

Original Message to brother Wayne Tanner

From: steve@genusa.com

Sent: Sunday, September 08, 2002 2:31 AM

To: Wayne R Tanner [mailto:waynet7@juno.com]

Subject: Re: The Soul That Sinneth

Dear brother Tanner,

Greetings in the Hope of Israel.

I would like to let you know that the case laid out in your article "The Soul that Sinneth", stating that **death is hereditary**, is consistent with the Amended book, "Atonement: Salvation Through The Blood Of Christ." Please see the quotations below for proof.

On another topic, you may be interested to read **The 1887 Statement of Faith of the North London Ecclesia , the ecclesia of brother JJ Andrew**. As a leading member of the North London ecclesia, brother Andrew helped draw up this Statement of Faith in 1887 and he met under it till his change of views (in roughly 1892):

<http://www.genusa.com/tw-jja/JJAsSOF.htm>

You might find it useful to compare this SOF with comments made in your letter of May 13th, 1987. Also, you may be interested in having a full chronological summary of the teachings of brethren J. Thomas, R. Roberts and JJ Andrew concerning the judgment of the enlightened rejecter:

http://www.genusa.com/JT_Teachings.pdf (this document is periodically updated). There are other historical documents that may interest you (such as a letter from brother Thomas to A.D. Strickler in 1869 on the topic of the enlightened rejecter) at <http://www.genusa.com/truth/>

But I have digressed. May I summarize your article's inaccuracies? You claimed in your article that

"It has long been a major doctrine among those that subscribe the Amended Birmingham Statement of Faith that God does not visit the consequences of sin upon anyone that has not himself been an active participant in the sin."

And further,

"In addition [to] the above, Brother Graeham Mansfield sometime back published a book entitled 'Atonement: Salvation Through The Blood Of Christ.' Throughout that book, Brother Mansfield clearly demonstrated from the writings of various prominent Amended writers that those Amended writers taught that men are responsible only for their own sins and do not die for Adam's sin."

In contrast, please note:

THE CASE STATED FROM
“ATONEMENT: SALVATION THROUGH THE BLOOD OF CHRIST”

Here is a sampling of what is taught in “Atonement: Salvation Through The Blood Of Christ”. Please note, that the following quotes are simply the result of searching for expositions which directly reference Romans 5:19. There are many other applicable verses (eg. 1st Cor 15:21) and writings that would bear out the same doctrinal position:

1. These things enable us to understand the like figures in the New Testament. **“The body of sin” is “our mortal body”** (Rom. 6:6; 8:11), **mortal because of sin (Rom. 5:12)**. “He hath made him (Christ) to be sin for us who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him” (2 Cor. 5:21). That is, “God sent his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin (R.V. *as an offering* for sin) condemned Sin in the flesh” (Rom. 8:3). (Page 23)
2. Question 8: ***Did this condemnation to death fall on Adam only, or on all his posterity? Answer: On all his posterity also Rom. 5:12, 19.*** (Page 59)
3. **by the mere fact of inheriting his fallen nature they are “made sinners” (verse 19), or placed under “condemnation” (verse 18). These Scriptural truths furnish the only explanation of the death of infants and of others who have “not sinned after the similitude of Adam’s transgression” (verse 14).** (page 90)
4. At the same time, it is obvious from Paul’s treatment of sin in Romans 5, that we are born into a constitution of sin. That, however, is our misfortune not our fault. Paul wrote, *“By one man’s disobedience many were made (Gk. constituted) sinners”* (Rom. 5:19). (Page 191)
5. **1. Death entered the world of mankind by Adam’s disobedience—Romans 5:12, 15; 1 Corinthians 15:22** (Page 220)
6. **Paul’s teaching regarding the cause of man’s condition of suffering and death is simple and conclusive. In Romans 5, he wrote: “Through the offence of one many be dead” (v. 15). “Judgment was by one to condemnation” (v. 16). “By one man’s offence death reigned by one” (v. 17). “By the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation” (v. 18). “By one man’s disobedience many were made sinners” (v. 19). “Sin hath reigned unto death” (v. 21). “Death reigned from Adam to Moses even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam’s transgression” (v. 14).** (Page 245)
7. Paul, in his unerring utterances, throws much light upon the subject. He wrote: “By one man sin entered into the world” (Rom. 5:12). **This is not merely an act of disobedience, but something that resulted from such, and that “entered into the world” (not merely the man) as a result.** What “sin” entered the world consequent upon Adam’s transgression? There is only one possible answer: That which is described as sin in the flesh. Paul referred to it as: “Sin that dwelleth in me” (Rom. 7:20). (Page 246)
8. It is important to understand clearly that in the garden of Eden, sin resulted from “lawlessness”—or, disregard of God’s law (1 John 3:4, R.V.); **and that the result of sin was a changed condition terminating in death. Man was not a death-stricken creature until he sinned. The apostle Paul wrote: “Through one**

