

## C.C. Walker on the Necessity of Divisions

"I have received a few copies of an 8 pp. pamphlet called 'The Young Christadelphians' Amity Movement.'

'Amity' is friendship. Is there no amity among old Christadelphians? See the case of Rehoboam (1 Kings 12). The young men's counsel only produced division, as the Lord had determined and proclaimed.

From p. 2 of the pamphlet it appears that you want recognition in fellowship between the divided camps of Christadelphians.

During more than fifty years past I have had to do with many divisions.

So far back as 1866 the late brother R. Roberts was compelled to separate from the 'Dowieites,' who tolerated in fellowship those who held the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, an immortal fireproof Devil, and other 'strong delusions.' Dr. Thomas, being approached at the time by an 'amity' movement entreating him to help stop division, replied that he would do all in his power to help it forward; and the threatened division between Dr. Thomas and brother Roberts was only avoided when the latter firmly and uncompromisingly 'avoided' the heresies and the tolerationists who were the cause of the 'division and offence contrary to the doctrine which they had learned' of the truth (Rom. 16 : 17, 18).

Then, in 1873, came the Renunciationist controversy on the Sacrifice of Christ, introduced by the late brother Edward Turney and others; the result being more division, and more making manifest of the approved and the others (1 Cor. 11 : 18, 19).

Then, in 1884-5, came the Inspiration Controversy, introduced by the late ex-clergymen, brethren Ashcroft and Chamberlain and others, and resulting in more division, and with similar results.

Then, in 1894, came the Resurrectional Responsibility controversy, introduced by the late brother J. J. Andrew and others, with similar results.

Then, in 1902, came the Clean Flesh heresy, introduced by the late brother John Bell of Sydney and others, with similar results.

Now, what would you have had the two parties do in all these heresies? Recognise each other in fellowship? Impossible! 'Can two walk together except they be agreed?' (Amos 3 : 3). Note that this is God's own rebuke of the 'Children of Israel . . . *the whole family.*'

You preach unity, and declare that there should be no division at all, because, as you say, it is 'fundamentally wrong' (p. 4).

In this you are confused, and contradict our Lord himself: 'Suppose ye that I am come to give peace on earth? I tell you Nay; but rather division' (Lu. 12 : 51).

You say (p. 5), 'division is, as before, evil, and must be exposed as such. It is a system which must be destroyed. It is the duty of all to help to destroy it.'

Excuse me, but this is *nonsense*. 'Division' is the very antithesis of 'system.' There are two religious systems: 'The Truth' and 'Lies' (Rom. 1 : 25; 2 Thess. 2 : 10-12), and you can no more stop division when these come together, than

you can stop effervescence when a solution of an acid comes into a solution of an alkali.

It was so with the Lord himself in Israel. 'There was division among the people *because of him*' (John 7 : 43). See also chs. 9 : 16; 10 : 19 . How could it be otherwise?

It is true that Paul *beseeches* the Corinthians '*that ye all speak the same thing*, and that there be no divisions (1 Cor. 1 : 10; 11 : 18 , 19; 12 : 25 ). But you know what 'some' in Corinth said about the Resurrection (ch. 15); and all these passages must be read together, and harmonized with the apostle's doctrine and practice throughout the New Testament.

'Say ye not, A confederacy to all them to whom this people shall say, A confederacy' (Isa. 8 : 11–20).

'If there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God-speed; for he that biddeth him God-speed is partaker of his evil deeds' (2 John 10–11).

Both prophet and apostle were thus alike intolerant of wrong doctrine and practice; and this is the right divine precedent. Our Lord himself commends Ephesus for intolerance of evil and evil-doers (Rev. 2 : 2, 3, 6); and rebukes Pergamos for tolerating the doctrine of Balaam and of the Nicolaitanes (verses 14, 15); and Thyatira likewise for 'suffering' the Jezebel seductions (verse 20). But he commends 'the rest in Thyatira' who would have none of it. As to Sardis; there were but 'a few names' there 'worthy' to 'walk in white' with the Lord (Rev. 3 : 4); while 'lukewarm' Laodicea was in danger of utter ejection (verse 16).

On p. 5 you set down 'Something of those Involved,' and point out that the Suffolk Street section 'comprises 61 ecclesias in England, and many others abroad.' You say that these ecclesias are organised on exactly the same lines as those of the other section, which is not exactly true. And you ask, 'Is their 50 years progressive work in the truth to be ignored?'

If numbers were to decide, I might point out that the Central ecclesia section comprises over 200 ecclesias in England and many others abroad; but

'Numbers are no proof that you

Will in the ark be found;'

and salvation is not an ecclesial, but an individual matter. 'Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven' (Matt. 7 : 21). 'Strait is the gate, and narrow is the way which leadeth unto life, and few there be which find it' (verse 14). 'Many are called, but few chosen' (Matt. 20 : 16; 22 : 14 ). No one wishes to 'ignore' anyone's 'progressive work,' but the Lord is the Judge of this, not man; and the time is 'the time of the dead,' not now.

It is quite true (p. 5) that there are 'evils of division; but who are the sinners in the case? The majority above referred to? No, but the introducers and espousers of the heresies before alluded to. We are exhorted to 'mark' and 'avoid' these. Surely, you do not want to exhort us to do otherwise.

The present position, though not ideal, is quite tolerable. Those who are not prepared to 'mark' and 'avoid' heresies and heretics, can find society with the

tolerationists; but if they try to bring about 'amity' (friendship amounting to recognition in fellowship) between the 'avoiders' and the 'avoided,' they will only precipitate more 'division.'

The thing has been tried over and over again, always with this inevitable result.

If you do not believe this, brother Clementson, file this unpleasant letter, and when your 'Young Christadelphians' have become as old as the writer thereof (which I hope they never will in this mortal estate) they will doubtless have discovered for themselves by sad experience the truth of the things therein written.

'Amity' (friendship—Fr. *amitié*). 'Ye are my friends if ye do whatsoever I command you' (John 15 : 4).

The foregoing is submitted in all 'amity' by

Your brother in the Lord,  
CHAS. C. WALKER.

*(The Christadelphian, 1938, pp 324-326)*