Tales from the Archives

Because of its historic connection with Methodism, Dickinson College has periodically served as a depository for items associated with the Conference and the denomination. Several years ago an effort was made to identify all such materials and transfer them to the conference archives at Lycoming College. But every so often Dickinson College discovers additional items that rightfully belong to the Central Pennsylvania Conference.

Such was the case last summer when an inventory of the vaults in the Dickinson College archives turned up two boxes of original transcripts of Methodist Episcopal church trials. One box covers the entire existence of the East Baltimore Conference (direct predecessor of the Central Pennsylvania Conference) from 1858 to 1868. The second box covers the first three quadrennia of the Central Pennsylvania Conference from 1868 to 1880. Exactly when and under what circumstances the material was deposited at Dickinson College remains a mystery, but its discovery has shed new light on those years of Central Pennsylvania Methodism.

One particular benefit the discovery brings to the archives is the ability to document exactly why certain pastors withdrew from or were dismissed from the ministry during those years. Most of the "scandals" involve doctrinal (e.g., preaching that there is not a literal hell) or practical (e.g., purchasing a load of hay on the Sabbath) or administrative (e.g., removing a church member from the rolls) issues.

While about half of the trials resulted in pastors being excluded from the ministry, it is clear that very few of the charges would be entertained, let alone sustained, in the Church of today. The material has not yet been fully evaluated, but it appears on the surface that it may be suitable for the basis of a graduate thesis and/or several articles in future issues of THE CHRONICLE.

In the meantime, THE CHRONICLE is pleased to present articles based on two of those trials. The articles include actual transcripts and exhibits from the church trials – material which at the time was considered confidential information not intended for public release. It has been judged, however, that the passing of 150 years and the nature of these particular trials allow for the inclusion of this material in this volume.

"The Call of God?" deals with the struggles of Rev. Levin R.B. Rhodes (1840-1928) to fulfill what he believed to be calling into the ordained ministry. "The Promise of Man?" deals with the struggles of Rev. John T. Cole (dates unknown) to balance his personal emotional needs with the rigors of circuit-riding and separation from his family and friends. Both are stories of persons who, for one reason or another, were not outwardly successful as ordained ministers in Central Pennsylvania.
The Call of God?
One Mid-Nineteenth Century Story

Determining whether one is called into full-time Christian ministry has never been simple. A person must always balance his own sense of calling with the counsel of others – friends, family and the Annual Conference. The following is more than the story of one mid-nineteenth individual’s struggle with God’s calling. It is also a revealing glimpse into the expectations of congregations, peers and the Conference regarding the itinerant ministry of the day.

Levin R.B. Rhodes was born January 21, 1840, in Frederick County MD to Elisha Rhoades and Elizabeth Rice Rhoades. Levin’s ministerial records, including letters by his own hand, use the surname “Rhodes.” The preferred rendering of the family name, however, appears to be “Rhoades” – and that is actually the name on Levin’s tombstone.

Little is known about Levin’s father Elisha, except that he and Elizabeth were married September 1, 1819, and that he appears to have died about the time of Levin’s birth. The will of Elisha’s father-in-law Peregrine [Perry] Rice, written January 27, 1841, contains certain provisions “if my daughter Elizabeth Rhodes should marry” which indicate that Elisha is no longer in the picture.

The birth and death dates of Levin’s mother Elizabeth (1/3/1802 – 6/2/1891) are given on her tombstone in the Methodist Cemetery in Jefferson MD – about 6 miles southwest of Frederick on old US 340. This suggests that the Rhoades and/or Rice families lived in the Jefferson area and attended the Methodist church there. Elizabeth was one of 14 children of Peregrine Rice. The family appears to have been close, as Elizabeth gave all three of her sons names of her brothers: John (b. 1828), Perry (b. 1829), Levin (b. 1840). Even their “extra” middle names reflect the names of Elizabeth’s brothers, as Perry’s second middle name is Benjamin and Levin’s second middle name is believed to be Baltus.

The 1830 census data states that Elisha is in his 30’s, Elizabeth is in her 20’s, and that they have two sons aged 0-5 (John H. and Perry Thomas Benjamin) and three daughters aged 5-10 (names unknown). Children born after that date include two daughters (America S. and Elmyra E.) and one son (Levin R.B.).

