

*The Knowledge of  
God  
and the  
Gatherings of Men*

*by Nigel Johnstone  
belmontpublications.co.uk*

*Preface to the Reader*

I publish, here, letters written during the past two years, during which time I have lived in Malvern, Worcestershire, during which time I have sought the kingdom of God and his righteousness, as commanded by the words of the Lord Jesus.

During this time, I have written several books and done what I can to seek out that which is of God, in Christ, in this area.

And here are my findings, documented for all to read who wish to know.

I have edited almost nothing; the letters are virtually as they were written and posted. I have sometimes deleted names, sometimes used just initials, sometimes declared the whole name.

Rarely, I have made very slight adjustments in order to express divine matters according to my present understanding rather than leave expressions from the past which are short of my present enlightenment.

*Nigel Johnstone*

Malvern, april 2013.

*Contents*

4	The Person of Christ
8	The Sonship of Christ
43	The Righteousness of God
54	Preaching and Singing
55	Fellowship
59	Departing
60	The Old Covenant
62	Oversight
64	Excommunication
65	The Broken Covenant
67	Authority

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Published by Belmont Publications

© Nigel Johnstone, 2013.

All Rights Reserved.

## *The Knowledge of God*

To: Ian Potts, Devon  
14 april 2013

I briefly listened to a small section of the recording of what is said to be your voice, called "Made Sin" on the subject of "Reconciliation". In the two minutes, or so, that I listened, I heard you refer to God that he was, firstly, "made man" and that he, secondly, "died".

You advertise a number of recordings of the John Metcalfe Publishing Trust, all of which can be listened to directly on your website, and you advertise the locations of all of the Gospel Standard congregations. You give the impression, thus, that you are affiliated with, and perhaps speak for, both organisations. That which you advertise as the "ekkllesia in Devon", would, therefore, appear to be associated, also, with both organisations.

I have, therefore, copied this letter to the Editor of the Ministry magazine - of the John Metcalfe Trust - and to the Editor of the Gospel Standard.

I wanted to point out that, in his very nature, God cannot be made other than he is - divine. Nor, in his nature, does the life of God ever cease or change in any way. He is everlasting in nature, in being, in life and in righteousness. These are immutably divine. They are not personal characteristics; they are attributes of nature. To speak of God being made anything other than he is or to speak of God's life ceasing in any way at all is to misunderstand the very nature of the Deity.

It is written that, God was *manifest* in the flesh, I Timothy 3:16, and it is written that Jesus Christ was, in the flesh,

## *The Knowledge of God*

condemned to death or put to death, *thanatow*, but Peter does not say that he was actually killed for we know that John tells us that Jesus spoke of his own decease being voluntary, John 10:18, I lay down my life - *psuche* - of myself.

It would seem to me that if these recorded words are, properly, your own, that you misunderstand the person of Christ and the nature of God. If we misunderstand the doctrine of Christ in any degree, then, by so much, we know not the Father and the Son. For we must abide in the doctrine of Christ if we would know the Father and the Son; else we know not God at all. II John:9.

I recommend to you the publication called "The Soul of Christ" written by Mr William Huntington which, I believe, will thoroughly inform you of your error and will, if you are receptive, correct it. God is a spirit, saith Jesus. Nor can deity be anything other than what deity is, everlastingly. God *cannot* be made man, sir. Else, is he no longer God, in nature.

God cannot die. I am that I am, saith he. He is the self existent, immutable, everlasting I AM.

But he who was born of a virgin was The Son; of man. The Son from everlasting; of man by conception. The Son of God; of man by the seed of David. This was not a change of nature. This was a union of nature. This was not a change in the immutable; this was the manifestation of God *in* flesh. Nor could that which is divine ever die. I lay down my life - *psuche*, living soul - said Jesus. That which he had, he laid down. But the *he* who laid it down still lived. Thou shalt not leave my soul in hades, saith he who is in the bosom of the

## *The Knowledge of God*

Father. My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken me ? saith he, upon the tree, who did the will of the Father and took the cup that was passed to him.

In Jesus Christ, one unique person is seen, by faith, who possesses all that is proper and pertinent to deity as it subsists in a nature that is divine, and, thus, exists in the spiritual realm, yet also fills heaven and earth. And that one unique person also possesses all that is proper and pertinent to manhood in a nature that is created and, thus, is a natural part of the created realm and, also, possesses a human soul that is of the spiritual realm.

This human soul is a living soul. The Son; of man did not, and does not, inhabit a dead corpse. Nor did, nor does, his divine presence enliven a mere empty shell of a material body of only flesh and bones. The Son; of man encompasses in his being all that is appropriate to divinity and all that is appropriate to humanity, nothing excepted.

Yet is he one.

Else could he not have suffered for those who have bodies and souls. Nor could he have descended. Nor could he have preached deliverance to the captives.

After descent, and after preaching deliverance, he was quickened. His soul was re-united with his uncorrupted flesh, for, Thou wilt not suffer thine holy one to see corruption. He was brought again from the dead, this Lord Jesus, and thus was the firstbegotten from the dead.

In life, he could say to the crucified, repentant thief, Today shalt thou be with me in paradise. Thereafter he could he

## *The Knowledge of God*

pray to the Father, Father receive my spirit, whereupon he breathed it out.

This one, unique person, can say as he stands with feet upon earth, The Son; of man which is in heaven. Of this one can John testify, John 1:14 - who is become flesh, tabernacling among men - that he is in the bosom of the Father and also declares the Father.

This is the man who is God's fellow who received the sword into himself, quenching its divine fire and its piercing judgment. This is the one who, alone, was appointed to be the Testator whose death would bring in the everlasting testament. This is the only one who could ever bear sins and who, thus, could ever and only be the one who shall, and does, preach *aphesis* - unburdening - to captives and broken ones.

This is the only one who can mediate between God and men, the man, Christ Jesus.

These matters require great care, Mr Potts. I ask that you seek out the article I mentioned for your own sake and for the sake of those who hear your words.

Nigel Johnstone, Malvern

## *The Knowledge of God*

To the Congregation met at Lygon Bank, Malvern and to all assemblies in fellowship with them :-

november 2012

Before even gaining entrance to your building to attend my first meeting, I spoke with a man - T - on the doorstep and I testified to whom I believed. Such was his response to my words that I had to add to my testimony and I discovered that only I believed that the Lord Jesus Christ is, everlastingly, the Son of God. A man called Richards - Richards Junior - overheard some of the conversation and after the meeting we spoke and I wrote to him. He wrote back to me and I discovered that he is with Turner and not with me.

At the age of nineteen, in 1971, two years after being converted out of considerable darkness and ignorance from a mixture of modernistic presbyterianism and loose modern evangelicalism, I was encouraged to read Mr J C Philpot's book, *The True and Proper Eternal Sonship of the Lord Jesus Christ*. Mr Philpot states in this book the truth to which Mr J N Darby also, earlier, witnessed.

Mr Philpot's book was printed in 1862, again in 1926 and again in 1962. The 1926 edition has a preface by Mr J K Popham in which he underlines the need for its re-printing due to error resurfacing.

Mr John Metcalfe has, also, in 1979, written a tract called, *Eternal Sonship and Taylor Brethren*, in which he quotes Mr J N Darby and supports what is in Mr J C Philpot's book. "There are persons," says Mr Darby, "who take it that Christ was only Son as come into the world. *I lose all that the Son*

## *The Knowledge of God*

*is - if he is only Son as incarnate."*

Let it here be noticed, most emphatically, that Mr J N Darby says that he, personally, loses all that the Son of God is, if he *only* believes in him as Son in incarnation. That is the meaning of Mr Darby's words. If he, personally, does not believe in the Son of God, as Son, prior to incarnation, saith he, then he loses everything in that unbelief. Everything.

If not Son of God in his person, that is, his everlasting person, and therefore nature, then what they must be saying is that he is only "son of god" in humanity. That he is, they say, God's beloved son as a man. If they say that by taking humanity to himself he *becomes* the "son of god", then he was not so before. Ergo, it is not an attribute of his divine nature. Thus, they must be saying, he has no relationship, in deity, with God. Or, they must be saying - and see later - they are admitting that they don't know what relationships exist. For Father and Son is all that is revealed in scripture. And if they confine *that* to his incarnate nature then they have to - and, see later, they do - confess that they have not a clue regarding any other relationship there might, or might not, be - they say.

They, thereby, lose everything.

And this I have, myself, observed in what I have heard, so far, at Lygon Bank Meeting Hall. I have perceived an over emphasis on the humanity of Christ. Which is hardly surprising if men attempt to associate the words, Son of God, with the human nature - only - of Christ. Christ's humanity is the son of Mary. The Divine Person is the Son of God. To associate that which is true of His Deity with his

## *The Knowledge of God*

humanity is, as Mr Darby says, to lose everything.

And they demonstrate that they have lost everything by the way in which they speak of Jesus Christ. They humanise his real person. They engage human sentiments and natural affections in attempting to empathise with his Person. But if they do not know him as the Son of God from everlasting in his real deity, then they are guilty of idolatry for they are worshipping a human shell. They are worshipping a human nature which - to them, in their belief - does not manifest the Son of God.

The “jesus” they worship is a human shell inhabited - so their scheme says - by a dark, unknown, unrevealed deity. No wonder they shrink from talking about this. And they do. And they appear to feel guilty as they do so. Which does not surprise me, as their conscience will be at work. For they do not give God the glory.

Instead, they sentimentalise a human shell, concentrating wholly upon it. For they know not the deity that they - supposedly - think is manifested by this human nature. They call him “Son of God” but they do not believe his deity is the Son of God. Therefore, the one they are calling “Son of God” is that which came from Mary’s womb. Which is not a person. That which came from Mary was a human nature, not a human person. This is utter idolatry.

