bring before you in plain terms should be of outstanding interest to you, unless you were feigning ignorance again. For you must already know the substance of all that I now place before you. Otherwise, the right exercises and feelings and the sufferings of the Lord’s sheep mean nothing to you ; and the stating of truth means nothing to you.

These statements are but eight, taken from a large number. If you read them with an honest and good heart—I am sorry to say we have seen little, if any, of this so far—before the Lord, you will find that they demand an answer, and that they take a good deal of answering.

Do not be so foolish as to pretend to write off these deep-felt exercises as “not according to the will of God” (also page 3 of your Vol. 27) ; because the will of God meant simply everything to the eight writers,

as to the thousands of others, like-minded and suffering with them. The will of God never leads in two different directions morally.

In this connection, on page 327 of Vol. 27 you remark, "The answer is coming substantially now from what is here. You have something here that is giving an answer. God has not just got people saying nothing; *He has people that can answer and give something substantial.*" Well, these eight beloved saints, and others before them, and thousands since, have been waiting for up to six years for some answer from you ; but in vain, so far. This is the 19th letter I have written to you with cogency but there has been no answer ; with urgency but there is only silence from you ; in matters paramountly affecting the heart of the Lord, but no answer from you has been forthcoming. Are you an honest man? But, of course, you cannot give any answer ; you can only ignore or evade.

You speak of the answer being "substantial". Well, the pain and grief and heartbreaks in the families you, with your supporters, have so *volubly* and hyper-diligently "served" (how evilly you use that word! e.g., Vol. 27, p. 394) and operated on, and wrecked, have for five long years certainly furnished *a most substantial* answer, world-wide, to any enquirer. What is, *indeed*, substantial is the enormous universal aggregation of confirmation of what I place now before you so potently ; I say "so potently" because of what it involved to the eight writers (as so many others) to leave those they so really love.

There was one of your ardent supporters around here locally last Lord's day evening, but he could not

answer a few questions—neither can you—which demand an answer, e.g. :—

- (a) Your deliberate untruthfulness in stating, constantly, that you had never said that husbands must leave wives, etc., when we are surrounded with wrecked homes ;
- (b) The gulf between the concertedly-sung expressions, e.g., in hymns to the Holy Spirit (see e.g. Hymn 383), and the elimination of the Spirit in your meetings and behaviours. The matter of your addiction—their leader—to drink was, I gather, also pointedly brought home. And also the testimony!

No answer is forthcoming either from you or anyone else in matters which pre-eminently and imperatively demand answer. Review the Court cases!

I am familiar with those who, quoting Scripture, speak of the dumbness, and deafness, and blindness, of the Lord's servants. How agile they are to hide their face from shame! That will not do now. An honest man can face truth.

Maybe, however, in our search for an answer we may find one on page 347 of Vol. 27—though I soberly believe they are the idlest and emptiest words of all—where you say, or rather speak of others as saying, “I wonder how God ever put up with me at all!” If they should be your words, many will at once, and for once, agree with you. But it means simply nothing.

Then in Section B of this letter, I reproduce communications which I personally have received on current questions of truth. Again, they constitute but

a few of the many letters I have had. All these letters are open to scrutiny, with due safeguards to prevent victimisation. The letters were not written with any thought of publication or communication to you. They are from all over the world. Truly your "line is gone out through all the earth and (your) language to the extremity of the world" (Ps. 19 : 4).

On page 300 of Vol. 27 you say, " 'Ye are the light of the world'. It can be seen. Anybody could see it.". Certainly there is something that can be seen by anyone with eyes in his head, or his heart. For you are the source of sorrows untold—not through the truth but through evil teaching ; not to yourself, but to thousands of innocent and Christlike believers. Mr. Taylor, you have left behind you a long *world-wide* trail of enduring sufferings wherever you have gone. That is what is assuredly "seen" at present.

On that page 300 in reference to Matt. 5 : 13-20 you state "So there is a substantial order of things locally and generally". J.N.D.'s footnote to verse 16 of that passage says that it refers to "all that is upright and honourable and comely, what ought to be in one who feels aright". No one could ever suggest that the Exclusivist Sect are marked *in the slightest degree* by what is upright or honourable or comely, or by right feelings. Indeed, it is quite the reverse.

It should have been a consideration with you, long ago, that through you the precious "Name of Jesus" is spoken of evilly, and the testimony is belied.

SECTION A—Letters of Withdrawal from the “Exclusive Brethren” Sect

Extracts from, or Summaries of, a few of the numerous letters

THE INDICTMENTS ABIDE INCONTESTABLE YET STILL UNANSWERED

(1)—*Gordon E. Pilgrim (Nostrand Ave., New York)*
1st June, 1963

Letter sent after many months of soul exercise and sorrow of heart, after walking for 48 years in happy Christian fellowship, imbibing teaching of the Lord “through devoted and humble servants : J.N.D. to J.B.S., F.E.R. and J.T.—the dear man of God, whose last words the night before the Lord called him home were “Show her grace”. Such a spirit has left an impression on me which I cannot forget. “Grace, the power of unity and gathering”. J.N.D.

Now, in recent years, the teaching, coupled with legality, is causing painful pressure ; the sheep are not being fed with heavenly food ! Instead, they are universally scattered, and family relationships disregarded. The doctrine relating to natural relationships is not in keeping with the Scriptures. “Natural relationship has been established by God, and whoever disregards such relationship : Woe be to him.” (J.N.D.).”

Followed by references to other things taught and enforced—“Authoritative Ministry” ; some matters having the semblance of self-righteousness with the despising of other people (Luke 18 : 9) ; whilst ‘eating’, dividing families and many painful things are not in accordance with the Scriptures. “In view of these

sorrowful conditions existing among us, and to have a clear conscience before my God, I must discontinue to have fellowship with you—not the fellowship of God’s Son, Jesus Christ our Lord.”

(2)—*Albin Wita (Prestwick, Ayrshire)*

11th December, 1961

“Since the Glasgow meeting with Mr. S. McCallum and Mr. Taylor, Jr., I tried earnestly before the Lord to accept what has been ministered. I have searched my heart and the Scriptures, and cannot identify it with the Lord. I have found that what has been introduced, and the way in which it was applied is denying Christ, and produces confusion among the people of God.

The Scriptures are not openly violated, but are being adjusted to the ministry, instead of the ministry adjusted to the Scriptures.

After my conversion in 1946 I was happy to identify myself with the Brethren, because they loved the Lord, held the truth in love, and were prepared to go the whole way to bring souls to Christ by the living demonstration of the love of Christ. Who can testify of it more than a stranger whom they picked from the street, sat at their table, shared their food which was rationed at the time, and above all shared their precious Saviour, the “Living Bread” which no man can ration.

It was this love which converted me, healed my soul and body, and set me on the course of following my Saviour, my Master and my Shepherd. This love is now replaced by fanatical zeal and persecution which denies the spirit of Christ . . .

I find that I cannot accept blindly what is presently

ministered because it means to me to betray Christ as the Good Shepherd.

In spite of it all I tried to go on as long as I could in Prestwick and get help . . . As now it is impossible to give warning or to reason because of the fanatical condition in many localities, nothing remains for me but to stop remembering the Lord with the Brethren in Prestwick, though I love them much. If I do not do it, I feel it would be hypocritical ; I also feel that I cannot be separated any longer from hundreds of those who were withdrawn from for no real reason.

Dear Brother, I cannot accept before the Lord that :—

- (i) Everyone who is not breaking bread with us is a vessel to dishonour and an unclean person.
- (ii) A leader is infallible in everything he refers to in the ministry.
- (iii) Physical eating is in every circumstance spiritual fellowship.
- (iv) The gospel is only for the children of the saints, and all are not welcome to the preaching of the Word of God.

. . . A current of ministry which is scattering and destroying instead of gathering and building. Why does it scatter? . . . because its method is not of Christ . . . He is still the Good Samaritan . . . He is the truth, and He also is the only Way. Otherwise . . . the end justifies the means. This is how Christ is presently denied.

Such haste (in getting clear of associations) as promotes legality and fanaticism leads away from the sphere where the Spirit of God is operating, and creates a

feverish condition of chaos and panic. God is a God of order and peace, not of confusion.

As for you, dear Brother, I thank you and the Lord for the spirit of Christ shown to me by yourself and your wife till now. Also I would like to thank the dear Prestwick brethren for all the kindness and love which I shall always cherish in my heart."

(3)—*F. G. Holding (Colwyn Bay, Denbighshire)*

19th January, 1961

"Beloved Brethren, having enjoyed happy fellowship with you for over 20 years, and with brethren generally for nearly 50 years, it is with deep sorrow that I now write to say that as you are going on with unjudged evil, I can no longer walk with you.

My reasons, *among others*, for taking this course are as follows :—

- (i) The setting up of "authoritative ministry", so-called, on a level with, or even above, the word of God.
- (ii) The current teaching that believers who are not in fellowship with us are in the same position as "wicked persons" withdrawn from in accordance with 1 Cor. 5. (Meetings with J.T. Jr. at Horsham, July 1960, and elsewhere).
- (iii) The current teaching, firstly, that eating with a person necessarily involves fellowship with him, and, secondly, that to express our Christian liberty we should have alcoholic liquors on our tables.
- (iv) The introduction of "novelties", such as a plate in lieu of the usual collection box, and a host of

other items, which find no place in the word of God.

- (v) The evil character of the so-called assembly judgment at Hornchurch regarding our brother, Mr. G. R. Cowell, and other assembly judgments of a like nature by means of which servants of the Lord have been summarily cast out of the fellowship.”

(This summary was followed by notes leading to the conclusion that true separation of heart can only be brought about by a positive living ministry of Christ ; followed by extensive notes on the five points mentioned. The memorandum in itself affords a complete condemnation of the “Exclusive” system in the light of what you speak of as “the three great ministries”.)

