

The Nazarene Fellowship Circular Letter No. 203

September/October 2003

In this Issue:

Page 1 Editorial	Sister Helen Brady
Page 2 Letter from	Brother Douglas McKinlay
Page 3 The Sure Word of Prophecy	Brother Eric Cave
Page 6 Letter to a Christadelphian friend	Brother John Stevenson
Page 7 Letter from the editor of "Shofar" magazine	Brother Richard Pursell
Page 9 Reply to above	Brother Russell Gregory
Page 12 Understanding The Scriptures	Brother Phil Parry
Page 14 Letter to Brother Richard Brown	Brother Eric Cave
Page 26 "Render unto the Pope..." extract from The Spectator.	Adrian Hilton

Editorial

Dear Brothers and Sisters and Friends, Loving Greetings,

Jonathan, the son of Saul and Ahinoam, is one of the most open hearted and likeable human beings in the Bible. It was his misfortune to be caught in the feud between the two men closest to him: his father King Saul and his friend and brother-in-law David.

Jonathan was a daring and successful young officer in Saul's army, and skilled at archery, for which the men of the tribe of Benjamin were noted. He first distinguished himself early in Saul's reign in the attack on the Philistine garrison at Geva, north of Jerusalem. Two thousand Israelites under the king's command cut the garrison off from the rear, while Jonathan led a thousand men in a frontal assault that wiped it out.

The Philistines reacted swiftly. They sent a strong army of chariots, horsemen and foot soldiers back into the hills and occupied Michmash, another nearby town. The Israelites fled and Saul was left in a desperate situation with only a remnant of six hundred men. But Jonathan saved the situation. Taking only his young armour-bearer with him, he climbed up above the rocky pass, and surprised and killed a platoon of Philistine soldiers moving through it. Exaggerated accounts of this sudden attack spread through the Philistine army and threw it into a panic. The Israelites attacked and were able to rout the enemy. This unexpected victory at Michmash was the turning point in Saul's military campaigns-

When the young David was brought before Saul after he had slain Goliath, Jonathan impulsively stripped off his own armour and gave it to David together with his sword and bow, for "the soul of Jonathan was knit to the soul of David and Jonathan loved him..."

As we know later Saul came to hate David and tried to kill him and when David fled from the court and Jonathan pleaded with his father for David, Saul hurled his spear at his son. When the friends met again in a lonely field through a pre-arranged signal, Jonathan sadly agreed that David was forced to go into hiding, but they swore eternal loyalty and took a moving and tearful farewell of each other.

When the Israelite army was defeated by the Philistines on Mount Gilboa, Jonathan was slain together with his father Saul and his two younger brothers. Their bodies were mutilated and hung on the wall of the nearby city of Bethshean. The men of Jabesh-gilead, across the Jordan river, stole up at night, took down the bodies and buried them under a tamarisk tree in their own town.

David, still in exile, poured out his anguish into the immortal lament for his beloved friend;

Your glory, O Israel, lies slain on your heights. How the mighty have fallen... Saul and Jonathan - In life they were loved and gracious, and in death they were not parted - They were swifter than eagles, they were stronger than lions. How the mighty have fallen in battle! Jonathan lies slain on your heights. I grieve for you, Jonathan my brother you were very dear to me. Your love was wonderful, more wonderful than that of women. How the mighty have fallen! The weapons of war have perished!

True friendship is one of the splendours of human experience. We are told in Proverbs that “there is a friend that sticketh closer than a brother” and “a friend loveth at all times.” But as with all human relationships the moment comes when they end and those left behind are bereft and deprived. David’s lament for Jonathan is a perfect example of someone in deep grief, grief even for Saul who had been such a difficult and unpredictable presence in David’s life and a thorn in his side.

“Be perfect, be of good comfort, be of one mind, live in peace; and the God of peace shall be with you.”

Love to all Helen Brady

In our last Circular Letter Sister Helen Brady asked the question, “If anyone can enlighten me further - i.e., on the matter of Jephthah’s vow - see Editorial, page 2 - I should be very pleased to hear.” We were glad to receive the following response from Brother Douglas McKinlay writes:-

Dear Sister Brady, In response to your request, I will tell you that which I believe to be the answer to the problem of Jephthah’s vow.

I find it hard to accept that Jephthah would or could imagine that God would accept such a sacrifice. Jeremiah 7:31. “And there they have built the high places of Tophet... to burn their sons and their daughters in the fire; which I commanded not, neither came it into my mind,” also Deuteronomy 18:10 - “There shall not be found among you any one that maketh his son or his daughter to pass through the fire...” I suppose that it could be argued that the objection was that the sacrifice was to Molech. However, I think that Jeremiah 44:3 & 4 indicates that God regarded all such sacrifices as an abomination. Certainly as far as I am aware there is no indication that God would permit or accept such a sacrifice.

Judges 11:31 - The vow was that - “Shall surely be the Lord’s...” - I understand that to mean devoted to God, as 1 Samuel 1:3.

“I will offer it up as a burnt offering.” In the margin of my Bible there is an alternative for “and,” it is “or,” so that it then reads, “It shall surely be the Lord’s, or I will offer it up for a burnt offering. This alternative is in line with the different procedure for animals and humans, as Exodus 13:13.

Verse 39 suggests that after a period of bewailing her virginity she returned to her father’s house and remained unmarried.

Verse 40, has the daughters of Israel went yearly (margin - “from year to year,” as 1 Samuel 3) to lament (margin - “to talk with”). Strong’s Concordance - to ascribe praise, attribute honour, celebrate.

My suggestion is that Jephthah adopted the option that was open to him and devoted his daughter to the Lord, which meant that with her consent she remained in her father’s house as unmarried. That the daughters of Israel made a yearly pilgrimage to celebrate her devotion and ascribe praise and honour to the decision that she had made.

With love in the Lord Jesus, Douglas McKinlay.

P.S. The same word “lament” is translated as “rehearse” in Judges 5 verse 11 - “There shall they rehearse the righteous acts of the Lord...”

We wish to thank Brother McKinlay for his thoughtful answer, one which we feel is right and fitting to all circumstances. - Russell.

THE SURE WORD OF PROPHECY

“We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts.”

Lance Lambert is a Jew, a Messianic Jew, converted to Christianity in his teens over 50 years ago, his Pentecostal and Charismatic beliefs will not endear him to most of the readers of this magazine, but his views on Bible prophecy are I believe worthy of our attention. Although of British Jewish descent he has lived in Jerusalem for many years and is familiar with the political scene in the Middle East and the leaders of both Jew and Arab. In the words of the organisers of a recent conference he is an international speaker and lecturer, Bible scholar and author with a worldwide ministry of teaching and writing. I am indebted to brethren Stanley Jelfs and Geoff Hampton for the tapes of some of his recent lectures on the present prelude to the return of Messiah for which we too, grafted into that good Israel olive tree, make our daily prayers.

Daniel is an example of our attitude to prophecy. In the first year of Darius he realised from the writings of Jeremiah that the 70 years of Babylonian captivity were ending. He therefore set, himself to seek “by prayer and supplications, with fasting, and sackcloth, and ashes” (Daniel 9:3) to intercede and pray into fulfilment the words of Jeremiah. We know that Daniel continued to prophesy in the third year of Cyrus (Daniel 10:1) and it was in the first year of that king of Persia that the decree went forth for the Jews to rebuild the Temple at Jerusalem (Ezra 1:1) so it would seem that Daniel’s prayers and supplications continued for at least five years before he actually witnessed their fulfilment although he was encouraged by further revelations during that period.

We scarcely need to emphasise that when prophets refer to the “heavens and the earth” they invariably use this expression as a metaphor for “rulers and ordinary peoples” as a glance at Deuteronomy 30:30 and 31:1 will confirm where “Moses spake in the ears of all the congregation of Israel the words of this song, until they were ended. Give ear, O ye heavens, and I will speak, and hear, O earth, the words of my mouth,” and we have also Isaiah 51:16 where YHWH said to the prophet “I have put my words in thy mouth, and I have covered thee with the shadow of my hand, that I may plant the heavens and lay the foundations of the earth and say unto Zion, Thou art my people.” Equally we need to be aware that when scripture records prophecies as “in the last days” or “at the end of” what has been recorded, then we need to ensure that the words may refer to the end of an ‘age’ or of a particular historical ‘fact,’ or even have a ‘dual application,’ something which all prophetic expositors are inclined to disregard in pursuit of a particular forecast they are interested in. Lance Lambert then points out at the beginning of his address -

THE SHAKINGS

Isaiah the greatest of the prophets testifies that “In the last days it shall come to pass that the mountain of YHWH’s house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it,” (Isaiah 2:2). A time also declares Isaiah when for their transgressions men shall “enter into the rock, and hide in the dust, for fear of YHWH and for the glory of his majesty, when the lofty looks of man shall be humbled, and the haughtiness of men shall be bowed down, and YHWH alone be exalted in that day” (Isaiah 2:10,11). A time when “they shall go into the holes of the rocks, and into the caves of the earth for fear of YHWH, and for the glory of his majesty, when he shall arise to **shake** terribly the earth” (v.19), the “clefts of the rocks and into the tops of the ragged rocks - when he ariseth to **shake** terribly the earth” (v.21). And again in chapter 11 v. 15 Isaiah testifies that “Yahweh shall utterly destroy the tongue of the Egyptian sea and with his mighty wind **shake** his hand over the river and smite it in the seven streams and make men go over dry shod and there shall be an highway for the rest of His people which shall be left from Assyria; like as it was to Israel in the day that he came up out of the land of Israel.” And again in Isaiah 13:13, “I will shake the heavens, and the earth shall remove out of her place, in the wrath of the YHWH of hosts, and in the day of his fierce anger.”

Ezekiel also in chapter 38 verse 38 asserts that “When Gog shall come against the land of Israel my (i.e. YHWH’s) fury shall come up in my face, for in my jealousy and in the fire of my wrath have I spoken, surely in that day there shall be a great **shaking** in the land of Israel” and in verse 20, “All the men that are on the face of the earth shall **shake** at my presence.”

Joel in chapter 3 verse 1 testifies that “when God brings again the captivity of Judah and Jerusalem he will gather all nations and bring them down into the valley of Jehoshaphat and will plead with them there for my people and for my heritage Israel, whom they have scattered among the nations and parted my land” and in verse 16 of that chapter declares that YHWH will roar out of Zion, and utter his voice from Jerusalem; and the heavens and the earth shall **shake**; but YHWH will be the hope of his people, and the strength of the children of Israel.”

Haggai adds his testimony in prophecies, which were only partly fulfilled when the exiles returned and rebuilt the Temple. Chapter 2 verse 6, “Yet once, it is a little while, and I will **shake** the heavens and the earth, and the sea, and the dry land; and I will **shake** all nations, and the desire of all nations shall come: and I will fill this house with glory, saith YHWH of hosts.” and again in chapter 3 verse 6, “the word of YHWH came unto Haggai in the 24th day of the month saying, Speak to Zerubbabel, saying, I will **shake** the heavens and the earth and I will overthrow the throne of kingdoms, and I will destroy the strength of the kingdoms of the heathen; and I will overthrow the chariots, and those that ride in them: and the horses and their riders shall come down, every one by the sword of his brother.”

The psalmist gives comfort for the elect in those days, especially Psalm 46. “Behold the works of YHWH, what desolations he hath made in the earth. He maketh wars to cease unto the end of the earth; he breaketh the bow and cutteth the spear in sunder: he burneth the chariot in the fire. YHWH of hosts is with us; the God of Jacob is our refuge.” And in the New Testament the writer to the Hebrews writing in chapter 12 verse 23 to “the general assembly and the church of the firstborn, which are written in heaven” declares in verse 26 “Whose voice then **shook** the earth: but now hath he promised, saying. Yet once more I **shake** not the earth only, but also heaven. And this word, Yet once more, signifieth the removing of those things that are **shaken**, as of things that are made, that those things which cannot be **shaken** may remain. Wherefore we receiving a kingdom which cannot be moved, let us have grace, whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence and godly fear: for our God is a consuming fire.”