It appears that Levin’s family compensated for the untimely departure of father Elisha by becoming close-knit and church-oriented. Unfortunately, details of Levin’s spiritual journey have not been preserved. Records indicate he felt
called to the ministry, presented himself to the Baltimore Conference\(^1\) of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was admitted on trial at the March 1863 annual conference, and received an appointment to serve the Patuxent Circuit.\(^2\) In those years preachers were typically given a different assignment each year, and Rev. Rhodes served successively the Prince George and Charles and St. Mary’s Circuits before transferring to the East Baltimore Conference in 1867 and being assigned to Antietam.

The transfer to the East Baltimore Conference was likely motivated by a desire to return to the conference that included his home area of Frederick County. He may have waited four years to make the switch in order to complete his journey to full ordination within a single conference. Levin R.B. Rhodes was ordained a deacon by the Baltimore Conference in 1865 and an elder by the Baltimore Conference in 1867, immediately after which he transferred. Had he known the boundary changes that were being considered, however, Levin may have remained in the Baltimore Conference. The following year, 1868, the East Baltimore Conference ceased to exist. Its Maryland congregations were placed in the Baltimore Conference and its Pennsylvania congregations became the Central Pennsylvania Conference. As Levin’s assignment was just across the state line in Mercersburg PA, he once again became part of a conference that did not include his home area of Frederick County.

Levin Rhodes was now 28 years old and still single, and it seems as though he continued to maintain close ties with his family in Maryland. The March 1869 annual conference assigned him to be the junior preacher on the New Washington Circuit in Clearfield County. While pastors were expected to report to their new assignments as soon after conference as practical, it appears that Rev. Rhodes visited his family in Maryland for a while and did not report to New Washington until early mid-April.

After this unfortunate start, matters at New Washington continued to deteriorate. Rev. Rhodes developed a reputation for being unreliable and not showing up when he was scheduled to preach. This worsened when he returned home to Maryland “of necessity” for a few weeks in the middle of the summer and without making adequate arrangements for his absence. In late fall he journeyed without formal permission to participate in revival meetings on another circuit. While there, he suffered an injury when his horse fell – and in the eyes of

---

\(^1\) His choice of the Baltimore Conference is a little mysterious, as Frederick County MD was within the East Baltimore Conference. The original Baltimore Conference was split in 1857, and the Pennsylvania and northern Maryland portions were formed into the East Baltimore Conference. In 1868 that action was reconsidered, the split was re-made following state lines, and the Pennsylvania portion was formed into the Central Pennsylvania Conference.

\(^2\) The Patuxent River is the longest river entirely within the state of Maryland. It drains the central part of the state and flows into the Chesapeake Bay north of Washington DC.
many, his “recuperation” took much longer than expected and included a desire to return home to Maryland to fully recover.

These and other incidents led to the filing of charges that he was “inefficient and unacceptable” as a traveling preacher. The district superintendent counseled with Rev. Rhodes and, upon his promise to do better, the charges were not formally filed. In the meantime, in March 1870, he was assigned to Washington Circuit near Bellefonte. Unfortunately there were also complaints from that circuit that Rev. Rhodes was not keeping up with all of his duties.

Then as now, there are several levels of ministry. An ordained elder in the travelling ministry is guaranteed an appointment each year and is expected to go where he is assigned. Sometimes, for reasons of health or finances, ordained pastors remove themselves from the travelling ministry and “locate” for a period of time. Such a pastor on location is not given an assignment, but he continues to be recognized as an ordained pastor and may assist within the local charge where he lives.

Prior to the March 1871 annual conference, the district superintendent counseled Levin Rhodes to locate and remove himself, at least temporarily, from the travelling ministry. Rev. Rhodes refused to do so, maintained he still felt called and able to be part of the travelling ministry, and made a passionate written request to be given another chance to prove himself and his calling. At this point, the district superintendent felt compelled to follow through with filing the formal charges as the only legal way to serve the best interests of all involved. A trial was held during the March 1871 annual conference, the charges were sustained, and Levin R.B. Rhodes was “located without his consent.” This means that he was removed from the travelling ministry, but not stripped of his ministerial credentials or forbidden to help on the charge where he lived.

