

# Resurrectional Accountability I

Our subject is Resurrectional Accountability. This is the first of four presentations, for which I am responsible for only two... which will address the doctrinal issues as opposed to the history of this fellowship separating issue.

We are tasked with considering the truths related to the amendment to the 24th statement in the Birmingham Ammended Statement of the Christadelphian Faith. Let's review that for the sake of reference:

**24. That at the appearing of Christ prior to the establishment of the Kingdom, the responsible (namely, those who know the revealed will of God, and have been called upon to submit to it), dead and living -- obedient and disobedient -- will be summoned before his judgment seat "to be judged according to their works," and "receive in body according to what they have done, whether it be good or bad."**

[2 Cor. 5:10](#); [2 Tim. 4:1](#); [Rom. 2:5-6, 16](#); [14:10-12](#); [1 Cor. 4:5](#); [Rev. 11:18](#).

The issue is the qualification for the required attendance at the judgment. Is that basis exposure to the light of divine truths... or is it limited to those who have been participated in a covenant binding ritual, such as baptism and been subsequently either faithful or unfaithful? The third alternative is that perhaps this issue has no significance at all. This is the consideration that we address.

We can certainly demonstrate the truth of this amended declaration, that it is the exposure to the light of divine truths that qualifies one for a required presence at the judgment seat of Christ... it is the sowing of the seed of truth that qualifies the justified divine expectation of fruitfulness. However, this won't be quite as simple as my confidence may suggest to you. The reason for the complexity of any issue related to divine truths is that not one of them can possibly stand apart, alone or isolated. That would be impossible. That is not the way our Creator operates or communicates. Every understanding, every principle and every activity of our Heavenly Father is interconnected with everything else. This is true of both His spoken word and His written word. Everything our Heavenly Father does and says is absolutely flawless. It is right. That rightness, that righteousness of our Creator must be respected above everything else. Nothing can contradict anything else. It is all one perfect structure that we are tasked with understanding so that we might be in His image and His likeness – physically and morally... the original intention of creation. This foundational responsibility, that every understanding concerning our Heavenly Father's principles, laws and expressions must blend perfectly with all others, dramatically expands the consideration of any one principle into a consideration of how that one principle fits perfectly into the entire structure of all divine principles and expressions. The issue concerning whose presence will be required at the judgment cannot stand alone. The necessity for this amendment sprang from a growing challenge within our brotherhood revolving around the divine condemnation in Eden and the implications of baptism... which also affects the principle of atonement, which must blend flawlessly with the principle of peace.

Whenever there is an unresolved disagreement there are always unexpressed presumptions. Therefore we need to define and understand foundational terms to avoid the trap of these unexpressed presumptions. We need to understand words like resurrection, responsibility, sin, righteousness, atonement, divine vindication, and peace. We also have to understand that dictionaries are very close to meaningless. We have to define terms by divine standards, not fleshly

standards. An example of this is the basic word peace, which is the result of atonement. Peace defines the final stage in the divine plan, beyond the atonement, that time when our Creator will be all and in all. The 'dictionary' defines peace as the absence of disturbance... the absence of aggression. This is the exact opposite of the divine definition of peace... which is the presence of harmony. The flesh defines peace as an absence and disturbance and aggression as the reality. Our Heavenly Father sees peace as the perfect harmony of all things with disturbance and aggression being the temporary absence of peace. These understandings are exactly the opposite. It is the perfect agreement of harmony that defines God's peace. But it is the toleration of diversity, the unchallenged acceptance of disharmony that defines the flesh's concept of peace. The understanding of this simple foundational word -peace- can have a tremendous impact on the understandings of divine principles and how we balance the significance of each issue. This is a question of focus, priorities and perspective. We cannot understand divine principles or words from a fleshly, heart based, instinctive perspective. Dictionaries are a sand foundation and not a rock foundation for the permanent structure of our understandings.

Resurrection is another term that has been horribly confused in this divisive issue. There are clearly two separate -but related- categories of resurrection. However, frequently we read and hear expressions in the brotherhood that suggest there is only one category of resurrection. That is absolutely impossible. When we hear brethren mention "the" resurrection we should be asking which one they are speaking about... not in the sense of timing, as in the beginning of the Millennial Kingdom or the end.... But in the sense of whether they are referring to the resurrection to judgment or the resurrection to immortality.. following judgment. These are the two categories of resurrection... perfectly opposing the two categories of death. There is a permanent death (scripturally expressed as perishing, like a beast) and there is a temporary death ([Matt. 10:28](#); [Ps 49:](#) ). This **temporary** death is the death of anyone whose presence will be divinely required at the judgment. Their death is temporary and not permanent. There are two categories of death and there are two categories of resurrection. This has everything to do with our consideration as many misunderstandings have been promoted by presuming that scriptural statements applying exclusively to the resurrection to immortality can be somehow superimposed onto the resurrection to judgment. This is one of those unspoken presumptions that create confusion and unresolved differences. Let's address these two separate resurrection categories so that we don't make the same mistake.