- man* sin entered into the world, and death *through* sin ...” The transgression in Eden had immediate effect upon Adam and *all* his progeny—of which, by nature, Jesus Christ was one. “Unto *all* men death passed through ...” (Rom. 5:12, A.V. and Rotherham). This single act of sin on the part of Adam and Eve resulted in a constitutional change which carried through to all their posterity. “Through the disobedience of *the one man*, the many were *constituted* sinners ...” (Romans 5:19, lit. Gk.). (Page 260)**
9. Their relation to *sin* and *death* is thus described: “By one man *sin* entered into the world, and death by sin; and so *death passed upon all men*, for that all have sinned. For until the law sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed when there is no law. Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned *after the likeness of Adam’s transgression*” (Rom. 5:12–14, R.V.). (Page 330)
 10. Sin having entered into the world, and death having passed upon all men (Rom. 5:12), deliverance from death must be according to the Divine prerogative. Just as one born a slave under the State law is only liberated upon the condition which the supreme authority imposes, so deliverance from the *state or constitution of Sin* which passed upon the human race from Adam, can only come on the condition, or conditions, prescribed by the Father. (Page 330)
 11. Just upon the same principle that death passed upon all men on account of one that sinned, so the righteousness of one brings eternal life upon all that believe in Jesus (Rom. 5:12–21). In the one case all men are hopelessly involved in the results of the sin of one man, through no fault of their own (Rom. 8:20). In the other case they become entitled to eternal life through the righteousness of one, by voluntarily confessing their own personal sins and belief in the resurrection of Jesus from the dead (Acts 2:38; 22:16; 8:12). (Page 344)

You may find a full reply to your article at
http://www.genusa.com/tw-jja/WRT_TheSoulThatSinneth.htm or
http://www.genusa.com/tw-jja/WRT_TheSoulThatSinneth.pdf

If you would like to verify the quotations please let me know and I will purchase and send you a copy of 'Atonement: Salvation Through The Blood Of Christ', a 368 page book from Logos Publications. Also, Logos has recently reprinted "The Evil One" which covers the Biblical aspects of "the devil", "sin in the flesh", "the law of sin and death", "the two acceptations of sin" &c.

Fraternally, your brother in Christ,

Stephen

"Only let your conversation be as it becometh the gospel of Christ" (Philippians 1:27)

P.S.

LOGOS PUBLICATIONS produces magazines and books of perpetual value:
<http://www.logos.org.au> Logos also offers a Daily Readings Comments and also Pioneer Reading Comments on email, should you wish to receive either service

Brother Tanner's Response

From: Wayne R Tanner [mailto:waynet7@juno.com]

Sent: Sunday, September 08, 2002 7:58 AM

To: steve@genusa.com

Subject: Re: The Soul That Sinneth

Dear Steve,

Your letter is astonishing. Are you not aware that the very quotations Brother Mansfield made in his book from brethren of the past prove that what I quote proved my contention? All those brethren clearly argued that we are not sinners ourselves until we sin ourselves. They also did clearly state that we do not die because Adam sinned but because we sin ourselves. You cannot deny that my statement was that Brother G. Mansfield demonstrated in that book that those many brethren taught what they did. Are you denying that Brother Roberts taught what I said he did in The Slain Lamb? The quotations are there and are very clear. I don't understand why he made those quotations for Amended Christadelphia to see, but it is good that he did.

So Brother Mansfield took a different slant after making those quotations and taught differently. That would mean only that he disagreed with what those brethren taught. But they did teach it and it was long an Amended doctrine and in some quarters it still is.. That was my point.

A certain segment of the Amended, because of "The Partial Atonement theory" have begun to come out and sound more nearly Unamended than they have in the past as they seek to contend against the theory. It is funny how things like that cause that to happen. Also it could be demonstrated for you that some brethren can be found making statements on both side of the issue at different times.