Whom ye ignorantly worship, said Paul to the Athenians - The Unknown God - is the one in whom we live and move and have our being. Paul accepted that, amongst the various gods of gold and silver which were set up, this altar denoting a deity which was not a material object was where he could direct the attention of the Athenians.

## *The Knowledge of God*

But those who worship a material shell of human nature and call that human nature, "The Son of God" are in a far worse state than the ignorant Athenians. In their unbelief - that is, their lack of understanding and receiving, by faith, the true doctrine of Christ - they, as Mr Darby so rightly says, lose everything.

And having so done, in their erroneous unbelief, tampering with philosophical pride and with human reasoning, they then take the next logical step into a horrendous darkness by denying the Father. And denying the true, proper, relationship - within the deity - of Father and Son.

They actually go much further but I refuse to write down on paper where this takes them. It revolts me to such an extent that I say, O my soul, come not thou into their secret; unto their assembly, mine honour, be not thou united. I consider it to be vile.

What they fail to understand reveals their personal ignorance of him who draws near to the poor, the broken and the contrite. He who sends a man whose name is John. He who teaches and instructs his own. He who blesses by choosing and causing to approach, Psalm 65:4.

For this God is a wondrous, blessed, glorious God. Such is the sheer holiness and purity and divine blissfulness of his being in the Father and in the Son that they, in a divine relationship of unutterable love, dwell in such a perfection of holy and glorious unity that the Father and the Son, in One Spirit, are One God.

There is no other God.

There can be no other god.

His is the fulness that filleth all in all.

## *The Knowledge of God*

There is no room for another god.

This is one of the attributes of the Divine Nature. Fulness.

This fulness is discovered by one who is drawn into communion with the deity.

Such is the glorious, divine purpose that those who truly believe in the true God are partakers of this divine nature. That is - *Theias koinonoi phuseos*. In communion with the divine nature, II Peter 1:4.

And this is through knowing the Person of Jesus Christ. I will not leave you comfortless, saith he, John 14:18. Not without a paraclete. I will come to you - as conveyed, in union, in the Spirit. For Christ is not known without the Spirit. It is the Spirit, in a blessed divine union, who conveys him to his own. This is the knowledge of God. Blissful communion in the Holy Ghost.

At that day - after resurrection and ascension and the descent of the Spirit - ye shall know that I in my Father. And ye in me. And I in you. John 14:20.

A blessed, wondrous, unity in the one Spirit. In Christ.

Because of whom he is.  
The everlasting Son of God.

I stand, now in 2012, as I have always stood from my beginnings, with Mr Darby, Mr Philpot, Mr Popham and Mr Metcalfe. I stand with spiritual men. I stand with the ministers whom God has sent. I stand with those faithful to the doctrine of Christ. I do so because of the communion I

## *The Knowledge of God*

enjoy as a result of believing the doctrine of Christ which was brought to me.

### **Ὁ Οὐκ Οἶδατε**

I quote to the congregation at Lygon Bank twelve words of Richards Junior from a letter he addressed to me which begins, "It was a privilege to meet you". I am missing out, for the sake of clarity, two phrases but I quote the whole sentence at the end of this letter, in an Appendix, so that the whole of it can, also, be assessed.

"I am unclear as to the identity of those Persons known as"

Since Mr Richards is "unclear as to the identity of certain Persons", it is pointless for him to give me their names and I therefore think it inappropriate, at this stage, for me to write these names down if Mr Richards is unclear about whom they are. He lists three names. These three names will be instantly recognizable to anyone who has read the holy scriptures.

Mr Richards seems to accept that other people know these Persons for he says of these Persons "known as". But, being uncertain of their identity - he says identity, not identities, notice - he therefore testifies that he, personally, does not know the identity - singular - of this Person who is known by three names.

Mr Richards uses the word "unclear". I think that should be "ignorant".

Mr Richards uses the word "identity". I think that should be "Person".

Mr Richards uses the word "identity" - singular - in

## *The Knowledge of God*

reference to certain names. I shall call this thrice-named “identity”, “God”.

Mr Richards is ignorant of the Person of God.

He wrote this. I am just quoting him.

I have his original letter in my possession.

**Ὁ Οὐκ Οἶδατε.** John 4:22. What ye know not.

Despite being ignorant of the Person of God - professedly so, in writing - he proposed in his letter to “preach” on the following Sunday. He came to my personal address and hand delivered his letter to me across the threshold. Such was the response I felt in my spirit that within three hours I had hand delivered my answer through his own letter box, in which letter I expressed my shock that, given his ignorance, he intended to stand up and “preach” to others.

I went to hear him “preach” and had to sit for almost an hour staring at the back of the chair in front of me. I felt so embarrassed to see a man so singularly incompetent at public speaking, so singularly full of himself, so singularly inept in spiritual matters that it made me squirm in my seat and made me incapable of lifting up my eyes - even once - to look at the speaker. The drift of his talk was so ineffectual, so lacking in actual content that there was nothing there for me to which to take any strong objection. For he said nothing.

For a whole hour - he said nothing.

Twice in his talk he admitted to being “confused”. I am not clear as to what he was confused about as he was so confused that it was not possible to say, exactly, what was confusing him at that particular stage. It may have been

## *The Knowledge of God*

that he just was talking too much and couldn't remember where he had got to in his - I was going to write "argument" there, but I have changed my mind and will just write meanderings.

Most public speakers - in fact just about any public speaker possessed of any kind of personal dignity - would have some other means of recovering their bearings in their talk, if they inadvertently strayed. The method Mr Richards used, confusedly admitting his own confusion, left me confused as to why he was confused and resulted in the little credibility he had - supplied by my willingness to be as charitable as possible - being blown out of the water by his own explosives. After the explosion, there was only flotsam to be seen on the calming surface.

Afterwards, he invited me to his house and I accepted. I had already refused to shake his hand, but he still invited me so I felt inclined to go if, by any means, I might, with meekness, instruct one who opposed himself, II Timothy 2:25. I regard that hour as Mr Richards' first admonition, privately. During that hour I declined an invitation for Mr Richards to engage in prayer and I told him that this was an entirely inappropriate gesture.

This present letter is, to my way of thinking, Mr Richards' second admonition, publicly, Titus 3:10.

Mr Richards' letter to me says that he is privileged to meet me and says that this is so because he regards me as one who owns and loves the Lord Jesus Christ. On this basis he invited me to a meeting and on this basis he invited me to his private house.

I therefore understand, by Mr Richards' actions, that I am

## *The Knowledge of God*

part of that fellowship of which he is a part and I therefore address that fellowship, since Mr Richards, himself, personally, has given me the opportunity to do so.

Mr Richards has not excluded me because of my faith. Therefore I re-state the faith that I stated on the doorstep of Lygon Bank Meeting Room - after which I was permitted entrance; that I stated in two letters to Mr Richards - after which I was again invited to a meeting and then invited to Mr Richards' private house; and that I stated, quite comprehensively, before Mr Richards and Mrs Richards in their home.

As I understand matters at present, Mr Richards has received me on the basis of the faith that I have - comprehensively - stated and has not excluded me.

I, on the other hand, regard Mr Richards as being in error, according to the recorded word of Jesus Christ, himself, according to the recorded word of the Apostles, Paul, Peter and John; and also according to the recorded word of Mr J N Darby, Mr J C Philpot, Mr J K Popham and Mr John Metcalfe. And Martin Luther, see later.

So Mr Richards has given me the opportunity, by his own written invitations, to express my faith and to express my utter opposition to his own error.

This matter was occasioned by one, Mr Turner, whom I addressed on the doorstep of Lygon Bank Meeting Room before I even set foot inside the building to attend a meeting. Engaging me in conversation, Mr Turner raised the matter himself.

## **Πνευμα ό Θεος**

Jesus said, *Pneuma ho Theos*, John 4:24.

Spirit, the God.

The AV translates this as, God is a Spirit.

There is one God.

In the very nature of God, there is one God.

There is one Spirit, who is God.

Spirit, the God.

In the beginning, God, Genesis 1:1.

And the Spirit of God moved, Genesis 1:2.

Before the incarnation, from the beginning, Spirit the God.

One God. One Spirit.

*Pneuma ho Theos*, saith the Son of God, incarnate, with his own lips.

## **Και Θεος ην ό Λογος**

John the Apostle records four statements in John 1.

1. In the Beginning was the Word.

*En arche en ho Logos.*

2. And the Word was with the God.

*Kai ho Logos en pros ton Theon.*

3. And God was the Word.

*Kai Theos en ho Logos.*

4. He was, in the beginning, with the God.

## *The Knowledge of God*

*Outos en, en arche pros ton Theon.*

And the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us.

Incarnate.

Before the incarnation, from the beginning, God was the Logos.

*Theos en ho Logos.*

The absence of the Greek article in statement 3, and the fact that statement 2 precedes statement 3 and the fact that the word “with” is associated all convey, quite plainly, an authoritative relationship, from the beginning.

I have used the word “superiority” in the past and I no longer like to use that word. I prefer the word authority. That is not a matter of form. What is a matter of form is that in the form of God, One did not think it robbery to be equal with God, Philipians 2:6, being of that form. There is an equality, due to form, that is - nature.

My Father is greater than I, saith Jesus, John 14:28. Greater, as Father. In the form of God, the Son thought it not robbery to be equal with God. But the authority is a matter of Person. And thus a matter of relationship to that Person. The authority and the voluntary submission are a matter of Person, personal qualities and relationship.

Son of God expresses sonship in nature. In Divine nature, Son. Son of the Father expresses sonship in relationship. In the bosom of the Father, Son.

From the beginning, One was the Son of God, in nature, everlastingly. Equal to God. Equal in Divine nature to that which was God, also in Divine nature. From the beginning, One was the Son of the Father, in relationship,

## *The Knowledge of God*

everlastingly. Before the incarnation. In his person, a Son, yielding that which is filial to the Father in a bond of divine love, in a perfection of holy unity.

