

A narrative of FACTS as to what has transpired of late at 2544 Stevens Ave., in this City.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., May 10th, 1895.

To Saints gathered to the Lord's name everywhere.

Beloved Brethren in Christ:—

A circular was sent us signed by seven brethren, who recently left the assembly at the above named place, because they could not *force* us to reject our Brother McLaren, and they gave no verbal reason for leaving except that. Now, if saints will forsake an assembly, without first proving either immorality, unsoundness, or uncleanness to *exist* in it, then surely, those who *remain*, should not be condemned because of those who depart.*) Had their circular been *correct*, we would not have replied to it, but we believe, that for the Lord's honor and in justice to Brother McL., as well as in faithfulness to all saints, it should be corrected, so that all may know the *facts*, and act accordingly.

And we desire to do this in love and grace to all. Their circular is herewith reprinted with ours, so they can be seen together. The comments and marginal notes *are all ours* also. The

first statement is that it was "*painful*" for them to do it. So it should have been considering what he wrote, as it *pained* the Lord, *grieved* the Spirit, and *did injustice* to their brethren.

His next statement is, that Brother McL. is not in fellowship *with them*, but has identified himself with the Brethren. The former is true, but he has not left O. B's nor left E. B's. He is still in fellowship with the assembly, that he has always been with since he came to this country.*) They say, that "while he was under discipline", he sought to make *division* in other churches. This is not correct, as will be seen from the attached letters, sent us, from the only assemblies where he ministered while he was under *supposed* "discipline", and this was previous to their "cutting them off", (Gal. v: 12). Those four assemblies were written to, requesting them to state the *facts* as to Brother McL.'s reception among them, and we received these answers. The four *individual* letters from Howard Lake were sent us unsolicited, which we also attach, for our brethren to read, and they can then draw their own conclusions as to the truth or untruth of the charge made against Bro. McL. of having made division where he

He did not go anywhere except where he was invited and *assured* that all were happy in receiving him. He declined going to some places where he was invited for, because *some* in those gatherings objected. He did not wish to cause "*division*" or "stumble" any, as not done so.**)

subjection to his brethren and to the authority of the Lord's will," is the next charge, which in a sense is true,

our brethren who have gone, always considered this *the assembly* while they were with us, — if so it must be still, unless *they* were *the assembly*. They have not driven the Lord away from us.

We do not know of any division of late, except at Buffalo, N.Y., and Toronto, and in both these places it was caused by two leading E. B. laborers who received the Pittsburgh circular as a *test and term* of fellowship. By doing so they excluded saints out of *their* fellowship as those saints could not accept the *new* terms. They were therefore cut off by those who *would be* "Lords over God's heritage." Bro. McL. has not acted in this way; he has not sought to *force* anyone to do anything. He has not made trouble anywhere. Retaining his seat *here* has offended some who have withdrawn.

as Bro. McL. does ignore brethren rule, or assembly authority, *apart from scripture*, so do we all here, but at the same time we (Bro. McL. included) will accept Godly counsel or admonition from any brother, or bow to the act of any assembly, if the act is according to the word of God. They say they were "*compelled* to depart from iniquity." They did not show us any *iniquity* to depart from, if there was any, why do they not name it in their circular. If it was among us, it must have disappeared, as we do not know of any existing now any more than before they left.

They say they "waited on the Lord" about it. If they had, they would not have turned their backs so *suddenly* on those gathered to *His name*, withouth first proving some sin there. We fear it was on *leaders* elsewhere they waited.**) They say they acted in "*humility*." It looked to us like *self-will* acting in *the flesh*. They say their faces are *in the dust*. We wish it were so, not merely "*as it were*," as stated in their circular. It is the "*low state*" that they *admit* they are in that has caused them to write such a cruel circular.***) We can only say, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."

Now the *facts* in the case are as follows, as *before God*: Bro. McL. since the Plainfield conference in 1892 has not seen any scriptural reason to refuse any saint, believed to be "sound in the faith," nor any reason why he himself should not break bread with any company gathered to the Lord's name, that were believed to be *all right*; he has publicly stated these convictions here,

*) It was told to some of us (by one of themselves who saw it), that a letter was sent them from New York, stating that Bro. McL. was "possessed with Demons". This sounds very like Mark iii: 30, where they said the Lord had "an unclean Spirit". This is about as near to the "blasphemy against the Holy Ghost" as anything we know of.

**) When they sent out their letter, there were just fourteen of them, viz: the eleven who went out and the wives of three of the brethren, who were not present that memorable morning, and they now claim to be *the assembly*. This does not look like *humility*, or having their faces in the dust, but "pride goeth before destruction and a haughty spirit before a fall." (Prov. xvi: 18.)

and wherever he has been for a long time past. We all *professed* to see just as he did as to the *former*, but were not all clear as to the latter, though *some* of us were quite clear as to *it* as well. It was however supposed to be left to individual consciences, as to how each would act so long as the word of God was not set aside. Last fall Bro. McL. broke bread with an O. B. company in Chicago. On his return home, *four* of the "chief men among the brethren" here, said they would not be happy for him to break bread "with them" any longer. One of them said that the *assembly* had rejected both him and his ministry; some objected to these statements as not being the voice of the assembly, as there had not been any assembly meeting.

Bro. McL. then asked the *objectors* if they *refused* him the privilege of breaking bread. One of the *four* said, "No, as there was no cause to refuse him", but that they had a conscience as to his doing so. He then said he would not forfeit his place, but would respect their consciences by sitting back on Lord's day and give them time to look into his case, which he did, and he waited for nearly two months on us to decide (as an assembly), whether we considered him inside or outside. We talked over the matter often while Bro. McL. was away, ministering elsewhere, and we concluded to have an *assembly* meeting to decide it, with him present, and some brethren from St. Paul and Hamlin were invited, and they came.

It was felt by *all*, that breaking bread with O. B's was not sufficient for putting him away; and so an attempt was made to prove that a letter which he had written contained *untruth*. This failed, as the statement in question was proven to be *truth*. Next an attempt was made to prove that he held and taught *unsound* doctrine; this was also seen to be groundless.*) Next it was declared that he was *un-*

*) The charge was that he had taught, that "Satan had the Lord in his mouth"

clean, because he had broken bread with O. B's, as they were *defiled*, but all failed *miscrably*.**) At the close of his *trial*, Brother McL. asked if there was anything now against him, more than having broken bread with O. B's. The *assembly's* reply was *nothing more*, and not one contradicted it, but there was no confession on the part of the accusers for what they had failed to prove.

A Brother from St. Paul, who had said previously to some and written to others, that Bro. McL. was *unsound*, was present, and Bro. McL. asked him (in the presence of all the rest) if he knew of anything wrong that he taught. He said, he "could not say that he did."

