

The Mustard Seed Advent, 22-June-2012

22-Jun-2012

Christ, the Most Precious Truth

Dear E_____,

You asked a question regarding Matt 24: 5, a Text which states, *...“many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ; and shall deceive many.”* Christ gave a time parameter: The disciples asked about His return which, by inference, was to be the end of sorrows as shown by verse eight. Such could only apply to the first century according to Jesus’ promise of *John 16*.

You were wondering if Jesus, instead of Christ, was the speaker that forged that message for us. Your thinking is that such a theme was engendered from His heart as a doctrine and not that of Christ, and that the possessive pronoun, “my”, refers to Jesus. You are resultantly caused to wonder, was Jesus describing people who were to deceive the masses to believe that He was indeed Christ? Before delving deeply into the MSC’s denial of that assertion, let me first remind you that Father orchestrated the strategy to conceal Christ within Jesus and cause Him to speak through Jesus. This led all, from the very beginning of His three-and-one-half-year testimony, to believe that Jesus was Christ. By this point, we can rest assured of Father’s intricate design by reminding each other that He, Father, won praise from Christ for wisdom to hide His and Christ’s identity until the day when a man would emerge to declare His, Christ’s, name. The Lord said,

“I thank thee, O Father...because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and has revealed them unto babes. Even so, Father: for so it seemed good in thy sight...no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal...Come unto me...take my yoke upon you, and learn of me...” — Matt 11: 25-29.

Therefore, the belief that Jesus and Christ were the same person was not orchestrated by first century deceivers, as your thesis implies; instead it was orchestrated by Father. Christ, in *Deut 18*, expressly, openly, and honestly told us that He would communicate to His people through the Prophet, Jesus. He did not deceive them, and He is not even credited as the source of the wisdom to hide that prophecy. It was Father’s design. With His truth, it not only needs to be biblically stated, but it also requires that it be unfurrowed, explained, or taught. Such is the meaning of turning oil into light. It is essential for all *mustard seed* Adventists to fully understand that Father chose to preclude the enlightening process until today. By Father’s use of this tactic, we therefore cannot credit the first-century deceivers for the mistaken notion that Jesus and Christ were the same person because Father left them no other possible conclusion.

“...the difficulty of course, lies in the fact that hardly a theologian allows for the possibility that his understanding of the Bible might be at least in a measure erroneous, and that Inspiration might almost at any moment manifest itself anew, unroll the scroll and bring forth timely Truth, ‘meat in due season,’ and thus expose their private concoctions of so-called truth.”

• • •

“ We as Christians have obviously failed to note that if the secret things of God, matter not how simple, were to be unsealed at anytime by anyone, Inspiration would never in the first place have concealed them in symbols and parables. Christendom is still blind to the fact that to attempt to break into the mysteries of God would be to attempt to defeat His purposes; yes, to try to break into the Divine code, is to try the impossible...how can we do such before time and without the inspiration of the same Spirit Who indicted them?” —VTH, *2Timely Greeting*, 44, p 30, 31.

Father, out of love for humanity, hid the light of Christ to save the world. He did so realizing that, if the truth be told prematurely, many would reject it and could not, by Jesus’ atoning sacrifice, have their sins of ignorance covered —causing billions of souls to be eternally locked in Satan’s cruel clutches. This concealing of Christ’s identity in Jesus was not hidden from the devil proving that Father and Christ were upfront and honest on their level of awareness but were more

Christ, the Most Precious Truth

precautious about the knowledge revealed to the “children”. Instead of not publishing their claims, heaven merely commanded the devils to not convey the Lord’s gospel. **“And in the synagogue there was a man, which had a spirit of an unclean devil, and cried out with a loud voice, Saying, Let us alone; what have we to do with thee, thou Jesus of Nazareth? art thou come to destroy us? I know thee who thou art; the Holy One of God...And devils also came out of many, crying out, and saying, Thou art Christ the Son of God. And he rebuking them suffered them not to speak: for they knew that he was Christ”** —Luke 4: 33, 34, 41. Here we see that devils tried to make an open and broadcasted distinction between Christ and Jesus but were forbidden. This fact shows that Christ, the Educator, must be the one who controls the learning syllabus and that even truth is destructive if given prematurely. Accordingly, we reference the feeding practice deployed in human, child development by wise parents: They distinguish between milk and strong meat. Christ, as the Dove who rested on Jesus is a strong-meat doctrine. To deliver such to babes before they have garnered their spiritual teeth is an exercise in torture, a devilish endeavor. Heaven forbade the devils from that crime; likewise it forbade earth.

