

ANOTHER HARVEST SIFTINGS REVIEWED

"Every man's work shall be made manifest; for the DAY shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire, and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is."—1 Corinthians 3:13.

August 22, 1918

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

1222 Morris St.

TO ASSOCIATED BIBLE STUDENTS.

MY BELOVED BRETHREN:—

Grace and Peace! A year and a half ago the wrongdoings of certain leading British brethren, who refused to desist from their course at private exhortation, and who, in hopes of crushing me, published misrepresentations abroad, forced me to appear before the British Church as the exposé of their evil course. Within a year the wrongdoings of the Society's leaders, who also refused to desist from their course at private exhortation, and who, in hopes of crushing me, also published misrepresentations abroad, forced me to appear before the whole Church as the exposé of their evil ways. And now, for the third time, I am forced to appear before the Church as the exposé of the wrongdoings of certain leaders among us who have refused to desist from wrong ways at private exhortation, and who in part, to crush me, published misrepresentations against me at the Asbury Park Convention after having, for some time past, carried on a "political" campaign of "whispering" against me, the fruit of which campaign it was designed to reap at the Convention in the ousting of three brothers (Brothers Hirsh and Jolly, who stood with me, and myself) from the Pastoral Bible Institute Committee, etc.

Doubtless the hearts of many of you were deeply grieved at the attacks made upon me by Brothers Rockwell and Hoskins, the former in his sermon, the latter as Secretary-Treasurer, *officially* reporting without the Committee's authorization, the majority of whom repudiated his utterances in his address to the Elders and Deacons, and in his address before the whole Convention, Saturday, July 27, 1918, and then again the next day. Their general charges and spirit were so much like those of Brother Rutherford that for the most part those of you who witnessed these, and heard my answer, were by Monday convinced that I was being harvest-sifted and unbethed anew. Therefore, I consider this third attempt to crush me the same in spirit as the other two, and therefore call it "Another Harvest Siftings." Therefore, this paper, which is a brief review of this third movement, is called "Another Harvest Siftings Reviewed." In brief, my loyalty to "that Servant's" ideals, arrangements, charter and will, and to the interests of the Church against the efforts of certain leaders to put some of them aside, has made me the target of this, a third widespread attack.

Earnestly and long, but, of course, not perfectly, have I, by kindness, long-suffering and reasoning, sought to hold these brothers back from their course; but seemingly it was all in vain! The responsibility of foisting this trouble on the Church is wholly theirs. As by the British and American "Society" leaders, the troubles were set afloat by a campaign of "whispering," and then by public attacks before large numbers of brethren, myself keeping silent all the time, and trying to persuade them to keep matters secret; so has it been in this trouble, which was rudely thrust upon the recent Convention according to well-thought-out preparations, despite the promises of the one mainly responsible for the publicity to keep the trouble from the Convention.

EARLY GENERAL CONVENTION NECESSARY

Had the evil been limited to the Convention, I would, so far as exposures are concerned, rest content with what I answered there; but alas! the matters have been spread broadcast, and the wrongs and evil effects connected with them are so great, that duty to God and the Church forces me to place before the Church a brief summary of the wrongs that have been committed. If conditions would permit, gladly would I bury the evils out of sight; for they are not told with pleasure but with profound grief that such things could be privately and publicly committed among us. They are told in the hope that their recital will arouse in the Church the spirit of repentance; for the evil qualities out of which these wrongs have flown are, alas! not limited to the Committee members more or less involved. These qualities (of which the following are examples: grasping for power, lord-

ing it over God's heritage, the spirit of fear and compromising, assassinated slander, contentiousness, partisanship, arbitrariness, legality and worldliness seeking to corrupt the Church's organization) are quite widespread among us, and the Lord calls upon us to set them aside.

My motive in reciting these things, believe me, my Beloved Brethren, is not to chastise anyone, but to arouse the Church to a sense of danger from Santanic working on our weaknesses to our spiritual injury, to earnest, humble prayer and heart-searchings as preparatory to assembling in solemn Convention to investigate these things, and to devise ways and means of helping all concerned to put these evils aside. Abundant are the evidences of God's displeasure upon us for these wrongs. Abundant are the evidences of His withholding blessings from us for the same wrongs. In God's name, therefore, let us assemble ourselves in Convention that unitedly we may learn to understand the spiritual diseases that are working havoc in our midst, and the treatment and remedy for their cure. If, in His spirit, we make the effort, He will surely bless us therein. What the situation requires is much humility, candor, honesty, love, and a clear view of the nature of the evils and means of putting them aside, combined with persistent determination, by God's grace, faithfully to use His spirit, Word and Providence to make the diagnosis, prescribe the remedies and accept the treatment.

Since the Convention some of you have, with distress, learned what took place there. You have learned that there were, to put it mildly, questionable acts committed. You have heard that the old Committee appointed by the Fort Pitt Convention was dissolved; because a group of four of its members wanted to get rid of the other three, who blocked their unscriptural, papistical and revolutionary course in certain particulars. You have learned that this was accomplished by questionable acts and methods; you have learned that the supporters of the Group, as well as some of the Group, used methods like those that Brother Rutherford used before and at the shareholders' meeting last January. You have learned that these same methods prospered unto the undoing of the old Committee, and unto the electing of a Committee consisting of about six members slated for the Committee by the Group. You have learned that some exposures were made Sunday, July 28; and as a result, the Convention, refusing longer to be bossed and driven by the Group and some of their partisans, and, becoming apprehensive that all was not gold that was given a glitter, not only refused to be clotted and stampeded into forming a new society and into adopting a program for what would be another spurious *first* smiting of Jordan; but also withdrew from the new Committee powers that the old one had, *i. e.*, the power to publish a periodical and to have an Editorial Committee. Thus, those who came to the Convention seemingly to discredit others, left the Convention with their own credit far from being enhanced, and besides shorn of much of their power. Alas! that against these foretold results they refused to take kindly forewarning, which would have been heeded, if they had exercised the necessary meekness.

By the Group are meant the following persons: Brothers Hoskins, Margeson, Magee and Wright, the first of whom committed in his attacks the added wrong of disparagingly mentioning names, *i. e.*, of Brothers Hirsh, Jolly and myself, though Brother Rockwell started the attack with an attempt at assassination of me. Both in justice and charity I am glad to say of Brother Magee that he, both to others and to me, expressed strong disapproval of the attacks of Brothers Hoskins and Rockwell. I will not, I cannot, believe of Brother Wright that he approves of their course.

While not presuming to judge the hearts, in justice to all concerned, I ought to state on whom it seems to me the varying degrees of external responsibility rest. From my knowledge of the facts, the most guilty of the Group seems to be Brother Hoskins, with Brother Margeson as a close second. These two seem to have done the main part of the planning, whose climax and purpose were reached in the Conven-

tion business meetings, July 27. It is but fair to say of Brother Magee that he is too honest a man, and too noble a Christian, knowingly to have entered into the plots of the other two brothers. It seems to me that he has been measurably deceived into a course favorable to the plans of the other two, and has been skilfully used as a tool in the furtherance of their plans under the influence of some false impressions, which he honestly believed to be true. I do not believe that Brother Wright entered into the plotting at all. But, unfortunately, like Brother Magee, he generally supported the policies of the two on the vital questions of principle that divided the Committee. Of these four brothers, I use the word Group, not disparagingly, but to have a brief term to designate them in their working together.

After he came on the scene, Brother Rockwell seems to be almost on a par in the plotting and wrongdoing with Brothers Hoskins and Margeson. Brothers Hoskins, Margeson and Rockwell, in not a few particulars, closely resemble Brothers Rutherford, Van Amburgh and MacMillan respectively, in the rôles they played. The *cunning and brutality* of Brother Rockwell's attack on me, on the Convention platform at Asbury Park, lasting over a half hour, and made Saturday morning in his sermon on "The Sevenfold Mission of the Church," with Isaiah 61:1,2, as text, were in spirit and in main accusations, i. e., in charging "insanity," selfish ambition for leadership, etc., a reproduction of Brother Rutherford's "Harvest Siftings." This attack was a part of a *deliberate plan* to drive me out of the Pastoral Bible Institute Committee, and to destroy my influence among the brethren.

These brothers and some of their supporters, by their words and acts, for quite a while before the Convention, gave Brothers Hirsh, Jolly and myself enough clues of their plans to enable us to understand their main purposes in having called a Convention, though not before the Convention was voted for. The three main purposes of their arranging for the business features of the Convention were, first, to get rid of Brothers Hirsh, Jolly and myself; second, to stampede the Convention into endorsing their policies of forming a Society with a Charter DIFFERENT from that of "that Servant" and of organizing the Church for what would be another SPURIOUS FIRST SMITING OF JORDAN; and third, to obtain from the Convention for their Committee all the Powers of the Society's Board of Directors; whereas the old Committee was limited in its sphere of activity, according to the instructions of the Fort Pitt Convention, to those features of work that the friends in general, by their responses to the Committee's letter, stated to be their understanding of the Lord's will as to the kinds of general service necessary for the Church, i. e., Pilgrim service, which, of course, includes conventions and a periodical.

