

**Demonstration of Errors in the New Teaching
as affording opportunity for presenting the Truth.**

7^a. THE GROUP AS A WHOLE.

Having tested each of the parts separately by the only unerring standard of truth, and shown how unscriptural the New Teaching is with respect to them severally, we, have now to see what they are taken together, namely, an ingeniously devised and elaborately wrought out system with the distinct formulation of what amounts to a special creed, consisting of four definite factors, arranged in a fixed consecutive order, which is declared to be the only one "possible morally."

The Enunciation of the Scheme in the Deviser's own Words.

I think the kingdom is the first step, the covenant is the next, and reconciliation follows on that, and reconciliation leads to eternal life. (American Notes, p. 157).

Now there are three or four things I want to touch on, which follow each other successively, which you apprehend in the path of the spirit, &c. There are four great thoughts. The first is the *Kingdom* of God expressed in the Lord Jesus, &c. The second is the *Covenant* or teaching, &c. The third I take follows upon the covenant and that is *reconciliation*. And the final point that comes out is *eternal life* unto which grace reigns (pp. 128 9).

We have seen that the course of God's ways in blessing comes out in the kingdom, and the new covenant, and reconciliation and eternal life. That describes pretty much the order of God's ways both in regard of Israel and of Christians, &c. There is no other order possible morally (p. 357).

These and all other quotations in the current papers are the verbatim statements that have actually been made as to each subject examined, so that any resort to the usual subterfuge of trying to make believe "they do not mean that" will not avail, for they do more, the things are said, have been revised, and even repeated. The meaning is unmistakable and correctly set forth. One cannot quote the whole book and extracts only can be made, but they give what was positively uttered in every case, with the page for verification. A system that can put such wrong constructions on the very words of God Himself will not scruple to misrepresent and seek to cast discredit on mine. It is sad work, but God is above it all. They cannot deceive Him. He sees farther than all of them, and will vindicate His own truth.

Three times over in the foregoing we have the *four* things, the kingdom, the covenant, reconciliation, and eternal life, repeated in the same systematic form, with a gradual passage from the one to the other in succession till eternal life is reached as the climax. This amply corroborates what we pointed out at the start in our enumeration of the errors. Alas for the arbitrary grouping! There is no such *system* in Scripture, no such *order*, and no such *process*. It is perfectly certain that, in the dealings of God with souls spiritually, until there has been a prior new birth of the Spirit there can be no entering the *kingdom* of God, not to speak of other things that are contemporaneous with that divine operation, " Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter the kingdom of God" (John iii. 5). If that must precede, how could the "kingdom" be *first*? Especially since it is said to be something not established till Christ took His place at the right

hand of God! It is nothing but supposition in the teeth of Scripture.

As for the so-called "New Covenant," there is no such covenant in the Word as that which ranks *second* in the system and said to mean "teaching." The preceding paper on the "New Covenant" proved that conclusively.

Then "Reconciliation," as taught in Scripture, could not rightly be placed *third* in any scheme, because it is for *enemies*, who are besought to be reconciled, and is a blessing which is received on accepting the message, just as justification, which is for guilty sinners, is received on believing. It is *crucifixion* sets aside the "old man," not reconciliation.

Nor is "Eternal Life" ever presented in God's Word as the result of a lengthened process. So far from this, it is the gift of God, and in both John's Gospel and Epistle is constantly affirmed to be consequent upon faith on the Son of God. Accordingly the *grouping* is a mere artificial and mechanical device without any Scriptural sanction, no less than is the alleged intransposable *order*.

The System's pernicious Effect on the Interpretation of Scripture.

Take for example the Epistle to the Romans.

My point in this, every thought in Rom. iv and v has reference to the world to come (American Notes p. 134).

Now I have gone so far in order to show how this chapter (Rom, v.) is in connection with the world to come and the kingdom (p. 137).

You get three great things in the beginning of Rom. v, the first is *peace*, the second *grace* and the third *hope*. These three great principles are connected with the Lord Jesus Christ who is supreme at the right hand of God (p. 30).

Is that what characterise the kingdom?

Yes. "Therefore being justified by faith we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." "Through our Lord Jesus Christ" brings in the thought of the kingdom (151).

I wish all might get an apprehension of the kingdom having been established in the Lord Jesus Christ at the right hand of God. The effect of it upon us down here is that we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand and rejoice in the hope of the glory of God. Now supposing that you have entered the kingdom the next thing is God teaches &c. It is the term of the New Covenant, the love of God shed abroad in our hearts (p.p. 140. 142).

