

Dear Jacob, David and Marco

3rd September 2018

It is my prayerful desire to respond to your letter of dismissal and numerous posts on social media both by yourselves, Moriel personnel and supporters in a way that both honours our Lord and holds true to the conduct required of believers whilst adequately addressing your numerous accusations regarding my doctrine.

With the exception of my understanding regarding salvation during the Millennium, not once have any of you or for that matter any Moriel administrator, ever expressed concern regarding my doctrine. On the contrary, you have repeatedly asked me to minister either at your conferences Jacob or in the case of Marco, at Community Church of Devore, not to mention the very positive feedback I received from both Margaret Godwin and Pierre Mosley regarding my ministry. Just a week prior to your letter dismissing me from Moriel, Jacob was inviting me to speak with him at the Moriel Northern Conference in March next year. If there were any concerns with my doctrine, they would have had to have surfaced that week as at no time in my entire association with Moriel had any concern ever been expressed with the exception of the issue regarding the Millennium and that only very recently.

Owing to the fact that Moriel holds itself to the highest integrity of obedience to the Word and conducting itself in accordance with it, I am intrigued as to why none of you approached me with your concerns and afforded me the opportunity to address them before making a public judgement which has not only shown me up in an extremely negative light but more importantly has brought much confusion to the brethren.

Since you have brought this out into the public domain and have not followed the biblical pattern of first going to your brother or in the case of a heretic, as some are now calling me, admonish me twice before rejecting me (Titus 3:10), you have left me no choice but to respond in public.

For sake of brevity I respectfully ask you to allow me to address the three of you as a collective. No disrespect is intended at all.

Salvation During The Millennium Reign

In your letter you write that I had agreed to amend my teaching on this subject, then posted that I agreed to retract it completely. Neither of these statements are accurate or correct. When I met with Jacob and David Lister in Los Angeles together with my wife Jacqui, I agreed to clarify my position on the Millennium. I was and am most willing and open to correction if I am shown where I am wrong scripturally. This was what I agreed to and still very much still agree to.

I then asked you, Jacob, to explain to me how you understand this subject as I am very open and willing to be corrected. Your response was less than two minutes long. You made two points. Firstly, you likened the salvation of the Bride to a Midrash of the three stages of the ancient Jewish marriage.

You saw the time between the Marriage Feast of the Lamb (Revelation 19:7-9) and the New Jerusalem descending from Heaven (Revelation 21:9-10) as corresponding to the time between the betrothed couple celebrating their marriage at a wedding feast/banquet and the actual consummation of their marriage. Thus you reasoned that the Millennium Reign corresponds to this time period in which men can be saved as we currently are and become part of the Bride together with us.

Secondly you said that on the night Jesus made the New Covenant that He said that this is the eternal covenant made in His blood, therefore the covenant cannot end even into the Millennium. I diligently searched the scriptures and could not find any place where He said this or anything similar

to what you had said. Perhaps you never realised what you had just said, but both Jacqui and I heard it clearly but even so I will gladly give you the benefit of the doubt, as I too have on occasion not quoted scripture 100% accurately without consciously realising it.

Yet the only mention of the covenant being everlasting in the New Covenant is in Hebrews 13:20 and applies specifically in its context to us in this age.

With your response to my question, I began to ponder very prayerfully my position and even brought the topic up a few weeks later with Marco when we were together in Canada. Both Chris and Jane from Canada recall very vividly while we all sat at their dining room table that I asked them all, including Marco and Rebecca for their understanding on the subject as I was wanting to get clarity before I responded.

Neither Marco nor anyone else disagreed with how I saw things even though I was asking for their critique of my view and any input that would help me see things from Jacob's point of view. Nothing was forthcoming, so I continued to study the subject which is why I had not yet responded. Added to this, I have been ministering extensively since the initial meeting in May and had not gotten round to what I thought was an expounding of my understanding of a rather secondary issue in light of the fact that it has no outworking on any believers salvation or relationship with the Lord in this age.

