

29th August 2019

Introduction

1894 Enlightened Rejectors

Dear Brethren and Sisters of the Lord Jesus.

We recall the last of our bible classes on the history of the truth in the modern times, and we recall how the last division we looked at was in 1885 over Partial inspiration. We recall that this was a very troublesome and tragic year also personally for Robert Roberts where not only did he lose many of his brothers and sisters in the division but also two of his children died in young age. It is noteworthy of his personal predicaments, and the tough times he and others like him endured, not to bemoan the situation, instead in 1885 Robert Roberts found a way of dealing with such things was to return to the scriptures, and this he shared by ways of exhortation and comforting letters in the series of four letters he wrote some of us might have in possession, and makes very uplifting reading: To the Elect of God in Time of Trouble, also a fifth letter entitled A Letter to my enemies.

In 1886 a new constitution of the Birmingham ecclesia was drawn up, to take in consideration the controversy which had been caused by the partial inspiration claims. A couple of years later, poor Robert Roberts was involved in the Sugar disaster, where a secret process of refining sugar by electricity, was claimed to be invented.

Unfortunately, though very well intentioned, it was thought to be a good thing to secure some of the prospective wealth for the sake of helping forwarding the truth, and the Palestine Colonisation Project in particular, and so it was that much loss was experienced in Christadelphian circles, and of course Brother Roberts was blamed. However he and others were innocent victims of a great fraud.

Nevertheless, it was always the hope of Robert Roberts to be able to make up the personal loss of funds that he had unwittingly caused to others. It was another difficult time, and we think we have it tough! Well, the years passed. In 1890, Nazareth Revisited was published. But four years later, an article was published by FG Jannaway under the title Repent, indicating that there was trouble in London on the subject of Resurrectional Responsibility. So it appeared. A certain brother JJ Andrew, who was a highly esteemed brother, who had stood firm in past controversies, and supported Robert Roberts and others rightly dividing the truth, and one who had been a leading light in that First Fraternal Gathering we mentioned back in 1872, anyway he had become possessed of the idea that none but the baptised could possibly be raised to dead for punishment. There was no disagreement of course for the righteous, that to be deemed righteous, one at the very least had to be baptised according to the gospel of Christ, but in JJ Andrews own words, his theory stated *"Those who are outside of (Christs) redemptive work cannot come forth (to resurrection) They are in Adam. Christ has never 'bought' them They never come within the scope of his blood and therefore he is not their Lord to judge them."* In other words he was saying that a man might with perfect impunity, or liberty, reject the gospel and commit every kind of wickedness, without fear of facing resurrection and condemnation so long as he diligently kept outside of Christs redemptive work that is did not become baptised into Christ. JJ Andrews published a pamphlet entitled the Blood of The Covenant to support his idea

The Preface to R Roberts response was: *Probably the best preface will be the following extract from a letter just received from brother Lake, of the London ecclesia:— "I am glad to hear that you are preparing a reply to the pamphlet, 'The Blood of the Covenant.' You*

have probably heard of the severe conflict into which the meeting at Barnsbury Hall has been plunged by this question. The matter has been developed in this way: Our basis of fellowship states, in proposition 5: 'That resurrection affects those only who are responsible to God by a knowledge of His revealed will. ' This clearly conveyed and was interpreted by all, including brother Andrew, to mean the responsibility of enlightened rejectors of the truth." "About three years ago, however, brother Andrew suddenly adopted his present views. We had known for years of some who held similar views, but the question was thought to be an out-of-the-way one, having little bearing upon any vital matter, and there was a tacit agreement not to strive about it. This attitude is maintained by many, including myself, to be the right one, even now." "Brother Andrew would not, after his change of opinion, accept this position. He commenced to introduce the matter into lectures and addresses, with much denunciation of the doctrine in the basis as "error, &c. This was the beginning of strife. He subsequently gave notice of a proposition involving his new principle, which created much controversy, and the sense of the meeting being strongly against it, was ultimately withdrawn." "But although knowing that these views were opposed to our basis and to the minds of the brethren, brother Andrew still pressed them upon every possible occasion—converting all our meetings into a scene of contradiction and dissension; and of late saying that those who taught that resurrection was possible by the power of God only and outside of the blood of Christ, were 'blasphemers, 'held a fatal error,' and were "liars. This made action necessary. Repeated private remonstrances having been made without avail, notice was given to bring the matter under the notice of the ecclesia in an official manner. In order that the subject and the action taken should be fully understood, a series of meetings were arranged for an exhibition of the evidence upon the question. The last

of these was held on Sunday last. Next Sunday, another meeting is to be held at which a motion will be made, re-affirming the truth as defined in the basis." "I thought it best you should be in possession of these facts.