That is the order of Rom. v. is it not? Yes, there is no other order possible morally.

The four things you mentioned are found in Romans v? Clearly (p. 357).

The kingdom is righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost, then the Covenant brings in Divine teaching &c. Then you come to reconciliation &c. It is all leading on to eternal life (p.358).

Now take up the last verse "That as sin hath reigned unto death even so might grace reign though righteousness unto eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord" what thoughtful person could say that grace reigns unto eternal life now? I do not think it does yet. I do not think that grace is manifestly set in the ascendant. It is "unto eternal life," this is a divine thought and has reference to the world to come (p. 136).

If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus and shalt believe in thine heart that God raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation (Rom. x : 9.). Salvation at the present time depends upon confession of Christ as Lord, That is, in the Kingdom of God, the world to come is brought into the view of the Christian, in the fact of Jesus being crowned with glory and honour (p. 137).

Is it possible that anyone, having the faintest conception of the lofty grandeur and unrivalled magnificence of Paul's Letter to "all that be at Rome" with its wondrous unfolding of divine truth, could so ignore the wideness of its scope and bearing as to get himself to lower it to the level of a treatise on anything so contracted as a "kingdom," much less to avow that "every thought in chapters iv and v has reference to the world to come?" Think of that which concerns what is for ever and ever, and deals with the *eternal* relations of the individual soul of man as *man* to God as *God*, being ignobly reduced to a mere question of the "world to come," or Millenial reign, which is only to last for a thousand years! This shows the sad havoc which human ideas can work when essaying to tamper with what is divine. It is all the more inexcusable in view of the fact that we are not left to conjecture in the matter. The Spirit of God declares at the very commencement of the Epistle that it is the "Gospel of God concerning His Son" with all that such involves.

The Reputed Three Great Things at the beginning of Romans v.

It is affirmed "you get three great things in the beginning of Romans v; the first is *peace*, the second *grace*, and the third *hope*. These three great principles are connected with the Lord Jesus Christ who is supreme at the right hand of God." This is doubly wrong. In the first place, there are *more* than three great things in the opening verses of Rom. v, and in the second, none of these specified blessings are connected with the position of Christ at God's right hand as mistakenly alleged, but are all expressly founded on His death and resurrection. This is what it says "If we believe on Him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead, who was delivered for our offences and raised again for our justification" (Rom. iv. 24-5). "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom also we have access by faith into His grace wherein we stand and rejoice in hope of the glory of God" (Rom. v. 1-2). Accordingly Rom.v begins with *justification*. Why is that left out? It precedes peace. Then *access* is there as plainly stated as peace, grace or hope. What then becomes of the restriction to three? Nor is there a word in the passage about the "right hand of God," which is not the truth presented there at all. The whole of the things are made to rest on "delivered for our offences and raised again for our justification." The "therefore" of ver. 1 hangs on that previous statement without in this connection any mention of His exaltation. Further Christ is not the object of faith here but *God*, "Believeth in Jesus" is in Rom. iii. 26, but there nothing is said about peace. Here it is believing on the God that "raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead." Hence all the resulting things are referred to *God*, not to Christ, though based on His finished work. The peace is peace with *God*, the grace or favour in which we stand is the favour of *God* and the hope in which we rejoice is the glory of *God*. Hence it is not with *Christ* at God's right hand, though He is most assuredly seated there, that the blessings of Rom. v. 1-2 are associated according to the truth there taught but with *God's* raising Him from the dead after His deliverance for our offences, a line of truth which has its own circle of benefits. Another and even higher chain of bless-

ings result from Christ's ascended position. Each has to be kept in the place assigned it by God.

The Supposed Kingdom of Romans v.

