

The Nazarene Fellowship Circular Letter No. 67

June 1985

In this Issue:

Page 1 Editorial	Harvey and Evelyn Linggood
Page 2 Reply to "The Case Against The Two Sons of God and Other Nazarene Literature"	Brother Phil Parry
Page 10 Samson	Brother Leo Dreifuss
Page 11 Remarks on a BBC "Thought For The Day"	
Page 12 Mental Brakes	

Editorial

Dear Brothers and Sisters, We extend warm Greetings to all in Jesus Name.

And thank all who have communicated with us during the past month and those who have contributed to the work in this corner of the Lord's vineyard.

A Christadelphian friend of ours sent us an article allegedly refuting the teaching in Nazarene literature, hoping thereby to return us to their faith. We are sure she is sincere in her intentions and really thinks we have been 'led astray' by heresy and this article (a copy of which will be sent to any on request) was supposed to convince us that we had followed 'cunningly devised fables' by taking heed to the Truth taught by Edward Turney and many others some 31 years ago.

We leave it to the careful reader to make up their own mind who is nearer the Truth portrayed in the Scriptures by a study of the reply to the said article (which is not signed) by our Bro. Phil Parry in this issue, we also have an exhortation by Bro. Leo Dreifuss entitled 'Samson'

I was able to visit our Sis. May Lockett for her 96th birthday and found her fairly well, she sends her love to all.

Bro. John Carter sends Greetings and love to the brethren and sisters, he is now 84 and strong in the faith we share. We pray for the welfare of you all, both temporal and spiritual.

With Sincere Love in the Lord's Service. Harvey and Evelyn Linggood..

Matthew 5: 16.

Let your light shine as beacons from a tow'r,
The Master said while speaking unto men;
That all may see throughout life's darkest hour
A light, a hope to cheer their hearts again.

Do not neglect to speak one word, or ten,
A word of love, a word of truth or peace;
That word may bless the lonely heart just when
It yearns for truth and seeks from sin release.

And let your deeds of charity increase,
Your acts will spur another to behold
The better way, the way that leads to peace,
And turns his footsteps to the Masters fold.

'Twill cause your joys with speed to multiply
When men seek God and His name glorify

A Reply to a Christadelphian “The Case Against The ‘Two Sons of God’ and other Nazarene Literature.”

We have had presented to us by a Christadelphian an article which was thought contained all the evidence necessary to prove Edward Turney’s “Two Sons of God”, and other Nazarene literature to be faulty in the light of Old Testament and New Testament teaching. The writer does not sign his name, but if he purports to represent the Christadelphians then he shews himself and them to be illiterate, indiscriminate readers of the Bible and false accusers of those who are quite the opposite, I can only say that when a Christadelphian in the 1940’s I would not have considered him to be representing my views on the sacrifice of Christ which were very much in harmony with those of Edward Turney though I had never heard of him nor the false accusations that were levelled against him and other members of the Nazarene Fellowship whose existence and names I was unaware of.

To this false accuser, and perverter of the Gospel which Paul received by the revelation of Jesus Christ, it should appear strange that by a prayerful study of the Word and refusing to be wise beyond what was written I should come to the realisation that the condemnation was not of literal flesh, or that sin was a physical element infused into it through the operation of God, but that sin was abstract, the transgression of Divine Law which defiled Adam’s conscience but made no difference to his flesh, and that both Dr. Thomas and R.Roberts believed this and refused one D. Handley baptism for entertaining such an imagined and false theory already perpetrated by the Apostate Church of Rome. The champion ‘Goliath’ whom I will refer to as Mr X in my further comments, denies the truth of Edward Turney’s belief and statement that Adam and Eve were created subject to corruption and death, and in so doing he accuses Dr. Thomas (the pioneer and first adopter of the name Christadelphian), Robert Roberts, and even he who had the Spirit of God, the Apostle Paul, as believing and stating the same thing. Added to this even clause IV of the B.A.S.F supports with scripture references all four, yet Mr. X produces Adam and Eve in bodies not even mentioned in the Bible account; he therefore lends no support to Genesis, to the Apostle Paul, to Dr. Thomas, to R.Roberts, and the whole of Clause IV of the B.A.S.F.

Speaking to the Corinthians Paul stated, “There is a natural body and there is a spiritual body.” “The first man Adam was made a living soul, howbeit that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural, and afterwards that which is spiritual. The first man is of the earth earthy: the second man is the Lord from heaven.” There is neither mention or room for an Adam created with a superior nature to that which Paul says was first, and although God created Adam capable of corruption and death this did not make him any worse, he was not subject to corruption and death through breach of Law, he was not under Law at the time of his creation, and this is what E. Turney is trying to explain, Dr. Thomas also confirming the same in the following statement, “The animal nature will sooner or later dissolve. It was not constituted so as to continue in life for ever independent of any modification. We may admit therefore, their corruptibility, and consequent mortality, without saying that they were mortal. The inherent tendency of their nature to death would have been arrested.”

