

Class Two

Resurrectional Accountability

Adamic Condemnation

Now we come to the motivation for the mistaken impression that only the baptized will be raised to judgment. The amendment to clause 24 was the response to the reasoning that began to be circulated in the brotherhood concerning a **legal** condemnation related to Adam & Eve's failure that was somehow separate from their physical condemnation. It is mistakenly suggested that this legal condemnation has to be somehow satisfied or overcome by a blood covenant sacrifice in order to bring the dead back to life. This reasoning is based on several impossible presumptions. Once again we can only come to a confident understanding of divine truth by understanding basic scriptural terms. We have to understand terms like sin and atonement and the rituals like baptism and circumcision. We have to understand the relationship and limitations between divine laws and divine principles. These terms are frequently misrepresented in both the amended and unamended communities, which makes the continuing separation even more difficult to resolve. Just as Christadelphians have frequently referenced the terms of the resurrection to immortalization as if they applied to the resurrection to judgment... so we also see a fairly common misuse of terms like sin and atonement.

Historically, reunion has been sought with a focus on the 24th amendment itself, defining what categories of people will be required to participate in the resurrection to judgment. However, without addressing the root cause for the doctrinal challenge of resurrectional responsibility the situation cannot be resolved. The issue of Adamic condemnation is the root cause that has to be addressed.

Let's restate a couple of significant ground rules. Creation is all about our Creator... not us. It is the natural seduction of the self-worshipping human heart, the instinctive thought process of cursed mortality ... to reverse that emphasis... to make everything about ourselves. This is why the two consistent features of all false doctrine is that incorrect doctrines will always degrade Yahweh and exalt ourselves. There are no exceptions to this rule. This is why when we hear things like... the sacrifice of Jesus Christ was primarily about the forgiveness of our sins... or that loving our neighbor as ourselves is the fulfillment of the greatest commandment to love Yahweh our Elohim with all our heart and soul and strength. We should be objecting to these heart generated expressions that reverse the focus from our Heavenly Father to ourselves. Christ's sacrificial death was primarily to validate the righteousness of his Father, which facilitated our access to forgiveness, as a natural byproduct. That forgiveness through the death of Jesus was a result of the true reason for his sacrifice.... Not the primary reason itself. And we are only required to love our neighbor as much as we love ourselves. Christ's new commandment instructed us to love our brothers and sisters in Christ greater than we love ourselves (and therefore greater than our neighbors) and we are supposed to love our Heavenly Father with every ounce of emotion and intellect and energy we have... far, far greater than either of the other two love commandment categories. When we shift the focus away from our Creator and to ourselves... that is when divine truths are in jeopardy. This is why meekness, the suppression of the human ego, the circumcision of the naturally self-worshipping human heart...

is the only path to understanding eternal truths. The path to error is always through an uncircumcised heart which can be baptized or not.

So let's begin with the condemnation of Adam and Eve for their failure.

There was one divine law in the Garden.

Gen 2:16-17 *And the LORD God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: ¹⁷ But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.*

As Dr Thomas notes in Elpis Israel and most center margins will confirm, we should understand the condemning phrase to say... for in the day that thou eatest thereof... dying thou shalt die.

This was the promise of a change in nature. Adam and Eve could not have been in a mortal (in a death assured state at this time)... or God's threat would be absolutely meaningless and inconsequential. One of the misconceptions sometimes expressed about this threat is that man was already in a dying state and God's threat was merely the threat of an immediate execution. That is an impossible understanding as that would make God a failure. If Yahweh were to actually immediately execute Adam and Eve then He would have been a failure. Mankind, in the image and likeness of God, was the focal point of the entire creative effort, placed in charge as the caretaker. If God were actually threatening to immediately execute them He would have failed and had to start again from scratch. Our Creator is not a failure. We are the only ones who fail... not Him. The impossible threat of immediate execution would have been a lie. God cannot lie. This is what I mean when I say that incorrect doctrine degrades our Heavenly Father. Another similar proof that man could not have already been in a mortal state would be our Creator's statement of approval concerning all of creation.

Gen 1:31 *And God saw every thing that he had made, and, behold, it was very good. And the evening and the morning were the sixth day.*

Everything the Creator had made was not simply good. It was **very** good. This statement also completely and separately eliminates the possibility that man was already in a dying nature. There is nothing about death or mortality that would qualify its description as being divinely good. Under divine law anyone merely touching a dead body had to leave their family and community for seven days and participate in a sin offering... twice... on the 3rd and the 7th days of their separation. Death –and the assurance of death in mortal nature- contradicts the divine approval of everything being "very good." To emphasize the value of this term "very good", let's note that Jesus... the man who had no transgressions, no personal sins whatsoever... refused the lesser title of "good." Jesus was the best component of creation the world had ever seen since sin corrupted all of creation, yet didn't even qualify for the lesser title of simply "good."

Matt 19:16-17 *And, behold, one came and said unto him, Good Master, what good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life? ¹⁷ And he said unto him, Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is, God.*

Even Jesus did not consider himself to qualify for the title "good" in his sin-cursed mortal nature during his ministry.

