

Critique and Credibility

„What They Said Would Happen“ My Response to Aleck Crawford’s Critique

I thank Aleck for his critique of my booklet, ‘**What they said would Happen.**’ We must be accountable for what we say or write. However, his critique raises questions of credibility.

I invite the interested reader to examine Aleck Crawford’s critique and then my response. If further clarification is required please feel free to contact me.

The issues are addressed in the following order:

1. Preaching another gospel.
2. Preconceived ideas.
3. Dr Thomas – inspired.
4. Myth
5. Radicals
6. C.P. Wauchope
7. Ireland.
8. The Early Christians
9. John Thomas a False Prophet
10. Gods once ‘animal men.’
11. Angels and creation.
12. Christianity a ‘Now’ religion
13. The resurrection
14. Judgment
15. Russia to control European countries
16. Is this the hope of Israel?
17. Animal sacrifices
18. Thomas a plagiarist
19. Roger Stokes
20. Saints (immortalized Christadelphians)
21. Two Gogues
22. Conclusion
23. Mormonism
24. Wrested Scriptures
25. The Issue

In his preface Aleck quotes Galatians 1:8,9, which refers to ‘**preaching another gospel,**’ and asks, ‘Does the Bible teach the same first principles of the gospel as that which Christadelphians teach?’

Lets see Gal 1:8-9 in it’s context.

***‘Paul, an apostle, (not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead;)
And all the brethren which are with me, unto the churches of Galatia:
Grace be to you and peace from God the Father, and from our Lord Jesus Christ,
Who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil world, according to the will of God and our Father:
To whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen.
I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel:
Which is not another; but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ.
But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed.’***

Its important to know the original from which the ‘other’ gospel deviated.

According to the context it is the gospel (Good News) of **'grace and peace from God the Father, and from our Lord Jesus Christ who gave himself for our sins ...'**

This is confirmed in chapter 2:20 and 6:14 where the apostle shares his response to the gospel: ***'I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.'*** 2:20

'God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me and I unto the world.' 6:14

Please note these vital words: ***'I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel.'***

For the apostle, ***'the grace of Christ'*** is the 'Good News.' Elsewhere the apostle says, ***'For by grace are ye saved.'*** Ephesians 2:1-8.

Aleck asks: 'Does the Bible teach the same first principles of the gospel as that which Christadelphians teach?' The context of Galatians 1 indicates that the original gospel of the Bible is very different to that which Christadelphians teach.

Three points need to be stressed about 'preaching another gospel':

1. There isn't another gospel. The apostle states: ***'Which is not another; but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ.'***

Any thing other than the 'grace of Christ' is not 'a gospel.'

2. The gospel is 'the gospel of Christ.' Its all about Christ. It is ***'the grace of Christ'*** as stated by the apostle.
3. The 'other gospel' is condemned. Those who promote it are under the 'anathema' of God.

'Let him be accursed' is the apostolic denouncement. God is insulted and angered when anything other than ***'the grace of Christ'*** is presented.

Where does that leave Aleck?

Aleck speaks of preconceived ideas. Is there a Christadelphian who comes to the Bible with no 'pre-conceived ideas'?

Do not the teachings of John Thomas (like those of Joseph Smith, Charles Taze Russell, Herbert W. Armstrong of other exclusive groups) determine the preconception of Christadelphians?

Christadelphians that I've met 'earnestly contend' for the teachings of John Thomas and Robert Roberts whom they hail as 'pioneers.'

Aleck then grants concessions to Christadelphians and to Dr John Thomas. Indeed, 'all men make mistakes.'

However, there's one mistake that God does not excuse — falsely predicting the future. Deuteronomy 18:20-22

Dr. Thomas — Inspired Aleck writes: ‘Unlike the Catholics which claim the Pope is infallible in his pronouncements if he speaks ex-cathedra or Mormons who claim God speaks through their spirit-guided president or Evangelicals who claim to be guided by the Holy Spirit or Pentecostals who claim to have one or more of the Holy Spirit Gifts or Jehovah's Witnesses who claim God speaks through the organisation, Christadelphians do not claim to have the spirit, nor do they claim God speaks through them. John Thomas never claimed to be a prophet and no balanced Christadelphian would claim this for him.’

Consider some claims made by Christadelphians for the writings of John Thomas and Robert Roberts:

‘These books, and no one can disprove the statement, reveal to us, as no other writings in existence do, the way of salvation —they enlighten, and create faith ---solve problems and thresh out difficulties which perplex and baffle the ordinary man — reach an altitude in understanding which none of us, ere Christ comes, can ever expect to reach, let alone excel. Emphatically we can say of the authors of these books, “These men are the servants of the most high God, who show us the way of salvation.” (Cover of Christadelphian Instructor.)

Of John Thomas, Robert Roberts writes: ‘...but for John Thomas, those who now rejoice in the truth, would still have been sitting, like the rest of the world, in “darkness and the shadow of death”’. Dr. Thomas: His life and Work.

While lip service is paid to the Bible, really two authorities have existed. I quote: If such works as "Elpis Israel" and "Eureka" are neglected an essential foundation for individual research and investigation is lacking', Christadelphian Standards, p. 104. 'Let us also treat with scorn any suggestion to hide or shelve the works of Bro. Thomas and Bro. Roberts', Christadelphian Standards, p. 52.

See also ‘A Glance At The History and Mystery of Christadelphianism.’ Web <http://www.netcomuk.co.uk/~pdover/histmyst.htm>

Myth. Aleck refers to ‘pagan mythology.’ **Was ever a greater myth imagined than animal like beings from other spheres becoming ‘Gods’ and creators? — also the anticipation of humans becoming ‘ELOHIM – mighty in strength and framers of new worlds?’** See P.187, Elpis Israel.

Radicals. Aleck then passes off the blunders of chronological dating to ‘radical members.’ **How do I know that Aleck isn’t a ‘radical member’?**

Was it not John Thomas, himself, and Robert Roberts who set dates for the Second Advent and commencement of the millennium?

Roberts castigated date setters before him, inferring that they didn’t know the mind of God and then set his own date that failed.

What about H. Fry who wrote in 1919: ‘The 1335, starting from the same event and ending 1942, will probably see Daniel standing on his lot or portion possessing either eternal life or his portion in the land, the kingdom of God being established. A great work will have to be accomplished before the possession of his allotted portion in the land, which means that Christ’s coming to the saints may now be at any time.’ (The king of the North, H. Fry. P.31)

Where does it end? Thomas said 1868, Roberts, 1910, Wauchope 1934, Fry 1942! (*Anastasis p. 20*)

Like the Watchtower Society, Herbert Armstrong and others Christadelphians have sensationalised predictions and lured unwary folk into their exclusive system of false belief which they label 'truth.'

Division. Who are these radicals of whom Aleck speaks? Christadelphians have publicly denounced churches for their divisions. How often did we see their advertisements — 'Can a divided Christendom save? --- One God many churches — Why? **Why are Christadelphians so divided?**

C.P. Wauchope

Please read carefully

Aleck writes: 'Hutchinson spends a whole page on C. P. Wauchope. However, C. P. Wauchope made predictions of his own that did not agree with general Christadelphian understanding. In fact I don't know anyone who shared his views. Many communities have a few radical individual members who sometimes promote their own ideas after the manner of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram (Numbers 16). It is uncharitable of Hutchinson not to recognise that fact. The interest of Christadelphians in the report in Hansard was because the second coming of the Lord Jesus Christ was put before the Australian parliament.'

Facts for Aleck: C.P. Wauchope was a world recognized Christadelphian lecturer. He lived in Adelaide and belonged to the 'Shield' Christadelphians - the main body of the sect.

In the commemorative publication 'A History of 100 years of the Adelaide Christadelphian Ecclesia,' prominence is given to the name of C.P. Wauchope and his association with the Christadelphian synagogue.

