

The Nazarene Fellowship Circular Letter No 270

2nd Quarter 2015

In this Issue: -

Page 1	Editorial	Brother Russell Gregory
Page 2	A Jew Accepts Jesus	Brother Leo Dreifuss
Page 5	The Passover	Jewish Chronicle
Page 7	Speaking The Truth in Love	Brother J Cameron
Page 10	News Item from Israel	
Page 11	Prayer in Secret	Brother E.Turney
Page 13	Letter to a Christadelphian	Brother Phil Parry
Page 17	A Short Extract Written By Calvin On The Bible.	
Page 17	Non-Muslims Muslims and the Jihad Against the West	Bosch Fawstin

Editorial

Regarding the days in which we live there are a great number of prophecies that have come true and have convinced Bible students that the scriptures can be depended on; however, there are some prophecies which we are told will be kept secret until the time comes for them to be revealed.

Many prophecies are recoded in the Book of Daniel, but he was not allowed to explain or reveal everything for us but was told, in chapter 12 verse 4, "But thou, O Daniel, shut up the words, and seal the book, even to the time of the end." And again, in verse 9 he was told a second time, "Go thy way, Daniel: for the words are closed up and sealed till the time of the end."

This is very frustrating for those who want to complete the 'jigsaw' of prophecy ahead of time. For years people have endeavoured to correlate scriptures prophecies with world history and have obviously come close to doing so, but there remain gaps and uncertainties, and over-enthusiasm has produced many false predictions.

While the Bible gives us much information, there has also been speculation as to how foretold events would unfold; how the various nations would be allied together and against whom they would make war. Today we see the extraordinary situation in which one country will help an enemy country if another enemy is getting too strong - and then change allegiance as soon as necessary to try and keep the balance of power in their favour! And old enemies become new friends. Who would have thought that Germany, only 70 years after the holocaust, would be perhaps the greatest supporter of Israel today!

But to return to the prophecies which Daniel was not allowed to reveal, we feel they can now be seen in the rise of Islam. Although Islam has a nasty and distasteful history, it has never been considered a terrible threat to the whole world, but now it has evolved with enormous amount of financial backing, also training in the most deadly types of modern warfare, and this is linked with unparalleled hatred of all those who do not agree with their cause. The sole mission of Islam is to avenge every supposed infringement of their false god's honour until the whole world is one with them.

No writers on prophecy ever conceived of these things, and so no one expected them. It is the rise of Islam as a dreadful and merciless enemy with such unreasonable hatred that is so alarming. Their hostility of all who do not agree with their extreme self-righteousness knows no bounds and even their animosity for their fellows is unequalled in history; in the last fifty years alone they have killed some ten million fellow Muslims for not following stricter rules!

Below there is an article written by “A recovering Muslim” entitled “Non-Muslim Muslims and the Jihad Against the West” which gives us one little insight into what the rest of the world is up against.

The Bible tells us of this fearful time when “men’s hearts are failing them for fear and for looking after those things that are coming upon the earth – Luke 21:26; A time of trouble such as never was since there was a nation – Daniel 12:1; And except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved: - Matthew 24:22; and many such expressions of anxious times ahead.

But we have the assurance given us by Jesus in Luke 21:36, “Watch ye therefore, and pray always, that ye may be accounted worthy to escape all these things that shall come to pass, and to stand before the Son of man.”

With Love in Jesus to all our readers, Russell.

“Behold, the whirlwind of the LORD goeth forth with fury, a continuing whirlwind: it shall fall with pain upon the head of the wicked. The fierce anger of the LORD shall not return, until he hath done it, and until he have performed the intents of his heart: in the latter days ye shall consider it.” Jeremiah 30:23,24: -

A JEW ACCEPTS JESUS

This is the testimony for Jesus written to his friends:

Let me explain how I, Leopold Dreifuss, accepted these Truths. Being a natural Jew, and having attended Christadelphian lectures for some time, I “became interested in the views of the Nazarene Fellowship.

I don’t know whether you know us by this name. Most Christadelphians call us “Renunciationists,” or “Clean Flesh Heretics,” because of their mistaken idea that we deny that Jesus has come in our flesh. Now, let me say from the outset that this is not true. Let me make it quite clear to you that we do acknowledge that Jesus has come in our flesh. Now, in the following, I will try to explain to you just where we differ from the Christadelphians, and how I came to be convinced of it.

In our opinion the most essential thing in the understanding of Scripture is to know the Lord, to understand the mission which God sent Him to fulfil. But to understand that we must first go into the questions of Sacrifice and Redemption.

Let us start right from the beginning of Creation and examine Adam’s position before He sinned. There we see the first man created by God from the ground and pronounced “very good”. He was corruptible, for we read that there was the Tree of Life in the Garden of Eden. Now, he had only one single commandment to keep - not to eat of the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil. He was given a free will, therefore it was in his power to choose whether he would keep God’s commandment or not. But although Adam and Eve were created very good, we must bear in mind that they were corruptible, and could sin if they so choose. For had they not the inclination to sin before they were driven out of Eden the serpent could never have succeeded in tempting them. However, the serpent did succeed, and they sinned.

Now, God said, “In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shall surely die.” Let us find out what sort of death it was - natural death, or violent death? Very probably it was not to be a natural death, for he was corruptible in any case and depended on the Tree of Life if he was not to die. But we will discover yet better evidence as to which of the two deaths God meant. In the Hebrew text the sentence “thou shall surely die” reads “dying thou shall die.” This construction of a sentence is often used in Hebrew, and it indicates a strong affirmation. For example, when we say in English “he did come” in the sense “he surely came”, the Hebrew says “coming he came.” So, “dying, thou shall die,” means a very certain death. Moreover, the

same phrase occurs again later on in Genesis where Abimelech, king of Gera, took Sarah, thinking she was Abraham's sister. God, appearing to him in a dream, said, "thou shalt surely die" - in the Hebrew "dying thou shalt die." There cannot be any doubt that this means judicial death, for he would have died the natural death anyway, and had it not been a sudden judicial death, why should Abimelech have been in such a hurry to send Sarah away. Finally, the phrase occurs when Solomon tells one of his enemies not to cross the brook of Kidron. But Shimei did cross the river, and we read that he was stabbed to death. So here we have the best evidence that the sentence "thou shalt surely die" is a violent, sudden or judicial death.

This death Adam deserved, but, had he suffered, it there and then, none of us would ever have lived, and God's purpose to fill the earth with His glory would have been frustrated. This could not be. The first thing God did was to act in mercy. He slew a lamb and thus transferred Adam's guilt to an innocent animal. This, of course, was only a temporary measure, until Christ came, but I shall say more on that later. Only let me say here that God is merciful, but He is also just, a just God who will never repent. Adam's sin had to be paid for somehow. It could not have been forgiven, for how could God look over the breaking of His commandment and yet establish His authority? The lamb which was sacrificed, and whose skin He subsequently used to clothe Adam and Eve, was only a temporary measure. Of course God foreknew what He was going to do. But until Christ paid the penalty, the slaying of animals had to continue.

Man was now in a position in which he was estranged from God. God had to keep him from the Tree of Life, because before man was once more qualified to Eternal Life, the first sin, or rather the penalty for it, had to be paid for. Until Christ's advent man's right to Eternal Life was forfeited, or in the words of Paul (Romans 7:14) mankind was "sold under sin."

It is a general principle in Scripture, by which God gives man a choice to serve either good or evil. When man chooses the evil, he has nobody but himself to blame for the consequences. Cain and Abel had that choice: one chose the good, the other the evil. Joshua put that choice before the children of Israel. He said, "Choose you this day whom ye will serve." Going back to Adam, he also chose the evil when he transgressed. He was now sold under sin, the servant of sin. Sin is often personified in Scripture as a master. Adam sold himself to that master. This last sentence, of course, is figurative speech, and it really means, as explained above, that he was estranged from God. But let us again examine the phrase "sold under sin." You will, no doubt, know that in old times, when slavery was practised, a slave was the property of his master. Everybody who was born to him while he served became automatically his master's property.

If he wanted to become free he had to be redeemed. With this at the back of your mind you should now appreciate what it means to be "sold under sin." It means that the whole of Adam's posterity was under the master of Sin. In practice, that meant that they were born without the right to Eternal Life, unless they obtained that right by bringing their sacrifices as recognition of their need of redemption. Needless to say, of course, that these sacrifices had to be brought in the right spirit of faith.

Under the Law of Moses this need was even more pressed home. What was the meaning of the daily sacrifices, the Passover Lamb, the services on the Day of Atonement? Was it not the constant lesson that there was a need of redemption? These sacrifices were not for any particular transgression of any particular law: for if anyone sinned he had to bring a sacrifice in addition to all these, and if he brought it in the right spirit of faith and true repentance, God forgave him, for how often do we read in Leviticus, "If a soul sin, he shall bring... and it shall be forgiven him," God does not exact a penalty over and over again - that is not the idea of a merciful God. So the daily sacrifices, etc., must have been for something else.

