

1st Response from brother Jimmy Washeck

-----Original Message-----

From: Jim and/or Sharon Washeck [mailto:washecks@juno.com]

Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2002 7:18 AM

To: kittbrown@zianet.com; waynet7@juno.com; burnsrusa@netscape.net; robmil42@hotmail.com; sammi1@citlink.net; ecclesia@jayefferpartners.ca; SSh9988744@aol.com; vthusted@jam.rr.com; gcnicholson@attglobal.net; SmommaS@aol.com; mjasionowski@hotmail.com; mac.briley@worldnet.att.net; pellucidar@juno.com; osp@netinc.ca; pkpuffin@hotmail.com; vreed@flash.net; muddmdl@aol.com; gpl@acay.com.au; gerlsuzesankey@yahoo.com; bobdebhend@aol.com; asankey@matrixbancorp.com; ajgorman@email.msn.com; aaronthomas2@juno.com; hbs1114@juno.com; jimdolly@ev1.net; Fein9211@msn.com; charliebeen@alltel.net; anitasue65@juno.com; rseureka@aol.com; pwood@moment.net

Cc: steve@genusa.com

Subject: Fellowshiping "JJ Andrew's 1887 Statement of Faith"

Brethren,

I confess that I do not know all the recipients cc'd in Stephen Genusa's 9-9-02 e-mail to Bro Vandergriff, but I want to get the following information out to the Unamended household as well as to interested parties. In regard to the question posed..."Are you willing to fellowship, if it were possible, on the basis of JJ Andrew's 1887 Statement of Faith.", (p.12, #5, The Rules and Statement....The North London Ecclesia....Jan., 1887), the following documentation from Bro Andrew adds the necessary clarity with which to assess the issue. An attempt has been made to present this SOF article #5 on resurrectional responsibility as representing a unified position within that ecclesia, and, as the personal belief of Bro Andrew at that time. Bro Andrew clarifies the circumstances and the intent of article #5 in the pages of The Sanctuary-Keeper. In his article titled *The Judgement Controversy in London*, (Vol 1, July, 1894, pgs. 27 through 31) Bro Andrew reviews the heightened controversy of the previous years and also comments on article #5:

The ecclesial basis of fellowship in the course of the present discussion has, for obvious purposes, been used in a way which was never intended. When originally drawn up the question had not been thoroughly sifted. The words so often quoted, "Resurrection affects those only who are responsible to God by a knowledge of His revealed Will," were inserted in consequence of not being able to affirm that none out of Christ would be raised to judgment; but they did not represent a dogmatic attitude. If the subject had been viewed as clearly demonstrated, it would have been expressed in more explicit language and also in a negative form. At the time the basis was adopted, and ever since, there have been two minds in London on the question, but as it was treated as an open one no difficulty has previously arisen. Bro. Oowler has always held his present belief, and he has made no secret of it either in London or Birmingham. Other brethren in London (North and South) have been of the same mind for years, some from their immersion. Such have not considered that they were out of harmony with the ecclesial basis, because they have understood the word "knowledge" in its comprehensive Scriptural sense, as used in II. Peter ii. 20, to describe those who have been "washed" from their sins (22).

The Sanctuary-Keeper article clearly documents the ongoing difference of beliefs within the North London Ecclesia and reports that the final result of the matter was the "*withdrawal of about one-half the ecclesia*". From this we might assume that the North London brethren were split pretty evenly on the issue.

Also significant is Bro Andrew's explanation that many "*understood the word knowledge in its comprehensive Scriptural sense, as used in 11 Peter 2:20, to describe those who have been "washed" from their sins (22).*" This statement impacts directly upon other quotes of Bro Andrew which might appear to indicate his support for the light brings responsibility belief. (Bro. Andrew affirms in the debate with Bro Roberts that he had early on held that belief as reflected in Jesus Christ and Him Crucified, 1870 (reprinted as The Real Christ), but, it was "a position which I never deemed strong...".)

Although this explanation from Bro Andrew regarding article 5 was written in 1894, it is both detailed and consistent with the history of the "judgement controversy" as reviewed. If The North London SOF is to be characterized as "JJ Andrew's 1887 Statement of Faith", surely we should have no difficulty accepting JJ Andrew's explanation as to the circumstances and meaning of the statements therein.