The next Lord's day Bro. McL. was away, and this same Bro. came back and stated at the breaking of bread, that *he did* know of unsound teaching by Bro. McL. This caused some present to lose confidence in him, and to question his honesty; one brother spoke to him in the meeting, asking him why he did not say this, when asked by Bro. McL., and when he was present to defend himself. His reply was, that he did not think it would have been to the Lord's honor to do it then. We leave all to judge of this *excuse*, as they deem best.†)

It was this same *busy* St. Paul Bro., who said that

and "shook him as a dog would shake a rat". Bro. McL. asked who ever heard him say this, and was told that it was a Bro. Hartt of White Birch, Wis., that said he heard him teach it. Bro. McL. at once wrote him, and that letter, with the reply, we attach, to show how hard our brethren tried to blacken Bro. McL. Bro. Hartt is known to be truthful, godly and spiritual. Bro. McL. does hold and teach that in Psalm xxii: 21 the Lion is *Satan* and his mouth the *grave*, where the *dead body* of Jesus was held between death and resurrection. Whether he is correct or not remains to be proven.

**) All these attempts to blacken Bro. McL. were prior to, at, and subsequent to the meeting, to investigate his case.

†) We now are in possession of correspondence stating that this same bro. has since been among the gatherings (where Bro. McL. labored, while under "discipline",) seeking to sow discord, and "cause division" among the sheep and lambs of Christ, by endeavoring to blacken Bro. McL's character, but he did not succeed very well. We are sorry this brother has not got some better employment, as such work will not bring any reward "in that day". We have no doubt but that he is a child of God, but he is doing Satans work; he is at present an agent for the "Accuser of our brethren", but perhaps unconsciously.

it was Bro. Hartt who said he heard Bro. McL. teach about the *dog and rat*. "But he that doeth wrong shall receive for the wrong which he hath done, and there is no respect of persons." (Col. iii: 25.) He also said at Howard, when there, that John xvii: 21 could not be on earth.

Some of Bro. McL's accusers (who would not shake hands with him when he came home, because he had broken bread with O. B's), then said that his having had fellowship with them, did cut him off from *us*. He did not think so, and said that if that was *all* that was against him, that the next time he was at home over Lord's day, he would sit in to remember his Lord as usual, unless that in the meantime he should see differently.

The next time he was present he again took an outside seat, stating that he would still wait, as some of his brethren and sisters were not satisfied.*) At the beginning of the meeting, a brother stood up and stated that he could no longer be a party to keeping Bro. McL. outside, as he knew of no cause.

The leader of this *schism* then rose and read 1 Cor. xi: 20 as his warrant for leaving, and said he could not break bread any longer in such a gathering, and he walked out, and sat down in the outside place with Bro. McL. The latter said to him, "brother, don't leave the table on my account"; his reply was, "it is not on your account, but on *theirs*," pointing back to the circle he had left. Three more brethren then rose and said they could not submit to Bro. McL. being kept outside, and they invited *him* to sit in, but he declined, stating that he preferred waiting a little longer, for the Lord's honor and the welfare of the saints. Four other brothers then *followed the leader*, and sat in the outside place.†)

*) There were only twenty-seven out that morning besides Bro. McL.

†) These brethren did not show the least bit of respect for the consciences of those they left. *Two* of the leaders, who went out *then*, had refused the emblems

Three *simple* souls, through their influence, went out with them; those *three* have no idea of what they went out for, but they *counted* in the flight.*) One other sister then followed the exodus.

After a long unbroken silence, the wives of two of the leaders went out (but *seemingly* with great reluctance,) and sat down with their husbands; this made eleven in all, a *new* party to the Lord's honor. Everything was again quiet and a brother inside rose and gave thanks and passed the emblems. Six sisters and one brother, who remained inside, did not partake of them, being confused by what they had just witnessed.†)

The next Lord's day none were present, but those who had broken bread the previous Lord's day, (nine in all.) Bro McL. still took an outside seat, stating that for the sake of those who had not gone out, but were still unsettled, and also because he understood, that those, who had gone out, had not yet broken bread in separation, he would wait another week at least. We broke bread as usual and he looked on.

The next Lord's day he resumed his seat, as it was now evident they had left, and since then we have had peace and blessing. One brother has been restored who had not broken bread for over six months, having been stumbled by the actions of two of the leaders who are

the Lord's day before, although they were still inside, and they gave no reasons for it. Bro. McL. was not even in the city, so it could not be on his account.

*) Two of them live in the country, twelve miles away, and came in Saturday and were all night at the house of one of the *leaders* and came to meeting with him.

†) One of the seven was a sister on a visit from a neighboring assembly. At the close of the meeting she went over to Bro. McL. with tears in her eyes, and said: "Bro. McL., it was not on your account I refused, but I was so upset by what took place, that I did not know what I was doing."

now *outside*.)*) Two of the confused sisters who refused the emblems that morning are again in their places, and judging from appearances, more will soon be restored. One other sister has repented having gone with them, and has confessed her mistake; she is now in her place, happy and at rest. Some saints who were not present at the "*insurrection*" have kept their place, and are astonished at the course of those who have gone away and set up another table. Our brethren have gone off and started a *new* assembly, claiming it to be the only one in this city.†) But nevertheless the Lord is still in our midst, as we *are* gathered to His name, and free from *evil*, so far as we know; and we believe *He* is with all who are similarly gathered. We are told that two of those distracted sisters (who declined the emblems), have gone *with them*. We understand that the brother and the other sister are not breaking bread anywhere, but are remaining at home with *sore hearts*, and are no doubt waiting on the Lord as to where to go. Some in this assembly have been away from home for some time, and others who live in the country have not been to meeting since before the *secession*. We don't know where they will go. We have not gone to see *any* of them; we leave them all to the Lord. "He is a shield unto them that put their trust in Him." (Prov. xxx: 5.) ‡)

There are at present thirtyone of us breaking bread in the Hall, and we know that some of the new party at bro. Milton's house are not there from choice but of necessity. Yet we are told if we leave Minneapolis we are expected to carry with us a letter of commendation from those

*) Over a year ago about a dozen or more saints withdrew; the cause they assigned for it was the *intolerance* of the *same* two leaders. Some of us were *sorry* when the first Exodus took place, but we frankly admit that in the *present state of things* the last was a relief, though we feel the loss of some *individuals*, who have gone.

†) And they suggest, that any saint leaving Minneapolis, better have a letter from *them*. Is not this the height of *exclusive* presumption?

‡) One of the signers of their circular was out to the *hall* on Lord's day evening and told us he did not know of *anything wrong* with us. He is one of those who was *influenced* to sign their circular.

seven brethren on Fourth avenue. Think of it! It would seem as if the words of Job were in place here, "No doubt but ye are the people and wisdom shall die with you" (Job xii: 2).