As you know, these sacrifices in themselves cannot take away sin. The redemption of mankind from this bondage to Sin could only be paid for by the antitypical Sacrifice of Christ Himself. But although these animals could not redeem mankind as a whole, the keeping of the law, together with faith, did give a few individuals title to eternal life, to mention only Elijah, Caleb and Joshua (the only two to survive Israel's 40 years' journey in the wilderness). There were also Enoch and Noah, before the Mosaic Law, of whom the Scripture records that they pleased God. Even after the introduction of the Mosaic Law we read of many who have kept it. "The law and the commandment is holy, just and good," and it was "ordained to life" (Romans 7:10).

What was it then that the law could not do? It could give title to eternal life to individuals, and we know that Moses and David, who are now asleep, have obtained a title to it. They were sold under sin as much as anybody. "What the law could not do" was to redeem from Adam's sin.

When we want to gain information about God's plan concerning anything, we look at the Old Testament and then apply it to the New Testament. Let us now do that to find out something about the Divine plan concerning redemption. According to the Mosaic Law, an Israelite who became a bondservant could redeem himself if he had the means; otherwise the next of kin had to do it. But we can learn even more about this topic from Exodus. Israel was in bondage to Pharaoh. God chose Moses as their redeemer. Moses was an Israelite by birth, but by law he was in a position different from the other Israelites, He was not under the Egyptian bondage, for Pharaoh's daughter adopted him and brought him up as her son.

Let us now apply this to Christ, our Redeemer from the Adamic bondage to Sin. He was born of a woman, our nature. But He was the Son of God, and therefore not under bondage to Sin. For by divine law the man, the father, decides under Law whose the child is. But this will not affect his flesh and blood; his nature is the same. Similarly, Jesus was of human nature, but not born servant to Sin, He was one who had power to redeem. And just as Moses was brought up by Pharaoh's daughter and dwelt at Midian in the wilderness until the time came that God appointed him his task, so Jesus was brought up with a human foster father, and He went into the wilderness where He was tempted, before He began the preaching of the Gospel.

Because Jesus was of our flesh he had, of course, the same inclination to sin as we all. He had to make the choice between good and evil - between fulfilling His Father's will and His own will. But where Adam failed, He succeeded. Here, then, are the essential points about Jesus' redemptive work.

He, like Adam, had a free and unforfeited life. Whereas Adam was the son of God by creation, Jesus was the Son of God by begetting, and thus Adam's next-of-kin - and hence in a position to redeem Adam from the bondage to Sin. He paid the penalty which Adam should have paid, and which the animals paid in type - that is, a violent death, with the pouring out of His blood (for "dying, thou shall die," was God's sentence).

There was no violation here of Moses' Commandment in Deuteronomy that the children shall not be put to death for their parents' ...for Jesus gave His life. He didn't need to give it to reconcile Himself to His own Father: for He was never under Sin, and never forfeited His right to life. But He died for Adam's sin, which had become "the Sin of the world"; He offered Himself, knowing that He had the power to lay down His life and take it up again - for why shouldn't He have had that power?

What is mankind's position today? Adam's sin has been paid for - God is just, and nobody ever has to die again as a punishment for Adam's sin. But Adam's act has left mankind under a great disadvantage. He has cut off all his posterity from the Tree of Life. If we want to obtain eternal life, we must associate ourselves with Christ. Of course, those that never see the Light are just like the beasts of the field that perish. But those who do see the Light become responsible,

I was convinced of this doctrine, for I found it far more logical than anything I have ever heard on religion. Nothing which any minister preaches is anything like it. I have learned a lot by attending Christadelphian lectures. But I have never seen it so clearly. Because I realised this responsibility I was immersed, for once a person sees Light and does not avail himself of this great salvation, he confirms Adam's sin. He is then "in Adam," and Paul writes: "As in Adam all die..." (1 Corinthians 15:22). This death, which all in Adam die, is the judicial death on the day of judgement, for, from what I have been saying all the time, you should find that it cannot be the natural death; for everybody dies this death - even those who never see Light and are under no Divine law; for where there is no law there is no transgression (Romans 4:15), Hence, those people will not incur the penalty for sin, which is violent death, yet they die a natural death.

Once we are "baptised we are in the same legal position as Adam before he sinned, or Jesus. But, of course, we can forfeit our right to eternal life if we sin wilfully: for if we sin "a sin unto death" now and get our name blotted out of the book of life, there is now no sacrifice but a fearful looking for the fiery judgment. But otherwise, we are now the Children of God, not through anything we have done, but only because of God's mercy in sending His Son. And even so, we are only children by adoption, while Jesus is God's Son by begetting. Well, can you now explain why it was necessary that Jesus should have been born the

miraculous way in which He was? And can you now see why men like Moses and Elijah and Noah could not redeem us from “the Sin of the world,” although their records show a life which pleased God?

Well, there is just one more topic which, to our great regret, presents a difficulty to many Christadelphians, so that they cannot see many of the beauties of God’s word. Concerning this idea of “sinful flesh.” This phrase occurs only once in Scripture - in Romans 8:5. All linguists agree that this is a faulty translation. The Greek version says “Sin’s flesh”. The word “sin” in Scripture is often used for “sin offering” (see Genesis 4:7, which is absolutely without any sense - unless “sin” here means “sin offering” - a. lamb, or a bullock; for in Cain’s day people were shepherds, and there would be an animal at his door handy if required for sacrifice). And in Romans 8:5 “sin” also means “sin offering,” or, according to the margin of many Bibles, “sacrifice for sin”.

The seventh chapter of Romans is regarded as very difficult by most Christadelphians.

Let us link this up with chapters 6 and 8. In chapter 6, verse 20, Paul says, “for when ye were servants of sin, ye were free from righteousness.” He goes on to explain how we were made free from sin, etc. Now he inserts chapter 7, as in parenthesis, in which he describes his position before he was converted, while he was the servant of Sin. Then, in chapter 8, or rather the last verse of chapter 7, he links up his former statement with his new position, and then, in chapter 8, declares: “There is now, therefore, no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit.” Now, here the word “flesh” cannot be our natural literal flesh: for we have that after our immersion exactly as before. It refers, of course, to his position before he was converted. This now gives us the key to chapter 7. When Paul says “in my flesh dwelleth no good thing,” he speaks of the time before his conversion. For, if in our literal flesh dwelt no good thing, how could our bodies possibly be the temple of God? Finally, let us look again at chapter 8, verse 9. “But ye are not in the flesh” (those brethren were, of course, in their natural flesh), “but in the spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His.” So, then, the “flesh” means the state before baptism, the “spirit” afterwards, or sometimes, instead of the “flesh” we read about the old man - “put off the old man.”

Now, if you think about these things, I am sure that with the interest and scriptural knowledge you have got, you will find out many interesting and beautiful things.

Sincerely your brother in Christ, Leopold Dreifuss.

THE PASSOVER.

If the success of a mission be a test of the authenticity of the Faith which is founded on and accepts such mission, Judaism, in the gradual achievement of its sublime purpose, proves itself divine. Now that we Jews throughout the world are about to celebrate the inauguration of one great branch of our Mission, we are forcibly reminded of the truth that History - which is Fact - is stronger than Philosophy which is often Fancy ; and that while Speculation in the assumed garb or disguise of Logic assails the foundation of our Creed, inexorable History helps to render its truth triumphant.

Three thousand years ago, at this spring time of the year, there dawned on the world the great System of Judaism in the startling events of the Passover. It was in the month of Abib, the opening of the buds – the month which from a like reason bears the name of April through a Latin source - that the blossoms of Freedom first opened - blossoms that were to ripen into goodly fruit. A fruit that has often been tainted by the blight of persecution and bruised by the autumn gales, but which blossoms perennially like the golden berries in the garden of the Hesperides.

In no phase of history has there been such a succession of varied, dramatic and interesting scenes as in the episode of the Exodus. Scene follows scene, each intense in action and forcible in effect. The Bible paints it with graphic and picturesque power. From the gloomy opening of the drama with the advent of the plagues

in the ill-fated land, to its jubilant closing scene on the shores of the Red Sea, events succeed each other with never-failing vividness; and from each may a lesson be learnt.

One great effect of the Episode has been to impress the Majesty of Faith on the World. Speculative Philosophy may do its best - or rather its worst; its teachers may lecture with brilliant eloquence from every platform, may pile Pelion on Ossa - book upon book - in a vain endeavour to scale the skies; but they cannot weaken the force of that structure of Faith which is up-reared on the events of the Exodus and which spans the Present and the Past. The results that have directly or indirectly proceeded from the incidents of the marvellous narrative which Passover celebrates give increased intensity to History and fresh force to Faith.

