

Nazarene Fellowship Circular Letter no. 190

July/August 2001

In this Issue:

Page 1 Editorial	Sister Helen Brady
Page 2 The Doctrine of Original Sin Shown to be Unscriptural	Brother Jas. M. Brown
Page 4 Counterparts of the Scribes and Pharisees	Brother Phil Parry
Page 6 A Final Letter from	Brother Graeham Mansfield
Page 7 A Response	Brother Russell Gregory
Page 11 Letter from	Brother Peter and Sister Meryl Morgan
Page 13 1st Reply to Brother Alfred Norris	Sister Helen Brady
Page 14 2nd Reply	Brother Phil Parry
Page 15 3rd Reply	Brother Russell Gregory
Page 16 "There is a Way which Seemeth Right unto a Man"	Author unknown
Page 18 Note Regarding "The Jesus Book"	Brother John Stevenson
Page 19 Final Part of "The Atonement X-Rayed"	Brother A.L. Wilson

Editorial

Dear Brothers and Sisters and Friends, Loving Greetings.

Today provides excellent opportunities for followers of Christ to differentiate themselves from the world and to emphasize their commitment to truth, if of course anyone will listen. It was the truth Jesus told and said would make men free, truth which His followers spread, a truth so uncompromising in its rejection of the world's values that it has entranced people throughout the ages. This is because Christ's teaching tells us in its truthful simplicity that the world is a fraud and should be rejected.

I read recently that the Archbishop of Canterbury is so dismayed by his church's public image, and his own, that he is to call in a 'high power publicity firm' to improve both, if the newspapers are to be believed. The current phrase for these types is spin doctors and they are widely used by politicians. They are adept at making things and people look other than they actually are. This is vital in politics for the public should never see politicians and politics too clearly or they might learn too much.

It does not appear to occur to the Archbishop to make his church more godly and concerned with real scriptural truth, he just wants to alter its outward appearance. Whited sepulchre are the two words that spring to mind here.

To follow Christ is about truth or it is about nothing. Jesus said "I am the way the truth and the life." There is nothing about images or perceptions in the life of Jesus. He could read and write and He knew the Scriptures. He had no training in evangelism and no resources. But the stupendous message He brought and above all His deep love and compassion in laying down His life for His friends, that they might have life and have it more abundantly, has transformed people throughout the centuries, given hope to the hopeless, comforted the sick and captive and has provided the searching mind with its heart's desire.

Is it any wonder that the Archbishop's church is empty? One after another of God's commandments are dropped, re-written or declared outmoded. Last year the Archbishop found no problem in going to a banquet where the Chinese Communist dictator was being honoured by the so-called great and good. They would be more properly described as the unprincipled, high-placed godless and successful. The banquet was to court the favour of the world's largest consumer market as yet untapped. It didn't seem to matter to any of those present that the evil dictator rules over a regime which, since it assumed power in 1949, has killed more than 60 million people, holds another 20 million in labour camps and political prisons and is engaged

in a systematic genocide of those within its empire who reject its values. What a hideous regime that Chinaman represented. It beggars belief that anyone could bear to be in the same country with him let alone the same room. But this country's main church leader was on the top table sitting next but one to the dictator. You can imagine him saying to him. 'I hear you have a bit of an image problem too.' Here indeed is the world the flesh and the devil, huge and appalling for all to see and for followers of Christ to abhor.

It brings to mind how blessed it is to know that "...here we have no continuing city, but we seek one to come." - Hebrews 13:14.

Love to all, Helen Brady.

The Doctrine of Original Sin Shown to be Unscriptural

We Christadelphians call the doctrine of Original Sin, "Sin in the Flesh."

Dr John Thomas taught:

"It (sin) represents that physical principle of the animal nature which is the cause of all its diseases, death and resolution into dust. It is that in the flesh which has the power of death; and it is called sin because the development or fixation of this evil in the flesh was the result of transgression. Inasmuch as this evil principle pervades every part of the flesh, the animal nature is styled 'sinful flesh' that is, flesh full of sin, so that sin in the sacred style came to stand for the substance called man." (Elpis Israel, page 113).

This statement of Dr. Thomas is replete with errors and absurdities. It is not true that "all diseases, death and resolution to dust" are the result of Adam's sin. Disease is the result of violating the laws of health, and natural death is but the result of the complete loss of vital power in the blood. Thousands of accidental deaths occur annually and innocent persons are executed, not because Adam sinned, but because they are the victims of circumstances, or are unjustly slain. Original sin has nothing to do with such "resolution to dust."

Moreover, it is not a fact that sin was fixed in the flesh by Adam's transgression. There are no fixed principles and no organs in the flesh now besides those put in Adam's and Eve's bodies by their Creator. The building up and breaking down processes, styled in physiology, anabolism and catabolism, operated in their bodies precisely as they do now in all natural bodies. Their bodies were renewed by the air they breathed as well as by the proteins, carbohydrates and fats that were so necessary to their well-being, and metabolic equilibrium, or perfect health, was maintained by them so long as the laws of health were strictly obeyed. It is quite contrary to reason to assume that eating good ripe fruit resulted in disease.

If Adam's sin fixed what Brother Thomas calls the "evil principle" of sin in the flesh of all human beings, the race would break the law as naturally as it partakes of food and takes rest in sleep, or any other natural act. And as no one can be blamed or censured for what is transmitted in the flesh and blood, the race could not be judged or condemned for such fixation of "sin in every part of it flesh." Fortunately the wise Creator did not fix sin in Adam's body, and He made it impossible for any one to fix a sin in the flesh of his progeny.

He made the race for great possibilities for good or evil. He knew it would need training the right way, for every normal human being may be improved by being brought up in the Way of Righteousness. So God gave the first man a Law, or rule of conduct and told him what would be the consequence if he broke it. After what theologians style "the Fall of Man" occurred, God did not show any displeasure towards Adam's children because of Adam's sin. One of them committed murder as men and women do now. The others were righteous. No evil principle of sin was fixed in their flesh. Hence Abel and Seth were righteous and Cain wicked.

If the fixation of sin in the flesh is what causes men to sin now, what caused Adam and Eve to sin? Did they have sin fixed in their flesh before they broke the Law? If not how did they brake it? Is it not clear that they allowed their own thoughts to become inordinate and thus enticed by their own persistent wishful thinking, they sinned? It is perfectly clear. Hence the monstrous dogma of the fixation of sin in the flesh is false and contrary to the truth of the Scripture as well as to enlightened reason.

Many accept the dogma that the sentence propounded on Adam “defiled and became a principle of his being and was transmitted to all his posterity” (Original Birmingham Statement of Faith. Article V). If this assertion be true, God not only defiled Adam. But permitted all human beings to be defiled by the sentence. Then when they had sin and death fixed in their body and were defiled, why ask them to obey the Law since they could not have done so by reason of being defiled? God is made responsible for defiling the whole race, according to this creed announced In the Temperance Hall Statement of Faith. Now, how did God save the race from the result of this defilement? Listen! “Teach” said Brother Thomas, as “Jesus Christ, when upon earth was Deity manifested in sinful flesh in the nature that sinned in Eden.” (Christadelphian, October 1869, page 286). What does this mean? It means that Jesus was Deity. This Deityship impossible in that Deity of the Bible cannot associate Himself with sin. Yet Brother Thomas’ reasoning would have it that Jesus, miraculously begotten, was what the Bible repudiates for God who cannot lie (Titus 1:2), in that the Deity associates with sin in Jesus, who as Brother Thomas maintains “was sinful flesh.” And what was He when born? “Sinful flesh” said Brother Thomas. What is “Sinful flesh”? “Flesh full of sin,” is Brother Thomas’ reply. Here a miracle was performed to produce Jesus as is supposed to be the main thought, but a mightier miracle still prevails according to Brother J. Thomas, in that Holy Spirit is made to beget sinful flesh in the womb of Mary. Thus a corrupt thought begets a system of thinking which brings into being equally as inconsistent as ever Rome invented, or Calvinistic Presbyterianism upheld to be divine truth, and exposes to view the dread fact that Brother Thomas and R. Roberts argued us back into the doctrinism of Churchdom by reason of use of terms alleging a supposed opposition to what Rome and Protestantism really teach, while these same terms by their very plausibility involve the deceived to a greater depth of inconsistency than previously.

Hence a miracle was performed for the purpose of producing one who, although “Deity” was “Flesh full of sin.” In what way was this miraculously conceived “Deity” better than any other of those whom God defiled? He was not a particle better, for he was “sinful flesh.” And what was this “sinful flesh” (flesh full of sin) produced for? “For the condemnation of sin in the nature that sinned in Eden.” How was sin condemned in Jesus’ body? By crucifying Him on the Cross? Who crucified Jesus? The Jews and Romans. Did they act in accordance with God’s design in doing this? They did, according to Brother J. Thomas who wrote: “Who was the High Priestly Offerer in the Crucifixion? The Eternal Spirit (Hebrews 9:14) upon the principle that what one doeth by his instruments, he doeth by himself.” (Ambassador, April 1868, page 117).

Here is Brother Thomas teaching in his own recorded words which when analysed by critical minds, bring to the light that Brother Thomas as certainly as yet (at the time of his writing above) hardly free from the taint of Calvinism, and that this taint appears in his written works, which if imbibed by us may as well do its fell work of hurrying us back again into the bosom of Mother Rome.

Here the thinker will stop short to consider how it may be that a murder might be acceptable to God as a sacrifice for sin, it being apparent that sin personified in the persons of His murderers, made Jesus a sacrifice to their sin, this being the meaning of that spoken by Peter in Acts 3:13 saying, “Whom ye delivered up and denied him in the presence of Pilate,” while Christadelphians with millions more misread Acts 2:23 as meaning “God delivered him up to be crucified,” the meaning here being plain enough that God by His foreknowledge had given Jewry His Son to be their Saviour, knowing that people would kill Him through their wickedness. In this their cup of iniquity was brought to the full, with the result that that murder has not yet been requited for by Israel. If then Calvary was Jesus’ sacrifice for sin, Jewry did not sin in murdering Him, the fact being that Jewry, with God, co-ordinated to effect this (so called) sacrifice, and so we have a reasoning which, analysed to the logical limits, denies all the previous life of Jesus prior to Calvary to have been anyway a sacrifice in itself in preparing Him for the Saviourship of the World. To go further in reasoning, if Calvary were of itself the cleansing of the world as the sin of Adam had been alleged the defilement of the world, then substitutional salvation must be the substance of the teaching of the Bible.