(4)—*J. E. White (Bulawayo, Rhodesia)*

18th December, 1961

“ It is with sorrow that we write to say that, in order to maintain a good conscience before God, we can no longer remain in fellowship with you. Over the years, in the mercy and goodness of God, we have enjoyed happy fellowship with many of the dear brethren who were undoubtedly sustained by a living ministry of Christ, but, alas, during recent times serious evil has crept in. Principles and practices now operating amongst us cannot be of God, and the evil influences working in our midst are plainly evident to the simplest believer. We feel we cannot, for one moment longer, continue to identify ourselves with a system where unsound doctrine is taught, where the activities of the Holy Spirit and the sovereign rights of Christ

over His assembly are ignored and where the authority of the Holy Scriptures is undermined. God is no longer rightly represented amongst us, Christ is being ministered less and less, and the preaching has become largely defective. Rules and regulations are binding the brethren to a system that permits the mind of man to work, and this dishonours Christ and results in a practical denial of Christianity. Paul tells us very plainly that we must depart from iniquity. We dare not delay but as moving out to the Lord we desire to hold fast every bit of positive truth ministered since J.N.D's time, surrendering nothing but the heresies that have been manifest in full measure since July 1959 . . . We shall always be delighted to see those who have in fidelity to Christ, broken their links with what is false and iniquitous. May others be liberated to hear the Lord's voice, "Come out of her, my people, that ye have not fellowship in her sins."

We desire to be here, in our small measure, true to Christ in the scene of His rejection. We own our allegiance to Him and genuinely desire to dedicate ourselves afresh. We can do no other than yield ourselves to God." "Gal. 5 : 22. The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, kindness, goodness, fidelity, meekness, self-control."

(5)—*Charles W. Cooper (Belfast)*

6th December, 1960

"This letter is to acquaint you of the fact that, in order to maintain a good conscience before God, I must withdraw from fellowship with you . . . It is my conviction that the ground of gathering has so materially altered in recent years that you are becoming

a sect . . . I discern that a striking similarity to the system grew up very insidiously at Plymouth in 1845, from which J.N.D. eventually withdrew. The leading features of that system were :—

Attaching undue authority to teachers, and to one in particular, by means of which the distinctive authority of the word of God was nullified.

Building up an organisation intending to promote unity, and the institution gaining such a hold on the brethren that, as J.N.D. has said, both spiritual and natural affections were set aside to maintain the claims of the system.

Giving up the preaching of the gospel, and devoting that occasion to teaching the brethren, which was said to be more important.

I judge, brethren, that some if not all of these things are operating amongst you . . . my path became clear from . . . Matt. 14. It is the Lord's call to Peter *out of* the boat. Human nature prefers to remain in a system where the persons are held together, not by attraction to Christ, but by regulations, rules, creeds, a routine of meetings and such like things. Some are held by loyalty to an earthly head ; fear of excision holds others. What the disciples thought did not deter Peter; he descended from the ship and walked upon the water to go to Jesus. The Lord calls us out of every boat, however comfortable, and He also gives courage and faith to obey. He is both my Object and my Resource . . . Having been brought up amongst you, I leave with sorrow of heart, but *I cannot sanction, by my presence amongst you, practices and a position which, in my judgment, are not supported by God's sure word—*

the only security for the saints in a day of departure.”

(6)—*Philip Haddad (Ilford, Essex) January, 1961*

Reference to the heart-searching exercises leading to withdrawing :—

I (i) Examination of the false teaching as to Eating.

(ii) Sectarian references (“The circle”, “The company”, “The position”, “The fellowship”). Remark (N.Y. Readings, Nov., 1960, p. 292) suggesting that those not breaking bread with J.T. Jr. are not in the assembly.

(iii) The enforcement of so-called “authoritative ministry”, and based not on the Scriptures but a spurious claim to “the mind of Christ”.

(iv) Atmosphere of unity and love displaced by unrest, fear and suspicion.

(v) No room for individual conscience as before God ; a dictatorial attitude stifling right exercises ; and drastic dealing with those not in line.

(vi) “The wrong kind of man has been setting himself up amongst us” and allowed to exercise authority with features other than of the Head of the assembly.

(vii) The valuable ministry of the Lord bearing on the need for the suited inward state where what is outward is insisted on, was condemned on the flimsiest pretexts, with sad instances of evil behaviour coming to light shortly after.

II (i) The whole system of brethrenism has

become an ecclesiastical body dominated by one man, none daring to raise question ; popery in effect.

(ii) J.N.D., F.E.R. and J.T. were not ambitious of leadership. They served the Lord in humility ; their ministry was based on scripture ; they had God's glory before them. "Their ministries remain as our treasured heritage".

(iii) Talk of "moderated ministry" and "better atmosphere" are Satan's device to submerge the past, stifle exercises, and dull consciences, and produce Bethesda conditions ; and deludes such as stay where they are, in hope of a fresh position to turn to.

(7)—*Johannes Kleylein (Zwickau, Saxony)*
undated—probably 1961. (Addressed to
Mr. G. R. Cowell and the beloved brethren
in Scotland)

(i) "Peace be unto you multiplied. Rejoice in the Lord alway : and again I say, Rejoice. We have much joy in our Lord Jesu, just as the Apostle Paul would say, and we have triumphed in the Lord.

(ii) The brethren in our country wish to hear things of you and your good fight for the Lord's interests and putting down what the man brought in. We are free to respect only what the Lord tells us and did bring out . . . The things about the man Taylor Jr. are now really known as terrible things against the Lord Himself. Love can never be so cruelly cold and bitter, hating the peoples

of the Lord's sheep. He brings not such statutes, such directions for God's people like the system of Taylor Jr. We know the Lord, we look for His word, we have the scriptures and the prophets, we have beloved brethren who hold the Lord's commandments, and so we are willing to follow only along such lines, and not the lines of Jim Taylor, Jr It is said publicly, 'He would be an Apostle' A wrong apostle is really the right description we put this man's thoughts to the test like the Bereans and find that it is very wrong and the worst matter which was ever brought out among the holy people.

- (iii) That is what gives us much joy to find the right way through the Lord (and) the Holy Spirit, and to withdraw for the sake of the Lord's holy name.
- (iv) The brethren who are too cowardly to leave such wrong things are more or less led into hypocrisy.
- (v) In Zwickau the brethren are free together and have great confidence without taking up the teaching of J.T. Jr."

(8)—*Robert H. Smith (Cranford, New Jersey, U.S.A.) 21st December, 1960*

"It is with the deepest sorrow that one writes this letter to my beloved brethren. The ministry relative to 'eating' . . . does not commend itself to me but rather is contrary to the Scriptures and what we have been taught." (Reference is made to F.E.R., Vol. 5, p. 112 and J.T., Vols. 174 and 177). The conclusion is reached that all eating with others is not to be prohibited, but much care is needed. Allusion made to leaders in the locality who have been engulfed for years

in after-hour entertainment and dinners, etc., as well as almost every noon hour. "God knows and He is the Righteous Judge". We are in the world but not of it. Separation from the world is vital, but there is the aspect of testimony, Phil. 2 : 15-16, "as lights in the world". "On Saturday, Mr. J.T. Jr, said, "We must go by scripture—no 'ifs', 'and/or', or 'buts'." This would, I take it, be true of 1 Cor. 10 : 27 for according to 2 Tim. 3 : 6 "Every Scripture is divinely inspired . . . to every good work" . . .

I quite recognise the loneliness this position will entail . . . Only the Lord will be able to sustain me in it. I am one who greatly values J.T's ministry and life. It would be sad to depart from it. It is possible for all the leaders to go wrong on a point. This is seen in John 21. I close with much sorrow . . . "

SECTION B—Extracts of Recent Letters from a Few of the Thousands who have Suffered Intensely Through Your Wicked Teachings and Wicked Enforcements

(Abstracted at random from files and not arranged in order of date, or geographically or in any other way.

They speak for themselves. They were all addressed to me except as stated otherwise.)

(1)—*Letter dated 8th June, 1966, from U.S.A.*

(Re named leader) "We've suffered much at his hands."

(2)—*Letter dated 16th June 1966, from New Zealand*
" . . . the terrible teachings and doings, relentlessly imposed upon so many of our dear brethren ; seemingly at times as though every precious feature of the

truth was being swept from us ; what deep sorrow filled the hearts of so many of us, alone measured by our God. Grief-filled hearts, although well-knowing that He is ever faithful, finding their faith tested more than they had ever thought possible ; but what praise and thanksgiving to our God when realising that He is saying “Thus far and no further”, to such an evil system, professedly, alas, in His Name.

I am assured that . . . will be much used of the Lord to send a wave worldwide of great encouragement and thanksgiving to God ; truly “a well of living water” bringing precious refreshment to many weary and sad souls, and God thereby giving great stimulation to faith.

I and my wife were withdrawn from on the “eating” doctrine. I showed brethren there was no Scriptural basis for such an application of truth, but they urged me “simply to submit to the brethren” ; I told them I am obligated to maintain a good conscience before God ; that we have the Spirit’s guidance in the Word ; and that they could not sustain from the Scriptures what they held. They said, “What about the ministry ?” I pointed out that Roman Catholicism seeks to maintain, along with the Bible “the traditions of the Fathers” ; and they were seeking to do something of the same character.”

(3)—*Letter dated 17th June, 1966, from Australasia*
“Nearly 6 years ago my wife and I separated from the Exclusivists and so severed a link of 60 years. Much had yet to come to light. The Lord, however, helped us to see the unscriptural ground on which the brethren were proceeding under the leadership of J.T. Jr. We have had cause ever since to thank the Lord for

such a wonderful deliverance. Like countless others we left many dear ones behind ; this has only energised us to make fervent and continual prayer for them that they too, and some at least of others for whom we still “sigh and cry”, may be delivered.