Dr. Thomas is suggesting that the continued obedience of Adam and Eve would have merited a change from corruptible nature to incorruptible if God so willed. See “Elpis Israel.” The alternative to this change, though obedient for 950 years, would be death by or through natural causes, but this could not be termed “Death by Sin”, and this is where Paul makes the distinction in his Epistle to Romans and Corinthians, that the sentence incurred by Adam’s sin was judicial, through the shedding of blood, and that without the shedding of blood God does not remit sin. Even the Mosaic Law shewed that an animal which had died of itself was not a fit and acceptable typical sacrifice for sin. The life of the animal had to be seen to be taken in the appointed way as a substitute for the life forfeited by an individual who had committed a sin worthy of death, the said individual already being subject to the natural death common to all men. Surely this has its roots and origin in the garden of Eden, where Adam and Eve forfeited their natural lives by sin and God foreshadowed the sacrifice of His Own Son in the coats of skins secured through the taking of life by blood-shedding as a covering and deferment of the sentence “Thou shalt surely die”? Was it not by this observance and faith that Abel offered a more excellent and acceptable

sacrifice than Cain? Surely God the uncreate Deity had no palatable reason for accepting the one and refusing the other. No, there must be some other significance and this is portrayed in the scriptures from Eden to Gethsemane and brought to light through the glorious Gospel of the Blessed God.

So according to Turney says Mr. X “Adam and Eve were created subject to corruption and death! Does not God say He imposed these upon them as a condition of evil, as part of the punishment for their transgression? According to Turney they had their sentence before they sinned!

My dear Mr. X, hear Paul, Dr. Thomas, Robert Roberts, and Clause IV, “Thus speaking thou reproachest us also, for we are in agreement with E. Turney.” Despite the evidence presented Mr. X continues, “The whole argument turns on the change that occurred as a punishment for Adam’s transgression. Genesis 3:17 shows that the change was quite sudden; “in the day that thou eatest thereof dying thou shall die.” Through the transgression their minds had been changed to know good and evil and as a result their whole bodily constitution was then made subject to death.

From the evidence I have presented this appears nothing more than dogmatic assumption and illogical nonsense. Does living for nearly one thousand years after transgression, point to a sudden change? If Mr. X wants a scriptural illustration of a sudden change from one bodily nature to another he should read the evidence of Paul, I Corinthians 15:51 and 52 “Behold, I shew you a secret, we shall not all sleep, “but we shall all “be changed, in a moment in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality.” The sudden change embodied in the sentence “Surely die.” involves the taking of life through the infliction of bloodshedding. A sentence of corruptibility, of decay and death, cannot be pronounced on a person who is already subject to it at creation; this is to charge God foolishly. Mr. X does exactly this when he says God imposed these upon them, whereas God only tells Adam and Eve what would be the result of their being turned out of the Paradise of Eden, that he would have to till the ground and eat bread by the sweat of his brow, the blessings of the garden of Eden not being available, and being dust, unto dust he would ultimately return. Other adverse conditions applied to Eve, but all was a consequence of forfeiting the blessings available to them in Paradise The deferment of inflicted death upon Adam and Eve through the typical sacrifice of the animal for the provisional covering of their sin, did not confer on them the right of restoration to their previous status, this was only possible when the true antitypical sacrifice for the Sin of the world had been made, and Paradise restored in readiness for the last Adam, who succeeded where the first Adam failed, both being in the same nature; a fact believed by Turney and members of the Nazarene Fellowship and which makes void this libellous statement borrowed from “Slain Lamb,” that we do not believe that Jesus Christ came in identical, corruptible flesh and blood nature as ourselves.

It is almost beyond comprehension that a professing follower of Christ should wrest the Apostle John’s words out of their context and meaning to combat a self-invented theory wrongly attributed to E. Turney and his supporters. No wonder John warned his brethren, “Beloved believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world.” I John 4:1. I read this when a Christadelphian and I have read it as a Nazarene and in both cases it never taught me that there were people in John’s day that believed Jesus had come in a different flesh from all other men, all it taught me was that there were Jews who would not accept that the promised Messiah had come of the seed of David according to flesh, and had been crucified, and that there are orthodox Jews in our day who still do not accept it, John was not concerned about what kind of flesh Jesus had, he knew that there was only one flesh of men energised by blood. John’s concern was that these people did not believe that Jesus had come at all, and this is how I have always understood it, therefore it is shameful to use the Apostle John as aiding and abetting an attack on E. Turney and his supporters; but drowning men will always clutch at straws.

Mr. X speaks of God imposing evil in the literal flesh of Adam and Eve but he completely ignores the good that also should have been imposed as a result; he chooses to ignore the fact that it was a Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil which related to intellect, not the physical quality of the flesh. Both Dr. Thomas and Adam Clarke agree that the Apostle Paul in Romans 7:18 is referring to himself as an unregenerated Jew under the Law or as he terms it in v.5 “in the flesh” or not “in Christ,” and inferring to the Roman believers that being “in Christ” they were no longer “in the flesh,” thus Paul could not be

speaking of the literal physical nature of flesh and blood, he was speaking of two Laws, the Law of sin and death, and the Law of the Spirit of Life in Christ, and the fact of having been transferred from under the one to the other without any physical change in the literal flesh, he therefore says as a consequence of this change which must be moral and legal and not related to the physical; Romans 8:1 and 2, "There is therefore now no condemnation 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 in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death." Mr. X, together with Christadelphians in general believe that they have not been made free from the law of sin and death and in this they are quite consistent, because they believe this law of sin and death to be an evil which God imposed in Adam by physical infusion and became literally transmittable throughout all his posterity as an element of sin impossible to remove except by physical means. Therefore in effect, with this false theory, immersion in water makes no difference to their position, they are not in Christ, but still afar off, not having been made nigh by the blood of Christ. Ephesians ch, 2. It appears from his condemnation of Turney, that Mr. X comprehends of no other death spoken of in the Bible but the death common to man and animal creation, and to say otherwise is a fallacy and erroneous assumption and compels a wresting of New Testament references on this basic subject. In this he condemns Jesus Himself, but firstly let us consider his misuse of Paul's words in Romans 5:12, "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." Mr. X stated that this death was sudden; can he explain the sudden sin also of the all that sinned, yet not born for years, in fact centuries after?

