

FOURTH EDITION

# Adamic Condemnation

— AND —

## THE RESPONSIBILITY QUESTION

---

---

The Subjects Scripturally Set Forth, and Reviewed  
in the Light of Christadelphian Writings; in a  
Lecture Delivered in Leeds, England, By

**THOS. WILLIAMS**

---

---

### CONTENTS:

1. The Leeds Lecture.
  2. Questions and Answers at the close of the Lecture.
  3. An Appendix, Explaining other Scriptures.
  4. Where Is the Blame?—Correspondence between the Editor of the "Christadelphian" and the Editor of "The Christadelphian Advocate."
  5. An Open Letter to the Editor of "The Christadelphian."
  6. Questions for Frank and Fair Answers; but not Answered.
- 
- 

**CHRIS**

Additional Copies Obtainable From:

**CATIONS**

Christadelphian Advocate Publications

P.O. Box 11701

Richmond VA 23230-0101

# Adamic Condemnation or the Responsibility Question

THE SUBJECTS SCRIPTURALLY CONSIDERED AND REVIEWED IN THE LIGHT OF HISTORY OF THE CHRISTADELPHIAN WRITINGS OF THE NINETEENTH AND TWENTIETH CENTURIES.

A LECTURE, DELIVERED BY BRO. T. WILLIAMS, IN THE CHRISTADELPHIAN HALL, GREAT GEORGE ST., LEEDS, ENG.  
REPRODUCED FROM MEMORY.

In 1903 the editor of the Advocate delivered a lecture upon the same subject in the same hall, which was recently published in the Advocate. A local change having taken place since then, it was deemed advisable by the Yorkshire brethren to invite the members of the ecclesias meeting on the "Amended" basis to come and hear an explanation of the causes of division, and the possible means of removing the causes. The following invitation was, therefore, issued: Christadelphian Hall, 81 Great George St., Leeds, 26th Nov., 1907. Dear Bro. or Sister: Greeting in "the Truth."

There appears to be some misunderstanding by the Ecclesias in England separated from us as regards the teaching of Bro. Thos. Williams, of Chicago, on the question of "Adamic Condemnation." We have, therefore, invited him to especially address members of the Yorkshire meetings in the above hall on Monday, Dec. 2nd, at 7:30 p. m., and we have the greatest pleasure in asking you to attend, so that you may hear and judge for yourself. Bro. Williams will reply to any question submitted in writing by any brother or sister at that meeting. The subject of his address will be: "Adamic Condemnation: Its Origin and Nature—Redemption Therefrom, When and How?"

Trusting that we may have a goodly company of the believers, and that all may be benefited.

I am, for the above Ecclesia,

Yours faithfully in Christ,

G. B. SUGGITT, Recorder.

Bro. Overton, late of London, but now of Boston, Lincolnshire, kindly responded to the request to be chairman. There was a large assembly of brethren and sisters from surrounding ecclesias, forty, we were informed, coming from the "other meeting" in Leeds. After a few appropriate remarks by the Chairman, Bro. Williams delivered his lecture as follows:

Beloved Brethren and Sisters:—I am glad to see so large a number present to-night, because it indicates that there is a lively interest taken in the questions we are about to consider. Indeed, it ought not

to be otherwise in regard to matters fraught with so much trouble as those have proven to be which are the subject of our address to-night.

Now, brethren and sisters, I will not call this a lecture, because that seems too formal. I would rather call it a heart-to-heart talk. I want to feel, and I want you to feel, that we are close to one another in an earnest endeavor to explain matters in such a way as to remove all barriers, real or imaginary, that may hinder fellowship, and stifle that love which ought to exist among men and women of the one faith.

It is to be regretted that the force of evil circumstances is such as to compel me to refer to myself to quite an extent in what I am to deal with to-night. I wish it were otherwise, but since my name has been used so freely, and since I have been charged by some with having been the cause, in a large measure, of the division that exists, how can I deal pointedly and effectively with the matter without comparing what I have spoken and written on the disputed subjects with what those who have opposed me have spoken and written, and with what they have read from others with whom they claim to agree?

My first appeal to you must, therefore, be in relation to words and phrases that have come to be regarded by some as expressions of false doctrines. Let me frankly say, I do not attempt to shirk my share of the responsibility for the use of such phrases as "Adamic condemnation," "Adamic sin," "racial alienation," "inherited sin," and such like. I tell you candidly, I do not feel in the least guilty of any wrong in having used these terms. I believe they are the most appropriate terms that can be employed in expressing certain aspects of the Truth. While, therefore, I am charged with being the inventor of these for the purpose of giving expression to alleged false doctrines, it is not because I object to them that I deny the charge, but because to use them is not wrong, and because they are words and phrases that have been in use by our principal writers since the nineteenth century revival of the Truth.

As regards the meaning of these terms, it is not expressed clearly in the Birmingham Statement of Faith? Let me read a few extracts therefrom, first, from Article III.: "That Adam broke the law, and was adjudged unworthy of immortality, and sentenced to return to the ground from whence he was taken—a sentence carried into execution by the implantation of a physical law of decay which works dissolution and death." The first thing for us to consider here is the discrimination between the "sentence" and the "execution" of the sentence. Why is it important to distinguish between the sentence and its execution? Because we claim that the sentence is the "condemnation," known as "Adamic condemnation;" and the execution is the physical effect of the sentence. Here is our first issue, and it is an important one in its bearing upon the doctrine of baptism; for if the "sentence" or "condemnation," is not distinguished from the physical effects, the design of baptism to remove the sentence, yet leaving us to wait for the "redemption of the body," cannot be understood. You will recall the fact that Brethren Sulley and Walker

criticised me for saying that the sentence upon Adam was a "pronouncement," and that the "sorrow and death" were the results of carrying the pronouncement into execution. Now does not this quotation from the Birmingham Statement differentiate between the sentence and its execution? Does it not first say that "Adam was sentenced"? Was not the sentence a pronouncement of the law as expressed in the words, "Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it; \* \* \* unto dust shalt thou return"? Is this not a declaration, a sentence, a pronouncement? After saying that Adam was "adjudged unworthy and sentenced," does not this Article III. state another thing when it says that the "sentence was carried into execution by," etc.? Brethren, is it not a well-known fact that the sentence of a person, the "condemnation," is a different thing from the execution of the sentence? I think some of our brethren stumble over this by confounding the sentence with the words "implantation of a physical law." Of course mortality became a physical law, or a law of nature, as the result of sin, as surely as it is a law of nature that water cannot rise above its level; but what we call laws of nature are not accidents; they are the execution of decrees, either expressed, or designed in the mind of the Creator without being expressed in words. There is a law of light, and a law of heat in the universe; but this fact does not obliterate the decree, "Let there be light." It was therefore naturally in accordance with the ordinary evolution of thought, that the writer of Article III. wrote first of Adam being "sentenced," and afterward of "a sentence carried into execution;" and right here is the place for me to say that, since the coming of the sentence preceded that of the execution, or the result, the removal of the sentence will, at baptism, precede the removal of the physical effect, or the result. But here I am assuming that Adam's sentence is upon and its execution operating in his descendants; does this Article III. say so? Let me be frank again, I plead "guilty," if some must consider it a guilt, in claiming that both Adam's sentence and its results affect all his descendants. In this claim am I an inventor? or does this Article III. make the claim? Read: "In Adam's sentence all mankind are involved, in consequence of their being physically derived"—Ah, says my objector, there you have it—"PHYSICALLY derived." Wait a moment, there is another thing here: "physically derived from his physically affected AND UNCLEAN being." It is a "law" of God that sin-stricken nature is "unclean," as typified by leprosy, in which case there was a "legal" uncleanness in addition to the physical condition; and for a cleansing there had to be an offering made. Now the latter part of this Article III. says that "In Adam's sentence, all mankind are involved"—in his "sentence," mark you—a sentence arising from an inherited "unclean" state.

Of course, I am not quoting this as authority to prove the question itself that is in dispute; but I am quoting it to show that an inherited sentence and inherited physical results were subjects of a

Statement of Faith long before my opponents discovered that, in me, it was heresy to believe in such inheritance. As to the truth of the matter in regard to the "inherited sentence," this is settled beyond dispute by the Apostle Paul in Rom. v:18—"Therefore as by one offense judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by one righteousness (see margin) the free gift came upon all men unto (in order to) justification of life." The Diaglott translation is even plainer than this: "Therefore, indeed, as through One Offense sentence came on All Men to Condemnation; so also, through Our Righteous act sentence came on All Men to Justification of Life."

Now let me read from Article VI. to show that the same condemnation was inherited by Jesus, and that He by dying abrogated it: "These promises had reference to a second (or last) Adam, to be raised up in the condemned line of Abraham and David, who should obtain life by perfect obedience, and by dying abrogate the law of condemnation for those under condemnation, and therefore, for himself." Now here is the "legal"—"sentence"—"pronouncement" aspect clearly stated again. Note the words, "abrogate the LAW of condemnation." You would not speak of abrogating a physical state, would you? To abrogate is to repeal, or to set aside, or render inoperative a law, or a legal enactment—not the neutralizing of a physical law, or a law of nature. Jesus had to satisfy the demands of law in the legal sense, or in the sense of sentence upon an unclean nature, as the means of reaching the fulness of "justification," which would result in removing the physical law of death from His nature. Strictly in harmony with this thought is this Article VI. in distinguishing between (and yet not losing sight of the co-relation) a "law of condemnation to be abrogated;" and the being raised from mortality to immortality. Now, brethren and sisters, we have clung to these ideas throughout the controversy, and the discussion and division have been forced by those who have declared that the law of Adamic condemnation is never to be abrogated, but that each one must fully pay the penalty for himself; and that "the sacrifice of Christ has nothing whatever to do with Adamic Condemnation;" that it saves only from the second death by removing the sentence of the second death which, they say, enlightenment in the gospel brings upon us. There is, therefore, no need for division with those who stand by this statement of faith.

"Racial alienation" is a phrase seriously objected to, and twelve numbers of a periodical entitled "The Truth's Warfare" were published, sanctioned by the editor of "The Christadelphian," in which this phrase and the others I have mentioned were ridiculed. So I must now ask you to open your eyes to the fact that a phrase that was for years employed without a word of fault-finding has for the first time become objectionable to some in the Adamic Condemnation controversy. If you will read on page 210 of "The Ways of Providence" you will find that Bro. Roberts used the phrase as innocently as I have, never supposing it to express anything but the truth; and, let me say, it is capable of only one meaning. He says: "A man has

not learnt the ways of God thoroughly who does not recognize that most of His dealings with the children of men in the present state of racial alienation are performed with gloved hands."—"Ways of Providence," page 210.

I have a little book entitled, "Worship In Relation to The Alien," on the cover of which are the words, "Republished from the 'Christadelphian,' with emendations." Therefore the contents of this little book had the endorsement of Bro. Roberts; and after careful preparation, it was published, in book form, in 1887. In this are expressions stronger than I ever used, so far as I can remember, on the subject we are considering; and, strange to say, in all the ridicule which Brethren Sulley and Walker and Bro. A. D. Strickler and the entire "Warfare" staff of writers devoted themselves to, they entirely overlooked this little pamphlet. Even the author of the pamphlet himself, judging from his later writings, has forgotten, or has carefully evaded, what this little book says. Let me read from page 4: "Apart from divine guidance, the mind of man inevitably works in a way baneful to himself and displeasing to God. 'There is a way that seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death.' Of this we have much Bible proof. Adam discovered it at the expense of his life; and the law of sin and death instituted at the time of the transgression has brought the lesson down to us. \* \* \* Man was originally made upright, but he has since 'sought out many inventions.' Through rebellion at the outset of his career, he separated himself from divine favor and intercourse, and became physically and mentally impure."

Here we have a separation from Divine favor, and a physically and mentally impure condition. What is this "separation," if it is not alienation in Adam's case and racial alienation in our case? To make it still clearer that the separation and the physical state are Adamic, the author adds: "The Scriptures are exceedingly emphatic with regard to the"—What?—"present NATURAL condition of man. They define it to be one of"—One of what?—"one of ALIENATION FROM GOD (Col. i:21), of WRATH AND DEATH" (Eph. ii:1-3). Brethren, you who separated from us on account of our believing in racial alienation, do you think we ever declared the doctrine in stronger language than this, the language of one who is now frequently writing and insinuating against us? As you well know, the author of this little book is Bro. A. T. Jannaway, of London. He is one of the men who wrote truthfully in and previous to 1887 of separation from God through Adam's sin, or "rebellion at the outset;" and of a condition termed "physically and mentally impure"; and of the Scriptures being "exceedingly emphatic with regard to the present natural condition"; and of this "natural condition of man" being "one of alienation from God, and of wrath and death."

This brother was quite clear-minded in 1887 on the subject in hand, as evidenced by the next paragraph on page 2: "With equal emphasis do the Scriptures proclaim that in this condition the sons of Adam must ever remain, unless they avail themselves of God's loving

and merciful means of reconciliation, viz., union with Christ, the appointed 'fountain' for 'sin and uncleanness.'"

Now, brethren and sisters, here we have Bro. Jannaway, in 1887, with the indorsement of Bro. Roberts, declaring the very doctrines that we are blamed now for defending.

1. Here we have it clearly set forth that the "law of sin and death," from which Paul says the "law of the spirit hath made us free" was "instituted at the time of the transgression" of Adam; while, in an effort to evade the force of Paul's words in their application to Adamic condemnation, some of our opposing brethren have taken refuge in the claim that "the law of sin and death" is the law of Moses.

