

The Nazarene Fellowship Circular Letter No 88

March 1987

In this Issue:

Page 1	Editorial	Evelyn and Harvey Linggood
Page 2	Exhortation	Brother Leo Dreifuss
Page 5	Jesus At The Bar - (part 1)	Brother Andrew Wilson
Page 8	Letter from	Brother Phil Parry
Page 11	The Federal Principle	Brother Ernest Brady

Editorial

Dear Brothers and Sisters and Reader friends, Warm Greetings in the Name of Jesus.

We thank all who have contacted us during the past month, the letters and phone calls are very much appreciated and keep us in touch with one another when it is not possible to meet together as we should like.

We understand Bro. David Phillips is in hospital again having further treatment for his eye trouble, we pray it may be effective and wish him a speedy recovery.

The situation in the Middle East is still explosive, we wonder how long before the end comes and the wicked will be annihilated and "the desire of all nations shall come" and bring peace to this troubled world.

In this issue we have an exhortation by Bro. Leo. Dreifuss entitled "Lies and Confusion." The first instalment of a booklet by Andrew Wilson entitled "Jesus at the Bar" also a letter from Bro. P. Parry to Bro. L. Dreifuss and a short article on "The Federal Principle." Bro. and Sis P. Parry send their love to all the brethren and sisters. We close with a prayer for the welfare of you all and love in the Masters Service.

Sincerely yours, Harvey and Evelyn Linggood.

Dear Brother or Sister, We thank all who supply us with suitable material for the Circular Letter with articles etc. However we shall be pleased to receive short items (of say 75/100 words) or paper and magazine cuttings with your comments, suitable for filling up odd spaces rather than quoting poems etc.

We often find there are interesting items from other religious publications of various beliefs. Although we do find some astounding statements at times by and relating to various Christadelphian magazines. It saddens us at times how far astray they are from the Truth, despite their claims to accept the Bible as their sole authority for their beliefs.

Maybe there are some of our publications now out of print you feel worth repeating over a period. Just let us know.

Harvey and Evelyn].

When a man desires anything inordinately, he soon is disquieted in himself. The proud and covetous can never rest.

The poor and humble in spirit live together in perfect peace.

The weak in spirit, and he who is still in a manner carnal and inclined to things of the senses, can with difficulty withdraw himself altogether from earthly desires. Therefore he is often afflicted when he attempts to withdraw himself from them; and is easily aroused to anger when he encounters any opposition.

If he hath followed there his appetite, he is presently disquieted with remorse of conscience in having yielded to his passion, which profiteth him nothing to the obtaining of the peace he sought for.

True quietness of heart is therefore obtained by resisting our passions, not by obeying them. (Galatians 5:22)

There is no peace in the heart of the carnal man, nor in him who is addicted to external things. Peace is in the spiritual and fervent man.

An Exhortation Genesis 3 and Esther 3

Lies and Confusion

It is often said that half-truths are more mischievous than outright lies. This is so, and we have two examples of mischievous half-truths, or subtle mixtures of truth, half-truth, truth falsely presented, and complete lie in the scriptures. And because so many sins and false doctrines originate from such mixture of truth and lie, we want to consider together two examples:- 1. Haman's accusation of the Jews to King Ahasuerus. 2. The lie of the serpent in Eden.

Let us first of all examine Haman's statement about the Jews in detail

Esther 3:8 – “There is a certain people scattered abroad and dispersed among the people in all the provinces of thy kingdom; and their laws are diverse from all people; neither keep they the king's laws: therefore it is not for the king's profit to suffer them.”

The first part was true; there was a certain people, the Jews, scattered abroad and dispersed among the people in all the provinces of Persia. The second part was a half-truth, or rather something true in itself but presented in such a mischievous manner as to give the king an untrue impression. He said: “their laws are diverse from all people.” This was true as long as it was understood that their laws which were diverse from all people were religious laws. But the way Haman presented the case would give the king the impression that their civil laws were the ones which were diverse from the laws of other people. And so a truth was subtly misrepresented and turned into a lie. The truth: - that they had religious laws which were indeed different from any other religious known at that, or any previous age, - turned into a lie - that their civil laws were different from anybody else's, and finally, having given the king this false impression by misrepresentation of the truth, he follows it up by adding a complete lie, “neither keep they the king's laws.” That was certainly not true. Jewish tradition always expected the Jews to conform to the laws of the country in which they lived. In this respect, Jewish tradition is in line with the Divine mind. For later on, the apostles tell us in their epistles also to be “subject to the powers that be.” The only possible exception, both among the Jews in the Persian provinces, as also among Christians to this day, arose when the law of the land ran contrary to God's commandments. Such exceptions are on record, as in the case of Daniel and his companions Shadrach, Meshak and Abednego. But apart from these necessary exceptions, the Jews endeavoured to conform to the laws of their Persian ruler.