Martin Luther comments on the four statements of John and comments, with great perception and spirituality, on the absence of the Greek article and the word order. He wrote that if attention is paid to these, then the two main heretical errors of the history of men's commenting on the apostolic word would be totally eradicated. These two errors are arianism and sybellianism. The error into which Mr Richards falls could be termed tritheism but Mr Richards denies this, privately, therefore he makes himself guilty of sabellianism.

Mysteries, revealed, in the simplest words possible.  
Words that babes can understand.  
These things are revealed to babes, Matthew 11:25.  
None need be ignorant.

But these things are hidden from the wise and the prudent.  
They remain ignorant.  
They understand not, for they wish to appear to men to be wise and prudent.

## **Ashere Pesha Nasa**

David knew God. Actually knew him.

David knew one whom he called The LORD, *Yahweh*, Psalm 110:1. David knew one whom he called My Lord, *Adon*, David knew that these Persons had a relationship between one another, in one Spirit. The LORD speaks with authority

## *The Knowledge of God*

and makes an appointment. The Lord, is thus, given an eternal appointment - a Priesthood. Thou art a priest for ever, sweareth the LORD, to the Lord.

But it is more than eternal. It is everlasting.

The seed of Phinehas is given the covenant of an everlasting priesthood, Numbers 25:13. To him who is responsible for the execution of judgment which demonstrates the righteousness of God is this honour given. And, thus demonstrated, he that believeth shall have it *logizomai* unto him.

*Yahweh*, says David, appointed *Adon* to an everlasting priesthood. His appointment is in view of his person. His personal qualities suit him for this appointment.

David knew these Persons, personally. He heard the speech of *Yahweh*. He knew *Adon* as “My” Lord.

David knew God because God, himself, laid his hand heavy on David, day and night, till his moisture dried up within him, Psalm 32. David kept silence. David was not a man keen to speak in public, pretending to instruct others whilst he, himself, was far from God.

David was silent to men, but, within, David *roared*. Like a lion denied its prey as the antelope swerves, bucks and disappears into the undergrowth, too fleet of foot, the lion stands with its paws foursquare on the ground, lifts its noble, mighty head and roars, such that the very branches of the trees quiver with the reverberations.

Men heard nothing.

But God heard.

## *The Knowledge of God*

For *Pneuma ho Theos*.

Spirit the God.

And they that worship him, beginning with a silent roar, shall worship him in spirit and in truth.

Eventually, after the convictions and impressions and influences of God, who is Spirit, David intended to confess. I said, I will confess, Psalm 32:5.

But he who is Spirit knew, already, of the intention of the heart and, immediately, before the words were in his lips - though they were, indeed, in his lips - David knew, in spirit and in truth, that God had heard that which his heart had spoken, after which his lips followed. For the Lord is good and ready to pass by (*sallach*), Psalm 86:5.

Blessed transgression “forgiven”.

*Ashere pesha nasa*.

More correctly, the transliterated Hebrew, in the original word order, is :-

*ashri nshui phsho*.

I prefer to quote, otherwise, the wording that is more easily accessed in Young’s Concordance, to facilitate referencing.

*Ashere pesha nasa*.

*Nasa* does not, in my understanding, mean “forgiven”.

Blessed transgression uplifted. The burden was uplifted from David even as the words were formed in his mouth. He that believeth can affirm this experience. This is the knowledge of God. This is how God *reveals* himself. To babes.

David says it is the LORD - *Yahweh* - who does not impute iniquity to the man whom the LORD blesses thus.

## *The Knowledge of God*

The Lord - *Adon* - also has a part in this.  
According to his everlasting priesthood.  
Everlastingly, he is a Priest.  
Then, he became incarnate.

But David speaks not of this, particularly, in Psalm 32. For he is speaking in Psalm 32 of that which is experienced, not of doctrine whereby that experience occurs. David was well aware of all the sacrificial evidence that surrounded him. He does not, here, refer to it. Just to the inward experiences of pressure, then dryness, then roaring, then intention, then uplifting, then blessedness.

He also speaks of an inward leading and instruction that follows from the previous experience.

One speaks to him in verses 8 and 9, at least. I would say that One speaks, now, within David, together in unison with David, as David, now in spiritual union with the Speaker, addresses verses 10 and 11 to many. Now he can speak to others, no longer silent. Now he knows God, in Spirit. Now, shall he teach transgressors thy ways, Psalm 51:13.

I will instruct thee, saith the One in Psalm 32:8. And teach thee. I will guide thee with mine eye. He need not command with the mouth. This One just looks somewhere and David, his spirit in union with that Spirit, is sensitive to that look. David will know what to do by just that looking of the One he knows, unnamed, as yet, in Spirit. *Pneuma ho Theos*.

Later, David would say, in the depths of penitential grief, after he had displeased the LORD in the matter of her of Urias, and after the LORD sent Nathan to show to David the harmfulness of what he had done, that it was sin, "renew a right spirit within me - first - cast me not away from thy

## *The Knowledge of God*

presence - second - and take not thy Holy Spirit from me - third.”

He craved that a right spirit would be renewed in him. Without it, he would be cast away. Cast away, the Holy Spirit would be withdrawn from him. He to whom he prays, O God, verse 1, has the power and the authority to take away the Holy Spirit, verse 11.

The right spirit is David's spirit.

The Holy Spirit is *Pneuma ho Theos*.

Spirit the God.

My eyes fill with tears as I write these words. Blessed, blessed One who thus guides and teaches. *Pneuma ho Theos*.

I reverence, I adore, I worship this Blessed One, who, everlastingly, is a Blessed Spirit. Without Him, I would not know God.

Before I knew his influences, I knew only a darkness. Only a law, whose only purpose, to me, was to bring me to Christ. It had no other purpose, for me. But in the dark, I was schooled. In the darkness, roaring and crying and longing and weeping and fearing; terrified, in the darkness. Alone, bereft, frightened until, at one period in my life - when alone in my spiritual exercises - I moved my limbs in that repetitive way that traumatised people do. Stark, dread, darkness; utterly alone in my own existence. Without God. Without hope. Dead in trespasses and sins.

His hand pressed sore; broken, I, under his power. Yet this chastening was not to my destruction. For God became my salvation.

## *The Knowledge of God*

Blind though I was, I was yet being led - in the dark - towards the Light of the world. The incarnate One. As made known in the word of the apostles whom He, himself, chose, separated, taught, chastened, rebuked, upbraided, provided for, and, ultimately, sent to preach his everlasting gospel. Men of like passions as I. But men of whom there are only, and ever can be, but twelve.

Other men, since, have, clearly and evidently, been called by Christ - himself, personally, not through men - such as Timothy and Titus. In like manner as Paul was called, so are they called. But not to like office. There can be no further. This, the cessation of miracles and signs tell us. These things attached only to that most singular calling. Both the office and the signs have, now, ceased.

Now, we have those who, like Timothy and Titus, have the apostolic charge - the charge message as well as the gospel message - to both preach and to set up government which is suitable to what they preach - the everlasting gospel, Revelation 14:6, which says, Fear God..... and worship Him.

The everlasting gospel declares the Son of God, made flesh.

I know not God as unmanifested. The Lamb was slain from the foundation of the world. Who gave his flesh for the life of the world, was always envisaged, always represented, always figured before men. Then, fully manifested, he shed his blood for many.

I know the One who, previously set forth in many ways, was made flesh.

Those who seek any knowledge of God outside of the way in

## *The Knowledge of God*

which the everlasting gospel of the Incarnate Son of God makes known, in word, the truth - they shall find only darkness. The word is preached for *obedience* to the faith which it proclaims among all nations, Romans 1:5.

I believe on the One who, incarnate, reveals Himself. I did not, by any kind of works - of the flesh, of nature, of man - find God. He chose to reveal his Son in me, Galatians 1:16. By water and by blood was I born to be who and what I am.

He is the Son of God.  
The everlasting Priest.

God has revealed himself in the Person who is incarnate. He is the Son of God. He, himself, is the Son of God. Then, he was incarnate.

God has revealed Himself, in the Person of the Son. The Person who is revealed, himself, has certain everlasting qualities which suit him for an everlasting appointment. Those everlasting qualities are a feature of His real person.

I worship Him. I adore Him. My Lord and my God.

He has revealed that he, also, has a God. He reveals the Father. The Person of the Father is revealed through the Person of the Son. I worship He whom the Son reveals as Father. I adore him as God. Even as he does who revealed him to me.

Such is the unity of the Father and the Son, in one Spirit - *Pneuma ho Theos* - that I call Him - God.

This is how I know God. This is the God I know.

## ***Agnosto Theo***

*On our agnoountes eusebeite.....* says the Apostle Paul to the Athenians upon seeing the inscription "To the Unknown God". *Agnosto Theo*. He says, Whom ye ignorantly worship. To worship unknowingly is to worship ignorantly.

Ye know not what ye worship, says Jesus to the woman by the Samaritan well. But, We know what we worship, John 4:22.

Salvation is of the Jews, he adds. That is, that of the Jews shall come Christ, the Saviour. And that is how God will be known. A man will know God by being saved. And, abiding in the doctrine of Christ, whereby he was saved, he shall know the Father and the Son, II John:9.

As to the rest, the word *agnosto* is used, in its various forms, twenty nine times in the Greek scriptures. One short of thirty.

Short of the complete knowledge which adds up ten and ten and ten. Anything short of this knowledge - in an attempt to worship - is to be an Agnostic.

## **Kata Joannhn**

According to John the Apostle, however, Jesus speaks thus :-

**A.** John 10:36.

Him whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world. The Father, as Father, sanctified him. Then sent him into the world.

## *The Knowledge of God*

Only a deluded, ignorant man would attempt to twist such words into meaning something that they do not, quite clearly, mean. Only a serpent would influence a man to do this.