Thus there faces every sincere mind the factor that sin in the flesh and sin by the flesh are at the cross-roads so far as meeting at one table is concerned. Either system requires a different and opposite Christ. Sin-in-the-flesh, that of a substitutional one, that of a sin-compounded-flesh made Saviour; versus one who never permitted sin to defile Him that He might compound Righteousness with His flesh, in becoming one in mind with the Deity. (See Hebrews 1:3 and John 1:14).

Such two opposite Christ's cannot sit together at one Table. It but becomes a Table of Devils at which Jesus who offered Himself to God at the Jordan as having fulfilled all righteousness, must withdraw Himself with His Own who, understanding His sacrifice having been completed to become the Lord Christ at the Jordan, in Spirit of the Word of God; afterwards showed Himself to a traditionalised and therefore poisoned minded people as the Christ of God, who was willing to even give His life-blood as a testimony before them of His love for that people. Jesus by His life under the Law, brought to light the only redemptive factor involving salvation for everyone, consisting in such dying to self as the only way to truth that must become one's life, to live in Spirit to God, thus Paul could well say in Romans 8:8, "So, then, they that are in the flesh cannot please God. But ye are not in the flesh, but in Spirit, so being that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his. And if Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the Spirit is life because of righteousness." Herein Paul gives the lie to the dogma of "Sin in the flesh."

Brother Jas. M.Brown

* * *

The above article was copied from The Australian Christadelphian Magazine, No. 39, dated 31st October 1953, having been compiled by the Editor.

Counterparts of the Scribes and Pharisees

In the past one hundred and twenty-eight years of controversial writings by persons professing to believe in the Word of God recorded in what is described as the Bible, much of what Jesus said has convinced me of the fact that counterparts of the Scribes, Pharisees, Sadducees and Lawyers of His day do exist among those with whom we contend for the Truth.

For example it comprises to my mind an element of people who believe Jesus was in need of redemption and salvation from a condemned body of sin inherited from Adam due to his sin in the Garden of Eden and which passed upon all men unto the grave. In view of this, how could forgiveness of sin have any effect on a body contaminated by an element of sin pervading it? I have never read in the Bible where a person's sin was forgiven and the body changed or improved as a result to a superior nature.

When recently I read from Matthew 9:6, I was struck by the fact that if Jesus needed to die to rid Himself of this so-called sin in His flesh how could He have the power to forgive sins? Yet He declared He had power on earth to do so, but I would not say indiscriminately, but in regard to Himself I am sure He had no need or reason to do so yet this fact is denied by the modern counterparts I have mentioned.

They acknowledge His power of forgiving and healing but they say in effect what Jesus said of the Scribes, Pharisees and rulers, "Ye will surely say unto me this proverb, Physician, heal thyself." This is the equivalent of their modern counterpart saying He had to die for Himself and His own salvation - He healed others, He saved others, but Himself He could not save only by destroying the Devil in His flesh (Hebrews 2:14. He cast out devils by the power He possessed but to do this for Himself He relied on wicked hands to put Him to death on the tree of Calvary.

These are the falsehoods with which we have contended, not to engender strife but to present truth and peace of mind to those who will hear. "Is not this Joseph's son?" (Luke 4:22). To the modern counterparts this is exactly what Jesus was - in their view He was under sin-condemned flesh by His birth of a woman, the

absence of a male line in His genealogy or pedigree conveniently ignored and the true reason for His Divine begetting and birth of the virgin Mary.

The fact that He was the Son of God did not exempt Him from the fact that He was a living soul like Adam was at his creation from the ground and also styled a Son of God at the time. But where Adam lost that status by sin, Jesus in the same nature retained His. This is plain truth; Jesus was Son of man being of similar nature with Mary but not a son of Adam by male descent, a condition and recognized factor from the beginning. (See Deuteronomy 25:5-7 and Ruth 3 & 4 & Numbers 27). Thus Jesus was declared through Mary to be the seed of David according to the flesh but Son of God through begetting by the Power of the Father overshadowing Mary.

Nowhere in the Genesis record does it say God condemned the flesh of Eve or Adam. He condemned 'the committed sin' in that both were capable of obedience. Jesus proved obedience possible by His own conduct under greater trial than Adam, yet being of the same physical nature also uncondemned. Take away this false theory of condemned nature and what do we find, or what is left for us to accept but a legal position as a result of Sin entering into the world (not into the flesh) by one man's disobedience. God did not curse Adam's flesh, He cursed the ground for Adam's sake that it brought forth thorns and thistles in his tillage of it as a reminder of what he lost in the Garden of Eden; and through his exemption from "the death by sin," through the blood of Christ foreshadowed in the Lamb of God's provision in Eden and on Calvary as the substance, he might still look forward to a restoration in the Paradise of God through the promised Seed. But please note, not without faith and the Grace of God in His Son Jesus.

As concerning the physical flesh there has never been a condemned line but it appears from one source of writing in this age that the nature of Abraham and David became inferior to their predecessors for some reason. The reason has been known for many years by the comparative few who know truth from error by rightly dividing the word of truth. They found that the person or persons responsible for stating this error held the theory that human flesh was divinely condemned and that Jesus being born of a woman of the seed of David according to the flesh must therefore have been raised up in a condemned line of descent from David and Abraham. This erroneous, unscriptural statement could only be a way of supporting another false theory, namely that the death of Jesus was for Himself and to demonstrate what was due to condemned "sin in the flesh" in a sinless bearer of it if any can make sense of such absurdity.

The root of this misconception is found in Hebrews 7:27 where the writer is referring to Jesus as High Priest in Heaven who does not need to offer Himself anymore for people's sins for He did this once only when He allowed Himself to be slain on Calvary's Tree. It is accepted that He was sinless, yet He is wrongly likened unto the Aaronic Priest who offered not himself but an animal, first for his own sins in order to qualify himself fit to offer a sacrifice for the people. Jesus was not a Priest on earth, He was a willing offering for all and though God delivered Him up for us all, it was sinners who slew Him, yet His death was accounted for their redemption as well as for Adam. The option of salvation was open to all by enlightenment and acceptance of this grace of God in His Son. Why then this lack of accepting such an unblemished human being and sinless Christ as the purchasing price to save Adam and all in his loins from the "death by sin" which legally passed upon all men? Jesus gives the answer in His parable of the Sower of the good seed of the Kingdom of which He was kernel of fertility, hence nothing wrong with the seed. What was wrong was the adverse effect on its growth as pointed out in the parable and is explained by Jesus in His reference to the Jewish rulers of His day in fulfilling Isaiah, as quoted in Matthew 13:10-17. Their counterparts of our day are little different, nevertheless the foundation of God stands sure having this seal, the Lord knoweth them that are His, hence predestination which depends on individual faith and acceptance of the Gospel of Grace and salvation taught firstly by the Prophets and in these last days by His Son and His appointed pastors and teachers whom we could say were not only sent in person but also sent through the medium of pen and paper - the Spirit of the Word activating the mind or the good ground on which it falls.

One can therefore understand what Jesus meant in His response to those people who sought for further signs of His Messiahship, Luke 4:22-27, "And they said, Is not this Joseph's son?" What do their counterparts say in effect? Exactly the same. He was Joseph and Mary's sinful condemned flesh; 'Physician, heal thyself, destroy the power of the Devil in thy flesh, by death.' A misconception of the meaning of Hebrews 2:14.

No prophet is accepted in his own country and in his own house but there have been and are those who have believed the true report and to whom the arm of the Lord has been revealed, not at a stroke but line upon line, line upon line, here a little and there a little, unnoticed until it is apparent at a certain time of life and of indecision as to what is Truth, "Light is sprung up." This happened as prophesied in Isaiah 9:1,2 but Jesus was sent there for that purpose as we read in Matthew 4:13, "And leaving Nazareth, he came and dwelt in Capernaum, which is upon the sea coast, in the borders of Zebulun and Nephthalim: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet saying, The people which sat in darkness saw great light, and to them which sat in the region and shadow of death light is sprung up."

This is how the true knowledge and understanding of Christ's relationship to His Father and the mission He willingly accepted as a free-born Son to redeem Adam and all in his loins illuminates in a flash as it were, the mind that has been befogged with the false theories and indoctrination of men for so many years thinking they are what is ignorantly styled The Truth.'

We who call ourselves Nazarenes have all experienced in our minds a certain amount of light as far as religious teaching is concerned but as Jesus declared of such a limited amount of light, "If the light that is in thee be darkness (and it was at the time), how great is that darkness:" (Matthew 6:22,23. Luke 11:34-36).

"God who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his son" (Hebrews 1:1,2). On the mount of transfiguration, Moses and Elijah were excluded by the voice from heaven, "This is my beloved son, Hear ye him."

This is why the Nazarene's have come to the light and are trying to display that light to others who are in darkness but think they are in the light. We thank our Heavenly Father for revealing it to us in the divers manners and ways He has worked and so it is written, "Let him that glorieth glory in this, that he understandeth and knoweth me, saith the Lord."

Please note: As I said in my earlier remarks, nowhere in Genesis, or for that matter, in the whole Bible, does it say that God condemned Adam's nature. If this were so then God condemned His own work. He condemned sin, not the flesh. Sin was accounted to Adam not to Eve. She transgressed through beguilement and deceit; Adam sinned wilfully and it was imputed to him as the "Sin" federally of the world and through the male line in his loins. Eve was not in his loins when he sinned.

Jesus condemned sin by His righteousness, not by His death. Noah condemned the world of ungodly people by his righteousness and faith, not their flesh. Until this false doctrine of condemned sinful flesh is discarded, the atoning work of God in Christ is of no value to the understanding and to salvation from the bondage of Sin.

Brother Phil Parry.
(17th July 2001)

Final correspondence from Brother Graeham Mansfield:

We have received a final reply from Graeham Mansfield as he wishes to stop any further correspondence. He reiterates the usual Christadelphian beliefs and my first thought was not to bother with his letter, however, as he raises several exceedingly poor arguments which are commonly held amongst Christadelphians I felt it may be well to make some observations for the consideration of our readers. So here is Graeham's letter dated the 17th June 2001 in reply to my letter published in the last C.L. page 21:-

"Dear Russell, This is in reply to your letter of May 4th, 2001.