The Exclusives, in spite of what they might say, are confused at what has happened and is happening. B. Hales had a very prominent place among them in this land, and his recent fall left its mark on them. One of them, visiting an ex-Exclusive to “recover” him admitted that the Exclusives are all confused and do not know where they are. There is evidence of this ; instead of extreme coldness they now smile upon us! **MORE THAN THAT IS NEEDED.**

They have erected their “Iron curtain” between us but *God* is ever *supreme*, and will clear the way. One evidence of His present working is that He is going to the source of the evil, in the leader and leaders themselves . . . In view of all that has happened, involving deep sorrows and even deaths, one can hardly think how it will be met ; but God will reach His desired end.”

(4)—*Letter dated 1st July, 1966*

“I left this Sect 4½ years ago and only regret I did not do so sooner.”

(5)—*Letter dated 30th June, 1966*

“I was with the Brethren for many years in the happy days. I AM NOW SEPARATED FROM MY WIFE AND FAMILY as they are still ardent followers of what is ‘error’ in the light of Scripture”.

(6)—*Letter dated 11th February, 1966*

“The refusal to see or hear is the enemy’s work.

Untruth is buttressed thus. They support it by regarding all who are not in agreement with their heresy as 'under assembly discipline'. *This, however, is but an easy cloak for sin.*"

(7)—*Letter dated 1st May, 1966*

"I have received Volume 1 of 'Unanswered Questions to New York'. You have drawn up an indictment which would sink any ordinary battleship, and would, I believe, sink Big Jim himself, if he were starting from scratch. But we are not. I heard . . . say in September 1961 that things had been going wrong for 30 years—and that was perhaps an understatement. Jim T. could never have climbed into the saddle (by methods which he could well have copied from the medieval Papacy, or the Kremlin) if the saddle had not been there. I well remember George Lucas coming under very considerable fire at a London Care-meeting at Kennington in the mid-30's for demurring to the suggestion that only J.T. could enunciate a new exercise. Our late valued brother (A.H.) told me last year that his information was that from 1950, J.T. Jr. handled all his father's correspondence.

So it is hardly wonderful that the combination of indoctrination, brain-washing, and mental pressure has left most of its dupes incapable, save by something near a miracle, of ever thinking again . . . I cannot help wondering to what extent J.T. Jr. is putting himself into the class of those described in ch. 3 of 2 Timothy as "deceiving *and being deceived*". The Exclusives now have *all* the marks not so much of Laodiceans as of Laodicea itself, of which the most damning is that they DO NOT KNOW.

A big proportion of Exclusives never hear what is done in their midst in the name of "the truth", and if they do hear, just do not believe, and are told not to believe, it has ever happened."

(8)—*Letter dated 27th July, 1966 (from Devon)*

"I am a late Exclusive, and now thankful to be free of its bondage and cruelty. I am a widow (86 years) and came out soon after my husband was taken to be with the Lord three years ago."

(9)—*Letter dated 26th July, 1966 (from Scotland)*

"Exclusive Brethren . . . I withdrew from that fellowship in 1963 owing to its wicked teaching."

(10)—*From a Statement received 30th July, 1966*

Alcoholism. There are $6\frac{1}{2}$ millions of confirmed *alcoholics* (i.e., persons urgently needing treatment) in the U.S.A. The number has rapidly increased in the last 11 years (see to-day's "London Times"). So any incitement to drinking habits which emanates from the U.S.A. is obviously suspect.

(11)—*Summary of a long Letter undated, received*

27th July, 1966 (from a Widow in Somerset)

"My husband was the first brother to be put out in this locality through J.T. Jr's 'new ministry'. When they brought my husband's name forward at the assembly meeting, he was not able to answer for himself, being at work. So the thing was carried out most unrighteously. I did not go to the meeting for a time. But, as my youngest daughter living at home was breaking bread, in the end I went back.

One evening, a 'sister' Miss G. came and asked me if I would do what another 'sister' somewhere else had

done—that was leave my husband, so as to make him have nervous breakdown, and so force him back to the meeting. This I refused. So the brethren read me out.

Then, as they said there was a divided house, they gave my daughter a time limit to leave home or be put out.

Under the said Miss G's influence, she left home and went to live with her. It nearly broke my heart. And my dear husband was in a dreadful state with his asthma. But the Lord has been our help and comfort. Then Miss G. and others matched my daughter up with a brother from Bristol ; but we were not allowed to the wedding, or even to give a present.

Then there was Mrs. B . . . She told the brethren she would not leave her husband (not in the 'fellowship') or her two boys (who came to the meeting) so they put her out.

Then there was my husband's aunt, Mrs. M.N., a widow who, as she had severe blood pressure and was very deaf, had to have her daughter (not in the 'fellowship') to live with her. The brethren said Mrs. N. must leave her home as it was "unclean", and sell her house, and give the proceeds to the place of refuge the brethren were building near Bristol! They said she could live, a fortnight at a time, with different brothers! She refused and was withdrawn from October 1964. The Lord took her last Easter. She had been with the brethren all her life.

I have been so worried about my daughter the Exclusives took from us. I heard she was to have a child, and as we were not allowed to go to her home it was most difficult to find out how she was keeping.

But we have since heard the child was born, and my daughter in a dreadful condition. So my husband and I went to the Southmead Hospital to see her. But when we arrived there they told us she had been taken home. So we made our way there only to be told we are not to visit there again unless we go back to the Exclusives. Which is quite impossible.”

(12)—*Letter dated 19th May, 1966*

“Take my own case ; in May 1962, when I sent a letter of protest they responded by excommunicating me ; a few days later, my younger daughter (a school teacher) was prevailed upon to leave me ; and a few days after that my wife was abducted (you cannot call it anything else) ; and so my two sons and two daughters “abandoned” me. I have one son in M . . . and he was thrust out before I was. I had been breaking bread for 47 years!”

(13)—*Letter dated 16th February, 1966*

“I often think of my ‘IN’ days—how Monday night after Monday night the brothers prayed that the Lord would “graciously release those held in bondage by the systems of men”! Now they, themselves, are in a bondage unknown to any other Sect ; and we are free!”

(14)—*Letter dated 18th June, 1966*

“Something must have been said about being more gracious to near relatives, for there has been visiting (parents and children ; or husbands and wives), and paltry admissions of hardness and legality, offers of help at any time, etc.—plus, of course, appeals to return. There is, however, to be no greeting or speaking in the street!! and any confessions are watery,

and on the lines that "We admit that we, as individuals, have been all wrong, but the assembly has not been wrong." How absurd!

I pointed out to a brother that they have (I used his own expression) "committed spiritual murder", all in the name of the Lord, and quoted to him J.N.D. "That to do any such things in His Name was but to blaspheme the Name". Ezek. 20 : 27 fully supports this.

Some personal appeals to return have come *from grandchildren* who, in some cases, the grandparents *had never seen!*

One brother when insistently implored to return, was kissed and re-kissed a number of times at each visit ; and then when he and his wife were so foolish as to go to the so-called gospel preaching, they had to sit on "the sinner's seat" and hymn books were withheld. At the first preaching, the preacher said that those who broke bread touched their spiritual bodies during "the essential meeting". In the next preaching the preacher (a different preacher) said they were very near *their departed brethren* in the Lord because *when the Lord came in they were with Him because they are with Christ!* This gives an insight as to how things are. J.N.D. called such speculations "spiritism", which, I judge, is on the way to "spiritualism".

Mrs. . . . has had a visit from "Exclusive" brothers who told her that the assembly meeting which put them out had been rescinded, and *that they could now be assured that they would have their part in the Rapture* . . . This sort of rubbish is, of course, not repentance or truth and there is nothing for God in it—a 'new

patch' on a very shabby old garment! But 'Jehovah requireth that which is past'."

(15)—*Letter, 22nd May, 1966 (from Australasia)*

"I left the London Brethren nearly 3½ years ago and live alone, but I have the Lord, the Spirit and the written Word . . . I left, over the very exercises which appear to be yours and the Lord Jesus is now more real and living to me. The kingdom of heaven is not eating and drinking.

We thoroughly enjoyed Gerald Cowell's visit in 1959, the meetings were so heavenly and full of Christ. I remember thinking it was so good, could it last? Satan will surely seek to smash it up! I did challenge "the Position"—However, the Lord is not in "the Position"—*nor am I* . . . My father, blinded from the start, now admits that the dividing of families was an attack of Satan—it is one thing to blame Satan ; but *every man's sin is his own*. Mr. Jim is now ministering that nowhere has he taught that husbands are to leave wives etc., but then, as you say, NO ONE BELIEVES HIM ANY WAY. He has made Bruce and John Hales the scapegoats over the broken families issue, as they were withdrawn from New York, and were reinstated from New York (New York—J.T. Jr.—even prescribing the scriptures to be read at their reinstatement!)—out of 'fellowship' 6 months! Those who cause trouble and confusion in the house of God will have to answer for their sins—*their own*—for it is God's assembly. "The Position" is really Edom, which God hates, with its hardness and reckless cruelty (we have wrecked homes here). My father and mother who are still 'In' long for me every day, but while

they continue in "the Position" I stay away. They suffer three-fold . . . May the pure Word of God burn into their conscience by the power of the Holy Spirit so that they may be saved out of it all! . . . "

(16)—*Letter, 15th May, 1966 (from New York State U.S.A.)*

"We are ever thankful that the Blessed God has led us out of that awful system before our eyes became blinded like the rest."

(17)—*Letter, 13th June, 1966 (from North America)*

"Your book was just in confirmation of what we've been through ourselves, and it is sad to see so many still under such bondage.

In July 1965, we were told to leave, and Amos 3:3 was used, because we would not be subject to their rules and regulations. Our two young girls, breaking bread, and very tender hearts (9 and 13 then) didn't want to have an upset home too, and my husband would not set a different table (to eat) nor would I try to make it so hard for our precious girls, so they were withdrawn from in August, 1965.