In the new 'temple' we read that the first public lecture was given by Bro. J. Broadbridge and this was followed by a series of 4 lectures on "Christadelphian beliefs' by Bro. C.P. Wauchope. P.22

'The walls of the temple were finally topped in July 1927. Bro C.P. Wauchope was invited – to lay the last brick.' P.23

'In 1925, Bro. & Sis Wauchope visited ecclesias in New Zealand, Canada, the United States, and the United Kingdom as part of a "peace and unity' movement. P. 49

'To further the Peace efforts of the Adelaide ecclesia, 10,000 "Appeals' and 'Brochures' were distributed throughout the world. Also Bro.& Sis. Wauchope travelled through North New Zealand, Canada, a small part of the U.S.A. and Britain. They knew that a 'disease of division and disfellowship which for 40 years had torn and disrupted the Brotherhood' could not be healed quickly.' P.50

'1930 — Bro & Sis Wauchope again visit Canada and Britain to further the work of the Peace Movement. P.50

1931 —Following the return of Bro. & Sis. Wauchope after nearly 18 months abroad, Bro Mansfield reports: The matter of teaching and instilling upon the minds of the Brotherhood the correct biblical meaning of fellowship was an extremely hard task to follow...' P.51

Hardly the role of 'a radical individual promoting his own ideas after the manner of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram'!!!

What can we believe of Aleck Crawford when He says of C.P. Wauchope: 'In fact I don't know anyone who shared his views?' – and brands him a radical individual?

Parliament Misled.

Aleck says, ‘The interest of Christadelphians in the report in Hansard was because the second coming of the Lord Jesus Christ was put before the Australian parliament.’

Misleading parliament is a serious offence. In 1921 a politician gave a speech to the Federal Parliament of Australia based on the prophecies of C.P. Wauchope.

Walter Marks’ speech (recorded in Hansard and featured in trutheternal.org) was applauded by the Christadelphians and published under the title, ‘The Sensational Speech.’ However, subsequent events revealed that the Australian parliament had been seriously misled by false prophecy.

Marks stated: ‘The next war, which is the Armageddon, will happen in the year 1934.’

‘Three nations will attack the British Empire. Two of those nations I am going to name now, and the third I would rather not name. The two nations are Russia and Germany, who, combined with the other (France), will be at war with the British Empire in Palestine.’

‘When Christ re-appears, it is said it will be on the spot on which he left the earth, just east of Jerusalem, and in the robe of a tattered beggar and thief. That means that he will quietly and silently come into the British headquarters. There will be great storms, tempests deluge and fire — no doubt from the air — coming down and wiping out the army opposing us. The British nation from the start has been one of the main — I hardly know how to express it — but has been ordained by the Almighty to take this part on Christ’s final return to earth.’

‘Nothing can ever undermine the British Empire to our utter destruction, because it is marked out, and our name is marked out on His final coming, to play a great part.

‘Without us he cannot return in 1934. We play a great part in those ‘latter days’, ‘the time of the end’. The British Empire has always been a refuge for the oppressed people.’

‘Mr Wauchope, of Adelaide, has written two books, which I ask honourable members to buy; one is entitled “The Troubled Nations”, and the other contains “Four Letters on Armageddon”; and when honourable members have read them I think they will agree with what I say.’

‘The king of England is specifically mentioned as coming in his ship and on bended knees offering his own crown to Christ. The other kings do not voluntarily offer their crowns, but are compelled to do so.’

‘This book tells me that the kingdom for which we pray every day will be here in 1934, and so far as men have followed up this prophecy can ascertain, there is not one cog of any great event which has gone out of its place in nearly 2000 years.’

‘Whether or not the conference at Washington will be a success we cannot at present say, but I will agree with the Leader of the Opposition that there is to be no war in the Pacific. The war is to be where it has always been — in Europe and the Mediterranean. There is no reference wherever in this prophecy to a war in the Pacific. We cannot wipe out our armies and navies altogether, because in thirteen years’ time we have to play a great part. I do not say that colossal expenditure should be incurred to-day, or for the next few years, on great armies and navies, but the British Empire must, under Christ’s direction, keep her army and navy up to a certain level in readiness for the great day.’

‘So far as we can see, the Japanese will not invade Australia. As a matter of fact, many believe that, according to the Bible, great numbers of Japanese and Chinese, on Christ’s return — the millennium following Armageddon — are to go to Palestine with Christ and the Jews, because the Japanese have always been looked upon as a people who are immortal.

Honourable members are aware that the Japanese love to fight, and enter battle without fear or misgiving, because they know that on their death they will go straight to Paradise. They look to a higher future, and, so far as we can ascertain, they will, at the millennium, go into Palestine with Christ.’

‘I could go on for some hours on this subject, which is highly interesting, because it has, in my opinion, a vital bearing upon the matters in regard to which this parliament has to legislate.’

This is very serious. Not only did Walter Marks discredit himself and the Christadelphians in his statements to the Australian Parliament he claimed that his deductions were based on the Bible whereas they came from the books of C.P. Wauchope, a leading figure in Christadelphia.

Parliament was misled – and so were Australian people who listened to sensational prophecies by Christadelphians.

Cover up — Reprint. Aleck tries to excuse what has been done. I acknowledged the ‘Note to the 1951 edition of Christendom Astray which explained that ‘The whole of chapter 16, on the “Evidence that the End is Near”, has been deleted.’

However, in the passage of concern in Elpis Israel, sentences have been deleted without acknowledgment to conceal a glaring false prediction.

Aleck quotes from my article but ignores two of the vital sentences that I underlined. i.e., ‘**The Russian fleet of forty ships in the Black Sea is in preparation for this event.**’ Why does he ignore the other sentences?

When these sentences are deleted a casual reader would miss the failure.

Christadelphians have recently published a colourful covered edition of EI and omit the embarrassing words — also the copies that I have — 1939, 1949 and 1983 footnote other things but not the deleted sentences.

Why are the crucial sentences deleted from so many of the more recent editions??

What I would like to know is this: Whether the sentences are omitted or not what is Aleck doing about the failed prediction? It failed before the eyes of Dr Thomas – and then he continued to make even more false predictions!

Regarding Christendom Astray and the 16th chapter, Aleck says that Logos has reprinted it in the original. May I ask from whom it is available? I tried for many years without success to get a copy of CA, which included the 16th Chapter.

I said a lot more about the 16th chapter of C.A. than the failed date and I invite all honest evaluators to read pages 3-5 in my booklet ‘What They said Would Happen.’ Please write for a free copy or see trutheternal.org.

Its all very well for Robert Roberts to say that there had been a failure. **What else could he say?** And, what about his ruthless castigation of those who failed before him?

Ireland. At this point I’m calling Aleck’s honesty into question. Is he saying that there were no failed predictions concerning Ireland? I documented the failed prophecy of Ireland in ‘What They said Would Happen’ on the website ‘The Investigator.’ My booklet on the ‘trutheternal’ site simply referred to the failed prediction for sake of space.

Aleck, you surely know about the failed prophecy and are critical of me for not supplying the quote. Would you please print it in full on your own site.

For Aleck to consider.

In 1848 Dr. Thomas wrote:

The judgment upon Ireland has been sitting since 1786. That crisis was the beginning of a retribution of seventy-five years. This period is called ‘THE END’ — the end of the last period, of

the continuance of modern Europe, as organised into ten kingdoms, and the "Holy Roman Empire" in the days of Charlemagne. A.D. 1786 was the beginning of the end, 1848 the concluding of the end, and 1864 the termination of the period. The events of these seventy-five years are the fulfillment of the following words concerning modern Europe: 'The Judgment shall sit and they shall take away of his (the Little Horn's or Holy Roman) dominion, to consume and destroy it to the end.' ... After 1864 Ireland and the rest of the world will enter upon a new era, in which peace, righteousness, and blessedness will reign in the midst of the nations. (Gospel Banner November 1864)

Speaking of the resurrection of Daniel the prophet, Dr. Thomas wrote in 1854 in his Exposition of Prophecy titled *Anatolia*:

But in a few years, that is, about 1866, when the 1335 years terminate, he will 'arise to his inheritance' in the Kingdom of God. (Anatolia, 1854, p. 97)

Then for 40 years the resurrected "saints" would "execute vengeance upon the nations":

How highly important is this exhortation now, seeing that in about a dozen years the resurrection will have transpired, and no further invitation to inherit it be presented to the world. The glory that shall follow is great for the approved. The world is theirs, when all nations come and do homage before the Prince of Israel, because His judgments are made manifest. But before they can have 'power over the nations,' they must bind the strong that rule them. This is their mission at the end of 1335 years: 'To execute vengeance upon the nations, and punishment upon the peoples; to bind their kings with chains, and their nobles with fetters of iron; to execute upon them the judgment written; this honor have all his saints.' From A.D. 1866 to A.D. 1911, a period of over forty years, they will be engaged in this work, and in the organising the world upon new and better principles. (Anatolia, p. 97)

The early Christians. Again, Aleck quotes Acts 1:6-7. All the disciples did was ask a question which is insignificant compared to the dogmatic forecasts of Roberts and Thomas.

