

## Methods of thrusting error on the brethren!

Brother Leon Snyder (for short, later referred to as LS) writes his present PT and BS articles by picking and choosing, often from early Parousia writings, whatever suits his purpose at hand, ignoring what later Parousia or Epiphany writings have to say about the issue in question. This is his way of getting some bases for his new theories to make believe that what he says is well grounded on the teachings of the star members and the previous leaders of God's people, as for the sake of correctness, he wants to be seen, at least for the time being, as their continuator, as was the case with JFR, who while gradually and increasingly deviating from the teachings of Pastor Russell, at first didn't dare to say so in so many words. Ironically, his deviation also started from changing the doctrine of justification, which he also claimed did not exist prior to consecration, which claim is being reiterated today by LS and his supporters.

By selecting carefully chosen extracts from the rich literature resources of the past – which sometimes include early and immature thoughts, later on were discarded or made more precise – he sometimes (1) **quotes**, and sometimes (2) **just paraphrases** the content in his own words so as to clothe the ideas in the colors more to his liking. If this is not enough, he (3) **doesn't hesitate to add new ideas from himself without in any way informing the reader**, who is to think that is the way Bros. Russell, Johnson and Jolly taught. The words added can as much as entirely change the sense of the original utterances from the Lord's servants, and that's what this method is all about – to make the reader think the new teaching is not new at all, but came into being in the days of the star members and the other leaders of God's people who followed them and who, unlike himself and his predecessor Ralph Herzig, had God's seal of authenticity.

A corroboration of methods 2 and 3 (of paraphrasing and adding words to the originals from previous leaders, without informing the reader of the additions, and even without mentioning the actual authorship of the words quoted or paraphrased) is the article on justification from the BS 886, which contains extracts from Bro. Jolly's talk of 1916, from a time when two kinds of justification were still at work. Here is what LS published in the BS 886, p. 8:

*“We conclude, then, that a proper faith in the provisions of God for us, will not be content with a small measure of justification, but will actively press on to the full attainment of justification and consecration. To receive a measure of justification and then not use it to its intended purpose of consecration would be to receive the grace of God in vain (2 Cor. 6: 1). Those who receive a measure of justification by faith at the present time and do not go unto consecration and justification in their fullest sense, for expanded Gospel Age purposes, can lose their measure of justification by faith (or reckoned restitution), in order that they may receive actual restitution with the rest of the world—for never having fully consecrated, they are still a part of the world, having received the present grace of God in vain.”*

Before quoting the original words by Bro. Jolly, let me present the paragraph in question as it appeared in the Polish BS (Sztandar Biblijny 263), as it reveals another interesting peculiarity of the present LHMM publications: they give different versions of the same PT or BS magazines in different languages, probably based on their own evaluation of how much error the readers in pertinent countries will accept at any given time. In the Polish version, the paragraph above came with an extra explanation in brackets, and was considerably shortened at the end, which shows LS regards US readers as liable to swallow any amount of error, whereas for the Polish field he must try harder by providing extra explanations and withholding some material, at least for now. To make it easier for you to compare the two paragraphs, I have marked **the extra explanation in Polish in yellow**, and **the words omitted from the Polish version in green**:

*“We conclude, then, that a proper faith in the provisions of God for us, will not be content with a small measure of justification, but will actively press on to the full attainment of justification and consecration [by saying “the full attainment of justification” the author means a full advantage of the grace of*

justification, which comes after consecration – translator’s note after explanation from the author]. To receive a measure of justification and then not use it to its intended purpose of consecration would be to receive the grace of God in vain (2 Cor. 6: 1). Those who receive a measure of justification by faith at the present time and do not go unto consecration and justification in their fullest sense, for expanded Gospel Age purposes, can lose their measure of justification by faith (or reckoned restitution), in order that they may receive actual restitution with the rest of the world—for never having fully consecrated, they are still a part of the world, having received the present grace of God in vain.”

Instead of the green part, at the end of the paragraph in the Polish BS is the following note in brackets: “[changed in the Polish version, as per the author’s wish].”

