**YM’s DEVIANT TEACHINGS By Chin Aun Quek**

**(2013.10.13 Board of Ministers Meeting, Singapore)**

**INTRODUCTION**

The reason for this seminar is to discern the deviant teachings of Brother Yang Yuh Ming. I have actually acted upon the request of the Board of Ministers to organize the deviant teachings of Brother Yang (YM). What I have come up with is based on recordings of YM’s sermons, as well as the essays of a certain Rawls, which was posted on HBL, as well his own website, “Vanilla Hills”.

I have always been listening to YM’s sermons. Although some of his teachings have deviated from our faith, I never had the intention to do anything to him. I listened, and let it go. I have not taken down notes as to which particular sermon and in which areas he has deviated. Since BOM has asked me to collate and organize his deviant teachings, I listened through his recordings again in order to collate his deviant teachings. I have also indicated roughly the timing of the recording to make it easier for you to locate where the recording is. If you see that in my notes there are dotted lines (…), it indicates that I couldn’t quite discern what he was talking about or I skipped the unimportant parts. When you have an unbroken line, it means that I could only roughly make out what he said and am not very sure. Whether it is dotted line or an unbroken line, those things that we have skipped do not affect his main message at all.

1 Timothy 6:20-21 -> Paul exhorted Timothy on the one hand to hold on to what he has received, as well as to avoid vain babblings of the world because some, due to such inclinations, have deviated from the truth.

The reason why YM has been taken off divine office is because his teachings have deviated from the truth that we preach. After he has been terminated from office, instead of reflecting on himself, he turned for the worse. On the 20th and 21st of June this year, they called for a global meeting to discuss future plans for their work. He has, in many parts of the world, conducted seminars to teach his deviant views. He has very boldly, with no regard for anything at all, taught his deviant teachings that differ from our basic beliefs.

What define our basic beliefs are our ten articles of faith. They have been passed at the World Delegates Conference. Every church in every part of the world must abide by the ten articles of faith. This is also an important standard for us to determine whether a certain teaching is deviant. These ten articles of faith are not human dogma, but are based on the bible and extracted from it. The ten articles of faith are something that all of us, irrespective of whether we are ministers or not, as long as we are members of the True Jesus Church are shepherds given the charge by the Lord, should defend the truth.

We cannot but warn members against the deception. We must warn the believers against these wrong YM teachings. Believers, when they hear YM, may feel that what he teaches is reasonable. They may not be able to discern where he has gone wrong. This is the very reason why it is so deceitful – his teachings sound true, but are not. We must point to the exact mistakes in YM’s teachings, so that all believers will come to an understanding rather than to continue in the deception. We should guide our believers to hold fast to the teachings stipulated in the ten articles of faith. We need to be very clear as to which areas YM has deviated from our basic beliefs. How have his teachings deviated from our common faith? Only then will we be able to make it clear to our believers, especially the sympathizers and the curious.

I have not done an in depth biblical exposition of the truth which we believe. I have just used YM’s teachings as a basis to do discernment. I believe we can know what is in a man’s heart by what he says. When we listen to what YM says, we know that he has deviated greatly. This is something that I sigh in deep regret for him. You may think that this is because I have a preconceived notion of YM, that he has not spoken wrongly but it is me having heard wrongly. This is possible – I can make mistakes and I can misunderstand. But it can also be possible that you are the biased party. He is wrong, yet you keep saying that he is not.

What shall we do? We need all ministers to examine and scrutinize this together. I believe the words of scripture. The spirit of the prophet is subject to the prophet. Everyone has received the same Spirit. If this is so, the Holy Spirit will guide all of us. I cannot say that by the Holy Spirit I am right and I will not care about you. Can it be that the rest of you have not received the Spirit of Truth and the Holy Spirit is not guiding you? We must understand that the spirit of the prophet is subject to the prophet, unless the certain individual has not received the same Spirit as us. If we receive the same Spirit, then all of us will be guided by the same Spirit. This is the reason why when different individuals have different understanding of the truth, Paul never said that since he had received direct revelation from God, he can thus disregard everybody else. He did make this emphasis, as a personal encouragement for himself, that he does not receive any instruction from man but from the Lord Jesus. Whatever man speaks, if it comes from the Lord’s instructions, I will obey. If this is only human instruction and not from the Lord, I will disregard. Paul conferred with the rest and gathered for a meeting to discuss with the rest what is the truth. This is a very clear model in the early church, how they operate. This is also the model that we in the True Jesus Church should follow. This is the reason why Jesus did not choose only one apostle but twelve, committing to all of them the truth, for all of them to promulgate it.

Today, I reckon that YM’s teachings are deviant. Apart from the origin of Satan that has been decided against by the church – the meeting has decided that his teaching of concerning the self-existence of Satan has deviated from the bible. Apart from these, in the recent years, he has deviated in several areas from our basic beliefs.