2. That the "law of sin and death," against which there was "rebellion at the outset of his (man's) career," "separated him," (man, in the sense of mankind) "from divine favor and intercourse."

3. That thereby man also "became physically and mentally impure."

4. That "the Scriptures are exceedingly emphatic with regard to the present natural" (or inherited) "condition of man."

5. That this "separated-from-divine-favor state, and this physically and mentally impure condition, are" defined to be "alienation from God," and a state "of wrath and of death."

6. That Eph. ii:1-3 is a proof passage as well as Col. 1:21.

7. That this relation of "separation," and "wrath," and this condition of "physical and mental impurity," will "forever remain, unless they" (mankind) "avail themselves of God's loving and merciful means of reconciliation."

8. That the means of reconciliation from this "separated" "alienation" and "wrath" relation is "union with Christ, the appointed fountain" for "sin and for uncleanness."

Of course it is admitted that "union with Christ" is effected at baptism; therefore reconciliation from the "law of sin and death," from the "separation" and "alienation," which Adam brought upon mankind "through rebellion at the outset of his career," is a vital part of the gospel.

Before I say aside this little book, I must call your attention to another indication of what was the author's natural order of thought in respect to the co-relation of the unclean and legally condemned state brought by Adam's sin, and the result of baptism into Christ. This will be seen by reference to the third paragraph on page 5. You will not forget that so far as we have gone the author has confined his remarks to the Adamic origin and alienation and death. Now, in natural order, he points out the means of escape: "In Christ, man is accounted perfect (Col. ii:10; I. Cor. i:30)—a qualification which is essential before he can have boldness to enter into the holiest, or direct his supplication to God."

Then, seeming to be desirous of including all that baptism justifies from, the author adds: "Those in Christ have recognized the holiness of God and their own sinfulness, and by induction into Christ

have had their hearts 'sprinkled from an evil conscience,' and their 'bodies washed with pure water' (Heb. x:14-22). Thus have they fulfilled the necessary principle set forth in the words, 'I will be sanctified in them that come nigh unto me.'"

Here we have a comprehensive view of the relation of baptism into Christ to Adamic condemnation, and to personal sins. Again let me say, if there is no departure from this now, there is no reason for division arising from this question of Adamic condemnation, the sacrifice of Christ and baptism in relation thereto.

In order that you may see what effect the change has had upon some who departed from the principles we have here in this book so clearly set forth, let me refresh your memories concerning what some have written on what had been a long established truth. You well know that before this controversy arose, no one questioned that at baptism there was a passing out of Adam into Christ. Of course this was well understood to be a passing from one relation to another, and not a change of nature; as Dr. Thomas puts it—"a passing from the sentence of death to the sentence of life." This legal, or relative sense it was understood the Apostle Paul meant when he said, "And we are complete in him" (Christ). This view of the matter, you see, connected Adam's sentence with the work of Christ—the one as the cause of that which the other was sent to remedy—including, of course, what evils had been added to the fallen state by the personal evil works of Adam's descendants. This connection which had always been regarded as an established fact, and represented by the phrases, "in Adam" and "in Christ" became inconvenient with those who had, in their war against us, set up the claim that "the sacrifice of Christ had nothing whatever to do with Adamic condemnation," and who participated in issuing the "Truth's Warfare," in which they argued in a vain attempt to prove that baptism was for the remission of personal sins only. Therefore the editor of the "Christadelphian," adapting himself to the new departure, announced (but without proof, of course,) that although we are, by baptism, in Christ, we are not out of Adam; and therefore the old idea expressed in the phrase "out of Adam" had been erroneously held from the nineteenth century revival of the Truth. Now, brethren, listen while I read what one of our new departure brethren wrote in this little book, endorsed by Bro. Roberts, in 1887, and which had previously been published in the "Christadelphian." It is the last paragraph on page 5: "There is no middle ground: a man must either be in Christ or out of Christ. If the latter, then his position is already defined—a position of disfavor, to which applies the statement, 'God heareth not sinners, but if any man be a worshipper of God, and doeth his will, him he heareth,' (Jno. ix:31). Now mark, "For a man to RESTORE himself to the favor of God," etc. \* \* \* "When this is not done, there is alienation—hopelessness."

Now "restore" is a word that carries us back in search of a time when we were in "favor with God," and we find it utterly impossible to stop till we are back in Adam before he sinned. There being "no

middle ground" between "in Adam" in the fallen state, and "in Christ," it follows that in baptism we pass out of Adam into Christ. On this matter Dr. Thomas writes in "Elpis Israel," page 118: "All sinners are in the first Adam; and all the righteous in the second"; and he shows that the sense of the phrases is the "constitutional" sense, not the physical; for neither phrase is used in the Scriptures in respect to the physical condition. In concluding this part of our subject, let me quote you the words of Bro. Roberts in the A. R. Debate. R.—"I understand that God gives the obedient believer a clean slate. \* \* \* Everything is wiped out that stands against us in any way, whether in ADAM or ourselves." A.—Then there is a passing OUT OF ADAM into Christ? R.—Certainly. When he passes into Christ his relation to the whole death dispensation which Adam produced is put off."

Right here I must quote to you from the "Declaration"—and some will ask, Which? Ah! that tells a tale. It tells us that quietly, and without a hint, the "Declaration" was changed. Why? Why? Why?—if our opposing brethren have not changed? Therefore I must be careful to read to you from a copy of the "Declaration" that is genuine; for there we shall find the truth before adulteration took place. It reads thus: "Baptism \* \* \* is the means of that present (legal) union with Christ"—D. page 46. My dear brethren and sisters, do you not see that there has been a tampering with the Truth, and that changes in our old-time literature show that those who have changed are conscious of the fact that their new position is out of harmony with what had previously been printed? I cannot leave this part of my subject without reading to you what Dr. Thomas says in Eureka, Vol. I. p. 303: "The apostles taught that death had been cancelled, and immortality, that is, deathlessness or life and incorruptibility, brought to light by Jesus Christ in the gospel of the kingdom—**THAT THE WRITING OF DEATH AGAINST THE SAINTS HAD BEEN CROSSED, OR BLOTTED OUT,** and incorruptibility of life and body for them procured by his resurrection as the earnest of theirs."

The fact is, brethren and sisters, an evil spirit got into the ranks, unseen by most of our members, and encouraged by a few, who, perhaps, did not fully detect its dangerous character. One of the writers imbued with it has confessed, but deplored, that while Bro. Roberts was in the editorial chair of the "Christadelphian," manuscripts sent to him advocating the doctrines which are the primary cause of our trouble were decapitated, and only small portions were given in the pages of the "Christadelphian." These doctrines confined the relation of the sacrifice of Christ and the design of baptism to personal sin; and it is evident that Bro. Roberts saw, as all enlightened brethren must see, that they excluded Christ entirely from that relation to sin and death which required the death of the cross. It was to further the propagation of the theory that salvation pertained only to forgiveness of personal sins, and did not include federal sin, that Bro. Bruce published his little pamphlet on "Remission of Sins," and afterwards conducted the "Warfare" for twelve months, till it died a well-

deserved death. It was what appeared to be his opportunity, in having a paper that would publish his theory, the editor of which would not throw his manuscripts into the waste paper basket, as the editors of the "Christadelphian" and of the "Advocate" had done, that emboldened Bro. A. D. Strickler to declare in the "Warfare," No. 2, p. 18, "That the present work of Christ has to do only with sins of actual transgression and the conscience, and not with the body, as is plainly taught in the Scriptures." Then, on pages 20 and 23 he manifests his real belief that salvation does not deal with mortality and that mortality, instead of being the result of Adam's sin, is of God's creation, the very theory now advanced by the erring brethren in Australia, led by Bro. Bell. Let me read it to you: "It is not a question of right or wrong whether man is in the world as a mortal creature; God has a purpose to accomplish, and, as the apostle shows, he has the right to make 'one vessel unto honor and another unto dishonor.'" Now let me read from page 23: "Let us clear up our minds about the phrase 'sin in the flesh,' and understand that it is the physical organism which causes sin; and hence IT [the physical organism] IS A CREATION BY THE NATURAL LAWS OF GOD THAT MAN COULD NOT HELP, AND THEREFORE CONDEMNATION COULD NOT REST UPON HIM AS A MAN FOR IT." There you have the Turney, Nichols, Cornish, and Bell theory, that puts Christ completely outside of Adamic condemnation, and leaves him absolutely free from any necessity to make a sin-offering for himself. The strange part of it is that this sort of poison was being sent out for twelve months in the "Warfare" with the sanction of the present editor of the "Christadelphian," and in addition to the "Warfare," Bro. Strickler sent to the same editor several other tracts setting forth the same, and more, heretical doctrines; and yet it was announced that they were acceptable and would be passed around. And here let me say, that it was because the Chicago Ecclesia stoutly contended against these doctrines that the editor of the "Christadelphian" induced many in this country to agree to a division; for, be it known, the responsibility question was only a very small outgrowth of these doctrines; and you will not forget that it was (in the way they put it, to make it appear ugly) "Adam's sin" and Christ's sacrifice and baptism in relation thereto that were the real issues. I must give Bro. Walker credit, however, for lately, as it seems to me, falling back into the very position the Chicago Ecclesia contended for against him and Bro. Sulley. The publication in recent numbers of the "Christadelphian" of Bro. Roberts' propositions dealing with the Cornish theories in Australia, and the defense of the truth against the late Bell departure, seem to have driven Bro. Walker back into the right position; and if he will now extend his commendable opposition to the same heresies advocated in the "Warfare" and in the Strickler pamphlets, there will be still greater credit due to him; and thereby the way can be opened up for a happy reunion.

I must show you that beyond the shadow of a doubt the quotations I have given you are not slips of the pen, but they assert what

is still more boldly set forth in the same pamphlets. I am aware, as all who have carefully read these writings are, that the writers frequently contradict themselves; but did you ever see an attempt to bolster up false theories that was not contradictory?

I will now read to you from the Strickler pamphlet entitled "The One Great Offering," p. 1: "Was Christ's offering for himself, to atone for the imputed sin of Adam to him, or for the unclean sinful flesh which he inherited from his mother, or for both? **BOTH OF THESE POSITIONS ARE OUT OF HARMONY WITH THE TRUTH.**" That's exactly what the "Free Life" theorists say, is it not, brethren?

Again, fourth paragraph, on same page: "Was Christ's offering to atone for his sinful flesh? If it was, then he was held guilty by God for possessing it, which would be unjust." Again, a little further down: "Christ was not responsible because he had a sinful nature; he was helpless in the situation, and therefore for God to require him to make an offering to atone for his sin nature, or to atone for himself because he was found in possession of a sin nature, would **MANIFESTLY BE UNRIGHTEOUS.**" Did you ever see any thing more like the "Free Life" theory than that? The very arguments used in support of that theory are used here—I should have said the very assertions made, for they do not deserve to be called arguments; and even the manner of asserting here suffers sadly when compared with the ingenuous, subtle manner of an Edward Turney.

I do not believe that it is needful for me to point out to you the fallacy of denying that Jesus had to atone for his sinful flesh on the grounds that "Christ was not responsible because he had a sinful nature," as asserted in one of the quotations I have read from the Strickler pamphlet. It is well known by enlightened brethren that God requires atonement to be made for inherited conditions, where there is no personal responsibility for the cause of the condition inherited; and right here is that legal aspect which our erring brethren seem to constantly overlook. After our Lord had cleansed the leper, there was an offering to be made which the law required; and while lepers were not personally responsible for the cause of their inherited condition, the law was very exacting in its demands upon them. In Lev. xiv:2 we read: "This shall be the **LAW** of the leper in the day of his [physical] cleansing." Then the offerings he was to make are described, and in the thirteenth verse we read that a "sin-offering" had to be made; and following along through the minute requirements of this law of leprosy, which, of course, you know is a type of the law of mortality, for leprosy is a type of mortality—coming to verse 19 we read: "And the priest shall offer a sin-offering, and," now mark, "**MAKE AN ATONEMENT** for him that is to be cleansed." Here, you see, is an inherited disease for which atonement had to be made; and yet it is the inherited mortality of Christ for which the sin-offering had to be made according to "the law" of mortality as with "the law" of leprosy—it is this that our erring brethren are trying to evade, seeming to be frightened at the idea of a "sin-offering"

for federal sin, and atonement for the cause of a condition for which the individual was not personally responsible. This departure is nothing but a wild rush away from truths expressed in the phrases, "racial alienation," "federal sin," etc. Furthermore, if a sin-offering and atonement had not to be made by Jesus for himself because he was not responsible for sinful flesh nature, He ought not to have made a sin-offering and atonement for any one else; for surely He was not responsible because others had sinful flesh any more than for the fact that He had. Just so, the author of "The One Great Offering" will say, He did not atone for the sinful flesh of any one. Just so, we reply, you prove yourself to be back in the "Free Life" theory, which allowed sin-offering and atonement for personal sins only. And, can you not see that if you are right in saying that "If Jesus' offering was to atone for sinful flesh, then He was held guilty by God for possessing it," you ought to go further and say that, if Christ's offering was to atone for our personal sins, then He was held guilty by God for our personal sins? You have lost sight entirely of the plan of salvation; and in your blind striking at me for advocating "inherited alienation" and "federal sin," you have fallen into a pit—that from which you cannot be delivered, because you teach that no one must atone for you who is not responsible for your sins. Foolishly, you have predicated the act of atonement upon the responsibility and guilt of the atoner for the sins to be atoned for, and thus have you made salvation through Christ impossible, since He was not responsible for any act of sin, nor for the fact of sinful flesh. You fail to distinguish between Christ being held responsible for the evil, and the responsibility of His mission to cleanse, purge, offer for, and atone for the evil which befell the race of which He was a member.