Leaving the differences in Polish and the reasons thereof aside, let us now compare the said paragraph with the original from which it comes, not a word breathed by LS of the original writer (Bro. Jolly), or the year it was composed in (1916). Please note one significant addition from LS:

*“We conclude, then, that a proper faith in the provisions of God for us, will not be content with a small measure of justification, but will actively press on to the full attainment of justification and consecration. To receive a measure of justification and then not use it to its intended purpose of consecration would be to receive the grace of God in vain (2 Cor. 6: 1). Those who receive a measure of justification by faith at the present time and do not go unto consecration and justification in their fullest sense, **for expanded Gospel Age purposes**, can lose their measure of justification by faith (or reckoned restitution), in order that they may receive actual restitution with the rest of the world—for never having fully consecrated, they are still a part of the world, having received the present grace of God in vain.”*

The bold and underlined part shows the addition from LS, “for expanded Gospel Age purposes.” Why did he consider it necessary, especially with Bro. Jolly’s Parousia viewpoint of two-step justification present in the paragraph anyway (“a small measure of justification / the full attainment of justification and consecration”)? He must have wanted to make sure that the reader would get the idea of both the two-step justification as still valid now (“for expanded Gospel Age purposes”), and the idea of losing one’s justification for not consecrating, omitting from the Polish version the very harsh words of the tentatively justified as being “part of the world”, as they were seen in the Parousia.

It should be added that when the same 1916 talk Bro. Jolly was reprinted by Bro. Hedman (which he did in the PT 640, p.53), he put a caveat at the beginning, among other things asking the reader “to keep in mind the perception of the sermon and the brethren as prevailing in 1916”, which amounted to saying that Bro. Jolly’s treatment of justification was adapted to the Spirit-begotten ones, who after repentance and believing in Jesus were granted just a measure of justification (tentative), and when they consecrated, were privileged to enjoy the full measure of justification (vitalized). LS wants the reader to understand this pattern is still valid today, long after Spirit begetting has ceased.

Another example of LS using this method is his letter to the Polish brethren read out in 2014 at a convention in Poland, in the town of Rzeszow, being a blend of extracts from previously written Truth articles dealing with the nature of the LHMM Movement. While quoting Bro. Gohlke’s words about the independence of the classes (which for him was their full autonomy in all respects), he added from himself three words qualifying that autonomy – “under LHHM guidelines”, which make void all that Bro. Gohlke wrote on that. For LS, the doctrine of congregationalism in practice comes down to classes being independent and antonymous “under LHHM guidelines.” Please compare this new understanding of the congregational rule with what a star member left us (E 8, 325):

*“Each ecclesia of the Lord’s people is, under Christ’s Headship, the mistress of its own affairs, in complete independence of all other persons; ecclesias and ecclesiastical organizations, but acknowledges its ties with others in Christ for Christian fellowship and helpfulness.”*

Is there any room for LS's "under LHMM guidelines" in Bro. Johnson's definition of congregationalism? For LS, ecclesias are free as long as their freedom is exercised within the confines and guidelines set by the LHMM. From this perspective, we might say that everyone is free, even a prisoner, who can do what he likes "under prison guidelines."

Looking for any bases for the teachings preached by LS today can be seen in his statement from the PT 749, p.3, where he is desperate to find some ground for the theory that a justified believer loses his or her justification if they do not consecrate to God. Where did he find something to lean on? Read on: "We can readily see the concept from Bro. Russell's early writings." In Bro. Russell's early writings, at a time when Bro. Russell did not see the quasi-elect classes (and there are as many as ten of them, as taught later on in the Epiphany). When there is an idea he'd like to propagate, he will go anywhere, and ignore anything to find some support, as he does in this case, ignoring a wealth of material from Epiphany writings to the contrary.

In honesty, we must admit that paragraphs on tentatively justified losing their justification in consequence of not consecrating were reprinted in the PT as well, by Bro. Hedman, but were not penned by him, but by Bro. Russell, who did not see the quasi-elect classes as faith classes in God's plan, which at a time when nobody else but Spirit-begotten Little Flock and Great Company were sought was something normal, since the whole emphasis was put on the work of the harvest, with even the Youthful Worthies hidden from view, to say nothing of the CECs or unconsecrated tentatively justified. The quasi-elect as classes were beginning to be noticed gradually, as the Spirit-begotten classes were passing away and the non-Spirit-begotten ones were coming to the fore. The full truth on the latter was given to us only after the Gate to the Court was closed and only the Camp remained – a mutual place for all the tentatively justified – the last consecrated class (CECs) and the unconsecrated tentatively justified.

As most brethren know, Bro. Hedman, just like Bro. Gohlke before him, didn't like changing anything in what they reprinted from earlier Truth writings. Accordingly, their reprinting this or that from the store of Truth is no proof of their teaching all the things contained in it. Out of respect they left them as originally written, but while doing so, they never came up with erroneous teachings on anything, pointing to Pastor Russell as the originator of the error preached by them today, which is the method employed by the LHMM after 2004.

