

# **Outrage On Justice**

## **Foreword**

Under the title Doctrinal Disappearing Tricks, some of what follows was originally written for the interest and information of members of The Nazarene Fellowship. Having however received requests from a number of Christadelphians for copies for their own reading and also supplies for distribution, we decided the matter might well be circulated more widely.

In case the title should seem to be impertinent, the following explanation is offered. The words are quoted from John Carter and appear in context on page 11. For nearly twenty years we have been engaged in efforts to bring to the notice of the Christadelphian world the true facts about so-called Clean Flesh and in the process have become the subject of considerable misrepresentation and abuse. In the last year, the Editor of "The Christadelphian" has been stealing our clothes by putting forward views identical with one phase of those first propounded by Edward Turney, but at the same time he has been representing them to be traditional Christadelphianism. In exposing this deception - for it is no less - and giving the reasons why we think he ought to resign, we are simply trying to high-light the difference between them. Our object is the same as ever - to awaken our friends to the God-dishonouring inconsistencies in their traditional teaching concerning the nature and sacrifice of Christ. We have no hope - nor hardly even the wish - that John Carter will resign; all we hope to do is to force the issue into the open, irrespective of personalities and vested interests, so that every brother and sister can if they choose, be in a position to decide whether the truth is that Jesus was born under condemnation and had to die for Himself, or whether it is that He was holy and undefiled and gave Himself a sacrifice for us.

Ernest Brady.  
(1959)

## **OUTRAGE ON JUSTICE**

One Friday evening in the year 1873 a famous lecture was delivered to a crowd of Christadelphians in the Birmingham Temperance Hall. Under the title of "The Slain Lamb", it was intended to refute what was widely believed to be an heretical teaching about the nature of Christ. Afterwards printed and sold as a pamphlet, the lecture has ever since been regarded as the standard Christadelphian exposition of a highly controversial subject.

Whenever anyone has experienced difficulty in understanding how the death of Christ reveals the love of God, or wondered about the justice of an arrangement in which righteousness appears to have been rewarded with the wages of sin, the advice has been, "Read 'The Slain Lamb' - that explains everything."

The copy at hand is dated 1921 and may be one of the last editions printed; it was included in the catalogue of literature in supply at least until November, 1953, but since 1954 it has not been advertised. Whatever may be the explanation of its disappearance, "The Slain Lamb" has certainly never been repudiated. The text has been slightly tampered with but its principles are embodied in the Birmingham Amended Statement of Faith, which is the work of the same author and the acknowledged definition of the doctrines of the reunited Christadelphian Community.

In the light of recent developments, these two documents, "The Slain Lamb" and the B.A.S.F. are of some considerable interest and importance.

Our concern in the matter arises from the fact that, as former Christadelphians, our study of Scripture and past controversies brought the conviction that the author of "The Slain Lamb," was not only grievously at fault in his exposition but was also guilty of very grave misrepresentation, (see note 1, page 34).

When the present writer published his conclusions, he was described by the Editor of "The Christadelphian" as "a renegade brother." It is therefore with both surprise and satisfaction that we see, sixteen years later, that he has made admissions which not only justify our appraisal of the theory of Robert Roberts, but have also caused some of his own brethren to accuse him of sharing with us what is misleadingly called The Clean Flesh Heresy. At the same time we are more than a little apprehensive that in the circumstances and context in which these admissions have been made, they may be more injurious to the cause of ultimate truth than beneficial.

Very adverse judgments have been passed upon the work of the present writer by leading Christadelphians and time alone will show to what extent these have been deserved; at any rate, no one harbours the delusion that he deemed it a matter of indifference whether one believes (a) that Jesus was under Adamic condemnation, or (b) that He was a free-born Son of God. Some people may feel they lack the capacity to distinguish between the two views - though we do not believe there can be anyone so dim-witted - and that it does not matter therefore whether they believe the one or the other - or, if that were possible, both at the same time. At least they know that we of the Nazarene Fellowship considered it a matter of such gravity that when we understood what the B.A.S.F. really involved, we renounced the name of Christadelphian and were re-baptised.

The sad aspect of the present situation is that, having at last realised the fact that Jesus was in every sense uncondemned even if not perhaps the full implications of the fact, John Carter is handling it in such a way that very few will be aware of the startling doctrinal revolution which has taken place. So long as an issue is clear cut, there is at least the possibility that one here and there may realise its importance, but when the issue is confused by one side stealing the other's clothes, then it becomes immeasurably more difficult for one to form an intelligent judgment.

The tale has been spread around that these matters are very deep and complex and beyond the capacity of the average brother or sister. This is quite untrue. The question is really very simple. It has been made to appear difficult only because of the masses of argument put forward in order to bolster up a false foundation. Inevitably, in the course of controversy it has been necessary to meet these arguments and show their weakness and this has sometimes required considerable writing, but the basic issue is quite uncomplicated and anyone with sufficient reasoning power to believe that there must be One God, The Creator of all, is capable of understanding it.

## **The Old Paths**

Fortunately or unfortunately, according to one's viewpoint, it is fully realised by a minority, who are in fact now the only genuine Christadelphians left, that the recent declarations of doctrine by the present Editor of "The Christadelphian" are directly contradictory of the Exposition given in "The Slain Lamb" and to the definition contained in the B.A.S.F. In consequence, they have banded themselves together to resist what they are convinced is a very serious heresy and have commenced to publish a periodical called "The Old Paths."

We welcome this, not because we endorse its doctrines - on the contrary; nor because we find any pleasure in strife among brethren, but because we consider that the best treatment for what we can now only regard as the obsession of Christadelphians is to have brought home to them, as fully and frequently as possible, the implications of the doctrines to which they are committed by the B.A.S.F. Formerly, we could depend upon men like A.D.Norris and W.F.Barling writing in The Christadelphian to enable us to do this; it sufficed to draw attention to the blunders they fell into as soon as they attempted to put their interpretation of The Atonement into plain language. We believe it is the reaction to their writings and the comments upon them which we have made from time to time, that by the grace of God has brought about the present world-wide dissatisfaction with the ruling group in Birmingham.

Since the reunion of the divorced sections of the community, however, there has become apparent a process of toning down or glossing over of those dogmas which in recent years, especially

in America and Australia, have become widely recognised as unjustifiable from Scripture. There has, nevertheless, been no frank admission that some of the fundamental principles are wrong, and Christadelphians still claim to be teaching the truth brought to light by Dr. Thomas and established in Great Britain largely by the work of Robert Roberts. Indeed, as late as March 1958, the Reunion Committee put on record by a resolution that they accepted without reservation the B.A.S.F. as a true definition of the Oracles of God. So far as the things concerning the Kingdom of God are involved, we have no fault to find but in regard to the things concerning the Name of Jesus Christ, which are the more important because participation in the others depends upon them, the claim is quite unjustified.