Deeply do I deplore the necessity of using names. I will not plead in my defense for mentioning names the fact that some of the Group and some of their supporters did this first, both before and during the Convention. All will bear me record that I did not speak of the facts and names until after they had told their interpretation of facts and mentioned names PUBLICLY at the Convention. The names, thus being made widely public through the course of these brethren themselves, to use their names here will now do them no wrong. Then again, not to use names would work injustice, especially to Brothers Magee and Wright, as that would in the setting given to matters below impliedly set forth that they are as guilty as some others, whereas they are not.

Then, again, the matter cannot be presented with the necessary clearness without giving names; still further, the right of publishing this paper, whose object is the calling of a diagonal and remedial Convention, which all sober minds, after reading this paper, will recognize as a crying need, cannot reasonably be demonstrated without mentioning names. All will recall that under similar conditions last year, the brothers who constitute the Group strongly advocated the

calling of an investigative and curative shareholders' meeting. Therefore, they cannot consistently object to such a Convention under similar conditions now; nor were they blamable for using names and stating the acts of the Society's wrongdoers under like circumstances last summer. In fact, the use of names and the mention of evil deeds of those who wrong the entire Church is a duty, and is not to be confused with evil speaking. See "Manna" comments for July 14.

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE SOCIETY—RUTHERFORDISM IN THE COMMITTEE

IN OBEDIENCE TO THE DECISION OF THE MAJORITY OF THE OLD COMMITTEE, AND ALSO IN OBEDIENCE TO THE MAJORITY OF THE CONVENTION COMMITTEE, that sample copies of "The Bible Standard" be distributed Friday night, July 26, at the Convention, Brother Hirsh announced to the conventioners the fact that he had the long-desired first issue of the paper for them. He then left it to a vote as to whether they desired it then. After an almost unanimous affirmative vote of the Convention, he invited them forward to receive the paper. This course greatly angered Brothers Hoskins and Margeson, whose rage almost caused them to make a counter-announcement, for they had for a long time been delaying the publication, partly for reasons known to themselves. Then, in the little back room, they fell upon me, upbraiding me for my part in the matter. Among other uncomplimentary remarks, by which they characterized the course of the majority of both Committees in this matter, Brother Hoskins used, several times with heated emphasis, the expression, "This is Rutherfordism." Quickly seeing the similarity, but in another sense than he meant, I replied to the following effect: "Yes, Brother Hoskins, it is Rutherfordism, just as two Board members, Brothers Rutherford and Van Amburgh, and one not on the Board, Brother MacMillan, sought to set aside the voted decision of the Board's majority, so you and Brother Margeson, two members of the Committee, with the assistance of one not on the Committee, Brother Rockwell, are now doing. It is Rutherfordism, indeed." In fact, it was Rutherfordism repeating itself; but, strange to say, this time it is among ourselves.

The comparison was so complete and apparent that Brother Hoskins did not answer me. Since that night, with his statement, "This is Rutherfordism," in my mind, I have made a careful study of the history of our Committee since its appointment on January 6, 1918, comparing it with the history of Rutherfordism in the Society. As a result of my study I have gathered together, under twelve divisions, or heads, one hundred and fifty particulars (to which I could add more, if necessary), wherein Rutherfordism in the Society finds its counterpart in Rutherfordism in the Committee. In this comparison Brother Rutherford, or his representatives, correspond to the Group, or their representatives. It is sad to contemplate these points of comparison; because they prove that some of those who protested against Brother Rutherford's wrongdoings have, in spite of having his example before their eyes as a warning, and in spite of their protest against it, imitated it so closely, as these twelve divisions and one hundred and fifty particulars indicate.

Could these brothers have fallen into the same evils as Brother Rutherford while living close to the Lord? Do not their knowledge of and protest against his wrongdoings increase their own guilt? He at least did not have a similar example as a warning before his eyes. How are the mighty fallen! Let the daughter of Zion weep for the iniquity of the children of her people! In these correspondencies, not the number of persons involved, but the nature and quality of the acts are the points of comparison. Arranged in parallel columns these twelve divisions, placed as heads over the one hundred and fifty particulars, are presented to the brethren for consideration, as follows:

THE DEADLY PARALLEL

[After Reading Number 1 in the First Column Then Read Number 1 in the Second Column, Etc.]

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE SOCIETY

- I. Brother Rutherford persisted in taking up and acting on subjects outside of the sphere of an executive and manager in the Society's affairs to the disruption of the Board of Directors.

(1) Brother Rutherford persisted in discussing the suppression of certain interpretations of the Lord's Word, e. g., "that Servant's" interpretation of the Parable of the Penny.

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE COMMITTEE

- I. The group persisted in taking up and acting on subjects outside of the sphere of activity prescribed by the Fort Pitt Convention, even to the disruption of the old Pastoral Bible Institute Committee.

(1) The Group persisted in discussing the suppression of certain interpretations of the Lord's Word, e. g., "The Evil Servant," Elijah and EN'Sha, etc.

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE SOCIETY

(2) He sought to combine in various acts the board of the Society and the Board of the People's Pulpit Association.

(3) Brother Rutherford planned securing legal action to drive the Board's majority and Brother Johnson from Bethel.

(4) Brother Rutherford advocated a spurious *first* smiting of Jordan as an indispensable thing in the first book-publication of the Society, as the chief part of its program of work.

(5) For months Brother Rutherford insisted on dissolving the Society, *i. e.*, making a one-man affair of the Society, despite the fact that "that Servant's" writings, will and charter made what, during his life, was a Society *in name only*, a Society *in fact*, at his death.

(6) These acts side-tracked the consideration and accomplishment of some of the work that Brother Rutherford was authorized to do.

(7) The obtusion of these matters divided the Board into two parts.

II. False and wrong motives were charged, especially against Brother Johnson, to the disruption of the old Board.

(1) Brother Johnson was falsely accused of aspiring to control the work and the Board, whereas, he pushed Brother Rutherford ahead and advised against himself being made a Board member and President.

(2) Brother Johnson was falsely accused of being led by the spirit of ruling or ruining.

(3) Brother Johnson was falsely accused of trying to delay the work of the Society.

(4) Brother Johnson was falsely accused of being in a clique with certain members of the Board (whereas, the accuser was thus guilty) to disrupt the work of the Society.

(5) Brother Johnson was falsely accused of seeking to divide the Church by the one who later did divide it.

(6) Brother Johnson was falsely accused of seeking a following by the one who won a following.

III. Brother Rutherford attempted to suppress the presentation of any Biblical thoughts to the Church, unless he favored them.

(1) Brother Rutherford did this among the Pilgrims by a resolution of his own to suppress what was new, apart from Volume VII and what he favored, on pain of their being out of harmony.

(2) This Brother Rutherford did among the Elders by requiring them to submit to the seventh volume and Society policies' tests.

IV. Brother Rutherford insisted on setting up false standards of teaching authorization to the disruption of the old Board.

(1) Brother Rutherford advocated that nothing be taught additional to "that Servant's" writings except what the Churches (frightened into believing by his propaganda) had first approved, thus making the Church, not the Lord, at the mouth of the teachers "set in the body," the arbiter of what was meat in due season.

(2) Brother Rutherford advocated and decided that nothing be taught additional to "that Servant's" writings except what he sanctioned.

(3) Brother Rutherford advocated that nothing be anywhere taught additional to "that Servant's" writings, except what the Editorial Committee first approved.

(4) Brother Rutherford advocated that nothing be taught that might occasion disagreement among Truth people, despite the fact that he admitted that we were in a sifting, which, of course, means that God wants, by disagreements, to separate the classes, *i. e.*, Little Flock, Great Company, etc.

(5) Brother Rutherford attempted to boycott in Pilgrim work those Board members and others who stood for BIBLICAL PRINCIPLES IN THESE MATTERS.

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE COMMITTEE

(2) Brothers Hoskins and Rockwell, immediately after the conviction of the Society leaders, introduced, for the Committee's favorable action, a plan to make overtures to effect a reunion with the Society.

(3) These two brothers planned securing legal action (through a firm of New York corporation lawyers) to recover control of the Society after the conviction of the Society's leaders.

(4) Some of the Group and some of their supporters advocated, as an indispensable thing that our first periodical number set forth what would be a spurious *first* smiting of Jordan as a chief part of the Committee's future work.

(5) For months these four brothers insisted on forming a Society, *i. e.*, dissolving the Committee, despite the fact that the Fort Pitt Convention voted down a motion to form a Society.

(6) These acts side-tracked the consideration and accomplishment of some of the work that the Committee was authorized to do.

(7) The obtusion of these matters divided the Committee into two parts.

II. False and wrong motives were charged, especially against Brother Johnson, to the disruption of the old committee.

(1) Brother Johnson was accused falsely of aspiring to control the work and the Committee, whereas, he pushed others to the front and advised against his being elected an officer.

(2) Brother Johnson was falsely accused of being led by the spirit of ruling or ruining.

(3) Brother Johnson was falsely accused of trying to delay the work of the Committee, *e. g.*, the publication of "The Bible Standard"; whereas, he pushed it at least as much as any other member of the Committee.

(4) Brother Johnson was falsely accused of being in a clique with Brothers Hirsh and Jolly (whereas the accuser, with the Group, was thus guilty), to disrupt the work of the Committee.

(5) Brother Johnson was falsely accused of seeking to divide the Church by those who are now dividing it.

(6) Brother Johnson was falsely accused of seeking a following by such as seem to be seeking that very thing.