The apostle Paul never distinguishes between "literal flesh" and "figurative flesh." In Romans 7 he speaks of his physical body, "sin that dwelleth in me." "For I know that in me, that is, in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing" (verses 17,18). Obviously he is not speaking about sin as an abstraction, but as a physical principle, including the brain, which generates the product of the mind, stimulated by the physical impulses

of the body as any medical authority will confirm; but according to your dual interpretation, the “figurative flesh” or carnal mind forms no part of the physical body! Introducing an external principle into the human body is the first step toward the catholic apostasy! The apostle is careful to point out the need of redemption from sin in the physical body apart from the Law, in verse 14: “For we know that the Law is spiritual, but I am carnal, sold under The Sin.” Note that Paul is not speaking of “sins” here, as transgressions, but “the sin,” sin in the flesh, his human nature, by which he is held captive whilst mortal. The Law of Moses condemned sin so thoroughly in the moral sense that it condemned all men, for all transgressed it. If sin is a moral term applying to transgression only, then perfect obedience is possible to man, and we should perform what is possible. What need, then, is there for Christ above the Law of Moses in God’s redemptive scheme? Why, according to your interpretation of Romans 8:3, did ‘Christ have to condemn sin by coming in the flesh’ when he never transgressed, and therefore from your point of view was not associated with sin in any way - like the bullock under the Law of Moses.

In contrast, the Truth remains firm and steadfast - that Sin could only be justly condemned in the nature which sinned. Anything else must logically lead to substitution only. Why did Christ have to “suffer in the flesh” (1 Peter 4:1) when according to your interpretation He only suffered in His mysterious “figurative flesh” morally? Sin in the flesh could never be condemned by a perfect obedience to a moral law only because it had to be condemned at its very source, in the flesh, the source of transgression. The clear teaching of the apostle in Romans and Hebrews is that apart from Christ’s sacrificial death all the world stood condemned before God, Jew and Gentile alike, for all sinned and fell short of the glory of God! A sacrificial death for sin implies far more than a death from perfect obedience. It expresses the principle of sacrifice for nature as its justly deserved due. At the end of our Lord’s life of daily crucifixion, His literal flesh-body still had to be crucified, the *diabolos*, the cause of all transgression, to be annulled in Him. His sacrificial death cleansed and perfected His nature (Hebrews 2:14); His perfect obedience to God’s will gave him a title to resurrection.

The truth is that even the thoughts of the carnal mind (your so-called “figurative” flesh) proceed from its cause; sinful flesh, setting the intellect and feelings to work in an unclean, sin-biased way. Man’s brain-flesh is the physical source of the impulses of defiled human nature upon the principle that like produces like. In reality, the *diabolos* in the body, the old serpent-liar, still fully deceives its dupes today that its existence is figurative only, whilst unbeknown to its victims it justifies its own thoughts and desires, deluding them that the flesh can render perfect obedience to God when its transgressions are forgiven by Christ. It boils down to the old Gnostic heresy by which, though condemning it, you are deceived yourself.

Since Eden the principle of a blood-shedding sacrifice pointed the way to redemption from the law of sin and death in the representative burnt offerings of the faithful. The continual washings of the priests, ceremonial blood-sprinkling of the altar and tabernacle furniture with blood under the Law of Moses taught the ongoing need for sin-covering and cleansing from sin of the physical constitution of bodies washed, things touched with blood - quite apart from the sacrifices themselves. In the words of the apostle, the Law was a schoolmaster leading unto Christ - where would be the need for the Law of Moses to continually repeat these principles over and over again, to the point of monotony, if all it had to do was point to forgiveness of transgressions by a Redeemer whose flesh would be the same as Adam’s descendants, uncondemned, obtaining eternal life through a sacrifice resulting from perfected obedience only? And for what purpose was the altar under the Law, atoned and atoning - if that principle did not relate to the Lord Jesus? And if it related to the Master (Hebrews 13:7,20), then He required atonement. And if He required atonement, since He was sinless, for what reason? The only satisfactory reason is to abrogate the law of condemnation in Himself. Here is where the Truth is found.

Sincerely, Graeham Mansfield.”

* * *

There are so many naive thoughts and complicated statements in this letter it makes me doubt whether Graeham knows what he means. Why can’t he write in clear terms?

Graeham confidently assures us that “The apostle never distinguished between literal flesh and figurative flesh,” but his confidence is ill-founded for we read that those baptized into Christ are no longer in

the flesh, Romans 7:5, “For when we were in the flesh” (i.e. before baptism into Christ), and Romans 8:8,9, “they that are in the flesh cannot please God. But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit.” Would Graeham have us believe that we are no longer in literal flesh once we are baptized into Christ? When we see a blunder like this we must conclude that any argument built upon it must be carefully questioned. Paul is of course speaking of sin as an abstract in this case as in some other parts of his letter to the Romans.

It hardly needs recourse to medical authority, as Graeham recommends, to confirm that the brain is physical matter - but one’s thoughts are not physical matter. Our choosing to keep God’s commandments or to reject them is not physical matter. Law gives choice and temptation is our opportunity to please God. It is faith by which we are saved. And our faith should guide our decisions when tempted for without persistent determination to put God first in our lives we may fall. Mark 7:21 - “For out of the heart of men proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy pride, foolishness; all these evil things come from within and defile the man.” These are not the result of sin in the flesh but lustful thoughts. “For as he thinketh in his heart, so is he.” (Proverbs 23:7).

To put Romans 7 into context we suggest one at least starts with chapter 6 where in verse 39 Paul says “for as you presented your members (i.e. we as persons) enslaved to impurity and iniquity, so now present your members bound to righteousness for sanctification” (Emphatic Diaglott). We were slaves to sin until we changed our relationship to our Creator through baptism into Christ’s death and this baptism put us back almost but not quite into the same relationship Adam had with God when placed in the Garden of Eden. I say not quite because Adam was not at the first offered forgiveness in the way that we are through Jesus Christ. When Adam failed in perfect obedience he forfeited the life he had been given. In God’s mercy and love for His created son He covered over that first sin with the shed blood of the animal(s) slain at the time and then Adam was in the relationship to his Creator as one forgiven and on probation again for life more abundantly through faith, not works. Similarly, in our time we are free from sin being forgiven through Jesus Christ and now bound to God through Him and on probation for eternal life through faith, not works.

Chapter 7 builds on this showing how we were in bondage to sin in the same way as a wife is bound to her husband while he is alive. If her husband should die she is free to be bound to another. Now in Christ we are freed from the bondage to sin and bound in love to Him and His Father by grace and mercy. Verse 4 “you were put to death by the Law through the body of the Anointed One in order that you may belong to another... for when we were in the flesh, those sinful passions, which were through the law worked in our members to bring forth fruit to death. But now having died we are released from the law, by which we were held; so that we may serve in newness of Spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter.” (Emphatic Diaglott). Now in Christ we are no longer in the flesh but alive in Christ, with the end being everlasting life through baptism into Christ’s death. The apostle Paul does not talk of any redemption from sin in the flesh but from the bondage to The Sin in which we found ourselves when we first came to a knowledge of the truth.

When Paul says “For we know that the Law is spiritual, but I am carnal, sold under The Sin,” Graeham says that “Paul is careful to point out the need of redemption from sin in the physical body apart from the Law. He is not speaking of sins here as transgressions, but The Sin, sin in the flesh, his human nature.” However, Graeham is again mistaken for Paul is not speaking of sinful flesh or human nature. He is speaking of “The Sin” of Adam which alienated him (Adam) and the human race from God and for which redemption back to God is necessary. The human race was sold to Sin as a Master and we are bound to Sin as a Master. Being baptized into Christ’s death frees us from this bondage to The Sin and we are bound to another, even Jesus Christ our Saviour. It is all to do with Law and nothing apart from Law.

Then Graeham goes on to say “The Law of God condemned sin so thoroughly in the moral sense...” We ask is there any other sense in which God could condemn sin? All God’s laws which He gave mankind to keep are moral Laws, all His judgments are moral judgments. It is all a matter of God’s Laws - the keeping of His Laws or the breaking of His Laws - good morals or bad morals. Which of the ten Commandments are not directed towards good moral behaviour? What part of the Sermon on the Mount is not an exhortation to good moral behaviour? The quality of our flesh, our supposed sinful flesh, is not even a consideration.

Graeham says that “Introducing an external principle into the human body is the first step toward catholic apostasy.” We ask, from what basis did the Christadelphian doctrine of ‘sin in the flesh’ derive if it was not from catholic apostasy? The Mother Church’s doctrine of Original Sin introduced by St Augustine teaches the changed flesh of Adam and Eve at the fall and this false doctrine has been held by most of the harlot daughters ever since, including Christadelphia. However, Scriptural facts do not lead us into false doctrines. Nowhere in the Bible is our flesh said to be sinful and never, ever, has any Christadelphian been able to show that it is from scripture.

Graeham reluctantly supposes that “If sin is a moral term applying to transgressions only, then perfect obedience is possible to man, and we should perform what is possible.” The Scriptures teach that sin is transgression of law, that is, God’s Law. We say that there is no other kind of sin. For Adam the law was “Thou shalt not eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.” A simple straight-forward law for an inexperienced and uneducated man. We see there was no offer of forgiveness at this early stage should he transgress but we see also that forgiveness was in the mind of God as is evident from Matthew 25:34, “Come ye blessed of my Father and inherit the Kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world,” which would only be possible through forgiveness being made available. It was, therefore, by the mercy and grace of God that Adam was spared - through the sacrifice of the animal slain in Eden and so that the human race could eventually produce fruit to His honour and glory. In this first instance we can deduce that Adam was on probation for eternal life based on works. Having failed this first test he was then put on probation for eternal life through faith.

We have always claimed that perfect obedience is possible, not that we know of anyone who has accomplished it apart from Jesus but we have only to ask ourselves what sin have we been forced to commit despite ourselves? I am confident the answer is none, and that any sin we commit is through lack of resolve on our part.

However, it is also scripture teaching that even if we have never committed a single sin in our whole life time we still need reconciliation to God. In His wisdom God concluded us all under the one sin of Adam for the purpose of receiving a blessing through Jesus sacrifice. Paul explains this in 1 Corinthians 15:21,22, “For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.” This reconciliation has nothing to do with so-called sinful flesh for sinful flesh is foreign to the scriptures.

For salvation we need faith not works. “By grace are ye saved, through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God. Not of works, lest any man should boast.” However, good works should follow - “we are the workmanship of God created in Christ Jesus unto good works.” Neither should we continue in sin that grace may abound for Jesus said; “Ye are my friends if ye do whatsoever I command you.” Again He said “Be ye therefore perfect even as your heavenly Father is perfect.” Even if we use the word “perfect” in the sense of “complete,” (as some insist) it still requires of us obedience to His Will. Obedience is asked of us and is possible for us to perform. It is surely false humility to suppose we are so bad that we cannot please God or do what is good in His sight because of our wretchedness having our sinful nature or sin in our flesh - and false humility is hypocrisy.