Our Creator not only approved of everything that had been made over those six evenings and mornings He declared it **all** to be very good. Since death is presented throughout Kingdom Law given through Moses as the evidence of the presence of sin... then death could never have been part of the

original very good creation . The divine threat for introducing the polluting factor of sin into a very good creation was dying thou shalt die... a conversion into mortality from a non-dying state. This satisfies the righteousness of Yahweh. This understanding does not degrade Him as a failure, or a liar or one who vacillates on what is good and what isn't.

This failure by Adam and Eve was a denial of the righteousness of the Creator. The Creator had declared that sin would bring death. The serpent offered opposing testimony... that God was wrong... that Adam & Eve wouldn't really die and that they would become gods in their own right on the basis of their disobedience. Adam and Eve chose the God despising testimony of the serpent and declared the Creator's rightness to be false. This introduced the polluting influence of sin into a previously very good creation. Along with sin came the physical effects... the manifestations of sin: mortality, disease, suffering, frustration, danger, violence and hardship. This is another divine principle that must be understood. There is a direct connection between the physical features of creation and spiritual truths. These physical changes in creation had to be towed along with the introduction of sin. They were not part of the previously "very good" creative state. The principle of divine righteousness demands that relationship. This is what peace is all about... the harmony between what is physical and what is spiritual. This spiritual-physical relationship is why all of these physical results of sin are diminished during the Millennial Kingdom when the devil and satan and the serpent and the dragon are chained in the bottomless pit for 1,000 years. When sin is restrained, the accompanying physical effects of sin are restrained. Agricultural abundance increases dramatically. Violent carnivorous beasts like lions and wolves and bears become harmless herbivores. Poisonous reptiles and insects become harmless. Even mortal life is extended. It will be said that if a 100 year old man died that he was just a child... with so much of his life before him. When sin is eliminated completely from existence after the final judgment, the third immortalization event in the divine plan... then death and the grave are also eliminated. There can be no death if there is no sin. They are inseparably bound together. Paul confirms this understanding of the introduction of death following the introduction of sin. *Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned* (Rom 5:12). Paul makes it clear that death followed sin and death's introduction into creation was a direct result of sin. Death did not precede sin. Sin preceded and initialized death.

The condemnation of Adam and Eve changed their nature, from undying (but still subject to death) to an assured death through an aging process or violence or disease. These issues could not have been part of the original very good state of creation.

Adam and Eve's first response to their failure was shame... something new to them. Their nakedness was insignificant to them before sin corrupted a very good creation. Now they were ashamed and their instinctive response... their **hearts** told them... to cover that nakedness. Along with sin came the divine gift of the conscience. That conscience was completely unnecessary before mankind internalized that exterior temptation source of the serpent. Adam and Eve had been completely innocent, incapable of generating a challenge to the understanding of divine rightness- divine righteousness. However our Creator had no interest in a robotic devotion, just as we don't trot down to Toys R Us to start our family with a couple Chatty Cathy dolls. We want real children in our own image and likeness that choose to love us. Adam and Eve had to prove their devotion and trust in the rightness of their Heavenly Father. They did not. That necessary exterior temptation source of the

serpent became internalized into their nature upon their failure. In our cursed mortal state we possess an innate predisposition to error and failure, inherited from our parents. We are not dependent upon an exterior temptation source any more. We don't need to be **taught** to lie or steal or deceive. We **do** need to be taught **not** to lie not to steal, not to inflict harm. However, along with that internalized temptation source our Creator included a conscience in this change of our nature from undying to dying, from a very good state to cursed mortality. This gift of the conscience generated the first shame for nakedness. We know how God removed their inadequate fig leaf aprons and covered the shame of the nakedness of Adam and Eve with two coats made from a single animal skin. Even though the English translation does say skin's'... the Hebrew is singular. Two coats were made from one skin. That is highly significant, but we don't have the time to comment on that significance at the moment.

This is where the concept of atonement is introduced, the covering of the shameful nakedness of sin. Something we do every morning after we awaken to the light of a new morning. We get dressed. We cover our nakedness as we would appropriately be ashamed to be naked in public. There are no other creatures in the world who generate clothing to cover their nakedness... just sin cursed humanity. We are the only ones with a conscience. The whole world repeats the lesson of the atonement every morning... blindly.

Sadly there are a lot of misconceptions among Christadelphians about the principle of atonement... as there have been... for 150 years. This issue of atonement is prominent in the motivation for concluding that only the baptized will be raised to judgment.