I am still very willing to change my views if you are graciously able to help me understand the following dilemmas I have with this subject, apart from the ones that you are now very familiar with. No disrespect or contrariness is intended but a sincere desire to learn if I am indeed wrong in my understanding.

In Ezekiel 44:5-9 it is written, *⁵And the Lord said to me, "Son of man, mark well, see with your eyes and hear with your ears, all that I say to you concerning all the ordinances of the house of the Lord and all its laws. **Mark well who may enter the house and all who go out from the sanctuary.** ⁶"Now say to the rebellious, to the house of Israel, 'Thus says the Lord God: "O house of Israel, let Us have no more of all your abominations. ⁷When you brought in foreigners, uncircumcised in heart and uncircumcised in flesh, to be in My sanctuary to defile it—My house—and when you offered My food, the fat and the blood, then they broke My covenant because of all your abominations. ⁸And you have not kept charge of My holy things, but you have set others to keep charge of My sanctuary for you." ⁹Thus says the Lord God: "**No foreigner, uncircumcised in heart or uncircumcised in flesh, shall enter My sanctuary, including any foreigner who is among the children of Israel.**"*

It is clear in the above text that those who are not circumcised in their flesh may not enter the Temple during the Millennium, yet we know from the New Testament that circumcision is not necessary for the Gentiles (1 Corinthians 7:19; Galatians 5:6; Galatians 6:15; Colossians 3:11 etc. etc.).

- Why then, if folk are born again according to the New Covenant in the Millennium, do they need to be circumcised according to the Old at this time?

In Ezekiel 44:10-13 it is written, *"And **the Levites who went far from Me, when Israel went astray, who strayed away from Me after their idols, they shall bear their iniquity.** ¹¹ Yet they shall be ministers in My sanctuary, as gatekeepers of the house and ministers of the house; they shall slay the burnt offering and the sacrifice for the people, and they shall stand before them to minister to them. ¹² Because they ministered to them before their idols and caused the house of Israel to fall into iniquity, **therefore I have raised My hand in an oath against them," says the Lord GOD, "that they shall bear their iniquity.** ¹³ And **they shall not come near Me to minister to Me as priest, nor come near any of My holy things, nor into the Most Holy Place; but they shall bear their shame and their***

abominations which they have committed."

The above passage indicates that the Levites who went astray would never be restored back to the Lord and are forbidden to minister before Him as priests in the Millennium whilst continuing to bear their shame. Yet under the New Covenant our sins are blotted out (Acts 3:19) and remembered no more (Hebrews 8:12 and Hebrews 10:17).

- Why are the memory of these sins then still retained by the Lord?
- If they are priests under the New Covenant at this time, why are they forbidden to minister before the Lord as it seems to contradict 1 Peter 2:4-5 and 9-10?

It is further written in Ezekiel 44:23, *"And they shall teach My people the difference between the holy and the unholy, and cause them to discern between the unclean and the clean."*

- Why, if folk are born again, do they need to be taught to differentiate between the clean and the unclean, if they are not under Law but under the covenant of grace?

Further, it is written in Ezekiel 45:15-17, *"¹⁵And one lamb shall be given from a flock of two hundred, from the rich pastures of Israel. These shall be for grain offerings, burnt offerings, and peace offerings, to make atonement for them," says the Lord God. ¹⁶"All the people of the land shall give this offering for the prince in Israel. ¹⁷Then it shall be the prince's part to give burnt offerings, grain offerings, and drink offerings, at the feasts, the New Moons, the Sabbaths, and at all the appointed seasons of the house of Israel. He shall prepare **the sin offering, the grain offering, the burnt offering, and the peace offerings to make atonement for the house of Israel...."***

- Why does the Lord command that atonement be made for the house of Israel if they are saved by grace and these sacrifices are only memorials and are not meant to atone?
- Why are they not forgiven as we are, through the blood of Jesus and just atoned for?
- Why does the Lord say that the sacrifices are for atonement and nowhere in all scripture as far as I am aware is there any reference to them being merely memorials in the Millennium?