These are some of the prophecies to which Lance Lambert draws attention in his preaching and his belief that the first of the **shakings** was fulfilled in the first World War of 1914-1918, a war which no one expected or anticipated, the Kaiser was cruising the Norwegian fiords on holiday when war was declared, everyone expected that the worlds statesmen would settle the differences in a few weeks but the eventual outcome resulted in 22 million deaths, the disappearance of the mighty Austro-Hungarian empire, the even mightier Ottoman empire, the German Reich and Kaisers own dynasty with all its overseas possessions, the Russian empire of the Tsars, and the disappearance of the Chinese dynasty. These were all **shaken** out of existence; it also resulted in the appearance of the two great evils of our modern world, Marxism and the accompanying Humanism. For the first time in over a thousand years Jerusalem was freed from Islamic possession, and from the divine point of view the Balfour declaration began the long promised return of the Jews to their homeland, more important to YHWH than all the overturnings of the kingdoms of men-

The second great **shaking**, claims Lance Lambert, was the six years of the second World War of 1939-1945 ending with Hiroshima, which led to the perishing of 55 million men and women. The disappearance of the British Empire (the so-called Commonwealth is but a pale reflection of former glory when over one quarter of the world maps were coloured red), the disappearance of the Spanish, Dutch, Belgium and French empires and overseas possessions, all were shaken out of existence. The rise of Marxist Socialism and the accompanying Humanism has led to the virtual disappearance of what we may term the moral conscience, particularly in Europe and to a lesser extent in America; corruption in every aspect of society and the love of money is now the norm. The world’s dependence on Middle East oil has led to the rebirth of slumbering Islam and irreconcilable differences between Islam, Judaism, and Christendom. But from the divine point of view the declaration of independence by Israel in 1948 is a fulfilment of prophecy more important than the entire world wide chaos of wars between nations, which are

simply a “drop in a bucket’ compared to that fulfilment of the Word of God signified by the establishment of the State of Israel in the exact part of the worlds territory to which YHWH has appointed it.

Lance Lambert preaches that although “the earth is the Lord’s and the fullness thereof” yet the tiny little territory of Israel is in a very special way, ‘His’ land. There are nineteen places in the Bible where God claims Palestine to be His special land, and any people or nation that presumes to partition that land will disappear as Joel prophesied. For over three thousand years this has been the case. Edom, Ammon, Moab, Philistia, Assyria, Babylon, Rome, Saracens, Ottomans have all disappeared into the oblivion of history, and warns that if Bush and Blair persist in their “road map for peace” then they have sealed the destiny of their peoples who will likewise disappear and urges all Christians to pray for Bush and Blair to have a change of heart. It is his conviction that the Iraq war was the beginning of the final **shaking** of YHWH which will result in the total destruction of all human power and powers by the Messiah and the establishment of His Kingdom, but does not seem to realise that the “all nations” of Joel 3 must include Britain and America. He asserts that when in scripture we see the words “Esau” or “Edom,” then we should read “Islam” presumably on the basis of Romans 9:13 and Malachi 1:2-4. “Jacob have I loved and Esau have I hated.”

It was in 1945 that this writer first realised the nature of Islam. The facts of the holocaust had just been revealed to a horrified world amidst almost universal condemnation of Nazi Germany. Yet in every Arab village in the Middle East there was rejoicing, dancing and street parties glorifying Hitler as a true servant of Allah – six million Jews had been murdered and few infidel Christians and Gypsies. Allah be praised’

The Arabic translation of the Bible renders “God” as “Allah” thus supporting a false ecumenism amongst thoughtless intellectuals of this world, but there is a world of difference between YIFWII and Allah the false prophet of scripture. Romans 12:18 testifies “If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men. Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath: for it is written, Vengeance is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord,” and Hebrews 10:30 declares, “For we know him that hath said vengeance belongeth unto me, I will recompense, saith the Lord, and again, The Lord shall judge his people.” In Deuteronomy 32:35, that chapter which lays down the fundamentals of all prophecy, Moses claims of YHWH, “To me belongeth vengeance, and recompense, their foot shall slide in due time: for the day of their calamity is at hand, and the things that shall come upon them make haste,” and again in verse 41, “If I lift up my glittering sword, and my hand take hold on judgments; I will render vengeance to mine enemies, and will reward them that hate me.”

“Vengeance belongeth unto YEIWII, the disciple is exhorted to “turn the other cheek and do good unto all men. Not so those who worship Allah. For the benefit of those who do not have the Circular Letter No-192 of Nov/Dec 2001 we quote from “Basic Tenets of Islam” on page 11:-

Basic Tenets of Islam

Territory. The spreading of Islam is by territorial conquest. Once Islam has controlled a territory or area it is regarded as always Islamic. If the territory should be subsequently lost to non-muslims then the nature of Allah has been diminished and the territory must. be retaken

In relations between nations. Muslim nation to Muslim, there is the concept of “The House of Peace.”

In respect of Muslim nation to non-Muslim nation there is the concept of “The House of War.” No nation can get out of the “House of War” except by becoming a Muslim nation: i.e. by having a Muslim leader.

Peace True peace cannot exist between Muslim and non-Muslim nations. The concept of Jihad (Holy War) is always in force to spread Islam through territorial conquest- Territory lost to Islam (as Israel and Lebanon) must be reclaimed. In Islam vengeance does not belong to Allah, but to the Muslim community which must avenge Allah. Therefore there is no possibility of peace with non-Muslims in the Western understanding of peace as co-existence between societies or as pluralism within society.

Israel Islam can never accept the right of Israel to exist in Palestine. First and foremost Israel is ruled by Jews, making it a Jewish state, not a Muslim one. That places Israel in “The House of War.” Secondly Israel became a state in the post Ottoman period which was Islamic. Muslims conquered the area in AD 638. Therefore Allah was diminished when his (?) territory was taken over by non-muslims and it must be reclaimed for Allah by the Muslim community. It is immaterial that the land was given to the Jews by covenant with YHWH BC 2000 as recorded in Genesis and that the Jews have prior historical and religious claims to it, all such arguments are rejected as lies by a religion which asserts that the Bible has been corrupted to hide the predictions of the coming of Muhammad. The truth for a Muslim is that God (Allah) first gave the revelation of Truth to the Jew who perverted it, then to the Christians who also perverted it, so He gave it to Muhammad the last of the prophets who superseded all others. To a Muslim, Christians and Jews are inferior to Muslims and are therefore second class citizens (dhimmis) in an Islamic state and must submit to Islamic Law.

The Qura'n The qura'n is the constitution of a Muslim nation; Government and theology are the same. There can be no democracy as the west understands it, nor any separation of church and state. Governments are therefore dictatorial and theocratic as expressed by the leader, the servant of Muhammad. Iraq is called a ‘democratic republic’ but is total despotism. Saddam Hussein gained power by personally shooting his predecessor in the head. He rules by the bullet and not the ballot, and because everything that happens is the predestined will of Allah (which leads to fatalism) submission is demanded (in fact Islam means submission) surrendering all to Allah. Muslim clergy cannot talk or write about their faith to non-muslims, nor question the teaching of Muhammad.

The foregoing was circulated as part of a monthly newsletter sent by Brother Leslie and Sister Edith Johnson during their residence in Jerusalem in 1990 to sundry Christadelphian brethren and sisters mainly in the North of England and can help us to understand the reason for the present world situation and the hand of God in drawing all nations to Jerusalem for their destruction: “It is not in man that walketh to direct his steps” (Jeremiah 10:23) and Jeremiah continues, “O YHWH, correct me, but with judgment; not in thine anger, lest thou bring me to nothing. Pour out thy fury upon the heathen that know thee not, and upon the families that call not on thy name: for they have eaten up Jacob, and devoured him, and consumed him, and have made his habitation desolate.” We are witnessing a repeat of the time of Jeremiah in the rise of Anti-Semitism throughout the world and the pressures on Israel to divide their land in these last days of the gentiles. We hear nothing, even in Bible believers such as Lance Lambert of the gentile prophecy of Revelation in these times yet it ties in beautifully with what the prophet’s have said, but more of that if the Lord permit later. The apostle Paul said that “He was debtor both to the Greeks and to the Barbarians; both to the wise and to the unwise,” and we too can learn from even charismatic and secular sources the importance of the signs of the times as we pray for the peace of Jerusalem and the coming of the Master.

Eric Cave

A few months ago I received a copy of a letter which Brother John Stevenson sent to a Christadelphian friend after receiving a taped lecture by Michael Ashton. This is what he had to say:

“I have listened to Michael Ashton’s lecture on the tape... Michael stresses that the Atonement was God’s work. I am sorry he put so much stress on that; it is self-evident that the Atonement was God’s work, but it needs to be acknowledged that innocent Jesus needed enormous dedication and strength of will to make that last journey to Jerusalem knowing that He would be publicly executed like a criminal, but He went for the love of His Father and for us sinners. I was sorry that Michael did not acknowledge that.

He then says that Adam and Eve were created very good. There is no dispute about that, the Bible clearly teaches it. But then Michael says that sin, or disobedience, changed that. There was a difference afterward; they were mortal, and also they were prone to sin; temptation became their lot. I think you are aware that we of the Nazarene Fellowship emphatically reject that, and we would want to know where Scripture teaches that. After their disobedience they were physically absolutely no different whatsoever, but their relationship to God was changed. We also have studied the important difference in the biblical uses of the words “mortal” (which means under condemnation) and “corruptible” (which means perishable). By careless usage, first by the R.C. church, and then by the modern world in general, mortal

now means corruptible, i.e. destined to die of old age, but that is not the meaning of the biblical use of that word.

Michael then discusses the difference between mortality and sin. He says mortality is what takes us to the grave; sin is what keeps us there. He says sin equals transgressions. (There is a fine line of difference; sin is a negative word, trespasses is positive, but I will not pursue that now). Then he says mortality is physical. That is where he is mistaken, being muddled with corruptible. He has to maintain this in order to “prove” that Jesus needed to die for His own salvation from His mortal nature which was prone to sin, even though He had never sinned.

“God was just in condemning sinless Jesus to the grave, to condemn the SIN principle in human nature.” This is a travesty of the Gospel; it is a mockery of the sacrifice our holy Jesus made for us.

“Jesus condemned sin in the flesh because that is where sin resides, in the flesh.” No, it doesn’t, not in the physical flesh. Paul very often uses “flesh” metaphorically, like “You no longer walk in the flesh, but in the spirit.” Sin is an abstract noun; it can’t be a principle in the flesh.

“Jesus was saying, and fully accepted, that He was part of sinful human nature, born into mortality, and recognized that God couldn’t allow an immortal sinner, therefore it was right that He should die; He hadn’t brought it on Himself, but He had to die because He was part of humanity.” What piffle! What utter nonsense! This is just another attempt to justify Robert Roberts’ mistakes and uphold the unscriptural clauses he put into the B.A.S.F.

I don’t think the matter is worth wasting words on. You have seen our literature and we would like to be shown where any of our beliefs are unscriptural. We know you couldn’t; no-one in the Christadelphian world will discuss these matters with us over the open Bible. But I also want to make it clear that I do not make a major issue of these mistakes; to me the gross evil is the excommunication of anyone who questions the mistakes of Robert Roberts. The picture of the Judgment given in Matthew 25 has nothing whatever to do with theological doctrine, but of turning from the broad way into the straight and narrow. John Thomas noticed in the nineteenth century two things about the popular churches; (1) they were grossly mistaken about Bible doctrine, and (2) they were full of hypocrites. Unfortunately he put them together and “identified” them as one. But someone mistaken about doctrine is not necessarily a hypocritical sinner. But when Christadelphians set themselves up as judge and jury on doctrinal matters they are imitating the R.C. church, and by following Robert Roberts they are making a very grave mistake. But if you cannot see the clarity and accuracy of our literature, it is no use wasting words.

With best wishes in the love of Jesus, from John.

Readers will recall that in the last Circular Letter I wrote a short piece about the “Shofar” magazine. I have now received the following reply from one of the editors, Brother Richard Pursell.

Dear Bro. Gregory, Thank you for yours of July 5th... May I say at the outset that I appreciate the tone of your letter, and I hope you will receive my thoughts in the spirit in which they are intended. It appears we are both seeking truth, and much to my delight, we have touched upon a good deal of common ground already.

I believe the term ‘Original Sin’ has always been associated with the papal doctrine of Augustine, where descendants of Adam are believed to inherit the guilt of their father’s sin. While it is obvious that ancestor’s sins affect their descendants, it is not true that their guilt is transferred. This concept was dealt with in some length in Shofar 3.1 under the headings of “imputation.” From this, it will be seen that the “imputation of Adam’s sin” does not mean “guilt of Adam’s sin.”

The converse of this imputation principle may be seen in the benefits of blessings which are often inherited, while the merit of righteousness for such benefits is likewise not transferred. Hence, sin is no more inherited than is righteousness. The effects of either, however, can be, and are. A good example of this is the leadership of Israel. When the king was obedient to God, the nation prospered, when

disobedient, it faltered. Therefore, rain was withheld from Elijah and the “seven thousand” true worshippers as much as it was from Ahab, Jezebel, and the priests of Baal. The misdeeds of the rulers were borne by the subjects.

Romans 8:3 is immediately on the heels of chapter seven in which the apostle is quite clear about “sin in his members.” I believe that the expressions “sinful flesh” and “sin in the flesh” may be allusions to this same principle “in his members” which in Paul, like us, “wars” against our will. I have no objection to the translation “sin’s flesh” or “flesh belonging to sin,” rather than “sinful flesh,” but it seems to me that all these would express the thought that the nature of man is a product of sin in the beginning and nothing more- Certainly, flesh itself is not sin, for sin is an action, and flesh nature is only a product of that action. Mankind inherits the product, not the “sin.” As I understand it, the doctrine of “Original Sin” makes no such distinction.