There are separate groups of people participating in each of these two resurrections... the resurrection to judgment and the resurrection to immortality. These two groups certainly overlap but there are people who will participate in the resurrection to judgment who will never participate in the resurrection to immortality... those who are rejected at the judgment. There are also people who will be living at the return of Christ who will not participate in the 'resurrection ... for judgment' ... as they will already be alive when called....but will participate in the resurrection to immortality. There are also separate conditions for qualifying for the participation in each of these two resurrection categories. This issue of the qualifications for participation in the resurrection... our 24th amendment of the BASF... has everything to do with understanding the separate qualifications for each of the two resurrection categories.

Let's just briefly look at how these two separate resurrection categories are referenced in scripture.

**Acts 24:15** *And have hope toward God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust.*

This is the resurrection to judgment, including both the just and the unjust. It is the issue of who is constituted by the "unjust" that is the focus of our issue in this address. Paul's comment to Felix exclusively references the resurrection to judgment, as no one disagrees that the "unjust" will not be immortalized. Now let's compare that resurrection to the one Jesus references in Luke.

**Luke 14:13-14** *But when thou makest a feast, call the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind: <sup>14</sup> And thou shalt be blessed; for they cannot recompense thee: for thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just.*

This recompense Jesus relates to the particular resurrection he references is strictly limited to the resurrection of the just... not the resurrection of the just and the unjust that Paul referenced to Felix. The resurrection to judgment is not a resurrection of recompense. The recompense is reserved for after the judgment when the just are eternally rewarded with eternal life and the unjust are eternally punished with a forever death. Paul in Acts refers to the first resurrection category, the resurrection to judgment for the just and the unjust. Jesus, in Luke, refers to the 2nd resurrection category, the resurrection to immortality which is only for those he determines to be just.

Paul also distinguishes between these two resurrections when he explains to the Phillipians that he does not presume his eternal acceptance by Christ. We use this reference when we defend the true gospel against Christians who believe in the God despising concept of an instant, guaranteed salvation upon a single repentance. Paul writes in Phil 3:11-14: *If by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead. Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect: but I follow after, if that I may apprehend that for which also I am apprehended of Christ Jesus. Brethren, I count not myself to have apprehended: but this one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.* There is no question in either Christadelphian side of this consideration about the terms of judgment accountability that Paul certainly qualified to a demanded presence at the resurrection to judgment. That certainly isn't in question. Paul is exclusively referencing his participation in the second resurrection category... the resurrection to immortality... that he refuses to take for granted. Paul's expression would be absolutely false in the context of a resurrection to judgment but absolutely appropriate in the exclusive application of the resurrection to immortality.

We have to be very careful when we read about or reference 'the' resurrection... which resurrection is being addressed... as there are separate qualifications for participating in each of these two resurrection categories.

Let's consider four aspects of each of these two resurrection categories and see how they are different:

1) Participants 2) Qualifications 3) Timing 4) Physical nature of each resurrection category

## I. Resurrection to Judgment:

**Participants:** Those who have been exposed to the light of divine truth, in whatever capacity our judge determines is adequate. This would include the disobedient and the obedient. The disobedient would include both those who had participated in a covenant binding ritual and those had not participated in a covenant binding ritual... such as baptism or circumcision. We have to be aware of the fact that no woman could have ever participated in the covenant binding ritual of circumcision. That is physically impossible. Yet I doubt any of us would suggest that Sarah, the mother of Isaac, or Leah or Debra the judge of Israel will not attend the judgement. But, this is the issue we are considering, No matter what our position we have to accept that the participants of the resurrection to judgment will not exactly match the participants in the resurrection to immortality. That would presume a total acceptance of everyone raised from the dead without any need for a judgment whatsoever. No matter what our position concerning the qualifications for the demanded attendance at the resurrection to judgment we have to recognize there are separate participants between these two resurrection categories.

**Qualifications** for the resurrection to Judgment will be the dead who have some level of accountability to respond to the evidence of our Creator's righteousness... the just as well as the unjust. This resurrection is related to the right of divine vindication for exposure to our Creator's righteousness. The witnessing of divine truth and glory... the sowing of the seed ... carries with it a responsibility to respond or answer for that disrespectful ambivalence. The Creator has a right to expect a harvest when He sows His seed in the living, breathing dust of the earth that we know as men and women. We are accountable to the divine sower even if we refuse to embrace that seed and develop that seed into fruitfulness.

**Timing:** There are two future resurrection to judgment events in the divine plan... The 1st will immediately follow the return of Christ before the Millennial Kingdom is initiated and 2nd is at the conclusion of the Millennial Kingdom. The other timing issue is that the resurrection to judgment takes place before judgment, before the rejection of those Christ refuses and before the resurrection to immortality. The timing for these two resurrection categories are completely different.

**Physical Nature of this Resurrection:** The resurrection to judgment is a raising from the dust state of death to a living state, undoubtedly still mortal –as it is defined as an awakeing-a return to a previous state, and not a new condition that could never be referred to as an awakeing. This renewed state is not comparable to the original undying state of Adam and Eve before their condemnation... just as Lazarus and the Widow of Zarephath's son and the daughter of Jairus, and Dorcas, etc.