Reverting to Haman's lie, we see how he deliberately gives a false impression, follows it up by a lie, and then concludes that the Jews should not live. A mischievous confusion of truths and lies.

The lie of the serpent in the garden of Eden is in some respects similar. The serpent said:- "Yea, hath not God said, ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?... Ye shall not surely die: for God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil." The first statement was intended to question what God said. "Yea, hath God said...?" Then follows a direct lie: "Ye shall not surely die." God said: "In the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shall surely die." The serpent flatly contradicted this and said, "Ye shall not surely die." And finally a subtle mixture of truth, untruth and truth falsely presented: "For God doth know that that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil." It was true their eyes were opened, and that when they were opened they knew good and evil. True, in this respect, they were then like the angels, who also have a knowledge of good and evil; when the serpent spoke of gods, it must have meant the angels, for they were the only living creatures, apart from Adam and Eve, whom the serpent knew. But the serpent gave the impression that this knowledge of good and evil was something to be desired, as indeed it is when God gives us knowledge, and when God is recognised. Does not Solomon exhort us to get wisdom? Yes. But he also tells us to retain God always in our knowledge, and that the beginning of all wisdom is the fear of God. This was lacking in the sort of wisdom with which the serpent tempted Eve. It was worldly knowledge as it is taught in our day, science falsely so called, and based on wrong foundations, because God is not recognised. The wisdom to be desired by the servants of God is described by James (ch. 5 v 17) "But the wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy." This is the kind of wisdom to be desired. And it is the kind of wisdom which God's children will get, if they ask in faith. Solomon asked for such wisdom, I and he got it and possessed it as no other king before or after him. But let us contrast this with the kind of wisdom that the serpent tempted Eve with. It is the foundation of the kind of wisdom that is in the world to this day. The first thing that impresses one when one examines the worldly wisdom is that the existence of God and His Word is openly questioned if not denied. In many circles of society. God is not recognised. Where He is recognised in a limited way, we find very often the inspiration of the Bible questioned. Peter says that all prophets spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit. The modern critic, on the other hand, makes no secret of the fact that he does not believe in any Divine inspiration. According to him, the prophets merely spake as they thought fit. And the first critic was the serpent in Eden. There is the origin of the so-called higher criticism. The serpent said, "Hath God said, ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?" Here is the very first temptation, trying to cast a doubt on the validity of God's commandment. Then follows the lie "Ye shall not surely die." And how this lie has persisted. It found its way into the ancient Egyptian and Greek philosophies where it took the form of the theory about the immortality of the soul. It was one of the first heresies Paul had to contend with when some of the early believers questioned the resurrection. They were so full of Greek philosophy that the gospel of the resurrection was a difficulty to them. And the last statement of the serpent is the most mischievous of all: "For God does know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil." After the serpent had previously raised a doubt in Eve's mind about whether God really spoke and forbade eating of a certain tree, and after it had contradicted God's threat "Ye shall surely die," he now goes on to misrepresent God completely. The serpent gave the impression that God did not mean to put Adam and Eve to death at all, but that He merely threatened to do so in order to prevent Adam and Eve from acquiring knowledge of good and evil. There are at least two ways in which the serpent misrepresented God:

1. It represented God as uttering an empty threat, in fact it represented God as not telling the truth - for an empty threat is, after all a kind of untruth.