He then refers to 2 Thess 2:1-12 and says that the lie was from the serpent to Eve that she should not die. **Where did the context say that Aleck?**

Also you only quote part of the serpent's lie – why not quote it all? The Serpent said, **'But ye shall be gods.'**

John Thomas embraced that lie with visions of grandeur and imagined beings such as ourselves becoming 'ELOHIM' – mighty in strength and framers of new worlds...' *Elpis Israel* p.187 --- also Mormons and Herbert Armstrong.

Whilst we should live in expectancy of the Lord's return, predicting dates that fail makes us false prophets.

Indeed, John Thomas should admit of his speculation after his blunder about the Crimean war.

John Thomas – a prophet. Whether one claims Thomas to be a prophet or not he played at prophecy by dogmatically stating what lay ahead. If I make shoes I am a cobbler. If I make predictions I am a prophet. It's as simple as that.

Harry Tennant. I find it interesting that Aleck cites a leading Christadelphian, Harry Tennant, who, in an article, warns readers not to speculate about the future. It carried the title **'PROPHECIES THAT WENT WRONG.'** **WHERE CAN I GET A COPY?**

Gods once 'Animal men.' Yes, I did misquote. However, the first part of the quote is spot on, --**'They were once animal men of other spheres.'** May I ask: **Where does the Bible say that?**

The other part of the quote said, **'Who aspired to Godhood.'** Whilst this is a misquote, note how accurately it summarises page 187 of *E.I.* Listen to the exact words: **'BEHOLD THEN THE CONSUMMATION! Mortal and corruptible beings like ourselves become Elohim, mighty in strength, and framers of new worlds, of which the planet we inhabit, even its present state is a grand and glorious specimen.'**

Aleck says, 'For example John Thomas in 1849 suggested in *Elpis Israel* the non-fundamental idea that the angels came from a pre-Adamic creation on earth. By 1869 he declared he no longer held that idea. "To what orb or planet of the universe they are indigenous, is not revealed..." *Phanerosis*, Logos Edition, page 66.

Read those words again Aleck. They re-enforce the statement in *Elpis Israel*! What about page 72 of *Phanerosis*: **'Those who were Elohim contemporary to Adam had once been the subjects of shame and fear --- they had once been sinners --- so they must have been mortal --- Thus all immortals but himself were once mortal—sinners subject to death...'**

So our creators were once mortal, subject to death!

The Bible and animal men. Aleck even quotes scripture to support concepts of animal men.(humans are animal men) But, where in the Bible is there any notion of animal men of 'other spheres' – and that they were made subject to vanity? — And that they became 'Gods'? How gullible are we supposed to be? Aleck talks about mythology and yet defends the greatest myth imaginable –the serpent's lie — **' ye shall be Gods'**!

Christadelphians, Wake Up! The teachings of John Thomas are based on the greatest lie that ears have ever heard — the lie of the serpent — ‘Ye shall be Gods!’

Rev 21:3 discredits the serpent’s lie. Man was made for fellowship with God – not to be God!

Only God is God – eternal and unchanging. Hear God’s own testimony: ‘I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty.’ Rev 1:8

Angels and creation. Aleck says: ‘The main thrust in Hutchinson’s argument is that the creation was done directly by God, and the Elohim were not involved.’

That the creation was accomplished directly by God is the most foundational doctrine of Scripture. See Rev 4:11, Acts 4:24, Romans 1:20, 25, Isaiah 40:28, etc.

Let the Creator, Himself, reply to Aleck: ‘I am the Lord that maketh all things; that stretcheth forth the heavens alone; that spreadeth abroad the earth by myself.’’ Isaiah 44: 24.

Regarding the Elohim: What could be more precise than Psalm 8:5 ‘For Thou hast made him a little lower than the angels ...’ – and also Job 38: ‘Where was thou when I laid the foundations of the earth, and all the sons of God (Elohim) shouted for joy?’

Why did John Thomas ignore the testimony of scripture and postulate a delegated creation (as did Plato)? The answer is found on page 185 of Elpis Israel. He says:

‘Such a procedure on the part of the “Only Potentate,” whose abode is in the light, and whose servants, the Elohim, are innumerable, would have been unfitting His dignity and underived exaltation. He has revealed Himself to us as a Potentate, a King, a Lord, etc.; now those who fill these stations commit to others the service of executing their will and pleasure. And thus it is with the Invisible and eternal Potentate. His kingdom ruleth over all. His angels, or Elohim, mighty in strength, do his commandments, hearkening unto the voice of His words. They are His hosts; His ministers, that do his pleasure.’

In childish rationalism Thomas pictures God as one sitting in a chair giving commands to others to do his work. But, Jesus said, ‘My Father worketh hitherto, and I work.’ John 5:17

Look now at Genesis chapter 1: Who is it that gives the commands? It is Elohim. It was Elohim who said, ‘Let there be light.’
For absolute proof that Elohim of Genesis 1 is the Almighty, and underived Deity. see 2 Cor 4:6

What Aleck fails to recognise is that in most instances of the Old Testament Elohim refers to God Almighty. (Isaiah 40:28) Creation in the Bible exhibits **OMNIPOTENCE.** ‘God Said’ – and it was so. This is the starting point of faith. See Heb 11:3.

Christianity a 'NOW' religion.

Aleck now argues directly against scripture. I quoted the great words of assurance from 2 Cor 5:17. Aleck accuses of quoting out of context by citing verses 9-10 — (and out of context.) I said nothing about not appearing before the judgement seat of Christ. If Aleck took notice of the context it refers to all men appearing before the judgment seat of Christ. Why didn't he quote the next verse to get the context right? ***'Knowing therefore the terror of the Lord, we persuade men; but we are made manifest unto God.'***

'Therefore, if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things have passed away; behold all things are become new.' Let the open-minded reader consider the following verses and he will see clearly that I quoted in perfect context.

'Behold, now is the day of salvation.' Aleck seizes on the words of the previous verse which says, 'We then, as workers together with him, beseech you also that ye receive not the grace of God in vain.'

We hear so little about the grace of God from people like Aleck Crawford. ***'For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: not of works lest any man should boast.'*** Eph 2:8-9

If Aleck glanced at verses 3-4 he would see that it refers to ministry – ***'Giving no offence in anything that the ministry be not blamed.'***

'Beloved, now are we the sons of God.' It's because believers are now sons of God that they will see him and be like him.

Indeed, believers are promised eternal life. When God promises something we can depend on it. If Aleck had read further on in 1 John he would come to these words: ***'And this is the record that God has given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life. These things have I written unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God that ye may know that ye have eternal life, and that ye may believe on the name of the Son of God.'*** 1 John 5:11-13

It seems that Aleck is determined to prevent us from having what God wants us to have.