Fraternally, Jim Washeck

1st Response to brother Jimmy Washeck

From: Stephen Genusa

Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2002 10:12 AM

To: Jim and/or Sharon Washeck [mailto:washecks@juno.com]; kittbrown@zianet.com; waynet7@juno.com; burnsrusa@netscape.net; robmil42@hotmail.com; sammi1@citlink.net; ecclesia@jayeffpartners.ca; SSh9988744@aol.com; vhusted@jam.rr.com; gcnicholson@attglobal.net; SmommaS@aol.com; mjasionowski@hotmail.com; mac.briley@worldnet.att.net; pellucidar@juno.com; osp@netinc.ca; pkpuffin@hotmail.com; vreed@flash.net; muddmdl@aol.com; gpl@acay.com.au; gersuzesankey@yahoo.com; bobdebhend@aol.com; asankey@matrixbancorp.com; ajgorman@email.msn.com; aaronthomas2@juno.com; hbs1114@juno.com; jimdolly@ev1.net; Fein9211@msn.com; charliebeen@alltel.net; anitasue65@juno.com; rseureka@aol.com; pwood@moment.net

Subject: Re: Fellowshiping "JJ Andrew's 1887 Statement of Faith"

Greetings brother Washeck,

> surely we should have no difficulty accepting JJ Andrew's
> explanation as to the circumstances and meaning of the
> statements therein.

If I may, it appears to me that you may have a problem as to the meaning of his statements? *The full quotation is this:*

"Reference has been made to *my change of attitude*. **Yes, a change from a position which I never deemed strong to one which I do deem strong**" (JJ Andrew, Resurrectional Responsibility Debate, Opening Comments)

All one has to do is ask:

1) "what was the position he 'never deemed strong', from which he changed?"
and

2) "what was the position he changed to, which he did 'deem strong'?"
to realize that the arguments that
"he always believed the same" or
"let's interpret his earliest writings as if they were his final position"
is an impossibility.

> An attempt has been made to present this SOF article #5 on resurrectional
> responsibility as representing a unified position within that ecclesia,

It was not my intent to claim there could not have been exceptions in the London meeting. However, aren't most Statements of Faith adopted by ecclesias a "unified position", **for the majority of the members, at the time it is adopted?** One would think so since the majority adopted it; and since that is the basis of the breaking of bread; and since the drawing up of the SOF always would have been done with great care, to express the ecclesia's position as *clearly* as possible. To claim that because a minority of members did not understand it as the English expresses it -- that this therefore invalidates the position indicated in the English -- is to make the exception the rule. (It was a "minority" for the majority accepted the 1887 SOF as written).

> *When originally drawn up the question had not been thoroughly sifted.*

That brother Andrew had not thoroughly "sifted" the issues himself is clear in the fact that he abandoned his previous position.

As to the claim that

> Also significant is Bro Andrew's explanation that many
> *"understood the word knowledge in its comprehensive Scriptural sense, as
> used in 11 Peter 2:20, to describe those who have been "washed" from their
sins (22)."*

It was not brother Andrew's explanation that "many understood". The word "many" is not in his quote. That is *your interpretation and addition* to his words. He mentions brother Owler and "other brethren". If it were many, or a majority, being on the defensive he would have gladly claimed it in support of himself. But he did not do so. We also know that sister Andrew was an early adopter of the idea. There is no indication that it was "many" brethren in 1887. The nearly even split came years later after the trouble had stirred and brother Andrew had put forth his views for a number of years.

That the word "knowledge" was viewed as inclusive of baptism, a remarkable claim in itself, is never indicated in the previous quotes from brother Andrew. Why should it have been? He moved *from "a position which I never deemed strong..."*. If you are suggesting that this is what he meant to say, then that is a post-historical addition to the texts, that does not exist in brother Andrew's writings.

Furthermore, the inclusion of Rom 5:13 as a proof text on item #5 in the 1887 SOF is indicative of the position of the brethren who assembled the SOF and of the ecclesia which adopted it.