2. It ascribed to God a narrow, jealous mind as if God did not want Adam and Eve to attain wisdom. The serpent attributed to God the kind of jealous mind which we find abundantly in the world. The mentality by which a skilled craftsman, for example, does not want to teach his skill to anybody else, in order to maintain his own superiority, and in order to monopolise his craft by cutting out competition. We find it in the world today at work; but it is not new. It was in the world already at Paul's time, when in Ephesus, Demetrius, a silversmith, caused quite an uproar because he saw a threat to his occupation as

a result of Paul's preaching of the true gospel. So we see how the serpent by means of a lie misled with a little misrepresented truth tempted Eve. It made Adam and Eve think that God did not want them to become wise, and made them desire the worldly wisdom which is not founded on the knowledge of God. And then follows that subtly represented item of truth: that if they ate of the forbidden fruit, their eyes would be opened and they would know good and evil. How Adam and Eve desired that their eyes should be opened. Yes, in this the serpent was right; their eyes were opened, and they knew good and evil all right. But in what a shameful way did they come to it.

Now contrast the way by which Adam and Eve attained the worldly knowledge with the proper way by which Solomon obtained true Divine knowledge. Solomon desired knowledge. But not as a result of the tempter putting a desire for the wrong kind of knowledge into his mind. His desire for knowledge was put into his mind by his father David whose Psalms are full of prayers for just that right kind of knowledge and understanding of God's ways. David the man after God's own heart, brought up his son Solomon to walk in God's ways, and Solomon in his early years faithfully followed therein and so he asked God for wisdom. God gave Solomon wisdom from above which he needed for his responsibilities as a king, and before long, a case arose where he manifested it. God gave Solomon the sort of wisdom that makes for satisfaction and a contented mind. How different from the sort of wisdom that Adam and Eve obtained the wrong way. Their first experience of knowledge was a sense of guilt, shame and a stricken conscience. Their first item of knowledge the realisation that they had done wrong. To the godly man, the "entrance of God's Word into the heart giveth light." But Adam and Eve were not enlightened that way.

In fact, their understanding was darkened to the ways of God, darkened by the mischievous subtil perversions of the serpent. Their eyes were truly opened, but not for their good: it led to a sense of shame, and they hid themselves from God, afraid of the consequences of their sin.

No, God does not refuse wisdom to His children. But He wants them to get a godly wisdom, and He wants them to go the right way about it: Solomon's way, by prayer and obedience. He gave this wisdom to Solomon. He gave Adam and Eve a measure of wisdom too. Before they sinned, their duty was to dress and to keep the Garden of Eden. There was only God who was able to show them how to do it. And after their fall, God did not leave them entirely to their own devices. He clothed them, He gave the first promises of the Saviour, of the seed of Eve, and He taught them, and possibly their children, the first principles about sacrifice, the shedding of blood. Such knowledge never came from the serpent, neither then nor nowadays. It is not taught by the so-called preachers in the world, they do not understand it themselves. They have not got the first principles – the necessity for the shedding of blood. This to them is just an ancient primitive custom.

Dear Brethren and Sisters, let us endeavour to get understanding the right way. There is only one way we can do it in our age - by prayerfully studying the recorded Word of God. Let us be thankful to God that we have had, as we hope, at least the elements of the Divine Truth revealed to us, and having had this knowledge revealed to us, let us hold fast. One of the foremost exhortations which the Lord Himself delivered in His last messages to the seven Asian Churches was:- "Hold fast." If that exhortation was necessary for them, it is necessary for us.

We now once more are about to partake of the Emblems. So our thoughts move from the events that took place in the Garden of Eden to those that transpired in the garden of Gethsemane. From the serpent, the originator of all lies, to the One who is the Way, the Truth and the Life. And before we partake of the emblems, I just want to leave one more thought with you. When men neglect God, God forsakes them, and leaves them to their own device and ceases to reveal Himself to them. Adam and Eve felt forsaken when they realised their sin. Then we see Jesus who took our sins upon him and also Adam's. He died the death that God threatened to Adam, of which the serpent hinted that God never intended to carry it out. When on the cross, He also was for a short moment forsaken of God. But what a difference in the circumstances! In the case of Adam and Eve, it was their own folly that caused them to be forsaken. Christ could have claimed angelic aid. Had He done so He would not have been forsaken? But He chose to die, and His choice to die the sinner's death necessitated that God should withdraw His Spirit from Him for three days. Then again, we sometimes feel forsaken of God, if things

go wrong; it maybe that God is trying us. And if we do not lose faith, we learn every time that “all things work together for good to them that love God.”

