

# **Baby Steps:**

## **A Guide to David Nathan**

David Nathan has admitted using "baby steps" to get his hearers around to his way of thinking [see video BSV4, 58mins 1sec]. Let's try to discern where those "baby steps" are leading.

The following page is made up of three main sections:

Part 1 - A Compendium of David Nathan's Errors

Part 2 - Is David Nathan Genuinely Open to Correction?

Part 3 - How David Nathan Convinces People to Believe in Him

All emphases in quotes below are my own unless otherwise stated. And all quotes from Scripture are taken from the KJV unless otherwise stated. For the key to understanding the source references used here, see the end of the document.

Finally, please note that all three sections are a 'work in progress'.

## **Part 1 of 3**

### **A Compendium of David Nathan's Errors**

#### **INTRODUCTION**

If you haven't read the Open Letter I sent to David Nathan on December 4th 2018, I strongly recommend doing so before exploring the information below.

The following section is under active development. No paragraph is necessarily in its final, complete state yet.

Some of the concerns expressed below may seem minor on their own, but it would be foolish to view them in isolation. Ask yourself if a pattern emerges from these individual points (especially once I've had a chance to fill out each of the different categories I've identified). Even if a teacher is only leading God's flock a couple of degrees off from the correct heading, they will soon be in dangerous territory.

Note: I freely acknowledge that Nathan occasionally gives the correct teaching on some of the issues below. But that only serves to make the following all the more worrying, since he clearly knows the truth. Instead of giving a consistent message he is muddying the waters. He is meant to be a teacher, making scripture clear, not

making it confused, sowing doubt, and encouraging people to pick and choose what to believe.

### **PRAYER TO "GOD"**

\*\*\* The Bible repeatedly calls us to fear God. In fact, Isaiah 8:13 says "Sanctify the LORD of hosts himself; and let him be your fear, and let him be your DREAD". Yet David Nathan says, "we pray ... '\*Father\* in heaven', not '\*God\* in heaven'. I \*CRINGE\* every time Christians pray 'God...'. He's Abba. He's Father." [BSV4, 40mins 22secs]. Yes, He is our Father. But is He not also our God? Is He not our King? Our Judge? Our Lord? And a "consuming fire"? Presumably David Nathan must cringe like mad every time he reads the following Bible passage written by the prophet Jeremiah: "I prayed unto the LORD, saying, Ah Lord GOD! behold, thou hast made the heaven and the earth by thy great power and stretched out arm, and there is nothing too hard for thee: ... the Great, the Mighty God, the LORD of hosts, is his name..." (Jer. 32:17-19a).

### **REPENTANCE**

\*\*\* Nathan regularly omits repentance from the gospel. For example, "For me to ... be born again, ... what is the one thing I can do - the ONLY thing I can do? Believe. The ONLY thing that makes you or I righteous in the sight of God is to simply believe [in Christ and what He did for us]..." [BSV5, 4mins 35secs]. Note the complete lack of any mention of repentance. Nathan also omits repentance when he says "[If you don't give your life to Christ] every one of your works is going to send you to hell" [BSV5, 9mins 3secs]. Actually, of course, it is sin that sends you to hell. And, when Christ said, "It is finished", Nathan claims that Christ meant, "Every requirement for man's righteousness is being fulfilled right now in Me, and as soon as I give up my spirit, it is done" [BSV5, 5mins 19secs]. But if EVERY requirement was fulfilled by Christ, then we don't even have to believe, let alone repent.

\*\*\* Nathan says, "You and I all have to enter into the New Covenant. How do we do this...?" [BSV3, 31mins 30secs]. Nathan then neglects to breathe a single word about repentance.

\*\*\* In the (nearly) three entire pages devoted to what DN calls the doctrine of salvation, repentance from sin is never once mentioned. Only repentance from dead works – and even then the word "repent" is never explained. [BSD2, pp1-3] (Repentance from a sin involves really, really wishing we had never committed it, and really, really being determined never to do it again.)

### **SIGNS OF GOD'S WRATH**

\*\*\* Regarding what will happen in the lead-up to "the coming of the Son of Man", Nathan tells us that things "will be normal" [BSV3, 11mins 06secs]. He continues, "There's not going to be ANYTHING extraordinary." He then asks the rhetorical question that he knows must be on the mind of some hearers: "What about 'blood moons' and all that kind of stuff? No! The moon WILL turn to blood, but not BEFORE Jesus comes for His Church" [11mins 15secs]. Nathan teaches that the Church will be raptured after the Tribulation period and just as the wrath of God starts to be poured out, so he is saying that the wrath of God will not be preceded by ANY signs in the heavens, despite the Bible plainly saying "I will shew wonders in the

heavens and in the earth, blood, and fire, and pillars of smoke. The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, \*before\* the great and the terrible day of the LORD come" (Joel 2:30-31; see also Luke 21). To quote Nathan again, "NOTHING will give ANY indication to the unsaved that God's wrath is about to be poured out. There will be NO sign for the unsaved. Do you understand?" [BSV3, 13mins 9secs; see also 44mins 10secs to 44 mins 27secs]. Is Nathan not making God out to be rather unreasonable here? The fact is that there WILL be signs, but -- just as most people ignored the signs leading up to the birth of Christ -- the unsaved will either ignore them or won't have the wisdom to grasp their significance. Believers who are faithfully watching, as Christ called us to, \*shall\* recognize the signs however. "[W]hen ye see these things come to pass, know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh at hand." (Luke 21:31; see also v28).

### **NATURE OF HELL**

\*\*\* "Upon those who have a covenant, there is salvation. Where there is no covenant, there is \*only\* death, eternal separation, and damnation" [BSV3, 32mins 11secs, emphasis his]. Nathan makes no mention here of hell, no mention of torment or fire or brimstone, no mention even of suffering or darkness. Should he not take such opportunities to encourage us to fear the Lord and improve our walk with Him?

