

Dear Brother Herzig:

Thank you for your letter of July 18, 2013 (probably you meant June), which I believe was written in good faith. Some of its parts come as a surprise to me. I am going to quote all such passages under seven points in italics and comment on everything that I see as deserving a comment.

1) Now Brother I understand that you have some disagreements with the Truth message as it is set forth from the Bible House in America and particularly with the understanding related to the doctrine of Justification as it has been presented by Bro. Puzdrowski at various Conventions in Poland during the past year or so.

Why are imputing to me I “have some disagreements with the Truth message as it is set forth from the Bible House in America”. Please do not make such general statements. Specify what you mean, as you do later on with justification, but do not try to make believe there are many things I disagree with because that is simply not true and not fair. I am reminded of Brother Jolly’s example from one of his talks in which he mentioned a brother coming up to him with accusations of another brother having three wives. When asked what their names were, he could not mention any. May I remind you of a long examination I prepared to defend and justify your stand on YWs springing into existence as individuals as early as 1878, which I worked out in reply to US opposition people contacting me with their ideas? I did send it to you then. How many presentations like that did you receive then?

It is true, however, I disagree with the doctrine of tentative justification as presented in four talks by your German representative at two Polish conventions, last year and this year, both at Poznan. The way he presented it is in direct opposition to what the Truth literature states about it. Briefly speaking, in the four talks he was trying to prove that tentative justification comes to an individual only at consecration, whereas the Parousia, Epiphany and Basileia teachings place it after manifesting repentance and faith in Jesus, i.e. before consecration. Why are you claiming this new approach to justification “is set forth from the Bible House in America”? Can you please point to any page presenting that new teaching in the Truth writings? I do not see it taught anywhere, quite the reverse! Where do you see it?

2) Now brother, you probably realize that you need to make allowances for Brother Puzdrowski's struggle with the English language.

What is it that you really mean? What does his “struggling with English” have to do with his teaching new ideas on justification? If he struggles with this language, he probably does not understand the Truth message written in it, which I think is true. If so, he should not undertake doctrinal matters but concentrate on the ethical ones and those written on the outside of the scroll.

3) And you have to make allowances for your own personal lacks relative to the Truth message as it has come forth piece-meal through the years here in the U.S.A. concerning justification and consecration.

I do make such allowances and that’s why I am such a careful student of the Truth writings. My discourse defending the doctrine of justification as presented in the Truth writings over the years, which is probably the reason why you have written this letter to me, is full of quotations from Bros. Johnson, Jolly and Gohlke. I do not rely on my understanding and I do not present my own ideas to the brethren. I can support all I say in discourses by referring listeners to the sources in the Truth writings. Again, give any references to the parts I may have misunderstood. This remark is not to the point at all, Brother. It reminds of one of your other accusations against me from three years ago, when you charged me with translating and publishing E volumes on my own, as a freelancer, without consulting Bro. Woznicki in the matter. I replied to that accusation, but my letter went unanswered, as did all the other ones in which I did my best to explain myself out of the various misrepresentations about me reaching you and, sadly, accepted by you as true.

4) *Furthermore, you do not have to agree with every proposal and understanding of truth put forth from the Bible House but you are not permitted to state your oppositions far and near to every class or convention that you serve.*

That I heartily agree with and I am doing just that. Which part of the Truth message presented so far have I opposed in any of my talks anywhere? Again, specify. Do not make general comments creating false impressions. You do not want me to appear worse than I really am, do you? If I ever come to the conclusion you are no longer being used by the Lord to give the Truth as due, I can assure you that before I start opposing your teachings, I will resign from the office of the aux. pilgrim of the Movement, as I am fully aware I should not be doing it under its auspices.

