

PROPHETIC REVELATION

From
the
Website...



He that hath an ear, *let him hear!*

This issue contains a collection of articles which are posted on the Prophetic Revelation website on the World Wide Web. They are compiled and printed especially for those who have no access to the Internet.

Inspiration — Inbreathed

I have been told by extremist followers of the Message of William Branham that, just as THE BIBLE WAS INSPIRED OF GOD, THE MESSAGE WAS SIMILARLY INSPIRED OF GOD and therefore should be accepted without reservation. They were satisfied to state that the very Holy Spirit Who inspired holy men of God to write the BIBLE inspired Bro. William Branham to speak the MESSAGE.

However, is there a difference between **“THE WRITTEN WORD OF GOD IS INSPIRED”** and **“THE MESSAGES OF WILLIAM BRANHAM ARE INSPIRED”**? To put it in another way, what difference is there when a person says **“THE BIBLE IS WRITTEN UNDER THE INSPIRATION OF GOD”** and **“EACH MESSAGE OF BRANHAM IS SPOKEN UNDER THE INSPIRATION OF GOD”**?

To answer the question we must first ask **what is meant by “THE INSPIRATION OF GOD”** ?

The word “inspiration” in itself simply means “emotion, arousal, or reaction of the mind, feelings, etc., stimulated by someone or something to a special activity or creativity”. For examples: a man may say, *“I was inspired to read the Word of God daily after I heard that great sermon preached.”* Job says *“But there is a spirit in man: and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding”* (Job 32:8).

However, the word “inspiration” used in these Bible verses: *“All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works”* (2 Tim.3:16-17) has a different meaning. It came from the Greek word: **“theopneustos”** meaning **“divinely breathed in”**. The word appears ONLY ONCE in the Bible here and no where else.

Because of their cultic belief (their eyes focus upon the flesh of the man, William Branham) these extremist followers of the Message believe with all their heart that the spoken words uttered by Bro. Branham in his messages are the same as the words written in the Sacred Scripture (the Bible). They claimed that just as every written word in the Bible was penned down by the movement of God’s hand upon the writers, so too every word uttered by the tongue of Bro. Branham was controlled by the Spirit of God. Bro. Branham never taught that nor did he ever say that the words he uttered were infallible.

PROPHETIC*REVELATION

Blindness has certainly come upon these people. Too long have their eyes been upon the messenger, Bro. Branham, that they can no longer see THE CHRIST. They see God's messenger, an anointed one, a christ, as THE WORD Himself. How foolish they can be.

To say that the message preached by Bro. Branham was inspired of God does not point to every single word uttered by him. It is the revelation contained in the message itself, NOT the oral words that came forth from his mouth. Consider a believer who was inspired by God to take the revelation of the Godhead and Water Baptism in the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ to a Trinitarian Christian friend. And the latter, upon receiving the revelation of the Word, might exclaim, *"Thank you for the exposition! God has indeed sent you to me with such a wonderful message concerning the Godhead and Water Baptism in Jesus' Name! Surely, that message is inspired of God!"*

Does his exclamation mean every word uttered by the believer was inspired of God **or** does it refer to the truth he received in the message brought to him by the believer?

The apostle Paul stated very clearly that *"All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works"* (2 Tim.3:16-17). He never said that his (or any prophet's or apostle's) spoken words (used during their preaching) were **"INBREATHED"** though his messages (or those of the other men of God) were inspired of God.

The Sacred Scripture, the WRITTEN WORD, is INBREATHED of God in that God chose each word to build a picture from Genesis to Revelation. Over a period of about 1500 years God anointed some forty different men, regardless of their position in life, to pen His Word.

All the original writings of the Sacred Scripture were written by ANOINTED MEN of God. But the WORDS they penned were selected by the Holy Spirit and **positionally placed** in the Volume of Books and therefore they can in no way be DISLOCATED, MISPLACED and MISINTERPRETED. The WORDS were **"DIVINELY BREATHED IN"**, **"THEOPNEUSTOS"**. And, only an anointed man of God could take those words and BREAK OPEN THE TRUE REVELATIONS OF THOSE WRITINGS. Remember that Paul said **"ALL SCRIPTURE IS GIVEN BY INSPIRATION (INBREATHED) OF GOD..."** He did not say anything about the ORAL WORDS USED IN HIS PREACHING BEING GIVEN BY THE INSPIRATION (INBREATHED) OF GOD. Yes, the Apostle Paul was **inspired of God to preach** His WORD, that is, he was emotionally and spiritually moved by the stimulation (anointing) of the Holy Spirit to preach God's Truth. But his oral words (words he used in utterance to expound God's Truth) were **not INBREATHED** of God.

The SCRIPTURE is like a computer (compact) disk. Out of it an anointed man can take out the necessary expressions and rightly

FROM THE WEBSITE...

divide them to reveal a TRUTH. Whatever truth he expounds lies in there but the oral words he uses (though some words might be prompted by the Spirit) to expound the truth are his. But they are **not equivalent** to the "INBREATHED" WRITTEN WORDS of the Scripture. Let me illustrate with this:

THE WRITTEN WORD is like a SEED, say an apple seed. Planted the seed will reveal certain portions of itself from day to day. But each portion is a PART of the seed. It is not equivalent to the seed. Again a leaf, though a part of the seed, is unlike the seed in any way. Therefore our preaching or even our own writings, about the truth we have, is unlike THE SCRIPTURE which was INBREATHED of God.

THE WRITTEN WORD is actually **THE LOGOS** in written form. All that God is — in revealing Himself — is in the LOGOS. All that God wants us to know is given to us in THE WRITTEN WORD. Yet, the WRITTEN WORD is not arranged systemically like, for example, a law book that contains the laws of the land. God had it written in a story-telling form, expressing Himself (even in songs and proverbs) in His relationship with His creatures. He quoted and put the words of Satan, Pharaoh, Korah, Ruth, the Pharisees, Herod, Jesus Christ, etc. in His Volume of Books. Yet, those words were INBREATHED and POSITIONALLY placed by Him.

The words that a preacher uses in his preaching or writings of God's Truth cannot be said to be INBREATHED of God even though he is greatly anointed to teach or write the Truth of God. We cannot add anymore to THE INBREATHED WRITTEN WORD. We can only expound what is inside there. And Bro. Branham certainly did that just as Jesus hinted in Matthew 13:52: *"Therefore every scribe which is instructed unto the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is an householder, which bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old."*

We thank God for Bro. Branham. But we need to get back to **THE ABSOLUTE** to find our place and our Faith in those pages of the Holy Script. It's one thing to listen to or read Bro. Branham's words, it is another to know where the Truth lies in those pages of the Scripture. Otherwise, we don't have a foundation. Like Paul, Branham said, CHECK IT OUT WITH THE WORD. But the problem with those extremist believers of the message is they do not have the revelation of the Lord Jesus Christ, so they just take the oral words of Bro. Branham as their final authority.