Again, everything I said in the article is proven to be true. The quotations made from G. Mansfield prove that those brethren taught what I said they did. I will not at the present time take up a dispute with you because my energies for the time being are directed toward the attempt to unite those who disagree. Nothing you have said disproves what I proved, and was that those brethren did teach what I said they did. Brother G. Mansfield's quotations prove it, as do the quotations from the "Slain Lamb"

Also, you must not forget regarding your chronology that Brother Roberts at first believed and wrote that the resurrection of rejectors at the same time as saints in Christ "was inappropriate". But he changed his view on that and other points. Does your information make certain that your readers are in possession of that information?

I will not go to your Web Site. I have no stomach for the further involvement at the present. As I said. my total energies are directed elsewhere at the present and my 73 years tells me to steer clear of involvements that miss the point as I have demonstrated in this letter.

Health and blessings to you, Steve,
Wayne R. Tanner

2nd Response to brother Tanner

From: steve@genusa.com

Sent: Sunday, September 09, 2002 3:46 AM

To: Wayne R Tanner [mailto:waynet7@juno.com]

Subject: Re: The Soul That Sinneth

Greetings brother Tanner and thank you for the response!

1) Are you aware of the fact that the clean-flesh heresy has been the subject of opposition from Central, particularly in Australia in the late 1960's *culminating in the disfellowship* of H. A. Twine and his followers around 1971; and again recently the subject of opposition from the late 1990's (following the death of brother HP Mansfield) onwards? There have been divisions in England just this year over the matter as the clean-flesh teachings of H. Fry (late 1890's-1920's) have resurfaced with the aid of brethren including John Martin, John Knowles, Brian Luke, John Hensley, Richard Stone and others. Are you aware of these facts?

2) Will you please give me *your* definition of the term "clean-flesh"?

3) If it were possible, would you be willing to break bread on brother JJ Andrew's basis of fellowship in 1887 (this was 5 years before he published *Blood of the Covenant*)?

<http://www.genusa.com/tw-jja/JJAsSOF.htm>

4) Do you uphold the same doctrinal positions stated in his ecclesial SOF of 1887? I believe you have referred to the "first 35 years" of ecclesial history as the doctrinal position you maintain. 1887 ought to be pretty close to the end of that 35 years. And the fact that it is brother Andrew's position should be a plus.

Now in response to your last: Please, if I may demonstrate the stated position of my first response from a single quote.

The quote referenced the following verses: Romans 5:14, 18-19 *"...death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression..." "... by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation..." "For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners..."*

Quotation number 3 of 11 was this: *"by the mere fact of inheriting his fallen nature they are 'made sinners' (verse 19), or placed under 'condemnation' (verse 18). These Scriptural truths furnish the only explanation of the death of infants and of others who have 'not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression' (verse 14)." ('Atonement: Salvation Through The Blood Of Christ', page 90)*

What is indicated by this *single* quote from the *Amended* book you referred to?

- 1) Human nature is fallen, hereditary, physical, and Biblically described as 'sin' (the 2nd acceptation of the word 'sin')
- 2) Human nature constitutes us 'sinners' (that is we are under the 'constitution of sin' before personally committing a transgression)
- 3) This sentence of condemnation was the result of Edenic transgression
- 4) Infants die because they inherit that physical sentence (that is they are born with the law of sin and death in their 'members')

Those are all reasonable points to draw from the one quote, and all the more so when you read the other quotes. That is to say, the quotes prove that Amended writers, particularly in the book you referenced, but did not quote from, unanimously teach that the sentence of death is physical and hereditary. And not death only, but the law of sin, which is joined with that law of death inherited from Adam.

Do you believe death is a physical inheritance? So do we. Do you believe death came upon all men, through the sentence of condemnation placed upon Adam? So do we. To insist otherwise, when you have been given proofs, and such direct statements, does you no credit.

You portray to your readers that there are only *two* positions in Christadelphia, which you have always set forth as follows:

Unamended = Thomas Williams/JJ Andrew OR Amended = Clean-Flesh

The reality is that there is another position occupied by many brethren which is as follows:

Amended = The pre-1892 Position of Christadelphia

But why stop at pre-1892? Perhaps you would prefer the 1887 position of brother Andrew? I'd agree to that. Or we can draw it back to 1871 if you like.

I am not claiming that all Amended believe this pre-1892 position. There are some that do not -- just as there are Unamended brethren that do not follow some or all of the 1892 positions of brother Andrew. There are some Unamended brethren that choose to follow A.H. Zilmer (who also taught clean-flesh) when it comes to denying the post-millennial rebellion, whereas other Unamended brethren do believe in a post-millennial rebellion.

Brother Andrew once held *that* pre-1892 position as JJ Andrew's own ecclesial statement of faith in 1887 demonstrates.