Hitherto, the only evidence one has seen in Christadelphian literature to indicate a change is the disappearance of some old clichés and the occasional admission of a facet of the truth, almost shamefacedly and with little or no attempt to fit it into the framework of the old teaching. Now, however, we have seen from the pen of John Carter a series of admissions which are in complete opposition. This is not satisfactory from any point of view. It is not even honest. Those who believe, or imagine they believe, what John Carter is writing to-day, are building truth on a false foundation. If they do not believe it, they are rejecting the Word of God. Either way they are in danger. With his present views, it is as misleading for him to call himself a Christadelphian as it would be to call himself a Trinitarian while believing in the One God of Israel.

Whether the process we have referred to is the result of the expression of honest convictions arrived at by unbiased study, or whether it is a deliberate design, intended to give elbow-room to the various dissentient groups, we have no means of knowing, but in our view it will be impossible for it to produce anything but renewed controversy and division because the brethren and sisters are not being treated fairly and given the opportunity to understand the issue.

The snag is that Christadelphianism has a hard skeleton of doctrine which is very well known and which has been too long established to have tricks played with it. Different aspects of it can be presented very convincingly, depending upon the skill and fancy of the expositor, and so long as the bones are concealed or ignored a plausible case can be made out. When, however, anyone sets to work to correct the malformation which has now been diagnosed, he is bound to become involved in some very deep and complicated surgery and will probably finish with a corpse on his hands. This is the predicament in which John Carter finds himself. In his August 1958, issue, he has the Christadelphian body on the operating table for what was intended to be a very minor operation, but by his declaration on page 373, column 1, where he says:-

“Jesus possessed our nature, but he was never estranged from God,”

he has succeeded in getting the head and the body of his patient completely severed.

If Jesus could possess our nature and yet not be estranged from God, this is proof conclusive that there is nothing the matter with nature, as such. There is no possible way of grafting such an admission on to Christadelphianism, for this is founded on the theory that nature is defiled, unclean and sinful. For one who sees John Carter’s admission as a truth, there is no alternative to frank confession that physical condemnation is as much a myth as hell torments and that the death of Christ was not, as Christadelphianism asserts, the ritual destruction of a body of sin.

The theory of Christadelphianism is (perhaps we ought now to say, was) that the transgression in Eden brought into operation a process of physical degeneration (“the implantation of a physical law of decay” - B.A.S.F.) which imparted to human nature a tendency towards evil which no normal person can overcome and which finally brings about death. This theory, which was reaffirmed in the Carter-Cooper Addendum, looks well enough until it is tested in its application to the Lord Jesus Christ. It is the result of making this test which has brought John Carter into conflict, not only with the brethren who are responsible for “The Old Paths,” but with the very basis of Christadelphianism itself.

As evidence of this, the Editor of “The Old Paths,” B.S. Snelling, quotes in his October 1958 issue, the following passage from “The Slain Lamb”:-

“Now if it was necessary that Jesus should come personally under the curse of the law in his own person, in order that he might bear it away in his resurrection, and so open a way for the redemption of such under the law as should accept his name, what about this other

curse?... was not Jesus to bear away all curse? Surely no-one can say no. If it was necessary he should have the curse of Moses on him to bear it away, was it not necessary he should have that other curse - the hereditary curse of Adam on him also? Yes, beloved brethren and sisters, he did have it on him and he did bear it away.” - R.Roberts.

This may be taken as the key passage of “The Slain Lamb.” The whole argument is concentrated upon establishing its authors’ conviction that Jesus came under two separate curses. As a man He came by birth under the curse incurred by Adam. As a Jew. He came by the manner of His death under the curse of the Mosaic Law. It was, so Robert Roberts asserted, the fact that these two curses converged on the head of Jesus - and this fact alone, which explains His sacrifice. He incurred the hereditary curse of Adam by inheritance from His mother of a nature defiled by sin and He incurred the curse of the law by His “innocent” transgression in suffering death by hanging on a tree. Although freely admitting that Jesus was personally sinless, the writer maintained that He must of necessity have been under these curses in order that He might die under them. It was this fact, that He was personally condemned by these two curses, which enabled Him, by His death to remove them for Himself first and therefore also for sinners. Thus, although personally righteous, these curses rested upon Him because of what He was, and together they made His death an inevitable and unavoidable fate. Divine justice required Him to submit to death before He could be said to be truly obedient to God and worthy of resurrection. This is in essence the argument in “The Slain Lamb.”

Now, if the author was correct in his thesis, these are truths which will stand for all time. If they were true on that Friday in 1873, they are true to-day. There can be no ifs and buts - there is no room for qualification or modification; if Robert Roberts was correct, these affirmations are as valid now as they were then. If he was not correct, if they were not valid, then the whole of the doctrinal structure which is built upon them is unsound. And that means Christadelphianism itself, for the arguments in “The Slain Lamb” underlie the B.A.S.F. and are the very foundation principles of what is referred to as The Truth.

## **The Verdict To-day**

Those Christadelphians who support “The Old Paths” reaffirm the theory laid down by Robert Roberts in the extract above. They say, quite correctly, these are the basic principles on which the community was founded, and which it has always upheld, and they are understandably shaken to the depths by their realization of what John Carter’s admissions involve. But they speak for only a minority. What have other Christadelphians to say? “The Old Paths” group appears to be under the impression that John Carter is the first who has questioned the validity of Robert Roberts’ reasoning. This is not so.

About a year ago we received a copy of the Australian magazine called “The Logos” and in it an article by Albert Collins, also a Christadelphian and incidentally a member of the group who opposed reunion and who regard themselves as the last defenders of the faith. In reference to the identical passage from “The Slain Lamb” quoted above, where the assertion is made that Jesus had to come personally under the curse of the law, the writer said:-

“This view is open to objections so serious as to overthrow it.” - Albert Collins.

