

DEBUNKING EARL WILLIAMS ON THE NEW TEACHING OF GRACE BY FAITH ALONE

In August, 1994 Mr Earl Williams, a pastor of the Worldwide Church of God in Atlanta, gave three sermons in a series he called "What is Real Christianity?" in which he expounded the new Worldwide Church of God teaching of grace by faith alone. This became the next major doctrinal battlefield after the nature of God and before the new covenant teachings which triggered the mass exodus that led to the formation of the United Church of God. I will now look at quite a number of the shocking things he discussed in his sermons and show just how unbiblical much of this new teaching on grace really is.

When he speaks he sounds like a Southern Baptist preacher. Just to give you an idea of what he sounds like, picture a Southern Baptist preacher with a highly emotional voice running his words together, spaced by pregnant pauses like they do, and picture him saying this gem from his sermon. "Buddhists have the sayings and writings of Buddha but the boy is dead, all right? He's just sitting up there, can't do nothin'. Muslims have the writings and laws of Mohammed but that boy's dead too...Jews have the writings of the Old Testament of Moses and Ezekiel and Isaiah but them good old boys are dead! They're dead! Christianity is much different. In Christ we not only have His teachings, we have Him alive as a person. That's the difference." He just seems to have a completely different spirit in him with the way he speaks and the way he constantly puts the law down in subtle and not-so-subtle ways as we will see as we go through his sermon material.

TAPE 1:

He says, "Why is it that some still judge who could possibly be a true christian upon the observance of the Sabbath? They say, 'Well, those people couldn't be christians - they don't keep the Sabbath,' when Colossians 2:16 plainly and clearly says, 'Do not judge anyone in regard to a Sabbath day or a festival'". First of all, he misquotes the verse. The verse actually says, "Let no man judge **YOU** in food or drink, or regarding a festival or...sabbaths." It says nothing about judging others status on the Sabbath or Holy Days. The Ten Commandments are the barest letter-of-the-law minimum requirement of true christian living. The Sabbath is a sign between God and His people which we are told is **PERPETUAL** or forever covenant. It is the test commandment for it is the one command that this world's "christian" churches utterly refuse to keep. **If they had God's spirit it would surely lead them to keep this most basic and vital commandment(John 16:13) which is one of the big 10. We are not to condemn others but we are also told, "by their fruits you shall know them"(Matt.7:20).**

He says, "The grace of God does not lead to immorality and anyone who practices immorality as a way of life is not saved. You have the assurance of

Christ. That's the only guarantee I can give you that a person under grace won't live an immoral life. That's the only guarantee. I ask you, 'Is that enough?' Is Christ enough guarantee for that?" He also said that confusion is where you mix two things together which shouldn't go together, such as mixing grace and law or faith and works, and therefore you get mixed up. He is the one mixing things together which can't be mixed. It is a contradiction in terms to say that it is not a pre-requisite to salvation to keep the law and say that one who claims to believe in Christ yet fails to love others or lives immorally is not saved. **If the immoral are not saved then that means a certain standard, does it not, before salvation is given?** If loving others or not living immorally are the mark of a true christian as well as just claiming Christ's sacrifice then that means they are requirements or pre-requisites to salvation. This is classic double-talk. It is rank stupidity to think that someone who claims Christ's sacrifice is going to be guaranteed to live morally by Christ.

Anything that HAS to be there in our life whether keeping the law or just proclaiming you academically believe Christ was the Messiah is a pre-requisite to salvation. Phillip Arnn of Watchman Fellowship also believes there is a great contradiction in the new grace teaching. In a letter to a member he wrote, "Tkach is doing a fine job of sending mixed signals about the place of the Sabbath and Holy Days in relation to a member's relationship with God. It is fair to state that WCG still believes that a believer can lose their salvation. This view is called Armenianism. Tkach says that you can lose your salvation if you are not an overcomer. Just what makes one an overcomer in Tkach's mind is the point of confusion." I agree with that last statement that there is confusion over what makes one an overcomer in Pasadena's mind as the Sabbath, Holy Days, tithing, etc. seem to have been relegated from being commands to good but voluntary principles as we shall see later on. My point is that there appears to be a contradiction with the beliefs that the immoral are not saved even, if they are in the church, and that there are no pre-requisites to salvation, therefore, I feel that this doctrine is, to borrow Dr Hoeh's words, unfinished business. Either there are no pre-requisites which can take our salvation away or there is something that has to be in our life before we will be saved. There is no middle ground! What direction do you think it will go if it does change?

God says that He gives His spirit to those who obey Him(Acts 5:32). Now, not every one obeys God or at least tries do they? It is offered to all but we have to respond to it. **If we have to respond to that, even if it means just believing that Christ is our Saviour and accepting it then isn't that a condition - that mere response?** Something that we have to do before we receive that gift is a condition even if it means coming forth and accepting it. **Only if God gave it to everybody irregardless of whether you believed and accepted Christ as our Saviour could it be truly considered an unconditional gift.**

Our full obedience to God from here on in our lives to the best of our ability with His help we have NEVER said deserves NOR EVER earns us the gift.

To say differently is totally false! **Those who say so never quote a written example of how we taught you have to earn salvation.**

I will give you the most simple explanation that I can think of to illustrate the meaning of qualifying to receive a gift. If I say I will give every child under 10 a beautiful toy that is worth hundreds of dollars does the fact that the child is under 10 earn him this expensive gift? Of course not! I have the gift and I can choose the criteria of who gets the gift. The same goes for God. Whatever conditional criteria God chooses, be it just accepting Christ or staying in the direction of trying to obey Him fully, even though we'll make mistakes along the way - whatever those criteria are and that's what we're trying to prove the answer to - none of those criteria earn us the gift, though God has every right to set them!

Neither is salvation a reward for having those criteria because keeping God's law is merely what is expected of us - our duty(Ecc.12:13). The Bible talks about being rewarded for our works(Matt.16:27) but this is referring to the positions of rulership we will receive in God's kingdom(Luke 19), not salvation.

If the child is over 10 and they miss out because of the criteria I set does that mean that I don't love them unconditionally. Of course not! So the idea that God's love being unconditional means that He requires nothing of us to receive salvation doesn't, of itself, hold water. You have to prove the point with other statements if it be true.