We would like to highlight some of the words which have been said in the aforementioned preface. Did you notice the words: *We had known for years of some who held similar views, but the question was thought to be an out-of-the-way one, having little bearing upon any vital matter, and there was a tacit agreement not to strive about it. This attitude is maintained by many, including myself, to be the right one, even now.*" This is a point that we would like to return to in a short while. *

Another point is worth noting as well, that JJ Andrews was not writing to remedy a lack of understanding as he claimed in his pamphlet, but instead he had himself come to a new understanding, an different way of seeing things which was plainly wrong, He was in fact contradicting himself, as for years he had held the correct view, as Robert Roberts shows: We quote: *"It is the result of a change of view. In Jesus Christ and Him Crucified, pages 115 and 148 brother Andrew teaches the doctrine which he now opposes, and more than one ecclesia has adopted the statement of faith drawn up by him, in which it is stated that resurrection is for those "who are responsible to God by a knowledge of His revealed will," and that "all these, whether just or unjust, faithful or unfaithful, will be raised from the dead at the second appearing of Jesus Christ."* The new pamphlet is written, therefore, not to "supply a deficiency" (as he expresses it), but to overthrow a position deliberately taken in previous publications.

Another point we should carefully note down in our file for experience, just in case we come across it again, the apostacy that JJ Andrew was proposing can be very simply defined, that is: that men who knowingly rebel against the authority of God will not be raised for punishment unless they have been baptised. Simple to understand, and simple to counter and rebut and show that is very wrong. However, in JJ Andrews pamphlet promoting his new ideas, puts across this proposition in very long -winded ways. Roberts described it as *“extensive and very diffuse. It is spread over a large surface. It is not definitely formulated in any part of the pamphlet. It is only to be gathered from a long dissertation drawn out into over 32 sections. In this scattered form, the large employment of unproved assertion and the subtle interweaving of words used without a definite meaning is liable to produce an effect not attributable to just reasoning, but to the mere process of dogmatic reiteration”* We thank Robert Roberts for that colourful description. But is this not the same process whereby earlier false doctrines were injected into the ecclesias? We can see a pattern developing.

It is the same pattern that was forewarned by Peter: 2 Peter 2:1 *But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction.* 1 Timothy 4:1: *Now the Spirit speaks expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils;* We note the words, seducing spirits, and damnable heresies brought in privily, quietly, in the back door. In this case disguised with a lot of fluff. The serpent when speaking to Eve used guile, and deceived her. Same

spirit. So involved in this new idea is that men cannot rise from the dead unless the Adamic sentence is taken away; that the Adamic sentence is taken away in the case of those who are baptised into Christ, and in the case of those under the law who submitted to circumcision and sacrifice, and that, therefore, they can rise to judgment because they are not under the Adamic sentence: These claims, Robert Roberts dismantles.

At the beginning he shows that there are scriptural examples which completely disprove this theory to be man made and incorrect: He says *"First of all, it conflicts with the fact that resurrection has already taken place in recorded cases where there could be no question of atonement, of which the son of the widow of Zarephath may be taken as a type. These cases are disposed of by JJ Andrew calling them "mere miracles," but this does not dispose of them at all; they are a direct confutation of the contention that resurrection cannot take place where the Adamic sentence is operative, for in all the cases referred to, that sentence had not been interfered with in any way, typically or otherwise, yet God raised them for his own purpose. This shows the Adamic sentence is no bar to God raising the Adamicallly-sentenced dead, if He have any reason for doing so. If Elijah could raise an Adamicallly-sentenced human being as "a mere miracle," to show the power of God, obviously Christ can do the same at his coming. So, we see here the way in which some of the arguments could be dismantled.*

However, it is often about language. One advantage of cutting though to the plain truth today, is that people are very lazy, and don't like speaking more than they have to. This means that you can cut through more easily to the point being made. When you read some of the older dissertations in making a point, some authors tend to go around the houses so to speak, when people did not have

distractions like they do today, and could concentrate longer it was no problem, and they would get there in the end, However on the other hand it is easier to confuse those who did not have the same level of education. We noticed in the last division we looked at, how many did not follow the arguments, and were deceived as Robert Roberts lamented. Here it seems the same wordiness and misty glaze seems to be the devil's tool at use. Although I have not got this apostate pamphlet the Blood of the Covenant by JJ Andrew, in reading Robert Roberts response, it appears that JJ Andrew had befuddled understanding of the doctrine of the Atonement, of the way in which sin was symbolically covered by the blood of animals, pouring out of innocent sinless blood, symbolic, same as circumcision and sacrifices, however it appears that JJ Andrew appeared to attach actual power to these rituals, that circumcision for example he believed was an actual atonement for Adamic sin. But writing such claims in long wordy ways using scriptural phrases, but misapplying them, dressing up his argument which on the surface sound and read well, deceiving the unwary. However as can be seen there are glaring inconsistencies, and his own arguments later destroy his own propositions. The booklet written by Robert Roberts is most certainly worth a read, but is too lengthy at 50 pages to reproduce or summarise his arguments, but rather it is advisable to present the truth which exposes the fallacy. It is true that if men and women are ignorant of the truth, then they will not be resurrected.