A babe, reading such words, receives the truth of them. That the Father sanctified the Son. Then the Father sent the Son into the world.

But as the serpent in the garden, with subtlety and cunning and devious malice, asked questions of the word that the man had stated - the man chosen by God to express his word to Eve - so the serpent hisses in the ears of a man who has not received the apostolic word from those sent to minister it.

This man thrusts himself forward to be a preacher. Despite having no discernible gift and yet an embarrassingly magnificent desire to do so, he spends an hour saying - nothing. Which is all he has to say about God for he, himself, confesses to me in a letter that :-

“I am ignorant of the Person of God.”

[Quote. See full textual reference in the appendix.]

If a man receives not the love of the truth, receiving it - in obedience - receiving the word of John the Baptist, to repent - first - then to Behold the incarnate Word - if a man does not submit to this, he shall remain in darkness.

But that is not all.

For God, in order to expose the darkness within him - who wishes to stand and preach - God shall send him a delusion, a strong delusion, that he will believe a lie. Then, speaking

## *The Knowledge of God*

this lie - and we know where lies come from - he shall expose himself to all of us who seek the Light. The liar shall speak his lies, his delusion, and we shall then see what God before could see, but we could not, that the man is in darkness within. And, now, deluded, his mouth speaks the darkness which is within. And we can see his words, which he, himself, chose to write down.

Men in the world who care nothing for religion and live a carnal existence will be judged, quite simply, by their evident works. Religious men who live an apparently religious life and yet, within, are in darkness and hypocrisy and all manner of evil, shall be sent strong delusion such that their words will utter blasphemies and their words, in judgment, shall condemn them.

But the Spirit of God, *Pneuma ho Theos*, shall guide those whom God blesses - the poor, the needy, the broken, the contrite - into all truth. And their mouths shall speak, in the Spirit, the Truth.

And those who are of the Light shall hear words of spirit and of life. And they shall say, To whom else shall we go. Thou hast the words of eternal life, John 6:68. As did I, at the age of seventeen, sitting on Christman Common, to the man who, first, spoke the apostolic word to me. "I've nowhere else to go," I said. Nor do I now. But now I am able to say those words only directly to Jesus Christ my Lord.

Eternal life from the Word, in whom is Life. His Life is the light, John 1:4. All else is darkness.

**B.** John 16:28.

I came forth from the Father and am come into the world.

## *The Knowledge of God*

Babes read this and accept the meaning of the words. He was. He came forth. From the Father he came forth. Therefore, before coming, he was in the Father. In the bosom of the Father was he, before incarnate. And is he, even as incarnate, John 1:18. And in his bosom, is John. John 13:23.

John is in the bosom of the Son, incarnate. And , thus, John is in the bosom of the Father, in Christ. All else is darkness.

He who is not in the bosom of the Incarnate, everlasting, Son and, thus, in the bosom of the everlasting Father, shall say :-

“I am ignorant of the Person of God.”

[Quote. Textual reference, in full, in the appendix.]

Of his delusion, I need to enquire, and know, nothing. I just needed these words, in writing, with his signature at the bottom. Thus is revealed, to all, the darkness within him.

### **C.** John 17:5.

O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.

Babes reading this understand, in the Spirit, that The Father, before the world was, glorified the Son, with his own self. His very being - that of the Father - is glory. And the Son received of that glory. Now, incarnate, he desires that same glory to glorify his manhood.

It is my own personal opinion that these, particular words were spoken, whatever may be true of the rest of the context, after the resurrection of Jesus Christ and prior to his ascension. I understand that Jesus uttered these words,

## *The Knowledge of God*

as reported by John, after suffering and after dying and after rising again. Throughout the four accounts of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John it is most evident that events and words are grouped in ways which serve spiritual purposes, rather than with regard to the historic order, the place of the event or the exact persons who were in the vicinity.

Thus, as man, he had finished the work.

Thus, as man, he had achieved, in manhood, all that the Father had commanded for this man's earthly purpose. Thus, it is time, and Jesus prays to the Father that, as now incarnate, he should now be received into that same glory which he had, everlastingly, in the Father.

It is the glory of the Father. The glory that is because he is. His own self glorifies the Son. This is a matter of relationship. Father and Son.

The inglorious stumble on in their darkness. And - now - deluded. So - now - we know who they are.

He that transgresses and abides not in the doctrine of Christ hath not God, II John:9. And, sometimes, he will, in his dark stumblings, actually write the words down which evidence his inner state.

Then shall he convey to us, covertly, but once we decipher the subtlety of the wording, overtly, "I am ignorant of the Person of God"

Quote. Textual reference soon follows.

He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ hath both the Father and the Son.

II John:9. And, sometimes, he shall be moved of the Spirit, to

## *The Knowledge of God*

express what he knows, in great plainness of speech.

## *The Purpose of Satan*

### *How ?*

Before looking at the purpose of satan, I ask, how was this error introduced ? From anitiquity, the arian and sabellian errors infested the outward kingdom of religion on the earth. Repeatedly, they have arisen in history and, repeatedly, they have been vigorously opposed by the spiritual. And, even, by the not so spiritual who, at least, are capable of reading written material and being honest about what is conveyed there.

But, latterly, the sabellian error has been re-introduced in a much more subtle, and much more deadly form. It strikes at the heart of faith and, if imbibed, fills the whole of a man's religion with poison. Once take this error in and everything - everything - is affected and infected. In time, the toxins of this venom will pervade every single nucleus of every single cell of the whole of the body of a man's religion.

Then, the toxins will damage the messenger RNA within the nucleus. Then the messenger RNA will alter the genetic code of the DNA of the cell. Then the cell, itself, will reproduce an altered copy of itself.

Nothing will be left. All that was, is now changed. Quietly, with extreme subtlety, without a fight, without a fuss. Just by injecting a tiny amount of toxin.

Like Georgi Markov, the Bulgarian in London who was

## *The Knowledge of God*

momentarily poked with an umbrella point adapted to convey a micro-pellet containing just 200 micrograms of Ricin. From *Ricinus Communis*, the castor bean plant, had been extracted one of the deadliest and most feared of toxins which scientists at Porton Down were able to identify, from Mr Markov's autopsy, in the strictest of conditions. I was once invited inside the second wire at Porton Down. That involved getting past armed soldiers, who are trained to kill, with German Shepherds - which are trained to kill.

Toxins are not a game. This is deadly - deadly - serious.

Much, much more serious is this error. Mr James Taylor, senior, wielded the umbrella. The Serpent supplied the toxin. The body was the professing church.

Instead of telling his hearers to, Behold the Lamb of God, he told his hearers something else.

What else he told them is of no interest to me and I have no intention whatsoever of repeating it. Shall I take up the umbrella so that anyone who reads this letter could - possibly - be infected ?

No. Only those who have received very especial training in the handling of such deadly material are suitable; trained, qualified and authorised to investigate these viciously damaging, highly contagious and potentially fatal toxins.

Having, once, learned that James Taylor, Senior, was the source of this new strain of fatal toxin, I am not interested in being influenced by anything he said or wrote - ever. If he came out with such stuff later in his life, then the seeds of it were, presumably, there all along. I'm quite content to

## *The Knowledge of God*

confine myself to more reliable studies, thanks.

As far as I am personally concerned, if someone can propagate such an error later in their ministry then I shall, for myself, regard all of that ministry as wood hay and stubble. And I shall leave judgment to the Son of man in that day. But for myself, I wish to be safe.

Quarantine is the word.

As we are shown in Leviticus with regard to leprosy.

I have deliberately held back the contents of Mr Richards letter, for the same reason. He says other things in his letter that I have not quoted. One sentence is utterly blasphemous. I will not write it down and I will not even hint at the foul, vile words that he has used. But I keep it, on record, in my possession.

Behold the Lamb of God, saith John the Baptist.

He says it only - only - to those who have, first, received his word and, under that word, have been baptised - an intimate process of internal washing. As the six stone pots are filled at Cana, so does the water of the word of John fill up the whole man, inwardly.

He that hath two coats, impart to him who hath none.

It is not lawful for thee to have her.

Think not. *Think* not ? Yes, think not to say within yourselves .....

Be content with your wages.

Only once a man has a new mind - *metanoia* - and is filled, totally filled, in his new mind, totally filled in his humanity, full of the water, utterly cleansed - only once the wayside

## *The Knowledge of God*

has been dug up, the earth of the soul been penetrated, turned over, crushed, broken, shredded, turned again and sifted into fine, friable, breathing, moisture-retaining good earth. And during this, every resistant, hard, stony blockage been removed. And, also, every shred of every root of every thorn- producing vegetation has been torn out and burnt.

Only one who has been through such a process is ready for the next word of John. Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.

This One came from Bethlehem, from the manger, from the womb of the virgin. This One came out of Jordan, baptised, to fulfil all righteousness. Of this One John bears record - I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove and it abode upon him. Of this One John again bears record - This is the Son of God.

This is my beloved Son, saith he from above.  
Hear ye Him.

This is where God is to be found.  
Not anywhere else.

This is how God is to be found.  
Not anyhow else.

This is how the error was introduced.  
By not hearing - and doing - the word of John the Baptist.  
Fanciful, pompous, arrogant, self exalting philosophy and sophistry of man. In the midst of which was a microscopic amount of a deadly, vicious, fatal toxin.  
Armchair postulators - and armchair readers - gobbing off about religion. Man's vaunted pride. Man's haughty mouth.

## *The Knowledge of God*

Man attempting to investigate, with his arrogant brain and his sin soaked flesh and his pompous philosophy, the invisible, the utterly spiritual, the immense, the unreachable, the unrevealed, the Creator of heaven and earth whom neither the material heaven nor the immaterial heaven of heavens can contain.

Uncalled, unsent, untrained, unhumbled, unspiritual men.