My last question comes from Ezekiel 46:1-3, *Thus says the Lord God: "**The gateway of the inner court that faces toward the east shall be shut the six working days; but on the Sabbath it shall be opened, and on the day of the New Moon it shall be opened.** ² The prince shall enter by way of the vestibule of the gateway from the outside, and stand by the gatepost. The priests shall prepare his burnt offering and his peace offerings. He shall worship at the threshold of the gate. Then he shall go out, but the gate shall not be shut until evening. ³ Likewise **the people of the land shall worship at the entrance to this gateway before the LORD on the Sabbaths and the New Moons.***

I understand that the eastern gate of the temple is holy to the Lord for it is through this gate that He enters the Temple. Under the Old Covenant access to the inner courts of the Temple were restricted to the Levites. Yet under the New Covenant we are encouraged to come boldly into the Holy of Holies through the blood of Jesus (Hebrews 10:19-22) because the veil has been torn. (Matthew 27:51; Hebrew 9:8-9)

- Why in Millennium are believers restricted from entering into the Lord's presence except on the Sabbath and Holy Days?
- It appears that those in the Millennium are subject to restrictions that we are not under. Why the difference if we are both under the same New Covenant and as you affirm are part of the same Bride? Why do they seemingly not enjoy the same benefits we do if we are both under the same covenant?

Your insights and answers will be most welcome as this is all I have sought.

Standing on a Rhema

The next few allegations that have been made all come from a course outline that accompany a series titled Foundation Principles Course or the newer series titled Elementary Principles. It saddened me when I realized that none of you bothered to take the time to even listen to any of these teachings before making your damning accusations and drawing your tainted conclusions before making them public without first ever expressing any concerns to me directly. Had you followed the biblical instruction and come to me first you might never have made some of these allegations.

The word “rhema” according to Thayers Greek dictionary is defined as, “that which is or has been uttered by the living voice, thing spoken, word”. Vines defines rhema, “denotes "that which is spoken, what is uttered in speech or writing"

Hence the context it was used in was that which is spoken to you by God or shown you as you seek Him for wisdom and guidance. Nowhere in the teaching do I ever suggest nor have I ever suggested or intimated that a word give you by God is equal to scripture. This is an assumption that you have made by reading a bullet point summary of a teaching without listening to the content.

You then go on to make a false assumption that I propagate the error of seeking a new word to supersede the written word. I have never suggested or taught anything like this, on the contrary I have stood against this very thing. Yet you made this assumption and made it public without any attempt to verify my position or even listen to the teaching.

I challenge you to listen to the teaching for yourselves and you will see for yourselves that you have falsely accused me of teaching something that I never did or have ever done. Below is the link and you can start listening from the 29th minute. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=egFkJawXhCk>

For the sake of that which is noble and right in the sight of our Lord I hope that you will do what is honourable and listen then judge whether or not you have brought a false accusation against a brother.

Laying on of Hands

Again it is clear that you have not listened to this teaching as you make this accusation and I quote directly, “This very similar to the transferring of anointing found in erroneous charismatics teachings. Exodus 30 teaches us that the anointing cannot be transferred.” And, “Neither can we, (on the basis of Exodus chapter 30 and the absence of exegetical warrant in the New Testament) sanction David's understanding of "laying on of hands",...”

Three times in just one of many places in the teaching, one after the other I repeat the very thing that you have written, “you cannot transfer the anointing”. Yet you accuse me of teaching what I have not taught and indeed teach against and then make a false accusation publically.