Now, brethren and sisters, these are the theories I have been blamed for refuting. My claim has been that "racial sin," "federal sin"—that which explains why we are mortal, the very condition from which we need salvation—that this sin fastened itself upon the race, of which, according to the flesh, Jesus was a part; and that a sin-offering had to be made by Him and FOR HIM as an atonement, in order that He may be the Atonement for us, for our sinful, mortal condition as well as for His; and that the remittance of personal sins, in our case, and not in his, is an added thing—not that I, when I said that personal sins were an "incident," compared with the "sin of the world," said or that I meant that personal sins were a small matter, scarcely to be called sins, as Bro. Walker tried to make me say. I think I have as much horror of sin as he has; and pardon me when I say, I hope my life has borne this out.

Now in regard to further objectionable terms that have been attributed to me, let me inform you, brethren, that in June, 1902, I issued this tract entitled, "A Plea for Action," etc., and if ever a sincere and humble and hopeful act was performed, this was one, for I well know what my thoughts and feelings were then; and they were such as I would hope to have at the moment when summoned before our Judge. In this I explained all the ugly phrases and gave

their history and their meaning; and it is an unaccountable thing to me that my opposing brethren did not respond to my appeal. In this I quoted from Dr. Thomas and Bro. Roberts proofs of such a character as made it absolutely impossible for any to refuse my appeal without refusing the doctrines these brethren had set forth. Here, on page 7, is a lengthy quotation from "Elpis Israel:" "On page 114 are the words, 'The flesh is invariably regarded as unclean'; 'God made him sin for us'; 'His body was as unclean as the bodies of those he died for'; 'Sin in the flesh is hereditary'; 'The ORIGINAL SIN was such,' etc.; 'Upon the same FEDERAL principle,'" etc.; and then the Doctor says: "Mankind being born of the flesh and of the will of men, are born into the world under the constitution of sin. That is, they are natural born citizens of Satan's kingdom. By their fleshly birth they are entitled to all that sin can impart to them. What creates the distinction of bodies politic among the sons of Adam? It is constitution. By constitution, then, one man is English, and another is American. The former is British because he is born of the flesh under the British constitution. \* \* \* There are two states, or kingdoms, in God's arrangements, which are distinguished by constitution. These are the kingdom of Satan and the kingdom of God. The citizens of the former are sinners; the heirs of the latter are saints. Men cannot be born heirs by the will of the flesh; for natural birth confers no right to God's kingdom. Men must be born sinners" (Here is "inherited sin," "federal sin") "before they can become saints, even as one must be born a foreigner before he can be an adopted citizen of the States. It is absurd to say children are born holy, except in the sense of their being legitimate. None are born holy, but such as are born of the spirit into the kingdom of God; children are born sinners or unclean, because they are born of sinful flesh; and that which is born of the flesh is flesh, or sin."

Please observe how the Doctor distinguishes between "constitution" and the physical state. The born Englishman is of English blood; and in addition to this he belongs to the British constitution, which is his relation to the British system of laws. When he changes his citizenship, he passes from one constitution to another, but he is still the same physically. This is how the Doctor illustrates our passing, by baptism, from the Adamic constitution to the "constitution of righteousness." When we are citizens of the Adamic order of things, we are aliens from the new order; and it is to our racial descent from Adam this alienation is due, just as it is to the racial descent of the Englishman that his alienation from the States is due. The point to be kept clear is, that since naturalization changes the "relation" of the Englishman and does not change his "nature"; so the passing out of Adam into Christ changes our relationship, but does not change our nature. Therefore, since the design of baptism is for this purpose, its root is to be found in the Adamic sentence of death and burial; and its effect is the removal of this so that the "sentence" may be deprived of its power to hold us in death and dust,

and thereby the resurrection became the means of final "physical" escape from the results of Adam's sin.

On page 118 the Doctor says: "As the constitution of sin hath its root in the disobedience of the first Adam, so also hath the constitution of righteousness root in the obedience of the second Adam. Hence the apostle says, 'As through one offense (sentence was pronounced) upon all men unto condemnation; so also through one righteousness (sentence was pronounced) upon all men (Jews and Gentiles) unto pardon of life. For as through the disobedience of the one the many were CONSTITUTED SINNERS; so also through the obedience of the one the many were CONSTITUTED RIGHTEOUS.'" I may continue to quote and quote confirmatory of this, and now, brethren, how can you account for the issuing of pamphlet after pamphlet in a strenuous effort to limit baptism to personal sins, and to prove that it removes the sentence of the second death? Is not baptism a means of adoption? of being "born again"? of "putting off the old man and putting on the new man"? of passing from "in Adam" to "in Christ"? of becoming the "seed of Abraham" instead of Gentiles? of putting on the saving name? of being "crucified with Christ"? of dying, being buried and raised with Christ? of becoming "new creatures"? of becoming "clean through the word"? of becoming "free from the law of sin and death"? of passing into that state wherein "there is therefore now no condemnation?"—Is it not a passing "from death unto life"? And yet pages and pages have been written by brethren who ought to have known better, in the vain, fruitless effort, and in a Salvation Army and ranting Methodist manner, to try to persuade intelligent brethren and sisters that all that baptism is for is to "get your sins forgiven," or to secure the removal of "the penalty of the second death," a penalty which, they assert, comes upon one by becoming enlightened in the gospel. How can any enlightened brother or sister blame us for stoutly and persistently contending against such a return to the ridiculous Methodist style of "getting your sins forgiven" and against the unheard-of foolish, irreverent gospel-nullifying and God-dishonoring invention that enlightenment in the glorious gospel—a gospel sent by Heaven's love to rescue a groaning humanity—by this gospel perishing, groaning, lost men and women are brought under the sentence of the second death; and that all that the gospel does through the agency of baptism is remove the penalty brought by its own hands? Surely facts—foolish facts—in the ranks of some Christadelphians—have turned out to be stranger than the most fictitious fiction ever conceived by the most prolific imagination. Flee you, brethren, from association with such heresies! Escape for your lives while opportunity is within your reach; for if this is not "another gospel" and a complete perversion of the gospel of Christ, there never was one.

Now, brethren and sisters, I want to show you how faithfully the Chicago Ecclesia tried to satisfy brethren Walker and Sulley and to prevent them from making the division. As you know, we were charged with believing that Christ died, and that we are baptized for

the one sinful act of Adam—a charge which, upon its face, ought to have been its own refutation, for it is too big a falsehood to commend itself to sane people. Well, it was made, and we were published as guilty of believing it, even after we submitted the following as defining our true position:

1.—We believe in baptism there is a transition from a state of alienation in Adam to citizenship in Christ; and that through it we shall ultimately be freed from the physical effects of Adam's sin.

2.—That in baptism we are freed from Adamic condemnation so far as relationship is concerned, that is, that instead of being "far off" in Adam, we are "made nigh" in Christ.

3.—That Christ was born under, and died to remove, Adamic condemnation.

4.—That we inherit Adam's sin in its effects, in that we are out of Eden, aliens, mortal.

Now let me beseech you to carefully reflect, pause and consider these statements, and therein you will see clear and unequivocal declarations which explain our belief in regard to "Adam's sin," "federal sin," "racial alienation," and all the terms that our opponents have taxed their ingenuity to make appear ugly. These statements, when presented to Bro. Sulley in Chicago, were declared to be all right there and then, in the presence of the two men who conceived the cause of the division in sin, and gave it birth in iniquity. How could Bro. Sulley do otherwise than accept these statements, knowing as he must that they perfectly agreed with the Birmingham Statement of faith, and knowing that they agreed with the general writings of able brethren, and knowing well that they were based upon the teachings of the Scriptures; and, further, knowing that he, indorsed by Bro. Roberts, had written the same truths, when in "The Temple Plan" he wrote as follows?—

"There are two classes of sins from which the human family needs deliverance. First, those to which men are related by RACIAL DESCENT (Rom. v:12-14); second, individual trespasses. In immersion there is a recognition of the first."

But our statements were refused by the two complainers, and in response to Bro. Sulley's expressed desire to satisfy them, we tried again; and submitted the following, quoting partly from the Birmingham Statement and from Dr. Thomas, so that if they refused us they must (and we knew from the beginning they would, whatever we may submit) make it manifest that they were refusing Dr. Thomas and the Birmingham Statement:

1.—We believe that in baptism there is a transition from a state of alienation in Adam to a state of citizenship in Christ, and that through it we shall ultimately be freed from the physical effects of Adam's sin—mortality. We are not personally responsible for Adam's personal sin, and are not therefore baptized for it in that sense; but federally we are all under Adam's sin and are baptized to remove the condemnation which came thereby, and to place us in Christ recon-

ciled to God. Since it is known that we believe we are baptized for our personal sins, it is needless to state it.

2.—Adamic condemnation brings a physical disability inherited from Adam. We are freed from this federal condemnation and reconciled to God at baptism, but we are not freed from physical disability till the change of body. We are also freed from personal condemnation for past sins, and justified by our obedience to the faith; but we are not freed from whatever physical disabilities these may have brought till we are changed to spirit nature.

3.—It was necessary for Christ to die according to the Scriptures to redeem us **AND HIMSELF** from the condemnation resting upon the race. "Christ was a sufferer in the days of his flesh from all the effects that came by Adam's transgression, including the death that passed upon all men, which he shared by partaking of their physical nature" (See Birmingham Statement).

4.—We believe that one of the scriptural definitions of sin is transgression of law. Adam broke the law, and he alone is personally guilty. Another scriptural definition of sin is, "Sin in the flesh is hereditary; and entailed upon mankind as a consequence of Adam's violation of the Edenic law." "The original sin was such as I (Dr. Thomas) have shown in previous pages. Adam and Eve committed it, and their posterity are suffering the consequences of it. The tribe of Levi paid tithes to Melchisedec many years before Levi was born. The apostle says, Levi, who receiveth tithes, paid tithes in Abraham. Upon the same federal principle all mankind ate of the forbidden fruit, being in the loins of Adam when he transgressed. This is the only way men can by any possibility be guilty of the original sin. Because they sinned in Adam, therefore, they return to dust, from which Adam came" (Elpis Israel p. 115).

Now, brethren, after all this, and much more of the same sort, the division was forced in Birmingham, partly, and, at first, principally, because our belief on Adamic condemnation was objectionable. The responsibility question was afterwards more prominently made an excuse than it had been for insisting upon the division; but, as you know, we stand in respect to that where the body has stood since the revival of the truth, and where Dr. Thomas stood, in relation to the fellowship aspect of it, till the day of his death.

Now the trouble has largely arisen from the importation to Birmingham of the "Warfare" and Strickler theory, and for many of you it will be needful for me to more fully explain that theory, before I quote what I have here from Bro. Roberts. The theory is, that the Adamic penalty is irrevocable, and from it there is no redemption; that it is a penalty which rests upon every individual descendant of Adam, and must be paid by each one for himself, by natural death. That it affected Jesus in the same way, and that if He had not been required to die for our personal sins, the death of the cross, or the shedding of blood, would not have been necessary for Him, and natural death would have sufficed in His case. The claim is, that as soon as we have died a natural death, we have, ourselves, thereby met

all that the Adamic penalty demands, and therefore "the redemptive work of Christ has nothing to do with Adamic condemnation." When this, in the form of "The Buffalo Statement of Faith," was published in the "Christadelphian," Bro. Lake, of London, wrote to that paper stating that if the Adamic condemnation is mortality only, and we meet all its demands as soon as we are in the grave, immortal emergence must follow; for why should we be raised mortal after we have, by dying, met all that the condemnation (mortality) demands? But the doctrine was accepted, and the tracts setting it forth were circulated in Birmingham. Having assumed that the Adamic penalty must be paid by all by means of natural death, and that the redemptive work of Christ was not related to it, these pamphlets declared that it would be unjust if God required Christ to atone for sinful flesh. It was not to be atoned for, but to be destroyed. You will see that the error arises from the mistaken supposition that salvation in Christ is to save from dying the second death, instead of to save out of death, that is, the death the gospel finds us under. These brethren fail to see that the Adamic sentence consigned all to the dust, and that unless Christ broke the power of this death, all would be held eternally; and therefore that the sacrifice of Christ was the necessary thing to "bring again from the dead THROUGH THE BLOOD OF THE EVERLASTING COVENANT" (Heb. xiii:20). Turning away from the truth in relation to that which made salvation necessary for Christ and for us, they invented another reason for baptism, namely, the "removal of the sentence of the second or eternal death. The orthodox nullification of the gospel is in the delusion that salvation is intended to save men from going to hell to be tormented; this new nullification of the gospel is that the plan of salvation is intended to save men from the sentence of the second death, which sentence, they assert, the gospel itself imposes upon all who become enlightened in the truth. The Scriptural plan of salvation was instituted to save men out of the lost, outcast, fallen, condemned, perishing condition in which the gospel finds them.

I am not explaining these matters to you because I believe you to have accepted the false doctrines, but to show you that those you are associated with have separated from us because we denounce their theories as perversions of the true gospel. Of course, you know that it is Christ versus Adam—the latter as the cause of the perishing state of mankind; and the former as the one to redeem from this. Therefore it was a death from which resurrection was to be made possible that Jesus came to redeem from; and it is a death from which we are to have a resurrection that baptism symbolizes; and it is not the second death, from which resurrection is impossible. To talk about removing the sentence of the second death is to manifest ignorance of the fact that the sentence of the second death, when pronounced, will be irrevocable; for it is a sentence against men and women who have been unfaithful in a probation for eternal life or eternal death. This sentence will be imposed after judgment, not before probation.

