

## *The Mustard Seed Advent, 01-Mar-2006*

---

### *Meeting Opposition*

1-Mar-2006

Dear Ernie,

Attached is my recent reply to a query from the field which you may appreciate. It focuses on a theme, a catch phrase, which the Lord has unfolded to me, one that neatly and concisely addresses some of the opposition against the doctrine of Jesus, of Christ, and whether or not Jesus pre-existed. Everybody knows of the spiritual rhapsody, "...*Amazing grace how sweet the sound that saved a wretch like me; I once was lost, but now I am found, was blind but now I see...*" You will see as you read how this applies. But suffice it to say that, for me personally, the Lord showed me His true identity some 12 years ago approximately. I was born spiritually (baptized) at age 12; therefore, since this new birth, I—similarly to the blind man of *John 9* who eventually confessed that Jesus was the Son of God even though the leadership rejected this claim (*John 9: 35-37*)—"being blind since birth have endured for approximately 26 years of my life under that condition. Rather than disparaging in that sad reality, I rejoice in having my eyes opened to the "fullness of the knowledge of Christ" (*Eph4: 13: I once was blind, but now I see.*

You may agree that Jose, as he is meeting opposition in Florida over this very issue —people joying in their blindness rather than celebrating the Lord's efforts to give them vision— likewise can benefit from this E-mail. Please forward it onward to him.

Dear J \_\_\_\_\_,

You raise a lot of points which can best be addressed by a summary answer. Before doing so, let me commend you on your closing statement: "Salvation is free, not hard to understand." Truer words cannot be found elsewhere in the body of your letter. For the truth is, that Gabriel's explanation was simple: Jesus was conceived in the womb by the Father. This requires no more explanation —even youthful and innocent Mary comprehended it. Unfortunately, humanity, possessed with the need to mold God after their own righteousness, has, since the Constantinian epoch, canonized the concept that Jesus, against Gabriel's profession, pre-existed. They took the Lord's simple words —"**before Abraham was, I am**"; "**I am the manna that came down from heaven**", "in the beginning was the Word", etc—and made presumptions. They presumed that Jesus, the *Prophet like unto Moses*, was not aided in His ministry as the Bible promised that He would, and that these words spoken through Him applied to Jesus. They did not take care to analyze the Bible's clear pronouncements of our Lord. Now my job is to efface 2000 years of needless complexities with the simple word of God. Think of it this way: to prove that Jesus pre-existed, you merely need to find a statement made by Him before or after His three-and-one-half-years of ministry stating as much. If you, Constantine, and others can make such a profession with such ease, why could not the Lord? Who is the superior communicator?

You did not address my reasoning to explain the angel's profession to the shepherds in *Luke 2:11*. Your address of that point could have avoided all the verbal queries of your E-mail. Simply put: If Jesus could be called the Saviour at birth, 33 1/2 years before His death, burial, and resurrection, then why could He not be called "Christ" prior to His anointing? This question is especially salient when you consider that, according to BIBLE PROFESSION, the name of the Lord was to be a concept understood and taught by the "man of wisdom" who has heard the Rod —see *Micah 6: 9*. In fact, *Micah 5: 4* promises that —not Peter, not John, not even the Angels of *Luke 2*, nor any other, only —he, the man of wisdom, was to "stand and feed", in the "last days" "in the majesty of the name of the Lord his God" (read *Micah 3: 12* through *5: 6*).

Please think a little more carefully about the application of the name of Christ as it relates to *Deut 18*. Your logic is not clear. The publication does not suggest that anyone who is inspired received the title, Christ —only the Prophet described in *Deut 18*. Peter received his inspiration to

## Meeting Opposition

discern "the Christ" directly from the Father. And being a vessel of truth, he proclaimed his new insight. God requires this of us all, but not all are labeled Christ as you imply that I argue. Christ professes to speak only those things which the Father has commanded Him to speak --none else have been given this assignment. We do not have the talent to perform that task. Not everyone can be the perfect ambassador. Therefore, Christ, to save humanity, spoke through Jesus. You are also in asserting that, based upon my arguments, John was also Christ. John the Baptist was inspired by the third person of the Godhead; therefore, when he completed his commission, the Comforter left, and John died. Thus only could Jesus/Christ profess that 'I must go so that the Comforter can come'. These are not my words, they came directly from the Father by way of Christ.

Christ also said "*no man knoweth who the Son is, but the Father, and who the Father is but the Son, and to whom the Son will reveal*". By your E-mail communiqué, you obviously disagree with this profound announcement by the Son, Himself, a declaration received directly from the Father. From whom did you get your light so that you, in countervalance to the Lord's very own -- "not hard to understand"— pronouncement, can so easily define who the Son is? This is the question you must answer. Was it from the "MAN" Paul, maybe from the "MAN" Peter, could it have come from VTH or EGW? Or, has your vast knowledge of "who the Son is" come from the "MAN" whom the Scriptures prophesied would receive great prosperity by "casting the truth to the ground", the Papacy (Dan 8)? If it came from any of these and not from the Rod hearing "man of Wisdom", the man to whom Christ promised to reveal His identity, then upon what basis do you have to presume that your sources of knowledge of the Son's identity are exceptions to the God-the-Father rule of knowledge pertaining to Himself and His Son?

Finally, Paul warned that the NT Church was in need of more "KNOWLEDGE OF THE SON OF GOD". This knowledge was scheduled to come in the day when the church would become united (please read Eph 4: 11-14). But not only in that text, but in several other places he confessed exactly of what the Lord professed —his ignorance of "who the Son is". In fact he promised us that when we cast aside the teaching which they, the apostles, had discerned, "the milk" and take to ourselves the strong meat, then we will learn to choose the good and refuse the evil. Thus he pointed us forward to this day, the day when we can leave the principles of the doctrine of Christ and move on to perfection. This being the case, prudence dictates that we look to the "man of wisdom"—not to any other inspired authors— to discern "who the Son is". This does not imply that Paul deceived us; it merely manifest that he simplified for us (MILK) a doctrine which we could not then bear. All of these issues were carefully explained in my booklet, please continue your appreciation of Paul's writings and "prove all things" (1 Thes 5: 19-21) and read it carefully.

Why would God feed us doctrine in stages? Why give us milk, denying us a clearer insight into His glory, and then unfold newer and deeper meanings afterwards? The answer is "not hard to understand": for the same reasons why mothers feed their new-born children milk instead of carrots or apples, etc. To advance the thought further: Why did God blind the beggar of *John 9* from his birth? He did it perhaps for the very reason why He advances us in stages --so that He may be glorified. After all, was this not the reason for our creation? But ponder carefully, that poor, blind man of *John 9* suffered for years and years, and to compound his misery, he suffered through no fault of his own. But let us examine the benefit and not be negative: nothing could match the joy that he and his family experienced that day when Jesus healed him. The lesson is indeed simple "not hard to understand": Instead of us today begrudging the years of our blindness about the Lord's identity, let us learn from that poor, blind man's example and celebrate that our eyes have now been opened—once we were blind; now we see.

Sincerely yours to exalt the truth which Constantine "cast down".

Derek