Again I invite you to listen to the actual teaching and then you judge whether I have taught what you accuse me of or not and you then decide if you have acted with integrity or not. Here is the link to the teaching,

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-Nt_Sto6FY&list=PL6bQl0na1HX8xkg1yd6KOrKvJPQMs5a_6&index=6

The Baptism of the Holy Spirit

On this I do not offer a defence but an acknowledgement that I have the same understanding on this

subject as Dr Martin Lloyd-Jones, David Pawson and practically every Pentecostal theologian and minister has had with very, very few exceptions.

I have listened to Jacobs teaching that he did in November 2017 at Ainsdale on the subject and feel that it is inconsistent with his own testimony. In the teaching he says that at salvation you receive the Holy Spirit objectively but at some point it then becomes a subjective experience. I have no problem in theory with this.

He cites his own experience in being saved through a cult and then struggling with backsliding for two years before being filled with the Spirit. What made the objective become subjective if not that the Holy Spirit came upon him to empower him to stand. How does this differ from what I teach?

You then take issue with the fact that I wrote that the most obvious signs in the scriptures that someone was filled with the Spirit was that they prophesied and spoke with tongues. I never said it was the only sign but the obvious signs. If you had listened to the actual teaching you would have heard me emphasise over and over again that tongues are not the only sign and that folk can be filled with the Spirit and not speak in tongues. But again you preferred to issue a judgement without seeking to confirm that your accusations were correct.

Here is the link to the teaching if you are wanting to know what I actually teach and believe,
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jhJwHV-Y2ik>

Being Slain in the Spirit

Your entire objection is that and I quote you, "And in these quotes, there is no distinction between "falling" as a physical act, and the actual Greek terms used to denote instances of worship..."

Again you make accusations and assumptions from a very brief bullet point summary on a lengthy teaching without listening to the actual teaching itself and then arrive at a presupposition of what I actually believe and teach.

Charles Wesley, Jonathan Edwards, George Whitefield, Francis Asbury, Charles Finney, George Fox and Dr Martin Lloyd-Jones and a multitude of conservative non-charismatic ministers have since the 1700's from time to time witnessed something akin to being slain in the Spirit.

In my teaching I expose the demonic, the hypnotic counterfeit and the genuine as witnessed by those in scripture.

This subject is covered in the last quarter of the teaching on the Laying on of Hands,
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-Nt_Sto6FY&list=PL6bQl0na1HX8xkg1yd6KOrKvJPQMs5a_6&index=6

Dominion Theology – God Has to Ask Permission to Intervene in This World

I take the blame for this as I had in the past not explained my position clearly enough in course notes that I had written many years ago. I did a teaching expounding my understanding on this as I am 100% against dominion theology.

I welcome your comments on my actual and not perceived views so that if my understanding is incorrect I may receive correction. Here is the teaching that explains my understanding, I will amend the notes to more clearly reflect this and I thank you for bringing it to my attention,
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YE7_LfvjZo&index=1&list=PL6bQl0na1HX89i2D6M4Z_MU8Xjr nQqJmL

In Summary

As a brother and a fellow minister I would have appreciated the opportunity to be corrected if I was indeed in error privately before taking this into the public domain. Unfortunately you have chosen to handle this both unwisely and unbiblically and as a result many have been hurt and confused by all this.

I seek not to defend my reputation for I have none nor care for one but I seek the wellbeing of the flock who are easily unsettled in these turbulent times.

In an instant whether willingly or unwillingly you have undermined everything I have ever taught by your many allegations. To say that somethings I teach are good and the rest bad only leaves people with the question, what is truth and what is error?

That you have caused relationships to be severed by your accusations and my family both saved and unsaved to be severely affected by your accusations is something that I hope you will reflect on and hopefully learn from.

Despite my immense disappointment with the many unfounded accusations you have made and the way you have acted I assure you of my continual love for you all and wish you nothing but God's grace and goodness upon you, your families and your respective ministries.

Till we all come to the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, to a perfect man, to the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ;

David Nathan



Bread of Life Ministries

www.bolm.co.za

info@bolm.co.za



Bread of Life Ministries

"And you shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." John 8:32