Surely this could only mean in the sense of imputation, not guilt; even in a similar way that Abraham's faith was imputed to him for righteousness but this righteousness not being a physical element in his flesh! When some years ago in England a Judge passed sentence of death on a man guilty of murder, this sentence did not operate suddenly in the man's nature changing it to something worse, his nature was unaltered but he was capable of repentance and a change of conduct for the better, if a reprieve was given. There is a close similarity in Adam's case. Mr. X also quotes James ch. 1 "Sin, when it is finished bringeth forth death," but if James is referring to the common death, then the latter also applies to one who is righteous, but here the apostle is consistent and relates this death to sin and, not the death common to righteous and wicked.

Mr. X in reference to Turney says, "We will expose his misuse of scripture as we proceed." Here Mr. X introduces a condition on his readers if he is to succeed. He says, "All we need to keep in mind is that basic truth of scripture: that death and dissolution into dust, is the penalty of sin." Now we have proved from Paul's epistle, from R. Roberts and Dr. Thomas, from E. Turney, and will also do so later from Jesus Himself, that death by dissolution into dust is not the penalty for sin, so he has little hope of exposing E. Turney without exposing his own brethren, together with Paul, and Jesus Himself. When he accuses Turney of mishandling scripture he exposes his own limitations in the perception of the meaning of the types and shadows from Eden to Christ. Turney rightly says "We do not think Isaac typical of Christ as an offering." But he agrees there was a resemblance in the sense that Abraham was prepared to slay his beloved son accounting that God was able to raise him from the dead, and the fact that God would offer His own beloved Son for the sin of the world, but the clue lay in the fact that the ram caught in the thicket and slain by Abraham in the stead of Isaac, was the real type of the offering of Christ and which saved Isaac from an inflicted death by blood shedding.

Anyone who reads "The Two Sons of God" by E. Turney can judge for themselves that far from trying to mislead or put people off the scent he is exposing men like Mr. X who try to be wise beyond what is written. Certainly Turney says, "It has been said by some writers this and that." But is Turney a liar because he withholds their names? Do not you yourself compel me to address you as Mr X because you have withheld signing your name to what you make out to be a case against E. Turney and Nazarene literature, but which recoils on your own head? You even disagree with those men you name as knowing better, Dr. William Kay and Dr. Adam Clarke. You, and most Christadelphians recoil in horror from the very mention of the word substitution which is involved and used by both commentators. You do not read our literature with any intention of finding the Truth but with the same attitude as the Scribes and Pharisees when contending with Christ.

The sayings of Jesus recorded in John chapter 6 were beyond their perception because they trusted in the flesh and literal descent from Abraham by which they thought they were heirs to the promises. John, in chapter 5 verse 24 records Jesus as saying, "He that heareth my word and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death to life." To those who regard and believe natural death and dissolution into dust as the condemnation and penalty for sin which passed upon all men by physical imposition, this statement of Jesus is impossible to understand or accept, yet John understood and believed it as also did those whom he addressed in his first epistle chapter 3 verse 14 "We know that we have passed from death to life because we love the brethren. He that loveth not his brother abideth in death." We ask, what death does he abide in? John has already given the answer, "The death from which they had passed" but they were still in flesh and blood nature, so it is evident that he is speaking of the same death referred to by Jesus in John 5:24, the death which has hung as a sentence over all men as a result of Adam's sin, but to which they are not amenable until enlightened. Such enlightenment gives the possibility and opportunity for a person to pass from under this sentence of death to a sentence or justification of life. See Romans ch. 5 vs 17-21 and chapter 6.

I would remind Mr. X that Paul is not describing death as the result of an hereditary corruptible nature, but the death which came by sin and which Jesus suffered in reality for all men but to which He Himself was not amenable, having derived His life direct from God even as Adam did, and shewed in that same nature, that obedience and respect for God was possible, and thereby justifying God's righteousness in condemning sin, not the nature in which His Law had been breached by an intelligent and responsible Adam. It was on these lines that Turney wrote "The Two Sons of God," and described and explained how that under possession of equal nature and probation the first Son failed but the second maintained his integrity and Sonship, and was instrumental in the work of God in reconciling the world unto Himself, "God sent not His Son into the world to condemn the world but that the world through him might be saved."

Mr. X and Christadelphians, continue to affirm that God sent His Son with a sin-principle and evil element in His flesh and finding no cause to condemn Jesus in His conduct He, God, planned His murder through the instrumentation of the Jews and Romans, and thereby He was able instead to condemn sin in the flesh, thus destroying the Devil in Christ which had the power of death. Hebrews 2:14.