One of the greatest failings in understanding any divine truth is the danger of oversimplification. The natural urge of the human mind is to keep things simple and easy... segmented. This is definitely not the way our Creator operates or communicates. His communications are all interconnected and interdependent. He uses visions and dreams and dark sayings and imagery and symbols. Our Creator communicates with an intentional complexity. Everything affects everything else. This is true in scripture and this is true in the features of creation... what ungodly mankind loves to refer to as 'nature.' One example of this is how the concept of atonement is limited by some who suggest that atonement is exclusively about forgiveness. This is why some suggest that God's threat of an immediate execution was averted... that the forgiveness that came with the covering of Adam and Eve's nakedness eliminated the immediate nature of the death threat. We've already determined there had to be a change in nature due to the introduction of sin, but this inappropriate limitation of atonement to simply forgiveness is an extension of that same error. This is a feature of false doctrine... any challenge to the rightness of our Creator cannot stand by itself. That is why there is no such thing as a single lie. Lies breed. Lies are self-multiplying. One lie requires other support lies which require more support lies. Atonement is certainly about forgiveness. However, it would be a huge mistake to suggest that the covering of atonement is exclusively or simply about forgiveness.

Again this limitation of atonement to simply forgiveness can be demonstrated as false in quite a number of different ways. The ultimate application of atonement is when the immortal spirit nature covers the mortal flesh nature. This is the language of the resurrection to immortality... that of the atonement covering. The New Testament is absolutely saturated with exceptionally clear expressions of the immortalization of the faithful being described as a covering.

1 Cor 15:51-54 *Behold, I shew you a mystery; We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed,*⁵² *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.*⁵³ *For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality.*⁵⁴ *So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory.*

This is a description of the resurrection to immortality, which follows the rejection of the unjust which follows the judgment which follows the resurrection to judgment. This language of immortalization is all about a covering... an atonement.

The Apostle Paul employs similar language and draws in to the description of immortalization a covering of shameful nakedness... just like in the Garden of Eden:

2 cor 5: 1-4 *For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.*² *For in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be **clothed upon** with our house which is from heaven:*³ *If so be that **being clothed we shall not be found naked.***⁴ *For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened: not for that we would **be unclothed**, but **clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life.***

This language describing the immortalization process is all about a covering, an atonement... not simply forgiveness but immortalization... the spiritual covering the physical. Forgiveness is just a part of the atonement equation... a significant part- but definitely not everything. One proof of this is that under the divine laws of the Kingdom of God given through Moses at Sinai it was not just the sin offering that facilitated an atonement. The sin offering focused on the terms of forgiveness. However the first and last altar offering of every day was the burnt offering. The burnt offering is not equated with forgiveness, like the sin offering. However the burnt offering was given for atonement. In fact the primary foundational lesson... quite interestingly in our current context... was a dedication to the **knowledge** of Yahweh. This identification of the primary lesson of the burnt offering is not a supposition. God makes that understanding perfectly clear in a verse quoted more than once by Jesus during his ministry.

Hosea 6:6 *For I desired mercy, and not sacrifice; and the **knowledge of God** more than **burnt offerings.***

The Burnt offering that was intended to offer an atonement, but it's divine application was not associated with forgiveness ... The divine intention was to emphasize our complete dedication to understanding our Creator... God wants the knowledge of God more than burnt offerings.

Lev 1:3-4 *If his offering be a burnt sacrifice of the herd, let him offer a male without blemish: he shall offer it of his own voluntary will at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation before the LORD.*⁴ *And he shall put his hand upon the head of the burnt offering; and it shall be accepted for him to **make atonement** for him.*

It is the burnt offering as well as the sin offering that are both expressed as being necessary to make atonement for someone. Sometimes they are joined together, such as when a new mother had to make an atonement for herself for giving birth... for which she needed no forgiveness whatsoever, as having children is an act of righteousness fulfilling a divine command.

Lev 12:6-7 *And when the days of her purifying are fulfilled, for a son, or for a daughter, she shall bring a lamb of the first year for a burnt offering, and a young pigeon, or a turtledove, for a sin offering, unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, unto the priest: ⁷ Who shall offer it before the LORD, and make an atonement for her; and she shall be cleansed from the issue of her blood.*

There is more to atonement than simply forgiveness ... or the burnt offering would have nothing to do with atonement and a new mother would not be required to make an atonement for herself for performing the righteous act of bearing a child.

A flawless projection of how the principle of atonement is fulfilled in the immortalization procedure... the answer to the shameful nakedness of sin from the Edenic condemnation where our nature was changed... is displayed on the very Day of Atonement. Only the High Priest could enter the Most Holy in the Divine Sanctuary beyond the veil, where the divine glory rested on the mercy seat between the cherubim. He was only allowed to enter that Most Holy chamber on one day every year.. on the Day of Atonement. On that day the High Priest entered exactly three times. Those three entrances into the representation of the divine presence in the most holy perfectly project the three immortalization events in the divine plan... the 3 atonement events on this Day of Atonement.

1st the High Priest had to take two handfuls of incense and fire from the altar of burnt offering into the Most Holy Place and generate a cloud of incense to cover the mercy seat... in order to save his own life.