Paul - the chiefest Apostle - to whom was given to lay a foundation that no other man could, then, or ever shall again, lay; to whom was given an abundance of revelations; to whom was given - maybe, for he doesn't exactly say so - to be caught up to the third heaven to unutterable things; this Paul was humbled with a thorn in the flesh, lest he be lifted up.

Does that not tell these men anything ? Who meander across scripture, mouthing off their own, tangled, dark philosophies ?

We live in the last times. Desperate, desperate times. There is an Enemy who is raging, every single moment of every single hour of every single day. Raging to assert himself above all that is. To grasp at every last moment of his comparative freedom, while he still retains the powers and authority to do so - ere the heavens themselves be dissolved in fire - raging as he infests all that he can with his own selfish being.

Those who receive not a love of the truth that they might be saved, shall be injected with some, or other, toxin.

The knowledge of God is the only way of salvation.  
Those who are interested in something other than salvation

## *The Knowledge of God*

- like standing talking about religion in front of other people - shall not even find the strait gate. They shall probably describe it to others. But they shall not accurately describe it and thus their hearers will be unable to locate the invisible gate that the speaker knows about but has never, himself, actually discovered.

Those who, genuinely, are sent of God, as John, will come out of the wilderness. They will have been sustained, alone, through a long period of isolation during which they will have been tried to an extremity. And beyond. Then, and only then, shall they utter in the name of the Lord.

As did Jesus. Who spake nothing until after he was marked out by John and singularly noted from heaven. Who then was driven into the desert. To be tempted. Tempted and tried to the uttermost. Then he came preaching. Even such a One. Fulfilling all righteousness, in every way, came he.

As for men, how much more should men be swift to hear and slow to speak.

David begins, in Psalm 32:3, with - with what ?

With this -

when I kept silence.

If a man has not learned these fundamental lessons, he has only one alternative. Be quiet and begin again.

Which is why I graciously gave to Mr Richards a free copy of my book, *The Beginning of the Gospel*, Belmont Publications.

By not listening to, hearing and doing, the word of John is how the error of sybellianism, in its present, mutated viral form, was re-introduced in modern times. By listening to something else.

## *The Knowledge of God*

Just as Eve did not listen to, hear and do what the man said, who had been instructed by God himself. Then - after not hearing - did a serpent bite her.

There is something already in the heart that causes the mind to mis-hear, the thoughts to mis-think and that causes the understanding to mis-understand.

The thinker will think they have seen light.  
They have not. Darkness has filled their interior.  
How great, then, is that darkness.

Repent. Change mind. *Metanoia*. Receive the word of John.

### **Why ?**

But why introduce this error ? Why would a serpentine Entity want to hiss such words after mesmerising a suitable subject into such a hypnotic state that they are deaf to logic, blind to legible scripture, and insensitive to conscience ?

Why ?

From his beginning, he desired to exalt himself, the highest of all created being, to an even higher place. But that was not possible. Only by elevating himself, apparently, over the One who would be incarnate, could he attain a higher place. Envy, discontent, self exaltation, irreverence, disrespect, lawlessness - led to lies and murder. For by his deception was death brought in, over all mankind. He murdered the entire human race to exalt himself. Callous, careless of any other being, utterly unsociable - the Poneros - he was the very origin of sin. Sin, thus, came into the world, through deceit.

Deliberate, malicious misrepresentation of the genuine

## *The Knowledge of God*

nature, the transparent honesty, the sincere goodwill of God.

Yea, hath God said ..... ?

Adam had not partaken of that which was, openly, clearly, available in the midst of the garden. The Tree of Life. Thus had God, then, warned him of the existence of another tree. But it is not stated to be in the garden. In the place of God's blessing.

Still he did not partake. Nor did he encourage Eve to partake. He was "with" the woman when she decided to partake of the other tree. If a man does not partake of Life, a serpent shall bite him.

But why inject this, particular type of venom - the kind that leaves Mr Richards saying he knows not the identity of three persons ? In the Appendix, I quote the whole sentence. The error attempts to be subtle, but it is not subtle enough that the Logos shall not, logically, dispel all darkness and shine forth with Truth.

The Life is the Light.

Mr Richards, whatever he may say, is left, in the dark, with three gods. He claims that this is not the case, in private conversation. In which case, then, he worships one unknown god who has pretended to be three persons. He worships a deceitful impersonator. Or he worships three deceitful impersonators.

At least the Athenians were sensible enough to worship One Unknown God. This gave Paul the opportunity to name that One as the one in whom we live and move and have our being.

## *The Knowledge of God*

But Mr Richards has three unknown gods. He is “unclear” as to the identity of these three. If unclear of the one identity, then it is God he does not know. If unclear about three identities, then he is ignorant of all three gods that he worships. Though how he worships them is, itself, not clear, if they be not clear in identity to him.

But this is certain that he is left with three ..... things..... One of whom he exalts above all that is, or should, be called God and worshipped. *Pneuma, ho Theos*. Spirit, the God.

One he exalts to the temple of God, sitting there, as if he was God. The Place of the Father on the throne.

And one he exalts to shewing forth himself, incarnate, that he is God. The place of the Son of God, incarnate.

Mr Richards’ three unknown entities are exalted to these places, in place of the everlasting God in Father, Son and Holy Ghost.

These entities do not, actually exist.

So tell me, who is the entity that exalts himself, actually, hiding behind three non existent entities who are just concoctions of the imagination ?

The one who, thus, exalts himself by listening to the serpent and then mouthing the lies of satan, is a man. The man in whose mouth these three entities exist. For they exist nowhere else but in the mouth. Like three frogs, come they forth.

There shall come an apostasy first.  
Then shall that man of sin be revealed.

He shall exalt himself.

## *The Knowledge of God*

And, thus, shall that invisible Entity be expressed, who possesses no mouth of his own. He shall be expressed by the man of sin, from whose mouth takes shape the nonexistent entities that are exalted to deity, in place of all that is holy and all that is true.

But *Pneuma ho Theos* expresses himself in the mouth of those who, like David, he has pressed sore in conviction and led to Christ through the tutorship of the law. Thus does the Father, in the Spirit, lead such as David to his Son that he might reveal his Son within them. Such are baptised in the Holy Ghost, who, having dealt with them by pressing their spirit down within themselves in convictions, he now fills them from within, inwardly enlightening them, dwelling within, leading, guiding, teaching. Such are, thus, brought to the knowledge of the Father, through the Son, by the Spirit.

Then are they glad, Psalm 32:11. Then shall the upright in heart shout for joy.

Then shall they be gathered together, in one Spirit, who is exalted in each one. For each one is crucified with Christ and denies self and thus, *Pneuma ho Theos* is prevalent in each one, not the flesh. Then shall God and the Father also be enthroned in the place where he, himself, said he dwells - poor and of a contrite spirit, that trembleth at my word, Isaiah 66:2. And then shall he shew himself forth who is God, manifested. The Christ.

Meanwhile, the Entity rages, establishing a momentary kingdom on earth which will, no doubt, be heralded as a millennial feature. Another error in which those who are entangled shall be in danger of terrible deception in the last times as the Wicked is manifested. We have seen one Reich and its miserable, poneritic leader. One more still will have

## *The Knowledge of God*

to be endured - though far, far more subtle - ere the heavens and the earth are dissolved in fire so that an everlasting kingdom can be established, on earth, where God, in manhood, shall reign for ever and ever. Amen.

*Nigel Johnstone*

Malvern, november 2012

### ***Appendix - Mr Richards' Letter***

*"Personally, though we read of "the Spirit of God" in Gen 1:2, I am unclear as to the identity in the Old Testament, of those Persons who, God having come into revelation, have been made known as the Father and the Son - our Lord Jesus Christ: and the Holy Spirit."*

*Signed G John Richards, november 9<sup>th</sup> 2012.*

"God having come into revelation" is meaningless. Having come ? What on earth does that mean ? Into revelation ? How, on earth, in any language expressible, can anyone "come" into revelation ?

God revealed himself. The self he revealed is the self that is. What other words is it possible to use ? "Come into revelation" is an attempt to avoid the truth. The truth that God revealed himself. The self He is, was revealed.

"Have been made known" expresses the hearing of the ear. Not the seeing of the eye. Now mine eye seeth thee, says Job. A man who knows God will say he knows him. This is the reportage of an observer, who, evidently, does not understand what he reports.

## *The Knowledge of God*

“In the Old Testament”. I take it Mr Richards means in the scriptures of the Old Testament, for God did not reveal himself, fully, through the Old Testament but in the New Testament.

The Father and the Son could not be fully revealed until the Father actually sent the Son. Obviously. In the Old Testament scriptures, much mystery was hidden. But is now revealed. He whom David knew as The LORD was, quite evidently, the God and Father of the Lord Jesus Christ. He whom David knew as My Lord, is most evidently, the son of David and the son of Abraham, the Son of man. That is The Son; of man. The Son of God come in the flesh.

But the spiritual, led of the Spirit, will see an abundance - an overwhelming abundance - of hints, liftings of the corner of the veil as it were, in all the scriptures. In all the scriptures, Jesus Christ speaks - to them who have an ear to hear - of himself, but only, after resurrection, to chosen disciples, Luke 24:27. Of his real self. His everlasting self. He showeth himself through the lattice - but only to his bride, in a secluded garden of spices, Song 2:9.

Mr Richards problem is not that the scripture is obscure. The darkness lies within himself.

Nigel Johnstone, 15<sup>th</sup> november 2012.

~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~

## *The Knowledge of God*

To: Mr B A Ramsbottom, Editor of the Gospel Standard Magazine.

The Day of the Lord.

### **Osset, John Metcalfe and the Doctrine of Christ**

Days should speak, Sir, and multitude of years should teach wisdom, but there is a spirit in man. And where there is such a spirit, then is there the inspiration of the Almighty to give understanding to the sons of men.