This is the blasphemous interpretation of how we come to know God and Jesus Christ whom he sent described by Mr. X on page 4 where he also makes several false statements, and misrepresentations of some writers whom he refrains from naming and whom he accuses of not accepting the true doctrine of the nature of Jesus. Mr. X resorts to the meaning of certain words, but when it comes to the phrase "Sinful Flesh" which is not in the true version and Greek rendering, but should read "Sin's Flesh," he prefers it not to be corrected because it would destroy the whole concept of original-sin as a physical law and element of evil in the flesh. To insert the word offering is not to add to, or alter what is written, but to explain how and when Jesus was made "Sin" for us. If it was at his conception and birth of Mary then this was the time when it is stated he knew no sin before-hand, so that he must have been pre-existent as a being of intelligence with the Father, and under probationary law. This, neither we, nor Mr. X would want to accept, but he and Christadelphians are forced to accept it on account of a false conception of II Corinthians 5:21 and also the unscriptural belief that Jesus sacrificed His character, not His life blood, on the cross of Calvary which in fact Mr. X affirms in his comments. We are not baptised into the character of Jesus but into His death which was a sacrificial one by blood shedding. In this act we do not associate ourselves with the death by decay and corruption, Jesus did not die that death, but we still do, so the latter cannot be styled the law of sin and death from which Paul declared he had been made free.

This again gives the lie to Mr. X's accusation that Turney confuses the two aspects and misleads his followers in so doing. He says at the top of page 4 "Let us apply scriptural reasoning to the problem in hand. Nothing is plainer than the teaching that in Jesus there was no sin neither was guile found in his mouth. None would convict him of sin. In this sense he was the offering without spot or blemish." Who says there is a problem? The problem if any, is created by those like Mr. X who do not apply scriptural reasoning, and which has been proved in my earlier remarks. The fact is they believe in two Christs not one, a black one and a white one and in order to escape their created problem they dart from one to the other, thus confusing the issue which Turney and ourselves have made plain in so much literature over

the past few years and which they have tried to repress by false accusations and misrepresentation. The Christadelphian problem is seen in Mr. X's direct opposition to Paul's declaration that the Law of the Spirit of Life in Christ had made him free from the law of sin and death which Mr. X insists is a natural law of sin and death in man's members, which is the "sore travail" or "bondage" in which man groans. How can Mr. X make such a play on the word "perfect" when as well as meaning perfection as to the nature of angels, it also means perfection of character and in the context of scripture perfect or very good in kind and condition? Jesus shewed that the nature of which he was composed and born of a woman, was sufficiently up to the standard of obedience God's requirements demanded, and this is what Turney and the Nazarene Fellowship have always believed and taught. God does not give Laws impossible for us to keep, but we must accept, that keeping them will profit us nothing if we are alienated or estranged from God through the bondage or captivity into which Adam sold us, making us bastards or illegitimates from God's Sonship; which several prominent Christadelphians have stated was not the position of Jesus when in the natural flesh, as this would make him as much a son of Adam as they are.

The strength of Christ's position lay in His direct Sonship to the Father making Him free from the condemnation which passed upon all men on the Federal principle by Adam's sin, the life of Jesus was not forfeit to sin as was theirs, so His strength lay in his ability and freedom to lay it down willingly for the many constituted in the one Adamic body. This "constitution" is explained in the fact that God concluded all men under the forfeiture of life as derived from Adam, but He did not conclude them as actual sinners or compulsive sinners by nature. God's object was that as He concluded all men under the one sin committed by Adam, even so by the righteousness of one, Jesus Christ, all men could be constituted righteous. This is not a physical transaction in any sense, but a Legal and Moral one through enlightenment and faith. Romans ch. 5. Neither Turney or we have ever said that the nature of Jesus needed no improvement, of course it did, otherwise He could not ascend to Heaven a High Priest for ever, making intercession for His adopted brethren, neither could He return as King of an everlasting Kingdom to be established, as a result of judging or ruling the world in righteousness. But as we have stated, the nature He possessed was no different from ours in quality, it was the ownership which made Him unique in the fact that God was able to ransom or redeem us through the gift of His Own Son, if Jesus had been "Sin's Flesh" that is owned by Sin, or forfeited to sin through Adamic alienation, then God would have been in no position to offer what was not rightly His own. This is where the strength of Jesus lay, and not as some teach, that God gave Him special strength to overcome the weakness and evil in His nature. God could have done so with any Jew, but any Jew was not free to give a life unforfeited to sin, even if he committed no sin; hence Turney's statement, "We do not think Isaac typical of Christ as an offering." The lesson to learn is that God decides what is typical of His Son as an offering for sin, and we should not try to be wise beyond this. The ram caught in the thicket was not under condemnation for Adam's sin, neither was its life forfeited thereby, in this way a lamb offered as a sin-offering was typical of the flesh and blood nature of Christ, and Jesus declares that it was His flesh and blood which He was giving for the life of the world which Adam forfeited by sin, how therefore can Mr. X affirm that Jesus sacrificed his character? In that case we have a High Priest at God's Right Hand with no idea of what He was before his sacrifice, or why He is there, because something sacrificed cannot be re-claimed.