But let us beware that the reason for God’s forsaking us is not that for which God forsook Adam and Eve. Let it not be caused by our own folly! We live in the last days. Once more, it is the last Breaking of Bread service of the year. One Sunday, it may well be the last before Christ comes. Let us hold fast what we have and pass the rest of our pilgrimage as faithful stewards of the Lord, possessed by wisdom from above. Let the Lord have cause to commend us for just this kind of wisdom, and not merely for the wisdom of the unjust steward, who only had the wisdom of the world to recommend him.

Brother Leo Dreifuss

Jesus At The Bar. **by Andrew L. Wilson.**

The booklet with the above title was first published to the best of our knowledge in 1908 although the contents may have been prepared even before that date. It was republished in 1942. In the appendix to the 1942 issue L. Wilson says, “In the reprint, by use of capitals, we have endeavoured to emphasise the word FLESH, in hope of revealing that absurd confounding of flesh with the person composed thereof, occurring in Christadelphian teaching and doctrine.”

The author himself in his Preface says, He owes his direct indebtedness in the primary stage of his religious career, to the writings of the late Dr. Thomas and others, his settled conviction of “The freedom of Christ from all condemnation” is due to the writings of the late Bro. Edward Turney; and while he claims to have proved Jesus “Clear at the Bar,” and man’s utter helplessness to redeem himself, he has also endeavoured to show that the theory of God’s endowing Jesus with extra power to overcome His supposed “Sinful flesh” is no part of God’s scheme of redemption.

We make no apology for using Jesus at the Bar as material for our Circular Letter. Many Christadelphians of the rising generation have never heard of the booklet, while many of past generations have made every endeavour to keep Nazarene Fellowship literature away from their readers who think for themselves and wish to prove all things. In an earlier booklet by A.L.Wilson entitled “Jesus My Substitute” some Christadelphian writers took exception to the word substitute being used as the position of Jesus in relation to man’s redemption. Asking how could one individual be a substitute for more than one? As sinners are Legion they considered it to be out of the scope of reason. While others stated the word substitute is not found in the Bible. On the same basis the word representative must also go. But remember as the author states words are merely the ‘garments’ of thought, but we must use or wear the correct garment according to the occasion, or context in the Scriptures. Christadelphians deny substitution; they declare that Christ was under condemnation to death on His own account. In effect they are asking that a person who is bankrupt, should be asked to stand as financial security for a debtor - would any public receiver be so foolish?

WHY THEN DID JESUS DIE?

To prosecute this case, we shall require once more to bring Jesus to the Bar, and select an equal number of witnesses for and against. Firstly however let us listen to the words of Jesus himself John ch. 10 from verses 17 and 18 “...Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life.....No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again...”

Now let us turn to our witnesses: Firstly from the Scriptures and then from Christadelphian writers.

PAUL. "Christ died for our sine according to the scriptures." 1 Corinthians 5:13.
ISAIAH. "He was wounded for our transgressions." Isaiah 53:5.
PETER. "Christ suffered for sins, the just for the unjust." I Peter 5:18.
JOHN. "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." John. 1:29.

JOHN THOMAS: "Sin is that in the FLESH which has the power of death, because the development or fixation of this evil in the FLESH was the result of transgression." - Elpis Israel page 113
CDN Magazine. Aug.1875 p 564: "Jesus offered for His own sins."

R. ROBERTS: "The sentence of death ran in the blood which he inherited through Mary. He was therefore in the days of his FLESH as much under its power as those He came to save." - The Ambassador Mar, 1869 page 85.

C.SMITH: "There is no IF in it, you know. He was made Sin by being made of a woman and thereby cursed by the law." - In a letter to the Author.

J.J.ANDREWS: "Christ was by birth made of fallen, sinful nature, and that His death as a sacrifice was necessary to cleanse Himself as well as others." - "Blood of the Covenant" - Preface