I spoke just before of qualifications to receive a gift like salvation, which of themselves do not earn us the gift. A qualification does not mean something we do to earn something. **They are two different things though Pasadena tries to blend them into one to prove their case.** Is the term qualifying for salvation biblical? Let's have a look at a few scriptures.

1 Corinthians 9:27, "But I discipline my body and bring it into subjection, lest, when I have preached to others, **I myself should become disqualified.**"

2 Corinthians 13:5-6, "Examine yourselves as to whether you are in the faith. Test yourselves. **Do you not know yourselves, that Jesus Christ is in you?; unless indeed you are disqualified.** But I trust that you will know that we are not disqualified."

Hebrews 6:4-5, "For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted the heavenly gift, and have become partakers of the Holy Spirit, and have tasted the good word of God and the powers of the age to come, if they fall away, to renew them again to repentance.

Psalm 51:11-12, "Do not cast me away from Your presence, And do not take Your Holy Spirit from me. Restore to me the joy of Your salvation, And uphold me by Your generous Spirit."

I don't know how you, the reader, see these verses but what seems very clear to me from these verses is that you can lose the spirit and the gift of salvation after you have had it! Pasadena, though, is telling us that our salvation is unconditional and guaranteed when we accept Christ. It would appear very plainly from these verses that I can lose the gift if Christ isn't living His life in me - if I don't stay in a repentant state of mind! The very fact that you can lose it shows that the gift of salvation is not totally unconditional, even if it just means remaining in the academic conviction that Christ is our Saviour.

If we have to test and examine ourselves to find out whether Christ is living His life in us and that we are not disqualified doesn't that sound just a little bit more than just accepting Christ's sacrifice? It's the effort/ the heart/ the attitude of trying to be the best with God's help that builds character in us no matter how much we stuff up along the way. If the "Just believe" teaching were true would we any longer need to wrestle against wicked spirits in high places, or run in a race to win, or fight the good fight, or war a good warfare, or press toward the mark or beat our bodies to bring it into subjection or strive to enter the straight gate as we are told to do in the Bible? I think that's a good question to think about.

Williams says, "What do you mean...when you say law? Are you speaking of the Ten Commandments? Are you speaking of the sacrifices and the washings? In the New Testament, law refers to the whole thing. All (the first) five books of the Bible. **It has become a common idea in some churches that there's a separation between ceremonial law and that which is moral, and there isn't. There isn't. Washings and sacrifices and the Ten Commandments and the Sabbath and Holy Days is one big lot when Paul speak of the law.**"

He says that when Paul says the word law he always means the whole thing - he never separates the moral and civil laws from the ceremonial and sacrificial laws. Is this true? It is true that he never uses adjectives such as moral or sacrificial to distinguish which law he is referring to but he clearly speaks about different laws when we read the context. We have to ask the question, "Which Old Testament laws are still binding and which are not?" He also says Paul said cursed is everyone who doesn't keep everything in the book of the law, not the 10 but all 613 laws and he accuses Mr Armstrong of being selective. Was he really or is this just another false accusation?

In Galatians 3:19-25 Paul writes, "What purpose then does the law serve? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made...But before faith came, we were kept under guard by the law, kept for the faith which would afterwards be revealed. Therefore the law was our

tutor to bring us to Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after faith has come, we are no longer under a tutor." Is this law we are no longer under the Ten Commandments or the statutes of the Old Testament? The question is answered by determining which law was added because of transgressions. The answer is found in Jeremiah 7:22 which says, "**For in that day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, I did not speak to your fathers or command them concerning burnt offerings or sacrifices.**" It was the laws concerning sacrifices which pointed them towards the ultimate sacrifice of Christ whose was the only one that could truly take away sin. It could not have been the Ten Commandments or the statutes because they have been there since the beginning. God said Abraham kept "**my commandments, my statutes and my laws**"(Gen.26:5) and that Israel in the World Tomorrow will "walk in my(God's) statutes and...will keep my judgments"(Ezek.36:26) which is a pretty stupid thing to say if we are no longer under those laws.

The sacrificial law was a temporary schoolmaster or teacher through symbolic acts that pointed Israel to Christ's ultimate sacrifice. God's Ten Commandments define what sin is(1 John 3:4, Rom.7:7). **Since sin is the transgression of the law and the added law was added because of sin, then it had to be a different law to the Ten Commandments which define what sin is.** Paul explains himself further in Hebrews 10:1-10 where he says,"For the law, having a shadow of the good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with these same sacrifices, which they offer continually year by year, make those who approach perfect...Sacrifice and offering, burnt offerings, and offerings for sins you did not desire, nor had pleasure in them(which are offered according to the law), then he said, Behold I have come to do your will O God. He takes away the first that he may establish the second. By that will we have been sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all." The sacrifices are clearly referred to as the law or code of behaviour that was taken away and replaced with the sacrifice of Christ.

Paul in Hebrews 9:9-10 makes it plain which are the laws that are temporary and no longer in force where he says, "It was symbolic for the present time in which both gifts and sacrifices are offered which cannot make him who performed the service perfect in regard to the conscience - **concerned ONLY with foods(offerings, that is) and drinks, various washings, and fleshly ordinances imposed until the time of reformation.**" We read of the administration of death and the administration of the spirit in 2 Corinthians 3. The first administration gave only strict-to-the-letter penalties. Human judges could not account for repentance and mercy. There needed to be a new administration of the same laws that could give pardon and eternal life to those who repented and desired to be obedient. There are many laws which cannot be applied to a modern society and the church is not to administer the physical penalties, at least not until the World Tomorrow, when there will be a balance between the two administrations, where the old to-the-letter penalties will be balanced with mercy and

pardoning upon repentance. We are to keep the statutes in their spiritual intent today as much as they apply to our modern age.

He says that you are cursed if you keep the law and not follow Christ. He quotes Galatians 3:5-13 to say that we are saved by grace through faith alone, not grace by faith and works. He says "Now notice, verse 10. Verse 10 and 11. **All who rely to maintain their relationship with God on the law are under a curse.** For it is written, cursed is everyone who does not continue to do everything in the book of the law, that first five books. No separation... Clearly no one is justified before God by the law, because the righteous will live how? By faith." On tape 3 he says, "Some believe that we are saved by grace, but after that we have to live by the law, they say. Saved by grace and kept by law. Is that true? I think Paul gives us that answer in Galatians 3. I won't turn there. You check it out when you get home."

