

12-09-2011

5.2: Surmounting the Wall of Bias

Preface: This letter is a second addendum to the MSC's book, 5.0, *Confederacy Trap* and another previous, ensuing article, 5.1, *The Great Roll and Eternal Sexuality*.

Dear Jasmin,

You wrote an E-mail seeking to discredit the Lord and His prophecies, particularly His promise of Immanuel. This you did today after many months of broken communications between us. Almost three years ago, you wrote the following:

“This is my final request to remove my name and e-mail from your list. All further communications will be considered harassment and reported to the authorities. Your emails are scary/threatening and I fear for my life. Legal action will be taken (against your organization, Mr Derek West, and Mrs V. West) if you contact me again. This is a promise!” — E-mail from Jasmin Jasmin, Monday, January 26th, 2009, 1:00AM.

Funny that you claimed then to be in fear for your life since you now write again and since you disguise yourself behind many aliases when you communicate with me. If your fear is genuine, then it could only be due to the heavy, spiritual burden which rests upon your heart as you have ignored the Lord's counsel and commission for you. It is only in that vein that your fear has credibility with me. In your most recent E-mail sent today, you began it by writing in blazing-red highlight, the following:

“This is a private E-mail and can't be published, made public, shared with others, included on any website, etc.” — E-mail from Jasmin Jasmin, Friday, December 09, 2011, 3:38 PM.

People who express and exchange religious ideas with me, ideas often involving non-personal and theological concerns, do so at the risk of public exposure. I use my judgment to decide —only seeking to protect those who may be exposed to severe, demoralizing embarrassment. I do not burden myself to protect human pride. But public exposure of ludicrous and foolish arguments is often needed because many may be susceptible to the same deception, and as the Lord's shepherd, duty requires that I risk all to feed the flock. I publish what the Lord leads me to publish —ever mindful of only His' [sic] concerns to protect the flock. I am His servant. Thus, I guess you will have to finally execute your threat to take your grievances to the appropriate authorities —in your case, the SDA ministry— or sue me before Caesar. If successful, it would not be the first time that real Christians have been persecuted by secular governments. Anyhow, you do not have any claim because, as mentioned already, you do not even write in your own name. It is only my inspiration which unveils to me your identity.

The reason why I publish with such “reckless abandon” is because I publish what the Lord leads me to publish, and I recognize that my duty is to defeat falsehood with the truth. This as a backdrop, you also offered to me in your most recent E-mail the following doctrinal conclusion:

“Are you teaching that Jesus and Christ are not the same? Do you believe that Jesus was born and did not preexist? Maybe you will enjoy reading the below. The author mentioned something you will enjoy reading. The rest of the article is also included. For instance, the Hebrew words for 'love,' 'mercy' and 'compassion' are frequently mixed up, because they mean nearly the same thing. Likewise, because most young women in antiquity were virgins and most virgins were young women, the Septuagint wasn't careful to distinguish the words for 'virgin' and 'young woman' in translation. This is how the Hebrew in Isaiah 7: 14 —which describes a young woman giving birth to a boy who will be named

5.2: Surmounting the Wall of Bias

Emmanuel— ended up in Greek as a virgin giving birth. Though these facts about Greek and Hebrew are generally undisputed among scholars, the translation error remains, both because people are usually unwilling to give up familiar translations, and also perhaps because the Gospel of Matthew describes the virgin birth of Jesus by quoting the mistaken Greek translation of Isaiah 7:14. ” — Your E-mail Friday, December 09, 2011 3:38 PM.