### **UNDERMINING GOD'S WORD**

\*\*\* Quoting Luke 17:34, regarding those people who will be taken during the Rapture and those who will be left, Nathan says, "There will be two men in one bed. Or, 'There'll be two in one bed' -- [the word] 'men' has been added by the translators." [BSV3, 14mins 43secs]. Nathan pauses here and stares at his audience with a resigned look as if to encourage them to assume the worst -- i.e. that that the Bible's translators were pro-homosexual and altered the Bible to suit their ungodly views. But the facts, which Nathan systematically hides, are these. Firstly, the presence in the Greek of a masculine noun and masculine article in verse 34 (and verse 36), compared with a feminine noun and a feminine article in verse 35, means the underlying text implies the word "men", so it was correct of the translators to add it. Secondly, in poor countries around the world it is not uncommon for two men to have to share the same bed without there being any sexual connotations at all. Thirdly, according to Nathan's own teaching, there is no reason to think it strange that two Christian men would be in one bed in the last days. Resources will be very limited, because Christians will not have been able to take the mark, and they will therefore have been unable to buy or sell for years by that time (3.5 years according to Nathan's teaching, but nearly 6.5 according to his diagram in BSV4 at 1:03:15secs) -- and many will have been hunted by the forces of the antichrist and may well have been obliged to move to more secure, but inevitably less comfortable and more cramped, accommodation.

\*\*\* Nathan says, "[The Book of] Revelation is a SUMMARY of all that God has spoken through His prophets regarding the end of the Age. It is not a book of new revelation. It is a SUMMARY of that which has already been spoken" [BSV4, 11mins 29secs, emphasis his]. The implication of this is not just that the Book of Revelation is completely misnamed, but that it is redundant too.

\*\*\* Nathan reads from the Bible with his hand in his pocket at 7mins 45secs of BSV4.

\*\*\* Nathan quotes Genesis 6:9 as saying, "Noah was perfect in his generation [singular]", [BSV3, 28mins 58secs; see also 29mins 8secs] whereas both the KJV and Nathan's preferred Bible version the NKJ, say "perfect in his generations [plural]". There are ramifications to this difference, as the first five verses of Genesis 9 indicate. Noah was not 'perfect', but his ancestry had not been tainted by the "sons of God" (v2), so he was 'perfect in his generations'. By changing this, Nathan surreptitiously reduces faith in God's word.

### **PROMOTING LOW STANDARDS OF BEHAVIOUR**

\*\*\* Nathan expounds on Luke 17:35 (regarding the Rapture) by saying "within the workplace ... There will be those taken [and] those left" [BSV3, 15:32]. But this makes no sense according to Nathan's own teaching. What would be the point of going to a workplace if cash has cancelled and you can only be paid by taking the mark? The whole point about the '2 men in a bed' passage is that we need to keep short accounts with God. We need to be alert to the state of our conscience. And we need to make sure that, whenever we 'lose our peace', we get right with God again without delay.

\*\*\* Nathan says, "The unwise Church. Remember in the parable of the five wise and the five foolish virgins? ... The foolish virgins ... [are] 'MOROS' ... [The Greek word] 'MOROS' means that you are wilfully ignorant ... Now we have huge sections of the Church ... [that are MOROS]... Christians today are meeting in wilful ignorance. There are evangelical, Pentecostal churches that are saying homosexuality is okay." [BSV3, 44mins 27secs]. By saying this, Nathan implies that you have to be very far from God to come under the umbrella of 'foolish virgins'. (As an aside, at the very moment when he could and should have given a really clear explanation of HOW and WHY we need to be alert (i.e. we need to be alert to our spiritual state before God), he instead makes a pathetic joke: "You need to be alert. South Africa is in desperate need of lerts" [BSV3, 59mins 43secs].)

\*\*\* Nathan writes, "we are saved through faith in God's grace alone" [BSD2, p6]. At first glance this looks fine, but it is absolutely wrong. We are saved (by grace) through faith in \*Christ\* alone.

\*\*\* According to Nathan, people who are "apostate" are still part of "the Church" [BSV3, 4mins 28secs]

\*\*\* Nathan claims, "Jesus has forgiven us for every single sin we ever have OR WILL commit" [BSD2, p2]. If that is true, why did Peter say to Simon, after Simon had been converted, "Repent therefore of this thy wickedness, and pray God, if perhaps the thought of thine heart may be forgiven thee." (Acts 8:22)? See also James 5:14-15; 1 John 1:6-9; Mark 11:26 etc.

### **THE 'NEW AGE'**

\*\*\* The New Age movement loves to use the word 'age' in the sense of "the Age of Aquarius", "the Age of Pisces", and "the New Age". However, sound translations of the Bible do not use the term in this sort of sense. So it is weird to hear David Nathan use it regularly. For example, he says: "When the age of grace comes to an end, we enter into a New Age." [BSV2, 21mins 23secs]. He also refers to "this current Age" [Ibid, 23mins 2secs], and to the "End of the Age" [BSV3, 1min 37secs; see also

BSV4, 26mins 21secs]. And "concerning the end of the age" [BSD2, p11]. He also uses the phrase "in this age" twice in BSD1, and refers again to the "age of grace" in BSV6 [14mins 57secs]. Is it REALLY wise to use such terminology, given the influence of the New Age movement within evangelicalism today?

### **SATANIC COUNTERFEIT**

\*\*\* David Nathan implies that, among the different ways in which the Baptism of the Holy Spirit has been "perverted" there is no Satanic counterfeit of the Baptism in the Holy Spirit [BSV1, 01:21:17secs].