Remember: *"All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works"* (2 Tim. 3:16-17). That's the absolute truth. No other written words or spoken words of men OUTSIDE OF THE SCRIPTURE are so.

~~~~~

## What is a *Branhamite*?

Several readers have written me to say that I should be ashamed of myself for calling certain followers of William Marrion Branham, *Branhamites*. Should I?

I have been asked to show the existence of a *Branhamite* or a church called *Branhamite* where the man called Branham is worshipped.

How blind can one get! First, show me an **antichrist** or a church called Antichrist where a man called Antichrist is worshipped! No antichrist will declare openly that he is an antichrist, nor will they call their church Antichrist Church. Second, does an antichrist know or believe that he is an antichrist? Does a *Branhamite* know that he is a *Branhamite*? To deny the fact about the existence of *Branhamites* is to deny the existence of antichrists! Their fruits declare who they are.

I am not a *Branhamite* though I have often been accused of being one just because I believe his message. **The name *Branhamites* is given by denominational churches not to those who follow Branham's teachings but to those who actually lift him up above Christ and His Word.** Whether or not I use the name for such fanatical followers, the fact remains that there is such a group of followers, who by their creating an **ism** around the man and his message, have brought a **reproach** to the Faith he stood for.

There is no place in an assembly or the life of a True Bible Believer for an *ism*. An *ism* is created by men upon whom false spirits dwell. And there are many *isms* in Christendom. However, these *isms* are not created by true men of God. (Self-styled men of God like Jim "Jonestown" Jones and David "Waco" Koresh created their own. Such kinds are dangerous.) *Isms* are created usually by men who are acquainted with the men of God in their lifetime and even by those who believed them after their death. History shows plenty of such religious men who were not able to see the Word of God in the men of God. In their religious zeal they would lift up a man of God and make him the absolute for their life and religious faith. Claiming to have the truth, they would *move away from* the Word of God and *into* the words uttered by the man of God. They would give their interpretations which, by and by, would become the *religious traditions* they would uphold. They could never fall back upon the True Word though they may claim it. The Pharisees and the Sadducees, in their *isms*, are such examples. So, are the Roman Catholics in their *Roman Catholicism*. Likewise, the *Branhamites* in *Branhamism*.

Lastly, there is an ecumenical spirit moving among the different camps of those in *Branhamism*. Though they differ in their interpretations of the words of Branham and in their doctrinal stands, they do have one thing in common — "*say only what the prophet said*".

## FROM THE WEBSITE...

Like drunken men leaning on one another so as not to fall, they will argue against one another over the various statements of Bro. Branham in defence of their own interpretations. Amazing!

William Branham was blamed for creating *Branhamism*. The truth is that he had nothing to do with it. Many of his followers did it. *Branhamism* is listed in a number of books as a false cult. *Lutheranism* was not created by Martin Luther and *Methodism* was not created by John Wesley. Both these *isms* are never listed as false cults. Why? Because these followers do not “say only what their prophets said” like the *Branhamites* do (when they take the words of Branham to formulate doctrines). Unlike the *Branhamites*, they look at the Word of God as THE ABSOLUTE. Shame on you, Bible believers, if you cannot look at the Word of God!

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

### **Is there a difference between the Message (of William Branham) and the Bible?**

A great number of Branhamites proclaim that they are the same thing. They said that “*the Message is the Bible and the Bible is the Message*”. This is foolishness. Oh, how blind and deceived are these Branhamites!

Of course there is a DIFFERENCE between THE MESSAGE and THE BIBLE! The Message points to the Bible. The Message points us back to the Original Apostolic Fathers' Faith. The Bible does not point to the Message. It only verifies that the Message is true.

For example, you drive down a highway and come to a junction where you see a sign-post with a message pointing in a certain direction “*To New York City, 70 miles*”. You obey the sign and follow the direction the message provides. An hour later you reach New York City. Now, in New York City will there be a sign that actually point you back to that road sign at that junction on that highway? Of course not. Why? Simply because a sign, a message, always points to an important thing, place, etc. Not vice versa!

Also a sign does not point to itself. You can park your car at that road junction, stare at the sign, point to it and say to yourself, “*All right, that's 'New York City'*”. And if you do not follow the instruction on that sign but “admire” that sign the whole day, even into weeks, months or until you die, you will still not be in New York City. Because the sign (message) is NOT New York City, it only POINTS to it – New York City. Then again, when you follow the instruction of the sign and finally reach New York City, do you still need that sign? Do you have to drive back to that road junction ever so often just to make sure that you are in New York City?

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

## Questions to you, Bro. Gan:...

• *Bro. Branham was vindicated of God, but who are you? Do you have the same vindications as the Prophet?*

Your questions are commonly put forth by many Branhamites to those ministers whose teachings they do not agree with. The latter question shows the immaturity of those who would ask such a foolish question. The vindications that William Branham had were vindications to his own calling as a Church Age Messenger fulfilling the Scriptures of Mal.4:5-6, Rev.3:14 and Lk.17:30 (cf. vv.22-30). If another minister has the same vindications as Bro. Branham then both would have fulfilled the same calling of the same Scriptures. Then we would have two Messengers to the same Age. Wouldn't we? And would that not be unscriptural?

Consider this: Kenneth E. Hagin's mother said that an angel appeared to her during her pregnancy and told her, "*Fear not! The baby shall be born, for as John the Baptist was a forerunner to My First coming, this child will be a forerunner to My Second Coming.*"

Now, who then is the forerunner to the Second Coming of Christ — William Branham or Kenneth Hagin? Just look closely at each of their ministries for the true vindication.

• *Brother, do you have signs and wonders in your ministry? I was told that apostles and prophets must have such gifts.*

First of all, let me ask these questions: How many signs and miracles must an apostle or a prophet perform before he is regarded as one having such a ministry? Do they have to sensationalize the acts (like those being done in Pentecostalism and Charismaticism) to make themselves known? Do I have to document all my signs and miracles and then proclaim to all what has been done in the ministry? And would that mean that my teachings are true? Did Bro. Branham heal everyone who came to him? With all that which took place in his ministry, did all who hear him believe that his teachings were of God?

Some denominational theologians believe that the days of the apostles and prophets are over. They said that if there are such ministers, then these ministers must constantly perform healings and miracles; they must heal the sick without fail when the sick are brought before them for deliverance, citing the example in Acts 5:15-16. (I wonder what will the Branhamites say.)

Now, if what you were told is true, why did not John the Baptist, whom Jesus Christ regarded as a great prophet, perform one miracle? The disciples of Jesus Christ knew John the Baptist was a prophet, but none of them and not even the Pharisees ever raised the question

## FROM THE WEBSITE...

to Jesus (or to John himself) as to why he did not, or could not, perform miracles. So, then what do we have but one passage of Scripture (Acts 5:15-16) that the theologians dare to take and ascribe a qualification for God's apostles and prophets.

John the Baptist had no signs and wonders to vindicate him and his preaching and teaching of the coming Messiah, yet his ministry was readily accepted by the true worshippers. I wonder how many self-righteous Jews shook their heads and said, "*His claim is false because we didn't see any sign and miracle performed.*"

*• Secondly, I did not hear an audible voice of God calling me to the pastoral ministry. But I have a good church and ministry. How come those who are called to be apostles and prophets must directly hear the audible voice of God?*

Now, I have no idea where such a presumptuous view came from. It is basically unscriptural. Such a teaching can be compared to the view of those who believe that there are no apostles and prophets today. What is it? They teach that to be an apostle one must fulfill either of these two prerequisites: i) a witness of the life of Christ from His baptism until His death (Acts 1:21-22), or ii) have personally seen the resurrected Lord Jesus (1 Cor.9:1). Of course, only the second prerequisite can be fulfilled today. So, to destroy the existence of the apostolic ministry, they cite Acts 5:15-16 as the qualification needed.

Concerning the ministry, some have heard the voice of God; others have seen the Lord, in vision or otherwise. So, have I. But do these mean all are apostles or prophets?

Then again, who was Balaam? Was he not a prophet called of God but turned bad? Who was Judas Iscariot? Did he not move about with Christ in His ministry? Was he not sent of Christ to do miracles? And yet he betrayed Christ. Both had encountered the anointing and the Voice, but they did not walk in the Light they received.

The Lord knows how to call those whom He had ordained before the foundation of the earth. He deals with them individually and they know Him, as the Pillar of Fire moves in their life.

A true apostle points you back to the Word. He sets the Word in order and the foundation for the saints. He is anointed with the ability in "*rightly dividing the Word of Truth*". A true apostle does not force feed the saints; he does not use the fear tactic. And, an apostle does not feed the saints or answer questions with quotes of William Branham but he rightly divides the Word of Truth to them as God gives him the ability. If he does not know how to use the two-edged Sword (WORD) of the Sacred Scriptures, then he is not an apostle, he is not even a minister of God.



## PROPHETIC\*REVELATION

• *Brother, some American preachers told us not to use the African drums in worship. They taught us that the African cultures and traditions are pagan and are therefore against the Word. Is it true?*

No, it is not true. Different races have their different cultures, customs and traditions. Not all are necessarily against the Word of God. Some American preachers just can not differentiate what is pagan and what is not. One foolish mistake they make is believing that “*what’s American is right*”. When these American preachers go to Africa or Asia, they try to Americanize the people with their American values instead of the Gospel of Christ. They want everyone to dress the way Americans dress. Some have even told the believers in India that it is a sin for Christian sisters to wear a “Punjabi” dress — a dress in which a trousers is worn under a long dress or skirt. To them a “trousers” is a man’s garment, and women are not allow to put their legs into two “tubes” of clothing material. By such interpretation, Christian women are therefore not allow to wear pajamas to bed. These preachers have failed to understand that the American (Caucasian) culture is different in many ways from the Oriental culture. The traditional trousers women wear in many parts of Asia is far from the trousers that the women wear in America. They were worn many centuries before the birth of Christ. Of course, today’s women in modern Asia have adopted the American style of dressing. “Power-dressing” has become a norm. They wear shirts and pants (trousers) or else tight and scanty dresses to show off the female form.

Concerning drums, what’s the different between the African drum and the American drum? Some say: “*The African drums are tribal.*” Well, were there not twelve tribes in Israel? What’s wrong being tribal. Others say: “*They are used in voodooism and idol worship.*” Foolishness! Are all African drums used in voodooism or in idol worship? Are not the American drums also used in Psychedelic and Rock and Roll musics, and in Satanic churches? A drum is just a musical instrument regardless of its make. It’s how and what you use it for that matters.

The tribal ritual of cutting or marking the face in some parts of Africa can be considered pagan. The markings on the face may simply denote just which tribe the person belongs to, but it is still pagan in practice even though it may not have any religious significance. No Christian parent would subject their children to such a ritual.

A word of wisdom: we should not be quick to judge and presume any cultural and traditional practices, which we are unfamiliar with, to be pagan or evil simply because they appear “unChristian”.

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

## **The Biblical Significance of the September 11, 2001 Attack on America.**

Many Bible believers have asked me whether or not the 2001 September 11 attack on America was of any Biblical significance.

I believe there is.

In chapter 13 of the Book of Revelation we read of John's vision of two wild beasts. The First Beast is Romanism and the Second Beast is Americanism. The vision of John shows the rise of the Second Beast and its power. But pride and decadence gradually took hold of the beast and for the last 50 years it has been prophesying lies. It has become a False Prophet (Rev.16:13).

The September 11 attack marked the beginning of the end for America. When America declared war against terrorism it marked the inevitable doom for the Second Beast. No nation can win the war against terrorism. Terrorism may be contained but it cannot be conquered.

It is obvious that we are at the end of the age allotted for mankind. It has been about 6000 years since Adam and Eve were first put on this earth. It has been about 2000 years since the First Advent of Christ. And, according to the vision of St. John on the Isle of Patmos, the Church right now is at the tail end of the Grace Age — the Seventh and the last Church Age. This is the time of the harvest; the time for God to reap what He had sown and the time for mankind to reap what they had sown (cf. Matt. 13:37-39).

America, the land of the free, started off as a "promised land" for the Christian pilgrims who had fled from the tyranny of those who held power in Europe and England. Those pilgrims possessed both great Bible values and Christian virtues. God blessed the pilgrims and the nation of the United States of America was established on the 4th July, 1776. Since then it has grown into a great nation and a great power. And from there the Gospel of Christ was spread abroad to every continent on earth.

But what has become of America today?

Alas, America has fallen. It has become a nation of people who is self-indulgent, self-centered, egoistic, prideful and boastful. Although it is wealthy, the nation is in a state of decadence. Crimes of violence and rape are so rampant that in some cities the people are literally living behind bars of their own homes. Divorce rate keeps rising. Immorality and sexual perversion have also been on the rise. The nation is spreading and selling their filth around the world. But worst of all, the Christian people have forsaken the Bible Faith of their forefathers.

## PROPHETIC\*REVELATION

Like Israel, America is a nation who is called by the Name of the Lord. And like Israel, America is judged when she forsook the Word of God. About 40 years ago, William Branham, the prophet-messenger to the Laodicean Age, indicted this generation for crucifying the Word of Christ afresh and said that America was being judged. He said that he would no longer pray for America.

America is a great super power today, but it will not be long before she would be destroyed. And God has raised up Osama bin Laden, an Arab Muslim and a militant, for a purpose, that is, to cause America to realize that her time is up.

Who is this Osama bin Laden? And why Osama bin Laden?

### ABRAHAM

In the Book of Genesis (chapter 12), we have a record of the calling of Abram (whose name was later changed to Abraham). Abram's wife was Sarai (later renamed Sarah). At the age of 75 Abram left his homeland for the land that God had promised him. At that time, Abram and Sarai had no children. Later, God promised Abram a son who would inherit the land that Abram was to possess (Gen.15:18).

As days turned into weeks, weeks into months, and months into years, Sarai showed no sign of a conception. She was fast losing her patience, maybe a little agitated, as she approached her menopausal age. Having waited for 10 years, Sarai, who was then 75 years old, suggested that Abram take Hagar, her Egyptian handmaid, to be his concubine to build a family. (Read Genesis 16.) When Hagar had conceived, she began to despise Sarai. With Abram's permission, Sarai sent Hagar out of the camp. And Hagar wandered into the desert where the angel of the Lord met her.

*Gen. 16:10: And the angel of the LORD said unto her, I will multiply thy seed exceedingly, that it shall not be numbered for multitude.*

*11: And the angel of the LORD said unto her, Behold, thou art with child and shalt bear a son, and shalt call his name Ishmael; because the LORD hath heard thy affliction.*

*12: And he will be a wild man; his hand will be against every man, and every man's hand against him; and he shall dwell in the presence of all his brethren.*

When Abram was 99 years old, God paid him a visit. Then God changed Abram's name to Abraham and Sarai's to Sarah. And God made a firm covenant with Abraham. As a sign of the covenant, Abraham was circumcised. And soon after that Sarah conceived. This was the words of Yahweh concerning Isaac:

*Gen. 17:19: And God said, Sarah thy wife shall bear thee a son indeed; and thou shalt call his name Isaac: and I will establish my*

## FROM THE WEBSITE...

*covenant with him for an everlasting covenant, and with his seed after him.*

*20: And as for Ishmael, I have heard thee: Behold, I have blessed him, and will make him fruitful, and will multiply him exceedingly; twelve princes shall he beget, and I will make him a great nation.*

*21: But my covenant will I establish with Isaac, which Sarah shall bear unto thee at this set time in the next year.*

### THREE SEEDS

It is clear that Abraham had two natural seeds — one by Hagar, a bondwoman; the other by Sarah, his wife. It is also clear that the promise was made to the seed by Sarah and not that of Hagar. Isaac was the seed of promise; Ishmael was not. But there is yet “another seed” promised to Abraham, a “spiritual seed” according to the Word of the Lord.

*Gen. 17:4: As for me, behold, my covenant is with thee, and thou shalt be a father of many nations.*