We thank God for His guidance, and no longer have that terrible fear of man—and can really enjoy the love and fellowship of the Lord's people now : so many devoted, true believers.

We are so liberated and free now that we wonder how we were in such a system (Sect) for so long before seeing through it—but we know that things got worse and worse since 1959."

(18)—*Letter, 19th July, 1966 (from North America)*

(*Background*—the writer was withdrawn from five years ago (for challenging J.T. Jr. and Bruce

Hales. The latter had spoken of Mr. Cowell as “a minister of Satan”). His family consists of his wife and three children ; after he was “hounded out”, his wife and children were in effect forced to leave his house (two years ago) after (for one year) having no links of any kind with him, and refusing to eat with him, etc., etc.). (*See p. 98*).

“Further to my previous letter to you and your reply, . . . all efforts to get my wife and family to rejoin me—short of surrender and confession to the leaders in this locality, with accompanying “repentance”—have been completely unsuccessful.

These efforts took the form of personal appeals and pleadings with my family. In view of what appeared to be certain destruction coming upon my wife and children, I had my lawyers write the leaders holding them responsible for the enforced separation. This letter has never been replied to. A further, stronger, letter was sent to them . . . this has also been ignored. . . . My overriding wish is to secure extrication of my family and their return to me . . .

The lawyers state that in their many years of practice they have never encountered, or heard of, such conduct . . . ”

(19)—*Letter, 10th May, 1966 (from Australasia)*
 “J.T. Jr. has recently been in Sydney and New Zealand on a hurried visit, and many reports have been received, all pointing to his trying to back-pedal and to place blame elsewhere . . . He said that Australia and New Zealand have been guilty of some terrible things over the past 20-25 years!”

(*Note by H.C.*—This seems a crude but subtle attempt to place the blame for the last 5 years on the brethren themselves).

“One thing is clearly established—about half of the ‘In’s’ in Australasia are deeply concerned; and several admissions of ‘famine conditions’ in their midst have been reported. One brother who is still ‘In’ said, when told of this, “Well, I would say that things couldn’t get much worse!”

In some localities they still practice “living apart” in the same house, although they have owned that to have taken certain ones away to other homes was wrong. Only a few days ago, in New Zealand, they made the children return home, but the father and the three young people (16-21) have their meals apart! Another sister wrongly put out, was asked to return, but it was stipulated that she would have to live apart in the same house—*both are over 70 years of age*. She has flatly refused their overtures.”

(20)—*Letter, 25th May, 1966 (from Australasia)*

“In Australia last year I came face to face with cases almost beyond credit, so much so that some would dwarf instances which you have cited to J.T. Jr. . . . There was not a thing mentioned in the published letters that has not had its full counterpart, full-blown, in this country; and the many things would fill volumes . . . In this country there have been cases of persons taking their lives; others with mental breakdown; others that the doctors were at extremity over; and much concern given to both the medical profession and to the Authorities.

At one stage, the Governor of the country appointed

the Chief Inspector of the Police to look thoroughly into the goings-on of the "Exclusivists", and what he unearthed was appalling, including certain things (immoral) that I would not write about, although I know most of the details.

There have been broken homes, children taken away, too, etc., etc., and many aged brethren "put out" because they did not comply (in a number of instances they could not if they had wished to) with the "current ministry."

One of the worst, yet *not the worst* for certain reasons, was the case of Mrs. Corrie-Johnstone of Hastings, New Zealand. She knew J.N.D. well, as a girl, and used to be taken for walks by him, and one who came into fellowship early in life. Her life, in the main, was spent for the Lord and His interests—she knew the truth and filled out her part as an assembly sister. Her husband . . . died comparatively young, leaving his wife a widow with three young children. She was living with her only daughter (single) who was *put out* because she would not accept the ministry of segregation. This meant that the mother was told she must leave her home and the care of her *truly devoted* daughter, or else be withdrawn from. When visited she was also asked if she accepted Mr. Jim Taylor as the present voice of the Spirit, and she said she could do nothing of the sort. Later she was told she was "Out". She was then in her 98th year. We buried our beloved sister in her 100th year about two years ago. Even her son, who married a "Deck" would not, and did not in any way present himself as available before or afterwards unless they, the Exclusivists, were given "their

rights” to undertake all responsibilities. I know all the details well . . . I often visited and wrote to her”.

(21)—*Letter dated 4th June, 1966*

“My brother out there has had his house split by Big Jim’s edicts . . . What a ghastly system to cause such sorrow! . . . I am most grateful to be free of such Sectarianism. The Brahmin-cum-Stoic-cum-Pharisee hardness of Exclusivist Plymouthism is not my cup of tea!”

(22)—*Letter dated 2nd June, 1966*

“ . . . the false doctrines being taught by J.T. Jr. and foisted and forced upon his followers with no alternative save acceptance or expulsion with the wrecking of their homes and disruption of their families. I left them in 1961 but my wife remained with them and is still there. She was required to leave me. I have been con-
tending with her and the Brethren for 5 years now,
presenting the Scriptures bearing on the position she
is now in ; but without result. I have had no success
in my endeavours to get my wife back.”

(23)—*Letter dated 7th June, 1966 (from Australasia)*

“We visited . . . last week and were told that the Exclusive Brethren in the area are very active now in visiting to try to get Mr. . . . and family to return to them. An Exclusive brother said that they had been wrongly withdrawn from and now that the assembly meeting has been rescinded, Mr. . . . can feel happy to know that he will go up at the Rapture”!

(24)—*Letter dated 10th March, 1966 (from the mother of an 'In' family)*

“The terrible time of oppression and persecution of the last two years in particular—I write from personal experience—is being blamed on the ‘rival ministry’ of the Hales brothers (and now they are restored!). There are those who resisted what has been “current” and suffered—again—in consequence. We were amazed to hear a leading brother from Bristol say, of the Hales’s teaching, “What a terrible thing it was that it was all kept from J.T. Jr!”. But the fact is that J.T. Jr. knew all about it.

There has been more than one subtle attempt to bring in division in our family. We have been through deep waters.”

(25)—*Letter dated 17th March, 1966*

“I have a son living only a mile from this house. His younger daughter, who is nearly 2, I have never seen. Just one of the innumerable sad cases of anguish for which Jim Taylor will have to answer.”

(26)—*Letter dated 24th May, 1966 (Not addressed to myself)*

“News of our four children (i.e., who had left their parents’ home) is very scarce—almost non-existent; but we trust in God.”

(27)—*Letter dated 30th May, 1966 (from a brother, whose wife is still 'In')*

“In August 1960, a Mr. . . . was put out by the Exclusives for, among other things, unrighteousness (over £1,000 involved). He has now rejoined the J.T. Jr. Sect and at once—as of old—commenced to

harass all those who have withdrawn from the iniquity. He called here at 9 p.m. on the 22nd ; my wife admitted him. I had to threaten to telephone the police before he would go. Again, he telephoned at 10 p.m. on Friday. I may have to consider legal steps to prevent his dangerous intrusions. Meanwhile, are they subtly enticing my wife to break her marriage?

I had to spend my Easter vacation visiting my only sister who, with her health almost gone, worn down with it all, is at death's door at E."

(28)—*Letter dated 17th June, 1966 (from Australia)*
 "In 1947 we were received into the "Exclusivist" fellowship, and were fairly happy until 1960, by which time our brains had been washed sufficiently to believe that it was the Exclusivists who were really God's elect, and, according to P.L., the Aristocracy of heaven. Unknowingly, we were being transferred from Jerusalem to the Kremlin. So the platforms at Ashfield Hall, Sydney, were rearranged so that Jim Taylor's military police, Bruce Hales, Taylor's son-in-law, and John Hales could have a better view of the battlefield from opposite ends.

After three months of confessions that were made which compared with what might have been read in Sodom-Gomorrah's foulest papers, one brother went on the platform and said that with all the confessions made, no sin was so great as the refusal of Jim Taylor's ministry! Although very ill indeed, I walked to the centre of the Hall, where about 1,400 were sitting, and, picking up the microphone, said, "Brethren, after much thought and meditation, my wife and I :—

- (a) Can no longer believe in a Universal Leader ;
- (b) Cannot accept the teaching of Authoritative Ministry ;
- (c) Cannot regard everyone not breaking bread with us as unclean ;
- (d) Are fully capable of dealing with the Drink question."

We left the Hall ; ignoring John Patton and John Hales who called us back. We did not attend for 14 days, during which our home was our prison. We had to take the door-bell off ; and even then the Galatian military police entered by the back door. One brother gained access by a deliberate lie, stating we had misunderstood the ministry, and that we could have meals with our family (all married) even before any return to 'fellowship'. Thus prevailed on to return, they gave us the best robe they had—but it was "Taylor-made". Eventually I had to be placed in a mental institution, the expenses amounting to £200, and my family had to travel up to 850 miles to see me. I thank God that now in this liberty we can truly sing Hymn 23" (quoted in full in the letter).

(29)—*Letter, 13th July, 1966*

"In the meeting at . . . in April, 1964, I was charged with having two maids in my house and also keeping a dog ; maids were not to cook our food as they had "unholy hands", and they were not to sleep on the premises as "unclean people", and the dog was to be got rid of . . . Shortly after I was asked if I went with all J.T. Jr's ministry . . . I drew attention to certain [things he had said a few weeks before including the statement that "*God is now opening the seals, spoken of in Reve-*

lation, and has already opened one in Cuba". Then a leading brother said, "I think we should put our brother on seven days and in the meantime we should all shrink from him". He then led all of the brethren out of the room. During the seven days I was charged with railing on the brethren, and opposing the ministry of "beloved Mr. Taylor Jr.". My wife was charged with supporting me. At the end of the seven days we were put on a further seven, after which we wrote a letter withdrawing from 'fellowship'. No explanation had been offered as to J.T. Jr's statements. 50% of the meeting were not in accord with the 'assembly judgment', but the meeting is under the domination of one brother with marked sadistic tendencies."

