

RON WYATT, HONEST?, OR DECEITFUL FRAUD? #4

Clifton A. Emahiser's Teaching Ministries
1012 N. Vine Street, Fostoria, Ohio 44830
Phone (419)435-2836, Fax (419)435-7571
E-mail caemahiser@sbcglobal.net

Please Feel Free To Copy, But Not To Edit

DANGER, DANGER, DANGER – beware of the venom of Ron Wyatt! Lies are like a cobra's venom, and a cobra can rise up to strike one in the face! Ron Wyatt died August 4, 1999, but wittingly or unwittingly there are others carrying on his evil agenda! BEWARE, BEWARE, BEWARE, the doctrine of Ron Wyatt is the antithesis (opposition) of TWO SEEDLINE TRUTH! After Wyatt's death, Jonathan Gray took up his phony cause, and today Eli James (who claims to be a Two Seedliner) is close on Gray's heels!

Eli James, on Internet Radio interviewed Jonathan Gray May 31, 2009 where Gray stated the following: "The beginning of the story there was a prophecy of the coming Messiah, in fact right there in the book of Genesis, Genesis 3:15. Right from the very start the promise of the coming Messiah was made. ... So once again, as an archaeologist, I'm concerned more and more in my own work ... that you can depend upon the Bible. In fact, there is not one theological discovery that has ever been made that has disproved any Bible statement." Again, James interviewed Gray June 13, 2010, where Gray further stated: "The virgin birth actually proves that Jesus was what He claimed to be, whereas the opponents say that this is a scandal, and Christianity is a fraud ... and I think there are Jewish commentators from the past who say even Genesis 3:15 foretells of a virgin birth ... seed of the woman and not of the man." "... not of the man"? Oh really?

On these two occasions, Eli James had the opportunity to explain to Jonathan Gray that not only was our Messiah prophesied at Genesis 3:15, but that Eve was "the mother of all living (i.e., 'chay')", Gen. 3:20. The implication is that the word seed can be both singular and plural, denoting the Holy Adamic Race collectively. To limit the seed of the woman to one individual, as Gray did in these two instances, is a major misuse of the term! James not only omitted to correct Gray that the seed of the woman was also representative of "many" in nature, but that the seed of the serpent was also collective in the same manner. It is obvious, then, that Ron Wyatt and company didn't teach Two Seedline, but rather took the identical position as the one seedliners and anti-seedliners! This is like going in reverse at full speed.

While one should use caution when consulting Biblical commentaries, Jamieson, Fausset & Brown did quite well (at least in part) in theirs on Gen. 3:15, vol. 1 of 6, page 57:

"... I will put enmity between thee and the woman.' God is often represented as doing that which He permits to be done; and therefore, as it is contrary to His holy and

benevolent character to produce disorder or sow the seeds of dissension amongst any orders of His creatures, the statement here made must be regarded as a prophetic intimation of the moral state of this world, as a theatre of conflict between man and the powers of evil. There is a covert allusion to the temporary alliance between the serpent and the woman, for now that she had found in her dire experience that he had ensnared her to her ruin, she would henceforth recoil from him as an insidious and deadly enemy. **and between thy seed and her seed** [2233 'seed' zera] – the act of sowing, as well as seed, though used in reference to an individual (Gen. iv. 25; xxi. 13), commonly denotes plurality, and is equivalent to children, progeny, posterity (Gen. xiii. 16; xv. 5. 13; xvii. 7. 10; Ps. xxii. 23; cf. 2 Ki. xi. 1). Accordingly Kurtz – though recognizing the prophetic character of this passage – views the phrase 'seed of the woman' as equivalent to all the human [sic Adamic] race; and the modern Jews [sic Canaanite-jews] also take it as meaning collectively the children whom she shall bring forth – the whole family of [Adam]-man. But 'the seed of the woman' being contrasted with 'the seed of the serpent,' a designation, in this context, and conformably to Scripture usage elsewhere, of the wicked portion of mankind (cf. John viii 44; viii. 38, with Matt. xxiii. 33; 1 John iii. 8), the expression must evidently be considered as restricted to the children of God, 'who are born not of the flesh, but of the spirit' (cf. Gal. iii. 29); and from its denoting individuality in the following clause, as specially applied to one whose miraculous birth gave him a pre-eminent title to be called 'the seed of the woman' (cf. Gal. iv. 4). The prophecy points to a continual struggle which would be carried on between the offspring of the woman and the grand enemy of God and man: and no language could more appropriately describe the mighty conflict, of which this world has ever since been the theatre, between the kingdom of God and the kingdom of Satan. To us the words have a higher significance than they could have had to our first parents. Who does not now accept them as an epitomized history of the holy war which, from the moment of the fall, has been waged between the children of light and of darkness, between those who adhere to the cause of God and righteousness, and those who are ranged on the side of the Devil by their love and practice of sin? **It shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel** – [1931 'it' hûw' is a personal pronoun in the masculine gender ... shall watch or lie in wait, so as to attack; to fall upon suddenly (cf. Job ix. 17; Ps. cxxxix. 2; cf. Rom. xvi. 20), and the clause is thus rendered by Gesenius, 'He shall seek to crush thy head, and thou shalt seek to bite his heel']. The leading idea is founded in the habit of the insidious serpent to bite its victim in the heel or behind, and that of mankind striking or dashing at a serpent's head with a club. The same verb is used to describe the attack upon the head and the heel, to show that destruction is aimed at in both: But though the bite of a serpent on the heel of a man; when the poison infects the blood, is dangerous, it is not incurable. The crushing of the serpent's head, however, is destruction. ... The seed of the woman who was to bruise the serpent's head is connected with a singular verb and pronoun, and, denoting therefore an individual, points to Christ personally in a peculiar and emphatic sense. ..."