In Galatians 3:5-13 we read, "Therefore he who supplies the spirit to you and works miracles among you does he do it by the works of the law or by the hearing of faith? Just as Abraham believed God and it was accounted to him for righteousness. Therefore know that only those who are of faith are sons of Abraham...For as many as are of the works of the law are under a curse, for it is written, Cursed is everyone who does not continue in all things which are written in the book of the law, to do them. But that no one is justified by the law in the sight of God is evident for the just shall live by faith. Yet the law is not of faith but the man who does them shall live by them. Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us(for it is written, Cursed is everyone who hangs on a tree)".

Is Paul really debunking the grace through faith and works teaching and supporting grace by faith alone here? The two verses which show the context of what he is talking about here are the verse before this chapter(Galatians 2:21) and Galatians 3:12. In Galatians 3:12 he says, "Yet the law is not of faith but **THE MAN WHO DOES THEM SHALL LIVE BY THEM.**" He is actually quoting Leviticus 18:5 which says, "You shall therefore keep my statutes and my judgments, which if a man does, he shall live by them." Christ Himself said, "If you will enter into life keep the commandments" (Matt.19:17). Paul here is supporting the fact that we have to keep the commandments and the statutes of God but, though we are obligated to keep them, we are not justified or saved from our past sins because we keep them. Only Christ's sacrifice - not the works of the law, be it a high standard of commandment-keeping or animal sacrifices, can save us from our past sins. This he makes clear in Galatians 2:21 where he says, "I do not set aside the grace of God, for if righteousness comes through the law, then Christ died in vain." Just because Christ for our past sins by His sacrifice it does not release us from our obligation to keep His laws. **Paul here is debunking the works only heresy not the grace through faith AND works teaching.**

It says we are cursed if we don't continue in all of the things written in the book of the law and that Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law. What does he mean by this? There are blessings and cursings or penalties which are the consequences of living by or breaking God's law. When we sin we come under the death penalty(Rom.6:23). **All have sinned and are therefore under the curse or penalty of the law which Christ has redeemed us from. That is what it means.** It doesn't mean we are under God's curse if, after we are forgiven, we follow the things in the Old Testament laws like unclean meats, the Sabbath and Holy Days and the many other just ones as he is trying to twist it to mean.

He says, "**Who should we follow, Christ or the law?...see, you gonna get confused if you try to follow both**...In all of Jesus' words and deeds, in all of His acts and sayings, Jesus was not trying to establish or abolish the law. **He showed through all of His words and deeds, that He was the Messiah and that He came to replace the law with Himself.** That's the bottom line. Through His words and deeds He was trying to tell the people, 'I have come now. Look to Me, not look to the book of the law'. He uses Matthew 5:17 to try and back himself up on this point where Christ said, "Do not think that I came to destroy the Law or the Prophets. I did not come to destroy but to fulfill." He says that Christ is the embodiment of the law - that is He came to replace the law with Himself.

The word fulfill means "bring to pass(prophecy), carry out(promise, law, command)...develop one's gift's and character to the full"(Oxford Australian Dictionary, p.332). The word does not mean replace. There are three meanings for this scripture we can see from the three parts of the above definition. The first is that He brought to pass the prophecies in the Law and the Prophets about Himself. When you see the term Law and the Prophets it is describing two divisions of the Old Testament scriptures. The second is that He came to carry out the promises, and live fully by the Law of God a perfect life as an example to us all. The last meaning is that He came to fill to the full or develop the gift of God's law to the full. **We read in Isaiah 42:21 that "He will make MAGNIFY the law and make it honourable."** In Matthew 5:21-30 Christ showed that we are not just to keep the letter of the law but also the spirit of the law, that is keeping it in it's full intent as well.

He said that Christ didn't come to establish the law but to replace the law with Himself yet we read how Christ Himself says in the next two verses, "For assuredly I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle will by no means pass from the law till all is fulfilled. Whosoever therefore breaks one of the least of the commandments, and teaches men to do so, shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven, but whoever does and teaches them, he shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven."

Another scripture that he twists is Luke 16:16 which says that "The law and the prophets were until John. Since that time the kingdom of God has been

preached". **He says the word 'until' shows that something ceases and now we are to follow Christ, not the law.** Oh really? Remember we said before that the Law and the Prophets were divisions of the Old Testament scriptures. That was all that they had until Christ's teachings about the kingdom of God were added to it. If we apply this crazy reasoning then the prophets, which the apostles extensively quoted from and were part of the foundation of the church(Eph.2:20), are also done away. He goes on and on a few times about the importance of looking at scriptures in their context yet we read in the verse after the one he uses to say we now longer follow the law, "And it is easier for heaven and earth to pass away than for one tittle of the law to fail."

He says that the spirit of law is Jesus Christ as opposed to the intent and not just the letter of the laws He commanded. He said the prophets looked forward to the day when they would follow Christ and not to the law and the prophets. He says, "'Moses said...The Lord will raise up a prophet like me...You must listen to Him.' **Notice that! Even Moses will tell you,'Don't follow Moses'. And yet people want to follow the law.**" If the law is in Christ as he claims then how do we know how to follow Him? He misses the point that the law represents Christ's mind and how He would live. It's not something different. He says,"Don't you think Christ could do a better job of pointing out sin than a written code", again making it sound like something different. He says to which law are we to look - to the Law of Moses or the law of Christ - again making it sound like they are two different things. Luke 2:22-24 interchanges the Law of Moses with the law of the Lord. He says according to the Law of the Lord and then quotes Old Testament statutes found in the books of Moses. God says in Malachi 4:4, **"Remember the Law of Moses my servant which I commanded him in Horeb for all Israel with the statutes and judgments."** This scripture is prophetic for our day from its context where it goes on to talk about the Day of the Lord.