Of course it makes no difference as to the number in either place, as "two or three" are quite sufficient, if gathered to His name (Matt. xviii: 20), but some have written us, asking how many went out.

With this paper will be found a letter of commendation that this assembly gave Bro. McL. after the others left, and in it will be seen where we stand and what the principles are that govern us, and we leave it for all concerned to decide for themselves, in the Lord's presence and by the word of God, whether or not those principles are *divine* or *human*.

Your brethren in Christ,

H. L. GILKESON, THOMAS GOOD,
WM. C. LEWIS, JOHN BOUCHER,
H. M. WHITNEY, BENJ. W. LEWIS,
in behalf of this assembly.

P. S. We have had special meetings in the hall for the past six weeks with a good attendance of sinners and saints, and there is manifest blessing at each meeting. The Lord is at work, and so is Satan, but the victory is certain to those, "who are on the Lord's side." (Nahum i: 7.) We expect our Bro. Burrige in a few days, to hold some meetings here, and we look for rich results. He and Bro. McL. will then visit the assemblies, where the latter was received. We are glad to say that some of our brethren who left us, still come to meetings for the ministry of the word; for this we thank God, and take it as a proof of better feeling.

Copies can be had *free* from WM. C. LEWIS, 1234 2nd Ave. S.

TO THE SAINTS WITH US GATHERED TO THE NAME
OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST.

Minneapolis, Minn., April 1st, 1895.

Beloved Brethren:

"Painful" we think be-
cause they could not
have their own way.

Thank God.....

Not so.....

They should be *clear* be-
fore they charge them
with it.

Has God gathered them
on the ground *they have*
taken?

He would not be honest
if he did anything else ..

Was not under discipline.

They are not in fellowship
with them.

A mistake.....

Was never admonished
not to go.

Four.....

It becomes our *painful* duty to make known to you that our brother, J. R. McLaren, is no longer in fellowship with us, having knowingly and deliberately *identified* himself with Open Brethren, among whom we are *not clear* but that evil doctrine is still held and taught. He has also caused to be printed and disseminated views subversive to the ground on which we believe God has *gathered us*, and, not regarding the conscience and protests of his brethren, has attempted *to force* upon us a fellowship which we cannot receive. Furthermore his teaching while among us has been such as would tend to lead us into the same position which he himself has taken. *While under discipline* he has continued to visit gatherings *in fellowship with us*, thereby *causing division* and stumbling blocks,*) notwithstanding the *admonition* of his brethren. From such we are commanded to turn away. (Rom. 16: 17, 18.) This he has treated with contempt by *insubjection to his brethren* and the *authority of assemblies.*†)

At a meeting of the assembly to consider the action of Bro. McLaren, it was the *expression* of many in the gathering that we could no longer fellowship him or any who knowingly manifest fellowship with him. As an issue we have been compelled to depart from iniquity, (II Tim. 2: 19)

* There has not been any division, but merely a *secession* of a few who got *dissatisfied* because they could not *Lord* it over the consciences of their brethren.

† He has persisted in being in subjection to *the Lord* and will not bow to any authority but the word of God, which course they will not endorse.

till, however, owning the principles of God with those who are "endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." (Eph. 4: 2 to 6.) *)

Our action has not been with *undue haste*, but with much waiting on the Lord both as to Bro. McLaren and especially as to those who may or may not be *influenced by him* (as we believe our dear brethren are) that they might be clear from the evil. In humility before God and with our faces in the dust, as it were, we own our *low state* in allowing such to arise in our midst.

Our place of gathering, until further notice, will be at No. 2711 Fourth Ave. South. We would recommend that any brother or sister coming from Minneapolis and desiring fellowship, bear a letter of commendation.

Signed in behalf of the assembly.†)

FRANK HOEL,
DAVID ALLAN,
ALEXANDER ALLAN,
E. H. SMITH,
P. A. OLSON,
JOEL TURMBLE,
JNO. H. MILTON.

There are *four* truthful statements in the above circular:

- 1st. Bro. McLaren is not in fellowship *with them*.
- 2nd. That they are not *clear*.
- 3rd. They are in a *low state*.
- 4th. They meet at Bro. Milton's house, 2711 Fourth Ave. S.

The balance is all a mistake to say the least of it.

They waited just one week.

In *selfwill*, as we believe and on account of their "low state" they have left those gathered to the Lord's name without *proving* sin to exist among them.

The old assembly hall is still at 2544 Stevens Av., where all *Godly* saints are welcome.

* This seems very solemn to us, for we verily believe they have departed from the "principles of God" as well as from those who are "endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace."

† They should say in behalf of *ourselves*, as seven brethren are all that went out with them when they *sceded*.

ASSEMBLY HALL, 2544 Stevens Ave.,
Minneapolis, March 31st, 1895.

Beloved Brethren in Christ:---

We hereby certify that our Brother, J. R. McLaren, is still in full fellowship with us, notwithstanding that he has broken bread with Brethren known as "Open", and we commend him to all saints gathered to the name of our "Lord Jesus Christ", whether "Exclusive" or "Open" (so called.) He has our "Right hands of fellowship" and we bid him "God speed". We ignore the names "Exclusive" or "Open", but will *exclude evil*, and are *open* to conviction or teaching from the Word of God. We have been, until now, in acknowledged fellowship with saints known as the Grant Company, in the exclusive party, but we will receive all saints as well as them who are believed to be *Godly*, which to us means *Moral, Sound and Clean*. All such are free to break bread elsewhere and return, unless it can be *proven*, that where they have been, disqualifies them for further fellowship. We will also receive all Godly ministry from any servant of the Lord, and will "reject" all who preach or teach contrary to the Word of God. We also reject all *human* traditions or circulars as tests of *fellowship, reception or discipline*, only "Thus saith the Lord" will be bowed to. This we believe is maintaining *Divine* principles, and continuing *Divine* practices, as was seen at the beginning, and we believe this to be "Endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the uniting bond of peace." We know of no fellowship but "with the Father and with his Son, Jesus Christ," and "One with another", and we recognize no membership but that of the "Body of Christ" and believe, that *all* the members of that "one Body" should "Care one or another", and "Suffer" or "Rejoice" *together*, "For we are members one of another". There *were* some in this gathering who rejected these principles, but they have withdrawn without giving any Scriptural reason.