We have given a summary of the authors introduction to "Jesus at the Bar." Over the next few months we hope God Willing to repeat in full the booklet commencing at page 5. This, then, was the atonement according to our friends, and their attitude towards those who rejected it; but silent time works wonders, for to-day we find less unanimity amongst them on that question than in any other body under the sun. Some even pronounce the theory to be "a theological error;" but have they like Pilate, washed their hands from that 'innocent blood'? If not, let us transcribe a piece we find in one of their pamphlets on Baptism, p.11, where it is asked:- "Where does Baptism come in? and the answer is: "It comes in after belief. Baptism is of no value without belief. There might be a ceremony; but without belief it would be merely a ceremony - a needless ceremony." A condemned Christ, then, not being the Christ of God. Let those to whom this applies "Repent, and do the first works." Let truth prevail. Let us now examine the evidence, and endeavour to show that the condemnation brought against Christ is the deduction of a false premise, viz., "Sinful flesh," for which our present witnesses are not guilty, having been handed down to them by her who intoxicated all nations. She, logically baffled as to how redemption could be obtained through a "physically Sinful" redeemer, invented "the immaculate conception;" our witnesses, deceived by that premise, allow it the logical course, and falsely condemn Christ; while the truth of God, like a placid stream, winds its silver streak between these two bleak mountains of delusion. The only place in Scripture which lends countenance to physical sin is Romans 8:3, via., "Sinful flesh." We submit that there is not a more mischievous mistranslation in Scripture, and the delusion has gained as wide a currency as the immortality of the soul. In the Greek there is no adjective; it is the noun in the genitive case, signifying 'possession' and therefore as silent as death regarding the quality of the flesh. Here the author gives the Greek lettering which I cannot do, the meaning being "flesh of sin," or "Sin's flesh." How simple then: God sent "His own Son," His own possession. His own FLESH, in the likeness of "Sin's Sons," same kind of flesh, but different 'property,' who surrendered His life as the price of their redemption. Let us illustrate the distinction between quality and possession. A farmer for example, whom we will name "Thomas Righteousness," possesses twin lambs, one of which is sold to a butcher whom we will call "John Sin." Do you think the skin, FLESH, blood and bones of this Lamb have become "Sinful" by the mere circumstance of its having been sold to John Sin. Yet this is the logic by which, from this Scripture, we are asked to believe in a physically sinful Redeemer. Sinful qualifies character; but if applied to FLESH, stupidity. Now Adam, like a sheep, sold himself under Sin: cast himself out of the fold, the door of which was guarded by the Cherubim and "Flaming Sword."

Could he now approach God? Nay, verily. What, then, happened? Did his flesh become Sinful? No more than the flesh of the Lamb sold to the Butcher. There was defilement; but it was 'Legal;' he defiled his character, by which his relation to God was altered, the penalty for which was forfeiture of life. To expect deliverance then, from one who derives his life from this criminal source is an outrage both of reason and God's scheme of redemption. God alone can and must provide the ransom. This He has done in His Son (John 3:16; Revelation 13:8). Did this Son of God, then, require to shed His blood before He could approach His own Father? Pitiably delusion! "I was cast upon Thee from the womb." "Thou art My God from my mother's belly." (A slight diversion: surely this reference proves non pre-