Nor among these results is the least important the great Lesson of Freedom taught to mankind. For the principles of Liberty were new and unknown to the world till the episode of the Exodus. But then a people held in abject bondage resolved to be free, led by a great chieftain, and Heaven smiled on their enterprise. And from those days to these, the love of Freedom born in the Hebrew breast beneath the Egyptian sky has never perished in the Jewish heart. It woke to life in those bye-gone days and in that far-off clime. It has lasted through all the ages - through all the wanderings in the wilderness, through the political struggles of the Commonwealth and the Monarchy, through the struggles of post-biblical days, through the horrors of the Dispersion, through the brief golden season of the Caliphate, through the persecutions of mediaeval and modern ages. The banner of Love and Liberty was set up on the sands that stretch between the Nile and the Gulf of Alba, and the Jewish Race has never abandoned it. It has passed down with an hereditary grasp from generation to generation. Other nations in the days of yore submitted readily to a foreign yoke, but the Jew resolutely resisted. He taught the first Syrio-Greek and the barbarous Roman that every people would not tamely yield to hitherto victorious arms. Our fathers were beaten, it is true, but their spirit was never broken. Other nations were subdued by foreign influences, but the Jewish race has, under Providence, maintained its independence. The Jewish character is meek and forbearing, but never abject nor servile; loyal and orderly, but never slavish. The tread of the tyrant has pressed on the neck of the Jewish race, but that race has risen resilient when released.

The Exodus was the opening scene, the Prologue, of that great Revelation which, given among the thunders of Sinai, has never failed in its influence on civilized humanity. The principles of the Decalogue have pervaded the civil, social and moral codes and practices of subsequent ages. And indeed the Exodus, which is the path that leads to Sinai, was a marvellously well adapted opening to the grandeur of the coming scene. Most majestic is the history. An enslaved people rose against a heavy yoke. In vain a mighty king sought to rivet their fetters. A mightier King intervened and showed His Will by startling manifestations of His Power. Mourning and desolation fall on the stricken land. At midnight, under the light of the springtime moon, march forth the hurrying bands of fugitives. Before them spreads a rushing restless sea. The perils thicken around them. Before them throb the billows: behind them sound the angry tread and the clanging arms of the pursuing host. Again the manifestations of Divine Power is shewn. The waves part, and the rescued people pass through - to freedom, fame and immortality!

Year after year, in every age, in every clime, the commemorative services of the Passover have been held in all our Jewish homes. Thus not only stately synagogues, in crowded congregations, led by Canons and regulated by choirs, is the Holyday celebrated: but in the quiet home-circle, where the father and the mother are the leaders and the children are the congregation, the tale of the Exodus is told with many a symbolic and significant rite. So as the tale been told for centuries - thus is the religion of faith intensified by the religion of the family. Thus is the spirit of the Lord who redeemed us in the days of old invoked in that most solemn Temple which we call Home.

And the ceremony is trebly sanctified by the elders who sit at the board by tearful recollection of those who have gone before, and who shall never more join in the rites of the rehearsal of the Redemption: by their tearful hopes for the young ones who shall join in those rites in the days when the elders shall be no more. And never let us forget that the Passover, which is the Memorial of the first Redemption of our ancestors from the bondage of the Egyptians, is the type of the coming - though long delayed - Redemption from the bondage of a world of passion, sin and fear; the promised redemption which shall bring our people back to the Land they won by Faith and lost by Shame.

SPEAKING THE TRUTH IN LOVE

I recently alluded to the desirableness of our literature being as free as possible from abuse of our contemporaries in the religious world. It has since occurred to me that our oral utterances are even more liable to be marked by this vice, and that a consideration of the precept and example of our Lord and His apostles might help to guard us all from falling into it. From the extreme readiness with which the tongue obeys the impulses of the heart, especially in those of an ardent temperament, the utterance of a hasty, foolish, or abusive word - with a touch of the sarcastic or the satirical to lend it greater force and edge - may in certain circumstances be much more excusable, than the deliberate ill-natured outpourings which are too often allowed to flow from the pen, and to pass without compunction or correction through the press. This latter abuse of speech is utterly without excuse, and should receive the unqualified disapproval of every one who professes the name of the meek and lowly Jesus. But the former though the more difficult of attainment is not the less evil, and should be eschewed to the uttermost in all our communications, both among ourselves and with the outside world.

The character of our Lord as seen in His life during "the days of his flesh" is strongly marked by meekness and moderation. The apostle Paul writing to the Corinthians (2 Epistle 10:1) speaks of "The meekness and gentleness of Christ." And it is this character which our Lord claims as peculiarly His own in these well-known words:- "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest upon your souls. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light."

The Saviour's example of meekness and lowliness of heart is here commended by Himself for our imitation and for the imitation of all who would be His disciples - "Learn of me, for I am meek and lowly in heart." And let it be noted that although He says "Take my yoke upon you," it is not simply a yoke which He had constructed for their use; but a yoke which He takes upon Himself. Its full force and meaning is: Take upon you the yoke which I have taken, for He adds "and learn of me." Take me for your example - I am not asking you to do anything which I shrink from doing myself. And the reason He gives - "For I am meek and lowly in heart" - shows that these qualities are necessary to the bearing of the yoke which Jesus bore - for the glory of God and the good of man.

The Apostles were fully alive to the importance of these qualities as exemplified in the life of their Master for the imitation of His disciples. For example, Paul - "Let the same mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus, who being in the form of a god, did not count the being like a god a thing to be eagerly grasped, but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant. Being made in the likeness of men, and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross."

And Peter to the same effect: - "What glory is it if, when ye be buffeted for your faults, ye shall take it patiently? But if, when ye do well, and suffer for it, ye take it patiently, this is acceptable with God. For even hereunto were ye called: because Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example, that we should follow his steps.; Who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth: Who, when he was reviled, reviled not again: when he suffered, he threatened not; but committed himself to him that judgeth righteously: Who his own self bare our sin in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed." (1 Peter 3:20-23).

But there are some sayings of Jesus on record from which it has been inferred both by friends and foes, that Jesus indulged on occasions the spirit of reviling and threatening, and that even in circumstances when He had received no provocation by similar treatment of Himself. For example He said; "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For ye devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayers: therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation." "Woe unto you, ye blind guides, which say, Whosoever

shall swear by the temple, it is nothing; but whosoever shall swear by the gold of the temple, he is a debtor! Ye fools and blind, for whether is greater, the gold, or the temple that sanctifieth the gold?" "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For ye pay tithe and mint, and anise, and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgement, mercy, and faith: these ought ye to have done, and not leave the other undone. Ye blind guides, which strain at a gnat, and swallow a camel." "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For ye are like unto whited sepulchres, which indeed appeared beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness. Even so ye also outwardly appear righteous unto men, but within ye are full of hypocrisy and iniquity." "Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can he escape the damnation of hell!" (Matthew 23)

Now this language is consistent with the alleged "meekness and gentleness of Christ," or it is not. It is a well known fact that mere words do not fully and clearly convey the spirit of him who use them. Language originally spoken, and afterwards committed to writing is in an important respect a different thing to the reader from what it was to those who heard it. The effect depends not so much on the words employed as on the tones of the voice, and even the gestures of the body, with which they are uttered. The words in question considered merely as written words are capable of expressing harsh denunciation or tenderest commiseration. I have heard it related of the late Dr. Channing that a person once founded an objection to the character of Jesus on these words, and was entirely silenced by the Dr. giving utterance to the words in tones of commiseration. And any one may satisfy himself by experiment, that these words can be uttered so as to manifest the compassionate spirit of Jesus, or a spirit entirely foreign to His heart of hearts which of these we are to impute to the meek and lowly one no candid mind will hesitate to determine.

It is worthy of remark that the word "Woe" in the above quotations which seems to aggravate the apparent severity of the speaker, is capable of being rendered "Alas," as it actually is in Rev. 18:10, 16, 19. Hence it might be read, "Alas for you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites." And I observe that in Newcome's version all the occurrences of this word as used by our Lord are rendered by the word "Alas." Besides this, there is one instance in which our Lord used this word where it cannot have the denunciatory sense. It occurs in Matthew 22:19, - "But woe unto them that are with child, and to them that give suck in those days." It will be acknowledged by all that the word "woe" must have the commiserative sense here. This is sufficient to show from our Lord's own usage, that it may also have this sense in His rebuke of the Pharisees.

