

The Ark of the Covenant discovery, is it 'Adventist-friendly'?

Open letter to Seventh-Day Adventists,

By R. Tourniaire

This letter is specifically directed at Seventh-Day Adventists and the Seventh-Day Churches. The claimed discovery of Christ's blood on the Mercy Seat was made by an active Seventh-Day Adventist. Although Ron tried to cooperate with the church, he eventually got rejected by the leadership and a large portion of his people. We are going to look at why that happened and also some of the theological conflict areas Adventists think they face when they hear about this discovery. Only an intensive study can help us see if this discovery is false or true. Throughout time, God's own people kept rejecting the messengers sent to them. For that reason, it is essential we learn WHY that happened and how we can avoid making the same mistake, and also how we can tell if something is of God or of the enemy.

Topics in this letter:

*Our Mentality, *The discovery of the Ark first given to the Adventist Church *Prophecies with multiple fulfillment's. *The Day of Atonement 1. *Destroying the Adventist pillars? *To the law and to the testimony *Law concerning the sacrifice *Law concerning the blood *A prophet like Moses *The Day of Atonement *Both sacrifice and Priest. *Why could the resurrection take place? *IF He did *Bible prophecies the two sprinklings *Why use the word "anoint" *At the border of the promised land *The Ark to search out a resting place *The Ark of the Covenant had many functions *Can the tables of stone be shown to the world? *What it means to us personally

Question and answer's part:

Question 1: Wasn't the High Priest only allowed into the Most Holy Place once a year? How then could Jesus enter at Passover?

Question 2: How (or) does the Ark discovery fit with the 1888 message?

Question 3: Why are so many crazy people sharing this discovery without the right message?

Question 4: If it was from God, why didn't God send this message to our leaders and have them properly present it to the Church?

Question 5: Why many conservative Adventists reject it, aren't they close to God?

Question 6: These discoveries don't seem to have anything to do with calling people out of Babylon?

Question 7: Does God ever use archaeology?

Question 8: How can we tell what is of God, and what is of the devil?

Question 9: Was the Ark of the Covenant taken to heaven?

Question 10: Did Ron Wyatt go against 1844?

Question 11: Did Ron claim to be an archaeologist without the proper education, isn't that deceptive?

Question 12: How can one man find so many discoveries? Doesn't that make it unlikely?

Question 13: God would never expect us to believe the Ark discovery before it is physically shown?

Question 14: I believe in the Bible, I don't need these things to believe?

Question 15: This discovery, even if it's true, means nothing to me personally.

Question 16: How can you so boldly preach this when you haven't seen the Ark yourself?

Question 17: Who were to take over after Ron Wyatt?

Question 18: Why does God tell about the Ark before He shows it?

Question 19: Why is there only one witness to the Ark, doesn't it have to be more than one in order for a truth to be established? And why hasn't God been doing anything, adding any witnesses, since Ron died?

Question 20: I've heard some bad rumors about Ron Wyatt's character, shouldn't I use that to determine if he has God's fruits or was telling the truth? Would Christians lie?

Question 21: Maybe Ron was psychologically unstable, and fooled even himself into believing this discovery, that he saw things that «weren't there»?

Who am I?

I'm not a pastor, I'm not a scholar nor am I a prophet. I'm not even a man. And if this instantly makes you want to disregard this whole letter, I would like to remind you how some of the greatest truths have come from God through simple people. I'm not saying I am one of them, but what I am saying is that there might be something in this letter God would like you to know, and the only way for you to know for sure is to read it. For almost 30 years, I have been acquainted with the discoveries of Ron Wyatt. For a long time, I have had to listen to people talk badly about the man who helped lead me to Christ, and I've had to suffer harsh treatment by fellow Christians for believing him. But I know in my heart I did something at the beginning, many others didn't. I "searched the scriptures daily, whether those things were so." (Acts 17,11) I didn't trust anyone else to give me a conclusion. I didn't ask my pastor to study it for me. I went on my knees, and I said to God: "If this discovery is true, the evidence is in the Bible. If so, show me. And if this discovery is a deception, the Bible can expose it. If so, show me". Then I got up and opened my Bible. I will present some of the things I discovered. Can I say that I got it all right? No, this letter is not meant to tell you how it absolutely should be interpreted but to present you with some material you yourself can use to pray over and study to find out if some of it might just be right. Remember when Rachel Oakes Preston first addressed the Millerites about the Sabbath, they were too busy to give her any notice. Later, a couple of men decided to see if it weren't so and accepted her bible study. Then, Ellen White, who at that time had already received visions, was tested to see if she, by study, would receive the Sabbath before receiving a revelation on it. Yes, God wanted even her to learn to study scripture when presented with something new. And she did. Because of the pioneers' willingness to study and pray to see if «it is so,» the church got its main pillar of faith, the Sabbath, in its very name.

Now, please give me this time and hear me out and gather yourselves together and pray and study. Perhaps you can perfect this study? Maybe you can add to it, or something could be right and something else possibly wrong? When God sends us any light, we are to do this work and study. I cannot gather a large party of elders to study with me on these Biblical topics, so I'm sending it out to you all. It's now in your hands, please follow the council we have been given and study these things for yourselves. English is my second language, and so this letter is by no means in perfect English. But I hope the meaning will come across just fine.

Our mentality

Why did the Jews reject their own savior that they had been waiting for? How was that even possible? Before we can study the theology concerning the Ark, we first have to find out if we even have the right mentality to study.

Jesus said: *“Search the scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me. And ye will not come to me, that ye might have life.”* (John 5:39-40)

It's not to be avoided to note that in both Jeremiah's time and in Christ's time, the decisions of God's people led to the destruction of the temple. It was the leaders and priests that influenced the majority of the people to first reject God's messengers, and then eventually reject Christ Himself.

We see an important point worth reflecting on here. Jesus acknowledged that they studied the scriptures in His day. In fact, they praised themselves for being diligent students of scripture. They had schools where they learned how to 'correctly interpret' scripture. Yes, they did have theology schools. They had their scrolls under their arms, just like we have the Bible under ours today.

Yet, they searched the scripture and found no evidence there for Christ being the Messiah. The truth, as we know now, is that the mission of Christ was written all over, in the law and the prophets, yet they searched the scriptures and saw nothing 'convincing'. In the same way, someone claiming to be a humble Bible researcher, asserting there is no evidence for Ron's discovery in the Bible, might not reflect reality. It doesn't matter whether they are an educated theologian or someone who can brag about many years as a Bible student, which is why it's each person's duty to study the matter on their own with an open mind.

Let's look at an example of how they used the scriptures to prove Christ was not the Messiah:

“They answered and said unto him, Art thou also of Galilee? Search, and look: for out of Galilee ariseth no prophet.” (John 7:52)

Here we see the chief priests and the Pharisees confronting Nicodemus about Jesus. They encourage him to search the scriptures. They claim it says no prophet would come from Galilee. But does it really? Or are these assumptions added to Scripture? This is what we battle all the time. Not with the scriptures, but all the assumptions that people mix with the scriptures. Let's take another look and see this misunderstanding unfold:

“Others said, This is the Christ. But some said, Shall Christ come out of Galilee? Hath not the scripture said, That Christ cometh of the seed of David, and out of the town of Bethlehem, where David was?” (John 7:41-42)

The scriptures did say that the Messiah would originate from Bethlehem: *“And thou Bethlehem, in the land of Judah, art not the least among the princes of Judah: for out of thee shall come a Governor, that shall rule my people Israel.”* (Mat 2:6)

And so, they apparently had a verse from scripture 'proving' their case. And it didn't even contradict Jesus being the Messiah because although he never really lived there or came from

there when he started His ministry, He was born there. When looking at this scripture, people saw, and many still do, that the person mentioned had to have grown up there, lived there and/or started his work from there. But these are merely assumptions based on scripture. The verse doesn't contain these criteria. But, it's easy to suppose that the limitations we create in our heads are what the scriptures actually say. Numerous people tend to be very narrow-minded in this way. God's people keep reading the scriptures today and still conclude with things the Bible doesn't necessarily conclude with.

We create limitations that the Bible doesn't make. And part of the mentality behind this is controlled. Because once we have accepted a truth, we feel that this truth will be threatened by something new and unknown added to it, so we place our truth 'in a box', so to speak, to make sure nothing is added to it or removed from it. This is the main reason why diligent Bible researchers throughout the ages have ended up rejecting God's messengers. We are more faithful to our own assumptions than we are to scripture itself.

The Adventists' own prophet warns us against this mentality and says it can lead us into great danger:

“EVEN Seventh-day Adventists are in DANGER of closing their eyes to TRUTH ... because it contradicts SOMETHING which they have taken for granted as truth, but which the Holy Spirit teaches is not truth.” (The Ellen G. White 1888 Materials, p. 1547, by Ellen G. White)

“As a people we are certainly in GREAT DANGER ... of considering our IDEAS, because long cherished, to be Bible doctrines and on every point infallible, and measuring everyone by the rule of our interpretation of Bible truth. This is our DANGER, and this would be THE GREATEST EVIL that could ever come to us as a people.” (The Ellen G. White 1888 Materials, p. 830, by Ellen G. White)

The greatest evil? Why? Because it will prevent us from receiving any new light or messenger God would send us. Among conservative Adventists, this attitude is even more visible. They think that as long as they do not add one single doctrine to whatever light they had in the 19th century when Ellen White lived, they are saved, and God approves of them. But Ellen White stated the polar opposite. That if there had been no development, no new light or further reform took place, it's a sign that they are not favored by God.

“It is a fact that we have the truth, and we must hold with tenacity to the positions that cannot be shaken; but we must not look with suspicion upon any new light which God may send, and say, Really, we cannot see that we need any more light than the old truth which we have hitherto received, and in which we are settled. While we hold to this position, the testimony of the True Witness applies to our cases its rebuke, “And knowest not that thou art wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked.” Those who feel rich and increased with goods and in need of nothing, are in a condition of blindness as to their true condition before God, and they know it not.” — The Review and Herald, August 7, 1894

She compares the mentality to the warning given to the church of Laodicea. Now, many conservative Adventists love to discuss the state of Laodicea, placing it upon all the liberal Adventists. Yet, they have shown more of the attitude mentioned in this quote than any other. The ability to separate from a cherished view added to the light God has given is desperately needed to receive new light.

So, if you see a group of Adventists bragging about how they have fought off the devil and not added to their understanding of the law and the prophet since Ellen White, it's actually a bad sign.

One of the assumptions many have made concerning 1844, and that they think is from the Bible and Ellen White, is that if Jesus went into the Most holy place with His blood in 1844 (LIGHT FROM GOD) then that means (limiting conclusion) that He cannot sprinkle an Ark of the Covenant at any other time. Do you see the difference between light given by divine providence and added conclusions? We often think that one thing also means the other. But the only established fact is the 'one confirmed thing'. The other 'fact' is only our own conclusion, or our own opinion. The Messiah coming from Bethlehem did not mean He could not grow up in Galilee, did it? And so, it is when we add conclusions and think that those added conclusions are the actual light itself that we place ourselves in a position where we can end up rejecting God's ever shining light and also His messengers.

Ellen White says new light is always built on old light. And in this letter we are not going to remove any pillar of light given to the Advent movement, we are only going to supplement it.

When God's people receive light on a topic, they will always study and add thoughts and ideas to that light. These thoughts and ideas could be traditional thinking, and they might interfere with the next «block of light» God wants to place on 'the building'. Throughout all ages this has been the biggest problem, that when God wishes to build on previous light, we have placed so many ideas and thoughts on top of the «previous bricks» that the next «brick» doesn't fit. Or we worry that the personal things we placed on top of this 'brick' will be crushed by the «next brick». Then we start protecting our brick with all the stuff on it, thinking our 'stuff' was part of the light we received from God. All of God's people who have received previous light have traditional thinking that will be challenged with any new additional light. According to Ellen White, even Adventists would face this problem. And there are numerous quotes on this matter.

We can also compare it with a brick wall that has gaps in it. God doesn't reveal all the truth at once. While waiting for God to fill in our understanding where it's lacking, we tend to try to fill in these gaps ourselves, then we say that the whole wall is holy. When God brings the pieces that were supposed to go into the cracks in the said wall, we refuse because we have already squeezed our ideas into these spaces.

Let me bring this principle into practice. The strange faces of disbelief and worry I have received sometimes when telling them that there is no door out of the Most Holy place, and that when the High Priest went out of the most Holy Place in the temple, He had work to do by the altar again. They have received light that Christ has entered the Most Holy, they know that when Christ is finished there, He will return. And in that sequence of understanding, they have filled in the gaps.

They leave no more room for any other light of Christ's mission in the final stages of His priestly work that might be revealed later. Their traditional thinking says, "He'll do no more". However, the real light God conveyed to them only gave them an understanding of His mission in that particular place, not a full insight into everything. And so, the "do no more" is an inaccurate conclusion they added to the light God had already given.

God will always have additional understanding, additional knowledge and light for us to receive. But they most often come in portions. If we have wrapped the previous light with our personal conclusions and taped it all up with good intentions, we will prevent God from giving us a fuller, better understanding. We will conclude that the new light God is offering is threatening the previous light, when in fact it would strengthen the old light. And, before we know it, we will find ourselves fighting against God and His messengers with the best of intentions. We will comfort ourselves that we are protecting God's truth and that what we are doing is in God's favor.

This scripture reveals how badly this can end: «They shall put you out of the synagogues: yea, the time cometh, that whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service.» (John 16:2) «Think that he doeth God service». Did you go against the discovery of Ron Wyatt thinking you did «God service»? If you have, you now have another opportunity to study the matter.

In every stage of the Reformation, new light was given. But large groups stopped and refused to receive more knowledge that would have taken them further. And almost every new truth-bearer was viewed with suspicion and despised, and called someone who was changing a belief they thought was good enough. The Lutherans stopped with Luther, the Anabaptists stopped their progress, the Presbyterians etc. They all stopped with some strong leader(s), thinking they would stay safe if they believed what they believed and nothing more. Many Adventists have done this very same thing.

They stopped with Ellen White, even though the year she died she said that God had more light to give and also that God would send more messengers. «*As never before we should pray not only that laborers may be sent forth into the great harvest field, but that we may have a clear conception of truth, so that when the messengers of truth shall come we may accept the message and respect the messenger.*» (15MR 90.2)

The lack of new revelations and further reform is evidence that we are following man and not following the living Christ. For if it is Christ we are following, we will find Him constantly moving forward, and the only safety we have is to follow and not get stuck with the last great leader's belief alone.

Even many of those who received Ron Wyatt's message managed to do this as well. The moment he died they trusted that he, surely, he who had seen the Ark, must know all there is to know. And the safest thing would be to stick with whatever he believed and taught and not add any new understanding to it. So, even there, it stops. It appears that groups of God's people who have their eyes set on the wrong goal will always stop before they are supposed to.

And so, you will see some people continuing to share Ron's discoveries, wanting to do it just as he did it and criticizing anyone talking it to the next step.

Even though they say that what Ron believed is good enough for them, at the same time they wonder why God hasn't done much more since Ron died. This, of course, is because they are not moving forward with Christ. But Christ, not man or woman, is to be our focus point at all times. «*The Lord will take out of the way those workers who are not moving forward in His lines.*» (Manuscript Releases Volume Eighteen, p. 188, by Ellen G. White) God is very patient, this is something you should keep in mind.

The discovery of the Ark, first given to the Adventist Church

In the same way that the Messiah came to the Jews to help bring the gospel to the world, the discovery of the Ark of the Covenant was first given to the Adventist Church to help them share the third angel's message to the world.

When the leaders of the Jewish people rejected their God-given mission, it was handed over to uneducated and educated lay workers, a movement within the Jewish community. God did everything He was supposed to do. Just like He gave the Jews a prophecy of the coming of the Messiah in Daniel 9, He gave the Adventist Church a prophet to tell us ahead of time that the Ark of the Covenant was safely hidden in a cave and that it would be discovered at the right time.

Let's look at the two most important prophecies and what they tell us. People of all ages have wondered what happened to the Ark. The Jews as well. Yet no light of its destiny was given to them. If Ron Wyatt's discovery is authentic, there was only one church-related prophet who foretold where it was and what would happen correctly. And this was given to the prophet of the Adventist Church:

“Among the righteous still in Jerusalem, to whom had been made plain the divine purpose, were some who determined to place beyond the reach of ruthless hands the sacred ark containing the tables of stone on which had been traced the precepts of the Decalogue. This they did. With mourning and sadness, they secreted the ark in a cave, where it was to be hidden from the people of Israel and Judah because of their sins, and was to be no more restored to them. That sacred ark is yet hidden. It has never been disturbed since it was secreted.” (Prophets and Kings, p453)

She says this happened before Babylon destroyed the city and temple. That is right, God revealed to the Adventist church this great hidden secret.

She revealed the following:

- It was hidden in a cave
- It was safe
- It will not be given back to the Jewish people

Ellen White wrote on this book in the final stages of her life, and it was published after she died. So, about the year 1914, we know that the Ark had still been UNDISTURBED from the time it was placed in the cave. That is a long period of time when it was preserved. No one had found it, no one had the chance to destroy it. This means that Ellen White confirms that the tables of stone that were in the Ark are here in a cave, on earth, undisturbed up to the day she died.

But let's see what she says will happen to it in the future: *“And He [Christ] gave unto Moses, when He had made an end of communicating with him upon Mount Sinai, two tables of testimony, tables of stone, written by the finger of God.” Nothing written on those tables could be blotted out. The precious record of the law was placed in the ark of the testament and is still there, safely hidden from the human family. But in God's appointed time He will bring forth these tables of stone to be a testimony to all the world against the disregard of His commandments and against the idolatrous worship of a counterfeit Sabbath” (MS 122, 1901).*

«There are abundant evidences of the immutability of God's law. It was written with the finger of God, never to be obliterated, never to be destroyed. The tables of stone are hidden by God, to be produced in the great judgment-day, just as He wrote them. (The Review and Herald, March 26,

1908).

So, let's say that these quotes are talking about the tables of stone in heaven. The problem is that the ones in heaven are not really hidden. She clearly states it was the earthly Ark that was hidden, hidden from the «human family». Surely, God does not need to hide the tables of stone from the «human family» in heaven? The words are clear, yet those who refuse to believe Ron's testimony twist these same words.

“When the judgment shall sit, and the books shall be opened, and every man shall be judged according to the things written in the books, then the tables of stone, hidden by God until that day, will be presented before the world as the standard of righteousness. Then men and women will see that the prerequisite of their salvation is obedience to the perfect law of God. None will find an excuse for sin. By the righteous principles of that law, men will receive their sentence of life or of death” (The Review and Herald, January 28, 1909)

Again, notice how she says they have been ‘hidden’. And notice that God says it is “the tables of stone”, the physical handwritten tables that had been placed in the Ark.

Another famous quote is from *The Great Controversy*, a book very dear to the Adventists. To many, this quote speaks of God writing the law on the heavens. Yet, that is an assumption based on other things she writes in other places, failing to see that God may have multiple ways to communicate His law at the end times.

“The glory of the celestial city streams from the gates ajar. Then there appears against the sky a hand holding two tables of stone folded together. Says the prophet, “The heavens shall declare His righteousness; for God is judge himself.” [Psalm 50:6.]

“That holy law, God’s righteousness, that amid thunder and flame was proclaimed from Sinai as the guide of life, is now revealed to men as the rule of judgment. The hand opens the tables, and there are seen the precepts of the Decalogue, traced as with a pen of fire. The words are so plain that all can read them.” GC p639)

The hand holding the two tables of stone against the sky is not said to be FROM heaven, that is just something many assume when reading these very words. It says, “against the sky”. And it is the heavens, God, who is bringing this revelation about. It should be unnecessary to tell the meaning of English words, as you do with Hebrew and Greek words when studying the Bible. Most who have been able to read thus far know this scene might just as well be talking about someone holding the tables of stone up towards the sky. It doesn't necessarily have to mean there are just two floating hands without a body either (that's an assumption). The logical thing to do when seeing her other quotes on the Ark being found with the real tables of stone, is that Ellen White is describing the event from a perspective where she cannot see the face or identity of the person holding the law. Not that it is just hands alone. She sees it from that person's perspective or she looks up at the hands holding it and not down on the body of the man.

And if God would want to show the tables of stone along with a law from the sky, He can do so as well. God can do anything; He can do both. One does not do away with another. We mustn't add limitations to God and then claim it's a fact.

From Ellen White's quotes we, therefore, learn that order of the events:

—“With mourning and sadness they secreted the ark in a cave, where it was to be hidden”

—“The precious record of the law was placed in the ark of the testament and is still there, safely hidden from the human family.”

—“then the tables of stone, hidden by God until that day, will be presented before the world as the standard of righteousness.”

—“Then there appears against the sky a hand holding two tables of stone folded together... the hand opens the tables, and there are seen the precepts of the Decalogue”

Why do I feel like Paul when he was trying to show from the Old Testament that Jesus is the Messiah? The truth of this matter as well is so plain, yet many still refuse to see. For what she says to take place, we have to expect the following:

— The Ark must be located in that cave

— It has to be found by someone who believes the law is still valid (who observes them)

— And God has to give that person(s) permission to take out the law.

It's very simple. And let's add one more expectation.

— The Ark must be found by someone who had received God's previous messengers, among them is Ellen White, who foretold of the event. Meaning, an Adventist. Ellen White clearly stated the Jewish nation would not get the assignment. And so, what happened? A Seventh Day Adventist who respects God's law and believes in the last messenger, Ellen White, is led to search for the Ark, finds it in a cave and tells us that God will show them to the world after the National Sunday laws have been made. This is the fulfillment of prophecy.

If the Ark of the Covenant was to be found and God had planned to use the tables of stone, we know: *“Surely the Lord GOD will do nothing, but he revealeth his secret unto his servants the prophets.”* (Amos 3:7) So, what prophet of what church was told in advance? The Seventh Day Adventists Church. This discovery is actually witnessing back to Ellen White that she is a prophet of God. It's so simple, yet the church rejects it. Even uses Ellen White to reject it. Why? Because Ron Wyatt provided additional information that Ellen White didn't have. He said, not only was the Ark and the tables of stone there, but the cave was underneath the crucifixion site and the blood of Christ had gone down and fallen on the mercy seat.

And so, the shocking discovery is rejected completely. The events didn't happen as expected, as they usually never do. For some conservatives, this even rocked the pillar of the Adventist faith, that the Ark in heaven was sprinkled in 1844.

Was Ron challenging light that had already been given, or was he adding additional understanding? And this is the core subject of our study here in this letter. Were the Adventists, who had the prophet and had been foretold of this discovery, going to reject it? Just because it didn't happen as people expected it to? Who did that before? The Jews. They were expecting the Messiah, they longed for Him to come. But when Jesus didn't do things the way they had hoped and expected, they rejected Him. They just couldn't take the message that came with the Messiah. They were offended and believed it ruined the customs they had been given by Moses. And this is the exact same reason why many Adventists rejected this particular discovery.

Prophecies with multiple fulfillments.

One of the faults of the Jewish people was that they didn't understand that there could be multiple prophecies contained in one prophesy. In the Bible, you would sometimes see that there is made no difference between Christ's first, second and third coming. (If you are an Adventist, you believe that after the second coming to the earth, it is left desolate. And in time, the New Jerusalem and Christ will descend to earth again a third time to burn it and recreate it.)

It all appears as one prophecy, but it can be applied to multiple time-periods. The Jews didn't understand that the prophecy could be divided into different appearances of Christ, and different time-periods. They just saw that one time and desired it to come. And according to the prophecy, as they interpreted it, Jesus was to be a ruler, a king. He was to establish His kingdom on earth. But when Jesus came the first time, He did not fulfill these parts of the prophecy that was reserved for His second and even third coming.

So, the Jews claimed they had the Scriptures and the prophets on their side when they rejected Christ. They could quote it and point to Christ and say, He doesn't do that. He doesn't have the power He is supposed to. And then they added that if Jesus died, it is the ultimate evidence that He was not the Messiah according to scripture. For the kingdom of the Messiah would not end.

The flaw in their understanding was again to put limitations on the word of God that wasn't originally there. If God wants to place multiple time fulfillment in one prophecy, He may do that if He so chooses to. Jesus did it again when the disciples asked about the end of the world. Jesus merged the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 AD with the end of the world. Nowhere does He explain where the one prophecy ends and the other begins. In fact, they are mixed for the simple reason that they are similar events.

There are often multiple time prophecies in one prophecy. This is just something we must accept. And we must be smart enough to not use scripture against scripture or, even worse, use scripture against God Himself.

The Day of Atonement.

One such dual prophecy is the Day of Atonement. No one can deny that the symbols in these rituals must be applied to at least another time-period besides 1844. For all the sacrificial animals, the bull, the goat, and the ram, had their fulfillment in 31 AD. And the scapegoat has its fulfillment AFTER the High Priest was done "cleansing the sanctuary" and had left the Most Holy Place. And so, the Day of Atonement stretches in time for over 2000 years. Some of it had to happen on the cross (as that's when the blood of the day of atonement was shed), while other parts of it had to take place on the heavenly day of atonement in what is believed to be in 1844.

And we are going to look at symbol after symbol in the Day of Atonement a little later in this letter. And I hope you will agree with me when going through that study that not only does the discovery of the Ark of the Covenant not remove 1844, but if the blood didn't go down on the mercy seat when Christ died here on earth, then 1844 could NOT HAVE TAKEN PLACE. And

so, the conclusion of the study will reveal that the discovery confirms the heavenly Day of Atonement and doesn't abolish it. But we must look at some other important issues first and then we will get back to this specific topic.

Destroying the Adventist pillars?

For many conservative Adventists, this is their greatest worry tied to this discovery. And many are actively preaching against it by saying it rocks the foundations of our faith. It's viewed as a deception of the Devil. They think God favors them when they attack the discoveries with their words and actions. We see the same concern from those who rejected Christ and his disciples:

“Then they suborned men, which said, We have heard him speak blasphemous words against Moses, and against God. And they stirred up the people, and the elders, and the scribes, and came upon him, and caught him, and brought him to the council, And set up false witnesses, which said, This man ceaseth not to speak blasphemous words against this holy place, and the law: For we have heard him say, that this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place, and shall change the customs which Moses delivered us.” (Act 6:11-14)

There is nothing admirable about having this attitude if it's based on lies. You are not a concerned loving shepherd, you are just a liar, or at best a deceived liar. If those God called to share these things preach the pillars of the Adventists' faith, you are a liar if you say it leads people from them. It's as simple as that. It's not going to help you if you keep the fourth commandment, if you at the same time break the ninth.

The accusations the Jews made towards the disciples and Jesus are like the accusations made against these discoveries by many Adventists. Back then, they all, including Paul, had to defend themselves, saying the gospel was confirming the law and the prophets. That the sanctuary service was moved from earth to heaven, not that it was abolished. That the priestly service had moved from the earthly to Jesus, and that the law was still valid, not destroyed or set aside. The 'shadows' were just replaced by what they were shadowing, the mission of the Messiah. It was never done away with; the type was replaced with the antitype. Jesus said: *“Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill.” (Mat 5:17)*

It's those who don't know God as they should, that keep ending up using God's word against Him.

I'm sure the Jewish leaders and priests were very proud of protecting the “sheep” from what to them was a “terrible deceiver” of Satan. (Mark 3:22)

It's the same with this discovery. It doesn't remove one single Adventist God-given pillar, it compliments them. But, many people fail to see this because their eyes are clouded with misconceptions and false ideas. They let fear and misguided concern control them. They think their doctrines are clean and without any fault, when they are not.

The same that was said in the time of Jesus is said now:

‘If it's from God, why didn't he send the light from the leaders to the congregation?’

‘Why didn't God choose someone who was admired and acknowledged, rather than a common man/people?’

‘The Jews at that time knew less than we know now.

We know what mistakes they made, yet we repeat them just the same. And so, the fault of the Advent people is just as bad.

Why, with each generation of reformers, do they always think they now have succeeded? That they already finally have all the light they need? Why do we NEVER learn that we don't?’

A falling away in the church is always based on one or both of the following:

- 1) Rejection of light already given
- 2) The refusal to continue reforming and receiving new light.