You say, “maybe (I) will enjoy reading” your author’s ideas and conclusions. You are mistaken, but I do find it interesting that you give credibility to an author who questions our ability to discern light from Bible prophecies. I find it very dark, disparaging and depressing. Such an assertion is an affront to scriptural integrity. It is purely and entirely a fanciful rendition of history, logic, truth, and it manifests great distrust in God. It insults the work of the best scholarly translation in world history, the KJV. Your authors have nothing, absolutely zilch, to contribute to King James’ work and his scholarship. Modern technology has given to us many advantages but none of them will allow for 21st century workmanship in translation to exalt themselves above his 17th century scholarship. In fact, today —behind the guise of industrious diligence — idle laziness rules every aspect of this generation. We have no commitment to the Fourth Commandment, the mandate to do all our work in six days. A trip to almost any market, loaded down with tawdry, slipshod products prepared by slackard manufacturers, makes this point from many dimensions. It is no different in the intellectual arenas. Especially is this true with religion. Look what the scholars have done with issues such as the definition of clean meats, the Sabbath, vegetarianism, the State of the Dead, the nature of Christ, the return of the Lord, the hope of life, etc. With their reputations of slackardy, how can any dare pretend that today’s Bible scholars exceed the work of King James’ 47 scholars? Not only do we today have a greater wall of bias to surmount, but we also have more distractions; more diversions, more seductive allurements, and thus, more reasons to cheat in our commitment to sacrifice time, intensity, and quality to achieve excellence in study and public profession. Proof positive of this is that King James, when he was in doubt about missing words, supplied them to the Bible. He honestly conceded his insertions by italicizing all such insertions. This gave the earnest Bible student the opportunity to be hesitant before establishing a doctrine upon the text which included the insertions. Yet, many recent, Bible translations —thoroughly careless in this regard yet pretending to be diligent— borrowing from the KJV’s arduous commitment to scriptural purity, use his supplied words in the context that he set them and represent them as part of their actual translation. Consider the below example from John 8: 28. The Lord pointed to the day when the son of David, Immanuel, would be lifted up. Knowing that he would exalt Christ, He pointed His disciples to my ministry and told them that when (the son of man) David was to emerge, then they will understand His, Christ’s identity; then, when they honor David by throwing tradition to the wind and lift him up in their hearts, they will bask in an exalted light. KJV, using the italicized word “he”, left opportunity for this deeper rendition to be hidden until today, the time of its emergence:

“When ye have lifted up the Son of man, then shall ye know that I am *he*, and *that* I do nothing of myself; but as my Father hath taught me, I speak these things” —KJV.

“When ye have lifted up the Son of man on the cross, then you will understand that I Am he. I do nothing on my own but say only what the Father taught me” —NLT. The supplied phrase, “on the cross” is forced into this translation to make it harmonize with our common understanding. It shows great dishonesty.

“When you lifted up the Son of man, then you will know that I am He; and that I do nothing of my own authority, but that I speak just as the Father has taught me” —Montgomery. No indication of supplied words.

Only the *mustard seed*, me, Derek West, teaches that Christ does nothing of Himself, that He is separate from Father, and that His testimony came directly from Father untainted —even by His own thoughts or words. Those who have been blessed by my ministry know this because they have had for them the darkening clouds of tradition “wafted” away from their divine light leading them to disregard Constantinian Christology and, instead, lift up my work; thus they, as the first in human history, see the fulfillment of that very prophecy. The only way that inspired authors could ever think to know that which John 8: 28 promises, the separate identity of the son of man and Christ and

The Mustard Seed Advent, 12-Dec-2011

when he is to emerge, was by the turpitude of King James' work. He, by his interpretation, set the table upon which they now, in a picky way, squeamishly dine. This indictment all the more applies to your concern of *Isa seven*. Before the KJV, honest Bible interpretation made accessible to the common man was a thing precluded, in some cases by penalty of death. Why could not today's scholars at least be as honest to acknowledge their own insertions? —because they obviously desire to feign scholarship and supplant true work with their slipshod slackardy. This applies likewise to your trusted author. They use the preponderance of King James' work and insert their biases when it is convenient. Instead of accepting and acknowledging the Bible pronouncements which they do not understand, concepts like the virgin birth, Immanuel, the son of man, etc, they seek to change it to accommodate their narrow ideas —even if it means corrupting the historically well-known phenomenon of virginity. The only time they become zealously diligent to do research is when their personal pride of opinion is at stake, then, lacking integrity, they assail their trusting readers with a full foray of their planted doctrines. They want their unsuspecting readers to swallow their camel and strain on their gnat.