<http://www.genusa.com/tw-jja/JJAsSOF.htm> His ecclesial SOF shows that brother Andrew originally believed that 1) light made men responsible to the judgment seat of Christ (bema) 2) that the 'second death' is the sentence placed upon unfaithful saints and enlightened rejecters. We can add the fact that brother Andrew originally believed the law of sin and death was a *physical* and hereditary sentence -- not something removed at baptism except in a provisional, or constitutional, sense -- as in having a "right to the tree of life" but not being in actual possession of it (which would have physical consequences). I refer you also to *The Real Christ* by brother Andrew, recommended at the time by brother R. Roberts, in which brother Andrew taught the

enlightened rejecter and also his pre-1892 position concerning 'the law of sin and death'. **Ironically, this book by brother Andrew has been republished by the Berean (Amended) community because it represents pre-1892 teaching on Christ and the atonement.** Also, I commend to your perusal a series of article appearing in *The Ambassador*, 1867 by brother JJ Andrew on The Judgment Seat of Christ. I think you will find those articles enlightening.

As to the quote from "The Christadelphian", I discussed that in my full response posted on my web site, and referenced in the email sent to you. I would be the last one to defend "The Christadelphian" magazine. However, you could have chosen a better quote than the one you did. *The quotation you gave is inherently contradictory and therefore not the best statement to use.*

Furthermore, "The Christadelphian" magazine today is no more the spokesman for the Amended community, than "The Shofar" is for the Unamended community. "The Christadelphian" magazine represents that section of the Amended community which has clean-flesh tendencies just as "The Shofar" has its own tendencies and readership.

Brother Tanner you charge me with creating a paper-tiger. What "paper-tiger" did I create in my response? It is your paper-tiger argument I addressed in the first place, though I was kind enough to address it directly, without feeling the need to label it as such. 1) It was your misrepresentation of the Amended community which caused me to respond. 2) It was your misportrayal particularly of the Logos portion of the community as clean-fleshers. I might again refer you to my web site which has much historical information and expositions directed against clean-flesh. 3) It was your misrepresentation claiming we deny that mortality is a hereditary and physical principle of the body. I could go back and show where some Unamended brethren thought Saddam Hussein was the Gogian power! Does this prove that *all* Unamended brethren believed such a doctrine? I think not. In fact one could go back to old Unamended magazines and find a number of failed prophetic viewpoints -- yet it would be wrong to represent the entire UA community as having subscribed to those viewpoints.

Finally brother Tanner, knowledge makes saints responsible to live and behave as becometh saints. The principle stated by James is appropriate: "Therefore to him that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin." And from Titus we are exhorted to have "Sound speech, that cannot be condemned" You said in your first response that you had "no stomach for the [sic] further involvement at the present". Yet, if I may point out, you had the 'stomach' to misrepresent. I pray you may see your way clear.

Fraternally, your brother in Christ,

stephen

<http://www.genusa.com/truth/>

2nd Response to brother Tanner – Quotes

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

From: steve@genusa.com

Sent: Sunday, September 09, 2002 3:49 AM

To: Wayne R Tanner [mailto:waynet7@juno.com]

Subject: Re: Pre-1892 Quotations from brother JJ Andrew

Brother Tanner,

I want to provide you with some reference material referred to in my last message. Please let me know what you think about these quotations from brother JJ Andrew.

Fraternally, your brother in Christ,

stephen

"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).

“Resurrection of two classes. It is contended by many that the resurrection at the second advent comprises only one class – the righteous; but we think the scripture testimony already produced is quite sufficient to disprove this theory... A parallel passage to this is to be found in John v, 28, where we read that Jesus said ‘Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the grave shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation.’ **The ‘all’ here mentioned, are of course, not all mankind, but only that portion amenable to judgment – those who have become responsible to God by a knowledge of his law or truth.** Some of them will have been sufficiently obedient to entitle them to be called righteous... But there will be others who have been disobedient, and, therefore, deserving of punishment; of these, Jesus says 'They that have done evil (shall come forth) unto the resurrection of damnation'. Thus we see there are two classes comprised in this prediction about the resurrection.... This being so, how can this plain passage be reconciled with the theory which places the resurrection of the righteous at the beginning of the millennium, and the resurrection of the wicked at the end?... If further testimony be required from the mouth of Jesus, we cannot do better than refer to his description of the dividing of the sheep and goats. There can be no doubt that this takes place previous to the millennium, because the sheep are invited to enter the kingdom of the age to come, and the wicked are condemned to partake of the punishment preceding that age... The sentence pronounced upon this slothful servant is worded almost precisely the same as that against the unprofitable servant; and it shows, that at the second advent of the Master of God’s household punishment will be inflicted on those servants who have slumbered or are slumbering when he comes. In order that this may be done, those who have died must be raised from the dead, and the living must be brought **before the judgment-seat...** In the parable of the tares... **‘The tares,’ we are told, ‘are the children of the wicked one,’ – a phrase which comprises, not only**