Being now justified by his blood ... we have now received the atonement.'
Rom 5:9,11

Aleck takes us back to verse 2. Why overlook the context Aleck? Why didn't you quote verse one? - ***'Therefore being justified by faith we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ.'***

How can we have peace with God in Aleck's state of uncertainty? Consider this quote from a Christadelphian publication: ***'Ask anyone you know (among Christadelphians) —"Will you be in the kingdom of God?" Ask that question point blank, and require a point blank answer: Yes or No — and you will not get it. There will be swithering, hesitation, an expression of pious hope/maybe or more likely of doubt with even a flavour of despair, but not from anyone a straight "Yea yea" or "Nay, nay."*** (Reformation, H Whitaker, p.132)

In the Christadelphian publication, 'Events Subsequent To The Return of Christ,' the author refers to the anxiety of those called forth to "Sinai" and points out the 'preponderance of goats.' To help relieve the anxiety of those in their long wait to receive Christ's verdict

concerning them the author postulates that angels will undertake a preliminary judgment to give those in their long wait for Christ's verdict an idea of how they will fare.

Aleck seizes on the word 'Hope.' But look at the scriptures – they are not talking of his precarious hope. Why didn't he quote verse 5? - **'And hope maketh not ashamed; because the love of God is shed abroad by the Holy Spirit which is given to us.'**

Aleck, can you say that the love of God is shed abroad in your heart by the Holy Spirit, which is given to you?

The believer's hope is 'both sure and steadfast' – which we have as an anchor of the soul.' Heb 6:19

'There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus.'
Romans 8:1.

Typically, Aleck now jumps to verse 13 but stops short of the next verses. Note the very next verse: **'For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God.'** Then 16: **'The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God.'**

Can I urge the reader (and Aleck!) to study verses 28-39 — a wonderful commentary on the statement of verse 1.

'...but are now the people of God.' 1 Peter 2:10 Aleck quotes the next verse exhorting them to abstain from fleshly lusts that war against the soul. Would Aleck and all readers please read on to the end of the chapter and note verse 25. Peter is talking about the witness of believers to outsiders – note verse 12 and the verses that follow. But also consider the verses that precede the text:

'But you are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should show forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvelous light.'

Aleck says that there is no such thing as the evangelical concept of 'once saved' always saved. May I ask Aleck: **Has he even been once saved?**

Regarding the concept of once saved always saved: it is what Jesus, himself taught. He said, **'My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me: and I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand. My Father, which gave them to me, is greater than all; and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand. I and the father are one.'** John 10:27-30

Aleck quotes Heb 12:1-3. Please note that Christ is not only 'the author of our faith' he is **'the finisher'** of our faith.

Verses are cited from Timothy which tell how in the last days some will depart from the faith and be turned unto fables. We note that this is to occur in the latter days. Surely John Thomas must be a contender here with his fables of animal beings of other spheres becoming creators etc.

A comment on 1 Cor 9:27 which, to my mind, is the only verse that Aleck has put forward that might be evidence against the permanency of the saved doctrine.

However, Paul is talking about the fear of losing his crown not his salvation. See previous verses with reference to runners where only one wins.

Note now the great assurances of scripture:

'Now unto him that is able to keep you from falling, and to present you faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy, To the only wise God our Saviour, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and ever. Amen.' Jude 24

'Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, To an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you, Who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation ready to be revealed in the last time. Wherein ye greatly rejoice, though now for a season, if need be, ye are in heaviness through manifold temptations: That the trial of your faith, being much more precious than of gold that perisheth, though it be tried with fire, might be found unto praise and honour and glory at the appearing of Jesus Christ: Whom having not seen, ye love; in whom, though now ye see him not, yet believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory: Receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls.'

1 Peter 1:4-9

The Resurrection.

Aleck objects to my comments on the resurrection and refers to my 'false theory.' Let me return to explicit scriptures:

'Some man will say, how are the dead raised up and with what body do they come?' Please read all of 1 Cor 15 – and note the precise answer from God.

The body raised is not the body that died. See verse 37 – 'Thou sowest not that body which shall be.'

Aleck resorts to botany and the process of sprouting and growth in his attempt to deny the text of scripture. Paul refers to the new body that emerges from a dead seed and says nothing about germination and growth. **The resurrection, however, is dynamic and instantaneous.** Consider the words that follow:

'Behold, I show you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we all shall be changed, In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible and we shall be changed.' 1 Cor 15:51-52

'In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye.' That is what scriptures says - **and the dead shall be raised incorruptible and we shall be changed.'** Note that it all occurs 'in a moment.'

Compare another explicit scripture: 1 Thess 4:16-17

'For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first:

Then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord.'
1 Thess 4:16-17

Where in scripture is the Christadelphian theory of judgment at Sinai?

'Christ the first fruits.' Aleck refers to Lazarus and others who were raised from death before Jesus. They were raised physically — only to die again. Christ and believers are raised dynamically - never to die again. Notice in the closing verses of 1 Corinthians 15 that the 'last enemy' – 'death' - is destroyed at the second coming of Christ by the resurrection of the dead.

Aleck asks, 'Then what need is there of the judgement?'

Judgement in scripture is separation and condemnation – i.e. sheep from goats, wheat from tares, etc. But note this important principle: the species determines the separation – not the separation determining the species. One is either a sheep or a goat. He doesn't have to wait to discover what he is. Jesus said, 'I am the good shepherd and know my sheep, and am known of mine.' John 10:14

'For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved.

He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God.' John 3:17-18

'Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life.' John 5:24

Aleck claims the necessity of works for salvation (despite the Bible explicitly saying 'not of works lest any man should boast') He uses the argument of God providing food and the need to work to prepare it.

In salvation we are talking of 'spiritual food.' – not physical. There is no preparation required. See Psalm 23:5, Isaiah 55:1-2

Consider these verses, which contrast the physical manna to **'the true bread that came down from heaven.'**

'They said therefore unto him, What sign shewest thou then, that we may see, and believe thee? what dost thou work?

Our fathers did eat manna in the desert; as it is written, He gave them bread from heaven to eat.'

Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Moses gave you not that bread from heaven; but my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven.

For the bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world.

Then said they unto him, Lord, evermore give us this bread.

And Jesus said unto them, I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst.’ John 6:28-35

Note the point of the following:

‘Then saith the woman of Samaria unto him, How is it that thou, being a Jew, askest drink of me, which am a woman of Samaria? for the Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans.

Jesus answered and said unto her, If thou knewest the gift of God, and who it is that saith to thee, Give me to drink; thou wouldest have asked of him, and he would have given thee living water.

The woman saith unto him, Sir, thou hast nothing to draw with, and the well is deep: from whence then hast thou that living water?

Art thou greater than our father Jacob, which gave us the well, and drank thereof himself, and his children, and his cattle?

Jesus answered and said unto her, Whosoever drinketh of this water shall thirst again:

But whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life.

The woman saith unto him, Sir, give me this water, that I thirst not, neither come hither to draw.’ John 4:9-15

‘Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money; come ye, buy, and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk without money and without price.

Wherefore do ye spend money for that which is not bread? and your labour for that which satisfieth not? hearken diligently unto me, and eat ye that which is good, and let your soul delight itself in fatness.’ Isa 55:1-2

Aleck now quotes some isolated verses to make his claims. I will comment on one of them to show how he, in fact ‘wrests scriptures.’ He isolates Phil 2:12. I will quote it in context and further comment should be unnecessary.

‘Wherefore, my beloved, as ye have always obeyed, not as in my presence only, but now much more in my absence, work out your own salvation with fear and trembling.

For it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure.

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 ye shine as lights in the world;

Holding forth the word of life; that I may rejoice in the day of Christ, that I have not run in vain, neither laboured in vain.’ Phil 2:12-16

Paul is simply asking that they work out in daily living what God is doing in them as a witness to ‘a perverse and crooked generation.’

The Bible says: **‘He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved.’ Mark 16:16**

Aleck says that ultimate salvation is not a present possession. One of the texts that he cites (again without reference to the context) is Hebrews 3:12-14. I will quote the context which, in itself, rebuts Aleck head on.