III. Led by Brother Hoskins, the group attempted to suppress the presentation of Biblical thoughts to the Church, unless they favored them.

(1) This was done by a resolution of the Committee forbidding Committee members to teach anything new, particularly on types, symbols and prophecy, not set forth in "that Servant's" writings, unless agreed to by the Committee, on pain of their being out of harmony with the Committee.

(2) In harmony with this resolution, Brother Hoskins largely created such a sentiment among a number of the Elders of one of our largest Churches as led to the presentation of two resolutions in Elders' meetings, and also one in the Church, calculated to prevent the presentation of uncensored new thoughts to that Church, which very wisely rejected the resolution.

IV. The Group insisted on setting up false standards of teaching authorization to the disruption of the old Committee.

(1) The Group advocated that nothing be taught additional to "that Servant's" writings except what the Churches had first approved, thus making the Church, not the Lord, at the mouth of the teachers "set in the body," the arbiter of what was meat in due season.

(2) The Group advocated and decided that nothing be taught additional to "that Servant's" writings except what the Committee sanctioned.

(3) Several of the Group advocated that nothing be anywhere taught additional to "that Servant's" writings, except what the Editorial Committee first approved.

(4) The Group advocated that nothing be taught that might occasion disagreement among Truth people, despite the fact that they admitted that we are in a sifting, which, of course, means that God wants, by disagreements, to separate classes.

(5) Several of the Group attempted to boycott in Pilgrim work those Committee members and others who stood for BIBLICAL PRINCIPLES IN THESE MATTERS.

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE SOCIETY

(6) Reliable information proves that by July 29, 1917, Brother Rutherford had discussed boycotting in Pilgrim work members of the Old Board and others.

(7) Later information proved that he did boycott in Pilgrim work members of the old Board and others.

V. Brother Rutherford greatly exceeded his authority in grasping for power, largely treating the Society's work as though it were his private business, to the disruption of the old Board.

(1) Brother Rutherford signed his own name instead of that of the Society to the Society's correspondence with which he was charged.

(2) Unauthorized by and unknown to the Board, Brother Rutherford made contracts, in some cases using donated private funds, of whose existence he said nothing to the Board, to meet the expenses.

(3) Brother Rutherford accepted some donations which he kept as a private fund, apart from the Society's funds, to meet expenses, unauthorized by the Board; all this being unknown to the Board as such, until about July 26, 1917, when some of them, by a seeming accident, found it out.

(4) Apart from one time, Brother Rutherford gave, and required to be given, no exact report of receipts, expenses and balance on hand; and when asked at various times to give or furnish information on these matters, he gave the Board no exact information.

(5) Long after the Board had asked for such an accounting, Brother Rutherford continued to keep some of the Society's money deposited in his own name.

(6) Brother Rutherford insisted on signing some contracts in his own name.

(7) Without authorization of the Board Brother Rutherford paid for work which he was not authorized to have done.

(8) Brother Rutherford assumed authority to deal with Class matters not given him as his duty.

(9) In pursuance of such unauthorized acts, Brother Rutherford set Board members in an unfavorable light and caused injury to nearly all concerned.

(10) Brother Rutherford withheld from the Board important communications addressed to the Board.

(11) Against repeated remonstrances Brother Rutherford continued to control Pilgrim appointments without consulting the Board; and sought to prevent other than his Pilgrims from addressing Classes.

(12) Brother Rutherford appointed many persons to the Pilgrim office without authorization of the Board.

(13) Brother Rutherford advocated and did things calculated to injure prominent brethren with the Church, including public attacks on them, mentioning their names.

(14) In many instances he interfered in the private affairs of the Churches.

(15) Brother Rutherford seems to have used his office to make for himself a place in the Church.

(16) Brother Rutherford became the chief opponent of the brother who most favored him.

(17) Brother Rutherford publicly disparaged the presentations of Pilgrims with whom he did not agree.

(18) Brother Rutherford even publicly mentioned their names as the holders of opinions from which he dissented.

(19) Brother Rutherford continued to speak against them after being warned against the injustice.

(20) Brother Rutherford indulged in sarcasm at the expense of one of these.

(21) He winked knowingly to his sympathizers and sneered in disparagement of others.

(22) Brother Rutherford wrongly told of his disagreement with Brothers Hirsch, Jolly and Johnson to others.

(23) At first for months, in his public utterances, without mentioning names, Brother Rutherford said things calculated to undermine various brethren.

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE COMMITTEE

(6) Reliable information proves that by July 29, 1918, some, if not all, of the Group discussed boycotting in Pilgrim work two of the ousted Committee members.

(7) Later information proves that they have boycotted in Pilgrim work some members of the old Committee.

V. Brother Hoskins greatly exceeded his authority in grasping for power, largely treating the committee's work as though it were his private business, to the disruption of the old committee.

(1) Brother Hoskins signed his own name, instead of that of the Committee, to the Committee's correspondence with which he was charged.

(2) Unauthorized by, and not reporting it to, the Committee, Brother Hoskins rented, and in part furnished, a room for office purposes, seemingly using a private fund, of whose existence he said nothing to the Committee, to meet expenses.

(3) Brother Hoskins accepted some donations, as *treasurer*, which he kept as a private fund, apart from the Committee's funds, to meet expenses unauthorized by the Committee; all this being unknown to the Committee as such, some of whom first found it out July 26, 1918, by a seeming accident.

(4) Apart from one time, Brother Hoskins has given the Committee no exact report on receipts, expenses and balance on hand; and when asked at various Committee meetings on these matters, gave the Committee no exact information. (While claiming to make a report to the Convention as Secretary-Treasurer, unauthorized to do so by the Committee, he told the Convention that he did not have the figures with him, and therefore could not give more than an approximate report of the finances on hand, nor did he say anything of the amounts received and expended.)

(5) Months after the Committee instructed Brother Hoskins to transfer its funds in the bank to its name, he continued to keep the Committee's money in his own name in the bank.

(6) Brother Hoskins insisted on having the Committee's telephone taken out in his own name.

(7) Without authorization of the Committee Brother Hoskins paid for work which he was not authorized to have done.

(8) Brother Hoskins assumed authority to deal with matters in a Class not given him as his duty.

(9) Through the preceding act, through a letter which he wrote, and which was read in a Class meeting, Brother Hoskins set one of the Committee members in an unfavorable light to the injury of nearly all concerned.

(10) Brother Hoskins withheld from the Committee a communication (and information respecting it until it was eked out of him) addressed to it by one of our largest Churches inviting the Committee to establish its headquarters in the city of that Church.

(11) Against repeated remonstrances Brother Hoskins continued alone for two months to make Pilgrim appointments without consulting the brother who jointly with him was charged with the duty of making these appointments; and he sought to prevent at least one Church from having Pilgrim service unless he made the appointments.

(12) Brother Hoskins appointed persons to act as Pilgrims without authorization of the Committee.

(13) Brother Hoskins advocated and did things calculated to injure prominent brethren with the Church, including public attacks on them, mentioning their names.

(14) In more than one case he interfered in the private affairs of one of our Churches.

(15) Brother Hoskins seems to have used his office to make for himself a place in the Church.

(16) Brother Hoskins became the chief opponent of the brother who most favored him.

(17) Brother Hoskins publicly disparaged the presentations of Pilgrims with whom he disagreed.

(18) Brother Hoskins even publicly mentioned their names as the holders of opinions from which he dissented.

(19) Brother Hoskins continued to speak against them after being warned against the injustice.

(20) Brother Hoskins indulged in sarcasm at the expense of one of these.

(21) He winked knowingly to his sympathizers and sneered in disparagement of one of them.

(22) Brother Hoskins wrongly told of his disagreement with Brothers Hirsch, Jolly and Johnson to others.

(23) At first for months, in his public utterances, without mentioning names, Brother Hoskins said things calculated to undermine various brethren.

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE SOCIETY

- (24) These underhanded attacks also came out in "The Tower."
- (25) Brother Rutherford tried to force through the Board cut-and-dried programs.
- (26) Brother Rutherford doctored the minutes to suit himself, *e. g.*, those of the People's Pulpit Association, so as to make them sanction the holding of an annual meeting adjourned from early in January, 1917, to July 27, 1917, the date on which he sought to expel Brothers Hirsh and Hoskins from the Association and its Board.
- (27) Brother Rutherford unnecessarily used from the Society's contributions extravagant amounts of money to put up himself and some of his fellow conspirators at high-priced hotels.

VI. Brother Rutherford sought to lord it over God's heritage, to the disruption of the old Board.

- (1) Brother Rutherford sought to withhold from the Church the discussion of timely Scriptural subjects.
- (2) Brother Rutherford sought to withhold a properly authorized and revised Volume VII from the Church by disregarding the rights of the Board to control and of the Editors to revise, and by disregarding the needs of the Church.
- (3) Brother Rutherford claimed and sought to obtain for himself practically all the power of the Society's Board to control in the general work, which means that he could introduce any feature of work that he desired.
- (4) Brother Rutherford claimed and sought to obtain for the Editorial Committee, which he dominated, more power in the teaching office than "that Servant" received from the Lord, or ever used; *i. e.*, power to exclude from the Church any teaching not sanctioned by "The Tower" Editorial Committee.
- (5) By forbidding the teaching of things unsanctioned by the Editorial Committee (dominated by himself), Brother Rutherford arrogated to himself more power than "that Servant" received from the Lord, or ever used.
- (6) Brother Rutherford attempted to withhold, and succeeded in withholding, the service of faithful Pilgrims from the Church, as far as he was able.