In regard to the charges of hypocrisy, foolishness, blindness, &c., and the epithets "serpents" and "generation of vipers," the first question that arises is, was this an infallibly true description of the parties spoken of: for it must not be overlooked that there is no evidence in the passage that they were present and directly addressed by our Lord. The correctness of the description has never been called in question by any. So far as the matters of fact mentioned, are concerned it was notorious to the mass of the people that He spoke the truth. And so far as He attributed motives, as when he said "and for a PRETENCE make long prayers," and used the general term "hypocrites," our Lord who "knew what is in man," infallibly knew that the epithets He employed and the motives He imputed, were truly applicable to the parties He described. Besides, He knew precisely the effect His words would have on the minds of his hearers, who were "the multitude." He also knew that the mental and moral condition of the Pharisees themselves, even had they been present, would not be thereby injuriously affected.

Now it is just at this point that the bearing of Jesus' example on us becomes manifest. Before we can plead His example as a warrant for stigmatising our contemporaries, we must be able to fulfil the conditions referred to. We must be infallibly certain of the absolute truthfulness of the epithets and accusations we apply to those around us, and we must be quite sure that our application of them shall not have the effect of hardening in unbelief and disobedience, and that the greater course not have resulted in wakening enquiry and an interest in the truth. These conditions I am afraid can be fulfilled by none of us; and hence the example of Jesus must be limited for us to His imitable qualities. Jesus "knew what was in man." We hardly know ourselves, much less our fellowmen. We are, nevertheless, prone to perceive a mote in our brother's eye, while oblivious of the beam in our own. How true the lines of the Scottish bard, so often quoted: -

"O wad some Power the giftie gi'e us,
To see oursel's as ithers see us,
It wad fra'e mony a blunder free us,
An' fulish notion.

This weakness of the flesh may well account for the many apostolic exhortations to meekness and gentleness. These qualities are enumerated among the fruits of the Spirit in Gal. 5. More at length Paul thus exhorts – “Put them in mind . . . to speak evil of no man, to be no brawlers, but gentle, showing all meekness unto all men.” (Titus 3:1-2). This is both comprehensive and specific. It touches the Christian disciple as every point of contact with his fellowmen, and lays upon him a prohibition against every approach to coarseness whether in the form of sarcasm, satire, scorn, contempt, taunt, or ridicule. “Showing all meekness unto all men,” is incompatible with the above manifestations, and cannot be neglected in our intercourse with the world, without serious detriment to our own character, and to the truth we profess, and through these to “that worthy name by which we are called.”

But the apostle is even more specific; for in regard to efforts for the enlightenment of the ignorant, he says: - “The servant of the Lord must not strive, but be gentle unto all men, apt to teach, patient; in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves; if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth.” (2 Timothy 2:24-25). Peter, to the same effect, says, - “Be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you with meekness and fear.”

The violation of these precepts by the abuse of speech is much dwelt on by the apostles:-
“The tongue is a fire, a world of iniquity.”
“If any man offend not in word the same is a perfect man, and able also to bridle the whole body.”
“If any man among you seem to be religious, and bridled not his tongue, but deceiveth his own heart, that man’s religion is vain.”
“Walk in wisdom towards them that are without, redeeming the time. Let your speech be always with grace, seasoned with salt, that ye may know how ye ought to answer every man.”

The bridle is used not merely to stop the animal to which it is applied; but chiefly to regulate and control it while in motion. So must the would-be religious man regulate the movements of his tongue, and when occasion requires bring that fiery steed to a stand. Speech “seasoned with salt” is by no means equivalent to being spiced with pepper and mustard. Nor does it merely mean, as some think, that speech is to be preserved incorrupt. It is simply as it reads “seasoned,” that is, made palatable, like certain kinds of food. Speech to be of this sort must have nothing about it that would render the thoughts conveyed unnecessarily offensive to the hearers. The truth is in itself unpalatable to many, but its distastefulness must not be increased by the bitterness of speech and tone by which it is sought to be conveyed. Our speech must “be always with grace,” or graciousness, not merely while we are speaking to an audience with whom we are at one, but “always ;” even when we are engaged in controverting the most cherished views and opinions of our fellow men.

The following extracts from Solomon are much to the point, and are worthy of being kept in mind: -
“The mouth of the just bringeth forth wisdom; but the froward tongue shall be cut off.”
“A soft answer turneth away wrath; but grievous words stir up anger.”
“The tongue of the wise useth knowledge aright; but the mouth of fools poureth out foolishness.”
“There is that speaketh like the piercings of a sword; but the tongue of the wise is health.”
“He that hath a perverse tongue falleth into mischief.”
“Whoso keepeth his mouth and his tongue, keepeth his soul from troubles.”
“By long forbearing is a prince persuaded; and a soft tongue breaketh the bone.”

One great source of ungracious speech is the want of respect for others. We imagine that persons who are wrong in some things have no redeeming qualities whatever. But the fact is that there are few who are wholly unworthy of respect. Persons, principles and institutions have a nobler as well as an inferior aspect; and it is by shutting our eyes to the former, and always contemplating the latter, that we fail to treat them with that respect they deserve. How true the lines of the poet in this respect: -

“The darkest night that shrouds the sky
Of beauty hath a share;
The blackest heart hath signs to tell
That God still lingers there !”

There is one class of men who are often the objects of our criticism, and upon whom we are sometimes disposed to pour contempt and ridicule, namely - the clergy. We apply to them the designation applied by Jesus to the teachers of the people in His day - "Blind leaders of the blind." But we are apt to forget that even this term recognises the sincerity of those so described. If they are "leaders of the blind," they are blind themselves, and liable to fall into the ditch with their followers. Of course, they think and assay they are, but the fact is they don't see. This element of conscientious conviction is surely entitled to some respect. I am afraid there is too often the gratification of an innate love of sarcasm and ridicule, for their own sake, at the bottom of our invective against those who differ from us. This is the most unworthy motive that can be conceived: and if it exists in any one, it should be guarded against with jealous care.

And let us not suppose that a meek and gentle style of speech is in the least incompatible with the most distinct and faithful advocacy of "the truth as it is in Jesus." The thing may seem difficult to some, but it is far from being impracticable.

Brethren, let us consider these things, and if we approve them, let us keep them in mind, especially when we come into personal contact, and receive rough usage from our contemporaries. Let us remember that, while we are not responsible for the consequences of plainly and firmly maintaining the defence of the Gospel, we are responsible for the consequences of the spirit with which we do so. While we strive to be as wise as serpents - in the wisdom of God - let us bear in mind that the same authority enjoins us to be "harmless as doves." The apostle puts the whole matter in a nutshell in the following exhortation: -

"Do all things without murmurings and disputings, that ye may be blameless and harmless, the sons of God, without rebuke in the midst of a crooked and perverse nation, among whom shine ye as lights in the world, holding forth the word of life."

Brother J. Cameron.

News from Israel

This essay was originally published at www.bridgesforpeace.com.

A few weeks ago two "projectiles" landed in the Golan Heights. Alarms went off and nerves were rattled, but in the end officials called them "errant mortars." Errant or not, mortars or not, the reality behind headline news is that Israel is bracing for conflict. Skirmishes and sorties at the border and across it too, into Syria, hint at a growing tension that many here believe could quickly turn into war.

Hezbollah, literally "the party of Allah," is currently estimated have 130,000 missiles in its arsenal, maybe more. Most of these are not mortars. Israeli military experts have issued warnings that these missiles, manufactured with Iranian technology, are sophisticated, long-range and deadly. It is estimated that when the next conflict starts, Hezbollah will launch as many as 1,500 missiles into Israel every day. Many of these missiles, these same experts warn, will be able to reach targets anywhere in the Jewish state. This conflict, when it comes, will not be so easily contained as last year's war with Hamas in Gaza. Fewer missiles will be intercepted and casualties will be greater.

All of Israel's citizens will be in range, all will have to seek shelter when sirens sound. All cars will stop, all businesses will be interrupted. There will be no place in the country to which beleaguered civilians can escape from Hezbollah's assault. And all the more so if, from Gaza, missiles once again are launched throughout Israel's south.

Iran's not-so-hidden hand inside the "glove" called Hezbollah was exposed on Facebook a few days ago. The Tower, a news division of The Israel Project, reported that "an analyst with close ties to the Iranian defence ministry... posted that Iranian, Syrian, and Hezbollah officials will meet shortly to discuss their combined response to recent attacks in Syria that have been attributed to Israel." The analyst, Amir Mousavi, is "director of the Center for Strategic and International Relations in Tehran and a former advisor to the Iranian Ministry of Defence."

Last week, several Hezbollah weapons depots in Syria were destroyed. Their destruction has been attributed to unconfirmed Israeli operations. Mousavi called the operations “the beginning of the straw that broke the camel’s back.” Attributing Israel’s alleged activity to support of “its stepdaughters, [anti-Assad] terrorist groups in Syria,” Mousavi pledged that “leadership in Iran will not remain silent.”