Now to assure you that I have not misrepresented this new departure from the truth, I will read from the Buffalo statement of faith, which was published approvingly in the "Christadelphian," after the former editor, Bro. Roberts, had been throwing such productions into the waste paper basket. Here it is:

"We believe that the remission of these past sins removed the penalty of the second death that was due to us for them. That this penalty of the second death is the only condemnation that we are freed from at baptism." Then on page 20 of the "Warfare" we have these words: "We are guilty of sins of actual transgressions, and it is these, and these only, that are forgiven at baptism, and it is no provisional forgiveness either, but an actual removal of the penalty of the second death."

So you see, according to this, those who are condemned at the judgment-seat cannot be condemned to the second death, because its penalty is "actually" and "unprovisionally" removed by baptism. According to this, when one becomes enlightened in the gospel, the gospel becomes a judge, and ascends the tribunal, and passes judgment there and then, and actually imposes the sentence of the second death upon all, never having given a single soul of them a chance to receive a sentence of eternal life, contemporarily with their coming to deserve that of the second death, an entirely one-sided thing—a delusion which represents the "ways of the Lord as unequal." On the other hand, how beautiful the truth is! Mankind in sorrow, pain and death, which, "by one offense passed upon all men." To such it offers reconciliation to God for all who will symbolically "die with Christ" the death which He died to redeem Himself from the fallen state, in order that He may save all in him. By a new birth we are put on probation for eternal life, if faithful; or eternal death, the second death, if unfaithful; the question of which to be determined at the judgment-seat after probation—but why should I rehearse these truths which you well understand?

Well, now I must read a little of what this "Plea For Union" contains, to show you beyond a doubt that the last book Bro. Roberts wrote is in perfect agreement with our position; and that it is in direct opposition to the new departure as expressed in the Buffalo Statement and in the "Warfare," all of which were publicly indorsed in the "Christadelphian," and the advocates of which are now in fellowship with Birmingham and through it with you. Please remember that I have quoted from page 15 of the "Warfare" the words, "There can be no atonement made for sin's flesh"; and now compare that with the following:

"Christ is the antitypical Aaron, the antitypical altar, the antitypical mercy-seat, the antitypical everything. The types all converge upon and have their substance in Christ. There must therefore be a sense in which Christ was purged by the antitypical blood of his own sacrifice. Christ MUST have been the subject of a PERSONAL, CLEANSING (capitals ours) in the process by which he opened up the way of sanctification for his people. If the typical holy things

contracted defilement for connection with a sinful congregation, were not the antitypical (Christ) holy things in a similar state through derivation on his mother's side from a sinful race? If not, how came they to need purging with his own better sacrifice? Great difficulty is experienced by various classes of thinkers in receiving this view; needlessly so, it should seem. There is first the express declaration that the matter stands so: 'It was therefore necessary that the pattern of things in the heavens should be purified with these (Mosaic sacrifices); but the HEAVENLY THINGS THEMSELVES with better sacrifices than these (Heb. ix:23). 'It was of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer' (viii:3) 'By reason hereof, he ought as for the people, so also for himself, to offer for sin' (v. 3). 'By his own blood, he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption' ("for us" in an addition inconsistent with the middle voice of the verb employed, which imports a thing done by one to one's own self, ix:12). There was next the necessity that it should be so. The word necessity, it will be perceived, occurs frequently in the course of Paul's argument. The necessity arises from the position in which men stood as regards the law of sin and death, and the position in which the Lord stood as their redeemer from that position. The position of men was that they were under condemnation to die because of sin, and THAT NOT THEIR OWN SIN, but ancestral sin at the beginning. The forgiveness of personal offenses is the prominent feature in the apostolic proclamation, because personal offenses are the greater barrier. Nevertheless, men are mortal because of sin, QUITE INDEPENDENTLY OF THEIR OWN TRANSGRESSIONS. THEIR REDEMPTION FROM THIS POSITION IS A WORK OF MERCY AND FORGIVENESS" (Capitals ours). "We see Christ down in the evil which he was sent to cure; not outside of it, not untouched by it, but in it to put it away. The statement that he did these things for us has blinded many to the fact that he did them 'for himself' first—without which he could not have done them for us."—"Law of Moses."

### THE RESPONSIBILITY QUESTION.

Now, as to the responsibility question, we stand upon the old foundation as it was expressed in the Birmingham statement of faith before it was changed. The resurrection to the judgment-seat of Christ is for probationers, for "good" and for "bad," for eternal life or eternal death—a second life or a second death. All who will be judged in respect to these alternatives will have passed through a probation, and will have been redeemed from their alienated state into reconciliation; and that will have been true of them when they started on their probation which is expressed by Bro. Roberts in what I am about to read. I will conclude my remarks by reading as expressive of our fellowship attitude towards all of like precious faith the following from "A Plea For Unity," pp. 11 and 12.

Old Form of Proposition XXV.: That at the appearing of Christ, prior to the establishment of the kingdom, the responsible (faithful

and unfaithful) dead and living of both classes will be summoned before the judgment-seat "to be judged according to their works," and receive in body according to what they have done, whether it be good or bad (II. Cor. v:10; II. Tim. iv:1; Rom. ii:5, 6-16; xiv:10-12; I. Cor. iv:5; Rev. xi:18).

We ask the reader to turn to these texts and see if he can persuade himself that they refer to Gentiles out of Christ.

Note the words in the proposition, "faithful and unfaithful;" "both classes," not three classes; "judged according to their works good or bad." Can Gentiles be called either "faithful or unfaithful" servants under the bonds of the covenant? Can it be said of Gentiles that they will be judged according to their works—good or bad?

Now here are contemporary statements showing that it was not supposed that Gentiles out of Christ were included in Proposition XXV.:

"Rejectors of the Word, who do not come under the law of Christ by belief and obedience, may be reserved till the close of the thousand years. It does not seem reasonable that those who put away the counsel of God from themselves should be passed over without judgment, and yet, since they do not become constituents of the household of faith, their resurrection at the time when account is taken of that household would seem inappropriate. May they not be dealt with at the end?"—"Christendom Astray."

This says rejectors are

1.—Not "under the law of Christ."

2.—They may "be reserved till the end of the thousand years" for judgment.

3.—They are not constituents of the household of faith.

4.—Therefore their resurrection and judgment with the household is inappropriate.

"It is a pity to trouble yourself as to whether believing but disobedient Gentiles are amenable to resurrectional punishment or not. It is salvation an earnest man is after; it is this he will try to work for himself and others, if he can. If others will not obey the will of Christ, he need not be concerned as to the nature of their punishment."—"Christadelphian," 1882.

That it might be seen that in all forms of statements from the infancy of the Truth's revival and all the time the old form of Proposition XXV. was accepted, only "two classes," "faithful and unfaithful" are spoken of as destined to appear at the judgment-seat at Christ's appearing; and these statements, remember, show what Proposition XXV. was then understood to mean as well as state, we quote the following:

"THE JUDGMENT-SEAT OF CHRIST.—That at the return of Jesus Christ from heaven to establish his kingdom on earth he will, first of all, summon before him for judgment the whole of those who are responsible to his judgment. Those who are dead he will cause to come forth from the dust, and assemble them with the living in his presence. Faithful and unfaithful will be mustered together before

his judgment-seat for the purpose of having it declared, after account rendered, who is worthy of being invested with immortality and promoted to the kingdom, and who is deserving of rejection, and re-assignment to corruption after punishment.—“Declaration,” Proposition xxxi., p. 49.

“Are all who take on the name of Christ by belief of the truth and baptism destined to be saved?—No, only those who are faithful and bring forth fruits unto eternal life. Some walk after the flesh and some after the spirit.

How will the TWO classes be dealt with?—Those who are pronounced acceptable will receive eternal life, and be made to inherit the kingdom of God, and those who are found unfaithful will be rejected and given over to destruction.

When will these decisions be enforced?—At the coming of Christ. He will gather together HIS HOUSEHOLD to judge them, and to give to every man according to what he hath done, whether good or bad.”—“Good Confession,” pp. 28, 29.

There has been a change in Proposition XXV. for the purpose of getting the rejecter into it so as to make the responsibility question a test of fellowship and consequently a reason for refusing fellowship to certain brethren. Now here is the “amended” form of Proposition XXV. with what its framers desired to say thrown into bracketed words.

That at the appearing of Christ prior to the establishment of the kingdom, the responsible (namely, those who know the revealed will of God [alien “rejectors”] and have been called upon to submit to it), dead and living—obedient and disobedient [including alien “rejectors”]—will be summoned before the judgment-seat to be judged according to their [alien “rejectors”] works; and receive in body according to what they [alien “rejectors”] have done, whether good or bad.

Now I object to this “amendment” because it puts Gentiles upon the same platform with those in covenant relation, which is not only “inappropriate,” as Bro. Roberts says, but it mars the fundamental truth, that probation for “good or bad,” which is the subject of the judgment-seat for the household only, is based upon covenant relation. Resurrection to that judgment is predicated upon Christ’s resurrection, and the resurrection and judgment in this sense and for this purpose was a problem solved by Christ’s resurrection through the blood of the everlasting covenant. It is this that is important to us. “If Christ be not raised, \* \* \* then they also who have fallen asleep in Christ have perished.” The matter of how, when, or where God will deal with enlightened unbaptized Gentiles, who may have good or bad intentions, is a matter we may leave to Him who will do justly with all.

Now, brethren and sisters, I have kindly, yet earnestly, placed the facts and truths before you. You know that division among brethren is one of the things God says He hates. Those who cause, or who continue, a division among themselves and those who hold the Truth,

and with whom there is agreement on all fundamental principles, are in the hateful condition. Beware! Awake! while it is called to-day.

We had been informed that the "other meeting" had advised that no questions be asked at the close of our address. Under the impression that there would be none, we occupied about two hours in the lecture. Late as it was, however, some sent up written questions, the answering of which prolonged the meeting to a late hour. With all we had said, we were informed that all, except one sister, agreed; and she held a unique idea on the law of sin and death and the law of the spirit of life that we never heard of anywhere except from this sister and the brother whom she was indebted to for it. A statement of it is its own refutation with all informed brethren and sisters. It is that "the law of the spirit of life" has no penalty of death for any one; that when one who is under it sins, he is thereby transferred back to "the law of sin and death" and out from the law of the spirit of life. So that brethren and sisters are constantly passing back and forth. If a sin be committed to-day, the one committing it is immediately the subject of the transfer back; and if forgiveness be granted tomorrow he is transferred again, and so on. When the judgment is reached, no one is to be condemned by the "law of the spirit of life," or the gospel, for that will give life only; while the unworthy will be condemned by the law of sin and death. This seems to have been invented to suit the theory that those under the law of sin and death who have not been baptized will be judged at the judgment-seat of Christ, the argument being something like this: If saints who have fallen back into the law of sin and death be judged by that law, why shall not sinners who never become saints appear there to be judged by the same law? Of course this is a case of a wrongly assumed premise, and consequently a false conclusion. But how absurd, to claim that one who breaks one law is to be judged by another! And if it requires baptism to transfer us from the law of sin and death to the law of the spirit of life the first time this transfer is made, why is it not required in all the supposed transfers?

#### THE QUESTIONS.

One question was "How do you explain I. Pet. iv:17, 18? Our answer in substance was, that if, as many claim, this passage refers to the judgment-seat of Christ, it does not follow that those spoken of are enlightened Gentiles unbaptized. The theory seeking support from this passage for its claim of Gentile resurrectional responsibility must "read between the lines." But, to be brief, it is evident from the context that Peter was not referring to the judgment-seat of Christ, but to judgment in the sense of "fiery trials" coming at that time upon the house of God and upon the nation of sinners and ungodly Jews. In chap. i:6 and 7 Peter says: "Now for a season if need be ye are in heaviness through manifold temptations; that the trial (dokimion, proof) of your faith being much more precious than of gold that perisheth, though it be tried with fire," etc. The word translated "temptation" in ver. 6 is in the Greek, *peirasmois*, and means

"trial"—*poikilois peirasmos*, "manifold trials." This all refers to the trials which the "house of God" was destined then, in its probationary career to pass through. Returning to chap. iv., the word rendered "trial" in ver. 12 is the same as that rendered "temptation" in chap. i:7—*peirasmon*. Even our authorized translation supplies, in ver. 17, the two words, "is come," which is in perfect harmony with the context. In the words, "For the time is come when judgment must begin at the house of God," only imagination can see a tribunal far in the future. The word "judgment" here is from the Greek, *krima*, while in Rom. xiv :10, and II. Cor. v :10, the word for judgment-seat is *Bematos*, which means a tribunal. Examine the tenor of the entire letter, and you will see that the apostle is preparing the saints for a fiery ordeal through which they were then to pass, and so his words may be paraphrased as follows: "You must pass through manifold trials, that your faith may be put to the proof (chap. i:7). The end of all things in the Jewish economy is at hand (ver. 7), that is the time Jesus warned you to prepare for when he told you to 'pray that your flight be not in the winter,' etc., and of which He said, 'Except those days should be shortened there shall no flesh be saved; but for the elect's sake those days shall be shortened' (Matt. xxiv:22). Since 'the end of all thing (in the Jewish kosmos) is at hand,' 'be ye therefore sober, and watch and pray.' When you find yourselves in these troublous days, think it not strange,' but regard the 'fiery trial' as a means to put your faith to the proof; and rejoice that you are permitted to be 'partakers of the sufferings of Christ' (verses 12, 13). 'When you are reproached for the name of Christ,' which you will be by ungodly and sinful Jews and Romans, rejoice rather than fret, because while those who will reproach you will speak evil of Christ, 'on your part he will be glorified' (verse 14). In your fiery trial 'let none of you deserve what your enemies may impose upon you, but if you suffer as true Christians do not be ashamed, but be ready to glorify God. For the time is come when the judgment through which this wicked kosmos is to pass will be to you a fiery trial, since you will be the objects of attack by Jews and Romans who hate Christ, and if this judgment begin as a dreadful trial with you, what will be its effect upon the ungodly and sinners outside the household, or inside, who obey not the gospel? (verse 7). And if in this terrible ordeal the righteous scarcely are safe (not "saved") what, suppose you, will be its effect upon the ungodly and sinners?' 'Wherefore,' in view of all this trying prospect, 'let them that suffer according to the will of God commit the keeping of their souls to him in well doing, as unto a faithful Creator.'"