Williams equates the Ten Commandments with the old covenant making out that we have to follow Christ, not the Ten Commandments. He uses Exodus 34:28 to back this up which says, "And he(Moses) wrote on the tablets the words of the covenant, the Ten Commandments." And since there is a new covenant the old covenant and its laws have been replaced with Christ. The Old Testament was actually a marriage agreement in which Israel promised to obey God and He would in turn protect and provide for them. "Now therefore, if you will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant then you shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people, for all the earth is mine, and you shall be unto me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation"(Exod.19:5-6). God would provide all of the blessings recorded in Leviticus 26 and Deuteronomy 28 if they would obey all of His laws. The Old Covenant was not a set of laws that were omitted once the New Covenant was instituted. The Old Covenant was symbolically a marriage agreement between the nation of Israel and God. We have seen previously that Abraham kept God's commandments and they were therefore in existence prior to the establishment of the Old Covenant therefore the abolition of the Old Covenant

did not do away with what it did not bring into existence. The fault was with the people(Heb.8:8) not with God's wonderful law.

Williams says,"The law says in Exodus 31 that the Sabbath is a sign of God's true people. And some still believe that, and see if whether they're keeping the Sabbath." He says Luke 2:37 shows Christ is now that sign. Luke 2:37 says nothing about Christ being a sign between us and God though He is a sign of something else. Exodus 31:16 says that the Sabbath as a sign between Israel(physical or spiritual), is a **PERPETUAL covenant - that is, FOREVER!**

He goes on and on about following Christ, not the old law, but we have to ask how do we follow Christ? **If loving others is following Christ then what actions define what that love is or do we hope for the spirit to move us to know what is and isn't love. Is it just like Star Wars where we let go and let the force be our guide?** In Romans 7, verses 7 and 12, Paul makes it clear that it is the law which shows us what sin is. "Is the law sin? Certainly not! On the contrary, I would not have known sin except through the law. For I would not have known covetousness unless the law had said, You shall not covet...Therefore the law is holy, and the commandment is holy and just and good."

God's law defines what actions are love according to God. John makes this clear in 1 John 5:3 where he says, "For this is the love of God, that we keep His commandments and his commandments are not burdensome." **That's right - His commandments ARE NOT burdensome. They are a joy to keep, not a curse!** Moreover Paul makes it clear that God's law is the whole foundation of what love is in Romans 13:8-10 where he says, "Owe no one anything except to love one another, for he who loves one another has fulfilled the law. For the commandments, You shall not commit adultery, You shall not murder, You shall not steal, You shall not bear false witness, You shall not covet, and if there is any commandment, are all summed up in this saying, namely, You shall love your neighbour as yourself. Love does no harm to a neighbour, therefore love is the fulfilment of the law." 1 John 2:4 makes plain that **"He who says, I know Him, and does not keep his commandments is a LIAR and the truth is not in him."**

In 1 Timothy 1:8-9 Paul says that the "law is good if one uses it lawfully, knowing this: that the law is not made for a righteous person, but for the lawless and insubordinate." Williams heavily implies from this verse that we in the church don't need the moral law and the Ten Commandments any longer because of this. God's law is not just made up of commandments and statutes but also judgments such as penalties for breaking those laws - the law of judgments. This is what Paul is referring to in this verse as other clearer scriptures plainly rule out the possibility that the commandments and statutes are no longer for the righteous.

He makes an analogy about Christ and the law in which he says that the law is like a roadmap which we need to get to the mountain we're trying to get to,

which in his analogy is coming to Christ. He says that the map or the law is valid and good in that it pointed towards Christ and got us there, but now when we come to Christ we no longer need the map, which is the law, anymore because we have Christ. The question we need to ask if we are going to apply this analogy is when have we reached the mountain? **When have we reached Christ? Well, the true answer to that question is answered for us in Ephesians 4:13 where Paul says, "till we all come to unity of the faith and the knowledge of the Son of God, to a perfect man, to the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ." This will not finally happen until this corruption puts on incorruption(1 Cor.15:53) at the resurrection.** We don't have all the scriptures or the roadmap perfectly memorised yet and fully written in our hearts and until we do we need to continue referring back to the wonderful roadmap which is the law of God. As David said, "Your word is a lamp under my feet and a light to my path"(Ps.119:105).

Our next question we need to ask is how does Christ do a better job than the law? Does He whisper what to do in your ears? Does He send you a letter with some instructions/advice? Just how does He guide us? Does He leave it up to our own intuition? Just how does He do it? If Christ is in us and He moves us in our conscience how do we know it's not Satan's broadcasts? The New Testament tells us that we have to test the spirits (I John 4:1) and to do that we need the law of God to explain what sin is(Rom.7:7). Isaiah 8:20 tells us, "To the law and to the testimony! If they do not speak according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."

If Christ is going to guide us, in light of the above scripture, don't you think that is how Christ guides us - by His written instruction - His law? Just what do you mean Christ as our example? The way Earl Williams talks about Christ and the law it's almost implied that Christ's example is different to what was in the law. Christ lived completely consistent with the law. He said so in John 15:10. He was the spokesman for the Father and gave the law to Israel. It came from them and their minds. Would He live differently to that? His example is the written example in the Bible and His spirit moving us through our conscience. Again you have to test the spirits and use the law of God to know if what moves you is from Christ guiding you.

Williams goes on to say, "Others express this confusion of trying to follow both when it comes to other christians, and they say,'Well, there may be others who are, God's working with,' they can't quite say converted, 'God's working with, but they must eventually come to us in the Worldwide Church of God' or 'they must eventually be brought to the knowledge of the Sabbath and the Holy Days and start keeping it'. Then it ain't free. Some will say, 'I know we're saved by grace, but a person that's saved is going to be observing these things to please God and to be acceptable to Him'. Oh, really? Let's go to Romans 11. **I accept the fact that there are MILLIONS of true christians in all organisations.**" He plainly says that there are MILLIONS of true christians amongst the Sunday-

keeping Protestant churches out there. As we saw before, if they had God's spirit it would surely be leading them to truth(John 16:13). The Protestant churches virtually all believe in Satan's pagan-originated fables about the trinity, going to heaven or hell, God is trying to save everyone now, Christmas and Easter, Friday crucifixion/Sunday resurrection and the immortality of the soul. Only Sabbath-keeping groups have any sizeable amounts of truth in those areas because they are making an effort to keep all of God's commands, including the Sabbath. **And now, according to Him, the Sabbath and the Holy Days are reduced to non-essential customs or rituals which are not required for God to accept us. Why even bother keeping them if that is the case? It takes very little to do away with them once the church believes that this is the case!!!**

Continuing on he says,"Look at Romans 11, verse 5. Is it a co-mixture of both -law and grace? Romans 11, verse 5, he speaks of the elect both called to be christians out of Israel, and verse 5 he says,'So too, at the present time there is a remnant chosen by grace,' notice this, verse 6, very important, 'then if it's by grace, it is no longer by works. If it were, grace would no longer be grace.'" You can't have it both ways. He said if it's of grace then it's no longer of works. And if it were grace, it would no longer be grace if you added works. Christ plus anything has corrupted the gospel...Isn't it nice to meet here on the seventh day?...Now listen, whatever your church rituals are, fine - or customs - whatever you want to say. But the moment you say that this is what must be done to make you a bona fide, up-to-date Christian, then you've corrupted the gospel."