“^[269.1] I saw some, with strong faith and agonizing cries, pleading with God. Their countenances were pale and marked with deep anxiety, expressive of their internal struggle. Firmness and great earnestness was expressed in their countenances; large drops of perspiration fell from their foreheads. Now and then their faces would light up with the marks of God's approbation, and again the same solemn, earnest, anxious look would settle upon them. Evil angels crowded around, pressing darkness upon them to shut out Jesus from their view, that their eyes might be drawn to the darkness that surrounded them, and thus they be led to distrust God and murmur against Him. Their only safety was in keeping their eyes directed upward. Angels of God had charge over His people, and as the poisonous atmosphere of evil angels was pressed around these anxious ones, the^[270] heavenly angels were continually wafting their wings over them to scatter the thick darkness.”

“As the praying ones continued their earnest cries, at times a ray of light from Jesus came to them, to encourage their hearts and light up their countenances. Some, I saw, did not participate in this work of agonizing and pleading. They seemed indifferent and careless. They were not resisting the darkness around them, and it shut them in like a thick cloud. The angels of God left these and went to the aid of the earnest, praying ones. I saw angels of God hasten to the assistance of all who were struggling with all their power to resist the evil angels and trying to help themselves by calling upon God with perseverance. But His angels left those who made no effort to help themselves, and I lost sight of them.”

“I asked the meaning of the shaking I had seen and was shown that it would be caused by the straight testimony...” —EGW, Early Writings, p 269 & 270.

Perhaps this reference will convince you of why I must distribute my answer to your inquiry: As an “angel” of the Lord, I must waft away the darkness which has surrounded the true flock and, with a ray of light, encourage their hearts. I must deliver the straight testimony by the “True Witness to the Laodiceans”. You may be completely nonchalant about the darkness which envelopes you; for this the angel has left you, but the Lord's agonizing flock deserve His approbation. More to this issue reveals that King James can be excused for his insertion because discerning the identity of the Lord and the son of man in the context of John 8: 28 was a matter of divine inspiration —just as it was for the issue with which you began your letter, the identity of Jesus and Christ. Lest you, by conviction of this letter, become distraught with the darkness which prevails upon the church today, you can at least understand the reason: The insurmountable wall of bias has prevailed due to pretentious scholars today having a great lack of integrity. They are, to mix metaphors, drowning the church in a sea of pseudo-Christian doctrines which have been multiplied since the days of King James. It is this inundation which has erected the insurmountable wall of bias. For example, King James did not have to contend with a Sunday-Sabbath-observance bias because there was not a Saturday-verses-Sunday debate in his day. All assumed that the Sabbath was on the first day leaving no reason for the Catholic Church to persecute the saints of his day, 1600 AD, on that issue.

[5.2: Surmounting the Wall of Bias](#)

Regarding your simplistic analysis pertaining to the historical reality of female virginity, it reminds me of the deception that occurred in the beginning. You assume that Bible authors were historically unsophisticated to discern between virgins and non-virgins. This assumption of divine-sexual unsophistication is merely a regurgitation of the garden-of-Eden, snake-inspired deception which baffled Eve. It was the subtle assertion by the devil that led her to distrust Christ/God for he too suggested that the Lord could not effectively communicate; He lacked the power to deliver to us proper messages, and He was/is not credible. Now your favored scholars seek to convince the church that Christ did not take care to distinguish between good girls and bad girls. If you promote the theme that man corrupted the Bible by lackadaisically confusing virgins with the general body of all young girls, considering them to be one-in-the-same, then, by your promotion of that darkness, you become a champion of Satan's passion, the lullaby which suggests that there is no hope of salvation in Christ. For Christ commanded us, in John 5: 39, to find all teaching pertaining to Himself and to eternal life upon our search of the Scriptures. We cannot do so if men such as Matthew could not go to the book of Isaiah to read prophecy. If Isaiah was so carelessly uninspired to convey to us Bible prophecy and if God could not be trusted to orchestrate that mission over the history of language etymology, then we have no hope in the promise of eternal life. I must denounce with substance that deception and publish it so as to waft away its darkening effect. After all, how could any be confident in the Lord's promise that all prophecies, down to the jot and tittle, are to be fulfilled (Matt 5: 18) and, furthermore, demand that we believe all that the prophets have spoken (Luke 24: 25) if Christ didn't/couldn't deliver to us those prophecies untainted?