Much has been written on every subject mentioned by Mr. X, and it appears repetition will make no impact on the brain-washed, indoctrinated adherents of the "changed-flesh" - "physical-sin" theorists. Despite the fact that Jesus said, "Ye cannot serve God and unrighteousness (SIN)" Mr. X affirms and therefore accuses Paul of doing exactly that, with the utmost success and reward. Through lack of spiritual perception and indiscriminate reading of Paul's epistle to the Romans, Paul is accused of serving with the spirit-mind the law of God and with the fleshly mind the law of SIN, which Jesus says cannot be done with any satisfaction. Yet according to Mr. X, Jesus will give Paul and others of like disposition who have served two masters, "A crown of righteousness." Read Romans 6 where Paul gives the lie to such a concept and wresting of chapter 7. If Dr. Adam Clarke a member of the Apostate Church could see by discrimination of the context that Paul was not speaking of himself as a converted Christian, then surely those who profess to know their Bibles should discern this also! Dr. Thomas did, and we have his written confirmation of Adam Clarke's statement. Paul said in his epistle, "They that are in the flesh cannot please God. But you brethren, who are flesh and blood nature, are not in the flesh but in the spirit." Is not this therefore the "legal" and "moral" position of Christian converts, still unchanged in regard to physical flesh and blood nature? Are they not those whom Paul says are Christ's,

who have (past tense), crucified the flesh with its affections and lusts; the old man crucified with Christ that the “body of sin” or “sin’s body” might be destroyed by symbolic association with the death of Christ, that in the “likeness” of his resurrection they are new creatures not any more the servants of Sin but serving God in “newness of life”? “All children of God by faith in Christ Jesus,” says Paul, and not by a physical change of flesh to that which Adam is said to have had before they sinned male and female. Here in Galatians 3:26-28 Paul shews the legal and moral difference between the children of the Devil and the children of God, and if it had anything to do with the physical quality of the flesh, then Baptism should show us physically to be neither male or female, but the exact image and nature of Elohim in which Christ emerged from the tomb.

If Jesus took away the sin of the world which said by Mr. X to be a physical element in the flesh of all Adam’s descendants then his death was ineffective as far as we are concerned, and in order for us to do what Jesus did to destroy the Devil in our flesh we must commit suicide. Far from accepting such an absurd interpretation, the writer of Hebrews 2:14 and 15 shows that Christ’s sacrifice destroyed the power of Sin over men through the fact that God allowed the unforfeited life of His own Son to be taken in exchange for the forfeited life of Adam and all in him on the Federal Principle, thus, (15) delivering or redeeming them who through fear of the death by sin, were all their lifetime subject to bondage; not the bondage of corruption, but the alienation and bondage of the Devil or Sin personified as a master unto whom Adam sold himself, as I have stated. Natural death shows no difference between the sinner and the sinless, as the one dieth so dieth the other and like the beasts, they all have one breath, all are of the dust and all turn to dust again, but when the apostles speak of death they qualify what death they are referring to in its relationship to man. For example Romans 5:12 “Death by Sin,” and Romans 5:15, “If through the offence of one many be dead, (this cannot be physical but legal), even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life.”

Mr. X and Christadelphians in general, have no way of explaining this as long as they entertain the physical sin in the flesh theory, and in answering a similar statement by another Nazarene writer, a Christadelphian told me in correspondence that this was not correct because he had always been aware of the Federal Principle. But to be aware of the Federal Principle and to understand and teach it are two different things and would involve violation of the Statement of Faith, this cannot be tolerated. Nevertheless, two options are open in Paul’s teaching in Romans.

1. To remain under the Federal sentence of death despite enlightenment
2. Accept the grace of God and the gift of righteousness in order to reign in Life by one Jesus Christ.

These options effect the present possibility and neither of these options involve physical or natural death. Passing from one to the other is an option open to those who believe and understand why Christ died, and avail themselves of God’s Grace. True Baptism into Jesus Christ’s death can achieve this without any physical change, and if Mr. X is still unconvinced, I can only feel sorry that he, and others of such perceptive limitations, cannot see the holes in a ladder. Their so-called Baptism with such false theories and beliefs is invalid. It is unscriptural and untrue to say that all the evil, the various diseases and ailments including germs and viruses are the result of God changing Adam’s nature from “very good” to “very “bad” as a punishment upon mankind for Adam’s sin. This is a contradiction of what God declares in His Word, that the innocent shall not suffer for the guilty, a reading of Ezekiel chapter 18 will shew this, and this chapter has nothing to do with natural death, as the context will shew. Why should God make a statement, “It repenteth me that I have made man,” if He was not talking about the same Adam He created from the dust? If man had began to corrupt God’s way, should He have expected anything else of a nature He had changed by infusing all these evils and diseases into it of which Mr. X speaks? Several names witness opposition to this view of changed flesh; Righteous Abel, Seth, Enoch, Noah and Abraham, finally of course Jesus Christ. What we are witnessing, and making headline-news at present, are diseases, germs, viruses, which include what is termed “Aids” as a result of homo-sexual activity, venereal diseases normally advanced by ignorance of, and rejection and disrespect of God’s Law which forbids the deeds of those who have unlawfully contracted them, i.e., homosexuality, fornication and adultery to name a few. God’s Way and Law, has demonstrated that observance and respect thereto,