Commentaries citing this passage talk about a tension or conflict between Paul's and James' theology or writings. Paul here says that it is by grace and no longer by works while James in chapter 2 of his epistle plainly says faith without works is dead. Is this really a conflict? **You need to understand the context of what the two apostles were dealing with. Paul was dealing with Jews who were so strict in their law-keeping that they thought law-keeping of itself would save them while James clearly shows that those who go to the other extreme are wrong also, who say that you only have to just believe.** James shows that faith without works is dead. By the "Just believe" teaching, James points out that, if the just believe in Christ teaching were true(which it's not), then the demons would be saved - "Even the demons believe and tremble!"

Christ Himself said, "Every tree that does not bear good fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire. Therefore by their fruits you shall know them. Not everyone who says to me, Lord, Lord, shall enter the kingdom of heaven, but he who does the will of my Father in heaven"(Matt.7:19-21). In other words, profession is simply that - profession! Christ then went on, "Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in your name, cast out demons in your name, and done many wonders in your name? And then I will declare to them, I never knew you, depart from me, you who practice lawlessness"(Matt.7:22-23). Yes, works, though they don't of themselves save us, are important and are **REQUIRED**. The blood of Christ's sacrifice is what saves

us, justifies us and makes us innocent but without works God will not apply that pronouncement of innocence to you and save you from your sins and that is an ongoing process! Salvation is a process and some who started off right with God can lose out if they get caught up in the cares and snares of this world and drift away from God.

Williams says, "Colossians 1, in verse 12. Here he says that God has already qualified us. Now if God has qualified us, what can you add to it? Hebrews, I think chapter 10, says you've been perfected forever, and if you've been perfected forever, what can be added to it?" **God has qualified us, as it says in Colossians 1:12, for eternal life by giving us His Holy Spirit but we can disqualify ourselves and lose that Spirit(Ps.51:11,1 Cor.9:27) if we turn our backs on God's way of life.** In Hebrews 10:14 it says, "He has perfected us for ever those who are **BEING** sanctified." Yes this perfecting and washing us clean is a process that is happening regularly in our lives now as we seek forgiveness daily, while at the same time, building character until we will reach perfection at the resurrection.

Often when he refers to scriptures he says something like, "Romans 3:21, don't turn there" in an effort to defer people away from reading it as he's going through it. I noticed, as I did turn to the scriptures, when he did quote verses he quite often paraphrased and said things that the verse didn't actually say like that Colossians 2:16 example we saw before. He mentioned the night before his sermon, he got a call from a Protestant teacher who heard that he was going to speak on grace by faith alone, and this teacher encouraged him with it and told he would put him at the top of his prayer list. A classic example of demonic encouragement to teach contrary to what we've seen is not the teaching of the Bible. What I found awful was how he constantly talks about changing from what we believed in as coming out of bondage. **He said, "You should rejoice that God is so good and so merciful that He didn't leave us in slavery."**

TAPE 2:

Referring to the special music before his second sermon he said, "It will fit very nicely with the message that God has prepared for you today." I feel it would probably be more accurate to say, "It will fit in very nicely with the message that Satan has prepared for you today."

Quoting Isaiah 1:13-14 he says, "'Stop bringing meaningless offerings. These outward observances are meaningless to me. That doesn't please me. Your incense is detestable to me. Your new moons. Your sabbaths. Your commanded convocations. I cannot bear your evil assemblies. Your new moons, your festivals and your appointed feasts, my soul hates. They've become a burden to me. I am weary of them.' You talk about burdens. God says,'They're even a burden to me. I am weary of them.'" The implication is that outward observances like the Sabbath and Holy days are a burden to God." God says the

sacrifices were meaningless. They never did them with any heart and meaning. They did them routinely. They defiled God's Sabbath with burdensome extra man-made laws and so God called them YOUR feasts, not my feasts like He calls the Sabbath and the Holy Days in Leviticus 23, thus making a distinction from the true observances with a whole heart they should have been keeping. **The Sabbath is a delight to God we read in Isaiah 58 and we read the following about God's laws in 1 John 5:9, "For this is the love of God that we keep His commandments. And His commandments are not burdensome."** He also makes the comment, "Paul was armed and dangerous. The law made him that way...And he did that to protect the law. He did that. You see Stephen stood up and said, 'This thing is over.'"

Williams says, "When you read of things in the prophets about the world tomorrow and great abundance and doing this and that, all of that's talking about Christ primarily, physical blessings secondarily. The glorious abundance of the land - that's about Christ and His salvation. When it talks about the gathering together of days, that's Christ and His salvation, who fulfilled those days." Anyone who's read the major and minor prophets should know that the language of the physical blessings is quite literal and could only be referring to Christ and salvation secondarily.

He goes onto say, "Mr Tkach Jnr made a statement at a conference not long ago and he said, '...You know Ronald McDonald has done more of what true Christianity is about than the Worldwide Church of God.' Isn't that amazing? He wasn't saying that to put us down. It's just the truth." Is that so? Let's make a comparison. There's an old saying that it's better to teach a man how to fish than to give him a fish. Teaching God's laws and way of life through sending out hundreds of millions of pieces of literature over the years has changed countless thousands of lives both in and out of the church testified by many thousands of letters that the Personal Correspondence Department has received over the years. That from a church with a \$200 million annual revenue compared to the handouts of a multi-billion dollar restaurant chain.