As the formal church records on Levin R.B. Rhodes cease at this point, the rest of his life and spiritual journey cannot be given with certainty. It appears that he briefly returned home to Maryland, and then moved to the Indianapolis IN area to be with his brother Perry, who had been in Indiana at least since 1860. On October 1, 1873, in Marion County IN, he married Sarah Ann Schofield (who was born in Missouri). The following persons are buried in the Fall Creek Cemetery – Ebenezer Lutheran Cemetery in Indianapolis.
Levin R.B. Rhoades (1/21/1840 – 12/19/1928)
Perry Thomas Benjamin Rhoades (2/28/1829 – 11/6/1904): brother of Levin

The remainder of this article gives the paragraph of explanation by Conference secretary David S. Monroe and the full official record of the trial.
Exhibits A-H referred to in the trial are given in the Appendix. The explanatory footnotes for the trial and appendix texts have been added by the editor of *The Chronicle*.

----------

At a meeting of the Central Pennsylvania Annual Conference, begun and held in Carlisle, Cumberland County, Pennsylvania, on the 8th day of March, A.D. 1871, the following, among other proceedings were had, to wit: charges and specifications preferred by brother J.S. McMurray, P.E. Altoona District, against brother L.R.B. Rhodes; and said charges and specifications were referred to a select number, members of said Annual Conference, for trial; said select number consisting of

John A. Gere  F. Hodgson  J.W. Haughawout
J.M. Clarke  D. Hartman  W. Harden
T.F. McClure  J.H. McGarrah  J.A. Melich
A.M. Barnitz  F.B. Riddle  A.M. Creighton

Thomas Barnhart was appointed chairman. W.W. Evans was appointed secretary.

Attested,
D.S. Monroe, secretary

The select number, members of the Annual Conference to whom certain charges and specifications were preferred by brother J.S. McMurray against brother L.R.B. Rhodes, met for said trial Saturday morning, March 11th, 1871. Rev. T. Barnhart, chairman, led the devotional services. W.W. Evans, secretary, called the roll and the members previously named were all present.

The accused being present, the charges and specifications were read to him\(^3\), and he pleaded “not guilty” and issue was joined thereon. J.S. McMurray appeared as counsel for the Church, and E.W. Kirby as counsel for the defense.

The prosecution presented the following witnesses.

J.S. McMurray\(^4\) WAS CALLED.

“On receipt of letter marked C, I did not write Brother Rhodes, nor advise, nor consent to his leaving the work.”

---

\(^3\) The formal written statement of charges in the file is as follows: *Under a conviction of official duty, I hereby present the following charge against the Rev. L.R.B. Rhodes: inefficiency and unacceptability as a traveling preacher, and ask that he be located without his consent.*

Signed,

J.S. McMurray, P.E.

Altoona District, C.P.C.

\(^4\) Jacob Snyder McMurray (1821-1885) was the presiding elder (district superintendent) over Levin Rhodes.
Question by E.W. Kirby. “When did you present a copy of the charges against Brother Rhodes to him?” Ruled out of order by the chair as an irrelevant question, from which decision Dr. J.A. Gere appealed. Appeal not sustained. E.W. Kirby objected to all further proceedings until that question is settled as to when a copy of the charges were presented to Brother Rhodes. The president of the court ruled E.W. Kirby’s demurrer out of order in this connection.

REV. W.R. WHITNEY CALLED BY PROSECUTION.

Question by J.S. McMurray. “Was Brother Rhodes inefficient and unacceptable when he was your colleague on New Washington Circuit? Please state the facts.”

A: “I was asked by some of the members of the Quarterly Conference, I being the chair, whether I would entertain charges against Brother Rhodes. I replied I would not. They then privately prepared the paper read before this court, which paper I believe represents the opinion of the large majority of the membership. It was my own opinion.”

Question by J.S. McMurray. “What do you know about the injury received by Brother Rhodes and referred to in his letter?”

A: “I never saw the wound. In a few days after the injury, Brother Rhodes traveled on horseback sixteen miles to Glen Hope, where I learned he tarried a few days, and then rode on horseback eighteen miles to Tyrone. In a week or two, I learned, he returned to New Washington on horseback from Tyrone, thirty-five miles. I found this more riding than would have been necessitated in service on the circuit during this time. I requested the Presiding Elder to relieve Brother Rhodes of the circuit, preferring to be alone, if another colleague could not be found.”

Asked by J.S. McMurray. “Please state what you know about his leaving his work, the time and circumstances.”

A: “I was not consulted either before the first or final leaving. I did not see Brother Rhodes for some days before his injury, until at Conference. Brother Rhodes left the circuit first in November, returned, and left finally in December. This traveling between New Washington and Tyrone was done on horseback, which led me to conclude that he could have filled his work on the charge.”