Again Graeham asks “Why did Christ have to condemn sin by coming in the flesh when He never transgressed and therefore from your point of view was not associated with sin in any way?” But I did not, of course, say that Christ had to condemn sin by coming in the flesh. I quoted Romans 8:3 as meaning that Christ condemned sin (while) in the flesh, and this I believe is true. But for Graeham to suppose that therefore Jesus was not associated with sin in any way is just too absurd. Has he never read that Jesus took our sins upon Himself? Has he never read Isaiah 53:4 – 6, “Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows: yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the LORD hath laid on him the iniquity of us all.”

Graeham claims that “sin could only be justly condemned in the nature that sinned.” This has been used by Christadelphians for over one hundred years as their reason for saying the flesh of Jesus Christ was therefore “sinful flesh” and having “sinful flesh” He was able to surrender it on Calvary as a means of saving

Himself as well as us in Him. This is another faux pas. It seems very few have seen the fallacy of this argument. Is it not clear that Adam sinned while in the “very good” flesh in which God had created him? It is supposed to have been changed to sinful flesh afterwards! This being so it follows that Jesus Christ also had the same “very good” flesh when He was crucified. Which rather upsets the Christadelphian teaching that Christ’s crucifixion destroyed His “sinful flesh” and Graeham’s claim that “His death cleansed and perfected His nature”!

Graeham then says that “anything else must logically lead to substitution only.” Need we say more? No one can deny the principle of substitution in the offering up of Isaac in which the ram took his place. It is impossible to escape the fact that sacrifice is essentially substitutional. Sacrifice is the giving up of one thing for something else, usually it means giving up something of less value or importance for something of greater value or importance. But for words not to have lost their meaning then sacrifice is always the giving up of one thing for something else - and that too is substitution.

Again, “We are the purchase of His blood.” Purchase is substitution. Whenever we make a purchase we give up or substitute our money for the item purchased. We receive eternal life as the free gift from God through Jesus Christ who purchased us unto Himself and took our sins upon Himself - “Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes we are healed” (1 Peter 2:24). “The son of man came not to be ministered unto but to minister and to give his life a ransom (again substitution) for many.” If Jesus was not our Substitute then there was no reason for or purpose in His death.

And then Graeham would have us believe that “A sacrificial death for sin... expresses the principle of sacrifice for nature as its justly deserved due.” But this is not a sacrifice in any sense of the word. “Its justly deserved due” shows punishment, not sacrifice; punishment for having been made of sinful flesh. Putting aside the fact that we had no choice in the matter of the sort of flesh with which we were made and therefore no punishment could be justly deserved, we see the total injustice of Graeham’s view when we see Jesus Christ having to suffer the agony of crucifixion not because we are sinners desiring forgiveness but because the nature of Adam’s flesh was changed from very good to very bad. What a ‘Picasso-like’ picture this paints! Surely Graeham, you have inherited lies, vanity and things wherein there is no profit!

Graeham asks, “Where would be the need for the Law of Moses to continually repeat these principles over and over again, to the point of monotony, if all it had to do was point to forgiveness of transgressions by a Redeemer whose flesh would be the same as Adam’s descendants, uncondemned, obtaining eternal life through a sacrifice resulting from perfected obedience only?”

While we see Graeham is entrapped by his false belief in sin in the flesh as a curse from God and something from which we need redemption, the expression “to the point of monotony” when considering God’s Law given through Moses must surely be rather offensive to a loving Creator who wishes only well for His erring creatures. We would point out to Graeham that the continual offerings under the Law of Moses did not unduly affect all the people all the time. The continual daily offerings in the tabernacle, and later in the temple services were administrated by the priests on a rota basis to avoid monotony, and many thousands of priests were involved in this work during the course of any single year. In other parts of Israel there was no more continuity of service to the point of monotony than there is today for you and me. The Levites were chosen for the necessary task of teaching the people the first principles of their faith and keeping its meaning constantly before them. In many ways it is much the same today, but do we find it monotonous? I hope not. For my part I am constantly uplifted and exhilarated by the knowledge that my Saviour had such great love, courage and determination to give Himself that I might have life and have it more abundantly; that by the grace, mercy and love of God we will be perfected, and I want to tell the world about it. But who will listen and how many will even discuss Bible teaching in a reasonable manner? “Logos” proudly proclaim that they will not publish any views for discussion which they deem are not in harmony with their pet doctrines. In their own words: “Logos therefore, will not lend support to the publication of erroneous teaching now current, viz, partial inspiration, non-resurrectional responsibility of the enlightened, immortal emergence, unscriptural teaching of the sacrifice of Christ, including partial atonement, and the present possession of the Holy Spirit gifts.” They are sterile.

In Isaiah 5 we read: “Now I will sing to my well beloved a song of my beloved touching his vineyard in a very fruitful hill: and he fenced it, and gathered out the stones thereof, and planted it with the choicest vine, and built a tower in the midst of it, and also made a winepress therein: and he looked that it should bring forth grapes, and it brought forth wild grapes... What could have been done more to my vineyard, that I have not done in it? wherefore, when I looked that it should bring forth grapes, brought it forth wild grapes?”

Did God put sin in Adam’s flesh to help bring forth good grapes, or is that perhaps more likely the reason for the wild grapes? Did God require His Beloved Son’s death by agonizing crucifixion to show what flesh deserved? Horrid thought, but if it were so, then little wonder there were only wild grapes to harvest. But seriously, the wild grapes were the result of the lust of the flesh and the lust of the eyes and the pride of life, not of changed flesh, a change which only God could have made.

God-fearing people love God for the reason that He brought His Son into the world to save the world and as our example; who said “A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another; as I have loved you, that ye also love one another” (John 13:34). What was new about this commandment when the first two commandments were to love God with all one’s powers and to love one’s neighbour as one’s self, when indeed, the whole Law was based on love? Surely what made it new was that we were being asked to do more than the Law required. This Jesus did by going the extra mile, by turning the other cheek and by giving His cloak also. When the time came for Jesus to be received up into heaven He was not immediately taken up but chose of His own free will to go the extra mile to Jerusalem and of His own free will there to turn the other cheek before His false accusers and be crucified by wicked hands. He laid down His life, not in accordance with any demand of His Father, but of His own free will and in order to give His cloak of righteousness to all who through faith in Him are baptized into His death.

What more could He have done?

Love to all, Russell.

* * *

The day after writing his letter reproduced above on pages 6 & 7, Graeham wrote again in response to Brother Phil Parry’s comments published on page 22 of the last C.L. The main reason for this second letter was to complain about our attitude and so end our correspondence but he does make one comment which, coming from Graeham, we are at a loss to understand, and it is this:

“Phil Parry does not comprehend that Adamic sin did not change the nature; it merely put it under a law of sin and death.”

This is indeed a strange statement coming from Graeham Mansfield for it contradicts his claim of sin in the flesh. The Nazarene Fellowship has always said that Adam’s nature was not changed in any way when he transgressed God’s commandment. It was Adam’s relationship to His Creator that changed, not his flesh. It is sin that was condemned, not flesh; this has been Nazarene Fellowship teaching since the days of Edward Turney.

However, as Graeham says “it is obviously not to the benefit of truth that this communication be furthered” we may never know what was in his mind.

Russell.

Correspondence from Brother Peter and Sister Meryl Morgan:-

In C.L. No. 186, page 20, we published a short article entitled “Who Killed Jesus Christ.” While some thought it very good and asked to see it published as a separate pamphlet, others were offended and thought it too extreme. We have received one letter, from Brother and Sister Peter and Meryl Morgan which has come to us via Brother John Stevenson. I understand from John that Peter and Meryl would like to see some comment in the next C.L. regarding their views. They write as follows:

Dear John, Loving Greetings in our One Hope.

To quote Russell, he says “the Christadelphians nevertheless say God killed His own Son.” No Christadelphian has ever said this, it is a lie. Yes, Clause 12 of the BASF does state as you quoted, but that is almost a word by word quote of Acts 4:27,28. Also Acts 2:22-24, 3:18.

“Indeed Herod and Pontius Pilate met together with the Gentiles and the people of Israel in this city to conspire against your Holy servant Jesus, whom you anointed. They did what your power and will had decided beforehand should happen.”

We do believe this, so do you. It is God’s word.

What we do deny is that God must have punished His own innocent Son. God did not kill His own Son. People did this by their own choice.

God could have prevented it. God’s will was done. Isaiah 53:4,5,7-9, Psalm 22:1,2,3,9,10, 27-31 explain the Father’s part in our salvation.

Isaiah 53:4,5,7-9, Psalm 22:19-23, Hebrews 9:15,27,28 explain Christ’s part in our redemption.

As soon as we attempt to put God’s plan of salvation in our own terms, we seem inadequate. Russell appears to be trying to separate the part the crucifixion played in God’s plan, with the actions of those wicked men who did the terrible act. Yet we know that God is able to do everything. His actions were swift and violent when he dealt with Uzzah and with Ananias and Sapphira. He was able to prevent the crucifixion. He did not. We need to come to terms with this. We must explain it in terms of His love for us, which was so great He was prepared to allow His Son to give His life for us. Romans 3:25, 5:15, John 3:16,17.”

In the same letter Peter and Meryl Morgan also write concerning John Stevenson’s article “Sin Under the Microscope” which appeared in C.L. 188, page 13. They write:

SIN. There are several Bible definitions of sin.

1 John 3:4 “Transgression of God’s law.” Therefore, no law: no sin. Romans 4:15

1 John 5:17 “All unrighteousness is sin.”

Romans 14:23 “For whatsoever is not of faith is sin.”

James 4:17 “Therefore to him that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin.”

John 9:41 “If ye were blind, ye should have no sin.”

Luke 12:47,48 punishment according to your understanding of sin.

About the Lord’s Prayer:- In Matthew 5:9-13 it is speaking of debts, as I understand it these are sins of omission, we should have done things we haven’t.

In v.14 “trespasses” are spoken of, sins of commission.

Luke 11:2-4 it is “sins” both debts and trespasses.

I think it is God’s treatment of sin that varies, rather than sin.

May our Heavenly Father be with you, Peter and Meryl Morgan.

We here publish three replies to a letter from Brother Alfred Norris which he wrote in response to the publication of Brother Eric Cave's booklet, "The Birmingham Amended Statement of Faith - Handbook For Christadelphians."

Following the publication of Brother Eric Cave's booklet regarding parts of the Birmingham Amended Statement of Faith, Brother Alfred Norris was moved to write a letter to several of the Nazarene Fellowship as well as a few Christadelphians. We have not sought permission to reproduce Brother Alfred's letter but we are printing three replies below which should be sufficient to enable readers to grasp the gist of what he has to say:

1st Letter, dated 14th June 2001 is from Sister Helen Brady:-

Dear Alfred, Thank you for your letter. I was sorry to hear you are sick at heart but a little surprised it was over brother Eric Cave's booklet. However I know that sick of heart feeling only too well. I feel exactly the same when I read Christadelphian literature that depicts a defiled Christ and a belief that natural death is the wages of original sin.