Many pastors and preachers only focus on the first point. And the people are leading their own preachers astray when they say: “Come and preach to us what we already know and what we have already heard.” These are the most popular lay preachers and pastors today. Many come to their meetings, and they give them a clap of acknowledgment on their shoulders. “See? He’s a good guy! He preaches the truth we already know and nothing more. He’s safe, we can trust him”. But Ellen White warns us and says this is not the case.

Why have I taken the time to say all of this? For, as we saw at the beginning of this letter. It's not going to help us if we sit down and study the Bible if we have the wrong attitude. I would be sharing scripture verses in vain. The Scribes and Pharisees studied and didn't see the fulfillment staring them right into the eyes. They claimed to be close to God, closer than all the others, yet they didn't recognize their God when they saw Him face to face. Instead, they plotted to silence Him and kill Him. What is further away from what you think you are and what you actually are than that? They thought, as we do, that had we lived back then we would not have rejected the Lord as they did. To that, Jesus said: *«Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! Because ye build the tombs of the prophets, and garnish the sepulchers of the righteous, And say, If we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets. Wherefore ye be witnesses unto yourselves, that ye are the children of them which killed the prophets.» (Mat 23:29-31)*

They had the WORD and the EVIDENCE, but their attitudes prevented the light from shining into their hearts. This why I pray and hope you will look at the Biblical evidence that I will place before you with an open mind. Otherwise, not even the Bible can convince you. The Bible and the Bible alone will have no effect on you personally. Humble yourself, think less of your ability to discern and pray God to help you discern instead. Let self die. Trust God.

“To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.”

I have heard this scripture from Isaiah 8:20 been used against the discovery of the Ark of the Covenant with Christ's blood on it. It shows just how blind those who speak against it have become. Many who use this scripture text don't even know the law. Just because you are an Adventist or even a conservative Adventist doesn't mean you know the law. The word translated “law” here is “TORAH”. The Torah is also the instructions and laws found in the ceremonial laws. This means that we can find the truth by studying God's laws, ceremonial laws, and IF our conclusions and assumptions go against the testimony in these laws it is a clear SIGN that we are on a path AWAY from the truth.

The problem is that many Christians today have little knowledge of what these laws say. Still,

most are convinced that Jesus came to «FULFILL THE LAW AND THE PROPHETS» just as Jesus said. It doesn't mean that Jesus was obligated to follow everything that is mentioned in the ceremonial laws, but that these laws were given to testify of what was going to happen in the future. It's important to know the difference. Many of the ceremonial laws were prophecies. And this is why we can use them as a measuring rod.

And I will be doing this in this letter. So, we are not only going to just throw this scripture out as an argument, but we are going to practice it by going to the law and the prophets and see what they tell us. And you are welcome to dismiss argument after argument. We are warming up with some you can dispute if you like. But I hope the overwhelming evidence summed up when you have read it all will convince you.

Throughout this study, I will keep asking you the same question that you must answer for yourself:

— IS IT BIBLICAL?

Law concerning the sacrifice:

In Leviticus chapter 17, we are told the following law concerning the sacrifice:

“What man soever there be of the house of Israel, that killeth an ox, or lamb, or goat, in the camp, or that killeth it out of the camp, And bringeth it not unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, to offer an offering unto the LORD before the tabernacle of the LORD; blood shall be imputed unto that man; he hath shed blood; and that man shall be cut off from among his people: To the end that the children of Israel may bring their sacrifices, which they offer in the open field, even that they may bring them unto the LORD, unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, unto the priest, and offer them for peace offerings unto the LORD.” (Lev. 17:3-5)

What we learn here is that for a sacrifice to be approved as a sacrifice by God, it had to be done in front of the Lord's tabernacle. It could not be sacrificed independently of the Tabernacle. If Christ were to die out on the field, or on a mountain, or in any other place away from the sanctuary, according to this statement in the law, the sacrifice would not be accepted, and the blood would not work as atonement, but would instead condemn the man. Meaning, if Christ had to fulfill this He had to die by the Sanctuary or else the blood would not serve us, but the blood would accuse us. If we believe Christ had to fulfill this requirement as our sacrifice, it should be a scary thought that the sanctuary was not present where Christ was crucified.

In fact, all sin offerings, as well as burnt offerings and peace offerings, had to take place by the sanctuary. This was because the law that had been violated was inside the sanctuary and was to “witness” that the sin had been paid for.

So, we will ask the following question. Is it Biblical that Christ's sacrifice for mankind would take place at a place where the sanctuary items, including the law of God, were? Whether He did or didn't we cannot argue that it is a Biblical principle. We cannot argue that it is “to the law”. Especially when a sacrifice made outside the setting of the sanctuary wasn't accepted as a legal atonement.

What argument can you say against? You can say Christ died before the heavenly sanctuary and not the earthly. Or you can say the law did not apply to Christ's sacrifice. But if you say the latter, you cannot say your argument is «to the law» can you?

What is the argument for Christ fulfilling it?

Murder and sacrifice are not the same in the Bible, this is why certain criteria must be fulfilled. We are not saved by Christ being MURDERED; we are saved by Him presenting Himself as a sacrifice according to the ceremonial laws.

Jesus was the fulfillment of all the sacrificial animals.

The veil in the temple didn't tear until Christ died, and it represented the end of the earthly sanctuary. *“Jesus, when he had cried again with a loud voice, yielded up the ghost. And, behold, the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom; and the earth did quake, and the rocks rent” (Mat 27:50-51)*

Did it perhaps represent that the way to the Most Holy in the earthly sanctuary had been revealed? When the veil rent, they saw no Ark inside the Most Holy, but at the same time the rocks were rent underneath Christ's cross, and the Ark was revealed there instead. Because of the disobedience of the Jews, God, who knew this would happen, had taken the original temple furniture from them and had them hidden. The location was right where they would finally kill Jesus, so that the law would be fulfilled. It is an interesting thought at least, is it not?

If we think that it was enough for Christ to have died in front of a heavenly sanctuary, we need to take into consideration that if you believe that, that it is even being the case, is not evidence that Christ didn't also die in front of the earthly. One idea doesn't necessarily do away with another.

There is room for both in scripture, and there should be room for both in our hearts. Again, we must not place limitations on God based on our private interpretation. But you need not accept this argument, but I have more. A lot more. So, stay with me a little longer.

THE BLOOD

The next important detail from the law is that the blood COULD NOT BE PLACED wherever. *“For the life of the flesh is in the blood: and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul.” (Lev 17:11)*

Even though, at certain times, the blood was taken into the sanctuary, the rest could NOT just be wasted somewhere random. There were specific laws related to what the priest did with the rest of the blood. Occasionally, it was sprinkled in the direction of the Ark of the Covenant and the Most Holy, sometimes on the horns of the altar of incense and the rest was poured by the foot of the altar of burnt offering. Every so often it was sprinkled on its horns, sometimes on the side. All was done within the area of the sanctuary. It was not taken outside the area of the sanctuary. Blood was never treated as unimportant. According to «the law and the testimony», the blood of the sacrificial animal had to have a goal tied to its purpose. This is because according to the law,

it is THE BLOOD that saved us and that is to be the WITNESS to the sanctuary and law that our penalty has been paid.

Thus, the blood is the witness in the sanctuary service and is the only part of the sacrificial animal that was brought into the sanctuary.

And so, the sanctuary had to witness the animal sacrificed by it being sacrificed in front of it, and the blood was the only witness to enter the sanctuary itself.

We could say that this part of the law didn't have to be fulfilled by Christ. That Jesus didn't have to be sacrificed for our sake according to the LAW (Torah) and the prophets.

Or we can say that the foot of the cross is a 'good enough' replacement for the altar of burnt offering. Yes, we could say that. But how can it then be possible that the blood of the sacrificial animals was treated with more care than the blood of Christ sacrifice?

Is it Biblical that the blood would be taken through the foot of the cross and towards the sanctuary items? It certainly is Biblical.

But if you are not convinced, we will go on to even stronger arguments than these.

But one thing you must agree with when reading these requirements of the law is that the discovery of Ron Wyatt is at least closer to these specific laws than those who argue against it and say Christ did not have to meet these requirements, right?

A prophet like Moses

Before we are going to look at the Day of Atonement, we will look at the confirmation of the Covenant.

The law witness: *"The LORD thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken"* (Deut. 18:15)

A prophet like Moses? What was Moses assignment as a prophet? Let's have a look:

- To lead the people out of captivity.
- To teach the people God's laws.
- To be a mediator and confirm a covenant between God and the people.
- Introduce and lead the construction of the Sanctuary and the service there.
- Anoint the priests and the sanctuary.

We are told that for a High Priest to even be able to represent God's people in the sanctuary, a covenant between God and the people had to be confirmed. We know from the book of Hebrews that Christ is our High Priest and has gone into the sanctuary in heaven to work for us there. But the law, the Torah, says that a covenant MUST be confirmed before this can take place. And please notice, it is not me making this comparison between Moses confirming the old covenant and Christ's confirmation of the new covenant. It is the Bible itself that compares the two events by making them types and antitypes. In the book of Hebrews, chapter 9, Paul compares the two covenants. The same Paul writes in another place that there are new promises in the new

covenant and a new mediator. We are not told of any other changes. In order to confirm a covenant, Moses had to be a mediator between God and the people. So let us compare Moses and Jesus, the type and the antitype.

1. MOSES; The promise given:

“And Moses came and called for the elders of the people, and laid before their faces all these words which the LORD commanded him. And all the people answered together, and said, All that the LORD hath spoken we will do. And Moses returned the words of the people unto the LORD. And the LORD said unto Moses, Lo, I come unto thee in a thick cloud, that the people may hear when I speak with thee, and believe thee forever. And Moses told the words of the people unto the LORD.” (Exo. 19:7-9)

1. JESUS; Jesus preached the law but also the promise of salvation:

“If ye love me, keep my commandments. And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever” (John 14:15-16) “For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” (John 3:16)

In fact, Jesus identified what laws He were to confirm:

“Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil.” (Matt.5,17)

2. The time of MOSES: The law is given verbally to the people. (Exo.19,18)

2. JESUS: As we know, Jesus was educating people in God's law through His mission work for 3,5 years. He taught them to deny sin and choose obedience to God. The prophecies concerning the Messiah said He would do this. Jesus was a living witness, the law in flesh. In addition, He also said He came to confirm the law.

3. MOSES: The Law was written down.

The mediator Moses wrote the laws down in a book along with the promises. And so, the book contained both the law and the promise.

3. JESUS: Did He ever write down the law physically? We are told no one has ever seen God. And so, the Person Moses saw on Mount Sinai and who wrote then ten commandments with His own finger was none other than JESUS. Jesus Himself claimed to be “I AM”, and Ellen White confirms that the one Moses was interacting with was Jesus.

Therefore, if Jesus told the truth about being “I AM” or Jehovah, the Ten Commandments were written with the handwriting of Christ. And so, Christ wrote the law.

4. MOSES. Moses as the mediator builds an altar at the foot of the mountain.

4. JESUS. Did Jesus make an altar by the foot of a mountain? You decide after we have looked at the rest.

5. MOSES. Moses erected 12 pillars, one for each tribe of Israel. (Exo. 24:4)

5. JESUS. Did Jesus erect 12 pillars? Jesus chose 12 disciples to be the foundation for the spreading of the gospel and God's covenant with man. They were witnesses and ‘stones’ of the

memorial of the new covenant. (Rev. 21:14)

6. MOSES: 70 chosen

God chose 70 people of the eldest to see Him and be witnesses for the rest of the people. (Exo.24:9-10)

6. JESUS: 70 chosen

Jesus also chose 70 messengers that He instructed, and they were to be witnesses of Him to all of Israel. *“the Lord appointed other seventy also...”* (Matt.18,22, Se also Luke 10:17)

7. MOSES: FREE WILL

They were asked if they wanted to be part of the covenant by their own choice.

7. JESUS: I don't think I need to provide all the scriptures saying we enter a covenant with Christ freely. It's our decision.

8. MOSES:

8. JESUS:

Yes, let's just skip point 8 for now and go straight on to point 9.

9. MOSES: sprinkled blood upon the people as a sign they were a part of the covenant.

“And Moses took the blood, and sprinkled it on the people, and said, Behold the blood of the covenant, which the LORD hath made with you concerning all these words.” (Exo 24:8)

9. JESUS: I think you have already recognized the parallel and similar wording. But let's quote Jesus anyway: *“And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; For this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.”* (Matt.26,27-28)

Jesus asked them to partake in the covenant by drinking the symbol of His blood. It's clear now that Jesus is fulfilling the confirmation of the new covenant. But as in the old days, Jesus could not sprinkle His physical blood physically on every human being from that time and until our day. And so, He presented this symbol.

But the wording is similar. Both say, “the blood of the covenant/testimony” (Covenant and testimony are the same word in the original Biblical transcripts in the New Testament)

We see that of the things Moses had to do as a mediator between the people and God BEFORE they could set up the sanctuary and the sanctuary service, was to CONFIRM A COVENANT.

But I did skip a part. I skipped the very part that Paul uses to compare the two events, the very part Paul uses as type and antitype. And it's the very same part everybody else skips as well. Number eight.

8. MOSES: Blood and water had to be sprinkled upon the content or the book of the Covenant, the law.

“For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book, and all the people, Saying, This is the blood of the testament which God hath enjoined unto you.” (Heb.9,19-20)

Notice that there was to be given a promise, that the law had to be preached verbally, that it had to be written down and that blood and water were to confirm the covenant by it being sprinkled upon the BOOK OF THE COVENANT.

Are you starting to see the resemblance between Moses and Jesus?

What was the Ark called? The Ark of the COVENANT. Why is it called that? It wasn't that Ark Moses confirmed the covenant on. The Ark contains God's law and the mercy seat represented God's salvation (promise of a substitute), and therefore it was called the Ark of the Covenant. The two elements, the two pieces of the Ark, were placed together and represented God's covenant with mankind.

The Bible (the law) tells us Moses was prophesying about the mission of Christ. Paul tells us that Jesus was the mediator like Moses was, only for the new covenant. Paul makes the reference that the blood and water had to be sprinkled upon the Covenant and the promise.

So, did Jesus not have to fulfill this part? Is this another part of «the law and the testimony» He could skip?

The Bible says: *“But when they came to Jesus, and saw that he was dead already, they brake not his legs: But one of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side, and forthwith came there out blood and water. And he that saw it bare record, and his record is true: and he knoweth that he saith true, that ye might believe.”* (John 19:33-35) This could be a double prophecy as well. That a future witness to the water and blood is a true witness as well as John was.

Blood and water were mixed only two times in the law in connection with a sacrifice. One of these was when the covenant was to be confirmed, the covenant itself had to be sprinkled with blood and water. And the other time was when they sacrificed a bird in connection with a cleansing ritual.

When we see that Jesus sacrificed Himself at the cross and that blood and water came out of His side, the law points to this event. The fulfillment of the confirmation of the covenant.

What had Jesus said only the night before His blood and water poured out of His side? He said it was the blood of the covenant, right?

So, if we have something against the discovery of the Ark of the Covenant with Christ's blood upon it, at least in all fairness we must ask ourselves, did Jesus fulfill the law and the prophets on this specific point? Or did He skip the important part, the very part that made the covenant valid and made it a testimony?

We can tear out this part of Christ's mission and say His blood needed not to be sprinkled on the Covenant. The covenant was symbolic, and Christ's blood was just wasted upon the ground except a little brought to heaven. We can say that. But in all fairness, at least be honest and admit that this discovery at least has support from «the law and the testimony»?

The point I am making: it's actually when we reject the discovery we have to take away from the law and the testimony. But we don't have to do this if we accept the discovery.

The covenant wasn't confirmed without this main part, sprinkling with water and blood. If a covenant wasn't confirmed, the sanctuary service couldn't be established for the sake of man. We

have to ask; does the blood ending upon the mercy seat take away the pillar of the heavenly sanctuary, or does it actually compliment it? Is it a threat to the service of Christ in the sanctuary in heaven, or the means to that very service? Remember, this discovery DOES NOT SAY Jesus entered the chamber with The Ark of the Covenant, it just says His blood was sprinkled towards it and to it from a distance.

But some people may want to make everything into symbols. However, in the Bible, both physical and symbolic elements are always both present. Some say that in the new covenant EVERYTHING was symbolic. Walter Veith, a famous Adventist pastor said this to my very face. Then I ask, were the other elements symbolic? Did Jesus die symbolically? Were the water and blood coming out of His side only symbolically speaking, or did It actually physically come from His side? If the blood is not symbolic, why would the place the blood went be symbolic?

It was the Old Testament that was symbolic, the New Covenant was a real deal.

If the blood and the water were physical, there is no need to think that the covenant it was supposed to sprinkle was symbolic.

No matter what we choose to believe. We at least must admit that it can be a possibility and that the Bible doesn't go against it. At least that.

Is it Biblical that the blood and water were sprinkled towards the Covenant itself? It is at least a biblical idea.

But wait, there is more we need to look at. Because all the rituals and sacrificial animals pointed to the mission of Christ. Thus, the law has even more to give us. And the most interesting truth appears when we blend all the symbols of Christ together. Let's have a look at the day of atonement.

The day of atonement:

One of the main pillars of the Advent movement is the 22nd of October 1844. This date is thought to be the end of the 2300 mornings and evenings. In case someone who doesn't have an Adventist background were to accidentally stumble across this letter, I'll give a brief explanation. The time prophecy of 2300 mornings and evenings is found in the book of Daniel, and it says that after this time-period "*then shall the sanctuary be cleansed*" (Dan.8,14)

The expression to 'cleanse the sanctuary' is, of course, from the law. It refers to when the High Priest once every year, on the Day of Atonement, went into the Sanctuary and the Most Holy to cleanse it. On this day, blood was taken and sprinkled before and upon the Ark of the Covenant. 2300 days is believed to be prophetic time and therefore these days represent years. (Num. 14:34, Eze. 4:5-6, Dan 9:24-27) The angel doesn't tell Daniel more about this time-period, and as a result, Daniel gets very troubled. Would it take that long before they could return to Israel and restore the temple? Would they not be able to return now after all?

After praying and crying to God for Israel's deliverance, as he is worrying about his people, the angel returns to Daniel and says: "*Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city*" (Dan 9,24) The word determined is châthak and literally means that 70 weeks are "cut

off”, but cut off what? That would most likely be the last time-prophecy that Daniel didn't receive an explanation on which had him so concerned. Now, although God didn't give the start date of the 2300 days, it gives the start point of the 70 weeks that was cut off from that same period. Hence, if they have the same starting point, where the first ends after 70 weeks, and the other after 2300, you get to that date in 1844.

And so, the Adventist movement believed that just like Jesus at His first coming fulfilled the feast of Passover (not fulfilling it every year but that once). Christ would after the 2300 mornings and evenings fulfill the cleansing of the sanctuary, the Day of Atonement. On that day, those who had not truly repented were to be separated from Israel. And so, it's viewed as an investigative judgment that needs to take place before Christ can return.

There not being any visible sanctuary on earth anymore, it was assumed that the scripture was talking about the sanctuary in heaven, the one that Paul talks about in the book of Hebrews explaining that Christ is our High Priest there. In the book of Revelation, we can see the sanctuary items, the candlestick, the altar of incense, and even the Ark of the Covenant in a heavenly setting. And so, the Bible confirms in its last book that Jesus is moving through the stages of the heavenly sanctuary, ending with the Ark of the Covenant.

Paul explains in Hebrew chapter 8 that these items are not the earthly ones, but the ones the earthly were made after the pattern of. That means there was one earthly sanctuary made as a copy of the heavenly.

Jesus going into the holiest place in 1844 led to a reformation on earth. The reformation movement had long left the Catholic Church but continued to follow many of the pope's traditions and laws. But after 1844 God's people reformed all the way back to God's law and rejected the traditions of men. And then, when Christ went into the most holy place PHYSICALLY, God's people had the law given to them symbolically. God's church was finally restored back to His laws.

That's why this is an important pillar. Ron Wyatt firmly believed the interpretation of the 2300 days was correct, and believed Jesus did go into the heavenly sanctuary to cleanse it. When he said the blood went down on the earthly ark in 31 AD, many felt it weakened the previous light (Some believe it happened 30 AD).

Because why would Jesus need to sprinkle the heavenly Ark with His blood if He had already sprinkled the other Ark, God's earthly throne down here? Not being able, or having room for both, they decided to reject Ron's discovery. They felt the first sprinkling would make the second unnecessary and therefore ruin this interpretation. Some feel they can reject the heavenly cleansing. But what if the Bible has room for both?

Didn't Jesus, when He was here on earth, start His ministry by cleansing the temple? (Mat. 21:12) And did He not, at the end of His ministry, cleanse His temple? (Mar 11:15)

So, does that mean there are TWO Days of ATONEMENT? Well, it doesn't have to be. In other double prophecies found in the Bible, we see that if a topic is related in nature, they are intermingled inside the same time prophecy.

And here we need to take heed of Ellen White's counsel mentioned earlier in this letter:

“As a people we are certainly in GREAT DANGER... of considering our IDEAS, because long

cherished, to be Bible doctrines and on every point infallible, and measuring everyone by the rule of our interpretation of Bible truth. This is our DANGER, and this would be THE GREATEST EVIL that could ever come to us as a people.” (The Ellen G. White 1888 Materials, p. 830, by Ellen G. White)

Every idea we have added to our understanding of the DAY OF ATONEMENT that is not established by either the Bible or Ellen White needs to go. Or we will not understand the light sent to us from Golgotha.

One such idea that we need to let go of is that EVERYTHING that happened on the Day of Atonement had to happen in 1844. That is just not true. The only part that had to happen according to the 2300-day prophecy is that the sanctuary would be cleansed then. That’s what the prophecy says.

As mentioned before. The events happening on the Day of Atonement stretches from the year Christ was crucified (around 31 AD) and until Christ has left the Most Holy Place in heaven and has sent the devil into desolation.

Another misconception we need to let go, is that if Christ takes His blood on the mercy seat when He was cleansing the sanctuary in 1844, it was forbidden for Him to place His blood on any other Ark before this time-period. One thing doesn't have to do away with another. That's a limitation the Bible doesn't give, it's our own personal limitation.

So, let's look if there is a double prophecy in the Day of Atonement.

Firstly, we are told that Jesus was only to die once. So, He didn't have to die all over again to fulfill the cleansing ritual in heaven. Therefore, the blood of around 31 AD is the same blood used on the Day of Atonement. I think we all agree on that.

Let's look at the act called the cleansing of the sanctuary:

“And he shall take of the congregation of the children of Israel two kids of the goats for a sin offering ...present them before the LORD at the door of the tabernacle ...And Aaron shall bring the goat upon which the LORD'S lot fell, and offer him for a sin offering. ...Then shall he kill the goat of the sin offering, that is for the people, and bring his blood within the veil, and do with that blood as he did with the blood of the bullock, and sprinkle it upon the mercy seat, and before the mercy seat: And he shall make an atonement for the holy place, because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel, and because of their transgressions in all their sins: and so shall he do for the tabernacle of the congregation, that remaineth among them in the midst of their uncleanness.” (From different verses in Leviticus 16)

And so, although the blood taken into the Most holy represents part of the service of the cleansing of the sanctuary that is believed to have happened in 1844, we all agree the blood was shed when Christ died.

But we have almost forgotten about something essential. The priest could not perform the cleansing of the Sanctuary just like that, could he? He had to do something first.

Not only did a covenant have to be established and confirmed before the High Priest could represent us in a sanctuary (A covenant reflecting the covenant He would minister before in heaven), BUT for a High-Priest to be able to go into the Most Holy Place and cleanse the

sanctuary he had to do something else important.

For a long time, we have focused on Christ in the sanctuary, Christ in the most holy, but little attention has been given to what had to happen for Jesus to be able to perform these same assignments. The preparation for the cleansing of the sanctuary.

What had to happen is described in the Day of Atonement. And many will argue that Jesus didn't have to this part of the prophecy either, but I will show you why He actually had to.

PRIEST AND SACRIFICE IN ONE

The 'secret' to understanding these things is in one important revelation. That Jesus is a combination of a priest and the sacrificial animal, **AT THE SAME TIME**. When we look at the type in the old sanctuary service, we see the **PRIEST** and **SACRIFICE** being divided into two separate symbols.

And so, we either compare Jesus with the High Priest or we compare Him to the sacrificial animal, but we forget to see what happens when we blend the two into one to understand what the sum of Christ's mission is.

What happens when the **PRIEST** becomes the **SACRIFICE**? Here is the secret to Ron's Ark discovery unfolded. And I will explain how and why.

When the priestly assignment is mixed with that of the sacrificial animal, we get a **CONFLICT** that's not easily spotted in the Sanctuary service unless we mix the two. A priest had to be holy, have clean clothes and be clean. He could only take "our sins" into the sanctuary when the animal was dead, with the blood as a witness. No sacrificial animal still alive could walk into the Holy place. The sacrifice was either represented by meat or the blood, but it was necessary that it was dead.

But in the case of the plan of salvation, Jesus also had to be the sacrifice. So, why is this a cause of conflict? Because when the sin was pressed upon the sacrificial animal, that animal now became the target of the judgment and the one under condemnation of the law. The moment the sacrifice had the sin placed upon its head, it was under the curse. That was the whole point of the substitute, to separate it from the transgressor and place it upon the sacrifice so it could pay the price for it.

The sacrifice had no access to the sanctuary in a living state. Jesus as the living sacrifice could not go into the sanctuary in heaven, carrying our sins upon Him without atoning for them first. Even though Jesus was without sin Himself (so was the animal that had to be without spot and blemish) He could not go in while bearing it unatoned.

The sacrificial animal was a substitute, the animal itself had to die for a sin it hadn't committed itself, but it was only killed when sin was transferred to it.

Jesus was without sin, but when **OUR SIN** was placed upon Him, He became a curse for our sake. I don't think we can still comprehend fully how serious that is. Jesus said when He hung upon the cross: *"My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" (Mat 27:46)*

At that horrid moment when all our sins were placed upon Him, directing the law towards Him to take the punishment for them, He uttered those words. For a moment, OUR SINS separated Him from the Father.

Jesus could not be our High Priest in the heavenly Sanctuary in that state, with our sins upon Him. Jesus, while being the living sin-bearer at the cross, had no access to God's sanctuary. The only way to become our Priest in heaven, He had to bring blood, evidence of the sin being paid for by blood, with Him and He had to be clean from all our sin at the same time.

He could go to God without doing any of this, as He was without sin Himself. But then He couldn't be our High Priest because He had no blood. Or He could not go because He was still carrying our sin and by it under the condemnation of the law. By not taking our sins, He could save Himself, but He could not save us. Christ chose to save us with the challenges that came with it.

Jesus was to be sacrificed for our sins, they were placed upon Him like the sins were pressed on the head of the sacrificial animal. It was brutal. Paul says: *"For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him."* (2Col 5:21)

"Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree" (Gal 3:13)

What does Isaiah say of the event?

"He is despised and rejected of men; a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief: and we hid as it were our faces from him; he was despised, and we esteemed him not.

Surely, he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows: yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted.

But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed" (Isa. 53:3-5).

Ellen White writes: *"It was Satan's purpose to bring about an eternal separation between God and man; but in Christ we become more closely united to God than if we had never fallen. In taking our nature, the Savior has bound Himself to humanity by a tie that is never to be broken. Through the eternal ages He is linked with us. "God so loved the world, that He gave His only-begotten Son." John 3:16. He gave Him not only to bear our sins, and to die as our sacrifice; He gave Him to the fallen race. To assure us of His immutable counsel of peace, God gave His only-begotten Son to become one of the human family, forever to retain His human nature."* (Desire of Ages, Ellen White, p.25)

I feel the need to explain the obvious in order to make sure you understand the next thing I am going to say. Jesus took our sins upon Him on the cross. To accomplish this, Jesus also became part of the human family FOREVER.

So, let's get back to our dilemma. Because Jesus was BOTH the sacrificial 'animal' who had our sins pressed upon it AND the priest at the same time, we must re-examine some things that we have missed out on regarding the Day of Atonement.

We have to blend the prophecy of the sacrifice with the prophecy of the priest. Because the Priest

HAD TO BE CLEAN OF ALL SIN to represent us in the sanctuary and in the Most Holy Place. He was not to have sin that was NOT ATONED FOR upon him to be able to go there.

