

Partial Prophecy and the Single Eye, Part II

20-Oct-09

Walt,

As you continue in your sophistry, you quote EGW, and misuse her quote as a diversionary tactic allowing you to dodge the humiliation of acknowledging your error. You wrote to Emilio the following:

“One thing more is that I hope you know that it is not a sin to use the concordance for clarification of the words used in the Bible when necessary. See below for in speaking of William Miller, EGW writes: ‘Endeavoring to lay aside all preconceived opinions, and dispensing with commentaries, he compared scripture with scripture by the aid of the marginal references and the concordance He pursued his study in a regular and methodical manner; beginning with Genesis, and reading verse by verse, he proceeded no faster than the meaning of the several passages so unfolded as to leave him free from all embarrassment...’ ”—E-mail from Walt to Emilio, 19-Oct-09, 10: 32AM

This reference is an attempt by you to answer the MSA’s charge that you misuse the dictionary. The MSA cited you for using the dictionary to parse the simple words of *1Cor 13*; it made no mention of your use of a concordance. The charge was that of

Inconsistent Duplicity~~~~~ When a Text strikes your fancy, you quote it without the aid of a dictionary to strain over each word. However, when a Text crosses your expectations and dashes deeply held theories, you deploy the dictionary. This inconsistency destroys your credibility. You used this very deceptive tactic in your E-mail to Emilio of 17-Oct-09, 7:14AM EST. The words which you sought to define in order to massage away the obvious meaning of *1Cor 13* were the very simple words “fail”, “cease”, “perfect”, “part”, and “away”. Your dictionary insertions did not recommend any alternate construction to counter or correct Emilio’s use of that text. It only made you appear to be desperate. He quoted Paul to say, “...*Whether there be prophecies they shall fail...For we know in part, and we prophesy in part. But when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away...For now we see through a glass darkly*” —*1Cor: 13: 8-12*. This text was effectively deployed to explain why the *mustard seed* teaches doctrines which are thought to be in contradiction to the teachings under yesterday’s bountiful shower of manna: Their partial prophecies failed just as Paul predicted. *1Cor 13* along with many other Bible references gives positive proof to the MSA’s place in end-time eschatology and legally accommodates its Bible doctrines and mission. Paul’s inspired testimony, as shown in *1Cor 13*, disagrees with your presumptions of how the gift of prophecy was structured to work by God. But the message was made and your above quote does not reverse its resounding resolve.

Now that you have been called out over your inconsistency, you seek to confuse the charge by mixing it with a more legitimate research tool, a concordance. The objection was not over your deployment of a concordance, a book that helps us all to search for words in the Bible. Yet, in your above quote, you defend the use of concordances showing EGW upholding WM’s use of it as a research tool. In this duplicitous defense written to Emilio, did you confuse the two research tools, the dictionary and the concordance, because you did not discern the difference, or were you purposefully hoping that others would confuse the two study tools and concede to you false credit for scholarship; or are you attempting, by sleight of hand, to deceive Emilio tricking him to think that inspiration, by its use of a concordance, honors your misuse of the dictionary? If the latter is the case, I know Emilio; he is a thoughtful man greatly fortified against such tricks.

Partial Prophecy and the Single Eye, Part II

In a prior E-mail of the same day, one also sent to answer the MSA's criticism of your work, you used even more sophistry: You quote EGW to say the following:

"The Bible must not be interpreted to suit the ideas of men, however long they may have held these ideas to be true. We are not to accept the opinion of commentators as the voice of God; they were erring mortals like ourselves. God has given reasoning powers to us as well as to them. We should make the Bible its own expositor. {TM 106.2}"—E-mail from Walt to Emilio, 19-Oct-09, 10: 38AM; emphasis belongs to his letter.