VII. Brother Rutherford sought, in several "business" matters, to prevent carrying out the decision of the Board's majority, to the disruption of the old Board.

- (1) With the assistance of Brothers VanAmburgh and MacMillan, Brother Rutherford sought to prevent the publication of the first reply of the Board's majority, wherein they defended themselves against their ousting, and Brother Rutherford's circular letter of July 19, 1917, to the Class Secretaries.
- (2) With the assistance of these same brothers he sought to prevent the distribution of this same reply, July 26, 1917.
- (3) With the assistance of the same two brothers, Brother Rutherford sought to disparage the Board's majority relative to the publication and distribution of the reply, as well as to disparage the reply itself.

VIII. Through misrepresentation and violation of confidence faithful and prominent brethren, refusing to countenance wrong principles and acts, were, by Brother Rutherford and his supporters, privately and publicly discredited in the Church, to the disruption of the Society's old Board.

- (1) One of these was publicly and privately represented as an insane and fanciful speculator on types, symbols and prophecy, and as insanely aspiring to leadership.
- (2) Certain Directors were falsely represented as dominated by him.
- (3) These and he were falsely accused of obstructing the work of the Church.
- (4) These and he were falsely accused of dividing the Church.
- (5) These and he were falsely accused of advocating radical Scriptural teaching.

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE COMMITTEE

- (24) These underhanded attacks also came out in "The Bible Standard."
- (25) Brother Hoskins tried to force through the Committee cut-and-dried programs.
- (26) Brother Hoskins doctored the Committee minutes so as to make motions favor things that he wanted, contrary to the majority's intentions in passing them, which procedure the Committee had repeatedly to correct.
- (27) During the Convention Brother Hoskins unnecessarily used from the Committee's contributions extravagant amounts of money to put up himself, Brother Rockwell and others of his supporters at a hotel where for each of them he had to pay \$6 a day.

VI. A number of the Committee, usually the Group, sought to lord it over God's heritage, to the disruption of the old Committee.

- (1) The Group sought to withhold from the Church the discussion of timely Scriptural subjects. (It is but fair to state that later Brothers McGee and Margeson voted to rescind the objectionable resolution.)
- (2) Brothers Hoskins, Margeson and Rockwell sought to withhold the properly authorized and revised "Bible Standard" from being published by disregarding the rights of the Committee's majority to control in the matter, and disregarding the needs of the Church.
- (3) They claimed and sought to obtain for the Committee (which would usually mean the Group) *all the power of the Society's Board to control the general work*, which means that they could introduce any feature of the work that they desired.
- (4) They claimed and sought to obtain for the Editorial Committee more power in the teaching office than "that Servant" received from the Lord, or ever used; *i. e.*, the power to exclude from the Church any teaching not sanctioned by "The Bible Standard" Editorial Committee.
- (5) By forbidding the teaching of things unsanctioned by the Committee, they arrogated to themselves more power than "that Servant" received from God, or ever used.
- (6) They attempted to withhold, and now are succeeding in withholding, the service of faithful Pilgrims from the Church, as far as they are able.

VII. Brothers Hoskins and Margeson, supported by Brother Rockwell, sought in several "business" matters, to prevent carrying out the decision of the Committee's majority, to the disruption of the old Committee.

- (1) These three brothers sought to prevent the publication of "The Bible Standard" before the Asbury Park Convention, despite the votes of four members of the Committee, WHO VOTED THAT THE PAPER BE PUBLISHED IN TIME TO ANNOUNCE THE ASBURY PARK CONVENTION.
- (2) The same three brothers sought to prevent the distribution of "The Bible Standard" at the time that the majority of the large Committee and of the Convention Committee decided that it be distributed, July 26, 1918.
- (3) These three brothers, through Brother Hoskins, their leader, sought publicly to disparage the course of the Committee's majority relative to the publication and distribution of "The Bible Standard," as well as to disparage the paper itself.

VIII. Through misrepresentation and violation of confidence faithful and prominent brethren, refusing to countenance wrong principles and acts, have, by some of the group and some of their supporters, been publicly and privately discredited in the Church, to the disruption of the old Committee.

- (1) One of these was privately and publicly represented as an insane and fanciful speculator on types, symbols and prophecy, and as insanely aspiring to leadership.
- (2) Certain Committee members were falsely represented as dominated by him.
- (3) These and he were falsely accused of obstructing the work of the Church.
- (4) These and he were falsely accused of dividing the Church.
- (5) These and he were falsely accused of advocating radical Scriptural teaching.

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE SOCIETY

(6) Without foundation in fact one of them was habitually accused of seeking to lord it over God's heritage.

(7) Things that one of the five had told in sacred confidence were scattered broadcast.

IX. Brother Rutherford and his supporters, July 27, 1917, tried to force through the People's Pulpit Association and the Bethel Family several matters without proper discussion, to the disruption of the old Board.

(1) He accepted the program of a spurious *first smiting* of Jordan from a brother whose key and many other views of Revelation, etc., are vagarious and contrary to those of "that Servant"; and he insisted that all swallow his program and labor in harmony with it.

(2) From the false viewpoint that "that Servant" clearly taught a *future first smiting* of Jordan, he sought with almost no discussion to commit to this program the People's Pulpit Association under the new Board, which he was really organizing as the directorate of a new Society with what was in effect an altered Charter as indispensable for a *future first smiting* of Jordan.—July 27, 1917.

(3) He resorted to parliamentary evasions and other questionable things to prevent discussing questions fundamental to his whole plan.—July 27, 1917.

(4) He also resorted to cloture methods to prevent in the People's Pulpit Association and before the Bethel family sufficient discussion of his program.—July 27, 1917.

X. Privately and publicly he advocated what was in fact setting aside some of, and adding others to, the clauses of "that Servant's" charter for "his new society," unto the disruption of the old Board.

(1) His advocacy of the principle contained in the letter of Brother Dabney that all the Church ought to have a vote in the election of the Directors proves that he preferred not to have shareholders.

(2) His holding the "straw vote" proves that he wanted the Directors elected by "The Tower" subscribers in the Truth.

(3) By campaigning for and manipulating proxies he proved that he wanted the officers elected by the Directors of the Society.

(4) He wanted the directors to be elected annually, contrary to "that Servant's" arrangements.

(5) In his oration, written early in November, 1916, and published in the Memorial "Tower," he professed the highest regard for "that Servant's" charter.

(6) He was repeatedly entreated not to advocate these changes as disloyal to "that Servant's" charter.

(7) He was forewarned that for such advocacy thoughtful persons would be given good reason to fear that his published praise of the Charter would be open to the charge of insincerity and self-seeking.

XI. Brother Rutherford arranged for and conducted, in the interests of his plan for three days, January 3-5, 1918, a thoroughly "bossed" convention.

(1) He announced his plan beforehand.

(2) He carried out much of his plan; and was prevented from carrying it out entirely, e. g., a unanimous re-election, by some, previously unenlightened, becoming enlightened as to his purposes and methods.

(3) One of the avowed purposes of the Convention was to unseat the four Directors who sought to hold in check his unscriptural and dangerous plans.

(4) A widespread "political" campaign was waged creating much and general sentiment, particularly against Brother Johnson and generally against the Board members, inuring to their unseating.

(5) He engineered a movement to use for his advantage an absent brother, Brother Pierson, and used his opinions before the Convention to the discredit of the ousted Directors.

(6) He had at least one special mouthpiece to present motions with suitable and sometimes untrue remarks to carry out his previously arranged plan.

(7) In discourses and addresses he and some of his supporters sought to undermine, in the estimation of the conventioners, the brothers who were objectionable to him.

(8) A special meeting of leaders (unannounced on the program) was called to oil the machinery to be set in motion in the Shareholders' meeting.

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE COMMITTEE

(6) Without foundation in fact one of the three was habitually accused of seeking to lord it over God's heritage.

(7) Things that one of the three had told in sacred confidence were scattered broadcast.

IX. The Group and their supporters, July 27, 1918, sought to force through the Asbury Park Convention several matters without proper discussion, to the disruption of the old Committee.

(1) They accepted a program for a spurious *first smiting* of Jordan from a brother whose key and many other views of Revelation, etc., are vagarious and contrary to those of "that Servant"; and they insisted that all swallow their program and labor in harmony with it.

(2) From the false viewpoint that "that Servant" clearly taught a *future first smiting* of Jordan they sought to commit with almost no discussion the Convention to the policy of forming a Society with an altered Charter as indispensable to a future first smiting of Jordan.—July 27, 1918.

(3) They resorted to parliamentary evasions and other questionable things to prevent discussion of questions fundamental to their whole plan.—July 27, 1918.

(4) They also resorted to cloture methods to prevent, in the Convention, sufficient discussion of their program.—July 27, 1918.

X. Privately and publicly the Group advocated setting aside some of, and adding others to, the clauses of that Servant's charter in the charter of their proposed society, unto the disruption of the old Committee.

(1) They asked that there be no shareholders in the proposed new Society.