For we are made partakers of Christ, if we hold the beginning of our confidence steadfast unto the end; While it is said, Today if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts, as in the provocation. For some, when they had heard, did provoke: howbeit not all that came out of Egypt by Moses. But with whom was he grieved forty years? Was it not with them that had sinned, whose carcasses fell in the wilderness? And to whom sware he that they should not enter into his rest, but to them that believed not? So we see that they could not enter in because of unbelief. Let us therefore fear, lest, a promise being left us of entering into his rest, any of you should seem to come short of it. For unto us was the gospel preached, as well as unto them: but the word preached did not profit them, not being mixed with faith in them that heard it. For we which have believed do enter into rest, as he said, As I have sworn in my wrath, if they shall enter into my rest: although the works were finished from the foundation of the world. For he spake in a certain place of the seventh day on this wise, And God did rest the seventh day from all his works. And in this place again, If they shall enter into my rest. Seeing therefore it remaineth that some must enter therein, and they to whom it was first preached entered not in because of unbelief: Again, he limiteth a certain day, saying in David, To day, after so long a time; as it is said, To day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts. For if Jesus had given them rest, then would he not afterward have spoken of another day. There remaineth therefore a rest to the people of God. For he that is entered into his rest, he also hath ceased from his own works, as God did from his. Let us labour therefore to enter into that rest, lest any man fall after the same example of unbelief.’ Heb 3:14-4:11

Notice the emphasis on ‘Today.’ ‘Today, if ye will hear his voice.’

This wonderful passage of scripture is talking about entering ‘rest’ through faith – and when that rest is entered ‘works’ cease.

Hear the relevant words of Jesus Himself: ***‘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 unto your souls. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light.’*** Matt 11:28-30

Judgement I quote again: Heb 9:27: ‘And as it is appointed unto men (all men) once to die, but after this the judgment.’

But Aleck says, ‘Hutchinson’s insertion of (all men) into the quote from Hebrews 9:27 assumes that everyone is responsible. But if you read your Bible you will find that this is just not so.’

Has Aleck read his Bible? He only needs to go to Hebrews 12:23 to read *'...God the Judge of all...'* In no way does Heb 9:27 support Aleck's theory (or Robert Robert's) of only a few appointed to judgment!

Heb 9:27 says two things about man's destiny – 'once to die' – surely Aleck isn't suggesting that only a few die (see Romans 5) – after this the judgement. Those who die will be judged. Nothing could be more clear.

Consider the following texts:

'For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness; Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath shewed it unto them.

For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse' Rom 1:18-20

'But I say unto you, That every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment.' Matt 12:36

'But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at naught thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ.

For it is written, As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God.

So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God.' Rom 14:10-12

'Wherefore we labour, that, whether present or absent, we may be accepted of him.

For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad.

Knowing therefore the terror of the Lord, we persuade men; but we are made manifest unto God; and I trust also are made manifest in your consciences.'

2 Cor 5:9-11

'And as he reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come Felix trembled, and answered, Go thy way for this time; when I have a convenient season, I will call for thee.' Acts 24:25

For the time is come that judgment must begin at the house of God: and if it first begin at us, what shall the end be of them that obey not the gospel of God?

And if the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear? 1 Peter 4:17-18

'And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men every where to repent:

Because he hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead.' Acts 17:30-

31

'And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away; and there was found no place for them.

And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works.

And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them: and they were judged every man according to their works.

And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire. Rev 20:11-15

Aleck protests at the quote from Daniel - ***'And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.'*** Dan 12:2

He seizes upon the word 'many.' We note at the outset that it is 'MANY' – not a few. However, scripture 'many' can be 'all.' See Romans 5:10-21

Aleck comments on John 5:28-29 ***'Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves 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.'***

I pick up his question: 'How can he condemn a person to damnation if that person has "not done evil", since a person who does not know the gospel is not said to be evil.'

What is Aleck going to say next? His statement ignores the testimony of scripture.

'What then? are we better than they? No, in no wise: for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin; As it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one: There is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one.' Rom 3:9-12

'For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God.' Rom 3:23

Aleck postulates that only the responsible who have heard the word will be called to judgment. This is a very **comforting doctrine for the despots** and those who inflict terrible suffering upon others and very discomfoting for the few(according to Aleck's theory) who are called forth to judgment. See comment earlier about anxiety at Sinai.

Jesus (the Judge) said, ***'For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved. He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God. And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil.'*** John 3:17-19

'Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life.' John 5:24

Russia to control European countries.

Aleck barks loudly here but only seizes on one quote. What about the quotes on pages 7-9? My comment is not only valid but highly pertinent: “What European nations does Russia control today? Russia has lost the hold that she held over most of the continental countries!”

Note Aleck’s quote: ‘Notice that Christadelphians did not say that Russia would be in this position of supremacy “today” (i.e. in 2002). The disintegration of the Soviet Union and the formation of the CIS was a necessary prelude to the dramatic rise and inclusion of the Orthodox Church in the big picture of the Russian Federation.

Christadelphians declared that Russia either was or would be in ‘this position of ascendancy’ well before 2002. In 1983 They published a booklet entitled: RUSSIA’S BID FOR WORLD DOMINATION —SURE SIGN OF CHRIST’S COMING – in which they dogmatically asserted that Russia was in this very position. It said, ‘...and we are in a position to see that its predictions are correct, and to appreciate the true significance of the times in which we live.’

Please note: nothing was said in this pamphlet about the disintegration of the Soviet Union and the formation of the CIS etc.!!!!

I re-quote from H.P. Mansfield: ‘When the time is ripe, Russia will emerge from it’s iron curtain, and having confederated other European nations under it’s control will invade the Middle East.’ The world will appear to be on the eve of becoming completely communized.’ In 1968 Mansfield said that we were living in the very shadow of Christ’s return.’

He also said, ‘The growth of Russian power is a notable sign of the times indicating that the world is on the eve of the most dramatic event of all history.’

Mansfield also stated: ‘**It is of the utmost significance that today Russia occupies East Germany.**’ See Page 8, What They said Would Happen. Interesting that Christadelphian author, Graham Pearce, in ‘Milestones 1990’ highlights the re-unification of Germany and says nothing about the significance of the Russian occupation of East Germany!

In 1963 The Herald of the Coming Age said: ‘ When current events are aligned with Bible prophecy it becomes obvious that the world is on the very threshold of the most stupendous event of all time.’ P. 51

‘The modern revival of Israel, and the current growth of Russian power, constitute clear signs of the imminence of Christ’s coming ...’ Vol. 23 No 5, 1973.

Again, no hint of ‘The disintegration of the Soviet Union and the formation of the CIS was a necessary prelude to the dramatic rise and inclusion of the Orthodox Church in the big picture of the Russian Federation.’

It’s all very well to say these things after the event. Any one unskilled can do that!

In 1987 Roger Stokes published a 400 page book entitled, The Jews, Rome and Armageddon in which he said: ‘**Russia and her Soviet empire and satellites, in their policies of conquest, domination, terror, anti Semitism, and God-denying teachings mixed with Orthodox Church patronage, are almost**

prepared for the final major role they will play in the greatest conflict of all ages.’ P.323.

I commend Roger Stokes for retaining this statement in the later edition of JRA.

As to Aleck’s references to the overtures of Russia with Europe. It doesn’t undo the false claims of the past. Look what Christadelphians anticipated with Gorbachev!

As far as Robert Roberts is concerned he claimed that it was all to happen prior to 1910 – and ignored the failed prophecies of John Thomas.

I have no ‘argument with Ezekiel’ but call to account the sensationalism and failed forecasts of Christadelphia.

Britain. Aleck bypasses my comments on the failed predictions concerning Britain. It was interest in Bible prophecy and the forthright predictions of Christadelphians about the future of Britain and the failure of those predictions that led me to investigate further what had been predicted.

Christadelphians claimed on the basis of Bible prophecy that Britain would not enter the EEC. However, the inevitable occurred and Great Britain was accepted as a member nation. The predictions weren’t made on Bible prophecy. They came from the writings of John Thomas.