Did you think that Emilio, a man with much history in the *Rod* message, has never heard that reference? Did you not realize that all Davidians who have read the *Rod* are familiar with this statement from EGW? It is cited therein nearly 16 times according to my index (counting times used: an example of a research tool used properly to emphasize!)? When quoted properly, all will see that EGW and VTH used your statement to make the exact opposite point that you attempt to make. Not only do you violate EGW's strong demands to never elevate her work above the Bible, but you also, by quoting her out of context, make her appear to repulse inspired teachers who teach new doctrines from the Bible. Instead of helping your goal in that regard, a close rendering of the context does the exact opposite: It predicts a special man, a messenger of light whom Christ will send to magnify His power by his unique and unpopular insights into the Bible. The lines which you have deceitfully omitted sustain a place in the church for the advent of the Lord's *mustard seed* and reads as follows:

"...We cannot hold that a position once taken, and idea once advocated, is not, under any circumstances to be relinquished..."

"...Yet, when a view of Scripture is presented (obviously by a sin-overcoming human), many do not ask, is it true—in harmony with God's word? But, by whom (by which erring mortals) is it advocated? And unless it comes through the very channel that pleases them, they do not accept it. So thoroughly satisfied are they with their own ideas that they will not examine the Scripture evidence with a desire to learn, but refuse to be interested, merely because of their prejudices."

"The Lord often works where we least expect him. He surprises us by revealing His power through instruments of His own choice (again, by a sin-overcoming human), while He passes by the ♦♦ MEN♦♦ to whom we have looked as those through whom light should come. God desires us to receive the truth upon its own merits—because it is truth."

"The Bible must not be interpreted to suit the ideas of men, however long they may have held these ideas to be true. We are not to accept the opinion of commentators as the voice of God; they were erring mortals like ourselves. God has given reasoning powers to us as well as to them. We should make the Bible its own expositor."—EGW, *Testimonies to Ministers*, p. 105-106; Parentheses added.

Your message attempts to prove that EGW shunned those who studied novel, Bible revelations from erring mortals. Thinking that this description applies to the *mustard seed*, you seek to suggest that she instead encouraged our reliance upon our own individual skills to discern new meaning from the Bible without the benefit of a new-light messenger. Not only does this notion violate your very embrace of the *Rod* again showing your duplicity, it also violates EGW's teachings, dashes her promises of unity, and undermines the essence of her very inspiration, it also discredits the Adventist way. Your perverse twist on her quote is in complete disharmony with our work and experience since 1833 and is opposite to the very basic meaning of *The Three-Angels' Message*. No wonder you had to lift it out of context and truncate it then pray that none on the forum would awaken to your magical sleight of hand. EGW instead of making your case says the exact opposite throughout her writings but especially in the above statement. She talks of a new, controversial "view of Scripture" to be presented to the church, one that will dash ideas that we once advocated, being presented and being rejected or ignored by people because of their prejudice. She says, someone, a person whom we least expect, is to be deployed to reveal Christ's power, a man of the "Lord's own choice". We know that he is a human because she says Christ passes by the men to whom we have looked so as to enlighten us with His power. In other words, her objection is not that He deploys a "mortal"; she instead objects to the church's refusal to hear a mortal whom they have not ordained as an authority. She says that the Lord passes by the expected men to bring to us His man, His surprise, His unexpected elect.

The Mustard Seed Advent, 20-Oct-2009

He does not depend upon us to sort through the Bible without human help, but to the contrary, we are to become opened to receive new interpretations from novel, human sources. This speaks directly to