He says the law comes before human need. To prove this he quotes the example of David eating the temple bread on the Sabbath making out that it's O.K. to break "the law" if there is a human need. The example quoted is from 1 Samuel 21:1-6. What happened was that David and his men were in real need for food and the priest only had holy shewbread which had already served its ceremonial purpose for its day and had been replaced by new hot loaves. It was only allowed to be eaten by the priests. As it was the only bread on hand and had already served its purpose for its day before the Lord the priest offered it to David and his men. Now it is a little unclear as to whether it could be eaten by people other than the priests AFTER it had served its purpose. No doubt it by the tone of Christ's statement the Pharisees would have had added their own prohibitive law if it was O.K. in God's eyes and therefore David and his men only broke an extra Jewish law. If it was also prohibited by God after it had served its ceremonial

purpose it would be an ox-in-a-ditch emergency situation. We are to AVOID ox-in-a-ditch situations when it comes to the Sabbath. They should be the exception, not the norm! An ox-in-a-ditch emergency situation is not something you can apply to other commandments about adultery and divorce for example. The love before law theory would suggest that if a husband is unhappy with his wife and they're both miserable with each other and he loves another woman then it would be more love to get a divorce and marry the other woman. Jesus clearly debunks this scenario in Matthew 19:1-9.

This is how Earl Williams explains the incident where the rich young ruler came to Christ in Matthew 19. He said, "Good teacher what good thing must I do to get eternal life?' He said, 'Why do you ask me what is good...There is one who is good. If you want to enter life obey the commandments.' Another proof text. I had so many people come and say, 'But, Mr Williams, I know you say salvation is free but you've got to keep the law to be saved.' Must you? This is a proof text. I've even used it in sermons. Christ said, 'If you want to enter life keep the commandments', but you don't read the context of it do you? You run off with that scripture and say you've got to keep the commandments in order to be saved. Who's commandments? The Baptist church. The Pentecostal church. The S.D.A. church. The Law is religion. Now let's see if Christ really meant that.

"YOU SEE CHRIST IS FOLLOWING THE PROVERB OF ANSWERING A FOOL ACCORDING TO HIS FOLLY. He said, 'What must I do that I may inherit eternal life.' Christ quickly saw that this man did not understand salvation. He thought you had to do something to get it. So He answers this teacher, really a fool, according to his folly. **He said, 'You think you have to do something. Well, keep the commandments and you'll have eternal life.' Christ wasn't serious.** I'll show you that in a moment. He wanted to teach this disciple and us a few lessons. He wanted to teach us and this teacher that it is faith and love which is what Christ wanted. **He wanted to teach this person and us that the law dehumanises people.** That it dehumanises people and that you become impersonal. He wanted to teach that only God can save and it is through grace alone through faith alone. There's three lessons we'll see Him teach so masterfully here." **Red warning lights should go flashing off in our heads when any church leader starts referring to laws of God as bondage or the law dehumanizes you as stated by Earl Williams!**

"So the man says which ones and Jesus replied, 'Don't murder, do not commit adultery, don't steal, do not bear false witness, honour your mother and father and you shall love your neighbour as yourself.' Now the man in verse 20 is beginning to pick up on something. He's beginning to pick up that Christ is answering him according to his folly. Perhaps it was something in his tone but he's beginning to pick up that he hadn't got to the heart of the matter of what God wanted. Notice the phraseology. 'All these I have kept. What do I still lack? I sense Christ you're not giving me the full picture here. I've done all this and you know I have because I am a teacher of the law. What's behind this? What do I still

lack?' 'If you want to be perfect go and sell all your possessions and give to the poor.' What's important? Go and sell all your possessions and give to the poor.

"Remember I said that it 's love and faith. He says love. Go and sell your possessions and give to the poor. You see keeping the law - here's another effect of keeping the law - it not only dehumanises you but it also gives you a false sense of security that I have done the whole duty of man. I've kept the Sabbath, I've kept the Holy Days, I've tithed, I've done this and that so I can sit back in my easy chair of security and know that I am saved and secure. Uh-uh. No way Jose. He said, Go and sell what you have and give to the poor. Notice it 's more than that. Notice what He focuses on. 'And you will have treasure in heaven.' And notice part 2 - 'Come follow me.' Then come follow me - faith." In continuing on in this passage Earl Williams says, "Notice Christ shifted from the law to love." Notice how he constantly tries to disconnect love from the law which as we've seen you can't do.

Earl Williams makes it out he was keeping the commandments but Christ pointed out by what he asked him to do that he was coveting his goods and breaking number 10. Again he disconnects mercy and faith from law but mercy and faith come from keeping the law in the spirit and in the letter. Some people say that keeping that law can't be done. If that be the case then why did God say the following about John the Baptist's parents who had God's spirit, "**They were both righteous before God, walking blameless in ALL the commandments and ordinances of the Lord**"? Christ kept the law perfectly and He can do the same for us by living in us through His Holy Spirit(Gal.2:20). We will make mistakes as John the Baptist's parents would have but we can be counted as righteous if we strive to keep God's law in everything and claim Christ's sacrifice to cleanse us of sin when we do sin(1 John 1:9). **Christ was serious about keeping the commandments for eternal life in addition to accepting Him as our personal Saviour for our past sins because he went straight on to say it is impossible for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God but with God, anything, even us keeping God's commands through the Holy Spirit, is possible. If it's just grace and accepting Jesus then anyone can make it easily!** The statement he mentioned, "Come follow me" is an interesting one. Not only should we be striving to WORK out our salvation with fear and trembling(Phil.2:12) but we should be following and supporting Christ's work - the first commission of reaching the world with God's full truth and salvation and get behind the Work.

He says that when John talks about keeping the commandments in 1 John on a number of occasions he does not mean the Ten Commandments. He twists it by saying the commands he mentions are not the Ten Commandments but believing in Christ and laying down our lives in service which really are a summary of them anyway. Notice what he says, "For time's sake, let's go over to verse 23, in verse 22 rather. 'And we receive from Him anything we ask, because we keep His

commands.' Oh! There it is! The law, you said! There it is! You must obey the law - His commands! Huh. **Read the whole thing. What is the command of Jesus? What does He want? What does He desire? What pleases Him? 'Because we obey His command and do what pleases Him. And this is His command...' Two things. 'To believe in the name of His Son, Jesus Christ.' That's number one. Faith. Salvation through Christ, and Christ alone. Christ plus nothing.** And from Christ, that faith in Him should flow love. 'To believe in the name of His Son, Jesus Christ, and to love one another, as He commanded us.' That's the Lord's command. 'Those who obey His commands, live in Him, and He in them. And this is how we know He lives in us.'"