I think at this juncture I should ask directly why you keep referring to Bro. Puzdrowski's words as those coming from the Bible House? Have you cut off your hair yourself and given your office over to him? Is he the leader of the Lord's people at this time? Or do you just endorse his new teachings at Polish conventions? If so, why do you not present them in print for the brethren to examine and to eat or not to eat, according to whether they see it as Truth or error, as Bro. Johnson inculcates in E 3, 311-314? Whom is the Lord using now to give the Truth as due, you or Bro. Puzdrowski? If what he says in his talks is true (that he gives this new teaching on your permission and recommendation, having spent much time with you discussing Truth matters), what do you say to the Bible and Bro. Johnson prohibiting the brethren to rely on oral productions (1 Cor.4:6; E 17, 11)? Who knows what you say to each other in your private conferences and how much of that is correctly understood by Brother Puzdrowski, seeing that he struggles with English?

5) *Do you not see that this type of behavior is unsettling to the brethren, even if what you are preaching is correct?*

That really put me on the edge on my seat. Admitting that what I am preaching is correct, what you are saying here is, in fact, tantamount to stating that **preaching the Truth is unsettling to the brethren!** Not being able to point to any error in my presentation on justification, you simply tell me that I should not preach the Truth because it unsettles the brethren? It is the error spreader who should be told off, not the Truth defender. Do you not agree with Bro. Johnson from E 3, 170 that while the Lord's people "are peaceable, they are not primarily peaceable. They are *primarily pure*; and to maintain purity of doctrine and life, they will break peace rather than keep it at the expense of principle." I am a careful reader of the star members' writings and I do my best to stick to what they suggest as coming from the Lord Himself, as it agrees with the longings and desires of my heart. That is the Truth I want, and I don't want any other.

What is really unsettling to the brethren has been Bro. Puzdrowski's presentations over the last two years. It was not after my justification talk at the Łódź class two weeks after the Poznan convention that the brethren were close to tears or fury (depending on how each reacts to foundation felling teachings), but after Bro. Puzdrowski's May visit to Poland this year. Some wanted to give up altogether concluding all Epiphany teachings are becoming doubtful; others, unable to control their emotions, called what he said an "apostate and hideous teaching". This point should be raised in a letter to Bro. Puzdrowski, not to me. Ask Polish brethren at large and you will see.

While on this, I must say that all the four talks by your German representative were full of chaos in the way of presentation, irony and ridicule at the brethren in general, strictures on them for not wanting to accept the new light he was giving them (which shows he knows their opposition to it, and it was still before my talk, mind you), threatening the brethren if they do not accept the new light. Added to this was his body posture at the podium which I won't try to describe. At the Miętne talk last year, in which he shouted from the podium (doing it very loudly and with intonation the elderly brethren remember from Nazi soldiers during the second world war) that anyone disagreeing with what is given by higher ranking servants may soon be demoted and deprived of his position in the Movement, exactly as it is in this world's army, where privates are subject to sergeants, sergeants to captains, captains to colonels, etc. He used the hierarchy of the satanically organized army as a model for the Lord's people to adhere to, which shows him to be still deeply stuck in the nominal church organization.

No, Brother, I do not see that preaching the Truth can be unsettling to the brethren. My talk (not myself, because I was not giving my Truth) brought the reverse effect on the brethren after what they had been exposed to in Poznan (not only from this one brother, as our conventions in Poland have become divorce court rooms, new light centers, battle grounds between brethren, irony and ridicule workshops, etc.).

6) *Brother Russell advised that if we come to differences in doctrinal points, that we put such items on the shelf for the time being, when the Lord would possibly make them clear to our mind.*

Again, I accept it. But isn't it about things not clarified yet by the Lord through His servants? Do we lack any Truth on justification, either tentative or vitalized? Hasn't the justification path been outlined for us until the New Covenant and even beyond? The Lord has already made all this clear through His new-creaturely servants. Whatever else anyone says about it cannot be the continuation of the same shining path, but starting a new one, unless someone does it in harmony with the seven axioms. Can it be done in such harmony? If so, I would like to see and examine it, and then, if I prove it to myself to be the Truth, I will be the first to preach it. Just describe it, Brother, in this way in the PT and we will study it. This point, Brother, is not applicable to this case, don't you see?