"For until the law sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed when there is no law." (Rom 5:13)

Brother Andrew's own quotations bear this out as well. Take for example:

"For the persons here mentioned to be brought **before the judgment seat, is a proof that they must have been responsible to God, in some way or other, by a knowledge of his law**; because only those who are under his law are to be judged by it, and **they who are 'without law shall perish without law'**" (JJ. Andrew, *The Ambassador*, 1867, p. 234).

First, note that he is dealing with "the judgment seat" of Christ. But more importantly note the use of Romans 2:12. In Unamended teaching, this is often (to state it conservatively) applied to the Jewish age only, as is Rom. 5:13. The use of Rom 2:12 indicates brother Andrews' understanding of the corollary, and its application to the gentile age: "*and as many as have sinned in law shall be judged by law*" [the definite article does not exist in the Greek]

There is one other piece of ecclesial history concerning the London ecclesia that can be put on the table as well:

The Christadelphian; December 1894 p.477: "I am very glad to see your reply to brother Andrew in the November number of the Christadelphian, and am much pleased with the manifestation of the right spirit in which it is written. I have, as you know, refrained from taking part publicly in the various controversies that have agitated the ecclesia since my connection with them for twenty-six years, but this last one, being more particularly connected with the North London ecclesia, and so closely with myself personally, I am constrained to write you a few lines. I quite agree with you, that the question of Christ's sacrifice was a mere diversion from the main issue, **as to what are the grounds of responsibility to God ; but I was used as the lever that turned the points in this direction at the commencement of the controversy. I did not know at the time that brother Andrew had become a convert to sister Andrew's theory, which she had been agitating amongst us off and on ever since she came among us**

in London, and I took occasion one Wednesday evening to speak against the theory of non-responsibility where light had come-a theory which was producing such evil results with some at the Upper Street Lecture Hall."

The nearly even split meeting was the result of brother Andrew's efforts following his move from a position he did not deem strong, to a position he deemed strong.

Brother Andrew admitted that brother Thomas did teach the ER, a fact that only in recent years has been admitted by some Unamended brethren (though not all):

"T. asks whether our late beloved brother Dr. Thomas, did not believe that enlightened rejecters would be raised to judgment for refusing to become connected with Christ after they had come to the knowledge of the Truth? Yes; in *Elpis Israel* Dr. Thomas wrote as follows:-'If they prefer to eat of the world's forbidden fruit, they come under the sentence of death in their own behalf. They are . . . condemned to a resurrection to judgment for rejecting the gospel of the kingdom of God' (p. 117). In *The Revealed Mystery* the Doctor, writing of those who 'come to an understanding of the gospel, but have rejected it,' says that this class 'comes forth from the grave again to encounter the burning indignation of Christ, the judge of the living and the dead' (p. 14)." (JJ. Andrew, *The Sanctuary Keeper*, September 1897, p. 43).

He later admitted "a portion of first principles may be presented in a somewhat different light", the words "may" and "somewhat" being used to minimize the admission of what the brotherhood at that time knew was a fact.

Brother Andrew wrote, "It is further alleged that 'first principles which have been established and settled for forty years are 'recast' and this is adduced as 'proof that there is something unnatural in the argument'. The allegation being untrue, the conclusion based upon it has no weight. **A portion of the 'first principles' may be presented in a somewhat different light, but the only really new items** are a violent death in relation to Edenic disobedience, and the doctrinal aspect of 'the second death.'" (JJ. Andrew, *The Sanctuary Keeper*, July 1894, p. 13).

Finally, the position he moved to, that he did deem strong, differed from brethren J. Thomas and R. Roberts on more than the ER . The difference in positions might be summarized (I may have missed a point or two but this will suffice) as follows:

The Edenic penalty (what *muth temuth* means)

The grave unlocked by Christ's blood?

The Federal relationship with Adam (In Adam, In Christ)

When are we released from 'the law of sin and death'?

What it means to 'put off the old man'

The first and 'second death'

What is a Divine covenant?

The basis of resurrectional responsibility

Was Christ ever a "child of wrath"?

Was Christ alienated from the Father, as the Father's representative, while reconciling the world unto Himself?

Some of these historical differences between the Amended and Unamended are doctrinal. Some of the differences are sometimes simply a matter of expression, and of course, there is a difference in "historical differences" and the differences that greatly varies from individual to individual, based on their own understanding of the Scriptures.

I believe you have made the best of a bad case.

stephen