This MEANS that Jesus had to die to separate the sin that He was now carrying on earth from Himself. Only then could He appear as a cleansed Priest and carry the blood into the Sanctuary in heaven. Again: He could NOT enter the sanctuary with sin that was not ATONED FOR. We also see this represented with the cleansing basin standing right outside the Holy Place. The Priest had to cleanse himself before entering the Holy Place. If we understand this principle, then the symbols seen on the Day of Atonement can give us a new and fuller meaning.

Under the Day of Atonement, the sanctuary was to be cleansed because of the sins that had been carried in there by the blood (the blood represented the sin that was atoned for). All atoned sin was registered in the sanctuary. The High Priest was to go into the Most Holy place and sprinkle some of the blood on the mercy seat and in front of it, and then on the altar of incense as a ritual to cleanse the sanctuary.

“Then shall he kill the goat of the sin offering, that is for the people, and bring his blood within the veil... and sprinkle it upon the mercy seat, and before the mercy seat” (Lev.16,15)

Let's say this happened in 1844, not the killing of the goat, but the blood part taken into the most holy place.

Before the Priest could do this, before He could cleanse the sanctuary and sprinkle the blood on the Ark in the Most Holy Place, HE HAD TO... sprinkle the blood on the Ark. That is right, before he could sprinkle blood on the Ark, he had to FIRST sprinkle the blood upon the Ark. According to the witness of the Day of Atonement, blood had to be sprinkled on the Mercy Seat TWICE.

Twice, the High Priest had to go into the Most Holy Place with blood. The first time the Priest did it was to prepare Himself to cleanse the sanctuary, he had to sprinkle the Ark for HIMSELF and HIS HOUSE. This worked as a permit to be able to go in and sprinkle it the second time.

The first time is usually ignored or abolished, for, as they say, Jesus didn't have any personal sin, and therefore He didn't have to sacrifice for His own sake. And because they think this can only be required if the Priest had personal sin (assumption) they miss out of an important part that was prophesied of the plan of salvation.

If this was just to make sure the Priest didn't have personal sin, then God could have had him sacrifice his ordained sacrifice before the events of the day of atonement. Or before the ritual of the cleansing of the sanctuary. That is how it normally was done. It's true, Jesus NEVER had to sacrifice for His own sins, as He had never sinned. But the sanctuary service is a prophecy of Christ's work for us. Jesus was both the sacrifice AND the High Priest. The sacrifice, unlike the Priest, had the sin placed upon it. When the role of the sacrifice and the priest are combined, the Priest has to first cleanse Himself from the sin placed upon Him in order to represent us during the investigative judgment, under the cleansing of the sanctuary in heaven.

The High Priest was not permitted to be tainted with sin personally. He could only carry our sin into the sanctuary by the blood. And the only way for the High Priest to be cleansed to perform that service was to first sprinkle the blood on the mercy seat.

Bear with me as we will look into more details.

“And Aaron shall bring the bullock of the sin offering, which is for himself, and shall make an atonement for himself, and for his house, ...And he shall take of the blood of the bullock, and sprinkle it with his finger upon the mercy seat eastward; and before the mercy seat shall he sprinkle of the blood with his finger seven times.” (Lev 16:11&14)

Notice that here words have been added by the translators which add to the confusion. It just says for “him and his house”.

16:11	וַיִּקְרֹב	פָּר־אֶת אֲשֶׁר־לֹ	הַחֲטָאת	אֶשֶׁר - לֹ		11 And Aaron shall bring
	u'eqriv	aern ath - phr	e'chtath	ashr - l'u		the bullock of the sin
	and'he-brings-near	Aaron »	young-bull-of the sin-offering	which	for'him	offering, which [is] for
						himself, and shall make an
	וַיִּקַּח	מִדָּמַת	וַיִּשְׁחַט	אֶת -		atonement for himself, and
	u'kphr	bod'u	u'bod	bith'u	u'shcht	ath -
	and'he-makes-propitiatory-shelter	about'his	and'about	house-of'him	and'he-slays »	the bullock of the sin
						offering which [is] for
						himself:
	פָּר	הַחֲטָאת	אֶשֶׁר - לֹ	:		
	phr	e'chtath	ashr - l'u	:		
	young-bull-of	the sin-offering	which	for'him		

Did Jesus have a house tainted with sin He had to atone for before going to the heavenly sanctuary? Or could He skip this part, being human by flesh and spiritually belonging to heaven? Didn't Jesus have to sprinkle the Ark the first time? Or is all that took place during the Day of Atonement prophetic of Christ's mission for us?

Who is His house? If the High Priest had to sprinkle on behalf of His house before being able to take part in the cleansing of the sanctuary, it's worth finding out if the Bible tells us who Christ's house is.

Put short, Jesus is the second Adam, He took upon Himself human flesh and became ONE OF US, so He could represent us. Jesus became part of the human family. We don't have to guess who the family of the High Priest is, because the Bible clearly tells us: *“But Christ as a son over his own house; whose house are we, if we hold fast the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end.” (Heb 3:6)*

Further, we are told:

“For both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one: for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren, Saying, I will declare thy name unto my brethren, in the midst of the church will I sing praise unto thee.” (Heb 2:11-12)

The Bible tells us that after Jesus chose to come in human flesh, we became His house. We are the house of the High Priest because He came as a man, like one of us, so He could represent us.

Was the house of the High Priest Jesus sinners? Yes. Was Jesus a sinner? No. Did He take our sins upon Himself and become the sacrificial substitute? Yes. Was sin then also laying upon Jesus? So, did Jesus have to sprinkle the Ark the first time? You have to decide based upon these scriptures.

As a priest in the sanctuary, He could not be the sin-bearer. Don't misunderstand. The priest bore the sin into the sanctuary, but he always carried it in atoned for. The animal had to have been dead, the sin atoned for, before he could enter.

In order to represent us in the heavenly sanctuary, Jesus had to first sprinkle the Ark on our behalf and to cleanse Himself from the sin that He had taken upon Himself as the sacrificial animal. At least this is how it happened in the role play in the old sanctuary service.

The Ark had to be sprinkled twice. Once for the priest and his house (Jesus didn't HAVE TO as a priest BUT AS THE SACRIFICE, and as a priest He had to do it for His house that He had identified with).

There is only one scripture some might use to make an argument against this. Let's look at it straight away:

“Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them. For such a high priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens; Who needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's: for this he did once, when he offered up himself.

For the law maketh men high priests which have infirmity; but the word of the oath, which was since the law, maketh the Son, who is consecrated for evermore.” (Heb 7:25-28)

Does this scripture say Jesus didn't have to be cleansed from our sins and the sins of His house placed upon Him?

Paul is emphasizing that Jesus was perfect, He was without His own sins, that He was undefiled by sin. And he is talking about Christ' priestly service in heaven, where we don't have to worry about Jesus failing us like the priests here on earth did. He, unlike the earthly priests, never committed sins and never will.

Who would you feel more secure about representing you to a judge? One who had committed sins like yourself, or one who had not committed it? And this is Paul's point. The other point he is making is that Jesus only had to die once, not twice. That one time covered all the need. And this is because He only had to die for the sin placed upon Him, and not for His own sins. The scripture doesn't say Jesus didn't fulfill the symbols of the priestly sacrifice; it says: «for this he did once». He didn't have to separate the events and die twice.

The answer, again, is found in the sanctuary system. The lamb/sacrificial animal which the sins were pressed upon had to be without blemish. You cannot be a substitute if you yourself are under condemnation. And so, if Jesus was under condemnation for His own sins, He could not have OUR sins placed upon Him and pay for them.

And so, because Jesus was the SPOTLESS lamb, undefiled by sin and holy, He could take our sins upon Himself.

It's because Jesus is both the High Priest and the sacrificial animal at the same time. Christ had to fulfill both.

What is the assumption that we can add to this scripture, making Christ free from sprinkling the Ark the first time?

The first assumption is that it says Jesus didn't have to fulfill both symbols, but it actually just says He could do it at the same time.

The second assumption is that the verse says Jesus was NEVER defiled by sin. That this verse

means never, and not just that He personally never defiled Himself by sinning, so He could represent us.

Does other scripture back up the idea that Jesus wasn't defiled by sin when He took ours upon Himself?

Gal 3:13, 2Co 5:21, Isa 53:10 say He was.

“All of us like sheep have gone astray, each of us has turned to his own way; but the Lord has caused the iniquity of us all to fall on Him.” (Isaiah 53:6)

“Walk in love, just as Christ also loved you and gave Himself up for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God as a fragrant aroma.” (Ephesians 5:2)

“Christ also, having been offered once to bear the sins of many, will appear a second time for salvation without reference to sin, to those who eagerly await Him.” (Hebrews 9:28)

So, the conclusion here must be, that Paul does not refute that Christ needed to fulfill the first part of the sprinkling but that He didn't have to do it for His own sins. He could not be our sacrificial animal or priest if He had His own sins He needed to atone for.

Christ was that SPOTLESS LAMB. And for this reason alone, Jesus is a different High Priest, He is a holy and pure one.

But at the same time, the Bible does tell us that although He was never defiled nor were a sinner, He, at one particular point in time, carried our sins upon Himself and let the penalty fall on Him.

Meaning at that point in time, still not defiled by any personal sin, but with ours, He needed to die to cleanse the sin He was carrying for us.

At the same time, the holy Priest Jesus who had never committed His own sin, could as the sacrifice now carrying all our sins, atone the sin as both Priest and sacrifice at the same time.

So, what we understand from Paul is that Jesus could not do this in “ONE TAKE” if He had a personal sin. A priest could never serve the people and himself at the same time, this was because of his own sins. He had to first atone for his own before He, for the sake of the people, could bring forth the sacrificial animals.

With Jesus, it was different. He was only dealing with our sins, He could be the spotless High Priest and the sacrificial animal with our sins on it AT THE SAME TIME. Meaning, He only had to die once. He didn't have to clean Himself before He could bring salvation to us.

This is the main point of the verses we read.

We cannot interpret things into the verse that contradict other Bible verses.

Of course, Jesus got defiled by our sins when He took it upon Himself, or else He wouldn't be made a curse who had to die for the very same sins.

But although His earthly body had been prepared to be a sacrifice with sin placed upon it, His soul was pure and holy. The true identity of Jesus was never defiled by sin, as He was perfectly innocent.

His mind was never corrupted, His thoughts never dwelt on sins. He just laid His body down as a sacrifice that the sin could be placed upon, so He could die a substitute death. But this never changed His character. He wasn't defined in that way. But our sins did cover Him, and for a moment He was under condemnation, probably feeling the frightful separation from His Father.

So, these verses are not put there to reject the first sprinkling. Rather, they prevent anyone from claiming Jesus sprinkled the Ark the first time BECAUSE He had personally sinned. That he had to because of His own sin.

And when the discovery of the blood on the Mercy Seat comes out to the great public, these verses are there to prevent anyone from saying the first sprinkling had anything to do with Christ not being perfect Himself.

It was our sins alone that made it necessary for Him to die and sprinkle the Ark. It was OUR SINS that got Him under the curse, not His own.

Jesus cleansed us from our sins by placing them upon Himself, **but he also cleaned Himself from the sins placed upon Him.** All by doing this, He could bring the sin atoned for by His blood to the sanctuary and present it before God's throne.

“For Christ also died for sins once for all, the just for the unjust, so that He might bring us to God, having been put to death in the flesh, but made alive in the spirit.” (1 Peter 3:18)

“You know that He appeared in order to take away sins; and in Him there is no sin.” (1 John 3:5)

“By this will we have been sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.” (Hebrews 10:10)

“He committed no sin, nor was any deceit found in His mouth; and while being reviled, He did not revile in return; while suffering, He uttered no threats, but kept entrusting Himself to Him who judges righteously; and He Himself bore our sins in His body on the cross, so that we might die to sin and live to righteousness; for by His wounds you were healed.” (1 Peter 2:22–24)

“Whatever has a defect, you shall not offer, for it will not be accepted for you.» (Leviticus 22:20)

In order to understand this discovery, we need to blend the High Priest role with the role of the sacrificial substitute. If we don't do that, we won't understand it in its proper context. We won't understand why Jesus needed to be cleansed from the sins placed upon Him.

«Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace?» (Heb 10:29)

He was “sanctified” by the blood of the covenant. Why would He need to be sanctified by His own blood when He was already clean?

Let's look at the word “sanctified.”

hag-ee-ad'-zo

From G40; to make holy, that is, (ceremonially) purify or consecrate; (mentally) to venerate:

hallow, be holy, sanctify.

This scripture strengthens Leviticus 16's first sprinkling. For we know Christ was already holy and pure, fit to be our High Priest even before He made the sacrifice. And so, what had happened in the time between to make Him suddenly be purified by His own blood? Why would He need to be purified? Again, because at the cross, His earthly body was weighed down with our sins. The same body He rose with and that He brought to heaven. He not only cleansed us from our sins, He cleansed Himself at the same time by separating the sin not only from us, but by death also separating the sin from Himself as a person.

This is what happens on the Day of Atonement as well. Christ must die for our sins but also has to be cleansed and become our priest in the sanctuary in heaven. Christ must first sprinkle the earthly ark to confirm the covenant with heaven, to atone for our sins and to cleanse Himself from them legally so He can resurrect and be sanctified as He enters heaven on our behalf. This is why both the sprinklings that took place on the Day of Atonement had to take place. There are more details why one was fulfilled on earth and the other in heaven that I will further address.

Why the resurrection could take place.

When Jesus died, and took our penalty as our substitute, there was nothing that would indicate a resurrection. None of the substitute animals rose from the dead after being slaughtered. The sin was transferred to a substitute and the substitute was killed instead of the sinner, and that was it. A priest then carried the blood before the throne of God.

So, why did Jesus rise from the dead? Isn't that 'cheating'?

It was because Jesus himself had not sinned personally, that He could resurrect. Again, Jesus could not have resurrected if He had sin that was not atoned for placed upon him. And so, Jesus could ONLY resurrect if the sin placed upon Him had been separated from Him as a person. He could not "go to the Father" still carrying the sin upon Him. First the sin was separated from us and placed upon Him and then He died paying the price for them and thus He separates the sin from Himself again. Let us examine this more closely.

He could not resurrect as a sin-bearer, as a sacrificial animal. And so, the priest and the sacrifice were blended at the cross, yet it was only the priest that resurrected. By the blood on the cross and His death, Jesus separated the two—the two parted ways—the sacrificial 'animal' and the priest. And only the priest resurrected with the blood of the sacrifice in His hand to show it to the Father.

If the priest had been a sinner, the sacrificial substitute and the priest both had to atone, and the two could not separate after death and there could be no resurrection. But because the priest in the case with Christ had no private sin, He split the two, the substitute and the priest, after His death. Leaving the priest to pick up the blood of His own sacrifice.

First, He blended the two, then He separated the two.

Christ could not ascend to the temple in heaven if He did not sprinkle the Ark the first time.

Ellen White comments on the event at Golgotha:

«Christ fulfilled still another feature of the type. “His visage was so marred, more than any man, and His form more than the sons of men; so shall He sprinkle many nations.” In the Temple service, when the animal brought as a sacrifice was slain, the high priest, clothed in white robes, caught in his hand the blood that gushed forth, and cast it in the direction of the tabernacle or Temple. This was done seven times, as an expression of perfection. So Christ, the great antitype, Himself both high priest and victim, clothed with His own spotless robes of righteousness, after giving His life for the world, cast the virtue of His offering, a crimson current, in the direction of the Holy Place, reconciling man to God through the blood of the cross.—Manuscript 101, 1897, 11, 12. (“The True High Priest,” September, 1897.) {4MR 243.3}

IF He did

If Christ did sprinkle the Mercy Seat the first time, did both have to happen in 1844? If Jesus had to have fulfilled it the first time, the type shows us it HAD to have happened on the cross. The first time it is tied to His house here on earth, His earthly family, it's tied to a moment when He's bearing our sins. In heaven, Christ is pure and not tainted with any of our sins. Only here on earth at the cross did He carry our sins, and that was at the cross. If this part were to be fulfilled, it was not possible for it to be fulfilled at any other time. Only ONE TIME ALONE was he both sacrifice and High Priest, where He needed to cleanse the sin from off Himself. It never happened again. This part could not happen in 1844 for here Jesus is not a sin-bearer but just a priest carrying the result of His sacrifice. In heaven, this part is unnecessary. And remember that not all that took place on the day of Atonement were to happen in 1844. Jesus only had to die once. All the sacrifices that were made on the day of atonement happened on the cross. Jesus **did not** have to die over and over again.

But even if we should think that Jesus didn't have to die to cleanse Himself and 'His house' from the sin placed upon Him, or we don't even think the house of the High Priest actually represented us. Even if that is our reasoning, we are still left with these questions:

Is it a Biblical idea that the sprinkling of the Ark of the Covenant happened twice? Is it a Biblical idea that the Ark had to be sprinkled to cleanse the priest and his house, in order for the Ark to be sprinkled during the cleansing of the sanctuary? Did Jesus need to be separated from the sin placed upon Him before entering heaven? The answer has to be yes.

But, of course, we can just take it out and explain it away. Seriously, if we want to, we can.

In the sanctuary service, there was a cleansing basin the priest had to use before he could enter the Tabernacle. Our High Priest is Holy, does that mean the cleansing basin only represented the earthly sanctuary and not the mission of Christ? Was it not perfectly representative of Christ' stations as our High Priest? Or did it contain symbolism? Did our Jesus have to cleanse away the sin He had taken upon Himself before entering the Sanctuary in heaven?

You decide what you want to believe.

To many, it's such a terrible thought that they would rather dismiss the entire thing happening.

They are offended by the thought of our sins defiling Christ. Were our disgusting sins really upon Him in such a way that He was sentenced to death? Was it necessary for Him to remove them to be accepted by the Father as High Priest? Did our sins really separate Him from the Father? The thought that Jesus needed to cleanse away the sins He had taken upon Himself in order to enter the Sanctuary in heaven offended even John the Baptist. When Jesus came from Galilee to Jordan to be baptized, John first refuses baptizing Jesus:

“Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan unto John, to be baptized of him. But John forbade him, saying, I have to need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me? And Jesus answering said unto him, Suffer it to be so now: for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness. Then he suffered him. And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water: and, lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him: And lo a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.» (Mat 3:13-17)

Why did God give this acknowledgment after the baptism? In reality, Jesus was just as clean as before the event? It is because baptism is a symbolic act. It doesn't really cleanse anyone. John didn't understand the plan of salvation fully, as he viewed baptism as an admission of sin, an act of cleansing. This is why he was first offended when Jesus asked to be baptized. But Jesus knew that the baptism represented His death and resurrection. And the acknowledgment that proceeded was a foretaste of the acceptance Jesus would get from the Father after His resurrection. You remember Jesus saying to Mary not to touch her until He had been with the Father and had His sacrifice approved? Jesus had to partake in the death and resurrection in order to be anointed to His service after having had the sin placed upon Himself. It was the sin that was placed upon Him that made Him the subject of the death penalty. Besides that, He needed not to die, He was already clean. Jesus Himself was cleansed from the sins He bore on our behalf by dying while He was carrying it. It was Jesus, the victim with our sins upon Him, that died. But it was the innocent Christ that rose from the grave and made sure His sacrifice was approved, so He could be a spokesperson for the human family.

As an interesting side-thought, it is worth noting that Jesus was baptized in the Jordan River. That would be the same place the Ark once stood in the middle of the river while the river opened up. The Ark stood on the riverbed close by, where Christ was to prophesy His death and resurrection by His baptism. Again, we can see the Ark and the sacrifice of Christ blended symbolically.

This is all beautifully demonstrated in the cleansing sacrifices. Here we see, again, both blood and water are used together in a sacrificial setting. There is a parallel to the Day of Atonement. In the day of Atonement, the priest was first to sprinkle the Ark for Himself and His house. Here, the house is a metaphor for His earthly family. In Leviticus 14 we learn of a ritual that was to be performed if a house was unclean.

“And he that owneth the house shall come and tell the priest, saying, It seemeth to me there is as it were a plague in the house: ... And he that owneth the house shall come and tell the priest, saying, It seemeth to me there is as it were a plague in the house” (Lev.14:36-37)

Then we learn how they were to literally remove the infected stones to save the house. But once they had gone through all of these procedures, a final sacrifice had to be made to declare the house clean: “And he shall take to cleanse the house two birds, and cedar wood, and scarlet, and hyssop: And he shall kill the one of the birds in an earthen vessel over running water:

And he shall take the cedar wood, and the hyssop, and the scarlet, and the living bird, and dip them in the blood of the slain bird, and in the running water, and sprinkle the house seven times:

And he shall cleanse the house with the blood of the bird, and with the running water, and with the living bird, and with the cedar wood, and with the hyssop, and with the scarlet:

But he shall let go the living bird out of the city into the open fields, and make an atonement for the house: and it shall be clean” (Lev 14:49-53)

As a ritual of cleansing, a living bird was to be dipped in blood from the sacrifice of the other bird along with running water. The blood went into a vessel and was not wasted. The second bird is then cleansed and set free. This is very similar to what happened to Christ. He was sacrificed for our sins, and the blood and water from His side, IF IT REACHED THE MERCY SEAT, would ensure His own cleansing and allow Him to be released from the prison of death. He was sanctified by His own blood. This is a cleansing ritual, but of course, these birds could not really cleanse anything. It was all just symbolic of Christ’s mission.

Some would speculate that the freed bird represents us, but here both birds were “to cleanse the house” and could not represent a sinner or someone unclean as a sinner could not be used to cleanse something. Therefore, these two birds might symbolize Christ’s death and resurrection.

Christ died, just like the first bird. But He was cleansed from our sins and the sin that was put upon Him through the blood and water, and was set free like the second bird. Christ is both birds, the killed and the freed.

Even if we reject all of this, we have to see the Biblical aspect of Christ needing to be cleansed from our sins to be our representative in heaven. And so, our sins had to be paid for here on earth, and His cleansing had to take place here on earth. The first sprinkling is therefore not tied to the cleansing of the sanctuary, but to separate us from our sin, to die for our sin and to cleanse Christ for His next priestly mission. Thus, the first time does not do away with the meaning of the second time.

BIBLE PROPHECIES THE TWO SPRINKLINGS

But, you can say. If the Ark really were to be sprinkled twice, why weren't the prophets told about it so they could witness together with the law? Shouldn't the prophets have forewarned it? Well, what if they did? What if they got an accurate prophecy?

Let's first get an overview. The time aspect of the Day of Atonement is divided. The sacrifice that took place on this day was not to take place in 1844. The sacrifice was made at the cross.

When it comes to the cleansing of the sanctuary, we are given a time. The 2300 mornings and evenings tells us when the sanctuary was to be cleansed and therefore the Ark in heaven being sprinkled. So, the prophet prophesies at least of this last sprinkling and gives us the time for it. The first, as we have studied, may have represented the cleansing of the Priest and His house.

Let's place them in sequence.

1. Cleansing of the Priest and His house
2. Cleansing of the Sanctuary—2300 years

I want to suggest that what we can see here is a double prophecy tied to two different Arks. One on earth and the other in heaven. For we know Jesus did not fulfill all the symbols tied to the first ark in heaven.

Does it say the Ark would be sprinkled after the 2300 years in the book of Daniel? No, it doesn't actually say that. What it does say is only that the sanctuary would be cleansed. But we understand it this way because we know from the law that this is what happened when the sanctuary was cleansed. And so, based on Leviticus 16 and Daniel's prophecy, we add them together and say Christ went into the most holy and sprinkled the Ark in heaven. But what if Daniel tells us about the first sprinkling as well? And this time, he is actually more direct?

Meaning that his prophecy of the first time is more accurately explained than that of the second. If it is, is there any reason for us to accept one prophecy and not the other? The cleansing of the priest and His house happened, according to the prophecy, here on earth.

«Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most Holy.» (Dan 9:24)

So, Adventist believe this prophecy is 'cut off' from the 2300 years. If so, both time prophecies in the same timeline end with the sprinkling of the Most Holy. Both are pointing to a similar event. The one will take place «upon thy holy city» and the other in the heavenly sanctuary. At the end of the 70 weeks the Most Holy is to be anointed, at the end of the 2300 years, the sanctuary is to be cleansed. The same timeline is prophesying both of the sprinkling events. But some say, the 70 weeks is about heaven too, and that the heavenly sanctuary was anointed for service. What does the prophecy say itself? «Upon thy people and upon thy holy city» What does that mean? "Thy house"! The prophecy itself says it's about the earthly sanctuary and God's people. Jesus was clothed in human flesh and of Jewish descent. He died and gave His sacrifice for us in the «holy city», Jerusalem. The first prophecy is about the Most Holy tied to Jesus as a man here on earth, and the other is tied to the heavenly sanctuary.

So, does the Bible speak of two sprinklings of the Most Holy, one before the 70 weeks and one

after the 2300 years? It does, actually. It does mention the two most holy places being sprinkled. The first prophecy of the first time is more direct, while the second is vaguer. And so, we do have both the law and the prophets to support such a view. We have the ceremonial law and we have Daniel both supporting it.

Why would the two events be tied together with a prophetic bond?

Because if Christ did not confirm the covenant, the law, and if He did not sprinkle the mercy seat to cleanse Himself and us, He could not perform the priestly service in 1844. If we abolish Christ's blood going on to the mercy-seat here on earth, at the same time, we abolish the priestly service Christ is performing in heaven.

So does this theology ruin 1844 or does it, in fact, confirm it? Does it do away with Christ as High Priest, or does it add to it and establish Him as just that? Does it ruin His ministry, or does it confirm it? At best, whether we want to receive this or not, we need to agree on one thing at least. This theory DOES NOT destroy 1844. It actually leaves room for both. Claiming this discovery destroys 1844 is a FALSE statement. Ron, I, and many who have shared this discovery have no problem in believing that the Ark was sprinkled at the cross as well as in 1844. We don't have problems with dual prophecies, and we don't have problems with there being more to Christ's ministry than the pioneers first learned. We have room for both.

Don't make the mistake the Jews did, rejecting Christ's first coming because they couldn't see that the prophecies they had read about spoke of multiple comings and events. Don't limit yourself. At least be open to the possibility.

Why use the word ANOINT, ANOINTING is not necessarily done with BLOOD?

Doesn't this just contradict it all? Can anointing ever be done with blood? Why does it say, «to anoint the most holy»? It's worth noting that when Aron and his sons were inaugurated as priests, blood was used as part of the anointing, and so both blood and anointing oil were present when they were being anointed.

By using this word instead of sprinkling, God is helping us to not misunderstand. If it had said «to sprinkle the most holy» this would have signified a termination of a service, an ending. But when it says, “to anoint” it indicates that the sprinkling of the Ark for the first time is a dedication or the beginning of a work.

«And thou shalt offer every day a bullock for a sin offering for atonement: and thou shalt cleanse the altar, when thou hast made an atonement for it, and thou shalt anoint it, to sanctify it.» (Exo 29:36)

In this scripture, we see that once a sin offering for atonement had been made, the same altar was to be anointed. Meaning, you anoint it after bringing the atoning sacrifice. And so anointing was not just used at the inauguration.

So what type of anointing is Daniel 9 speaking of?

Let's look again:

«and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most Holy.»

Here we see the anointing is done in connection with an act of atonement, referring to a sin offering and not to a dedication of a heavenly sanctuary. Daniel 9 has all the clues we need, it's

done in connection with an atonement in the «holy city» (Jerusalem), and it involved God's people.

But let's say we reject this. Let's say we still believe it must refer to a dedication. It can still refer to that as well.

For instance, a covenant that is confirmed is a dedication, the start of something. The covenant was dedicated at the cross. The priest was dedicated at the cross, for it was there He first brought the means for our salvation, the sacrifice. So, by using the word "anoint the most holy" instead of sprinkling, God might be showing us that this is the beginning of Christ's work, but that also the beginning of Christ's work involves sprinkling as well as the end. The word "sprinkling" and "blood" is not used at the end of the 2300 prophecy either, it is what we assume based of the wording "cleansing the sanctuary". Daniel 9 is much clearer. You can't bring "*reconciliation for iniquity*", "*make an end of sins*", "*seal up the vision and prophecy*" and "anoint a most holy" at the same time without there being blood. According to the law it is not possible. Christ fulfilled the vision and the prophecy, brought the reconciliation, on the cross. And he could only do it if the Most Holy was anointed when He was at the cross.