Now perhaps you will be surprised to see how the Diaglott translation bears out this paraphrase. That you may make a comparison. I will read it, from verses 12 to 19:

"Beloved, be not surprised at the fire among you, occurring to you for trial, as though some strange thing was befalling you; but as you partake of the sufferings of the Anointed one, rejoice; so that at the revelation of his glory, you may rejoice exultingly. If you are

reproached in the name of Christ, happy are you; because the spirit of glory and that of God rests on you. For let none of you suffer as a murderer, or a thief, or an evil-doer, or as a meddling person; but if as a Christian, let him not be ashamed, but let him glorify God in this name. Because the season is coming for the judgment to begin from the house of God; and if it begin first from us, what the end of those who are disobedient to the glad tidings of God? And if the righteous person scarcely is safe, where will the impious and the sinner appear? Therefore let those who are suffering according to the will of God commit their lives in doing good to a faithful Creator."

Many have erred in misapplying this passage, and now I ask you to study it carefully and you will no longer make the same mistake. In "The last days of Judah's Commonwealth" Dr. Thomas makes the same application of the passage.

We were next asked to explain Acts xvii:30—"And the times of this ignorance God winked at, but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent; because he hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead."

Special emphasis was put by the questioner upon the words "judge the world," showing that he supposed these words to mean the judgment-seat of Christ for the saints and "rebels."

#### ANSWER.

If I believed in the resurrection of Gentiles to the judgment-seat of Christ with the saints, I would never try to prove it by this passage. Those who do this read the passage in a similar way to that of "orthodox" people reading "immortal soul" into verses where they find the word "soul." They mentally read thus: "God commandeth enlightened Gentiles to be baptized, because they are to be judged at the judgment-seat of Christ;" yet the passage says nothing of the kind, and no such meaning can be forced out of it. Those who misuse it do not believe any person is responsible to the judgment-seat until he is fully enlightened in the gospel, and is thereby the subject of a command to be baptized. They say the gospel does not become a command, imposing such responsibility, until the person has become a candidate for baptism. If this "command" imposes responsibility to the judgment-seat of Christ, it does so on all who are NOT enlightened in the gospel; for, look at what it says, with your minds freed from prejudice—it says that "God commandeth all men everywhere—to be baptized"? No, that is not what it says, and we know, and you all know that God does not "command all men everywhere" to be baptized; and it is most absurd to apply the command-all-men-everywhere to baptism. It does not apply, it will not fit. What it says is, "God commandeth all men everywhere to repent"; and all Christadelphians ought to know that "repent" means "change of mind," in this case, from believing in error to a belief in

truth. If it is necessary for me to prove this, let me say, the Greek word here for "repent" is *metanoein*, and the same word occurs in Heb. xii:17, where it is said, "He (Esau) found no way to change his father's mind" (see margin, and also the Diaglott rendering). This "command to all men everywhere," then, instead of being a command to be baptized, is a command to change their minds from false doctrines to true, a thing the so-called rebel has done, for if he has not, he is not "enlightened" and is therefore not a "rebel," consequently baptism is not a subject of "command" to him. When you take a text stick to it—to what it says. That "rebels" have changed their minds you will find proof of when you hear them discussing with the sects, sometimes excelling some saints. Are you willing, now, to read, "God commandeth Gentiles to change their minds from believing in the immortality of the soul to a belief of the truth, because he hath appointed a day in which he will judge them at the judgment-seat of Christ? That would be unenlightened resurrectional responsibility, whereas it is gospel enlightenment, it is claimed, constitutes "resurrectional responsibility to the judgment-seat of Christ." Stick to what the text says. Now I make bold to say that leading brethren of the "amended" party know that the words "judge the world" do not apply to the judgment-seat of Christ, and they are not declaring "the whole counsel of God" in keeping back the facts from those young in the truth. They know that the truth is expressed in the words "rule the habitable," and that the "appointed day" is the day of the Lord, the millennium. The original word for "command" has the meaning of "announce" as well as "command." Times of ignorance God overlooked, in the sense of not extending the announcement to any but the Jews; now the time to extend the announcement to the Gentiles has come "because"—why? Because He is going to judge them? No; but "because" He hath appointed a glorious day in which He will rule the habitable earth in righteousness, and He wants, and will have, men to be the "kings and priests to reign on the earth." What a pity that such a glorious gospel announcement should be so ruthlessly forced into service in a vain effort to prove that Paul was preaching to idolaters of Athens that a few enlightened unbaptized Gentiles would appear at the judgment-seat of Christ! Even if you confine yourself to the word "command" and not allow "invite" or "announce," the case is not altered; for a Royal "command" is often an invitation, and a few weeks ago you had an example of this. The newspapers announced that the King "commanded" the Llanelly Choir to come and sing before the nobles of the courts of Germany and England. What was that "command" but an invitation? And if the Choir had hesitated, or even refused to accept the honor, do you think the King would have punished them by inflicting a penalty? Deprivation of the honor would have been a loss; but not one to be compared with the loss of life eternal and the glory of the kingdom of God. God provided means for Gentiles to avail themselves of the blessings of the kingdom of Israel, but He never poured vengeance upon those who did not avail themselves of

the privilege. Let us, brethren and sisters, discriminate between gospel and law. The latter demands obedience whether there be a spark of love or not; but the Gospel says, "Love me, or your obedience is trash I do not want and will not have. I must have an obedience actuated by love;" and if your baptism has been prompted by your fear of resurrectional punishment, and not by love, you have offered to God a blemished sacrifice unacceptable to him, as shown in the types. To preach enlightened unbaptized resurrectional punishment to the "good and honest hearted" is useless, since they need nothing but the love and beauty of the Truth as an inducement; to preach it to others is worse than useless, since if it frightened them into the water the form of immersion is a farce; and those who participate in this method of adding quantity regardless of quality are offering to God blemished sacrifices.

The next question called for an explanation of Jno. xii:48.

#### ANSWER.

This passage is also dealing with an unbeliever, and not with an "enlightened" believer who refuses baptism. Again, let me say, when we take a text to prove a point, we must stick to it, and examine carefully every word and the context. The previous verse says, "And if any man hear my words, and believe not, I JUDGE HIM NOT. Here is one who "believeth not." Enlightened responsibility can mean nothing else but that the subject does believe, for if he does not believe he is not "enlightened." Jesus is here speaking of those who did not believe His gospel words. They were not, therefore, enlightened candidates for baptism refusing to be baptized. Now notice the words that follow "believe not"—"I judge him not." If Jesus meant here the "rebel" at the judgment-seat do you think He would have said, "I judge him not?" Will you say of the "rebel" "Jesus will not judge him?" Do you not see that there is enough here to cause you to pause and reflect, before you use this passage—for it is the one mostly depended upon as the strongest—as an excuse for making the responsibility question a test of fellowship; yet, strange to say, not a test of fitness for baptism? Come now, "let us reason together." Will not Jesus personally judge every saint, good and bad? Would He say of a saint, "I judge him not"? If He has the "rebels," of the sort this word is used by you for, in mind, does He not say of this "rebel," "I judge him not"? a thing He could not have said of a saint, and a thing you cannot say that He could say of the "rejecter"? You see, there is something to be explained here, and not to be scampered over in a take-for-granted manner that it means something contrary to what it says. You will say, "But he says, 'My word shall judge him.'" Exactly so, and here is a peculiarity, in the fact that He says, "I judge him not, but my word shall judge him;" and this peculiarity will not fit the judgment-seat of Christ; for He will personally judge every one that will stand before Him there. Mark further, the "enlightened rejecter" is "enlightened" and has, therefore, "received the word," and he contends for it in many cases. It is not a question of

“receiving the word” into his mind in his case, but it is purely a question of so loving it as to yield to it in baptism. But Jesus is here speaking of those who “receive not my word.” Can one be an “enlightened” man and yet not have received the word? I am presenting these difficulties to you just as you would do with an “orthodox” man on the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, to show that the passage does not say what some suppose it to say; and thus to prepare you to accept what it does say and mean. Perhaps it will blunt the keen edge of your prejudice if I tell you that Dr. Thomas, in a long series of articles entitled “The Last Days of Judah’s Commonwealth,” applied this passage to the rejection of Christ by the Jews as their Messiah, and their conviction by what He had said, when the judgment of God fell upon them in the destruction of Jerusalem in the “last days” of their commonwealth.

Now you know there are two classes of texts which have caused brethren on one side to say the Jews who had “no cloak for their sin” were enlightened; and on the other side, that they were not enlightened. The passages which support the latter are more numerous and definite than those which support the former. There is an apparent conflict between them, and since we know that there can be no real contradiction between them, it is for us to harmonize them. This is the way to “rightly divide the word of truth.” A careful examination will show that the indictment of the Jews was not for “rejection” in a mental enlightenment of the gospel; but for a rejection of evidence that Jesus was the Son of God and the Messiah, which evidence appealed to their senses of sight and hearing. They could not help but see the miracles, and therefore they could not but know that Jesus was what he claimed to be. It was this knowledge that removed any “cloak for their sin” of crucifying Jesus. But this knowledge did not extend to mental enlightenment in the gospel. They were not, therefore, enlightened rejecters of the gospel, for that they were not enlightened, is evident from the many passages I will presently quote. If you will read carefully what they say and what Jesus says to them you will see how ignorant they were of the gospel. The extent of their knowledge was sufficient to make them deserve the threatened, and afterward-received, judgments in the “last days” of their commonwealth; but no one can find evidence that they were enlightened in the gospel. The extent of their knowledge is shown in what Nicodemus said to Jesus—indeed he may be regarded as an example of all of them in the degree of knowledge. He said, “Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God; for no man can do these miracles that thou doest, except God be with him” (John iii:2). You have only to read the rest of the chapter to see how far this man was from being enlightened in the gospel. He was more frank than many others of his people in confessing that Christ’s credentials were good, but neither he nor the rest understood the teachings of the Teacher; for “it was not given to them to know.” They had eyes to see (the miraculous proof of His claim) “but they saw not” (the gospel); for of this Isaiah had spoken by inspiration; and if his words were fulfilled

in them, they could not be "enlightened rejecters of the gospel," and therefore the "judgment" they were to have in "the last day" was not that of the saints at the judgment-seat of Christ. Brethren, in the very words often quoted to prove their enlightened resurrectional responsibility, Jesus says, "But all these things will they do unto you for my name's sake, because they know not him that sent me" (Jno. xv:21). Then in verse 24 He adds, "If I had not done among them the works which none other man did, they had not had sin." Here the condemnation upon them, instead of being for enlightenment in the gospel, is based upon the fact of "works" which appealed to their sight and hearing in proof that Jesus was "a Teacher come from God." If their rejection bring them to the judgment-seat of Christ, it will be upon a basis not applicable to any now, namely, the witnessing of the performance of miracles. Put it this way: Jesus says that if these Jews had not seen the wonderful works which He did, "they had not sinned;" the Gentiles of our time have seen none of these works; therefore they cannot commit the sin which Jesus preached upon seeing the works. There was a special appeal to a special people, the rejection of which brought the judgments predicted by Jesus that were to follow the "filling up of their sins." This came in the "last days" of their age; and therefore we have here a reason why, in the passage under consideration, Jesus says, "I judge him not." It was not to be a personal judgment; but Jesus had uttered words of warning, confirmed by wonderful signs, that the killing of the heir by the "wicked husbandmen" would bring judgments upon them and their city in their "last days." When they would find themselves enveloped in the fury of that judgment, the hitherto-unheeded warning words of Jesus would be before their eyes to judge or to condemn them. Of this same judgment Jesus is speaking when He says that the Ninevites, Sodom, and the queen of Sheba "shall rise up in judgment against THIS GENERATION." This, brethren, is the teaching of this verse; and to apply it to the judgment-seat of Christ is to lay down premises logically yielding the conclusion that men ignorant of the gospel will appear there. This would be proving too much for the theory held by our opponents; and an argument that proves too much is self-destructive.