### **WORKS-BASED SALVATION**

\*\*\* Misquoting Scripture, Nathan says "we are born \*again\* of the water and the Spirit" [Blog entry, retrieved from Nathan's website, bolm.co.za, on Nov. 12th 2018, copy on file], the implication being that salvation is predicated on the believer undergoing water baptism, whereas making this a mandatory part of salvation leads to a works-based salvation. The thief on the cross was saved without water baptism.

\*\*\* Nathan says, "It is imperative for Christians to understand that as long as we continue to serve Jesus as Lord and Saviour we shall be saved" [BSD2, p12] Does this not sound like a works-based salvation?

### **WORD OF FAITH**

\*\*\* In a section of a document where Nathan claims to be \*opposing\* the Word of Faith movement, he erroneously writes that Proverbs 23:7 includes the statement "For as \*a\* man thinks in his heart so is he" [BSD2, p5]. This is a pivotal Word of Faith falsehood, enabling WoF teachers to argue that men can become whatever they like by 'visualizing' it. Neither the KJV, nor Nathan's preferred NKJ say this. The passage is referring only to a very specific type of individual: "Eat thou not the bread of HIM THAT HATH AN EVIL EYE, neither desire thou his dainty meats: For as \*he\* thinketh in his heart, so is he".

### **JEWES**

\*\*\* Nathan declares, "What Antiochus [Epiphanes] does is he begins to Hellenize the Jews. He builds a Gymnasium. Now, how absurd is that! If you're Jewish you'll see the irony. I mean, how many Jews do you see ever winning gold at the Olympics? We just don't do sport. You know, if he built a banking academy or an accounting academy or a medical hospital we'd be interested, but sport? You've got to be kidding. Yeah, build us a deli – that's more our style. Anyway, back then the Jews were different" [BSV4, 1:02:41secs]. This plays into the hands of antisemites. By not mentioning the terrible exiles and appalling persecutions meted out onto the Jews over the last two thousand years, Nathan obscures the reason why some Jews work hard to build a degree of financial security in case of a repeat. (Incidentally, people who are \*known\* to be Jews have, at the last count, won 144 gold medals at the Olympics, and Wikipedia's list of Jewish sportspeople is very extensive.)

\*\*\* See endnotes 45, 51 and 52 of my Open Letter to Nathan for some other ways in which he abuses Israel.

### **ROME:**

\*\*\* Nathan subtly teaches that Roman Catholicism is just another denomination of Christianity like Methodism, and that Catholics who visited the Toronto Airport Church are "Christians" [BSV4, 52mins 12secs].

\*\*\* Nathan heavily obscures the hand of the Roman Catholic Church in the quiet 'world empire' that developed after the Roman Empire fell. He does this by claiming that the Roman Empire comprised \*both\* the "legs of iron" AND the "feet of iron and clay" in the image Daniel described in Daniel 2:31-33 [BSV4, 5mins 11secs]. See also the chart in BSV8 at 4 mins 22secs.

\*\*\* Nathan says, "Even in traditional churches, you'll see the pastor, [or] the \*father\* ... standing up..." [BSV1, 1:23:17secs]. This indicates that Roman Catholic 'churches' are nothing less than "traditional churches".

\*\*\* Nathan says, "There are those in the Catholic church who are born again" [BSV8, 52mins 10secs]. He offers not the smallest scintilla of evidence for this claim.

\*\*\* Nathan asserts, "BY AND LARGE, a Catholic who follows the teaching of Rome can never have salvation" [BSV8, 52mins 15secs].

\*\*\* Having done a reasonable job of explaining why hot cross buns are utterly pagan, Nathan then says "I'm not saying don't eat them. ... If you can eat with a clear conscience, go ahead" [BSV8, 18mins 57secs]. The Bible, in contrast, says, "Learn NOT the way of the heathen" (Jer. 10:2a -- i.e. just three chapters after the Bible's reference to them in Jer. 7:18).

## **CONFUSION**

\*\*\* Nathan claims, "The Holy Spirit ... teaches us things that we cannot grasp with our natural mind because they are spiritually discerned." [BSD2, p8]. Nathan is seriously misquoting 1 Corinthians 2:14 which says, "But the natural \*MAN\* receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." The verse, especially when read in context, is demonstrably a reference to the natural (i.e. unsaved) man, as opposed to the spiritual (i.e. reborn) man. Two verses later, we are informed that Christians are given "the mind of Christ" (see also Rom. 12:2; Isa. 1:18a etc). By teaching that the human mind cannot grasp teachings about God and His Kingdom, Nathan can come out with all manner of confusion and error and his hearers are obliged to live with it all on the basis that the inability of their natural mind to understand it is no indicator of its falseness.

\*\*\* Nathan says "You and I can't go around ... imparting spiritual gifts to people" [BSV1, 29mins 00secs], whereas Paul says "I long to see you, that I may impart unto you some spiritual gift, to the end ye may be established" [Romans 1:11]. Of course, what Nathan means by 'spiritual gifts' is not what the Bible means by the phrase.

\*\*\* "By all accounts, Noah was one of the greatest failures as a preacher that the Kingdom of God has ever seen" [BSV3, 37mins 12secs]. Given that Noah is listed by God as one of the three most righteous men in the entire Old Testament, (Ezek. 14:14,18) this seems unlikely. What is far more likely is that the people Noah preached to were 'too far gone' to repent (c.f. Gen. 6:5).

\*\*\* Nathan argues that, "In Christ we are as righteous as God is." [BSD2, p2]. If that is the case, how come "the righteous \*scarcely\* be saved" (1 Peter 4:18a)? And why do we need to fear God if we are as righteous as He is?