Your trusted author asserts that "most young women in antiquity were virgins", force feeding to us the conclusion that we should ignore the promises of the Lord and, in place of His doctrinal-delivery system, accept the lackadaisical work of corrupt men today. You should be reminded that, in the Bible days, they did not have artificial insemination; it was therefore impossible for a virgin to conceive. She would first require vaginal penetration—a thing that, by natural processes, occurred many times in copulation before conception—and such penetration would technically remove her virginity making conception before penetration a miracle, a true sign of God's provisions for "*a virgin to conceive and bear a child*" —Isa 7: 14. If this were not the case, it would not have been represented as a sign for the House of David as Isaiah requested of that house to, "*Ask thee a sign of the Lord thy God; ask it either in the depth, or in the height above*" —Isa 7: 11.

King Ahaz, according to the Text, was compelled to petition for a supernatural event and, upon his refusal, he was arbitrarily given the sign of the Lord's choosing, the birth of Immanuel. This points to the need for the Lord to then articulate with exact precision all qualities of that supernatural sign. What aspect of it would be remarkable if He merely intended to convey that a young girl would get pregnant—a natural and common, but not a supernatural, event? This we can know for certainty because the sign made absolutely no mention of age; such is a supplantation of Bible prophecy with human logic, the very indictment from the MSC against other, non-KJV translators cited above; it is an illegal insertion, one without foundation. In addition, I assure you that the sign to the House of David, the promise that a virgin shall conceive and bear a child and shall call his name Immanuel, though it only partially applies to Jesus, and though it is figurative, has indeed happened with the *mustard seed*. He is the promised "son of man" the one who reveals the "I AM." When he is to be lifted up, he is to teach the identity of Christ and to show that He, Christ, is a Separate Personality from Father and Jesus. This is the work of Immanuel, for God is with us. For more details, you will have to acquire a copy of my book 5.0, *Confederacy Trap*.

But I now must ask, why do you assume that young girls today are different than they were in "antiquity"? Why do you presume that ancient, pagan societies could inspire females to exhibit more self-control than could our spiritually exalted, Christian-oriented cultures of today? What existed yesterday with them that would inspire more honor than we can expect from our children today causing your author to assert that, "...*most young women in antiquity were virgins...*?" Were the females of yesterday different? Did they have a diminished profusion of sexual hormones? Were the men then less aggressive or less ingenious to seduce them? Were they more patient to wait for sexual relief? Were pagan women creatures of greater honor? I hardly think that female

The Mustard Seed Advent, 12-Dec-2011

and male sexuality, especially in non-Hebrew cultures was any different then than it is now. Such is proven by the story of Jacob: He became excited when he first saw Rachel. So sexually charged was he that he pledged to work seven years for her. The contract of betrothal between him and Laban assumed that Rachel's father would preserve her from other men. She also must have been, at the very moment when Jacob first beheld her, of an age of sexually ripened maturity. Especially must this be the case because she already had a career; she was, by occupation, a shepherdess who independently herded sheep —see Gen 29: 6, 9, a task not fitting for pre-pubescent males or females. What about Rachel's desires for sex? If she and her sister Leah, after marriage, contended amongst themselves for the chance to copulate with Jacob, as the record shows, then women then, like women today, must have had the same yearning desires for sexual expression. Leah was older than was Rachel; yet, she herself passed through the same seven years of mature, female, sexual drought as did Rachel. This contradicts your theory that "most virgins were young". More than likely, in most cultures historically, if a young woman was sexually active, she would become pregnant, and this would expose her infidelity. So it may be approximate wisdom to conclude that a woman who is unmarried and without children was a virgin in times past, but you simply cannot argue that all young girls were virgins. Beyond that, the women that Jacob married were not representative of the general women of "antiquity"; instead, they were the fruition of honorable womanhood —a point worthy of divine distinction by careful use of the word "virgin". This could be the central reason why Isaac sent Jacob to Laban's house to find a wife and why both of Jacob's parents desperately yearned that he avoid the trap which entangled his brother Esau by staying clear of the women of Canaan.