Lev 16:12-13 *And he shall take a censer full of burning coals of fire from off the altar before the LORD, and his hands full of sweet incense beaten small, and bring it within the veil: ¹³ And he shall put the incense upon the fire before the LORD, that the cloud of the incense may cover the mercy seat that is upon the testimony, that he die not.*

This first entrance into the Most Holy was for the purpose of saving the life of the High Priest. This aromatic dust was converted from dust to cloud through the fire and the life of the High Priest was extended. This is a flawless representation of the first immortalization event when the ultimate High Priest, Jesus Christ, was converted from the dust nature... originally expressed as *dust thou art to dust thou shalt become* ... into the vapor cloud covering the mercy seat, the cloud that is a constant scriptural symbol of the divine presence, power and glory. This was accomplished by the fiery trials that Jesus persevered through without a single failure. In this way his life was saved... forever.

The 2nd entrance by the High Priest on the day of atonement into the Most Holy was to bring the blood of the bullock for the atonement of the whole family of the High priest. This represents the 2nd immortalization event in the divine plan when the brothers and sisters of Christ (also expressed as his bride and his children)... the family of the High Priest, will be immortalized at the beginning of the Millennial Kingdom... joining Jesus in his atonement... described as the marriage supper of the lamb.

The 3rd entrance of the High Priest on the Day of Atonement was when he brought the blood of the goat for the atonement of the rest of the nation. This projects the third and final immortalization in the divine plan when the rest of the world will be either immortalized or perish...at the end of the Millennial Kingdom. These three entrances and activities on the annual Day of Atonement perfectly reflect the three immortalization events in the divine plan... further solidifying our understanding that atonement is about more than simply forgiveness.

Limiting our understanding of atonement to just forgiveness initiates a domino falling set of errors, involving a distortion in our understanding of what constitutes sin, a distortion of what baptism represents and what it achieves and that limitation completely blocks our comprehension of the glorious light of divine truths that can be seen in the shadows of divine expressions. The inside and outside covering/atonement of the gopher wood ark with pitch... the inside and outside golden covering of the ark of the covenant with its six surfaces on the inside and its six surfaces on the outside. Those six geometric planes come together at 8 points of convergence (corners) to create that enclosure... reflecting the six letters of the Greek name of Jesus whose letters add up to 888... a further declaration of the 3 immortalization events in the divine plan... the name of the man –meaning savior - who is the key to all three atonement events.... His own, his family's at the beginning of the millennial kingdom and the rest of the world at the end of the Kingdom.

Understanding the eternal truths of our Creator's rightness is the key to seeing a far greater glory in both the written word of God and the spoken word of God. The spoken word of God is creation. God spoke and stars appeared, with all their scientific properties operational and interdependent. Our Creator spoke and continents formed. Our Creator commanded and the world was filled over the course of an evening and a morning with a complex interdependent and highly varied agricultural structure, fully mature and operational. God spoke and countless species of animal life came into existence around the planet fully developed and interdependent with plantlife, light and darkness , etc. Nature – creation – is the result of the spoken word of God. Unfortunately now creation is subject to the curse of sin and death just as we are. We are told that creation itself 'groans' along with us waiting for the adoption of sons.... Waiting for that rest from sin that will come following the 2nd immortalization event in the divine plan at the beginning of the millennial Kingdom, the 2nd atonement event.

There is a great deal more that can be confirmed about the principle of atonement. The condemnation of Adam for introducing God despising sin, contradictions to the Creator's righteousness into a very good creation will be resolved by atonement, which is more than just the forgiveness of sin. It includes the responsibility to project the rightness of our Creator. We don't just need forgiveness for personally projecting violations of his righteousness... which is what is called sin. We also have the responsibility of demonstrating that righteousness. We are tasked with avoiding wickedness but also with practicing righteousness. If we arrive at the judgment only concerned with whether or not we have any unforgiven sins we will not be ready for our Judge. Forgiveness is only part of the equation. We are not the center of the universe. Our Creator is.

Now the concept of baptism was at the core of the debates prompting the necessity to amend that 24th clause of our statement of faith in the late 19th century. We should understand the purpose for baptism, what is achieved at baptism, what is not achieved by baptism.

In order to create the proper foundational understanding for baptism we really shouldn't start in Romans 6. That is secondary. That is where baptism focuses on our benefits from baptism and what it achieves for us. First we have to understand what baptism means to our Heavenly Father. The clearest way to see that is to consider the necessary baptism of Jesus. Perhaps we, like John, have difficulty understanding why Jesus had to be baptized. This certainly confused John. John's baptism was described as a baptism of repentance, but Jesus had nothing to repent from. He suffered from no guilt. His baptism wasn't about forgiveness. The baptism of Jesus was all about righteousness, not sin forgiveness. That is exactly what Jesus clearly declares to John and to us.

Matt 3:13-17 *Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan unto John, to be baptized of him. ¹⁴ But John forbad him, saying, I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me? ¹⁵ And Jesus answering said unto him, Suffer it to be so now: for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness. Then he suffered him. ¹⁶ And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water: and, lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him: ¹⁷ And lo a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.*

There is no sane way to suggest that the baptism of Jesus was insignificant. Immediately after this baptism the power of Creator of the universe, the Holy Spirit is awarded to Jesus ... without measure. A public, verbal divine approval of Jesus is declared to all the witnesses of this baptism... immediately following that baptism. This is my beloved son... in whom I am well pleased. ... immediately after Jesus concludes the baptismal procedure. Obviously this baptism is highly significant and crucial to our comprehensive understanding of what baptism represents.