About your article “The Shofar Magazine.” Please understand that Shofar does not represent the Unamended Christadelphians in the U.S.A. Our magazine is privately published without subscription. The content is the opinion of its individual authors, and does not claim to speak for any particular “fellowship.” It is the opinion of the editors that a number of subjects need revisiting in light of either suppressed or new evidence. It is our aim to encourage our readers to rethink some doctrines that have been held as “sacred cows” for far too long. The events in the Garden are among those “sacred cows.”

In this regard, a brother commented some years ago that had John Thomas been such a knowledgeable student, as many have claimed, how did he miss the elementary idiom *muth te muth*? Certainly he had the pioneering spirit of individual thought etc., but some of his methods were questionable in my opinion. Often he seemed to be intimidating, and with unwarranted vehemence spoke condescendingly toward his opponents. One such case is toward Benjamin Wilson, author of the *Diaglott*, clearly a superb Greek scholar surpassing the skills of Bro. Thomas. Further, it was pointed out to me last year that he also plagiarized material of his contemporary’s prophetic observations which have proven by time to have been false. His stated thoughts apparently often were not his own.

While the B.A.S.F. states that the sentence on Adam “in effect defiled and became a physical law of his being,” I am unaware of any statement of a “prolonged process of ageing and eventual death.” I suppose the above phrase may be taken that way, but to me it expresses first the “legal” aspect, (“defiled”), and second the physical aspect of decaying mortality, a (“physical law of his being”). As I have written in *Eden to Calvary* I believe the legal is our abstract status (positional inheritance), and the physical is the commuted sentence “dust thou art” (the nature we bear). It is my opinion that the B.A.S.F. is faulty in other areas, but while the wording in article V on this subject seems to express truth of the events, the community has taught that the threatened penalty was a “process of mortality” rather than a “cutting off” by execution. The B.A.S.F. does not make the distinction between what was threatened (*muth te muth*) and what was received (dust thou art) through the Lord’s mercy.

It is my opinion most of the unamended Christadelphians, the Berean Christadelphians, the Old Paths Christadelphians, and from my experience, the former Suffolk Street Christadelphians, and a goodly number of Central Fellowship would agree with the scenario set forth in *Eden to Calvary* concerning the inherited nature of mankind and a need to “offer for it.” What most of them do not know, however, is that these doctrines were the very basis upon which Bro. John James Andrew of London built his thesis called “The Blood of the Covenant” published in 1894. As I had written to you before, the earliest evidence of the *muth te muth* concept I have found in Christadelphian literature is 1879, which would provide fifteen years for Bro. Andrew to have gathered his thoughts. What we have expressed in *Eden to Calvary* is a compilation from a wide number of sources including Bro. Andrew, Thomas, Roberts, Walker, Whittaker, Mansfield, Barnard, the Nazarenes and even Trinitarians. The sources are really immaterial, it is the content that is of interest to me. It is my opinion that the name-smearing campaign that has been waged by the bulk of Christadelphia against Bro. Andrew and those who have recognized the value of his work has been very effective regarding the downplaying of these doctrines. You see, Bro. Roberts virtually controlled the Christadelphian press in the late 1890’s and since Bro. Andrew was his adversary, certain items were “spun” to appear ugly, such as “original sin” and guilt for Adam’s sin, etc. These accusations against Bro. Andrew stuck and the false accusations and spin have become known as “Andrewism,” a most unfortunate label used to deter anyone who may venture into his forbidden doctrinal territory. Most of what

is said about him I find to be false, in fact I have never yet seen anyone actually quote him, only what someone else said he said. I suppose the same was done to Bro. Turney, but I have no particular evidence. Certainly the same happened to Bro. Barnard in the 1950's with the Old Paths division in Britain and Australia. Bro. Barnard was accused of teaching what has been called "Andrewism," that is, "guilt of Adam's sin," when in fact there is no evidence at all for such accusations other than the spin of Bro. Carter. If, however, all you read was R.R. about Bro. Andrew and Carter about Barnard, what would you think? To my knowledge, the same is now going on in Australia toward Logos.

It is quite possible there is a misunderstanding concerning the term "sin in the flesh." As I said above, flesh is not sin, nor can it be, because sin is an action, flesh is a substance. Flesh can, however, be called sin, since as a substance it is a result of the action of sin. When we speak of "flesh," we speak of a dying nature, that is mortality. We believe mortality is a result of sin, "By one man, sin entered and death by sin."

While it is true we have commented in Shofar on 2 Corinthians 5:21 about Christ being "made sin," I do not believe we have put "much emphasis" (as you say) on it as if our entire argument depended upon it. While the KJV seems to give the impression of His physical nature being "made" sin, there is evidence elsewhere that He was made like unto His brethren, made of a woman. It is in light of this concept that 2 Corinthians 5:21 is generally taken to refer to His nature. In fact, the quotes from Bro. Thomas which you have reproduced merely say that flesh is "called" sin, and elsewhere "made sin" is equivalent to "in consequence of sin."

But Bro. Broughton's article is enlightening and informative. It is of particular interest that he has identified Paul's writings to be based in Old Testament scripture. This is important. I say this because we often think the apostle had acquired some epiphany that was new and unique. In this case, I find it particularly revealing that Paul, in 2 Corinthians 5 could well be commenting on Isaiah 53. If this is the case, then it is logical to see "sin" as "sin offering." This view does not change the thrust of our argument concerning the nature we bear, however, and that of our Lord as being the same. It only means that this verse may not be conclusive evidence to that effect. Also, if a "sin offering" were required where there clearly was no "sin" committed, and that our Saviour offered "first for himself" as the Hebrew's author comments, we are justified to inquire what the offering in respect to Himself (Christ) was for. It is our opinion that it was for the unclean nature (called sin) inherited from His mother. This view would coincide with the requirements of other situations where a "sin offering" was made even when there was no active sin or guilt involved, such as leprosy (Lev. 14), childbirth (Lev. 12), and even bodily issues (Lev. 15), etc. This leads us to conclude that the object for which Christ's sin offering was made relative to Himself was for something circumstantial, that is, the nature He bore, since there was no sin of commission. That is why brethren have no qualms about terms such as "sin in the flesh," "sinful flesh," etc., even though perhaps the specific verses such as 2 Corinthians 5:21 may not address the physical aspect exclusively. "Sin" is viewed by these brethren in a general sense, which includes our nature which they believe to be a product of actual sin in the beginning.

I hope I have answered your concerns satisfactorily. Yours in the One hope, Richard Pursell.

— — —

In response to the above I wrote to Bro. Pursell as follows:-

Dear Brother Pursell, Greetings in Jesus Name. Thank you for your letter received early in August. It is always good to receive correspondence which endeavours to honour our loving heavenly Father and His beloved Son and I know this is also what you wish in publishing the "Shofar" magazine.

I was pleased to see you write that "flesh is not sin, nor can it be, because sin is an action, flesh is a substance." But then you continue "Flesh can, however, be called sin, since as a substance it is the result of the action of sin." But why are you are persisting in your claim that Adam by sinning produced flesh which can be called "sin" when the Scriptures do not? This opinion is the result of Christadelphian theology.

My purpose in portraying your view as :-

‘A worker by working produces a work’
‘A talker by talking produces a talk’
‘A sinner by sinning produces sinful flesh’ -

was to highlight the absurdity of Christadelphian theology. It is surely obvious that a sinner by sinning produces a sin and nothing more, and certainly Adam was not clever enough to change his own flesh, and there is no point in God making it any different than in the beginning which was “very good”. Adam’s nature was not made worse because he chose wrong any more than ours is improved if we choose right. The law of God was given in order to make it possible for man to choose right or wrong and this ability was given that we may build characters well pleasing to Him. So far as the faithful are concerned a change of our physical nature will occur at Christ’s return. No other change of nature is referred to in the Scriptures. (Apart from decomposition to dust, with which we are not concerned here).

Certainly Paul referred to those who are “in the flesh” as those who remain in Adam and do not do the will of God, having insufficient faith. Paul refers to such as “sold under sin,” using “Sin” as a king reigning over them. In this sense they belong to “King Sin” or as Paul expresses it, they are “sin’s flesh,” that is, they are “flesh belonging to King Sin.” We have to recognize that those in the flesh are in bondage to sin - it is a matter of ownership, not a physical quality.

Paul writes also of those who are “not in the flesh” but are “in the spirit;” they have come out of Adam, they are no longer owned by King Sin but are owned by King Jesus. As also in Galatians 5:18 “But if ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not under the law, verse 16, “Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh.” They are now in Christ through baptism and are in a changed relationship to God as His adopted sons. These have been “bought with a price even the precious blood of Jesus.” And this is as far as Paul goes.

I agree that the imputation of Adam’s sin does not mean the imputation of the guilt of Adam’s sin, but nowhere have I seen you explain that the imputation of Adam’s sin is the fact that all are sold under sin for the purpose of the salvation of the faithful in Christ.

The teaching of inherited guilt is seen in the doctrine of Original sin along with the belief in sin in the flesh, or changed flesh, introduced into the Roman Catholic church by Augustine and derives from pagan superstitions before him. Both of these notions can be seen in Article 9 of the Church of England’s 39 Articles which I reproduce here:-

Of Original or Birth-Sin

“Original Sin standeth not in the following of Adam (as the Pelagians do vainly talk;) but it is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam; whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil, so that the flesh lusteth always contrary to the spirit; and therefore in every person born into this world, it deserveth God’s wrath and damnation. And this infection of nature doth remain, yea in them that are regenerated; whereby the lust of the flesh, called in the Greek, *phronema sarkos*, which some do expound the wisdom, some sensuality, some the affection, some the desire, of the flesh, is not subject to the Law of God- And although there is no condemnation for them that believe and are baptised, yet concupiscence and the lust hath of itself the nature of sin.”

This I believe is where Robert Roberts obtained his Clause 5 of the B.A.S.F. Some years earlier he had said, in “The Slain Lamb,” that “The mind of the flesh is an evil and sinful thing; for its natural impulses resident in the brain flesh are all in directions opposed to God,” then when trying to justify his understanding of “sinful flesh” he tried to pour ridicule of an opponent by saying “It is a marvellous piece of new-born wisdom to say that “sinful” applies to the character but not to the substance that produces the character.” He was forced into this ‘reasoning’ in order to find some justification for the crucifixion and so he wrote in “The Blood of Christ”:- “It pleased God to require the ceremonial condemnation of this sin nature in crucifixion in the person of a righteous possessor of it, as the basis of our forgiveness.”

But you say that “flesh is not sin, nor can it be...” so I am naturally interested to know your thinking on the crucifixion.

Next we come to Romans 7. While much of this is written in the present tense it is only common sense to see that it refers to some time past, for Paul ends the chapter by asking, “Who shall deliver me from this body of death?” and answers “I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin. There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.” At the time of writing this letter, Paul was not “in the flesh” but had been delivered and was now walking in the Spirit. He now “served the law of God” with his mind of reason, for he was “in Christ Jesus.” “For the law of the Spirit of life” was “in Christ Jesus” and “hath made me free from the law of sin and death.” He was delivered and free from the law of sin and death which had held him captive in Romans chapter 7.

Mortality. After you say “Flesh can, however, be called sin, since as a substance it is the result of the action of sin,” you go on to say “When we speak of ‘flesh’ we speak of a dying nature, that is mortality. We believe mortality is a result of sin,” you are again correct only in part. Mortality is a result of sin, true, but sin is transgression of law and therefore a legal term and not the expression of a changed physical state. As a legal term it denotes that the mortal person is subject to death, or ‘on death row’. It does not denote that ‘flesh’ has become a dying nature, and so your expression “the physical aspect of decaying mortality,” is confusing. By “decaying mortality” I believe you mean “corruptibility.” Mortality applies to the legal and moral sphere, while corruptibility applies to the physical.

But there is no reason to suppose Adam was created with a non-dying nature when all around him was a natural world of birth, growth to maturity, reproduction and death. Mankind “has no pre-eminence above a beast:” (Ecclesiastes 3:19) either now or then. “All go to one place; all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again.” The offer to Adam and Eve for obedience to God’s law was not a continuation of their *nephesh* life but a change to *chay* life. An interval of death would make no difference. Of the faithful, we read in Hebrews 11:39 and 40, “And these all having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise: God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect.” The sleep of death is of no account once one awakes.

In your last paragraph you write, “Also, if a ‘sin-offering’ were required where there clearly was no ‘sin’ committed, and that our Saviour offered “first for himself” as the Hebrew’s author comments, we are justified to inquire what the offering in respect of Himself (Christ) was for.” My reply to this is that the author of Hebrews does not say that Christ offered “first for himself.” It says that the Levitical high priest had first to offer for himself, and this was in order to make himself acceptable to God before he was legally fit in the sight of God to offer for the people. Jesus was not an High Priest while on earth, not being of the tribe of Levi, but became an High Priest at His resurrection, after He had given Himself to be the sacrificial offering. This is confirmed in Hebrews 8:4 where we read, “For if he were on earth, he would not be a priest, seeing that there are priests that offer gifts according to the law...” With this as a starting point one cannot reach the conclusion that Jesus offered first for Himself or that He had anything whatsoever to offer for.