Upon reading this article, we wrote the pamphlet called “A Christadelphian Lifts The Curse” commending Brother Collins for his courage and honesty in admitting the worthlessness of the so-called reasoning of “The Slain Lamb” lecture, but also pointing out the very serious and far-reaching implications of the fallacy which he recognised underlay Robert Roberts’ case. This brought me a most indignant letter from a certain brother, containing the remarkable reproach, “I am astonished at the presumptuous title... no one but God can do what the title claims.” I replied, “I am in complete agreement with you that no one but God could lift a curse which in fact applied. If, however, you have read my pamphlet you should be aware that it was not God, but Robert Roberts who affirmed in “The Slain Lamb” that Jesus had to come under both the Mosaic and the Edenic curses in order to be in a position to remove them by His death. This diabolic doctrine is perpetuated in the B.A.S.F.

which I assume represents your belief. Albert Collins, a Christadelphian of no less sincerity than yourself, has come to the conclusion that Jesus was never in fact under the Mosaic curse, and this justifies the title of my pamphlet. If one Christadelphian may unjustly impose a curse on Jesus, may not another justly lift it? Furthermore, if you have read your August Christadelphian you will know that the Editor himself, has now gone even further and admits that Jesus was not a child of wrath and therefore could not have been under the Adamic curse either. It does not appear to me to be unchristian to draw attention to these revolutionary admissions made by your own brethren nor illogical to point out that by them they have undermined the very fabric of Christadelphianism.”

In the pamphlet mentioned, we suggested that the recognition of the existence of so serious an error in a work of such reputation raised very grave issues. Anyone is liable to make a mistake and it would be unreasonable to expect Robert Roberts or anyone else never to make a slip. But this is a different matter. Here he has laid down what he thought was a proven scriptural truth, namely, that in order to remove the curse of the law for those who were under it, Jesus had to come under it Himself. His purpose in doing so was to support what he realised was an unproven one, namely, that in the same way He must also have come under the hereditary curse of Adam. If now, after 80 years, we have it admitted that the major premise of the argument is false, is not the conclusion based upon it, also false?

In the course of his article, Brother Collins said, of Robert Roberts;-

“He was simply deceiving himself with words.”

We thought this also was a very shattering confession from a Christadelphian whom we know professes unswerving allegiance to the old basis, and we asked the writer to consider the possibility that if Robert Roberts was self-deceived in imagining that Jesus had to be cursed under the law before he could bear its penalty for those who were under it, is it not probable that he was likewise deceiving himself with words in his inference based upon it, that Jesus had also to be born under the hereditary curse of Adam before He could remove it for others? We asked him the question, “If Jesus could take away the curse of the law. Not by coming under it personally but by bearing the penalty due to those who did, why argue that it was impossible for him to take away the Edenic curse unless He was personally under its condemnation?”

However, although probably conscious of the force of it, since he has not attempted to answer the question, Albert Collins was not prepared to go so far as to jettison the whole of Robert Roberts’ reasoning in spite of his admission that it is based on a fallacy. It is a constant source of wonder to observe how people can follow a line of reasoning consistently until it comes into conflict with a prejudice or preconception, when they will break it off short rather than accept a conclusion which is inconvenient.

In this case we hazarded the prophecy that Albert Collins would not be able to hang indefinitely in mid-air. This was a year ago. Now something like a miracle has happened and it is not Albert Collins but John Carter who has landed. No less than Robert Roberts’ successor himself has now demolished the other leg of the argument in “The Slain Lamb.” We do not know how he reacted to the declaration in the “The Logos” that Robert Roberts was self-deceived when he stated that Jesus had to be under the curse of the law, nor do we know how Albert Collins regards the declaration in The Christadelphian that to speak of inherited sin is to talk Jargon. One thing, however, which is abundantly clear, is that between them these two brethren have exposed “The Slain Lamb” for the foolishness it is and shattered the B.A.S.F. for all time!

But what about the opprobrium which was heaped so unjustly upon the heads of those who rejected this view when it was first given - in August 1873? Who is going to clear the name of Edward Turney and those thinking like him, who have been pilloried and misrepresented down to this day? Who is going to be found among Christadelphians with the candour to admit that they are now making exactly the same renunciation as caused Brother Roberts to shout – “I will die, if necessary, in the attempt to stem this tide of corruption which is sweeping away the brethren”? Such heroics would not have been called for had he been able to meet that tide by proving coolly and scripturally that it was indeed a tide of corruption. The utmost he could do was put into “The Slain Lamb,” there is no doubt of that, and although it satisfied the majority at the time and has done duty ever since, truth will

out and it is now apparent that some of those best able to judge are becoming aware of its worthlessness. Above all, what is going to be done about the Birmingham Amended Statement of Faith, which claims for the self-same doctrines that they are the Oracles of God?

Past experience tells us that the response of some people will be to ask, "What is the use of raking all this up - a lecture given 85 years ago, a pamphlet out of print - what do they matter? It is what we believe to-day that counts." Agreed. But what a Christadelphian believes to-day is professedly based upon the teaching of Dr. Thomas and Robert Roberts and as long as this claim continues to be made and the name used, the individual must expect to be held responsible for their doctrines, not only by men but also by God. In actual fact, and in spite of the disclaimers sometimes made, if one thinks the matter over, he will most likely find that he does in fact believe substantially what Robert Roberts said, for his exposition was founded upon the theory inculcated almost from the cradle, that human nature is physically defiled by sin. This is the basic theory of Christadelphianism and we have yet to meet one who does not, in effect, believe it. It may be held with more or less conviction or expressed in different ways; we have met those who have said, no, of course, we do not believe human nature was changed; but when we have come to reduce the matter to fundamentals, invariably it turns out that they have no other explanation for the depravity of mankind.

## A Practical Test

In order that the reader may discover just where he stands in this matter, we suggest he tries the following experiment on himself. Here is the substance of "The Slain Lamb" in a series of literal quotations of Robert Roberts' actual words:-

"God required Jesus to submit to the death of the cross in order that he might come under the curse of the law... Upon what scriptural authority does this new theory say that he took the seed of Abraham without taking the curse inhering in it? ... I will show you before I am done that he... bore our condemnation in his own person, necessitating his death before he could be purified from the curse... It is the person, the individual, the nature which is condemned... it was crucifixion which was required of him...a submission required of him by The Father... It is a marvellous piece of new-born wisdom to say that "sinful" applies to the character but not to the substance that produces the character... Christ took upon him the nature of Abraham and David, which was sinful nature... What is the result then? This: that God is pleased, the sin and death law of our race being carried out upon his hereditarily-mortal, but righteous, though law-cursed son, to raise him for his righteousness sake." - Robert Roberts.