Cross-examination by E.W. Kirby. “Do you know whether he was injured or not?”

A: “A number of persons who did see the injury told me of it. I think they were reliable.”

Q: “Did they tell you the extent of the injury?”

A: “Some of them said they thought it would not disable him more than two or three weeks.”

Q. “What time was it when Brother Rhodes first left the circuit?”

5 Walter Richard Whitney (1840-1922) was the senior pastor 1869-70 on the New Washington Circuit in western Clearfield County, during which time Levin Rhodes served as the junior pastor.
A: “In 1869. That was the time he received the injury.”  
Q: “What time did he return?”  
A: “I think it was in December.”  
Q: “Then he left finally in December, about two months before Conference?”  
A: “About two months and a half.”  
Q: “At what Quarterly Conference was it when these brethren asked you if you would entertain charges against Brother Rhodes?”  
A: “It was at the third of that conference year, about the last of October. He was hurt just a few days after this Quarterly Conference.”  
Q: “Were you and Brother Rhodes on amicable terms?”  
A: “To the best of my knowledge we were.”  
Q: “Did you complain to Brother McMurray of Brother Rhodes’ conduct?”  
A: “I did not complain until after he was hurt, when I did enter my complaint by letter.”  
Q: “Did Brother Rhodes ever disobey you in any orders you gave him as junior preacher?”  
A: “At the time he first left the circuit he was on his way to attend Brother Buckley’s Quarterly Meeting, which I understood he was not to attend without first receiving a letter from Brother Buckley.”  
Question by the chair. “Did you forbid his attendance at Brother Buckley’s Quarterly Meeting without first receiving a letter from him?”  
A: “I did.”  
Asked by E.W. Kirby. “Did he go with or without authority to Brother Buckley’s Quarterly Meeting?”  
A: “I looked upon it as going without.”  
On motion the court adjourned until two o’clock p.m.

Court reassembled at 2 p.m.  
Cross-examination of Rev. W.R. Whitney continued by E.W. Kirby.  
Q: “Did you ever hear Brother Rhodes preach, and how often?”  
A: “I heard him a number of times, but do not know how often.”  
Q: “What do you think of his preaching?”  
A: “I thought his preaching very fair.”  
Q: “In what sense was he unacceptable and inefficient?”  
A: “On account of disappointed congregations, and neglect of pastoral duty. Also, it was complained of his frequent absence from the charge.”  
Q: “How often before he was hurt was he absent from the circuit?”  
A: “The brethren complained of his long delay after Conference in coming to the circuit. I only remember of one protracted absence after coming to the circuit, until the time he left when he was hurt.”  
Q: “How long after Conference before he arrived on the circuit?”  
A: “About the middle of April.”  
Q: “To what length did that protracted absence extend?”  
A: “Three weeks.”  
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Question by J.S. McMurray. “Did he frequently disappoint congregations?”
A: “He did.”

Question by J.S. McMurray. “What service did he render in protracted meetings?”
A: “He held one protracted meeting of a week’s continuance, and he assisted at two others.”

Question by E.W. Kirby. “How many did you hold on the circuit?”
A: “Seven.”

Question by E.W. Kirby. How many before and how many after he was hurt?”
A: “Four before and three after.”

Question by J.S. McMurray. “Did he attend the prayer meetings in New Washington where he made his home?”
A: “But seldom.”

Question by W. Harden. “From all you saw on the circuit, and from the generally expressed opinion of the people, did you consider him acceptable and efficient on the circuit?”
A: “I did not.”

Question by F.B. Riddle. “What do you mean?”
A: “I mean unnecessary absence.”

J.W. BUCKLEY 6 CALLED BY THE PROSECUTION.