Indeed the Scriptures are silent on the matter of Jesus ever having joined in any sacrifice or offering required of other people. The nearest we have to the matter of Jesus making an offering is recorded in Matthew 17:24,27 - “And when they were come to Capernaum, they that received tribute money came to Peter, and said, Doth not your Master pay tribute? He saith, Yes. And when they were come into the house, Jesus prevented him, saying, What thinkest thou Simon? of whom do the kings of the earth take custom or tribute? of their own children, or of strangers? Peter saith unto him, Of strangers. Jesus saith unto him, Then are the children free.” Jesus, though “made under the law” as we are told in Galatians 4:4, was not in the same relationship to His Father as others under the law. To be under the law is one thing, to have fallen foul of the law is quite another. As the (sinless) child of God and King of the earth, Jesus was free from paying tribute as was required of others, so He went on to say, “Notwithstanding, lest we should offend them, go thou to the sea, and cast an hook, and take up the fish that first cometh up; and when thou hast opened his mouth, thou shalt find a piece of money: take that and give unto them for me and thee.”

It is worth noting the word “pay” in verse 24 - “Doth not your Master pay tribute?” is the same word Jesus used on the cross when He said “It is finished.” This could well have been translated “It is paid” in John 19:33, for His shed blood was the price Jesus paid for our Redemption - “Forasmuch as ye know that ye were... redeemed with... the precious blood of Christ...” 1 Peter 1:19. Again, “The church of God which he hath purchased with his own blood.” Acts 20:28.

You say it is your opinion that most Christadelphians would agree concerning the inherited nature of mankind and a need to “offer for it,” and sadly, this may well be so, but where are we told that there is a need to “offer” for our inherited nature? Jesus didn’t “offer” Himself for His or our inherited nature. He tells us in John 10:10 why He came - “I am come that they might have (*zoe* or Spirit) life, and that they might have it more abundantly. I am the good shepherd; the good shepherd giveth his (*psuche* or natural) life for the sheep.” Jesus came to redeem us and this he did by buying us back from the bondage into which Adam sold himself and us.

Jesus gave Himself that we might have “*zoe*” or “eternal” life, not for some change in the flesh of mankind due to Adam’s sin. The notion that there is a need to offer for inherited nature is a myth.

“They that are Christ’s have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts. If we live in the Spirit, let us also walk in the Spirit.” “Walk in the Spirit and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh.” Galatians 5:23,24 & 16.

With love in the Lord,

Russell Gregory

Understanding The Scriptures

“How Readest Thou?”

Fifty or more years ago I heard a Christadelphian lecturer use the expression ‘I take it, from what Jesus said in his temptation in the wilderness, “It is written that man shall not live by bread alone but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God” thus the expression from the lecturer was “Bread alone will land a man in the grave.”

I thought nothing of it at the time but have since come to realise the error of a Christadelphian making such a statement in view of his belief that the Word of God was that which landed Adam in the grave - Genesis 3:17-19 being quoted as the penalty due to Adam’s sin, whereas this was the result of his life being spared provisionally in anticipation of the Second Adam who would lay down His own life at a future time, animal sacrifices being God’s provision and substitutes until in due time God would send forth His Son as the true substitute for Adam’s penalty.

The lesson then is that we must live by the Word of God and die into the death of Christ by the Word of God and live through Him as those who are alive from the dead (Romans 6:3-5).

It is not bread alone that lands a man in the grave but his corruptible nature inherited from Adam who was told that in consequence of the Ransom price not having been fully paid, he would in the sweat of his face eat bread all the days of his life under a second probation and would cease to live by virtue of his created and corruptible flesh and blood nature and not as falsely believed and taught, as the penalty for his sin. Even the righteous, living by the word of God are put in the grave but the grave cannot hold them when the Trumpet of Life sounds, but alternatively the unregenerated living by bread alone will abide in death, not natural physical death but that legal position of death that came by Adam’s sin. (See 1 John 3:14).

It is more evident these days that children and adults are being influenced on TV and Radio by certain people that everything evolved from some great explosion of gas solidifying and so forming the heavens and the earth on which present day man evolved. The story of Adam’s creation is rejected therefore, in

favour of evolution from a species of the ape; where then can religion enter if man is responsible to apes? How then can sin enter into the world and a legal sentence of death by sin requiring a man to be redeemed from such a position? And how can any gospel of salvation be understood if evolution is still in process and nothing happened nearly six thousand years ago in Eden to bring religion or reconciliation to a Creator of all things if Eden and its consequences is a myth?

If Darwin, David Attenborough and the like presenters of natural subjects relating to human beings and animals, are to be accepted instead of the writings in the Bible by Holy men of God moved by His Holy Spirit, how for example can Paul's epistle to Romans make any sense or give any hope for the future?

It is evident that Paul accepted the Genesis's account of Adam as a created corruptible being before he transgressed the law of his Creator, so when he speaks of "death by sin" he cannot be referring to the common or natural death experienced by the ape species and other animals but the fact that there exists a supreme Creator to whom all men are responsible when the truth is presented to them as in Romans chapter 5, a declaration that brings all men under the dominion of Sin until they accept God's way of reconciliation as revealed in His Holy Word through the Prophets from Adam to Moses and from Moses to Jesus Christ and those disciples appointed by Him, the called according to His Will.

When I witness the superstition and idolatrous practises in the world I think of what the Apostle Paul said in his day of idol worship, "We know that an idol is nothing in the world, and that there is none other God but one. For though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or in earth (as there be gods many and lords many), but to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him: and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things and we by him." 1 Corinthians 8:4-6).

Not even in Britain let alone the Middle East and Far East as well as many other parts of the world, can this be said as a declaration of belief and faith apart from the few that God is calling out from this dark world of vain tradition. Certainly Paul was a Jew and was converted to Christ with further enlightenment ("Whereby, when ye read ye may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ"), which in other ages was "not made known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit; that the Gentiles should be fellow heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the Gospel." (Ephesians 3).

We know that this involves the promises God made to Abraham "In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed." Does this mean one has to be in the loins of Abraham to be heir to the promise? Certainly not. Paul shows in Galatians 3:26-29 that a person must be introduced into this relationship by conforming to the conditions of Him who said "I am the Way, the Truth and the Life, no man cometh unto the Father but by me."

What advantage then hath a Jew? Or what profit is there of circumcision? Much every way, chiefly because that unto them were committed the oracles of God. But we may reason that baptism into Christ has replaced circumcision so how can Paul say that circumcision profits? I see two important points here. If as Paul says, the oracles were delivered chiefly to the Jews then the whole Christian faith must be based on what is proved to be the oracles of God contained in the scriptures of the prophets of Israel and confirmed in the shed blood of Jesus Christ the Seed of the woman as promised in Eden - God's only begotten Son of Mary.

Circumcision was an outward sign and a seal of the righteousness Abraham had by faith, which he had yet being uncircumcised (Romans 4:11).

The practice of circumcision was continued under the law of Moses but to many, then and now, it became a mere sign in the keeping of the letter of the law and not a seal of the righteousness by faith. And thus, boasting in descent from Abraham in the order of natural flesh ceased to make them the children of God. (Galatians 3:26-29).

No natural born Jew can ignore the outward sign of his circumcision for it shows him his responsibility to the oracles of God which demands belief and faith in the God of Abraham and the Messiah who was promised, as Paul wrote, "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Jesus Christ, for as many

of you as have been baptised into Christ have put on Christ. And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise."

Paul's reasoned declaration in Romans 2 from verse 17 is summed up in verses 28 & 29, "For he is not a Jew which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh: but he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the Spirit and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men but of God."

We conclude then that God is interested only in the people who have died symbolically into the death Jesus experienced in the place of Adam's death which came by breach of law, not his natural death which was a result of his created corruptible nature from the dust of the ground. If this is not accepted, then the reason Christ died as a sinless sacrifice for Adam and all in his loins has no place in his teaching and those of the Holy Scriptures.

Except for Christ Jesus all were concluded under Adam's sin but are not personal sinners until enlightenment brings them under Divine Law and is violated. The flood did not occur without sinners having been enlightened first by Noah, a preacher of righteousness (Hebrews 11:7) (2 Peter 2:5) for 120 years (Genesis 6:3).

The longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, it is still waiting in the dispensation of God's Son to whom all power has been given in heaven and in earth even the Messiah not recognised or expected to come from Heaven by the politically minded Jews in the State of Israel and elsewhere who boast in circumcision and natural descent from Abraham and the coming of a Messiah of flesh and blood nature to be their king.

When a Christadelphian some fifty years ago, I was taught that the Kingdom of God would be the kingdom of Israel restored by Jesus at His second coming, the biblical reference used as proof, Acts 1:6, but there is a great difference between the Kingdom of God and the kingdom of past Israel which was divided by kings of Juda and kings of Israel, some good and some evil. It came about when they desired a king like the surrounding nations when God said to Samuel "They have not rejected thee but me, that I should not reign over them." Jesus will restore God's kingdom - 1 Corinthians 15:24-28 and this is the Kingdom Jesus told His disciples to pray for; and the times and seasons God had put in His own power it was not for them to know, there was work for them to do before that time.

So it is for us of like faith, but who hath believed our report? Isaiah 53. Jews and Gentiles take heed. If ye be Christ's then are ye heirs to the Promised Land but not owners of it by any map instituted by men who know not the Truth.

Brother Phil Parry

Brother Eric Cave received two tapes of a lecture by Brother Richard Brown in which Brother Richard challenges anyone to produced a better understanding of The Atonement using the same Bible sources as he uses. Brother Eric took up the challenge:-

Dear Brother Richard, May grace and peace be with you and your house... May I first of all congratulate you on your expositions, much of which I agree with, though sadly from my point of view marred by faulty premises and inevitably, faulty conclusions. I was however greatly encouraged by your repeated offer "let those who object produce their arguments from the same source" which I now propose to do, and further, using your own language and references but with their logical rather than Christadelphian understanding. Forgive me if I firstly sketch in the alternative understanding of the atonement, with the scriptural evidence for the Nazarene understanding, as opposed to the one you have so strongly defended. After which I propose to comment on every scripture reference you have quoted in the tapes for your consideration. This will necessarily be a lengthy letter, but will demonstrate why so many Christadelphians, in this age of increased knowledge are recognising their former mistakes, and I do so with the assurance that you are both sincere and honest enough so that, as John Thomas is reported as saying

when challenged on his beliefs, “I will willingly change my views if you can show me where I am wrong, but if I can show you where you are wrong, will you be equally candid and change yours?”

May we then first consider Jesus, the apostle (one sent) and High Priest of our profession before He began His ministry? John tells us (1:29), “Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.” Matthew tells us (3:13), “then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan unto John to be baptised of him. But John forbad him, saying, I have need to be baptised of thee, and comest thou to me? And Jesus answering said unto him, suffer it to be so now: for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness.” What did Jesus mean by those cryptic words?

The answer we believe is that before He began His ministry, and following the example of many Old Testament prophets, the Lamb of God gave this first prophecy in an enacted parable of that coming ministry. The people of Jerusalem and all Judea and all the region round about Jordan, (Matthew.3:5), were baptised of John in Jordan, metaphorically “washing away their sins” but the Lamb of God had no sins to be washed away, and went down naked into that water to take upon Himself those transgressions which the people had left behind in that water, metaphorically clothing Himself with the “filthy garments” of Joshua (Zechariah 3:3) the antitype, (Matthew 8:17) That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Isaiah the prophet saying, Himself took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses; and YHWH hath laid upon him (not in Him) the iniquities of us all.

Remember the woman in Matthew 9:20 with an issue of blood who touched the hem of His garment and was healed, the coverings which He bore throughout His ministry until He figuratively nailed them to His cross at Calvary when again naked and sinless, He surrendered, of His own volition, His *psuche* i.e. His animal or natural life. John 10: 11, “I am the good shepherd, the good shepherd giveth his life (His natural animal ‘life’ Greek - *Psuche*) for the sheep” to rise three days later in the glory and beauty of His spiritual (Greek – *Zoe*) life, of which He had spoken in the previous verse when He testified “I am come that they might have life” (Greek - *zoe*).

“Surely he hath born 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 YHWH hath laid on him the iniquity of us all,” - the iniquity was ‘on’ Him not ‘in’ Him. He bore our sicknesses, leprosy, blindness lameness, not by becoming blind or lame or leprous, but by curing them. A devil, a deranged mind, mental state or disease could be removed simply as an act of mercy by the exercise of divine power; whereas our sins, our transgression, could only be removed by taking them upon Himself, not into Himself, but upon Himself, as the garment which the woman with the issue touched. And so He “fulfilled all righteousness” at that baptism by John. And He suffered, the Just for the unjust, bearing the judgments of our sins so that Divine mercy and forgiveness might be available to all.