!!ABSOLUTELY NO DOUBT WYATT WAS LYING!!

After studying this case, it is quite evident to me that there are two camps within the Seventh Day Adventist church, maybe even three. From the content of Adventist Uriah Smith's book *Daniel And The Revelation*, it leaves no question in the reader's

mind that he took a historical view of prophecy. On the other hand, from the evidence which was contributed by Skip Baker on May 31, 2009, when he called into Eli James' Talkshoe on the Internet, Baker stated:

"I just wanted to mention, in the other video tape, if I recall correctly, Ron claimed he videotaped the Ark and had got good pictures of it finally. He goes back to his hotel and got to thinking 'Well what should I do with this?' Then he said, of all things, he would go back and ask the four angels that he had met in the cave. So he goes back and asks them, 'What should I do with this video tape?' They said, 'We'll take it, because God wants it to come out when the mark of the beast happens.' And he said he gave it to them, and they took it with them, although they didn't demand it when he came and asked 'what shall I do with this?' They said, 'We'll take it.' That was a little tidbit I picked up by watching the movie part." This is **futurism**, not **historicism**!

The damning part of this is the sentence: **"We'll take it, because God wants it to come out when the mark of the beast happens."** The "mark of the beast" is already fulfilled history, as explained in detail in part 3 of this series, so either the angels were liars or it was Wyatt who lied about the whole "Christ's blood on the Mercy Seat" and "finding of the Ark of the Covenant" account!

The following is a note that I made at the end of lesson #10 of 14 of Bertrand L. Comparet's series on The Book Of Revelation: Note: It is your humble transcriber's opinion that the *interdict* by the Pope did indeed historically fulfill Revelation 13:16, concerning the *mark*. It should be noted that the total numerical value of "Vicar of Christ" adds up to 666 in Latin. It must be remembered that this is a number relating to a man. At the time John wrote his Revelation, the 10th century Arabic numbers which we use today had not yet been invented. Before the Arabic numeral system, various numerical values were assigned to several letters of the alphabets of different languages. And indeed, VICARIUS FILII DEI (Vicar of Christ) in Roman numerals adds up to 666. There are several instances in which various names of persons can add up to 666, but the man at Revelation 13:11-18 is a two-horned beast. Two-horned because he ruled over governments, both ecclesiastical and civil. And when the history of Revelation 13:11-18 is properly identified, none other but the office of the Pope can qualify. It might parallel in some manner the United Nations *interdict* called "sanctions", in which trade between nations is restricted. But surely the United Nations is not the two-horned beast at Revelation 13:11-18! Therefore, the taking of the "mark of the beast" is past history and we should not be concerned with that during our present time period. We should not yield to the scare tactics being promoted today by uninformed and unqualified propagandists.