(2) They advocated that the Directors be elected by the subscribers of "The Bible Standard."

(3) They advocated that the officers be elected by the Directors.

(4) They wanted the Directors to be elected annually, contrary to "that Servant's" arrangement.

(5) They professed in Facts for Shareholders, written early in November, 1917, the highest regard for "that Servant's" charter as divinely given.

(6) They were repeatedly entreated not to advocate these changes as disloyal to "that Servant's" charter.

(7) They were forewarned that for such advocacy thoughtful persons would be given good reason to fear that their published praise of the Charter as Divinely given would be open to the charge of insincerity and self-seeking.

XI. The Group arranged for and conducted, in the interests of their plan for three days, July 26-28, 1918, a thoroughly "bossed" convention.

(1) They announced their plan beforehand.

(2) They carried out much of their plan; and were prevented from carrying it out entirely by some, previously unenlightened, becoming enlightened as to their purposes and methods.

(3) One of the avowed purposes of the Convention was to unseat the three Committee brothers who held in check their unscriptural and dangerous plans.

(4) A widespread "political" campaign was waged creating much and general sentiment, particularly against Brother Johnson and generally against all three of the Committee members marked for defeat, inuring to their unseating.

(5) They engineered a movement to use for their advantage an absent brother, Brother Sturgeon, and used his opinions before the Convention to the discredit of the three rejected Committee members.

(6) At least one brother acted as their special mouthpiece in presenting motions with suitable and sometimes untrue remarks to carry out their previously arranged plan.

(7) In discourses and addresses some of them and some of their supporters sought to undermine, in the estimation of the conventioners, the brothers who were objectionable to them.

(8) A special meeting of Elders and Deacons (unannounced on the program) was called before the announced Convention business meeting. Judging from the atmosphere, speeches and motions the evident object of this special meeting was to work up the Elders and Deacons to support the plan of the Group for the business session following.

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE SOCIETY

(9) To the advantage of his plan the false statement was made that he had legally filled four vacancies with Directors with valid powers, until the next election, when all the Directors were to surrender their powers and stewardship.

(10) Brother Johnson protested formally and solemnly against the proposed action of the shareholders to elect directors without there being vacancies on the Board, according to the Charter.

(11) To the advantage of his plan the false statement was circulated that the seven Directors had come to the Shareholders' meeting believing their places vacant.

(12) So unfavorable to the four Directors had the atmosphere of the Shareholders' meeting become, through the "political" campaign, that they had very great difficulties put in the way of their proving that "that Servant," having arranged their places on the Board, Brother Rutherford could not oust them, nor of right ask them to resign, nor take over the control of the stewardship that they had acquired under "that Servant's" arrangements.

(13) By arbitrary insistence in matters in which at most the Shareholders should have gone no further than to suggest, they would not permit an Arbitration Board sitting as a separate body to deliberate on the facts as to whether the Directors of the Society should surrender the rights of "that Servant" in his Will and Charter to a Brother Rutherford-controlled-meeting.

(14) The demand was made by a majority vote that the Directors surrender the powers that "that Servant" gave them in his Will and Charter to a Brother Rutherford-controlled-meeting.

(15) This demand, it was insisted upon, must be granted at that meeting without permitting appropriate discussion.

(16) This demand was enforced by the Brother Rutherford-bossed Convention without discussion on the part of the Directors and others.

(17) This demand, so favorable to Brother Rutherford's plan, having been granted, they were, by a resolution, impliedly asked to accede to an election of their successors, *i. e.*, they were in effect asked to resign.

(18) They knew that the shareholders would have voted them out of office, if they did not accept the situation demanded by Brother Rutherford and his supporters; and therefore, under this stress, they ceased to object to the election proceeding; *i. e.*, they in effect resigned.

(19) The four Directors knew that they were marked for slaughter.

(20) The surrender of the powers of the four Directors, conferred by "that Servant's" Charter, not only put the entire directorate into the hands of the Brother Rutherford-controlled Convention, but also the Society's other assets.

(21) To say that the above described course of this Shareholders' meeting was coercive is putting matters mildly.

(22) When brethren of spiritual discernment saw that in the course of Brother Rutherford's supporters the Lord's spirit was plainly lacking; and when they sought to have the proceedings stopped, just before the election of Directors was taken up; they were uncharitably accused of seeking to obstruct matters.

(23) Brother McGee, the proposer of the motion to delay matters for investigation, was treated with contempt and silenced by "a point of order."

(24) Up to the time of balloting for new Directors, repeated efforts were made to change the purpose of the supporters of Brother Rutherford's plans.

(25) All such efforts were in vain, because Brother Rutherford's "political" campaign had misled the majority of the shareholders, who seemed impatient with the efforts to enlighten them on the real merits of the case.

(26) The shareholders, responding to motions favorable to the plans of Brother Rutherford, elected six brothers to membership on the new Board who were advocated for such membership before the election by Brother Rutherford and his supporters.

(27) The other new member of the Board was nominated by supporters of Brother Rutherford's plans.

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE COMMITTEE

(9) To the advantage of their plan the false statement was made that the Committee had been instructed at the Fort Pitt Convention to act until the next Convention, to which they should go and give up their powers and stewardship.

(10) Brother Johnson formally and solemnly protested against the proposed action of the conventioners, unauthorized by the Fort Pitt Convention, to elect Committee members in a body appointed by another and independent convention.

(11) To the advantage of their plan the false statement was repeatedly made that the seven Committee members had come to the Convention to resign.

(12) So unfavorable to the three marked Committee members had the atmosphere of the Convention become through the "political" campaign, that they had very great difficulties put in the way of their proving that the Fort Pitt Convention, having appointed and empowered the Committee, and not having made them subject to another Convention, the Asbury Park Convention, could neither depose them, nor of right ask their resignation, nor take over the property that they had acquired under commission of the Fort Pitt Convention.

(13) By arbitrary insistence in matters in which the conventioners should have gone no further than to suggest, they would not permit the eighteen members of the Fort Pitt Convention present to withdraw in a body to deliberate on the question of surrendering the rights of the Fort Pitt Convention to a convention bossed by the Group.

(14) The demand was made by a majority vote that these eighteen brethren vote the powers of the Fort Pitt Convention over the committee to the Asbury Park Convention.

(15) This demand, it was insisted upon, must be granted in the Convention's presence without permitting appropriate discussion or the withdrawal of the eighteen brethren for private deliberation.

(16) This demand was enforced by a Convention "bossed" by the Group without discussion on the part of the three and others.

(17) This demand, so favorable to the plan of the Group, having been granted, the Committee was asked to resign.

(18) They knew that the misinformed Convention would have ousted them, if they did not accept the situation demanded by the Group and their supporters; and therefore, under this stress, the three resigned.

(19) The three knew that they were marked for slaughter.

(20) The surrender of the powers of the Fort Pitt Convention to the Asbury Park Convention, not only put the Committee into the hands of a bossed Convention, but also the Committee's assets.

(21) To say that the above described course of the Convention's business meetings on Saturday, July 27, was coercive is putting the matter mildly.

(22) When brethren of spiritual discernment saw that in the course of the supporters of the Group the Lord's spirit was plainly lacking; and when they sought, just before the election of a new Committee was taken up, to adjourn the meeting, they were uncharitably accused of seeking to obstruct matters.

(23) Brother Johnson, the proposer of the motion to delay matters, until more deliberation and prayer could be given matters, was treated with contemptuous catcalls of "shame" and silenced on "a point of order."

(24) Up to the time of voting for the new Committee repeated efforts were made to change the purpose of the supporters of the Group's plans.

(25) All such efforts were in vain, because the Group's "political" campaign, by July 27, 1918, had misled the majority of the conventioners, who seemed impatient with the efforts to enlighten them on the real merits of the case.

(26) The Conventioners, responding to motions favorable to the plans of the four brothers, elected six brothers to membership on the new Committee who, with one possible exception, were advocated for such membership before the election by the Group and their supporters.

(27) The other new member of the Committee was nominated by supporters of the plans of the Group.

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE SOCIETY

(28) The five Directors who had opposed Brother Rutherford's usurpations were not elected.

(29) Before the election Brother Rutherford made special efforts to separate Brother Pierson from the four "opponent" Directors.

(30) Brother Rutherford, without an election thereto, assumed the chairmanship of the shareholders' meeting.

(31) Throughout the shareholders' meeting Brother Rutherford, as chairman, ruled in favor of his plans, to the disadvantage of the four ousted Directors.

(32) At one point he signalled Brother MacMillan to have a motion made advantageous to his plans.

(33) Attacks were made on the four Directors and on several of their supporters, their names even being disparagingly mentioned.

(34) These attacks were made preparatory to the business centering in the election.

(35) The activity of certain interested sisters, before and during the Convention, helped to create the unhealthy atmosphere of the first business sessions of the shareholders' meeting.

(36) The shareholders' meeting, controlled by Brother Rutherford, permitted no discussion of certain vital issues.

(37) To the last Brother Rutherford sought to "boss" the shareholders' meeting.

(38) His tactics turned what should have been a feast into one of the few bad Conventions held among Truth people.

(39) His general course made a division in the Church.

(40) His general course greatly distressed the Church.

(41) His general course undermined the faithful's confidence in him.

(42) His general course wrecked the Society's real work.