The principle is used several times in the Bible. As mentioned previously, Jesus started His work by cleansing the temple, and then He finished His work by cleansing the temple. Jesus cleansed us from sin at the cross, He cleanses the sanctuary from the recording of our sin at the end. So, these are biblical principles.

But you can say, and some of you will, that you don't accept this. That Jesus didn't have to do this or that it was a symbol of something else. Fine. But give me this, isn't it at least Biblical for a priest to sprinkle a covenant before starting his service in a sanctuary, or to sprinkle the Ark before cleansing the sanctuary? Is it Biblical to use the word anointed when a sin offering had just been made and the altar needed to be sanctified? Is it a Biblical idea? Give me at least that.

When Ellen White said: Jesus, as both High Priest and victim, threw the result of his sacrifice towards the holiest at the cross, we can claim that she probably meant something else. Or we can choose to believe her. That she was inspired by the Holy Spirit to write what she wrote and that it is, in fact, true.

The Day of Atonement, back to the altar of burnt offerings?

"And he shall take a censer full of burning coals of fire from off the altar before the LORD, and his hands full of sweet incense beaten small, and bring *it* within the veil:

And he shall put the incense upon the fire before the LORD, that the cloud of the incense may cover the mercy seat that *is* upon the testimony, that he die not:

And he shall take of the blood of the bullock, and sprinkle *it* with his finger upon the mercy seat eastward; and before the mercy seat shall he sprinkle of the blood with his finger seven times" (Lev 16:12-14)

The first sprinkling of the Mercy Seat was to be HID FROM THE EYES OF THE HIGH PRIEST; he was sprinkling the mercy seat without seeing it. It was covered by the smoke brought there. In the same way, the mercy seat was hidden when Jesus died on the cross, and He

sprinkled it without seeing it. He was already passed away when the blood and the water poured out from His side, an event made possible by God's interference. Making the soldier pierce Christ's side and making the rocks rent. In the first sprinkling in the Sanctuary, symbolically speaking, coal from the altar took part in hiding the mercy seat from the priest. For as a sacrifice clothed in our sins, Jesus was targeted by the law, and it claimed His life as payment. He could not enter the place with the mercy-seat clothed in our sins, nor could He behold it while clothed in our sins, while being under the condemnation that was supposed to be ours. This was the result of switching places with us. The second time, in heaven, this is not an issue. And so, the two sprinklings made on the Day of Atonement fit perfectly with this discovery as well as the cleansing of the sanctuary in heaven.

We might call the events of the two sprinklings «part 1» and «part 2». We learned of part 2 first and getting to know Ron's discovery, we learned how part 2 was made possible by introducing part 1.

But God's people felt threatened when they realized that they had not been given the full knowledge when they learned about Part 2. That has always been the problem with God's people. They always think they have the full picture when they don't. And when God adds additional understanding, they have no room for it. But for us, the important part is not if they or we have room for it, but if the Bible has room for it. The Bible must be our guideline, not assumptions.

So is it right that our attention should go from the cross, then to the ministry in the most holy place in heaven, and then BACK to the cross in our day of age?

«And he shall go out unto the altar that is before the LORD, and make an atonement for it; and shall take of the blood of the bullock, and of the blood of the goat, and put it upon the horns of the altar round about.» (Lev 16:18)

This is actually what takes place on the Day of Atonement. Adventists have just missed that part and thought it was all over after the Most Holy. The law itself witness otherwise. First, the priest made atonement for Him and His house, then He goes into the Most holy place to «cleanse the sanctuary» the type of the investigative judgment after 1844, and then something else happens. The priest now takes the rest of the blood of both animals, the blood of the ox and the goat together, and sprinkles it on the horns of the altar. The altar, again, was where the animals were sacrificed as an illustration of Christ's death here on earth. The altar was the image of the crucifixion site.

The last part of this ministry work on the Day of Atonement is to bring the blood from both the cross and the cleansing of the sanctuary (1844) BACK to the beginning, the place Jesus was sacrificed for our sake. It is the same blood, because Christ only died once. Thus, the last part of the Day of Atonement, before the goat symbolizing the devil is sent into the wilderness, is to bring the attention to the place Jesus died. The last focus point of the Day of Atonement is therefore the crucifixion site. The ox-blood and the goat-blood were placed on the HORNS of the altar. Horns in the Bible symbolize POWER or STRENGTH.

The power and strength of Christ's ministry in heaven for our sake is the blood of the cross. And so, on the great day of atonement, God brings our attention from the Most Holy in Heaven and back to the cross. The rest of the blood after what was used to cleanse the sanctuary and the most holy, the blood of the goat, is taken back to the horns of the altar representing the cross. God wants our final attention to be taken back to the power of the cross. In other words, this discovery isn't in competition with 1844 and Christ in the Most Holy Place, it is directing our attention to the power of Christ's ministry, towards His death for our sake. Notice that not only

the goat's blood used in the cleansing of the sanctuary is used, but also the blood of the ox. Like this, the two events are blended, and together they are the power of our faith. Christ bringing the attention back to the cross might indicate that He is now in the final stages of His work in heaven. He is now ready to come back.

It is clear from the Day of Atonement that our last focus and strength is the blood of the cross.

(See also below, on the Question and Answers part: «How does this discovery fit with the 1888 message).

But we can reject this interpretation and even if you don't think this might have some truth to it, I have more I'd like to address before you make up your mind.

At the border of the promised land.

Adventists have long held the view that we are on the border of the true heavenly promised land, just like the Israelites were once standing in front of the Jordan River ready to cross over.

What is the next most important message they receive as they are preparing to cross?

«When ye see the ark of the covenant of the LORD your God, and the priests the Levites bearing it, then ye shall remove from your place, and go after it.» (Josh.3,3)

That's right, the Ark became the main focal point for God's people on the last part of their journey. The Ark was to go before them into the Jordan River and then stand there till all of God's people had crossed over and then go after them. Is this what we see with the discovery of Ron Wyatt? Standing right at the border, Jesus tells us to «see the ark of the covenant and follow it», meaning to receive the light coming from the Ark? Was it meant to lead God's people in the last challenge and battle? After following the Ark and crossing the Jordan they eat the Passover lamb, a symbol of Christ death on the cross.

Perhaps you no longer wish to compare the two events as thoroughly? Because you don't want to follow the Ark? You don't want an earthly Ark to be part of the last end time message?

It's fine. But is it Biblical that the two events can be compared? And is it biblical that the Ark was the main focal point of the last part of the journey leading them to take part in the Passover once again? At least we can agree on that. Even if we want to remove the Ark from the parallel.

But, I have more.

The Ark to search out a resting place.

One of the purposes of the Ark was to lead God's people to a resting place. *«and the ark of the covenant of the LORD went before them in the three days' journey, to search out a resting place for them.» (Num 10,33)*

Who was to seek out a resting place for them? It was really the Lord, not the Ark, right? Because the Ark is only an object, it cannot lead anyone. Why does God then say the Ark was to lead them to a resting place? Why not just say «I will»? Everything written in the law has meaning,

and here it testifies the many assignments of the Ark.

Did the Ark find them a true resting place in the end?

The Ark traveled with them to many places. When they entered the promised land, they placed it in Shiloh, a name which means peace. Later it was placed in Jerusalem, which also means peace. But this was not the rest they had been promised. The Jews had hoped this land would be their rest, but it never was. Where was their true rest?

What does Paul say? *«For we which have believed do enter into rest, as he said, As I have sworn in my wrath, if they shall enter into my rest: although the works were finished from the foundation of the world.» (Heb 4:3)*

Our rest is at the foot of the cross. Only by the salvation given there can we and them and everyone else find true rest. If the Ark really traveled all the way to the foot of the cross, if that was the last stop of its journey, then the discovery of the Ark of the Covenant will truly lead man to true rest. The belief in Christ's death in our place. If the Ark ended up any other place, it could never lead anyone to true rest, ever.

Don't you agree?

The Ark of the Covenant had many functions.

Many seem to think the Ark had no other function or value outside the Day of Atonement. They limited the Ark. But what does the Bible tell us? Let's look at how God used it in the past:

1. It was at the sanctuary at Sinai.
2. God gave instructions to Moses from the place of the Ark (it functioned as both throne and judgment seat). Moses could enter the most holy when it wasn't the day of atonement. It was only the priests who weren't allowed to enter the most holy more than once a year. Moses, as a prophet, could (Exo. 25:22)
3. The Ark went before and lead the people in the wilderness to help them find resting places.
4. The Ark of the Covenant was present when they needed to determine who God's chosen ones were (They placed almond staffs before the Ark to see which one bloomed). Moses went before the Ark twice during this rebellion. (Num 17: 4-5 & 10)
5. The Ark would go before them over the Jordan River, the river would stop flowing while the Ark was there, and it was to go after them once they crossed the river. (Joshua 3:13-17 & 4:11)
6. It was to partake in the war against Jericho. It went around the city 6+7 times. (Joshua 6)
7. It took part in a renewal of the covenant ceremony at mount Ebal. (Joshua 8:33)
8. The people and the leaders came before the Ark when they had a problem or needed help. (Joshua 7:6, Jdg 20:27, 2Ki 19:14-15)
9. It stood in the sanctuary in Shiloh.
10. It's presence brings plagues over the people in five Philistine cities. It's used as a status symbol of God's kingship when it's placed in the Dagon temple and the god Dagon falls before the Ark. (1.Sam 5)
11. It brings judgment over the people of Beth Shemesh. (1.Sam 6)
12. It brings blessings to its guardians.
13. It stood alone in a tent in the city of David without the other sanctuary items. (1.King 3:4)
14. It was then moved into the temple.

15. It was hidden away.

It is, of course, God who is behind all of it, not the Ark itself. But we see God uses the Ark as a tool to illustrate multiple things.

The things I have summed up here are important for what I want to address next. I want you to compare how God uses the Ark with the events that are coming upon us right now.

- It was to go before God's people, and also after them.
- It is to lead us to a resting place.
- It's to go before and partake in the holy wars of God the Almighty.
- It will make the idols of the enemy fall.
- It will be used to remember and repeat the covenant of God.

It seems like I'm talking about the discovery of the Ark today, but this is how God used the Ark in the past. So why would it not be used the same way today?

So, I will ask again. Is it Biblical that God will use the Ark as a power symbol, and that the Ark will go before and after God's people in the last conflict? Is it Biblical that God can use the Ark to preach that Babylon has fallen? Is it Biblical that the Ark can be used to remind us of God's covenant with us and with the whole world? God has used the Ark for all these purposes previously.

And the Ark of the Covenant discovery by Ron Wyatt does all of these things. It reminds us of God's covenant, it begs us to enter a covenant with God. It will expose the enemies' lies that the law is no longer valid, seeing it was confirmed. It can show that God's original ten commandments still EXIST and are therefore valid. And it also invalidates Papal changes to the law. But can it expose Babylon? Babylon will fall, just like Jericho did.

This discovery can repeat the victories of the Ark in the past without even moving an inch from where it is located. Its power is the testimony of being by the foot of the cross.

Is it Biblical to think the Ark can take part in all these end time events? The Bible says yes!

Can the tables of stone be shown to the world?

Ron Wyatt, who discovered the Ark, testified that the angel that guarded the ark said that the law will be shown after the national Sunday laws are established in the USA. It is the tables of stone located here on earth that will be shown. But then they must be taken out of the Ark and possibly be held by human hands? Is that possible? Surely, this has never happened before? Surely, this cannot be supported in scripture, or can it?

Some think of Moses destroying the ten commandments, breaking them to pieces in front of the camp while they were still dancing around the molten calf. That is one example. But the tables of stone had yet to be in the Ark. There was no Ark at that point in time. And so, it is not a perfect example.

Twice, the Ark is mentioned in the book of Revelation. Both times in connection with the closing scenes of the history of the Earth.

It says: *«And the temple of God was opened in heaven, and there was seen in his temple the ark of his testament: and there were lightnings, and voices, and thunderings, and an earthquake, and great hail.»* (Rev 11:19)

The second time it's when the plagues are poured over the earth: *«And after that I looked, and, behold, the temple of the tabernacle of the testimony in heaven was opened..»* (Rev.15,5)

Now, although it appears to talk just about a heavenly Ark. It is important to remember that the tables of stone inside the earthly ark are not just some copies. It's a duplicate written by the hand of God, which basically makes it a second original.

When you have two originals, two tables of stone, one on Earth and one in Heaven, both are binding. If one judges us, the other one does as well. And so, when the tables of stone in heaven become 'active', it is not too far-fetched to assume that the law on earth receives a function as well.

Here we see again what a dual prophecy can be. A prophecy speaking of two events at the same time. *«And the temple of God was opened in heaven»*, as speaking of the heavenly, and the next part of the sentence *«and there was seen in his temple the ark of the testament»* speaking about the earthly. Or it could talk about both at the same time.

In Bible prophecy, they are not just saying one single thing. Every testimony and prophecy are saying multiple things at the same time. When something happens in heaven, something also happens on earth.

When Christ went into the Most Holy place in heaven, God's people received light on the law here on earth. When Stephen was stoned here on earth, Christ rose into a standing position in heaven testified by Stephen as he died, and so on. The sanctuary in heaven and his people here on earth will always be tied together.

Jezebel's daughter

In the book of Revelation and in the message there to Thyatira we are told: *«Notwithstanding I have a few things against thee, because thou sufferest that woman Jezebel, which calleth herself a prophetess, to teach and to seduce my servants to commit fornication, and to eat things sacrificed unto idols. And I gave her space to repent of her fornication; and she repented not.»* (Rev 2:20-21)

What was Jezebel doing in the New Testament era? She is just a symbolic figure. God wants us to go read the Old Testament and about her to learn something important. Jezebel was a pagan woman who married the king of Israel. When this union took place, or when Israel mixed idol worship with the worship of God, they were called harlots or whores. (Eze. 23)

Why is Jezebel in Revelation? Because the situation the Christian church went through can be paralleled to what happened in ancient Israel.

So, Jezebel in the Bible refers to the Christian church uniting with paganism, a union which was the main religion during the Middle Ages. Remember, Jezebel was a queen.

Babylon in Revelation chapter 18 is also described as a queen. A leader and a harlot. But the harlot also has daughters.

Did you know that Jezebel also had a daughter? And that this daughter was wed to the king of Judah?

The book of Revelation talks about the harlot's daughters. Adventists have long identified them with the partly-reformed protestant churches. Adventists believe that, among other things, the daughters of the harlot are the ones in the USA who will create the image of the beast and enforce the mark of the beast.

So, THE DAUGHTER will do this. The daughter of Jezebel.

With this in mind, that the daughter in part refers to the USA, is it interesting to see what Jezebel's daughter is up to in the Bible story. She tries to take the Judean kingdom by force after her husband dies. And she starts to PERSECUTE God's chosen seed (the royal line). She is permitted to continue for 6 years. Who is God's royal line in the Bible? It's the followers of Christ. (Rev.1,6)

What will be the great witness against Jezebel's daughter, and which helps re-establish God's system?

The testimony, God's law, is placed in the hands of God's chosen, and it's shown to the people. Once the people see this, they turn against the woman. The daughter of Jezebel is then persecuted and killed.

«And he set all the people, every man having his weapon in his hand, from the right side of the temple to the left side of the temple, along by the altar and the temple, by the king round about. Then they brought out the king's son, and put upon him the crown, and gave him the testimony, and made him king. And Jehoiada and his sons anointed him, and said, God save the king. Now when Athaliah heard the noise of the people running and praising the king, she came to the people into the house of the LORD: And she looked, and, behold, the king stood at his pillar at the entering in, and the princes and the trumpets by the king: and all the people of the land rejoiced, and sounded with trumpets, also the singers with instruments of music, and such as taught to sing praise. Then Athaliah rent her clothes, and said, Treason, Treason.» (2Ch 23:10-13)

Bear in mind, this is not the first time the Ark of the Covenant has gotten involved in an attempted coup d'état. The first time, Moses entered the Most Holy with the Ark and left the staffs before the Lord, and in the morning *“Aaron's staff, representing the tribe of Levi, had sprouted, budded, blossomed, and produced ripe almonds”*. So, God's Ark has taken part in deciding who God's chosen are before.

When the bible shows us a dilemma, where a 'Jezebel' will get influence and a leading position in the churches, about a harlot and a harlot's daughter who tries to destroy God's chosen, and how the tables of stone are used as a testimony to expose her deception, we have a parallel. Remember, the daughter of Jezebel only had Judah that she could influence. The harlot in Revelation has deceived the whole world. So, does the Bible tell us that God can and most likely will do the same in the end time conflict? Showing the testimony, the tables of stone, to the world?

What truth is subdued right now? The third angel's message -that God's true people are those who have the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus. The partly-reformed Christians who

follow a changed law are the ones claiming to be God's chosen ones today.

Some who have been against the discovery of the Ark of the Covenant might say: It's impossible that the law was taken out of the Ark and shown, and so it had to have been a copy.

To that, I will answer: When a copy of the law is mentioned in the Bible, the wording is clear. But in this story, it says «the testimony», and the specific original Hebrew wording used, was only used to describe the two tables of stone. The book of the Covenant was never called the testimony. If it was a copy, it was usually called “the law”. If someone claimed this was not the tables of stone but a copy, then speculation and limitations must be placed where God doesn't necessarily put it. Furthermore, speculation is not evidence. I accept what it says the way it says it, I don't add to it. Before this event took place, “the testimony” was only used to describe the original tables of stone, the Ten Commandments. Or else, they used the word «Torah». It's the law and the testimony we are to evaluate the Bible with, and in the law, there is only one thing called «the testimony» and that is the handwritten ten commandments.

The Bible says it is the testimony that is shown. And we don't have to explain it away just because it's a usual event.

The reason people often want to explain things away is that they don't understand it. And we don't easily accept what we don't understand. They don't understand how it's possible for the table of stone to be taken out of the Ark and shown to the people at that time. So instead of changing their thinking, they change the Bible.

But let us still chose not to believe this and persuade ourselves that it was 'just a copy'. Firstly, this would not convince the people that God was with the king and that the Queen was a deceiver. I'm pretty sure the priests already had copies. A copy could not convince the people God was with the king, anyone could hold a copy. The boy could be anyone, how would they prove he was of the king's seed, the last one alive? Everyone knew that not just anyone could take the testimony from the Ark. So far, it had only been Moses. If it happened, it had to be by God's approval. The result of what happened convinced them that God's hand was involved. That the King's identity was what he claimed it was. A liar and a false leader could not hold the law like that in his hands.

And even if we want to stress that it had to have been a copy, it is still an example and type of the last conflict.

Notice that it's not just the testimony that is being shown. It is also the king. The King and the testimony united. The discovery of the Ark of the Covenant doesn't just show us the ten commandments, it also shows us that Jesus really was the Messiah and our King. So, the discovery of the Ark of the Covenant shows us both the King's identity, through the blood, and the tables of stone.

This story in the Bible is the only one I could find that indicates that the tables of stone can be held by someone and be shown to the people.

How it was done, we don't know. Angels might have given the High Priest the law. Whatever it was, not one could touch the Ark without God's consent. But with God's consent, the law could have been taken out. The event was so convincing that the soldiers, all her allies and the whole people turned against her immediately.

So, is it Biblical that God will let someone show the law as a testimony at a time when the harlot's daughter has placed her altars among God's people to rule over them? The Bible says yes. It is Biblical.

Ellen White writes: *«The work of God in the earth presents, from age to age, a striking similarity in every great reformation or religious movement. The principles of God's dealing with men are ever the same. The important movements of the present have their parallel in those of the past, and the experience of the church in former ages has lessons of great value for our own time.* {CIHS 69.1}

But if this doesn't convince you, I still have some more parallels I'd like to share. The next, perhaps even more hard to ignore. But you have read this far and are truly seeking answers.

What it means to us personally.

In the next story, we might learn what the discovery of the Ark means to you and me personally. In the SDA Bible commentary, where Ellen White describes the destruction of the temple, we read:

“Jews Exemplified Termination of God's Forbearance—The Jewish nation is before us as an example of the termination of God's long forbearance. In the destruction of Jerusalem the destruction of the world is typified.” SDA Bible Commentary, vol. 3 (EGW), Page 1133

Many are acquainted with the destruction of the earth being foreshadowed by the destruction of Jerusalem the second time. But it is also foreshadowed by the first destruction of Jerusalem by the Babylonians. In this parallel, we might get to know more about the purpose of the discovery of the Ark and what it means to us individually. Let us compare to see if it actually is a parallel:

The destruction of Jerusalem and the destruction of the earth:

EZEKIEL:

The four corners of the city:

Eze 7:2 *«the end is come upon the four corners of the land.»*

REVELATION:

The four corners of the earth

Rev 7:1 *«on the four corners of the earth»*

EZEKIEL:

The reason the end has come:

The altar of the image of jealousy was set up at the northern gate. (8,5)

The leaders turned their backs to God's law and worshiped the sun at its time and place. (8,16)

Where is their loyalty? The leaders have set up the image and are worshiping it.

REVELATION:

The reason the end has come:

The image of the Beast is set up (Rev.13)

The Mark of the Beast law is chosen over God's law. They who don't follow it are those who keep God's times and law.

EZEKIEL:

God's people are sealed before the destruction:

"and set a mark upon the foreheads of the men" (Eze. 9:4)

REVELATION:

God's people are sealed before the end:

"Hurt not the earth, neither the sea, nor the trees, till we have sealed the servants of our God in their foreheads." (Rev 7:3)

EZEKIEL:

The temple is filled with the smoke /door of Mercy closes:

«Then the glory of the LORD went up from the cherub, and stood over the threshold of the house; and the house was filled with the cloud, and the court was full of the brightness of the LORD'S glory.» (Eze 10:4)

REVELATION:

The temple is filled with smoke / the door of Mercy closes:

«And the temple was filled with smoke from the glory of God, and from his power; and no man was able to enter into the temple, till the seven plagues of the seven angels were fulfilled.» (Rev 15:8)

EZEKIEL:

Plagues come over the people:

«The sword is without, and the pestilence and the famine within: he that is in the field shall die with the sword; and he that is in the city, famine and pestilence shall devour him.» (Eze 7:15)

REVELATION:

Plagues come over the people.

Revelation 16 speaks to us about 7 plagues.

Even though I don't take the time to fully explain, I believe you can clearly see the parallels.

EZEKIEL: Babylon besieges the city:

They are closed inside the city and cannot buy or sell. (do trade)

REVELATION:

The beast encamps around God's people and denies them the right to buy and sell. (Rev. 13:17)

EZEKIEL:

Jerusalem is destroyed:

About five years after Ezekiel's vision, Jerusalem is destroyed.

REVELATION:

Christ's second coming and judgment over the earth:

After all these events mentioned, the end will come.

As you can see, the events prior to the destruction of Jerusalem are a parallel to the events prior to the destruction of the world. As you also know, the book of Revelation is mostly references to the Old Testament. God made it this way so that we could find the knowledge of what happened in Bible history and the explanation for the symbols used in the New Testament. We have no reason to believe that when the temple is filled with smoke in the book of Revelation means a

service there is over, unless we have a reference. If we compare it with Ezekiel we can understand why. There, the temple was filled with smoke as the Lord left the temple and the people were left to their enemies. So, God uses an event that happened in the Old Testament to tell us about the future. By this parallel, we get even more information on the end time.

We can learn what happened prior to these mentioned events. A forgotten part, so to speak. And this is very intriguing. We are going to a time where the fate of Jerusalem was already decided, but while the individual could still turn from their ways, before the door of mercy closed. Let us see what happened in this period of Jerusalem's history.

And remember, this is within the time frame where Jerusalem's days are already numbered. This is also why this story should be among the ones that are compared.

EZEKIEL:

Before the destruction: (Read 2.Kings, Jeremiah etc.)

- * Land was corrupt, and they are told it will be destroyed.
- * The King starts a reform, tries to rid them of their idols and false religious worship.
- * The book of the Covenant was found.
- * The book of the Covenant is publicly read to the people. The people are enlightened and receive knowledge about God's law.
- * The king re-establishes God's feasts in the kingdom.
- * The Ark of the Covenant is taken out from its hiding place.
- * At this time the end cannot be prevented, but it can be postponed for a few years. And it's postponed approx. 30-something years.

Now, notice that the book of the covenant represents the book Moses confirmed the covenant with. The one he took blood and water upon. It's the discovery of this very book that gave the king insight and led to an even deeper reform in the land. It also leads them back to God's times/feasts and laws.

We then see the Ark being placed back into the temple. So here we see two representatives of the law revealed at the same time. Both the original and the copy resurfaced. And the meaning is sensational. But first, is there such a parallel in the book of Revelation or in our days? Only if we receive the discovery of the Ark of the Covenant can we find a parallel.

REVELATION:

Before the destruction:

- * The world and the church are corrupt, and we are told that the end is coming.
- * Jesus pleads with His people to reform and separate from false doctrines and fallen churches (Rev.18) We are told that God's people are those who keep His law (Rev.14,12)
- * The Ark of the Covenant will be seen in «His temple». This can possibly be a prophecy with double fulfillment. When the temple was opened in heaven and the Ark was seen, it could reference that the Ark was the covenant with mankind here on earth that will be found. (Rev.11,19) In the example of Jerusalem's destruction, both the Book of the Covenant (that contained the law and the promises) and the Ark resurfaced. Both the copy and the original. If these events point to the end times, it can mean that the Ark here, as well as the Ark in heaven, will «be seen». In the situation in Jerusalem, one of them had been hidden in the temple with the other items while the Ark was at a different secret location.

So, I ask again. Is it Biblical that a discovery of the Ark of the Covenant prior to the destruction of the Earth will be made? Or at least a witness of the covenant God made with mankind? If what happened in Jerusalem is a parallel, then it is Biblical.

We can ignore this interesting parallel with the discovery of the Ark. We can say that this part didn't need an antitype. Isn't it strange though, that all the symbols match, that there was one additional symbol? God would not destroy Jerusalem before the people had a chance to be acquainted with the covenant He once confirmed with them. Even though the city was doomed, they were going to get one last chance to seek refuge with the Lord. They were to personally know the content of the covenant, to be sure it was not ignorance that caused their doom. For all we know, it could be men like Ezekiel, Daniel, and his friends were fruits of what took place, the fruit of the reform that followed the discovery of the Book of the Covenant, and the resurfacing of the Ark of the Covenant. They might have been saved by it.

Although the Book of the Covenant was found and the Ark of the Covenant placed back into the temple, the people still chose, only a few years later, to turn their backs to the Ark to worship an image they had set up, and also the sun itself. These were the same people who had the book read to them and knew the Ark was back in the temple. They even had a false sense of security, bragging to Jeremiah that they still had the law with them. So, what does this mean to us personally? Well, it's been longer since Ron Wyatt found the Ark and to our day then it was from the book of the Covenant was found and until Jerusalem was destroyed. Maybe the inhabitants on earth are blessed and will get more time to turn than what they did? But what did the discovery of the book of the Covenant mean to the people personally?

It might be a shock for you to hear this.

«But to the King God says: «Because thine heart was tender, and thou didst humble thyself before God, when thou heardest his words against this place, and against the inhabitants thereof, and humbledst thyself before me, and didst rend thy clothes, and weep before me; I have even heard thee also, saith the LORD. Behold, I will gather thee to thy fathers, and thou shalt be gathered to thy grave in peace, neither shall thine eyes see all the evil that I will bring upon this place, and upon the inhabitants of the same. So they brought the king word again.» (2Ch 34:24-25 + 34:27-28)

From this setting, we learn that God had already determined that the end would come. But BECAUSE King Josiah cried and humbled himself when he heard the words from the book of the Covenant, the law and the promises, something special happened. Josiah made another attempt at reform. The result of the King's plea was that the DOOR OF MERCY was extended a few more years.

This is serious, people. The discovery of the book of the Covenant pushed the end between 30 and 40 years into the future. It represented an extended time of probation. A last chance. How do we know this is an extension of probation? For the people only received atonement through the sacrificial system and the sprinkling of the blood on the Day of atonement. When the Ark had been removed and hidden, it meant that there was no more atonement. But after Josiah's plea, the Ark was placed back into the temple and the people would again receive atonement through the sacrificial system. So, when the Ark was placed back into the temple, it was literally an extended period of atonement granted them as a people.

So, this is what this discovery meant back then. Could it also be what the Ark of the Covenant discovery today witness of as well? A last extended probation-time where God wants to wake up and reform His people?