## II. Resurrection to Immortality:

**Participants: Only** those who are accepted by Christ after the judgment will be concluded in this resurrection.... Making this distinction very different from the resurrection to judgment. The parties certainly overlap... but they are not the same. In fact there are some people who participate in the resurrection to immortality who will have never participated in the resurrection to judgment. This would be those who are living when they are called to judgment. We are specifically told Jesus will judge the living and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom (2 Tim 4) so we know there are

people who will not experience the resurrection to judgment but still qualify to participate in the separate resurrection to immortality.

**Qualifications:** Everyone agrees that all those baptized into the true gospel will be required to attend the Judgment. However while that distinction is certainly sufficient for a demanded participation in the resurrection to judgment it is insufficient for the assured participation in the resurrection to immortality. The just and the unjust will be required to attend the judgment but only the just will participate in the resurrection to immortality. An absence of obedience does not eliminate one's participation from the resurrection to judgment but certainly eliminates one's participation in the resurrection to immortality. The qualifications for these two resurrections are different. That is why it is so important to distinguish which resurrection we are referencing when we speak about the qualifications for participating in 'the' resurrection.... Such as the amended clause in the BASF.

**Timing:** This resurrection to immortality take place after the resurrection to judgment and after the judgment process itself has concluded and after the rejected have been identified and dispatched to utter darkness for their weeping and gnashing of teeth. There is a totally separate timing for each of these two resurrection categories.

**Physical Nature of This Resurrection:** The resurrection to immortality is a raising from flesh to spirit, from mortal nature to a covering immortal nature, from dying thou shalt die to living forever without the capacity for death, from sin producing with the capacity for righteousness to exclusively righteousness without any capacity for sin whatsoever. This is the ultimate application of atonement... when corruptible puts on (or is covered/atoned) by incorruptibility... when mortal puts on (is covered/atoned) by immortality. When our heavenly citizenship, that house made without hands and reserved in heaven is brought to us by our Messiah and we are no longer naked before our God. This resurrection issue of the physical nature of each of these two resurrections dramatically separates these two resurrection categories. It is like the way scripture defines the original creation of man. Our creator formed the body from the dust of the earth and then breathed into that frame the breath of heaven. We rise in the first resurrection category as the living dust of the earth. We rise in the second resurrection category to heavenly bodies that are like the wind, as Jesus tells Nicodemus when he answers his question about how we have to be born again to inherit the Kingdom.

Clearly there are two separate resurrection categories addressed in scripture. They have different participants, different qualifications, different timing and a rising to different natures. Distinguishing between these two resurrection categories is critical to determining the truth of this amended 24th statement, the truth about divine principles, the truth about divine laws and the divine plan. The progression of these two resurrections is not simply logical, this progression is projected a number of different ways throughout divine expressions. It is the progression of flesh before spirit, of death before life and natural before spiritual. First is the bodily, fleshly resurrection back to a limited life and then there is the spiritual resurrection to unlimited life. These two resurrection stages reflect both the 'image and likeness' divine design goal from the creation of man. The combination of these two resurrection categories also demonstrates the principle of peace... how the physical and the spiritual must perfectly harmonize in the divine plan. This is the plan of atonement that leads to peace

When we do not distinguish between these two resurrection categories we invite error. When we speak of 'the' resurrection... as if there is only one resurrection, then we invite error. Let me offer an example. About 120 years ago a brother in the North London Ecclesia referenced Hebrews 13:20-21 *Now the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant,*<sup>21</sup> *Make you perfect in every good work to do his will* A sister who was promoting the idea that exclusively those who are baptized will be at the resurrection responded to his reference with this question: Since the basis for the resurrection of our Messiah was based on the blood of the everlasting covenant when why do you suggest our own resurrection is **not** based on that same blood of the everlasting covenant?

The reference to the bringing again from the death our Lord Jesus Christ through the blood of the everlasting covenant refers to his immortalization-the 2nd resurrection category... not his raising to mortality before his resurrection to immortality. This sister's question presumes the precedents for the resurrection to Christ's immortality are supposed to apply to our resurrection to judgment. That is an absolutely impossible application, based on presuming the qualifications for participating in the resurrection to immortality are exactly the same as the participation in the resurrection to judgment. It is a totally illegitimate question. It is based on this mistaken impression that there is only one resurrection category presented in scripture. The record of this event explains that this sister was the wife of Bro JJ Andrews, who was at the center of this challenge to divine truths.

So one major issue we have to keep in mind is that when the word or concept of the resurrection is referenced we must differentiate the resurrection category that is being referenced, whether it is the resurrection to judgment... the resurrection to immortality .. or the progressive combination of both.

There is another ground rule we should establish before we look at the evidence for the amended clause to our statement of faith. This is how our Creator is free to express Himself differently than we do. We are supposed to think like Him. We should never suppose that He is limited to communicate with us in the context of our own limitations. He is the standard for us to conform. He is not required to conform to our standards. That false foundation would validate the blasphemous doctrine of the trinity, the denial of the flesh of Christ. One example of this is the divine right to express the reality of future events in the past tense... as if events in the future have already taken place. **We** are not free to use expressions like this as we are not capable of forcing the realities of our intentions, unlike our Creator. Paul presents this divine expression precedent as proof of the claim that faithful Gentiles can consider ourselves the children of Abraham and heirs of the divine promises that Abraham was offered.