The Sure Mercies of David~~~~~This theme neatly dovetails with the Text from Deuteronomy which you sought to deploy so as to deceive Emilio. You sought to trick him to think that the son of David, the ‘surprising instrument of God’s own choice through whom light should come’, cannot be trusted to interpret the Bible. What a dark attempt to deceive for if he cannot, we will never know our victory in Father; we will never triumph over the dark cloud of partial prophecy so as to see full brightness now dawning upon us. Thus you, true to your style of deception, snipped out of context the following Text: **“The prophet, which shall presume to speak a word in my name, which I have not commanded him to speak...even that prophet shall die”** —Deut 18: 20. [Here would be a good time for a definition, not from the dictionary, but the Bible: **How does the Lord deploy the use of the term “prophet!?”**] This Text, in a nutshell condemns blasphemy, and you, by including it in your sophistry, do a masterful job defeating your own strategy. By deploying this Text, your attempts to condemn all true agents of Christ, even the elected son of David, under the auspicious brim of its umbrella, gives to him the very device to defeat you. In furtherance of this consideration, a marvelous light shines forth. Even in the midst of your sleight of hand, and in the shadow of your quote from Deut 18: 20, an interesting question arises: EGW refers to herself and the leading brethren as erring mortals. This confession by her own lips, under the impress of the Holy Spirit, shows that her testimony was partial and that, as a self-professed “mortal” she was going to die. The question which resultantly looms large is, how did she, VTH, and Wm Miller—all deceased, NT prophets— become so “errant” so as to be included under the umbrella of Deut 18: 20? The Text itself answers the issue: They all presumed to speak a word in Christ’s name. We wrongly perceive Deut 18: 20 to be a condemnation; instead, it is a tracer of the human path to the Kingdom, the path of prophets, any person who speak for Christ. They all assumed or presumed to speak a word in Christ’s name, but did so **UNKNOWINGLY**. Their entire light and ministry was attributed to Christ; they presumed that Jesus pre-existed as Christ, and by virtue of this mistake, they could not extend their lives into eternity without the penalty expressed in Deut 18: 20, the penalty of death. They surely died—just as your highly favored reference promised— but they died with the hope of resurrection unto eternal life. Notice that the Text says, “the prophet”; it does not say, “the false prophet, which shall presume to speak a word in my name”. After all, any false prophet would be condemned by the Lord. This fact brings us back to the text which you so greatly attempted to darken and obscure, Paul’s revelation of partial prophecy as expressed in *1Cor 13*. It shows to us that all NT prophets prophesy—not in falsehood, but—in partiality.

Sadly, yesterday’s prophetic heroes did indeed die; it was a sleep in the Lord Jesus for they went to the grave with the prospect that, according to the specific criterion of the Atonement, He will remove their “unknown” sins. **“And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying...If a soul shall sin through IGNORANCE against any of the commandments of the Lord concerning things which ought not to be done (like presuming to speak in Christ’s name)...he shall lay his hand upon the head of the goat, and kill it... it is a sin offering”** —See *Lev four*. If the command of Deut 18: 20 condemns presumptuous prophets, then it also must consistently condemn presumptuous, Christ-blasphemous, non-prophets. This would include teachers, apostles, fourth-century emperors, popes, Davidian-forum administrators, spies for the SDA church, and common people: Anyone who declares Christ’s word is such a prophet. Consequently, the sin offering covers blasphemy by any and all church members—not just officially designated prophets— so long as the sin is done in ignorance. In fact, if anyone takes upon the noble calling of enforcing righteousness, they are doing exactly as the Lord desires; they are heroes to heaven. Christ spoke the Law in the OT and repeated His Father’s commands in the NT; therefore, such a bold disciple who voluntarily steps forward is fulfilling the call extended to all men, to promote Christ and His truth. By reason of this analysis,