will avoid the many adverse diseases and ailments possible to man's corruptible nature, such things are only inevitable therefore through man's rejection of God's Way and choosing his own which results in all sorts of complications and unnecessary suffering. The medical term "Aids" as it is known in our day is explained and directed by Paul as describing those homosexuals who rejected God and received in themselves that recompense of their error which was meet, Romans 1:24-52. In the general order of things we accept our coughs and colds injuries and such like, but if we were living in Garden of Eden conditions we would not be seeking the Kingdom of God and His Righteousness, but Jesus assures us that in seeking God's Kingdom and Righteousness which is Life Eternal, the things necessary for our corruptible existence will be provided. Matthew ch. 6. The creature was made subject to vanity not willingly but by reason of Him who hath subjected the same in hope. Mr. X denies this by saying, all this evil, death by decay and disease, was by reason of Adam's sin. Were the animals nature changed by reason of Adam's sin? Were they not already corruptible and capable of natural life and, in accord with their species, some living longer than others? Does Mr. X still have to clutch at straws, for support by men spoken of by God as having committed folly in not speaking of Him the thing that was right as Job had done? Do you need men like this (for whom Job had to pray), to support your unclean physical flesh theories when they are not even speaking of physical flesh? Do you accept the statement of uninspired men that "Even the Heavens are not clean in God's sight"? Does not God dwell in the Heavens? Was it not the Holiest of all, even Heaven itself, into which Christ entered by His own blood? These statements from the book of Job have been scripturally and satisfactorily explained in Nazarene literature for those who are interested, and is still available. Have Christadelphians never read in "Visible Hand of God," R. Roberts explanation of how Enoch a righteous man who is said to have walked with God, was exempt from, as he terms it, natural death through associating himself with the typical offering and sacrifice of Christ and yet his flesh was no better than that of Jesus? One wonders how they miss the point that R. Roberts had to resort to the teaching of E. Turney and the Nazarenes on the substitutionary sacrifice of Christ, in order to extricate himself from a dilemma of his own making! It is obvious Christadelphians are prepared to blind themselves to truth and will misrepresent even Job's so-called three friends in order to support a rotten prop. They should realise by now the scriptural terminology of literal flesh as descriptive of man; "in the flesh" as a legal position of alienation; and the "lust of the flesh" as unlawful desires of the mind void of spiritual knowledge. Not too long ago a Christadelphian wrote about this lack of realisation among his members, and I wrote to compliment him but had no reply, perhaps pressure from men like Mr. X has silenced and prevented him, for indeed others were aware of what I wrote.

I am disgusted with what Mr. X says about the disciples of Jesus who had fallen asleep through sheer exhaustion and lack of sleep, that it was not this kind of weakness, but the "mind of the flesh," with its weakness of will. He follows on with another quotation in regard to the heart of man, and wrested from its context in such a way that it also accuses Christ of being deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked. Also Christ's disciples as in a degraded state and unclean through an inbred defilement. Yet Jesus had already addressed His faithful disciples as "Clean" through the word He had spoken unto them. "Clean" in Bible terminology usually has to do with law, otherwise Mr. X makes Adam "unclean" at his creation, for it was only his conscience that was defiled by sin. Of course Jesus had the same propensities in His nature as Adam and ourselves, for good or evil, it was His choice, and it is ours, we do not deny this, but what we say is that if God had given any other spiritually minded Jew the strength of purpose physically and mentally in the way Mr. X is quoting from Psalm 80:17, that Jew would still have been powerless as a sacrifice for the Sin of the World, the Power or Strength lay in His Divine begettal and Ownership although of the same quality of flesh and blood as all other men. Dr. Thomas wrote this fact wittingly or unwittingly, even in the manner that Caiaphas said, not of his own mentality and understanding, not even by choice, but being High Priest, whose, lips should keep knowledge, the Spirit of God forced him into stating the expediency and efficacy of Christ's Sacrifice.

Mr. X continues to mislead his readers by attributing to O.E.H.Gregory a word he did not use, the word "Equal." Jesus said "For the Father judgeth no man but hath committed all judgment unto the Son: that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father. He that knoweth not the Son honoureth not the Father which hath sent him." John 5:22 and 23, Here is a condition R. Roberts overlooked and also Mr. X. We cannot enter the Holiest of All, Heaven itself, without the Mediator and High Priest of our profession, "No man cometh unto the Father even to honour or worship Him, except