unbelieving adversaries, but also all believers who are not faithful to their master; for Jesus says, 'He that is not with me is against me'... we may conclude the burning of the tares *immediately precedes* the glories of the millennial age." (JJ Andrew, *The Ambassador*, December, 1867)

"It is apparent that those who sin in the clear light of knowledge do so under far greater responsibilities than those who sin in ignorance." (JJ Andrew, *The Ambassador*, January, 1868)

"But where no law is there is no transgression. Sin is not imputed when there is no law – for man that understandeth not is like the beasts that perish; hence those only who have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law – that the law of righteousness required by God during the dispensation in which each individual has lived." (JJ Andrew, *The Ambassador*, May, 1868)

"(Your correspondent) has evidently not perused the writings of **Christadelphians** carefully, or he would never have asserted that they believe in the resurrection of 'the whole family of man'...On the contrary they **believe that only a portion of the human race will be raised from the dead-that portion which is responsible by a knowledge of God's truth**" (JJ Andrew, *The Christadelphian*, Jan. 1871, p. 93).

"Daniel (Dan 12:2), in harmony with other prophets predicts that only some, or 'many of them that sleep... shall awake.' **The 'many' will comprise all those who, by a knowledge of God's revealed truth, have been brought into a state of responsibility, from the time of Abel to the second appearing of Jesus Christ.** To the faithful portion, styled by Daniel, 'the wise,' resurrection is all-important: it is the gate from the prison-house of the grave to eternal life: without it, they would like the heathen, become 'as though they had not been" (JJ Andrew, *The Real Christ*, pp. 174-175).

"Brother [JJ] Andrew reminds the Editor that writing on the same subject in *The Herald* Dr. Thomas says, 'We believe that the Scriptures teach the resurrection of the just and the unjust, who have died under times of knowledge, whose knowledge they have accepted; and the resurrection a thousand years afterwards of 'the rest of the dead' who have intelligently rejected it. The rest of the dead are those who never come under a constitution of righteousness; not because they did not know, but because they refused to do so. Having been enlightened, but preferring darkness to light, they will arise to judgment at the end of the millennium.'" (*The Christadelphian*, 1870, p. 186— Vol. 5, No. 7, p. 161)"

"That resurrection affects those only who are responsible to God by a knowledge of His revealed will; that all these, whether just or unjust, faithful or unfaithful, will be raised from the dead at the Second Appearing of Jesus Christ, and will, with the living, appear in a corruptible nature, before the judgment-seat of Christ, to give an account of themselves, and to receive in body according to that which they have done, whether it be good or bad. Acts xxiv.15; Rom. v. 13; Isa xxvi. 13-14; Rev. xi. 18; 2 Tim. iv. 1; Rom. xiv. 10-12; 2 Cor. v. 10" (Statement of Faith Published by The North London Ecclesia, Upper Street, Islington, London, January 1887, Item #5; Authored in part by brother JJ Andrew; See also The Christadelphian, 1894, p. 200, line 6 for comments upon this)

... And Years Later... 1892-93

"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'... **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).

Brother Tanner's 2nd Response

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

From: Wayne R Tanner [<mailto:waynet7@juno.com>]

Sent: Monday, September 09, 2002 9:01 AM

To: steve@genusa.com

Cc: robmil42@hotmail.com; sammil@citlink.net; ecclesia@jayeftparkers.ca; SSh9988744@aol.com; vhusted@jam.rr.com; gcnicholson@attglobal.net; SmommaS@aol.com; mjasionowski@hotmail.com; mac.briley@worldnet.att.net; washecks@juno.com; pellucidar@juno.com; osp@netinc.ca; pkpuffin@hotmail.com; vreed@flash.net; muddmdl@aol.com; gpl@acay.com.au; gerlsuzesankey@yahoo.com; burnsrusa@netscape.net; 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: Pre 1892 Quotations from brother JJ Andrew

Dear Steve,

I clearly informed you in my response that I would not enter into dialog with you at the time being. I told you that for the time being my energies will be directed toward the NASU matter. In addition I am due in the near future to give a series of three lectures at a gathering. I cannot allow you to distract me at present. For that reason I will not even read your correspondence. I glanced at a couple of paragraphs only and saw that you were quoting from Brother Andrew.