**Rom 4:17** *As it is written, I have made thee a father of many nations,) before him whom he believed, even God, who quickeneth the dead, and calleth those things which be not as though they were.* Paul notes how Yahweh spoke to Abraham in the past tense concerning an event that had not taken place at that time. Yahweh claims he had already made Abram a father of many nations ... before the man ever had a son. If our Creator says it will happen – it is as good as done. Now if this form of expression were to be used by ourselves... we mortals ... this would be considered arrogantly presumptuous, but it is perfectly appropriate for our Creator.

James warns us in chap 4 starting in vs 13: *Go to now, ye that say, To day or to morrow we will go into such a city, and continue there a year, and buy and sell, and get gain: <sup>14</sup> Whereas ye know not what shall be on the morrow. For what is your life? It is even a vapour, that appeareth for a little time, and then vanisheth away. <sup>15</sup> For that ye ought to say, If the Lord will, we shall live, and do this, or that.*

We are warned that we are not permitted to speak like God in this context, not to speak of future events as if they have already happened, as if they are assured – because we say so. The inappropriateness of our use of this form of expression should not limit the legitimacy of the divine right to use this form of expression... of referring to future events as if they have already taken place. Now this is significant when we examine statements concerning baptism and what baptism achieves and its limited ritual purpose in the divine plan for this particular divinely appointed age (the Ecclesial Age)... as baptism was not required during the 1st Kingdom age that began at Sinai and ended at Jerusalem or the Patriarchal Age that had a different set of laws and a different form of priesthood than both the 1st Kingdom Age and the Ecclesial Age. There are expressions our Heavenly Father uses concerning what is achieved at baptism that is entirely future, yet expressed in the present tense... as if it has already taken place. This is part of the problem for why this disagreement has been perpetuated concerning the qualification for resurrection... enlightenment or baptism.

There are two more basic prefacing points we have to make before we can reference the evidence for our amendment that we are considering. The first is that creation is all about recognizing the rightness of our Creator.... That He is right in everything He does and says. Every law and every ritual confirms one or more aspects of the rightness... the righteousness of our Creator. This is the primary issue and that may seem academically simple.... Of course God's right. However in application, there are always contradictions to this rule whenever any form of false doctrine is introduced or perpetuated.

Extending from this foundational statement that everything is about validating the right-ness of our Creator.... is the understanding that every single form of doctrinal error will always do two things.

1. Degrade Yahweh
2. Inappropriately exalt ourselves

This is true of absolutely every form of false doctrine. The very first sin was a denial of the righteousness of our Creator. Adam and Eve believed that the serpent told the truth and that God had lied, that God was wrong and the serpent was right. That denial of the righteousness of the Creator introduced death and suffering, but ... along with a plan for both reconciliation and salvation, depending on recognizing that our Creator was, is and always will be – right. The doctrine of the immortality of the soul is a denial of the righteousness of the Creator. It suggests we do not really have to die because of sin... that sin is just as eternal as righteousness. The doctrine of an immortal God of wickedness, an immortal angel that sins and promotes sin is another denial of our Creator's righteousness and a declaration that His nature is inherently unclean. That doctrine suggests one can sin but live forever without really dying, without ceasing to exist. It is another confirmation of the serpent lie and a denial of God's testimony that sin must die that sin (contradictions of the Creator's right-ness) cannot be forever. The doctrine of the trinity suggests that our God disguised himself inside a mortal overcoat, pretending to be human and lying about having the capacity to sin, lying about having the capacity to die, lying about dying, lying about coming back from the dead... which is

impossible for an immortal. That is an incredibly blasphemous doctrine, which is why John prophesies of this denial of the flesh of Christ as being the very signature of the antichrist system. It reverses the intended progression of man being in the image and likeness of God and requires God to degrade Himself into the image and likeness of man... reversing the emphasis. This doctrine demands that man is the standard to which our Creator must conform to save His wrecked creation project. Any form of false doctrine will always, without exception, be divinely degrading and exalt the flesh. The denial of the righteousness, the rightness, of our Creator is what sin is all about.. it is the missing of that mark... the target of our Creator's right-ness. This is why the glory of our Creator must cover the earth as the water covers the sea. The glory of God is the appreciation of God, the appreciation for His principles and the depth of His power and perfection. Without appreciation, there is no recognized glory. Sin is the denial of the Creator's rightness... whether in thought, word or deed. Our Creator demands His right of vindication. He will be vindicated. The world opposes Him and everything He stands for. This is why it is not just those who qualify to be immortalized that will be raised for judgment. Our Creator demands His right of personal vindication with those who were exposed to some understanding of His righteousness.. but rejected that righteousness, preferring their own at His expense... whether they are baptized or in covenant relationship or not... no matter which divine laws were expected to be observed in whatever divinely appointed age men and women may have lived or are living. The point of raising those who will only be rejected following judgment is the vindication of our Creator's righteousness. There is no other point to their public rejection. This is also why immortal emergence is a false understanding... that we spring from the grave in an immortal state. The presumption there is that judgment takes place during our death. This false doctrine – of immortal emergence from the grave - is also dependent on the misapplication of the two categories of resurrection and denies the divine righteousness of our Creator's vindication before those who had been somehow familiar with that righteousness but rejected it, elevating their own concept of what is right above the Creator. An example of this right of divine vindication, is when this divine right is extended to the faithful by the promise of our judge to the brothers and sisters in Philadelphia: Jesus says: *Behold, I will make them of the synagogue of Satan, which say they are Jews, and are not, but do lie; behold, I will make them to come and worship before your feet, and to know that I have loved you.* Jesus promises to vindicate the faithful but persecuted brethren in Philadelphia...at the judgment, when those false Jews (untrue to their elevated status as the genealogical descendants of Abraham) are required to bow before the very people they had persecuted. These Jews are clearly enlightened rejectors. They are not accused of being pretend Christians... as the faithful had been called for decades by the time the angel gave John these revelations on the island of Patmos. They were unbaptized Jews whose presence would be demanded at the judgment seat by Jesus Christ for the purpose of extending the benefit of divine vindication to those who inherit the divine nature. Now if we want to suggest that the basis for the presence of these Jewish enlightened rejectors at the judgment would be their circumcision then we would have to extend that precedent forward throughout this whole Ecclesial Age. We aren't free to stop at 96 AD. That presumption is absolutely impossible. If mere Jewish circumcision -well after the death & resurrection of the Messiah has taken place - demands a man's presence at the judgment seat then there would be no Jews left in Israel when the immortalized Christ and the saints are supposed to save them from the Gogian invaders, as recorded in Ezekiel 38 and 39 and Zechariah 12-14. We can't have it both ways. The unbelieving Jews in Philadelphia who persecuted the baptized faithful will rise from the dead for the resurrection