Not one verse in the whole of the Bible teaches that Jesus Christ died for Himself. He died as He was born “that holy thing born of the virgin.” There is no such thing as “sinful flesh.” We are all born as our first parents were, ‘Very good,’ or as Pelagius contended “Without virtue and without vice,” as more and more Christadelphians now admit: John Thomas used the term sinful flesh in “Elpis Israel,” but realised his error before he wrote Eureka and always in the latter volumes uses Sin’s flesh or Flesh of Sin, but failed to acknowledge his former error. The A.V. is a mistranslation and many modern versions correct it, or note it in the margin as 1 pointed out in “The Divine Plan.” The Greek words in Romans 8:3 are *sarkos amartias* literally “of flesh of Sin” it is in the genitive or possessive case and signifies that the physical body following Adam’s transgression became the property, the possession of “Sin,” for “His servants ye are to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey” and Adam and all in his loins had become constitutionally the bondslaves of Sin, Satan the Devil, the Old Serpent, an abstract personification of man’s will as opposed to God’s will. Exodus 21 and Leviticus 25 define the terms under which a bondsman may be purchased from bondage by a near kinsman, which is what Jesus did, although Adam was created, and Jesus was begotten by YHWH, for we are “bought with a price” a ‘purchased possession’ by a price which Adam himself could not pay, having alienated himself and all his subsequent progeny from YHWH by transgression, and I would remind you that the only definition of ‘sin’ in scripture is ‘transgression of law.’ And here I must remind you of that little verse in Hebrews 7 which you appear to have ignored, “For the priesthood being

changed, there is made of necessity a change in the law” Hebrews 7:12, and those baptised into the death of Christ are no longer under the Mosaic law of sin and death, but the law of the Spirit of life (*zoe* life) in Christ Jesus as Romans informs us. All Adam’s progeny and Eve were formerly the possession of ‘Sin.’ Bondslaves have no possessions dead or alive. Legally and technically bondslaves are the ‘money’ of their owner (Exodus 21:21).

Until the death of John Thomas in 1871 both he and Roberts were emphatic in insisting that there was no physical change in Adam when he sinned, his flesh was exactly the same before transgression as it was afterwards. Only after the death of John Thomas did Roberts perform his doctrinal somersault and revert to Christendom’s “sentence implanted corruptibility.” Please ask yourself why Jesus offered unleavened bread at the last supper as the symbol of His body if that body was ‘flesh-full-of-sin’? The Law of Moses is adamant, under no circumstances can leaven, the symbol of sin, accompany any offering to YHWH. The only time leaven is mentioned in the law is in the wave or heave offerings for the Levitical priesthood to provide their normal daily bread, they never accompanied the sin offerings, or the burnt offerings, the trespass offerings, or the peace offerings, nor does Jesus ever say that He overcame your supposed “bias to sin in His flesh.” He says that He overcame “the world.” Robert Roberts merely displayed his ignorance of the Greek language when he asserted that sinful flesh was a good translation of *sarkos hamartias* in Romans 8:3 literally ‘of flesh of sin,’ and was unaware that nouns in Greek have five case forms, and not the two forms we are familiar with in English.

And again before I proceed it is necessary to point out your misuse of Romans 7:14-25. A passage which the translators have incorrectly chosen to put in the present tense despite it being a contradiction of all that Paul had been arguing in the previous chapters, for these verses can only apply to Paul’s situation before his baptism. Before he “put on Christ” and abandoned the Mosaic law of sin and death and replaced it with the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus. As I am sure you are aware the English language is a “time orientated language with verbs based on past, present or future tenses; whereas neither Hebrew nor Greek conform to this pattern; actions being either complete or incomplete. Except for the future tense the tenses in Greek are concerned almost wholly with the nature and state of an action and not with time, hence the English rendering is dependent on the doctrinal belief of the translators, and the AV was translated by Roman Catholics who on many occasions failed to consider the context and compare scripture with scripture to obtain the correct understanding, the context, prefixes, or suffixes deciding which English tense approximates to the meaning. Ask yourself the questions whether the man who had said in Romans chapters 5 and 6 that he had been “justified by faith” and possessed “peace with God through Jesus Christ” had been “justified by his blood,” “saved from wrath,” “been reconciled,” whose body had been “buried by baptism into the death of Christ,” “freed from sin,” “no longer under law, but under grace,” “made free from sin and become a servant of God, having fruit unto holiness and the end everlasting life,” all phrases which occur in chapters 5 and 6. The man who wrote to the Galatians “I am crucified with Christ; nevertheless I live; yet not I but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me. Ask yourself - Is it possible that such a man could have written those words in Romans 5 and 6 as they appear in our AV and yet declare in the very next chapter that he was still carnal and sold under sin? Impossible! And many Christadelphians now recognise this scriptural fact, see for example “Romans in the Light of John’s Gospel” by Geoff and Ray Walker. The crucifixion removed us from the legal (technical) ownership of ‘Sin.’ 3 John 2:2. “And he is the propitiation for our sins’, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world” and verse 12, “Your sins are forgiven you for his name’s sake.” Chapter 3:14, “We know that we have passed from death unto life (*zoe* life), because we love the brethren.” If we accept that sacrifice and continue to “walk in spirit and not in flesh” (Romans 8:1) then we are reconciled to YHWH now.

That brings me to the contentions on your tapes and please note that what follows is not written in any spirit of confrontation or nit picking. All my friends are Christadelphians or ex Christadelphians but I am desperately worried that if they continue to follow Roberts’s B.A.S.F. they are putting themselves in the same position as the Scribes and Pharisees who committed the ‘unforgivable sin’ by declaring that our Saviour “had a devil” or “an unclean spirit” as Mark puts it in chapter 3:29, “But he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Spirit hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation because they (Scribes and Pharisees) said, He hath an unclean spirit.” Faced with the problem of a sinless Jesus being of our nature, the Catholic Church invented the doctrine of “Immaculate Conception” but Roberts’s solution that Jesus must have been created with “sinful flesh” was much worse. Could the God of infinite love, infinite

righteousness, and infinite justice have fathered unclean (defiled) flesh for the purpose of seeing that flesh, His only begotten and beloved Son murdered by wicked hands?

You begin then, correctly, by defining the word atonement as reconciliation in its only N.T. occurrence. Romans 5, "For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life. And not only so, but we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ by whom we have now received the atonement." Four questions and one fact arise from this statement and are relevant- Why were we "enemies"? How are we "saved" by His life? Which "life" is Paul speaking of? Which death did Jesus suffer? And the fact, that we already possess the "atonement." We are already reconciled; there is no question of having to wait for an imaginary judgment day for those "in Christ" as we are taught in 1 Corinthians 15. See verses 35, 42, 51 & 52.

My answers then are as follows:

1. We were "enemies" because we were all in Adam's loins when he sinned and instead of being the property of God became the property of 'sin,' alienated from our former Lord for "his servants ye are to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey," and Adam disobeyed. Scripture says, "Thou hast magnified thy Word even above thy Name." 'Obey my Word and live, disobey my Word and die.' "In the day thou eatest thereof dying thou shalt die."

2. We are saved because Jesus paid the price of that redemption (to Law. not to God or to the Devil) with a 'life' that was never in Adam's loins, for God was His Father and 'Life' comes from the male. No man can have two fathers. By taking Eve from Adam's side the Father ensured that Jesus was never in Adam's loins. He was the seed of the woman, a new creation, the second Adam but never the seed of the first man and thus by Mary shared our nature and blood and corruptibility and therefore could be tempted in all points like us, and only if He had sinned would He have been in the same situation as we are, i.e. needing salvation. "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone, but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit."

3. The life He voluntarily surrendered on the cross was His natural animal life. His *nephesh/psuche* life, not the *chay/zoe* life with which YHWH had endowed Adam in Genesis 2:7. The 'death' which He died was not the "common" death of all men of which Moses spoke in Numbers 16 (see page 23 of "Musings on Creation") but 'judicial death' i.e. sudden inflicted death for law breaking as promised to Adam and foreshadowed in Numbers 16 by the men who "provoked YHWH." Roberts ignored, or was ignorant of the fact that scripture testifies that all human beings are born with two types of 'life' and can die, or be referred to as 'dead' with three types of 'death.' You will find further proof of these facts in the booklets I sent you last week and in Nazarene literature. The relevant fact is that when in Genesis 1 the angels created Adam in their own likeness they created him as they had the animals with natural and animal 'life (Hebrew - *nephesh*). "Who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the earth" and only in chapter 2 did YHWH blow into his nostrils the spirit of (Hebrew - *chay*, Greek - *zoe*) life that returns to Him at death.

You have also claimed in this opening section that "Christadelphians are unique in the belief that Jesus was a "representative man." Sorry, Richard, I have to correct you on this assertion. For the first 25 years of their existence as a community they believed with John Thomas that Jesus was our "substitutionary testator" as the first 1850 edition of "Elpis Israel" (of which I have a copy) confirms. Only after the death of the doctor did C.C.Walker dishonestly alter the doctor's mss. describing Christ as our "substitutionary testator," page 213, and alter the original mss- to read "our mediator." I have shown my copy, dated 1850 to several Christadelphians for confirmation and you are welcome to examine it and the other alterations to the original that subsequent editors have amended (sic) to agree with Roberts's Statement of Faith. You might also persuade Michael Ashton to let you examine the original mss. in the custody of the Christadelphian office which I understand was last examined by several brethren in, I believe the 1950's, who all agreed that the alterations must have been made after the death of the doctor in 1871 and his subsequent correspondence demonstrates that he never changed his opinion. It is only since Roberts performed his doctrinal somersault that "substitute" was ruled out and "representative" came in together with all the subsequent splits that untruth caused.

Your next reference is Genesis 3:11, where you are correct until you say that the covering of Adam and Eve was because they were 'defiled by sin.' It does not say that. The verse simply says, "Who told thee that thou wast naked? Hast thou eaten of the tree whereof I commanded thee that thou shouldest not eat of it?" Nothing is said either in this verse or anywhere else in scripture that their bodies were defiled or altered physically by their transgression. Check the meanings of the word as used in Leviticus and Numbers and see if any of the various defilements could have applied to Adam and Eve. They cannot! Let me also quote from "Exploring Bible Language" by Alan and Margaret Fowler, the former, Christadelphian, a distinguished surgeon and his sister wife with honorary degrees in both Hebrew and Greek. Concerning the term "flesh" they write as follows;-

EXPLORING BIBLE LANGUAGE Chapter 17 - FLESH

'Flesh' is a common Bible metaphor which has several shades of meaning. The literal meaning of flesh (Greek *sarx*) is the soft tissue of the body as distinct from bone and blood - as in Luke 24:39, Behold my hands and feet that it is I myself. Handle me and see, for a spirit does not have flesh and bones as you see me have.

In the New Testament 'flesh' is almost always used metaphorically, with many subtle differences in emphasis.

1) Flesh may simply be extended to mean body design, as in 1 Corinthians 15:39, "All flesh is not the same flesh, but there is one kind of flesh of men, another flesh of beasts, another of fish, and another of birds."

2) More specifically, flesh is used as a metaphor for the human body, as in John 1:14, "And the Word became flesh, and dwelt among us and we beheld his glory."

3) It may refer to human beings in general, as in Luke 3:6, "And all flesh shall see the salvation of God."

4) More commonly, the metaphor is extended into the moral sphere and refers to man's animal, as opposed to his spiritual nature as in Romans 8, "There is therefore no now condemnation to those who are in Christ Jesus, who do not walk according to the flesh, but according to the Spirit. (End of quote).

The question of 'nakedness' is not helped by your frequent use of the word 'defiled.' I accept it is the same word in Hebrew as unclean, but in our language and in Greek 'defiled' has a harder and more permanent connotation than 'unclean' which is a condition which could be cleansed by washings, and at eventide, or after a specified period the bearer becomes clean again, or as in the case of the birth of Jesus, Mary was unclean for the 33 days plus her normal menstruation cycle after which she was technically 'clean' whereas 'defiled' as a transitive verb signifies in English to befoul, to pollute, or corrupt. Shechem the Hivite defiled Dinah (although that is a different word in Hebrew meaning 'ravished'). She was not defiled until he lay with her. Leviticus 5:3 shows how men may be defiled, or land, altars, blood, high places, priests, contact with dead bodies, our minds and our consciences and many other things may be defiled, but never do we read that Adam was defiled physically by his disobedience or by eating the fruit. Blood sacrifices; by the sacrifice of an animal as a substitute instead of the sinner resulted in a covering of the sin but not its permanent removal, although 'sin' is an abstract term. There was no change in the physical make up of Adam and Eve, or permanent change in their minds, except that like the angels they now knew good and evil. The transgression alienated them from their Creator so that they became legally, i.e. technically and constitutionally the property of 'Sin' and the sacrifice of the lamb(s), and their repentance permitted contact with deity to be restored, as you yourself have said. After the transgression, now the property of 'Sin' they were owned by an unclean spirit (Mark 3:30) and were considered technically as unclean. Once we are 'in Christ' we are cleansed, "Resist the devil and he will flee from you," and to His disciples, "Now are ye clean by the Word which I have spoken," "I have given them the words which thou gavest me." It was the Word of God that cleansed them, and to the leper, "I will, be thou clean." Matthew 8:3, and how do you explain the words of Jesus in Mark 7:15, "There is nothing from without a man, that entering into him can defile him, but the things that come out of him, those are they that defile him"? And Proverbs 7:15, "For as a man thinketh in his heart, so is he."?