After running an eye over these extracts, 99 out of every 100 Christadelphians will say something like the following: "Well, I don't see much to find fault with; after all, we know that human nature is sinful because we all do wrong, and we know that Jesus had the same nature as us - as Robert Roberts says, it was the nature of David, who was a sinner. And if Jesus had not obeyed the commandment of God to lay down His life He would have been disobedient, wouldn't He? No, I don't see much wrong with it."

Good enough! That proves our point, that basically, Christadelphianism is "The Slain Lamb" and vice-versa. What now has to be faced is the fact that Albert Collins and John Carter have reduced it to waste paper. It is not our purpose here to deal specifically with that lecture; this has been done in "A Review of The Slain Lamb" by the late F.J.Pearce, and every one of the statements quoted have been shown to be logically and scripturally untenable. It is more than sufficient for our purpose to show that John Carter has now done the same.

Here now, in order that the reader may make the same test on himself in regard to the statements under consideration, is a similar series of verbatim extracts from "The Christadelphian" of August 1958:-

"Jesus, although of our nature, was not a child of wrath... there is no inheritance of any personal condemnation... a theory which makes the Son of God a child of wrath is self-

condemned... it is foolish to speak of estrangement from a 'nature'... the possession of a nature conferred by birth brings no liability for punishment... it is an outrage on justice to talk of estrangement as a result of something a person cannot help" - John Carter.

When he reads this second series of quotations, practically every Christadelphian will say again, "Well, I don't see much to find fault with in these either. After all, Jesus was the Son of God; He was holy and undefiled, so how could he be a child of wrath?"

These are perfectly sound comments and we are glad to be able to say that we are in complete agreement with them. The trouble is, that it is impossible - literally impossible - to fit such views into Christadelphianism, for they are in utter and complete contradiction to it. This simply illustrates the remarkable capacity for indiscriminate credulity of the average lazy mind; it can entertain, and imagine it believes, things which are diametrically opposed. Few people seem to have the patience to keep two abstract conceptions in mind at the same time long enough to be able to Judge whether they are compatible or not. Thus, they believe, or think they believe one thing at one moment but they can put it aside, turn over the page and imagine they believe another which is in direct contradiction to the first. It is our conviction that this kind of mental slovenliness will not be found in one who is honestly trying to develop what the Apostle terms "the mind of the Spirit." If the concept of a Saviour, who was the Son of God and who, though of our nature, lived a life of perfect obedience, is not engraved upon our minds sufficiently deeply and clearly to make it unthinkable for us to tolerate for one moment the theory that His death was required for the purification of His nature, then surely it cannot be a conviction of any real value. Saving faith is supposed to give substance and reality to things not seen, yet if what we call our faith is so feeble that it permits us to harbour in another compartment of our mind, a superstition so foreign that when the two are put together they destroy each other, it is certainly not a faith with substance; it is not a faith at all, it is mere self-deception.

For nearly a century, the two words "The Truth" have been regarded as synonymous with what Christadelphians have preached. What is to happen to them now that it is recognised that in this one vital and far reaching aspect it was not truth at all, but error? Is it now to be "The New Truth," "The Latest Truth" or "The True Truth"? If It was the truth when it involved preaching a Saviour born under the hereditary curse of Adam and bearing in His flesh the physical defilement of sin, what is it to be called now that John Carter has admitted that any theory which involves such things is self-condemned?

No Christadelphian has ever questioned the view that Jesus was sinful flesh. Dr.Thomas in Elpis Israel states it in these words (114-115pp):-

"Sinful flesh being the hereditary nature of the Lord Jesus, He was a fit and proper sacrifice for sin" and again "Sin could not have been condemned in the body of Jesus if it had not existed there."

There is no vagueness about this language and no one can have any doubt about the view Dr.Thomas held, that Jesus was Himself sinful flesh; Robert Roberts says (page 375, col.1), that "Sinful flesh cannot be in harmony with Him" - therefore it follows that Jesus cannot have been in harmony with Him. But, says John Carter, such a conclusion is absurd. What can anybody make of such confusion and contradiction?

Some 12 or 14 years ago, when a group of Christadelphians in the south learned with shocked surprise that they were supposed to believe that the death of Jesus was primarily for Himself, as stated by the B.A.S.F., the writer was asked to go to Portsmouth and debate the subject with Philip Handley. As a result, Hayling Ecclesia accepted the view that Jesus was holy and undefiled in every sense and died solely for sinners and they withdrew from the Christadelphian community and were re-baptised. Although all possible means were taken to suppress the matter and prevent publication of the debate, the disturbance was so widespread that J.B.Handley, hoping to counteract it, obtained permission to print and circulate a pamphlet by Robert Roberts called "A Scriptural Exposition of the Redemptive Work of Christ."

At the time we paid little attention to this, since it was no more than a re-statement of beliefs and teaching which had been held unquestioned for generations. The important thing to notice is that J.B.Handley, being of the opinion that those who had renounced Christadelphianism had allowed

themselves to be seduced owing to their inexperience and lack of deeper knowledge, selected this particular work because he felt it was the simplest, clearest and most authoritative treatise on the subject. It came to mind when we read the present reviews of John Carter, and the contrast is so striking that we think the reader should have an opportunity of comparing his statements side by side with those of Robert Roberts.

**John Carter**  
*The Christadelphian 1958)*

p.372. "To talk of 'inherited' sin is to talk jargon."

p.372. "We inherit mortality and a tendency to sin, but this does not make us the subject of wrath until we sin."

p.373 "Otherwise, since Jesus was of our nature He would be a child of wrath; which is absurd."

p.373. "The paragraph affirms that our relationship to the constitution of sin involves a condemnation inherited from Adam. This we believe to be unscriptural"

p.373. In addition, if the flesh is the barrier between God and man, then it was a barrier in the case of Jesus. Was there ever a barrier between Jesus and God that estranged Him?

p.374. A theory that makes the Son of God a child of wrath is self-condemned

p.374. "God is estranged from individuals, and (therefore) it is foolish to speak of estrangement from a nature"

p.374. If death is a punishment, and surely an imposed violent death must be so regarded, then we are now told that the possession of a nature conferred by birth brings a liability for punishment.