Partial Prophecy and the Single Eye, Part II

such a person becomes a prophet, one who speaks in the name of the Lord. After all, as stated, such a courageous initiative is never condemned by the Lord; it was how David was vaulted onto the ancient, political scene. The problem comes when they misrepresent the truth of Christ, then it must be discerned, according to the Atonement, whether that offense was intentional or premeditated. Walt, you, and all on the forum who have rejected the Lord's still-small voice have refused Christ's light. This analysis of reconciliation to Father does not apply to you. You are a watchman who refuses to blast the trumpet, a *Rod-bearing* leader who refuses to speak to the Rock. For those unlike you, the innocent ones like WM, EGW, VTH, MJB, etc, Leviticus shows that all levels in the church must look to the Atonement to remove their UNKNOWN sins, the sin of blasphemy included. **“Thus shall Aaron come into the holy place:...then shall he kill the goat of the sin offering, that is for the people, and bring his blood within the vail...and sprinkle it upon the mercy seat”** —See Lev 16. Mercy! Mercy! What is mercy? —David knows. For the Lord says, **“I will make an everlasting covenant with you, even the sure mercies of David. Behold, I have given him for a witness to the people...”** —See Isa 55: 3, 4. If you want mercy, you best seek Jehovah's witness, David. Mercy is the only key to remove our sins. It is one of the points of righteousness that we, to exceed the Pharisees, must begin to understand and enforce. **“Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees...for ye pay tithe...and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith...”**—See Matt 23: 23. You can't understand mercy; you can't teach it unless you first know that it comes from Father. And the identity of Christ and Father are revealed to the Lord's witness, David —See Luke 10: 22. The world has a multitude of visionary concepts of mercy; they need not Webster's, but God's definition; they need David to be His witness then they will all be united. They will have the single-eyed vision. Any other definition of mercy, judgment, faith, and the love of God is certain to deceive. To put simply that which was carefully explained in the Atonement E-mail, all who are to have their sins removed will do so because Father sits on a throne above all the laws, even the law of Deut 18: 20; He —not Jesus, not Christ, but Father— occupies the Mercy seat.

Unless you know Father, you have no concept of His mercy; you become a condemned Pharisee. EGW was an errant mortal, but she will eventually rise to glory. Even though she presumed to speak in Christ's name, the Atonement and the Testimony assure to her Father's “mercy”. His assurance was guaranteed by Christ, and His word cannot miss the mark, it will not return unto Him void. This is the very testimony, the testimony of mercy, by the witness of mercy that is only now being made plain. Fully knowing, as shown in my prior letter, *Partial Prophecy and the Single Eye, Part I*, that the full revelation of Christ's identity will be hidden and withheld until the very last day, and then it will be broadcast by the son of David, Father promises forgiveness to those who falsely prophesy in Christ's name yesterday by commanding Christ to say, **“Wherefore I say unto you, All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men...whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him...”** —Matt 12: 31, 32. It is one thing to unknowingly defame Christ because no man knew His identity but Father (Luke 10: 22), but to defame the one sent to clarify His identity, sent by the power of the Comforter to reveal His name and His power, has absolutely no recourse, no provision for atonement.

This vision of forgiveness reveals Father's mercy; it shows to all the importance of your favorite text pertaining to presumptuous prophets. However our victory is revealed in the promise that we shall put away all partial doctrines. We have come to this day of perfection, the day when the church becomes

Triumphant from Dark Speeches~~~~~Why does EGW utter such obscurities requiring this letter to make them plain? What does she mean when she first says that Christ will reveal His power through a man, then she cautions us to distrust “erring mortals like ourselves”? The identity and exposure to this question is the only virtue of your E-mail for how can we have it both ways? If nothing else could, this conundrum explains Christ's admonition that all prophets, except the *Prophet like unto Moses* utter dark speeches or speech that is not “apparent”;