existence of Christ. H. and E.L). When He, therefore, by the grace of His Father, undertook, on behalf of the sheep, to reopen the door of this Fold, did He flee at the approach of the wolf? Did He escape the “Flaming Sword”? The veil of the temple was rent in twain. The Lord hath laid on Him, His Lamb, the iniquity of us all. Thus He has become “the door,” through whom alone we can go in and out and find pasture. But we are told that the body of sin had to be destroyed (Romans 6:6) and that this was Jesus’ “Sinful body.” The rendering here could not be improved, (again Greek lettering) body of sin. Here again, quality is confounded with possession. It is not therefore, a Sinful body, neither Jesus’ body, nor even Paul’s physical body; but there is in Paul’s style a body here rendered powerless: i.e. “Sin’s possession” of Paul is rendered powerless by his faith in the operation of the working of God in Paul’s symbolic crucifixion, death, burial, and resurrection with Christ. It is this peculiar metonymic style of Paul that stumbles many. Even Paul’s vehement solicitation, “Who shall deliver me from this body of death? fails lamentably to prove that either Christ or Paul was physically Sinful. Ponder the idea of Paul’s desiring to dissolve physical partnership with himself! This savours somewhat of the old Lady’s disembodied theory. Clarke is of opinion that Paul’s allusion here is to an ancient custom of certain tyrants who bound a dead body to a living man, and obliged him to carry it about till the contagion from the putrid mass took away his life. Was there anything bound to Paul having this inevitable result? “The law was added that the offence might abound; a remembrance of sins every year; the ministration of death.” The association fits the idea; hence Paul, in his metonymic style, exclaims, “Who shall deliver me from this body of death? Was he (Paul) then, delivered, and how? Christ purchased his freedom from the curse of the law by taking the curse upon Himself. Then we are asked How was sin condemned in the FLESH of Jesus, if it were not there? This is perhaps, one of Paul’s statements to which Peter refers as being hard to be understood, which those who are learned beyond what is written (I Corinthians 4:6) wrest to their own destruction (II Peter iii.6). Paul also addressed his brethren: “Ye are not in the FLESH.” Did he mean they were not FLESH and blood? He also says: The “foolishness of God is wiser than men.” But we must abandon all idea of ‘sport’ - He says: “The weakness of God is stronger than men,” but we must not entertain any idea of “invalidity.” He also says: “Christ hath abolished, in His FLESH, the enmity.” Does this mean that enmity was an element of the FLESH of Jesus? Then Paul’s next phrase deepens the confusion: “even the law of commandments.” Was the law which was holy, just, and good, “enmity”? Cannot our friends see that it was the cause of enmity; and that Jesus, by honouring the law, and enduring the execution due to the transgressor, removed the enmity, and, thereby, united Jew and Gentile in one body? Literally, what is sin? John says; “the transgression of law” (I John 3:4). What is the process of its existence? James says: “Every man when he is tempted, is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed.” Did Jesus then, ever allow lust to conceive and bring forth sin? God completely condemned sin then when, as Isaiah says, “The chastisement of our peace was borne by Him.” How did He bear it? Just as Peter says: “In His own body on the tree” (I Peter 2:24). Study Paul’s metonymy. Then we are told that Jesus was “made sin” (II Corinthians 5:21) by being “made of a woman” (Galatians 4:4), and, thereby, “cursed by the law.” Paul says: “No man speaking by the Spirit of God calleth Jesus accursed.” (I Corinthians 12:5).

to be continued.

Letter from Brother Phil Parry to Brother Leo Dreifuss :-

Dear Bro. Leo,

Loving greetings in Jesus Name and trusting you are well. With reference to our conversation on the phone concerning the literature entitled “Christ our Passover” passed on to you and in which you say much is quoted from “Elpis Israel” and “Slain Lamb” to bolster up the false doctrine of “condemned nature” and “sinful-flesh” and human nature being synonymous with sin etc. This is the whole weakness of current Christadelphians they do not read and think for themselves on what the Scriptures teach in harmony with respective subjects, but as our late Bro. Brady stated in his reply to Reg Carr of “The Testimony.” They turn to the pioneers Thomas and Roberts whose writings are in many cases contradictory, false and suspect, and ask, What do they say on the subject? And a few quotations from “Elpis Israel” or “Slain Lamb” and perhaps “Ministry of the Prophets,” C.C.Walker is to them an

explanation and “an end of all strife.” This is far from being the case and it has been proved over and over again, and still these same people carry on with veils over their eyes obscuring the light of the glorious Gospel of Jesus Christ revealed by his apostles through the Holy Spirit. Regarding the subject of Christ abolishing in his flesh the enmity: Ephesians 2 vs 15. This is obvious to you Leo but apparently not to your Christadelphian visitors, that the “enmity” was that which stood in the way of both Jews and Gentiles being antitypically reconciled to God, and this entailed ratification of the Covenants by the shed blood of Christ - and that, it is absolutely foolish to even think that the law of commandments contained in ordinances were actually in the physical flesh of Christ. Paul was showing that at one time the Gentiles were outside the commonwealth of Israel and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no Hope and without a God, due to the barrier or middle wall of partition remaining as long as the Mosaic Law was in operation, this partition having been broken down through Christ’s Sacrificial death. In other words, as long as Christ remained in flesh and blood nature having in himself the “Life” or equivalent Ransom-Price for all, the wall of separation between God and man, between Jew and Gentile, would continue to exist. Thus Jesus could say with all authority by His direct Sonship, “I am the Way, the Truth and the Life, no man cometh unto the Father but by me.” Thus signifying that the way into the Holiest was only possible through the veil or partition being removed. We recall that at His crucifixion the veil of the Temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom - see also Hebrews chapter 10 vs. 19 and 20.