7) *I have two references in the Truth writings that I wish to present to you for your consideration. ... E. 9 pp 294:1 - 300:1; E 10 pp. 128-129:1.*

I have read it again on your suggestion. How strange that two brethren should be using the same basis for entirely opposing conclusions. On the strength of what it says there I defend the Truth already given by the Lord in the Truth writings, against a new teaching which is subversive of what the Lord has already given us. You recommend me to read the same to understand that I should not be doing it! What the two references say with reference to what we are talking about is nicely summed up by points 6 and 7 of the conclusions Bro. Johnson came to as a result of his experience:

*(6) that never on new doctrines, types or prophecies, i.e., those not first explained by that Servant, should he express an opinion before the brethren—a thing that in the past he frequently failed to practice; and (7) that if he should get a thought on a new doctrine, type or prophecy, without letting the brethren know anything about it, he should present it to that Servant, and wait on him to **endorse** and **present it to the Church before speaking thereon to the brethren**, and if he would disapprove of it, he should remain silent thereon as being in all likelihood mistaken.*

Who is violating the letter and the spirit of the star member's words? Is it really me? Am I giving any new teachings to the brethren? Am I not just defending what the Lord has already given, by quoting abundantly from the Truth store?

Closely related to this issue is the antitype of Ex. 23:19, which is explained by Bro. Johnson as follows (E 11, 400): We "**understand the prohibition to type that we are not to partake of spiritual food before it is due—not to force premature interpretations on the Word and accept them for ourselves and give them to others to accept.**"

Don't you think this teaching, for the explanation of which this Brother spent four talks over more than a year, without anyone understanding a word of what he was saying as supportive of his new idea, falls under this prohibition? And what about meat offering, as explained by Brother Jolly in the PT 1964, 70?

"When anyone offers the pertinent worship and praise to God through declaring His Word, his preaching is to be with the Truth rightly divided, even in its details (when any will offer a meat offering unto the LORD, his offering shall be of fine flour, Lev. 2: 1), and with the holy Spirit of understanding (oil) and the fruits of the Spirit, especially disinterested love as praise (frankincense)."

What we are getting from this brother is such a far cry from the above that I will not spend any more time proving it. I have just marked the three basic things in three colors, none of which is present in this Brother's preaching. It's quite the opposite.

Brother Herzig, for the past four years I have been telling you about deviations from the ways of the Truth in Poland. All I have been getting in return has been disdain, shelving, misrepresentations, accusations and suggestions that there is something wrong with me, with occasional instructions for me what to do (e.g. "do whatever the representative tells you and everything will be fine"). But that's not the problem, that's a privilege. The problem is those perversions from the truth are on the increase, both by way of teaching new doctrines and new arrangements. This year has been such a dramatic step forward in the fatal direction that more and more brethren are being woken up to the real state of affairs in the Polish branch of the Movement. During the question meeting at Poznan, we learned that classes refusing the service by the disfellowshipped pilgrim are "suffering from hallucinations and their refusal to have the 'brother' serve them will no longer be tolerated."

By letting the wrong course continue and supporting the real problem makers you are losing the brethren and their respect. All I can do is to tell you about it again, since you invited me to give an answer to your letter. As I see it, you are being manipulated into believing that black is white and white is black. It's not for me to make you see the way I do. We are all on trial and I would love to stand mine as well as I can, making the Lord and only the Lord pleased with me. You can stand your trial as you like. After I have done my duty before the Lord by acting where I believe He wants me to act, I rest in peace leaving everything to His overruling providence. Do whatever you see fit. It's your trial, after all, unless, like your German representative, you believe all YWs have already passed their trial and cannot fall (that's another of his revelations this year; you might also listen to the sectarian questions put to the brother wanting to show his consecration in Germany this year).

That's all I can say. I wish you guidance from the Lord to make the right choices for Him and come off victorious. If you decide to reply, please be specific, as I have tried to in this presentation.

June 23, 2013

Adam Urban, Poland