You wrote the following:

“As I continued to meditate on that scripture, new meaning flashed before me from that familiar text. Before I share with you a different perspective I just want to reference an email that you sent last year:”

“When, in my studies, I reference the Testimony of Jesus, I take care to emphasize that which has not been noted in 2000 years of Christology: that Christ spoke through Jesus. In other words, I teach the rule —not the exception— for it is the thing that has been ignored. I have not had the luxury to focus on the exception. In fact so much so has this been a part of my conscious thought pattern, that I have anticipated the day when I will have to give a careful accounting for the three-and-one-half years of Jesus’ ministry by deducting the first 40 days and including the last 40 days after the resurrection. But the point of His testimony can be more carefully refined to show episodes when He spoke independent of Christ.”—Derek West, MSC, Wilderness Temptation, 31-May-2011

“Understanding that Christ gave the Words that Jesus spoke for the 3 ½ years of Jesus’ ministry 2000 years ago (Deut 18), can this be one an ‘exception’ whereby it was Jesus prophesying of the deception to come thereafter. How I read this verse, which provides more scriptural evidence of the surmountable position that Jesus and Christ are two separate Persons, is that Jesus forewarned that many shall come and say that I, Jesus, am Christ---the biggest deception of all time. That is the doctrine that has since been established since Constantine and has deceived many; Jesus is Christ.”—Your E-mail, Thurs, 21-Jun-2012.

My reference, cited by you as a pretext to your question, does not give clarity to your conclusion. The Bible shows that Jesus was led into the wilderness by the Spirit, Christ, so as to be tested by the devil. What test would it be, if Christ gave to Jesus the answers? Hence, it is biblical and logical that He spoke independently of Christ. After Calvary, the biblical and logical analysis also applies. The reader should be able to garner home this point without any more explanation; thus, I will advance in my reply. Regarding Matt 24: 5, I see no justifiable, scriptural basis to suggest that in Matt 24 Christ/Jesus made an exception to the protocol of revelation as covenanted by Christ in Deut 18. To compliment your thinking, you allude to the SOP reference which promises that new meaning will surface from familiar Texts. To quote EGW exactly, she said the following:

“Great truths which have been neglected and unappreciated for ages, will be revealed by the Spirit of God, and new meaning will flash out of familiar texts. Every page will be illuminated by the Spirit of truth. The Bible is not sealed but unsealed. The most precious truths are revealed; the living oracles are heard by wondering ears, and the consciences of men are aroused into action” —EGW, *Counsel on Sabbath School Work*, p 34.

The MSC’s doctrine that Christ spoke the *Testimony of Jesus* while invisibly abiding upon Jesus is indeed the new meaning which EGW promised. It is part of ‘the most precious truths which are to arouse men into action’. I find no scriptural basis to deviate from that monumental finding to support your sentiments. What is the requisite for a scriptural basis!? —a scriptural foundation can be the only premise for which ‘new meaning can flash forth from familiar Texts’. Consequently, let

The Mustard Seed Advent, 22-June-2012

us analyze the question more deeply by carefully detailing the Bible-based logic: Remember, Christ was responding to the disciples' private query, and Christ was a diligent and thorough teacher. To suggest that Jesus interrupted Christ to deliver His own self-engendered, non-Father-dictated pronouncement of future prophetic events is to teach a completely different Gospel than that which was promised by prophecy; it impeaches the entirety of the Lord's communion with His people. Remember, since Christ withheld His own judgments (John 8: 26; 12: 47-50) in favor of those of the Father, then would not Jesus deploy the very same modesty? If He did not, then would His prophecies be more accurate than those of Father's? If yes, then why would Christ or any other being see the benefit of speaking to Judah through Him? The implication from that conclusion, one that must be resisted, is that Jesus was even more perfectly equipped in wisdom to perform that job. Such presents a quandary because Christ was the One, who even though unwittingly, was asked by His disciples to reveal the signs of His coming and the end of the world. To suggest that Jesus interrupted His communique to them would suggest that He, Jesus, knew of the future, prophetic events revealed in that chapter better than Father requiring His interruption of the prophetic seminar in order to assist Christ. The astonishing, prophetic events of *Matt 24* are central to our salvation and have been unfolded to us because Father commanded Christ to so do. He, at that time or beforehand, gave no such commission to Jesus; rather, Jesus was merely commissioned to allow His voice to be used by Christ.