It was on the cross that He, Jesus abolished death and brought life and immortality to light, He did not abolish death in Himself as Christadelphians falsely declare, He suffered death in the place of Adam, and those in Him by enlightenment if they choose to avail themselves of the opportunity of passing from death to life by faith and the symbolism of baptism into His death (not natural). Why do Christadelphians persist in dissecting Christ as a man or personality of character, from His flesh? Surely it was the man Christ Jesus - everything that made up a man - with whom God was well pleased at the waters of Jordan, also before and after His statement to John the Baptist to that effect, for Jesus said “My Father loves me because I do always those things that please Him.” It was not a part of Jesus that God loved to the exclusion of His flesh as Christadelphians maintain, so it is time they forsook these false and indoctrinated theories of their pastors and teachers and got to the stage where Paul and his fellow apostles taught that without the shedding of blood was no remission of sins and that Jesus made peace between God and man through the blood of His cross, that men were reconciled (who were once alienated from God) in the body of His flesh, through death (blood-shedding) He needed no reconciliation Himself for He was never estranged from God even from birth and needed therefore no redemption Himself. see Colossians 1:15-29. There is not a Scripture which states Jesus had to die for Himself or on account of having identical nature with His brethren, He was capable of natural death even as we are but His death on the cross was inflicted, by blood-shedding, for the specific reason of taking away the Sin (singular) of the world. The great theme of that object and purpose can be traced through the scriptures from Eden to Gethsemane the one thing causing blindness to its conception and understanding, being the false and unscriptural premise that natural death was the penalty passed upon Adam for his sin when in fact this was a capability of his nature at creation. The difficulty with Christadelphians is in their belief of the mistranslation of the term “Sinful flesh” which Paul never used, and which is an impossibility in any case, sinful is a state of the carnal mind which is enmity against God and applies to the legal position of alienation from God and belonging to sin as a master, or as the term should have been correctly translated “Sin’s Flesh” a matter of possession not quality. Sinful applies to Character, not flesh. Despite all that is taught in the Law of Moses concerning what constituted acceptable animal sacrifices as an atonement and a conscience cleansing of the offerer, Christadelphians persist in their pernicious doctrine that Christ was a type of these, yet, condemn themselves and Christ himself, by contending that he was a polluted and corrupt offering of unclean, condemned flesh. Paul in Colossians 1:21, 22 is setting forth the fact that the faithful Colossian converts had “been reconciled in the body of the flesh of Christ through his death, that they might be holy and unblameable and unproveable in his sight - continuing in the faith grounded and settled etc., as members of his Body of flesh and Spirit - The Church - Christ in them the Hope of Glory. This is the very opposite of what Christadelphians are prepared to accept, so if rejection of the Lamb of God’s provision means their rejection by Him, so be it; they have only themselves to blame and are identifying themselves unwittingly perhaps, with the seed of the serpent.

Remember, there was nothing wrong with the flesh or the blood of Christ, the life of His flesh was in the blood - but when He rose - the life of His flesh was not the blood, nor in the blood; His flesh was energised by Spirit. Natural life in the blood having been “sacrificed” and could not be taken back. There is no change of the physical flesh as is seen in Paul’s reference to Ishmael and Isaac, Galatians 4:20-31.

He that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the spirit, even so it is now. How can Christadelphians explain the clause in their statement of faith in view of this distinction made by Paul? A clause which states Jesus was raised up in the condemned line of Abraham and David; the former “A Friend of God,” the latter, “A man after God’s own heart,” and finally Jesus by a voice from the excellent glory, “This is my beloved Son (flesh and blood nature) in whom I am well pleased”? This describes God’s approval of those who were justified in His sight by faith – the quality of their flesh had nothing to do with it. Relationship to Him was what really mattered, “I will be sanctified in them that come nigh Me.” “No man speaking by the spirit of God calleth Jesus accursed,” (either before or at his crucifixion). Can Christadelphians read-Malachi 1:11 and 12, without a searing of conscience in their view of a polluted Christ? “For from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same my Name shall be great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering: for my name shall be great among the heathen saith the Lord of Hosts. But ye have profaned it, in that ye say, The table of the Lord is polluted (This is my body given for you) even his meat is contemptible (My meat is to do the will of Him that sent me). Should I accept this of your hand? saith the Lord. The bread and the wine symbols of an unclean Christ - a polluted offering? But cursed be the deceiver that hath in his flock a male, and voweth, and sacrificeth unto the Lord a corrupt thing.” Consider the lesson in the following chapter. Think more for yourselves do not bow to creeds of men who wrest the scriptures to their own destruction and that of others. The way into the Holiest has been made possible through God’s Gift of His Son, He who came not to be ministered unto (unnecessary in His case) but to minister, and to give His ‘life’ a ‘ransom’ for many. And to them who look for him shall he appear the second time without a sin-offering (only once offered) unto salvation.