to judgment for the express purpose of the vindication of our Creator and those who supported and validated His righteousness... entirely outside the framework of any baptism qualification. There are quite a number of these examples where people outside any covenant relationship with our Heavenly Father who have somehow rejected the legitimacy of their exposure to enlightenment, will be forced to attend Christ's judgment for the exclusive purpose of divine vindication. Those who reject whatever form of divine righteousness that may be revealed to them, whatever enlightenment they may be presented with, cannot evade our Creator's right of vindication just by refusing baptism. They are not more powerful than the Creator of the universe, holding his vindication at bay by the absence of a ritual. That is the nature of incorrect doctrine. It is always God degrading.

There are only two gods in this world. There is our Creator and there is the mirror. That mirror god goes by many different names... Baal, Ishtar, Zeus, Rah, Allah, Buddha, Jehovah, and many others. Any distortion of divine principles, of divine truths, is a refocusing by our instinctive heart generated thinking away from our Heavenly Father and to the mirror... elevating ourselves in our own eyes at our Heavenly Father's expense.

Let's look at the qualifying feature for those whose attendance is demanded at the judgment seat of Christ. Then we will examine the issue of the scripturally pronounced presence of enlightened rejectors whose participation in the resurrection to judgment will be demanded but who will never participate in the resurrection to immortality. Then we will look at some defensive reasoning on this issue. In our next class we will examine the issue of Adamic condemnation. It is the misunderstanding of this condemnation in Eden that is the supporting structure for the mistaken concept that exclusively the baptized, or those in covenant relationship will be the only ones who can possibly be raised to judgment.

Let's start with **John 3:18-19**

*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. <sup>19</sup> And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil.*

The condemnation referenced here is initiated by light and eliminated by belief... not baptism... but belief. Now baptism would certainly be included in the framework of anyone who truly believed... as baptism is the first act of obedience upon understanding. If one is not baptized then they certainly never "believed." The messiah's condemnation that cannot be escaped is for those who were exposed to the light but preferred darkness instead of that light, because their deeds were evil. This cannot be any clearer. Christ's words here declare unequivocally that it is light –enlightenment- that is the difference between our judge's condemnation or not.

This is a powerful statement but would be dramatically weakened if it were an isolated expression. Let's look at some references describing the wrath of God.

**Rom 1 18** *For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness*

One does not have to be baptized in order to hold the truth. How many people have grown up in the Christadelphian community, refused to be baptized and led lives according to the ungodly rules of

society? They number in the thousands in this generation alone. One does not have to be baptized to "hold" the truth in unrighteousness. The wrath of god will be revealed **from heaven** against these people, whether or not they have been baptized.

**Eph 5 5-6** *For this ye know, that no whoremonger, nor unclean person, nor covetous man, who is an idolater, hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God. <sup>6</sup> Let no man deceive you with vain words: for because of these things cometh the wrath of God upon the children of disobedience.*

Now who are these children of disobedience and what is this wrath of God that comes upon them?

The children of disobedience would be those who disobey the commands of God. One of those commands was to be baptized upon repentance. Therefore those who do not obey the command of God and His son – our judge – to repent and be baptized would certainly be among those who were disobedient. However one first has to personally be exposed to the divine commands in order to have the capacity to obey or disobey. Those who have been exposed to the light of divine truth certainly have the capacity to obey or to disobey. Baptism is an act of obedience. Refusing a legitimate baptism is an act of disobedience. The wrath of God is promised against those who disobey God. Now the wrath of God cannot possibly be limited to this life.. .prior to resurrection. That conclusion would validate the philosophy of Eliphaz, Bildad and Zophar... the three supposed friends of Job who insisted on the principle of exact retribution... that since horrible things had happened to Job, that alone was proof of his extreme wickedness. If we think that is true then we are required to conclude that Jesus himself was wicked, as he suffered horribly. The principle of the wrath of God can be applied to this mortal life, but not exclusively. The context for our reference is the inheritance of the Kingdom of Christ and God. That is the context of the wrath of God that will come upon the children of disobedience... who certainly include those who have disobediently refused a legitimate baptism. This expression also confirms the validity of our amendment that it is enlightenment that qualifies one for a required participation in the resurrection to judgment and exposure to the wrath of God for disobedience.