Here is what Bro. Russell wrote about it in R 2385. It can easily be recognized it is in line with what Bro. Hedman reprinted in the PT 686, and what was and still being offered by Bros. Ralph Herzig and LS after the developments in the LHMM took a turn for the worse.

R 2385: *„We understand, however, that no one can maintain his reckoned justification who indulges in wilful sin--nor can he long continue in a justified attitude without progressing to the next legitimate step of full consecration and self-sacrifice. If he loses his justification without making use of it in consecration, etc., he has merely slipped back again to the plane of the world, and if he has not enjoyed full opportunity for consecration, he probably will have some future opportunity to revive his justification and to consecrate himself; but in any case he loses all the precious opportunities of the high calling to the new nature, besides the blessings which he might have enjoyed in this present life. Furthermore, his greater knowledge having added to his greater responsibility, he may expect "many stripes" in the future, or disciplinary judgments, in proportion to his resistance to the light, and failure to use it.--Luke 12:47,48)."*

Please compare it with mature Epiphany thoughts about the unconsecrated tentatively justified, from PT 654 of 1994, p.88. Pay special attention to the underlined parts, which show that **the tentatively justified wouldn't consecrate** to God, and then state the result of that for those who while not consecrating, remained loyal to righteousness and the ransom.

*“As another part of the class represented in the "sons" we have the persevering faith-justified of the Gospel Age. These are the Gentiles (and some Jews also) who during the Gospel Age have recognized themselves as sinners, at enmity with God. Repenting of their sins and accepting Jesus as their Savior, they have attained to justification by faith and peace with God (Rom. 5: 1); but instead of using their justification as a stepping stone for access into a higher standing (Rom. 5: 2), namely into the race for the prize of the high calling (Phil. 3: 14), or else for Youthful Worthship, they have stood still. They have not been willing to follow in the Master's footsteps (1 Pet. 2: 21), to make a full consecration of themselves to God (Rom. 12: 1), to deny their own will selfward (Matt. 16: 24) and worldward (Matt. 10: 37-39), and to accept God's will as their own (Matt. 26: 39; Heb. 10: 7).*

*“However, while they have not given themselves to the Lord in consecration, they have nevertheless clung to faith in the Ransom, and continued to practice righteousness to the end. We understand that they also will be numbered among the secondary earthly seed, who (under the Ancient and Youthful Worthies as the primary earthly seed) will bless all the families of the earth, converting them to the Kingdom of God.”*

Is the teaching on the tentatively justified failing to consecrate the same in both quotes? Which one, in the light of the bright Epiphany teachings, seems to be more mature, logical and in line with the seven axioms? I don't think anyone without a desire to impose his own pet theory on others needs an answer to that, it being self-evident.

In Bro. Russell's various pen products one can find many thoughts which were later corrected by himself or Bro. Johnson. E.g. in R 3107 of 1902, he writes about the New Covenant as follows (emphasis added):

*„Nothing can be more clear than that this New Covenant is without a solitary condition, so far as the people to be blessed by it are concerned. It is a covenant or agreement wholly on one side--an unconditional promise on the Lord's part of what he will do for the world. We say for the world advisedly, because we are to remember that in respect to the Day of Atonement sacrifices and the blessings therefrom, Israel is a type of all the world of mankind desiring to come into covenant relationship with the Lord, as the Levites represented the household of faith, and the priesthood was typical of the royal priesthood, the Church,--Jesus the High Priest, and consecrated believers the underpriesthood.-- 1 Pet. 2:9.”*

If someone ever needs to prove that the New Covenant is an unconditional promise from the Lord to bless the world of mankind, he will easily find some proof for it, ideally in “Bro. Russell's early writings.”, when the Truth on many subjects was only beginning to get brighter after centuries of darkness.

And if anyone wanted to change the dates for the Gospel Age Harvest, all they must do is look into “Pastor Russell's Sermons”, p.287, from where they can dig out the following dates:

*“It is concerning the Harvest time of this Gospel Age that I address you on this occasion, believing that this entire Harvest period, according to the Scriptures, is to be forty years long, and that we entered it in 1878, and that consequently it will close with 1918.”*

There are more of the like in the Parousia literature. It remains to be seen how many of them will be used to preach error today, against the full light given by God later on?