\*\*\* "A child is perfect in the sight of God, according to Scripture." [BSV8, 42:24]. The Bible actually says, "The wicked are estranged from the womb: they go astray as soon as they be born, speaking lies." (Psa. 58:3), and "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me. (Psa. 51:5). Whatever one's view on original sin, no child is "perfect" in the sight of God except for the Lord Jesus, because He was conceived of the Holy Ghost rather than by man.

## MISCELLANEOUS

\*\*\* "This woman [The Harlot, is] ... sitting on a beast with seven heads and ten horns. So, we have the woman and the beast. ... We know that the beast speaks of the anti-Christ. So this woman rides on the power of the antichrist" [BSV8, 2mins 53secs]. But this is highly misleading. The beast is not the antichrist but Satan himself: "And there appeared another wonder in heaven; and behold a GREAT RED DRAGON, having seven heads and ten horns" (Rev. 12:3). By teaching that the beast is the antichrist, Nathan indicates that the harlot will only have power \*after\* the antichrist has come on the scene, rather than for hundreds and hundreds of years before.

\*\*\* Nathan claims, "Persecution is \*easy\* to deal with" [BSV4, 47mins 41secs]. How does this help believers get ready for being tortured for Christ in the last days? The Lord Jesus told us "For then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be," and the prophet Daniel was appalled by the vision he had of the persecution of the saints in the last days (Daniel 7:28; 8:27).

\*\*\* In answer to someone who asks "If someone truly can lose their salvation ... what would happen?", Nathan replies "They would return to the world and lust after it and have NO desire to return to the Lord" [Blog entry, retrieved from Nathan's website, bolm.co.za, on Nov. 12th 2018, copy on file]. The obvious inference is that, if we know that a particular person was born again at one point, they cannot possibly have lost their salvation if they show even the vaguest interest in Christ.

\*\*\* Nathan says, during a very brief critique of Joel Osteen, "we shouldn't name any names" [BSV4, 1:04:03secs]. Yet, Paul 'named names' in 1 Timothy 1:19-20; 2 Timothy 1:15; 2:18 and elsewhere.

\*\*\* Nathan says, "Beware of the supernatural that is void of ANY teaching. Beware of meetings where it's ALL experiential" [BSV4, 57mins 36secs]. Having attended Toronto-type meetings myself in the 1990s, I can say that few if any of those meetings were void of \*any\* teaching, but all were extremely unhealthy.

\*\*\* Nathan says, "So we see two types of people on Earth. Those who walk with God and those who walk after their own desires, fulfilling the lusts of the sinful nature" [BSV3, 29mins 25secs]. But this is misleading. There are MANY people who are

deeply committed to unselfish religions or ideologies, often requiring them to fight the lusts of the sinful nature rather than walking after their own desires, but who are not Christians and are therefore not walking with the true God.

\*\*\* Nathan writes that, "There comes a time in every Christian's life when God expects us to be able to share the fundamental principles of our faith with others. We all reach this stage at different times but God expects us all to arrive and begin to produce fruit." [BSD2, p1]. The 'fruit' God most cares about is the fruit of the Holy Spirit in our character, but Nathan implies that this type of fruit is irrelevant to God.

\*\*\* Nathan writes, "God does not want us to first become righteous before coming to Him for this is the sin of dead works." [BSD2, p2]. In that case, one is forced to wonder why God bothered to send John the Baptist into the world to urge the children of Israel to repent prior to Christ's ministry starting. Living in a righteous way is *\*not\** the "sin of dead works". "Dead works" are simply those works that God has not ordained. If, for example, God had not called me to write my Open Letter to David Nathan, then it would have been a "dead work" of mine to create it, and I would have wasted my time and would get no reward for it in heaven. David Nathan gives an entire talk on the subject of "repentance from dead works", yet what he defines as "dead works" is seriously false.

## **CONCLUSION**

I plan to add ten new entries per week to the above lists, until the Lord says I can stop.

In the meantime, more of Nathan's errors are available from Moriel's letters and videos – especially the initial letter severing their ties with Nathan (at the time of writing, it is available from Nathan's website, and it is also available from me).

# **Part 2 of 3**

## **Is David Nathan Genuinely Open to Correction?**

### **INTRODUCTION**

The following is a (draft) look at David Nathan's supposed openness to correction and his supposed willingness to truly repent of his serious doctrinal errors.

#### **A) OPENNESS TO CORRECTION:**

Nathan claims to have been saved in 1986, yet he apparently expects us to believe that he has never come across sound teaching on *\*any\** of the issues covered in my open letter, nor *\*any\** of the issues discussed in the above list of other non-trivial errors of

his, nor *\*any\** of the hundred or more other issues I plan to point out over the course of the next two months.

Admittedly he was part of a Word-of-Faith church in his early days, but he says he left this a full 25 years ago. Besides, the very fact that he was part of it should mean that he is more, rather than less, willing to fully understand and expose the errors of the Word of Faith movement, given that it ensnared him and that he would presumably want -- if he were genuine -- to never again be duped by any variant of it.

In 25 years in *\*MINISTRY\** after leaving the Word of Faith movement, he *\*must\** have heard at least a *\*few\** talks, read a few books, booklets, articles etc, and had a few folks -- including remnant teachers -- privately talk with him about the dangerous falsehoods to be found in WoF, TB etc. So why is he still promoting those errors to this day, as evidenced by my open letter?

Interestingly, the video on which my letter is based actually sees Nathan indirectly *\*admitting\** that he has read materials exposing things like the TB, for he talks about autosuggestion and other techniques for causing hypnosis, and he talks about those souls who suffered ridicule etc in order to bring us sound doctrine on matters like the TB.

In closing, he was also member of Moriel's staff for nearly four YEARS. He MUST have known that he was teaching things that were diametrically opposed to Moriel's position. What's more he must have had a fair idea of WHY Moriel took the stance they did on these issues. Yet he was so 'open to correction' that he ignored all of this.