**John 3:36** *He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.*

This wrath of God, that cannot possibly be limited exclusively to this life without denying the righteousness of God... this wrath of God abides on those who do not **believe** the son of God. Certainly that can apply to those who are baptized... despite starting well they did not continue to the end, as is necessary. However those who have been given the opportunity to believe but have refused to believe at all... without any baptism... certainly also qualify for this wrath of God abiding on them... even after they experience that temporary death prior to the resurrection to judgment.

The command to obediently repent, followed by baptism is offered to all men. Paul declares this issue to the Athenians on Mars Hill in the context of the resurrection to judgment.

**Acts 17:29-31** *Forasmuch then as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and man's device. <sup>30</sup> And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men every where to repent: <sup>31</sup> 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.* The requirement for obedience that makes one subject to the judgment of the world in righteousness is prior to baptism, not after. This defiant refusal to obediently submit to baptism will be addressed by our Creator's appointed judge, whose resurrection is proof of the eventual resurrection to judgment of all those accountable to this command to repent, of which baptism is simply the initial demonstration.

That command to repent and then be baptized was one of the commissions given to the faithful just before Jesus left earth.

**Mark 16:16** *And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.*

Those who believe **and** are baptized will be saved. We quote this verse constantly when we preach the truth to demonstrate the necessity to be baptized as a result of our belief. We don't have the right to presume that the next phrase of the unbelieving being damned at some time in the future to be specifically limited to those who actually were baptized. The damned does not indicate those who simply perish with no divine condemnation, no divine vindication being realized. The Greek word that is translated "damned" here is predominantly translated as condemned. Those to whom the gospel is preached but do not believe and then become baptized **will be** condemned. Jesus demonstrates how this word should be understood when he addresses the scribes and Pharisees who demanded yet another entertaining miracle to prompt their weak confidence.

**Matt 12:41-42** *The men of Nineveh shall rise in judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: because they repented at the preaching of Jonas; and, behold, a greater than Jonas is here. <sup>42</sup> The queen of the south shall rise up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: for she came from the uttermost parts of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and, behold, a greater than Solomon is here.*

Jesus makes it clear that those who refuse to respond to him during the generation of his ministry will be "condemned" by the men of Nineveh who will also rise to judgment, despite the absence of any circumcision or covenant relationship with the Creator. The Ninevites were neither circumcised nor baptized. However they were exposed to the light of the gospel... through the sign of the prophet Jonah of life out of death. These Men of Nineveh, along with the queen of the South – the queen of Sheba (also not circumcised – as that would be physically impossible,, and also not in covenant relationship with Yahweh)... all of these will be present at the judgment following their resurrection to condemn those who refused to respond to the ministry of Jesus, refused to be baptized into his name. These enlightened rejectors , along with those who refused to believe and be baptized after Christ's ascension,.. will be publicly condemned for their foolishness. Our Creator will realize His right of vindication... and there is no way we can prevent that by simply refusing to be obediently baptized. We are not more powerful than God, We do not have the power to prevent His right of vindication simply because we choose to disobeyingly deny the command to be baptized.

**John 6:44-45** *No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him: and I will raise him up at the last day. <sup>45</sup> It is written in the prophets, And they shall be all taught of God. Every man therefore that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me.*

The condition expressed here for being raised up at the last day is hearing... Every man that **heard** (not everyone that has been baptized... but everyone that has 'heard'). These must come to Jesus, being raised up at the last day.

It is this 'hearing'... not baptism ... that is the repeated condition for God's demand that we answer to Him for rejecting His righteousness.

**Deut 18:18-19** *I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him. <sup>19</sup> And it shall come to pass, that whosoever **will not hearken unto my words** which he shall speak in my name, **I will require it of him.***

We know this prophet Moses speaks of is Jesus Christ. We are repeatedly told that in the New Testament. It is the words of Jesus that must be hearkened to or our rejection of his words will be required of us by our God. God will require... He will demand of those who did not hearken to the words of Yahweh spoken by Jesus... These enlightened rejectors will be asked.....by what right they refused God's testimony. They will be accountable to answer why they disrespected their exposure to the light of divine righteousness.

Attendance at the judgment is not limited to a covenant relationship or circumcision or baptism... it is about whether we have heard the words of truth that determines our participation in the resurrection to judgment.

An extension of this principle is the issue of alienation. Those who are not in any way exposed to the life of our Creator, which is the reward of the faithful, are expressed as being alienated from that life on the basis of their ignorance... not on the basis of their non-baptism.

Eph 4:17-18 *This I say therefore, and testify in the Lord, that ye henceforth walk not as other Gentiles walk, in the vanity of their mind, <sup>18</sup> Having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them, because of the blindness of their heart:*

I recognize this does not reference the basis for resurrection and judgment but it does reference alienation from the life of God. It is not simply non-baptism that alienates someone from the life of God... It is ignorance.