(43) His general course called for the faithful to question his leadership.

(44) His general course called for an unbossed Convention for consultation and action relative to his acts and aims and the conditions in the Church.

(45) Fearing an investigation, he refused to call an extra meeting of the shareholders, which he was asked to do.

(46) Brother Rutherford wrote to the Philadelphia Church that he had too much to do to arrange for a special meeting of the Society's shareholders; and that an extra meeting of the shareholders would be too inconvenient for them, and therefore he *unanimously* decided not to call them together.

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE COMMITTEE

(28) The three brothers who had opposed the questionable efforts of the other members of the Committee were not elected.

(29) Before the election the Group of four made special efforts to separate Brother Hirsh from Brothers Jolly and Johnson.

(30) The Group, without an election thereto, assumed in the person of their convention chairman, the chairmanship of the business sessions.

(31) Throughout the business meetings the chairman of the Group ruled in favor of their plans, to the disadvantage of the three marked committeemen.

(32) At one point he signalled to Brother Robbins to make a motion advantageous to the plans of the Group.

(33) Attacks were made on the three committeemen, their names even being disparagingly mentioned.

(34) These attacks were made preparatory to the business centering in the election.

(35) The activity of certain interested sisters, before and during the Convention, helped to create the unhealthy atmosphere of the first business sessions of the Convention.

(36) The business meetings of Saturday, July 27, 1918, controlled by the Group and their supporters, permitted no discussion of certain vital issues.

(37) To the last the Group sought to "boss" the business meetings of the Convention.

(38) Their tactics turned what should have been a feast into one of the few bad conventions held among Truth people.

(39) Their general course is making a division in the Church.

(40) Their general course is greatly distressing the Church.

(41) Their general course is undermining the faithful's confidence in them.

(42) Their general course is wrecking the Committee's real work.

(43) Their general course calls for the faithful to question their leadership.

(44) Their general course calls for an unbossed convention for consultation and action relative to their acts and aims and the condition of the Church.

(45) Seemingly fearing an investigation they have refused to call an early Convention, which they were asked to do.

(46) The new Committee wrote to the Philadelphia Church that it has too much work to arrange for a general Convention (a Convention that might uncover matters?) and that the location of Philadelphia makes it too inconvenient for a convention to assemble there; therefore, it *unanimously* decided to disfavor the request of the Philadelphia Church for a general Convention.

XII. A most impressive feature brought to light by a comparison of the wrong acts of Brother Rutherford and his supporters on the one hand, and of the Group and their supporters on the other hand, is the fact that in the main particulars both Groups committed the same kind of wrongs exactly to the day, one year apart. Many of the faithful, scripturally regard the spirit-begotten supporters of Brother Rutherford as of that class of anti-typical Merari Levites (Great Company, Vol. VI, page 129), typed by the Mahli (Num. 3: 20, 33), descendants of Merari. Some of these faithful are beginning to have grave fears that the Group and their supporters may be of the anti-typical Merari Levites (Great Company), typed by the Mushi descendants of Merari. Does it not seem probable that the Lord allowed an exact year to elapse between the revelation (by actions) of the anti-typical Mahli and the anti-typical Mushi Levites?

(1) Brother Rutherford was voted into power by the passing of his by-laws, recommended by Brother Margeson and two others.—January 6, 1917.

(2) A little later the Board was organized by the election of the Society's officers.—January 6, 1917.

(3) Brother Rutherford defined his powers after his by-laws were spread on the Board's minutes.—January 20, 1917.

(4) Brother Johnson's statement, drawn up at London, on February 17, 1917, setting forth the wrongs of Brothers Stream and Crawford, reported to Brother Rutherford as injurious February 19, 1918.

(5) Brother Rutherford's cable to the London Managers and to Brother Johnson declares some of the latter's work to be "absolutely without authority."—February 24, 1917.

(1) The Committee was voted into power by Brother Margeson's resolution, over which he seemed to consult two others (Brother Margeson succeeding a resigned member, helped largely to form the Group as separate from the other three brothers).—January 6, 1918.

(2) A little later the Committee was organized by the election of its officers.—January 6, 1918.

(3) The Committee defined its powers after discussing its minutes and spreading upon them the powers conferred on them at the Convention.—January 20, 1918.

(4) Brother Johnson's statements on the "evil servant," on February 17, 1918, at Philadelphia setting forth the wrongs of Brother Rutherford, reported to Brother Hoskins as injurious February 19, 1918.

(5) The Group's resolution of February 23 (passed at night, therefore February 24, Jewish time), discountenancing any teachings not approved by the Committee (which, of course, means the Group) declares Brother Johnson's work on that evil servant, Elijah and Elisha, etc., "absolutely without authority."—February 24, 1918.

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE SOCIETY

(6) Brother Hemery, in the interests of Brother Rutherford's "absolutely-without-authority" cable, suspiciously watches Brother Johnson as "unsafe," preparatory to and during the sessions of the Investigating Commission.—March 2-5, 1917.

(7) As the agent of Brother Rutherford, Brother Hemery tells members of the Investigating Commission of the "absolutely-without-authority" and "insanity" cables, with comments.—March 3, 1917.

(8) Brother Hemery, as Brother Rutherford's representative, at a special meeting, continues to slander Brother Johnson.—March 11, 1917.

(9) Brother Hemery, as Brother Rutherford's representative, at another special meeting, still continues to slander Brother Johnson.—March 13, 1917.

(10) At a Board meeting Brother Johnson is reproved by Brother Rutherford and several of his supporters for having supposedly acted "absolutely-without-authority" in the English affairs.—April 13, 1917.

(11) At this Board meeting Brother Johnson protests against his English activity being treated as "absolutely without authority."—April 13, 1917.

(12) Just after reading his paper on conscientious objection to the Bethel family, Brother Rutherford said to Brother Johnson that it was necessary for the safeguarding of the brethren from military service to claim that the Society and the Church were one; *i. e.*, it was attempted to organize the Church otherwise than the Lord organized it.—May 11, 1917.

(13) Brother Johnson's Scriptural objection to this plan is treated lightly by Brother Rutherford.—May 11, 1917.

(14) Through the Board's compromising resolution *re* Brother Johnson's English activity, Brother Rutherford succeeded in throwing a cloud over his English work.—June 20, 1917.

(15) Brothers Rutherford and MacMillan try to get rid of Brother Johnson by attempting to send him on a transient Pilgrim trip, landing him at his home, June 21, 1917.

(16) Brother Johnson's refusal to go on a Pilgrim trip, and his appeal to the Board against Brother Rutherford's order for him to leave Bethel, blocked, temporarily, the effort to put him out of the Society's work.—June 22, 1917.

(17) By making affidavit to four vacancies in the Board, and by appointing four new directors, Brother Rutherford blocked efforts to interfere with his plans.—July 12, 1917.

(18) The ousting of the four Directors fully decided upon and attempted July 17, 1917.

(19) The reaffirmation of the ousting definitely made in a Board meeting July 18, 1917.

(20) Part of Brother Johnson's basis of mediation rejected July 18, 1917.

(21) Many of the Bethel family, influenced by a "political" campaign, coldly receive Brother Johnson on his return from Cromwell.—July 25-26, 1917.

(22) Brother Johnson was fiercely and cunningly attacked by Brother Rutherford in the morning meeting of the People's Pulpit Association.—July 27, 1917.

(23) The ousted Board members and Brother Johnson were ordered out of Bethel; *i. e.*, out of official relation to the Society, by order of Brother Rutherford's Executive Committee.—July 27, 1917.

(24) Trickery and coercion were used, especially against Brother Johnson, to put and keep him out of Bethel.—July 27, 1917.

(25) Brother Johnson was made the target of hooting by Brother Rutherford's supporters.—July 27, 1917.

(26) Brother Johnson was actually, and the four ousted Board members were virtually, put out of Bethel July 27, 1917.

(27) Brother Rutherford, in effect, appoints an unauthorized Editorial Committee when he and others arranged to send out his "Harvest Siftings" as Society literature insurrectioned by "The Tower" Editorial Committee, and unknown to a majority of its members.—July 28, 1917.

(28) The publication of Brother Rutherford's "Harvest Siftings," an attempt to boycott the Board's majority and

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE COMMITTEE

(6) Brother Margeson, in the interests of the Group's "absolutely-without-authority" preaching resolution, at Boston suspiciously watches Brother Johnson as "unsafe."—March 2-5, 1918.

(7) Seemingly acting as the agent of Brother Sturgeon (whose working program the Group has adopted), Sister Henderson hands out a slanderous paper against Brother Johnson, with comments.—March 3, 1918.

(8) Sister Henderson, seemingly as Brother Sturgeon's representative, at a special meeting continues to slander Brother Johnson.—March 11, 1918.

(9) Sister Henderson, seemingly as Brother Sturgeon's representative, at another special meeting continues to slander Brother Johnson.—March 13, 1918.

(10) At a Committee meeting Brother Johnson is reproved by the Group as having acted "absolutely without authority" in the Elijah and Elisha discourse delivered at Jersey City and Newark, where he spoke on this subject by request of the Classes.—April 13, 1918.

(11) At this Committee meeting Brother Johnson protests against his preaching timely truth being treated as "absolutely without authority."—April 13, 1918.