And are we doing what they did back then? Turning our backs to God's laws to fornicate with the religion of Babylon or the world?

Did the leaders of the Seventh Day Church cry and plead with God when they heard about it?

No. They attacked it and mocked it. Did they let all the people hear about it, like Josiah had the book of the covenant read to the people? No, they hid it from them and prevented people from hearing about it.

So, why would we get an extended period of atonement?

“And he saw that there was no man and wondered that there was no intercessor: therefore, his arm brought salvation unto him; and his righteousness, it sustained him.” (Isaiah 59:16)

What is greater than the book of covenant sprinkled with animal blood? The Ark sprinkled with Christ's blood. Yet, they first turned and repented when they learned of the discovery of the book. But God's people and their leaders didn't turn and repent from the greater discovery, the one that is the blood of their Savior.

«Then began he to upbraid the cities wherein most of his mighty works were done, because they repented not: Woe unto thee, Chorazin! woe unto thee, Bethsaida! for if the mighty works, which were done in you, had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes. But I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the day of judgment, than for you. And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted unto heaven, shalt be brought down to hell: for if the mighty works, which have been done in thee, had been done in Sodom, it would have remained until this day. But I say unto you, That it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment, than for thee.» (Mat 11:20-24)

Who made the intercession for God's people, for God to extend the time of mercy? Why was the door of mercy extended for us today?

Jesus is our King. Was there a time where the door of mercy was about to be shut, and He begs before God on our behalf to keep the door open a little longer? We know from Ellen White it happened not long before the sealing:

“I saw four angels who had a work to do on the earth and were on their way to accomplish it. Jesus was clothed with priestly garments. He gazed in pity on the remnant, then raised His hands, and with a voice of deep pity cried, “My blood, Father, My blood! My blood! My blood!” Then I saw an exceeding bright light come from God, who sat upon the great white throne and was shed all about Jesus. Then I saw an angel fly with a commission from Jesus, swiftly flying to the four angels who had a work to do in the earth, and waving something up and down in his hand, and crying with a loud voice, “Hold! hold! hold! hold! until the servants of God are sealed in their foreheads.” I asked my accompanying angel the meaning of what I heard, and what the four angels were about to do. He said to me that it was God that restrained the powers, and that He gave His angels charge over things on the earth; that the four angels had power from God to hold the four winds, and that they were about to let them go; but while their hands were loosening, and the four winds were about to blow, the merciful eye of Jesus gazed on the remnant that was not sealed, and He raised His hands to the Father, and pleaded with Him that He had

spilled His blood for them. Then another angel was commissioned to fly swiftly to the four angels, and bid them hold until the servants of God were sealed with the seal of the living God in their foreheads. (CET 102.1&2)

In the parallel before Jerusalem's destruction, the plea of the king came when the book of the covenant was found, and the Ark was seen again in the temple.

Do you understand how serious this matter could be for those who say: «I don't care about the discovery of the Ark; it means nothing to me»? How serious this might look in the eyes of heaven if the meaning of this is, at this time, the same as it was then? That we are wasting these precious moments given to us. Although only God knew the time of the second coming, yet once Christ learned the time was up, He started pleading with God to see if His Father was willing to change the date for the sake of Christ and those He shed His precious blood for.

What did they do in Jerusalem? Some made a reform, but the people were split into two groups. The leaders literally turned their back on the Ark in the temple and their extended time of mercy, just to continue as before until the end came over them.

The others «*sigh and cry for all the abominations*» (Eze. 9,4)

The discovery of the Ark of the Covenant was an alarm clock meant to wake up God's people. To give them a last chance to prepare.

We must ask again. Is it Biblical that the Ark testifying of God's covenant, law and promises to mankind will be found and made known to the people before an apocalypse? Is it Biblical? Has God done it before? The Bible says yes.

What I have to deal with preaching these things to you.

What do God's people do in this perhaps last phase of our extended time of mercy? They sleep in the most critical phase in the history of the Earth. The leaders of God's people, lay-people and pastors alike, they all shake their heads and say: «This discovery seems strange, it doesn't FEEL biblical. We don't dare to receive it»

I had the pleasure of getting to know Ron Wyatt, yet nothing that I have presented here of these Biblical studies is from him. I went home and prayed God to show me whether the discovery was biblical or not. And then I studied with an open heart and mind. The leaders, pastors, and lay-workers going so actively against could have done the same. They could have stripped their pre-conceived ideas down and gotten back to the facts of our previous light. But when they studied, they looked for limitations, and wanted to decide what God could and could not do based on their own disbelief.

Why don't God's people know their time of visitation?

«*And shall lay thee even with the ground, and thy children within thee; and they shall not leave in thee one stone upon another; because thou knewest not the time of thy visitation.*» (Luke 19:44)

The Adventist church had the prophecy that the Ark would be found. Yes, even one of their own people discovered it. Their very own prophet said it was hidden and would be found. And when it actually happens, they reject it. And with the rejection, they also lose the blessing, the mercy, and the preparation.

The Jews did not recognize the Messiah, even though they had the scriptures. They were blinded

by disbelief and by the want to elevate self. Oh, how the ego is so dominant. There are many things in the Bible pointing to this discovery. But I have said more than enough. Weep, pray and prepare for what is about to take place. There might still be hope.

What has happened to the discovery? While you were asleep neglecting your duty, dwelling on your insecurities, Catholics, evangelicals, and others with a faulty understanding of prophecy is receiving it and mixing it with lies. Messianic communities receive it and are mixing it with a false end time understanding.

Jesus was born among the Jews because they were close to the truth and could more rightly bring the gospel out to the world. But because most of the Jews rejected Christ, the pagans and their doctrines became dominant.

All around the world today, copies of the Ark are brought in together with lies and deception. The Devil is preparing to nullify God's last call to the world. Yet many of God's people are not prepared to stand on His side. When the law is shown, they have to battle their on failures when God needed them to be victorious in bringing the truth out. Their agony during Jacob's time of trouble will be difficult.

The angel guarding the Ark said the tables would be shown after the national Sunday laws are established. Only Adventists have this understanding and can explain it fully. Yet they remain silent. Jesus said: *«I tell you that, if these should hold their peace, the stones would immediately cry out.»* (Luk 19:40) Some say this verse can be applied to modern archaeology confirming the bible. But none of these have confirmed God's salvation and Christ as King. Why did Jesus say this, what was it the leaders wanted to be silenced when Jesus said this as a response? That Jesus was the Messiah, that Jesus was the King.

Is there any other rock or archaeological discovery ever made that shows us that Christ is our King? No, there is only one. The Ark of the Covenant discovery along with Christ's blood.

Don't look for a reason to doubt because you will find it. Just like those who rejected Christ in their time found plenty of reasons to doubt. They even came with completely unreasonable conditions to believe. They said to Jesus that if He managed to get Himself down from that cross, they would believe. Were Jesus to walk away from the plan of salvation just to convince a few people? They wouldn't even be saved, as Jesus would not have atoned for them. In the same way, I am faced with people demanding the strangest unbiblical things in order to believe this discovery. But our reason to believe is in the Bible. In the time of Jesus they were not satisfied with the evidence given. After Jesus had fed thousands of people, they came up to him and said: "Show us a sign, so we can believe". Because they didn't want to believe, they rejected all the evidence that was already there and continued to chase some documentation they could not get. No sign Jesus gave, no prophecy, was good enough for them to believe when they did not wish to.

In another parable, Jesus tells them how they wanted someone to rise from the dead to preach the truth so they could believe. Jesus said they have the law and the prophets and that is enough. Still, in the parable, Jesus called the man they wanted to testify after his death by the name Lazarus. Interestingly enough, Jesus did rise a man named Lazarus from the dead a bit later. Do you know what they said then? Did that make them believe? No, they wanted to kill Lazarus. They rejected one of the greatest sign of Christ divinity.

If you make your neck stiff and refuse to believe no matter how much evidence you see and hear, you will not be convinced even if the Ark stood right in front of you. For all you knew, it could be a fake or by the devil. You could continue to find reasons to be scared and doubt.

Is the Ark of the Covenant discovery Biblical? From the blood on the mercy seat to the tables of stone shown to the world, all have their parallels in the Bible. Those who reject must explain this away, remove it or disregard it.

But even if you don't believe the witness in the Bible of these discoveries then at least be fair and say it could be Biblical if it's interpreted that way. Consider that you are not called to silence others or to persecute your brethren/sisters. Especially when they witness of this discovery that leads people to receive knowledge of the law, the Sabbath and Christ.

Just because you do not wish to receive this, step out of the way so others can study. It's never dangerous to study the Bible. Anyone who convinces you to not study, is probably not advising you wisely.

If something leads people to be obedient to Gods "commandments" and "the faith of Jesus" we should be careful of standing in the way of that message. This was Christ argument. He said: "And if a house be divided against itself, that house cannot stand.

And if Satan rise up against himself, and be divided, he cannot stand, but hath an end" (Mar 3:25-26). Satan is not served by people being obedient to God.

This could even be the third angels message.

There are even more parallels and stories in the Bible that witness of this discovery. But I will leave you with this. I plead with you to make the right decision.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:

Question 1: Wasn't the High Priest only allowed into the Most Holy Place once a year? How then could Jesus enter at Passover?

Question 2: How (or) does the Ark discovery fit with the 1888 message?

Question 3: Why are so many crazy people sharing this discovery without the correct message following it?

Question 4: If it was from God, why didn't God send this message to our leaders and have them properly present it to the Church?

Question 5: Why many conservative Adventists rejects it, aren't they close to God?

Question 6: These discoveries don't seem to have anything to do with calling people out of Babylon?

Question 7: Does God ever use archaeology?

Question 8: How can we tell what is of God and what is of the devil?

Question 9: Wasn't the Ark of the Covenant taken to heaven?

Question 10: Did Ron Wyatt go against 1844?

Question 11: Did Ron aspire to be an archaeologist without the proper education, isn't that deceptive?

Question 12: How can one man find so many discoveries? Doesn't that make it unlikely?

Question 13: God would never expect us to believe in the Ark discovery before it is physically shown?

Question 14: I believe in the Bible, I don't need these things to believe.

Question 15: This discovery, even if it's true, means nothing to me personally.

Question 16: How can you so boldly preach this when you haven't seen the Ark yourself?

Question 17: Who were to take over after Ron Wyatt?

Question 18: Why does God tell about the Ark before He shows it?

Question 19: Why is there only one witness to the Ark, doesn't it has to be more than one in order for a truth to be established? And why hasn't God been doing anything, adding any witnesses, since Ron died?

Question 20: I've heard some bad rumors about Ron Wyatt's character, shouldn't I use that to determine if he has God's fruits or was telling the truth? Would Christians lie?

Question 21: Maybe Ron was psychologically unstable, and fooled even himself believing this discovery? That he saw things that «wasn't there».

Question 1: Wasn't the High Priest only allowed into the Most Holy Place once a year? How then could Jesus enter at Passover?

Answer 1: Our biggest mistakes are made when we add conclusions and assumptions to scripture and then use those very same assumptions as an argument. We sometimes have ideas that, we think, are IN THE BIBLE, but it's not really in the text.

Firstly, let's divide the two questions. The first about Jesus entering during Passover.

1) Jesus didn't ENTER the Most Holy Place during Passover. The claim was never that He went into the cave and ministered there. What He did do was throw His blood in direction of the Most Holy place from a distance (this was sometimes done by the Priest in the Sanctuary service as well; blood was thrown towards the Holy Place from a distance). The blood did go on the Mercy Seat in Christ case, but by being thrown from a distance. The discovery, or the result of this ministry, was not made known until we were living in the Great Day of Atonement in our day. So, God waited with showing the blood on the Mercy Seat until the Great Day of Atonement.

2) Leviticus 16 never states that no one is allowed to enter the Most Holy Place on other days. This is a misconception. Let's break down what God actually says:

“The LORD spake unto Moses after the death of the two sons of Aaron... Speak unto Aaron thy

brother, that he come not at all times into the holy place within the veil before the mercy seat, which is upon the ark; that he die not: for I will appear in the cloud upon the mercy seat. Speak unto Aaron thy brother, that he come not at all times into the holy place within the veil before the mercy seat, which is upon the ark; that he die not: for I will appear in the cloud upon the mercy seat."

Now, the first thing worth noting here is that it DOESN'T SAY «only on the day of atonement you can come».

The first sentence «the LORD spake unto Moses after the death of the two sons of Aaron» explains why God is giving these instructions. The next sentence says about Aron «that he die not». So, God is in the aftermath of his two son's death, explaining to Aron how he can avoid a similar fate.

The next important sentence explains to us WHY Aron can't come at all times into the Most Holy.

«.. that he die not: for I will appear in the cloud upon the mercy seat».

This is the reason Aron will die entering the Most Holy place. The idea that it was the Ark of the Covenant itself that would kill anyone who comes before it any other day is just that, a private interpretation of the Bible. But we need to let the Bible explain itself. And God Himself gives the reason in the text, there is no reason to doubt that God knows what He is talking about. The reason is not that the Ark is inaccessible, BUT that God would appear above it (His throne) in a cloud.

This means that when God LEFT the Ark, or that the cloud no longer was above it, the reason was partly gone. That is why man DID approach the Ark at other times. When they were moving it when it was placed various places (it wasn't always in a Most Holy Place). People didn't die from standing before it.

The requirement given Aron had a reason to it that we must respect, but this reason did not go for all men at all times. The Bible itself tells us that Moses, who was NOT the High Priest, but who like the High Priest was a symbol of Christ, could enter other times during the year. And so, God's prophet went by different rules. Moses was not negatively affected by God's presence because of his role.

To Moses God said: *«And there I will meet with thee, and I will commune with thee from above the mercy seat, from between the two cherubims which are upon the ark of the testimony, of all things which I will give thee in commandment unto the children of Israel.»* (Exo.25,22)

Other examples are when God told Moses to bring a pot of manna that was later placed with the Ark (Exo 16:34 & Heb 9:4). Or when God ordered Moses to bring a rod for the different tribes and later Aron's rod before the Testimony. (Num 17)

What we learn is that God is the one who decides who comes and when. And He gave directions to Aron that he couldn't come just any time BECAUSE He would show Himself there.

Then we learn HOW Aron could come. *«Thus shall Aaron come into the holy place: with a young bullock for a sin offering, and a ram for a burnt offering.»*

The requirement was also that he had to bathe and wear His holy clothing. So, Aron could NOT

enter the MOST HOLY without blood from a bullock to place upon the Mercy Seat.

This requirement was tied to Aron's priestly service. The next part of the Day of Atonement is about the «cleansing of the sanctuary» and how it is done. But what we first read was HOW Aron could be permitted to go into the Most Holy Place.

And so, the Bible does NOT say that no one could enter or approach the Ark on any other day. Rather, it actually says: *«that he come not at all times into the holy place»*.

It does NOT say it is because no one can enter the Ark's presence without dying, BUT that the reason is *«I will appear in the cloud upon the mercy seat»*.

Why Ron could go in: The Shekinah glory or the Lord in the cloud is not currently over the Ark of the Covenant. Even if it was, if Ron had been given a similar role as Moses he could still go in. But the reason for not coming before the Ark mentioned in Leviticus 16 is no longer there.

Remember, even the Philistines could take the Ark without dying and place it into their Dagon temple. That would require them to be less than a meter before it without dying. The men carrying the Ark to this place were not Levites. Those who had taken the Ark to war were killed on the battlefield and not taken captured. And so, the presence of the Ark doesn't kill anyone. As long as Ron was led by God for His work, he could go in, witness and do what God instructed, without it being anything tied to the service during the Day of Atonement.

Also, it's important to remember that Christ's blood on the mercy seat is a final sacrifice. The blood covers even Ron's past sins and makes it possible for Him to engage in the work. Ron himself believed he could go in because Christ blood was upon it.

Does this destroy the Day of Atonement, 1844? Only if we limit God where the bible does not limit Him. If our objections to these discoveries are ideas we have formed in our mind, that we mistakenly thought the Bible said, then it's our ideas that need to change.

Question 2:

How (or) does the Ark discovery fit with the 1888 message?

Answer 2:

The Adventist movement had for a long time been reforming back to God's original laws. They had received light on future events and the end time events. The more the message of returning to God's law was rejected by other Christians, the more eager they became in proclaiming the importance of obedience. After a while, the focus on Christ in the Most Holy Place was taking their focus away from Christ's righteousness and even the cross.

They had done and were doing important work, but they were in danger of becoming formalist and even legalistic. The important blend of Christ in the Most Holy Place and Christ on the cross had been considered less important. To many, it was difficult to understand how Christ's righteousness could be given to us.

The message of Christ entering the Most Holy Place in heaven and the role of the law was an essential truth that needed to be shared.

But as we investigate Ron's discovery in scripture, we find that Christ's blood on the mercy seat is what made Christ's ministry in heaven even possible. That all points back to the cross. Even Christ's ministry in the Most Holy place points first and foremost to the cross.

The discovery of the Ark of the Covenant here on earth blends the two events while at the same time highlighting the cross, our only means of salvation. It's through Christ's blood our prayers ascend to the sanctuary in heaven, it is by His blood He makes intercession. It's by His blood, He got the means to minister on behalf of us. Furthermore, it's all tied to His death at Golgotha.

God's people weren't ready for Christ's second coming in 1888 because they had lost sight of the most important part. That Christ's righteousness is imputed on us by faith in the blood. And the message of Waggoner and Jones was that we cannot gain victory over the sins in our lives, that we become as hypocrites, if victory is not done by beholding the blood of the cross. They were explaining how beholding Christ could do a miracle inside us. Receiving Christ's righteousness is receiving His work on our behalf and letting Him continue that work as we behold Him.

The message of the 1888 address was not IF we can gain victory, but HOW we gain it. The more we look at ourselves and try to conquer sin with our own strength, the more we are likely to fail. But conquering sin by faith and trust in Christ work in us, surrounding to Christ while beholding Him, we will miraculously conquer sin. The difference is typified in the Old Covenant and in the New Covenant, and most Christians today live in one of the two covenants.

They believe we should keep the law, they make a pitiful attempt, and they fail repeatedly. The law has become a harsh finger on the outside, and they can never seem to get it right. They are living in the Old Covenant system.

The new covenant system is not based on our own works, but Christ's works in us. We approach Christ by His blood and behold Him, and He does the works in us.

The discovery of the Ark of the Covenant during the Great Day of Atonement brings the focus back to the cross in our last days here on earth. Our last chance is tied to us beholding Christ on the cross. It's the only thing that can impart Christ's righteousness upon us.

Nicodemus asked how it was possible to be born-again by the Spirit, and Jesus pointed to beholding the cross as the only answer to gain this spiritual birth. (John.3)

God is not taking our attention away from the service Christ is doing for us in the Most Holy Place in heaven, He is just helping us to view it from the right perspective. He is making sure that the last message to the world is balanced correctly.

The Day of Atonement contained a testimony, starting from the cross and lasting until God's people are saved and separated from the devil.

On this great Day of Atonement, God has brought all the elements of this day back into the picture. The cross and the investigative judgment must be united and go together in God's last call to mankind.

If anyone has a problem with God doing it this way, it might be a good idea to re-examine why we so easily think that evidence of Christ's atonement for us on the cross is competing with the ministry He's performing in the Most Holy Place in heaven? If we do find it competing rather than complimenting each other, have we perhaps had an unbalanced understanding of the Day of

Atonement?

Question 3:

Why are so many crazy people sharing this discovery without the right message to accompany it?

Answer 3:

The devil knows if he cannot keep the information from you, or not being able to silence it, he must change tactics. Unfortunately, you will always find tares among the wheat. And those tares are ready to do what the devil suggests to them under the guise of «the name of God». Having apparent bad or unstable people present God's message will put people off before studying it.

One method he can use that we see in the Bible is to have the wrong people support it.

"And it came to pass, as we went to prayer, a certain damsel possessed with a spirit of divination met us, which brought her masters much gain by soothsaying: The same followed Paul and us, and cried, saying, These men are the servants of the highest God, which shew unto us the way of salvation.

And this did she many days. But Paul, being grieved, turned and said to the spirit, I command thee in the name of Jesus Christ to come out of her. And he came out the same hour." (Act 16:16-18)

Another one who suffered this problem was, of course, Jesus when He was here among us.

"And devils also came out of many, crying out, and saying, Thou art Christ the Son of God. And he rebuking them suffered them not to speak: for they knew that he was Christ." (Luke 4:41)

Now, they seem to confirm who Christ was, but when some of the Jewish leaders associated Jesus with Beelzebub, having demons testify that you are the Messiah might just serve to make the situation worse. Who wants to follow Christ after the testimonies of demons, right?

So, the devil does these things. He will have crazy people, sometimes even possessed people, to proclaim that these discoveries are true, just to put you off and get you suspicious. God allows it because He has repeatedly told His people to measure things by the law and the prophets, and not by who seemingly acknowledge it.

If Ron had been a clearly unstable or possessed man, then that would be a testimony against it because God has told us that we shall know them by their fruits. But there is a difference between the first messenger of the message and other people that receive it and share it.

Christ was holy and pure, yet people calling themselves by Christ's name can do terrible things while preaching. Priests abusing boys in the Catholic Church is a prime example. Now you shouldn't disbelieve Christ just because someone who calls himself a worker of Christ, someone who preaches Christ's words, does bad things.

If Ron stands the test of being a messenger of God, then crazy people repeating his words cannot be used against the discovery itself.

Question 4:

If it was from God, why didn't God send this message to our leaders and have them properly present it to the Church?

Question 4:

How was the Sabbath accepted into the Adventist movement? A woman by the name of Rachel Oakes tried to tell the eager movement who were waiting for Christ's second coming that they were not ready, they had not reformed back to God's law. She was trying to address the topic of the Sabbath. But this movement felt they were precisely where they needed to be. Then the disappointment in 1844 happened, and the small group that remained started re-examining themselves and their faith. It's in this aftermath they are presented with the Sabbath and now finally take it seriously.

Ellen White had already started to receive visions, she was already chosen by God as a prophet. They were active in the advent movement. Then someone introduces the Sabbath to them, not by vision or dream, but by a human messenger. Humble as they were, they didn't question: 'if this was important, then why hadn't God just shown it to Ellen White in a vision first?' She clearly had contact with God already, why hadn't God just told her directly to accept the Sabbath before? Why did she have to hear it from a worker and study about it like everyone else? They prayed and studied it and accepted it. Later, God gave them confirming visions that this was of Him and the importance of the Sabbath.

This is an excellent example of how God works and how He tests us and our willingness to love the truth when it's presented to us. When we are made acquainted with a point of truth, not by thunder and lightning, but by the still voice of a fellow human being, our sincerity is tested. Do we listen to the Holy Spirit, do we love the truth presented to us? In this way, God can find His people in this world.

We see God using the same method over and over again. When Jesus was born, it was not announced in the temple or in the King's castle. It was not given by an angel to the priests and scribes.

God gave the message to shepherds and a couple of elder people who were waiting for the Savior.

God had given enough light for the leaders and priests to expect that the Messiah was born. The father of John the Baptists was a respected priest and the vision given him was shared with them:

“And fear came on all that dwelt round about them: and all these sayings were noised abroad throughout all the hill country of Judaea.” (Luke 1,65)

So, they would have heard and had time to investigate or pray over the matter. When Christ was born, the message that the Messiah was born was spread wide and far: *«And the shepherds returned, glorifying and praising God for all the things that they had heard and seen, as it was told unto them.» (Luke.2,20)*

And the prophet Anna: *«And she coming in that instant gave thanks likewise unto the Lord, and spake of him to all them that looked for redemption in Jerusalem.» (Luke 2,38)*

The priests and leaders even had to help the wise men find Jesus, but they themselves did not look for him. If the leaders had accepted the light sent to them by all these people's testimony,

they would have been prepared and known exactly who Jesus was when He started His ministry. Jesus wasn't just rejected when He was doing His ministry, He was already rejected as a child.

The leaders and priests did not get to take part in proclaiming Jesus as the Messiah because they rejected the truth, they didn't love the truth.

“Now pride and envy closed the door against the light. If the reports brought by the shepherds and the wise men were credited, they would place the priests and rabbis in a most unenviable position, disproving their claim to be the exponents of the truth of God. These learned teachers would not stoop to be instructed by those whom they termed heathen. It could not be, they said, that God had passed them by, to communicate with ignorant shepherds or uncircumcised Gentiles. They determined to show their contempt for the reports that were exciting King Herod and all Jerusalem.

They would not even go to Bethlehem to see whether these things were so. And they led the people to regard the interest in Jesus as a fanatical excitement. Here began the rejection of Christ by the priests and rabbis. From this point, their pride and stubbornness grew into a settled hatred of the Saviour. While God was opening the door to the Gentiles, the Jewish leaders were closing the door to themselves.” (Desire of Ages, p.63)

And God allows that. He didn't fire all the bad leaders and priests and took over the Jewish congregation. Rather, God continued with the remnant that was faithful.

If the Adventist leaders and pastors have been given an opportunity to hear and learn about the discovery early on and rejected it, they have excluded themselves from taking part in sharing it.

Unfortunately, this happens. We are not exempt as a people from repeating the mistakes of God's people in the past. Rather, we are told that their mistakes are something we need to learn from.

“The Jews had deceived themselves by misinterpreting the words of the lord through his prophets, of his eternal favor to his people Israel.” (Jeremiah 31:35-37 quoted) These words the Jews applied to themselves. And because God had shown them so great favor and mercy, they flattered themselves that, notwithstanding their sins and iniquities, he would still retain them as his favored people, and shower especial blessings upon them. they misapplied the words of Jeremiah and depended for their salvation upon being called the children of Abraham. If they had indeed been worthy of the name of Abraham's children, they would have followed the righteous example of their father Abraham and would have done the works of Abraham. this has been the danger of the people of God in all ages; and especially is this the danger of those living near the close of time.” (The spirit of Prophecy Volume Two [1877], pp. 52,53, by Ellen G. White) *My comment*

It's not to be avoided to notice that those who trusted their leaders and priests to evaluate light in their place perished together with their spiritual leaders. They who did this were lost in the time of Jeremiah at the first destruction of the temple in Jerusalem, and they who were led to reject Jesus as the Messiah and followed their leaders perished when the second temple was destroyed.

The destruction of Jerusalem is a type of the end of the world. There is no better time to reconsider letting leaders and priests decide on our own behalf what light is or is not from God. Our salvation depends on our own personal study.

When all of this is said, it's important to notice that God did bring the light of these discoveries to the leading men in the Adventist church before the people. They just didn't like God's messenger, or His message. The first men to enter the Noah's ark site were respected Adventists in leading positions. The decision to blow up a section of it, finding nothing they thought interesting, using this violent type of research, they abandoned the site. However, as a witness to man, God wanted to bring this discovery out. Thus, after a display of unwillingness from these men, God chose a humble independent Adventist instead. This time, God got what he had wanted. The spiritual part and the proper research.

Ron Wyatt used Ellen White's description of the Exodus route to find the crossing site. Adventist scholars could have done the same, but they were too busy trying to gain acknowledgment by other Christians and would therefore just accept the false routes presented in the Bibles.

The same with the Ark of The Covenant discovery. Ron was communicating with a leader of the Adventist Archeological society. His daughter even claimed he was in Jerusalem at the time Ron made the discovery, yet asked to be left out of Ron's stories because he was afraid. His daughter later claimed that her father, on his deathbed.

The discovery of the Ark was made known to prominent Adventists, and they were in dialogue with Ron. At a certain time, another witness claimed they had offered Ron a pastor position at a church in exchange for them being the ones to present the discovery as if it were theirs. When Ron refused, they later went against him.

Ellen White writes about the leaders in Christ days: *"These humble worshipers had not studied the prophecies in vain. But those who held positions as rulers and priests in Israel, though they too had before them the precious utterances of prophecy, were not walking in the way of the Lord, and their eyes were not open to behold the Light of life. So it is still. Events upon which the attention of all heaven is centered are undiscerned, their very occurrence is unnoticed, by religious leaders, and worshipers in the house of God. Men acknowledge Christ in history, while they turn away from the living Christ. Christ in His word calling to self-sacrifice, in the poor and suffering who plead for relief, in the righteous cause that involves poverty and toil and reproach, is no more readily received today than He was eighteen hundred years ago."* (Desire of Ages, p55-56)

All in all, God had to deal with prominent Adventists in both the work with Noah's ark and the Ark of the Covenant, and not all of them had pure hearts. God chooses whom He wants to use after His own heart. Ron was a man after His heart. Remember what God told Samuel when he first saw the firstborn, the most important child of the family, with an admirable appearance: *"Look not on his countenance, or on the height of his stature; because I have refused him: for the LORD seeth not as man seeth; for man looketh on the outward appearance, but the LORD looketh on the heart."* (1. Samuel.16,7) God then instructed Samuel to anoint the youngest of them all, the very one the father hadn't thought of as important enough to even come to join them.

