

24-Sep-07

His Arm Does, Part III

THE DISCIPLE WHOM THE LORD LOVED

The below letter was sent to the DSDA Forum in response to an E-mail from a member of that forum. It is made available for all to read:

Dear Johnathan,

To this day, you have strategically evaded the evidence put to you. You claimed that the *mustard seed's* (MSC) doctrine of Christ has no scriptural basis. Instead of issuing a humble concession, you continue to reject the MSC's teaching which proves from the Bible that Christ invisibly descended and abode upon, Jesus, the only begotten. You refuse to believe that this incontrovertible account proving that Jesus did not pre-exist as Christ has been validated by the Bible. Why have you not yet confess that your attack on the MSC was inaccurate, overstated, and deceptive? Is it because such a stand would require the casting aside of variance, wrath, strife, and heresy, and it would require the opposite which is meekness? The MSC is saddened to report that the same question must be presented to the forum moderator and other leaders on the forum and in the general body. Evidently, the impulse of integrity, whereby a man stands up for principle—even if it means personal shame and embarrassment—is a relic of a bygone, Adventist era. None seem to...

Cherish the Fruits of the Spirit~~~~~. The quandary of the Davidic quagmire is made manifest: How can we ever have unity when brethren in leadership favor their own personal estimation or reputation among their peers, proudly “sticking to their gun”, so to speak; they do so without regard to principles of *Christ our Righteousness*”? To whom can the Lord's sheep look to for leadership if the leaders in Davidia, “...*are shepherds that cannot understand: they all look to their own way, everyone for his gain, from his quarter*” —Isa 56: 11. It must be difficult for Walt and others on the forum to heed the counsel of James 5:16 (“*confess your faults one to another*”) so that they may become fair and objective teachers. For to joyously acknowledge and accede to a doctrine first presented by one whom you vehemently disagree requires a soul devoid of envy and strife; it requires grace and meekness—see Gal 5: 19-26. Thus, the MSC urges the forum to remember “...*the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness...let us also walk in the Spirit. Let us NOT be desirous of vain glory, provoking one another, envying one another*”—Gal 5: 25-26. Conversely, it is an impossibility for the carnal heart to acknowledge its own faults or the grand successes of its detractors; instead, protecting its pride and self esteem is the driving force of its every pulse? However, a leader after the order of David would cast aside all threats to his own personal safety (diminished reputation) to exalt the honor of the Lord. He well knows that the lion, the bear, and the giant potentially may cause him great harm and even death, but self preservation, “gain from one's own quarter”, is not to be the focus for him as a triumphant saint; instead, his focus is fixed upon exalting the righteousness of Christ. Evidently, this has not been your drive, Johnathan: you have been given several clear Bible statements, included among those are *John 17*, and *Isa 53*; yet, instead of conceding the point and, like a man who has the fruits of the Spirit, admitting your false charge and retracting it, you have instead sought to add to those texts twisting them to flatter your pride, or the gain from your quarter. Consider *John 17*; You make the following twisted assertion:

CITATION A:

"Dear Forum,

"If we are to believe the report of Isaiah and John 17, then we must believe in what John wrote as he begins John chapter 17 that say's,

'These words spake Jesus, and lifted up his eyes to heaven,...' ... But verse 3 below clarifies that notion by putting the word 'and' before Jesus Christ instead of in between Jesus and Christ. (see verse below) 'And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.' Verses 4 and 5 clearly brings Jesus in line with the words "I" and "Me" since verse 1 biblically declares that Jesus spoke these words, then why would Jesus make a prayer request to the Father to 'glorify thy Son' as if He were referring to another Son?... Since Jesus spake these words 'glorify thy Son' and 'has given him power over all flesh', then Jesus is referred to in the first person as the 'I' and the 'Me' in verse 4 & 5 points directly to His Self which proves that before Jesus was born He pre-existed. Jesus was the name given to Christ at His miraculous birth." —E-mail, Sat 22-Sep-07, 5:21AM

