

YOU HAVE BEEN WARNED

Letters from a Sister to John Carter and His Reply

Abertillery. June 1st 1945.

Dear Brother Carter,

Greetings. I have read your article in the June Christadelphian entitled "Blind Leaders" and I wonder why you do not apply the same to our leaders, both living and dead, as you must know as well as I do that your literature and the Statement of Faith contains errors. It is only in the last few months that this has been brought to my notice and it has caused me mental agony to think that what I have loved and defended for 30 years was shattered; my resignation has been sent in and no doubt, you have been acquainted of the fact.

Now, Brother Carter, in all sincerity and humility, I ask you, are you out to teach pure doctrine, or defend the literature that has been put into your trust? I told you long ago that it needed revising, but then I did not know to what extent it was wrong or the seriousness of the errors. It would be a costly matter, no doubt, but if it was done the funds would be forthcoming and the many divisions that are taking place would be avoided. There has been plenty of literature sent round to open the eyes of honest brethren, though many, like the Recording brother here, do not want the Truth and boast that they burn it unread. Another Recording brother I know put it out of sight, fearing trouble in the ecclesia; I myself have been warned against it by many, but after reading some of it I was soon convinced that I have been following errors. We who are Bible readers and love Truth have more understanding than our teachers because they will not humble themselves and be taught.

In my final letter of resignation I said that I had much to thank the Christadelphians for "on the material side of the Kingdom," but they are astray on the nature of Christ and His sacrifice and resurrection; I received no reply – only withdrawal.

What a responsibility lies at the door of the leaders of Christadelphians who defend errors and make no effort to correct them; they are the "Blind leaders of the blind," and there can be no hope for them if they persist in false doctrine and teaching of lies.

Please excuse my plainness of speech but I feel very anxious for the "Blind Followers;" I have been one myself for 30 years, but I thank God that my eyes have been opened and I pray that others may be also. How I wish that you would read some of these booklets that deal with the real errors in the Christadelphian works and then you might be able to lead the divided body to unity in the Truth, even in Christ, who is The Truth.

Believe me, yours faithfully,

Mrs J.A.French,

* * *

Abertillery. July 2nd 1945

Dear Brother Carter,

Greetings; you did not reply to my letter of June 1st - and yet I think it has influenced the writers of some of the articles in the July "Christadelphian."

First, may I state that the pamphlets you so object to are sent out in love and sympathy to enlighten the sincere followers of Christ and help them to see that in Christadelphian writings they are embracing many errors. But instead of studying what they say - or answering them, you and the other

leaders pronounce them heresy and the writers heretics. Even Nicodemus was wiser than you: "Doth our law judge any man before it hear him?" (John 7:51). You judge and condemn publicly in your magazine, yet you neither quote what they say nor try to refute it. Even Brother Islip Collyer speaks of the question as strife about words, but he does not name the pamphlet or the writer, nor does he quote the words which he says cause the strife. It would be more honourable to quote the words and explain, or if possible, refute them, before he condemns. Let us hear both sides of the argument. I have now studied it for myself and instead of it being strife about words, it is an earnest contention for pure doctrine; there is faith and faith.

You have preached to others that their doctrines are wrong and expect to be heard, but you will not listen when the errors in Christadelphian works are pointed out. Many will say of Islip Collyer's letter No. 31, "Good, it will silence those who differ." A year ago I should have agreed to all he said, but I am wiser now; the majority of Christadelphians are so biased by their upbringing and associations that they cannot see the simple truth.

At the end of last year a Yorkshire brother sent me "The Resurrection and Judgement of The Saints," by Wm. Richmond and said in his letter, "Truth sees no lion in the path, and many up North believe in the incorruptible resurrection that Wm. Richmond taught, but will not confess it, fearing excommunication;" so I read the booklet and sent for more. I received a selection of pamphlets from Birmingham, and to my surprise they were from those we call "the clean flesh people." I fought for months until I had to give in; they were right; Christadelphians were wrong. I sent some to Sister Houlston, of Ludlow, and she, being more intelligent and with her experience in writing in the Testimony and for the Isolation League, decided in four weeks, while I had been four months, and we were both baptized the same day last May.

Oh that we had known before; but we have always been warned not to read these pamphlets and have trusted too much in our leaders, who we now realize hold "the unclean flesh heresy." If you do away with that it will remove many errors and give you a clean and spotless Christ "who needeth not daily, as other high priests, to offer up sacrifice for himself" (Hebrews 7:27) for He was "holy, harmless, undefiled and separate from sinners" (verse 26) and "in him is no sin" (1 John 3:5); "he did no sin" (1 Peter 2:22).

It is only Christadelphians who say He benefited from His own sacrifice, but in that case it would be no sacrifice. "He was cut off, but not for himself" (Daniel 9:26). He was cut off for "the sin of the world;" "the scripture hath concluded all under sin" (Galatians 3:22).

With all the education, literary talents and many books to help them, it is amazing to me that the eminent writers for the Christadelphian magazines cannot perceive the truth. "Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent and hast revealed them unto babes" (Matthew 11:25); and the babes, the despised ones, are trying to teach the wise and prudent and are preaching the Truth, whether they will hear or whether they will forbear.

I notice that F.W.T. has awakened to some truth - even the forgiveness of sins now; that we can be "presented faultless;" then how about the Christadelphian judgment?