Your Brethren "In Christ" in behalf of this assembly,

H. L. GILKIESON, 3000 Harriet Ave.
THOMAS GOOD, 1610 E. Franklin Ave.
H. M. WHITNEY, 3301 Harriet Ave.
WM. C. LEWIS, 1234 Second Ave. S.
JOHN BOUCHER, 2925 Dupont Ave. S.
THOS. DUNN, 1320 Fourth St. N.
BENJ. LEWIS, 1234 Second Ave. S.
E. S. CHASE, 12 Sixth St. N.
R. C. KILBOURNE, 1813 Fourth N. S.
H. H. COLEMAN, 2517 Stevens Ave.
H. BABCOCK, 2931 Garfield Ave.
R. H. HOLBROOK, 619 East 24th St

P. S. When the above letter was given to Bro. McLaren, there were but five names on it. We thought that was sufficient, but one E. B. laborer stated that was all the *brethren* who remained at the hall. Another of them tried to make out that there were more, but that all were not happy about him getting it. To prove the *untruth* of both statements, all the brethren, who are at home, have now signed it. There were only seven brethren that went out, including the leaders.

EAU CLAIRE, WIS., March 25th, 1895.

To the saints gathered to the name of our Lord, Jesus Christ, at 2544 Stevens Ave., Minneapolis, Minn.

Beloved Brethren in Christ:—

As we have heard that it is rumored, that our Bro. McLaren was not received here by all the saints, we take this way of declaring that such is not the case. There was not one dissenting voice.

We know of no reason to refuse him. His having broken bread with O. B's (so called) is no barrier here, as we do not *know* of anything wrong with them.

Your Brethren in Christ,

S. J. RAY.

M. TROTT.

T. MURPHY.

In behalf of the assembly here.

ALEXANDRIA, MINN., April 15th, 1895.

To the saints gathered to the name of our Lord, Jesus Christ, at 2544 Stevens Ave, Minneapolis, Minn.

Beloved brethren in Christ:—

We wish to state, that our Bro. J. R. McLaren, on his return from St. Louis, visited us, and was received by the whole gathering. We knew, that he had broken bread with "Open Brethren" (so called) in Chicago, while attending their conference last fall, but we cannot with a clear conscience disfellowship him on that account.

We know him, from personal acquaintance, to be sound on foundation truth, moral in life, and clear from association with immorality or blasphemous doctrines. We may differ from him and he from us, on points, which, as a rule, call for forbearance on both sides, and patient waiting on one another, but as to truth concerning the Person and Work of Christ, we have heard him preach and teach, and can heartily endorse all as being *Scriptural*. The charge that he is causing divisions, we are not able to accept as being true, but believe, that whatever in the way of division has taken place, can be traced to *another source*.

We wish it distinctly understood, that we have not (as reported) gone over to "Open Brethren", who, as far as anything we *positively* know, are scripturally gathered, and as a company are "sound in the faith".

Neither have we espoused their cause as against "Exclusive Brethren", but we desire to be in fellowship with all so gathered and who love our "Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity and truth". Nevertheless, we must of necessity refuse every test that would conduce division, or mar the fellowship of saints thus "endeavoring to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace". We do not esteem our Bro. McLaren to be

without fault, (who among us have none?) but be it far from us to give him the place of a “wicked person” or “heretic”.

In our estimation, to do so is most serious and solemn, and involves grave accountability before God.

“Brethren, pray for us, for we trust, that we have a good conscience in all things, willing to live honestly.” And we would not, knowingly, have fellowship with either moral or doctrinal evil. May much love and gentleness characterize all your ways with one another, is our prayer.

In behalf of the assembly here,

W. H. SCOTT, JOHN MCFARLANE,
JAMES F. DICKEN, J. H. EVANS,
R. B. MCFARLANE, JEROME DICKEN,
WM. JOHNSTON.



SAUK CENTRE, MINN., March 28th, 1895.

To the saints gathered to the name of our Lord Jesus Christ at 2544 Stevens Ave., Minneapolis, Minn.

Beloved Brethren:

We have heard, that it is said by some of you, that Brother McLaren was not received here by the whole assembly. We desire to say, that this statement is not correct; we were only too glad to have him with us; not one here would think of refusing him.

His having broken bread with Open Brethren (so called) does not defile him, so far as we know, and we *will not* refuse him, nor any servant of the Lord until we know of some *scriptural* reason for doing so.

Your Brethern in Christ,

MARK. SWIFT,
C. G. PALMER.

In behalf of the assembly here.

HOWARD LAKE, MINN., March 28th, 1895.

To the saints gathered to the name of our Lord, Jesus Christ, at 2544 Stevens Ave., Minneapolis, Minn.

Beloved Brethren in Christ:—

Report comes to us that two in the assembly at Minneapolis are sowing discord among the brethren, by saying that Brother McLaren was not received here by all. This is a mistake; there was not a dissenting voice, that we know of, and we are not *strangers* to each other here.

The gathering on *that* Lord's day morning was as large as usual and all was *harmony*. His labors here were *blest* by the Lord to *many*. We are satisfied that the Lord was pleased with his ministry here and we believe we "have the mind of the Lord." It grieves us to see that there are so many minds where all should be of one mind. Oh, that we had more grace and were more "obedient to the faith." If our hearts were "set on things above", if we were "considering *Him*," all would be well, God would be glorified and sinners without excuse.

Your Brethren in Christ,

C. W. TAYLOR,
E. B. SMITH,
J. CRAIG LONG.

In behalf of this assembly.

HOWARD LAKE, MINN., March 28th, 1895.

Beloved Brother McLaren:—

Along with the assembly letter I feel led to drop you this individual note, as I know it will cheer your heart to hear of blessing through your ministry while here. Some of my relatives received rich blessing, which will help to draw them from the denominations, and nearer to *Christ*.

For my own part I can say my soul was *fed*, and I was not fed in vain. My heart does not reprove me for what I have received, and Jesus knows that I would not purposely justify an error, and it is for *His* sake that I pen these lines.

Your Brother in Christ,

C. W. TAYLOR.

HOWARD LAKE, MINN., March 29th, '95.

Dear Bro. Gilkieson, Minneapolis, Minn.

Gal. v: 1. I have just heard that it is said that our Brother McLaren was not received by all the assembly here. I will say that the statement is *untrue*. He was received by *all*. Mrs. Thos. Milton was sick, and was not at the breaking of bread, on account of her illness, but there was not a dissenting voice, and why should there be? "Let Brotherly love continue!"

Your Brother in Christ,

J. C. LONG.

HOWARD LAKE, MINN., March 29th '95.

Dear Bro. Gilkieson.

Personally I could see no reason why we should not receive Brother McLaren, I have never seen any charge against him, that to my mind would disfellowship him. His ministry here was blessed. The whole assembly, I believe were out on that Lord's day morning, except sister Milton, who was sick.

Affectionately, your Brother in the Lord,

S. J. CUTTS.

HOWARD LAKE, MINN., March 30th '95.