Your plan, as made evident by *Citation A* above, is obviously to drown the attentive reader in a sea of convoluted logic causing them to swallow your hatred for Christ as His true nature is revealed. Fortunately, He has elected a champion who has skill to make simple that which is complex. Thus we have the below MSC analysis that —if not a child, then certainly— a spiritually maturing adult can follow. Before addressing that, I must quote your other E-mail showing more convolution of logic:

CITATION B

"Take note of the highlighted ones mainly 1John 2: 24, 'Let that therefore abide in you, which ye have heard from the beginning'

That validates Isaiah's report because Isaiah was written before John wrote his letter. Also verses 26 warns us about being seduced, and in verse 27 it states the biblical fact that, "we need not any man teach you, but the anointing teacheth you all things", that would include the Jesus/and/or Christ theory had it been taught in the beginning, John declares, See below..." —Your E-mail, Saturday, 22-Sep-07, 3:42 AM

Johnathan, in *Citation B* above, you pretend to understand that which the Epistle John admonishes us to embrace when he says, **"that...which we have heard from the beginning"**; resultantly, your faith is founded, not upon Christ, but upon...

The Sin of Presumption~~~~~. Without any contextual evidence, you presume that John's reference applies to a time before the advent of Christianity such as the beginning of Scripture, the beginning of the universe, the beginning of time (???); you do not specify. Resultantly, based upon this open-ended and dark interpretation, you further presume upon the reference of *Isa 53* and *1 John 2* making John's first-century, gentile students appear as experts on the nature of Christ as that nature was expressed in *Isa 53*. A more careful reading of *1 John 2*, will show this presumption to be in gross error. John, the one who wrote the Epistle of John, was a man thought by Bible Scholars to be the very same as *John the Gospel Writer, John the Revelator*. If this thinking is correct, and the MSC finds no reason to contradict it, then he, John, was the man, John Boanerges, the son of Zebedee and the beloved disciple of Jesus (see Bible helps to the KJV, *The Open Bible Edition*, Thomas Nelson, Publishers). In the context of his first epistle which you cite above, John is referring to the *Testimony of Jesus* and its corresponding commission to the gentiles. He is not referring to the beginning of earth at creation, nor the beginning of the great controversy, not to the beginning of time, nor the beginning of Isaiah's prophecy, not even to the beginning of Israel, or any other beginning when he reminds the church of **"that which ye have heard from the beginning"**. He speaks of the doctrines which the NT Church hath heard —not read— from the beginning of their apostolic commission pertaining to Jesus' ministry. Thus does the Apostle John, in the very verse cited by you say, **"ye also shall continue in the Son and in the Father"**. To appreciate this point more fully, it would help if the reader understands that, by the end of the first century, the church had exploded with gentile membership, a people who had no