*Gen. 22:15: And the angel of the LORD called unto Abraham out of heaven the second time,*

*16: And said, By myself have I sworn, saith the LORD, for because thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy son, thine only son:*

*17: That in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea shore; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies;*

*18: And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed; because thou hast obeyed my voice.*

This spiritual “seed” would make Abraham a father of many nations. It would also bring about a blessing upon all the nations of the earth. This spiritual “seed” is none other than the Lord Jesus Christ. Read Acts 3:25-26.

Therefore, there are altogether 3 seeds which came through Abraham:

- 1) seed of the bondwoman (Hagar) — Ishmael,
- 2) seed of the promise (natural) — Isaac,
- 3) seed of the promise (spiritual) — Jesus Christ.

Yahweh revealed Himself to Abraham to bring forth a FAITH to the nations of the earth. Abraham passed this Faith to Ishmael and to Isaac. Later, when Ishmael (along with his mother, Hagar) was cast out of the family, God promised Abraham that He would

## PROPHETIC\*REVELATION

bless Ishmael and make him a great nation of 12 princes (cf. Gen. 25: 13-16).

Ishmael knew only the God of his father, Abraham. He worshipped Yahweh. So did his descendents. But Ishmael was “a *wild man*” who lived by his bow, ever moving about in the wilderness (Gen.21:20- 21). Likewise, his descendants. Further, the prophecy that “*his hand will be against every man, and every man’s hand against him*” suggests that the Ishmaelites would often be at war. And lastly, that “*he shall dwell in the presence of all his brethren*” points to the fact that the “militant” Ishmaelites would be able to live and survive among all those who were related to them by the blood of Abraham. They live mainly in the Middle East, especially in the desert region known as Arabia, a name which is synonymous with the nomadic tribes of the region. The Ishmaelites then became known as Arabs. [Note: Not all Arabs are true Ishmaelites.]

### ISLAM and OSAMA BIN LADEN

Some 2500 years later, in the 7th Century AD, a child named Mohammed, was born and raised in Mecca. Mohammed claimed that he was a descendant of Ishmael. Today, all Arabs also claim that they are of Ishmaelite descent. The life history of Mohammed and all his claims that led him to be “a prophet” have been controversial issues for centuries. To his followers, he was a great prophet and a gentle person. To others, he was a wild man with wild ideas.

The teachings of Mohammed are against the Faith of Abraham and Isaac (Judaism), and that of Christ (Christianity). Mohammed claimed that Ishmael, instead of Isaac, was the chosen and promised seed of Abraham. He claimed that he himself was a prophet of Allah, not a prophet of Yahweh. By substituting the Name of the God of Abraham, he evidently did not accept the Faith of Abraham. As such, he did not identify with the God of Israel. He had totally created a new religious faith — Islam.

Islam, which means “submission”, has its own factions and fanaticism — different sects and radical men. Every major religion has its shares. Christianity is no different. We see Jonestown and Jim Jones, and Waco and David Koresh. When an egoistic man propagates his wild ideas with radicalism, he is a dangerous man. He is even more dangerous if he mixes politics with his religious ideology. Religions and politics do not mix.

Concerning Mohammed’s teachings, did he issue “*jihad*” and call for “*death to the infidels*” as acts which faithful followers of Islam should carry out? Good Muslims say, “*No. That was only for that particular period of time when prophet Mohammed was dealing with his enemies.*” Radical Muslims say, “*Yes. And it’s still applicable today. It is every Muslim’s duty to obey the words of Allah and his*

## FROM THE WEBSITE...

*prophet, Mohammed.*” Is Islam a militant religion? Or, has it become a militant religion?

Osama bin Laden is an Arab. A wild man as he is, Osama has become more militant with his interpretation of the Islamic faith. In many countries around the world, there are many men just like him, even though they are not “wild” Arabs. But because they embrace the Islamic faith, they tend to become wild and rebellious. They will not hesitate to destroy the lives of those who happen to stand in their path of ideological propagation and achievement — religious or/and political.

It appears that the tribal culture of the 7th Century is inherent in the Islamic faith. That era was a golden age for Islam when its followers took up arms and conquered Saudi Arabia, the entire Middle East, Central Asia, and large parts of India. The Islamic armies raged through Egypt and across North Africa, destroying corrupt Byzantine Christianity in their path. Modernity is not something Osama and other so-called pious men like him seek for. They not only relish the past golden age of the 7th Century, but also seek to revive it in the present era.

The world’s three great religious faiths are in conflict basically because of the Land of Israel. Judaism, Christianity and Islam are traced to Abraham. The first faith is Judaism through Isaac and his son. The second faith is the Christian faith through Jesus Christ, the Son of God. The third faith is Islam through Ishmael. Islam opposes the sacred writings (basically the Old Testament) which belongs to the Jews and the Gospel (the New Testament, together with the Old Testament) which belongs to the Christians. And the conflict in the Middle East over the Land of Israel (or Palestine as the Palestinians called it) has an effect on many Muslims around the world. Besides the Arabs, many Muslims around the world believe that Palestine belongs to the Palestinians who are mainly Muslims.

America has not only fallen from the faith of her forefathers, she has also not been dutiful and sincere in her dealings with Israel’s interests when Israel was terrorized by those who sought her destruction. Hence, Osama bin Laden. In issuing a *fatwa* (judgment) and a *jihad* (holy war) against America, Osama gave America a wake-up call. Yes, it’s a late wake-up call. But Bible prophecy has to be fulfilled, even the prophetic vision in which George Washington saw a series of three world wars of which the third war showed the destruction of America. Similarly, William Branham also saw the devastation of the land of America in a vision in 1933.

The visions of the prophet Daniel and the apostle John also clearly showed the destruction of America. The apostle John did not see any further vision of the *Second Beast* after Revelation chapter 13 except that it had become a *False Prophet* (Rev. 16:13; 19:20; 20:10). In his

## PROPHETIC\*REVELATION

vision, Daniel (in chapter 11) was told that there would rise a mighty king to overthrow the Persian Empire. That king was Alexander the Great. He died at the height of his conquest and his kingdom was divided into four divisions. In the north was the Seleucid kingdom of Syria and in the south was the Ptolemaic kingdom of Egypt. These two kingdoms were often at war with each other as recorded in verses 5-19. Verses 20 and 21 then show the rise of "*a vile person*", a term which apparently points to the Antichrist. Historically, Antiochus IV Epiphanes fulfilled the events described in verses 20-34 when he desecrated the altar of the temple in Jerusalem by offering a sow on it. It was an "*abomination that maketh desolate*" the sacred place of the temple. Antiochus was a type of the Antichrist. However verse 35 put the events "*to the time of the end*" showing that the prophecy is still in the future when it would be fulfilled by the true Antichrist (2 Thess. 2:3-12).

At "*the time of the end*" when this "*vile person*", the Antichrist, appears, America would be powerless to fight the war with him. Hence, the king of the west is not mentioned in Daniel 11:36-45 when the world powers come against the Antichrist. The power of America would be defeated in a war with Russia as prophesied by Ezekiel in chapters 38 and 39.

### **A WORD TO THE WISE IN AMERICA**

America, be prepared for the end. The Gospel left Israel for the Gentiles when Israel rejected the Word. It traveled westward with the SUN to Europe. Europe was blessed then and had her revival under the Reformers. When religious Europe got spiritually cold, the Gospel took leave of the European continent and went westward across the Atlantic Ocean to America. And God blessed America. But in less than 200 years the Second Beast had lost her faith and she began to speak like a dragon. Lies poured out of her mouth by the power of its two horns (political and religious). Her spirit became deceptive and America became a false prophet. Today, America claims to have the Word of God, but she does not have the Faith. She does not have the Truth for God has already taken the Gospel and moved westward across the Pacific Ocean to Asia. This is the third and final leg of the Gospel to the Gentiles before it sets with the SUN to rise again for Israel.

America, you have had your days. The Word of the Lord had gone forth for you to humble yourself and to return to the Word. But you would not. Even among the followers of the Message of William Branham are many proud men who claim to be preachers of the Word. Many of these men are so radical in their faith that they would proclaim that "*you are an unbeliever if you do not believe verbatim what William Branham said*". And these men are so blind to their own arrogance that they think they are humble. Just because they are

## FROM THE WEBSITE...

Americans they believe that they have a better understanding of the Word of God than the ministers of other races. Some are racists. Then, there are those who would override the Word of God, just because they are apostles, that they would condemn those who do not see eye to eye with them. (My fellow ministers, if you are an apostle, your apostolic authority is not what you say; your word is not the authority. Your authority is the anointing of God which gives you the ability to handle the SWORD and to divide the WORD with a finesse of establishing God's revelation for the saints.)

America, lift up your eyes and follow the SUN! Yes, the SON of God will soon arise with healing in His wings for the children of Israel.

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

## **...remember the Lord's death till He comes...**

Of recent years there has been a teaching which have caused many Endtime Message believers to no longer come together to partake of the "Lord's Supper". False teachers and false prophets of Branham's Message have been going around spreading the teaching that since the Lord, or the Word, has come in 1963, there is no longer a need to gather around the Lord's Table; there is no longer a need to "*remember the Lord's death till He comes*". Are those preachers demon possessed? Do they not know that Bro. Branham even had communion services after 1963?

Because of a lack of a "**Back to the Word! Back to the Absolute! Back to the Apostolic Fathers' Faith!**", the *PAROUSIA* of Christ is totally misunderstood. The coming of the Spiritual Word and the coming of the literal Person of Christ (for the Bride in the Rapture), which are entirely two different events, are interpreted as a single event. And that this event has already been fulfilled.

**May the Lord have mercy on those preachers  
who have taken away the blessing of the  
Lord's Supper from the people by spiritualizing  
the ordinance set down by the Lord —  
a memorial of His death until He returns *literally*.**



## Can A Divorced Woman Remarry?

Many Endtime Message preachers claim that they have God's anointing, the oil that stimulates their zeal for the things of God. Unfortunately, the oil that they possess is apparently not the oil of the Lord God as their zeal tends to lead them to a way which is contrary to the WAY of the Lord. Like the Foolish Virgins, these preachers will only find the true oil, the true anointing, just when the Marriage of the Lamb is over and the door is shut for the sealing of the Bride for the final transformation.

It is sad but true that many Message preachers are dotting on the Message of William Branham without any true revelation. Hence, not only are they spreading false doctrines, but they are unwittingly opposed to, and condemning, the true doctrines of the Bible. One such false doctrine centers on whether or not a divorced woman can remarry.

Recently, I heard a preacher scream on a tape that the passage of Scriptures in Romans 7:2-3 applies to every woman on earth, whether saved or unsaved, Christian or non-Christian. He emphasized that an *unsaved* divorced woman can never ever remarry just as a *Christian* woman cannot remarry if she divorces her husband.

Obviously this preacher knows nothing about the Word of God. He spends more time interpreting, or rather misinterpreting, the many statements of Bro. Branham. In doing so, he is condemning God's Truth unknowingly. By simply taking the text of Romans 7:2-3 without an understanding of what Paul meant, this preacher is just like many other preachers who simply refer to Acts 15:20 and teach that a Christian cannot eat food offered to idols, strangled animals and blood. [Is it Scripturally true that Christians cannot eat blood and food offered to idols? See article in this book.]

Before the Gospel was preached and the Holy Spirit given, there were basically two groups of people on this earth — the Gentiles and the Israelites. After Pentecost when the Spirit was given to both the Jewish and the Gentile believers there were three groups — the saints of Christ (which comprises the Jews and the Gentiles), Israel (the people who have the LAW but do not receive Jesus Christ as their own Messiah) and the sinners (who do not have the LAW nor the CHRIST).

Now, the LAW was given to Israel. It was not given to the Gentiles; it was not given to the sinners. This is a fact. How then can this preacher apply the LAW to judge a people who knows not the LAW? How can God judge by the LAW a person to whom the LAW was not given? So, evidently, this preacher has preached a lie. Paul spoke the truth when he said, *"For as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law: and as many as have sinned in the law shall*

## FROM THE WEBSITE...

*be judged by the law*" (Rom. 2:12), and "*...by the law is the knowledge of sin*" (Rom. 3:20b). That's why Paul made it very clear in these words: "*Know ye not, brethren, (for I speak to them that know the law,) how that the law hath dominion over a man as long as he liveth?*" (Rom. 7:1) before he went on to illustrate the relationship between a believer and his Saviour in the next five verses.

Rom.7:2: *For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband.*

3: *So then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress: but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man.*

4: *Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God.*

5: *For when we were in the flesh, the motions of sins, which were by the law, did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death.*

6: *But now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held; that we should serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter.*

Notice, when Paul gave the illustration of the relationship between a believer and his Saviour, he was illustrating a TRUTH by using the example of a man, who knew or had the LAW, how that he was under subjection to the LAW (like a married woman is subjected to her husband). As long as the LAW has dominion over the man, he cannot "*marry another*". However, the man is free to "*marry another*", that is, to Christ Jesus, only when he is dead to the LAW (through the Body of Christ). So, being released from the law, the man is now able to serve in the new way of the Spirit.

Therefore, how could this example of Paul's be used (by the preacher and many others like him) to form a doctrine that an unsaved divorced woman cannot remarry? Being unsaved, the woman must be a sinner as all man and woman are born sinners. So, does it matter if she should marry and divorce as she likes? After all she has already been judged: "*For the wages of sin is death*" (Rom.6:23). A sinner commits all kinds of sins. Can the LAW given to Israel be used to judge her? Why is the preacher using the Law and even the Bible to judge such a sinner when she knows nothing about its Author and the Saviour who loves her? What a strange preacher.

If she is an Israelite woman who knows the LAW then she would be judged by the LAW. Then again, the Bible has concluded that "*ALL have sinned and come short of the glory of God*".

## PROPHETIC\*REVELATION

There is a weird humor when the same preacher said that the unsaved woman could only remarry when her divorced husband (who had left her) died, but not by her murdering him (he added for jest). Does the preacher think that the woman cares much about whether or not her ex-husband, who divorced her, had died and how he died? What if her ex-husband migrates to a far country, does the preacher expect her to keep track of her ex-husband's whereabouts and his death so that she could remarry? What if he goes missing and dies?

Come to your senses, preacher! She's a sinner! She is not going to wait for him to die at a ripe old age and then remarry at the time when she has become a grand old lady!

Just because Bro. Branham was a prophet, the preacher tried to justify his own reasoning by quoting many statements from the prophet's sermons. However, many of the statements which had no bearing upon the issue were often quoted out of context. It is a great sin to misquote Bro. Branham against the Word of God. Let me ask him this question: if this same unsaved, twice divorced woman (whose ex-husbands are still alive) is now happily married to a third husband for a good five years, and has borne him two children, now comes to accept the Lord Jesus Christ as her own Saviour - what will the preacher tell her? Will he tell her that she is an adulteress and that she is living in sin? Or, is there something that she must do to correct her standing with the Gospel since she has, according to the LAW, three husbands? Must she separate from the present husband to remain single so that she could be called a Christian and be considered saved in the Gospel? Tell me, preacher.

Again, what if a young unsaved, twice divorced woman comes into the Gospel of Christ and subsequently meet a Christian man to whom she would like to marry, can she marry him? Or would you, Mr. Preacher, respond with a *"No, she cannot remarry, because she's got two living husbands and she is already an adulteress. She must remain single until both the ex-husbands have died"*?

Romans 7:2-3 has often been used, by such preachers as the one mentioned above, to "kill" every woman who remarried, or will remarry, while her ex-husband is still living. They often try to further support their reasoning by applying the first part of 1 Cor.7:11 which states *"But and if she depart, let her remain unmarried..."* These preachers are saying, *"See, the divorced woman cannot remarry. She must remain single until her husband dies."*

The application of the statement of 1 Cor.7:11 together with Romans 7:2-3 is a serious error. What Paul wrote to the Romans and what he wrote to the Corinthians are two different things altogether. Even the statement *"But and if she depart, let her remain unmarried..."* being sliced off from the rest of Paul's text already shows a serious dislocation of the Word of God. And further misplacing it alongside