After you wrote to me, I waited awhile before answering, for I am but threescore years and thou art more. Thou hast spoken and written much over many decades; I but lately have begun to utter that which I have been given.

So, I waited, mindful of thy years and thy decades of utterance and reluctant to intrude upon thyself further. But I could not forbear, Sir, and trust another letter from myself will not overburden thee.

Thou hast chosen to merely comment on the fact that I have made it clear that I cannot subscribe to your articles of faith, particularly regarding the so-called - and erroneously termed - "righteousness of Christ". Then, thou hast wished my wife and I well.

In so doing, thou hast chosen not to refrain from good wishes on the grounds that I bring not the doctrine of Christ. Else, if it were so, that I bring bad doctrine, it would be inappropriate for thee to wish me well, for then thou wouldst be partaker of what the Apostle John calls evil

## *The Knowledge of God*

works. But it is not the case, Sir, for thou hast wished me well and hast made it clear that thou art well aware of the fact that I do not subscribe to that error.

Sir, you wish me well despite that I make clear to you that I am against this doctrine. Thus I have to assume that you are not desirous to defend it; for which I blame thee not, for it is both indefensible and unworthy of defending.

I blame thee not, Mr Ramsbottom, for wishing me well and for not attempting to defend that error by one single word or comment. For I think it to be utterly uninspiring and it proves itself to be unsupportable by faith. Men of legal stance and men habituated to argue for falsity do, indeed, I know, argue much and often and most vociferously on the side of this illegal, unrighteous concoction. But thou hast not joined in with such, Sir, to thy credit.

Men of faith do not contend for uninspiring doctrine, but, rather, passionately contend for the faith once delivered to the saints. Men of faith vigorously support the truth and combat error. Men of vibrant faith have a sword in their hand which cuts to ribbons that which opposes the glorious gospel of the Blessed God. Men of faith die with Samson, "leaning" on pillars, bringing down the house of their enemies upon themselves. Men of living faith intelligently and astutely divide between the precious and the vile; compare things spiritual with things spiritual; weigh just weights in the sanctuary where only the shekel is currency; and measure the worshippers in the house of God with a measuring rod.

I am privileged to have been well taught, over many years, and I need not reiterate the arguments against the error which Mr John Metcalfe has most adequately set out in his

## *The Knowledge of God*

book, "Justification by Faith".

This only would I add, however, as outlined in my own book, "Righteousness" that the righteousness of God that is logicated - *logizomai* is translated, inaccurately, imputed - is the *demonstrated* righteousness of God, not an invisible attribute. Phinehas demonstrated an execution of judgment and that is why righteousness is logicated unto him to all generations for evermore and why his seed after him, not of many but of one, shall have the covenant - later revealed to be a testament - of an everlasting priesthood.

I would say that *dikaioma* - Romans 5:18 - is not, as some say, an *accomplished* righteousness but, in relation to its use in judgment, is a *demonstrated* righteousness - that which is visible by its execution.

For the idea of "imputing" the "active" "obedience" of another does not, at all, inspire faith, for it cannot inspire faith, for it is nonsense. Nor can the "imputation" of an invisible attribute inspire faith for I cannot perceive what is going on.

What inspires my own faith - and that with strong stirrings from the Spirit within me - is the demonstration of the Righteousness of God upon his own beloved Son in the hours of darkness at Skull Place. *This* inspires a living, pulsing, heart-throbbing *faith* within me.

*Wherefore*, I contend for it most vehemently.

Holden from seeing what occurred in the dark, I am yet inspired by what is revealed, by the apostle Paul, in the doctrine of Christ by the apostolic word. Thus the revelation of the demonstrated righteousness is made to

## *The Knowledge of God*

my faith. It is revealed in the gospel.

But this muddled concoction of a so-called “active” “obedience” is not revealed anywhere at all except in the secret conundrums of Westminster in 1643, when disseminated by Parliament or the Monarch or whomever we are, supposedly, obliged to as natural clods of earth. For they have attempted to put heaps of soil under an obligation to worship, it would appear to me.

But the children of the kingdom receive revelation through the gospel to their vibrant faith and, in response to such a demonstration of truth, God logically equates that faith with the righteousness that they actually believe in being demonstrated.

What could be more logical ?

Certainly it is not logical for Luther to tell me that Christ redeems by being made a *disciple to the law* for I know that he redeems by being made a curse. It is not logical for Calvin to follow Luther and say that Christ *began to redeem when he assumed the form of a servant*, for the same reason.

Nor is H Bonar correct to describe Christ's *life as vicarious*, for no vicar-priest in the old covenant ever had any attention drawn, whatsoever, to his walk, only to his ministry at the altar. Nor should John Owen declare that *His Son Jesus* (sic!) *lived the life we should have lived*, for the death was what the law required, not a lived life.

Mr Darby says, philosophically, that we are *accounted righteous according to the value of his resurrection*, while William Kelly tries to view justification, unrighteously, in the *favour* of God, but I know that God is no respecter of

## *The Knowledge of God*

persons.

Johnathan Edwards writes of *the laws which Christ obeyed when he perfected righteousness*.

John Owen, upon whom I suspect Mr Huntington leaned in this respect, speaks another time - in the context of Christ the Mediator and Surety of the covenant - of *the imputation of the active obedience of the righteousness of Christ to us*.

Thus, it is, I surmise, that Mr Huntington documents *the Saviour's active obedience to the law paid by him as our Surety*. Mr Philpot concurs, even more particularly, and writes quite clearly in favour of an *active obedience*.

After naming such illustrious company I feel obliged to add the name of C H Spurgeon who says, *it is only Christ's keeping the commandments that entitles me to enter into life*. Yes, Sir, if what is meant is the commandment of the Father, which is life everlasting; but not otherwise.

But this I know, that all that the law required on my behalf was a death, which Christ rendered and which the law sees and therefore it has nothing at all to say to me, for I am dead, now, also. And this also I know that all my transgressions - which are, also, sins and offences - were against the Person of God. And it is God, himself, in Person, who has satisfied himself with regard to my own, accountable actions upon his own Beloved Son.

As for this theory, what need have I of it ? None whatsoever, Sir. It is extraneous baggage to me. A burden to a man who has a race to run !

As for me, the least of all brethren, not fit to be called a

## *The Knowledge of God*

brother by any, I prefer to follow justified Abraham up the mount, who carried fire in one hand and a knife in the other. For thus is the everlasting testament brought in, with the death of the testator. Only when the flaming sword is sheathed in the one who is God's fellow, is everlasting righteousness made sure to all generations for evermore.

Only when God himself uplifted transgressions from David was justified David separated from his transgression. Blessed transgression uplifted. And God uplifted them, carrying them in containment until the hours of darkness at Skull Place. This is the blessedness of the man whom God justifies.

The righteousness of God is not revealed in the visible, earthly works of Jesus. Nor in the invisible conception in the womb of the virgin. Nor yet in the manger at Bethlehem. Nor at the temple where a twelve year old boy astounded aged men with questions and answers. Nor at the fulfillment of righteousness by the waters of Jordan. Nor in the desert where an hungred felt an Entity's approach. Nor on the mount where Moses and Elias appeared. Nor in the garden where perspiration - only - dropped like drops of another fluid.

The righteousness of God was *demonstrated* when the flaming sword was sheathed in the Sin Bearer on the tree. And nowhere else.

Here, shall I meet with thee, saith God Almighty. Where blood is sprinkled. Between the cherubim who gaze at the place where the body of the Testator lay.

Here.

## *The Knowledge of God*

And nowhere else. In the place which is the aftermath of the *demonstration of Righteousness in the execution of judgment.*

Thus I, passionately, speak of that which I have received. But I notice that men who hold the active obedience theory do not speak of their doctrine so passionately. Yes, they defend it in intellectual and legalistically theoretical terms - though all of that can be met, on its own ground, and can be answered fully - but it is very evident to myself, particularly in the case of the prolific and spiritually edifying writers, Mr Huntington and Mr Philpot, that this theory does not influence them in a personal and spiritual way as does the truth.

Hold the error, they did, for they were, I would think, afraid to depart from what so many in history and so many contemporaneously - to themselves - held to be orthodox. But I perceive that these two good men held the theory only. I do not see that they passionately believed it. Not from my own studies of their writings, in any case.

The Brethren writers departed from the active obedience theory but did so either intellectually, as Mr Darby, philosophically meandering into another theory, or, as Mr Kelly, verging on to unrighteous favouritism rather than logicated righteousness.

As I wrote before to you, Mr Ramsbottom, tragic it is that the early Brethren movement and the early Strict Baptists did not more harmoniously unite, in spirit and in truth, that their relevant shortcomings should not have been prevented from further expression.

## *The Knowledge of God*

And here I relate to you what I hope - Oh I do sincerely hope - may be that which might make some endeavour to prevent history being repeated. For now I write about Osset.

Many years ago I visited Osset as a representative, at the time, of the John Metcalfe Publishing Trust. I went to attempt to interest the then incumbent of the Gospel Standard Bookshop at Osset in further purchases only to be met by a man who wished to return books, not because of any manufacturing fault, but because of the contents. Weakly, I accepted, for I was young, raw, ignorant and not long recovered from backsliding.

But as I drove away on the M1, a lorry overtook me and as it drew level, I saw that the side fencing was loose and flapping. As it pulled ahead of me, the fencing fell off directly in front of my car such that I had to brake very firmly indeed in order to stop just before the large mass of metal.

In those days, I was not sufficiently cognisant of such events and did not take stock of myself. Had I done so, I would have retraced my steps and undone what I had done. But, nevertheless, that evening I phoned for advice from a superior. The rest, others will know.

I believe it was for the very reason that I have written this letter that the books of John Metcalfe were returned. And weak was I to accept them on that basis.

Now, I am a different man, altogether.