prior knowledge of the OT Scriptures. Also you should likewise appreciate that, although some OT prophets may have encased the prophecies in mystery, Jesus' testimony was the first to reveal the concept of the Father and the Son to the church according to John 8: 54, 55 and many other texts. The Jewish church abhorred the notion that God had a Son. In fact, this was the very reason why the Lord's enemies crucified the Lord proclaiming "**he made himself the Son of God**" —John 19:7. Prior to His ministry, the saints presumed Christ, the God of the OT, to be identical to God or the same as the Father (see John 1: 1). For you to advance as fact your private presumptions is to put the Apostle (Epistle) John, and his students in a station of greater authority than Father and Christ who promised to hide the unbearable truths from the early NT church and to reveal those things as the church matured. (see Matt 22: 25, John 16: 12-14, John 16: 7-8, Heb 5: 12, John 6: 39, etc). Thus do you presume that the report of *Isa 53*, the statement that the Lord led His Arm, Jesus, as a lamb to the slaughter, was understood by John and the gentiles the way in which the Papacy has taught; that is, that the Father led Jesus to the slaughter. You ignore the fact that the Papacy, taught falsehoods, not Bible truths, and that its scriptural signature is described in *Dan eight* to be that of casting the truth to the ground. This being the orientation of the Papacy, what makes any dare to presume that, in his assault on all gospel truth, the Papacy would destroy the Sabbath, the rules of marriage, the themes of forgiveness, the true virtue of Mary, the path of faith, etc, but leave intact and in purity, the most important truth, the truth of Christ and Father? Thusly, to promote Papal themes, according to Christ, is to elevate the abomination that maketh desolate. Finally, if the early NT church perfectly understood the Father and Christ, as we are required to assume in order to accept your theory of *Isa 53*, then why did John promise in *Rev 10* that the "Mystery of God" would not be finished until the last day, the day when the seventh trumpet was to sound. Do all see now why we are warned against the sin of presumption? Such a tactic is likewise dangerous when seeking understanding on that which EG admonished that we master, the Lord's prayer and its correspondingly intricate...

Scientific Meaning Recorded in John 17~~~~~. Putting *Citation B* on the shelf until later in this answer and revisiting *Citation A*, whereby you, Johnathan, seek to convolute the prayer of *John 17*, we are forced to take notice that your entire argument hinges upon the fact that the Scripture says Jesus spoke the prayer of *John 17*. In a simple attempt to substantiate this claim, you quoted the author, John —not the Lord, the Life-saving *Testimony of Jesus*— to say, "**these words spake Jesus and lifted up his eyes to heaven...**" —John 17: 1. If this thesis can be debunked by Scripture, then, without wresting over the mountain of convoluted logic that you offer, your argument will then become a stepping stone for the MSA. Yet, the point must be reiterated, it takes integrity to teach the Scriptures, and, Johnathan, you demonstrate a great lack of that quality by this argument. You shamefully pose this question as if the MSC has not invested the past 20 months explaining to you the answer to your objection, that Christ spoke through Jesus. Why advance an argument which the MSC has already clearly answered? Already having the answer, what is your goal behind the statements of *Citation A*? Is it to seek to destroy and confuse others? Your answer will allow you to judge the origin of your fruit: does it come from the grape-producing Vine, or is it poison ivy? All who have read should well know that the MSC has answered the question pertaining to the communications of Jesus. All on the forum, especially you, Johnathan, are very well aware of the Bible fact that Jesus, during His testimony spoke the words commanded to Him by Christ Who hid within Him. Consequently, when Jesus lifted up His eyes and prayed, He did so at the orchestration of the indwelling Christ. Therefore, how is it Johnathan, that you begin your argument with subterfuge suggesting that Jesus spoke independently of that other Holy Spirit, Christ? How is it that you left that key factor out of your analysis? Were you being ignorant, deceptive, or foolish? Please give the forum your answer to this query. The following points must also now be advanced to defeat your twist on logic:

(One) The Bible clearly shows, in Moses' prophecy that the Prophet, Jesus, would not speak His words but those commanded to Him. It says, "**I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren...and will put my words in his mouth and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him**" —Deut 18: 18. This description of Jesus' work cannot be ignored because

His Arm Does, Part III

Jesus Himself, under the Command of Christ, said in *John five* that the only true Christians are the ones who believe Moses testimony of Him. The *Rod*, in 1TG 15p 5, validates the Lord's statement by pointing us to *Deut 18* to show the Lord's meaning. Questions that you must now answer are as follows:

- Since all of the words of Jesus' testimony were words spoken by Him at the command of Christ, would not that apply to the prayer of *John 17*?
- Also, since the *fullness of the doctrine of Christ* was to be revealed only in the last day, *John six*, and in the day of perfection, *Eph four*, and this fullness was to unveil the hidden presence of Christ on Jesus, then would not all intelligent students anticipate the commentary from the author who wrote the book of John to describe Jesus' prayer as a petition devoid of the unseen influence of Christ commanding Him what to say? We would not expect it to disclose that which Christ commanded should be hidden by Jesus wording the text differently and saying "These words commanded Christ for Jesus to pray"
- Did not Christ clearly manifest His desire to speak to His church while hidden, hidden, HIDDEN upon Jesus according to *Deut 18, Luke four, Matt 17, Luke 10: 22, John 8: 28, etc.* Consequently, would He not, in keeping with this tactic, inspire the gospel writer, John, to properly give Jesus credit for speaking the words?
- Although Jesus was given credit for verbalizing the words, suggesting that the thoughts were communicated from His lips and tongue, does not that fact still uphold the conclusion that Christ clandestinely spoke through Him?
- Was not this the very covenant promise which Christ gave to Israel assuring them that He would speak to them through the Prophet?
- Since you have been told these answers several times over the past 20 months, yet, to advance your recent, E-mail argument, you make no mention of those inconvenient and yet-to-be refuted, Bible facts, then please tell the forum monitor, a man who now claims to be sensitive to (only) negative names and labels, which names can be used to describe such a man as yourself other than a liar; a deceiver; a slithering, Edenic serpent, etc.
- Are you a milk consuming saint or have you advanced to use the strong meat of the word? If you are still milk fed, then you must honestly excuse yourself from this discourse, a message of strong meat. If you are a consumer of strong meat, then you must answer the question posed to you 20 months ago and reveal to the forum the answer to this simple question: which doctrines of Christ have you dutifully abandoned in compliance with the Bible and *Rod* mandate for strong-meat consumers?
- If your answer is none, if you have no doctrines of Christ to report that you have abandoned, then why cannot we call you the biblical names which accurately describe your infantile approach to theology? Also, why do you pretend to honor the Apostles when you have clearly violated Paul's command to leave the Principle doctrines of Christ?
- If Christ calls people who refuse to advance with the extra oil weeping, teeth-gnashing, foolish virgins, can we then apply His testimony to you today or must we wait until tomorrow when the trauma of sadness actually begins to afflict you in a greater way and you are made to see the price which you have exacted for your pride?

(Two) Now since we have established that *John 17* represents a prayer offered to Father by the lips of Jesus as He was commanded to speak by the hidden presence of Christ and we have given irrefutable and unchallenged, Bible facts, backed by the *Rod*, then it is clear that when the prayer ask Father to glorify His Son, using the third person, then, without adding or subtracting from Scripture and without using the tactic of the serpent in the garden by suggesting that Christ's words need to be modified, we can simply discern a prayer request for two separate beings, Jesus, the Only Begotten as the first one and Christ, the Eternal Son as the second.

(Three) Christ, using different pronouns, first and then third-person singular, compelled Jesus to make two appeals for glory in the same prayer: Speaking of Jesus, a different Person, He properly spoke in third person and said "**Father, the hour is come; glorify thy Son...**" Then, being the actual communicator, One Whom John could not recognize then, but One Whom Father perfectly identified, He changed the subject and said, "**and now, O Father, glorify thou me...with the glory which I had with thee before the world...**" if He were not making His request for two different people, as the MSC proves, then He would be guilty of repeating Himself, a violation of His own

The Mustard Seed Advent, 24-Sep-2007

teachings which forbid “vain repetitions”. Did He not, during His testimony, command, “*But when ye pray, use not vain repetitions, as the heathen do...*” —see Matt 6: 7.

(Four) Christ asked Father for two types of glory which are diametrically opposed: glory for His Son on earth and among men (verse three) while, at the same time, glory for Himself in heaven as He enjoyed it before creation (verse five). He made these requests with proper speech using the third person singular (Him) in verse three and the first person singular (Me) in verse five. This is a simple fact made complicated by the pollution of Emperor Constantine who canonized the conclusion that Jesus was pre-existent as Christ. Had he not traditionalized this thesis, we would read the text without any confusion. After all, it is indeed highly irregular for any to speak of themselves simultaneously, in the same breath, using different pronoun cases switching back and forth from first to third person.