Jesus explains to John that his baptism was all about fulfilling righteousness... fulfilling all righteousness. What is this "all righteousness" that is displayed in baptism? Now some have suggested that Jesus was basically saying... hey I'm just doing what I was told to do... suggesting that it was the righteousness of Jesus that he was referring to by his baptism. That would be a foolish mistake. Jesus was all about his Father's righteousness... his Father's principles... his Father's laws and plans... not his own or himself. What righteousness of the Heavenly Father is demonstrated by the baptism of Jesus and baptism in general? This goes right back to both the condemnation in Eden and the promise of redemption from that condemnation.

Paul interprets that two stage ritual of baptism for us in Romans 6 so that we can understand the first stage to be a death and the second stage to represent renewed life. We personally & voluntarily descend in to the water to be buried with Christ. We ascend out of that water grave, demonstrating the promise of renewed life through Christ. This death before life pattern is a fairly common scripture pattern.

The righteousness demonstrated in the baptism of Jesus was that Yahweh was right when he demanded death for sin in the Garden of Eden. The voluntary submission to a baptismal death is a declaration that we agree God was right to demand death for sin. This is what caused the whole

problem in the first place. Adam and Eve objected to this declaration, choosing the serpent's testimony that death for sin was not legitimate or right. All forms of apostasy reject the righteousness of the Creator in this declaration that sin must die. The immortality of the soul is a perfect expression of the serpent lie... a declaration that the Creator is not right, that His policy that sin must die is wrong. First and foremost baptism is a declaration of the righteousness of our Heavenly Father for demanding death for sin... the condemnation of Adam in Eden. The second stage of baptism reflects the rest of the equation... the renewed life. This is the grace aspect... that despite the fact that our Creator is perfectly justified and right in demanding death for sin.... That He is also right to offer renewed life based on our recognition and acceptance of His rightness for demanding death for sin. Jesus rose from that baptismal death projecting the righteousness of God for his grace... the promise of renewed life despite the justified condemnation to death. The grace of Yahweh is not a contradiction of His judgment. Baptism projects both aspects of our Creator's right-ness... that He is right in judgment and that He is right in grace.

Baptism is about greater things than simply the forgiveness of sins. That is a consequential lesson. The forgiveness of sins is a result of understanding, believing and demonstrating the righteousness of our Creator, that all his policies and eternal truths are just and legitimate and right.... just as the only reason we can exit the baptismal grave –reflecting renewed life – is because we first voluntarily entered that water grave... recognizing that sin has to die.... THEREFORE, all our personal sins are eliminated at baptism. It isn't magic. It isn't some technicality of law. It is a demonstration that we agree with our Heavenly Father that He was right in Eden and our ancestors were wrong.... That the world is wrong and our Heavenly Father is right.

This is true of every single divinely imposed ritual in any age. Every single one of them is a demonstration of some feature of the righteousness of Yahweh... without exception. All four of the Ecclesial Age mandated rituals are confirmations of the righteous policies and just truths of our Creator. Besides the now obvious application of baptism we also see the participation in the memorial service representing our participation in the death and resurrection of our Messiah, demonstrating the rightness of that required sacrificial death in the breaking of the bread representing his body of flesh and the drinking of the wine representing his mortal life blood sacrificed out of love for his Father and mankind. We see both the reconciliation procedure and the salvation procedure demonstrated in the broken bread and the wine. Sisters' headcoverings is explained by the apostle Paul to be a validation of the divine order of the four headships... that God is the head of Christ who is the head of man who is the head of woman. This is why a brother must never pray to the Father with his head covered, which would be denying his authoritative head: Jesus Christ. But it is also true that a sister must always cover her head when she prays in order to respect the divinely appointed headship of man but also to refrain from projecting the glory of man in the face of God through an uncovered head. This ritual is a projection of divine principles. The sister who refuses to cover her head in prayer is denying the rightness of the Creator in the appointed headships and rebelling against the Creator's appointment of man being her head. Paul's evidence for the legitimacy of Sisters silence was that Eve was created after Adam and that the initial deception of Eve requires a sister's silence. If sisters rebel against this silence ritual they are declaring that the Creator was wrong to make Eve second instead of at the same time as Adam... and that Yahweh was wrong in the judgment of Eve's submission to Adam for her part in the failure. Every divine ritual is a physical demonstration of the rightness of

divine actions and policies. This is the primary purpose of baptism. Any extensions to this understanding about baptism must fit within that framework without contradiction to that core purpose.