That these Jews did not know the gospel you can easily learn by reading their expostulations with Jesus and His rebukes to them. Let us glance over the matter, "If I have told you of earthly things and ye believe not, how shall ye believe, if I tell you of heavenly things?" They "loved darkness," and would not come to the light (Jno. iii:12, 19). "For neither did his brethren believe in him" (chap. vii:5). "Have any of the Pharisees believed on him?" (verse 48). "Ye cannot tell whence I come, and whither I go." "Ye neither know me, nor my Father" (chap. viii:14, 19). "If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins" (verse 24). "When ye have lifted up the Son of man, then ye shall know that I am he" (verse 28). Verse 31 shows that some "did believe on him" to the extent that He was "a Teacher come from God," but He tells them that "If ye continue

in my words, then are ye my disciples indeed." Here was the knowledge which "seeing and hearing" the works produced, but not that of enlightenment in the gospel, for this had yet to be attained by "continuing." If they did continue, what would follow? Verse 32—"And ye shall (not do) know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." Then you have the evidence that they were not such as are now called "enlightened rejecters" in verse 33 and along through the chapter—"Why do ye not understand," etc. Read at your leisure to the end of the chapter and you will be able to discriminate between the sight and hearing knowledge they had, and the mental knowledge of the gospel they had not. Then think of Jesus' words, "They know not what they do;" of Peter's, "through ignorance ye did it," and many other passages. Apply the key which I think I have now clearly given you, and the seeming conflict between passages will vanish, and you will see that the passage in question refers to the Jewish rejection of Jesus' claims, despite evidences appealing to sight and hearing; and for this His warning words (not He personally) would judge (condemn) them in the approaching "last days." In the "last days" God spoke by his Son. "The end of all things is at hand"—end of the Jewish "things" and days. Jesus appeared once in the "end of the world." Examine all these statements and you will see what "judgment," what "rejecters," what "last days" the passage speaks of; and then you will see a good reason why Jesus says of this rejecter, "I judge him not; but my word shall judge him;" and you will also know that of the judgment at the tribunal where the saints will be judged, Jesus could not say of a single one, "I judge him not." The extent to which that judgment did come upon them is declared in I. Thess. ii:15, 16—"Who both killed the Lord Jesus, and their own prophets, and have persecuted us; and they please not God, and are contrary to all men: forbidding us to speak unto the Gentiles that they might be saved, to fill up their sins always: for the wrath is come upon them to the uttermost." Of this John the Baptist had said, "The axe is laid to the root of the tree."

In conclusion let me add, any passage that you may submit that unmistakably refers to the judgment-seat of Christ will show by the context, by reason, and by the general tenor of the Scriptures, that only saints are there, to be judged for good or bad, for life or death.

---

#### APPENDIX.

---

While traveling about we have many and varied questions asked, and many passages of scripture presented for explanation. On the subject of resurrectional judgment, we have found some puzzled over a few passages in addition to those explained in our Leeds Lecture. The subject has been made so much of by the "amended" party that one is compelled to expose the evil of the misapplication of scripture they resort to in an effort to magnify an unimportant question into one of a vital doctrine. Even when two agree upon any doctrine, a misapplication of scripture by one to prove that doctrine should be

corrected by the other if he be able to do it; for it is every one's duty to "rightly divide the word of truth." When any one may be able to say, "I agree with you as to the subject we are talking about," he may also say, "But I do not agree with you in using that passage to prove it."

We find that most of the mistakes are made in dealing with words spoken to the Jews; and these arise from not giving due heed to the fact that prophecy had declared that the Jews would not understand the gospel when preached by Jesus and His apostles. By carefully noticing the words in the prophecy it will be manifest that the Jews were to see and yet not to see; they were to hear and yet not hear (Isa. vi:9; John xiii:14, 15). These can mean nothing else but that they would see and hear the miracles to be performed, leaving them no excuse for crucifying Jesus, and deserving of the judgments that came upon them in the "last days" of their commonwealth; but they would not "see," or "understand" the gospel, and therefore could not be "converted." This made them responsible to judgment pertaining to the present life, like the antediluvians, Sodomites and many others; but, even if enlightenment in the gospel alone, out of covenant relation, does entail resurrectional judgment, they were not subjects of such enlightenment. The effort to base their resurrection upon such enlightenment is in direct opposition to the prophecy which had declared that they should not be enlightened, they should not "perceive," they should not "understand."

Jesus and the apostles were constantly warning that generation of the coming judgments upon the Jewish nation, and of the destruction of their city. The "days" were to be so terrible that if they "were not shortened none of the elect even would be saved" from the evil consequences. But these, if they took heed to the warning, to "flee to the mountains," would be saved. This judgment was "about to come," as Paul forewarned the Jews, and Felix in particular; and a vivid picture of the "sun being darkened, the moon becoming blood, and the stars falling from heaven," since all this was "about to come," was enough to make Felix tremble; while it is unreasonable to believe that Paul, in giving the first lessons on the gospel, was telling an unenlightened man that he would appear before the judgment-seat of Christ after resurrection.

Superficially viewed there are a few passages which seem to imply that unenlightened Jews will be raised to judgment, and these have been presented to us for explanation, and we will give here for the consideration of our readers the explanations we have verbally given to enquirers. Against prejudice it is hopeless to present any explanation; but it is to reason we appeal.

One passage is Matt. xxvi:64—"Jesus saith unto him, Thou hast said: nevertheless, I say unto you, Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven." It is claimed that this means that Caiaphas and the chief priests must be raised from the dead in order to "see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power and coming in the clouds of heaven."

But if this is to be so, it would be necessary to add to the words by the imagination, in order to see these ignorant men standing before the judgment-seat of Christ upon the basis of enlightenment in the gospel; for the claim is that there must be sufficient enlightenment to constitute fitness for baptism before "rejection" can take place. "Seeing the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven" would seem to refer to events that are to transpire after the judgment of the saints has taken place. The "clouds" seem to consist of saints, and the "heaven" may be the "new heaven," and the "right hand of power," the glory of Christ in multitudinous manifestation, subsequent to the "opening of the door in heaven." (Rev. iv:1). This, in any case, cannot mean that these scribes will appear at the judgment-seat of Christ; for that will then have become an event of the past, and, confessedly, their unenlightenment excludes them.

If it be insisted that Jesus referred here to what the individuals addressed should personally see subsequent to their resurrection, basing his claim upon the words "ye shall see," etc., upon the same principle it could be proved that these men will join in praise and adoration of Jesus at His coming; for does not the Lord say to the same officials of the nation, "Behold your house is left unto you desolate: and verily I say unto you, Ye shall not see me, until the time come when ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." (Luke xiii:35)? Scripture must explain scripture. Moses used the pronoun "ye" when foretelling the destruction of Jerusalem. The "ye" in all these cases, where the distant future is in view, applies, not to those addressed in the individual sense, but to the nation. As a nation, they will "look upon him whom they have pierced," and for these "a fountain is to be opened for sin and for uncleanness." (Zec. xii:10 to xiii:1). It is necessary only to notice what Caiaphas said to see his lack of "enlightenment" in the gospel.

One more passage will be sufficient to notice, since, from what has been pointed out, the rule applicable in such cases will serve in others. Luke xiii:28, 29—"There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth, when ye shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets, in the kingdom of God, and you yourselves thrust out. And they shall come from the east, and from the west, and from the north, and from the south, and shall sit down in the kingdom of God." By a comparison of Matt. vii:13, with this narrative in Luke, beginning at verse 24, it will be seen that those words were addressed to our Lord's disciples, not to the Jews. Jesus is, therefore, exhorting His disciples to be prepared for the "straitness" of the way into the kingdom; and he assures them that many will be disappointed when they "seek to enter in and shall not be able," finding the "door shut." Some err in applying this to "rejecters" upon the ground that our Lord is to say to them, "I know you not whence ye are" (verse 25), but they forget that they strenuously strive to prove that He does know the "rejecter," and that too, as a "servant"—when they are not employing this passage. This peculiar form of words is the "drapery" of the

parable; they are words that would be suitable in a case such as Jesus is supposing, which is the foundation of his exhortation. There is always a key to the true meaning of any passage of scripture if we search diligently and compare scripture with scripture. To decide whether the words "I know you not" are to be taken as distinguishing "rebels" from unworthy saints, all we need do is, search and see whether the same words are unquestionably applied to unworthy saints in any other passage. Then we shall find that, in the parable of the ten virgins, where no dispute can arise as to whom the "five foolish virgins" represent, we have the words, in Matt. xxv:12, "I know you not." This compels us to conclude that they are applicable to rejected saints at the judgment-seat of Christ.

With this information we can return to the passage in question, and notice that those rejected are represented as saying, "Lord Lord, open unto us. . . . We have eaten and drunk in thy presence;" and in Matt. vii:22 they say, "We have prophesied in thy name, and in thy name cast out demons, and in thy name done many wonderful works." They stand at the judgment-seat to be disappointed, a thing "enlightened rejecters" can in no sense be represented as doing, since, if they were "enlightened," they would not be disappointed in being rejected, were they to appear at the judgment-seat and find the "door shut;" and surely they would not try to plead their case for admission, as those are represented as doing.

## Where Is The Blame?—Judge Ye

Although we had striven to effect a reunion of the divided ecclesias upon the old basis of fellowship, and had been made to feel that our importunity was regarded in Birmingham as an intrusion, Brother Jones' appeal, which recently appeared in our columns, prompted us to try again. Hence the following correspondence. Brother Walker's last letter indicated that further correspondence would be undesirable, and therefore we wrote our last as an "Open Letter." That all may see the real situation, judge for themselves, and act in accordance with the demands of the case in the fear of God and not in the fear of men, we now publish the facts.—Editor.

Glaslyn Cottage, Mumbles, Jan. 28, 1908.

C. C. WALKER, Editor The Christadelphian.

Dear Brother:

Were I writing to you upon any subject other than that of the Truth and its interests, I should deem it necessary to ask you to overlook any seeming intrusion on my part in doing so.

There has been silence between you and me for several years, but I am impelled to break it now by the fact (a) that Bro. Jones, of Worcester, Mass., has recently besought you and me to try to effect a reunion of the brethren; and (b) by the fact that your late writings against the departure from the Truth in Australia, on the nature and sacrifice of Christ and the mortality of Adam, seem to fully agree with the position we hold. To this I may also add the correspondence from Canton, Ohio, and your acceptance (as it seems to me) of the right position taken by Bro. W. Whitehouse against the unscriptural doctrines held by Bro. Z. Whitehouse in common with those who published the "Buffalo Statement" and sundry pamphlets written by Bro. A. D. Strickler, and the "Warfare" editor. You will remember receiving these pamphlets, among which was one entitled, "The One Great Offering of Christ For Sin," from which I quote the following:

"Was Christ's offering for himself, to atone for the imputed sin of Adam to him, or for the unclean sinful flesh which he inherited from his mother, or for both? Both of these positions are out of harmony with the truth."—p. 1. (Of course you will know it is the second and third clauses of the question I am calling your attention to). On the same page, after "2nd," Bro. Strickler further says:

"Was Christ's offering to atone for his sinful flesh? If it was, then he was held guilty by God for possessing it, which would be unjust." After giving fallacious reasons he further adds:

"For God to require him to make an offering to atone for his sin nature, would manifestly be unrighteous." In other pamphlets sent you by Bro. Strickler, he says that "All that baptism is for is the removal of the penalty of the second death." He also adds, "It is no provisional removal either, but absolute." These last statements appeared also in "The Truth's Warfare."

Now Bro. Z. Whitehouse and those with him hold with Bro. Strickler, and are separated from Bro. W. Whitehouse and those with him because of differences on these questions. Bro. W. W. says (and it is refreshing to see it) that he will cling to what Bro. Roberts says, scripturally, in "The Law of Moses"—that Jesus atoned for sinful flesh in the one great offering—as long as he has breath. In your defense of the truth against the Australian departure, and in your seeming agreement with Bro. W. W. you seem to me (and I sincerely hope it is so) to be in agreement with the Chicago Ecclesia and all others in fellowship with them.

I am therefore writing you now to ask, Is this so? If it is, is not the cause of the breach reduced to a small matter, namely, the question of the resurrectional judgment of rejectors?

If we agree on the nature and sacrifice of Christ, and on the design of baptism based upon this sacrifice, do you think the difference between us on the responsibility question is enough to cause and continue the division?

In order that you may give me an unprejudiced answer, permit me to remind you of the fact that we positively refused to indorse the position of those who left us holding that no resurrection was possible out of Christ; and that we offer as a basis of settling the difficulty the following, or any form of words setting forth the same:

Jesus made "the" resurrection a certainty for Himself and His brethren through the blood of the everlasting covenant. "Them that are without, God will Judge." Where? When? and How? we leave open questions; but let it be distinctly understood that we do not deny God's power, right or prerogative to raise for punishment any out of covenant relation. But we do not believe these will be subjects of "the" judgment "for good or bad" to which probationers only are amenable, which judgment is spoken of in II. Cor. v:10; Rom. xiv:10.

Now, Bro. Walker, with matters before us as they are now, do you think a reunion of those separated by the Adamic Condemnation and Responsibility Question possible? Or do you think it promising enough to encourage a conference of representative brethren as a means of trying to effect a reunion?

Faithfully yours in the interests of the Truth and its supporters,  
THOS. WILLIAMS.

21 Hendon Road, Sparkhill, Birmingham, 7th. Feb., 1908.

MR. T. WILLIAMS, Glaslyn Cottage, Church Park, Mumbles.

Dear Brother Williams:

In reply to yours of Jan. 28th, I may say that I heard from Bro. Jones of Worcester, a few days ago; but that I do not see my way towards effecting a reunion of separated brethren with your help.

Neither my views, nor my written expressions of them have changed, and I cannot, of course, be held responsible for the expressions of others.

From correspondence which recently passed between you and Bro. F. G. Jannaway, it seems to me that you are still prepared to

fellowship positive denial of the resurrectional responsibility of unbaptized persons who know the truth but will not obey it.

Also I learn that the South London brethren, approached by a brother apparently on your behalf, have declined an interview under the circumstances.

This seems to me to be the only thing they could reasonably do. And in view of the B'ham position defined in the Statement (prop. xxiv.),—which you have so heartily opposed—I do not see my way to agree to any interview unless there were some assurance that you were of one mind with us.