## FROM THE WEBSITE...

Rom.7:2-3 only gives rise to a misinterpretation of the Scriptures, something which Bro. Branham had warned believers not to do.

Whom was Paul addressing to and what was he addressing in 1 Cor.7:11? And why did Paul add a command to that statement "*But and if she depart, let her remain unmarried...*" with a conjunction "*or be reconciled to her husband*"?

How many preachers truly have an understanding of what Paul was dealing with in 1 Corinthians 7?

Yes, Paul was dealing with how to avoid fornication among Christians. But in dealing with the topic, Paul had to deal with the different circumstances of the many believers. A closer look at verses 10 to 16 will reveal that one cannot just slice off this part of verse 11, "*But and if she depart, let her remain unmarried...*" and simply apply it to every woman.

Now, examine this closely. In 1 Cor.7:10-11, Paul commanded the husband and wife (who were, of course, converts from paganism) not to divorce the spouse. He commanded the believing wife not to separate from her unbelieving husband. But if she were to divorce, or separate from, her husband, she must remain unmarried or else be reconciled with her husband. A Bible-believing wife has no power in anyway to seek a divorce from her husband whether he is a believer or an unbeliever. She is bound to him as long as he lives. Likewise, a Bible-believing husband cannot divorce his wife whether she is a saint or a sinner (vv.12-14). The bond between a man and his wife in marriage is for life, "*till death do you part*". However, on the grounds of fornication committed by his wife, a Bible-believing husband has the choice of either forgiving her or divorcing her. Following the example of Prophet Hosea, a truly loving husband ought to forgive a truly repentant wife. A Christian must not harden his heart and refuse to forgive or to repent. If the wife is unrepentant and wilfully continues to sin against him, the husband may, in such a case, choose to free himself from the marriage bond by a divorce.

Before Paul concluded his words on the relation between husband and wife (vv.16), he addressed an issue which was put to him by the Corinthian believers concerning unbelievers who sought to divorce their spouse. He answered: "*But if the unbelieving depart, let him depart. A brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases: but God hath called us to peace*" (vv.15).

According to Paul's revelation a marriage bond can be dissolved or broken if the unbelieving partner wilfully and deliberately deserts the spouse whose faith is placed in the Gospel or the Word of God. The believing husband or wife is not under bondage in such cases. God does not give the Gospel Truth to a person to frustrate him or her but to set him or her free and at peace.

## PROPHETIC\*REVELATION

Verse 15 is one verse that Brother Branham did not touch on in his message "*Marriage and Divorce*" nor did he ever explain the verse in any of his sermons. Because of this, many ministers tend to sidetrack the issue which Paul spoke about, while others would merely refer you to verses 10, 11 and 39. But verses 10 and 11 deal with believing husband and wife who are separated from their spouse (not on the grounds of fornication); and they are commanded to remain single or be reconciled with each other. If either of them chooses to remarry, he or she would be guilty of committing adultery (Lk. 16:18). Verse 39 is Paul's answer on whether a Christian woman could remarry after the death of her husband. Death breaks the marriage bond and the living partner is free to remarry. But verses 12-15 deal with an unbelieving spouse. A true Christian must continue to live with his or her unbelieving spouse if the latter is willing to live with the former regardless of his or her new found faith in Christ. A believer must not and cannot put away his or her unbelieving spouse. But an unbeliever (not having the Spirit of God and who doesn't care about the consequences) may wilfully and deliberately seek to divorce the spouse because of the Gospel. (Remember, both were pagans but one has just found Christ causing the other to hate and to separate. No sinner man, who truly loves his wife, will seek for divorce just because his wife accepts the gospel. But he will if he hates the Gospel and cannot get his wife to reject Christ.)

Prophet Ezekiel taught that the innocent should not be held responsible for the sins of the guilty (Ezek. 18:2-4, 13, 17-32). Paul, having the same view and understanding, also wrote that if the unbeliever wished to divorce the spouse (who had believed Christ) let the unbeliever do so. The Christian brother or the Christian sister is not under bondage (of the marriage bond) in such a case, but that God has called us (Christians) to peace. If the unbeliever insists on breaking the marriage covenant, the believer should peacefully submit to the unbeliever's desire. The believer will not be held responsible under such circumstances.

Now, since a brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases, can he or she remarry? Does the Gospel pose (in such cases) any hindrance to further marriage and normal creative relationship? How does this man or this woman avoid fornication (the subject which Paul was dealing with in the whole of chapter 7 of 1 Corinthians)?

Many Endtime Message believers will retort that only the man can remarry but not the woman. And many, in refusing to look at the Scriptures squarely, would dogmatically assert that verse 15 is a part of verse 11a. They would even refer to Rom. 7:2-3 for added weight. My question is this: In Christ Jesus, is there a preference for the man over the woman? Are not all one and equal in Him as far as the Gospel is concerned? Read Galatians 3:28. In Deuteronomy 24:1-4, the Law of God allowed a woman, under certain circumstances, to remarry

## FROM THE WEBSITE...

without her being called an adulteress. Yet many Endtime Message preachers would not allow a believing woman, under the same circumstances stated in 1 Corinthians 7:15 and being under Grace, to remarry without being called an adulteress. Is the Law more merciful than Grace?

On two separate occasions, I presented the following case to two ministers for their comments:

A young girl got married and divorced twice. In her sins, she came to meet the Saviour Who promised her a *New Life* and a *New Beginning*. She handed all her sins to Jesus Christ and repented, believing that He would throw all the sins of her past life into the Sea of Forgiveness and Forgetfulness. She then fell in love with a Christian man and wished to marry him. My question was: **Can she marry?** (You could also apply this question to a whore who have lain with many men and lived with some as man and wife, but subsequently found Christ Jesus and then a man she loved.)

*“No!”* came the emphatic answer. *“She cannot marry because she already had two husbands. If she marry again, she will be living in adultery.”*

Referring also to 1 Corinthians 7:15, I asked one of the two ministers as to why Paul wrote that God had called her to peace (see 2 Thess.3:16; Eph.6:15) when, according to him (the minister), God still remembered the sins of her past life? [Who would you believe: St. Paul or such ministers? ]

Now, had not God thrown all her sins into the Sea of Forgiveness and Forgetfulness? Did not the Blood of Jesus wash away her every sin? Or had God suddenly decided not to forgive her and started to remember her past life of having two husbands? Is that the kind of God that we serve and trust for our salvation? If so, we have done it all in vain because He may just turn around and stop showing us His Grace and Mercy and bring up all our sins from under the Blood to remembrance so as to condemn us. Otherwise, that minister was wrong to presume that God would remember the sins which we had already repented of.

Brother Branham once said that man could forgive but could not forget the wrong done him by another. But that isn't so with God. When he forgives the sins of those who repent, He also forgets them. Blessed be the Name of the Lord! As such, when God forgave the sins of the young girl's past life, He would also forget her sins of adultery, fornication, cheating, lying, cursing, etc., and even if she had used God's Name in vain. *“Therefore if any man (or woman) be in Christ, he (or she) is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new”* (2 Cor.5:17). She was a sheep who had gone astray in her own way, but has now been found by the Great Shepherd!

## PROPHETIC\*REVELATION

*“She can find peace in God,” the minister said, “by remaining single, without marrying again.”*

I asked, *“Living the rest of her life, for some fifty or sixty years, without a husband and a family of her own? For the rest of her life, live and die as a spinster because of the Gospel?”* (Does she deserve such a punishment? Wasn't she an innocent victim of circumstances, and a sinner born into this sinful world where anything could happen to a person without Christ? Is the Gospel Good News to set her free or is it Bad News to bind her even further?)

He replied blatantly and sarcastically, *“If she desires to marry, it must be for sex!”*

And this polygamy-believing minister admitted that he took his wife with him wherever he traveled because he needed her sexually (obviously to satisfy his own passion). Here is a minister who would justify his own needs but has no qualms in condemning the woman because of her needs! (Sounds to me like the Scribes and the Pharisees recorded in John 8.) Men like him preach polygamy to justify their own sexual desires or their involvement in polygamy. They try to bind a woman convert to her past of being a divorcee while disregarding her other sins. Such ministers are quick to judge but God is quick to forgive.

I once said that if accepting the Gospel Truth (as interpreted by such ministers[?] in the ministry who disregard the WORD OF GOD and misinterpret the words of His prophet) was going to prevent a woman from having a normal married life it would be better for her to get married to a man who also had the desire to be a Christian, before they both proceed to confess Christ as their Saviour.

And, what would such ministers say then? Would they tell her to leave this husband to return to her first or second husband (who, being sinners, might by then had already remarried) in order that she could be a Christian? (Remember: God's Word explicitly forbids such reunion. Deuteronomy 24:1-4.) Or would they tell her, *“I am sorry. Your third marriage is not valid. It's just not possible for you to be a Christian and be married.”* Would they make the latter statement and pronounce that she had committed an unpardonable sin?

One so-called minister from Africa wrote in his letter to me that when sexual union had taken place between a man and a woman, it would automatically be considered a marriage. Hence, a young girl raped by a man would be considered married to him and therefore could not marry another. O what folly! What idiocy! Imagine being married to a mad rapist. What kind of minister is he who would go around teaching such nonsense?

To many ministers there seems to be no solutions to such problems. Such young sisters in Christ are left to fend for themselves

## FROM THE WEBSITE...

against the vile attacks of the devil on their flesh. But Praise God, the Bible has the answer! God always has an answer to any difficulty. In the Law era, He provided a way for the woman caught in a difficult situation because of the hardness of her husband's heart (Deut.24: 1-4). In the Grace era that we are living in, He has also provided a way for the spiritually reborn woman who had been a victim of a sinful life molded by Satan, even her unbelieving husband (1 Cor.7:15). That's right. Remember, the Law of Moses affected Israel only because it was given unto them and not the other Gentile nations. Similarly, the Law of Christ does not apply to the unbelievers but only to those who are born into His Body. Remember also that we are not talking about couples that some sinner men or half-drunk magistrates or backslidden preachers have joined together (out in this sinful, messy world) that could be put asunder. But we are talking about those whom God has joined together in His Name that no man can put asunder without tampering with the Law of Christ.

At this juncture, I would like to remind those of you who are snickering at what has been discussed so far to check with the Word carefully. Don't merely quote the prophet's words without an understanding. Don't say things which he did not say. But say only what he had taught on the tapes according to THE WORD OF THE LORD, according to the teaching of the Lord Jesus Christ! Amen! The Logos of God is what you ought to hear and not merely the words of a prophet. Don't satisfy your own pride, lust and belief on polygamy by misquoting him. One thing for sure, you are not going to be judged on that Day by his words (his utterances) on the tapes but you will be judged by the Word (*Logos*) of God, which is laid down in the Holy Scriptures.

The prophet was uneducated, but if you do exactly what he said, "*Go back and check the Scriptures*", you will surely have the understanding. If you continue to quote his statements without any true revelation concerning the TRUTH, you will be just as blind as the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Scribes. The prophet himself had said that if any of his teachings was not in the Scriptures then we should not believe it. Amen! He even cautioned the hearers "*...to be careful what you're listening to. See? There's so much of it that it's just the human side...*" (Sermon: "*He Cares, Do You?*").

The Sacred Scriptures, contained in the Bible, are the Absolute of God, not the tapes of the prophet. The preachers who told you that the taped sermons are the ABSOLUTE are LIARS! "*Yea, let God be true, but every man a liar*" (Rom.3:4). Flee from them before they destroy your faith! "*Back to the WORD! Back to the Original!*" screamed the prophet. He never contradicted the WORD. Many people have misunderstood him.

~ ~ ~ ~ ~



>> **From the Email Folder:**

**THE UNMARRIED AND THE WIDOWS**

—— **Original Message** ——

*From: Jason  
To: Richard Gan  
Sent: Sunday, April 21, 2002 1:52 PM  
Subject: Good Commentary*

-----

*Bro. Gan:*

*I was reading this in a Bible commentary that I have. It's by John MacArthur. These are about I Cor. 7:8, 9. 7:8 unmarried...widows. "Unmarried" is a term used 4 times in the NT, and only in 1 Corinthians (cf. vv.11, 32, 34). This verse makes it clear that the unmarried and widows are distinct. Verse 11 identifies the divorced as the "unmarried" to be distinguished from "widows" (vv. 39,40; single by death) and virgins (vv. 25,28; never married). Each use of "unmarried," then, refers to those formerly married, presently single, but not widowed. They are the divorced. It is likely these people who were formerly married wanted to know if they, as Christians, could or should remarry.*

*as I am. Paul was possibly a widower; and could here affirm his former marriage by identifying with the unmarried and widows. His first suggestion is that they stay single because of its freedoms in serving the Lord (vv. 25-27,32-34).*

*7:9 let them marry. The Gr. tense indicates a command, since a person can't live a happy life and serve the Lord effectively if dominated by unfulfilled passion — especially in that Corinthian society.*

*7:15 let him depart. A term referring to divorce (cf. vv.10,11). When an unbelieving spouse cannot tolerate the partner's faith and wants a divorce, it is best to let that happen in order to preserve peace in the family (cf. Rom.12:18). The bond of marriage is broken only by death (Rom.7:2), adultery (Matt.19:9), or an unbeliever's leaving.*

*not under bondage. When the bond is broken in any of those ways, a Christian is free to marry another believer. Throughout Scripture, whenever legitimate divorce occurs, remarriage is assumed. When divorce is permitted, so is remarriage. By implication, the permission for a widow to remarry (vv.39,40; Rom.7:3) because the "bond" is broken, extends to this case where there is no more "bondage."*

*So my understanding of this issue is that unmarried women do not refer to virgins. It refers to divorced women or men. They can remarry*

**FROM THE WEBSITE...**

*if they are divorced for a legitimate reason. Death, adultery or the unbelieving departs from the husband. You are BOUND by law to your husband or wife (both believers), but when there is an unbeliever involved (this is a different case) and she can't stand your faith and wants to leave then let her leave. Paul says the marriage bond has been broken and if the bond is broken then that would mean that the person is free to remarry just like widows in I Cor. 7:39, "A wife is BOUND by law as long as her husband lives; but if her husband dies, she is at liberty to be married to whom she wishes, only in the Lord." If the believer is not bound in verse 15 to the unbeliever (if the unbeliever departs) then it follows that the believer "is at liberty to be married to whom she wishes, only in the Lord."*

*So, basically what the Scriptures are saying is that if there is a Scripturally legitimate reason for divorce then the bond is broken for both husband and wife (for there is neither male nor female in Christ).*

*Is there any inconsistencies to my understanding?*

*Also, I think that there are a lot of people that are still bound to their partners by the (mis)interpretation of ministers in the message and their failure to realize that "All scripture [is] given by inspiration of God, and [is] profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." (I Tim.3:16,17) They've failed to really study the word of truth and to "Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth." (II Tim.2:15)*

*Again, I am not 100% sure of this understanding, but I am beginning to see it more and more.*

*God bless,  
JD*

— — — — —

**Reply:**

Bro. Jason:

Yes, the connection between the two words *unmarried...widows* is noticeable. Yet, when you try to show the Branhamite what you understand (you understood correctly), showing them the Scriptures, you know what you'll get.

Look at what Bro. Branham said in this quote which I read on a website:

*Questions And Answers - 08/23/64m*

*Now, on this here, Here's what I say. Let me say this, not the Lord, let me say it. If you are married at this time, and you both are saved, and you're filled*

## PROPHETIC\*REVELATION

*with the Holy Spirit, and you love one another, and you've got little children (Now, remember this is me, not the Lord. See?), go ahead and live together; be happy; 'cause you couldn't live with your first wife or you wouldn't have married her. Then if you leave this [second wife] and go back to your first one, you're doing worse than you did in the first place. See? So you see, you're all messed up; there's no way of getting out of it. There'd only be one way truly that I can say from the Bible: both of you live single. See?*

Now, was Bro. Branham saying to **go ahead and live together** or **both of you live single** ?