(Comment. Have you retracted your false teaching, so contrary to Scripture and "the three great ministries"? I do not comment on the other points. It is all odious).

(30)—*Letter, 1966 (from South Africa).*

"In your letters to J.T.Jr. you mention "Universal Leadership". This wrong doctrine stumbled my dear old father of 82 years, and because he would not accept it he was withdrawn from. At his withdrawal meeting the Exclusivists read Mal. 3 : 18, and this, together with the fact that two of them, who saw him on his sick bed, called him "a wilful, wicked man", caused his untimely death."

(31)—*Letter just received (from Australia)*

"Trusting . . . that your open rebukes will prove far more in keeping with God's glory than so many others' hidden love. Personally I have very little admiration

for any brother who stayed in "the position" more than two years after Mr. Cowell's Martyrdom".

(32)—*Letter, 2nd June 1966. (Glasgow district—about the time that S. McC. was in Glasgow and stating that J.T. Jr. had never said that wives should leave husbands, etc.).*

"Since 1961 when I left the Exclusives, owing to their enforced teachings on Eating, etc. I have consulted with the brethren and my wife four or five times in an endeavour to get my wife back, but without result. I have been married 25 years."

(33)—*Letter, 16th May 1966 (from Australia)*

"My wife and I are among the many suffering the sorrow of a broken family through J.T. Jr's wicked teachings. In fellowship 30 years, our life among the saints was intensely happy. Then J.T. was taken. J.T. Jr. pressed to the front ; there was much unease at his attitudes and utterances, with much of which we could not agree. Gospel preachings ceased, and, in lieu, a sort of castigation of saints was set up. There was great weight on many ; but we dare not question openly what we knew was wrong. In 1964 my wife's mother died ; she was not amongst us, but a dear lover of the Lord, and very bright though latterly a total cripple. It fell to me to arrange the burial. At the grave, we stood well apart. After the service my brother-in-law asked me to provide needed transport in my car for 3 relatives from the cemetery. For this we were "Shut Up" as having compromised the 'fellowship' because I had 'phoned the minister and allowed "unclean" persons into my car! We were debarred from attending meetings ; and constant

visits by zealous young brothers left us no peace until we had to say we had been wrong in 'disobeying the ministry'. We were most unhappy. My daughter and husband were staunch supporters of J.T. Jr. The days were full of sorrow for us. Later we were again arraigned for "compromising" in that (suffering from duodenal ulcers) I had *a drink of milk in a milk bar* near my place of business, and then I had been "observed" talking to my next-door neighbour. So we were "Shut Up" again ; constant harassing visits of many young brothers bringing us to exasperation. Then, because I spoke out, quoting Scriptures, and refused to accept "the authoritative ministry of J.T. Jr." and to own either him as "the man of God with the mind of the Spirit", or a local young brother as "the man of God at Eastwood", I was withdrawn from in April 1965. This was a great relief to me. *But after that the Exclusivists did everything in their power to induce my wife to leave me.* I am thankful that my wife's love prevailed over the strong, subtle inducements of "the brethren" *to break up our home.* Even my daughter entered the battle, offering my wife a home if she would but leave her father, "that wicked man who had gone into the world"! Praise the Lord, my wife was withdrawn from last June. We have never looked back. But our daughter, her husband and our 3 grandchildren will have nothing to do with us.

P.S.—I must denounce the wickedness of the Exclusivists. They have made determined efforts to break up our little meeting, but without success except where a household was dominated by an insubject wife. What a joy to hear the glorious gospel preached in its

purity! While thanking God for His delivering mercy, we “sigh and cry” at the enslavement of so many of our brethren.”

What I have reproduced above is but a small, but factually accurate fraction of the whole story. If you have not already heard of these facts, that, Mr. Taylor, is your own fault and your own responsibility. But the setting out of what I now bring before you in this letter has the advantage that, in the event of these, my letters to you, being also published, there will be an abiding record of a true cross-section of what has been and is still current in the terrible “Exclusive Brethren” Sect, under your supreme leadership.

And even that minute cross-section which *powerfully demands some answer from you* is not left merely without any substantial answer—see page 122 above—but without any answer at all.

C.A.C. truly says (“Deuteronomy” p. 163) “Departure from God is never so serious as when it takes assembly character . . . Religious influences that do not give Divine Persons their proper place are essentially idolatrous. There should be holy jealousy as to such things, and intense repudiation of them . . .”. Paul withstood Peter to the face. “The whole character of the dispensation was involved ; Christianity itself was at stake”. That corresponds with the position to-day, in principle. “Paul . . . exposed, before all, the evil that was working.” I myself personally am in no wise equal to that, but the Lord is, and He is helping ; and God will be glorified.

But who is on the Lord’s side? A brother or a sister is scarcely worthy of the name if remaining quiescent

when the rights of the Lord are challenged.

The customary sequence is—first your wicked teaching ; then, a brother subtly entrapped ; then brethren's habitual heartlessness (at your behest) comes openly into evidence ; then putting in ward ; then interrogation and provocation ; then withdrawal of, say, the husband ; then the home is in effect wrecked, it is "unclean" ; abduction of wife and children may follow, the "assembly" planning, subsidising and facilitating all this ; then your aggressive supporters, you call them priests, I call them thugs, exult in their successful exploits ; and the Supreme Universal Leader states "the Father's works are perfected in *us*." There may additionally eventually be the scathing condemnation by a Court of law of yourself and your Sect.

As to your references to the need for "abandonment", the very first thing to abandon is the Supreme Universal Leader, and all connected with him, his teachings, and his thoughts and his ways (which are certainly not God's). In the doing of this, *that is, the withdrawing from iniquity, and the fleeing from what is truly unclean,* the Lord is glorified.

One point more. Sooner or later there is certain to be a powerful demand for a formal investigation—which would command respect—into the teachings and activities of the sect. I have referred to the need for this in an earlier letter. It is bound to come about. Public concern is being aroused strongly. But an impartial inquiry into the nature and results of your teachings and the relative methods resorted to and the procedures

followed,^f is urgently called for in the interest of everyone who loves truth (apart altogether from the important matter of the public weal and Rom. 13 : 1-6). If any such inquiries were instituted, James Taylor Junior would not emerge with many laurels.

Faithfully for the Lord,

HUBERT CALVEY

Southport—24th October, 1966

Mr. JIM TAYLOR JR.

Behaviour in the House of God

(No. 10)

Dear Mr. Taylor,

1. I wrote you on 26th July last (my letter No. 6 to you on "Behaviour in the House of God") asking you some very pertinent and important questions involving the principles of Righteousness and Honesty, in regard to the letters, purporting to be "Letters of James Taylor" in your published Volumes 1 and 2 under that title.

As three months have elapsed and I have not heard from you I think it well to remind you of my letter and my important questions therein.

I now write you on a further, and possibly cognate, matter, to which also I hope I shall receive your specific reply.

2. In the Volume 2 of "Letters of James Taylor",

page 318, the following sentence appears in a letter which purports to have been written by J. T. to Mr. H. P. Wells dated 21st June, 1943—

“Any individual ground we take that robs us of I Corinthians or Scripture generally is not of God”.

3. My question is whether the wording of that sentence is precisely and completely the wording as it was written by J. T. himself?

4. My reason for asking the question is that *I do not believe that J. T. would have written that sentence in that form, i.e., the form in which it appears in the published volume.*

5. It would seem that either the word “individual” has been inserted, or alternatively some such words as “or collective” have been deleted after “individual” if “individual” appeared in the original letter.

6. If any addition to or deletion from the original wording as written by J. T. was made by anyone other than J. T. himself, would you kindly let me know—

- (a) details of the additions or alterations made ;
- (b) who made them ; for what reasons ; and on whose authority ;
- (c) when they were made?

Yours in faithfulness,

HUBERT CALVEY.

Southport—8th DECEMBER, 1966

Mr. JIM TAYLOR JR.

(N.B.—*The covering envelope was clearly endorsed
“Urgent, Personal and Important”*)

Behaviour in the House of God

(No. 12)

Dear Mr. Taylor,

Information received to-day from South Africa necessitates my writing you again on this subject and regarding the specific case mentioned, in view of which, and bearing in mind your recent visit to South Africa, you will find that what I state demands now urgent and serious consideration, on account of the features of the case itself, but also in view of the implications which arise out of it.

THE CASE—Mr. and Mrs. Edward M. G. Baker of East London (formerly of Port Elizabeth), South Africa.

SUMMARY AS BACKGROUND

Principle Involved

(a) The Lord's own words in Matt. 19 : 9 make it clear that adultery is the only ground of divorce.

(b) Rom. 7 : 2 makes it clear that nothing, not even desertion, or evil treatment, but only physical death, can separate the wife from the husband.

Both (a) and (b) are unqualified.

The Facts

Nevertheless your Sect, wickedly, on your directions, required Mrs. Baker to leave her husband “to clear F

herself” because Mr. Baker was no longer a member of your Sect.

Then your Sect, because they were subsequently afraid of being exposed in Court, told Mrs. Baker in the Court proceedings to plead guilty of malicious desertion of her husband, and own publicly that she was the transgressor. This was the cunning device of the Sect to secure her divorce. It was deliberate, and most wicked. The Sect, under your leadership, professes to be governed by righteousness. But that action was of the devil.

Not only that, but your Sect—who instigated and enforced that desertion—then most evilly, in their wicked craft, withdrew from Mrs. Baker (all part of the evil plan), so that, if summoned into Court, as indeed happened, they would be able to tell the Court (to deliberately mislead it) that Mrs. Baker should not have left her husband and they had therefore withdrawn from her, and declared her, on account of the desertion, “unclean”, and “unfit for Christian fellowship”.