What might Iran do? According to Mousavi, Tehran may step out from behind its Hezbollah curtain and openly place its own troops, the Islamic Resistance Brigades, throughout southern Syria.

Assad’s government, for its part, said Mousavi, would transfer its forces to northern Syria. Once divided, Assad to the north and Iranian troops to the south, Mousavi said that Tehran’s troops would “deter the Zionist enemy” from further depot destruction and do so with “major surprises” that “this criminal entity” cannot anticipate.

Conventional wisdom among analysts in Israel is that the only reason Hezbollah has not yet attacked is because Iran has not authorized it. Hezbollah, acting for Iran, has been fighting groups that desire to overthrow Syria’s President Bashar Assad. One of those groups is Islamic State (IS). Iran, it is thought, does not want Hezbollah fighting on two fronts. It also has not wanted to hurt chances of successful negotiations to lift international sanctions. Hence it has held off an assault against Israel.

Iran’s apparent willingness to place its own troops in southern Syria may indicate a change in Tehran’s Hezbollah policy. If Hezbollah is released from involvement in Syria, it will be free to focus all of its destructive ambitions – and firepower – on Israel. And it will be empowered to do so by Iranian troops at its side, just across Lebanon’s border in southern Syria.

Mousavi’s scenario may also signal Iran’s laissez faire attitude toward negotiations regarding its nuclear program. Already able to produce a nuclear weapon in as little as one month, Iran’s primary goal for negotiations has been removal of international economic sanctions.

In recent weeks, those sanctions have begun to crumble without a negotiated agreement. Russia has agreed to sell a sophisticated missile system to Iran, China has quietly restarted business, and Europe too is ready to once again allow trade. In short, Iran may believe it has achieved everything it wants without US President Barack Obama and his fellow P5+1 international negotiators.

If both of these things are so, war from Israel’s north may come sooner than later. Much sooner.

The author is bureau chief for USA Radio Network and Bridge For Peace News.

PRAYER IN SECRET.

“But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father, which is in secret; and thy Father, which seeth in secret, shall reward thee openly.” (Matthew vi. 6.)

The subject of prayer is both broad and deep. It is not, therefore, our present intention to speak of prayer in a general sense, but to direct our observations more particularly to that aspect of prayer presented in the words of the Lord Jesus above cited. The manner in which the Lord here speaks is that of contrast: “But thou, when thou prayest.” Hypocrites, at public and ostentatious prayer, were just before the subject of His strong reprobation; and now he commands his disciples to shun these customs. If even the Pharisees had the true spirit of prayer, they had long since forgotten it. Praying with them was one of the most congenial practices of manifesting their confirmed and unbounded pride; and this was fostered and rendered more abominable by the observance of their performances on the part of the ignorant passers-by.

Christ, however, had nothing to say against prayer because it was done publicly. He himself sometimes prayed to his Father in the midst of a number of persons; but it does not appear that he did this frequently.

The occasions recorded are very few on which Jesus prayed in public. He set the most marked example of his own injunction in this as indeed in all his other precepts. His general habit seems to have been to seek intercourse with the Father in the solitude of night, increased by the seclusion of the situation chosen. All night, in the solitary places among the hills round about Jerusalem, he poured out his soul to God; when no human eye saw, nor feet of the traveller disturbed the fervent flow of his burdened and compassionate heart. The devout imagination easily pictures the Redeemer of the world on his knees beneath the brilliant star-lit sky on some slopes, or hid in the deep shadow of some death-like valley, his eyes blind with tears, and his heart swelling with pity for mankind, but more particularly for his own nation. No eye saw him there, save that Eye which never sleeps; and no ear heard his groans and sobs save that which is never shut against the prayers of His saints.

The need for public prayer on the part of Christ was evidently very small, from the fact of its infrequent occurrence. Still Christ is more distinguished for praying than any other Bible character, Daniel not excepted who in captivity prayed to God three times a day. This circumstance suggests the idea that strictly private communion with our Creator is a duty of far greater importance than intercourse with Him through the medium of public supplication. We would not be understood to utter a single word of disparagement against praying in the family circle, much less against praying in the church, or other assemblies of the brethren; but we would give great prominence to habitual prayer made to God in the closet, with closed door, because we fear that this practice is not sufficiently attended to among us; that most of our praying is done in a public manner, at the meetings of the brethren.

Truly private prayer has great advantages to the offerer. It presupposes a proper frame of mind in which to approach the eternal throne. It presupposes the absence of pride, and the abounding presence of true humility. It assumes the deep felt need to apply to our heavenly Father as “the giver of every good, and of every perfect gift; of life, and breath, and all things.” It is evidential of a profound sense of dependence on God, and of a continual need to ask Him to give us those things which we require, and to constantly thank Him for all that we enjoy, feeling confident that it was bestowed upon us through His kindness and tender care. The man who really feels these things to be true cannot fail to spend much time in secret prayer to God. We can hardly speak of such a man praying merely from a sense of duty to God; but the idea of solemn pleasure seems to outweigh all, and the occasions will be numerous on which such a person will find him at the foot of the throne with only God and Jesus Christ as spectators of his holy joy. Such a man will realize in the Almighty a Friend; will appreciate in a peculiar manner the saying that Abram was “the friend of God;” to whom he could come for counsel and help; and will, with singular pleasure, regard Jesus as “a friend that sticketh closer than a brother.”

It is highly improbable that anyone will pray often to God in secret who does not feel strongly the desires and the needs before alluded to. He might pray, and pray much in public; pray with demonstration; but unless the affections are set on things above where Christ sitteth at the right hand of God, it seems hardly possible to come to God in secret. The motives for doing so would not exist, and private prayer is not a thing that could be long continued without motive, and that of a very strong kind. The child who desires some favour of his father never dreams of taking occasion to ask him in public. It never strikes him that any advantage is to be gained by preferring his request then. He is perfectly content to ask his father alone; his mind being fixed on two objects only, the things wished for, and upon him in whose power it is to give or to withhold. If we are God’s children indeed, this will be the case with us. We shall not seek to speak to our father openly, but in secret, believing that our Father who seeth in secret will reward us openly.

If we have firm faith in God, there is no single thing which we desire that we shall not ask Him for. If we do not make our requests known to Him, it is a strong evidence that we have no belief that all things are in His power. We had better not ask at all than ask without faith. Such a demand amounts to little short of an insult. God is not to be applied to as men sometimes are, trusting to the chance of receiving what they ask for; but they are to ask in faith, believing that they shall receive. If this is persistently done we are sure the goodness of God will soon be known to the suppliant; the statement that God hears and answers prayer will soon become a conviction. We shall soon learn to approach God as a dutiful child approaches his father, in full confidence that whatsoever is good will be given us. That is a beautiful passage with which Christ rebuked the Pharisees: “What man is there of you, whom if his son ask bread, will he give him a stone? or if he ask a fish, will he give him a serpent? If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your

children, how much more shall your heavenly Father know how to give good gifts unto them that ask him?" And what is so decisive a test of reliance on our Creator for everything we have as habitual secret prayer?

Secret prayer to God softens and subdues the animal passions. There are no such powerful means of disciplining the whole moral man as is found in secret prayer. There we must pray for forgiveness as we forgive those who have offended against us. This is a complete remedy for cold-heartedness, ill-temper, envy, and every evil passion. In secret prayer to God we become justly ashamed of everything which we know to be contrary to His character, and are the more emboldened to make full confession and to ask for pardon.

By habitual fervent prayer the whole man becomes assimilated to God. If we love God and Christ, we cannot help but imitate all we see in them as far as lies in our power. All persons loved by us are even insensibly imitated by us. And no man can long come unto God in his closet unless he loves God, therefore we may infer that those who best reflect the character of the Divine Being spend the most time earnestly and joyfully in secluded intercourse with Him. It is an inalienable principle of our nature that the object which we love most receives the greatest share of our thoughts and attention. We do not try to make a display of our love, and yet it is so displayed as to be seen by all around. It must be thus with regard to God and Christ, otherwise we are giving false names to our actions; our devotion is a lifeless performance. In this matter the trite saying that "actions speak louder than words," finds a striking exemplification. Secret prayer appears to be one sign of conversion. The Lord sent Ananias to inquire for Paul, saying, "Behold, he prayeth." And as regards the power of prayer, what has it not achieved? It has changed an angry brother into a friend; to wit, Jacob and Esau; it has turned the counsel of the wise into foolishness, as in the case of Ahitophel and David; it has raised the dead to life; it has shut up the heavens, and even stopped the sun in his course.