Comparet in lesson #8 stated: "In southern France you had a considerable Protestant group, the Albigenses, who were finally hounded to extinction, massacred to the last man, woman and child by the 14th century. You ask 'How did the Pope do this when he didn't have a standing army, at least other than in his dominions in Italy?' He did it because he claimed power over all kings. Remember, the peoples of all these European countries were basically Catholic. They had been taught that the Pope, or indeed any Catholic priest, could take any of these persons and condemn him to hell if he saw fit, and there he was going. It didn't matter that Yahshua the Christ died on the cross to save him from that. If the Pope or the priest said: 'You are going to hell', you went to hell. And they taught a very impressive idea of what hell was like. Remember,

the Pope claimed the right to give the crown to any king, and likewise to depose any king. If the king said, 'Well pooh-pooh to you – I'm here, and the head of my army, now what are you going to do?' The Pope could do something about it; he excommunicated the king and he put the whole kingdom under the interdict until that king either was removed or had made his peace with the Pope.

"Under the interdict, no priest would perform any religious ceremony. You couldn't be married. If one of your relatives died, you could dig a hole in the ground, but not in a consecrated cemetery. You couldn't have any funeral ceremony for him. And remember that everybody believed that unless one bought his way out of purgatory, by paying a good sum of money to the 'church', that he was going to burn in flames for thousands of years. Maybe this was your beloved mother that was just buried – she couldn't ever go to heaven – she hadn't been buried in a consecrated cemetery and no priest was going to say a Mass for her. Likewise, all Catholics, everywhere, were forbidden to carry on any kind of transaction with people who were under that interdict. If your country needed to import part of its food supply, that was shut off. Who was going to sell it to you? If you needed to sell your products abroad, who was going to buy from you? In other words, everything in a nation just simply came to a screeching halt. The people were told 'now look, your relatives that have died in this period have all gone forever to hell, and you yourself are going there too because the 'Church' isn't going to get you out of it unless you get rid of this king.' It didn't take long for that kingdom to have a very effective revolution for the king to deal with. Thus, when the Pope told the king of any country 'There are heretics in your kingdom, and I command you to slaughter them all and stamp out heresy', that king was going to do it. And he did it."

In Lesson #10, Comparet stated: "In 1809 he (Napoleon) annexed the Papal States. During the period of anarchy, between the fall of Rome and Charlemagne taking over, the Pope had expanded his power until he ruled, you might say, the central third of the Italian peninsula. Later, under the more powerful kings of the restored empire, he was given additional bits and tatters of territory. Therefore, he had fully a third of all Italy as the Papal States. Hence, Napoleon had annexed the Papal States – remember, he'd already shown the Pope that the crown was not the Pope's to give. Pope Pius the 7th then excommunicated Napoleon. In the past, that had been a terribly powerful weapon. You'll remember that the Pope excommunicated Henry the 7th of Germany, a maneuver which just simply took him off the throne. He had to come to where the Pope was at Canossa and humbly begged for forgiveness. The Pope kept him standing outside the castle barefooted in snow for three days before he would let him in. In a country whose people were Catholic, the interdict upon the nation, or excommunication of the king was a terrifically serious thing, because when the population was substantially all Catholic, they were forbidden, under pain of eternal damnation, to recognize that they owed any loyalty to the excommunicated king. They couldn't even deliver food for him to eat, nor could they have any dealings with one who had been excommunicated by the 'church.' Hence, the Pope thought he had a terrific weapon against Napoleon. But Napoleon simply arrested and imprisoned the Pope until he signed a treaty, recognizing Napoleon's conquest of the Papal States. Therefore, if you listen to some preachers nowadays telling you that the Catholic 'Church' is about to gain worldwide dominion, that's another of these foolish ideas."

This has been a concise analysis of the “mark” of the “beast” at Revelation 13:17, and Napoleon’s subduing the pope’s authority. This contrived “angel story” alone about some future “mark of the beast” brings all of Ron Wyatt’s wild claims into question! This shows that his premise is based on **futurism** rather than an **historical** Biblical interpretation. This places him in league with Cyrus I. Scofield, a member of the Lotus Club (a branch of the Illuminati), who was bought and paid for by such Canaanite-jews as Samuel Gompers, Fiorello LaGuardia, Abraham Straus, Bernard Baruch, Jacob Schiff and Samuel Untermyer; actual descendants of the Cain-satanic-seedline of Gen. 3:15! [*lowercase “pope” mine*]

Wyatt’s associate Bill Fry wrote: “He [the angel in the chamber] then walked back over to Ron and told him two things. The first was that if Ron remained faithful, he would have a part in bringing out the tables of stone so that they might be put on display. The second was that the Ark was not to be revealed to the world or the tables of stone put on display until shortly after a law was passed that would attempt to enforce the mark of the beast upon people.”