Question by J.S. McMurray. “Was his injury of a serious character?”
A: “I did not so regard it, though it was at my Quarterly Meeting. He preached on Saturday and Sunday nights. After Sunday evening service he rode to brother Spencer’s, about two miles distant. His horse fell and threw him. He was wounded in the left knee. I dressed the wound. To the best of my knowledge the wound was 1 1/8 inch in length, a little over 1/16 inch deep, about 1/4 inch in width – more of a bruise. It was painful for the time being. I thought it was not serious from the fact that I was once wounded in precisely the same way, and in about 1/2 hour after I continued on my journey and filled my work. His injury was on Sunday evening November 12. He spent that week at brother Spencer’s until Friday or Saturday. On that afternoon of that day, Brother Rhodes arrived at brother Patchen’s in Glen Hope on horseback – 18 miles distant. I preached in Glen Hope on Sabbath morning. Brother Rhodes was present and declined an invitation to preach, but preached in the evening. He spent the following week at brother Patchen’s and on Saturday, if I mistake not, left by stage for Tyrone7 – 18 miles. About two weeks after one of my neighbors informed be of Brother Rhodes’ return. On Saturday he left in a snowstorm for New Washington. I think on the following Monday I was informed by a neighbor of his passing through Glen Hope for Tyrone. That is all I knew or heard of him directly.”

6 John W. Buckley (1832-1918) was senior pastor 1869-70 on the Glen Hope Circuit in central Clearfield County while Levin Rhodes was serving on the neighboring New Washington Circuit.

7 Glen Hope is east of New Washington, and Tyrone is east of Tyrone. The assumed reason for travel to Tyrone is to connect with transportation to his home in Frederick County MD.
Q: “What do you know of his efficiency or acceptability as a traveling preacher?”

A: “In reference to his preaching I never heard any complaint. So far as I have heard him, that has been satisfactory. There seemed to be a deficiency, when with me, as to pastoral duties, as he did not visit the people. He did not labor much at the altar. We never had any special dispute or difficulties except once he refused to go to his work. It was not serious. Sometimes Brother Rhodes was absent from his work – one occasion especially. He was absent for some time in the lower part of Maryland. I did not know at the time where he was.”

Q: “Do you regard him as an efficient and acceptable traveling preacher?”

A: “Basing my judgment on what was generally told me, I would say he was not.”

Cross-examination by E.W. Kirby. “When Brother Rhodes preached for you at Glen Hope, did he preach pretty well?”

A: “It was acceptable to the people.”

Q: “Did you not see him leave Glen Hope for Tyrone?”

A: “I was informed only.”

Question by D. Hartman. “When Brother Rhodes traveled with you, did you think the charge could do better without him?” Objection to by the defendant. Objection overruled.

A: “I can say to me he was not acceptable to the people. I consider Brother Rhodes very inefficient through his unacceptability – from want of disposition to make himself acceptable. There were general comments.”

Question by F.B. Riddle. “Did you consider him as efficient as might be reasonable expected?”

A: “No.”

Question by John Lloyd. “Did you think he did all he was physically able to do?”

A: “I did not.”

REV. L.N. CLARK\textsuperscript{8} WAS CALLED.

Question by J.S. McMurray. “Please state what you know of the general sentiment of the people of New Washington Circuit of the inefficiency and unacceptability of Brother Rhodes.”

A: “As far as I have heard the sentiments of the people correspond with the paper read marked A.”

A paper marked D was read. Two papers marked F and G respectively were read.

\textsuperscript{8} Lewis Newman Clark (1833-1909) was pastor 1870-71 on the New Washington Circuit, thereby being the pastor that followed Levin Rhodes on that circuit.
J.S. McMURRAY CALLED REV. J.W. BUCKLEY

Q: “State what you know of the acceptability or unacceptability of Brother Rhodes on Washington Circuit, and any facts in your possession.”

A: “I have been twice to Washingtonville during the year – once with Brother McMurray, and once by his request. As far as I am acquainted with the people, I find them very pleasant and very kind. The first time I was informed by several brethren that Brother Rhodes was not at all acceptable to them. On the second occasion, I found the feeling materially increased. I heard Brother Rhodes’ statement in reference to the sermon he had preached which did not seem to improve the feeling, but rather irritated. I might say further in reference that one of my own members was present and heard it, and remarked to me ‘that was pretty rough.’ He thought that Brother Rhodes evinced temper.”

Q: “When I proposed to you to provide for that work for the balance of the year by connecting Brother Rhodes’ circuit with yours, what answer did you give me?”

A: “I objected positively.”

Q: “Did you not say ‘I had him for a colleague once and never want him again’?”

A: “Perhaps I did.”

A paper marked H was read.

REV. JACOB B. MOORE was called.

Q: “Were you present at Brother Buckley’s Third Quarterly Meeting last year (1869), did you meet Brother Rhodes, and what was his demeanor at brother Spencer’s after the fall from his horse?”