I have a recent email from Venezuela, from a believer who is seeking for an answer to one problem of M&D in his church. This brother wrote about a woman who married a Portuguese when she was a teenager and in less than a year the man abandoned her. They were not Christians. Some time later she lived with (not officially married) a divorced man for 30 years and had 5 children. Ten years ago, she was saved and fellowshiped in a message church. There were much debate over her case. Some ministers said she must go back to her first husband. Other said she need not. But the pastor told her that she must not have any more sex with her present husband. The present husband has now also accepted Christ.

I wrote the brother and told him to tell the man and the woman that there can be no more divorce between them. And that they can go and live together and make love again.

Their sins are all gone. Why do those ministers dig them up? God forgives and forget. How can they judge a believer's past life when he/she known not the Saviour, nor His Word?

Some of the Branhamite preachers are so blind to the Word. If they take Branham's words, then they should know that he said that when a man and a woman comes together, they are married. The way he said it, kissing will tie a man to the woman, as if they were married. Did not Paul said that when a man join himself to a harlot he is one with her? Then, my question is: "*Can a prostitute, who becomes a Christian, marry?*" Remember, she has slept with many men, therefore many husbands.

Well, study well.

*RGan*

~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~

## Can Christians Eat Food Offered To Idols, And Blood?

This question is invariably met with either one of the following two answers:

- 1) *No. Such things should never be consumed by Christians.*
- 2) *Yes, but only food offered to idols. Christians cannot eat blood.*

But what saith the Scriptures? Is it true that the Word of the Lord forbids the eating of food offered to idols and the eating of blood?

The following Scriptures, from both the New and Old Testaments, are often used in support of such beliefs:

*ACT 15:19-20 - Wherefore my sentence is, that we trouble not them, which from among the Gentiles are turned to God: But that we write unto them, that they abstain from pollutions of idols, and from fornication, and from things strangled, and from blood. (cf. 15:29; 21:25)*

*GEN 9:4 - But flesh with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof, shall ye not eat.*

*LEV 7:26-27 - Moreover ye shall eat no manner of blood, whether it be of fowl or of beast, in any of your dwellings. Whatsoever soul it be that eateth any manner of blood, even that soul shall be cut off from his people. (cf. 17:10-14)*

To put this issue in perspective, let us examine the sequence of the underlying events as recorded in the Acts of the Apostles.

When the Apostles and the Jewish converts in Judea heard that a group of Gentiles had also received the Holy Spirit through the ministration of the Word by Peter, they expressed their disbelief. They contended with Peter who convinced them by narrating the events which led to the Gentiles' conversion. The Jews then accepted that God had also given the Gospel of salvation to the Gentiles.

Now, it wasn't very long after that that the number of Jewish converts to the Gospel began to dwindle and many Jews started to oppose and blaspheme against the preaching of Paul. With the very same Gospel that the Jews had rejected, God sent Paul and Barnabas to preach to the Gentiles. Many Gentiles were soon converted. But there were some Judean Jewish believers who later went to the city of Antioch and taught the Christian Gentiles that "*unless you are circumcised according to the custom of Moses, you cannot be saved*" (Act 15:1). This caused Paul and Barnabas to have a heated dispute

## PROPHETIC\*REVELATION

and debate with them but those believers would not accept the words of Paul and Barnabas as final. So, together with some other believers, Paul and Barnabas were sent to Jerusalem to get the final answers from the Apostles and Elders there.

Notice that, at that juncture, Paul was just a Prophet and Teacher in the ministry of the Lord Jesus (cf. Act 13:1). That's why whatever truths he said on the subject was literally by-passed. The Christians would only accept the answer from the Apostles in Jerusalem. Paul was humble enough to accommodate to their wishes. So he went on to see the Apostles.

In Jerusalem, some converts from the Pharisaical sect also believed that the Gentile Christians needed to be circumcised. When Paul, Barnabas and those men with them arrived at Jerusalem, they met with the Apostles and the Elders and gave them the report.

*ACT 15:6 - So the apostles and elders came together to consider this matter.*

The matter was much disputed at the council meeting. Opinions were offered until finally James, the brother of our Lord Jesus, stood up to give his proposal of what he thought was the best answer:

*ACT 15:19 - Wherefore my sentence is, that we trouble not them, which from among the Gentiles are turned to God:*

*20 - But that we write unto them, that they abstain from pollutions of idols, and from fornication, and from things strangled, and from blood.*

Looking at this, let us remember that, the 11 Apostles were once disciples of the Lord Jesus Christ during His 3½-year ministry. They walked with Him. They ate with Him. They learned from Him. Besides these 11 disciples, there were many others. Some of these disciples were later called into the Apostolic ministry. The James who gave his final judgment on the issue was the brother of our Lord Jesus Christ. He was not one of the original twelve disciples. He, not Peter, was believed by many to be the head of the Church in Jerusalem. Anyway, all these men were either disciples of Christ when He was alive or after His death. And all were called into the Ministry of our Lord. However, they were also religious. Here, in this passage of Acts, is recorded the mind of the disciples who were anointed with the Holy Spirit, on or after the Day of Pentecost, and ordained as Apostles or elected to the office of an Elder. The record shows that they were still just as religious, holding on to the laws of Moses, in one way or another. One would expect Peter, the big fisherman, at least to know what the Lord had taught concerning the work of Grace and speak up truthfully under the leadership of the Holy Spirit. He didn't; neither did any of the others who had walked with Christ, nor even James and John, the sons of Thunders.

## FROM THE WEBSITE...

The final proposal, delivered by James, showed the religiousness of their mind. They were still holding on to the law of Moses to a certain extent. Though they finally decided not to force the law of circumcision upon the Gentile converts, giving the reason that it was a Jewish rite, would they still have it imposed on a believing Jew who, per chance, happened to be uncircumcised?

With the law of circumcision aside, James said: *But that we write unto them, that they abstain from pollutions of idols, and from fornication, and from things strangled, and from blood.* If the law of circumcision was not applicable, why impose some other laws? Some Christians feel that the Gentile believers must be taught those things because they did not know nor worship the True God of Israel. They were idol worshippers, fornicators and blood eaters. Given that the Gentiles were such characters, but to whom were the laws of God, through Moses, first given? Was it not to the Jews and not the Gentiles? Therefore, were not such laws, given repeatedly to the Jews throughout the different generations, applicable to them because that among them were idol worshippers, fornicators and blood eaters? But why these three particular laws? Why not others?

No doubt the Spirit of the Lord have this record written down for a good example of how a person could be converted from a certain religious faith and its system into the Gospel of Grace, yet his religious mind would still hold on to some of the former beliefs. Is it not true that we could convert a man out of the world but that it is hard to rid the world out of the man? Likewise, the same is true with the Apostles and the Elders. They were once believers of the Law of Moses and the prophets, but were converted to the Gospel of Grace, and yet they still held on to (some of) the Law.

Yes, I believe that the Lord is guiding them just as He promised He would — *“But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you”* (Jhn.14:26).

Throughout the Bible, we are shown that God always revealed Himself to individuals. He worked with individuals. The Apostles knew that. They themselves were individually dealt with by their Master when He was with them. But the Apostles, as human as they were, sometimes let their feelings and passions get the better of themselves. And this was a case in point. Instead of individually seeking the Lord, they met with the Elders and together convened a council meeting. Perhaps they did that because of the pressure from the believers who sought for the consensus of all the Apostles and the Elders at “their headquarters in Jerusalem”. And this is what we see today in Christendom, wherever and whatever the “headquarters” are. Christians would look for a consensus and treat that consensus as an absolute. And, of course, the larger the group (of theologians,

## PROPHETIC\*REVELATION

preachers, believers), the consensus would appear to be absolutely and theologically correct.

God never worked with a group. He never will. On the revelation of the Word, no council of Christians that was ever convened had obtained the Perfect Will and true blessing of the Lord. All they have was a collective agreement among themselves, with only the Permissive Will of the Lord — *“For it seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things”* (Act 15:28).

If all the Apostles at Jerusalem had individually sought the Lord diligently regarding the issue facing them, they would all have an answer from the Lord, by His Spirit. God might reveal to one or two persons. Then there might come a confirmation by a prophecy or a word of knowledge. The Apostles should not have rushed into the issue seeing that it concerned the Mind of the Lord, the revelation of His Truth. Instead they set down quickly together with the Elders and held a council. Surely in a multitude of “counselors” there would be dispute and debate over an issue. The council had much dispute over the issue in question before they came to an agreement. It was an agreement based on religious feeling concerning the law, which was spiritual. However, it was not based on a spiritual revelation because the opinions of the flesh were involved. The carnal mind is always at enmity with God.

Well, a letter was written and addressed to the Gentile believers through Paul, Barnabas, Barsabas and Silas, that *“That ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication: from which if ye keep yourselves, ye shall do well. Fare ye well”* (Act 15:29).

Remember that Paul, Barnabas, Barsabas and Silas were prophets and teachers in the Ministry of Christ at that point in time. They were not Apostles nor Elders of the Jerusalem Church. Hence, they were obviously not a part of the council of Apostles and Elders who sent them to the Gentile believers with a letter of the council’s decision on the matter of circumcision.

I believe that though Paul was in agreement with the answer given on the matter of circumcision, he was certainly not in favour of the enforcement of the laws upon the Gentile believers. But Paul held his peace. He respected the decision of the Apostles and the Elders of Jerusalem. He was an anointed man with the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of God. He believed that God would reveal His Truth progressively to take His saints *“from glory to glory”* into perfection (cf. 2 Cor.3:18; Heb.6:1-3; Eph.4:11-16).

Concerning the Christian life, Paul had a clear revelation that it was contrary to Grace to subject a believer to the Law. This is clear from the message of his epistles. He also knew that they were those

## FROM THE WEBSITE...

who were either confused or had extreme opinion concerning the keeping of the Law. But he approached it with grace and understanding against those without such knowledge of the truth as he had.

The Jewish nation, as a whole, had become set in their religious traditional faith that they could not see the Messianic Gospel. The Lord then sent Paul to the Gentiles with the Gospel. Paul was specially used by the Lord. As Paul's ministry grew, he identified himself as an Apostle by the will of God — *"Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God, according to the promise of life which is in Christ Jesus"* (2 Tim. 1:1). Much later the other Apostles finally recognized Paul as one of them, but one with a far deeper revelation of the Word (2 Pet. 3:15-17).

Now, let us look at Paul's revelation on the subject in question.

1CO 8:1 - *Now as touching things offered unto idols, we know that we all have knowledge. Knowledge puffeth up, but charity edifieth.*

2 - *And if any man think that he knoweth any thing, he knoweth nothing yet as he ought to know.*

3 - *But if any man love God, the same is known of him.*

4 - *As concerning therefore the eating of those things that are offered in sacrifice unto idols, we know that an idol is nothing in the world, and that there is none other God but one.*

5 - *For though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or in earth, (as there be gods many, and lords many,)*

6 - *But to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him.*

7 - *Howbeit there is not in every man that knowledge: for some with conscience of the idol unto this hour eat it as a thing offered unto an idol; and their conscience being weak is defiled.*

8 - *But meat commendeth us not to God: for neither, if we eat, are we the better; neither, if we eat not, are we the worse.*

9 - *But take heed lest by any means this liberty of yours become a stumbling block to them that are weak.*

10 - *For if any man see thee which hast knowledge sit at meat in the idol's temple, shall not the conscience of him which is weak be emboldened to eat those things which are offered to idols;*

11 - *And through thy knowledge shall the weak brother perish, for whom Christ died?*

12 - *But when ye sin so against the brethren, and wound their weak conscience, ye sin against Christ.*

13 - *Wherefore, if meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to offend.*



## PROPHETIC\*REVELATION

Idol is nothing, but many converts who are new in the Faith may not think so. Being accustomed all their life to the idea that an idol is a god (something real), such converts think that, if they eat the food offered to an idol it means eating it as a thing offered to something that is real. And because their conscience is weak, they feel defiled.

Food does not bring us closer to God, whether or not we eat them. It does not make us any better nor does it make us any worse. It is how we exercise our freedom in the things we do that we do not become a stumbling block to the weak.

Paul further warns that if a weak brother sees a believer, who has the knowledge, sits and eats in an idol's temple, he will be upset and confused in his mind and his conscience weakened, perhaps his faith may even be destroyed. In such case the offending believer is deemed to have sinned against the Lord.

In exercising our liberty we must remember never to offend a weaker brother. Our liberty must not be taken for granted such that we make ourselves stumbling blocks to others. Paul even said that if eating meat offends a brother, he would be careful never to eat meat again to offend him.

In the same epistle, Paul also brought up the issue of an idol and food offered to it. He warned the believers not to commit the same mistake as Israel did. Under the mighty hand of God Israel went out of Egypt. They tasted the many blessings of God throughout their journey. But they tempted the Lord several times and were dealt with accordingly. At Horeb, their craving for food caused them to commit spiritual fornication with a golden calf and to eat food offered to it (Ex.32). Paul asked:

*1CO 10:19 - What say I then? that the idol is any thing, or that which is offered in sacrifice to idols is any thing?*

*20 - But I say, that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God: and I would not that ye should have fellowship with devils.*

*21 - Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils: ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table, and of the table of devils.*

*22 - Do we provoke the Lord to jealousy? are we stronger than he?*

Obviously the answer to both parts of Paul's question (v.19) is — nothing. However, Paul pointed out a fact that the sacrifices of pagans are offered to demons, not to God, adding *"I would not that ye should have fellowship with devils"*. Now, this remark, together with the statement of verse 21, has been taken by some Christians to mean that Paul was saying that a Christian is forbidden to eat food offered to idols. On the contrary, Paul was saying that he did not want believers to have fellowship with demons. (The cup signifies what is

## FROM THE WEBSITE...

offered and the table signifies a place of fellowship.) Israel did just that. They had drank of the spiritual blessings of God and ate from the table spread out for them in the wilderness. But at Horeb they made and worshipped a gold-molded calf. They worshipped it and offered sacrifice to it, and then sat down and ate the sacrifice. Israel had committed spiritual fornication by worshipping the idol (as the god who brought them out of Egypt); thus, fellowshiping with demons. Read Exodus 32.

With that Paul once again brought up the care of another person's well-being. A believer should realize that not all things are helpful and beneficial even if they are lawful.

1CO 10:23 - *All things are lawful for me, but all things are not expedient: all things are lawful for me, but all things edify not.*

24 - *Let no man seek his own, but every man another's wealth.*

Now, Paul gave the very best advice possible concerning food:

1CO 10:25 - *Whatsoever is sold in the shambles, that eat, asking no question for conscience sake:*

Eat whatever food you want that is sold in the market without asking any question for conscience' sake. If this is the true advice of an Apostle of the Lord, then the eating of anything — any food which the dietary law of Moses forbids in Leviticus 11, including blood, is not contrary to the Christian faith. If conscience troubles you about eating certain food, then avoid eating them. Otherwise, as Paul said: *"Happy is he that condemneth not himself in that thing which he alloweth. And he that doubteth is damned if he eat, because he eateth not of faith: for whatsoever is not of faith is sin"* (Rom. 14:22b-23).

1CO 10:26 - *For the earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof.*

Some Christians may yet argue and exclaim, *"But the blood is life! Life is in the blood!"*

True, but what has that to do with the faith and the walk of a Christian?

*"Oh, because Jesus shed His blood for our sins!"*

True, but what has that to do with the eating of animal blood?

*"Because if we eat the blood of animal, we are not respecting the Blood of Christ."*

Untrue. This is one strange presumptuous teaching I have ever come across. There is no such teaching in the Scriptures. The whole argument against the eating of blood in the New Testament is the "law" which was first put forth to the Gentile believers by the Jerusalem council.