The question is asked "Is that what characterises the Kingdom ? The answer is, yes, "therefore being justified by faith we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." "Through our Lord Jesus Christ brings in the thought of the Kingdom." Was ever such a far-fetched construction heard of before ? "Through our Lord Jesus Christ" simply means what it says. It is "through" Him as the channel, just as everywhere else. There is absolutely nothing about a 'kingdom' in thought or word either in the expression itself or in the passages in which it occurs. Indeed to connect these blessed things with the thought of a "kingdom" is to rob them of their real significance, no less than to destroy the true value of Christ's work through which we are brought to *God* Himself as God and stand in His favour. What has justified before *God*, and peace with *God*, to do with a kingdom ? Just nothing at all and only the necessities of a system can account for thus perverting the plain statements of God's word. As for the attempt to make the sitting of the Lord Jesus Christ at the right hand of God the establishment of God's Kingdom, it is just the opposite, for His position there now is the proof that He was *refused* the kingdom, and that it has been *postponed* for another day, not to mention the fact that the moral kingdom of God was already on *earth* when our Lord was here and needed no establishing in *heaven*. Nor could Christ's own kingdom on His own throne possibly be set up, morally or any other way, as long as He sits on His Father's. Then, how could the "world to come" be "brought into view" *now* if it "*is to come*" ? Christ must be crowned with glory and honour on His *own* throne for the "world to come" being "brought into view" and then He will not be at God's right hand at all. It is remarkable how this New Teaching spoils everything it touches.

The Fourfold System read into Romans v.

Over and over, the kingdom, the new covenant, reconciliation, and eternal life are said to be in Romans v, not only so but in that very numerical *order*, which is, moreover, declared to be the "only order possible morally." You read the chapter, but *no* "kingdom" nor any "covenant" is discoverable. Justification is there, and the love of God shed abroad in our hearts is there, but is justification a kingdom, or love a covenant ? Reconciliation is there too, but not as *third* in any system. We have "reconciled to God by the death of His Son," but in the history of the soul reconciliation takes place at the same time as "justified by faith." The Apostle by the Spirit had to treat of both the righteousness and the love of God. He might have taken the latter before the former. But the Spirit chose to unfold first what God has effected for sinners on the *righteousness* side, dealing with the whole question of *guilt* and the justification of the *ungodly*, and that, observe, before He is pleased to show what God has done for the sinner on the *love* side. It was a question of the design of the Spirit, and *both* could not be spoken of at once ! but because the one is taken up before

the other, does that mean that a sinner can be justified without being reconciled, or reconciled without being justified, much less the interjection of an imaginary covenant between the two? The righteousness of God, justification, and guilt all go together from the *justifying* point of view, while the love of God, reconciliation, and enmity are found side by side from the *reconciling* aspect of the truth. Righteousness is prominent in the one, love in the other. The former is fully expounded before treating of the latter, and then of course it has to come *after* the other in the order of *exposition*, though not in the order of *time* with respect to the soul, for they are simultaneous. Love would not be in place, while the other was being handled, but the moment reconciliation is to be introduced the Spirit at once brings in the love of God *towards* us while yet sinners, ungodly and enemies, His own unmoved love, Himself its source, proved too in what is done *outside* us, the love that is proper and peculiar to Himself, and in the sovereignty of His goodness manifested to enemies. Hence reconciliation is in the chapter, but not as following upon either "kingdom" or "covenant," nor is the love the same as the love of God shed abroad *in* the hearts of *saints*, but the love of God *towards* us while yet *sinners*.

Then the final one of the group, eternal life, is in the last verse of Rom. v, but not *fourth* in any scheme. So far from this, as there treated of, it is viewed from a different side of the truth entirely from justification, peace or reconciliation. These all depend on the *work* of Christ *for us* but eternal life in this chapter at least results from association *with* Christ as Head of a new *spiritual* family just as Adam was head of the human family.

Nor is it a question of a kingdom. The effort to turn "grace" reigning through righteousness into kingdom because the word "reign" is used is another bad effect of the system. Is "Let not sin reign in your mortal body" a kingdom? The reign of grace simply means that *grace* is the present prevailing principle of God's dealing and action towards sinful men in this age. As *death* was the result of *sin* having reigned, so *eternal life* is the result of *grace* now reigning. The reign of *sin* does not mean a kingdom, neither does the reign of *grace*. As the former was that evil thing *sin*, prevailing over all, resulting in *death*, so the latter is the prevalence of another principle with an opposite effect, namely, *eternal life*. The words are plain enough, "That as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord." (Rom. v: 21.)

In the face of this what can the following mean?

'What thoughtful person could say that grace reigns unto eternal life now?"

This is verily a strange question to ask, for what 'thoughtful person' with the language of the verse before his eyes would dare deny it? As sin hath reigned bringing death in its wake then and there, so it is just "now" that grace does reign with eternal life as its sure consequence. Yet the answer is given "I do not think it does yet," and we are told instead, "has reference to the world to come." God says that *now* is the period of *grace* that "grace and truth came by Jesus Christ," that the "grace of God hath appeared," that it is *righteousness*, not grace, which will *reign* in the "world to come," just as it will *dwell* in the "new heavens and the new earth."