Another prediction was that Britain was to be the essential friend of the Jews. At least one Christadelphian has owned up to the failure. He writes, ‘Both the identity and the character of “Sheba and Dedan and the merchants of Tarshish” have about them the same uncertainty. The equation of all three with Britain, for many years asserted with supreme confidence, now (1969) begins to look slightly sick in the light of modern politics and the events of the last twenty years. “Perfidious Albion” which has systematically and cravenly broken all its promises to the Jews in a spineless attempt to keep friends with oil rich Arabs, has, as its reward, achieved only promotion from a first-rate to a third power in record time. The “toothless bull dog” is feared by none and respected by few.’ The Time of the End, H.A. Whittaker. P.58

"Is this the 'Hope of Israel'?"

Aleck writes: ‘For a person who has had the book *Elpis Israel* (which means *The Hope of Israel*) in his possession for as long as he has, ought to know that this in its totality is neither what Christadelphians believe nor is it Bible teaching. So this fact begs the question, "What is John Hutchinson's agenda"?’

The mortals during the millennium (defined below) will be ruled over by the saints of all ages, and in particular the **mortal Jews** will be ruled over by the 12 Apostles, not Christadelphians as Hutchinson alleges.’

I quote again from *Elpis Israel*: ‘Judah’s submission to the Lord Jesus, as the result of seeing him, will give them no right to eternal life, or to the glory and honour of the kingdom. It just entitles them to the blessedness of living in the land under the government of Messiah and the saints. So with the ten tribes; their faith in the word preached will entitle them to no more than a union into one kingdom and nation with Judah; and a participation in the blessings of Shiloh’s reign during their natural lives.’

Let the Bible define ‘the hope of Israel’: *Then Agrippa said unto Paul, Thou art permitted to speak for thyself. Then Paul stretched forth the hand, and answered for himself:*

I think myself happy, king Agrippa, because I shall answer for myself this day before thee touching all the things whereof I am accused of the Jews: Especially because I know thee to be expert in all customs and questions which are among the Jews: wherefore I beseech thee to hear me patiently. My manner of life from my youth, which was at the first among mine own nation at Jerusalem, know all the Jews; Which knew me from the beginning, if they would testify, that after the most straitest sect

of our religion I lived a Pharisee. And now I stand and am judged for the hope of the promise made of God unto our fathers: -----

Whereupon, O king Agrippa, I was not disobedient unto the heavenly vision: But shewed first unto them of Damascus, and at Jerusalem, and throughout all the coasts of Judaea, and then to the Gentiles, that they should repent and turn to God, and do works meet for repentance For these causes the Jews caught me in the temple, and went about to kill me. Having therefore obtained help of God, I continue unto this day, witnessing both to small and great, saying none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come: That Christ should suffer, and that he should be the first that should rise from the dead, and should shew light unto the people, and to the Gentiles.' From Acts 26

This was the 'Hope of Israel' for which the apostle was bound. Note the words, '... saying none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say.'

Consider the words of Jesus 'Then he said unto them, O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken: Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself. Luke 24:25-27

'And he said unto them, These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me. Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the scriptures. And said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day: And that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem.' Luke 24:44-47

For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith: as it is written, The just shall live by faith. Rom 1:16-17

'Brethren, my heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they might be saved. Rom 10:1

The 'hope of Israel' is Jesus Christ and him crucified and risen from the dead and being saved through him. – not living as mortals under Immortals!

Question: Where does the NT say that mortals will be ruled by immortals?

Statement: No one can be saved after Christ returns. Jesus said that it will be as it was in the days of Noah. They ate, drank married until the day Noah entered the ark, 'And knew not until the flood came and took them all away; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be.' Matthew 24: 39 See especially Matthew 25:1-13

On Zechariah 12:10 See John 19:36-7, Rev 1:7

Animal Sacrifices

Aleck says, 'Perhaps Hutchinson would like to explain what is meant by Ezekiel 44:11, "Yet they shall be ministers in my sanctuary, *having* charge at the gates of the house, and ministering to the house: they shall slay the burnt offering and the **sacrifice** for the people, and they shall stand before them to minister unto them"?'

The New Testament which interprets the Old Testament explicitly states that animal sacrifices have been abolished, they have no value and God is not interested in them. There is no reference in the NT to future animal sacrifice. What could be more decisive than the following:

'And every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins: But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God; From henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool. For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.'

Whereof the Holy Spirit also is a witness to us: for after that he had said before, This is the covenant that I will make with them after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my laws into their hearts, and in their minds will I write them; And their sins and iniquities will I remember no more. Now where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin.' Heb 10:11-18

"Thomas — a plagiarist"

"Thomas was a plagiarist who stole the writings of others and claimed them as his own original work."
WTSWH, page 10.

Aleck says, 'This unsubstantiated claim suggests that that John Thomas was the same sort of person as Joe Smith. John Hutchinson presents no evidence in his pamphlet nor his website. If his claim were true, then Christadelphians and their earlier unfriendly critics would have found this out when it occurred as they would have been much more familiar with books published then, and therefore long before Hutchinson. In fact, John Thomas was widely read and frequently refers to the writings of others, generally to disagree with them. The reader should not be deceived by such sensational slander.'

Aleck, are you serious? You challenged me in personal email about this. I guaranteed the evidence and asked what you would do about it? I requested your address so that I could send it to you. You disappeared!

Indeed Thomas was a plagiarist and his unfriendly critics were very aware of it and challenged him about it. The one who exposed the dishonesty of Dr Thomas was a leading opponent referred to in Roberts biography of the Dr.

Now here is the evidence. I find it hard to believe that Aleck wasn't aware of it and I ask, as I did before, what will he do about it? The following is taken from 'A Glance at The History and Mystery of Christadelphianism,' by David King – 'an unfriendly critic.' See web <http://www.netcomuk.co.uk/~pdover/histmyst.htm>

Unblushing plagiarism. It should be remembered that we are not writing thus for the first time, and our "Glance at the History and Mystery of Thomasism," published A.D. 1869, when the Dr. was in this country, and then put into his hands, contained the same charges. We then wrote that the Dr. had been charged with deceiving his readers by professing originality when gross plagiarism prevailed. The charge and proof thereof, having been published by others, come into small space here. In his introduction to Anatolia he alludes to certain pamphlets whose unprincipled authors have, as he says, taken, without acknowledgement, parts of his *Elpis Israel*, and used them as their own. He then adds that, unlike those pamphlets, "Anatolia is original throughout." The words, as here, are printed in italic, and there are no qualifying phrases in the context. What amount of what he terms "unacknowledged plagiarism" would be discovered were his entire work examined, the writer cannot say, having, with a view to this test, only compared a small portion of the book. The following quotations from "The Prophecy of Ezekiel concerning Gog," by Granville Penn, on the one hand, and from Anatolia, on the other, will show whether the testimony of Dr. Thomas on common facts is more reliable than his predictions concerning prophetic dates.

ANATOLIA.

"The question as to what nations are signified by Rosh, Meshekh, and Thuval has long since been determined by the learned. The celebrated Bochart, about the year 1640 observed in his elaborate researches into sacred

geography, that ROS, Ros, [the Hebrew word is omitted] is the most ancient form under which history makes mention of the name of RUSSIA; and he contended that Rosh and Meshekh probably denote the nations of Muscovy and Russia. 'It is credible,' says he, 'that from Rosh and Meshekh (that is the Rhossi and Moschi) of whom Ezekiel speaks, descended the Russians and Muscovites, nations of the greatest celebrity in European-Scythia.' We have indeed ample and positive testimony that the Russian nation was called Ros by the Greeks in the earliest period in which we find it mentioned, as Ethnos de oi Ros Schnthichon, peri ton archtoon Towron; that is, the Rosh are a Scythian nation bordering on the northern Taurus! and their own historians say, 'It is related that the Russians (whom the Greeks call Ros, and sometimes Rosos, Rosos) derived their name from Ros, a valiant man who delivered his nation from the yoke of its tyrants.'" p. 65.**

"And thus the three denominations, Rosh, Meshekh, and Thuval, united in the prophecy point out, with equal capacity and conciseness, those widely extended regions, which, at the present day, we denominate collectively THE RUSSIAN EMPIRE." p. 66 **

"Since the name of Scythae, or Magog, is to be considered not by itself, but in geographical connection with Galatae, or Gomer, we have only to enquire, whether any geographical affinity is really ascribed by the Greeks to the Scythae and Galatae? and to ascertain to what regions of the earth those names so associated, were applied. If we can discover these two points we ought thereby to have discovered specifically the Magog of the prophecy, which is to be associated with the region, or people, of Gomer." - p. 67.