## PROPHETIC\*REVELATION

Why was the blood of animal an issue in the Old Testament? Recall the Fall in the Garden of Eden. The blood of an animal was involved in the Fall. That animal was the Serpent. The Devil, through the Serpent, had not only brought chaos upon mankind but also upon the animal kingdom. Hence, the sacrificing of innocent animals by the hand of the Lord to clothe Adam and his wife. An animal was sacrificed, blood was shed and a life was taken just so that its skin could clothe the Man. Another animal also faced the same fate to clothe the Woman.

However, it was not the skin covering that was an atonement for sin, rather it was the shedding of blood (Heb.9:22). The skin was only a covering for the nakedness which man became aware of when he fell short of the glory of God. But the skin speaks of the life of an innocent animal given up that man might “live” in the eyes of God. Not only was animals sacrificed to appease the wrath of God, but they were also eaten. Therefore, it proves to be true that through an animal (the Serpent) death had struck the body of man by the intermingling of blood (in fornication). The body of man began to die (Gen.2:17; 3:4). Hence, animals have to die to “compensate” the dying body of man that he might “live” — literally as food for his body. It was in both these lines of thoughts – the blood and the life – that God forbade the eating of blood under the Law which He gave to Israel, His covenant people. By the Law, Israel was constantly reminded of the blood issue in the Fall of Mankind and the requirement of the shedding of blood of an innocent life for the propitiation of sin (Lev.17:14; Deut.12:23; 1 Jhn.2:2; 4:10). Hence, the life is in the blood — our soul hangs upon the Life of God which was in the Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Finally, examine this next verse:

*1CO 10:27 - If any of them that believe not bid you to a feast, and ye be disposed to go; whatsoever is set before you, eat, asking no question for conscience sake.*

The word “feast” is “festival” and not a meal at a lunch or dinner table as a number of Bible translators have erroneously translated it. Here Paul is saying that if an unbeliever compels you to his pagan festival feast, and you desire to go, just eat whatever is laid on the table before you, without asking question for the sake of conscience. And since it is a pagan feast, the food on the table is likely to include blood cooked in some form. So, if you eat without asking question, you just might be eating blood.

*1CO 10:28 - But if any man say unto you, This is offered in sacrifice unto idols, eat not for his sake that shewed it, and for conscience sake: for the earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof:*

## FROM THE WEBSITE...

29 - *Conscience, I say, not thine own, but of the other: for why is my liberty judged of another man's conscience?*

30 - *For if I by grace be a partaker, why am I evil spoken of for that for which I give thanks?*

31 - *Whether therefore ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God.*

32 - *Give none offence, neither to the Jews, nor to the Gentiles, nor to the church of God:*

33 - *Even as I please all men in all things, not seeking mine own profit, but the profit of many, that they may be saved.*

From the concluding text of Paul, we can see that it's not what we eat, as is also evident by Paul's epistle to the Romans (chapter 14). But it's how we use our liberty without becoming stumbling blocks to those around us, believer or unbeliever, who are without the true knowledge of the Word and are uninformed concerning the Truth.

ROM 14:1 - *Him that is weak in the faith receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations.*

2 - *For one believeth that he may eat all things: another, who is weak, eateth herbs.*

3 - *Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not; and let not him which eateth not judge him that eateth: for God hath received him.*

4 - *Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth. Yea, he shall be holden up: for God is able to make him stand.*

5 - *One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind.*

6 - *He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it. He that eateth, eateth to the Lord, for he giveth God thanks; and he that eateth not, to the Lord he eateth not, and giveth God thanks.*

7 - *For none of us liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself.*

8 - *For whether we live, we live unto the Lord; and whether we die, we die unto the Lord: whether we live therefore, or die, we are the Lord's.*

9 - *For to this end Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living.*

.....

20 - *For meat destroy not the work of God. All things indeed are pure; but it is evil for that man who eateth with offence.*

21 - *It is good neither to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor any thing whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak.*

## PROPHETIC\*REVELATION

22 - *Hast thou faith? have it to thyself before God. Happy is he that condemneth not himself in that thing which he alloweth.*

23 - *And he that doubteth is damned if he eat, because he eateth not of faith: for whatsoever is not of faith is sin.*

In conclusion, as Bible believers living under the Grace of the Lord, we know that we are not under bondage to the Law but to the Spirit of the Living God. Therefore, "if we live in the Spirit, let us also walk in the Spirit" (Gal.5:25) to the glory of the Lord Jesus Christ.

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

### **A second set of Seven Seals?**

For some years now there's been another strange teaching propagated by some Branhamites. They alleged that William Branham actually taught that there were 2 sets of "SEALS" in the Book of Revelation — one set on the inside and the other on the outside. I find it hard to follow their arguments which come with dozens of the quotes of the prophet. One group makes the 7 Thunders as the SECOND SET of SEALS which, according to them, were revealed in 1963. With that they claim that the Rapture has taken place. Another group teaches that the "little book" of Rev.10:2 is not the one in Rev.5:1; and that each of these two books has 7 Seals on it. Many quotes, taken from different sermons of the prophet, are used to force-fit their so-called revelation.

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

**Many Endtime Message followers are actually brainwashed by so-called Endtime Message preachers and by fear into believing that unless they believe the words exactly as spoken by the Prophet Branham on his tapes, or The Spoken Word books, they are not an elect and therefore will never make it into the Rapture.**

**To repeat what Branham said REGARDLESS of the Sacred Scriptures is to spit in the Face of the Lord Jesus Christ.**

## Of Man's and Woman's Garments

*The woman shall not wear that which pertaineth unto a man, neither shall a man put on a woman's garment: for all that do so are abomination unto the LORD thy God. (Deut.22:5)*

*In like manner also, that women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamefacedness and sobriety; not with broided hair, or gold, or pearls, or costly array; (1Tim.2:9)*

Christians are expected to dress right in the sight of God and man. No doubt it is not a difficult thing for the men to dress right. But for the women there seems to be *just a little problem* — just what constitutes a “*modest apparel*” and what apparel constitutes “*that which pertaineth unto a man*”.

There have been much “force” put upon Asian believers to conform to a Western Christian standard of attires. Because of this, Asian ministers blindly passed the instructions to their flocks and instructed the men to wear “shirt and trousers” and the women to wear “blouse and skirt”. Anything other than these are an abomination to the Lord.

Is that so?

Several years ago, a German minister came here and after a meeting he came up to me and said, “*Bro. Gan, your mother-in-law is wearing a man's garment.*” [See her photo on the right.]

I said, “*Is that so?*”

He replied, “*Yes, she is wearing trousers.*”

I asked him, “*Would you like to dress exactly like her? Could you dress like her?*”

He smiled bewilderedly. I said to him, “*What she is wearing is a woman's garment, not a man's. It's called the samfoo.*”

“*But it's trousers that she's wearing!*” he adamantly retorted. Like many believers, he was looking only at the trousers.

Ha!...trousers! A word that almost every Message believer associates with a man's pants; and pants is a man's trousers! How silly! It is the Western mind (especially the American's, pardon my saying so, but it is a fact) that knows only things occidental or American. It is a mind that is so narrow, thinking that everything that is practiced by the American Christians is “Christian and Biblical” and is good, and therefore should be taught and adhered to by all other races of Christians. God forbid! Does Christianity originate from the West?



**TROUSERS**

The word “trousers” simply means “a piece of cloth made to wrap around each individual leg of a person, usually worn under a garment”. In English the word “trousers,” when it first appears, was used to describe the leg-garments of the Irish, who wore their breeches or trunk-hose and stockings in one piece, a custom seen in the 17th-century. Trousers or trousers-like garments are called by different names in different countries. The Scots call it *breeks* or *trews* and the Dutch call it *broek*. You may have heard of *chaps*, *knickers* and *breeches*.



Since ancient Chinese time, the trousers or trousers-like garments were worn by both the men and the women, even when they were toddlers. The garments were tailored more like pajamas than the trousers we know today. But what “*pertaineth unto a man*” and what was truly a “woman’s garment” was the difference in the tunic — a garment that covers the top part of the body down to the hips, thighs or legs. It was the design, the colour and the pattern on that piece of garment that determined whether it was a man’s or woman’s attire. Look at the photo on the right and compare the *samfoo* the man is wearing with that of my mother-in-law’s. The man’s had a bold design and pattern, and was usually of a single solid color. The woman’s had a softer color. A wealthy woman’s *samfoo* may have a soft lacy design, or several decorative colors or just a plain soft color like pink or orange.



The two pieces made up a *samfoo*. They were never designed to cling to the body to show the human form.



The trousers that the Western women wear today is not the kind that the ancient Asian women wore. The American moral deteriorated fast after WWII. It was common to hear American husbands say, “*My wife wears the pants/trousers at home,*” meaning that the wife is the boss of the home. It is also true and very common for many American women, even

Christians, to wear the trousers, a garment that their pioneering ancestors did not wear. What’s more, they took the blue jeans and wore them and then slowly altered them to hug their female form. From that time on, the so-called “female pants” were changing ever so often to suit the taste of women’s fashion. Such changes and alterations do not justify it being a woman’s attire. It is done to either make a woman look sexy or powerful (like a man). (See advertisement poster and pantsuit models on the right.)



## FROM THE WEBSITE...

From the West the designs of the sexy looking, tight fitting pants were carried to the East, and soon the simple samfoo was influenced by the western trousers' designs. The legs of the trousers were cut



narrower and tighter like the jeans and modern slacks of the American women. Look at the picture on the left (taken in the 1960s). The woman on the left of the picture wore a floral-patterned *samfoo*. Compare that with the one worn by my mother-in-law. You will notice that the sleeves had been cut back (an influence by the West) and the tunic was not as long. Notice the two women on the right in the same picture. Both wore a corrupt form of the *samfoo*. The trousers legs were cut narrower and tapered to the ankles. The women were even wearing high-heeled shoes to make themselves taller and “leggy” (again an influence by the West). As a whole, the dress style of the two women is comparable to many of the seductive and outrageous garments worn by today's youth.

Now look at the pictures on the right. Can anyone disagree that a proper *samfoo* is a “modest apparel”? Then compare the *samfoo* with the “T-shirt and jeans”, the “shirt and trousers” or the office “pantsuit” that women wear today. The *samfoo* is originally a woman's apparel, the “T-shirt and jeans” and the “shirt and trousers” are originally man's. The women who wear them corrupt themselves by wanting to be equal with the men. More so, when they power-dress in “pantsuit”. Beside such corruption, an impure woman will dress extravagantly (either “blouse and skirt” or “shirt and trousers”) and adorned herself with jewelry, simply because such attire fittingly represents her internal pride and seductive desires. But a “born again” woman will dress with simplicity and modesty, without jewelry, simply because such apparel fittingly represents her internal humility and purity.



Besides the Chinese women, many other Asian women, like those in Indo-China and India, had since ancient time wore trousers too.



Unlike the *samfoo*, many have a much longer tunic that covers the thighs or the legs. The common skirt of today was not a garment known to the Asian women until the occidentals brought them over to the East. When they did, many traditional garments were even fashioned to display a Western look. For example, instead of the usual tunic, a skirt-like garment is worn covering the trousers. Look at the first picture on the next page. Many northern Indian women still wear the simple colorful traditional Punjabi dress, a garment consisting of a pair of trousers



and a long tunic as opposed to the sophisticated modern versions seen in the picture on the far right.

I have heard of “horror tales” from some believers in India how that the believing sisters had to dispose of their Punjabi dress because some Caucasian ministers insisted that they were wearing man’s garments because they were wearing a pair of trousers! (Again, they were looking at “trousers”.) It seems that that was all the ministers knew about garments.



Also, I have heard how some American believers would want to “convert” all woman believers in Asia, especially the Chinese, into wearing skirts! (A word of advise: “convert” them only if they are wearing the so-called “women’s trousers” made popular by the American women.)

Any spiritual Christian could see the modesty in such a traditional dress as the *samfoo*, the *ao dai* or the Punjabi dress. But the foolish Branhamites could only quote Branham and say what he said – about trousers being a man’s garment! (Is the culottes trousers?) Tell me, if you have wisdom, what TROUSERS was Bro. Branham referring to?

**SKIRT**

Now, does the wearing of skirt make a Christian woman Christian? Is that the only type of garment to be worn by Christian women? Is the skirt truly a woman’s garment? Or is it just the American Christians’ dogmatic idea that it is? They should compare their modern designing styles with that worn by the Amish women. Many of today’s blouses and skirts are tight fitting and body hugging, emphasizing the female form. There are blouses that have low neckline and skirts that do not cover the knees.



Do you know that the early European men wore skirts? Look at the picture on the left. Is there a distinct difference that sets the man’s apparel apart from the woman’s?



Have you ever seen a man in the present days wear a skirt? You may say, “Yes, the Scots wear kilts, but they wear them only on special occasions.”

Really? But is not a *kilt* a skirt? If it is so, then the wearing of such an apparel would be an abomination to God. Then again, is it really?



## FROM THE WEBSITE...

What about the man in the picture on the right? He is from Bhutan and he is wearing a skirt. Must a Bhutan Christian man put away his traditional wear and put on the Western type trousers? Think seriously and Biblically less you be wise in your own conceit. Must Asian Christians dress like American "Message Believing" Christians in order to be True Bible Believers?



Now, let me relate another incident. This one involved an American minister who came to Singapore a few years ago. Shopping at the supermarket one day, he suddenly turned and whispered, "Bro. Gan, there's a man wearing a woman's garment."

Turning towards the direction he was facing, I saw an Indian man wearing a shirt and a "skirt-like" garment which we call a *sarong*. I said to him, "That's not a woman's garment. That's a man's."

"How is that so?" he asked. Well, at least he asked. I told him that I will answer him later. And I did, as you can see from the photo taken on the right.

A demonstration is worth a thousand words. I requested an Indian minister and his wife to put on the Malaysian traditional apparels, and I put on one too. I asked the American minister to take a closer look at our apparels and to notice the differences. Can you tell the difference between a man's and a woman's *sarong*?



Like the skirt worn by the Bhutan man, the *sarong* worn by man is striped or checked. (It can even be plain white which is worn commonly by the men of India.) The woman's, however, is not so. Theirs are printed with flowers and beautiful patterns. If a man were to wear that feminine *sarong*, he would have committed an abominable act because he had "put on a woman's garment".

Notice how casually dressed the Indian minister and myself were with just an undergarment for our top. However, to go outside in public, a shirt is usually worn with the *sarong*. (I wore *sarong* since I was a youth. To go out in public, shirt and trousers are more appropriate for me, being a Chinese since most Chinese men rarely wore the *sarong*.)



## PARADOX

The German minister presumed that my mother-in-law was wearing a man's garment because she had on a pair of "trousers". The American minister thought that a man's *sarong*

was a woman's "skirt". These two ministers did not have the slightest inkling about the oriental garments, since they judged the oriental apparels by the present standard of the occidental's. I wonder how many more are like them.

A word to the wise and to fellow Bible believers of the Lord Jesus Christ in the Western world — do not force your Western Christian cultures, traditions and values upon the Asian Christians and think to change them. Different races have different norms. Upon greeting, one may shake a believer's hand, a brother may hug another brother and yet another may "kowitz" to his fellow brother. Christians should distinguish between racial and pagan customs and traditions, and keep away from paganism. Some racial customs and traditions may be offensive, of these we also avoid. Whatever is etiquettely correct is proper. Whatever is proper has its place in the Scriptures. Whatever is truly Scriptural would be found in every race of Christian people — be they white, yellow, brown or black.



Do you believe that the apostle Paul understood what Deuteronomy 22:5 actually speaks about? If so, do you think he forbade the believing men of Rome and Greece from wearing skirts? If not, why not? The answer is obvious. Just look at the pictures here. The Romans and the Greeks had almost similar styles. (Note: To the Romans only barbarians wore trousers.)