And, again, the requests were opposite. He proclaims that the Son has been given power over all flesh, all humanity, but that He needed glory so that Father could be likewise be glorified. In other words, men could not receive life unless they recognized Jesus to be their salvation, their path to Father; thus, Christ, in other words, asked Father to glorify Jesus **after** —not before— the world was. Then, as if speaking of a different person, He requested a different glory for Himself, glory devoid of human recognition, glory before the world was. For you to suggest that each request was for the same person is likened unto an expectant mother asking God for a son who is a daughter, or a military commander simultaneously asking for war and peace, or a pilot seeking to go full speed ahead in reverse: these themes, like Christ’s prayer, are contradictory unless it is understood to apply to two people. Yet, this fact will never sell itself; it must be coupled by the testimony of Moses in *Deut 18*, the very testimony which makes a man a true Christian according to Christ. It is the key which unlocks the mystery of God.

- Men, for the past 2000 years did not recognize Christ, and they exalted Jesus as Christ, therefore, Father obviously answered Christ’s petition.
- Since the Prayer begins speaking of Jesus in the third person by saying, “**Father, the hour is come; glorify thy Son that thy Son also may Glorify thee**”, then we have the clearest proof that the Object of that prayer, Jesus, had not brought to Father glory beforehand. Thus, He was not responsible for the miracles and light given in the Old Testament; He did not pre-exist. The reverence for God depicted in the OT was achieved by the work of another, Christ.

(Five) Christ claims that His work was done. He while speaking in the first person said the following: “**I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do**” —John 17: 4

- The point has been made by you and others on the forum that there is only One High Priest/Mediator which is Jesus and in so doing you defeat your own blindness. This is so because Christ said that at Calvary, He finished the work given to Him. We all know, especially in view of *Rev three*, and Dan 8:14, that Jesus’ work, being our only mediator as you yourself claim, had just begun: It was not finished. The MSC has never claimed that Christ was the NT High Priest or Mediator.

(Six) *Isa 53* give a report on Jesus in which you evidently have chosen to not believe. In your E-mail, by misunderstanding the *Epistle of John*, you manifest a desire to add to and take away from the Bible, a condemned sin. You seek to add to the report of *Isa 53*, the workings of the Father, though such theme is nowhere therein stated. Therefore, you are guilty of reshaping the Bible into your own Papal-inspired image. The following points will further expose your sophistry:

- If the scholars are correct with the belief that *John the Gospel Writer*, *John the Epistle*, and *John the Revelator* are the same individual, John Boanerges, the son of Zebedee (Mark 3:17, Matt 4:21), then he shares several qualities with the MSC, 1) he and his family unpretentiously valued the gift of discipleship unapologetically esteeming its highest seat, (Matt 20). 2) He recorded the MSC’s dominant theme, the doctrine of life without death merely by belief in Jesus’ testimony (see John 6, 8, 11, etc). 3) He, in his epistle, emphasized the Lord’s promise of that life (see 1John 2: 25). 4) He was the most favored apostle, the one in the very bosom of the Lord (John 13:23). He was the youngest, the one who closes the gospel work (see Revelation)
- John also being the disciple whom Jesus loved, is comparable to David, Christ’s beloved; he published peace; his anointing and favor aroused the envy of the other disciples (Matt 20). He had

His Arm Does, Part III

the burden of expressing his high calling as the Lord's favorite and did so by referring to himself indirectly as "the disciple whom the Lord loved" —see John 20: 2, 21:7; 21:20.