We intend to consider the subject of prayer from other points of view in our next issue. In the meantime let us all and every one draw near to God more frequently in retirement, imploring Him to succeed his truth in every place, and give us individually knowledge, and wisdom, and strength to fight the good fight of faith.

Brother E.Turney

Letter to a Christadelphian who no longer wishes to receive our literature:-

Dear Stella, Greetings in the Name of Him who is The Way. The Truth and The Life. Firstly I would assure you that through Brother Geoff mainly and over a number of years I have been made aware of the views you have tenaciously held onto, though opposed in many cases to the teaching of the Holy Scriptures. It was on account of this that I was able as an ex-Christadelphian, to enlighten Geoff to, not only the Truth contained in your latest Hymn Book but also the errors to which your community, including yourself, lend your voices, thus showing a lack of understanding and unity of the True Faith.

I drew Geoff's attention to Hymn 295, the third verse having been altered from the older Hymn Book which reads, "What though our in-bred sins require our flesh to see the dust," to, "Yea, though thy sentence, Lord, requires all flesh to see the dust." You say it means the same only put in a different way," but who authorized it to be put in a different way? Not only so, but it does not mean the same, for as your community teaches of Jesus, He was flesh, yet He did not turn to dust. Again, the sentence upon Adam was death by the taking away of his life in the blood when he became disobedient, not 930 years after. It was in the day in which Adam knew to be of the evening and morning duration and nothing to do with a thousand years - the antitypical lamb slain in Eden contributed to Adam and Eve being raised from death in a figure, not natural death but the legal death by sin, for without law there could be no sin, yet Adam was capable of dying naturally when created. Your own community have often used this fact as a tool against the believers in the doctrine of the immortal soul, insisting that Adam was a living soul and also wresting out of context Ezekiel chapter 18, i.e., "The soul that sinneth it shall die."

But Ezekiel 18 speaks of inflicted death to transgressors of the Law of Moses, and of those who were obedient who would not “surely die” but live, yet even these died the common death through the nature in which Adam was created, thus showing that their natural death was not the penalty for sin.

You say, “Unrepentant men and women are under sentence of death because of their sin” but you do not clarify this wild and irresponsible statement. You class all people as being under sentence of death whether they have sinned or not, because of a nature your pioneer R.Roberts invented and produced and explained in Clause V of the B.A.S.F. in violation of Clause IV, for which he was also responsible, and also true and correct in saying that Adam, as a living soul and natural body of life, very good yet subject to death without law as all animal species were at their creation; he could affirm nothing but that on scriptural grounds. Yet he says Adam broke the law under which God had placed him and instead of putting him to death by his sin, God delayed that just penalty by changing Adam’s nature to a physical law of decay (which was already in operation) but also added an element of bias to sin to a greater degree. Thus Roberts has impugned the justice and righteousness of God by adding to His Word that which is not there.

If we are not competent enough to read the Bible effectively or for that matter, other people’s writings, we are not free to alter them to suit our own theories, yet C.C.Walker did just that in a later Edition of “Elpis Israel” because the correct edition on Page 233 of my copy refers to Dr. Thomas as “Jesus Christ is the substitutional testator.” C.C.Walker admits liability for altering this to mean “mediator.” He claims this was a “Correction... on the grounds that it was a more accurate description as the context of the doctor’s arguments proved.” Nonsense! Dr Thomas in this paragraph is quite clear and precise in his choice of his legal terms and is speaking of a will and testament and any lawyer or sensible student of Bible doctrine reading the context would understand it.

To me it is ludicrous to receive a circular advertising a “Distance Learning Course” on how to read the Bible effectively, from, in this case, Blackpool Christadelphians. There is a section on the last page with the heading, “About the Christadelphians” where it continues “Christadelphians adopted their name in the mid 1880’s, it means Brothers and Sisters in Christ.”

I do not dispute the meaning of the name but I do dispute what is said under the heading of the Name given to the American authorities by John Thomas to describe the people who followed his doctrine. For example, this leaflet says of Christadelphians, “They are bound together by a common faith in the Gospel preached by Christ and His Apostles in the first century. It was this faith and its appeal to men and women from all walks of life which brought the community into existence.” This cannot be true in view of the fact that the Christadelphian doctrine is astray from much of what the Old Testament prophets spoke by the Holy Spirit and what Jesus and His Apostles taught by the same.

What is more and to be deplored, is the incorrect statement that “Christadelphians are bound together by a common faith in the Gospel preached by Christ and His Apostles in the first century.” If this is so how can they explain the various and differing views found in the writings of Dr. Thomas and Robert Roberts in opposition to the teaching and faith of the Apostles of the first century and also the casting out of their present and past communities under the false B.A.S.F. those who believed the teaching of Jesus and His Apostles of the first century?

You know very well they either resigned or were cast out for not accepting the teaching of Dr. Thomas and Robert Roberts on certain important matters relating to the Atonement through the blood of Christ, of Redemption now, of Judgment now, of Names now in the Book of Life, and incorruptible raising if not blotted out, of the Kingdom of God consisting of only Jews and Gentiles in Christ and under His teaching and faith. There was a unity of doctrine and faith in the first century Ecclesia of Christ but not in that of Thomas and Roberts.

How then can it be claimed that Dr. Thomas brought the Truth to light when in this leaflet it states, “Christadelphians do not believe that any of their members, past or present, have received any special revelation direct from God”?

Well might they admit this of both Dr. Thomas and Robert Roberts, for neither were wholly in harmony with the Holy Scriptures and Epistles of the Apostles of Christ. Paul said to the Corinthians, “For I delivered

unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins (not on account of our nature, nor on account of His own nature, but) according to the Scriptures,” and what did the Scriptures teach about sins? That Jesus, foreshadowed in the typical lamb slain in Eden, died for Adam’s sin by suffering willingly the penalty of inflicted death due to that sin, thus sparing Adam’s life and obtaining the birth and existence of all in his loins to give them also the opportunity of salvation through His shed blood. Paul received this doctrine first of all from Jesus Himself, Galatians 1:11, “But I certify you brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me is not after man... (verse 12) For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ.”

Christadelphians cannot say this of themselves. Their so called gospel never commenced with the Lamb of God slain for Adam that he might have redemption and continue to live out his life in accordance with the physical law of his created substance. Their doctrine came from men in the persons of John Thomas and Robert Roberts, and their adopted name, Christadelphian, did not take place in the 1880’s through Dr. Thomas but during the American Civil War when he was asked to designate a suitable name to distinguish his fellow-believers. He died in 1871, so it appears some Christadelphians do not know as much about him as they should, for even much of his written works were contradictory and also out of harmony with Holy Scripture. But nevertheless, I do accept his sincerity and what was true according to Scripture and much nearer to it than ever Robert Roberts taught and bound Christadelphians to in a thirty Clause creed headed “Truth to be received” yet full of untruth which has been the cause of division and not a binding together at all to the Gospel of Christ as the Blackpool Christadelphians ignorantly profess.

Over the years, Dear Stella, you have been made aware of the true position and you are finding it hard to kick against the pricks, so you discontinue having our free magazine which warns of the precarious position and hopelessness of non-acceptance of the sacrifice of Christ as a substitute for the penalty for sin Adam incurred which was death by infliction.

It is a fact that Jesus did not die to save Adam from natural death, neither us, but from a legal sentence of death which passed upon all men after Adam sinned; yet death by decay was present in Adam at creation but not on account of transgression of law, for law had not then entered the Garden of Eden. You know our teaching, that contrary to the teaching of your leaders, sin is not human nature but sin is either taught in Scripture as transgression of Divine Law or it is personified as a “Bond-master,” in both cases in Paul’s Epistles.

I ask you and all Christadelphians to realize that the knowledge and understanding of the Atoning work of God in Christ comes by reading the Bible effectively. The Ethiopian could read the Scriptures but they were not effective to him until God showed it to him by a devout man in whom was the Holy Spirit. In the 3rd and 4th chapters of John’s record much was taught by Jesus both to Nicodemus and the Samaritan woman, the latter having heard him, said through her lack of understanding of the truth, “I know that Messiah cometh which is called Christ: when he is come, he will tell us all things.” Did you not say words similar to this a little time ago? “When Jesus comes all will be made clear”? But Jesus is here now, the Word is nigh thee - no need to bring Christ down from above - “I that speak unto thee am he” - the Spirit Word of God in flesh.

Read Romans chapter 10. If as stated about the Christadelphians in their pamphlet, that they do not believe that any of their members past or present have received any special revelation direct from God, then I can say from my own experience of 17 years as a member of the Christadelphian community, that this statement is untrue in my own case and others before and after me, and is also a denial of the statement of Jesus in John 6:44, “No man can come to me, except the Father, which hath sent me, draw him: and I will raise him up at the last day. It is written in the Prophets, And they shall be all taught of God. Every man therefore that heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh to me.” Verse 37, “All that the Father giveth me shall come to me: and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out.”