**Robert Roberts**  
*(The Redemptive Work of Christ)*

p.9 "Christ did no sin, but He inherited the Condemnation of sin in deriving His nature from a daughter of Adam, the condemned.

p.8 "At the same time (Jesus) ... being sinful flesh derived from the condemned transgressor of Eden, it admitted of sin being publicly condemned in Him."

p.5 "He (Jesus) must therefore have been the subject of a personal cleansing in the process by which He opened the way of sanctification"

p.5 "The position of men was that they were under condemnation to die because of sin, and that not their own sin in the first instance, but ancestral sin at the beginning."

p.4 "There must therefore have been a sense in which Christ... must have been purged by the anti-typical blood of His own sacrifice."

p.10 "These conditions involved the declaration of the Father's righteousness in the public condemnation of sin in its own flesh in the person of a guiltless possessor of that flesh."

p.10 "Jesus did not come into the world as an individual but as a representative... Christ was cursed by the law."

p.9 "The crucifixion was a Divine declaration and enforcement of what is due to sin, and as it was God's righteous appointment that this should be due to sin, the infliction of it was a declaration of God's righteousness."

Any fair minded person must see that between the two view points there is utter and irreconcilable contradiction. There is no shadow of doubt that Robert Roberts held that because man is of sinful flesh derived from Adam, he is automatically estranged from God. To-day, John Carter says, No, all we derive from Adam is mortality and a tendency to sin. Robert Roberts undoubtedly

held that Jesus was under condemnation because of His nature. John Carter says, No, such a conclusion is absurd.

To the last comment quoted John Carter adds, “To what strange ends can theories lead.” Since it is abundantly evident that the theories in question were propounded by the first Editor of The Christadelphian and yet to-day we find his successor in office performing an elaborate vanishing trick in order to dispose of them, we can agree that they have indeed, led to a strange end, but it ill becomes the man who stands in such a false and anomalous position to adopt such an air of superiority.

When he writes on page 372, “To talk of ‘inherited’ sin is to talk jargon,” we of the Nazarene Fellowship agree with him, but it is there plain to see in the clauses we have quoted from the Statement of Faith and it is perfectly clearly taught in the works of both Dr. Thomas and Robert Roberts, and therefore either John Carter is mistaken in his deductions or else he is convicting the Doctor and R. Roberts of talking jargon and reaching conclusions which are absurd. We may repeat, we think John Carter is right on the point, as far as he goes, and that his predecessors were, in fact, guilty of jargon and, perhaps, something worse, but we cannot applaud the consistency of his position at the head of a community whose fundamental basis is that human nature is defiled by sin and that Jesus Christ was in the same condemnation as those He came to save.

It seems probable that the policy of the Board of Directors of The Christadelphian will be to try to gradually accustom their readers to a change in the climate of thought. If this is the intention it might be that given a sufficient period of time it would meet with some success and enable the basis of faith to be gradually modified without a major upheaval – but does anyone really think that any such period of time remains? Surely it would be wiser to say, “We were mistaken on this point; we now see that the truth is not what we have always supposed.” It would require courage to make such a confession; it would entail some sacrifice of pride; but it would be honest and it would help to preserve the integrity of the English language. Better still, it would be true and would make it possible to meet the Lord without the shame of having taken away from Him, by a false tradition, the credit and honour to which He is so well entitled.

Truth is truth. We may have more of it or less of it. It has many different faces. But it cannot be one thing at one time and something different at another. Those who value it at all will not be so foolish as to maintain that the teaching of Robert Roberts in 1873 and of John Carter in 1958 are both the truth, because they are simply rendering the word meaningless. It is not for us to explain how or why he can still claim to uphold what has always been called The Truth. Perhaps he is in too difficult a position. All we can do is to quote his words and compare them with others and say, judge for yourself.

## **Is It Worthwhile?**

Truth itself has a value; the search for it is the one soul satisfying activity of the truly intelligent person. But the more important aspect of the matter is that it is the truth which saves. “Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.” If we discover that what we are believing is not the truth, or is a mixture of truth and error, can we be truly free? There have been in times past periods when less of truth was attainable and no doubt what there was at any moment of history was sufficient to make those who had it free. But if there is more of truth attainable to-day than we can be bothered to master, or more than we can comfortably fit into our scheme of things, then we are failing in the only field in which we can make any return to our Creator for the gift of life and to our Saviour for the promise of life more abundant. Those who are slavishly bound by a false sense of duty or loyalty to the dogmas of brethren who, though doubtless faithful in their day and according to their light are now seen to have been mistaken, are surely unworthy of the opportunities they have been given.

There is no persecution for righteousness’ sake to-day. There is nothing that could be called tribulation from external things to be endured by believers. What is required of us is that we be faithful to Him who has called us - faithful in our minds, and this can only mean putting first above all things the truth He has revealed for us. If we are too indolent to sort out clearly in our minds what we actually believe and cannot make the effort necessary to reject anything which fails to stand the test of reason enlightened by the Word, are we worth anything at all? God is a rewarder of those who diligently seek Him. Faith, hope and love are the marks of a true seeker and believer, but none of

them will serve as a substitute for truth, for this is the foundation upon which alone they can accomplish anything. It is the truth, believed, which alone constitutes a person a saint in Christ. How therefore, if we are not able to decide one way or the other on a matter as far-reaching and fundamental as whether His death was for Himself or not, how can one hope to be found worthy of the rewards of diligence?

One reads with amazement, anger and pity of the things which Caiaphas and his followers did to Jesus. Do you realize what the Birmingham Amended Statement of Faith does to Him?

When you hear His voice saying, "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends," do you reply, "One moment, dear Lord, You are under a slight misapprehension. You laid down Your life for Yourself. Your friends were saved certainly, but as You were in the same condemnation as they, Your death was actually for Yourself. You probably thought at the time You were giving Yourself as a ransom for all, for that is what You told Your disciples, but unfortunately the Statement of Faith was not then available, otherwise You would have understood that You were as unclean as those You came to save; Your very flesh was obnoxious to Your Father and therefore it had to be destroyed upon the cross for Your own purging. You see, dear Saviour, we have to beware of the idea of substitution. Many people (you continue) even including some of the apostles, got the idea that You died in their stead but our leaders have told us that this would be unthinkable. God could not justly allow His innocent Son to bear the penalty due to sinners and so we had to find a reason for Him to punish You as well as us. We managed to find this in a mistranslation of Paul's words in Romans 8:3 – "Sinful flesh." We believe that all flesh is unclean, including Yours, and therefore Your body had to be ritually destroyed for the condemnation of sin in the flesh."