- These facts being true, then the antitypical John, is the *mustard seed*, the penny-passing steward is the one to teach, minister, and serve the disciples today, the rulers over the 144,000 (Matt 19). He, while identifying himself as a fellow servant, one UNWORTHY OF WORSHIP finally graduates them to perfection: He shows them the need and the way to finally worship —not the SOP, but— Father. Therefore, the last message to the disciples comes from antitypical John to cease their worship of the SOP and begin to worship God —see Rev. 19— a message already delivered to Davidia.
- This being the case, then the *Epistle of John* could not have possibly taught as you suggest, that the early NT Church understood the exact station of Christ, Jesus, and God as portrayed in *Isa 53*; such was to be a last-day theme. They could not have understood that Father led Jesus as a Lamb to the slaughter. In fact, if Jesus pre-existed as Christ, He would already have been familiar with the *Plan of Salvation* and would not have needed any to lead Him thus.
- *Isa 53* clearly shows that the Lord (Christ) led Jesus, His Arm. To assert that the *Isa 53* report portrays Father leading Jesus to slaughter is technically inaccurate. All of Christ's moves while He hid upon Jesus were orchestrated by Father; however, it was Christ whose unseen presence upon the earth who directed Him. This is evidenced by facts given already in the prior E-mail and by the evidence below.
- The first is recorded in Matt 4:1. It shows Jesus beginning His work with tribulation, that of being led into the wilderness by the Spirit to be tempted. This Spirit had to have been the very One which rested upon Him at the anointing and which abode upon Him. Therefore, it could only have been Christ. Remember and respect the Lord's testimony: He said that Father was in heaven and that the Comforter could not come until He departed.
- Secondly, Jesus, immediately after His temptation, quoted Isaiah, a text which states, the Spirit of the Lord is upon me. Then after a pause, Jesus (Christ) said, "**This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears.**" Thus, the Scripture reading was a statement from Isaiah, the revelation of meaning from the text was from Christ. That which was fulfilled was that the Spirit of the Lord, the hidden presence of Christ, was upon Him, Jesus. Consequently, for this reason and for the reasons given above, it could have only been Christ —not the Comforter nor Father— Who led Jesus as a Lamb to slaughter, the report of *Isa 53*. Who will believe this report? Will you?

The MSC could go on and on to deepen this study; however, consideration must be given to the saints who zealously will read this E-mail. Being that they have heard many of these things before, the MSC must avoid "vain repetitions". Therefore, we will now speak to a new issue,

The Abiding Love of Christ for John~~~~~. As we close this E-mail, we must remember that the mission of Christ and Jesus is to convert the branches of the Vine so that they may bear fruit. It is befitting that, at the end of the day, our test would be the challenge to overcome the evil traits of envy, revilings, hatred, and strife. These, according to *Gal five*, are the enemies of our mission to bear fruit. Many who are carnal in their impulses, men who have never learned to be spiritual, resist with great intensity the theme that the Lord could favor with a special love, His Disciple John, David, His beloved, today. Sure, He loves all of the disciples as expressed in John 15: 12; however, like Jacob to Joseph, Abraham to Isaac, Christ reserves a special love for the man which does that which Davidia refuses to do and honors His commandments and keeps His word. Such a man is the one to whom Christ reveals His nature, the antitypical David, the one who receives supreme love from not only Christ but also from Father for Christ's testimony came directly from Father:

"He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me: and he that loveth me shall be LOVED of my Father, and I will LOVE him and will manifest myself to him...If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will LOVE him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him. He that loveth me not keepeth not my sayings: and the word which ye hear is not mine, but the Father's which sent me." —John 14: 21, 23, 24

One point must now be highlighted from this, the Lord's Testimony: that both Christ and Father base their love —not upon human appearance or looks, nor race, not wealth, nor social status, but— upon principle. Like a complex calculus equation, the Lord's love has limits. Those men who love His commandments are the ones who will receive Father's love and His highest honor, discipleship. Therefore should not you love the man whom They love; should not the mind of Christ be in you?