Many laws were handed to Israel with care to make distinction between virgins and young non-virgins: For example, the title "virgin" was so special to the Lord that He exacted penalty upon a husband for tarnishing that reputation. It says,

"^{13}If any man take a wife, and go in unto her, and hate her, ^{14}and give occasions of speech against her, and bring up an evil name upon her, and say, I took this woman, and when I came to her, I found her not a maid: ^{15}Then shall the father...take and bring forth the tokens of the damsel's virginity unto the elders of the city in the gate: ^{16}And the damsel's father shall say unto the elders, I gave my daughter unto this man to wife, and he hateth her; ^{17}and, lo, he hath given occasions of speech against her...And they shall spread the cloth before the elders of the city. ^{18}And the elders of that city shall take that man and chastise him; ^{19}And they shall amerce him in an hundred shekels of silver, and give them unto the father of the damsel, because he hath brought up an evil name upon a virgin of Israel...^{20}But if this thing be true, and the tokens of virginity be not found for the damsel: ^{21}Then they shall bring out the damsel to the door of her father's house, and the men of her city shall stone her...because she hath wrought folly in Israel" —Deut 22: 13- 21.

Notice, the phraseology damsel, woman, wife, or maid are used carefully and in conjunction with the added descriptive term, virgin. The meaning of each expression, as proven by the above Texts and others, was not always interchangeable. A woman can be termed just that, a woman; she could be called, a wife; or she could be called a damsel; she could also be called a maid or even a daughter. In two OT Texts, our more favored word of today, the term "girl" is even used. This being known, we see that there was no shortage of synonyms to describe a young female and no reason for any but the devil to suggest confusion on the issue. We have no just cause to challenge the prophecy of *Isa seven* for the same synonyms could have therein been used. It could have easily said, 'a "girl" shall conceive and bear a son' had that been the lesson which the Lord intended for our salvation. But this was not so for we can now loudly herald that a female's sexual history determined the applicability of the second noun modifier, virgin. The importance of the Lord's zeal to make a distinction is expanded even further: By law, a man was not precluded from expressing ridicule of another man's daughter, be she young or old, but penalty was to be exacted upon him for evoking an **"evil name upon a virgin of Israel"**. Such a slanderous indictment could inspire a violent reaction from the girl's brothers and father who rightfully took joy in their family name. Good governance —which was the Lord's burden— would be desirous to preclude such a reaction and to preserve the peace. The evil "name" (evil description) which the Lord required to be used