I am sure you are quite mistaken in thinking that Eric Cave writes in an "unhappy spirit." I think the unhappy spirit is more likely to be present, acknowledged or not, in the Christadelphian reader when faced with irrefutable truths.

Nor do I find Eric's exposition of his views in opposition to the BASF to contain "convolutions of argument" and "appeals to semantics and grammar." That field has always been more your forte.

Eric's booklet is clear and logical and above all a Biblical explanation of the truth about the Gospel of Salvation. If indeed Eric had resorted to those convolutions and semantics you mention I should not have understood him. But I did understand. I have had no formal education yet I found myself quite able even 50 years ago, to discern what I still believe to be the truth, as opposed to CD dogma, and I learned it from a very early age simply by eavesdropping on the continual conversations and discussions that took place in our home, between my parents and their CD friends and relatives.

I do not think Eric is set on going into battle as you put it, with the intention of causing "disabling grief and unhappiness in the minds of his readers." He is simply stating truth as he sees it, just as Edward Turney did, as Russell does and as my father did too, and as countless others have done down the years. They are all moved by the strong desire to shew those who are astray, as they have been themselves at one time, a better way. I think your comments that those who are currently contending for truth are looking forward to another "bloody battle" and "thirsting for conflict" are uncalled for. In my opinion these are the unfounded accusations of someone who sees the truth of the matter, but prefers to look away merely to protect the status quo. It is this implacable attitude of mind that hinders spiritual well-being and progress, not the determination of those who speak and write what is true.

You do your fellow believers a patronising disservice, the "dear soul's" as you term them, in suggesting that few of them can comprehend truth. It might be difficult for them shackled as they are with years of brainwashing by managing brethren and ill-informed lecturers and writings, confidently informing them that Christadelphians are right about everything and have nothing to learn. But there is nothing complex about what we believe; indeed I sometimes think that is the problem. Christadelphians like complexity and muddle. Many have managed the transition from muddle to clarity in years gone by and Eric is the latest proof of this fact. My father reckoned he could teach a 12 year old child the true Gospel in half an hour. What is needed is a humble, clear, clean mind empty of prejudice and traditional nonsense, allied with a lack of fear in losing face, status and social pleasures. These are the real barriers to learning the truth and attaining spiritual well-being, not a lack of intellect and comprehension.

You quote 2 Timothy 2:23-26, "Foolish and unlearned questions avoid..." would you take this injunction to yourself and refrain from trying to enlighten an unlearned clergyman about his false belief in the Trinity and heaven and hell going? Or refrain from explaining to a Catholic you knew and cared about and who was under the delusion that there is a place called purgatory and that the Virgin Mary is the mother of God? I think not. Christadelphians have always been keen to shew their superior Bible knowledge to

such deluded persons. That is exactly how we feel about Christadelphians; we care about you and your spiritual well-being and want you to know the truth.

I have said enough and I can understand you will not want to reply; too much of a sea change is required of you.

I send my best wishes. Helen Brady.

* * *

2nd letter, dated 26th June 2001 is from Brother Phil Parry:

Dear Alfred, It is most disturbing that a revelation of Holy Scriptural Truth in contrast with traditional Christadelphian errors of doctrine made to abound so unexpectedly by Bro. Eric Cave whom you know so personally, should sicken you, not by reason that he is right, but because you wanted to remain uninvolved in further discussions of the issues of strife and division caused by much of the incorrect views written into "The Christadelphian Statement of Faith," and wholly supported by yourself and other responsible managing brethren and Editors. After 60 years of membership Eric has come to the Light.

I feel sure it was not Eric's motive or intention to bring you out of hibernation or to cause you any further stress, but to submit his well-founded views to others who could be capable of a clearer and better perception of the points raised. The poor souls you refer to are only poor by reason of the Truth having been suppressed, with also the threat of being cast out if they expressed views contrary to a basis of doctrine demanded for membership of the Christadelphian community. They are poor therefore through lack of wisdom and understanding of the Atoning blood of Christ which the Nazarenes have been drawing attention to since 1873 when Edward Turney made this subject so clear and was consequently despised and rejected by a man who failed to read and understand the correct teaching of the first few chapters of Genesis, in fact he went so far as to add theories that were untrue.

I would that I could say of the dear souls you describe as unfitted to cope with the disputes brought to their notice, that they are the poor of this world rich in faith whom God hath chosen, but the responsibility is theirs to prove this by appealing to the Spirit Word instead of the leaders and lecturers responsible for the confusion they are in. They could then be ready and capable as the Apostle exhorts his fellow believers in Christ, "Be ready always to give to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you with meekness and fear" (1 Peter 3:15), not fear of the consequences but Godly fear.

Eric Cave's "Handbook For Christadelphians" was compiled for the benefit of those who profess to have a true reason based on the inspired Word of God and was addressed to all the above, not to gender strifes (you and your predecessors have done enough of that) and you imply that you personally are responsible and do not know what to do. But you have not been asked to do anything more than those dear souls who either knew their Bibles and what they were accepting for Salvation, or were deceived by false teachers and require to be warned of the serious situation they are in and what to do about it, that is, if they are not content to be carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness. (Eph. 4:14). Clauses IX and X of the B.A.S.F. being an example among others.

Eric Cave's appeal at the age of 88 years is for Christadelphians who desire Truth and Eternal Life, to test what he has written for their good. The appeal from you, Alfred, is for them to avoid it, and where ignorance is bliss remain so. You need not be involved, and any controversy is due to those who have no valid answer to the Truth that is being placed before them. None in Ellwood Ecclesia had any answer to the views I held though scripturally based, neither had I any knowledge of the Nazarene teachings at the time, but one man took it upon himself to prevent me from addressing the whole Ecclesia; he said if this were allowed the Managing Brethren would be a laughing stock. This has been the Christadelphian policy since Robert Roberts and the very reason why that community in general have no understanding of the true reason why Christ died on Calvary, so what of your concern for the spiritual well-being of the great majority of your beloved brethren and sisters are you unconcerned with the minority?

Eric Cave, along with all Nazarenes, is concerned for all, no matter what Creed or denomination, for indeed Christ died for all, but all do not avail themselves of that gracious sacrifice; it is sad that so many are guilty of polluting it.

Trusting you will improve in health and have time to consider the position.

I am yours in the patient waiting for my Lord and Saviour, Phil Parry.

* * *

3rd letter dated 25th. June 2001 is from Brother Russell Gregory:

Dear Alfred, Greetings in Jesus' Name. Thank you for your letter received last week via Helen Brady.

I have considered your appeal and feel your concerns for the household of faith are stretched and without foundation, making your first two paragraphs imaginative, while in your third paragraph I have reservations about your views affecting "the great majority" of your "beloved brethren and sisters."

I value Scripture teaching and hold the first two commandments as binding on us all. To love God with all one's heart, and with all one's soul, and with all one's mind, and to love one's neighbour as one's self is to keep all the law and the teaching of the prophets.

Many years ago as a Christadelphian asking "difficult" questions of my elders the usual answer I received was that I should read what Dr. Thomas or Robert Roberts had written upon the matter in question. As we all have the same Scriptures for our information it never seemed right to me that I should be told to go to either Dr. Thomas or R. Roberts and it never occurred to me then that I was told this because my "elders" couldn't explain sensibly the doctrines they were supposed to believe.

As disciples of Jesus Christ we cannot lay another foundation as do the Christadelphians with their Statement of Faith and God forbid that we should ever destroy anything that is precious in His sight, either inside or outside the fellowship to which you belong. I fail to see why you should find Nazarene Fellowship literature upsetting when it has been proven over and over again to be scriptural teaching as opposed to Christadelphian traditions. You ought to be rejoicing with us that the truth has been uncovered yet again. Not that there are any new convolutions of argument in Brother Eric Cave's booklet; there aren't, for it has all been said in one way or another time after time. The appeals are not to semantics and grammar but to sound reason and common sense as opposed to Christendom's, including Christadelphian's, appeal to imagination, to mysticism and to superstition so relished by those of weak and erring faith. There is too much Roman Catholic doctrine in Christadelphian teaching for it to be wholly true.

You know better than most just how many labyrinthine teachings there are flowing from the numerous rifts within Christadelphia. These are the real causes of disabling grief making it exceedingly difficult for disciples of Jesus to find the true Gospel message.

Our thirst is not for conflict, but we will not shrink from conflict if we are faced with it, our thirst is for sound reason, and oneness with Jesus Christ. Oh for the simple faith of the Nazarenes!

Read again 2 Timothy 2:23-26 and see if you understand what Paul is saying:

"Foolish and unlearned questions avoid, (do you apply this to questions on the Atonement?) knowing that they do gender strifes (beget quarrels). And the servants of the Lord must not strive (quarrel about trifles - arising from silly questions); but be gentle unto all men, apt to teach, patient, in meekness instructing these that oppose themselves (these that dispute about trifles); if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth; and that they may recover (to become sober again) themselves out of the snare of the devil (of self delusion), who are taken captive by him at his will."

When have we ever concerned ourselves with foolish and unlearned questions, and what are the faults you wish to charge us with? Please tell us and for the Lord's sake we will try to do better.

Jesus said we should strive to enter in at the straight gate. Paul says we should strive - as contending with an adversary, - to compete for a prize, - to endeavour to accomplish, - to struggle together with him. We can do all things through Jesus Christ. We strive as the Lord would have us strive - to spread the Gospel for which Jesus died.

Not only does Nazarene Fellowship teaching express "the sincere milk of the word" but we do not allow "the sincere milk of the word" to contradict "the weightier matters of the law, - judgment (justice, accusation), mercy and faith"

For examples: a) Justice in the Atonement wherein Jesus the sinless Son of God is not under condemnation nor required to die for Himself, yet Christadelphians claim Him to have been accused and accursed. b) Mercy towards all repentant souls who do not have to die because of the supposed sinful flesh as taught be a large portion of Christendom, but in mercy, by coming to Christ they escape the condemnation they were under. c) Faith in the word of God that when one is taken and another left then judgment for the faithful has taken place. Faith in the word of God that believes Paul's answer to the question, "How are the dead raised up and with what body do they come" and he answered, "It is raised in incorruption... it is raised a spiritual body... the dead shall be raised incorruptible..." but rubbished by Christadelphian superior intellect.