(12) A representative of the Group proposed the formation of a Society as necessary for the work; *i. e.*, it was an attempt to organize the Church otherwise than the Lord organized it.—May 11, 1918.

(13) Brother Johnson's Scriptural objection to this plan is treated lightly by the Group.—May 11, 1918.

(14) Through the compromising course of some of the Committee members and their supporters relative to Brother Johnson's course toward the Society's leaders on trial, his Elijah and Elisha teaching is placed under a cloud.—June 20, 1918.

(15) Brothers Hoskins and Rockwell's plan (made at the conviction of the Society leaders) to form a reunion with the Society, based as it was on a denial that the division of last year was the separation of Elijah and Elisha, was logically an attempt to get rid of Brother Johnson.—June 21, 1918.

(16) Brother Johnson's objection to, and the majority of the Committee disapproving of, the projected reunion with the Society temporarily blocks what in reality was an effort to put him out of the Committee's work.—June 22, 1918.

(17) By finally preventing a meeting for July 13, 1918, several of the Group blocked efforts to interfere with their plans.—July 12, 1918.

(18) Several members of the Editorial and Pastoral Bible Institute Committees fully decided that Brothers Hirsh, Jolly and Johnson must be ousted, and a new Committee (whom for the most part they named) be elected; the plan for withholding the paper was a part of the attempt to put this into execution.—July 17, 1918.

(19) The reaffirmation of the ousting definitely made in the meeting of the Committee July 18, 1918.

(20) Part of Brother Johnson's basis of mediation of Committee's troubles; *i. e.*, by dissolving the Editorial Committee, rejected July 18, 1918.

(21) Many of the conventioners, influenced by a "political" campaign, coldly receive Brother Johnson July 25-26, 1918.

(22) Brother Johnson is fiercely and cunningly attacked by Brother Rockwell in the morning meeting of the Convention.—July 27, 1918.

(23) Brothers Hirsh, Jolly and Johnson were ordered out of the Committee by the Group's supporters.—July 27, 1918.

(24) Trickery and coercion were used, especially against Brother Johnson, to put and keep him out of the Committee.—July 27, 1918.

(25) Brother Johnson was made the target of hooting by supporters of the Group.—July 27, 1918.

(26) Brothers Hirsh, Jolly and Johnson were put out of the Committee July 27, 1918.

(27) The Group appoints an unauthorized Editorial Committee, when they and others elected such a Committee without authorization of the Convention.—July 28, 1918.

(28) The making public of the untrue propaganda in opposition to the three Committee members solidifies into the

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE SOCIETY

Brother Johnson, is sent first of all to the Boston Elders and Deacons July 29, 1917.

(29) Brother Rutherford, directly and through Brother Van Amburg, at the Boston Convention, claims that the four Directors and Brother Johnson were misrepresenting him.—August 5, 1917.

There are additional to those given under Division XII, many more year parallels under the preceding divisions

RUTHERFORDISM IN THE COMMITTEE

decision of the Group and others to boycott at least two of them, which boycott has been in force since the Convention.—July 29, 1918.

(29) The new Committee passes a resolution which was the next day sent to the Philadelphia Church intimating that Brothers Jolly and Johnson were misrepresenting them.—August 5, 1918.

GENERAL CONVENTION

PHILADELPHIA, PA., SEPTEMBER 8-10

August 4 the Philadelphia Church requested the Committee to arrange for a General Convention at Philadelphia for September 8-10. August 13 Brother Hoskins, Secretary of the Committee, wrote that the Committee unanimously disfavored granting their request. As shown above, their reasons parallel those given by Brother Rutherford for declining the request of the Philadelphia Church last year for a special meeting of the shareholders to regulate the situation.

There seems to be good reason for fearing that certain remarks that some of the friends at Philadelphia made during the discussion of the motion to ask for a General Convention, and that indicated that the trouble in the Church might come up for discussion and investigation during the Convention were made known to the secretary of the Committee, and it is possible that this thought had something to do with the Committee's declining to favor the invitation. The Committee has the same reason to fear an investigation that Brother Rutherford last year had. While I do not charge this possible reason as a motive, not knowing just how they felt or what they said in their meeting, I do know that their not holding such a Convention will work as advantageously to them, and as disadvantageously to the faithful as Brother Rutherford's declining to hold an investigative and remedial meeting of the shareholders last year worked advantageously to him, and disadvantageously to the faithful. As soon as I heard the Committee's answer, I decided not to follow the course that the Board members pursued last year, i. e., letting Brother Rutherford have his own way in the matter of an investigation. I, therefore, prepared and submitted to the Philadelphia Elders and Church a resolution which was endorsed by the Elders and passed by the Church, and which I quote in full on the next page in this paper.

IN HARMONY WITH THIS RESOLUTION THE ANNOUNCEMENT OF A GENERAL CONVENTION FOR THE PURPOSES, DATES AND PLACE MENTIONED IN THE RESOLUTION IS HEREWITH MADE. ALL THE LORD'S PEOPLE IN HARMONY WITH THE PURPOSES OF THIS CONVENTION, AS GIVEN ABOVE, ARE, IN THE LORD'S NAME, GIVEN A CORDIAL INVITATION TO ATTEND AND PARTICIPATE IN THE CONVENTION.

Kindly permit me to explain why I framed and submitted such a resolution. While a church can call and hold a local Convention, it goes without saying that it has no power to hold a General Convention. It has no jurisdiction beyond its own Classes. A General Convention can, under God, be properly called by no one else than by our Lord or the Apostles or the Prophets in the Church; for no one else in the Church has the right to address the whole Church on matters of faith and practice, nor can any human being, or Church, or combination of churches, give any person or persons the power to address the whole Church on matters of faith and practice.

While "that Servant" was alive, by his peculiar office, in addition to his prophet office, he had and used the power to call and arrange for General Conventions. Since the only living persons in the Lord who have the power to address the whole Church on matters of faith and practice are the second order of teachers in the Church, the prophets (I Cor. 12:28; Eph. 4:11), for they are the only living persons whose office function it is to teach and serve the whole Church, one or more of these have this right in emergencies. The right of a Committee to call a General Convention of the

Little Flock cannot be given it, as such, by a General Convention; but those members of a Committee who have the prophet office may, not as Committee members, but as prophets, call and arrange for a General Convention of the Church. Therefore, in view of the crisis in our midst, as one of the duly qualified and active prophets in the Church (for the Pilgrim office, as "that Servant" has shown in Volume 6, is the prophet office in the Church), and thus, as one who holds the office that gives the right to address the whole Church in matters of faith and practice, in the name of God our Father and Jesus Christ our Savior, I invite the brethren everywhere to meet in General Convention at Philadelphia, September 8-10, for the purpose of spiritual feasting, of investigating into and of seeking a remedy for the troubles in the Church.

The fact that I have asked the Philadelphia Church to pass this resolution is due, not to my having doubts as to my right to call a General Convention, but to satisfy some who may have such doubts. The mornings of the Convention will be devoted to discourses, from which will be excluded all references to the troubles; the afternoons and evenings of the Convention will be devoted to a consideration of our Church difficulties and proposed remedies. All in harmony with the purposes of the Convention to make an honest Christian effort to investigate the difficulties and to devise remedies for them will be given full liberty compatible with the Lord's Spirit to express themselves in the business meetings. Others than such persons are not invited to come; for it is desirable that no one be permitted to take part in these meetings who seeks to prevent, pervert, hinder or oppose the Convention and its purposes. Experience has demonstrated the need of pursuing such a course as this, and, therefore, one of the first motions that will be submitted to the Convention in our first business session will be one calculated to put this thought into effect. We earnestly entreat the brethren everywhere to consider the things written in this paper; to pray over them, and prepare themselves to take a sober and intelligent part in the discussions. Let us do all in our power to prevent this Convention from being bossed. Will we not abhor trickery and cunning, especially when we see these working to the injury of the Lord's people? Will we not seek to prevent their activity at this Convention? Will we not encourage the hearty co-operation of all the brethren to secure these purposes?

Kindly address your communications re rooms, boarding, etc., to B. M. Kittinger, 406 Seville St., Philadelphia, Pa.

Please state in your letters the number of persons in the party, their sex, color, whether you want rooms alone or with others, the price per day, and whether you desire meals furnished at your lodging places. Information as to location of hall of Assignment Committee, etc., will, on your arrival, be given by the bureaus of information, at the Broad Street Station (Penna. Railroad), at the Reading Terminal, and at the Baltimore and Ohio Station, Chestnut and Twenty-fourth Streets. Please ask the bureaus of information for the MIZPAH Convention.

Again let us exhort to humility, to prayer, to sobriety, to candor, to love and to diligence in seeking Zion's prosperity. "They shall prosper that love thee." Wishing all of you God's richest blessing and joining with you in prayer for the same. I remain with much Christian love,

Your brother and servant,

PAUL S. L. JOHNSON.

RESOLUTION OF THE PHILADELPHIA CHURCH

PHILADELPHIA, PA., August 18, 1918.