by me,” said Jesus. He does not suggest, neither does Mr. Gregory, that there is equality with Himself and the Father, but He does shew the priority and conditions appointed of His Father whereby honour can be rendered, and this is through the Son, if men reject the Son which the Father sent into the world, they dishonour the Son and the Father “Equally.” Because of the overwhelming obsession and bias, of belief in sin as a physical element in the flesh, which medical Science cannot even explain, Christadelphians are continually reading into our literature things that are not there in order to mislead and confuse their own readers and members. Like E. Turney, I would like to be face to face with this sort of adversary. On his last page 12, Mr. X takes over the role of antichrist which they accuse us of being in regard to the nature of Christ. He says, “Unless the Father had produced a Son, “made strong” enough to overcome the trials and temptations of our nature, all mankind would be without the salvation our condemned state so sorely needs. So in fact Jesus must have had a nature superior to ours, so Mr. X is now saying that Jesus did not come in our inferior nature. How can we trust men who wrest the scriptures to their own destruction? He follows with the most deceitful and despicable interpretation of the lifting up of the Brazen Serpent that it is possible to invent, in order to discredit the flesh of Christ as separate from His character, which character he says, provided the perfect sacrifice, releasing Him from death, to save all those who discern the Lord’s Body. How did Jesus sacrifice his character? This is an abstract impossibility. How did this release Him from death? It definitely did not. He prayed to His Father to be released from it if it were possible, “Nevertheless not my will but thine be done.” He drank the cup. He was not released from death. He suffered it, the Just for the unjust that He might bring us to God. Don’t anyone try to tell me that His resurrection released Him from the terrible suffering He endured by the scourging, the derision, the nails piercing His hands and feet, and the lifting up; to be gazed upon as the personification of the serpent in the flesh. Firstly we are told that Jesus sacrificed His “unblemished character” for us, and then we are told that a polluted body, was lifted up on an accursed tree that we might look upon it and be saved from death. This interpretation approves even a violation of the Law of Moses, but not even the tree was the subject of a curse, the curse applied to the criminal by reason of what he had committed in breach of Law. Mr. X says, The serpent is the symbol of sin and evil, in the scripture, yet the Divine Wisdom chose to typify Christ by this brazen replica! The serpent of brass is therefore a threefold type of the body of Jesus;

1. Brass represents the Flesh of Sin
2. The serpent represents Sin in the Flesh
3. Lifted up on a Tree.

That Christ should be so represented baffles and confounds all that deny the true nature of Christ, “not discerning the Lord’s body”. Of this, I have no doubt, and I must protest that, such an interpretation, disgusts those who discern the Lord’s body and the true reason He was lifted up. How does Mr. X discern the Lord’s body in the Breaking of bread and Drinking the wine, the symbols of His body and blood, which Jesus instituted before He was lifted up, and of which Jesus said, “Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you”? Did not Peter say in regard to the unclean unto which Mr. X likens Jesus, “Not so Lord for I have never eaten anything common or unclean”? Mr. X and his sympathisers should read John chapter 6 verses 27 - 47 with much more perception and discrimination than they have shewn hitherto. Perhaps they should correct what God said of His Son Jesus when John Baptised Him, and re-phrase His words as Jesus hung on the cross, “This is the one half of my Son in which I am not pleased.”

The Nazarenes know of no “Dual Christ” as taught by Christadelphians, we therefore accept Mr. X’s word that he and they have the “venom” of the serpent in them and by reason thereof, has proved the case against themselves and not E. Turney and his supporters. If there were prizes for the most unscriptural, illogical and paradoxical statements on the things concerning Christ’s mission, sacrificial death and resurrection; leading Christadelphian writers past and present, would undoubtedly be the winners.

The Nazarenes believe that it was a body of flesh and blood, - a life, that was lifted up on the tree and taken by wicked hands, and upon whom the Father laid the Sin of the World that it might be taken away. Mr. X and Christadelphians oppose this view by saying it was the character of Jesus which was sacrificed and they have no confidence in Christ’s flesh. Mr. X has demonstrated that all he knows is the

fact that, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh," another study of Galatians chapter 4 might not be amiss if he is capable of any discrimination at all. And also Romans 8:8-10 and 13. Edward Turney's case and ours, rests upon a rightly dividing of the word of God and not self-invented types and interpretations which are not there. The Sin of those bitten by the serpent was not in the "Serpent of Brass" lifted up on the pole by Moses, but was, by the Divine condition of faith in looking up to it, transferred to it, thus averting "inflicted-death- by-sin." In this manner the prophetic statement of Jesus containing the optional "if" signifying He was under no compulsion to die on His own account, is on record for our redemption and salvation from the death which by conclusion, not actual guilt, passed upon all men. In reference therefore to the "brazen serpent" Jesus said, "And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me." Could the blind have looked up at the "brazen serpent"? Can they who are spiritually blind by consent or otherwise, see its counterpart in Jesus Christ? How then can you escape in neglecting so great a salvation?

Bro. P. Parry

Exhortation "by Bro. Leo Dreifuss

SAMSON

Among the personalities of the Bible Samson occupies a rather unusual position. We usually think of God's servants, in the Old Testament at any rate, as prophets, or as great leaders, such as Moses or David. We usually think of them as having visions of God, or some other direct communication with God on special occasions. But no such events are recorded about Samson. The gift that God had given him for His work was somewhat unusual: that of superb physical strength.

The gift of God always varied from person to person according to need and the task to be carried out. In the New Testament Church there were different gifts of the Holy Spirit, such as healing, teaching, prophesy, interpretation of tongues etc.

Samson was endowed with this unusual strength for the purpose of delivering Israel from the Philistines. The first we learn of him is that from his birth he was dedicated to the Lord. There was no razor to come upon his head. He was to be a Nazarite all his life. A Nazarite was a person who for a certain time took it upon himself not to shave his head, not to drink any wine, and to devote those days especially to the service of God. At the end of this specified period he went to the priest, brought a number of sacrifices prescribed in the Law of Moses and ceremonially shaved his head. But Samson was to be a Nazarite all his life and no razor was ever to touch him.

The first recorded incident in his life occurred when he persuaded his parents to get him a Philistine girl to wife. It was a grief of heart to his parents, but they were ignorant of the full facts of the case until later: namely that Samson merely sought an occasion against the Philistines, and so really did God's work, though his parents could not be told of all the true facts.