The great apostle Paul never sought to change the customs and traditions of the Christians of other races. Neither did the other apostles. The teachings of the apostles are clear — that man is to be as

man and woman is to be as woman. The man is the head of the wife and therefore his hair is to be cut short. The woman is to be subjected to the husband and therefore her hair is to be kept long (cf. 1Cor. 11:14,15). As to apparel, the advice is to *"dress modestly, with decency and propriety, not with braided hair or gold or pearls or expensive clothes"* (1Tim.2:9, NIV cf. 1Pet.3:3). There is nothing mention of trousers and skirt. Not even Deuteronomy 22:5 speaks of them, only of GARMENTS as a whole, clothes that affirm the gender identity — that which has been prepared solely for man and that which has been prepared solely for woman. Amen!



## FROM THE WEBSITE...

\*\*\*

In writing the preceding article, I expected brickbats from some readers of the article. No sooner was it posted (on the WWW), I saw this post on <http://forums.delphiforums.com/mp3message/messages> -

*From:*

*ASDFG252*

*Nov-23 9:34 am*

*To:*

*SAMSPANGLER*

*Bro. Sam*

*I happened to notice an addition that Bro. Gan put on his website and I was utterly shocked to see where this Message is going to.*

*I realize that doctrine can be so elevated that it can have a person run around in circles from those who attempt to confuse but a woman wearing trousers???*

*When you do the "reasoning", and you figure in the "cultures" his doctrine promotes uncertainty and tries to override the Prophet.*

*I saw some of the emails you sent him ( posted on his web page) and if you have the time perhaps you can explain how this new revelation is in line with the Prophet.*

*Lord Bless*

\*\*\*

This message believer knows next to nothing about God's Word. Just read what he said. Notice his mind is centered on "trousers". As I have written above, this word is all that most western minds seem to associate with only the man's garments, and as long as a woman has her legs in two "fabric tubes", she sins.

What does the man know about "reasoning"? Nothing. He thinks "reasoning" with the wisdom of God is bad, and all he has is his own "reasoning" about the message of the prophet...the prophet...the prophet... Beyond that he has no knowledge of the teachings of the Lord Jesus Christ. My bet is that this person is either an American or European. If he is not, then he must have been "westernized" by the American culture and tradition. Men like him, if he is made a missionary to Asia, would definitely seek to get all believing women to forsake the wearing of their traditional garments to wearing the American skirts (perhaps, the Amish way, if he is a fanatic).

This person took a potshot at me in support of the accusation put out by another Forum chatter about me being an "8th messenger". The following is his post:

## PROPHETIC\*REVELATION

From:  
LOGOS103  
Nov-23 4:18 am  
To:  
SAMSPANGLER

Dear brother SANSPANKLER.

You see, if you ask the pope: "Are you the anti-christ?", he surely will answer: "NO, not at all". See, nobody will answer "yes", because the answer will be too stupid.

So Richard Gan says: "I am not the eighth messenger". But, is it so? Give just a look to his "fruit" (his teaching) and anybody that has a little revelation of the Message will quickly recognize that the man is presenting himself as one with a "worldwide ministry" needed for the Bride. See?

Now, if Gan does not believe he has a "special ministry", then why he has a web site full of his books and teachings on doctrines? Why? Is it not enough, or is it maybe not clear the doctrine preached by the "seventh" messenger? Do we need more doctrines, more Bible revelations, more truth to be revealed, more Bible interpretations, beside that brought to us by the prophet of God for our age?

Why instead of promoting the "Message" Gan promotes "his own" teachings? Why? What is the "reason" he has behind for doing so?

And why is he against the Church Age Book, telling that the book is not of Brother Branham, when MANY TIMES Brother Branham tells that it is "his" book? You know why? BECAUSE THE CHURCH AGE BOOK "DESTROYS" Gan's teachings.

For any genuine believers the Church Age Book is the BACKBONE of the entire Message. Once you remove that Book, you have removed the Best Teaching of Brother Branham. And R. Gan is doing exactly just that.

Any believer that knows really the Message in Its entire revelation, if he then reads the books of R. Gan he will quickly recognize that this man is just presenting "his own ministry", and that his teachings are just "dead stinking theology". That's all. R. Gan says: "How can LOGOS103 tells that of me, if he does not know me?". Well, LOGOS103 have read his books and doctrines in his web site. Is not that enough? Plus, some time ago LOGOS103 had a e-mail correspondence with Gan and Gan quickly called LOGOS103 a "branhamite", only because LOGOS103 was pointing him the Message brought by Bro. Branham. Is not this enough to judge the "spirit" of R. Gan?

Plus, LOGOS103 have heard from many witnesses, even from Singapore itself, that the teaching of R. Gan in many points is in

## FROM THE WEBSITE...

*contradiction with the pure teaching brought by the prophet and his bringing confusion among Message believers.*

*Nevertheless, I advice everyone to find out for himself whether the doctrine of R. Gan is right or not. Compare it with the Message. If in just ONE point it is contrary, then you decide for yourself what to do with R. Gan's doctrine.*

*Of course, if you do NOT KNOW the Message very good, if you do not have the Holy Ghost, you maybe agree with Gan. But if you know the Message, then you will quickly recognize that in that man there is acting a spirit that is not right. I say a "spirit". Maybe the man is a fine man; maybe he is a brother, and a real one. But we have to judge the "spirit", the "teaching", not the man.*

*R. Gan says that many preachers are against him. Surely, it is the "preachers" that mostly check his doctrine, because they have to "watch over the Flock" God have given them.*

*But why R. Gan is putting on Internet his teachings, "influencing" therefore believers that are not from his own church? Why? In this way is not he spreading his teaching to other believers that God HAS NOT given him to take care of? Sure it is.*

*If R. Gan is a minister, then he should be busy to feed the Sheep that are in "his" church. He should be busy to fulfill his "local" ministry. But by putting his teaching on internet, he is teaching OTHER believers, influencing OTHER churches, INVADING other pulpits. And that is WRONG! Than puts his ministry ABOVE the "local" ministry. And that is the "eight messenger spirit". See?*

*For this age we have ONLY ONE ministry that is above the local ministry: the ministry of the prophet-messenger William Marrion Branham. Any other minister that try to put influence ABOVE the "local" ministry, is NICOLAITISM. Read it in the Church Age Book. And Richard Gan is doing just that. Not openly, of course. But by putting in internet his books to the public, he is doing just that. See?*

*Now, why does he teaches his doctrines to the worldwide public believers? Is it to edify "his" church members? No, because for his church members he has his pulpit. Then "for who" are given those teachings in internet? FOR THE BELIEVERS OF "OTHER" CHURCHES! But for other churches God has the "local" ministry.*

*And "who is he" to INVADÉ the pulpit of others message ministers by presenting his teachings to their believers, stealing in this way respect to the "local" ministry and bringing confusion among the believers? Who does that, is not an ANTI-CHRIST spirit? Sure it is an anti-christ spirit.*

*Why does he not put in his web site only the Message of Bro. Branham? Why does he not promote ONLY the Message of Bro.*

## PROPHETIC\*REVELATION

*Branham worldwide, like many other brothers and ministers are doing, included my pastor (see [www.lavocedidio.com](http://www.lavocedidio.com))? Why? You know why? Because Gan believes that those that are presenting ONLY the Message are "branhamites", and he is the one to correct their branhamite doctrine. See, that is the "eighth spirit" ministry.*

*Well, if by presenting the Message and the ministry of the prophet of God makes one a branhamite, then I am very glad to be a branhamite. I prefer to be a branhamite rather than to be a "gan-anite". But the Lord knows if I am a branhamite or one of His beloved children!*

*I could say more, but I think I have said even too much.*

*God bless you.*

\*\*\*

Reading the post, I could not help but feel sorry for the man (LOGOS103). The majority of whites think so much of themselves. Someone once said to me, indirectly: "America produced William Branham and that's why the Branhamites are proud of it." How silly! An Asian brother told me, "Tell the Branhamites that Asia produced the Lord Jesus Christ." I just smiled. America once belonged to the Red Indians, and the early Red Indians were related to the Eskimos and the Eskimos were people who came from across the Bering Strait, from Asia. Bro. Branham had Red Indian blood and he said that the white Americans were the renegades. I am not in a fight for racial rights. America has fallen because of her filth, immorality, pride, etc. America is spiritually blind.

Nevertheless, look at the immaturity of the man. He thinks that the Pope himself knows that he is the Antichrist and would therefore deny it when asked. (Did Judas Iscariot know he was "a devil"?) Therefore, he insinuates in the same manner of thinking that I was denying myself being the 8th messenger when asked. It just shows that he is intellectually foolish. It is also apparent that he does not believe in the Ascension Gifts ministry that Christ gave to perfect the Bride (Eph.4). He may say he does but does he know the works the Spirit is doing through those Ascension Gifts of apostles, prophets, evangelist, pastors and teachers? (A Branhamite once told me that the ministers of the 5-Fold Ministry are to feed the sheep of God by teachings from the messages of Bro. Branham.) Like the other man he is also taken up with the words of the prophet...the prophet...the prophet... He can not see beyond William Marrion Branham. Bro. Branham is just too BIG for him to see the Christ, THE WORD of God. He can not see the teachings of the Lord Jesus Christ. Why? Because, like all Branhamites, he thinks Branham brought it all. That's why these people do not know the Bible.

## FROM THE WEBSITE...

Notice how a Branhamite's mind thinks. As I said it is usually not only foolish but very childish and immature. (I highlighted some of his thoughts in **bold**.) He said, "*But by putting his teaching on internet, he is teaching **other** believers, influencing **other** churches, **invading other pulpits**." Adding to that he said it is "**nicolaitism**" unless, of course, I do like he questioned: "*Why does he not put in his web site **only** the Message of Bro. Branham? Why does he not promote **only** the Message of Bro. Branham worldwide, like many other brothers and ministers are doing...?*" So, any website that is not "Branham/Message" in content is an **invader** of churches and the webmaster is a Nicolaitan. (Smile!) I wonder where he got that idea from. Definitely not from the prophet, much less from the Scripture. What's more, to him, such a person who teaches by the revelation of the Spirit must be the 8th messenger. A very presumptuous person indeed! He has no fear of God in committing presumptuous sin. Yet he claims to have the Holy Spirit.*

When such a man mentioned "*witnesses*" he actually meant "*hear-sayers*" — "*Plus, LOGOS103 have heard from many witnesses, even from Singapore itself, that the teaching of R. Gan in many points is in contradiction with the pure teaching brought by the prophet and his bringing confusion among Message believers.*" The Truth here is: I have no close relationship with the Branhamites here in Singapore. My ministry had been under constant attack from them since the beginning (in the 1970s) when they failed to proselyte me and my assembly. As long as Branhamism is lifted up, confusion reigns among the believers of the message. The original BIG message assembly (of more than 100 believers back in the 1970s) had a corrupt minister and ministry. Believers led by some dissatisfied "leaders" in their midst split the assembly. Over a few years the split groups kept splitting till many of the people are no longer around today. There are now only a handful of worshippers. Some stay home on Sundays just listening to the taped messages of the prophet. The majority have returned to the world or to their denominations. What a shame! And why am I blamed as a scapegoat when those people had never associated with me nor had they sat under my ministry? But they certainly have received several strange accusations against me.

Branhamites, wake up! You have all brought a reproach upon the name of William M. Branham and his message!

LOGOS103 may think that having a website full of the messages of Bro. Branham qualifies the person as a believer of the message of Malachi 4:4-6. But hasn't he read in the Scripture of certain people who are full of the prophets and their messages, and yet Jesus Christ CURSED THEM ALL?

The Pharisees, Sadducees, and Scribes of their days were interpreting Abraham, Moses and the prophets according to their traditions and not according to the revelations that were inspired and



## PROPHETIC\*REVELATION

revealed by the Spirit of God. Their revelations were actually contrary to what was taught by those holy men of God themselves. *“We have Moses, we have his messages, we have his laws. Oh, we have also Isaiah, Ezekiel, and all the other ones, too. And on top of that we have Abraham as our father. But you, Jesus, you are an **invader**. You do not teach and quote the way we do from those prophets. You are **invading our pulpits**. You are a Nicolaitan. Away with you, you’re a devil!”*

Jesus answered them, and said, *“My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me. If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself. He that speaketh of himself seeketh his own glory: but he that seeketh his glory that sent him, the same is true, and no unrighteousness is in him. Did not Moses give you the law, and yet none of you keepeth the law? Why go ye about to kill me?”* (John 7:16-19). Jesus even called them vipers, hypocrites, children of the wicked ones and other unpleasant names. He would have nothing to do with them. Likewise, I would have nothing to do with the Branhamites.

Like the Pharisees and the Sadducees this man thinks he is “presenting the Message and the ministry of the prophet of God”. He has no idea that like the Pharisees and the Sadducees he is actually destroying the very Truth of the messages of the prophet when he takes the “letter of the Word” of the message of the 7th angel (cf. 2 Cor.3:6). And like many cocky Branhamites, he is proud to be a member and part of the “Branhamite” lodge like others in Christendom who joined the Wesleyan lodge, Lutheran lodge, Campbellite lodge, etc., and all claiming to have the Holy Spirit. True saints of God do not belong to a lodge, they belong to Christ and Christ knows them as God’s children because they identified with His teachings. Christ does not have any relationship with the Branhamites just as He did not have any relationship with the Pharisees and the Sadducees as God’s children, even though they claimed to have had the message of the prophet Moses. Jesus said, *“Do not think that I will accuse you to the Father: there is one that accuseth you, even Moses, in whom ye trust. For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me; for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?”* (John 5:45-47). See? They claimed Moses but they did not believe his writings, even though they stayed with every word of Moses. If they truly believed Moses, they would have believed the teachings of Christ. The same goes for the Branhamites. They claimed Branham and every word he uttered but they do not really believe his message. If they do, they would have believed the teachings of our Lord Jesus Christ. Such people are extremists in taking Branham’s words as those who are extremists in fighting Branham’s words. Hence, there is one that accuseth them, even Branham, in whom they trust.

## FROM THE WEBSITE...

One more word to the wise. A "Message Forum" site is like any "chat room" on the NET. It is often filled with strange characters whose names are like LOGOS103, MYVIU, ASDFG252, etc. Can one tell whether they are men or women? Some "smart" women might just login to "teach" doctrines. I do not usually visited such sites unless I am sent a link to a post. I have no desire to be a part of the "chatting". It is a place where one will not find the teachings of Christ, rather one will find "intellectual discussion" on the doctrines of Branham and plenty of arguments over his statements. And most who gathered to discuss are Branhamites and if anyone else comes in and says some Truth that offends them, they will sit on him and even ban him from the "chat" (if the host is a Branhamite). Such a place is for the many who do not have the revelation of God concerning His Plan and Purpose for the Bride according to Ephesians 4. A "Message Forum" site is also potentially a Rumor Mill or a Gossip Parlor.

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

[I was given this link to a Forum Page: <http://forums.delphiforums.com/n/nav/start.asp?webtag=Ofek>. It is far from Branhamism.]

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

### **From the Email Box:**

*I can't help but think about the 70 who went out with signs and wonders and served the Lord but when it came to the Word preached they were not able to receive it. Jesus told his disciples that it was given to them to know the mysteries of the Kingdom and that is how I see this situation. These people simply are not "given to know". They have had shepherds that have led them astray in the beginning and they have been lost since. Without the Holy Spirit, they will never find their way back to the fold. So they repeat what they have been taught and lead others astray because often they have a large following. Blind leading the blind. I can only be thankful that God has "given to me to know" that God did not stop revealing His Word when he took his Prophet home. And that he gave his bride a ministry to bring forth that understanding. Like Bro. Sam, I have no problem being one of the "mighty men" that stands for the truth like those who served King David. Watching over God's anointed. I have said in the past, it isn't you as a person, but rather the calling that God has given that we must respect. And that calling has made you the person you are!!! Faithful to His Word! Amen. And you encourage us as well to stay faithful in it.*

*I have gone back and have been reading Bro. Branham's messages on Hebrews. Looking into the scriptures about perfection. I don't think we have caught all that understanding and I think that is why so many have failed in understanding what that "perfect" is. In Hebrews, it speaks of leaving the principles of faith and going on into perfection.*

## PROPHETIC\*REVELATION

*In other words, we don't stop doing them, we just shouldn't still be arguing over them!!! Which seems to be what some are doing. Trying to have some greater revelation, I guess.*

*Thanks for sharing!*

David [USA, 11/25/02]