I have given substantial evidence that the “mark of the beast” was fulfilled in the pope claiming to be the “vicar of Christ” on earth, and was in force for 1260 years, according to a correct **historical** interpretation, not the phony “futurist” interpretation of Cyrus I. Scofield which Ron Wyatt’s errant theology parallels. The second testimony to Wyatt’s falsehood is Jeremiah 31:33: “**But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith Yahweh, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people.**”

This is supported by the apostle Paul at Hebrews 8:10, which reads: “**For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith Yahweh; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people.**”

So what is all of this business of a dreamed-up angel promising Ron Wyatt that he would be the instrument for presenting the law (and Israel and Judah were the only people ever destined for this in both the Old Testament and the New)? Those old stone tablets with the law written on them didn’t work in Old Testament times, neither have written laws worked since the Crucifixion, nor will they be effective in the future! Only the law written in the Israelite conscience will ever be effective! The stone tablets of the law only served as a “type” that would later be written in the hearts and minds of the twelve Israelite tribes. After having Yahweh’s law written in our conscience, why would anyone want to return to the letters of the law contained in the Ark of the Covenant? Hence, Wyatt’s tale continues to fall apart!

Wyatt’s problem was, he was excavating in the wrong place! He should rather have done his excavating in the heavenly Tabernacle and searched there for the heavenly Ark of the Covenant (called “the Ark of His Testament”, Rev. 11:19). To understand the heavenly tabernacle, we must take into account Hebrews 8:1-2 & 5-6:

“1 Now of the things which we have spoken *this is* the sum: We have such an high priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens; 2 A minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which Yahweh pitched, and not man. ... 3 For every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices: wherefore *it is* of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer.

⁴ For if he were on earth, he should not be a priest, seeing that there are priests that offer gifts according to the law: ⁵ Who serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things ...”

On the mount of transfiguration, once Peter had a vision of the heavenly Tabernacle, he was no longer pleased with the Temple at Jerusalem (Matt. 17:4; Mark 9:5; Luke 9:33). A fair scholarly treatment of this subject is found in *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. R-Z, page 506, under the subtitle:

“5. The tabernacle in the New Testament. The influence of the terminology is to be seen in such phrases as John 1:14: ‘The Word ... dwelt [i.e., ‘tabernacled’] among us,’ and the laver or ‘washing of regeneration’ (Tit. 3:5). Then there are references to the tabernacle in Acts 7:44; Rev. 13:6; 15:5; 21:3. The Letter to the Hebrews sets forth the Christian interpretation of the Mosaic tabernacle. Its titles show the presence of God, his righteousness, and his ‘conversableness.’ The furniture of the court symbolizes man’s approach to God, just as the furniture of the most holy place represents God’s approach to man in holiness, grace, and sovereignty. According to Hebrews, the tabernacle is modeled on a heavenly pattern (8:5); it has its divine prototype (8:2, 5; 9:11), the ‘greater and more perfect tent’; it has a symbolic meaning for the writer’s age (9:9), but the way into the sanctuary is not yet opened as long as the outer tent is still standing. But when Christ appeared, he entered once for all, not into the human sanctuary, but into heaven (9:24). Similarly in Rev. 21:3 the dwelling of God with men is identified with the Holy City, the New Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven, dwelling among men, and removing all tears, sorrow, pain, and death.

“But even heaven and the New Jerusalem are not the real culmination of the tabernacle image. After all, the tabernacle and the New Jerusalem are only places. What is of chief significance is that the tabernacle is the place of the presence. The tabernacle thus properly belongs to the theology of the Incarnation. No doubt, the idea of the presence dwelling in a place had begun to give way even in the O.T. to the idea of the presence living in a person. But this personifying of the presence image of O.T. faith took place fully in the person of Jesus Christ, ‘for in him all the fulness of God was pleased to dwell’ (Col. 1: 19; cf. 2:9).”

A very fitting excerpt from *The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible*, vol. Q-Z, p. 582, on this topic propitiatory, in finalizing reads: “Paul directly equates the cross of Calvary as God’s mercy seat, or the redemption of sinful man (Rom. 3:25).” As we see, from this last excerpt, the blood-soaked cross of Christ served in place of the Mercy Seat that was in the Holy place, thus making the Mercy Seat only a shadow of the cross to come!