Had they been told of his real motive for wanting that girl the marriage may not have taken place, and Samson's scheme would have been frustrated. Our faith is also often tested in that we do not know all the facts; we may only know these after the resurrection. And then comes his first display of strength when a lion met him and he rent it. Shortly afterwards a swarm of bees and honey was found in the carcase of the lion. He ate it and also gave his parents of it. This provided the occasion for the quarrel which he sought with the Philistines. We know how he put forth a riddle which they could not solve. He told his wife eventually, who then told her people. And so Samson slew thirty Philistines using the spoil he took from them to give his pledge to the Philistines for expounding his riddle. After this followed incident upon incident in which Samson wrought havoc among the Philistines' lives and property, from burning up their cornfields to lifting off heavy gates of fortifications which guarded the towns in those days, or slaying a thousand men with the jawbone of an ass.

The account of his life then tells us of his affair with Delilah, another Philistine woman. The motive appears to have been the same as that of his marriage: to seek a quarrel with the Philistines. Delilah tried to find the secret of his great strength. For some time he did not tell her the truth; but by sheer persistence she eventually prevailed, and he told her all. We know the sad end. Delilah caused him to sleep and got a man to shave off the seven locks of his head. So his strength departed from him. The Philistines “bound and blinded him, and made a great feast in honour of one of their heathen deities. But their temple was built on pillars: they brought in Samson to make them sport. Samson begged a lad to guide his hands towards these pillars and prayed to God that his strength would come back to him just once more. God heard him and with a mighty heave he brought down their temple with all the people in it upon himself, so that at his death he killed even more Philistines than while alive.

Unlike any other great persons in the Bible there is no record of any direct communication between God and Samson; no direct command to do a certain thing at a certain time or in a certain manner. Rather does it appear that God gave him that one gift of superb strength and commissioned him to use it against the Philistines as and when opportunity arose. And it is evident that Samson certainly used this gift very well in the work God had assigned him to do.

All of us have different gifts. We are not all speakers or able preachers, but we all have some ability in one direction or another, and God knows our limitations and does not expect the impossible. If we can say that we always use our gifts and abilities according to the will of God and not to our own selfish ends then we need not be afraid of facing our Master in the day of judgment.

Finally one more thought. Things went wrong after he had told Delilah the secret of his strength. It is true he was under strong pressure. But the Nazarite vow and the Nazarite life were very solemn things, and like everything else dedicated to divine service at the tabernacle, not to be trifled with. Samson’s great mistake was that he betrayed such a solemn secret to a heathen people most ignorant and rebellious against God. We are told in the New Testament “not to cast our pearls before swine” and although Samson lived long before this was written, the principle applied in all ages to all divine matters, and in this respect Samson failed. As in the case of Adam, Solomon and king Ahab, his wife was the cause of his fall. How appropriate then is the exhortation to the Christian not to be unequally yoked with the unbeliever. The command applied equally to the nation of Israel to whom intermarriage with the surrounding heathen people was prohibited. The motive of Samson’s marriages was probably sincere enough - as with his first marriage to seek an occasion against the Philistines. But he must have known that Delilah was not loyal to him, for she was in communication with the Philistines before to entice him to tell her his secret. In giving such a solemn matter away he had gone too far.

We live in a world of unbelief, among people who admit disbelief in God and who sneer at His word. By all means we must try to convert them where opportunity arises, but until there is some evidence of this let us beware how we talk to them. Let us guard against talking of divine matters in a manner that merely encourages them to scoff at it.

In Thought for the Day a B.B.C. religious correspondent made mention of various beliefs of today and earlier times which are mentioned in the Scriptures, among which the following were cited; Familiar Spirits; Witchcraft; Sorcery; Soothsayers; Observers of Times, and Prophets.

Coming to today we have much superstition; Fortune Telling; Astrology and publications such as Old Moore’s Almanac.

The speaker said the most debased today in the Old Testament were the Prophets.

This as it were hit us very hard, being believers in God and His Word. We read in II Peter 1:19 “We have a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place.” The source of prophecy we see if we continue to read this chapter in Peter, we

are told at verse 20, “Holy Men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit.” Prophets in the Old Testament each testify to the fact that God gave them words to speak. Many instances come to mind from Isaiah, Ezekiel and Daniel. After which we come to the following prophets who show the same authority of God. Each of which in their first chapter confirms God’s authority.

HOSEA 1 v 1;	JOEL 1 v 1;	AMOS 1 v 5;	OBADIAH 1 v 1;
JONAH 1 v 1;	MICAH 1 v 1;	ZEPHANIAH 1 v 1;	HAGGAI 1 vs 1-5;
MALACHI 1 v 1;	ZACHARIAH 1 v 1.		

The above mentioned Thought for the Day was broadcast late 1985.

E. H. Linggood.

MENTAL BRAKES

When angry words come to our lips, we need mental brakes.

When tempted to say unkind things, we need mental brakes.

When gossip raises its ugly head and there are tales we could carry, we need mental brakes.

When our minds are awl with thoughts of fear, worry and self-pity, we need to apply our mental brakes vigorously.

We should use our mental brakes to Stop Quickly whenever we have the impulse to think, talk or act negatively.

He who sows seeds of kindness enjoys a perpetual harvest.