The Mustard Seed Advent, 20-Oct-2009

not easy to understand. He said, “...*If there be a prophet among you, I the Lord will make myself known unto him in a vision, and will speak unto him in a dream. My servant Moses is not so, who is faithful in all mine house. With him will I speak mouth to mouth, even apparently, and not in dark speeches*” —Num 12: 6-8. Simply put, we learn from this text, one that Walt did not factor in his study of OT prophets, that, just as explained by EGW, all prophets are unfaithful; they are erring mortals. The only exception is the *Prophet like unto Moses*. This is why Derek West achieves perfection; he does so by uttering and explaining —not his own ideas, but— the *Testimony of Jesus*. Because prophets speak to us representing God, we have historically attributed to them endogenous and natural righteousness, a thing that has never existed on earth. Adam’s fall is the quintessential example to prove this point. He did not have the full Testimony of Jesus; he could not choose the good and refuse the evil. Adam, the angels, and the other sons of God need the influence of Christ for their righteousness; Jesus, is the only One now considered as an exception to this rule for He abode 30 years in righteousness before the Dove rested upon Him. From this we have another illustration to prove why we must distinguish between Jesus and Christ. In our studies yesterday, we also did not realize that the OT prophets were only elected by Christ to teach and admonish in His name, because, unlike all other men, they perfectly delivered a message. Proof that others falter in this regard is the embarrassing way in which the NT church, all these 2000 years, has abysmally handled Jesus’ testimony ignoring all themes that we do not agree with or understand. More of this will be said as I close. The Bible designates many offices; all are appointed by Christ: There is the office of patriarchs, of judges, of kings, of prophets, of priest, of elders, etc. All had their separate talents; none were intrinsically righteous. Moses is the highest prophet; he is called faithful in all the Lord’s house, more faithful than all the other professions. Likewise will be the *mustard seed*; the “faithful and wise steward”. In the day that he fully matures —the time is now here— his commission will be to “bind up the Testimony” and “seal the Law”; thus, he must be heaven’s lawyer, its counselor to earth, and its witness. To do these things, he must become a perfect ruler, judge, and witness, one who gets the message right. He cannot be a purveyor of “dark speeches”; human redemption depends on it; he must metaphorically do as did Christ; he must speak and turn darkness into light.

But he will not use Walt’s dictionary to define perfection; instead, he will use Father’s testimony as revealed through Christ. To the rich young ruler, He said, “**Keep the commandments...If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come and follow me**” —Matt 19: 17-21. He no longer becomes an erring mortal, like EGW, because he knows the commandments and keeps them; he sells all that he has meaning he divests himself of all partial prophecies that he cherished; by virtue of this sale, he receives true wealth, true knowledge and interpretations of the Bible; and these doctrines he delivers to Jerusalem, the poor, the sons of America’s former slaves. Beyond all that, he is deemed perfect by Father because he follows Christ; he submits his will to the Father as commanded. Consequently, he is no longer an “erring mortal like yesterday’s partial prophets”. This is the answer to the riddle! His interpretation exceeds the “reasoning powers” that God has given to others in the church. He is the true expositor of the Bible. Let us put it to the test right now: Christ said, “**Verily, verily ...If a man keep my saying he shall never see death**” —John 8: 51. He also said, “**For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life**” —John 3: 16. Both of these Texts, and many like them have been on record for 2000 years; yet, not only have erring mortals died, perished, gone into the grave, but none has ever preached these themes like the *mustard seed*. Why have they not? —because they did not understand them, and they presumed that, against the appeal of *Isa 55*, some of Christ’s words were to become voided. They were ministers, prophets, teachers, all who presumed upon the name and the power of Christ. Derek West is the first to change this pattern, the first to interpret, believe, and openly broadcast the full efficacy of Jesus’ testimony. He has turned those obscure and dark prophecies into light; he has made them apparent. “**Let the wicked forsake his**

Partial Prophecy and the Single Eye, Part II

way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts...For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord...So shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me void..it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it” —Isa 55: 7-11.

Immanuel is given 20 years to master the skill of choosing the good and refusing the evil, and though we approach the end of that period, we cannot now say exactly either the day or the hour. Yet, he has done as commanded to the rich-young ruler; he has sold his partial prophecies and plans to deliver the proceeds of the sale to the poor, the burning bush. Therefore, we can be certain that, he has life; he is no longer an “erring mortal” like the founding fathers of Adventism and EGW. His immortality is a predicate of Christ’s unvoided word. This is the meaning of EGW’s heretofore dark speech pertaining to the messenger to come.

Sincerely,

Derek