I have transcribed what he has taught and have extracted from his recordings to play back for everyone to hear. You can listen to what is played back and compare with what I have transcribed to see if I have erred in any area. Some of you may think that since I have only listened to extracts but not the whole thing, could I have lifted it out of context? I have given to Preacher Shee the full sermons from which the extracts were taken. You can actually get these from Preacher Shee or download these from HBL website. I have indicated in my notes which session my extracts are from. We do not need to listen to the full sermon now as we don’t have the time. I also reckon that you do not need to listen to it in full at home to make a decision. It is enough when you listen to these extracts to make a decision. The body of his sermons is correct. Some have moved me. These are good. However, in certain areas, there are deviations. If you do not discern these portions, you would think that these are right. Because he has moved you in the earlier parts, when he has deviated, you would not care about it. This is what is meant by teachings that seem right, but are wrong. We only need to decide upon it based on the extracts. Just like when you see a doctor, when you tell him your heart is aching, the doctor will diagnose you by examining your heart, not through scanning your entire body, only when your heart is not the problem will he suspect elsewhere. I believe we should make a discernment based on what we will hear today. Let us put aside our biases and place our duty as stewards of God’s household before us to make our discernment. Let the BOM make a joint decision as to whether these are deviant or not.

**(I) THE THREE SACRAMENTS**

I will deal with the first deviation, which is the absoluteness of our three sacraments. These are found in the fourth, fifth and sixth articles of faith that are baptism, foot-washing, and Holy Communion.

**Foot-washing Sacrament:**

**(A) YM says, “I really do not know if foot-washing is really that important.”**

This was brought up in seminar in Taiwan in 23/09/2012. In this recording I have taken two extracts. He spoke other things during these two extracts. Let us here mp3 1.1 then mp3 1.2.

**(mp3 1.1)**

***(2012.09.23,during lecture in Taiwan, Q&A session for Romans 4.) (29:29-29:50)*** *Someone asked, “Did Paul receive the foot-washing sacrament?”, “Oh, did he receive the foot-washing sacrament, would you protest if he did not have his feet washed?” “No”, “No, that’s good, then that’s alright. Just let him enter. The Bible …. has no record*

 ***(31:13-32:05)****YM said, “…I do not know if he had his feet washed, really, I do not know,* ***I really do not know whether the foot-washing sacrament is that important****, but I will do footwashing, I had said before that if salvation requires 10 marks, True Jesus Church wants me to attain 12 marks, I will attain 12 marks, anyway it is alright to do more, just don’t do less. But if you say the teaching regarding the foot-washing sacrament is very well-founded, I find it difficult, you want to firmly keep to this teaching, I can topple it if I ‘m of the opposite camp. But since this is the current belief of True Jesus Church, and he would not lose his salvation by having his feet are washed, then just wash his feet. However if people do not wash their feet, you just have a chat with him, say we have footwashing, it is better this way, you are … 12 marks, if he is willing he can have his feet washed.”*

**Analysis:** There is only one true answer to this: Is foot-washing related to salvation? If you don’t wash your feet, will you have no part with the Lord? Our answer is in the affirmative. Although the bible does not record other believers having received the foot-washing sacrament, we believe that the apostles would have acted on the Lord’s instructions to wash the feet of all believers because it is the Lord’s command, has to do with having a part with Him, and has a direct and absolute relationship with salvation. Therefore, we believe that the apostle Paul has received footwashing.

However, YM’s answer is that he is unsure. He says he really doesn’t know if Paul received the foot-washing sacrament. He also says that he doesn’t know if the foot-washing sacrament is really that important. He doesn’t deny the foot-washing sacrament, but he feels that it is not absolutely necessarily. He says that foot-washing is an extra two points. Ten points gives you salvation, but if the True Jesus Church requires you do twelve points, you might as well. He says that if other people have not done foot-washing, speak to them and tell them that having foot-washing is better and that with it, you have twelve points. By speaking in such an unsure manner, he has deviated from our point made in the sixth article of faith that foot-washing is to have a part with Christ. It is for sure and is a must. It is not extra. It is definitely not the extra two marks. It is the Lord’s command, not something we add boldly. It is not that we can be saved by ten marks, but we add on to make it twelve.

**(B) YM asks: What if Foot-washing has nothing to do with salvation?**

This is spoken on the 10th of October, 2012, in Tainan.