~~~

I notice your article on garments is making a stir, huh? I like it really. I admit I was not aware of the common (mis)conception. I do know that different cultures wear different clothes. In the Philippines, some ethnic groups wear 'sarong' kind of dress. But 'saya' (skirt) is our cultural dress among women.

I posted your article in the church so the brethren can also get enlightenment. Thanks and God bless.

Jonathan [Philippines, 11/26/02]

~~~~

*I was reading what that fellow had to say about you and your website. I feel bad for him. He had a great deal of cult like ideas. Isn't the Bible the Absolute for God's people? Didn't they go back to the reformation and realize that the Bible being the final authority is the first and foremost revelation of the reformation. It goes for the restoration of the church also. If God has opened up something to us in the bible then if it is consistent we shouldn't be ashamed to testify of it. Bro. Branham said his words would fail, but that God's word (the bible) would never pass away. The bible is the final revelation of God's word, in other words there are no new revelations beyond it. However, the truths contained in scripture must come to fruit in the hearts and minds of believers. Until the Church is raptured the word of truth will be unfolded to her more and more.*

*It's struck me lately that it took me a long time to let the purpose of the message be fulfilled in my life and ever since it did I have had a greater peace. It has revealed Jesus Christ to me, but now I haven't separated that from scripture. It has called me out of denominationalism and the spirits thereof. It has gotten me back to the bible. Before that my heart wasn't turned to the apostolic fathers' faith. My heart was just turned to the sermons of bro. Branham instead of letting the sermons of bro. Branham turn me back to the apostolic fathers' faith. See that subtle difference that the devil had accomplished.*

JD [USA, 12/08/02]

~~~~

Concerning the Bride and the Message...

The word "Bride" in the Bible has been taken too lightly by many Christians. It is true that in every age a message was given to call the elect. But not all who claimed that they believed the message of their respective age were truly members of the Bride. That is the reason we have the different Church Ages because the people organized themselves into denominations after each message was given. The same is true of the Seventh Church Age.

In each age there were some true elect who **followed the light of the message into the Word, and then continued on in the light of the Word as the Spirit led them.** On the other hand those who denominated within the message would die just like those who followed the message of Moses without the leading of the Spirit. Only Caleb and Joshua were the "bride" members who were led by the true faith and went on into the Promised Land.

Now, since we are living in the last Church Age, the ministry of Ephesians chapter 4 must have its fulfillment — because it is a "last day" ministry. Paul's words must be fulfilled. The word "*perfecting*" means "*complete furnishing*". The saints, under the present 5-Fold Ministry, will be shaped and equipped by God thoroughly. This is a continuous process. In Heb.6:1, Paul used the word "*perfection*" to denote its consummation. That's why he said not to "*lay again*". Simply, it means "*don't stay put and go over and over the same things you have learned, but go on until we are completely consummated in Him.*" You must be obedient to the Word after you have heard the message. Bro. Branham himself said that **the FULL WORD would come after Rev.10:7**, not before or during his ministry. Amen.

As you read or hear the words of the prophet, you are encouraged to check out the Scripture. Since the prophet cannot contradict the Word, you have to find the Scripture verses to support your answer you give to every one who asks of your faith. We cannot just say "*Because Bro. Branham said so, I believe.*" The denominationalists can also say the same: "*Everything that is in the Bible, we do believe.*" But what do they believe? See?

Can the message of the messenger, Bro. Branham, perfect the Bride?

The messenger with his message is **only A SIGNPOST which shows the way, A POINTER that points to something!** Did not Bro. Branham say that? Bro. Branham preached many messages, but there is only **ONE MESSAGE** behind them. That is, "**COME BACK TO THE APOSTOLIC FAITH, COME BACK TO THE ABSOLUTE, ETC.**" He never pointed to himself. He never pointed to his own words. **He**

PROPHETIC*REVELATION

always pointed to God and His Word. Therefore, the message cannot perfect anyone. Why? Because only the **SPIRIT** and the **WORD** can do that. 1 Jhn.2:5; Gal.3:3; Eph.4:11-16. And that is where the messenger and his message pointed to. The message tells you where and how you can be perfected.

It is in the WORD that the Spirit of God will take His Own WORD and through the Ascension Gifts (5-Fold Ministry) perfect the members of the Body of Christ. The saints will line up with the Word set in order by the apostles. They will be edified and built up in the faith by those in the prophetic office. Through the working of the evangelists, the Church will be strengthened. Lastly, the saints will be carefully nourished and taught by the pastoral and the tutorial ministries.

As every part of the Body of Christ does it work, these GIFTS will work in the saints until they come to complete maturity and the unity of the faith in the knowledge of Jesus Christ. When they do attain the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ they will no longer be as children so easily tossed and carried about with winds of strange doctrines. And as the love of God permeates every lively stone, the Body of Christ, with Christ being the Head, will be joined and held tightly together with the full expression of love in the whole Body.

“Let us be glad and rejoice, and give honour to him: for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife hath made herself ready.

And to her was granted that she should be arrayed in fine linen, clean and white: for the fine linen is the righteousness of saints.

And he saith unto me, Write, Blessed are they which are called unto the marriage supper of the Lamb. And he saith unto me, These are the true sayings of God.” – Rev.19:7-9

~ ~ ~ ~ ~