If you check the use of the term in Leviticus you will find that men are ceremonially defiled or made unclean under the law by the following:- touching unclean issues (5:3), eating snakes and unclean insects (11:43), leprosy (13:46), uncovering nakedness of near relatives (18:24,25), homosexuality and bestiality (36:27), seeking after wizards (19:31), priests who touched dead bodies except their near relatives (21:1,3). None of which of course could apply to Adam.

Allow me next for a few paragraphs to demonstrate how you and John Thomas and this writer himself for sixty years misunderstood this aspect of the atonement. I quote from The Divine Plan, a copy of which, according to my records you received in 1998, although you do not appear to have read it:-

THE DIVINE PLAN - A RE-APPRAISAL OF SOME CHRISTADELPHIAN TRADITIONS.

Page 8 SIN IN HUMAN NATURE

Christadelphian views on this subject have likewise been guided by what the doctor wrote in 'Elpis Israel' even though these differ from some later writings. The following passage appears on pp 127/128, Revised Edition 1973 (as it also did in my original issue.)

"Sin, I say, is a synonym for human nature. Hence the flesh is invariably regarded as unclean. It is therefore written "How can he be clean that is born of a woman?" (Job 25:4). "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one" (Job 14:4). "What is man that he should be clean? And he that is born of a woman that he should be righteous? Behold God putteth no trust in his saints, yea, the heavens are not clean in his sight. How much more abominable and filthy is man, that drinketh up iniquity like water? (Job 15:14-16),"

And this he explains in another place by saying "he sent his own son in the likeness of sinful flesh (Romans 8:3) and for sin condemned sin in the flesh in the offering of his body once (Hebrews 10:10,12,14). Sin could not have been condemned in the body of Jesus if it had not existed there. His body was as unclean as the bodies of those for whom he died, for he was born of a woman, and not one can bring a clean body out of a defiled one. For that Jesus himself says, "That which is born of flesh is flesh (John 3:6). According to this physical law, the seed of the woman was born into the world. The nature of Mary was as unclean as that of other women, and therefore could only give birth to a body like her own, though especially "prepared of God."

For nearly sixty years the writer had tacitly accepted the above reasoning, until it suddenly occurred to him that the first of the doctor's quotations from Job was uttered by Bildad, the second by Job himself, and the third by Eliphaz, and he remembered that both Eliphaz and Bildad had been "forgers of lies" but even more importantly YHWH himself has twice confirmed that assessment of Job, and declares twice in chapter 42, when accusing Eliphaz, "Ye have not spoken of me the thing that is right as my servant Job hath." Further investigation revealed that when Job himself in the second quote speaks of a "clean thing" he uses a different Hebrew word from that used by Bildad and Eliphaz when they speak of "clean."

When Job says "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one," he uses the Hebrew *tabor*, used 91 times in the O.T. and almost always refers to that ceremonial cleanness in the Law. First used in Genesis to make a distinction amongst the animals taken into the ark, and in the law of that cleanness which a man or woman could lose by an issue or by contact with dead bodies etc., and which normally only lasted till even or after washings. God instructed Haggai to ask the priests "If one bear holy flesh (i.e. flesh intended for sacrifice - Exodus 29:34) in the skirt of his garment, and with his skirt do touch bread or pottage, or oil, or wine, or any meat, shall it be holy? And the priest answered and said, No. Then said Haggai, if one that is unclean by a dead body touch any of these, shall it be unclean? And the priests answered and said, it shall be unclean."

But when Bildad and Eliphaz use the word "Clean" it is the Hebrew *zakah* which refers to innocence or moral purity in a person, as for e.g. "Who can say I have made my heart clean, I am pure from my sin?" (Proverbs 20:9). Or "wherewithal shall a young man cleanse his ways? By taking heed thereto according to thy Word." (Psalm 119:9).

When therefore the doctor arrived at his conclusions that ‘flesh’ is invariably regarded as ‘unclean’ and that this is a ‘physical’ law of human nature he was clearly unaware that he had arrived at those conclusion solely on the testimony of two convicted ‘liars,’ because Job who had “spoken that which was right concerning God” had said “Who (meaning what man) can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one.” and Job had been speaking about man and not God, and what men cannot do, God to whom nothing is impossible, can, and did, and continues to do, as we shall see when we examine all the evidence.

New Testament Greek does not have two differing words for ceremonial (temporary) cleanness and that moral cleanness of which the liars spoke. One word, *katharos*, appears to act for either of the Hebrew words, as when Jesus said to His disciples, “Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you” or when He responded to the leper who believed, and said “I will, be thou clean,” or when He sent out the twelve with the instructions to “heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, and cast out devils” (Matthew 10:8) nevertheless we need to bear in mind the two differing types of cleanness when considering the differences between the ‘holy thing’ born to the virgin and the normal descendants of Adam who were in his loins- The word ‘physical’ does not even appear in scripture.”

It is over four years since I published the above, and I am still waiting for any Christadelphian to demonstrate where my facts are wrong!

Back to your tapes. The next reference mentioned is Genesis 3:19, “In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken, for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.” YHWH is reminding Adam that despite the additional dimension of *chay* life, with all its spirit potential, with which he had been created, he was still a natural animal body with the limited life span with which he had been first formed. But now, because of transgression, the pleasant existence in paradise tending the garden must end, the expulsion from the garden meant the end of that idyllic existence, and ‘hard labour’ contending with thorns and thistles and with an ever increasing family to support would now be his punishment.

You then go on to claim from Genesis 3:1,7,10 and 11 that these verses demonstrate the doctrine of ‘atonement’ or ‘covering’ with which definition I agree, but fail to see how the tree of knowledge of good and evil was their ‘natural protection’ which ‘slipped away’ by the action of the serpent- Surely it was a simple matter of choice: freedom to choose to obey God or to disobey and suffer the consequences, namely ‘judicial death’ on that same day even though “mercy rejoiced against judgment” and the sentence of death was suspended. Chapter 3:1 simply describes the tempting words of the serpent, temporarily endowed with human speech, for Adam had to be ‘proved’ obedient or disobedient. “Hath God said ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?” Verse 7 says, “And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof and did eat, and gave also to her husband with her, and he did eat.” Verse 10 says “(Adam) heard the voice of God in the garden and was afraid, because I was a naked one and I hid myself.” Verse 11, “And he (God) said. Who told thee that thou wast naked? Hast thou eaten of the tree whereof I commanded thee that thou shouldest not eat? Verse 22 which you do not mention simply says, “Behold the man is become as one of us to know good and evil” No physical change is even implied and certainly not mentioned. It is true that if the human race was to survive then some means must be found to avert that sudden judicial death now required by law, for at that time Adam had no progeny to “be fruitful and multiply,” nor is there anything in these verses to indicate that God intended to put any such thing as a “bias to sin” in the literal flesh of his “very good” creation by some mysterious way, to do so would be to acknowledge that He had created a faulty man whose nature must be altered, as well as making God responsible for causing us to sin- When therefore you claim that “What had changed was the mental nakedness created by the subtlety of the serpent” then I am pleased to note that, as yet, you have not claimed any physical change of the flesh of Adam and Eve, but I would ask you to remember that “Adam was not deceived.” He understood from the beginning of this chapter that his choice was contrary to the will of God. If the serpent, also created “very good,” could change the “mental state of Adam and Eve,” for which there is no support in these verses, I think you need to supply a better explanation of its role in the transgression than some imaginary “mental nakedness.” You might also consider that in addition to the literal there is also a metaphorical aspect of the Genesis account, but we will leave that for now.

Your next reference is Genesis 6:14 and the Hebrew word *kaphar*, all of which I accept as scriptural and uncontested as I do the expositions of what follows in Leviticus 12, 14 and 15 and Luke 2 and Exodus 29, all of which are excellent expositions of the antitype of the facts surrounding the atonement EXCEPT - and what a difference it makes to your whole exposition - they are only antitypes that can apply to Christ when they are complete. When the altar is clean, the ark and the mercy seat and all the furnishings of the tabernacle are cleansed and the various atonements of the law can proceed, when the covering garment of Sin was taken away from Joshua the son of Josedech, then and only then do they become antitypes of Jesus. But WHY? WHY? WHY? do you omit from the catalogue the central and most important antitype of all - THE SACRIFICE ITSELF? Which needed no cleansing for it was a creature without defilement, without sin, without blemish, a male of the first year, YHWH's Passover, provided by God, "God will provide himself a lamb," said Abraham to his son Isaac- He was holy, undefiled, separate from sinners. He was the "better sacrifice" of the heavenly things that contradicts all your efforts to label Him as sin defiled flesh, or "mental nakedness" needing to be cleansed as we do from Sin whose only wages are death.

I believe you have also misunderstood the antitypes of Zerubbabel and Joshua in Zechariah 3 and 6 when they began to build the Temple- "Now Joshua was clothed with filthy garments and stood before the angel." It was the garments that were filthy, not the man. The fulfilment of this part of Zechariah's prophecy was surely when Jesus arose from the baptism of John metaphorically clothed with the filthy garments of the sins left in Jordan by the people, and the spirit descended from heaven like a dove, and as Matthew records the voice from heaven testifying that "This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased."

You continue with the claim that "Jesus was related to Adam and therefore defiled. He was no exception." This is wrong and you cannot prove it. He was certainly the woman's seed, but she herself was never 'in Adam's loins' as I have already demonstrated.

Jesus was certainly the sure foundation of the spiritual Temple of believers. The literal foundations of the temple built by Zerubbabel and Joshua were in actual fact overturned according to Josephus, by the Roman soldiery in AD70 searching for the gold that had melted and run down between the joints of the foundations in the Holy Place when it was burnt down.

When therefore you claim that the change of garments in Zechariah 3 was equivalent to the purging of iniquity in the body of the one who bore our sins this is quite untrue. Clothed with those sins, Yes! There was no iniquity in His body to be purged. You yourself have admitted that He was morally clean. Not only is there nothing said about 'bodies' in Zechariah up to this verse; the garments foreshadowed our iniquities laid upon Him and the only physical change was when He surrendered His *psuche* life ("it is finished") to rise in the glory of His *zoe* life three days later. Look again at John 20 for a fulfilment of this prophecy at the resurrection. Zechariah 3:5 where the literal Hebrew is "*remove the garments filthy from him, and he said to him, See I have caused to pass from you your iniquity and I will clothe you with festal garments and I said let them set a turban clean upon his head, so they set a turban clean on his head and clothed him with clothes and the angel of YHWH stood and charged the angel of YHWH Joshua saying thus says YHWH hosts if in my ways you will walk...*" (Hendrickson literal). The A.V. says that the angel of YHWH stood by, though there were two angels as verse 5 in the literal Hebrew confirms, hence in the fulfilment we read of one at the head and one at the feet where the body of Jesus had laid until He rose immortal (John 20:12). Then in Zechariah 3 the prophet reverts at verse 6 to his own times and to the son of Josedech and promises him that if he walks in YHWH's ways and keeps his ordinances (mg) then he too will be a judge in the kingdom and walk amongst angels, and the redeemed. And also Zechariah again speaks to the son of Josedech of the bringing forth of a future Branch of which we read in Zechariah 6 where vv 9-15 appear to speak in my personal opinion of a promise which could only apply to the rebuilding then about to commence conditional upon verse 15, "If ye shall diligently obey the voice of YHWH," which historically they did not, and therefore neither did YHWH fulfil those verses at that time. Both Zechariah 3:7-9 and 6:12-15 are conditional upon obedience to YHWH and historically refer to the times followed by Roman domination and the emergence of the Scribes and Pharisees as rulers and custodians of what the returned exiles should believe, it can hardly be maintained that in the brief period following the times of Mordicai and Esther that "the iniquity of the land was removed and the exiles called every man his neighbour under the vine and under the fig tree," or that verses 9-15 in chapter 6 were ever fulfilled in those days.

You then go on, assuming your false ‘sinful flesh’ theory to claim that Adam in Genesis 5 begat Seth and then lived a further 800 years and begat sons and daughters, and then go to Romans 8:3 to prove the theory (which we have already proved is a mistranslation). So why omit verse 1 and 2 of that chapter:- “There is therefore now (when Paul wrote Romans) no condemnation (Greek - *katakrima* = down judgment) to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. For the law of the Spirit of life (*zoe* life) in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death,” and then find you have to accuse Mary the mother of Jesus of being a sinner! What about Luke 1, “From henceforth all generations shall call me blessed.” A blessed sinner Richard? Please think again.