This is our contention as to why babies and infants who die, do so without hope. Belief is necessary for salvation, for resurrection, John 20: 31 *But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name,* and again Hebrews 11:6 *But without faith it is impossible to please him: for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and*

that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him. The ignorant, and those unaware of the truth, die like beasts, and will not rise to judgement. John 9:41 *If, ye were blind, ye should have no sin,* and Psalm 49:20 *Man that is in honour, and understands not, is like the beasts that perish.* The previous verse show that those who die in ignorance, even if they be very wicked men, they will die, never to rise again. 17 -20: *For when he dies he shall carry nothing away: his glory shall not descend after him. Though while he lived he blessed his soul: and men will praise thee, when thou doest well to thyself. He shall go to the generation of his fathers; they shall never see light.* God does not hold those who are ignorant into account, they are already punished through death. As said Paul in Acts 17:30 *And the times of this ignorance God winked at.* However, knowledge brings responsibility. James 4:17 *To him that KNOWETH to do good and doeth it not, to him it is sin.* Knowledge places an obligation of the person to act in a specific way. They cannot say *It was my fault I did not know.* Knowledge means a decision has to be made, even if it means to ignore the knowledge. You can pretend you don't know something, but who are you kidding. Not God. Jesus spoke of this to his disciples in Luke 12:47 *The servant that KNEW his lord's will, and prepared not himself. neither did according to his will, shall be beaten with many stripes... for to whomsoever much is given, of him shall much be required.* Again in his parable of the house on the rock and the house on the sand, he concludes by saying about the house on the sand that fell: Matthew 7: 26 *And every one that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, which built his house upon the sand:* Calamity and judgement shall certainly follow. Again to those that were under the law of Moses, who had the gospel preached in that format: Deuteronomy 18: 18 -19 *I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth; and he shall speak*

unto them all that I shall command him. And it shall come to pass, that whosoever will not hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him. Jesus this prophet had this to say: John 12:48 47 And if any man hear my words, and believe not, I judge him not: for I came not to judge the world, but to save the world. He that rejects me, and receives not my words, hath one that judges him: the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day. Those then who do rebel, and decide to ignore the gospel which has lightened their eyes, and shown them the truth, will certainly be punished, Romans 2:2,5 We are sure that the judgment of God is according to truth against them that commit such things. After thy hardness and impenitent heart treasurest up unto thy self wrath against the day of wrath, and revelation of the righteous judgment of God. Those who do not care about seeking forgiveness for their sins, Jesus has this to say: Matt. 12:32,36 And whosoever speaks a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever speaks against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come I say unto you that every idle word men shall speak, he shall give account thereof in the day of judgment.

That the day of judgement is not just talking about death which happens to all men, is clear as Paul explains that Christ will resurrect the just and the unjust. Acts 24:15*And have hope toward God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust.* Also the prophet Daniel proclaims: 12: 2 *And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.* This is quite clear, no matter how much flummery and flowery language people employ, cut to the facts, and look at what the Word says, it is far simpler, but people lean and rely on others

too much, and cant find recourse to these passages perhaps or by force of personality they think they should go along or just to keep the peace. Again in Revelation 21:8 *The unbelieving... shall have their part in the lake which burns with fire and brimstone; which is the second death. That these rebellious and backsliders are worthy of such a resurrection and humiliation is because they have humiliated the grace of God,* Hebrews 10: 26: *For if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remains no more sacrifice for sins, But a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries. He that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses: Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden underfoot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace?* This is why Jesus states unequivocally John 5:29 *And shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation.*

Just to conclude with the point we asked you to recall. *

We had known for years of some who held similar views, but the question was thought to be an out-of-the-way one, having little bearing upon any vital matter, and there was a tacit agreement not to strive about it. This attitude is maintained by many, including myself, to be the right one, even now. CC Walker also confirms this: There had been much haziness of perception with regard to this matter among Christadelphians and divergent views were tolerated for many years... . It was for a little while that further strife and division might be avoided, but this proved to be impossible. Here he admits the reason for putting up with divergent views was to avoid strife. This is clearly a root of the problem. Ideas must be

challenged, and false ideas not tolerated. It is a position that Christadelphians at large has never learned from. Robert Roberts and other faithful took decisive action, and division did ensue. JJ Andrew left with his follows and published a rival magazine called the Sanctuary Keeper, and called his group the Advocate. Just over 20 years later, these all reunited with Suffolk Street, you remember who divided over Partial Inspiration.

Brother Terry