Closing my observations on the methods used by LS while conceiving his new truths, I'd like to draw the reader's attention to one more: he throws in his new ideas and tries to bolster them with something evident that raises no doubts in anyone's mind, but is totally disconnected from what he aims to prove. A perfect example of this can be found in the infamous PT 749, p.3:

*“We can readily see the concept from Bro. Russell's early writings. He, of course, is addressing the Little Flock in this reference, but the concept of the two steps (or parts) of faith justification, which are first the justified believer and second of consecrating oneself to God, applies (the concept applies) to all saved*

*classes of mankind. Even those who we refer to as the “Unconsecrated Quasi-Elect” will, early in their life in restitution, face the step of consecration. The only way the unconsecrated (of this life) Quasi-Elect, can actually receive that Quasi-Elect standing is by consecrating in restitution. God is just and the only reason He did not require consecration from those we style as the unconsecrated Quasi-Elect is because they were in Christian environments where consecration is not understood and taught. There is no escaping it; every called class as well as the sinful world of mankind will have to consecrate to receive everlasting life.”*

In the above paragraph, LS describes the two-step faith justification as a universal concept for the whole Gospel and Millennial Ages, and for all people. To make it more plausible, at the end of the paragraph he states a self-evident truth that all those wanting to live for ever will have to consecrate, which while being true is, however, completely unrelated to his two-step justification (before and after consecration) for all mankind and for both Ages. Saying so at the end of the paragraph, he wants to impress the reader with the thought that his arguments have been proven, since it is true that “*There is no escaping it; every called class as well as the sinful world of mankind will have to consecrate to receive everlasting life.*” How does it prove his teaching, however, that the second stage of justification comes by faith after consecration, and that with reference to all people of the two Ages?

Another illustration of the same principle of referring to unrelated things to prove something (i.e. mixing up ideas and classes in God’s plan) comes from Bro. Dan Herzig’s email correspondence to me (Adam Urban). Here is the part in which **Bro. Dan was trying to prove that if the tentatively justified know God invites them to consecration, and do not consecrate, they lose their tentative justification**. The following three paragraphs contain [Bro. Dan’s explanations in blue](#), with my comments put in black (as I answered his email to me by putting my comments in or under his):

When the writings refer to the “unconsecrated quasi elect” it does not mean that they can remain unconsecrated forever because we know all will eventually have to consecrate to receive eternal life. The “consecrated and unconsecrated quasi elect” refers to their standing in this lifetime. The unconsecrated quasi elect of this lifetime will have to consecrate in restitution to get on the Highway of Holiness and receive the benefits of their repentance and faithfulness in this lifetime. [that's obvious]

The difference in these two scenarios is; “WHEN the invitation to consecration is made.” In the first case are those schooled in the Parousia and Epiphany truth who were/are given the truths necessary to make their consecration clear. In their justified condition, our Lord, in his office as “teacher” made the next step of consecration clear and thereby invited them to consecrate (Rev. 3:20) IN THIS LIFETIME. If they are “invited” NOW, in this lifetime, and do not take the next step of consecration, they will lose their standing in the class that is now being developed, “The Consecrated Epiphany Campers.” An illustration might be “if you’re invited to dinner and do not show up, you do not get to eat at that table”.

There seems to be something wrong in the paragraph above, Brother. If tentatively justified are invited to consecration and do not consecrate, I think they **cannot** “lose their standing in the class that is now being developed, “The Consecrated Epiphany Campers,” for the simple reason they never had their standing in that class yet because they did not consecrate. Your illustration of someone invited to dinner who does not show up proves that such a one does not get to eat at that table, which is self-evident, but it also shows that whatever he had before being invited to dinner, is still his. Why should he lose his lunch, which he had arranged for before, only because he did not accept someone's invitation to dinner?

Comment on the food symbolism from the above: Lunch = tentative justification; Dinner = consecration.

Summing up, there are four methods of LS flooding the brethren with error:

- 1) quoting selectively from wherever He can of the rich Truth writings resources of the last 140 years while ignoring the later and further light on the same topic;
- 2) paraphrasing in his own words the earlier writings so as to lead the reader's mind to the pastures of his choosing, leaving him there under the impression that is the way the previous leaders of God's people taught on a given topic;
- 3) secretly adding a few important words to the paragraphs quoted from the other authors in order to make them teach different ideas from those intended by the original author;
- 4) throwing in true thoughts at the end of some fallacious reasoning in the hope of making the reader believe the error has been proven.

End of document