Let's now see how open to correction he really is. Here are some case studies:

#### 1) 'SLAYING IN THE SPIRIT'

In Moriel's termination letter, they complained (a) that Nathan was drawing no distinction between falling backwards and falling on one's face, and (b) that Nathan was drawing no distinction between falling due to *\*worship\** and falling for another reason. Nathan's response was to completely sidestep the issue of falling backwards versus falling on one's face. He wrote:

"Your *\*entire\** objection is that and I quote you, 'And in these quotes, there is no distinction between "falling" as a physical act, and the actual Greek terms used to denote instances of worship...' Again you make accusations and assumptions from a very brief bullet point summary on a lengthy teaching without listening to the actual teaching itself and then arrive at a presupposition of what I actually believe and teach."

The truth is that Moriel had a further concern that Nathan simply ducks. Moriel had gone to some trouble to make clear that they were very unhappy that Nathan was teaching that the direction of a person's fall was irrelevant. For a start, they quoted from his Foundation Principles PDF:

"How people fall does not determine if it is of God or not as some people fall backwards (John 18:6), some fall forwards (Ezekiel 1:28 & 3:23; Daniel 8:18) and others just fall (Acts 26:14; Revelation 1:17) It is not about the falling. If people are

conscious of falling, get them to sit on a chair so that they can concentrate on receiving from God rather than worrying if there is someone to catch them or how undignified they may look".(Pg. 10)

Moriel followed this damning quote by remarking, "Not only is this exactly opposite of Moriel's teachings, it even includes the case of John 18:6 where they came to arrest Christ and all fell backward at His Word, a specific example Jacob has repeatedly taught as proving the false "slayings" of many such as Benny Hinn and Bill Johnson." Just to reiterate, Nathan completely ducked this whole point and then had the cheek to lambast Moriel for 'making assumptions' and 'arriving at presuppositions', despite the unambiguous nature of his PDF text (and despite Moriel's criticisms being an entirely accurate summary of what he teaches in his video on the topic he \*does\* acknowledge Moriel raised). Incidentally, Prasch repeated part of his concern on this aspect of Nathans teaching (see BSV6, 39mins 15secs to 41mins 36secs), yet Nathan again left this teaching unaltered in his video.

(As an aside, note how Nathan condemns Moriel for making "accusations and assumptions from a very brief bullet point summary". This 'summary' Nathan speaks of is actually a PDF document, published on his website for all to see. As Prasch has noted, if you put something in print, you are responsible for what it says. And nowhere does the PDF 'Please don't take any notice of this document unless you have watched the associated videos'. If Nathan finds it this difficult to write sound summaries of his views, he should not call himself a teacher.)

## 2) 'TRANSFERRING THE ANOINTING'

In Nathan's initial defence letter after his sacking from Moriel (see BSD1), he wrote: "you make this accusation and I quote directly, '... Exodus 30 teaches us that the anointing cannot be transferred.' Three times in just one of many places in the teaching, one after the other I repeat the very thing that you have written, 'you cannot transfer the anointing'. Yet you accuse me of teaching what I have not taught and indeed teach against and then make a false accusation publically [sic]".

But Moriel did not accuse Nathan of claiming "\*you\* cannot transfer the anointing", they accused him of claiming that the anointing can be transferred, period. Nathan sets up a 'straw man' here. (And anyway, Nathan \*does\* teach, repeatedly, that a person can transfer anointing onto another person. See my Open Letter to him.)

## 3) 'FEELING THE SPIRIT'

Nathan's 'Foundation Principles Course' notes say, "When you lay hands on someone, it is the Power of the Holy Spirit that is in you that flows through you and into the other person. - Often (not always) you will feel the power of the Lord move through your body, up your arms and through your hands." [BSD2]. Jacob Prasch drew attention to these statements in his first video publicly denouncing Nathan [38mins 1sec], yet Nathan still hadn't altered or removed this section of his PDF when I last checked it more than 2 months later.

## 4) 'WORD OF FAITH'

All of the above teachings by Nathan are absolutely identical to what the 'Word of Faith' movement teaches. And Moriel's termination letter had pointed out additional teachings by Nathan that were identical to 'Word of Faith' errors (e.g. Nathan's claim

that "God can't do anything in this world because He has no legal authority" ['The Believers Spiritual Authority Series - Part 3 - Spiritual Warfare Session 1', as cited in Moriel's letter]. Yet, when Nathan was forwarded an email which said, "David Nathan teaches Word of Faith theology" [See DN's 'Sequence of Events' PDF, copy on file], Nathan didn't ask the writer of the email for his reasons for making this claim. Nathan simply replied, "These accusations that I teach word of faith doctrine are baseless". [Email sent Aug. 28th 2018, as reproduced in DN's 'Sequence of Events' PDF, copy on file].

#### 5) 'CHARISMANIA'

When the Community Church of Devore claimed that Nathan's "teachings and writings reveal the promotion, condoning and therefore promulgating [sic] of the exact same errors" of the "false movements of the extreme Charismania (Lakeland, Brownsville, Toronto etc)", did Nathan ask for specifics? Did he ask for evidence? Did he make any challenge at all? His 'Sequence of Events' PDF (BSD3) makes NO mention of him making ANY response to the email.

#### 6) 'FURTHER PROBLEMS'

On September 4th 2018, Moriel's David Lister sent out an email promising to make public "further problems with [Nathan's] teaching". Did Nathan ask Lister to give him prior visibility of these "further errors"? Did Nathan welcome the public being warned about the errors he had been teaching them? Did he at least write to say he welcomed finding out about errors in his teaching? Not a bit of ANY of these things. Instead he begged Moriel not to go ahead with their intention because he reckoned -- for no stated reason -- that it would cause harm to the Body (despite his 'ministry strapline' being "ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free"). Incidentally, he also blamed Moriel, rather than himself, for the harm and confusion caused to the saints by the false teachings he was promoting and which obliged them to sack him. [See email 'Please let us put a stop to all this', Sept. 4th 2018 (copy on file).] When Jacob Prasch released his video listing an array of concerns about David Nathan's teachings and practices (see BSV6), Nathan completely side-stepped the majority of those concerns.