"WHEREAS, On account of certain difficulties involving the Pastoral Bible Institute Committee and others, there is a crisis in the affairs of the Church, threatening a widespread division; and

WHEREAS, The Philadelphia Church has invited the Pastoral Bible Institute Committee to hold in Philadelphia a General Convention of three days duration, September 8-10, 1918; and

WHEREAS, The Committee unanimously declined to favor the invitation of the Philadelphia Church for a General Convention; and

WHEREAS, There is urgent need of holding, in the near future, a General Convention, not only to hear the Lord's Word, but especially to investigate and, if possible, to remedy the said difficulties; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, By the Philadelphia Church assembled Sunday, August 18, 1918, that we, the Philadelphia Church, ask Pilgrim Brother Paul S. L. Johnson, immediately to call and arrange for a General Convention, for September 8-10, in Philadelphia, not only to furnish spiritual feasts, but especially to investigate and, if possible, to devise a remedy for the said difficulties; and be it further

RESOLVED, That we, the Philadelphia Church, pledge our prayers and co-operation for the Convention and its purposes, and ask the brethren everywhere to do the same; be it further

RESOLVED, That we, the Philadelphia Church, will withdraw all priestly fellowship from any person or persons who, individually or collectively, attempt to prevent, pervert, thwart, or oppose the purposes of this Convention, as stated above; and, if a person so doing holds an office in our midst, we herewith declare his office vacant; and fraternally suggest that our Sister Churches follow our example in this particular.

(Signed) THE PHILADELPHIA CHURCH.

SOME TESTIMONIES

The manuscript of this paper was submitted to Brothers Hirsh and Jolly for criticism. You will be doubtless interested to read the letters that they have written, after reading it. These letters are, therefore, submitted for your perusal, as follows:

"MR. P. S. L. JOHNSON,
1222 Morris Street, Phila., Pa.

"DEAR BROTHER JOHNSON:

"I have read the manuscript entitled 'Another Harvest Siftings Reviewed,' which you have submitted to me for an opinion.

"I know from experience and from close association with you during the past year how much it must have grieved you to write such a Review.

"Respecting the British matters and a few other minor affairs that you mention, I have no first-hand information; but in regard to other things referred to in your Review, I can see no attempt at exaggeration or misrepresentation; you have underdrawn, rather than overdrawn.

"If charges had not been made in private and also in public by some of the brothers referred to, particularly from the platform of the recent Asbury Park Convention, I would, of course, advise against your publishing this second Review; but loyalty to the Lord, to the Truth and to the brethren demands that some one among us have the courage to spread these amazing facts before the friends that they also might have opportunity to judge for themselves.

"Faithfully your brother in the Lord,

"(Signed) R. H. HIRSH."

"DEAR BROTHER JOHNSON:

"Since reading your manuscript on 'Another Harvest Siftings Reviewed,' I have done considerable thinking and praying. Surely the Lord moves in wonderful ways! So many things occurring on the exact anniversary of similar things a year ago, should surely make it impossible to deceive the Very Elect in respect to this additional sifting in the Church! One or two parallels might not be so convincing, but who can honestly say of *one hundred and fifty exact parallels, over thirty of which demonstrate the time feature, that they all 'just happened so?'*

"Doubtless some, not willing to accept the truth nor able to withstand it, will impugn your motives or accuse you of needlessly exposing evil. I wish to assure you, dear brother, of my joy in noting that you do not judge the motives of the heart, but merely uncover evils intended of Satan to work havoc in the Church. You also have my deepest appreciation of your costly labor of love in the defense of the Lord's Little Flock and the Truth. So far as I know the facts, and I am acquainted with most of them, I endorse as true everything you have written. I realize that you have refrained from mentioning many things, perhaps because of your desire not to reflect unnecessarily against anyone's character.

"Many friends at the Asbury Park Convention will testify that repeated motions to hear the Scriptures on present events were not put to a vote at all, but were, by substitute motions and other slight-of-hand parliamentary tactics, railroaded out altogether. Many will remember how various Scriptural terms were scoffed at and ridiculed, and how Brother Rockwell urged that we are weary of hearing of Elijah and Elisha, and that we let them rest in peace, despite the fact that our dear Brother Russell, during his last year in serving the Church, spoke and wrote on this more than any other theme, and pointed to this very type as being especially helpful to us at the time of its fulfilment. Yet some oppose this present truth and, like the dog in the manger, will not themselves eat, nor allow this privilege to others.

"Do you not think, Brother Johnson, that the Church should be given to realize that the Lord never used a mouthpiece that rebelled against His Word? The present Committee (with one or two exceptions), refuses to feed upon the Truth now due, and are thus in no position to feed the flock. Some of them even boast (to their own shame), that they have learned nothing new since Brother Russell's death, and yet they inconsistently admit that we are now in the Epiphany (*bright shining*) of our Lord's presence. Shall we again drive a little stake fence and cease to walk in the light as it shines brighter and brighter? Brother Russell foretold that, 'with the closing of this Age,' the Levites would be separated from their association with the Priests in the Holy, to their proper place in the Court. (Z '11-22, Col. 1, ¶ 5, 6; Z '11-349, Col. 2, ¶ 2.) Realizing, then, what the Lord is doing in our midst, how grand the privilege of serving His Very Elect, and how comforting the assurance that having done all, they are standing, unshakable, rooted and grounded in Christ!

"Your Brother in His blessed love and service,

R. G. JOLLY."

“That Servant’s” View Justifies Brother Johnson’s Course

“From his high standpoint of appreciation of the divine law, the advanced Christian sees that in the Lord’s sight hatred is *murder*, slander is *assassination*, and the destruction of a neighbor’s good name is *robbery* and rapine. And any of these things done in the Church, among the professed people of God, is doubly evil—the assassination and robbery of a *brother*. The only exception to this rule, “Speak evil of no man,” would come in where we might know of an absolute necessity for making known an evil—where the relating of the evil would be contrary to our heart’s wishes, and only mentioned because of necessity—because of love for others who, if not informed, might be injured.”—Manna Comment, July 14.

“That Servant’s” View Again Justifies Brother Johnson’s Course

“It would be a great mistake, however, to suppose that the Apostle, in using this general language to the Church, meant that every individual of the Church was to do such admonishing. To admonish wisely, helpfully, is a very delicate matter, indeed, and remarkably few have a talent for it. The election of elders on the part of congregations is understood to signify the election of those of the number possessed of the largest measure of spiritual development, combined with natural qualifications to constitute them the representatives of the congregation, not only in respect to the leading of meetings, etc., but also in respect to keeping order in the meetings and admonishing unruly ones wisely, kindly, firmly. That this is the Apostle’s thought is clearly shown in the two preceding verses, in which he says:

“We beseech you, brethren, to know them which labor among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you; and to esteem them very highly in love for their works’ sake. And be at peace amongst yourselves.”—1 Thess. 5:12, 13.

“If divine wisdom has been properly sought and properly exercised in the choosing of elders of a congregation, it follows that those thus chosen were very highly esteemed; and since novices are not to be chosen, it follows that these were appreciated and selected for their works’ sake, because it was discerned by the brethren that they had a considerable measure of the Holy Spirit of love and wisdom and meekness, besides certain natural gifts and qualifications for this service. To ‘be at peace amongst yourselves,’ as the Apostle exhorts, would mean that, having chosen these elders to be the representatives of the congregation, the body in general would *look to them to perform the service to which they were chosen*, and would not attempt to take it each upon himself to be a reprover, or admonisher, etc. Indeed, as we have already seen, the Lord’s people are not to judge one another personally; and only the congregation as a whole may exclude one of the number from the fellowship and privileges of the meeting. And this, we have seen, can come only after the various steps of a more private kind have been taken—after all efforts to bring about reform have proved unavailing, and the interests of the Church in general are seriously threatened by the wrong course of the offender. But in the text before us the Apostle exhorts that the congregation shall ‘know’—that is, recognize, look to—those whom they have chosen as their representatives, and expect them to keep guard over the interests of the Church, and to do the admonishing of the unruly, up to the point where matters would be serious enough to bring them before the Church as a court.

“This admonishing, under some circumstances, might need to be done publicly before the congregation, as the Apostle suggests to Timothy: ‘Them that sin (publicly) rebuke before all, that others also may fear.’ (1 Tim. 5:20.) Such a public rebuke necessarily implies a *public sin of a grievous nature*. For any comparatively slight deviation from rules of order the elders, under the law of love, the Golden Rule, should certainly ‘consider one another to provoke unto love and to good works,’ and so considering they would know that a word in private would probably be much more helpful to the individual than a public rebuke, which might cut or wound or injure a sensitive nature where such wounding was entirely unnecessary, and where love would have prompted a different course. But even though an Elder should rebuke a grievous sin publicly, it should be done, nevertheless, lovingly, and with a desire that the reprovèd one might be corrected and helped back, and not with a desire to make him odious and to cast him forth. Nor, indeed, does it come within the Elder’s province to rebuke any to the extent of debarring them from the privileges of the congregation. Rebuke to this extent, as we have just seen, can proceed only from the Church as a whole, and that after a full hearing of the case, in which the accused one has full opportunity for either defending himself or amending his ways and being forgiven. The Church, the *Ecclesia*, the consecrated of the Lord, are, as a whole, his representatives, and the Elder is merely the Church’s representative—the Church’s best conception of the Lord’s choice. The Church, therefore, and not the elders, constitute the court of last resort in all such matters: hence, an elder’s course is always subject to review or correction by the Church, according to the united judgment of the Lord’s will.”—Vol. VI, Pages 300-302.