Dear Bro. Gilkieson.

Not being present when the others of this assembly wrote you regarding Brother McLaren, and his ministry amongst us, I take this opportunity of adding my testimony as to his faithfully giving out the word, and many got blessing, I must say that I felt its power also. He was unanimously received in full fellowship and we look for him to return again soon, that we may have "a second benefit". "Let brotherly love continue." (Heb. viii: 1.)

Yours in Him,

See Num. xi: 24—30.

A. N. CARTER.

3121 Clinton Ave.,
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., April 5, 1895.

Beloved Brother Hartt, White Birch, Wis.

It is said that you have circulated a report to the effect that you heard me say, that the devil had the Lord in his mouth and shook him as a dog would a rat, or words to that effect. I cannot believe that you ever said such a thing, but would be much obliged if you reply by return of mail stating what foundation there is for such a rumor. Please enclose this letter in your reply.

Mine and me are well, and trust the same is true of you and yours. These are truly "perilous times," but He is coming very soon.

My christian love to your household.

Your Bro. in Christ,

J. R. McLAREN.

P. S. Send it to Bro. Gilkeson, 3000 Harriet ave., as I may be away.

WHITE BIRCH, WIS., April 18th, 1895.

Dear Bro. McLaren.

I cannot recollect having met Bro. Gilkeson, 3000 Harriett Ave., so I write to yourself.

In connection with the Psalm 22—21 I believe the teaching was that satan had the Lord in his mouth, I heard you go over the Psalms a year ago last fall with another brother in Christ, and found much comfort in the 22nd, 23rd and 24th. On my visit to you, at your home I believe I brought the matter up and recieved the above teaching which I take to be *the scripture*, viz.: Satan had possession of the Lord's *dead* body in the grave for three days and three nights. As to the *dog* and the *rat* I do not recall anything of it, if I said it I think I must have added it myself as an illustration of the idea I conceived of the matter. No doubt the idea was not good; a lion and a lamb would be the idea. I cannot recollect having mentioned this to any one. Brother McKown is the only brother with whom I have had much conversation on spiritual things since I saw you, and if he told it, I suppose he used the words he heard me say, though I cannot recall the telling to him or anyone else. Any one to whom I have talked regarding you or your work as teacher or preacher cannot fail to know my high appreciation of both. Trusting all will be better when we see Him face to face, I am ever your affectionate brother in Christ,

W. C. HARTT.

3121 Clinton Ave.,
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., May 13th 1895.

To Saints known as the Grant division of "Exclusive" Brethren.

Beloved Brethren in Christ:—

As so many are writing to you, I feel led to drop a line as well, as I know there are still some of you who will be glad to hear, that notwithstanding the storm I am passing through, *I still live*, and through the mercy of God am well in body and happy in soul, and doing what *little* I can for the master, and He is *nightly* blessing His word to sinners and saints, especially so, during the past six weeks. To Him be all the praise, now and for ever. "In that day" it will be made manifest who it was that put *hindrences* in my way. In transgressing and lying against the Lord and departing away from our God, speaking oppression and revolt conceiving and uttering from the heart words of falsehood. (Isaiah lix: 13.) It is known to many of you that I *never* was connected with Romanism and for a good many years not with Protestantism "as a party," but I am now clear of *Brethrenism* as well, I am *really* "without the camp," "the Lords free man," bearing His reproach," "looking unto Jesus" seeking to "consider Him," realizing the necessity of this, "lest I be wearied and faint." I am hunted by *leaders*, as though I was a *wolf*, and they "seek to slay me" wherever they find me, and all because I wish to treat *all* "my brethren" as well as I do my "exclusive brethren." I am hated and persecuted by *some* of them, simply because I love them *all*, and wish to treat them *all* alike, when they are believed to be walking according to *the truth*. A sentence in a letter just received from a bro. who had received my first printed letter states it all in a nutshell. I here quote it:

"You have ignored *parties* and accepted *Brethren*, instead of ignoring *Brethren* and accepting *Parties*. Thank God that you have. You *surely* have his approval."

The number that have got deliverance in their souls, from "Exclusive" bondage, through my printed letter, is almost incredible the thanksgiving and gratitude expressed in their letters to me, and their requests for more of them, for those they love, has often filled my soul with joy of late, when receiving the denunciations of the E. B. Leaders, from all sides.

My Lord has condescended to use it in a way far beyond my most sanguine expectations. To Him be all the praise! Some of the E. B. laborers have nicknamed me *sore-head*, for having written it, but if it is true, then they ought to have *sore hearts*, and if it is not true, why don't they contradict it. My *head* is not sore, but my *heart* is, at the *ungodly* actions of those who profess to be so *Godly*. Actions speak louder than words, and they will not commend themselves to any *Godly* ones, by calling me hard names, but as long as the Lord uses my letters, they can call me what they please, only let them remember *His* words, "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me." One leading E. B. Laborer wrote to me asking where the assemblies were that I referred to on pages 16 and 17 of my former letter, and who, the laborers were Who refused the ministry.

I replied at once, telling him where one of the assemblies was, and that *himself* and myself were the two who refused the ministry there on account of their condition.*) I told him, where another assembly was, and gave him the name of the laborer who refused their ministry, and that he could write him as to the cause. I told him where the third one was, and that *I* was the laborer who would not have anything to do with them, as I knew of the *desperate* condition they were in.†)

*) I was surprised at his asking such a question, and all I could say was, "thou art the man."

†) I refrain from giving the laborers' or assemblies' names *now*, but may be

He also asked me for my authority for stating what I did on page 21, about the three E. B. laborers in California, so I sent him the three original letters that I had received from there, as my authority. When this brother wrote me asking for this information; he styled me *Dear Brother*. A few days after I met him "face to face", in the presence of several others, and he would not shake hands with me. This was used by the Lord to open the eyes of some who saw it.*) From the expression on his face, and his tone of voice I concluded I was not so very *dear* to him, as his letter would lead me to suppose, unless it was *dear* in the way of being *costly*, as my presence there was spoiling his *game*, of making *exclusives* of the saints he was seeking to influence. A few in that place will no doubt be led by him, as they know him to be "an able minister of Jesus Christ", and he has often been used in blessing to them.

Some of those who have gone out, were my warmest friends *professedly*, while I remained an "Exclusive", but since I have advocated intercommunion with O.B's, they have been very bitter towards me, and have shown their love to me by not ministering to me. This they said, they considered faithfulness to the Lord, but all this time they listened to my ministry and professed to get blessing from it. But the Lord has taken care of me. He is "the same yesterday, to-day and forever", and "sticketh closer than a brother". They loved me so dearly, that they gave me the "more blessed place, viz.: that of the *giver*, and their *humility* led them to take the *less blessed* place of receivers. It is truly wonderful, what *professed* Godliness, combined

obliged to do so later on together with other laborers and assemblies, unless they repent and confess in the meantime. If I *have* to, it will make some ears tingle.