If you heard the gentle reproof of the Master, "Say ye (this) of Him whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world?", would you have the audacity to reply, "Pardon us, Lord; we know from the writings of our brethren, many of whom are highly educated men with University degrees, that human flesh is physically defiled with sin and therefore cannot be truly clean, not even Yours, even though You were begotten by the Holy Spirit; and therefore there was no injustice in God requiring You to submit to the suffering of a shameful death. It is proved by Clause V of our Statement of Faith that You were raised up in the condemned line of Abraham and David and that You were therefore a sufferer in the days of Your flesh from all the effects that came by Adam's transgression, including the death that passed upon all men, which You shared by partaking of their physical nature; and while what You say is very interesting, we have to accept the Statement of Faith without reservation, otherwise we should not be allowed to break the bread which memorialises Your unclean body given for Yourself, nor drink the wine which reminds us of Your sin-defiled blood shed for Yourself."

## **Why John Carter Should Resign**

In the November issue of *The Christadelphian*, John Carter again refers to P.O.Barnard's views, and though he cannot see his way to print 3,500 words of his reply, he finds space for over 5,000 more of his own on the subject. We hold no brief for P.O.Barnard, but surely it would be fairer to allow him at the very least to make his defence to the onslaught made upon him in August. The fact that John Carter has not done so and refers to continue to present his own one-sided picture suggests that he realises that if the matter were presented impartially a larger proportion than he cares to contemplate of his own readers would find themselves in opposition.

It does not require a tenth of the space, however, to show what deep water he is in. either his quotations from Dr.Thomas and Robert Roberts nor his own desperate struggles are sufficient to deliver him from the storm he has whistled up.

As we have shown earlier, the basic Christadelphian theory always was that physical defilement, or the implantation of sin in human flesh, was the primary ground of Divine wrath against man. After what has been quoted from "The Slain Lamb" we do not need to establish this, though to show its acceptance and interpretation in recent times we may quote the following extracts from *Redemption in Christ Jesus* by W.F. Barling, published in "The Christadelphian" in 1946 and subsequently as a pamphlet in Australia: -

“Paul’s statement, “I know that in my flesh dwelleth no good thing” means for Christadelphians that human flesh is wholly evil... after the first transgression, Diabolos was inward, not external... the literal flesh is evil by nature... Jesus was a sinless bearer of our serpent-nature... our sinful nature needs both to be redeemed and brought into subjection... the crucifixion represented the mortification of a sinful nature, the cutting off of human flesh (which is a body of sin in the case both of sinners and the sinless)... Expressed briefly, the Crucifixion demonstrated conspicuously that “Sin, in the flesh” was being publicly condemned and nullified... How did the Crucifixion declare God’s righteousness? In that Christ possessed a nature under condemnation to death, so that there was no violation of justice in His death. It was not wrong for Him to die... The death of Jesus was just, because as Son of Man He was under Adamic condemnation, and thereby God could lawfully require Him to die.” - W.F. Barling.

These extracts are particularly significant not only because they determine what the Christadelphian position really is but also because they show in actual use by a contemporary member, expressions and phrases which John Carter has recently described as jargon, loose terms and the misleading use of words. Notice, for example, the phrase Sin in the flesh and how W.F.Barling uses it in the above extract. It is worth recalling that in July, 1958, John Carter said, “Much confusion has arisen from treating the phrase as a hyphenated expression” and he went on to explain, quite correctly, the figure of Sin personified as the master and owner of those who serve sin, adding “God condemned Sin in the work and death of Jesus... God condemned Sin, in the work and death of Jesus... God condemned Sin, in the flesh - the flesh in question being the flesh that Jesus and all other men share alike.” This is exactly the exposition given by Edward Turney in 1873, which has been denounced ever since by Christadelphians of every section. Yet here we have John Carter advancing it as if it were normal Christadelphian doctrine, yet at the same time he is in conflict with one of his own contributors.

The difference is put beyond dispute in the same pamphlet by W.F.Barling, where he writes,

“God condemned Sin in the flesh. Correctly understood, says The Nazarene Fellowship, this statement signifies that in the person of Jesus sin was condemned as a wrong thing to have committed, and that “sin in the flesh” in which Christadelphians believe is something which does not exist in fact.”

So now it is not only The Nazarene Fellowship but John Carter as well who says it is something which does not exist in fact.

Reading “The Christadelphian” for December, 1958, we could not help feeling sorry for B.S.Snelling trying to get the record straight. As already said, we have no admiration for the views advocated in “The Old Paths” but we have no doubt that they are the genuine Christadelphians now and the majority neither fish nor fowl. The Editor prints a letter from him quoting W.F.Barling’s argument that Jesus needed purification by death from the uncleanness of contact with sin resulting from His physical nature. Snelling’s point is perfectly clear and proves beyond question that Barling’s view was the same as his own, but he gets neither acknowledgement nor Justice from the Editor. Instead, he dismisses him with the most impudent piece of dialectical sharp-practice which it has been our misfortune to meet in a very long time.

He says,

“Re...the quotation from Barling, which is thoroughly scriptural, we must discriminate in the use of words...the language is the language of the types. The ‘blood’ of Jesus is the type-symbol of the offering of Jesus, or it has no real meaning at all...it can be made to serve ill-purposes when the real purpose is overlooked.”

This is a most unprincipled evasion and a typical example of the stratagem of taking the meaning out of words when they don’t happen to say what one wants them to! If the quotation is thoroughly scriptural, how can the real meaning be overlooked? Can he show an instance in Scripture

where the language of the types is in conflict with the literal? Who is making the type-language serve ill-purposes - certainly not Snelling for he only quotes what Barling said and shows that it agrees with his own statements? It is shockingly dishonest, because Barling is not in fact using the language of the types, he is speaking of the literal flesh and blood of Jesus, for he puts in brackets, to make his intention clear, "i.e., the person of Jesus." What Barling is doing, is using the types, with what appears to be calculated fraud, to prove that because they require to be cleansed by sacrifices, therefore Jesus needed to be similarly cleansed, and therefore must have been as unclean as they were.

The truth is that the types, which were the appurtenances of the Tabernacle, required cleansing because they were man-made and represented those who will constitute and serve the heavenly Tabernacle. If Barling had used the types as their Divine Author intended (we believe) he would have pointed out that whereas "almost all things are by the law purged by blood" there was one thing which was not so purged - and that was the very thing which typified Jesus - the sacrificial victim itself. No offering was ever made to cleanse the lamb before it was killed, because it was already legally clean and perfect and had been specially selected on that account. If it had had any legal or physical blemish it would have been useless as a sin-offering. W.F.Barling chose to overlook this vital fact and its bearing upon the Lamb of God of which it was the type, because he was defending the Christadelphian view which required an unclean offering to be the representative of an unclean race.