You will notice that John speaks about commandments in the plural constantly throughout his epistle and when he comes to 1 John 3:23 he uses the singular when he mentions believing and loving others. **If he was referring to those two things instead of the Ten Commandments, as opposed to summarising the Ten Commandments, he would have used the plural and not the singular. He would have said,'And these are His commands - believe Christ and love others', not,'And this is His commandment.'**" As we have already seen from Romans 13:8-10 loving others is a SUMMARY of the Ten Commandments, therefore they are not something different as Earl Williams is trying to constantly make out. They define what love is, therefore they are a beautiful thing, not a curse!

What does the word commandment mean? Doesn't it mean something that is obligatory - something that is a must and is required of us? Let's check out the what Christ said on the night of the Last Supper.

John 14:15 "If you love Me, keep **My commandments**.

John 14:21 "He who has **My commandments** and keeps them, it is he who loves Me. And he who loves Me will be loved by My Father, and I will love him and manifest Myself to him."

John 15:10 "If you keep **My commandments**, you will abide in My love, just as I have kept My Father's commandments and abide in His love.

Three times Christ said keep my commandments. Notice he didn't say keep my laws, keep my pattern of behaviour, he said keep my commandments - again the word means something that is **OBLIGATORY - SOMETHING THAT IS REQUIRED OF US!** At first we have to have to keep the commands of God because they are required of us but we have to move beyond that starting point in time as we grow in spiritual maturity and keep God's laws because we know they reveal what works and what doesn't in life and they are for our good to ultimately keeping them because we love God and we want to respond to God as much as we possibly can out of love and tremendous gratitude for His forgiveness and all the blessings He gives to us. **Just because we should**

strive to keep God's commands because we love Him, not because they are required of us in time, does not take away the requirement to keep them!

Let's have a look at just a few of the 32 occasions in the New Testament where the word "commandments" appears which show there is a consistency in the New Testament that there are still laws that are **OBLIGATORY** upon a christian if they wish to receive the gift of salvation:

1 Corinthians 7:19 "Circumcision is nothing and uncircumcision is nothing, **but keeping the commandments of God is what matters.**"

1 John 2:3-5: "Now by this we know that we know Him, if we keep **His commandments. He who says, "I know Him," and does not keep His commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him.** But whoever keeps His word, truly the love of God is perfected in him."

1 John 3:24, "Now he who keeps **His commandments** abides in Him, and He in him. And by this we know that He abides in us, by the Spirit whom He has given us."

1 John 5:2-3, "By this we know that we love the children of God, when we love God and **keep His commandments**. For this is the love of God, that we **keep His commandments. And His commandments are NOT BURDENSOME!**"

Romans 13:9-10: "For **the commandments**, "You shall not commit adultery," "You shall not murder," "You shall not steal," "You shall not bear false witness," "You shall not covet," and if there is any other commandment, are all summed up in this saying, namely, "You shall love your neighbour as yourself." Love does no harm to a neighbour; therefore love is the fulfilment of the law."

James 2:10-12 "For whoever shall keep the whole law, and yet stumble in one point, he is guilty of all. For He who said, "Do not commit adultery," also said, "Do not murder." Now if you do not commit adultery, but you do murder, you have become a transgressor of the law. So speak and so do as those who will be judged by the **law of liberty.**"

Is it possible to have love without law. In the Old Testament we read of the law of kindness(Prov.31:26). The fruits of the spirit are in principle and at least two specific cases(love and kindness) referred to as laws in the Old Testament. The love to God and others great commandments are directly from the book of Deuteronomy. Christ said that mercy, justice and faith were the weightier matters of the **LAW**(Matt.23:23). When it says against such(the fruits of the spirit in Galatians 5:23) there is no law it means that there are no laws against them, NOT that they are apart from the law. And the reason that is so is because those attitudes are a part of the law.

Law is a code or pattern of behaviour. Isn't a pattern of behaviour what love is, what patience is, what kindness is, etc. That's why the great commands of love to God and love to others are in the Old Testament

Williams misrepresents believing in Christ and faith in Christ to mean academic belief **ONLY**. James 2 and 1 John 2:4 show that belief means both academic **AND** emotional belief. If you really do believe wholeheartedly God's way is best in the depths of your being you will strive to live by it and not even desire to do your own thing.

TAPE 3:

In his opening prayer on tape 3 he makes some comments that I, not only think are a personal affront to Mr Armstrong, but to God also when he said, **"Thank you for being patient with us. Forgive us, Father, for our past mistakes. Forgive us for misrepresenting you and misrepresenting the gospel. We didn't know better, Father."**

In reviewing some of his previous material he says, "Some believe we are saved by grace but after that we have to keep the law. Saved by grace and kept by law. Is that true? I think Paul answers that for us in Galatians 3...Still others believe that God saves us by his grace and then after that he gives us His Holy Spirit so that we can come back and keep the law of Moses...Many have proof texted the book of John. **You see, John said if you love Christ and if you will love me, you will keep my commandments. How many of you have proof-texted that to prove that you're supposed to keep the law of Moses. I have - many of us. Does that mean the Ten Commandments, the Sabbath, the Holy Days and everything else. We're going to see that it doesn't.**"

He makes the Gospel only about the death and life of Christ and says nothing about the coming Kingdom. He says, "The gospel is the story of Christ coming, the Father sending Him, Christ's life, His death and His resurrection and His life in us. That's the good story. The love command is demonstrated through the gospel of Christ coming, living, dying and being resurrected. That's what love is...Even as we go to the Feast of Tabernacles. It wasn't about the world tomorrow. You read Leviticus 23. It's not about the world tomorrow. Now, you can extrapolate and make it that if you'd like, but they dwelt in booths, Leviticus 23, why? So that you would remember the story!...Notice even the Sabbath command, it starts actually in verse 12(of Deuteronomy 5), but let's pick it up in verse 15, 'Remember the Sabbath day.' What were they to remember? The story!(of the Exodus)...Was He talking about creation? Not necessarily."