You began your second address in Hebrews, which you correctly say was written to the believers at Jerusalem who were about to make a catastrophic return to Judaism. Before we begin this second address may I clarify a minor mistake? Paul was not the author of Hebrews, for the following reasons - Hebrews 10:32 & 34, “Call to remembrance the former days, in which, after ye were illuminated, ye endured a great fight of afflictions... for ye had compassion on me in my bonds, and took joyfully the spoiling of your goods...”

The ‘former days’ can only be the times mentioned in Acts 7 when Stephen was stoned and the brethren persecuted by Paul himself. And Paul was never in prison until many years later on his second missionary journey, and even then it is doubtful if those Jerusalem Jews could have had compassion on him and they were certainly not ‘the former days.’ Again in Hebrews the writer says (2:3) “How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him.” Surely Paul did not understand the gospel from other brethren. It was revealed unto him direct from the Lord Jesus who appeared to him on the Damascus road. He tells the Galatians in chapter 1, verse 11, “For I certify you brethren that the gospel which was preached of me is not after man for I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it but by the revelation of Jesus Christ.” It doesn’t alter your arguments, but I thought it worth a mention.

The Heavenly Things Themselves. 2nd address

You commence the second address with the claim that Jesus was our representative and not our substitute and that your contentions are “traditional Christadelphian Doctrine.” You are mistaken. John Thomas believed that Jesus was our “substitutionary testator” as I have proved from the original 1850 edition of “Elpis Israel” in my possession, as well as his belief in immortal resurrection at that time. It has only been Christadelphian doctrine since Roberts performed his doctrinal somersault after the death of the doctor and proceeded to disfellowship and charge with heresy anyone who disagreed with him. His view that Messiah came in the ‘defiled garments of human flesh’ is not only unscriptural but almost ridiculous, indeed to equate ‘defiled garments’ with ‘human flesh’ verges on that ‘metonymy’ (putting the name of one thing for that of another associated with it) which you later deny exists in scripture. It may be useful at this stage to prove the existence of ‘metonymy’ in scripture rather than when we come to it in your address later, again with a quote from Alan and Margaret Fowler’s book:-

“EXPLORING BIBLE LANGUAGE” by Alan and Margaret Fowler, page 60:

“Ephesians 6:12 Paul writes “For we do not wrestle against flesh and blood but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this age, against spiritual wickedness in the heavenly places.” Flesh and blood then is metonymy for human beings, (Matthew 16:17, Galatians 1:16) or human nature (Ephesians 2:15). Paul was not telling the Ephesians that they did not have to wrestle against human opposition. He was using the comparative negative idiom. He was warning the Ephesians that their struggle was not only a battle against ordinary human beings, they also had to contend with powerful political enemies of their infant church – enemies that had already made him a prisoner in chains.”

May I also point you to Deuteronomy 31:30 for another example of metonymy. “And Moses spake in the ears of all the congregation of Israel the words of this Song, “Give ear O ye heavens, and I will speak; and hear O earth, the words of my mouth. My doctrine shall drop as the rain, my speech shall distil as the dew, as the small rain upon the tender herb, and as the showers upon the grass.” Can you deny, Richard, that heavens and earth in this quote are not other names for the rulers and congregation of Israel? I think not.

Again in your address you have failed to consider the implications of your contentions. If it were true that Adam's transgression caused a change of nature from 'very good' to 'flesh full of sin?' which causes us to sin, then firstly, who caused Adam to sin? Was it the equally 'very good' created serpent? Or YHWH Himself? And, more importantly, who changed that nature? Only YHWH could have changed the nature of His creation, in which case, it follows logically that YHWH is responsible for our sinning. You have not confronted these facts, merely repeated the arguments, or what I have elsewhere termed "the extrapolations from suppositions" of Robert Roberts.

You began your 'journey through Hebrews' at chapter 5:1, "For every high priest taken from among men is ordained for men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins: who can have compassion on the ignorant, and on them that are out of 'the way;' for that he himself is compassed with infirmity. And by reason thereof he ought, as for the people, so also for himself, to offer for sins" and admit that your reason for so doing is that you can argue your case 'within the law.' But you have forgotten Hebrews 7:12, "For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change in the law," and that verse alone instantly exempts the Lord Jesus from what you put forward. But what is your case? Is it not to prove that Jesus had defiled flesh? I am in full agreement with you that all the examples you quote of the courts, and tabernacle, furnishings, altars, mercy seat, etc., are shadows of the true - after they had been cleansed, but when the writer of Hebrews speaks of every high priest, he specifically qualifies that claim with the words "taken from among men" and Jesus was NOT taken from among men. God was His Father and God provided Him to be the sacrifice. Simeon understood and said "Mine eyes have seen thy salvation, which thou hast prepared before the face of all people" (Luke 2:30,31). "When he commeth into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body thou hast prepared me (Hebrews 10:5). See also Hebrews 1:6 and Psalm 40:6-8. Also the qualifications for high priests under the Mosaic dispensation required that priest to be from the tribe of Levi, which also disqualifies Jesus who sprang from Judah through Mary; nor is there any example in the Mosaic priesthood of any priest through the female line. Inheritance is always through the male.

Having then I hope, addressed the premises of your contentions and shown them to be unscriptural, we next come to that claim that although Jesus was sinless He was "made sin for us," and your quote of 2 Corinthians 5:21. "For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteous of God in him" i.e. if we are "in Christ." You admit that He knew no sin, He had no sins for which to make reconciliation with God, "He needeth not daily (like the Levitical priesthood) to make that reconciliation for himself and then for the people's for this he did once when he offered up himself." But surely you can see that this passage is not saying that Jesus offered for Himself. His one offering was for the people. The whole tenor of this chapter is contrasting the priesthood of Jesus with the priesthood of Aaron, not seeking similarities with the Levitical order, that had already ceased when Jesus ascended to heaven to be High Priest for the righteous, those "in Christ." When you quote from Corinthians that He was "made sin," you forget the first principles of exposition that 'a text without a context is a pretext.' The Corinthians only source of information of scripture would have been the LXX. Only the Jewish element, if there were any at Corinth, may have had the Hebrew Old Testament. In the LXX the Greek *harmartia* is translated over 100 times to mean 'sin offering,' as well as sin itself as a transgression of law, and sin offering is the natural understanding the Corinthians would have when they read it. Indeed Hebrews 9:28 confirms that He was such a sin offering. Hebrews 10:11 also confirms that the offerings of the Levitical priests "could never take away sins." Jesus was the Mediator of the new covenant after the order of Melchizedec which negates your contentions that every priest taken 'from among men' had to offer for his own sins. Jesus was not a priest when He expired on the cross. He was a naked sin offering, pure and free from sin. "Sacrifice and offering and burnt offerings, and offerings for sin thou wouldest not, neither hadst pleasure therein, which are offered by the law" (Hebrews 10:8,9) and "the priesthood being changed there is made of necessity a change also of the law." Again, I repeat. There is not one single verse in the Bible which teaches that Jesus offered 'for Himself.' The Roman soldiery cast lots for those garments which symbolised our sins, the natural *psuche* life was surrendered as a substitute for those "in Adam" and saw no corruption until it rose in the full glory of that *zoe* life still bearing the wounds suffered for us as He demonstrated to doubting Thomas.

Again when you turn to Hebrews 5 and repeat that "Every High Priest taken from among men is ordained for men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins." then you

concentrate on verse 3, “And by reason hereof he ought, as for the people, so also for himself to offer for sins, you emphasise the word ‘ought’ as if it were a key verse, and raising your voice go to verse 5 to quote “so also Christ” then forgive me Richard, when I say that I find this both distressing and offensive and demeaning to my Lord. How could the one who was sinless “which of you convicteth me of sin?” - how could He offer for His own sin when He was sinless? And if you reply that He was offering for His ‘defiled body’ then God gave Him that body. Neither is it possible to prove that His body was defiled in any way by Adam’s transgression. The passage “So also Christ” has nothing to do with your supposition, as you will surely have seen if you had quoted the whole verse - “So also Christ glorifies not himself to be made a high priest: but he that said unto him, Thou art my Son, today have I begotten thee. As he saith in another place, Thou art a priest for ever, after the order of Melchizedek” (A prophecy fulfilled when He had ascended to heaven). So please Richard, look again at this chapter bearing in mind the context and purpose of the author which was clearly to emphasise the differences between the Levitical and Melchizedek priesthoods, remembering what is said in Hebrews 7:12, “For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law.” It was David in Psalm 2 who first prophesied of his begetting, and the writer to the Hebrews in his opening chapter who declares “Being made so much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they. For unto which of the angels said he at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee? And again, I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son?” Is it any wonder that more and more Christadelphians are recognising the impossibility of Roberts’s blasphemous delusions of defiled flesh even in the sacrifices, which under the law had to be of a sinless mate animal?

You then go into a lengthy dissertation to try and prove what you term “the Adamic condemnation,” presumably of the nature of Christ quoting passages from Robert Roberts “The Blood of Christ” and using Hebrews 7:27; 9:12, to prove by your “journey through Hebrews that beneath those glorious garments of the High Priests (of the Levitical order) lurked the ‘hideous’ spectacle of, as you earlier termed it, ‘defiled flesh,’ and culminating in “The absolute grammatical necessity that Jesus sacrificed for Himself” including an exposition of Aorist 1 and the word *heurisko*. Let me now quote what I wrote in 1998 on page 13 of “The Divine Plan” A Re-appraisal of Some Christadelphian Traditions:-

DID JESUS HAVE TO OFFER FOR HIMSELF?

Only if we start from the false dictum of Dr Thomas that the body of Jesus was as unclean as the bodies of those for whom he died can support of a kind be foisted on the two passages in Hebrews which Roberts uses in that Christadelphian ‘classic’ “The Blood of Christ” in his endeavour to convince us that Christ benefited from his own sacrifice. But this writer does not believe, or no longer believes, that his interpretation of Hebrews 9:12 is correct or that it is supported by Hebrews 13:20.

Hebrews 9:12 “Neither by the blood of goats and calves but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption {for us}.

Hebrews 13:20. “Now the God of peace that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great shepherd of the sheep through the blood of the everlasting covenant.”

Coincidentally Brother Roberts’ booklet “The Blood of Christ,” having now been in print for over 100 years is currently reviewed in the August (1998) Testimony, and the reviewer writes as follows:- “The Christadelphian understanding that Christ benefited from his own death (the reviewer is not aware of any religious body which has a correct understanding of this issue) appears early on in the booklet almost like a hammer blow to break down the theories of the apostasy. Hebrews 9:12 (the two italicised words ‘for us’) are not in the original - the verb is in the middle voice meaning “Having obtained in himself eternal redemption) and Hebrews 13:20 are handled with a measure of detail and although Brother Roberts makes the point forcefully enough he could also have added the marginal rendering of Zechariah 9:9.”

The marginal rendering of Zechariah 9:9 would read the verse as “thy king cometh unto thee, he is just and saved and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal of an ass.” Quite how that marginal rendering would have assisted Brother Roberts is unclear to the present writer when Jesus had neither suffered nor died when He fulfilled those words of Zechariah and rode into Jerusalem. No other version that this writer is aware of adopts or mentions that marginal note. But it is the statement that Jesus obtained

m himself that we are concerned with, dependent as it is on Brother Roberts's understanding of the 'middle voice' in Greek. Vines Expository Dictionary has this to say about the word *heurisko* in Hebrews 9:12.

"Heurisko" denotes "to find" in the middle voice, "to find for oneself" to procure, get, obtain with the sense of accomplishing the end in view, so in Hebrews 9:12."

The end in view of our Lord's sacrifice was that He should save His people from their sins. Nowhere does it say in scripture that He needed to save Himself from His own sins, for He had none. He obtained that eternal redemption for His people by His own will and courage, not as Brother Roberts imagined 'in himself and therefore God hath highly exalted Him. The blood of goats and calves did not arrive on the altar as unclean animals, neither was Jesus unclean. The blood of the everlasting covenant is firstly in scripture that which accompanied the offerings of Noah in Genesis 9, and all the subsequent promises of God to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and to David are spoken of as 'everlasting covenants.' But Isaiah tells us in chapter 24 that Israel broke the everlasting covenant, but God promised to renew it in chapter 55 and confirms it to the "seed which YHWH blessed" in chapter 61, as also Jeremiah in chapter 13, and finally to this passage in Hebrews 13 where the writer of Hebrews contrasts it with the blood of the bullock slain as a sin offering, whose flesh and skin and dung were to be burnt without the camp at the ceremony of the consecration of priests in Exodus 29.

There is no doubt that "The Blood of Christ" is a well written (clever) piece of Christadelphian literature, but assumes from the beginning that human nature is born sinful and unclean, and that Christ Himself suffered from that handicap. But as we have shown, sin is not a synonym for human nature.

Sin's flesh is flesh owned by 'Sin.' There was no physical change in Adam's nature after he yielded to temptation and came under the power of 'Sin.' Sin in scripture is both a verb and a noun, as a verb it is literally "transgression of the law," but is also personified as a noun as "the prince of this world," the devil who tempts us to commit sin, to whose deceit all men except Jesus have submitted, but whose power and authority we reject when we walk "in Spirit and not in flesh."