"From the Hebrew Scripture we learn that Magog and Gomer were the names of two of the sons of Japhet; and it is to ancient Hebrew authority alone that we can resort to ascertain where, according to the common repute of the Israelites, the nation which descended from those two heads of families, and which long retained the proper names of those heads, were spread and established. Josephus says, 'That Japhet, etc., etc.' [and so on, with a quotation from Josephus, the same as given by G. Penn.] It only therefore remains for us to ascertain which were the nations that the Greeks at the time of Josephus [called Scythae, and which they then called Galatae; and to observe whether the geographical affinities of these nations are such as answer to those which are plainly required by the prophecy for Magog and Gomer"].

GRANVILLE PENN.

"If we next enquire what nations are signified by those three proper names we shall find that this question also has been long determined by the learned. The celebrated Bochart, about the year 1640, observed in his elaborate researches into sacred geography that ROS, Ros, is the most ancient form under which history makes mention of the name of RUSSIA; and he contended that the two first of those names properly denote the nations of Russia and Muscovy. 'It is credible,' says he, 'that from Rosh and Mesech (that is the Rhossi and Moschi) of whom Ezekiel speaks, descended the Russians and Muscovites, nations of the greatest celebrity in European-Scythia.' We have indeed ample and positive testimony that the Russian nation was called Ros by the Greeks in the earliest period in which we find it mentioned. Ethnos de oi Ros Schnthichon, peri ton archtoon Towron. 'The Ros are a Scythian nation bordering on the northern Taurus.' This testimony

is given by Cedrenus, Zonarus, Leo Grammaticus, and Tzetzes; and their own historians thus report, 'It is related that the Russians (whom the Greeks call Ros, ROS, and sometimes Rosos, Rosos) derived their name from Ros, a valiant man who delivered his nation from the yoke of their tyrants.'" p. 19.**

"And thus the THREE DENOMINATIONS united in the prophecy point out, with equal capacity and conciseness, those widely extended regions, which, at the present day, we denominate collectively THE RUSSIAN EMPIRE." p. 22
**

"But, since the name of Scythae (i.e. Magog,) is here to be considered, not by itself, but in geographical connection with GALATAE, or GOMER, we have only to enquire, whether any geographical affinity is really ascribed by the Greeks to the Scythae and Galatae? and to ascertain, to what regions of the earth, those names, so associated, were applied. If we can discover these two points, we ought thereby to have discovered specifically the Magogue of the prophecy, which would be able to associate to themselves the region, or people of Gomer." - p. 41.

"We know from the Hebrew Scriptures that these are the names of two sons of Japhet! and it is to ancient Hebrew authority alone that we can resort, to learn where, according to the common repute of the Hebrew people, the nations which descended from those two heads of families, and which long retained the proper names of those heads, were spread and established. Josephus is the earliest Hebrew authority of weight and learning, to which we can address ourselves; and he distinctly informs us, 'That Japhet, etc., etc. [The quotation following being ANATOLIA] Scythae and which they styled Galatae; and to observe whether the geographical affinities of these nations are such as answer to those which are plainly required by the prophecy of Magog and Gomer. Herodotus, the most ancient Greek writer.' [Here follows the quotation from Herodotus, taken from G. Penn, p. 65. the same as referred to on the other side.] It only therefore remains for us to ascertain which were the nations that the Greeks, in the time of Josephus, called Scythae and which they called Galatae; and to observe whether the geographical affinities of these nations are such as answer to those which are plainly required by the prophecy for Magog and Gomer. Herodotus, the most ancient Greek writer." [Here follows the quotation from Herodotus, as copied in Anatolia, p. 36.]

"Enough is as good as a feast." But if the reader desire other samples of the originality of Anatolia, and of the trustworthiness of its author who declares it "original throughout," he will be able to find what he desires by going to Granville Penn for himself. The edition from which the above are taken bears date A.D. 1814.

But besides being, in this way, partly taken from Granville Penn, Anatolia is indebted to Thomas Newton, D.D. Not so openly in the form of exact unacknowledged quotation, but by transference of ideas in the succession in which they are found in his Dissertations on the Prophecies. If the reader would test this he should compare the paraphrase of Daniel 11 found in Anatolia with a paraphrase of the same chapter in The Dissertations.

Though this exposure of the fraud and falsehood of declaring "Anatolia original throughout" was as gall and wormwood to Dr. Thomas, and though the exposure followed him through the country, he came not forward to

refute it. But Mr. Roberts, who was at hand, for any business of that sort, walked right up to the facts, stared them in the face, and declared they were not there. He wrote -

"The use of a page or two of historical matter from an old work to illustrate prophetic teaching never contemplated by the original writer, affords D.K. an opportunity for another vehement plunge of his cannibal knife. Plagiarism is a very convenient cry, and serves his purpose, but it is not exactly suited to the case. Every writer must get his history from somewhere, but according to D.K. it must be original."

So much for Mr. Roberts! But the case is not thus met. Had Dr. Thomas merely taken historical quotations from Granville Penn, there would have been no room to find fault, but he takes Penn's deductions and inferences from historical facts and from prophecies, imitating his italics and other peculiarities, and inserts them in Anatolia as HIS OWN. He goes to work with Bishop Newton's Paraphrases of Dan. 11 before him, adopts and modifies ideas at pleasure, and then declares his work wholly original. It may not be convenient to admit that in all this there is plagiarism; but when, as he says, the author of *The Coming Struggle* drew upon his *Elpis Israel*, it was "unacknowledged plagiarism." Why did not Dr. Thomas name Granville Penn as one whom he had thus used, or why not at least have indicated the borrowed parts by quotation marks? But no, nothing of the sort - the great man must produce an entirely original book, and as he could not do it himself, better men, who had gone before, are made to contribute both words and ideas without acknowledgment. Give honour to whom honour is due! Let Dr. Thomas have his reward, and Mr. Roberts also who thus shows himself worthy to bear the Dr.'s mantle, and ready to carry on the work after his master's discreditable methods.

Roger Stokes

I didn't say that Roger Stokes belonged to the main Christadelphian community. He is, however, a Christadelphian and wrote a book of 400 pages. Can Aleck show from the book that his beliefs are not in accord with general Christadelphia?

At least Stokes didn't delete his failed prediction from a later edition.

Again, how is one to know that Aleck belongs to mainstream Christadelphianism?

"Saints (immortalized Christadelphians)"

'The saints (immortalised Christadelphians), will be associated with the Lord Jesus in destroying the political, ecclesiastical, and social systems. This is a work of devastation. It will involve much destruction of life -- bloody and scathing the judgement ministered at the hands of Jesus and the saints'. (p.223)

Again Hutchinson makes a false and misleading quotation from *Christendom Astray*. The words "immortalised Christadelphians" have been added by Hutchinson, possibly deliberately to deceive his readers. It is NOT part of the quotation. Since Hutchinson quotes from various Christadelphian writings he must know that the Bible phrase "the saints" is understood by Brethren in Christ to mean all those who have served God faithfully and in truth down throughout the ages, starting from the first man Adam.

Indeed, I did add the words 'Immortalised Christadelphians' in brackets. Christadelphians claim to be saints, 'the Brethren of Christ' and expect to be immortalised.

"False Prophets -- a sign of the times!