Yourself, as well probably of many Christadelphians, North, South, East and West of the globe, have been made aware of a Christadelphian man of 86 years of age and a member of that community for over 60 years and a regular reader of the Bible and fully aware of the views expressed from the time of John Thomas and Robert Roberts, yet like a bolt from the blue, revelation struck him and revealed the Truth in contrast with what he had believed to be the teaching of Scripture, and he was not afraid to show this contrast in

letters to certain responsible people who it appears had no respect for any views that were contrary to their B.A.S.F. Nevertheless, he now has many sympathisers especially the Nazarenes who endorse his views with their own, and praise God. On the matter of your communities Hymns, and especially the one, "When I survey the wondrous cross on which the Prince of Glory died..." you explain that "wondrous" does not apply to the Cross but in your view, to the One who was lifted up on it. Yet you are well aware that most of your literature and leading writers have likened Jesus to the brazen serpent Moses lifted up as a symbol of sinful-flesh and serpent-nature, which in fact He was not.

How then can they have read the Bible effectively when Jesus in John 3:14 to 16 gives a direct and opposite reason? Therefore the people responsible for such error are self-condemned with those who sing the Hymn with serpent-nature in mind and God offering up a condemned sacrifice as a Ransom for all in violation of His Law of Atonement.

Maybe, as you have said, some of the Hymns are compiled by members of your community, one, No. 292, I have learned was compiled by a man who held the teachings and views of the Nazarene Fellowship and its contents opposed to the views of your community including yourself, yet are contained in 1 John 3:2, "But we know that, when He shall appear, we shall be like Him; for we shall see Him as He is." David confirms this in Psalm 17:15, "As for me, I will behold thy face in righteousness: I shall be satisfied, when I awake, with thy likeness."

This is not the Christadelphian view, for their teaching is that they will rise in sin-condemned nature and must pass before the judgment-seat of Christ to be worthy of full and complete redemption, you also try to justify that theory and remain in that congregation who must be uttering lies when singing Hymn 263 at an immersion, speaking of the candidate's redemption and cleansing from sin by the blood of Christ. Also Hymn 174, in the memorial of Christ's introduction of the New Covenant through His body, and blood symbolized in the unleavened bread and the fruit of the vine. During the Mosaic Passover no leavened bread was to be found on pain of death, in that it foreshadowed not the true bread of God who was to come to release from the bondage of sin - He was to be by Birth and mission the unpolluted Son of God and as there was only unleavened bread on the Passover table He could say, "This is my body given for you," and of the wine, "This is my blood of the New Covenant." Do you drink water instead of wine? How then can you justify violation of the anti-type by eating leavened bread which Jesus did not use to introduce the New Covenant in co-ordination with the wine the symbol of His blood? Have you not read God's Words to His covenanted people? "Thou shalt not offer the blood of my sacrifice with leaven; neither shall the sacrifice of the feast of the Passover be left unto the morning." Exodus 34:25.

If forbidden in partaking of the type, how much more with the antitype Jesus, the Lamb of God in whom we have redemption through His blood (not will have), the forgiveness of sins!

Redemption in Christ means release from the Law of Sin and Death under which all have been born and that release requires death unto sin for all, with the exception of Christ who was never in that Adamic bondage but by suffering the death due to Adam and all in his loins, symbolic death with Christ secured a walk in newness of life in Him. "It is a faithful saying. For if we be dead with him, we shall also live with him; if we suffer, we shall also reign with him: if we deny him, he also will deny us; if we believe not, yet he abideth faithful; he cannot deny himself. Of these things put them in remembrance." What things? The fact that Jesus gave Himself a ransom for all - that we have redemption through His blood. If we deny it He will deny us. But He cannot deny Himself. - 2 Timothy 2:11-13 - Hebrews 10:14.

If we have become sons and daughters of God we should not, as Esau, sell our birthright for a mixture of confused pottage, a recipe found in the Christadelphian Statement of Faith which some people are doing through lack of ability to read it and the Bible effectively. For example, Clause IX is a nonsense and exhibition of scriptural ignorance that ever I have come across, especially from one whom you regard as an early Pioneer of the Christadelphian Community. This Clause IX implies clearly that the death Adam would have died in the literal day he sinned was by the taking away of his life by the shedding of his blood. Jesus died in this manner by bloodshedding, as the clause states - "He rose from the dead after suffering the death required by the righteousness of God." This is denied in Clause V and as I have said, such contradictory statements are an exhibition of the ignorance of people who cannot read effectively. I challenge you and the Blackpool Christadelphian's to prove me wrong, but I have no axe to grind personally, but an

acknowledgement of the Justice, Mercy and Grace of God through His Son, who loved us and gave Himself for us.

Yours in His service, Phil Parry.

A SHORT EXTRACT WRITTEN BY CALVIN ON THE BIBLE.

FOR this is life everlasting to know our only true God and Him whom He hath sent, Jesus Christ, in whom He hath appointed the beginning, midst, and end of our salvation. This is Isaac, the well-beloved son of the father which was offered in sacrifice and yet gave not place unto death; this is the vigilant shepherd Jacob, which had so great care over the sheep which he had in keeping; this is the good and merciful brother Joseph, who, in his glory, was not ashamed to acknowledge his brethren, were they never so base and abject; this is the great high priest and bishop Melchisedec, who made an everlasting sacrifice once for all; this is the excellent law-maker Moses, who writeth his law in the table of our hearts by his spirit; this is the faithful captain and guide Joshua, to conduct us into the land of promise; this is the noble and victorious king David - smiting down with his hand all rebellious power; this is the magnificent and triumphant king Solomon, governing his kingdom in peace and prosperity; this is the strong and valiant Samson, who, by his death, overthrew all his enemies; and, last of all, every good thing which heart can think or desire, is found in this only Jesus Christ. He humbled himself to exalt us, He became servant to make us free, He was impoverished to enrich us, He was sold to ransom us, He was imprisoned to bail us, He was made the curse for our blessing, an offering / or sin for our righteousness, He was disfigured to fashion us, He died for our life. Insomuch that by Him roughness is smoothed, anger appeased, darkness lightened, unrighteousness justified, weakness strengthened, discomfort comforted, sin bridled, despite contemned, fear boldened, debt paid, labour eased, sadness made glad, mishap goodhap, hardness easiness, disorder ordered, disunion united, ignominy made noble, rebellion subdued, menacing menaced, ambush discovered, assault assailed, battle beaten, war faughten, vengeance punished, torment tormented, damnation damned, depth drowned, hell chained, death dead, mortality immortal, and, to be short, mercy hath swallowed up all misery, and bounty hath overcome all evil.

Non-Muslim Muslims and the Jihad Against the West

Posted By [Bosch Fawstin](#) On December 2, 2011

My name is Bosch and I'm a recovering Muslim. That is, if Muslims don't kill me for leaving Islam, which it requires them to do. That's just one of the reasons I've been writing and drawing against Islam and its Jihad for a number of years now. But fortunately for us, Islam hasn't been able to make every Muslim its slave, just as Nazism wasn't able to turn every German into a Nazi. So there is Islam and there are Muslims. Muslims who take Islam seriously are at war with us and Muslims who don't aren't.

But that doesn't mean we should consider these reluctant Muslims allies against Jihad. I've been around Muslims my entire life and most of them truly don't care about Islam. The problem I have with many of these essentially non-Muslim Muslims, especially in the middle of this war being waged on us by their more consistent co-religionists, is that they give the enemy cover. They force us to play a game of Muslim Roulette since we can't tell which Muslim is going to blow himself up until he does. And their indifference about the evil being committed in the name of their religion is a big reason why their reputation is where it is.

So while I understand that most Muslims are not at war with us, they've proven in their silence and inaction against jihad that they're not on our side either, and there's nothing we can say or do to change that. We just have to finally accept it and stop expecting them to come around, while doing our best to kill those who are trying to kill us.

Another problem with Muslims who aren't very Muslim is that they lead some among us to conclude that they must be practicing a more enlightened form of Islam. They're not. They're "practicing" life in non-Muslim countries, where they are free to live as they choose. But their "Islam" is not *the* Islam. There's no separate ideology apart from Islam that's being practiced by these Muslims in name only, there's no such thing as "Western Islam".

Non-observant Muslims are not our problem, but neither are they the solution to our problem. Our problem is Islam and its most consistent practitioners. There is nothing in Islam that stays the hand of Muslims who want to kill non-Muslims. If an individual Muslim is personally peaceful, it's not because of Islam, it's because of his individual choice, which is why I often say that your average Muslim is morally superior to Mohammad, to their own religion. The very rare Muslim who helps us against Jihad is acting against his religion, but that doesn't stop some among us from thinking that his existence somehow means that he represents more than himself.