Sincerely your brother,

CHAS. C. WALKER.

Glaslyn Cottage, Church Park, Mumbles, Glam'shire, Feb. 8, 1908.

Dear Brother Walker:

Yours of the 7th inst. is to hand, from which I conclude that it is useless for me to trouble you any further in an effort to effect a reunion of the divided ecclesias, since you consider that reunion can take place only upon an acceptance of the Birmingham amendment of Prop. xxiv. of the Statement of Faith. That Statement is so worded as to declare that non-baptized persons will appear at the judgment-seat of Christ to be judged, and to receive accordingly "good or bad." Yes, I have opposed this, and it still clearly appears to me to be the only consistent attitude that any enlightened brother can take towards it. Let me repeat. Our offer, so far as the responsibility question is concerned, is reunion upon the Birmingham Statement before it was changed.

You say you "cannot be held responsible for the expressions of others." Stated in this naked form, this is true; but did not those who made the "expressions" I quoted to you in my last letter send you their pamphlets? and did you not say you agreed with them? Now, Bro. Walker, how can you fellowship those who deny that Jesus atoned for sinful flesh, which is surely a denial of a fundamental principle, and of one always regarded as such; and yet refuse fellowship with those who are (as I suppose you will now admit) sound upon every first principle, but who do not believe that un-baptized Gentiles, whether "rejectors" or those not "rejectors," will appear before the judgment-seat of Christ? As you know, this latter question has never been regarded as a first principle; and the fact that you do not require re-immersion in cases where persons have changed their mind on it is proof that you do not regard it as a first principle. You will remember publishing the Buffalo Statement of Faith, and defending it when Bro. Lake pointed out some of its dangers. How can you harmonize your action with your recent Scriptural attitude towards the Australian theory? The "Warfare" and the Buffalo claim that "there can be no atonement made for sin's flesh, or rather sinful flesh." (Warfare No. 1, p. 16). This leaves Christ outside of the atonement, where "Free Life" placed Him. Instead of the gospel being God's plan of saving man out of that which the fall of Adam brought upon us, the

Buffalo Statement says: "That this penalty of the second death is the ONLY condemnation that we are freed from at baptism." This, Bro. Walker, you publicly did indorse. Do you still indorse it?

As to the proposed interview in S. London. Bro. Jannaway refused to present the brother's request to the ecclesia; and also refused to meet me for a friendly talk unless I would declare that I was not in fellowship with this one and that one. Then, too, you must have seen the offensiveness of his letters, even the first one, which made it manifest that his intention was to prevent the interview asked for by members of his ecclesia.

Deploring the situation, for which the Birmingham "amendment" is responsible to a large extent, and in which your position is quite inconsistent.

I am yours faithfully in Christ,  
THOS. WILLIAMS.

21 Hendon Road, Sparkhill, Birmingham, 10th Feb., 1908.

MR. T. WILLIAMS, Glaslyn Cottage, Church Park, Mumbles.

Dear Brother Williams:

Yours of the 8th is duly to hand.

Yes, I think it will be best for us to go in our respective ways without further friction.

I must decline to discuss the statements to which you refer; but my own views on "Condemnation and Forgiveness" are stated and proved in the article under that heading appearing in "The Christadelphian" for November, 1900, page 463.

I feel I have nothing to add to or take from this article of over seven years ago.

Faithfully your brother,  
CHAS. C. WALKER.

#### AN OPEN LETTER.

Dear Brother Walker:

What you wrote me concerning your article in "The Christadelphian" for November, 1900, prompted me to send for that copy, under the impression that you had there dealt with the real issues on Adamic condemnation, and the responsibility question in a way to answer, at least indirectly, the questions I asked about your rightly denouncing in Australia what you indorsed in the Buffalo pamphlets and the "Warfare." Your article is worse than a disappointment. In your last letter to me you expressed a desire for as little "friction" between us as possible, and then you refer me to your article, in which you grossly misrepresent the "Advocate" and its friends, and charge them with dishonesty. How can you hope for less "friction" with such conduct as this? Because one brother advocates that God "cannot" raise any out of Christ you charge all the friends of the "Advocate" with the same thing; when you know that said brother separated from us for the very reason that we would not go to the

length he did; and you know that we have repeatedly said that we do not deny God's right, power, nor prerogative to raise any His purpose may require.

You write of me that I say that remission of personal sins is merely "an incident" in baptism. Your way of snatching the two words "an incident" and adding your own words to them is well calculated to deceive the reader and to represent me as regarding personal sins as of little consequence. Had you given your readers what I said, so that they might have been able to see the two words where I put them, they could have fairly judged whether I was apologizing for personal sins or not. How can you expect "friction" to cease when you labor and manipulate words to put me and the friends of the "Advocate" in such an evil light?

The trouble was, my argument was unanswerable, and you could not deal with it without condemning your false position. In substance, it was, and it is, that Adam's fall placed all the race in the condition that made salvation necessary. That the salvation from that fallen condition was exemplified in Christ, who had no personal sins. That we are saved by Him from the same thing He was saved from, and by the same one offering and atonement He was saved by. All this is true of Jesus and of us irrespective of our personal sins. Therefore, since Jesus needed and obtained salvation without having personal sins, we should have needed the same salvation if we had been free from personal sins. Therefore, the great salvation is a larger thing and a more important thing than forgiveness of personal sins. Since it provides for and requires the remittance of personal sins, these are "an incident" in the great plan of salvation. Now, can you, with the two words in this setting, object? You do object, however. Why? Because you have "retrogressed" into the Campbellite position, that all that baptism does is remit personal sins. Here, Bro. Walker, is the issue, and here is where you have receded; for you have accepted the Strickler and "Warfare" assertion that "the penalty of the second death is the only condemnation that we are freed from at baptism." (See Buffalo Statement, published by you).

In your article you labor hard to make your readers believe that we claim that man can disobey God without fear of consequences. Your claim is that the "consequences" are resurrection to judgment and to suffer the penalty of the second death; while we claim that God can deal justly with Gentile sinners without raising them from the dead; and that if they should be raised, there is nothing for them to be judged for, since they have not been on probation. Does this mean that they can sin against God with impunity? Brother Walker, when you state our case, do state it fairly. You know that Brother Roberts wrote in "Twelve Lectures" that none of the unjust of antediluvian times would be raised, because their sins were dealt with "according to the penalties of the times they lived in." Did this mean what you represent us as claiming—that sinners can mock God? Let us have a little fairness, brother.

You profess to state the issues on the responsibility question, but here you substitute something else. Our claim is that until the controversy arose there were some who believed in the "third class" resurrection, and others who did not. This was well known to the brethren generally and to Brother Roberts in particular. The same is true of the brotherhood today; and in this respect there has been no change, and we have never claimed that there has been any change in this respect. Now what is the change which I have termed "retrogression" and which you attack, claiming there has been no change with "The Christadelphian?" I will tell you, and do it in such a way that you cannot truthfully deny it. The attitude of "The Christadelphian" was, not to regard the difference as a "first principle," and not to make it a cause of division. I could fill pages in proof of this; but one quotation is enough here: "It is a pity to trouble yourself as to whether believing but disobedient Gentiles are amenable to resurrectional punishment or not."—"Christadelphian," 1882. This shows that the paper did not then do what it has done in your hands; for in your article to which you referred me to save "friction!!" you call the question "a first principle of the truth." Therefore "The Christadelphian" has changed and the addition to the statement of faith was made to suit this change. Now that Prop. xxiv. was not intended to include "rejectors" is evident from the fact that all whom it deals with are to appear at the judgment-seat of Christ; while Brother Roberts, who formulated it, did not believe "rejectors" would appear there; for he said that would be "inappropriate," and the time of their punishment was reduced to a "may be." Has not the "C." changed in this? Will you not take the contemporary statements as they are? and they show that Prop. xxiv. was not understood to include rejectors. Then, when you added to it, that manifested the change in you; and then you discovered that a "first principle" was involved, though you do not act consistently with the theory of its being a first principle, for you do not require re-immersion when a change of mind takes place, and in your ranks today are some who believe exactly as we do, and they are fellowshipped as long as they do not speak out too loudly.

You assert, without knowledge, that "'The Advocate' did not agree with the original proposition" xxiv. How could you make this assertion, when it was known that I participated in preparing the Chicago Statement long before the controversy arose, and we copied verbatim Prop. xxiv.? Your assertion would make me out a hypocrite, if it were true. Now long before you appeared in England, Brother Roberts and I talked together on the responsibility question (over forty years ago) and we differed. He always knew that I did not agree with him. Later we talked it over in Wauconda, and still we differed. Yet he wrote a commending letter to the "Advocate" and corresponded with me privately as "co-laborer." He knew of many others who held with me on the subject, and I know that Prop. xxiv. was framed in the form it was in order not to raise the responsibility question as a test of fellowship; while you changed it for the very

purpose of making it say and do what it never before said or did. In the hands of Brother Roberts "The Christadelphian" never did change its attitude in this matter; in your hands it did change, not, as you allege, because we took the extreme view the brother did whose fault in going to an extreme you unfairly blame us all for; for you know we did not support him in that extreme; and when you say, "Because a prominent brother, supported by the 'Advocate,' receded," you say what is not true. All the "up-and-be-doing" brethren will testify that this "cannot" claim was the one the one we fought against during our two visits in England, and our standing against it to the end was the cause of that "prominent brother" forsaking us. Now these are the facts and the truths, Bro. Walker, and your article is positively untrue in what it says upon these matters. I do not mean that you knowingly wrote untruths, but you risked your statements without knowing whether they were true or not; for how, for example, could you know my mind when you wrote that "The 'Advocate' did not agree with the original proposition." xxiv.? Can you point to a syllable to prove your assertion?

Your article throughout labors to confine baptism to the remission of personal sins, excluding what Dr. Thomas terms the "passing from the 'Constitution' of sin to the Constitution of righteousness." Now let me show you the bearing of the Australian controversy on this question. Brother Bell's denial that Christ had to die for Himself, as well as his brethren, with the Cornish claim that there is no "sinful flesh," compelled you to meet him by quoting Brother Robert's answer to Brother Cornish. Thereby you showed that Christ was sinful flesh, and was under Adamic condemnation. Therefore Christ had to die to redeem Himself out of that state and the condemnation resting upon that state, and out of the death, and out of the dust—ALL of which came from "federal sin." This redemption for himself was Jesus' "salvation," and was effected by means of a holy life and an obedient death, which death was a sin-offering and atonement for Himself as the antitypical altar. Now, since we need the same as He did, His death must meet our need also. For that reason we must "die with him," be "crucified with him," be buried with him, and be "raised with him"—mark, for the same, the very same, reason for us as His death, etc., was for him—and therefore baptism, instead of being only to remit personal sins (a Campbellite baptism) is for what Paul says, and seems to say it to you: "Know ye not that so many of you as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death?" (Rom. iv:2). Therefore what Christ literally died for IN RESPECT TO HIMSELF (with no personal sins in his case), we must symbollically die for IN RESPECT TO OURSELVES, to which in our case we must add the remission of personal sins. Why cannot you accept this, Brother Walker? By confining the design of baptism to personal sins you only tell one truth, to the denial of the other—the other whose meaning was exemplified in Christ's sacrificial death for Himself. What I am beseeching you to do is to accept the two, and cease your repudiation of federal sin as seen in Christ's atonement for

that sin, and, in His case, for no other sin. You ignore the vital part of salvation manifested in the one offering "first for himself."

You say in excuse for the change you made in Prop. xxiv. that "the scriptures relied upon to prove it remain the same"—referring to the proof texts under the old form. Yes, and while these scriptures did apply to the proposition in its genuine form, they cannot be made to apply to your spurious form. By injecting Gentiles into the proposition you flaunt your theory in the faces of the apostles who wrote, not to Gentiles, but to "saints" in Corinth, Rome, etc.; and you make Paul say of Gentiles, instead of "WE must all appear," etc., "THEY must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ to receive in body according to that they have done whether good or bad." This is the patched-up wrongly dividing of truth your parenthetical clause in Prop. xxiv. manifests; and to add to the injustice and recklessness of this you have made this, spurious production the means of a shameful division of the brotherhood—a division which gave long-waiting heresies their opportunity to spring into the camp to make what you had made bad a great deal worse; for previously "The Christadelphian," in Brother Roberts' hands, had consigned the Buffalo baptism-for-second-death, and no-atonement-for-sinful-flesh inventions to the waste-paper basket. Dear Brother Walker, while of necessity I am addressing you, as editor, I cannot help but believe that your attitude and actions in this unhappy division have been influenced by dominant spirits too strong for a mild man to resist, and—pardon me if this appear personal—I believe that in yourself you are a man of peace and of a quiet spirit, but a great responsibility rests upon some, whoever they are, for results of the changed attitude of the paper you are editor of.

To me the questions involved are of such vital importance that no labor to rectify the wrongs is too great. I have lost all hope of seeing a union of the entire brotherhood; for I know that among the two large bodies represented by the two large meetings in Birmingham, heresies have found admission and toleration, to an extent requiring drastic measures to purge out. But I have not lost hope of seeing many more, in addition to those who have rallied (during the last six years), returning to the old and genuine pure basis of days preceding the so-called "amendment." It is therefore for the good it may do in a general way that I will put the issues into the form of a catechism; for, let me say, I intend to publish this correspondence in order to show that I have done my part in response to Brother Jones' request, and in the vindication of the true status of the case, as well as to leave on record standing testimony of having humbly, yet fearlessly, performed a duty against all odds, numerically, well knowing that in the end honor and truth will prevail.