#### 7) 'ZIONIST'

The word "Zionist" is best -- and most biblically -- defined as anyone who is in favour of the existence of the nation of Israel in the Holy Land, with Jerusalem as her capital. People like the Illuminati are fundamentally opposed to Israel existing, let alone her having possession of Jerusalem. But in one of his eschatology videos, David Nathan used the term 'Zionist' to describe some of these evil people. When I wrote to Nathan, with great respectfulness, to enquire whether he had made a mistake in using the word "Zionist" to refer to certain members of the Illuminati and other New World Order individuals, he didn't reply at all for a fortnight. I then very gently asked him again, but he merely reiterated his original position in different words.

### **CONCLUSION TO SECTION A**

Please don't imagine this list to be an exhaustive set of instances demonstrating Nathan's lack of willingness to be corrected. It isn't. I've just run out of time to research and document more of them for the moment.

## **B) NATURE OF HIS REPENTANCE:**

If I were to discover that a talk I had confidently presented across the globe, or a video I had released onto the Internet for the world to see, contained a serious doctrinal error, I would be:

\* Deeply ashamed. I would not only instantly remove all videos containing the error, I would beseech anyone who had uploaded copies elsewhere to do the same. I would also make immediate and concerted efforts to contact churches where I had taught the error and beg their forgiveness and offer to do whatever was necessary to ameliorate for it.

\* Absolutely mortified. Not only would I remove the offending sections from my videos, but I would replace them with material EXPOSING and systematically DESTROYING the error (not just to rescue anyone who'd watched the video in its original, erroneous state, but also to make it harder for anyone else to reach a wrong position on the doctrine or to get away with teaching it falsely). In the early stages at least, I would also add a clear warning on my website about the error.

\* Extremely grateful. I would be hugely appreciative of being shown my error, and I would treat the person doing it with unbounded grace.

\* Profoundly humbled. I would wonder how on earth my walk with the Lord was so paltry that I failed not only to spot that I was teaching a serious error, but also that I failed to discern that the Lord did not want the material published in its present state.

\* Greatly chastened. I'd be much more careful in future, before releasing my materials to the public. For instance, I would run them by a larger number of people with a track record of walking soundly with God and producing sound teachings. And if I had learned that I had been teaching \*multiple\* serious doctrinal errors, I'd withdraw from ministry altogether and focus on getting my worldview correct before inflicting my teachings on any of God's precious lambs again.

How does this compare with the way David Nathan has responded when he has been shown his serious doctrinal errors and he has not been able to find a way to avoid facing up to them? (When he is 'rumbled' and he cannot find a way to wriggle out of it, he obviously has no choice but to appear to repent, otherwise his true nature would be plain for all to see.) I would estimate he does no more than 5% of the above. Let's see some examples:

He clearly hates to admit he's got his doctrine wrong. He much prefers to say things like "I had in the past not explained my position clearly enough", or "instead of giving emphasis to what I was try to explain, [my words] had the complete opposite effect and misconstrued [sic] what I was trying to convey." Or "[I used] a phrase that instead of explaining what I believed rather distorted [it]".

He also obscures his falsehoods. For example, he writes, "Regarding Moriel's video comparing me to Benny Hinn in an old teaching I did in 2009. I want to state that I no longer believe what I taught" and "I can categorically state that I absolutely do not teach this anymore", hiding the \*specifics\* of his erroneous teachings.

He is not exactly a model of graciousness when he is challenged, saying on one occasion, for example, "none of you bothered to take the time to even listen to any of these teachings before making your damning accusations and drawing your tainted conclusions" [BSD1]. (Among other things, this unpleasant set of remarks by him were made in relation to the attempt by Moriel, covered above, to \*correctly\* show Nathan his errors on the subject of Slaying in the Spirit.)

In this same vein, consider some of his closing remarks to Moriel: "To say that somethings [sic] I teach are good and the rest bad only leaves people with the question, what is truth and what is error? That you have caused relationships to be severed by your accusations and my family both saved and unsaved to be severely affected by your accusations is something that I hope you will reflect on and hopefully learn from." [BSD1]. Nathan accepts none of the blame for any of this.

Nathan may sometimes alter his videos, but I have \*never\* known him to replace the erroneous sections with material undermining, let alone demolishing, those errors. What he apparently prefers to do, when he thinks he can get away with it, is continue to teach his errors, but just in a more discreet way. For instance, in his 'Right of Reply' video, he says "I retract those remarks that an inanimate object can contain the anointing ... I want to reassure you that it is not something I teach" [BSV2, 27mins 40secs]. Just five days later he approved the release of an edited video (BSV1) which teaches exactly this:

When referring to the time when God did special miracles by the hands of Paul, Nathan claims: "Paul did something unusual" [45mins 1secs]. And after describing what he calls these "unusual" miracles, he then changes his tune and claims "This is \*not\* unusual" [45mins 25secs], as if it is something we should see on a regular basis today. His explanation for saying this is: "[T]he woman with the issue of blood reached out and touched ... the hem of [Christ's] garment and Jesus perceived that power went out of Him and she was healed. ... So, she touches His clothing and the anointing of God flows from Jesus THROUGH HIS CLOTHING to the woman" [45mins 27secs]. He goes on to assert, "When Paul in Ephesus lays hands on handkerchiefs and aprons, it's EXACTLY what happened to Jesus" [51mins 36secs].