These examples of the weightier matters of the law are all denied by you yet you say you still believe understandable truth, capable of sound explanation! Alfred, really!

We plead with you, Alfred, to forsake the traditions of the elders and embrace Scripture teachings. Do not be sick at heart over Brother Eric Cave's booklet but embrace the truth it reveals. Let us strive together in prayer as exhorted by the apostle Paul for the love of the Spirit and for the Lord Jesus Christ's sake. Shun profane and vain babblings. The Lord knoweth them that are His. And let every one that nameth the name of the Christ depart from iniquity. (2 Timothy 2)

Your brother in the Lord's service,

Russell Gregory

"There is a Way which Seemeth Right unto a Man"

The literalist cannot go far into the Bible, until he is lost midst such a forest, "that he cannot see the wood for the trees." Such a condition applies to those who, seeking the meaning of the Edenic Story, immediately apply the literal to all its phases, overlooking the solemn fact that, even with this story of the First Man, there was an intentional admixture of terms, by which, if undiscerned, the real message to be learned by later generations would have been lost, and so analogy was introduced immediately in the narrative concerning the thoughts and acts of the Edenic Couple. Analogy itself a term conveying similar or corresponding thought, by reason of bearing a certain resemblance thereto. Thus as we read that the Serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field, so it is that such seeking excuse for evil, hide themselves, or the thought by which they are identified, 'neath the cover of trickery. The resemblance ceases here, the literal immediately disappears, while the meaning is carried onward through the Bible by metonymy, whereby the act in the first place is always to be recalled, so we have in Revelations the statement, "And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the devil, and Satan, and bound him a thousand years, that he should deceive the nations no more."

Here we note the form of language is purely analogical, so with the Eden Story the same chapter in Genesis conveying this manner of the typical, by reading in verse 14, denoting the serpent to be a crawler in dust and living amidst such and being well understood that even a snake cannot subsist on mere dust alone

by eating the same. Then the analogical still maintains its typical character by reason that the woman's seed, would be at war through the ages. So we have here the perpetuity of the serpent indicated as though it were indestructible, whereas it was war between these symbolic conditions of the good seed and bad seed respectively of good and evil conditions on the earth, until this ends in the Kingdom of God.

So fine is the poetic structure upon which God's Holy Word is based, that one word added, or taken therefrom, destroys its original meaning, hence is the reason why so many systems or theories have been set up in the world, which are honestly enough held to be the original Word of God as taken from the Bible. But where it is some dozen or so of means exist whereby finer thought than the literal may be conveyed to men's minds, so it is that men themselves capable, or incapable as the case may be, to being sensitive to the fineness of thought to be conveyed, differ amongst themselves as to what amount of such fineness exists in any figure presented in the Bible, for the education of mankind. If then, the very finest minds midst men educated to the highest standard possible by other men, cannot always agree in these things, it is evident something else is required whereby a correct balance of thought may be obtained to appreciate and, therefore understand the Word of God. Something more than education, something that can be had from God Himself, this was admitted Jesus Himself saying (Luke 10:22), "All things are delivered to me by the Father: no man knoweth who the son is, but the Father; who the Father is, but the Son, and he to whom the son reveal him." Couple this to John 7:17 and we find the reason why it requires more than ordinary education to understand the Scriptures of God saying "if any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself.

Thus it will be realized that it is not intended nor given to all to understand the written Word of God, the reason being contained within the Abrahamic Covenant itself, that only a few who seek deliberately to find God, (this the 'narrow way of the *zoen*'), find truth at all. Evidently then, it is intended that the Bible itself was but meant for the few, who are to rule with Jesus the thousand years. This the meaning why, In the face of God's promise that Abraham's Seed should both surmount the grains of the sea-sands, and the stars for multitude, that the simple sum of 144,000 indicates that few. This then, explains why so few find the real meaning of the Eden Story, that they have a secure foundation upon which to comprehend the rest of the Bible. So with the Serpent Seed, as out of the mind of man and the Woman's Seed likewise cradled in that source, these comprehending these simple truths, become aware by revelation, what constitutes the meaning of the Two Trees of Life (*Zoen*) in Eden also. Serpent thought rooted in the mind, the Tree of *Zoen* of God also so rooted, likewise the Tree of Good and Evil Admixture rooted in the same ground. Thus we have here the only solution whereby peace to Christadelphia can come, in that as it is the present misconception of a great truth, which is at the root of division as has broken up Ecclesiadom, so it is that without a fuller comprehension of the Eden Story, peace shall never come to us while the Lord Jesus is absent from the earth.

And, when He comes again, He shall tell some, so being these meet Him at all, that He had given them the solution through revelation by the Apostle Paul- Paul who has told us the natural state is first of all, then the spiritual state, this itself divided into aspects or compartments in which three conditions, three separate laws operate, beginning in Eden as these were set in motion in the person of Adam the First. That is, that Adam having been created mortal being subject to natural law, was then raised to become a subject to the Law of Spirit of Life as presented to him in the Tree of Life (*Zoe*), but having flouted that Law of Spirit in the Face of God, thus lost his prestige as the first-chosen of the family of God as yet to be, so became the subject of the third Law of Sin and Death. All three conditions expressed in a human body.

As we say here, the Lord Jesus gave this revelation to Paul, who passed it on to the Corinthians as seen in 1 Corinthians, 2nd chapter, therein stating that as man either expresses his own mind through the flesh or that of the Spirit, so it is he comprehends truth to the extent "he can compare spiritual things with spiritual." Nevertheless, this same is a man of flesh, but, although being so, is of those who are included in the prophecy of the Burning Bush (Exodus 3:14), as to become Name-bearers of Deity in flesh. These the membership of the Body of Christ.

This mighty truth, that the *anastasis* of man toward God out of nature began in Eden, but Adam was unable to complete it whereby to attain to immortality. The matter was then suspended for a time while a New Arrangement came into being, this to be through a Promised One, He whom we know as Jesus of Nazareth. Chosen by His character (the character Adam lost for himself in Eden), see Hebrews the first chapter. The revelation of God's purpose for man not fulfilling itself through Adam, it was retained a

mystery from Adam to Moses as we read in Romans 5:14, saying “Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses,” through this same Moses God held out to Israel (Deuteronomy 30:19) saying in these strange words, “I hold out to you this day, life and death,” and here in the Septuagint the word for life is *Zoen*, not the *Psuche* life or natural that they already possessed. Thus Life (the *Zoen* of Eden), was suspended for men in any published application of it, until Moses came preaching the coming One who should reveal how human flesh could give righteousness before God. This, also without change of human nature. Those who, during the interval in which death was permitted to reign, had relationship to God; did so depending solely upon faith in promises made them by God; while as yet these hardly understood how these promises were to be fulfilled. Jesus in Luke 20, tells how this *anastasis* operated for such as lived by faith during the period in which *Zoen* was hidden to the many. As the hidden heaven these were the power for salvation by which when openly revealed in its commission, through the Abrahamic Promises; was offered through Jesus to the entire world.

That is to say until One promised should come, who would reveal how the *zoen* life could operate through flesh human nature and this One a descendant of Adam through the line of Abraham, the same *zoen* life was to be kept hidden except to a few who were responsible for sustaining the Royal Line which was to produce Jesus to be the Christ of God.

In this exposition we present the facts upon which the three Laws of God were based by Him for man, facts a few are aware of in Christadelphia, those few, who, so long now, have preached to one here and there, this wonderful truth by which a broken Christadelphia, even today, might be healed before it is too late.

While the many waste time concerned over pride of place for a dead man’s opinions respecting natural law being presumably the Law of Sin and Death, that fact declared by Paul in contradistinction, that natural death has no sin “in that those without law of Spirit, die without law of Spirit.” (Rom. 2:12). Thus Paul taught the three Laws established by God at the first, through which Adam passed until subject to the Spirit of Law of Sin and Death, he was made equal with the animal in processing toward that which he came from, “dust and ashes.” The difference between Adam and Abraham is, Adam was dead in Sin before entering the grave, ^(See footnote) Abraham was dead to Sin before dying physically, this is held to be “asleep” by God during the waiting period, for the manifestation to the world of the sons of God. (Romans 8:19). Thus we of the “Herald” prove natural law is no obstacle to salvation. Natural Law is not the curse of God, as most Christadelphians believe. Because Jesus threw open the way of *Zoen* (Life) to the entire world of mankind, so, also, he threw open the operation of Law of the Spirit upon all men. This Paul explains in Acts 17:30, while previously stating how those amidst all the nations were feeling after God, they would find Him; and so finding, He would find them as the Master has said to the Samaritan woman at the well. Ourselves remembering, that both the Lord Jesus and Paul speak of such as are capable of searching for God. Thus adulthood is the proven ground for the operations of Spirit Law. A factor very suggestive to Christadelphia especially, thus only adulthood can be dead in sin as responsible to God, so only adulthood can be subject to the Laws of either that of Sin and Death or that of the Spirit of *Zoen* (Life). For we must here state to all that, in the Greek, there is no such condition as “Law of Spirit of the *Psuche* or physical life in Christ Jesus.” The same *zoen*-life Jesus had from the Father as told in John 5:26, is the same *zoen*-life which all baptized into the Name are manifest, during their probation for salvation.

Author unknown

Footnote: This observation seems to us inconsistent with the authors’ previous reasoning. Editor.

“**The Jesus Book**” was compiled and edited by Michael McCauley and published by Thomas More Press in Chicago in 1978. It contains over 500 quotations about Jesus from people down the centuries; believers, agnostics, atheists, heretics and mystics, including Bonhoeffer, Calvin, St Patrick, a pope, Castro, Kruschew, Shelly, Lamb, and so on.

The quotation from David Holland, 1968, was decidedly interesting;-

“Were Jesus suddenly to reappear in the flesh, without fanfare or formality, let us say in a synagogue in Capernaum, it should not seem inconceivable that the Christian

world might find it expedient to reject Jesus - incredible as this prospect might be - were he to rebuke Christianity and its established practices, as he had rebuked the pious Pharisees and Sadducees for their insincere beliefs and practices.”

I agree with Holland. It is delusive to say “The Jews killed Jesus” there are plenty of revered wealthy patriotic Christian leaders who could persuade their followers to lynch Jesus, despite his popularity with the poor commoners, when they heard His denunciation of false doctrine, hypocrisy and exploitation. But the fact is that Jesus will not come incognito, but as King, with legions of angels, to end the evil rule of mankind and to instigate the Kingdom.

Brother John Stevenson.