The Mustard Seed Advent, 24-Sep-2007

—see *Gal two*. “**Now if any man have not the Spirit (mind) of Christ, he is none of his**” —Romans 8: 9. For this reason has the MSC accused you, Johnathan, and likewise many on the forum of “hating the Lord”, for He says, “**He that loveth me not keepeth not my sayings**”. This is not a judgment or name calling. It is a concrete, objective, and verifiable fact. Instead of accepting the Lord’s word, you have rejected and despised them. In your path to refuse Elijah’s attempts to show you how to pass the judgment, you have denied the *Testimony of Jesus* and have hated many of the promises directed to the disciples through Christ from Father. Below is a shortened list which illustrates the Words which you have despised:

- **His promise to raise up a man in the last day**
- **His promise to reveal Himself to one man and that no other man beforehand will be graced to know either His identity nor that of the Father —Luke 10: 22**
- **His promise to raise His testimony in the “Last Day” as the source of everlasting life —John 6: 39, 40, 44, 54**
- **The very definition of everlasting life to mean life uninterrupted by death**
- **His statement that life without death comes merely by believing —not that of EGW nor VTH primarily, but— His testimony (John 8: 51)**
- **His teachings that the Holy Spirit is Masculine —Many texts.**
- **His theme that the Holy Spirit’s main commission is to remind us of His testimony —John 14: 25, 26**
- **His definition of a Christian to be one who believes on Him as Moses described in *Deut 18* —John 5: 45-47**
- **His prayer of *John 17* in purity, just as stated and unaltered by 1700 years of Papal distortion, whereby He petitioned for glory for two people**
- **His command to reveal every light that you have to the House, the Church, and not hide it under the bushel —Matt 5: 16**
- **His promise that the *Testimony of Jesus* will win for you everlasting life —John 6: 50, 54**
- **His theme that some truths will be hidden from your eyes until you grow in maturity —John 16: 12-14**
- **His promise to exalt the humble and abase the exalted**
- **His command to extend mercies to the sons of America’s former slaves, to be good Samaritans to Jerusalem that fell among thieves —Luke 10: 30-37**
- **His record that Father is greater than Christ; that Christ is therefore not the same person as Father but a separate individual Whom He demands that we honor as we honor Himself —John 5: 19-23**

Father made it very clear, special love from Him will be extended to the man who abides by His testimony revealed by Christ through the lips and tongue of Jesus. He also clearly showed us that, despite your profession to the opposite, if you disrespect, disregard, dishonor, and distance yourself from those words, then you do not love, but rather hate Christ. Thus, it is the MSC’s duty to teach even that Bible theme, and it does so even over the objections of the moderator of this E-mail forum. Yet, let us be positive: Have you ever heard of anyone else, other than the MSC, the Lord’s beloved, to preach all of the unpopular themes of His testimony as itemized above? Even you, Johnathan, have admitted that no one has taught the Nature of Christ/Jesus as has the MSC. Therefore, are you condemned —not by the bad names from the MSC, but— by your own words. For the MSC gets its doctrine of Christ, as commanded by Jesus, straight from the testimony of Moses.

With this in mind, all must be made to realize that if the Lord needs to coax, cajole, plead, argue, beg, threaten, and name call merely to finally, after a great struggle, win your support, then His love for you cannot possible be as great as is His love for His highest disciple, the faithful steward who believes His word immediately and just by hearing: For he becomes the only one, the first one to start the Kingdom, the *mustard seed*. Conversely, the reciprocal is true: Your love for the Lord, at