Allow me to say that back before the 1890's the brethren, although they were of different opinions as to the basis of resurrection, all believed it was inappropriate that the so-called rejecter would rise at the return of Jesus. Both Brother Andrew and Brother Robert's shifted their position some and in addition Brother Roberts blamed Brother Andrew for believing and teaching what he himself had formerly taught.

One more thing I will say in view of your first letter is that you surely must be aware that most Amended members view the matter you quoted from Brother Mansfield's work as being taken care of by obtaining immortality at Christ's return and has no relevance to baptism. You surely know that in their defense Amended members have always emphasized that Jesus only offered on the cross for his sin nature and their emphases has never had anything to do with baptism relative to sin nature. You know also that has been the traditional difference between Amended and Unamended members. I saw no reference to what you sent that applied to baptism as accomplishing the figurative remedy that allows a condemned, unclean individual to communicate and be in covenant with God through the time of probation. Therefore, you quotations from G. Mansfield do not accomplish what you had hoped they would. For that reason I consider your effort to distract me to be redundant, a communication into which I will not enter. Forgive me if I am too blunt.

In hope of eternal live,

Wayne

3rd Response to brother Tanner

From: Wayne R Tanner [<mailto:waynet7@juno.com>]

Sent: Monday, September 09, 2002 11:12 AM

To: steve@genusa.com

Subject: Re: Pre 1892 Quotations from brother JJ Andrew

Dear brother Tanner,

You wrote:

"I cannot allow you to distract me at present. For that reason I will not even read your correspondence. I glanced at a couple of paragraphs only"

Thank you again for the response. I understand from your two previous emails that you do not want to enter into a dialog. That is fine. It's unfortunate you have time to respond but no time to read responses, but I understand you have other responsibilities, and as Christ truly said, "the labourers *are* few".

You wrote,

"Allow me to say that back before the 1890's the brethren, although they were of different opinions as to the basis of resurrection, all believed it was inappropriate that the so-called rejecter would rise at the return"

Ironically, *brother Andrew did not think it inappropriate* (a phrase borrowed from Christendom Astray -- originally written in 1862 under the title "Twelve Lectures" - - roughly 10 years before brother Roberts moved the "so-called" ER to the bema). Nor did brother Thomas beginning in 1861. Nor did brother Roberts beginning around 1871 (concurring with the final visit of JT to England). If you would prefer photocopies of the original articles please let me know. I think having copies of the originals have great historical value -- particularly when a brother is going to make representations of that history to other brethren.

Brother Andrew's quotations indicate he understood it was premillennial at least 4 years before brother R. Roberts did. If I may, let me quote brother Andrew specifically:

"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" (JJ. Andrew, The Ambassador, 1867, p. 234).

"It is contended by many that the resurrection at the second advent comprises only one class – the righteous; but we think the scripture

testimony already produced is quite sufficient to disprove this theory... 'The tares,' we are told, 'are the children of the wicked one,' – a phrase which comprises, not only unbelieving adversaries, but also all believers who are not faithful to their master; for Jesus says, 'He that is not with me is against me'... **we may conclude the burning of the tares immediately precedes the glories of the millennial age.**" (JJ Andrew, The Ambassador, December, 1867)

"Daniel (Dan 12:2), in harmony with other prophets predicts that only some, or '**many of them that sleep... shall awake.**' The 'many' will comprise all those who, by a knowledge of God's revealed truth, have been brought into a state of responsibility, from the time of Abel **to the second appearing of Jesus Christ.**" (JJ Andrew, *The Real Christ*, pp. 174-175)

"That resurrection affects those only who are responsible to God by a knowledge of His revealed will; that all these, whether just or unjust, faithful or unfaithful, **will be raised from the dead at the Second Appearing of Jesus Christ, and will, with the living, appear in a corruptible nature, before the judgment-seat of Christ, to give an account of themselves,** and to receive in body according to that which they have done, whether it be good or bad. Acts xxiv.15; Rom. v. 13; Isa xxvi. 13-14; Rev. xi. 18; 2 Tim. iv. 1; Rom. xiv. 10-12; 2 Cor. v. 10"
(**Statement of Faith Published by The North London Ecclesia**, Upper Street, Islington, London, January 1887, Item #5; Authored in part by brother JJ Andrew; See also The Christadelphian, 1894, p. 200, line 6 for comments upon this)

You may find chronological summaries of brother J. Thomas, R. Roberts and JJ Andrew at

http://www.genusa.com/JT_Teachings.pdf **This document details why the ER was originally put at the post-millennial judgment-seat and when and why it was changed to premillennial.** You can find a summary image of brother Thomas' teachings here: http://www.genusa.com/Truth/jt_Summary1.jpg The proofs, in the form of over 60 quotations from JT, spanning 1835 to his death in 1871, are located in the PDF document. I can convert that to HTML if you prefer that format.