The Real Kingdom of Romans xiv.

"For the Kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost" (ver. 17). This is the only instance in which "Kingdom" is mentioned in the Epistle, and it is the moral kingdom of *God* in contrast with meat and drink. The "righteousness" there referred to is *practical* righteousness, which has nothing to do with the "righteousness of God which is unto all and upon all them that believe," or *justifying* righteousness. The "peace" too, is practical peace (see ver. 19) and is quite different from "peace with *God*," while the "joy" is enjoyed joy subjectively in the Spirit, not at all the same as the objective "rejoicing in hope of the glory of God." Yet remarkable to say, these three features are confounded with the things found in the first two verses of Romans v, and actually quoted as if they were identical; thus "The kingdom is righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost, then the covenant brings in divine teaching," and so on till the complement of four is made up. That in Rom xiv. 17 is undoubtedly the "Kingdom of God," but what is said of it is read into the beginning of chap. v where there is *no* kingdom and falsely substituted for the peace, grace, and hope, that are there as if they were synonymous. Is not this disgraceful? Moreover because this one verse has in it the word "kingdom" distinctly saying what kingdom it is—the kingdom of God—giving the *practical* characteristics of it *spiritually* in contrast with *corporeal* meat and drink, it is surely too bad to mistake the grand thesis of Romans for anything so diminutive as a "kingdom" or narrow it down to the "world to come."

We might show similar treatment with respect to Cor., Gal., Eph., Col., Titus, and Hebrews, but this must suffice for the New Testament, nor have we space for more than a single example of the evil effects of the system on the interpretation of the Old Testament.

The Red Sea and the Wilderness made out to be the Kingdom.

What I mean is this, that when you have entered the kingdom then it is you are taught. If you take God's ways in the past, the kingdom was established before the Covenant. The children of Israel were brought to God in the wilderness. In that sense they were set in the kingdom before the covenant came to pass &c. When they passed through the Red Sea, they were saved from their enemies and the hand of those who hated them, and they come to Mt. Sinai and there it is the covenant is established (American Notes p. 36).

It is very evident from this, that the exodus out of Egypt and the entrance into the wilderness have been mistaken for what is here called "set in the kingdom" in defiance of the established facts of Israel's history. Even a child could show that the "kingdom" was *not* "established before the covenant" as alleged. The *future* manifested kingdom of the Son of Man will be established before the *new* covenant, but that was not so with the *old*. It was the exodus and the journey to Sinai that preceded the first covenant, not the Kingdom, which was not in existence till long after the conquest of Canaan, nor even in the time of the Judges, the last verse of which says, "In those days there was no king in Israel and every man did that which was right in his own eyes." You must go on to the days of David and Solomon for the Kingdom. Even figuratively the Red Sea typifies *redemption* and the wilderness the *earthly pilgrimage*, never the kingdom.

Would any one reading the inspired account ever think of making the exodus the kingdom, or saying the *old* covenant came *after* the kingdom in Israel's past history? It is the *order* of this *system* which necessitates this falsification, being *first* the kingdom, *then* the covenant. Consequently the kingdom must be put before Sinai, and the exodus in turn transformed into the kingdom. Why you should "enter" a "kingdom" in order to be "taught" is a strange notion. It is a *school* that has to do with teaching, and neither kingdom nor covenant. It is *grace* first *saves*, and then *teaches*, according to Titus, where there is not a word about "kingdom" in the epistle, while grace is the opposite of "terms."

Inconsistency of the System.

Reconciliation in 1898.

Is reconciliation for a *christian* or for a *sinner*? I do not think a *sinner* as such is conscious of wanting reconciliation. Would you preach the ministry of reconciliation to sinners? It would not be much good to them. Where is the ministry of reconciliation to be exercised? I think very much among those who believe. But do they need to be reconciled? I think so. (T.T. xi. p. 108.)

Reconciliation in 1902.

Instead of all being in a state of alienation, the world *has come into reconciliation by Christ*, that is the Divine side &c. God has not suspended reconciliation. The point of reconciliation is still there and the bearing of it is much wider now than even when Christ was upon earth. God was in Christ reconciling the world? Yes. (Truth for the Time part xv. pp. 102, 103, 104.)