John Carter's contention that Barling's view, saying "the language of the types" is the same as his own is ludicrous in the extreme. We should know, because the series of articles in which Barling made these parodies of scriptural exposition were written expressly to refute views advanced by this writer personally which were, on the point, the same as John Carter's present views. It will be interesting to see how long W.F.Barling will remain dumb while this question is debated. We know - and he knows that we know - that unless he comes forward soon to the aid of the minority he is branding himself a yes-man and is tacitly admitting that the basis of the case he made in "Redemption in Christ Jesus" has been sold out by the man who published it in the first place. Bearing in mind the Editor's admonition to discriminate in the use of words, let us now make the experiment of putting in juxtaposition a couple of the statements made by John Carter with corresponding ones made by Fred Barling.

Here is W.F.Barling:

"Christ possessed a nature under condemnation to death, so that there was no violation of justice in his death."

Now listen to John Carter:

"We are now told that the possession of a nature conferred by birth brings a liability for punishment. To what strange ends can theories lead us!"

It would take a remarkably astute advocate to show anything other than complete contradiction between these two statements and John Carter will have to think up something better than "the language of the types" to account for it.

Here again is W.F.Barling:-

"As Son of Man He (Jesus) was under Adamic condemnation and thereby God could lawfully require Him to die."

Now John Carter:-

"The paragraph (P.O.Barnard's) affirms that our relationship to the constitution of sin involves a condemnation inherited from Adam. This we believe to be unscriptural."

If it is unscriptural to affirm that ordinary men inherit a condemnation from Adam, how much worse to affirm that Jesus was under such condemnation and that this rendered His death lawful, right and just! This is what Barling does and if he is right, or thinks he is right, why is he not taking up the

cudgels on behalf of P.O.Barnard and “The Old Paths” group instead of letting the Editor make a tool of him by falsifying his words? Surely there is a limit somewhere to the jiggery-pokery which can go on before people will protest.

As one who is in a position to know, the writer can say without fear of contradiction, that the orthodox Christadelphian position is that represented by W.F.Barling and it is a complete and utter perversion of the truth for John Carter to claim that they are in agreement. During the course of his debate with the writer at Netherton, a hall-full of Christadelphians hooted with derision when expression was given to the views now coming from the pen of John Carter - though they became a trifle less enthusiastic when they saw the report in black and white and put every possible obstacle in the way of its publication!

It would be more than interesting to have from John Carter a frank explanation of his present position, but we are not likely to get this and must do the best we can with the material he has given.

We can take it as definite that he has now renounced the view expressed by W.F.Barling in the extracts mentioned above, also more recently by A.D.Norris in “Understanding The Bible” (see note 2, page 34), and by P.O.Barnard and Robert Roberts, that the mere fact of being a man, of defiled sinful flesh, placed Jesus, or places any other man, in a state of estrangement from God. He says, that although it is the nature we inherit from Adam which causes us to sin, it is not until we do, in fact, personally commit sin that we become blameworthy. This is how he expresses himself on page 510:

“Otherwise we have the monstrous doctrine that we are condemned for something in which we had no part and could therefore share neither blame nor guilt.” - John Carter.

We think this is a very good observation; it expresses a phase of the truth on account of which we left the community. But it truly amazes us to see that John Carter professes to believe that both Dr.Thomas and Robert Roberts held the view he holds and that the purpose of his quotations from their works on pages 515 to 518 is to prove it.

We do not question the authenticity of what is quoted, but it is common knowledge that both of them at various times gave utterances to views which were contradictory and answers to specific questions which it is impossible to harmonize. It is a selection of these which John Carter has now produced in order to spike the guns of the brethren represented by The Old Paths. But he knows, and we know, that this is not a candid statement of the position; the passages he reproduces do not represent the Christadelphian faith insofar as they bear on the question of inherited condemnation. It never was the case that Christadelphians believed that only a man’s personal sins alienated him from God. Such admissions as Robert Roberts made in this direction were made when J.J.Andrew and others pinned him down in regard to the position of Jesus. What he really believed can be learned from The Slain Lamb, the B.A.S.F. and Elpis Israel, and what Christadelphians really believe to-day can be learned from such men as W.F.Barling and P.O.Barnard, from The Logos, The Old Paths and, in its unguarded moments, from The Christadelphian.

What is more remarkable however than John Carter’s lack of candour in the selection of quotations from Robert Roberts, is the fact that in the course of one of them he supplies precisely the evidence which proves his own undoing.

In the course of his attack on P.O.Barnard in August, he states on page 374 that the possession of a nature conferred by birth does not bring a liability to punishment or an imposed violent death. We have already pointed out that this is in direct contradiction to statements made by W.F.Barling and quoted earlier. In November, page 517, col. 1 he also states quite clearly,

“We are not alienated from God because we possess this flesh which is mortal; but because we sin and so become alienated by wicked works.” - John Carter.

Both these statements are scriptural and consistent and are arrived at by applying the test of how they affect Christ; but both of them are contradictory of Christadelphian doctrine, as can be conclusively proved from the very same article, for on the next page, 518, col.2 he quotes a declaration from Robert Roberts concerning the death of Christ which is completely inconsistent with them:-

“As a sufferer from the effects of sin, He had Himself to be delivered from these effects; and as the mode of deliverance was by death on the cross, that death was for Himself first, not for sins of His own committing, but for deliverance from the (effect of the) sin of Adam.” - Robert Roberts.

The significant words to notice are “that death was for Himself first, not for sins of His own committing.” If John Carter is correct in suggesting that Robert Roberts believed that it is only wicked works that alienate and that the possession of a nature conferred by birth does not bring a liability to an imposed violent death, let him explain why he says Jesus’ death was for Himself first, seeing he had committed no wicked works.

To be consistent with John Carter, he ought to have said, “Seeing Jesus did not commit any wicked works, His death cannot have been for Himself, since mere possession of a mortal nature does not bring any liability to punishment.” This is what he ought to have said, but in fact he said the very reverse.

This then is the remarkable situation revealed. John Carter says that the mere possession of the kind of nature we know Jesus had, does not bring a liability to an imposed violent death, yet he quotes in support of his case a statement of Robert Roberts’ which says the exact opposite - that the death of the cross, which was an imposed violent death, was for Himself first. Why was it for Himself first, if He was not alienated from God, if His nature brought no liability to punishment and if He had no sins of His own either? You see the position we have reached? Either the death of Christ was for Himself, as affirmed by Robert Roberts and as laid down in the B.A.S.F., in which case it was, as proved by John Carter, completely unjust, for He was without sin; or His death was not for Himself and the doctrine of the Atonement as expounded by Christadelphians for 80 years is null and void.