5.2: Surmounting the Wall of Bias

when applicable was the accusation that the new wife was, before marriage, sexually active by vaginal penetration. It was the charge that she was delivered by the father to her husband with such an imperfection. To disprove that ugly allegation, the family would present “tokens of virginity”. The phrase, “the tokens of”, as indicated by the underlined above, was supplied in the KJV. (Many of the other versions, in unscholarly, “copy-cat” fashion used the same phrase but did not present it as being supplied) It refers to the article described in verse 17, a description that indeed belongs to the original Text, the ‘spread cloth’. The meaning of such is not clearly defined, but we can speculate. It may have been customary in the Hebrew, marriage ceremony to give a wedding-night sheet, perhaps a specially-tailored cloth prepared beforehand for the daughter to place under her while she was on her wedding bed. Since sex with virgins more than likely required the “missionary position”, the cloth under her served its purpose as a receptacle of sexual residue. Afterwards —by agreement from all— it would be recovered and preserved as forensic evidence to betoken the details thereto pertaining. If she was a virgin, it would have to become stained with blood, and being a specific article of the marriage, it would be a surety to the degree of almost an irrefutable certainty, that the woman was delivered as a virgin, evidence which the husband were required to accept. Such corroborative substantiation was needed then more than today, because, like Jacob, fathers then made contracts for marriage which often required the fulfillment of some obligation by the male suitor. Marriage was by betrothal. Many times the obligation was not work but was the transfer of cattle or other property for the hand of a man’s daughter in marriage. If he lived up to his end of the bargain, then the parents were legally expected to do the same. Conceivably, dishonest men potentially could be tempted to deceive, seeking to recover their dowry —perhaps wedding-night realities tarnished the anticipated bliss of the experience— and with “buyer’s remorse” (called hatred), he would seek to recover it by assailing the virtue of the woman. Such a temptation would lead unscrupulous men to cry foul without regard to the pain that their accusation would cause to both the girl and her family. Christ, being an excellent governor, precluded that resultant, social upheaval both by the above law and by His creative genius of sexual design. Such was manifested by the “token of virginity” or the spread cloth.

Whatever the token may have been —it was a matter of custom and not law— it is a surety that virginity was not presumed or taken for granted merely because the bride was a young girl. In fact, it is a disturbing reality that, although not so much the case in Israel —perhaps because they were polygamous— young girls could lose their virginity through incest. Such a thing happened in David’s own house with Tamar, Absalom’s full sister (see 2Sam 13: 4-19). Tamar’s half-brother, Amnon —brother from another mother— forced himself upon her.

“^{1}And it came to pass after this, that Absalom the son of David had a fair sister whose name was Tamar; and Amnon the son of David loved her...^{8}So Tamar went to her brother Amnon’s house; and he was laid down. And she took flour, and kneaded it, and made cakes in his sight, and did bake the cakes. ^{9}...And Amnon said, Have out all men from me. And they went out every man from him...^{11}...he took hold of her, and said unto her, Come lie with me, my sister. ^{12}And she answered him, Nay, my brother, do not force me; for no such thing ought to be done in Israel: do not thou this folly. ^{13}And I, whither shall I cause my shame to go? And as for thee, thou shalt be as one of the fools in Israel...^{14}Howbeit he would not hearken unto her voice: but, being stronger than she, forced her, and lay with her. ^{15}Then Amnon hated her exceedingly...^{18}and she had a garment of divers colours upon her: for with such robes were the king’s daughters that were virgins appareled...^{19}And Tamar put ashes on her head, and rent her garment of divers colours that was on her, and laid her hand on her head, and went on crying”—2Sam 13: 1, 8, 9, 11-15, 18, 19.

How delightfully touching and special! —David also greatly respected virgins. He even adorned those of his daughters in special apparel to display to Israel their higher esteem. He too distinguished between virgins and other women. Yet, our delight is blunted by the study of Tamar’s tears. Through incest, she was made to weep. By this we prove that the unsavory reality of incest makes even more salient the Lord’s above law. It yields multi-dimensional motivation to preserve until marriage the virginity of our daughters. It also accommodates and justifies the need for a newly-wed husband to secure virginal evidence. And showing even more of the Lord’s cunning and wisdom, the husband with his protective instincts in vogue, would have added reason to be coy