*) It seems to be the way now adopted by all the *noted* ones in that party to show their *Godliness*. The example was set by the leader of the party at *Plainfield*, (from whom we expected better) by his refusing to shake hands with Brother Burridge, when the latter called on him, and the "lesser lights" *must* necessarily imitate him, in order to be considered in *approved* fellowship and "faithful to the Lord". Are these *divine* actions?

with *pure* "Exclusiveism", will prompt even a saint to do, and make him "think, that he doeth God service". (John xvi: 2.)

Some of the brethren from the St. Paul assembly seem to have a special spite at me, and I do not know why. One of them, who is out in the Lord's work, was present the night of my *trial*, and had the audacity to stand up and tell me that I had no right to speak there, as I had put myself out of fellowship by breaking bread with O. B's. I knew that *he* had broken bread with them some months before I did, but had kept it secret for fear "he should be put out of the synagogue" at St. Paul. I then asked him, if he had not done so, and with a *flushed* face he was obliged to admit it, in the presence of all, as he knew I could prove it. This quieted him for a short time, but he soon rallied, and again told me that I was under discipline and must keep quiet. I then told him, that if HE did not keep quiet, I would be compelled to show up more of his inconsistencies. This had the desired effect of silencing him for the evening, as he did not care to have any further disclosures. He had wisdom in his wrath.

Some of the E. B. laborers (I can name them) are now *amusing* themselves, by pointing their followers, (not to "the Lamb of God" especially,) but to those whom they have been pleased to call "the *five* unruly Johns," viz:

John Burridge,

John Sims,

John James,

John Buss,

John McLaren,*)

who they say *went out from them*, but the *truth* is, that those five are *kept out by them*. These poor Johns are now the targets for all the exclusive cannons, rifles, re-

*) But they make another mistake, as J. does not always stand for John; which is the case with Brother Burridge, but he must suffer with them, nevertheless.

volvers and *popguns* that are in the field, but still *they live* and are heard from occasionally. *)

The two *JOHNS* of the new testament did not fare any better, but *worse*; John the baptist was beheaded, and John the Evangelist, it is said, was thrown into a cauldron of boiling oil. Perhaps some similar fate may yet befall the present *five* *JOHNS*, at the hands of those *gracious* ones, who *love* us so *dearly*. The past two Johns and the present five make the perfect number *seven*, however *imperfect* the last five are. What a comfort it is for us to know, that the meaning of the word *John* is *the mercy of God*. How blessed it is for us, in these "Perilous times", to enjoy *His mercy*, while being treated so unmercifully by some of our *zealous* brethren. One of the leaders in the *new* assembly says he would not be at a meeting where I was present. I wonder what he will do about the meeting "in the air." I *will* be there, and if he has to be at it, what will he do? His conscience will suffer in the extreme, no doubt, but mine wont, even if he is there, as there will be room for him and me, there will not be any of this *develish* exclusiveism up there. I feel like saying to him now, "But will you be there and I, JOHN?"

If you are sheltered by the blood,
Thank God the same am I
And when Jesus calls His bride
"Then you 'll be there and I."

You 'll see me then through loving eyes
Your heart from malice free
Yeu 'll own me as your brother *John*
When *HIS* dear face we see.

The *Johns* around *HIMSELF* will meet
And never heave a sigh
In that bright home, each other greet.
"Yes you 'll be there and I."

*) The entire absence of scripture in F. W. G's last tract, to justify their position, shows what extremities they are driven to for ammunition. Their case is as *hopeless*, as those people at Jerico, who were inside the wall of *their own making* [2 Kings vi: 24, 25]. Those they would not *allow* in, were better off, and so are we. We have plenty and would gladly share with them, if they would "*come out of*" or *let us in* to their exclusive fold [2 Kings vii: 3, 8, 9.]

The thunderings from the *Vatican* at Plainfield seem to be more fierce on my head, than on any of the other four *JOHNS*, even to the *would-be* Pope of the "Grant party", writing to *the faithful* that, I was "possessed with Demons"; "but none of these things move me". The Lord stands by me. "I will not fear what man can do unto me."

The wife of one of the leaders, who has gone out, told me, that she wished her husband saw as I did, and said, that the treatment her relatives had received, had driven them away. Since the secession another of the leaders' wives told me that if she had her way, she would not be with them, but would still be at the Hall. It is easily seen, that these cruel leaders do not even respect the consciences of their wives, but *crush* them into subjection, in order to gratify their *unholy* desire for division. I withhold the names of these sisters, as it was told to me in confidence, but they are both "subject to their own husbands", even if they have to suffer for it, and the Lord will reward them. They "revere their husbands" and are *there* because the scripture says, "Wives submit". I respect them for doing so. "Would to God" there was more of this seen among those claiming to be saints. If so, the word of God would not be so "blasphemed" as it is by those gathered to the Lord's name.

It is claimed that only for these few faithful ones on 4th Ave. the Lord would not have any table in Minneapolis now. Oh what *folly*! where will it end? I learned yesterday from one of themselves, that "tumults and swellings" are still the order of the day with them, some *personal* difficulties have arisen and some of even those *few* are now wandering about "seeking rest and finding none." God cannot bless any such pharisaical course as those have taken, who left 2544 Stevens ave. "without a cause." What is going on among them now, shows that while *harmony* is professed outside, *mutiny* exists inside. The Lord is speak-

ing to them; may they hear his voice. (Micah vi: 8,9.)

It is quite evident that soon I will have "no reputation," as according to the acknowledged "Exclusive" authority I am now so "unholy and profane," that "my name is cast out as *evil*" even from "Field and Work," as it was considered by the editor that it would pollute its pages to have it there. Some may doubt this, but I will prove it, as I do *everything*, before I ask anyone to believe it. Last fall before I had broken bread with O. B's I was holding meetings at Sauk Centre, Minn., and the Lord blessed the word in a wonderful way, in the salvation of sinners and the feeding and gathering of saints, and as the editor of F. & W. had often asked me to send him some items, I thought I would send him that one, as it was a *special*. But it was never put in. I learned the reason later on, viz. that I was under the *ban*, because I was said to be leaning towards O. B's. So of course I wrote him no more, although there were many such specials since. After I had broken bread with O. B's and while under alleged *leader* "discipline", I went to Howard Lake, Minn., by invitation, was there about a week and had meetings every night, and the blessing given astonished us all. Some of the saints said they had never seen anything like it. One brother said he would send a little notice about it to F. & W. I told him I did not think they would print it, as they did not like *me*, and I told him my reasons for thinking so; but he could not believe it, — thought he knew B. C. G. too well for that, so I said no more. He sent it, and in the *April* number a *mere mention* was made of it, but my name *left out*. In this way all would suppose that the laboring brother who resides there was the instrument that had been used. It was a well designed *scheme*, but the Lord blows on all such *dishonesty*. Is this *divine* practice?