When leaders or pastors do not cooperate with the spirit the way God needs them to, when they are in danger of turning God's message into something God doesn't want it to be, God must go past them and choose someone we might at first glance think of as a bad choice. But God, who knows the hearts, knows what He is looking for.

Certain people in Norway were very eager to go against Ron from the very first time he came. Later, they found an acknowledged Adventist archeologist in the United States and asked him to come over to do meetings to refute Ron Wyatt's discoveries. Many people came to these meetings, and before attacking Ron and his discoveries, this very man used the Sabbath sermon time to talk about himself. How many people liked him, how accepted and important he was, what important work he had been part of, just to make him seem suited to talk of these things. This was the basis given to us all to accept his word in place of Ron's, his own excellence. But the Bible gives us this clue. *«If I were to testify on my own behalf, my testimony would not be valid» (John 5,31)*

But this is not how we are to value if something is from God, not by their education or work. This man wanted to elevate himself over us in a way that was meant to portray that his study against the discoveries was so supreme that we need not study it ourselves.

Notice the difference in how Ron presented himself. He said he was just willing to do what God wanted, he said God showed him the Ark and that it wasn't the result of his own cleverness. In fact, he stated that none of these discoveries were. Nowhere did he elevate himself in any way to explain why God would use him. Ron gave God credit and honor. And those who went against him were busy building their own private reputation. For any truth seekers, this should be important to notice. Does someone give the credit and the glory to God for what they do? Or do they give glory to themselves and their own abilities, their titles, and private accomplishments?

“Riches, worldly honor, and human greatness can never save a soul from death; Jesus purposed that no attraction of an earthly nature should call men to His side. Only the beauty of heavenly truth must draw those who would follow Him. The character of the Messiah had long been foretold in prophecy, and He desired men to accept Him upon the testimony of the word of God”. (Desire of Ages p.43)

God chooses messengers from those who will honor Him and not themselves. God chose Ron because of his willingness to learn from Christ, be corrected when he did something wrong, and to give God glory and credit for these discoveries. Repeatedly, Ron said it was not his own cleverness that led him to find these things, rather he just asked God to use him to save souls.

«We must fall upon the Rock and be broken before we can be uplifted in Christ. Self must be dethroned, pride must be humbled if we would know the glory of the spiritual kingdom. The Jews would not accept the honor that is reached through humiliation. Therefore they would not receive their Redeemer.” (Desire of Ages, p.57)

People usually dislike those messengers God chooses because people are offended by humility. They often want to be honored themselves and are therefore attracted to the idea of being honored. There is a reason so many people are fans of other accomplished people. They represent «the dream» and so they find them attractive.

The leaders and priest's rejection of Ron is not an excuse for us to reject him. It has never been an excuse to reject God's messengers and it never will be.

«At Bethlehem, they found no royal guard stationed to protect the newborn King. None of the world's honored men were in attendance. Jesus was cradled in a manger. His parents, uneducated peasants, were His only guardians. Could this be He of whom it was written, that He should "raise up the tribes of Jacob," and "restore the preserved of Israel;" that He should be "a

light to the Gentiles," and for "salvation unto the end of the earth"? Isa. 49:6." (Desire of Ages p.63)

If the Son of God, when He came to this earth, was treated in this way, do we really think that His messengers will be treated any better? Do we think Gods end time message to the world will be loved more?

Question 5:

Why do many conservative Adventists reject the discoveries; aren't they close to God?

Answer 5: Many conservative Adventists have a great zeal for God's work and long to have a tight connection with God. But they have some serious weaknesses that make them vulnerable to rejecting light from God. They often will not add anything to their understanding, they think the reformation ends with themselves. It seems to be an insult to them to think that they would still need some great reform, as their faith is often built on them being where they are supposed to be.

The conservatives in Christ's days were the Pharisees, and they were often the harshest against Jesus. They used the law and the prophet against Christ, they said they believed Christ was in-fact demon possessed or even worse, the leader of the demons. They were moved by fear and the need to have elevated roles. Furthermore, they struggled to trust God to lead people individually, and they felt the need to take the control themselves.

I can only here say what I have seen personally in meeting with conservatives rejecting these things.

They use the Bible and the Spirit of Prophecy against the discoveries, very much in the same way the Pharisees used scripture against Jesus. They miss the obvious, the clearly written text, and waste time twisting quotes. This proves that they do not WISH to receive the light. They want to find reasons to reject it. And if you intend to find a hook to place your doubt, you will find it. *"While God has given ample evidence for faith, He will never remove all excuse for unbelief. All who look for hooks to hang their doubts upon will find them. And those who refuse to accept and obey God's word until every objection has been removed, and there is no longer an opportunity for doubt, will never come to the light...." {DD 11.3}*

Initially, I met some very active conservative Adventists. I didn't understand at first why they were so hostile to even consider these things. I then realized that it might be tied to their own elevation. They looked down on some of those sharing it in the sense that they saw themselves as «closer to God». Their relationship with God and answers to prayers made them feel important, people looked to them for answers. The idea that God would send them an important message through people they considered to be less «perfect» was offensive to them. These people were to have more knowledge of God's truth than them? What would that do to their position?

Legalistic conservatives will never approve of God's messengers because those God chooses won't be legalistic in their practice. They are moved by the Spirit and adjust constantly by it. They are not bound by traditional thinking. God's true light-reform is beyond human control and tends to cause fear with the legalistic individual who needs control.

And so, it was to their own 'benefit' to disbelieve it. Then they could be even more elevated

'saving others from this deception and appear as even closer to God than their 'competition'.

There is no competition between God's true workers, or there shouldn't be. But those who strive to be the most influential and important will treat anyone disrupting this as competition. They think God has a problem with them, but it's really them who has the problem.

My personal opinion is that those specific conservatives in my country rejected and went against these discoveries because they could not endure the thought that someone whom they considered 'less holy' would have light to give 'to them'.

I don't think they recognized their own emotions or why they didn't feel comfortable receiving the light. If God had something to say, surely God would tell them first? Because the church rejected sharing the discoveries, God has had to use many "fishermen", "tax collectors" "sinners", and "defiled women" to do it. Being in the position of having to receive messengers from someone you look a little down upon, can be a test from God. It most certainly has been in the past.

Some view true humbleness like Ron Wyatt had as him being weak. It's not weakness to wait for the Lord, it requires strength to let self go and wait for God rather than taking the control ourselves.

It's a test even Ellen White was faced with after being honored by God by receiving visions. She still had to receive the messages that came her way from others. And she did. God had chosen her because she was humble. In order to accept light sent to us, we must be humble. We cannot view ourselves as more holy or more elevated than we do other workers. If we do, God's messengers become a threat to our position and our faulty views of ourselves.

And so, the many conservatives did what the Pharisees did in their day. They searched the scriptures, not to prove that Christ was the Messiah, but to find quotes they could twist and use against this discovery. Then they could keep their elevated position, and people would continue to believe that they were the experts. And most of all, they would not have to exchange their own self-invented version of humility (their works, fasting and many rules and regulations) with true humiliation, the one Christ represented where the meaning and purpose of the law was manifested.

The result among several of these conservatives was precisely what they secretly desired. By claiming the other lay-workers were deceived by Satan, they could attract support and sympathy to their own ministry and would be elevated as those who can distinguish right from wrong. Without reflecting over their actions, they make their followers afraid of trusting others, which help them keep their influence over them. Those they viewed as competition were removed, and they could continue to have an elevated view of themselves. But what they missed out on, was a true conversion that the acceptance of God's message could have given them. A more realistic view of self and their need to continue reforming closer to God's ways. The reform that many conservatives have, is not the real reform originating from God, it's a reform into a legalistic religion where they try to be saved through works even though they claim that isn't what they are doing.

And this is just the very path I witnessed conservatives rejecting these discoveries went. They added more forms, rules and regulations. They were not just leading people into a fanatical religion, but they made themselves the consciousness of others. All the extra rules and

regulations lead several people to fall away from the path or to give up on their faith. Some people also went liberal because they couldn't live that way.

They clung to the fact that a few had been 'saved' as their fruit, while at the same time discouraging many other people. A typical sign of the conservatives that has gone astray is that they use "fear" as their main motivation for keeping man made laws and to "save others".

"Besides, it does not seem a proper way to win souls to Jesus by appealing to one of the lowest attributes of the mind,—abject fear. The love of Jesus attracts; it will subdue the hardest heart."
{CET 40.6}

Legalistic religion is not true reform, rather it's a sign of the absence of the true reform. Those who claim to honor God's law are not always the ones who actually do. Jesus brought this example in His ministry work on earth. One man asked how to keep the law, and Jesus uses the priest and the Levite as examples. The very ones that were teaching everyone to keep God's law and the importance of it, the very ones who were "known" to keep it, Jesus used as an example of lawbreakers. In the story of the merciful Samaritan, Jesus asked them which one of the three actually kept God's law, the priest and the Levite who were teachers of the law or the Samaritan that the priest and Levite looked down upon as a lawbreaker? It was the Samaritan that in this instance kept God's law, not the two men with the law in a scroll. And so, Jesus said to us: *«Judge not according to the appearance, but judge righteous judgment.» (John 7:24)*

It's worth considering that in their zeal to keep God's law, they are breaking all its principles and teaching others to do the same. You think they keep the law and therefore are blessed by God, yet they do not keep its principles, rather the legalism is causing them to portray God and His law in a false light. And so, they appear righteous while they are not. They appear to protect the law verbally but they, by their practice, make people feel disgusted towards keeping it, as the love in it is gone. Another good way to learn if someone is serving God in their zeal, is to notice if they are eager to persecute brethren that don't do what they do, or what they want them to do. Are they attacking their brethren by utilizing gossip and manipulation? Then they are not keeping God's law. We have no right to manipulate the minds of others by taking advantage of human instincts like fear and confusion instead of talking to their intellect. And gossip is actually clearly against the law.

Many conservatives do and will continue to fight these discoveries as it's an offense to them. They think God would reveal it in a sign or vision to them if it was true, because of their self-elevated position.

The work of spreading these discoveries can be compared to the time of Paul and the challenges he met.

«For the Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom: But we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness» (1Co 1:22-23)

This discovery has become a stumbling-block to conservative lay-ministries. The idea of Christ's blood going upon the mercy seat here on earth is offensive to them, and they have no room to add to their understanding, as they are sure they have already understood everything the way they were supposed to.

Few fit the warning to Laodicea more than them, for they think they have reached the end goal,

that they have all the truth they need. They think they are ready. This is the state of the church of Laodicea.

Our reformation is never over, our development is never finished. We only still have some beams of light. However, God has a lot more light that needs to be added to our current light. Messengers that will teach us that we are not so close to the truth as we had thought. That we still had pillars of faith yet to receive. This is offensive to many conservatives because it makes them «lose control» over their own view of themselves and over the people they are trying to lead.

“The great principle so nobly advocated by Robinson and Roger Williams, that truth is progressive, that Christians should stand ready to accept all the light which may shine from God’s Holy Word, was lost sight by their descendants. The Protestant churches of America—and those of Europe as well—so highly favored in receiving the blessings of the Reformation, failed to press forward in the path of reform. Though a few faithful men arose, from time to time, to proclaim new truth, and expose long-cherished error, the majority, like the Jews in Christ’s day, or the papists in the time of Luther, were content to believe as their fathers had believed and to live as they had lived. Therefore religion again degenerated into formalism, and errors and superstitions which would have been cast aside had the church continued to walk in the light of God’s Word, were retained and cherished. Thus the spirit inspired by the Reformation gradually died out until there was almost as great need of reform in the Protestant churches as in the Roman Church in the time of Luther. There were the same worldliness and spiritual stupor, a similar reverence for the opinions of men, and substitution of human theories for the teachings of God’s Word.” GC88 2971

If someone doesn’t want you to research and study something for yourself, if they don’t trust you to pray to God to show you the truth but wants to be your mediator in an area of conflict; If they want to scare you away from investigating, then they have taken a position that is not God-given. Be alarmed and go and do your own research.

On the great day of judgment, we cannot blame anyone for our failure to receive the truth but ourselves. We are responsible and will be held to account if we give our consciousness to someone else, if we trust fallible humans to determine for us what is the truth.

But those who are legalistic or formalistic want to either control others or be controlled. And in this setting, the living Christ is limited.

The second reason I believe God allowed so many leading conservative Adventists to go against, without doing too much to stop them, is that these types of people easily ‘float’ to the top. Meaning, if they had been convinced it was of God, they would instantly have taken the main role of preaching it. They would be known to represent it. The same type of people need control and would end up trying to control the work. They don’t wait for God or value true humility. Because of their great faults, legalism, and attempts to control the work of God, the message of God would not be presented in the correct light. Rather, it could lead even more people into formalism and a legalistic religion. A religion where the principle of God’s law is broken to bits.

Not being where they should be, and at the same time having great influence, perhaps made it a non-priority for God to have these same people accept the discoveries by His great influence. They had the law and the prophets, and they decided to try and use them against God’s light. God would not reward this with giving them supernatural signs to convince them.

Perhaps God needed them to be in a different state before He would try to persuade them. The combination of them not humbling themselves and God not wanting His discoveries presented with a Pharisee-like religion, made God allow them to go in this direction. A lot of the people sharing these discoveries around the world are distinguished by neither fitting with the conservatives nor the liberal groups. Coincidentally, neither did Jesus nor His apostles. They were not accepted by either group, nor did they belong in them.

If the many conservatives that do not value things the same way God does had believed it was from God, they would have pushed those God had chosen aside to be the main workers to share it. This would most likely distort the purpose of the discoveries and the message that was to go with them.

Some did receive it and have presented it falsely, but the less prominent the 'Pharisee' that receive it is, the less damage there will be.

It's as if the Pharisees received Jesus as the Messiah and, rather than changing, they would present this truth to the world together with all their own ideas of righteousness. The message would be distorted when shared with people. Instead, God chose those who had no position, he chose fishermen and people who weren't regarded as being spiritual leaders. They became Christ's leaders in the work of bringing the truth out because they were willing to learn from His humility, and they more rightly understood what God wanted to share and how.

And so sometimes, rather than wondering why God didn't use more effort and strength to have certain prominent lay-workers or some conservative pastors receive the discoveries, so the discoveries could get more attention, we should recognize that if someone isn't in the right 'place' to be taught by God, God will not start off by convincing them of these discoveries. He wants to teach them something else first, then when their mindset is in the right path (as we must always reform according to His will), then He can entrust to them truths they have missed out on while they were having the wrong mindset.

Therefore, God will not, and has not in the past, forced His messengers and message upon His people by signs and wonders if they were not open in the first place.

Question 6:

These discoveries don't seem to have anything to do with calling people out of Babylon?

Answer 6:

In fact, all of Babylon's sins are to be exposed. Who are we to stand in the way of any part of God's work in exposing them? That is what we in fact do when we go against these discoveries. And these discoveries expose some of Babylon's lies. Did you know that numerous Christians and Catholics reject the flood story? This is one of Babylon's lies. Sodom and Gomorrah are an example of the fate of the ungodly. The 'Babylonian' lie of an everlasting hell is exposed through these very remains. That is two of Babylon's lies exposed right there.

Constantine is one of the fathers of Christian lies, and he was also the first to make a Sunday law, and to make, by law, the feast of 25th of December. When he was a state leader, he blended Christianity with the Roman religion, Babylon entered the church like never before. But people seem to forget that part of his work that corrupted the church, was also many religious sites. If

Babylon is to be exposed, then this part of the work of proclaiming that Babylon has fallen is important.

The Exodus route and mount Sinai discovery disprove the Sinai-lie made by Babylon. Constantine's mother picked out the mountain, located in the southern part of the modern-day Sinai Peninsula. This lie has hurt God's work in the way that the absence of evidence of the Israelite settlement at this site has caused scholars to reject the entire exodus story. Not just non-religious scholars, but also Christian scholars. It also contradicts Biblical facts about the exodus. The tradition of this mountain being Sinai has therefore contributed to leading people astray.

God bringing out evidence of the exodus strengthens the Bible as an accurate book that is not to be easily dismissed.

The word Babel means confusion, and that is just what spiritual Babylon has done, caused confusion on the validity of the word of God and the stories therein.

Another lie of Babylon, and this is a serious one; for hundreds and hundreds of years, people have come to a false crucifixion site, being promised indulgences for coming there. Indulgences are given to remove part of the punishment in this world, or the next for either yourself or a deceased loved one. In the church, you are forgiven, but you will still have to be punished a certain amount. By going to this crucifixion site at certain times, you can be 'relieved' of your punishment or save your suffering loved one.

The churches also make people believe they are blessed by God by the lie of the «holy fire miracle» every Easter. People come with personal possessions to transfer the holiness from these church rocks to themselves. It's a big lie, and people have been deceived in numbers that cannot be counted. It's been the main religious site of the Orthodox and Catholic churches. Having it under their control gives them a sense of authority over Christianity. And tons of people have been and are still deceived to come here in order to receive a blessing, an indulgence or a favor with God.

Then Ron Wyatt found the real cross-hole, and by that exposed the entire lie of the established churches to their people. Of course, Ron would get resistance. Resistance by the scientific community, by the religious communities and by Jesuits working to make the discovery of non-effect among our own leaders.

Exposing the crucifixion and tomb lie of the Roman Church tears down a mass of ideas they have built up. It hurts their authority and the foundation the church is built on. God never spoke to them, He never came to them at this site, the holy fire is not from God, and no one will receive a pardon from God by making this pilgrimage, and no one ever has.

Ron Wyatt's discovery of the crucifixion site exposes one of spiritual Babylon's biggest lies. It shows Babylon's fall and that it is a place of unclean spirits rather divinely blessed like they claim to be.

Lastly, the Ark of the Covenant exposes the very biggest lie of spiritual Babylon. It proves that the earthly Ark of the Covenant containing God's law is still here on earth as a witness against man. That the law is unchanged. That Christ confirmed its validity by following the law's requirements. It shows us what sins we did that Christ gave His life to save us from. It shows us that God's throne is not in Rome, in Utah, at the Watchtower, Silver Spring or any other place.

God's throne still contains His law, and the mediator and church leader is still Jesus Christ.

It shows the third angel's message in Revelation 14 that God's people are those who have the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus. It proves that God still is in charge.

The spiritual Babylon has abandoned God's law, some have tried to change it or divide it, and claimed they were speaking on God's behalf. God revealing His earthly throne with the law in it, are causing the arguments of Babylon to fall. They are exposed as liars yet again.

And so, as you can see, these discoveries are helping to expose Babylon and exposing all their lies.

Babylon has fallen, and Ron's discoveries are a part of the reason it continues to fall.

Is it really our stand that God would not expose Babylon on these points? On all points?

Unfortunately, because Adventists have been too embarrassed and fearful to receive and share it, many of those woken by the discoveries become Messianic instead. They don't know where else to go where God's law, Sabbath and Jesus is respected.

Question 7:

Does God ever use archaeology?

Answer 7:

The word archaeology is a modern term and so it cannot be found in the Bible. However, we can see a different wording meaning the same.

God often uses historical events as a message to God's people about their own day. This can be seen repeatedly. Yet, we often think the stories themselves are enough. But God uses visuals together with words. The idea that God 'only uses words' is not and has never been a correct understanding. Especially before a pending destruction, God adds visual examples to His warnings.

One example is found in the book of Jeremiah. This is right before Jerusalem is to be destroyed, and Jeremiah's task is to warn them of the danger they are facing.

"But go ye now unto my place which was in Shiloh, where I set my name at the first, and see what I did to it for the wickedness of my people Israel.

...Therefore will I do unto this house, which is called by my name, wherein ye trust... as I have done to Shiloh." (Jer 7:12 &14)

Shiloh was abandoned as a religious center well over 300 to 400 years earlier. I'm sure you would agree that 300-400 old remains can be considered archeological remains. God says «go ye now», He told them to GO AND LOOK at the remains. Why were they to go look at then archeological remains of that place? To learn about what soon will take place in Jerusalem. God used Shiloh as the example because it touched the very core of the message God wanted to be shared. The people in Jeremiah's day thought that there was NO WAY God would abandon His temple in Jerusalem and let the city and the temple be destroyed. After all, it had been standing there for several hundreds of years. They just could not see that happening, and the priests went

against Jeremiah when he said the opposite. And so, God uses the remains after where the sanctuary had once stood and the buildings there that once were so often visited at feasts and ceremonies, and He said: «go look at it».

The visual example went together with the warning to strengthen the message. The image of the ruins in their heads were to have an impact on the serious nature of their position.

God continued to use physical examples together with His words to cause the words to have a greater impact. He instructed Jeremiah to use a vessel and break it while he spoke, he asked him to go place a belt by a river only to have it get ruined. Jesus did the same thing, he constantly used physical images to make His statements remembered and more easily digested.

God knows how our brain works; He created it. And modern science knows through numerous experiments. You can read about it in National Geographic, or Psychology Today, or go straight to studies done at universities. Studies show that our brain is mainly an image processor, not a word processor.

Words are abstract and rather difficult for the brain to retain, whereas visuals are concrete and therefore more easily remembered. And they can see this in how the brain works. And tactics are used in learning. If you try to memorize words, it can be hard to recall them if there are too many. But if you memorize with pictures, or visuals, your brain will have improved memory. And so, when God has an important message to give people, and He doesn't want them to forget it the moment they hear it, He knows that adding visuals will help the message not just go in one ear and out the other. God isn't going to give man any excuse for sin, or for rejecting Him. Definitely not a scientific excuse. God is the Master of Science. Therefore, God adds visuals that are either a parable tied to something you can see every day, or visuals of what He wants to teach us. Like the sacrificial system, that is a "show and tell" education.

So, when you get a visual of the remains of Noah's ark, Sodom and Gomorrah, Mount Sinai, please bear in mind you don't have to go there to get the visuals, you can get them through photos and through the internet. The important part for our brain is the visuals that come with the message. Look at the remains of the boat, hear the message that goes with it. For many who grew up with these stories, with children's books, they know the warnings of God well. But in our days, many people who have little to no knowledge about God need to understand God's last warning quickly. And God knows that the most effective way is not just to tell, but to **SHOW and TELL** to get the message properly through into our memory system. And I know a guy who knew just about nothing and one day saw an image of the remains of Noah's ark. Then he heard the message, and he saw the photos. And the brain processed the information quickly, and he quickly started to keep the commandments of God and have the faith of Jesus with no prior background. By these discoveries and these images of prior judgment, he quickly understood and reasoned, that if it is the end time now, he has to choose the side of those obedient and loyal.

And this is the fruits God wants. Learn quickly, remember it. Don't let it go in one ear and out another, let it go in and stay there so you at least will have to ponder over it, and the brain can process it easily. Right before the door of mercy will shut, masses of people must decide quickly. Not just quickly, **BUT** they must understand what the truth is amidst **TONS OF LIES** and false gospels. So, God used the most scientific method to get a message across, **SHOW AND TELL**. Short, simple and visual: If you do this, that will happen, if you do that, this will happen.

And every discovery tells that story up to the Ark of the Covenant, and it sets the standard plain and simple, this is what defines obedience or disobedience. This is what defines salvation.

Jesus used Sodom and the flood as examples of the end days. It's therefore very consistent with how God has worked in the past to give man a visual of these same things together with the warning of what is about to come over the earth.

Question 8:

How can we tell what is of God, and what is of the devil?

Answer 8:

The devil uses many different tactics, but his end goal is the same. That's why we can expose him by looking, not at the means he uses, but at where it's headed.

The devil's agenda, we know what it is, is to lead people away from obedience to God, and to lead them away from getting part in Christ's blood. It has been the same attack since Adam and Eve and will be until Christ returns. The agenda is not to necessarily lead us away from a belief in Christ dying for us. The devil doesn't mind whether we have our crucifixes or whatever. We can go to church and sing hallelujah, for instance. As long as we have a conflict with God whilst doing it, Satan is content.

The devil tricked God's people like this all throughout Bible history. They tried to worship God while at the same time being disobedient. This is why the first king of Israel, Saul, was rejected. He was sacrificing to the Lord, praising him, but he was being disobedient all the while he was doing it.

You see that throughout. Through Jeremiah God says, how can you steal and do all these horrible things and then come worship me saying you are delivered to do all these things? Or what about Isaiah 1 where God says HE hates the worship of God with unrighteousness?

Satan means opponent, he is a rebellion. And he wants us to rebel. He wants you to do it openly, if you don't want to do that, he will try to seduce you to do it. If you still won't do it, then he will try and trick you to do it. And if that doesn't work, he will try to deceive you to do it, and lastly if that doesn't work either, he will try and force you.

Therefore, as Christians, we need to guard ourselves against being deceived.

And the Bible gives us the weapon we need to fight it.

Jesus is clear, not all who says Lord, Lord will be saved. Not if they continue in iniquity at the same time.

So, the way the devil tricked God's people in the past, for instance before the temple was destroyed the first time, was to implement the false doctrine that you can combine false religion with God's name. Because they did both. And God rejected them.

- So Satan's lie will lead you to sin under the guise of godliness
- it will lead you to reject God's law
- It gives an alternative way to be saved that doesn't require conversion or to be born again.

God is clear in Revelation that His end-time people will have the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus. These two things are going against the devil.

The devil doesn't want anyone to be saved. And if a man receives these two things, the law in their hearts and Christ righteousness, they are saved.

And what does the discovery of the Ark of the Covenant witness? God's laws validity! That Christ confirmed the law, He did not abolish it. So, it contains the true gospel. And it offers the blood that saves us. The discovery of the Ark of the Covenant with Christ's blood exposes all the devil's lies and shows man the only way to be saved in our day.

If you then say it is of the devil you are calling evil good and good evil.

It happened once before. They said Jesus drove out demons by the help of the devil. And you remember what Jesus said: if a house has come in conflict with itself it can't remain standing.

If Satan constructed the discovery of the Ark of the Covenant with Christ blood upon it, he has come in conflict with himself. Because this idea exposes the devil's false gospel and proves the Antichrist as a liar. Because he claimed to have changed the law, and here is a discovery showing it is not changed. You don't change something Christ confirmed with His own blood without disrespecting the blood. (Heb.10,29)

This discovery is what Revelation 14,12 is all about.

I am here telling you to keep God's law, and I was myself reached through these discoveries. I know many who didn't believe we should obey God's law who now keep it because of this discovery. This discovery, if not preached by crazy people, leads people to the law and to Christ. The only one who would want to silence such a powerful testimony is the devil himself. I would make that claim. The devil wants this silenced. And many of God's people are helping him. They expect the word, but reject the manifestation of it, just like the Jews did.

Jesus explicitly said: *"A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit."* Matthew 7:18.

And when Satan one day shall impersonate Christ, he will do good works like Christ, maybe heal people, but he will still oppose God's law or parts of it. That's how you will know it's not Christ, despite the good appearance and good deeds.

God's work is signified by it leading people to Christ and to respecting His law. Whenever God has a message for His people, it's always a combination of a 'coming judgment' with an 'offer of salvation' together. It prevents people from viewing salvation as unconditional. So that we don't, like the people in Jeremiah's time, assume God would never destroy us even if we are disobedient.

God always preaches cause and effect. The result of taking one path over the other. And so, you will always see a warning together with God's offer of salvation. God does not want to fool us into a false sense of security.

It's not enough to have faith in Him if the faith is a presumptuous faith not rooted in reality.

So, to prepare for Christ's *first* coming, John was instructed to give the following message: *"Turn ye"*. This message is repeated throughout history. But God never warns of pending

destruction without, at the same time, giving the hope of salvation.

If we only preach God's salvation, we place people into a false sense of security. And if we only preach God's judgment, we lead them into despair and hopelessness. So, God's true gospel and message before any pending destruction are always both tied together. If they are not tied together, they are not representing the truth.