and to forestall the urge to bring charges against his newly-wed bride: Out of fear for her death, he would have great reason for sobriety and pause —reason to think twice before protesting— even if the charge against his newly-wed bride was true. The reality of this inhibition is seen in Joseph’s treatment of Mary; it was the reason why the Father entrusted the care of His beloved, Only-Begotten Son in the hands of a man of jurisprudence and mercy. The reality cannot be ignored: Some Hebrew men of history, because of their kind hearts, suffered under the deception of conniving women whom they loved and did not want to see stoned. Such pain would be assuaged by remaining married and then taking a second wife, and it would make that very inclusion into the family circle more palatable for the pretentious and naughty, first wife. But what about the darkness which looms over your letter? What can be said for those men, like your author, who failed to make the distinction between young girls and virgins? They become complicit with the commission of the same crime, the offense of bringing an evil name upon a virgin. Their complicity stems from the fact that they seek to diminish the good name, the noble grandeur and dignity that has been earned by the damsel and her parents: They seek to discredit her devotion and dedication to the Lord and His standards of purity. They are men like Amnon, “fools in Israel”. This being the case, virgins, women who preserved themselves sexually for marriage, were highly regarded by the Lord to the point where He protected their reputation. He took care to distinguish between the good girls and the bad, the virgins and the licentious. But more to the question at hand, this loving care to bring heightened honor to a woman who has preserved herself is an emphasis that Christ would not have betrayed in His prophetic decrees pertaining to virgins. Truly, just as promised, we can search the Scriptures to win eternal life; we can also uncover testimony to learn of Christ, to uncover His great jurisprudence and wisdom.

A lesson, central to this reply, should be made before closing it. Yesterday, men had to work to win the gift of a special woman. The Lord’s church is that special woman; yet, it is full of suitors who seek to pawn off on them their cheap fodder and clandestine motives. Instead of accepting their false conclusions, their hand in marriage, we should highly regard our purity and impose a comparable, spiritual standard upon those who seek to win our embrace with their seductive doctrines. Upon carefully inspecting their dowry, their work resume, we can be shown by the Lord’s man of wisdom if they are Fourth-Commandment breakers, men who cheat in their duty to work and seek to illegally convert the entire week into one perpetual Sabbath day of rest. The rest must only come after the work! This they do because they have poor scholarship; yet, they dare to vaunt themselves to be teachers. They have not heeded Bible counsel to *“Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed...”* —2Tim 2: 15. This letter does this very thing, it inspects the credibility of your suitor, and it seeks to waft away the darkness in which you have become enshrouded. To again mix metaphors, the MSC seeks to preserve you from being overshadowed in the darkness of evil men. Such are not worthy of your hand in union; you should not applaud the flashy tinsel which they seek to pawn off as gold. Sadly, because there is no shepherd now in Laodicea, her virgins have no protection. Antitypical Amnon has concealed his dark designs and, before his attack, he has cleared all men from the room. But by writing me, you need not, like Tamar, fall victim to his devious intentions. But all others will be left distraught when they see that their fate is sealed, and they have lost their spiritual purity. This is the Laodicean crime which angers the Lord and which justifies the slaughter of *Ezek nine* amongst them. They have destroyed lives solely and entirely to gratify their lust for power. This rape they have done by subterfuge and deceit. Only the eyes of the Lord’s end-time prophet, the “son of man” or antitypical Ezekiel in this case, has discerned the danger and has been shown their deception. In the chapter leading up to the slaughter of *Ezek nine*, the Lord said, *“Son of man, seest thou what they do?...and behold, there sat women weeping for Tammuz.* —Ezek 8: 6, 14. Whom else could such women represent other than those formerly pure saints who are made to lament that they have not been protected by men, righteous teachers, and have lost their spiritual purity through their naïve and trusting service to Amnon, men of artifice, deception, and rape? (see the entire chapter of *Ezek eight*).

5.2: Surmounting the Wall of Bias

Having conveyed rays of light to you, which can, if allowed, penetrate the darkness which has enveloped you and all of 'shaken Laodicea', the group which heaven's angels have already left, you apparently have an opportunity to embrace to yourself these rays of light and be re-included among the small band of faithful, prayerful saints. **"Struggle with all [your] power to resist the evil angels"**; begin by telling the darkening force who has corrupted your heart to, "get thee behind me Satan!" Then, you too can surmount the wall of bias and become included among the saints "with strong faith".

May the Lord's light free you from Amnon's assault.

Sincerely,

Derek