HAS ANYTHING MORE WICKED BEEN DONE IN THE NAME OF CHRIST?

Then there are all the indications that, as soon as they can do so, without undue publicity, they will receive Mrs. Baker back into their fold as being free of her husband.

All this is extremity of evil; and by your Sect; acting under your directions. It is not only contrary to public morality, and ordinary honesty, and upright behaviour, but contrary to the Holy Scriptures, to

righteousness, to the words of the Lord, and to your own letter of 19th August, 1964 to the "New York Times". In addition, it is positive wickedness. You speak of "unbelievers", but few of those you so designate would stoop to such infamies.

Your Sect, under your leadership, seems to be simply saturated with wickedness and fully furnished for every unclean work and for any and every Satanic device.

The Facts in Detail

- A. Mr. Baker was withdrawn from in 1962 because he did not accept (a) the ministry about eating; (b) that all Christians not in 'fellowship' are unclean. He also told the brethren who interviewed him that (c) he did not agree with the drinking, and would not himself take alcoholic liquor, or give it to his children aged 4 years and 2 years; and (d) he would not accept your ministry as authoritative and final. His wife remained in 'fellowship' with the Exclusivists.
- B.
 1. Shortly after, on returning home one day, he found that the Exclusivists had spirited away his wife and children to an unknown destination, later found to be Cape Town, *500 miles distant*.
 2. Mrs. Baker instituted Court proceedings for the custody of the children ; and Mr. Baker did likewise.
 3. The matter was settled *out of Court*, Mrs. Baker promising to return to her husband, with the children, but not to eat, sleep or mix with him.
- C.
 1. In 1964 Mrs. Baker again :—
 - (a) left her husband, taking the children with her ;

- (b) instituted proceedings against her husband, this time for a divorce, adultery being alleged.
- 2. A private detective for 8 weeks shadowed Mr. Baker, to find support for the charge of adultery, but completely in vain.
- 3. Mr. Baker, in his defence, brought in a counter-claim of malicious desertion.
- 4. At the Court hearing in November 1965, Mrs. Baker was unable to substantiate her allegation of adultery, and the case was postponed.
- 5. At the resumed hearing on *21st November, 1966* :—
 - (a) Four Exclusivists—Noakes, Eric Pudney (High Priest for Port Elizabeth), Neville Crow and Joe Beattie (High Priest for South Africa and local at Cape Town)—all *appeared in Court*.
 - (b) They *strongly pleaded that the case should be settled out of Court*.
 - (c) Mr. Baker would not agree, as he desired to clear his name of the unfounded charge of adultery.
 - (d) After discussions between the parties, the Exclusivists put forward the following plea :—
 - (i) the charge of adultery would be withdrawn ;
 - (ii) *Mrs. Baker, now the defendant, would be told to plead guilty of malicious desertion ;*

(iii) they, the Exclusivists, *condemned Mrs. Baker's action in leaving her husband*, and in fact on that account *had already withdrawn from her as a wicked person unfit for Christian fellowship.*

The Outcome in Court

(1)—The charge of adultery was withdrawn.

(2)—Mr. Baker was granted a divorce on the ground of his wife's malicious desertion.

(3)—Directions were given as to the upbringing of the children.

(4)—Mr. Baker to have *no* responsibility for maintenance either of Mrs. Baker or the children.

(5)—Mrs. Baker to pay £200 towards Mr. Baker's legal expenses.

Other Information—Owing to strain, Mr. Baker had been in unhealth and had lost his job, and been unemployed for some months.

Some Important Considerations which arise out of the Case, and which Call for Answer

The Wrecked Home and Family

(1)—It would appear that this, another, household has now been irreparably wrecked through its connection with the Exclusivist Sect. How do *you* feel about it?

(2)—There is the further serious matter of the children, of very tender ages, with the parentage in such conditions. It is most grievous and distressing. Have you contemplated the appalling situation which now exists where, a few years ago, there was a happy

family? A mass of trouble has come in and every particle of it is due to your evil teachings and enforcements, all without any warrant whatsoever in the Scriptures.

(3)—Therefore you personally have a direct and substantial responsibility in regard of this case and of the many others of a like kind all over the world.

(4)—On any fair view it seems intolerable that you, leading your fanatical supporters, should be allowed to continue in your way of “ruin and misery” (Rom. 3) as you travel from the U.S.A. to one country after another, indifferent to the trail of havoc you cause.

Features of the Case before the Court

1. The Wife abandoning her Husband

(1)—In your Vol. 14 (1962) you said that neither parent can leave the nuptial home where there are children of tender years. I cannot trace that any reference, in this case, has been made to that directive. Was that ministry merely face-saving and ‘make-believe’? Did you insist on its observance when you were in South Africa recently? Doubtless your local High Priests there discussed this case with you before you left on 21st November (the date of the Court hearing), and have conformed to your directives.

(2)—Your Exclusivists *condemned* Mrs. Baker outright and even withdrew from her for leaving her husband in ‘wilful’ or ‘malicious’ desertion; but in 1962 (the date of the Southampton ministry referred to) *they abducted her* the 500 miles distance.

(3)—*The abductors* were apparently not withdrawn from, either in this or any other of the cases; in fact *abductors* and *harbourers* have been commended by

Exclusivists for their wicked acts!

(4)—How did the local Exclusivists find it possible to withdraw from Mrs. Baker, and not from those who had counselled and assisted her or sympathised with her in her latest foolish “abandonment”—and do not forget, Mr. Taylor, that that word “abandonment” is *your own approving word!*—so disastrous to herself, her husband and her children.

(5)—But what are the alternatives that any poor harassed Exclusivist wife is faced with in such a case at your hands? If she *remains—as she should do*, irrespective of what you so foolishly state—at home with her husband in normal relationship, you, in your extremest punctilious Pharisaism, assert, *without any warrant at all*, that she is “unclean” and “unfit for Christian fellowship”; whilst if she, so foolishly, and unrighteously, *leaves* her husband owing to the threats or enforcements of your High Priests, based on your wicked teachings and enforcements, *she finds herself similarly excommunicated as being, as in this case of Mrs. Baker, “unclean” and “unfit for Christian fellowship!”* What a Code! But probably you call it a Charter! And who is the responsible author and enforcer of its absurdities and its evil? *It is you.*

2. The Exclusivists

(1)—What must be kept in mind, is that the Exclusivists have no status whatsoever in the matter as between husband and wife. They were simply in Court on a par with the public.

(2)—Therefore what, first, is not understandable is the statement in C5. above that “after discussions between the parties, the Exclusivists put forward the

plea . . . ”. The Exclusivists were *not* parties. They were *not* entitled to put forward anything.

(3)—The more closely the matter is examined, the more suspicious it seems.

(4)—As stated, also in C5. above, “The Exclusives condemned Mrs. Baker’s action in leaving her husband and on that account had already withdrawn from her as a wicked person unfit for Christian fellowship”. Now, how can you and yours (though capable of remarkable mental contortions) drastically *condemn* in this instance what they are not only *condoning* but actively *advocating* and even *enforcing* and even *subsidising* in other cases all over the world? It all seems the very essence of dark craft, a maze of deceit. Has the full story yet to be told? Had your Sect *nothing* to do with her “abandoning” her husband? Had you not encouraged her to do it?

(5)—Then as to your withdrawal from her, the desertion was *two years ago*. Did she not break bread frequently with your Sect after the desertion? Did they ever, in the two years, tell her to return to her husband? This question **REQUIRES ANSWER**, as do my other questions. It would appear that *they did not* so counsel Mrs. Baker—or any of the others; quite the reverse. In fact had they done so, they would have involved themselves more than ever. This shows the chaos—unrighteous and inconsistent—under your supreme leadership.

(6)—Mrs. Baker has been excommunicated as “unclean” and “unfit for Christian fellowship” *for doing precisely what you have told her and many others to do, namely on your definitions, to “withdraw from*

iniquity” and therefore to leave (“*abandon*”) her husband. That could be the clear condemnation of yourself, but the whole matter seems far murkier than that.

(7)—Then there are other cases all over the world. The wives are wrong, by your standard, *if they do not* leave their husbands ; and they are wrong (as Mrs. Baker) *if they do* leave them! And, *in each alternative*, so wrong that excommunication (the very last thing to do) is the only righteous penalty in your view, with its adjudgment of being “unclean” and “unfit for Christian fellowship”! What an unrighteous muddle!

(8)—The many who enjoin, facilitate and materially provide for and subsidise these “wilful desertions” may likely find themselves congratulated, but (when it suits!) your High Priests condemn the wilful deserter, the wife, and excommunicate her and no one else, though the desertions are directly imputable to them and to you. How wicked your teachings are!

(9)—As you are the instigator and enforcer of this “abandonment” fiasco, then the simplest righteousness *demands* that you should be excommunicated, and labelled “unclean” and “unfit for Christian fellowship”.

(10)—What is not 100% clear is the principle enunciated and asserted by yourself, “the man of God”, (*alias* “the Spirit’s mouthpiece”), which *casts out* Mrs. Baker, but *subsidised* the late Mrs. Brian Cowell, for instance, *for the very same thing*. (They both had one or more children of tender years.)

(11)—Do not overlook your answers, in ministry, to questions bearing on the theme and your citation of 2 Tim. 2, and even your feeble answer on page 163 of

your Vol. 14, that the point of all importance was to bring out the individual exercise so that the person is individually convicted of the truth and set free by it! The bearing of that on Mrs. Baker's case is seen. Perhaps you say that the truth has set her free? (See (16) below).

(12)—Mrs. Baker, on 21st November, 1966, sat the whole day in Court, weeping, and once fainted, but the High Priests (as in Luke 10) and their company took no notice of her, because as withdrawn from she was “unclean”, and untouchable! What a system! How does your orthodox “gentleness” and “law of kindness” ministry just a few weeks earlier (see “Life and Activity”) fit into that?