You wrote,

"One more thing I will say in view of your first letter is that you surely must be aware that most Amended members view the matter you quoted from Brother Mansfield's work as being taken care of by obtaining immortality at Christ's return and has no relevance to baptism. "

This is another misrepresentation. **We absolutely recognize the vital (ie. life and death) importance and relationship of baptism to the gospel; to the Abrahamic covenants; to the sacrifice of Christ; to the resurrection &c.**

Would you like me to quote proofs from the same book you referenced on the subject of baptism? Or are you out of time?

You wrote,

"You surely know that in their defense Amended members have always emphasized that Jesus only offered on the cross for his sin nature and their emphases has never had anything to do with baptism relative to sin nature."

Excuse me brother Tanner, but that is untrue. **Can you point me to a single quote in the book referenced which claims baptism does not have "anything to do" relative "to sin nature"?** On the contrary, the book teaches, as most Amended publications would, that baptism is the first public act of obedience, following belief of the gospel, by which the individual's sin nature -- a physical constitution of 'sin and death' -- may be changed. Through baptism the individual lives in hope of *the* resurrection, being of the seed of Abraham.

Finally, you wrote,

I saw no reference to what you sent that applied to baptism as accomplishing the figurative remedy that allows a condemned, unclean individual to communicate and be in covenant with God through the time of probation.

This argument is a non sequitur. That is, you claim that because you've seen no reference to a particular doctrine, therefore we must not teach it. **I specifically addressed Romans 5:19 since that was the specific doctrine you challenged.** If you had challenged our position on the Abrahamic covenant, I would have addressed that and provided relevant quotes.

On the one hand you do not want to engage in a dialog. On the other hand you misrepresent the Amended community in each response. It is fair to ask have you properly represented brother Andrew's writings? *If not, then how will you handle those you have spent most of your life opposing?*

If you would like to continue the dialog, if you will, in your next response please address these questions:

1) Are you aware of the fact that the clean-flesh heresy has been the subject of opposition from Central, particularly in Australia in the late 1960's *culminating in the disfellowship* of H. A. Twine and his followers around 1971; and again recently the subject of opposition from the late 1990's (following the death of brother HP Mansfield) onwards? There have been divisions in England just this year over the matter as the clean-flesh teachings of H. Fry (late 1890's-1920's) have resurfaced with the aid of brethren including John Martin, John Knowles, Brian Luke, John Hensley, Richard Stone and others. Are you aware of these facts?

2) Will you please give me *your* definition of the term "clean-flesh"?

3) If it were possible, would you be willing to break bread on brother JJ Andrew's basis of fellowship in 1887 (this was 5 years before he published *Blood of the Covenant*)?

<http://www.genusa.com/tw-jja/JJAsSOF.htm>

4) Do you uphold the same doctrinal positions stated in his ecclesial SOF of 1887? I believe you have referred to the "first 35 years" of ecclesial history as the doctrinal position you maintain. 1887 ought to be pretty close to the end of that 35 years. And the fact that it is brother Andrew's position should be a plus.

Fraternally, your brother in Christ,

Stephen

Summary of Logic Errors brother Tanner engaged in:

<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fallacy Of Extension (Straw Man) – “attacking an exaggerated or caricatured version of your opponent’s position.”</p> <p style="text-align: center;">And</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Error Of Fact</p>	<p>You “surely must be aware that most Amended members view the matter you quoted” “It has long been a major doctrine among those that subscribe the Amended Birmingham Statement of Faith that God does not visit the consequences of sin upon anyone that has not himself been an active participant in the sin.” “Since it is so strongly asserted in the official Amended doctrine that God would never punish with death anyone that was not an active participant in a particular sin.” “surely must be aware that most Amended members view the matter you quoted” “Allow me to say that back before the 1890’s the brethren, although they were of different opinions as to the basis of resurrection, all believed it was inappropriate that the so-called rejecter would rise at the return of Jesus.” “It has long been a major doctrine among those that subscribe the Amended Birmingham Statement of Faith that God does not visit the consequences of sin upon anyone that has not himself been an active participant in the sin.” “Since it is so strongly asserted in the official Amended doctrine that God would never punish with death anyone that was not an active participant in a particular sin.”</p>
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Argument By Emotive Language (Appeal To The People) – “using emotionally loaded words to sway the audience’s sentiments instead of their minds.”</p>	<p>“surely must be aware that most Amended” “It has long been a major doctrine among those that subscribe the Amended Birmingham Statement of Faith” “Since it is so strongly asserted...”</p>
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Begging The Question (Assuming The Answer) – “reasoning in a circle with no proof”</p>	<p>“Again, everything I said in the article is proven to be true.” “Nothing you have said disproves what I proved, and was that those brethren did teach what I said they did.”</p>
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Non Sequitur – something that just does not logically follow</p>	<p>“I saw no reference to what you sent that applied to baptism”... Therefore, you quotations from G. Mansfield do not accomplish what you had hoped they would.”</p>
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Moving The Goalposts – if your opponent successfully addresses some point, then say he must also address some further point</p>	<p>“I saw no reference to what you sent that applied to baptism as accomplishing the figurative remedy that allows a condemned, unclean individual to communicate and be in covenant with God through the time of probation.”</p> <p>Refer to the original goalposts:</p> <p>“It has long been a major doctrine among those that subscribe the Amended Birmingham Statement of Faith that God does not visit the consequences of sin upon anyone that has not himself been an active participant in the sin.”</p> <p>” ‘Atonement: Salvation Through The Blood Of Christ’... clearly demonstrated from the writings of various prominent Amended writers that those Amended writers taught that men are responsible only for their own sins and do not die for Adam’s sin.”</p>

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Excluded Middle (False Dichotomy) – “assuming there are only two alternatives when in fact there are more.”	Unamended = JJA & TW OR Amended = Clean-flesh 3 rd : Amended = Pre-1892 anti-clean-flesh
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Changing The Subject – “used to avoid having to defend a claim. It is connected to various rhetorical tricks, such as announcing that there cannot be a question period because the speaker must leave – though they usually do not.”	“I will not go to your Web Site. I have no stomach for the further involvement at the present. As I said. my total energies are directed elsewhere at the present and my 73 years tells me to steer clear of involvements that miss the point as I have demonstrated in this letter.” “I clearly informed you in my response that I would not enter into dialog with you at the time being. I told you that for the time being my energies will be directed toward the NASU matter. In addition I am due in the near future to give a series of three lectures at a gathering. I cannot allow you to distract me at present. For that reason I will not even read your correspondence. I glanced at a couple of paragraphs only and saw that you were quoting from Brother Andrew.”
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ambiguous Assertion – “statements made are not sufficiently clear so that it leaves some sort of leeway”	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Argument By Generalization – “drawing a broad conclusion from a small number of perhaps unrepresentative cases”	“In fact, as recently as February, 2002, <u>The Christadelphian Magazine</u> on Page 50 published an article entitled ‘Questions From The Mission Field’.”
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Argument By Selective Observation – “counting the hits and forgetting the misses”	“Again, everything I said in the article is proven to be true.” “Nothing you have said disproves what I proved, and was that those brethren did teach what I said they did.” See: Moving the Goalposts
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ad Hominem – “attacking the person instead of attacking his argument”	“For that reason I consider your effort to distract me to be redundant, a communication into which I will not enter.”

Misc: Ad hominem Attacks from Unamended Correspondants

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

From: Stephen Genusa [mailto:steve@genusa.com]
Sent: Monday, September 09, 2002 11:57 AM
To: 'James F. Connelly'
Subject: RE: Pre 1892 Quotations from brother JJ Andrew

I never said what they wrote was "the gospel". They are expositions of the gospel. Would you please bear that difference in mind when writing me?

Don't you find it interesting that brother Andrew also taught the enlightened rejecter, and that he had him appearing at the bema, and that he made this a matter of fellowship in 1887, 5 years before Blood of the Covenant was written?

stephen

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

From: James F. Connelly [mailto:jimdolly@ev1.net]
Sent: Monday, September 09, 2002 11:39 AM
To: Stephen Genusa
Subject: Re: Pre 1892 Quotations from brother JJ Andrew

I feel that Robert Roberts, John Thomas and all the others have had their say. I do not, nor have I ever felt that they are "the gospel". Some of the brotherhood feel they are "the gospel". However, I will continue to put my faith in the Gospel.

Do not send me any further info. Jim.