#### QUESTIONS FOR FRANK AND FAIR ANSWERS.

1. The Buffalo Statement, published by you, says: "The remission of these past sins removed the penalty of the second death that was due to us for them"—due to all of "us," not simply to "rejectors."—Do you believe this?

2. It also says, "The penalty of the second death is the only condemnation

that we are freed from at baptism"; and this is said in denial of any putting off of our Adamic relation at baptism, and it is a contradiction of Brother Roberts' answer: "Everything is wiped out that stands against us in any way, whether in Adam or ourselves."—Do you believe the Buffalo Statement?

3. Denying the relation of baptism to the death of Christ as an atonement for sinful flesh, the "Warfare"—a paper you commended—says, p. 16, No. 1: "There can be no atonement made for sin's flesh, or rather for sinful flesh."—Do you believe this?

4. "Warfare," p. 20, says, that all that baptism does is forgive personal sins, "and it is no provisional forgiveness either, but an ACTUAL REMOVAL OF THE PENALTY OF THE SECOND DEATH."—Do you believe this? If so, do you think a second death thus removed can be imposed upon the disobedient saints at the judgment-seat?

5. "Warfare," No. 2, p. 18, says: "Christ's present work has to do only with sins of actual transgressions and the conscience, and NOT WITH THE BODY."—Do you believe this? If so, is the body of the saints still in the legal "unclean" state? and then, how is such a body the "temple of the Holy Spirit"?

6. If Christ's present work has to do only with personal sins and the conscience, not with inherited legal uncleanness, nor with "federal sin," not with inherited Adamic condemnation, nothing but "the conscience," what had this work to do in relation to Himself, since personal sins and conscience formed no part of what His redemptive work did for Himself? If you still hold with this "Warfare" theory, how can you claim that the "Christadelphian" of today has not changed from the "Christadelphian" of the past, in view of this: "We have the declaration of Paul that Christ needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up 'sacrifices' first 'for his own sins' and then for the people's, for 'this he did once' (Heb. vii:27). Paul's statement is that Jesus did 'once' what the typical high priest did 'daily.' What was that? 'Offered first for his own sins and then for the people's.' It follows that there must have been a sense in which Jesus offered for himself also, a sense which is apparent when it is recognized HE WAS UNDER ADAMIC CONDEMNATION, inhering in his flesh"—"Christadelphian," September, 1873, p. 405. If this was not redemptive work—sin-offering—for the body, what was it? Where do personal sins and "the conscience" come in here?

7. The Strickler 8 pp. tract, p. 6, says: "Remember, the atonement is not made because we possess such a sin-producing nature."—Do you believe this? If so, what did Jesus atone for Himself for?

8. If you have the courage to deny this, and to admit that Jesus did atone for His sinful flesh, did He not atone for ours also? Whose sin was the cause of making flesh sinful? Since it was federal sin, does it not follow that Jesus, for Himself, atoned for the unclean state of sinful flesh which Adam's sin produced—mortality? Since baptism puts us in the atonement Christ's death made for His sinful flesh, does not baptism relate to federal sin as well as to personal sins?

9. Same tract says, "Baptism is a symbol by which we confess that we deserve death for our sins that are past." If this is all baptism is a symbol of, how can it be a symbol of Christ's death—a death which He died for Himself and for us for the same reason, and in His case there were no "sins that were past"? Do you not see how the truth is missed every time by not keeping Christ, our "forerunner," in view as an example?

10. Same p. says that baptism relates to "death after judgment and therefore the second death."—Do you believe this? If so, since baptism relates to the death of Christ and He died for Himself, did His own baptism and His death relate "to death after judgment and therefore the second death," in respect to Himself? See where this false theory leads you!

11. Same p. says, "This is the law of sin and death, it is wages for our evil deeds, and this death is certainly after judgment."—Do you believe this? If so, must you not, with "Free Lifeism," deny that Jesus was under the law of sin and death?

12. Page 1 says that to say that "Christ's offering was for the unclean sinful flesh which He inherited from His mother," "is out of harmony with the

truth."—Do you believe this? If so, must you not agree with "Free Lifeism" in saying the same thing, and with the editor of the "Shield" whom you have rightly opposed? But, where are you? Why withdraw from the doctrine in Australia and not over here?

13. Page 4 says, "Any doctrine must be erroneous that proclaims to the world that Christ died to atone for His own sin's flesh."—Do you agree with this? You do fellowship it. You seem to condemn it in the poor erratic "Messenger" by Brother Brode. But where are you? Is it not the burden of Dr. Thomas' teaching that Jesus DID atone for His own sin's flesh and for ours? and did not the "Christadelphian" stoutly contend for this before it changed hands and changed sides?

14. On page 4 we have worse and more of it. Look at it, dear brother, and surely you must denounce it as a fabrication that nullifies the gospel. Look at it: "The sins that Christ died for, suffered for, atoned for, are defined as transgression of law—all unrighteousness; never in no (he means any) instance that He died to atone for sin in the flesh."—How can you believe this and believe that Jesus "died for, suffered for, atoned for Himself? You say the "C." has not changed. It is now linked with this theory. But before its retrogression this represents its position: "Christ must have been the subject of a personal cleansing in the process by which he opened up the way of sanctification for his people." . . . "Were not the antitypical (Christ) holy things in a similar state through the derivation on his mother's side from a sinful race? If not, how came they to need purging with his own better sacrifice?" "All were both atoning and ATONED FOR. There is no counterpart to this IF CHRIST IS KEPT OUT OF HIS OWN SACRIFICE." If He was purified there was something to be purified from. What was it? Look at his hereditary death taint as a son of Adam, through whom death entered into the world by sin, and there is no difficulty."—"Law of Moses."

15. If it is true that "never in any instance does the Bible say that Jesus 'suffered and atoned for sinful flesh," what was the 'Renunciation' controversy about? Let Paul speak: 'By his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption" (Heb. ix:12).

#### THE NEW DEPARTURE

"Never in any instance do the Scriptures say Jesus died to atone for sin's flesh."

#### THE OLD FOUNDATION

"All were atoning and ATONED FOR. There is no counterpart to this if Christ is kept out of his own sacrifice."

Which do you believe?

16. In the article you refer me to you limit baptism to personal sins (a Campbellite baptism) and thereby logically limit Christ's death to the same, and thereby you exclude Christ from the offering He made. How do you harmonize that with this?—"Christ MUST have been the subject of a PERSONAL CLEANSING in the process by which He opened up the way of sanctification for His people?" Do not forget that we in baptism die with Christ, are crucified with Christ, are buried with Christ, are raised with Christ, and thus we become identified with His redemptive work in order to partake of it for the same reason and to the same end He did, and in His case all had its root in Adamic sin, and its end in redemption therefrom. Therefore to lose sight of this in baptism into His death is to lose sight of the plan of salvation in its broadest sense. Dear brother, can you not accept this, and allow that in respect to us the remission of personal sins, if you do not like my words "an incident," call it "part of" the design of baptism.

17. Let me put this in another way. Christ was "cleansed," "purified," "purged," "atoned for," "redeemed," "SAVED." What from? What out of? Out of what He inherited from Adam. In Christ do we not see "all righteousness" which was the antidote to Adam's sin? Did it not prove to be the anti-

dote, and the "abrogation" (Birmingham Statement) in His case? Therefore do we not see SALVATION exemplified in Christ's individual self? This being so with personal sins having no part, is not salvation a known quantity, an identifiable thing that, with Christ only in view, is such irrespective of personal sins? Do we not need, and must we not have, the very same salvation He had? In His, all we see is represented in the two federal heads—Adam and Christ. Is there any way for us to pass from the former, relatively or physically, except through, or by means of, baptism? Is it not in respect to our "relation" to Adam that Paul says, "The law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law (not the physical effect of the law) of sin and death"? Is it not in respect to the physical effect of that "law" "carried into execution" (Birmingham Statement) that Paul adds, we are "waiting for the adoption, namely, the redemption of the body"? In all this, in respect to Christ and to us, have we not salvation as a thinkable thing, the thing the Adamic curse would have required if no one had sinned after Adam? But his descendants did sin, and therefore their sins must be included. This is as clear as I can make it, and if you do not accept it, it cannot be because you do not understand it. Do you accept? If not, why not?

18. The 8 pp. tract of Brother Strickler says: "Was Christ's offering to atone for sinful flesh? If it was, then he was held guilty by God for possessing it, which would be unjust." Did you overlook this when you commended the Strickler pamphlets? Do you not see that this denies atonement in toto—for any thing? Does it not blindly make every one guilty who may be afflicted with any thing requiring atonement, leprosy, illegitimacy—to the tenth generation, etc.? If Christ could not atone for His sinful flesh because, as Brother S. foolishly claims, He would be guilty for possessing it, then it follows that He could not atone for anything He was not guilty of. Since He was guilty of nothing, it follows from this Strickler folly that He could atone for nothing, and so we have the plan of salvation a nullity. Let me reduce this to a syllogistic form in order to make sure that the simplest mind will see how this romancing pamphlet writer and "Warfare" champion has made the word of God of none effect. But I must tell you, Brother Walker, I would have had only pity for the author of these tracts, and would have spent but little time on them, had you not committed the "Christadelphian" to them, and thereby helped to spread the Buffalo disease to Jersey City, Pomona, and Toronto. Excuse my plain way of stating facts to you, dear brother, but I am taking this matter more seriously than you have supposed, I think; and I beg of you to take this long letter as a heart to heart talk with you, for your sake and for all who have become affected with this deplorable delusion I am now combating. But now for the syllogism:

1. Brother S. says, If Christ atoned for His sinful flesh, He was held guilty for possessing it.—(A false premise.)

2. He was not guilty because He possessed it;

3. Therefore He did not atone for His own sinful flesh.

Now let us put this to the test and see where it will lead us to.

1. According to Brother S. If Jesus was required to atone for OUR sinful flesh, He was held guilty because WE are possessed of sinful flesh. (Another false premise.)

2. He was not guilty because of this;

3. Therefore He did not atone for OUR sinful flesh.

So there is no atonement for sinful flesh at all. Do you believe this?

But this is not all. Let us try again.

1. Brother S. says Christ could not atone for sinful flesh unless He were held guilty for possessing it

2. Anything that Christ atoned for, He must be held guilty of;

3. Therefore since He was guilty of nothing, He atoned for nothing.

1. Jesus could atone for nothing He was not guilty of, according to Brother S.

2. He was not guilty of our personal sins;

3. Therefore He did not atone for our personal sins, and so we are left absolutely without any atonement for anything, and out of atonement with God we must remain—"without hope and without God in the world."

19. All this Strickler and "Warfare" contention, Brother Walker, is in a vain effort to evade the truth in respect to our relation to "racial alienation." The "C." in your hands indorsed the "Warfare's" twelve months' ridicule of this phrase; but the "C." in past days used to talk something like this: "A man has not learnt the ways of God thoroughly, who does not recognize that most of His dealings with the children of men in the present STATE OF RACIAL ALIENATION are performed with gloved hands"—"C."—afterwards published in "Ways of Providence," p. 210.

20. In your article you limit our relation to Adam to "blood relationship," and thereby deny the freedom from the law of sin and death. How can you do so and claim the "C." has not changed in view of this: "There are two classes of sins from which the human family needs deliverance. First, those to which men are related by RACIAL DESCENT (Rom. v. 12-14); second, individual trespasses. IN IMMERSION THERE IS A RECOGNITION OF THE FIRST"—Brethren Sulley and Roberts in the "Temple Plan."

21. In limiting baptism to personal sins, how can the "C." claim not to have changed when it now rejects, yet in the past said: "Legally a man is freed from Adamic CONDEMNATION at the time he obeys the truth, and receives remission of sins; but actually its physical effects remain until this mortal (that is this Adamicly condemned NATURE is swallowed up.—"C.," 1878, p. 225.

22. "Everything is wiped out (at baptism) that stands against us in any way, WHETHER IN ADAM or ourselves." "There is a passing out of Adam into Christ." "When he passes into Christ, his RELATION to the whole death dispensation which Adam introduced is put off."—Roberts in R.-A. Debate. "Baptism is the means of that present (legal) union with Christ."—"Declaration," genuine edition. How can the "C." deny having changed when these are its former declarations, while now it repudiates them, and has changed some of the books to suit its change?

Finally, the "Christadelphian," before it changed hands and changed sides, regarded the "rejector" as belonging to a "third-class," an outside matter, a thing it "was a pity for any one to trouble about"; and the rejector was held liable to resurrectional punishment, "may be at the end of the thousand years," and that because he was a rejector. Now the "C." endorses the theory that all who learn the gospel, whether they reject or not, come under the sentence of the second death, and baptism is to remove this sentence from all, of rejection. Here is the changed position of the "Christadelphian." Here is the "retrogression." Here is the abominable theory that by teaching our children the glorious gospel we put them under the sentence of the second death; and those dear ones who, having learned the gospel, intended to be baptized as soon as they felt they could be "good enough," and adorn it after taking on the name, but whom death snatched away, must come forth, still under the sentence of the second death, to suffer its frightful pangs and pains and at last return to the grave, and this time to oblivion. Talk no more about the inconsistency of the hell torment theory. You have gone into a shameful apostasy, and my voice is lifted high from the house-tops, and my pen runs to inscribe my protest against it, while brotherly, affectionately in the fear of God, but in the fear of no living man, nor of any number of them, I beseech you to retrace your steps while it is called today; for the night cometh when it will be forever too late! too late!! too late!!!

Earnestly and sincerely your brother,

THOS. WILLIAMS.