Now baptism is one of the laws of the **Ecclesial Age**. It was not required under the Kingdom of God laws from Sinai given through Moses. Baptism, nor any other covenant binding ritual was divinely required for the first 2,000 years following the condemnation of the human race through Adam. It wasn't until Abraham and just before the conception of the son of Promise that Abraham was given the covenant ritual of circumcision. Unlike the covenant ritual of baptism, the covenant ritual of circumcision was not – & could not possibly – be required of women. Sarah, Leah, Deborah the judge, all of these women did not participate in any covenant ritual... as the sisters do now during the Ecclesial Age. There is no mention of baptism being required again during the restored Kingdom of God. However circumcision is prophesied. Once again, there is no possible way for a woman to participate in this covenant ritual of circumcision during the restored Kingdom. The only age when a covenant ritual embraces both men and women... both Adam and Eve... is the current Ecclesial Age. Therefore on what basis could any of us presume to suggest that baptism or circumcision is the exclusive avenue for participating in the resurrection to judgment? Will Adam not be there? Or Noah or Noah's wife... what about Mary the mother of Jesus who is never **recorded** as participating in any covenant confirming ritual. What about Rahab or Ruth. Are these faithful women to be forbidden a resurrection to judgment because they did not participate in either baptism or an impossible circumcision? This presumption that only the baptized or those who have participated in a covenant ritual, thereby removing some imaginary legal stain from them, are the only people who will be allowed to participate in the resurrection to judgment contradicts divine principles, and contradicts divine righteousness, as well as reversing the **uncommon** sense of thinking like our Creator.

The amendment to clause 24 was forced in a significant measure due to an understanding of what is achieved at baptism... that baptism partially justifies men and women from a legal condemnation in the Garden of Eden. It was reasoned that the condemnation of Adam could somehow be separated into two issues from which justification had to be pursued for each issue separately. It was expressed that the verbal condemnation of death for sin was somehow separate from the physical condemnation of the dying process and that this verbal declaration became a legal condemnation while the actual working out of the sentence was the separate physical act. It was reasoned that baptism is a stage of justification, satisfying the legal or verbal application of the Adamic condemnation. Supposedly this would facilitate the raising from the dead to judgment of those who had escaped the legal/verbal damning aspect of Adam's condemnation. This separating of Adamic condemnation into both a legal and a physical application is unprecedented, is not confirmed by scriptural law or shadows or parables or visions. It is also a reversal of a significant truth concerning the relationship between divine principles and divine laws. We'll expand on that a little later.

When those who are accountable to the principle of divine vindication are raised from the dead for the purpose of facing their judge, they are restored to a mortal state. We don't know what maturity stage may be represented in their temporary restoration to mortal life, but there are precedents. We see a number of people that are raised from the dead back to a mortal state in the scripture record. We see Israelites and non-Israelites. We see adults and children. Their return to life is never qualified by a covenant relationship to the Creator. That is evident by the widow of Zarephath's son, raised by Elijah

as well as the 12 year old daughter of Jairus. The return from the dead cannot be somehow limited to those who have somehow removed the stain of some legal condemnation from Eden through a covenant ritual. We read of God's approval of both Abel and Noah in Hebrews 11, Yet neither one participated in any covenant ritual, such as circumcision or baptism.

In fact there is no precedent in scripture for inheriting a legal condition, as is suggested by those who opposed the amendment to the 24th clause of our statement of faith. It was maintained that the supposed legal component of Adam's condemnation (somehow separate from the physical execution of that condemnation) is inherited by all of Adam's descendants and must be separately addressed from the physical condemnation. However, if we could inherit a legal condition then why would I or my daughters have had to be baptized? I was conceived and born after both of my parents were baptized into the Christadelphian faith. This is equally true of my daughters. If we can inherit a legal condition of condemnation then why can we not inherit a legally justified condition? Why would the sons of circumcised Isrealite fathers have to be circumcised if it was possible to inherit a legal condition? This presumption of an inherited legal condemnation is against nature and opposes divine principles.

Divine principles ... are eternal. They are forever. Divine laws are temporary. Mankind has experienced two transition periods and await the third when the divine laws change. Paul explains in Hebrews, referencing Melchizedek's priesthood and how it was different from the Levitical priesthood says

Heb 7:12 *For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law.* God changes His laws. He never changes His principles. There was no baptism until the introduction of the Ecclesial Age... when the Levitical priesthood was dissolved and the Ecclesial Priesthood initiated... where just as the sons of the High Priest constituted the priesthood under the previous age, so the sons of the current High Priest (Jesus Christ) serve as the royal priesthood of the Ecclesial Age... as Peter declares.

Not only does God change His laws, He even demands compliance with laws that contradict each other... for the purpose of making us choose and seeing if we understand His principles, which are greater than His laws. The law of the Sabbath would be in complete opposition to the law of circumcision if a boy had to be circumcised on a Saturday. The lawgiver had not expressed any circumcision exception for Sabbath law. However Jesus points out that the Jews correctly chose to circumcise a boy on the eighth day despite that fact that would fall on a Sabbath. Jesus confirmed in John 7 that Circumcision law was greater than Sabbath law.... Because of the principles they each projected. The cutting off of the flesh on the eighth day represents the total elimination of all sin producing flesh in the 8th millennium. The rest from our labors on the 7th day, the Sabbath, represents the rest from sin in the 7th millennium. Just as the total elimination of sin is greater than a mere rest from sin... just as 8 is mathematically greater than 7... so the divine law of circumcision was greater than the divine law of the Sabbath.... Because of the divine principles they projected. Extending this observation, the Abrahamic covenant, of which circumcision was the assigned token, was greater than the Mosaic covenant, of which Sabbath observance was the assigned token. Sabbath law had to be broken to keep circumcision law... in the same sense that the Levitical priest profaned the Sabbath but were blameless... as Jesus explained to the confused Pharisees condemning his disciples for picking and eating grain on a Saturday.