Exodus 20:11 plainly shows the primary emphasis of the Sabbath is a memorial of creation. The reminder of the Exodus when they finally could rest from slavery was a secondary memorial(Hebrews 4). The fact that God in the two accounts of the giving of the Ten Commandments gave two different meanings

shows that God has many layers of meanings in the Sabbath and the Holy Days that He gave us. God's moral law tells us what works and what doesn't work. That's another reason why God gave us His Ten Commandments and His law. The Sabbath and Holy Days keep in the understanding of His plan here on earth and how He plans to bring all mankind into His family. When we lose sight of and no longer keep those days, as is potentially possible for the W.C.G. with Pasadena having taken away every plank for why we should even keep those days as we'll look at later, we lose sight of the great Master plan of God to save all of mankind!

Just as Paul shows the Passover and Unleavened Bread symbolism now have different primary symbolism in 1 Corinthians 5:7-8 with Christ being our Passover and the overcoming of sin pictured by purging out leaven out of our homes, so too, do the other festivals have other new primary symbolism for us as Christians. We are told the Gentiles will keep the Sabbath (Isa. 56:3-4, 66:23) and will not just watch the Jews keep the Feast of Tabernacles but be forced to keep it themselves and punished if they don't (Zech. 14:16-19). Since the Gentiles will have to keep the Sabbath and the Holy Days their meanings cannot be just limited to picturing Israel coming out of Egypt! There must be more significant symbolism in those days for all mankind!

Though not plainly stated in the New Testament, meanings for some of the latter Holy Days of the year were passed down orally and written of by some of the early church historians. Jerome noted that the Jews celebrated the Feast of Tabernacles as a type of the Messiah's rule on earth. In a comment on Zechariah 14, he writes (Comm. in Zach. 625-31), "He says, all who are left of the nations who came against Jerusalem will come up once a year to worship the King, the Lord of Hosts, and to celebrate the Feast of Tabernacles. The Jews look forward to these things with a vain future hope in a reign of 1 000 years, of which the celebration is itself a beginning." Methodius, a Catholic, before the doctrine was finally quashed by opponents, at about the same time wrote, "For I also, taking my journey and going forth from the Egypt of this life, came first to the resurrection which is the true Feast of Tabernacles, and there having set up my tabernacle, adorned with the fruits of virtue, on the first day of the resurrection, which is the day of judgment, **celebrate the Millennium of rest, which is called the seventh day, even the true Sabbath**" (253-4).

Because Christ had not died for them yet God often uses the Exodus, which was vivid in the mind and history, as a reference point as Earl Williams correctly does point out but not for everything as he tries and twists it to mean. Christ's life and death is the new reference point used in the New Testament because it now was the more vivid focal event to teach them lessons. Earl Williams does have a good point in showing us that the life and the death of Christ - that part of the full gospel - can teach us many lessons. The life and death of Christ is only a part of the full good news. Christ's second coming and the Kingdom of God and the incredible ultimate destiny of us in the church are also

used frequently in the New Testament to teach us lessons and to encourage us such as in Romans 8:18 where Paul says that "the sufferings of this world are not worthy to be compared to the glory which shall be revealed in us" and 1 John 3:3 where John says, "Everyone that has this hope in him purifies himself, just as He is pure."

Williams then makes these incredible comments, "One of the worst things that happened to me at Ambassador College was learning scripture cards. **Now, there's nothing wrong with scripture memory, but it was all kind of verses like 1 John 3:4 that I was to use when I went out in the field to put down the Protestant heresy and I've come to understand that it was the heresy.** Because all those scripture cards were taking the Bible out of context to prove your point. Scripture memory is fine, but you'd better look at it in its total context before you build doctrines on it. **And we built doctrines on scriptures pulled here and there. We have to face the truth folks.**" The funniest heretical statement he made that had me in stitches, was where he said that when Moses saw God at Mt Sinai it wasn't actually God but a hologram of God because John wrote that no man has seen God at any time. First of all, John was referring to the Father, not Jesus Christ who was the Rock of the Old Testament(1 Cor.10:4) and the one who dealt with Moses back then. Secondly, since when does a hologram produce such radiance that Moses glowed for days on end after he came down from the mountain and they wanted to put a bag over his head because he was so bright?

He says that 1 John 3:4 in the King James which says sin is the transgression of the law is a mistranslation. He says the Greek word,"Anomiam does not refer to the Ten Commandments. Anomian refers to lawlessness, and in specific here, it refers to rebellion." Does it really? **The Strong's Concordance defines it as "illegality i.e. violation of law...transgress(-ion of) the law"**. So I think he should be a little more careful with his facts. He also misrepresents Ephesians 2:14-18 to say law is no longer required. What Ephesians 2:14-18 is describing is the abolition of the man-made Jewish laws that forbid Jews mixing with Gentiles, much like the apartheid laws recently abolished in South Africa which divided the blacks and the whites.

He said, "And don't be ashamed of the gospel...Don't be ashamed of it. Don't say,'Well, it sounds like Protestantism.' Heh. We're so far behind." Oh really! **HOW COULD THE CATHOLICS AND PROTESTANTS BE RIGHT FOR CENTURIES ABOUT HOW TO BE SAVED AND THE TRUE CHURCH OF GOD BE IN IGNORANCE OF IT FOR ALL OF THAT TIME?** At the end of the sermon the audience, to my horror, actually applauded. It's sad that so many are so gullible in God's church today. I could not help but think of the scripture in 2 Timothy 4 where Paul says the time will come when they will no longer endure sound doctrine and heap up to themselves teachers because they have itching ears and they will turn from the truth to fables such as the trinity and grace by faith alone.

In conclusion God's law is revered continually in the Word of God and exalted as a beautiful and magnificent gift from God to show us how to love God and others. It is incredible how certain liberal teachers have twisted the scriptures so that instead of sin and breaking God's law are bondage they make the law of God out as bondage. Notice some scriptures which show the opposite of Earl Williams' cynical attitude to the law. **"The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul: the testimony of the Lord is sure making wise the simple. The statutes of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart, the commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes"(Ps.19:7-8). "O how love I thy law! It is my meditation all the day...for thy commandments are righteousness" (Ps.119:97,172).** "Wherefore the law is holy and the commandment is holy and just and good"(Rom.7:12). "For this is the love of God, that we keep His commandments: and His commandments are not grievous"(1 John 5:3). In Revelation 14:12 we read,"Here is the patience of the saints: here are they that **KEEP the commandments of God**, and the faith of Jesus Christ" and finally in Revelation 22:14 it says, **"Blessed are they that do His commandments**, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city".