Now notice the same pattern in all of Ron Wyatt's discoveries. Noah's ark for instance, which was a great destruction, but hope was given because of the eight people who were saved. The remains of the boat point back to the story that said on what condition Noah's family was saved and, of course, the reason the others were lost in the flood.

The same with the next discovery, Sodom and Gomorrah. They are archeological remains witnessing these two significant points. The remains point back to why the large number was judged and what led the three that were saved to be saved.

The exodus route tells the same story. When God's people crossed, they had followed God's instruction the whole way from when the Passover lamb was slain and up to this point. They could cross the Red Sea. But when the pharaohs' army came, they who had resisted obeying God's command, they perished in the same ocean. They were separated by two important factors. Obedience and sacrifice. The command and the lamb.

Again, at mount Sinai, three thousand people perished. Those who were willing to "turn from their ways" were to judge, and to execute judgment over those who were disobedient.

Lastly, the Ark of the Covenant discovery with Christ's blood tells the same story. It shows us what our sins are, that we have broken God's law. The same law that judged us for our transgression against it. It shows the blood, our salvation. If we don't receive the blood, that law underneath will judge us. If we accept the blood but not what the blood sprinkled, the law, we cannot take part in the blood. Only those who confess their sins, and thereby the authority and righteousness of the law, will have a part in the blood.

So, all of Ron Wyatt's discoveries are physical examples of the typical message God gives to His people and the world before pending destruction. "Turn ye," and you will be saved. But if you don't turn, you will perish as they did.

Question 9:

Wasn't the Ark of the Covenant taken to heaven?

Answer 9:

For a seventh day Adventist respecting Ellen White's prophetic ministry, this assumption cannot be made. She clearly states in the last couple of years she lived that the earthly ark was hidden in a cave here on earth and had been undisturbed. The Bible teaches us that the earthly sanctuary items were made after the pattern of that already in heaven (Heb.8 etc.), and so there would be two Arks. One in heaven and one on earth. God has a throne in heaven and one on earth, he is king in both places.

Question 10:

Did Ron Wyatt go against 1844?

Answer 10:

Ron believed in the Investigative Judgment and the spirit of prophecy. His faith was built upon the established truths of the Adventists pioneers. As someone who got to be acquainted with Ron during his final five years, I can affirm he stayed true to this belief until the end.

Of those Adventists that I know who received Ron's testimony, none of them rejected 1844 because of this discovery. Making the claim this discovery leads people away from 1844 is, therefore, a false claim completely without any proof.

It's possible many received this discovery who already doubted 1844 or who never knew of 1844. But what we look for are those who believed in 1844 and then rejected it after hearing Ron. I know of none among my acquaintances who share these things, they all continue to believe in 1844.

We can't just make claims that we make up in our heads, we need to present numbers and facts before making a claim, or we are false witnesses. If we say that this discovery leads people away from 1844, we need to actually know they do. We need to present evidence. So far, Ron, myself and many other are evidence of the opposite. In this letter I am defending 1844 and the discovery at the same time. In fact, I might not even have studied 1844 if it wasn't for Ron.

Question 11:

Did Ron aspire to be an archaeologist without the proper education, isn't that deceptive?

Answer 11:

Ron's motive was not to become a known archaeologist. As he himself stated numerous times, his agenda was to help God in showing people that the Bible was true. He wanted to help save souls.

To Ron, the discoveries were a means to do just that. For him, these discoveries helped to evangelize, not for him to personally receive fame or a name in the archaeological world.

And it's because of this those other Christian archaeologists came in conflict with him, as their agenda often was tied to titles, profession, and self.

Ron Wyatt asked God what He wanted to be shown to people and to use him in this work. Ron's heart was to help God finish the work to reach out. The motive of Ron and those of many archaeologists who criticized him are therefore very different.

That said, Ron took part in far more archeological research and excavations than many archeology students do. The first archeologists that inspired making archeology into a school subject in the first place were men like Ron, who read, travelled, and excavated..

Question 12:

How can one man find so many discoveries? Doesn't that make it unlikely?

Answer 12:

The discoveries of Ron Wyatt were *meant* to be unlikely. This question was meant to be addressed. Both in the case of Noah's ark and The Ark of The Covenant, Ron clearly states that He was told where to look by God. It wasn't the result of his own cleverness.

The reason God would use one man to find so many important things is to tie them together with the right message. Because it's a message from God and not inventions by man, the number of discoveries is accredited to God.

Ron's critics don't seem to understand the spiritual argument and use the number of discoveries against him. They seem to be missing the point of these discoveries being credited to God's miracle. God also had to preserve these sites to our day, which also is a miracle in itself. He lifted the remains of Noah's ark 6 meters, so an investigation could be done. Pictures both before and after the earthquake where it was lifted can be seen, and it's not possible to credit Ron with such a miraculous event.

This is not about Ron Wyatt, but about what God wanted to be done. God was more likely to get credit and for people to understand it wasn't just rocks and soil, but a message from God. Christians long to see God at work but so easily dismiss it when He does.

And consider this. The mother of Constantine went on a trip to the Middle East with the agenda to find holy places, and she claimed to make many discoveries. Three crosses, Part of Jesus Christ's tunic, pieces of the holy cross, pieces of the rope with which Jesus was tied on the Cross, Christ's crucifixion place (Scull hill) & tomb, Mount Sinai & the burning bush, Christ's birthplace, Church on Mount of Olives, House where the angel talked to Mary and so on. Why isn't anyone questioning her? She didn't even have to produce one single piece of evidence of her claims. Because people are not fighting lies, they fight the truth. They are not fighting Ron; they are fighting God.

Question 13:

God would never expect us to believe in the Ark discovery before it is physically shown?

Answer 13:

Both those who receive these discoveries and those who refute them might not study. Or feel the need to study. That's just how it is.

Years ago, I used to tell people that they could wait until the evidence for the Ark comes out, and make a decision then. I don't do that anymore. One of the young men I said to; "if you are insecure, wait until there is more evidence to show." died suddenly, tragically. He never got to wait. And he was not a Christian when he died.

Another example that woke me up is when I was in a synagogue, a Jewish synagogue. I was invited, they knew I was Christian and there were some other Christians with me. And the Jewish man said about Jesus being the Messiah: "When He comes, I will ask Him: "have you been here before? Did you come a first time?" And if He says yes, then I'll believe it".

And the evangelical Christians there seemed OK with that because they believe Jews will get that second chance. But I don't believe that. When Jesus comes, it's already too late.

What did Jesus say to the Jews: “*They have the law and the prophets to persuade them.*” (Luke 16,29)

We as Christians believe Jesus walked the earth, we believe He died, although we never saw the proof, we believe he rose from the dead, yet never saw the proof. We believe Jesus went into the Most Holy in 1844, yet we never saw it.

Spiritual things need to be discerned in a spiritual way. We don't have to wait to believe in the discovery of the Ark of the Covenant. The answer if it's of God or not is in the Bible.

A true Christian can NEVER base their belief on physical manifestation alone because we know there is a deceiver out there who is trying hard to deceive God's people, even to imitate Christ. So, the foundation of our faith can't be some physical manifestation, it must be from the word of God. To the “law and to the prophets”.

When Israel was at the border of the promised land, they were told: “*When you see the Ark of the Covenant, rise up and follow it*”. But the Ark of the Covenant was under a cover, they couldn't physically see it. But they saw the priests carrying it, they saw the evidence that God was going before them, and they believed the Ark was beneath that cover, and in faith, they obeyed God's command, rose, and followed it.

And we, at the border of the promised land, can do the same.

Can you imagine if the people answered the Lord and said: We won't follow the Ark like you say unless you take the cover off, so we can see it's actually the Ark. That would be unreasonable, wouldn't it, considering the witness was in the circumstances? And we, too, can receive this testimony based on the circumstances and the law and the prophet.

Question 14:

I believe in the Bible; I don't need these things to believe.

Answer 14:

God's usual method is to always warn people of a danger that is ahead. Especially before any upcoming judgment. And the Bible shows us how God warns people.

And it's not just by words, it's also by physical.

We know God loves to use parables or physical examples. He did in the time of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. The tabernacle is all a visible illustration of the plan of salvation. Among Ron's discoveries are Noah's ark and Sodom and Gomorrah, both are Christ's own examples of the time before Christ's second coming.

So, God showing the remains of what points to these stories is perfectly in line with how He reaches out to people in Biblical times. These are Christ's own examples for the world that lives in the end time. And then many Christians go out and say this must be from the devil. But the Bible says these are Christ's examples.

For me, it's peculiar, it reminds me of when Jesus came as one of us. He was the word made flesh, and they were eager students of the scriptures, but they rejected the word in the flesh. They

thought the word in the flesh was a deceiver.

The same here. The discovery of Noah's ark is in Genesis, in the Torah, and they believe that story. But when they physically see the remains of the ark, they think it is a deception.

The story of Sodom and Gomorrah: they believe the story, but when they see the physical evidence they think it's a deception.

The same with the exodus and Sinai. It's described in the Torah, but when they see it in real life, they reject it.

And lastly, the Ark of the Covenant with Christ's blood typified and prophesied all over the Torah –when they are told there is physical evidence – they call it of Satan.

So, haven't they done to these things what Jews did to Jesus? They claim to respect the word but reject the manifestations of the word.

And this is interesting: Why were they ok with receiving the word, but not the word manifested in flesh? What is the difference? How can one be a problem when the other wasn't?

It's the confrontation that comes with it. Sometimes it's also the messengers and the message that they don't like. If you just accept the 'word' in letters, you can interpret them to suit yourself.

But the moment the word is connected to the living Christ, to something physical, you are confronted with all your misconceptions, with how you live your life and your motives.

Sometimes it's God's messengers that provoke. You have an idea about what a good Christian is, and then God chooses someone who you don't think fits your image of who God is. And so, confronted and conflicted, you must either confess you might be off in your religious understanding or view, or you have to reject that the messenger is from God. If God chooses someone who you deem to be beneath you in talent and knowledge, you might get offended. Why wouldn't God use you instead of that person?

“They do not keep in view that God works by whom He will. Christ is to be seen as officiating through the delegated servant. The great evil is that the mind becomes narrowed and loses sight of the chief Worker; it gets on the instrument and decides the people cannot be advantaged unless the manners and the habits of the worker meet their own pattern exactly. They regard the speaker as a man merely, not a messenger whom God may use to deliver a message or do a certain work.

God has chosen man to do a certain work. His mental capacities may be weak, but then the evidence is more apparent that God works. His speech may not be eloquent, but that is no evidence that he has not a message from God. His knowledge may be limited, but in many cases God can work with His wisdom through such an agent, and the power be seen of God, more than through one possessing natural and acquired abilities and who knows it, and has confidence in himself, in his judgment, in his knowledge, in his manner of address.” (Manuscript releases vol 21, no 1530)

Anyone who exalts self will struggle when they meet God's true messengers and will instantly be offended. And this will in turn lead them to reject the messenger.

Numerous Christians don't want evidence for the Bible stories. And this is a huge study in itself, the human mind. And why we react the way we do.

Secondly, what would happen if the disciples told Jesus that they didn't need all the fish and pieces of bread he was handing them during one of the outdoor meetings? Do they only need one

fish and one bread? Surely, they didn't need all that food? Jesus was handing the disciples big portions of food for them to hand it out to the rest of the people. Jesus fed 5000 that way. When God sends us something that is meant to help other people find Him, it's because He wants you to help Him share it. Why, then, are you saying you don't need it? We are not just to live to please ourselves, to receive things for ourselves. We are meant to receive so we can share. And many people out there in the world need to see evidence or something physical, so they can be introduced to the Bible as a historically correct book. What you personally need is not what you should be concerned about.

Question 15:

This discovery, even if it's true, means nothing to me personally.

Question 15:

If the discovery is of God, there is an accompanying message and blessing with it. God never sends us a message without it containing important information that we need.

As I have done previously in this letter, the discovery can be compared to the discovery of the book of the Covenant and the re-appearance of the Ark before Jerusalem's destruction. In those days, it signified that the end had already come, but that God extended the time and the door of mercy was open for a little while longer. And so, one of the strongest messages with this discovery to those that have already accepted Christ's blood, and the validity of the law, is that time is practically up. You only have a small window of time left, use it wisely. With the message comes also additional information on how to understand some of the things that are about to happen.

Lastly, saying the evidence of your savior dying for you is nothing to you personally is disrespectful towards God. In 1. John 5,8 and onward God says that Christ blood is evidence on earth and Gods own testimony to us.

When Jesus was here on earth not everyone was attracted to Him:

"For he shall grow up before him as a tender plant, and as a root out of a dry ground: he hath no form nor comeliness; and when we shall see him, there is no beauty that we should desire him. He is despised and rejected of men; a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief: and we hid as it were our faces from him; he was despised, and we esteemed him not" (Isa 53:2-3).

God's messages may sometimes not have the outward presence that makes us attracted to it personally, but that doesn't mean we should neglect to investigate the matter. The truth doesn't always come in the wrapping we want it to. Therefore, we are not to go by our own personal feelings when we evaluate something and avoid making the mistake so many Jews made, thinking Jesus "wasn't for them".

Question 16:

How can you so boldly preach this when you haven't seen the Ark yourself?

Answer 16:

For the work I do, the most beneficial has been to not have seen it. Because if I have seen it, I am not a good example for everyone else who can't see it yet. If I have not seen it, I can say that my faith is entirely founded upon the law and the prophets. And if it is, it means that anybody I share

these things with doesn't have an excuse.

But if I have personally seen it, and I try to convince people to believe in this before seeing it, they have an excuse they can give me.

They can say I have an advantage over them. That was the excuse they gave Ron, and he knew he couldn't be an example, as he had seen first and then believed. That is why he desired so badly to show the evidence to convince people, as he knew it was hard to be an example in his position, but it wasn't God's time. However, Ron was a chosen witness to bring people's attention to what had happened on the cross and what was going to happen. One person had to witness to give the discovery the attention God wanted. Ron Wyatt got this blessing, but there is a greater blessing for those who receive it from the law and the prophets: *"Thomas, because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed: blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed."* (John 20,29)

Today we all believe Christ was here on earth, died and rose again because of the law and the prophets, and not because we saw it with our own eyes. This discovery that Ron bore testimony of, is also something we can believe based on the law and the prophets and by the spirit that testifies of the truthfulness of these things. And those who do believe, based on this evidence alone, are truly blessed.

And so, I feel very honored and humbled to be a witness for men and for the heavenly world, that there is no excuse to not believe.

And so, I pondered what I would do if someone offered me to see, for instance, a video of the Ark at a time when no one else could see it, that I would decline and say "show me only when you are ready for everyone else to see it" so I can continue to have the opportunity to be an example and in that way help people.

I have not been inside the tunnel and not inside the chamber with the Ark. Some seem very eager to get into the chamber containing the Ark, thinking evidence is everything. For those who think that way, re-examining how God does things might be worth their time.

What I did, was that I went on my knees with only one desire, and that was to know what the truth was. And I prayed: 'Lord, if this true you have left the evidence of it in the Bible, show me. And Lord, if this isn't true, you have left the evidence that exposes it in the Bible. Show me which one.'

And everyone can pray that prayer.

And then people will say: 'oh, but you're good at studying, and I'm not good at studying.' Well, when I started this research, I was a young girl who grew up hardly ever reading books, I had concentration problems.

I prayed to God for wisdom, and then I did my part, which was opening the Bible and start reading. And then my concentration problems got in the way, and I prayed three times for Him to take it away, so I could study His word, and the third time He did.

Understanding scripture is a spiritual gift bestowed on you if you pray for it. True Biblical wisdom. Not theological ramblings or guesswork - anyone can do that. True Biblical wisdom is from God. It's not something you can acquire due to your own brilliance. And so, it's not something you can get from theological schools or even maybe in your church or by your pastor.

It can only come from God as a gift.

It doesn't matter if you are young or if you are old, whatever problem you experience. Light from the word comes from the Lord. So, to know if something is light from the Lord or man's own speculations based on the word, you can pray to God for wisdom to discern. And that is also a spiritual gift given when you pray for it.

James writes in chapter one of his letter: *"If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him. But let him ask in faith, nothing wavering."* (Jas 1:5-6)

That is a Bible promise. To everyone.

When I started I didn't know where to begin to look in scripture and so God helped me and showed me where the parallels were. So, I wasn't being clever, He just showed me. And once I had received and shared what He revealed to me, He showed me some more and so on. God will always test you if you are willing to share before giving you more. The less you share, the less He will give you.

And my seminars and books will, if you don't know where to begin the study, they will give you clues to places in the Bible that might give you some answers. Or you can go straight to the Bible. But in both cases, you should go to the Bible, you have to have an open mind, so the Holy Spirit can guide you, and you have to do it in prayer.

Question 17:

Who were to take over after Ron Wyatt?

Answer 17:

People are lost sheep; they are wandering desperately looking for someone to lead them. And some do find people, and sort of get them to lead them. They find someone who seems smart. When you reject to take the role they want to give when they come to you, rather taking the advice to go to God instead, they just look for someone else to lead them. And this, a little bit, is why I think a lot of God's messengers are rejected. Because God's true messengers are not allowed to take a mediator role. They are not allowed to place themselves between Christ and the people. (1Tim. 2:5) They are not allowed to study the Bible instead of you, but they can help you and inspire you. (Heb. 8:11)

But the worldly mind that many Christians still possess, believe they need mediators. When Israel demanded a king to lead, God said to Samuel: *"And ye have this day rejected your God, who himself saved you out of all your adversities and your tribulations; and ye have said unto him, Nay, but set a king over us."* (1Sam. 10:19) Now, I'm not saying people that believed Ron is looking for a ruler, but I am saying the same principle is behind it. Those who do not have a close relationship with Christ, desperately look for someone they think might have, to go before them. They want a visible leader or someone they admire to lead out.

Usually, they don't want those who possess the qualities God requires for someone in that position, but someone who can take a role they desire. They desire guidance from a human hand. By this standard, they are likely to reject people God sends in their way to follow someone they

themselves seem fit, a visible strong and well-spoken person.

So, when Ron died, it did open for people with the wrong qualities to presume a leading role in the work. But that is not how God's work moves forward. God doesn't like self-elected leaders who try to control the work by their own wisdom: "... *for I will deliver my flock from their mouth, that they may not be meat for them. For thus saith the Lord GOD; Behold, I, even I, will both search my sheep, and seek them out.*" (Ezek. 34,11)

Those who disliked the self-elected people felt safer only trusting the work Ron had done to that point and rejected anyone else who tried to take the work forward. But this is also following man before Christ.

Throughout history, we see this same phenomenon that people stop with one person they admire and their growth stagnant. A true sign that you are following Christ and not man is that you are constantly reforming and receiving new light. It's never to stop while we are here on earth. It's like a river, it flows all the time. And Jesus is the shepherd that walks in front, and you follow.

Sometimes He is hidden from our eyes, and we desperately look around after another to guide us.

So, the Jews were stuck with Moses, they didn't want to receive further knowledge and rejected their Messiah. Messiah brought further understanding, and they didn't want further understanding, they felt it contradicted their previous understanding. But it didn't, it just explained it further.

And the same with the Christians. Their greatest fall was when they ended up with a mediator to replace Christ, the pope.

And the Reformation is perhaps the best example of this. Those who followed Hus, were called Hussite's. Those who followed Luther were called Lutherans. And notice, they didn't want to continue the walk of reformation. When a new light came, it was seen as threatening to what they already believed. And then Anabaptists, Methodists and so on. And when God gave the light to the reform movement on God's law, only a small portion continued walking with Christ and reformed. The majority was stuck in these different stages.

But the ones who followed Christ and just viewed the light bearers along the way as Christ's helpers, they continued because their eyes were fixed on Christ. And they knew that everyone who ever worked for Christ or God since Adam and Eve and until our day, none of them had a full and complete understanding. They could only share parts tied to their assignment in bringing the work forward. And then among Adventists, they are happy with the light they received, not understanding that God might want to take the reformation even further than the pioneers did. Ellen White stated, not long before she died, that there will be more reformation and more messengers.

She even said there would be more light from God's law that they hadn't received yet. Still, there are groups that don't want to accept any truth or reformation. Then the previous group is their focus point, and it is people they admire rather than Christ. They are stuck. The water isn't running or living. It's standing still.

And so, when Ron died, people looked to another man to find out what was going on. But Christ didn't stop with Ron Wyatt. He is still walking in front of us, showing the way. Ron Wyatt was

just a helper along the way, like all the other helpers that God chose. But we must continue walking after Christ and reform and reform. Reform our understanding, our lives, and our practices. Then we will be able to see the work going forward. And it has been going forward. However, Jesus doesn't wait for everyone, that's why we can see that only a small group of the groups continue the walk, the rest are stuck with whoever last they followed.

And so, some will only accept someone who does the same as Ron did. But Ron already *did* his job, the next step isn't to have someone repeat his work. And so, those who are looking for another Ron, who is going to go in Ron's footsteps, might be surprised to find out that Jesus is busy with the next phase. So, there won't be another Ron Wyatt. And whoever helps Jesus continue, they have their own names and will take on the next assignments, not copy Ron.

See, this is the mistake people made and do. Now, if the Lutherans, after Luther died, got another "Luther the second" who said and did exactly what the first one did, they would accept him. What most of them didn't want to accept, was someone who said things Luther didn't say or someone who did things a little differently.

So, it's easy to fall into these traps that close our minds to how Jesus works. We need to follow Christ and not man. But people desire so badly to have men to look up to.

We can look at it like a marathon where people are standing along the route offering water and aid, but none of them is the goal.

And so even among those who received Ron's testimony, you will see people that refuse to continue in the light God sends us.

I mean, this is good news. We can go to Christ today, and we can tell Him we're sorry we might have lost sight of Him, and where He is leading. Ask Him what He is trying to do instead of telling Him, or worse, commanding Him in what we think He should do.

By using different types of people, God proves that it's not about Ron Wyatt, but about our relationship with God. God most likely has many chosen men in the world right now, especially elected to bring the work forward, and many are completely unaware.

The work can stagnate for us personally if we do one of the two, that is really the same: To choose men to look to instead of Christ, either a man in the past or make ourselves leaders in the present. We are to look to Christ, nobody else.

Question 18:

Why does God tell us about the Ark before He shows it?

Answer 18:

1) The first reason is in the book of Amos, which is a promise. It says: "*Surely the Lord GOD will do nothing, but he revealeth his secret unto his servants the prophets.*" (Amos3:7) Therefore, if you are among God's people, He has promised you that you will be told in advance before He does something unexpected. Nothing that can have an impact on us personally will take place before He has warned us ahead of the event. To achieve that, the message concerning this discovery and the fact that God intends to show it to the world, must go out to His people all over the world. This has been hindered because leaders, priests, and pastors have tried to silence

the message. Many even refuse to let people speak of it in their churches. Thus, the information about the Ark of the Covenant to God's people has been silenced. Despite this, many churches around the world did receive the message, and the word was spread throughout the area.

According to His own principle, God must notify His people before He shows. God's people don't just live in one city anymore, they live all over the world. When people resist, things take more time. It could have been done quickly if the leaders and such received it and brought the news to all their divisions and had them bring it to all the people. They mock because it takes time, even though they are the cause for the delay. But the heavens see this and knows.

The first is for our benefit, for God doesn't treat His people the same way He treats those who haven't received Him. Knowing beforehand is a blessing from God. Knowing beforehand is all about preparation. This means that we are in a time of preparation.

Now, I'm not one of those who will say: "You have to believe this now, or you be lost". I've never heard anyone who shares these discoveries say anything like that. Many lay workers come up with ideas that they claim are a salvation issue, and you have to receive it when they say, or you'll be lost. I am not doing that. I think God is love and mercy, and He's patient. Even those who have gone against the discovery among God's people might be able to turn when it's shown. But that time is when God's people are supposed to go out with boldness and confidence to warn the world. And if you at that time must go through a heavy soul-searching process, maybe questioning yourself and your lack of judgment, feeling you let Jesus down, or have shame for having taught others to reject the truth: You will not be prepared in the same way as those who did prepare. Right? So, they who rejected will struggle more at a time God needs them to defend the truth. I can imagine their 'Jacobs battle' will be even more severe.

Do you remember Peter speaking to the Jews after Christ's crucifixion? He said: you killed Him, and He was your savior. And it stung their hearts and they converted. That is why the probation of the Jews lasted after Christ's death, they had 3,5 more years to turn. God's patience is astonishing.

Another example is Paul eagerly going against and then, after seeing Christ manifest Himself, ending up becoming a most trusted helper. So, everything is possible. Don't give up on people. Don't give up on souls. God will close the door of probation, that is not our job. It is not our worry. We are just to preach.

2) The second benefit God gets by waiting is what it exposes. People have followed leaders, respected pastors, and plenty of people are following lay workers. And in the world, people listen to archaeologists and scientists. God lets them mock, so they can show their true faces. The more they resist, the more lies they use to resist, the more they will be exposed when the evidence finally comes out. People will realize they have put their trust in people they shouldn't have trusted. God can then separate those deceived away from their deceivers. He can cut these unhealthy bonds.

Now, why can't this be accomplished when God shows the discovery instead?

If God had shown the discovery physically years and years before the close of probation and showed it immediately, the deceivers, who usually go with the popular and the accepted, would receive it and use it to deceive. By waiting, God exposes them as liars by letting them reveal their intentions, and He avoids them standing in the forefront of sharing these things along with

their deceptions.

Now, some will believe before it's shown and mix this discovery with lies. It still happens today. But, because it's not accepted yet, there are fewer deceivers than there would have been.

In the history of Christianity, the church remained purer when they were persecuted and weren't accepted. It's illustrated a few times in the book of Revelation. It was white, pure, but persecuted.

When the Romans started to change their policies, and started giving Christians good positions and acknowledgment, they became popular. What happened is that many who would never have stood for the truth during the persecution would gladly stand for the truth when it gave them an advantageous position. So, when the Christian movement was accepted, it started getting corrupt leaders and shepherds. People that were in it for the wrong reasons, who desired the positions not because they loved God, but because they loved themselves. And that's when Christianity went seriously downhill.

As you can see, it is not always beneficial for God's cause to be widely accepted and received in the world. The more accepted it gets, the more leading figures who blend truth with error are going to rise and step into God's clean water with their muddy feet. If the work is delayed, less narcissists will front it.

The devil is active, nonetheless, but he can do less harm. God also wants to have a people waiting for him without "*spot or blemish*" (Eph. 5:27), a purified people preparing for the end time events (Dan.12,10). The people God elects to help bring the last message to the world are therefore more likely to be fit to do the job if they have as little acknowledgment from the world as possible in advance. Those who do it purely for the love of the truth and not for personal gain are more likely to remain faithful in the middle of tribulations. Satan will always have his deceivers copying God's work, but they are not who we are talking about here. Satan's chosen are usually the ones who have received benefits for preaching, as Satan wanted them to stand in the spotlight. "*Woe unto you, when all men shall speak well of you! for so did their fathers to the false prophets*" (Luk. 6:26).

3) God never gives 100% of the evidence. He always leaves room for doubt. Why? Because this is the way to know more about where your heart lies. God knows where everyone's heart lies, but as Paul says in 1Corinthians 4:9, "*for we are made a spectacle unto the world, and to angels, and to men.*" There are many who will take part in or observe God's judgment.

If God leaves a little room for doubt, and you choose to doubt, it will say something about you and your heart. The other element that arises by leaving some room for doubt is to give us room to practice our free will. We are not forced into believing something.

But go through all the Bible stories, even when Jesus was here, and see. God always leaves room for doubt. He always gives that space, where you can, if it pleases you, to doubt. We are not to dictate the conditions for our faith, rather we are to trust God.

Question 19:

Why is there only one witness to the Ark? Doesn't it have to be more than one witness for a truth to become established? And why hasn't God been doing anything, like for example adding any witnesses since Ron died?

Answer 19:

It does. But maybe not like you think it will be fulfilled. Our preconceived ideas are always clashing with God's. The scripture says:

«At the mouth of two witnesses, or three witnesses, shall he that is to die be put to death; at the mouth of one witness he shall not be put to death. » (Deut.17:6)

«A lone witness is not sufficient to establish any wrongdoing or sin against a man, regardless of what offense he may have committed. A matter must be established by the testimony of two or three witnesses.» (Deut.19:15)

«But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established.» (Matt.18:16)

«This is the third time I am coming to you. In the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be established.» (2Cor.13:1)

«Against an elder receive not an accusation, but before two or three witnesses.» (1Tim.5:19)

The substance of the law in Matthew and 1.Timothy, is to not judge someone for a crime, or accept an accusation without additional witnesses. If we are to compare to Ron's discovery, this is not a matter of a trial against a brother. But even if it was, Ron is the one being accused. The burden of proof lies on his accusers.