But not such a man as contends for a party, or out of mere

## *The Knowledge of God*

natural loyalty, nor yet out of historic tradition, and certainly not for any reason that is personal, for I have none. And I certainly have no prospect of obtaining any advantage of any kind - either natural, familial, or social or anything else whatsoever.

No, I write for that I must. I write for the Spirit that is within me urges me to write.

And I write for that I have visited Blunsdon Hill and observed the order, the quietness, the reverence and the singing and the Authorised Version and the modest dress and the carefulness and the hospitality.

Yet I am aware of that which is lacking, too and of that which is admitted to be lacking.

So also am I aware of Tyler's Green and of that which is there and that which should not be there.

Yet am I not in fellowship with any.

I am as I am.

But for now, Mr Ramsbottom, you have accepted that I do not hold the "active obedience" error and you have, nevertheless, wished myself and my wife well. Wherefore, on that basis, I heartily accept your wishes. And return them.

I seek the unity of the body of Christ. In spirit and in truth.

I seek, this very day, the kingdom of God and His, not any other, Righteousness.

And I have, this very day, put these matters first before thinking about what I shall eat or be covered with, tomorrow. And I delight to so do, Sir.

## *The Knowledge of God*

For the Righteousness of God that was executed in judgment upon the Son of God, Jesus Christ, once satisfied, utterly, upon him is that same Righteousness that clothes all saints in one body, for the fine linen is the righteousnesses of the saints. Each one is clothed individually. For the garment was woven without seam, *arrhaphos*, and Tamar's pledge is *erhabon*, and the earnest of the Spirit's presence, within, signals that one is clothed, without.

Tamar's pledges, all three, witnessed on her behalf and she lived, and was not burnt.

It was prophesied that they would gamble for that *arrhaphos* garment. And it was diligently recorded that it came to pass. Huge attention was drawn to it. And a garment appears in the sepulchre, which, John seeing, he believed.

The presence of the Holy Spirit within is the witness that God has logicated his own righteousness to me, on account of the faith inspired within me by that wondrous revelation of his own righteousness being executed upon his Son. And the same garment that clothes myself is the same as clothes every believer in this glorious revelation.

But danger lies in the path of every man who trusts in something else for righteousness; who trusts, in effect, in the knowledge of good and evil, rather than the Tree of Life. For supposing that another - any other - should obtain righteousness, on one's own behalf, by the knowledge of good and evil, is altogether as mad and as bad as doing it oneself.

Brethren - as Hart says in his hymn - Be not too secure !

## *The Knowledge of God*

Thus, Mr Ramsbottom, Sir, on the basis that you have no defence to make, no comment to render, regarding my denial of that unrighteous error, I accept, heartily, your wishes that you expressed to my wife, Joanna Faith, and to myself.

And I return them, with my sincere hope that you and those of your own people will consider my letter. For I speak to wise men, Mr Ramsbottom.

I intreat that you would - sensibly and fairly - judge, therefore, what I say.

Nigel Johnstone, Malvern

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

## *The Knowledge of God*

Mr Peter Smart  
Cranham Evangelical Church, Worcester.  
monday 27<sup>th</sup> august 2012

Dear Peter,

Thank you for your edifying talk on sunday. It is solemn and salutary to be reminded that we must not refuse him that speaketh. The heavens declare to us every day. He that speaks from heaven speaks daily. Thank you for your exhortation.

I think Joanna said that we are away next soday in the Lord's will. I don't like to be away, and would not have chosen this weekend had I known that Gordon would speak. I do appreciate the fact that edification is from within the congregation. For quite a while I have visited Scotland, Wales, Wiltshire and many places in Gloucester and Worcester. Nowhere have I been able to find the gospel. Another gospel, as Paul says to the Galatians, yes. But not *the* gospel.

I have given up the burden of listening to men speak who, quite clearly, are not called, gifted or able to teach and to instruct. It is deadening to my spirit and tedious. Joanna and I only attend Cranham on Sunday morning. We go nowhere else, now. I am busy with writing and with preparing to launch books into book shops. There is much to do.

Nowhere in scripture do I see men going from one congregation to another who are not specifically set aside by the Holy Ghost and separated from the assembly. Nor can I see that "teaching" or "preaching" can be just one visit, when the visiting speaker has no idea what has been given beforehand. If the gospel is a body of doctrine, then surely it requires substantial instruction to impart it. Then it must require a man

## *The Knowledge of God*

to be in one locality for sufficient time to deliver all of his gospel.

If a man can tell me, in one hour, all he has to deliver of his gospel, then, frankly, I can do without it. It has taken me six books, so far, and now a seventh, to convey what I believe is the gospel and I have only just begun.

How good the singing was, without the instrument ! I trained as a Precentor for some years and I know from my own experience that the voice of a congregation needs to be led by a voice, not an instrument. I also know from experience that anyone can be encouraged to sing. Many never discover the value of singing in private devotions, which is a great pity, indeed. Many, too, never discover the immense value of singing the psalms. This I say, not as a Scot, but as a christian. The apostle commands us to sing psalms, hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in our hearts.

Nigel Johnstone  
Malvern.

Mr Peter Smart  
Cranham Evangelical Church, Worcester  
17<sup>th</sup> october 2012

Dear Peter,

I spoke with Duncan from Bethany and he is amenable to me meeting with them at any time. This will be useful if I accept assignments in Gloucestershire.

Regents Theological College, which has given me access to their library, allowed me to purchase twenty volumes of John

## *The Knowledge of God*

Nelson Darby's works and almost the first thing I read was a letter in which he said that, as a member of the body of Christ, he felt he should be received by any individual and by any company within the body. He said he disagreed with "membership" of local companies as he did not see his union with Christ in that way. United with Christ by regeneration, made aware of his union with Christ in his sufferings and death, he believed that he was already fully in fellowship with all who were such as he. I totally agree with Mr Darby's words on this. How edifying.

I'm still surprised that anyone would fault me on my marital status. It's quite clear to me that both Abraham and Elkanah married again in order to have children, but they did not put away their first wives in order to do so. It could be said they acted in unbelief. But it cannot be said they sinned.

Paul says, I Corinthians 7:27, that if a man be loosed from a wife, seek not a wife. But also if thou mayest have married - the literal rendering - thou didst not sin. Such a man would be as I am - the husband of one wife and, therefore, be a bishop or a deacon. Better to be content if loosed, but it is not a sin to be married in that situation. This, of course, at the instigation of the previous woman who leaves the man no choice since she is the departing - and severing - party, not he. Thus he is not under bondage in this case, as Paul says. Not in bondage if the other party departs and severs the bond totally and permanently. Thus he is loosed; lawfully to him, but unlawfully by her.

What I think gives people a problem today is that Paul only says this to men. It is not, of course, applicable to women. But in such a day as this, when the whole world is enslaved to a false idea of "equality", I think some cannot accept what is

## *The Knowledge of God*

plainly clear from scripture. But let them beware that they do not condemn the guiltless. Else, shall they, themselves, be condemned.

I have acted with a clear conscience according to the word of God. The opinions of men are of no interest to me. Otherwise I would be celibate - possibly an eunuch - teetotal and vegetarian. But God hath created good things to be received with thanksgiving by them which believe and know the truth, I Timothy 4:3.

There are many who misunderstand what is evident in the scriptures. Few perceive that Jacob was quite right to find a way of taking the inheritance which the angel of the Lord had promised his mother was rightly his. The elder shall serve the younger. And, since his brother despised the birthright - and, thus, traded it for soup - then it was quite proper to represent Jacob as Esau, given that Isaac was - at that time - unspiritually preoccupied with venison and a hunter for a son. Isaac had not been visited by an angel. His wife had not been able to enquire of her husband why there was conflict in her womb. So she had had to go to the Lord directly. Thus we see that he could not, in his unbelief, receive the truth and he must be shown that which was necessary, in order for the blessing to be, properly, apportioned.

I have heard Jacob - and, thus indirectly, Rebekah, being slandered by speakers who do not understand how believing men behave in times of conflict and spiritual trial.

Samson, also, is slandered for what he did. But he sought occasion against the Philistines by his marriage. And occasion he found. And fight against them he did. For he judged Israel.

## *The Knowledge of God*

And what of Tamar ? Nobody ever speaks from that passage, thankfully, but I dread to think what slanders would be levelled against the good woman if some did take it upon themselves to comment. What faith she showed ! What sacrifice she was prepared to make ! For she had been denied her spiritual fruit. And of her fruit would Christ be born.

These all died in faith; striving, fighting, reaching for what was theirs by spiritual right which men had tried to deny them. But flesh shall not prevail. The Spirit shall conquer, by one means or another, by means which unspiritual men do not understand and are quick to criticise.

Meats for the belly and the belly for meats. A tent peg through the temple for Sisrah and the spies sent out another way by a harlot. Water turned into wine at a wedding - after men had drunk all there was beforehand; and a handful of corn plucked on the sabbath day. David took the shewbread off the altar and he danced - vigorously, it would seem - before the ark of the Lord.

These were real men. These pursued after what they wanted - and obtained it by vibrant faith in the midst of enemies.

These be my mentors; these my companions; these my faithful forebears.

Amen and good grace to you in the name of the Lord.

Nigel Johnstone, Malvern.

## *The Knowledge of God*

Mr Peter Smart  
Cranham Evangelical Church, Worcester

sunday 21<sup>st</sup> october 2012

To Peter Smart :

I have been shocked to see a man at Cranham speak at the microphone wearing a hat on his head, thus, in my eyes, dishonouring his Head. I have been utterly grieved and shocked to observe - for the first time ever in my life - a man and a woman bring a lapdog into the supper of the Lord and pet it throughout the meeting. Yet I have refrained from criticising and I have suffered such things in silence.

Now, today, after waiting until there was a time of considerable quietness - when anyone might have contributed - being swift to hear and slow to speak, and maintaining the tenor and the content of what had preceded, I spoke from Jesus' own words regarding coming to Him, first, then hearing him, second, then obeying him as Lord.