Evidently the editor was a *little* ashamed, as he wrote the brother a *paltry* excuse for leaving out my name.

When the brother read the letter he was righteously indignant, and replied to it. I am now in possession of a copy of both letters, and will quote a few sentences from each. First from the editors letter, in which he says he "took counsel", but it is clear that it was "not of the Lord," but with a brother who is just as bitter against me as he is, but he is considered very *gracious*.

The following letter, before referred to, was sent to J. C. Long, of Howard Lake.

BEDFORD, N. S., April 17th, '95.

My Dear Brother.

I recieved your letter in time to insert a brief notice of the blessing with you, which one can truly thank God for, but after consulting with Brother Crain, we felt it best not to call attention to brother McLaren; if we did it must be with grief at his course. We are thankful for his blessing in the gospel with you, as elsewhere. We don't doubt but it is the work God has given him, but he knew what our convictions were as to O. B's, and he has acted in defiance of all that our consciences forbid, and in disobedience to the word of God.

If he or any other wish to go with O. B's, we don't hinder them from doing so. Dear Brother, let not your esteem for Brother McLaren pervert your judgment.

B. C. G.

In reply B. C. G. received the following letter:

HOWARD LAKE, April 26th, 1895.

Dear Brother Greenman.

Your letter to hand, some of the statements about bro. McLaren surprised me greatly. Now in regard to my communication, you say you "Consulted *Bro. Crain*." Dear Bro. please tell me why you did not give Bro. McLarens name, to the *abridged* item put in F. & W., is it because he dont agree with you on some points of fellowship? I see all the other places where there is blessing, the Laborers names are given, if there was *real* blessing here from the *Lord* why cannot *you* give his name as well as the names of the others, or do you only own th ose that signed the Pittsburg circular. Oh dear Brother, Suppose N. H. H. did not recognize your labors *here*, surely the Lord did. The old N. H. H. has gone to *fragments*, and will not this also? See Heb. iv: 12--13.

I cannot see for the life of me how a brother like you can take *party* lines, are you "endeavoring to keep the unity," when you belong to one party, to the exclusion of all the rest? One sentence in F. W. G's last tract as to fellowship with O. B's, (it is on page 6) is just what I believe to be the truth, viz: "To discredit the instrument God used is necessarily to discredit the truth thus acquired."

Is not this what you have done in omitting Bro. McLarens name from the item? Now dear Brother. I dont wish to dictate, to a gifted brother like you, but to know the truth from one, whom God used to deliver me. You told me that O. Bs. could answer or withdraw the charges in the Pittsburg circular, I understand that Mr. Holborrow has done this, if this be true, how can you refuse to give a name that has been identified with you, for a number of years, simply because he cannot see any reason why we are separated from O. B's.

Your brother in Christ,

J. C. LONG.

Now I leave all to form their own judgment as to whether "Field and Work" is a paper for *the Lord* or the organ of a *Party*, who *claim* to be acting on *Divine* principles. It makes no difference to me whether my name or my work appears in F. & W. or not, all will be recorded in Heaven and the Editor of F. & W., will have to see the name *there* that he was ashamed to print *here*. His name and mine will be on the same roll, also the one he consulted; and perhaps mine in the middle, if so what will they do?

When I was at Eau Claire, Wis., "while under discipline" the brother who has always been the shepherd and teacher in that assembly, was from home, this accounts for his name not being on their assembly letter.

Some have insinuated that he did not receive me, as his signature was not on it, but a letter he wrote a few days later to a brother here, shows how he would have received me if he had been there. I will quote a few sentences from his letter, which is now before me:

"I am very sorry indeed to read what you say about the divisions. How narrow minded we get and even then talk about our being in the freedom of Christ? I firmly believe that Brother McLaren has taken the right position, and I am glad that you and I see it in the same light. My path seems clear, not to recognize the divisions, but wherever any one "calls upon God out of a pure heart," to receive Him. Brother McLaren I understand was in Eau Claire over Lord's day, but went home Monday.

I should like to know how the brethren in Minneapolis receive him. Please let me know." W. A.

An E. B. Laborer has spread a report that the assembly at Howard Lake were not aware of my intended visit to them, and that only one brother there knew of it, and that they were surprised when they saw me. This is *false*.

I wrote to a prominent brother there stating that I had broken bread with O. B's, and asked how it would be with me in that assembly if I came there. He

showed the letter to all the *especially* responsible brethren and talked the matter over with others, and wrote me that they were all happy to receive me. Anyone questioning this can write Brother J. C. Long, Druggist, Howard Lake, Minnesota. This same *E. B. Laborer*, has stated to many that I was asked to sit back here in Minneapolis, when I came home, but would not do so. This is also *false*. This same laborer has gone to as many assemblies as possible seeking to blacken me, and in one assembly told them that "if they received me inside their doors, neither *he* nor any other ("Grant") Laborer would come under their roof," two in that assembly told me this. His own conduct in the assembly where he is locally connected, has been anything but commendable of late, and many are *smarting* there now in consequence of it. But there is comfort to me in knowing, that his words will not have any weight with those who will investigate matters. If those, who are seeking to injure me, were acting in *ignorance* of the facts, one could excuse them, but I am sorry to have to state, that with most of them it is willful, malicious falsehood, and they *know* it; still they think themselves too *holy* to break bread with O. B's, who, with but few exceptions, would shrink from the base course they are pursuing. This may sound harsh, and be considered speaking in the flesh, (see 1 Cor. iv: 3, 4, 5,) but however I may be censured, I must call things by their right names and "use plainness of speech", even if it does show my lack of gentleness. My name is not *Moses* the *meek* brother, but *John* the *blunt* brother; I have never been noted for *graciousness*, but my enemies have not yet been able to prove me guilty of *untruthfulness*, which they are so prone to. I wish I was *more gracious*, but I prefer to tell the *truth ungraciously*, rather than *LIE graciously*. A gracious LIE is surely not any more acceptable to the Lord than an ungracious truth. Truly we can see, that "Justice standeth afar off, *truth* is fallen in the street, and equity cannot enter" (Isiah lix: 14.)