On another count, Matt 24: 5 is a keystone revelation because it proves the name of the Lord to be Christ. The deceivers to come, He says, are to use His name, Christ, by claiming themselves to be Christ. Undeniably then, we have engendered clinching proof of the Lord's name, It is Christ. There are other Texts that likewise prove that Christ is the name of the God of the Old Testament, the Dove Who abode upon Jesus. Such facts are applicable here because He was the One who promised to speak to us. Even the devils as cited above in *Luke four*, affirm His identity/name, and this finding of Christ's identity is central to my ministry. You have seen the evidence; I will not here restate it. Suffice it to say that such points to Father's genius and wisdom to conceal the identity of Christ until the appropriate time; in so doing He exposes deceivers. For the church in the first century erroneously misunderstood that Christ was the son of David as proven by other *Testimony-of-Jesus* pronouncements —see Matt 22: 42-45 & John 7: 42. Inferentially then, the first century deceivers who claimed to be Christ and who came in the time of the beginning of sorrows, presented deceptions scheduled for absolution; this is so because the intended meaning of their deception was to identify themselves to be the promised-son of David. In final analysis, it is a matter of language translation: a matter of exactly what does a man mean by his words. Had not Father hid the Identity of Christ, they would have deceived, not just many, but all. Let me refresh your mind on the MSC's clearly stated position, the 'new meaning which has already flashed forth from familiar Texts which will inspire the righteous to action':

“So, the 2000 years of Christian history was promised to have two periods of false christs and false prophets . But the ‘disciples indeed’ should take extra care to observe a microscopic, analytical distinction between the false christs of the early period, during the “beginning of sorrows”, from the second episode to appear afterwards. The distinction is simply this: With the false christs during the period termed, the beginning of sorrows, those deserving of that label were individuals who were to announced themselves to be Christ. It says, “Many shall come in my name saying I am Christ.” —Matt 24: 5. Therefore, our understanding of their identity and our ability to know who those many people were to be depends upon our skill to decipher and ascertain their definition of who Christ really is. They are the ones who were to make the claim to be Christ; thus, we need to understand their use of that title. In the final analysis, it boils down to whom they say is Christ. Since evidence shown already proves that the common understanding, 2000 years ago, was that Christ was the son of David, then in reality, these false christs are claiming themselves to be the son of David. Any individual TODAY who claims to be David's son yet who intelligently distinguishes between Christ and the son of David, could not be deserving of the label, false christ —not only because he is living in an age far beyond the “beginning of sorrows”, but also— because he is not ‘saying I am Christ’ but rather, I am David's son, and consequently could not be an individual whom the Lord was referring to in Matt 24. Now for the second group: Remember there were to be two episodes of false christs to emerge. But, our microscopic analysis of the second group to be

Christ, the Most Precious Truth

correctly labeled as false christs, forces us to deploy a different analysis to determine their identity. The Lord, while speaking of them, conveys that label to them. He says, ‘For there shall arise false Christs...’ —verse 24. Here, we are not required to interpret someone else’s uneducated claims. To determine the identity of the second group, we —not only need to be informed about ‘the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel’, but also— need to understand the correct definition of Christ since the Lord, Himself, is making the application of false christs...’ —Derek West, Journey through the Murky Bogs, Oct 2005, p 34, 35.

To change the conveyor of the doctrine from Christ/Father to Jesus would suggest that Christ’s name can be impeached and would in turn challenge His, Christ’s, covenant to David when He said the following: “*I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build an house for my NAME, and I will stablish the throne of his kingdom for ever*” —2Sam 7: 12, 13. Let us consider the point this way: If Christ did not communicate it and if the pronoun “*my*” in the promise, “*many shall come in my name*” referred to Jesus and not to Him, as you suggest, then the Highest did not intend for it to be said and the *mustard seed* has not identified the name of the Lord. Resultantly, David’s son will need to build His house upon another name for even the deceivers who appropriated to themselves the identity knew that it meant the establishment of the eternal kingdom.

Remember the order of prophetic events which the Father revealed by great, painstaking effort; by the birth of Jesus, by the inspiration of *John the Baptist*, by the dissension of the Dove, by the promise to Israel, by piquing the curiosity of the disciples, etc; First an individual was to come onto the scene by identifying himself then he must proclaim his false message. It must be labeled as false because his emergence unfurrows a noteworthy deception. For such a deceiver to say as you assert, that Jesus is Christ, is not a deception of his engendering because 2000 years of history, from the disciples until the advent of the *mustard seed*, such a misconception already existed. “Deception”, again, is a misnomer for, in actuality, the teaching would be an unnecessary affirmation of their prevailing and already existing immature misunderstanding. It would be akin to an uncle of a 12-year-old, adoptive child that is unaware of his roots, telling his newly-discovered nephew, without provocation, that he indeed is not adopted. In so doing, that uncle only affirmed the child’s existing, immature ideas. We may call such a confirming relative a deceiver, but such confirmation, by his words, only serve to fortify the prevailing idea and is hardly worthy of a warning or prediction. It would be vain words, and Jesus would not interrupt the Lord’s counseling session with vanity.

I hope that this letter resolves your confusion.

Derek