God's temporary laws are subservient to God's eternal principles. We cannot superimpose some law to be greater than divine principles. We cannot assign some imaginary legal condition initiated at Eden that is so incredibly significant that it has the authority to contradict the Creator's right of vindication to those who have never been baptized. Because then we are suggesting that divine laws and the technicalities of legal conditions are greater than divine principles. That suggestion would be a violation of the righteousness of our Creator. No law..divine or otherwise, is greater than a divine principle.

When the millennial Kingdom is introduced, after the resurrection to judgment...after the judgment of the just and the unjust... after the rejection of the goats to Christ's left... after the resurrection to immortality of the approved... then the priesthood and therefore divine laws will change yet again. There is no mention of baptism whatsoever... Circumcision, yes. But there is also no mention of a required attendance at the final resurrection at the end of the millennium being dependent upon either baptism or circumcision. This is not an eternal principle. If rising back to mortality from death was dependent on the participation in a covenant binding ritual then this would be consistent through all law changes that took place whenever there was a change in the priesthood. Yet there was no covenant binding ritual prior for the first 2,000 years following the defilement of creation by sin.

Let's look at another issue of contention. This is the little word "in". We read of being in Adam and In Christ. Those who refuse the 24th amendment in our statement of faith suggest that it we are **either** in one or in the other. If we are 'in' Adam then we are not 'in' Christ... And if we are in Christ then we are not 'in' Adam. This either-or state is only true in the context of the resurrection to immortality. Here is the context:

1 Cor 15:22-23 *For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. ²² For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. ²³ But every man in his own order: Christ the firstfruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming.*

This expression is entirely in the context of the resurrection to immortality. The "making alive" of those "in Christ" is not a resurrection to mortality for the purpose of judgment. This is the expression of the resurrection to immortality, which is what 1 Cor 15 is primarily... but not exclusively ... about. This is the only either-or "in Adam" or "in Christ" application. This is another example of illegitimately trying to paste the conditions and features of the resurrection to immortality onto the resurrection to judgment.

Currently we who have been baptized are "in Christ" ... but not exclusively. We have not yet experienced salvation... only the promise of salvation... although sometimes that is expressed as being past tense despite the fact that this salvation is future and conditional, which is our heavenly Father's right of expression. We are still "in Adam" in the sense of suffering under the curse of sin and death that we have inherited from our ancestors. I would be happy to admit that the unbaptized are exclusively "in Adam" However that does not necessarily suggest that the baptized are no longer 'in Adam' as well as being 'in Christ' We have no current freedom from the curse against Adam that was passed to all subsequent generations. We simply have the assurance of the **hope** of redemption because we have shifted our loyalty from the initial and still dominant disrespect of divine righteousness generated initially through Adam **to** the respectful submission to our Creator's

righteousness initiated through Christ...each carrying with them the physical implications of those loyalties....death or life. Even though we who are baptized are now "in" Christ, this is a loyalty issue... not a legal issue. This is an eternal life hopeful issue, not a qualification for resurrection to simple mortality prior to judgment and prior to our immortalization.

There is also the significant issue of sin that needs to be defined. This is difficult as there appear to be different understandings of sin within the Unammended community as well as within the Ammended community. Officially... in each statement of faith that issue is defined. However those statements are dramatically elaborated upon, inverted, and twisted in application... in both fellowships.

We should understand, as has been presented since Elpis Israel was written, that there are two primary but separate categories of sin. There is personal sin, the transgression of the law, the denial of the righteousness of our Creator for which we are personally and individually guilty. However there is also our sin producing naturefor which we bear no guilt whatsoever. Some Christadelphians seem to have a difficult time grasping the concept of sin for which one bears no guilt. However Dr Thomas does a wonderful job of explaining this concept in a number of different ways. Very clearly he explains the concept in Elpis Israel that is also stated quite clearly in the both the amended and unammended statements of faith: "Sin, I say, is a synonym for human nature." This would be the guiltless category of sin... the producer of the product.... that product which is personal transgressions... the other category of sin, for which we do bear personal guilt. These two sin categories are very clearly demonstrated in the laws of the Kingdom of God that were delivered through Moses at Mt Sinai. There were six sin offering procedures through which Israelites sought repentant forgiveness for the sins for which they were guilty. There were also six guilt-free sin offerings prescribed by God for conditions that had absolutely nothing to do with personal transgressions. There was no guilt whatsoever for those six sin offerings demanded by God. There was the sin offering for the dedication of the bronze altar of burnt offering, representing Christ. Metal does not have the capacity to transgress divine laws. There was also the sin offering for a mother who gave birth to a child, which was an act of righteousness. She bore no guilt whatsoever but a sin offering and a burnt offering was demanded for her atonement, not her child's. There was the annual sin offering for the Tabernacle and everything associated with it. Metal and cloth and wood cannot transgress divine law. This was a completely guilt-free sin offering. There were also the three sin offerings required for each of the three conditions of physical uncleanness: touching the dead, recovering from a bodily issue and recovering from leprosy. Each of these six sin offerings had absolutely no guilt associated with them at all... .unlike the six sin offerings by which different categories of people would seek forgiveness on the basis of their repentance... whether the high priest, the nation, the rulers, the middle class the poor or the bloodless sin offering of the very poor, being simply fine flour.