Those who have predicted so consistently and falsely may themselves be a fulfilment of prophecy. For Jesus said: 'For false Christs and false prophets will arise and show great signs and wonders, so as to deceive, if possible, even the elect . . . Therefore if they say to you, "Look, He is in the desert!" do not go out; or "Look, He is in the inner rooms!" do not believe it.' (Mat. 24:26-27)"

We really need to feel sorry for John Hutchinson as he can't seem to get his quotes nor his contexts right. He does not quote from verse 27 at all and the first part before the dots is from verse 24. Also he has obviously missed the context of what he quotes so completely that he does not even realize that it refers to AD70 and the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans! E.g. "Then let them which be in Judea flee into the mountains" (v. 16). Besides no Christadelphian claims to be Christ or a prophet, nor do we show great signs or wonders. So clearly his conclusion is invalid also because the prophecy he quotes has nothing to do with Christadelphians.

Christadelphians have tried to show great signs and wonders in sensational predictions – and, by so doing, have made themselves prophets. They postulate a secret return of Christ whereas the Bible says ***'For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first:***

Then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord.' 1 Thess 4:16-17

Read the whole chapter of Matthew 24 Aleck? – Particularly verses 27-31?

"Thomas postulates 2 Gogs and Magogs!"

After quoting from three parts of John Thomas' writings, the above title appears in *WTSWH* but nothing about that follows the title. Again it is a bit of sloppy writing by John Hutchinson who you may recall is trying to point the finger at someone else. But it is not John Thomas who postulates this as Hutchinson exclaims. In fact it is the subject of two of God's inspired prophets. For the sake of getting the facts before the reader we quote from *Elpis Israel*:-

Aleck, you have completely ignored what I said about this. Let the reader turn to pages 12 – 13 where I documented the inconsistencies in Christadelphian writings.

Conclusion

Aleck concludes: 'John Hutchinson's point that date setting should not have occurred is correct, but his misuse of Scripture and his conclusion is not valid, as we demonstrated in our critique.

For reasons best known to himself, John Hutchinson (or perhaps one of his friends) has searched several Christadelphian books and pamphlets looking for errors. However, we have shown that his research has fallen far short of that necessary to produce a balanced and accurate picture of those who call themselves Christadelphians or Brethren In Christ. Therefore, he has made a lot of statements in *WTSWH* that were fairly easily proved wrong and some that are unbalanced.

It would appear that his understanding of the Scriptures is at best piecemeal and superficial which is typical of evangelicals. Like so many in Christendom, he quotes verses out of context and historical context, and also ignores so many other verses that have a bearing on his interpretation.'

Aleck, Your critique has left you wanting – you have discredited yourself!

You suggest that perhaps one of my friends has searched several Christadelphian books etc. Can you tell me who that might be? I have research records myself and what is written in *WTSWH* is my own work.

Look at your statement: 'If he would have read *Elpis Israel* and *Christendom Astray* with his Bible at his side he would have understood the true gospel, what the *Hope of Israel* is, and also that the **Christendom** to which he clings is **astray** from the foundational message of the Bible.'

Such a statement reveals the underlying weakness of Christadelphia. It rests on books like *Elpis Israel*, *Christendom Astray* etc – like the writings of Mary Baker Eddy, Herbert Armstrong, James Taze Russell, etc. that lead folk astray.

The Bible is my book and I thank the Lord that I am not bound to John Thomas, Robert Roberts, etc. The Bible says: 'As new born babes, desire the sincere milk of the word that ye may grow thereby.'

I grew up on a dairy and know the value of pure milk. So many contaminate the 'milk' of the Word of God with other books. Would to God they could be burned and we be left with the Holy Word of God.

Mormonism I have a copy of the document to which Aleck refers: 'Sketch of the Rise, Progress and Dispersion of the Mormons by Thomas and McGee Van Dusen.

Why didn't Thomas denounce the cardinal error of Mormonism? He didn't even mention it!

Two Mormons once visited our home. I asked them to read page 187 of Elpis Israel. In utter astonishment they said, '**But this is what we believe!**'

John Thomas may well denounce the Mormons. It doesn't alter the similarities of his own speculations. The Mormons themselves recognized it instantly!

Wrested Scriptures. In a query to Aleck, he replied by simply 'cutting and pasting' from a publication called 'Wrested Scriptures' with no acknowledgement. When I challenged him about it he claimed co-authorship of Wrested Scriptures. But the book says nothing about co-authorship!

Regarding Wrested Scriptures: an ex-Christadelphian wisely remarked: 'I find it amazing that R. Abel had such problem with the scriptures. He quotes a verse and then writes under it, 'Problem.' All the way through Abel finds problems with the scriptures.

The problem lies not with the scriptures but with R. Abel!

Abel's book was written to give Christadelphians ready made answers as he writes in the forward, '... there have been few Christadelphians who have not at some time or another found themselves tangled up in a discussion And there are few who have not been, at some time or another, compelled to admit, to themselves, if not to others, that they have been lamentably ill prepared for such responsibility.'

The book is true to its title. Never have I read such attempts to 'Wrest Scriptures' from their context and true meaning.

Let me cite one example. Abel (or Aleck) writes, 'One cannot know for certain whether he is in fact a sheep or goat until the Judgment seat of Christ.'
Jesus said: 'I am the good shepherd and know my sheep, and am known of mine.'

I quote an anecdote of R. Abel (or is it Aleck's?): 'The following illustration shows the differing ways in which 'saved' can be used: Imagine a downed bush pilot in the Canadian Arctic desperately attempting to maintain body heat in - 60°F weather. Weakened by loss of blood and broken bones, the cold of the icy blasts drives like nails through the parka's folds. At night the circle of half starved wolves becomes increasingly brazen. But suddenly in the few hours of daylight, a noise is heard out of the skies and overhead a rescue plane is seen coming in the direction of the downed craft. "Thank God, I'm saved" cries the bush pilot. But he is not completely out of danger. The rescue craft may be unable to land on the rough icy surface and by the

time a rescue team travels several miles the pilot may perish from loss of blood or fall victim to the wakeless sleep of the Arctic cold. Even when rescued by the team and placed in a rescue aircraft he is not "saved" in the strict sense of the term. The rescue craft may lose a ski on a protruding chunk of ice or may itself be ruined from carburetor-icing or a down draft. Not until the bush pilot is safely back at the base and fully recovered from his ordeal, can he be said in the fullest sense to be saved.' P.154

What utter rationalistic rubbish! Who would compare a frail rescue craft which may be unable to land on the ice or lose a ski to our Saviour of whom the Bible says, 'Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them.' Heb 7:25
Compare Luke 15:4-7

The Issue

The issue is simply: John Thomas or Jesus Christ, Elpis Israel or the Bible.

True Christianity is a personal relationship with the risen and living Lord Jesus Christ made possible through love and grace. Jesus came down from heaven, as he repeatedly said, to die on the cross for each of us. He died for our sins — the just for the unjust. Salvation is a free gift of God to those who repent and accept Christ as Saviour and Lord.

The relationship between Christ and true believers is likened to that of sheep to their shepherd. Please read John 10. The destiny of believers is found in the prayer that Jesus uttered for them: 'Father, I will that they also, whom thou has given me, be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory, which thou hast given me: for thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world.' John 17:24.
see also Jude 24-25

You are not destined to become a 'God' and be a framer of new worlds. You were created to know God and enter into relationship with him. How many times do we read in scripture, 'They will be my people and I will be their God.'
See Rev 21:3

You need to be free from the bondage of John Thomas and Robert Roberts. Jesus came to set us free. He said, 'If the Son therefore shall make you free, you shall be free indeed.' John 8:36

Sadly, I hear of Christadelphians who leave in disillusionment and are so turned off that they want nothing more to do with God or religion. If only they knew what good things were there for them in Christ.

I know ex-Christadelphians who are truly free and who have found true salvation and joy in Christ. Unfortunately, I believe there are many who fear ostracism and rejection by the cult. Let me say that the price is worth it to know the unsearchable riches of Christ and eternal salvation in Him.

Thanking your for your time and patience and thank you Aleck for the opportunity of reply.

John Hutchinson

Email johnhutc@iinet.net.au