It is obvious to anyone that the Editor of The Christadelphian has placed himself and the whole of the brethren who follow his leadership on the horns of a dilemma from which there is no escape. If Robert Roberts was right on this single point, then John Carter ought either to retract or resign. If John Carter is right, then the B.A.S.F. ought to be scrapped and the whole fabric of Christadelphian doctrine concerning the nature of man reconstructed from the ground up. In either case, as has been pointed out to me by one of his own brethren, if the members of the Central Ecclesia were faithful to their constitution they would recognise that they are under an obligation to take steps to disfellowship John Carter. We know personally those who have been disfellowshipped for holding views contrary to the Statement of Faith which are less far-reaching than those expressed by John Carter. There ought not to be one law for Editors and leaders and another for simple brethren.

Everyone realises that most of the trouble in the Christadelphian world, as in every other sect, arises from the use and abuse of man-made creeds. The real tragedy behind the apparent success of the recent reunion is that it was based upon a profession of adherence to the Statement of Faith which everyone knows is largely humbug. This together with the facts we have revealed in the foregoing, places before Christadelphians an agonising problem which they can only solve for themselves, and then only as individuals. We can see no prospect whatever of it being solved by them as a community and there is no escape for anyone by leaving the issue to their ecclesia. We have discharged our responsibility, by presenting the facts correctly and as clearly and simply as possible; all we can do further is to offer an outline of what we regard as the true and essential facts of the revealed plan of salvation.

-----

# **A Rational Faith Without A Creed**

The Nazarene Fellowship has no constitution, creed or statement of faith outside the pages of the Bible. It has reached its present understanding by reading and discussion of Scripture and study of any and every variety of opinion, past and present. If or when anyone feels that he can show that any point is in conflict with reason or revelation, we are glad to discuss it, for if we are wrong our chief concern is to get it right, but we do not attach much value to tradition.

## **1) The Things Concerning The Kingdom of God.**

The visible world and every form of life in it was created in the beginning by the Eternal God. Within the limits of the natural laws by which they are governed, all things, including man, remain as they were created, very good.

Man is a corruptible creature with the same physical nature as the lower animals, but being made in the image of God he has a free will and the capacity for reason. To develop character he had to experience good and evil, and for this purpose Adam was placed under law. By disobedience he brought himself under sentence of death. This was man's first lesson in religion - that sinners deserve to die. His second lesson was that God is merciful, because he was spared the judicial death he had incurred.

God's ultimate purpose, revealed in the Bible, is to bring the whole creation to perfection under the reign of Jesus Christ, and establish it for ever in accordance with the promise made to Abraham. This is the Hope of Israel - the true Gospel.

The selection of a people worthy to take part in that purpose has been proceeding throughout history by the preaching of this Gospel, and will continue until the literal return of Christ to the earth from his present dwelling with the Father.

Those who by faith and obedience have shown themselves acceptable to God are recorded in the Book of Life and will be called from their graves in incorruptible nature as the heirs of everlasting life, to live and reign with Christ in eternity. This is the resurrection of the righteous.

## **(2) The Things Concerning The Name of Jesus**

The rite of sacrifice introduced in Eden and defined in the Law of Moses, teaches God's way and calls for the exercise of that faith by which He is honoured. In making an offering in which the life of an animal was taken away by bloodshedding, the sinner acknowledged his guilt and unfitness to live and recognised that he could only be saved by reason of God's mercy. But animal sacrifices were only a temporary expedient and could not give effective deliverance because the life of an animal was not a true equivalent for the life of a man; they pointed to the sacrifice of Christ.

The life which had been lost by sin could only be redeemed by a human life. No descendant of Adam could give his life as a ransom, since the life of every natural-born man is a continuation of the life which was forfeited, and thus death as a deferred penalty or debt hangs over the human race. Therefore, it is evident that man could only be saved from extinction by one whose life was not derived by natural descent, who was not a sinner and who was prepared voluntarily to sacrifice himself. Such was Jesus. As a child of Mary He was a man of flesh and blood related to the race and of exactly the same corruptible nature, but as Son of God His life came to Him direct from the source.

In His temptations and physical suffering, Jesus proved that human nature of itself is not in any way defective, and showed by His example that obedience to the commandments is in fact within the capacity of everyone. Conscience serves to convict us all as sinners personally, but in order that mercy might prevail and one redemptive sacrifice redeem a multitude of people. God regards all Adam's descendants as having lost their life in his and become alienated with him. This is the federal principle.

When He allowed His murderers to nail Him to the Cross, Jesus submitted to a penalty He did not deserve and a condemnation which was utterly unjust in order to cancel, by the surrender of His own life, the debt owed by sinners. Jesus paid at Calvary the debt incurred in Eden. Had it been

inflicted upon the sinner he would have perished and the human race would never have been. Jesus, being sinless, was able to suffer the death and not perish, and being raised from the grave in incorruptible spirit nature He ascended to His Father and now awaits the appointed time for His return to reign upon the earth. Thus God provided in His own Son the one all-sufficient sacrifice for sin, a life for a life, and purchased back to Himself all those who put on the name of Jesus who were alienated from Him by sin.

Jesus as the heir of all things and God's representative on earth, in carrying out His Father's plan for our salvation by laying down His life as our substitute, upheld justice and law by meeting its claim and at the same time demonstrated supreme love and mercy. To believe these things and to be immersed in water as a symbol of the death which Jesus suffered for us literally is Christian Baptism and is the condition of forgiveness of sins and acceptance into the Kingdom of God.

## **Things We Do Not Believe**

It sometimes happens that people read or hear these explanations and realise that they are reasonable and scriptural, and they imagine that they are what they actually believe themselves, whereas, in fact, they hold views which are quite incompatible with them. We therefore append a list of some of the things which we consider are destructive of the True Gospel.

We do not believe in Immortal Souls, Heaven-going or a personal Devil.

We do not believe in The Trinity, that Jesus pre-existed or that He had Divine Nature.

We do not believe in Original Sin or Changed Nature.

We do not believe in Sin-in-the-Flesh or that people are born sinful.

We do not believe that Natural Death is the Wages of Sin.

We do not believe that Jesus died for Himself.

We do not believe that immersion for personal sins without recognition of the Federal Principle is Christian Baptism.

We do not believe that those asleep in Christ will rise mortal.