It's clear that the numbers of people making an accusation don't determine if something is to be regarded as truthful or not. The law itself warns us against it: *«put not thine hand with the wicked to be an unrighteous witness. Thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil; neither shalt thou speak in a cause to decline after many to wrest judgment» (Exo.23,1-2)*

Therefore, the idea that truth is decided by majority opinion, is a misconception. The law of two or three witnesses was to protect people from being accused by an enemy and then judged upon their accusation alone. In those days the death sentence was common, and great harm would come to the family if a husband, for instance, no longer could provide for his family after being wrongfully judged. We have the same challenges in a court system today, where there is a 'word against a word'- trial. It's very hard to make a judgement based on that alone. Therefore, when there is a 'word against a word'-trial, the defense or/and prosecutor must call in additional witnesses or add additional evidence in order for doubt to be removed and the accused be either judged or set free. It's the same principle the Bible gives to avoid someone being wrongfully punished or put to death.

The moment we apply this principle into the world of theology and God's manifestations, we will face several problems along the way. Can we establish a different discovery made by the Pope himself, for instance, just because a couple of priests confirm it? What about all those 'witnesses' claiming the Ark is in Ethiopia? Or the three young girls who witnessed the Virgin Mary appearing to them with a message in Fatima? Or the two witnesses claiming to have seen the Ark of the Covenant under the Dome of the Rock? What about the two false witnesses used in the trial against Jesus? There are many strange things we end up having to believe if we establish truth by those terms.

Moses didn't have one single witness that he had met God at Mount Sinai when he first came to Egypt. The only witness to this encounter was the sheep. Yet, he came to Egypt bearing witness to the elders of the Hebrews that he had received a message from God. They were requested to believe. Moses didn't get to bring witnesses from Sinai, but signs. Two signs were to be used to

convince them. One was turning the staff into a serpent, and the other was the miracle with his hand that turned leprous and then got healed right after. The additional witness was that which had been given through the prophets, their scriptures, saying God would give them Canaan as a homeland.

So, we see God allowing that the additional 'witness' be physical signs, and the prophecies. Now, Ron Wyatt claimed to have found the Ark but was unable at the time to show it, yet he was given additional signs that he could show. The evidence from the other discoveries was to give Ron credibility. This is the reason the other discoveries are so harshly attacked. People know that if they are true, they are a witness of Ron's credibility when it comes to the discovery of the Ark. If they admit God worked through Ron with those discoveries, God is also behind the Ark discovery that was done in-between the other discoveries. The Ark was found after Noah's ark and the Exodus route, but before Sodom and Mount Sinai. Many are afraid to even address Sinai in Arabia, fearing that if it's presented convincingly enough, people will also believe in the Ark of the Covenant story. If Ron just made up the Ark story, they feel God could not use him to find Sinai. So, in their minds, Ron had to have been wrong from the get-go.

Ezekiel was alone by the river when he saw God's glory. Both he and Jeremiah were told to use physical examples as a sign to bear their messages. God wanted people to believe them because of these additional signs. We see the same with Elijah and many of God's men that God sent to people with a message. They all were taught by God in private, and then two witnesses were to go with them, and I'll explain who those witnesses are in a bit. The point I am making is, nowhere do we see God is demanding His people to refuse to listen to a message just because there weren't a couple of witnesses there when the messenger received it. The truth was still considered truth. Therefore, when it comes to messages from God, it works differently than what people assume. There are other things that are to witness. We cannot base our faith on people's testimonies alone, for the multitudes go against God. The devil has an army on his side, and many workers that pretend to work for God. Human witnesses are not good enough to establish the truth. And God wants to teach us that.

When Jesus was baptized, John the Baptist testified about Him that He was God's chosen one. He said: "*there is the lamb of God*". What did John's disciples do? Did they say, we need a Pharisee and priest to witness of it too, then we will go follow him? Or did they follow Jesus on John's word?

The moment they heard John's witness, two of John's disciples went after Him and said to Him: "*Rabbi, where do you live?*" And Jesus answered: "*come and see*". (John 1)

And these two first disciples went looking for family and friends, and by the testimony of these ordinary men, Jesus got some more disciples. In fact, one of those two men who followed Jesus based on John's testimony was Peter's brother, and he ran to Peter and said: "*we have found the Messiah*" and then brought Peter to Jesus. What additional testimony did they build their faith on at that point? Enough to claim straight away that Jesus was the Messiah?

The Father witnessed, but not everybody heard the actual voice. It was a supernatural happening. And how would they know it was God's voice if they did?

So, you don't always have clear witnesses. The most important witness about Christ being the Messiah, was not just John and his testimony, it was the law and the prophets. In 1.John, The

Spirit is actually also called a witness, and can, therefore, be counted in as a witness. (1Joh.5:8)

Another thing that is called a witness in the Bible, which isn't a human being, are the scriptures. The Word (Rev.11,3). And this is the witness the apostles used in the beginning.

What happened after Andrew had found Peter and brought him to Christ? The next day, Jesus calls on Phillip and listens to what Philip says to his friend Nathanael: *"We have found him, of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets, did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph."* (John 1:45) The first disciples accepted Jesus on those terms. And the 'law and the prophets' were used as one of those witnesses that they based their belief on.

After Jesus had gathered a group of believers based on these witnesses alone, the visible evidence came, more signs and more wonders. Many saw them, but signs and wonders alone do not determine if something is of God, even if seen by many witnesses. (Matt.13:22 & 2.Th.2:9) Even if there were many witnesses to the Ark of the Covenant in the cave, it's not evidence that it is the actual Ark God had built and not some deception. God asks us to evaluate evidence differently than what can be seen or by how many bears witness of it.

We can see a similar approach with Ron's discovery being a message from God. The discovery itself is, according to the Bible, God's witness of his son. (1. John 8:8-9) Ron testifies of God's witness and becomes a witness, then we need The Spirit to witness of it and God's next witness is the SCRIPTURES. The law and the prophets. Together, The Father, The Spirit, a human witness and the scriptures lays the foundation of this discovery being from God.

And that is why numerous people think nothing has happened since Ron found the Ark, they are saying why isn't God doing anything?

Let me just say: a lot of work has been done on the sites, most of Ron's story and claims have been re-affirmed by new excavations. It's not true that nothing has happened, God is always busy bringing His work forward. He doesn't stop or pause. He knew there was a need for more witnesses by His standard.

Have you considered that God has been doing things, and you have not been listening? God's last witness before showing it are the scriptures, the law, and the prophets. And if He shows the Ark, if He shows the blood before the witness from the scriptures, you will most likely be unprepared for what God is doing next. God wants to educate people. The discovery was meant to lead people to the Bible.

Have you noticed Jesus illustrating this example on the day He rose from the dead? Who saw Jesus first? What is God's order? First, he shows Himself to a woman, and tells her to be a witness to the others. OK, so you first have the test of receiving God's messenger. A woman was looked down upon in those days, so what we see here is a witness that wasn't in high esteem. A historian even said they didn't count women as a witness in trials in those days, as women were viewed as unsuited to be witnesses. God chose a woman still. That is the first witness. The next witnesses are these; he comes as a stranger next to two disciples and starts teaching them from the scripture. They could have rejected it. Said: 'Oh, we don't know you, who are you to try and teach us?' But they didn't. They heard the voice of God's Spirit, they listened, learned, and wanted to learn more, they invited the unknown teacher into their home. It was first at this point that Jesus manifested Himself to them.

Well, so what about the leaders? You know that they were the first to be informed of what had happened. The soldiers told them an angel had opened the tomb. What did they do? They gave them money to stay quiet. They didn't want anyone to know. You know, Ron Wyatt did actually inform prominent leading people in the church about this discovery. But they decided to silence it.

To his true people, Jesus teaches before He shows. The reason it is important for God's people to be thoroughly educated in these things, is because of what Satan is planning to do when this discovery is made public.

The devil has already constructed his plan. And I might have an idea, in part, what it could be.

Let me illustrate using an example. Do you remember the story of Elijah? In that story, God manifests Himself in a grand way. The prophets of Baal could not get their 'god' to set fire to the wood on their altar. But when Elijah requested this from God in a simple prayer, the fire from God came down from heaven, devoured the sacrifice, the wood, the stones, and even the water around the altar. Everything was literally burned to ashes.

And 1. Kings 18 it says: *"And when all the people saw it, they fell on their faces: and they said, The LORD, he is the God; the LORD, he is the God" (1Ki 18:39)*

And the prophets of Baal were exposed, and the people even consented to their judgment. Complete victory for God, right? But God's enemy was not yet done. And a lot of the people were not rooted on a sound foundation. Their conversion was not built on the word. When Elijah finds out Jezebel is out to kill him, he panics and runs away as far as he can. He ran so far that angels had to come and serve him food and water to keep him alive. He runs all the way to Mount Sinai in Arabia and in a cave there, he cries to God that he is alone. But what happened to all those who for a moment said: *"the Lord is God, the Lord is God"*?

God told him: 'I still have 7000 people spread around'. The manifestation of God's power left Israel without an excuse, and it will be used against them on the judgment day. But great manifestations do not always change people's hearts.

This is what God was trying to show Elijah. Maybe Elijah felt that all they needed was this great visual manifestation, but God tells Elijah differently by showing a great storm, an earthquake, and a fire right in front of him. God's presence was not in all of that. However, when Elijah heard a still small voice, he knew it was the Lord and covered his face. It's not the great manifestation that converts the heart, it's the work of the Holy Spirit in our hearts.

God always used physical manifestations, He always has, Jesus did it too, repeatedly. Paul did, and the apostles did. But they are meant to lead to the word, the truth. Not everyone will allow God to guide us that way. Some want the manifestations but refuse to learn from the word.

The discovery of the Ark of the Covenant will cause a major stir when it's public. The law and the blood will cause a stir when they are shown to the world as well. And the Holy Spirit will use it to work on people's hearts. And the decision they end up taking based on knowledge will determine their final destiny.

But many will see and reject the Spirit.

What does the devil do when God manifests his power? Well, his tactics are well known. Jesus

said they will do to His servants what they did to Him. What did the devil have them say about Jesus? That He was of Beelzebub. They claimed He was Satan and that this was the reason He could drive out demons. What did Jesus say when they said this? Sin against the Holy Spirit won't be forgiven. That is sinning against the Holy Spirit, it's a close of probation. If you have seen a manifestation of God, and you have been educated and should know better, and yet you still say it is of the devil, you are committing this sin.

In all the turmoil, when the world first seems like they receive this great testimony from God, and then, what is greater than the law and Christ's blood? What is greater? There is one thing that is greater. The law made flesh, the owner of the blood, Jesus Christ. So, to destroy this testimony, the devil will pretend to be Jesus. To seemingly rise his authority over God's testimony, which this discovery is according to 1.John. And he will say what is of God is of the devil, and that He should know because he is Jesus. He turns the roles 180 degrees.

That is what he always does. It's what he did to Jesus. And people will believe him. And the only way you are not going to fall into that trap is if your faith is built upon the law and the prophets in addition to the visual. Those who have not may go from one visual manifestation to another, for their faith is not rooted in the truth.

You must receive all the witnesses to be able to handle the situation. Jesus tutored his disciples before the crucifixion, and it's the first thing He does when He gathered with His disciples again after the resurrection. He eats with them, and then He tutors them in scriptures again. Those who share these discoveries sometimes forget that although they are founded on scripture, those who they preach these discoveries to are not. It's God's worker's duty to build the rock foundation for them to stand on by pointing to the Bible. Rocks and sulfur balls alone will not stand the test. They need to bring them all of God's witnesses. The Old and The New Testament.

This is a problem that many who believe in Ron Wyatt's story have. They want to base their belief on the physical testimony only, and they resist being educated in the scriptures, which is God's next witness. This way, they are not building on God's foundation. Many of them are not receiving the entirety of God's witnesses. They think it's enough with Ron. And they don't listen to the stranger coming up next to them, Jesus, trying to teach them from scripture. Just like many Christians have rejected the discovery saying: "they don't need them to believe", not realizing they need the message that comes with them, and that those who they are to reach need them.

When this discovery is shown, it will go from seeming victory to utter despair and persecution.

Sometimes, we people are satisfied with only seeing. But God knows a lot better, He knows our faith is weak. And He wants us to have strong pillars, He wants our faith to be built on solid rock, His word. So, when the storm comes, your house won't be flushed into the raging waters. (Luke.6:49) Because it really is going to get ugly at the end.

Jesus used an example with the rich man and Lazarus. The rich man, now in hell, asks Jesus: "*I pray thee, therefore, father, that thou wouldest send him to my father's house: For I have five brethren; that he may testify unto them, lest they also come into this place of torment.*" (Luke 16:28)

Repeatedly, I have heard God's people demand a photo of the Ark or an additional witness as a condition to believing. At the same time, they are rejecting all the witnesses that God have already sent. Abraham in the parable says to the rich man: "*They have Moses and the prophets;*

let them hear them. And he said, Nay, father Abraham: but if one went unto them from the dead, they will repent. And he said unto him, If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead.” Didn’t Jesus prove this parable to be exactly correct? Didn’t they say if Jesus saved Himself from death, they would believe? And didn’t Jesus rise from the dead? What was their reaction to all of this? They paid the witnesses not to reveal the truth to anyone, they still didn’t believe.

God wants us to make the law and the prophets our secure foundation.

But will anyone engage in letting God teach them? Just because God doesn’t send a new human witness at once doesn’t mean the discovery isn’t true. God takes his time. For the prophecy against the city of Tyre to be fulfilled, hundreds of years had to pass. First, it wasn’t destroyed as the prophecy said it would be. Apparently, the Bible was proven wrong if you lived in those days. But many, many years later, the final part of the prophecy was fulfilled. A new city had been built, and the old remains, even the dust of it, was cast into the sea to make a pathway to the new city. Just like the prophecy had said. The first time the city was destroyed it seemingly didn’t happen as the Bible said, but when more time passed, it did get completely fulfilled in the end.

Those who saw the first destruction weren’t alive to see the rest of the prophecy fulfilled. They could have chosen not to believe in the accuracy of the Biblical prophecy. God has time to fulfill His own requirements. He doesn’t have to do exactly what you expect when you think He should. He has time to let you doubt so that your faith and motives get tested. This way, He can see if you will use the cause of doubt to turn your back on Him. If you do that, it strongly suggests that you wanted something else to be true, you didn’t really love the truth (2.Th.2:11). The main witness of the blood here on earth is the Spirit, the other is the scriptures. We really need to listen to their witness just as easily as we listen to human messengers. For they are the greater witness.

Question 20:

I’ve heard some bad rumors about Ron Wyatt’s character, shouldn’t I use that to determine if he has God’s fruits or was telling the truth? Would Christians lie?

Answer 20:

Here, I do have an advantage, having had the chance to get acquainted with him. However, you don’t need to have known Ron in person to know how to evaluate correctly. We will go straight to the law and to the testimony. The law is clear regarding gossip: *“Thou shalt not raise a false report: put not thine hand with the wicked to be an unrighteous witness.”* (Exo.23:1) *“Thou shalt not go up and down as a talebearer among thy people”* (Lev.19:16) We need to have an honest concern to not spread a potential false rumor. That is why gossip isn’t something we should be using to evaluate the truth. We are not allowed to raise a false report, and we are not allowed to SPREAD a false report.

It is so serious that it’s actually a sin that Jesus had to die to save us from. It’s recorded in the ninth commandment: *“Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.”* (Exo.20:16) We are in danger of breaking this commandment, which is just as important as the fourth. If we spread things about someone else that aren’t true, even with the best of intentions, if it is a false witness, it won’t matter how sincere we were. We have still broken God’s law.

There were false witnesses present at the trial of Jesus. Do you remember what they did? They took words Christ had actually said, and they twisted them into an entirely different meaning. The Bible calls them false witnesses. If you interpret someone's word to mean something you know they didn't mean, just to use it against them, you are a false witness. It doesn't matter if they said something similar. We usually use half-truths when we witness falsely, mostly all gossip and false reports are half-truths. We use the truth-part to legitimize our lie. In other words, we are lying to ourselves. Quite frankly, it also makes the lie seem more plausible because of the true part of it.

This tactic was used often against Jesus: *“For many bare false witnesses against him, but their witness agreed not together.” (Mar.14:56)*

We see it again when Stephen was about to be stoned: *“Then they suborned men, which said, We have heard him speak blasphemous words against Moses, and against God. And they stirred up the people, and the elders, and the scribes, and came upon him, and caught him, and brought him to the council, And set up false witnesses, which said, This man ceaseth not to speak blasphemous words against this holy place, and the law: For we have heard him say, that this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place, and shall change the customs which Moses delivered us.” (Act 6:11-14)*

Again, they twisted Stephen's words and intentions, and by doing that they become false witnesses. False witnesses aren't always someone sitting at home just making up a lie out of the blue (Although some do). A false report is made when you, for some reason, have something against another person, and you start looking for faults that might not be there, or adding thoughts and ideas to their actions that don't really represent that person. We value people after what we are capable of valuing. If we are jealous of someone, we try degrade that person to make ourselves feel better. In that way, a person minding their own business, doing a good job, can end up being called arrogant by a jealous person. For they perceive the other person after what exists in their own heart. They might feel humiliated, so the conclusion must be that the other one is arrogant. But whatever this person did that caused envy in the first place, might have nothing to do with arrogance at all.

The next step people take to make themselves feel better when they dislike someone is to get people to confirm 'their reality' to them so that the emotions they are bothered with can go away. Let us make a fictional example. So, a guy tells people he knows will agree with him that another person is arrogant and horrible. His friends believe in him, thinking that he wouldn't lie, and give him support by saying: "He should have been more considerate towards you. You could have done it just as easily". The man will then feel elevated by this and perhaps adds a little bit of exaggeration in his descriptions to get the acknowledgement he wanted. By his friends supporting him his feelings towards the other guy are now determined to be accurate and confirmed. From now on facial expressions or words from the slandered man can now be used as evidence of the claim. Before you know it, the word of this man gets around and his reputation is ruined by gossip, and he might not have done anything wrong at all. Those hearing the rumor now meet this person with a preconditioned bias to find faults, and when you look for faults, you can become completely unreasonable and find almost anything to use as a confirmation of what you've heard.

This is an example of how good people's characters are so easily destroyed in society just by some other person's inner sins.

Jesus warned that false witness is usually constructed in our hearts: “*For out of the heart proceed evil thoughts... false witness... These are the things which defile a man: but to eat with unwashed hands defileth not a man.*” (Matt.15:19-20)

If you take something someone did, and then add a motive as to why *you* think they did it, if this is done when you tell the story, you are witnessing falsely about that person. Some people lie to get what they want. Others see motives inside others that reflect their own motives because they assume others think as they do. The devil did this all the time to God, according to Ellen White, he described God with his own bad traits and described himself with the good ones. Most people consider themselves the good guy and anyone who gets in their way ‘the bad guy’. But sometimes we are not the good guy. Anyone who claimed to have a problem with Ron might just reveal their own personal motives or what is inside their own hearts. People’s reports cannot always be trusted.

If it’s that hard, then is it not better to not share information about others altogether? Truly, we should think twice before sharing gossip if it’s something negative against someone. It’s against the law! Before sharing, we need to search our hearts to figure out why we want this accusation to be true and what our motive is for sharing it. And if you dislike someone, investigate your own heart as to why you dislike them?

The first time I met Ron, I asked him a question, actually that was the only interaction between us privately at our first meeting. My first reaction was that his answer showed a lack of humility.

So much so, that I didn’t feel the need to continue the conversation. But at that time, I was not a born-again Christian, I didn’t understand how to evaluate according to God’s principles. Years later, when I had become an active Christian, seeking God every day in prayer, I re-examined my first dialogue with Ron and ended up with the *opposite* conclusion. That, in fact, he had shown true humility where I had wanted him to show fake humility. So, it was my reaction that reflected something wrong inside of *me* that caused me to think in that way about Ron. Had I been a contender to Ron, I might have used that very first conversation against him, thinking it proved my suspicions about him.

And I would have been at fault if I had, for Ron did nothing wrong. With amazement, I looked back at that first meeting and realized if Ron had said what I wanted him to say for me to call him humble at the time, he would have had to lie to me.

We need to understand ourselves to understand how we respond and view others. Usually, if we have an accusation against someone, the Bible tells us to go straight to that person, and not behind their backs.

If some wrong has taken place, then this wrong can only be made right by communicating with that specific person, or someone who can represent them correctly. Sometimes it’s just a misunderstanding and not something wrong. Choosing gossip instead of God’s solution proves that we don’t have a desire to know the truth. Instead, we have the need to put the other person down. Gossip is usually always to put someone else down to make us feel better about ourselves.

I want to bring up another example regarding Ron. I heard many rumors about him. One of them was that he wasn’t very bright or learned in the Bible. But when I travelled with Ron, it was the first time I heard someone quote the Bible by memory, and I was impressed at how much he actually knew. I had at that time not known someone who had the Bible in their heads like that.

So, two people here can bear two different witnesses. What made the other say what he did, I don't know.

But Christians should not be bearing false witness. We should not think we know what other people's motives and feelings are. We shouldn't guess 'the rest of the story' when we have only heard the first part of it, and then present it as truth.

Ron was lied about a lot by many different people. I don't even recognize the man who is described on some internet-pages compared to the man I got a chance to know. My experience is almost the complete opposite. I heard he was persuasive and dominating, but what I saw, was a humble man who never raised his voice or tried to take over a conversation. I saw someone who didn't put others down to elevate himself. And I know what he believed until the day he died, even though he has been accused of not believing the same things.

People are witnessing falsely, and I've been trying very hard to understand how Christians can lie about a brother. An apparent good Christian, a pastor, a leader, can such people really lie? The only reason I could find is the things I have just mentioned. Lies are not always deliberate, but they're related to what is inside our own hearts. Jealousy, the spirit of competition, the need for the truth to be a lie, or whatever other need there might be. People lie about each other all the time.

If they saw a devil inside Christ, they can see a devil inside Ron if that is what they want to see. (Mar 3:22) If Christ's own friends called Him insane at a time (Mark.3:21), then you will be certain to find people in the church who will claim Ron was beside himself as well. Jesus did say that His servants will be treated just like He was treated.

Why did they think someone so kind and holy resembled Beelzebub (Mar 3:22)? Was it tied to Christ's actions? They claimed it was. They claimed their view of Jesus was based off His behavior. But it was based on what was in their hearts, their jealousy, their misconceptions, their willingness to find faults where there were none.

Whatever faults Ron Wyatt had that I am unaware of, it's still not a testimony against the discovery. God's workers have always had faults, and God has continued to patiently work with them as long as he could. God is a forgiving God, and He doesn't just throw away His servants the moment they make a mistake. Peter learned that the hard way. Even if Ron made mistakes, it's still not to stand alone as a witness against all these miraculous discoveries.

My advice here is this; do not base your opinion on rumors, gossip or random testimonies. Base it on the law and the prophets.

Question 21:

Maybe Ron was psychologically unstable, and fooled even himself into believing this discovery? That he saw things that 'weren't really there'.

Answer 21:

When you get to travel with someone, you can learn quite a few things about that person. I met Ron seven times. Five of those times, I traveled across Israel and sometimes also Egypt with him.

During the same period as the last two times I travelled with him, I was actually working in a Psychiatric treatment center (hospital) as an environmental worker. Every time I came to work, I was given two to three patients that I was supposed to interact with. It varied who these patients were. Their age group was around Ron's age, some a little younger, and some a little older. They had different mental problems, and I was meant to keep an eye on them, to make sure they could handle their daily routines, and if a problem arose it was my job to calm them down.

Although they all had different diagnoses, like PTSD, delusions, schizophrenia etc., I quickly learned something they all had in common. Not just them, but people who had a minor psychological problem that I knew outside this hospital as well. None of them mastered the ability to handle emotional stress very well without their problems showing up. The more stress, the more their illness would show. Another thing they weren't good at handling was hunger, and even less, *any* type of confrontation. You can hide mental illness fairly well, until a certain point. When you are under pressure, that mental illness will manifest itself. Even psychopaths, that are loved by most people, will show their true face when under pressure.

The times I got to travel with Ron, I saw him under pressure, hungry, under opposition and confronted by angry people. I saw mentally ill and self-pronounced prophets coming to speak to him, and I saw him tired and sick. At no time did any psychiatric disorder surface. In fact, he had an inner peace that helped him. I do not believe a man can endure some of the things Ron went through without divine help. I think even a normal person without a mental disorder would struggle under some of the situations Ron faced. Me too. Ron had a connection with God that helped him through his trials and made him endure more things that perhaps you would.

Although I am not a mental health professional in any way. Going from working around mentally ill people to travelling with Ron and then going back to working with the mentally ill again, should at least reveal that I was not oblivious to typical signs of mental illness. My conclusion, based off my experience is that Ron did not have a mental disorder.

This man was in prison in Saudi Arabia, he was held hostage by PPK in East Turkey, he was mocked and attacked. Yet, he didn't lose his mind or ended up passive or apathetic. He continued preaching, loving and trying to reach people until his very last breath.

Sadness, anger, grief are all emotions God has created us with. They tell us a story about us. It says something about something that has happened to us or hopes that have led to disappointment. But when these same emotions lead us to sin against God and our neighbor, that is when we have become unstable.

Would authorities in four different countries, Turkey, Egypt, Israel, and Saudi Arabia have listened to a mentally unstable man again and again? Would the Israeli government allow Ron to excavate repeatedly if he was unstable? Trust me, the Israeli government deals with people with mental issues all the time. First, it's the crazy tourists that come and think they are prophets, or even Jesus. They are not invited to excavate but are kindly escorted out of the country.

Then, they have the many traumatized soldiers coming home from war and conflicts. They have also had the aftermath of the trauma placed on families after the Holocaust. Yet, despite all of Ron's claims regarding the Jerusalem excavation, that the Israeli government knew all about. When I was with him in Zedekiah in 95 and 96, he was still doing work there.

The recent excavations in Jerusalem show that Ron was truthful on his excavation story. He did

find the rope hole, he actually excavated down from it and found a cistern. This part of his work is confirmed. They did find the circular building and even the cross hole. They found the earthquake crack, and they found the entrances Ron had used to enter the cave system.

Through excavations performed after Ron's death, one part of his story after the other has been proved to be correct. This indicates that Ron did not make up this story, nor what happened leading up to finding the Ark. It's common for someone unstable or a liar to change stories, or to have to add lies to cover up the first lie, but Ron's story was consistently the same and was confirmed to have been truthful. They found the tunnel systems just like Ron explained. Ron has done all this work, and he had not been unstable. Why then lie about the last part? Did he suddenly go crazy on one point only?

Ron was too intelligent, hard-working and humble to make up such a story, and his other stories show his credibility. Until this day, I have not caught Ron in a single lie about his work. And I have been investigating. Things I couldn't really make sense of turned out to be true every single time. Yet, those who go against him, warning against him, have already been caught in several lies. That includes the Garden Tomb, representatives for IAA, and Adventists who have spread things about Ron that aren't true. And I have yet to see any of them apologize for this.

I left God when I lost faith in God's power to help and restore someone. I thought God had to pick only those who were already perfect, and that those that were struggling were left behind.

As a teenager that is who I thought God was. I did not think he cared for me. I didn't think He loved "sinners". Ron was the first to teach me this was not the case. He manifested God's love in how he treated others. By watching him in different situations, I also saw how God's strength could help him in difficult situations. His faith was a living faith. This helped me understand that I too could go to God and ask for strength to overcome things in me and around me that were not right. That God was there, and He cared.

This is the testimony Ron gave me, not by words but by how he lived. And because of his living testimony, I was finally able to let Christ into my heart. Ron was a humble, caring man. And I never saw him unstable. And if he did fail at some points in his life, and I am sure he did as everyone does, he at least lived what he preached the years I knew him. He genuinely cared about other people. He had the commandments of God, not outwardly but in his heart, and the faith of Jesus.