The only reason we're talking about Islam is because it doesn't mean peace. Islam wasn't hijacked by a "small minority of extremists" on 9/11, it was hijacked by a very small minority of moderates whose embarrassment in being associated with such an immoderate religion leads them to engage in moderate truth telling about it, proving their irrelevance as allies.

In addition to these politically active moderates, when you see well-assimilated Muslims in the West, you're not seeing Islam in action, you're seeing individuals living up to the old adage, when in Rome, do as the Romans do. They're essentially post-Islamic Muslims who have rejected Islamic values and have embraced Western ones. But since the process of their assimilation was implicit – as it happened naturally by their exposure to Western, i.e., pro-life, values – both Muslims and non-Muslims alike prefer to generously give Islam some credit for it. But a good Muslim, by our standards is a bad Muslim by Islamic standards. Objectively good human beings, who identify themselves as Muslim, give Islam a good face, one far better than it deserves. This only gives us a false impression about what it is we're facing, with just another excuse not to face it. And this leads to our acceptance into our culture of stealth jihadists who have figured out how to say what we want to hear, while they scheme behind the scenes to further Islamize the West.

In the name of distinguishing the enemy from Muslims who mean us no harm, far too many Western commentators have avoided using the name "Islam" for the enemy's ideology, and instead have decided to create their very own terms for the threat we're facing, terms that are alien to the enemy. Terms such as:

Islamic	Totalitarian Islam.	Political Islam.	Militant Islam.
Fundamentalism.	Islamofascism.	Bin Ladenism.	Islamism.
Islamic Extremism.	Islamnazism.	Radical Islam.	Jihadism.

We didn't use terms such as "Radical Nazism", "Extremist Shinto" and "Militant Communism" in the past. "Militant Islam", "Political Islam", etc., are redundant terms. Our pretending otherwise has proven disastrous. Thousands of American lives, both civilian and military, have been sacrificed because of policies predicated on the myth that "Islam means peace." We didn't try to reform Shinto or Nazism during World War II; the major changes in those cultures took place only after we thoroughly de-militarized them.

And it's no accident that Western analysts of Islam who are most informed about Islam are also most critical of it, while those least informed are least critical. But then there are those who, in their study of Islam, have become so enamored with their subject that, instead of sticking to what Islam is, they often write about what it isn't, what they hope it might be. They seem preoccupied with doing their part to save Islam from those who have allegedly corrupted it.

The Muslim world is where the true meaning of Islam can be found in practice. Islam – not any alleged deviant form of it – means misogyny, censorship, anti-Semitism, homophobia, wife-beatings, beheadings, honor killings, pedophilia/"child marriages", murdering infidels, etc. This is evil, and Islam sanctions every bit of it, but we've been told that we must respect "one of the world's great religions" because it's a religion. Following 9/11, the only thing George W. Bush knew about Islam was that it was a religion, and that apparently was a good enough reason for him to exonerate it as he did. And his advisor on Islam,

David Forte, told Bush exactly what he wanted to hear, that “Nothing this evil could come from religion.” But 9/11 did come from a religion. Whatever else 9/11 was, it was an act of faith.

And Bush saying “Islam is peace” shortly after 9/11 gave the enemy a gift they couldn’t have foreseen. Here was the one man who was charged to defend America from their attack and here he was defending the very ideology that motivated the attackers. Honesty is the best policy in general, and when it comes to war, it’s a moral imperative to find out the truth, to tell the truth and to act on the truth, no matter what sacred cow is killed in the process. And so a big part of why nearly 3,000 victims of jihad on 9/11 haven’t been avenged is because of respect for religion, even for a religion that calls for our destruction.

Muslims who really care about Islam are part of an organized effort to spread Islam, and I sometimes refer to this collective effort by Muslims as “Organized Islam.” No matter the means involved, Muslims working towards a more Islamic world want the same thing the jihadists want. This organized effort includes Mosques, Muslim organizations, Muslim individuals writing books, blog posts, etc. And they all invariably engage in anti-Western, Anti-Israeli propaganda, at the very least.

I often hear that we should be working with the Muslim world. Working towards what? As Ayn Rand writes, “In any collaboration between two men (or two groups) who hold different basic principles, it is the more evil or irrational one who wins.” Any time we spend “working” with a culture that calls for our destruction, we are working towards our own destruction, consciously or not.

While it’s true that jihadists don’t represent most Muslims, they do represent Islam. But then why don’t most Muslims engage in jihad? Like in any culture, heroes are a small minority, and that goes for Islamic culture as well. The jihadists are Islam’s heroes; they are the ones most dedicated to following Allah’s commands and they’re celebrated in the Muslim world for it. They are also the only ones to whom Islam guarantees paradise. And their rarity was made even clearer when we learned that only the pilots of 9/11 knew it was a suicide mission. Our enemy knows that it’s tough to get even hard-core Muslims to sacrifice their lives for Islam, but they don’t want us to know that. Just as they don’t want us to know that behind their boast that they love death is the fact that they hate life.

And while Muslims who blow themselves up in order to kill non-Muslims are a small minority, Muslims who would explicitly condemn them are an even smaller minority. And while I think that Muslims are mere sheep to their Jihadist wolves, there are also too many Muslim cheerleaders for jihad. How many Muslims celebrated 9/11? Far too many. Even in my own lax Muslim upbringing in America, there was an omnipresent anti-Semitism and misogyny. Some members of my family admired Adolph Hitler, who I refer to as “Islam’s Favourite Infidel.” Regarding misogyny, the birth of a girl became a day of mourning for Muslim women in my family; they understood the suffering this girl would endure under Islam, even in America.

Though we say we’ve been at war for over ten years, we haven’t even begun to fight the war the way we should be fighting it. And those calling for a change within Islam during this war would be surprised at how much Islam can be changed through an honest war on our behalf. You can’t make a violent religion like Islam non-violent by argument, only by greater retaliatory force against state sponsors of jihad terrorism.

The future of Islam and the well-being of Muslims is said to be of importance to us. Post – 9/11, the defence of our culture, our values, our very lives has been optional, but our defence of Islam has been absolute. It began with Bush’s “Islam is peace” and it continues with Obama, who said in his Submission Speech in Egypt in 2009, in front of members of The Muslim Brotherhood, “I consider it part of my responsibility as president of the United States to fight against negative stereotypes of Islam wherever they appear.” If only he felt the same about America.

We can’t be both for Islam and for ourselves. This enemy is fully on their own side and fully against us and they’ve made themselves believe that they’re the good guys and that we’re the bad guys, and our actions have done nothing but turn their hatred of us into an ever-deepening contempt. Before we see the enemy for what it is, we need to see ourselves for what we are. Only then can we, with full moral conviction, make them pay for what they’ve done and move us towards victory.

Our problem is not “Islamophobia”, but Islamophilia. It is this uncritical, uninformed, absolute defence of Islam by Western elites after 9/11 that I refer to as Islamgate. It’s a scandal for the ages that few involved would ever admit to being part of.

I care about the truth. I care about Western Civilization. I care about myself, my loved ones and my friends. I care about life. And that’s why I don’t care about Islam.

Our altruistic concern for the future and wellbeing of the Muslim world has come at the expense of American lives and treasure. We’ve placed the wellbeing of “The Muslim World” above our own self-defence. We’ve placed today’s Big Lie, “Islam means peace”, above the truth we need to act on. We’ve placed the lives of Muslim civilians above the lives of our soldiers, placing them in absolutely unnecessary danger in order to protect innocent (or even guilty) civilians. Our Rules of Engagement might as well be renamed the Golden Rules of Engagement, as our soldiers have been forced to treat the enemy the way we’d like to be treated. And the enemy takes full advantage of that, as they do of all of the policies our morally vain politicians have concocted. We need to shift the focus onto our own well-being at the enemy’s expense for a change.

We’ve tried everything since 9/11 except real war. War is the answer to Jihad.

So who cares about Islam? Muslims, Jihadists, Islamophiles, Leftists who naturally side with anti-American ideologies, guilt-ridden fellow travellers who think America is usually in the wrong, and religionists who believe any religion is better than none. But since Leftists and Islamophiles usually know very little about Islam, who truly cares about Islam? Those who are at war with us.

In the end, I care about Islam and the Muslim world as much as the Muslim world cares about America and the West. This is war. We can’t be on both sides. I’m not rooting for Islam or the Muslim world.

I’m rooting for us.

Bosch Fawstin

Freedom Center pamphlets now available on Kindle

*“... be blameless and harmless, the sons of God, without rebuke, in the midst of a crooked and
perverse nation, among whom ye shine as lights in the world.” - Philippians 2:15,*