I was interrupted by someone who gave no good reason for his interruption. He pointed out no error, no matter of discipline or conduct and only made a vague, qualitative opinion which could - and should - have remained private rather than disrupt the remembrance of the Lord.

This man has come from the Taylor brethren and when I first met him I made it clear where I, myself, stood in regard to the heretical error regarding the everlasting Sonship of the Son of God which many of that group denied. This man failed to respond one way or the other and deliberately did not say what he did, or did not, believe. You were witness to this. To this

## *The Knowledge of God*

day, he has refrained from saying what he believes on that matter.

I am left with the impression that this matter is the root cause of today's interruption.

I wait to hear from you, Peter, and I make it clear that I wish only to receive correspondence from yourself. Any other correspondence will receive no response from myself. You have my books and you, therefore, know what my gospel is. If my gospel is being rejected, then I shall depart - permanently - from among you.

Nigel Johnstone  
Malvern

To: J.B. Worcestershire

Many Sundays have I heard you, in front of the congregation, confessing sins and confessing "coming out of darkness" to attend the meeting.

This is the old covenant. This is the "remembrance of sins"; time.... and time.....and time, again. That old covenant never - never - makes the comers thereto perfect.

But a better hope does, dear sir.

And you will stay as you are, stay with all the failure, stay with all the unbelief, stay with all the darkness - until you find the preaching of the true gospel. A gospel which brings into light, continually. A gospel which will reveal a Saviour who purges all sins, genuinely.

## *The Knowledge of God*

Under the preaching of a true gospel - by one sent of Jesus Christ to preach it - a man finds victory over the dominion of sin. Such a man need not, week by week, confess - in front of a whole congregation - the failure of his daily walk, the shame of that which he feels but hardly dares to put into words, the darkness that he actually lives in.

The true gospel reveals a real Saviour.

Once properly instructed in such a true gospel, then - and only then - will the Holy Ghost witness within to the purging of sins, once, for ever. Then, Hebrews 10:18, shall sins be, really, actually, experimentally - remitted. "Unburdened" is the word - aphasis. Then, the Holy Ghost, dwelling within, remembers the sins and iniquities no more. Since his Presence is within, neither does he in whom the Spirit dwells.

Heed my words, sir. Reject them not.

They are for your salvation.

Nigel Johnstone  
Malvern.

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

## *The Knowledge of God*

To: BD and PS, Worcestershire and KR, Gloucestershire.

### **The Discipline of the Word of God**

An overseer can only oversee in the context of the ministered word.

Where the word of God is not preached, ministered, asserted and taught, there can be no oversight, no diaconate, no influence of elders.

The word is the beginning.

Then - only then - when those who are, genuinely, gathered by being born, first, of water and, then, also, being born of the Holy Spirit - *then* shall these living stones require oversight and eldership, that they might be built together. And it is the one who ministers the word who shall appoint that which is of the character and qualification to oversee and influence.

No elder in scripture ever appointed himself, or ever appointed another elder. They were - always - appointed by the one who ministered the word.

But if men rebel against the discipline of the ministry of the word of God, what have they ? If they refuse for the word to be that which is the genuine doctrine of Christ, what have they ? Nothing, is what they have. Nothing at all. Just dead prayers, worldly congregations, incompetent speakers lacking any authority, abundant ignorance and empty hearts. Because they choose to rebel against the assertion of truth.

And if there is that in an assembly which cultivates a culture of untruthfulness in the doctrine of Christ,

## *The Knowledge of God*

wherewith shall come a remedy ? The remedy shall have to come from outside. For it cannot - it *cannot* - come from within, in such circumstances.

And if there is resistance to that which comes from without ? What shall there be ?

Only tragedy.

The tragedy of genuine ability, real character and considerable potential, being wasted in a system which will not permit their true qualities to be developed and used as they should. A real tragedy, is what I see.

Having looked for over two years in these parts, and having found nothing that will submit to the word of God, I only now begin to see what can be done, freshly, from a new beginning. If there is no submission to the word of God, there is nothing - nothing at all - that can be recognised. One has to start again, from the beginning.

For in the beginning, was the Word.

Nigel Johnstone  
Malvern

## *The Knowledge of God*

Mr Stephen Johnston  
Naunton Lane Evangelical Presbyterian Church,  
Cheltenham 28<sup>th</sup> may 2012 Copied to Mr Andrew Young  
Filed for Possible Publication

Sir, Mr Andrew Young has informed me by letter that your presbytery consider it unsuitable for me to meet with you. I have never personally met any of your company and have only spoken - once - to yourself on the phone, on which occasion you invited me to attend one of your meetings.

Therefore your decision appears to relate to a letter I wrote regarding the way in which Jesus Christ was spoken of in your company and the fact that you display, outside, an Authorised Version of the scriptures, whilst, inside, using an unauthorised translation - taken from a corrupted text.

It seems I have been excommunicated from your company. And, therefore, you must wish me to be excommunicated from the entire body of Christ. Unless, you, yourselves, are separating your assembly from the body of Christ.

You have three alternatives, basically, I believe -

1. Excommunicate me from the entire body of Christ.
2. Separate yourselves from the body of Christ.
3. Kindly invite me to a meeting of your presbytery and listen to what I have to say.

The third is the scriptural way of doing things, according to the words of Jesus Christ, the Lord in whom I trust.

Faithfully, Nigel Johnstone, Malvern

## *The Knowledge of God*

Mr [deleted]  
Operations Director  
[deleted] Theological College  
26 march 2013

### **Broken Covenant**

The only document which I was ever permitted to see in respect of the covenant I made with your organisation was the receipt which told me I had ten years of access to your facility. Nothing else was ever shown me; nothing else did I sign; nothing else existed in regard to the covenant made between myself and yourselves. You have no “right” to make the reservation, secretly, without documenting it to myself, that if a covenant no longer suits you, you can break it. You do not possess such a “right”, Sir.

And I follow the example of Him who said, “They continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not,” Hebrews 8:9.

Who shall abide in the the tabernacle of the Lord ? Psalm 15:1. Covenant breakers ? No. Here is the man who abides in the tabernacle of the Lord - Who sweareth to his own hurt..... and changeth not. Psalm 15:4.

Mr [deleted] had my book, The Everlasting Testament, in which I show that man, by nature, is given up by God, for all that unregenerate man does is to break everything written on the tables of stone, repeatedly and without cessation.

Thus it is that God made an Everlasting Covenant which does not involve man in it, at all, for covenant-breaking man cannot be trusted anymore. The Everlasting Testament involves only the will and the commandment of

## *The Knowledge of God*

the Father and the willing submission of the Son. And it involves those who are beneficiaries, who do nothing, but only receive the grace of God, humbly. Thereafter, they behave uprightly. And they can be trusted.

Mr [deleted] received my gift of six books, the gospel which I minister, through [deleted] and he then delivered them back to me via [deleted]. Without acknowledgement and without comment. A few days later, your Organisation then broke its covenant with me.

Your cheque is enclosed, in pieces, just like the covenant you made.

I have no regard for people who behave as you have done to me. How do I know that your cheque won't bounce ? You might have reserved the right not to pay out on it. You might suddenly decide not to honour the covenant written on the cheque. Your cheque is, now, worthless to me. Cash only, please, hand delivered to my home address. Preferably by [deleted], who has consistently treated me with honesty and courtesy.

Nigel Johnstone  
Director, Belmont Publications  
Malvern

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

## *The Knowledge of God*

To: Mr John Grindell  
Wyche Free Church  
West Malvern

march 2013

My ears did not “perceive” anything “mistakenly”, Sir.  
You invited me back to Wyche and I accepted.  
I then confirmed it in writing, in a courteous way.

My only “involvement” with yourself and at Wyche has been :-

1) to point out that the Son of man gave his own life and was not “suffocated” to death for which the speaker thanked me, as he confessed he had made an error; 2) to make it clear that Jesus Christ is the everlasting Son of God, not Son of God by incarnation only, as your articles do not defend against this error; 3) to sing three verses of Amazing Grace, by permission, at the back of the hall as others prepared food and 4) to have a meal at Wyche - for which I paid £5 - during which I had pleasant conversation with Mr Goodbury and his wife.

You seem not to have realised, Sir, that all the “disturbance and distress” is coming from yourself. Mostly because you are paying attention to slander behind my back and you are agitated about my life and my wife, both of which subjects I offered to come and discuss with you, in detail, at your convenience, but you refused.

You failed to do anything at all about the error uttered in the pulpit. You attempted to stop me doing anything at the time, by raising your hand - which I ignored - and then have raised resistance against me. You failed to ensure that your

## *The Knowledge of God*

articles keep out the most important historic error of our times and then you do all that you can to hinder my own expression of the gospel of Jesus Christ.

Only a man who is obedient to the apostolic word has any authority in the body of Christ. Only a man who is subject to that word which was in the mouth of Jesus Christ himself and was reported by faithful men; and to that word which came directly from chosen apostles - only such a man, Mr Grindell, has any authority to speak within the body of Christ, or to speak on behalf of others within that body. If a man is not so obedient, he has no authority whatsoever to command me to do or not to do, anything whatsoever in relation to the body of Christ. It is not his body, Sir. Nor do unevicted accusations, unjustified criticisms, unproven slander and insubstantial gossip have any effect upon my purpose or my actions.

You desire, personally, no further influence nor involvement from me, and that is entirely up to yourself to facilitate. I am not required to assist you in that process. How you choose to facilitate that is nothing to do with me. My "influence and involvement", as you put it, is with those who believe the gospel of Jesus Christ who, voluntarily, from the heart, obey that form of doctrine which has been delivered unto them.

That influence and involvement shall continue as long as I am granted the grace, the mercy and the holy influences to pursue it and as long as I am directed from above so to do.

Nigel Johnstone, Malvern