Another E. B. Laborer from the *East* (but not one of the "wise men") was here for over a week, but did not call on me, but in company with the leader of the *new* assembly went about to some of those, who are standing for divine principles, and did their best to get "their minds evil affected against" *me*. Those to whom they talked, told me all about it. The text they preached from in each house was in substance "that wicked *man* McLaren", but they have not shaken one saint the least bit, but made them more solid than ever. One brother that they called on listened to all they had to say against me, and then asked the *laborer* if he had been to see me. He said no, he did not wish to see me. The brother then said, "You should see him first." He then left him to seek for more congenial soil to sow seed of discord in. See Prov. vi: 14—19. The Lord makes even "the wrath of man to praise him." But this laborer is not in very good repute even with the "Grant Party", as he is one of those who have regretted putting their names on the Pittsburg Circular, and he has written to have his name taken off (so I am told), and besides this on several occasions he has spoken too highly of "Open Brethren" to suit the leaders in his party, but his "folly shall be manifest unto all", as was that of the other laborer. But perhaps I am expecting too much from them, as they are both *Johns*. That is an unfortunate name, surely. It would be better for them both to be more *honest*, and I hope they will be from henceforth. This latter is the same laborer that I referred to on page 16 of my open letter, who refused to break bread in a certain E. B. assembly, and would not accept ministry from them on account of their low condition. He is now seeking to prop up the *party* who fellowship this same assembly that he can not fellowship, while the *leaders* of the "Grant Party" get *most* of their support from this same assembly*), but this dear brother could not re-

*) One of the highest dignitaries in that party gives his reason for justifying

ceive ministry from them. What do you think of him? Consistency is a jewel, but it does not shine very brightly in this eastern laborer. When all else failed, it was reported by two E. B. laborers that I had been *bought* by a certain brother to do as I am doing. The Lord knows how untrue this is. This brother heard the rumor and wrote a brother in this city, who has shown me the letter. I will quote a sentence from it:

"It has been stated to me that I bought Brother McLaren to take his present stand, and that I am supporting him as long as he keeps it. This is not *truth*, but *Satans lie*. I pray the Lord will not lay it to the charge of those who are spreading such falsehoods. I have never spent a dollar for such a purpose. I have ministered to Brother McLaren ever since I knew him, about five years, because I believe him, to be a servant of the Lord."

Assemblies are now beginning to feel the exclusive stroke. The whole gathering at Alexandria, Minn., has been cut off because they fellowshipped me. Dear brethren, is this not *Satanic* exclusivism? Even the church of Rome has no parallel for it. Where is it to stop? Will they erect the gibbet, and start the fires soon? Surely, the same spirit is manifested that prompted *Rome* to do so. Other assemblies, where I have been, may also have been cut off, but I have only heard of this one so far. They are thankful to be cut off from such a terrible fellowship and are rejoicing in their liberty, to go on with the Lord.

One O. B. laborer has circulated a report, that I tried to cause division four years ago in an O. B. assembly at Brandon, Minn. The *untruth* of this can be known by writing to John Ray, an O. B. laborer, who resides there, and who was at the meeting referred to. I can

and upholding that *same* assembly. He told a *saint* that I am well acquainted with and one that every one respects, that he received "*so much* money from *there*, that he could not do otherwise," I will not give any name yet, but brethren what do you think of this for "Exclusive" purity?

page
26

X

understand how the former O. B. laborer may have heard such a report, but he should not circulate it, until he *knows* it was true. I am sorry to have to say, that he has no hesitation in stating what he *knows* is not true. He has stated to many, that the O. B's were not happy about me breaking bread with them, that some of them objected to my doing so, and that I forced myself on them. The *untruth* of this can be known by writing to J. M. Carnie, 7257 Stewart Ave., Chicago, Ill. He is an O. B. laborer and resides there; he was present at the meeting, where I first broke bread, and knows all about it. Had there been one dissenting voice, I would not have broken bread, as I had nothing to gain, but much to loose by doing so, as far as *fellowship* was concerned.

The only other place where I have broken bread with O. B's was at St. Louis, Mo. While there I was the guest of David Hughes who was present at each meeting when I broke bread, he also can be written to, his address is 2940½ Chestnut St. The O. B. laborer who has spread these untruthful reports was present at the meeting in Chicago where I first broke bread, and knows that *no one objected*. Evidently untruthfulness is not confined to E. B's alone, some in both parties are not very particular what they say. If they knew my inconsistencies as well as I know them, they would not need to resort to *falsehood* in order to besmirch me. If they will speak the truth and show me where I have erred in word or deed, I will meet them and confess it, but when they *believe* me, I will face them and refute it, when I believe it is for the Lord's honor to do so. Two E. B. laborers and *this* O. B. laborer have "made affinity" with *Satan*, to crush me, but this trinity, led on by the "Devil" in their "false accusations," cannot hurt one "whose trust is in the Lord". Those two E. B's are *too holy* to break bread with this O. B. or allow him to break bread with them, they could not even preach the gospel with him, without being *defiled*, but they

can have full fellowship with him in this *unholy* work; how is this for "Exclusive" consistency? It would seem as though the Devil had got a special permit from the Lord, to *sift* me, as he had in Jobs case, but there must be a "needs be" in my case or it would not be permitted. Satan used Jobs *professed* friends to harass him, and so he has mine, those from whom he looked for comfort, gave him pain so it is with me. He often got impatient and fretful and "spoke unadvisably," so have I, but the Lord carried him through, and richly blest him in the end, and so *He* will me. His enemies were put to shame and so will mine be, "my trust is in the Lord." How blessed are *His* words to those who are passing through tribulation: "Be of good cheer, I have overcome the world." John xvi: 33. Our *leader*-deluded, *willingly* blinded, and *self*-isolated brethren on 4th ave. cannot point to one line in the assembly circular or this letter that is not true, and if they are true, then what have they done and where are they? "According to their deeds, accordingly *He* will repay." Isaiah lix: 18.

I have written more than I had any idea of doing, but if I have wearied you, forgive me. Please look at four final admonitions:— Eph. vi: 10—20; Phil. iv: 8; 2 Cor. xiii: 11; 1 Peter iii: 8—18.

Beloved brethren, the *crisis* has come. Are we to be governed by human traditions, or the word of God? Is it mens circulars or divine principles we are to bow to? Is it to be "Exclusive" *intolerance* and *bondage*, or "Christian" *love* and *liberty*? "Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage." Gal. v: 1. "Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit you like men, be strong, let all your things be done with charity." 1 Cor. xvi: 13, 14. "Let your loins be girt about, and your lights burning, and ye yourselves like unto men who wait for their Lord." Luke xii: 35, 36. "The

battle is the Lord's" and the victory is ours if we stand with him, and certain defeat if we don't. He will give to every man according as h's work shall be. Rev. xxii: 12. Let "no man take thy crown". Rev. iii: 11.

Your brother in Christ,

J. R. MCLAREN.