It is knowledge that offers the escape from divine alienation and from the pollutions of this world and it is knowledge that defines our accountability to the judgment seat, just like the amended clause 24 states in the BASF.

**2 Pet 2:20-22** *For if after they have escaped the pollutions of the world **through the knowledge of the Lord** and Saviour Jesus Christ, they are again entangled therein, and overcome, the latter end is worse with them than the beginning. <sup>21</sup> For it had been better for them not to have known the way of righteousness, than, after they have known it, to turn from the holy commandment delivered unto them. <sup>22</sup> But it is happened unto them according to the true proverb, The dog is turned to his own vomit again; and the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire.*

All that facilitates our escape is exposure to truth, knowledge. If we pursue that knowledge, being baptized and obediently faithful then our escape can be successful. If we are overcome –without any distinction concerning the degree of our response, baptism or otherwise - then the end result is worse than if we had never come to that knowledge of Jesus Christ. This does **not** say that if we become

entangled after we have been baptized then our latter end is worse than never having been baptized. The condition is knowledge... without any presumption of baptism whatsoever. We are worse off if we come to some knowledge of the truth, some knowledge of God's righteousness, and then turn away from it. We are somehow worse off than if we had never been exposed to that knowledge. This means that those who never **knew** the gospel are better off than an enlightened rejector. How is that possible if there is no accountability at the judgment for the enlightened rejector?

In fact, if we want to maintain that only the baptized will participate in the resurrection to judgment then we are contending that those who tried to be obedient by being baptized but then failed are worse off than those who knew the way of truth but rejected it completely from the start. **That** understanding would be a dangerous violation of the righteousness of our Creator.

Let's move further into the consideration of the status of the enlightened rejector. The point of difference concerning the amended clause 24 and the unammended clause is the issue involving the presence at the judgment following resurrection of those who qualify on whatever terms God determines as being enlightened, but they have not been baptized. These are the enlightened rejectors. These people will definitely be resurrected from the dead to face the righteous condemnation of God through Christ for their rejection of Yahweh's righteousness. These people are not in control. They do not have the power to snub their noses as the Creator, defying His right of vindication. They are not free to escape their promised divine condemnation or escape the wrath of God simply because they refused to obey the command to be baptized. It is God who is in control. He decides. We don't have the freedom to trump His right of vindication just because we have refused to comply with the command to believe and be baptized. This falls within the principle Jesus emphasizes at the conclusion of one of his judgment parables:

*For unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required: and to whom men have committed much, of him they will ask the more* (Luke 12:47). Our Creator demands the right for requiring from us according to what we have been given... not what we have taken (as in baptism)... but what we have been given... as in the sense of enlightenment. It is the same issue as the husbandman who has a right to the fruits of his efforts. Those who till the ground, and plant the seeds, and water and weed and nurture... have the right to expect a harvest. Those who have received the seed of truth will have to answer for their refusal to germinate and produce fruitful glory to the Creator, the ultimate husbandman. The divine principle of "to whom much is given, much will be required" is a validation of the amended clause of the BASF that we are considering.

**Matt 10:14-15** *And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear your words, when ye depart out of that house or city, shake off the dust of your feet.* <sup>15</sup> *Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrha in the day of judgment, than for that city.* (Mk 6:11)

This is a reference to the enlightened rejector who will suffer less mercy in the day of judgment than the Sodomites. Those who rejected the preaching of the disciples will be present in the day of judgment. Obviously these are not the obediently baptized that are completely rejecting the preaching of the disciples. This is one of many absolute proofs that the enlightened rejector, the non-baptized will be divinely required to attend that day of judgment, whether they were dead or alive in that 'day' of judgment.

Paul refers to the fact that God judges those outside the Ecclesia when he addresses the problem of the young brother behaving horribly immorally.

**1 Cor 5 11-13** *But now I have written unto you not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner; with such an one no not to eat. <sup>12</sup> For what have I to do to judge them also that are without? do not ye judge them that are within? <sup>13</sup> But them that are without God judgeth. Therefore put away from among yourselves that wicked person.*

The apostle Paul assigns judgment responsibility to the Ecclesia for the members of the Ecclesia.. but not those outside the Ecclesia. Paul explains that God judges them. The people within the Ecclesia who shame the righteousness of our Heavenly Father by their behavior should be judged by the Ecclesia. Those outside the Ecclesia who bring shame to the righteousness of the Creator **will** be judged by our Creator... through His son. No one has the power to take that right away from God simply by refusing to be baptized.

**Rom 2:6-9** *Who will render to every man according to his deeds: <sup>7</sup> To them who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory and honour and immortality, eternal life: <sup>8</sup> But unto them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath.*

The unbaptized certainly qualify as those who have not obeyed the truth but obeyed unrighteousness. They too will be rendered-to according to their deeds, in the same context as those who are awarded eternal life. We certainly can't limit those who have not obeyed the truth to the exclusively baptized.