His Arm Does, Part III

least at first, cannot be as great as is the love in the heart of the *mustard seed* for Him. It is the very mission of the *mustard seed* to teach you how to love the Lord; thus is he raised up in the last day to declare the *Testimony of Jesus*. You may, in the end, become a disciple, but, as this E-mail is a *Testimony to Davidia*, this record will stand forever before heaven and earth. We will always know that you were brought into the Lord's salvation, as it were, kicking and screaming against Father's counsel. Yet, even beyond that fact, we must understand that if Christ has a special love for David then should not you, being Christ's professed servant, also joy and celebrate in David's exalted favor? How could any have the indwelling mind of Christ and not favor whom He favors, even if such favoritism causes such a man to objectively have a lower appraisal of their own spiritual virtues? Are we not commanded to exalt the Lord in our lives and subordinate Father's will above that of our own? Only faith in Christ will cause you to do today that which the brothers of ancient Joseph failed to do yesterday: that is to celebrate Joseph's election while he was yet an apparently insignificant lad and to do so by faith, understanding that merely because Christ sees exceptional virtue, then such is good enough for you. Should not all disciples feel the same way about the *mustard seed*?—this is a theme of *Christ our Righteousness* and *Righteousness by Faith* which brethren *Jones and Waggoner* and *VTH* failed to teach. This lesson exposes the ugliness of the sin of strife and envy and the war in which it wages against true happiness. Now it becomes plainer than ever, only the Davidians who overcome these sins, those who bear fruit from the Vine, will mature to be the "shaken off" from the pastures of Carmel and Bashan (Isa 33: 9), the saints to be gathered unto David. Consequently, it is indeed sin of the highest order for such a man, a people, a forum to envy the Lord's special regard for David, the *mustard seed*. The Lord promises to love all of his disciples but for David, He and Father will always have a special place of higher estimation, for David is the one who brings Him glory: he will show the universe the victory over Satan by trusting in the Word.

Thus, what better way could there be to close the work than to show humanity how to bear fruit? Is not the Lord, the Son of the Highest, free to choose His favorites? Father promises that the disciples during the regeneration of Israel will be seated on the twelve thrones to judge Israel. Clearly then at least three levels of leadership are revealed in the *Testimony of Jesus*, the highest disciple who is the prime minister according to *Matt 20*, then the disciples who rule and judge the 144,000 according to *Matt 19*, then the leaders of Israel themselves, AKA, the first fruits/the 144,000/Jerusalem, the people who rule the gentiles and the rest of Israel. Each level will eventually joy in the spiritual maturity of their subordinates. The careful thinker will realize that if envy and strife should now be acceptable against the prime minister, then tomorrow when those same envious Davidian brethren are given leadership over the 144,000, they will need to teach them to have victory where they have failed; thus, what is the justice of their appointment to elevated leadership? Imagine an eternity whereby envy and strife rules the heart and a just leader needs to protect his back against his own resentful subordinates. Is not that the same curse which Lucifer fostered in heaven against Christ? If so, then should not all who uphold that same tactic be called by that very name, Luciferian Christians? Such would not be the Kingdom of heaven but the kingdom of hell all over again. Instead, the "*great people and the strong, there hath not ever been the like*" —Joel 2: 2— should now become the responsible teachers which the Lord requires and take on humility, cast aside all jealousies, envies, and strife so that they can point to their example in leadership to rule the throngs of men under their authority. In other words, they should begin to practice to march in rank.

For decades, we Davidians looked forward with great longing for the emergence of David. All along, we presumed that we would be ready for his kingdom, the *mustard seed*. We had no idea how the enemy would exploit our carnal impulses to become David's most bitter enemy. We, not understanding the calculus of the matter, did not anticipate how petty immaturities would unite us with Satan and his goal, to defeat Christ. We underestimated the power of peer pressure, the fear of standing alone and being the target of laughter, the petty jealousies which have been hidden in our hearts, would cause us to rebel instead of celebrating the inauguration of our brother being seated in power; we selfishly became hostile because one crab has escaped the barrel. But, in so doing, we

The Mustard Seed Advent, 24-Sep-2007

justify the Lord's disfavor of us and His love for the antitypical John. Have you failed to become a fruit-bearing branch? If so, heed this counsel and change today.

Sincerely,

Derek