We now publish the final part of

The Atonement X-Rayed

by A.L. Wilson

REGENERATION

Peter distinctly declares this is not the putting away of supposed filth of flesh but the answer of a good conscience toward God. Paul confirms Peter’s declaration: “There is nothing unclean of itself (Romans 14:14). This is a universal negative proposition which excludes not only man but all creation from your pagan assumption of sinful flesh. These declarations guide us as to how a right relation toward God is attained, that it is not a physical quality, but a legal question as to how man can be reconciled to God and become again God’s people, God’s fundamental law of private ownership.

A Just God cannot steal man back from sin’s captivity. It is not, therefore, the quality of flesh but a legal question of pure just redemption. Ponder, “Nothing unclean of itself” (Romans 14:14, Acts 10:28,11:8), “Every sin man committeth is outside the body” (I Corinthians 6:18). Our right relation to God, then, is reached by our implicit faith that His Son gave His life a ransom in place of (*anti lutro*) man. Then the glorious symbol in baptism, crucifying, dying and burying our Adamic relation and deeds, and rising to new life and relation to God in Christ Jesus.

THE ORDER

BEGOTTEN	1 Peter 1:3, 1 John 5:18, Philemon 10.
BORN	1 John 3:9, 1:13, 3:5, 1 Peter 1:23.
BABES	Psalm 8:2, Isaiah 3:4, Romans 2:20, Matthew 11:25.
MILK	Isaiah 55:1, 1 Corinthians 3:2, 10:3, Hebrews 5:12.
SOLID FOOD	John 4:32, 1 Corinthians 3:2, 10:3, Hebrews 5:14.
SONS	Galatians 3:26, 4:7, 1 John 3:2, Hebrews 5:12.
STATURE	Ephesians 4:11-16. 1 Corinthians 14.20, Hebrews 5:14.

“Behold! I and the children whom God hath given me are for signs and wonders.” “He shall see the travail of his soul and be satisfied.” God’s grain of wheat tasted death to yield this crop of wheat, otherwise He had remained alone (John 12:24). This is God’s wheat field, but the enemy, ever desirous to improve God’s work tried tares among the wheat, the association of a condemned Representative - the uprooting of which is at hand.

Then you say; “The taking away of sin includes allusions to flesh, blood, body, life and death.”

We agree and we shall examine these in their sequence to ascertain whether your assumption can honestly be read into them and see whether it adorns the gospel of Christ.

FLESH

Jesus: “I am the bread of life. The bread that I will give you is my flesh, which I give for the life of the world.”

C.C.Walker: “Dear Lord, you have neglected to qualify your flesh with my adjective “sinful” (Romans 8:3), a perfectly good rendering, and that you require to give your flesh for yourself also.”

Paul: “You hath he quickened in the body of His flesh, through death.”

C.C.Walker: “Excuse me, Paul, you have not given even a cough regarding the Master’s sin nature, on account of which He required His own blood to be shed before He could possible, be cleansed.”

BLOOD

Jesus: “This is my blood of the new covenant, which is shed for many.” “Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink His blood, ye have no life in yourselves.”

C.C.Walker: Dear Lord, excuse me. I cannot understand why you keep concealed up your sleeve the major prop of our Birmingham Basis of Fellowship. You are still as silent as a corpse regarding that kind of blood you received through the veins of Mary (R.R). Dear Lord, you cannot spare one drop of your blood for us to drink - you will require every drop before you can be cleansed from your own sin nature. Moreover, you utterly surprise me by your pressing us to drink your blood, seeing we must go through all that you, our Condemned Representative, go through (Christendom Astray, p 114 and Booklet, p. 32). Besides, dear Lord, why press us to such profane commercial transaction?”

BODY

Jesus: “This is my body which is given for you.” “A body hast thou prepared me,” “sanctified through the offering of Christ once for all.” “He bore our sins in His own body to the tree.”

C.C.Walker: Dear Lord, you utterly surprise me. Do you actually disdain my perfectly good rendering of Romans 8:3? You might have popped it in once, at least, in the many references you give. And you also, Peter, have given the show away and caused me to italicize so that it could be that Jesus bore our literal sins in His body which was sinful (Romans 8:3).

Peter: What authority have you, friend Walker, to tamper with and attempt to improve what I have written? If Jesus bore our sins in His body will you, or any other soul in Birmingham, refute substitution? Then you instantly juggle and construe our sins to mean His own supposed sinful flesh. All this jargon abominates and blasphemes the Divine definition and function of a sin-bearer, one who bears the penalty in place of another, with His stripes we are healed. Could our own stripes have healed us? No more than His own stripes could have healed Himself, if He was under your double curse! If therefore He was bruised for our iniquities, what is the logical deduction - pure and positive ransom in place of (*anti lutron*) man.

Never under heaven did God curse man or beast on account of his or its nature, but He did command that a murderer, or an ox that gored a man, shall be put to death. Your pagan assumption renders Christ blasphemously unfit for the purpose for which the Gracious God brought Him into existence.

LIFE

Jesus: “The Son of man came, not to be served, but to serve and to give his life a ransom in place of (*anti lutron*) many.”

C.C.Walker: “Dear Lord, be careful here, lest you let the cat out of the bag. You know that *anti lutron* means a ransom, instead of, just as redeem means to buy back (Dr. Thomas). You also know that you, our Condemned Representative, are utterly powerless to accomplish this, even for your self. You know that our

only deliverance from our sinful flesh is by perfect obedience and crucifixion, and we must go through all that you, our Condemned Representative, go through.” (Christendom Astray, page 114).

DEATH

Jesus: “The Good Shepherd giveth His life for the sheep.”

C.C.Walker: Yes, the Good Shepherd gave His life for the sheep but I have failed hitherto to convince Him that it was for Himself also. He must have adopted the Clean Flesh Heresy.

The very Scriptures you quote demonstrate how Jesus could and did substitute us in death and triumph over death and sheol. First: He was God’s own Son (Romans 8:3). Second, He fulfilled His Father’s conditions for the Divine nature, beyond the natural (Hebrews 1:9, John 12:24). Before glorification, therefore, He stood in a position whereby He could deliver up the life of His flesh in the blood thereof (Leviticus 17:11) a ransom for man, which Adam by sin forfeited (*zemeothe*). Jesus handed over His life in exchange (*en antallagma*) (Matthew 16:26).

This Jesus accomplished on the Divine Federal Principle. The second Adam stood in the place of the first. This Divine truth is reiterated seven times in Romans 5 alone – see also 1 Corinthians 15 and John 12:24, and Ephesians 1:4 etc. Your assumption of a condemned Representative requiring to square up his own debt, shatters all hope and plunges one into the blackness of oblivion!

Truly thou wast slain and hast redeemed (*egorasas*), bought us back to God by thy blood.

In Him was life unclaimed by Law. Jesus confirms, “As the Father hath life in Himself, so also hath He given to the Son to have life in Himself.” Now contrast the following; “Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, ye have not life in yourselves.” Again, “I am the light of the world, and the life was the light of man.” Your assumption of this one under condemnation blows the candle out.

Now, they sang a new song in presence of the Throne - and note particularly that no soul could learn that song except those who were redeemed (*egorasmenei*) - bought back. Still you pronounce this a profane commercial transaction! The apostle continues, “they were redeemed (*egorasthesan*).” I challenge Birmingham to refute Divine commercial transaction here. The very elements of these Greeks spell, “Bought out of the market” (*agora*).

CONFUSION OF TONGUES

“And the Lord came down to see the city and the tower which the children of men builded... and the Lord said, Go to, let us go down and confound their language, that they may not understand one another’s speech.”

History repeats itself. With our Christadelphian friends it is ever a case of “I say,” “Thou sayest,” “He sayeth” - all of them as the theory demands can paint Jesus as pure as the driven snow. In their next paragraph all of them can paint Him as black as the Earl of Pandemonium. We have found Him of whom Moses, the prophets, and the apostles did write; the Alpha, Middle Wall, and Omega of His Father’s own purpose - not white today and black tomorrow - but One who was the same yesterday, is today and will be forever.

Just listen to the late J.J.Andrew’s, “I Say!”

“A change must, therefore have taken place in Adam’s physical constitution as the result of this decree... How the change was effected is not revealed, nor is it necessary to know.”

I ask, must we therefore swallow wholesale this unrevealed assumption without even a pinch of salt? No one ever countered more completely the above stupid unrevealed assumption as was done by the late Robert Roberts:

“He Sayeth:” “Our friend (David Handley) imagines there was a change in the nature of Adam when he became disobedient. There is no proof of this whatever, the presumption and evidence are entirely the opposite direction. There was a change in Adam’s relation to his Maker, but not in the nature of his physical organisation.”

I pronounce this declaration of Divine Truth in the first rank in latter day Theology, which deserves to be framed in Gold.

Let us now hear friend Strickler;

“He Sayeth:” “That Jesus, having the common sinful nature with those for whom He died...etc.”

Again “He Sayeth:” “Christ’s offering was, therefore, for Himself as well as for the people, not for His sins. Christ, as we are, was in need of eternal redemption, and from the mortal flesh and blood condition... and from the possession and dominion of sin.”

I ask did not Jesus belong to God? If so, He could not at the same time be under the dominion and in the possession of sin - also, this would make God and sin joint proprietors of Jesus. No soul can belong to God and to the devil at one and the same time.

Jesus blankly denounces that notion. You cannot serve two Masters. Will you please furnish me with a greater confusion of tongues in any other denomination under the sun? Jesus says, “Come unto me, all ye that labour, and I will give you rest, my yoke is easy...” etc.

Christadelphian: “Dear Lord, You are as heavy laden as we, and require a rest more so than we. If you bear our literal sins in your own body which is already obnoxious to the curse, such a load will land you in Sheol.”

It is imperative we commence with the first principles of the faith, even milk, not butcher meat (Romans 8.3), until our faculties become habitually exercised for the discrimination and separation of God’s Son from the sons of sin, otherwise you involve the Son of God. Your absurd fatal adjective of sinful flesh is no where to be found in God’s book. As well say, “John Black, the butcher, his beef must necessarily be black also.” Again when believers are made the righteousness of God in him, you are wide, wide awake not to conclude in righteous flesh. Why then, like a pagan bungle and deface Romans 8.3 to conjure up sinful flesh to establish your pet assumption of Christ’s “very nature being obnoxious to the curse”?

You handle that text in the trickery of men by cunning craftiness, in systematic deception. There is but one plea left you, viz., ignorance. This calls forth pity and even in that case you should have left it alone. “Where there is no law, there is no transgression,” says the apostle. This rules sin out of court. If Christ was born in debt, requiring His blood poured out before He could obtain release from His supposed sinful flesh, why was He sent at all? When the completion of the time arrived “God sent forth His own Son.” To an unsophisticated soul that fact alone settles the question but you ever confound the quality of flesh with ownership. Why did God send forth His own Son? Hear the apostle’s adverbial of purpose: “That He might redeem (buy off - *ese agorase*) those under Law.”