Mark how the one is a complete contradiction of the other. Reconciliation in 1898 was declared for the *christian*, not for the sinner, was *not* to be *preached to sinners*, but its ministry was to be *exercised* among those who believe, who were said to *need* it. In 1902 reconciliation is all referred to the "world," that is, to *sinners* (as it should be if offered and preached to them) but alas! the pendulum swings to the opposite extreme, and goes as far *beyond* the truth as the other was *short* of it. Error never is consistent. It understates or overstates. The latter deliverance actually tells us that "*Instead* of all being in a state of alienation, the world *has come into reconciliation by Christ*." This is universalism. The former was too narrow, this is too wide, for it is not true that the "world *has come into reconciliation by Christ*." Reconciliation is proclaimed to the world of sinners, enemies to God, and they are besought to be reconciled, but they *are not reconciled till* they accept the message. Then, and only then, do they receive the reconciliation. Nor is this all. Admit that reconciliation is for the 'world' and has a "wider bearing even than when Christ was upon earth" and the whole system becomes dissolved. Its framer thus destroys it by his own words. *If* for the world, for sinners, it cannot be put *third* in any fourfold group. In that case it must be placed *first*, and what becomes of "there is no other order possible morally?" The entire fabric crumbles to pieces. It is amazing to contemplate how otherwise sensible and intelligent saints can still be found adhering to what is so palpably erroneous and untenable! That it is a definite *system* is incontrovertible, that it is *not of God* is equally clear, that it has a standard of right and wrong of *its own* that judges according to what is *for* or *against* the system regardless of that which is good or evil in the *sight of God* is also manifest so that what has the Lord's *approval* in

holding fast the truth is at once set down as *wicked* if it questions this teaching, and every one who cannot *accept* its systematic *error* is calumniated and persecuted. Love to those still in the midst of this most dangerous condition of things constrains one to put this straight question. What is it that so affects the minds of sober christian men of sound judgment in other respects, that they can get themselves to believe what *cannot* be, namely, a certain statement and its direct contradiction both at the same time? It grieves one to the heart to have to put it thus plainly, yet it would be unfaithfulness to shrink. There is only one solution, and that is a certain influence which invariably accompanies every *system* of the kind, the marks of which were strikingly depicted by another even before we were born. The reference to this feature in particular reads as follows: "Another mark often incomprehensible to one not under the influence, and that is, an incapacity to discern right and wrong, an incapacity to see evil even where mere natural conscience would discern, and an upright conscience reject at once. I speak of this incapacity in true saints. The truth is the soul is not, where under this influence (for it may be upright in other things) at all in the presence of God, and sees everything in the light of the object which governs it, and as to these things, the influence of the enemy has supplanted and taken the place of conscience. The moral marks will be found to attach to *every* case of evil power."

As to other characteristics: "The activity and zeal will be for the system, not to save souls or lead them on in Christ. There will generally be a good deal of acting *against* or depreciation of others who hold the faith of Christ. Paramount importance will be attached to the views which distinguish that institution. Good works will be found generally much pressed and that in a systematic way in which it works for and into the system. Truth, I mean truthfulness, will ever be wanting. Connected with this is the pressing much of certain doctrines, when it is safe, which form the bond of institution, and denying them in the alleged meaning, or explaining them away, when they are pressed on them by those who detect the evil. With this will be found the attributing to those, who hold the truth, every kind of doctrine they abhor, where there is influence enough to have their statements believed. Another mark is the extreme difficulty of fixing them to any definite statement, save as they have power to enforce it, and then it is bound on *others*, and there is the *sternest rejection of all who do not bow*. Calumny of the saints and their doctrines has been known from the testimony of the blessed Lord onward." Again, "When speaking was really impossible for *unallowed* brethren, some of these read a chapter in the Bible sometimes. This was stopped. A reserved and blameless brother was told he could read his Bible at home. He read no more." "The one undeviating object seemed to be to teach differently from what brethren had taught." Once more, "The tract-shop had become a violent party sectarian instrument. It is an institution I always indeed thought objectionable" (J.N.D. Eccl. Vol. iv. pp. 17, 18, 36, 37, 40).

All this has been enacted to the life in what has transpired in Melbourne. May the Lord in mercy extricate those dear to Him still there from this subtle snare of the Tempter before they become hopelessly entangled in its meshes. They run a fearful risk.

W.S.F.