A: “I was at the Third Quarterly Meeting held Pennville last November a year, and was at brother Spencer’s with Brother Rhodes. Brother Rhodes continued at brother Spencer’s I believe until the next coming Friday. During that time Brother Rhodes was out at the barn attending to his horse, and at the same time complained of having a sore knee, which he should have received by the falling of his horse. He left brother Spencer’s on Friday and went to Glen Hope. He stopped with brother Patchen, with whom I have my house. He requested sister Patchen to make some salve for his knee. Sister Patchen made the salve as requested, but informed me Broter Rhodes had not made use of the salve. After remaining there a few days, Brother Rhodes left for his home.

Question by John Lloyd. “By what conveyance?”

A: “By stage and cars.”

---

9 Jacob B. Moore (dates unknown) was junior pastor 1869-70 on the Glen Hope Circuit.
REV. G.W. IZER\textsuperscript{10} WAS CALLED BY E.W. KIRBY FOR THE DEFENCE.

Q: “What do you know with regard to the acceptability and efficiency of Brother Rhodes on Mercersburg Circuit?”

A: “He has been reported to me as being a fair preacher, and as having preached some very fine sermons to that people. During his pastorate several revivals were held on the circuit. I think that he was generally acceptable to the people.”

Cross-examination by J.S. McMurray. “Did you hear any complaints against Brother Rhodes when at Mercersburg as to neglecting his work or indifference to his work?”

A. “I did.”

Q: “From what you know of the sentiments of the people there, would they be willing to receive him back as their preacher?”

A: “I think that some would and that some would not. I have not the sentiment of the people to such an extent as to form an opinion as to which side of that question would have a majority.”

REV. J.B. MOORE WAS CALLED BY E.W. KIRBY.

Q: “What do you know in regard to his efficiency and acceptability heretofore?”

A: “At the dinner table today Brother A.S. Bowman and I were talking of Brother Rhodes. Brother Griffith stated that Brother Rhodes traveled Elk Ridge Circuit, and as far as he knew was acceptable.”

REV. J.S. McMURRAY WAS CALLED BY E.W. KIRBY.

Q: Did Brother Rhodes’ character pass in the Conference of 1870 without any objections?”

A: It did because as his Presiding Elder I assumed the responsibility of entering no complaint – although in my judgment there was just ground for it, and if I have committed any error in the case it is that I did not then make complaint. My reason for not doing so was sympathy for Brother Rhodes, a promise from him that he would hereafter do his duty, and a hope that he would.”

Q: “When was this bill of charges presented the accused telling him that they would be preferred against him at this Annual Conference?”

A: “This bill of charges was presented only today. The charge itself which I have presented to the Conference in my official capacity was first preferred against him between the 22\textsuperscript{nd} and 26\textsuperscript{th} of January 1871 by official members of his charge. I then proceeded in open Quarterly Conference with the accusers and the accused face to face to inquire with the reasons and facts of the case. As a result, I determined to remove him at once from the charge, satisfied that his usefulness as a minister among the people was at an end, and that there could be no reason

\textsuperscript{10} George Washington Izer (1849-1917) was pastor 1870-71 on Mercersburg Circuit, where Levin Rhodes had served 1868-69
for continuing the relation. He preferred being released. I informed him that as
Presiding Elder I had no authority to release him. He asked for time to consider
the matter. I gave him time. He then wrote me a note tendering his resignation.
During the interview with him, I expressed to him my judgment that he was not
adapted to the work of a travelling preacher and advised him to ask a location –
which advice I subsequently repeated by letter, and again repeated it the first time
I saw him here at Conference. He said he had written me a letter which I did not
receive, and said he would write another, which letter is here in evidence. I
presented said letter to the Bishop and Council. They unanimously advised that
he should ask a location, and addressed to him a letter to that effect, which I
presented him this morning. He refused to ask a location. I then on the calling of
his name presented the charge of inefficiency and unacceptability. I did not tell
him that in case of his refusing to ask a location I would prefer a charge, until this
morning – first, because I hoped he would consent as better for himself; secondly,
because I did not wish to seem to enforce advice by holding over him a rod.”

Question by D. Hartman. “In consequence of the fact of inefficiency, did the
work suffer?”
A: “It did suffer materially.”

Brother L.R.B. Rhodes made a statement before the Court, after which the
case was submitted to the Court. On motion, the charges presented were
unanimously sustained. On motion, Brother L.R.B. Rhodes was unanimously
located without his consent.