These two aspects of sin, both the guilty and the guiltless aspects are referenced in the New Testament repeatedly. Unfortunately they are often misrepresented in the discussions and debates between the amended and unammended fellowships. It has to be understood concerning the death of our Messiah that the sin he bore on the cross was not fake. We should never understand that Jesus was somehow made guilty and responsible for our personal sins. It was due to his uniquely guiltfree

life that he was free to destroy in his flesh the cause of sin.... Sin Cursed Human nature, what our statement of faith refers to as sin in the flesh. It was the cause of all sin that was violently executed on the cross at Calvary in our Messiah....exposed nakedly by the absence of any personal sin. This was a declaration that Yahweh was absolutely right to demand death for sin. This understanding was demonstrated at the baptism of Jesus and it was validated completely in the death of Jesus on the cross... that the Creator was right in demanding death for sin. This perfect demonstration of divine righteousness by Jesus is why the grave could not hold him and he pioneered the path of salvation, by which we might escape the condemnation – the physical condemnation of sin and death that we inherited through Adam... at the resurrection to immortality.

We read in Hebrews 9:26-28 *now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. ²⁷ And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment: ²⁸ So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation.*

Jesus comes again, but this 2nd time - without sin. The only sin he came with the first time, which he bore on the cross, was the guilt-free sin nature inherited from Adam that we all suffer from. The sin nature of cursed mortality that generates temptation from within, producing transgressional sin for which we **do** bear personal guilt for which **we** need forgiveness. Following our Statement of Faith, a number of doctrines to be rejected are itemized. One of those doctrines we must reject is the objection that there is no sin in the flesh. Over the last generation a challenge to this original position has developed within the Ammended fellowship, attempting to define sin as only one real category and one fake category. It is inappropriately presumed that any reference to sin in divine communication must be guilty sin or fake sin... a mere shadow or metonymy of the real sin. This was not our original position. Dr Thomas writes in Elpis Israel: "Sin, I say, is a synonym for human nature. Hence, the flesh is invariably regarded as *unclean*." In the same paragraph Dr Thomas writes: "Sin could not have been condemned in the body of Jesus, if it had not existed there." He continues again in the next paragraph: "... the purpose of God; which was to condemn sin in the flesh; a thing that could not have been accomplished, if there were no sin there." Dr Thomas also adds: "that which is born of the flesh is flesh", or sin. This is a misfortune, not a crime." Dr Thomas presented that second category of sin, the flesh, to have no guilt assigned to that category of sin whatsoever. The redefinition of that second category of sin as having some guilt assigned to it became the challenge our brotherhood faced under the direction of Bro Roberts. We don't have to do mental backflips to avoid understanding that second category of sin as being real, just to avoid this assignment of guilt to our nature. We don't have to suggest that sin in the flesh is just fake sin or shadow sin or exclusively a metonymous expression. As Dr Thomas originally expressed it from his scriptural studies... the flesh can be defined as sin but we bear absolutely no guilt for that whatsoever... just like the six sin offerings for unclean conditions where there was no guilt whatsoever.

There is a great deal more details and overwhelming evidence for the guilty and the guiltless categories of sin. The primary issue we should understand in this all too brief consideration of sin is that we do not inherit any guilt for a legal condition. The sin nature we inherit carries no guilt with it, simply a predisposition to an ungodly philosophy, focused through the emotional thought process we call "the heart". This must be circumcised. This natural, instinctive philosophy generated unbidden

from within us must be identified and rejected. If not we will constantly be redefining our own glory and righteousness as if it were God's glory and God's righteousness. That is the challenge.

We have considered some of the many proofs that the enlightened rejector, those who have not been baptized will be divinely required to participate in the resurrection to judgment on the basis of the divine right of vindication. We have briefly considered some of the foundational errors that prompted the need for the amended expression of this truth in our Statement of Faith. This is not an insignificant issue. The foundational issues are fundamental. If we alter one aspect of God's eternal truths... then we affect everything. The greatest issue to be emphasized is that we must not deny the righteousness of our Heavenly Father. We must validate that righteousness... by thought and word and deed.

Jim Dillingham

Granite State New Hampshire Christadelphian Ecclesia

Winter 2011