Then Paul would have had to say ... *Who will render to every man according to his deeds: <sup>7</sup>To them who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory and honour and immortality, eternal life: <sup>8</sup> But unto them that are contentious, and obeyed the truth initially by being baptized but didn't remain obedient to the truth, but obeyed unrighteousness, indignation and wrath.* Unfortunately for those who refuse the amended clause 24 of the BASF... that isn't what the Apostle Paul said.

We also have the testimony of the resurrection and judgment standards at the end of the Millennial Kingdom. Interestingly there is absolutely no reference to any requirement for baptism during the Millennial Kingdom reign. There is, however, the requirement of circumcision during the restored Kingdom for all the mortals who wish to visit the temple. We are specifically told that anyone who is not circumcised in the flesh as well as circumcised in the heart will not be allowed to enter the temple. Apparently the resurrection to judgment at the end of the millennial Kingdom will not be on the basis of being baptized or not during that 1,000 year period.

**Ezek 44:9** *Thus saith the Lord GOD; No stranger, uncircumcised in heart, nor uncircumcised in flesh, shall enter into my sanctuary, of any stranger that is among the children of Israel.*

**Rev 21:8** *He that overcometh shall inherit all things; and I will be his God, and he shall be my son. <sup>8</sup> But the fearful, and **unbelieving**, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the **second death**.*

There is no statement concerning baptism or any covenant relationship... just being fearful and unbelieving... similar to the conditions for participation in the resurrection to judgment at the beginning of the Millennial Kingdom. The second death would be the final death. If one was raised

from the dead, judged and rejected they would experience a second death. All those who never participated in the resurrection to judgment could not experience a 'second' death. Their first death would be their final death. Yet we find once again that it is unbelievers who will suffer two deaths, therefore these unbelievers... among whom would be enlightened rejectors.... Will participate in the resurrection to judgment and then suffer that 2nd death.

**1 Pet 4:17-18** *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? <sup>18</sup> And if **the righteous** scarcely be saved, where shall **the ungodly** and **the sinner** appear?*

Peter mentions three classes in the context of judgment: the righteous, the ungodly, and the sinner. The point of contention in our amendment is whether there are two or three categories of people at the resurrection to judgment.

1. Those who have been baptized but unacceptably disobedient to Yahweh and
2. Those who have been baptized and been acceptably obedient.
3. The third category is the issue of contention: those who were exposed to the light of truth but refused to obey to any degree... the enlightened rejector. Let's see how Dr Thomas views the status of these three categories:

*"It is light or knowledge which makes accountable men responsible. By this light accountable and responsible men are subdivided into three orders: first, those who would not receive the light; second, those who receive and continue in it; and, third, those who having received it, turn from it."—Dr. John Thomas (in 1847).*

Dr Thomas would most definitely have agreed with the amendment to that 24th clause. He was always part of the 'amended' fellowship, understanding the 3 categories of people whose participation in the resurrection to judgment will be demanded... on the basis of the divine right of vindication.

Jesus makes it absolutely clear that those who have been presented the truth but were unbelieving & unbaptized will definitely be at the judgment after the resurrection. In Matthew 23 he directly addresses the scribes and Pharisees at Jerusalem who have refused to positively respond to his message. He calls them hypocrites, children of hell (Gehenna, the geographical representation of the final divine rejection). He calls them blind guides, whited sepulchres full of dead men's bones and the children of prophet killers. Jesus says about these enlightened rejectors....

**Matt 23:32** *Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers. <sup>33</sup> Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?*

These enlightened rejectors have no capacity to deny Jesus or his Father their right of vindication. These enlightened rejectors who heard the words of truth cannot **escape** their damnation... not simply death, but divine condemnation ... which is a divine right.

Let's squeeze in one defensive commentary before we conclude this class.

1 Cor 15:20-23 *But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the firstfruits of them that slept. <sup>21</sup> For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. <sup>22</sup> For as in Adam all die, **even so in Christ shall all be made alive.** <sup>23</sup> But every man in his own order: Christ the firstfruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming.*

Much is made of this reference of being made alive referring to the resurrection to judgment. This is an example of how the 2nd resurrection category of a resurrection to immortality is mistakenly applied to the resurrection to judgment. This reference has no legitimate application to the resurrection to mortality. This exclusively refers to the resurrection to immortality. The reason we can be totally confident of that understanding is that Christ was definitely not the firstfruits from the grave to mortality... which is the resurrection to judgment.... but he was definitely the firstborn from the dead for the resurrection to immortality. Any proposed application of this reference to being a condition to the resurrection to judgment is completely illegitimate as that is not the resurrection being referenced. This is yet another example of how error is promoted by mistakenly applying the conditions of the resurrection to immortality as applying to the very separate resurrection to judgment.

We have not even begun to look at the issue concerning the divine accountability standards for sin and evil. We certainly have not exhausted the evidence for the required presence of the enlightened rejector at the judgment seat of Christ... the very basis for the amendment of clause 24 of the BASF. Unfortunately it is time that limits us. Further conclusive evidence remains to be examined. In our next class we will examine the issue of Adamic condemnation that is the inspiration for this illegitimate denial of the divine right of vindication in the raising to judgment of the enlightened rejector, those who have heard the words of life but refused any level of obedience, refused any validation of the right-ness of our Creator.

*Jim Dillingham*

Granite State New Hampshire Ecclesia

[Bible888@aol.com](mailto:Bible888@aol.com)