Finally, consider this. Nathan said the following in a video, sixteen years after he supposedly left the Word of Faith movement. "Why is it that the Church has no power? Although we've been given authority, there's no reality in ... the exercising thereof. The reason is, saints, we have to establish authority. It's no good being given authority, that authority needs to be ... exercised. ... Do you know that you can pray into pieces of cloth, and the very anointing of God remains and abides in that material. Do you know that?" [Servus Christi video, 0mins 5secs to 1min 42secs]. Now compare this with what he claimed when he was challenged about it: "The scriptures do not tell us to anoint materials ... Is this a precedent you teach?" You reply "Not at all ... I was trying to teach, not a prescriptive, but a descriptive example of an unusual miracle ... This was never done prescriptively." [GV247, 24mins 52secs].

## **CONCLUSION TO SECTION B**

The above section is under development. I expect to add further points, and to polish the material already here, over the coming weeks.

## **Part 3 of 3**

### **How David Nathan Convinces People to Believe in Him**

#### **INTRODUCTION**

The following is a (draft) look at the various reasons why people are happy to sit under David Nathan's teachings. I have split these points into two sections: Firstly I'll list the ways he gets people to accept his teachings, and then I'll look at the methods he employs to discourage people from correcting him on his teachings.

#### **A) GETTING PEOPLE TO ACCEPT HIS TEACHINGS**

David Nathan is of Jewish descent, is very intelligent, knows his Bible well (which makes Part 1 of this document rather telling), is a talented speaker, and has a good sense of humour. These are just some of the reasons why people are willing to listen to him (even though none of these things actually comprise biblical evidence that he is saved let alone sound).

As indicated several times in my Open Letter to him, he employs a wide variety of tricks to propagate his beliefs. Here is a selection of the ones I have spotted so far:

- If a given talk will be covering a topic about which there is some specific detail his audience is likely to know the truth about, Nathan teaches correctly on it early on, so as to cause his hearers to relax -- enabling him to subtly misteach on it later. (This approach also allows him to wheel out an excerpt with which to defend himself if someone claims he is teaching error.) For example, at one point in BSV1 he teaches that -- when it comes to what people may experience during the laying on of hands -- "It's not about feelings. It's not about anything like that." [35mins 37secs], but a quarter of an hour later he says, "STOP this thing that 'It's not about feelings', 'coz you know what? Sometimes it IS." [49mins 22secs, emphases his].
- In order to get away with misrepresenting Scripture (e.g. by adding to it, taking away crucial bits from it, transposing verses, or simply rewriting it), he avoids giving his audience the Scripture references, or else avoids looking up the passage, or else hurries past the passage. (See my Open Letter for examples of each of these.)
- In order to cause his hearers to 'turn off their antennae' so that he can quietly inject error unnoticed, he amazes and thrills his hearers by punctuating his talks with profound and valuable truths about Christianity. (He is not the only teacher to 'give with one hand and take with the other' like this.)

- As Jacob Prasch has pointed out, David Nathan regularly "plays the Jewish card". In other words he plays on his racial Jewishness as a reason to trust his remarks and think of him as having special insights, and that the Gentiles in his audience are hampered by being inculcated with "Gentile ideas" [e.g. see BSV6].

- In order to be able to wriggle out of accusations of misteaching, he uses clever wordplay. For instance, he says: "We find in the book of Acts, chapter 19, Paul in Ephesus. The Bible says that there were many miracles done by the Apostle Paul. And it says they were 'unusual'." [BSV1, 43mins 40secs]. By saying this, Nathan deceives people into thinking that ALL of Paul's miracles were 'unusual'. But, if challenged, Nathan can always defend himself by claiming that, when he used the word "it", he wasn't referring to ALL of Paul's miracles but only to the ones in Ephesus. (Acts 19 does not say there were \*many\* miracles done by the Apostle Paul.)

- In order to make it seem like the arguments against his beliefs are worthless, he sets up 'straw men'. This means he misrepresents a given argument, enabling him to appear to demolish it. An example can be found in BSV1 where he pretends that no detractor ever makes any distinction between falling forwards and falling backwards in the presence of God (see the section entitled 'SLAYING IN THE SPIRIT' in Part 2 of this document). Another example of a straw man is when Nathan writes, "Charles Wesley, Jonathan Edwards, George Whitefield, Francis Asbury, Charles Finney, George Fox and Dr Martin Lloyd-Jones and a multitude of conservative non-charismatic ministers have since the 1700's from time to time witnessed something akin to being slain in the Spirit." [BSD1] The question is not whether people experienced "something akin to being slain in the Spirit". The true question is threefold: (a) Did the falling happen due to hands being laid on them?, (b) In which direction did they fall?, and (c) Did they fall due to fear, or were they forced to fall?

- In order to make it seem like he is genuine, he is prepared to warn hearers about some of the more extreme teachings and practices within the Word of Faith movement. This allows him to promote core beliefs of the movement while appearing to be opposed to the movement. BSV1 is a good example of this.

- In order to misteach his hearers on a given doctrine, he implies that the topic in question can be completely understood through the study of just one, or sometimes two, portions of Scripture. This gives him plenty of scope for hiding the true, balanced position that potentially requires many separate passages of Scripture to be reconciled. (His talk BSV3 is one such. And his talk entitled 'There is no sorcery against Jacob' is another.)

- In order to appear responsible and sound, he gives warnings that superficially appear biblical. It is only when these warnings are carefully analysed that they are seen to be wrong. This happens at least three times in talk BSV1. See my Open Letter for two of those instances.

- In order to discreetly mislead his audience, he lies about the underlying Greek or Hebrew text and its correct translation. Few in his audience will have the knowledge to be able with confidence to correct him during the meeting. And, because of the

techniques we'll cover in a minute, fewer still will be prepared to try. My Open Letter gives an example of this, as does Part 1 of the document you are reading.