UNLESS the whole episode was simulated, to deceive the Court!—And in that not unlikely event too—one can truly say, and with added emphasis, “What a system”!

(13)—But for what purpose had the Exclusivists, including two local potentates, travelled so far, by aeroplane, to be present? They ignored Mrs. Baker when she fainted, but were urgent with their crafty advice to her. It is shady in the extreme. Had they (including the two High Priests, whatever that may mean—it means less than nothing to me) insinuated themselves into Court, self-appointed, with a speciously assumed watching-brief to use every resource (maybe not even excluding the Trust Fund) to ensure—maybe pursuant to your directive a few days earlier—that they must, at all costs avoid a full open Court hearing in the light of day? But if they thus took their directions from you, did you approve, privately, and do

you now, of their urging the plea of “wilful desertion” so that a divorce was obtained in one way, if it could not be in another?

And is there any understanding, implied maybe, that Mrs. Baker will be receivable back into your ‘fellowship’ now that she is divorced?

(14)—How is it that the full facts were not openly spread out before the Court, which is a matter of great importance? Because what you teach and enforce will not bear the light of day.

(15)—It is simply *shocking* that your High Priests, etc., urged Mrs. Baker to plead guilty of “malicious desertion” so that by this stratagem the divorce was accomplished, the charge of adultery having been found untenable; because *according to Scripture, that is not a ground of divorce*. And it would seem, moreover, that by this means a responsibility was thrust on Mr. Baker; and, moreover, the impression was carefully and deceitfully given, that her desertion of her husband was contrary to the High Priests’ thoughts.

(16)—Was there, in fact, thus a deliberate, calculated circumvention of a divine principle in order, craftily, to gain the strategic objective, namely the divorce? Then :—

- (a) Others who have been deserted should be on their guard as to such tactics;
- (b) I remind you, that you yourself have said, the end does not and cannot justify the means!
- (c) If Mrs. Baker, now divorced, is received back in due course into the Exclusivists’ fold, my suspicions will be shown to be right—but do not

forget the opening paragraph of your letter of 19th August, 1964 to the "New York Times" where you stated publicly that you "would not have communion (1 Cor. 10 : 16-17) with anyone getting a divorce otherwise" than the ground in Matt. 19 : 9.

- (d) The Judge's remarks in 1962 were wise and salutary. But how humbling for your Sect to be thus told by him where the true path of Christianity would lead!
- (e) There was the avoidance, in the present instance, of *a full Court hearing* ; and the avoidance *by excommunicating Mrs. Baker* of any appearance of weakening the truth as to divorce ; the plea of desertion was advanced at your instance (*by one already withdrawn from!*) ; *BUT* how was it possible to withdraw from Mrs. Baker *before* the Court hearing, seeing that it was only in Court that the charge of adultery was abandoned? Is there any shred of the whole matter which—on your side—answers in the faintest way to "the truth's pure light"? There is not.

(17)—As I remarked in my Letter No. 11 to you of 3rd November, 1966, your revolting Home-Wrecking Technique as an instrument of unspeakable coercion is the crowning-point of the evil teachings of a wickedly ruthless man, who, in his utter untruth, publicly asserted "I do not impose my views on anyone".

All that I place before you is very far removed from what is becoming to those walking in the light as God is in the light.

I will write you again, if the Lord will,

For the sake of His testimony,

HUBERT CALVEY

**EXTRACT OF LETTER TO
Mr. ALFRED J. GARDINER, STREATHAM**

20TH MARCH, 1965

“ Dear Mr. Gardiner, beloved brother,

“The Testimony of the Lord”

I have long intended to write you in this relation, but have been wishful not to add to your cares. It has become clear to me, however, that I am now responsible as before God to urge certain matters powerfully upon you ; even as the Lord will, I believe, hold you responsible to heed what I state. You may hear the distinct voice of adjuration. If you ignore it the truth of what I say is on record ; though grievous to narrate, or to read, it is all unchallengeably true.

I write in deep humility, and owning my part in the deplorable public confusion. My letter cannot be short; it can but touch on a mere fraction of what could, and maybe should, be righteously stated. I will be as concise as I can. The whole story, when eventually unfolded, will be overwhelming.

It is not a case of accusation, or attack, or of flesh trusting its own wisdom ; but of seeking, with the

Lord's help, to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints. I write with one, the supreme, objective, the glory of God, to strike a blow *for the truth*. I regret if what I say should wound you, or others ; but feelings with the Lord in regard of what is His own, dictate this letter. It is a time for resoluteness for the truth, without any fear of man. It is time that the Lord should be honoured.

I—Basic Considerations

(1)—“*Depart from Iniquity*”.

What I do say, centres on your own clear statement on pp. 102-4 of that serviceable (but now proscribed) compilation “*The Way Everlasting*” (1958). You say there, after referring to Satan's methods of attack, that the concern of those seeking to walk consistently with the Lord's name and the holiness of God's house is to withdraw from iniquity, iniquity being man's will in opposition to God's will, especially in the things of God.

You then rightly state :—

“ If I am identified with any religious body or system the principle of whose existence denies *the sovereignty of the Holy Spirit* according to 1 Cor. 12, and denies too, *the authority of the Lord*,—if, for instance certain parts of the *Scriptures are discredited*, and it is said that they are not inspired or that *they do not apply in this day*, that there has been *development since the apostles' day*, or *anything of that kind*—any body or system that is marked by these features is

stamped thereby as *iniquitous*. It is no use saying that there are many of God's people connected with it, that is not the point. *The point is that everyone is to accept responsibility for himself, if he names the name of the Lord, to depart from everything that is of the character of iniquity.*"

Beloved brother, I have to tell you that it is irrefutably clear, beyond the slightest shade of doubt, that the system you are still identified with is *iniquitous in its teachings, its methods and its practices*—this, I will fully shew—and that you, you especially, with your knowledge and influence, are responsible to the Lord to withdraw from it—that is, to withdraw from iniquity. The time has come to say it unequivocally in view of the name of the Lord."

NOTE—Regarding the above Extract.

(1)—The above are the opening paragraphs of the letter I addressed to A.J.G. on 20th March, 1965, being but a small part in length of the first of my six letters to him early in 1965.

(2)—No reply was received to any of those letters.

(3)—The quoted extract from "The Way Everlasting" is the truth and fundamental. Others have been helped by it. But my point was as to A.J.G.'s apprehension of the bearing of it on himself.

The Lord Jesus said, "Altogether that which I say unto you".

(4)—Truth never changes, even though it may condemn the leaders, who indeed may have the multiplied responsibility of their example and influence on others.

(5)—The extract quoted from A.J.G's paper applies to believers generally and powerfully bears on everyone found in fellowship with the system known as The Plymouth Brethren Exclusive Sect No. 4, headed by James Taylor Jr., which in an outstanding way is marked by iniquity and untruth—gross wickedness in teachings and gravest evil in enforced practices and methods—and to an extent really without precedent so that it has become a universal public scandal, and in fact grows worse and worse.

(6)—It is now impossible for anyone to take the ground of following righteousness, or answering to the claims of the Lord, or loving “the truth of God”, or “stimulating faithfulness” to it, or for anyone to speak of “the Spirit's guidance into the truth”—I quote from the Prefaces to the undernoted book—who has fellowship (partnership) in such a system of untruth and infamy. “Are not they who eat the sacrifices in communion with the altar?”. It says of Gad, “And He provided the first part for Himself, for there was reserved the portion of the lawgiver”. (Deut. 33 : 21).

(7)—A.J.G's own attitude to the fundamentally important principle mentioned above and so clearly set out in what he himself says, as quoted, as well as the matter of his judgment as to what constitutes Truth, have inevitably a direct bearing on the question of the trustworthiness of the 1963 Edition of “The Recovery and Maintenance of the Truth”, by A.J.G. If he, or anyone else, is found in fellowship with a Sect which, according to those clear definitions of but eight years ago, is marked by untruth and iniquity, then, it is only

fair to say, everything he, or such a one says on the subject of Truth, as well as what he omits to say, is legitimately called into question. My remarks on page 13 have a cogent bearing in this relation.

(8)—A.J.G. should know how much it costs me personally to bring this forward. *But I have no option*; “necessity is laid upon me.” It is due to the Lord.

December, 1966

HUBERT CALVEY

NOTES—

Abbreviations

“N.S.”—New Series Vols. of Ministry of J.T. (James Taylor Sr.).

“C.W.”—Collected Writings of J.N.D. (John Nelson Darby).

Correction—Ref. Vol. 1, p. 56, Mr. Court states that he was not withdrawn from. He and his household “individually withdrew on their own exercises because of unprincipled cunning and systematized error.”

Main Subjects of the Letters

<i>To J.T. Jr.</i> <i>Letter</i> <i>No.</i>	<i>Pages</i> <i>Nos.</i>	<i>Main Subjects</i>
1	1-16	Statements in J.T. Jr's Vol. 34—Elimination of criticism.
2	17-35	Statements in J.T. Jr's Vol. 34—Leadership—Being humbled in the Courts.
3	35-56	Agenda for Prayer Meetings—The Gospel of God ("The Compassions of God"—Get right <i>first at home</i>)—The Wrecking of Homes and Families.
4	56-77	The Wrecking of Homes and Families.
5	77-116	The Wrecking of Homes and Families—Extracts of Letters—Binding Committals—The Marriage Vow—The Outrageous Case of Dr. T. of Johannesburg.
6	117-120	"Letters of James Taylor."
9	120-157	Some Letters of Withdrawal from the "Exclusive Brethren" Sect—Extracts of Letters.
10	157-158	"Letters of James Taylor."
12	159-171	The Wicked Case of Mr. E. M. G. Baker of East London.
<i>To A.J.G.</i> <i>Extract</i> <i>of Letter</i> <i>(with Note)</i>	171-175	Obligation to Withdraw from Iniquity—Discernment of Iniquity and being governed by Truth.