Returning to your tapes. I carefully followed you through your expositions of Hebrews 5:1, Exodus 28, Hebrews 5:4,5 and 7:27, and my thoughts went back to our Lord's confrontation recorded in all three Synoptics, with the Scribes and Pharisees when they accused Him of performing miracles by the agency of Beelzebub and Mark records this as "the sin which hath never forgiveness, Mark 3:29 - "But he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Spirit hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation: because they said, He hath an unclean spirit."

Your own comment on Hebrews 7:27 was "It was necessary that Jesus, like the High Priest should offer for himself from the uncleanness of Adamic condemnation." Can you now see Richard, why I am so concerned that my friends will miss that "first, resurrection" if they continue to believe as you do in the B.A.S.F. What is the difference between your imaginary "uncleanness of Adamic condemnation" and having "an unclean spirit"? Think again Richard.

Again back to your tapes and your contention that the one thing that did not need cleansing was the Lord's morality for He was morally spotless and unblemished, and conclude that what He needed to cleanse was the defilement of sin's flesh, which we have already proved to be one of Roberts's "extrapolations from suppositions," but did not Jesus Himself say in Matthew 15 that it was only the things that "come out of the heart that defileth a man," and we read in Proverbs 23 that "as a man thinketh in his heart, so is he." So what about that 'mental nakedness' you postulated at the beginning of your address? Or the "hideous spectacle of defiled (unclean) flesh beneath the glorious garments of the High Priest" and why speak now of the "defilement of sin's flesh" when you previously spoke of 'sinful flesh,' which Roberts claimed was a 'good translation of Romans 8:3? Are you now admitting that the only change when Adam sinned is that technically he became the bondslave of 'King Sin' for "his servants ye are to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey"? He was now technically and legally the property of Satan as we have been trying to impress upon Christadelphians for 125 years.

I find it somewhat contradictory that you now say -

“If the pattern of the things in the heavens needed to be cleansed with blood, then Christ himself had to be purged with a better sacrifice. What sacrifice is better than that divinely appointed under the law - it was Christ’s own sacrifice operative first on himself.”

This is not merely contradictory, it is a travesty. What you are implying is that the sacrifice itself had to be sprinkled with blood before it could be a sacrifice, which is certainly not true of the Mosaic Law. Again I have to remind you that Adamic defilement is a myth and a lie as I think I have proved from your own scriptural references. But let me now introduce a scriptural prophecy which you have failed to mention. A prophecy which speaks specifically of the ‘atonement’ or ‘reconciliation’ and which yet again cancels the whole false edifice of defiled flesh or unclean flesh of Adamic nature causing it to collapse like a house of cards. I refer of course to Daniel chapter 9 from which I will just quote the last four verses: “Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make reconciliation (atonement) for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most Holy. Know therefore and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem unto Messiah the Prince shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks: the street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times. And after threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself: and the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end thereof shall be with a flood, and unto the end of the war desolations are determined. And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week: and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease, and for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolator.”

He was “cut off,” He was crucified, “but not for himself.” Can it be any plainer Richard? For nearly sixty years I too was deceived with the lies of the B.A.S.F. which I defended with vigour. For nearly sixty years I would have supported the misunderstandings you have extolled, until I was provoked by an accusation of heresy to examine what I had said about Genesis, until like the people of Jerusalem in Acts 3 to whom Peter said, “I wot that through ignorance ye did it as did also your rulers,” which I would paraphrase as the ‘Christadelphian establishment’ in these last days, with their stubborn refusal to publish any opinions but their own. You twice repeated the invitation “Let those who object produce their arguments from the same source.” I have accepted your invitation - I await your response. Meanwhile I pray that you and your house will find the pearl of great price as I have done.

Eric Cave. July 2003.

Render unto the Pope...

ADRIAN HILTON SAYS THAT THE EU IS A MEANS OF UNDOING THE REFORMATION AND EXTENDING VATICAN SOVEREIGNTY OVER BRITAIN

This realm of England is an Empire... governed by one Supreme Head and King’ So proclaimed Thomas Cromwell in his most critical piece of legislation, the Act in Restraint of Appeals in 1533. By calling England an empire, he designated it a sovereign state, with a king who owed no submission to any other human ruler and who was invested with plenary power to give his people justice in all causes. Interestingly, the Act’s critics in Parliament were not so much concerned by its doctrinal corollaries, as by the fear that the Pope might retaliate by organising a European trade embargo against England. The Pope, of course, laid claim to the ultimate divine right. He was, after all, the Vice-Christ, appointed to establish one unified empire under one emperor, belonging to one Church under one God.

England finally rid itself of papal interference in the Bill of Rights of 1689, which declared that ‘no foreign prince, person, prelate, state or potentate hath or ought to have any jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this realm.’ It may have taken 440 years from Cromwell’s foundational declaration, but entry in 1973 to the ‘European Economic Community’ brought England back into the Catholic fold, and exactly 460 years after the English monarch was declared

sovereign, the present Queen was reduced to vassal status under the terms of the Maastricht Treaty, which rendered her a European citizen and thereby subject to 'foreign princes and potentates.

The issue of European religious union is one that has been concealed even deeper than the plans for political union, but the ratchet towards a Catholic Europe is just as real. The Pope's recent demand that 'God' be featured in the emerging European constitution has been echoed by many leading Catholic politicians and bishops. While on the surface such a reference may offend only Europe's atheist and humanist contingent, it must be observed that when the Vatican refers to God, she sees herself as God's infallible vice-regent upon earth, the leading organ of divine expression; indeed, according to its publication *Oominus Iesus* (5 September 2000) as the only mediator in the salvation of God's elect, insisting that all other Churches, including the Church of England, 'are not Churches in the proper sense.'

The Roman Church is founded on a political dogma claiming that the Pope is 'supreme ruler of the world'; superior to all kings, prime ministers and presidents. These spiritual and temporal claims remain very much fundamental dogmas of Catholic teaching, permitting the Pope, through Cardinal Ratzinger, the Prefect for the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, to issue clear directives to Catholic politicians on how they should vote. Since their obedience is considered a 'moral duty' devolve everything to the overwhelmingly Catholic European Council of Ministers, Commission and Parliament, and the ultimate Caesar is the Pope.

Such would be the fulfilment of a Sunday Telegraph article (21st July 1991) which stated; 'Karol Wojtyla is calmly preparing to assume the mantle which he solemnly believes to be his Divine Right - that of new Holy Roman Emperor, reigning from the Urals to the Atlantic,' The Catholic Church is achieving this through its political wings - The Christian Democrat and Christian Socialist parties - with the EU's 'Founding Fathers' now reaping the ultimate reward: sainthood. The Pope has beatified Alcide De Gasperi, Robert Schuman and Konrad Adenauer for founding the Union 'on Roman Catholic principles.' A supporter of their canonisation said it shows that Europe 'was built upon a rock' adding, 'I think that the European Union is a design not only of human beings but of God.'" The very act of bestowing sainthoods on politicians is purposely designed to inculcate that European unification is God's will, and that those who lead it govern by divine right.

During the 1975 referendum campaign, Shirley Williams unambiguously associated the vision of Europe with Rome's goal of assuming political and religious authority over the lives of all Europeans. She observed, 'We will be joined to Europe, in which the Catholic religion will be the dominant faith and in which the application of the Catholic Social Doctrine will be a major factor in everyday political and economic life.' While the EU has adopted many symbols of nationhood (a passport, flag, anthem and currency) and is now moving towards the attributes of government (a president, foreign secretary, global ambassadors at the UN and G8), it follows that, since Europe has no unified demos, a 'deeper' cohesive force is necessary to hold the whole project together. When Cardinal Maria Martini of Milan addressed the European Parliament in 1997 in a symposium of Remembering the Origins of the Process of Integration, he identified this 'deeper' something - effectively a common state religion - reminding the Parliament that its true foundation was a religious one. He outlined the importance of a single faith (Catholicism), and emphasised that religions must not support nationalisms (i.e. the Church of England must not defend the English constitution), and Europe must recognise the 'primacy of the divine' (i.e., the primacy of the Pope). His address included demands for a new welfare state, in accordance with Roman Catholic social doctrine, and his contention that European integration was never about economic and monetary issues alone. He said, 'The Europe we must build is a Europe of the spirit.'

When divinity rules, it is, of course, infallible. According to canon law, the Pope claims immunity from all moral and civil authority: 'The First See is judged by no one.' This is precisely the spirit in which the EU governs, with the Court of Justice deeming that political criticism of its leaders is akin to the most extreme forms of blasphemy. It is therefore possible to suppress it without violating freedom of speech, affording the EU an undefined and seemingly unlimited power to restrict political criticism. Like the Papacy, the Court is supreme, accountable to no one, and the soul arbiter of citizens' 'rights.' Lord Shore, in his book *Separate Ways*, observed that the Commission acts precisely 'like a priestly caste - similar to what it must have been in pre-Reformation days, when the Bible was in Latin, not English; the Pope, his cardinals and bishops decided the content of canon law.'

Accordingly, any decision of the people which does not accord with the divine will has to be corrected. The very notion of 'destiny' is simply a euphemism for government by divine right, and this is the teleological explanation for three referendums in Denmark on the Treaty of Maastricht, two referendums in Ireland on the Treaty of Nice, and the suspension of democracy altogether in Belgium and Italy in order to ratify treaties or force through budgets. In each referendum, there is a 'wrong' and a 'right*' outcome. It also accords with the EU's sanctioning and funding of 'acceptable' political parties, i.e. those who ultimately accord with its own aims. When the United Kingdom votes no to the euro, the wrath of God will be poured out again and again until the people repent and accept their predestined fate.

Such a destiny can be foisted upon recalcitrant nations only when they are weakened. The Roman principle of divide and rule is resurrected in the 'Europe of Regions' strategy, which encourages each 'region' of Europe to look directly to Brussels for policy and funding, bypassing national parliaments in the process. This is a recreation of a medieval Europe of small, ineffectual states which can be easily dominated. The ecumenically minded Church of England has been complicit in the fracturing of England with its bishops chairing regional conventions, but the Ecumenical Movement is in reality a parallel front to Rome's divide-and-rule strategy. When Cardinal Bea stated that 'no concessions in dogma can be made by the Church for the sake of Christian Unity,' he was simply reiterating Rome's belief about itself. Any movement or concession is only ever on the part of the subsidiaries, since the centre is infallible.

There are significant structural parallels between the Roman religious system and the political subsidiarity principle, which is itself a concept of papal origin. In the theory of ecclesial authority, an important part is played by the concept of the representation of One Christ, who combined in himself all the offices for the dispensation of salvation (prophet, priest and king). If the Church is ruled by God, then God must necessarily flow down from above, step by step, so at the apex of human order there must be a single channel, directed by God himself, and only at the lower levels could the stream of God's will begin to branch into subsidiary levels. Subsidiarity was designed not to permit the tributaries to 'claw back' what may best be performed at a lower level, but to permit the infallible centre to decide what freedoms to grant the subsidiary levels. Whether it be termed federalism or centralism, 'subsidiarity' denotes the downward development of certain powers for the practical outworking of the Supreme Power's objectives.

There is much debate about whether the EU is a democracy, a theocracy, an oligarchy or a collective dictatorship, but at root it is none of these. It is an amphictyony - a confederation of states established around a religious centre. A Catholic-EU will inevitably result in the subjugation of Britain's Protestant ethos to Roman Catholic social, political and religious teachings. The Queen's coronation oath 'to govern the peoples of the United Kingdom according to their laws and customs' and 'to maintain the Protestant Reformed religion established by law' is negated by the process of deeper European integration. It is almost a symbolic confirmation of the Queen's vassal status that a 20p coin of Gibraltar bears an engraving of Mary crowned "Our Lady of Europe" - the suzerain spiritual authority - while the Queen is stripped of her usual titles DG, REG, FD - Queen by the Grace of God, Defender of the Faith.

Under the constitution for Europe, the EU will have a Catholic Caesar presiding over the Protestant monarch. The former Belgium Prime Minister Paul-Henri Spaak once made a plea for 'a man of sufficient stature to hold the allegiance of all people' and added, 'Be he God or the Devil we will receive him.' The allegiance of the Queen's subjects is usurped by the demand for allegiance to the suzerain power; a spiritually unifying allegiance which is primary, for without the unity of the demos, the European vision will die. Accession to the constitution for Europe would finally confirm that the United Kingdom yields to -the suzerain European Ecumenical Community - an empire in which everything belongs to Caesar, and where Caesar is God. Rendering the euro unto him would be all that remains for this vassal state to perform.

Adrian Hilton

Adrian Hilton is a former parliamentary candidate and author of The Principality and Power of Europe. He teaches Philosophy and Religious Studies. He is an approved candidate for the Conservative party.

Taken from **The Spectator** 30 August 2003.