- In order to minimise the potential for discovery, he tailors the degree of deception to the specific audience he is talking to. So, for example, whenever he taught at the Community Church of Devore, he was obviously particularly careful to obscure his true beliefs. Hence, when "believers in different parts of the world" pointed the elders of that church to check material of his, they wrote: "We are frankly shocked at the documents and videos that were [sic] asked to review" and "The very same errors which we were lead [sic] to believe David Nathan stood against but in actuality he espoused them KNOWING WE DIDN'T BELIEVE THIS while he was part of Moriel ministry". [BSD3, p13]

### **CONCLUSION TO SECTION A**

The above material is not complete, and I also plan to add more examples to the existing entries. Of course, another reason why people believe Nathan to be authentic is that, when his errors are made public, he appears to repent. But see Part 2 of this document for proof that his 'repentance' is far from being what his supporters imagine.

Yet another powerful way in which Nathan makes himself seem genuine is by accepting questions during his talks. But the next section will show that things are not what they seem here either.

### **B) STOPPING PEOPLE FROM CORRECTING HIS TEACHINGS**

David Nathan is happy to take \*questions\* during his talks, partly because doing so makes him look sound but also because -- even if the questions haven't been planted by him upfront -- it gives him the opportunity to come out with yet more error. But he puts a lot of effort into discouraging his hearers from actually trying to \*correct\* him. Here are some of the ways he does this:

- He makes sure he doesn't come across as gentle to those who might challenge his teachings. For instance, when he introduces the very controversial topic of 'slaying in the spirit', he mockingly sings Chopin's famous 'Funeral March', despite later \*admitting\* that some folks in his audience have experienced "horrendous" things in relation to this subject [BSV1, 1:09:32secs to 1:10:04secs].

- He pre-empts correction by pretending to face up to likely concerns (while patronising anyone who might be thinking of bringing up such concerns). For example, see BSV1, 1:18:36secs to 1:18:55secs.

- To minimise the likelihood that anyone will correct him, Nathan makes himself out to be some sort of 'super-Christian', far above the average believer. He does this in any number of ways. For instance, (a) he uses sophistry -- in other words he deliberately uses unnecessarily highbrow words (e.g. "impartation") and unnecessarily convoluted reasoning so as to make his hearers feel too backward to challenge him, (b) he boasts -- saying things like "Persecution is easy to deal with" [BSV4], and "to understand eschatology is the simplest thing in the world" [BSV3, 11mins 56secs]), and (c) he makes his teachings confusing, without hinting at any

discrepancies, so as to make his hearers imagine -- akin to the Emperor's New Clothes syndrome -- that he has some deep, unfathomable understanding of doctrinal mysteries that just look like an impenetrable mess to the average Christian.

- If an audience member correctly points out that Nathan has made an error, he won't respond in an appropriate, biblical way so as to encourage others to correct him. For example, when one of his hearers alerted him to the fact that he had made a non-trivial error (specifically, a serious false accusation against the KJV), he admitted that the person was right, but he offered no thanks, gave no apology, and shrugged the whole thing off [BSV1, 22mins 52secs to 23mins 55secs]

- If he cannot remember something, he seldom asks the congregants for help. For example, he mentions the headgear worn by Roman Catholic 'popes' and shows a picture of a mitre [BSV8, 52mins 33secs] but, when he forgets the name for it, he signally fails to ask anyone for assistance even though he must have known that at least a few members of his audience would be able to give it.

### **CONCLUSION TO SECTION B**

The above section is under development. I expect to add further points and additional examples, over the coming weeks.

## **SOURCE REFERENCE KEY**

### **BSVs (BABY STEPS VIDEOS)**

**BSV1** (Baby Steps Video 1) = 'The Doctrine of the Laying on of hands', released Oct. 17th 2018 (copy plus screenshot on file).

**BSV2** = 'David Nathan's Right of Reply', published by GlobalVision247tv on Oct. 12th 2018 (copy plus screenshot on file).

**BSV3** = 'As in the Days of Noah', published by David Nathan on Jul. 12th 2016 (copy plus screenshot on file).

**BSV4** = 'SESSION 2 DAVID NATHAN PERSECUTION, DECEPTION & ON TO VICTORY', published by Sitting in The Gate, Jul. 16th 2018 (copy plus screenshot on file).

**BSV5** = 'A Response to the charge of heresy regarding the efficacy of the blood of Jesus', published by David Nathan on Oct. 12th 2018 (copy plus screenshot on file). I sometimes refer to this as DN's 'Initial defence video'.

**BSV6** = 'A Scriptural Response to David Nathan & His Proponents', published by Moriel TV on Sep. 14th 2018 (copy plus screenshot on file).

**BSV7** = 'David Nathan's Right of Reply? (Jacob Prasch Responds)', published by Moriel TV on Oct. 12<sup>th</sup> 2018 (copy plus screenshot on file).

**BSV8** = 'Eschatology Part 2 (The Spirit Behind the New World Order)', filmed in 2010, published by David Nathan on May 16th 2013 (copy plus screenshot on file).

### **BSD (BABY STEPS DOCUMENTS)**

**BSD1** (Baby Steps Document 1) = David Nathan's detailed initial defence email, to "Jacob, David and Marco", sent on Sept. 3rd 2018 (copy on file).

**BSD2** = 'Foundation Principles Course', undated PDF, as retrieved from Nathan's website, bolm.co.za, on Oct. 29th 2018 (copy on file).

**BSD3** = 'Moriel's Dispute with David Nathan - A Chronological Sequence of the Evidence', undated 14-page PDF, as retrieved from Nathan's website, bolm.co.za, on Oct. 25th 2018 (copy on file).