But not to those who consider He was unclean, alienated, and needing redemption himself. This on the authority of scripture rightly divided - not my own.

Phil Parry,

Look Up and Go Through

Does the battle seem long, and the enemy strong,
Easing down for more strength to renew it?
Go on, meet the foe - on, is victory, you know;
Put your trust in the Lord and go through it.

Have you met a fierce test when you’ve done your best,
While foes muster help to undo it?
Even this cannot last, all things come to pass,
Turn your face toward the sky and go through it.

Have friends proved untrue, as sometimes they do,
And you wonder just what made them do it?
Disappointed, forlorn, beaten back by the storm,
Turn your face toward the sky and go through it.

If sickness o’erthrows you, as sometimes ‘twill do,
And you feel like you may not get through it,
Don’t pretend nothing’s wrong - sing a much sweeter song,

Put your trust in the Lord, you'll come through it.

If cyclone or tragedy tears up your world,
And your blood chills in fright as you view it,
All helplessly torn, do not try it alone,
You've a Master who'll help you go through it.

Go through it, oh, yes, whatsoever the test,
Not over, around, or eschew it;
Look life in the face - meet it by God's grace -
Keep your face toward the sky and go through it.

All "passing things pass," and all "lasting things last,"
A fleeting life's moment - you're through it;
All trials pass away, God's Kingdom's for aye-
Keep going that way - you'll get to it!

The Federal Principle **by E. Brady.**

It is generally agreed by those who accept the Bible as the Word of God that according to Romans 5 all the posterity of Adam are in some way involved in the sin of Adam and are affected by the penalty of death incurred by him. It is when it comes to deciding exactly how we are involved and affected that the differences arise. The majority understand that it was man's physical nature that was affected. Before the sin he is supposed to have been in some way superior to what we are now, but that either the sin or the sins sentence which followed caused his nature to deteriorate and made him a dying creature. This is equivalent to a kind of process of slow poisoning which ultimately brings death. There has been in recent years a lot of debate about the death penalty for murder; should it be abolished or retained, or should some other method than hanging be used to end the life of one who has destroyed life. What would have been the reaction of the public if anyone had suggested the kind of slow drawn-out punishment for murderers which religious people put upon God in the view they hold that all mankind are slowly dying - not for murder but for the sins which they are supposed to be unable to help? If any judge or M.P. or journalist had had the temerity to make such a proposal, he would have been denounced as inhuman and merciless, yet this is what is attributed to God in the common interpretation of how death passed upon all men, for that all sinned. How much more seemly and in accord with the true attributes of a just God is the Federal Principle; that we the members, are accounted parts of the federal Body of which Adam is the federal Head. Under this principle we become included in the sentence of death for Adam's sin only when we become enlightened; and the sentence is not executed because we can be instantly extricated from it by rendering obedience to the provision for redemption, which was effected prophetically in Eden by the slaying of the sacrificial lamb and antitypically at Calvary when our Saviour died. This understanding of the purpose of God excludes the unenlightened, leaving them under the natural law to die as do the beasts from the operation of natural laws. The reason behind the institution of the Federal Principle appears to be the desire of God to develop in men a faith in Him and His promise to provide the ransom price and to exhibit His wonderful love and mercy, not only toward Adam, His first created son, but also towards his offspring, because if Adam had been slain in Eden, as he deserved, we should have perished with him in effect, since we should never have had existence. Understanding and applying the Federal Principle shows us that the perfection of the plan of God lies in the fact that only one ransom sacrifice was necessary to extricate the one Adam(ic) Body with all its millions of members from the effect of sin, because the one sin in Eden represents all sins and this being made the ground of condemnation instead of individual sins, having been atoned for by the sacrifice of Christ all who come under Him are delivered from death.

Thus we see why, without the shedding of blood (Christ's) there is no remission of sin, and we see the stretched out arm of a loving and merciful Father who so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish but have everlasting Life.

Since this was written the death penalty in this country has been abolished.