On page 78 you print an extract from Robert Roberts on "God will be sanctified," and at the end of the first paragraph he speaks of Christ "who shared their sin-nature." You must know that there is no such term as sin-nature in the whole Bible. It is an invention of R.Roberts. Paul speaks of "first the natural, then the spiritual" (1 Corinthians 15:46,47). Perhaps Robert Roberts meant condemned nature; but even so he would have been wrong, for how could one condemned man ransom other condemned men? We are often given a lesson in simple Greek terms in the magazine, and I am wondering why those who profess to understand the Greek do not deal with some of the disputed texts like the "sinful flesh" of Romans 8:3. Is it because they know that the doctrine of defiled nature based upon it is unjustifiable?

Kindly read the lecture by Edward Turney on "The Sacrifice of Christ" and then Robert Roberts' reply "The Slain Lamb." If you are then in any doubt read "A review of The Slain Lamb" by F.J.Pearce and you will have a better understanding of the situation. Your magazine is a powerful organ to lead and sway the people who are being called out and the Truth will come out, so please do not misrepresent those who in the fear and love of God are showing you and yours a better way. Until recently I had complete confidence in the Christadelphian magazine and I can truly say I would have died for my faith; I thought if Christadelphians are wrong, then who can be right? It was with sorrow and pain that I learned differently, but now it is a joy to me to have a fuller and better understanding and having found a good thing, I only wish to share it with others.

Believe me, yours faithfully,

Mrs J.A.French.

* * *

Abertillery. July 9th 1945

Dear Brother Carter,

Greetings. The July Christadelphian in the intelligence from Ludlow says that Sister Houlston was "baptized into another fellowship." This may be a misunderstanding on the part of the Recording brother and we should be glad if you will correct it in the next issue. Sister Houlston was baptized on the same day as myself, into the Name of Jesus and was received into the fellowship of those who believe that He was not under condemnation but that His sacrifice was made voluntarily to redeem us, not Himself.

Thanking you, yours in the service of Christ,

Mrs J.A.French.

* * *

Birmingham, 19th July 1945.

Dear Sister French,

I have received your three letters but have not had time to answer them before. Your last shall be answered first.

You say Sister Houlston was baptized into the name of Jesus and you question the intelligence from Ludlow. But that is the very point where we join issue. I would contend that both you and Sister Houlston have most unwisely been baptized, to use Paul's phrase, "into another gospel which is not another." In fact, it is no gospel at all. With this conviction, how could either Ludlow ecclesia or myself publish the statement you suggest?

When I got your first letter and the leaflet you sent and had read them, the words of Paul came to my mind: "Who hath beguiled you that ye should not obey the truth before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth?"

It would be difficult to crowd more scriptural errors within the space of four pages than is done in the leaflet you sent. Unfortunately, to combat error and state truth very often takes longer time and more space than the declaration of error. I have noticed errors in nearly every paragraph. I am surprised to find that you are beguiled by statements such as these.

Sincerely your brother,

John Carter.

* * *

Abertillery. August 3rd 1945

Dear Brother Carter,

Greetings. Your letter of the 19th July to hand in reply to my three letters; I must say I think it very weak and you are very evasive and assuming. You do not even mention my second letter and you see so many errors in that leaflet - and give proof of none! This seems to be the spirit of the Christadelphian leaders, for you print an amazing letter from our dear Brother Islip Collyer (August, page 86) in which he mentions "undesirable literature," which he does not review but only misrepresents.

He says "It is suggested that a violent death was inflicted on Christ as a substitute for Adam." This is untrue; we contend that in His love God gave Jesus as a sin-offering and that Christ willingly offered Himself to release Adam and his family from Sin's captivity. We are "bought by the precious blood of Christ" and are no longer in Adam but in Christ, after baptism into His death, it is easy for you to prejudice your readers and prevent them reading these pamphlets for your magazine is a powerful organ, but it is not always used for the good of its readers (and yet it is "to make ready a people prepared for the Lord"!). I am amazed that you should have passed the last paragraph but one on page 87, where you allow Brother Islip Collyer to condemn himself three times in print. It just proves that neither you nor he understand Paul's letter to the Romans. Allow a sister to explain it for your benefit.

Paul writes to converted Jews (Romans 2:17). They are called saints (Romans 1:7). Then he describes the state of wickedness natural man falls into when left to himself (chapters 1 and 3). Then righteousness by faith (chapter 4). The federal principle is shown in chapter 5, whether in or belong to Adam or Christ. Chapter 6 tells our position and how we should live after rising from baptism. But in chapter 7 he writes to the brethren that know the law (converted Jews) and in verse 5 he says,

"When we were in the flesh" and relates the experience of a Jew under the Law, in the flesh or before conversion and without the Gospel. Paul (Saul) thought he was doing God service when he persecuted the Saints - against conscience, for he was "kicking against the pricks."

See what Dr Adam Clarke says about chapter 7- I guess you have his books. In chapter 8 Paul says, "There is now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh but after the spirit." Verse 9, "Ye are not in the flesh." So that saints may (and should) apply chapters 6 and 8 to themselves, but not chapter 7. I often heard from the platform "When I would do good evil is present with me." This is self-condemnation! We can be judged by our own words - see Matthew 12:35-7.

I feel towards you and your followers as Paul did in Romans 9:1-3, and 10:1,2, and as Moses in Exodus 32:32, and it is with this in mind and with this spirit that these matters are being published. Those who have eyes to see and ears to hear are leaving you behind. I have heard it said, and I think it is true, that Christadelphians are latter-day Jews and their eyes are holden; but there are a few latter-day Jeremiahs and Ezekiel's, with the word of God burning within and they are speaking the word to their brethren, whether they will hear or whether they will forbear, so that in the Day of Judgement none shall be able to say "We were never told."

With kind wishes, I remain your sister in Christ's service,

Mrs J.A.French.