The apostle has another adverbial of purpose, viz., that those bought off ones might receive something, viz., the sonship. But you denounce this “a profane commercial transaction.” I cannot help that, but there it stands in the pure irrefutable Greek thought: *ex* - out of, *agora* - market place. Will you or any other sole refute this? God accomplished what the Law could not do, since it was the “ministration of death,” and was added “that the offence might abound.” By no means the crude absurdity that “no mere man was able to keep the Law” - a scandal on a Just God. How then did God condemn sin and liberate man? By the sacrifice of His own Son in flesh - it was Jesus in flesh, not sin in flesh that was sacrificed. Peter clenches this point beyond refutation; “He was put to death in flesh (*sarki*), but was made alive in spirit (*pneumati*) (1 Peter 3:18). God, by the sacrifice of the life blood of His own Son paid the price “Lord Sin” demanded from Adam - otherwise we had never drawn the breath of life. This was the true light which

lighteth every man coming into the world. Your pagan assumption of Christ in debt on account of His flesh would blow the candle out;

There are two possessors mentioned in Romans 8:3, viz., God and the Devil. The Government of each is irrevocable. Adam sold himself to King Sin whose wages is execution (Matthew 16:26, Romans 6:23).

Now, God loved Adam, His dear destitute boy. Could this love of itself reinstate Adam in his Father's home? If so, then you blot heaven by the sacrifice of Dear Jesus on Calvary. On the other hand, if the Government of king Sin could prove your charge of the double curse, Edenic and Mosaic, against Jesus, do you imagine you improve matters? Contemptible Theology! This would reap oblivion.

Now, there was a certain rich man who had a steward (editor) who was accused to him of wasting his goods (Romans 8:3) and having called him, said to him, What is this I hear of thee? Render an account of thine editorship, for thou cannot be an editor any longer, And the editor said within himself, What shall I do, for the Master taketh the editorship from me? I cannot dig, and I am ashamed to beg. I know what I will do, that when I am deprived of the editorship that they may receive me into their homes. So the editor curtailed the debt of each, and the Master applauded the unjust editor for his perfectly good rendering of Romans 8:3 and for his skill in commercial transaction.

You conclude your pamphlet with the most appropriate question you ever asked in your life, viz.;

MEN AND BRETHREN, WHAT SHALL WE DO?

I reply, confound not the legal with the physical and thou shalt behold the Lamb of God, instead of a Condemned Representative. This will relieve you of conjuring up words and phrases to the tune of sinful flesh. Imaging Jesus a Constitutional Sinner. But this appellation was found too glaring when it had to give place to your theoretical distinction between Christ's physical constitution and His moral relation to His Father, thus dividing Christ into two sections, or apparent personalities. This enables you to sit astride the fence and advocate either side your assumption demands. The very God of heaven forbids you and your brethren to split up His Holy One after such a fashion! This acrobatic leap from the concrete physical constitution to the abstract moral relation eclipses the Old Lady's Immaculate Conception. It paralyses the law of contradiction and exhibits the most contemptible logic under heaven. Divine truth, like the water of life, winds its silver streak between these bleak mountains of delusion and death.

God's message is as silent as the grave regarding an abstract Christ. Did Jesus sacrifice His moral relation for us? This had nullified His power over the grave. Well, then, if you curse His physical constitution, will it improve your case? Would not a cursed sacrifice pollute the table of the Lord? (Malachi 1:12-14, Hebrews 10:12-14, 26-29). Did Jesus actually say, "This is my cursed body which is given for myself"? Are you not ashamed of your pamphlet?

Your association of a condemned representative, together with your theoretical distinction, enables you to conjure up two Christs, like the Siamese twins, one of whom you paint black, the other white; then as your assumption demands, you pluck your twins asunder and pop in Darkie into the nominative case of some of the most contemptible orations under heaven, like that of Herod who was afterwards eaten of worms.

Your theoretical distinction can scatter the rules, moods and figures of syllogism to the four winds of heaven and inflate our vocabulary to explosion!

CONCLUSION

Dear friend Walker, cannot you perceive what you and your brethren should do? With the apostle, I reply, "Arise, and be baptized and wash away thy sins," instead of forcing into the mouth of Peter that "He bare our literal sins in His body to the tree" and instantly construe our sins to mean His own supposed sinful flesh - a pitiable exposition of the function of a sin-bearer. Read Isaiah 53, "He was bruised for our iniquities, the chastisement of our peace was upon Him and with His stripes we are healed." Could we have been healed by our own stripes? Does not the prophet gloriously fill in Peter's ellipses? Just imagine the

Priest, on the Day of Atonement ‘pumping’ the sins of the people into the victim! Cannot you perceive that by your denunciation of the God-provided ransom the God of heaven pronounces the case against you and your brethren? You denounce ransom “a profane commercial transaction,” to uphold a pagan delusion of sinful flesh which would, if true, undoubtedly have involved Jesus since there is but one kind of flesh of men.

You also restrict the purpose served by the Divine begetting of Jesus to the arming Jesus with superhuman power to conquer this supposed demon in His flesh, and skilled yourselves to dodge his ‘Black Majesty’ by your pretence of going through ail that Christ went through. (“Christendom Astray,” page 314).

God declares “Ye have profaned it, in that ye say, The table of the Lord is polluted, and His fruit thereof, even His meat thereof is contemptible.” Could anything more contemptible than sinful flesh be placed on the table of the Lord! “And ye have snuffed at it, saith the Lord of hosts. And ye brought the torn, the lame, and the sick. Thus ye and your brethren brought an offering. Shall I accept this at your hand? saith the Lord. Cursed be the deceiver who hath in his flock a male and voweth, and sacrificeth unto the Lord a corrupt thing (obnoxious to the curse - “Christendom Astray,” page 113). For I am a great King, saith the Lord of hosts and my name is dreadful among the heathen.”

Cannot you and your brethren now perceive what the Lord requires at your hands in this Divine denunciation of sinful flesh sacrifices offered unto Him? Hear the conclusion of the Lord’s reproof of you and your brethren: instead of permitting the continuance of your sin-claimed Representative whose very nature you declare was obnoxious to the curse, He purposes to sweep from off the face of the earth your fatal delusion when, from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same, “my name shall be great among the Gentiles and in every place shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering.”

Could the gracious God have used language more explicit? Do you and your brethren approach God through this pure offering, this ransom in place of (*anti lutron*) man, the Gift of God alone? If this one were holy, harmless, undefiled and separate from sinners, do you justify yourselves by your crafty “theoretical distinction” in splitting up the Beloved of God to extract His moral relation and damn His physical constitution? Can you and your brethren, in spite of this Divine rebuke, satisfy yourselves that such is the pure offering which the Most High purposes to establish throughout the earth in the very near future?

We have analysed the assumption of Adam’s constitution being death proof and the evidence, as Dr. Thomas declared, points the opposite way. Let the qualified objector examine the statement *esti soma psuchikon*, Again, *ek ges choikos* (1 Corinthians 15:44-47). The baptized believer is therefore in the same relation to God legally, morally and physically as Adam was prior to rebellion. “If the Son shall make you free (*eleutheroras*) then shall you be free indeed.”

It is wholly a question of Law, ownership, relation and character, while the physical constitution remains the same. Every creation of God is good (1 Timothy 4:4). Nothing is unclean of itself (Romans 14:14). Even where there is no Law, there is no transgression, no sin. This annihilates the sinful flesh assumption and clears Jesus at the Bar. Again, “If I had not done the works amongst them which no other man did, they had not had sin.”

The Master challenged His enemies, “Which of you convicteth me of sin?”

C.C.Walker: Dear Lord, we are not aware that you ever sinned, but you are sinful flesh, rendering your very nature obnoxious to the curse.

The apostle exhorts us to look to the Leader and Perfecter of the faith, Jesus, who, instead of (*anti*) choosing the joy set before Him (see John 12:24), He first endured the Cross, despising the shame and has sat down at the right hand of God. The joy set before Him was not His own glorification, though the hour had come that He should be glorified - the joy set before Him was the “bringing of many sons to glory.” Instead of selfishly accepting His glorification and remaining alone, He chose rather to go through the jaws of execution, pay the ransom that the other Lord (as Dr. Thomas declared) demanded for man.

Dear friend Walker, I ask you in deepest sympathy, whether a Representative under the same condemnation could possibly have had any choice in the above case? The crucifixion of the Beloved of God is the greatest tragedy that ever transpired on earth, if this was to wipe off His own debt, then you blot the very Throne of God.

Jesus says: "The hour is come that the Son of man should be glorified." Indeed, I assure thee, except a grain of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone, but if it die it bringeth forth much fruit.

Does the soul breathe who could improve or render more explicit that other statement of His, "The Son of man came, not to be served but to serve and give His life a ransom in place of (*anti lutron*) many" (Matthew 20:28, Mark 10:45, 1 Timothy 2:6. John 12:24).

If redemption means to buy back (see Dr. Thomas's definition) and *anti lutron* means a ransom in place of, then a Representative as much under the curse as those He came to save must be a black fraud and I am positive that no soul of yours would permit me to buy back from you by handing you back your own coin!

I repeat, the joy set before Christ was not His own glorification but His bringing many sons to glory. He knew His own glorification was in safe hands, viz., "Thou wilt not leave my soul in sheol, neither wilt thou suffer thy holy one to see corruption."

"It is more blessed to give than to receive."

"Today, if you will hear His voice, harden not your hearts."

Your sincere friends. Andrew and Lena Wilson.

* * * * *

This article which we have been publishing over the last four C.L.'s is copied from the original which was distributed by Andrew and Lena Wilson in the 1930's.

A Pearl of Great Price

"*Yom*" is "day," "*B'Yom*" is "in the day." "*Muth Temuth*" is "surely die." The same words were used in the warning to Simeon (Kings) and Simeon died in the literal day. It may be asked, then why did Adam not die on the literal day? I reply, Adam deserved to die but, if God meted out the violent death there and then, we would not have had existence. God started at mercy; it was not a matter of God going back on His word. It has been used as an argument that if God meant that Adam should die in the literal day that he transgressed and did not carry out the penalty, then God went back on His word. Nonsense; it is not strange in Scripture for God to go back on His word if that going back is in mercy. What of Ninevah? Don't be misled by such an argument. God started at mercy in sparing Adam and us as being in Adam. The Great Woodman spared the tree, therefore the little buds.

From "Heresy or Truth, Which?" by E.Parker.