Abandonment	23, 45, 46, 51, 57, 78, 95, 156, 164-5, 167
Abduction of wives, etc.	... 30-33, 49, 103, 141, 161
Aberdeen (1964)	 5
Accommodation as bribe	 94, 154
Addition	 20
Adjuration, voice of	 7
Administrative Presumptions	... 64, 68, 69, 70, 71, 82, 96
Agenda for Prayer Meetings	 35-38
Alcoholism	... 7, 8, 26, 52, 53, 74, 75, 123, 139
Answer, giving an	... 4, 7, 16, 47, 122, 123, 155
Apostasy	 19, 46, 47, 77
Ascertainment of Facts	 58, 59, 156
"Assembly" untruth	 91, 159-170
Assessment of the situation	 75
Attacks on persons	 34, 79
Authoritativeness of Ministry	 26-27, 64, 116
Babies breaking bread with J.T. Jr. (See Prefatory Note),	44
Babies, taking of, from mother's breast	 95
Babies of even 3 months old to be abandoned (London)	48, 49
Baker (Edward M. G.) case	 30-31, 103, 159-170
Beck. Ernst,	 25
"Beginning." "From the,"	 40, 46, 78, 95 (and See "Development.")
Behaviour in meetings etc.	 34, 36, 124
Brethren's domestic gaols	 82
Brotherly Spirit	 92-93
Burials	 39, 44
C.A.C. (Coates, C. A.)	 42, 52, 55, 56
Central Hall, Westminster (London), July, 1959	... 91
Children, breaking bread	 44 (and see Prefatory Note)
suffering through the teachings	48, 49, 58, 59, 60, 81, 94, 103, 163
taken away (i.e., from home and parent)	... 95
Clericalism	 17-19
Committals binding—(and see "Marriage Vow")	... 100
Compassions of God	 39-47
Coercion	... (See "Enforcement")
Contending for the Faith	 77
Corrie-Johnston, Mrs.	 147-148
Courts of Law	... 15, 27, 28-33, 49, 52, 59, 66, 159-170 (and see 147)
Cowell. Brian,	 32-33
Cowell. Gerald R.,	... 21, 99, 129, 143, 153
Criticism. Suppression of,	 15-16
Deceit, dishonesty, etc.	13, 21, 28, 37, 43, 47, 50, 51, 80, 82, 83, 84, 88, 96, 108, 123, 159-170

Deficiencies, mental and moral	...	...	...	111
“Development”	...	...	...	18, 36, 38, 46, 172
Delay disallowed	...	...	...	90-91
Divorce	...	...	...	159-170
Doctrine of the Christ, Abiding in the.	...	...	...	41
Dorking	...	...	...	4, 12, 60, 87
Eating	...	...	...	80, 83, 86, 105
Enforcement	11, 20, 27, 36, 40, 41, 43, 48, 50, 54, 55, 57, 58, 59, 61, 67, 68, 74, 101, 108, 110			
Evenson, O. N.	...	...	...	25
Exclusivist Sect				
Elimination of criticism	...	...	...	15-16
Features	...	...	...	22, 28, 29, 32, 50
(and see Behaviour)				(see also Deceit, etc.)
Extreme methods	...	...	...	107, 165
Family and other Natural Relationships	21-22, 38, 39-47, 48, 49, 50, 54, 55, 56, 81, 82			
Natural claims, a priority of.	...	...	...	45
Family. The Second,	...	...	...	96
Fear of consequences	...	...	...	43, 88
Gaols, domiciliary	...	...	...	82
(Brethren’s gaols in their homes)				
Gardiner, Alfred J.	...	...	...	50, 71, 171-175
Gospel	...	...	...	11, 37, 39-46
Glories of Christ	...	...	...	24, 73
Grace	...	...	...	11, 55, 56, 107
Hardness	...	...	...	86, 94
Harbouring of wives	...	...	...	49, 94
Headship of husband	...	...	...	95
“Home—a great principle with God,,	...	...	...	107, 165
Honesty (see “Deceit”)				
Hypocrisy (see “Deceit”)				
Inconsistency	...	...	...	51, 84, 97, 164-167
Iniquity. Withdrawal from,	...	...	...	115, 156, 171-175
Investigation called for	...	...	...	58, 59, 74, 113, 156-157
Inward. Priority of what is	...	...	...	55
Jailors	...	...	...	19-20, 82
(and see Gaols)				
Jensen case	...	...	...	29
Kidnapping of children	...	...	...	103
				(and see 95)

Leadership	...	...	...	...	23, 27-29, 116
Leader—supreme, universal	...	...	...	...	28, 116
Legality	...	...	...	...	107
Letters, extracts, etc.	...	48, 53, 83-92, 98-101, 135-155			
Levity	...	...	...	...	1-3
“Local men of God”	...	...	...	...	26
London care meetings	...	...	...	...	48, 113, 138
Love	...	...	...	...	67, 68, 81, 82
Lyon, P. (and Mrs.)	...	...	...	...	49, 51
Manasseh...	...	...	...	...	11
Manhood	...	...	...	...	15
Marriage Vow	...	...	...	...	100-103
McCallum, S.	...	...	...	95, 96, 97, 99, 153	
Men of God”. “The local	...	...	...	...	26
Metropolitanism	...	...	...	...	70
Ministers	...	...	...	...	18, 34, 39, 45 (and see “Clericalism”)
Ministries” (or ministers).	“The three great,	12, 41, 43, 44,	45, 46, 56, 71, 72, 73, 81, 82		
Ministry of J.T. Jr.					
bafflement	...	...	...	...	4-6
lightness	...	...	...	...	1
presumption, etc.	...	...	...	...	9, 23
sex	...	...	...	...	6-7
twisting	...	...	...	...	5, 11, 22
uncomely remarks	...	...	...	...	24
general	...	...	...	...	34
(see also under J.T. Jr.)					
Moral basis	...	...	...	...	23
Perfection	...	...	...	...	8-10, 30
Position”. “The,	...	...	13, 15, 23, 80, 87, 98		
Presence of the Lord	...	...	...	...	23
Price, A. C. S. P.	...	...	...	...	21
Priests. J.T. Jr’s,	...	...	...	...	68, 69, 96
Publicity. Fear of,	...	...	...	...	52, 92
“Purification and Life” (G.R.C.)	...	...	...	...	21
Quiescence is blameworthy	...	...	...	...	155
Rapture. The,	...	...	...	...	92, 148
Raven, F. E. (F.E.R.)	...	...	...	...	25-27
Recovery	...	...	...	...	10, 23, 40, 46
Recovery, “The . . . of the Truth” (A.J.G.)	52, 53, 54, 55,				92, 174
Relationships. Natural, (See “Family”)					
Results of teachings, etc.	...	...	...	...	59-63, 74

Righteousness	...	...	...	...	23, 32, 47, 51
Root-cause. The,	...	...	...	...	68
Ruin	...	...	...	...	57, 77, 78
Satan. Committal to,	...	...	...	...	93, 115
Scriptures, The,	...	...	...	...	22, 49, 69, 96, 157, 158
Job 7 : 17	...	...	...	...	110
Luke 10	...	...	...	...	110, 168
1 Cor. 7	...	...	...	...	48, 111-114
2 Tim. 2	...	...	...	...	22, 23, 33, 97
Twisting of,	...	...	...	...	65
Sectarianism	...	...	...	...	9, 10, 25, 52, 69-70, 81, 121
Separation	...	...	...	...	55
Shining	...	...	...	...	10, 11, 12
"Sin", continuing in, etc.	...	...	...	...	90, 97
South Africa	...	...	...	...	32
"Spirituality"	...	...	...	...	6
Stanley, "Horace C., matter"	...	...	...	...	119-120
Stow Hill Depot	...	...	...	...	5
Sufferings of Brethren	...	...	...	...	10, 11, 24, 25, 38, 47
(also see "Children")					
Suicide	...	...	...	...	89
Tammany Hall	...	...	...	...	71
T. Dr., Johannesburg	...	...	...	...	32, 84, 103-110
Taylor, James (Senior)					
"Letters of James Taylor"					
(Accuracy and Authenticity)					117-120, 157-158
Taylor, James (Junior)					
Personally	5, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 28, 33, 48-50, 156, 167				
Leadership	...	...	...	...	10, 23, 27-29, 45, 52
Teachings, etc., distinctive	...	...	...	...	23, 49, 51
vagueness	...	64, 66, 67, 68, 73, 74, 94, 95, 96			
variable	...	...	...	...	65
authority	...	...	...	...	64
contradictory	...	...	...	...	65, 66
wrongness	...	...	...	...	75
husbands and wives	4, 29-33, 34, 47, 50, 51, etc.,				159-170
Visits to U.K.	...	...	...	...	12
Vol. 34 (his)	...	...	...	...	1-15, 17-27, 49, etc.
(See also under					
"Ministry of J.T. Jr."					
"Wrecking of Homes", etc.)					
Truth	...	...	...	...	12-15, 22, 54
(See under "Witness")					
"Unclean" Houses, persons, etc.					43, 57, 60, 87, 96, 110, 160, 165, 166 167 etc.

Untruth	...	...	...	14-15, 28-29, 46, 80, 96, 174
Voice of the Holy Spirit	...	...	...	27, 40, 43, 50
Walton. Mrs. Edith (Malvern)	...	...	...	62
Ward. Putting in,	...	...	...	62
Withdrawal. Letters of,	...	...	...	121-135
Witness to the Truth	...	...	...	12-15
Wives free to abandon husbands	...	...	...	65
“Word Proclaimed. The”	...	...	...	11, 39-40
Wrecking of Homes and Families	4, 21, 29-33, 40, 47-51,	53, 54-75, 80-115,	159-170	
(See also under “Dorking” and “Letters”)				

See also pages 83-92, 98-101 and 125-154.