**(mp3 1.2)**

***(2012.10.10 during the lecture in Tainan, Q&A1 session on To View the Church from the Bible.)(3:52-5:13).***

 *YM said, “I will not deny the 5 basic doctrine sthat the True Jesus Church has received , there is no need to deny this, because I cannot spot any flaws. If salvation is 10 marks, True Jesus Church insists on 12 marks, that is up to you. Perhaps some things are extra, perhaps, but it is not going to affect salvation. For example t foot-washing sacrament mentioned eralier, I will not deny it, but you Paul Wei did not have your feet washed, for me it does not matter, I will not say that you will not be saved because you cannot have your feet washed, especially in your times. If foot-washing sacrament does not pertain to salvation, I am saying ‘if’, listen carefully so you do not spread the word everywhere.I have been terminated from office, the next step would , be excommunication, so be careful. But I told them if they want excommunicate me, I am left with Paris church, because my membership is with Paris, therefore it’s not simply anyone could excommunicate me. Therefore if True Jesus Church wants to have 12 marks, I will not object, but do not restrict yourself to those marks, you have to manifest the life, if you have 2 more marks then other people, then manifest a richer life.”*

**Analysis:** (1)YM says, “I will not deny the received 5 Basic Doctrines of the True Jesus Church.”

- But he has made something absolute – the truth regarding foot-washing – into something that is not absolute.

-He says “if the foot-washing has nothing to do with salvation”- YM constantly emphasizes to the listener to listen for the phrase “if”.

-But I listen to what Jesus says. Jesus says that if I do not wash you, you have no part in me. Whatever the Lord says is absolute. Yes is yes and no is no. It is not an “if” situation. -God says that the day you eat of the fruit, you shall surely die. But the serpent said you shall not surely die. Because of this, Eve let down her guard and sinned.

(2)If we believe in something absolute, there is no “if”s. YM says that I will not say that if you do not have foot-washing, you will not be saved. He says again, to be safe require ten points and if the True Jesus Church wants twelve points, that doesn’t matter.

(3)This is not in line with the way we teach about foot-washing. We teach that foot-washing absolutely has to do with salvation. If you do not wash your feet, you have no part with the Lord. We will not consider *if* foot-washing has nothing to do with salvation.

**(C) YM says that in 1932 the True Jesus Church decided in a meeting that foot-washing has nothing to do with Salvation.**

YM made this statement on 9/9/2012.

**(mp3 1.3)**

***(2012.09.09,BaldwinPark.1.)(42:44-43:38)***

 *YM said, “In 1932 True Jesus Church denied, in a meeting, denied that foot-washing has any relationship with the Lord.ps, you can read this is the Holy Spirit Times. They did not believe why one has to go through foot-washing sacrament to have a part with Jesus, for the simple reason that we have already been baptized. I have already been baptized to become God’s son, why do I need foot-washing to have a part with the Lord Jesus? Therefore they vetoed, True Jesus Church vetoed, in the year 1932, Elder Thomas Kuo was the chairman then, this was clearly recorded in our church history. Now it becomes of concern, it is alright, we are not saying that they were wrong in the past, but that the truth will be more abundant, more apparent, today we have grace upon grace. If you are baptized to have a part with the Lord, you want to have your feet washed to have a closer relationship with the Lord, isn’t it so ?”*

Discernment:

I1) In 1932, the meeting did not say that foot-washing has nothing to do with the Lord Jesus. Instead, they did not agree that foot-washing is having a part with Jesus. The way YM puts it makes us think that foot-washing originally was to have a part with Christ but at that meeting, it was overruled.

(2) At that time, whether foot-washing truly gave us a part in Christ was not part of our teachings yet. It was during that meeting that it was discussed. At that time, it was discussed if foot-washing had to do with having a part with Christ. At that time, they had not come to this decision yet. You can actually be very clear and look at the resolution they made in that meeting. I have given you Appendix 1 which you can take a look

(3) What they actually refuted at that meeting was what the northern churches held. In the northern churches, they have three views regarding foot-washing. Firstly, foot-washing washes away one’s sins. Therefore, before a person dies, he has to ask a minister to wash away his sins by washing his feet. We have heard that in the northern churches you have the situation of washing one’s feet before one passes away. In 1932, this was voted against. Secondly, foot-washing is seen as an expression of love. After a couple’s wedding, the bride and groom wash each other’s feet. This was voted against so today we don’t have this. Lastly, foot-washing is the confessing of sins to one another. If you have offended another, you have to have mutual foot-washing. What this meeting decided against was these three propositions of the northern churches. Although it was discussed whether foot-washing makes one have a part with the Lord or not, it was not decided that foot-washing was to have a part with the Lord.

Please look at Appendix 1.1, page 52-54. What is the resolution?

The resolution is that before the Holy Communion, ministers will in the name of Jesus wash the feet of those who are new converts to follow the example of the Lord and to show that there is mutual love. You see that they did not agree to the three propositions of the northern churches. They also did not agree to whether foot-washing has to do with a part with Christ. But they know that they have to do it. It is to follow the example of Jesus, to show there is humility and love. However, later on the church met again to resolve that foot-washing has to do with a part with Christ. That remains unchanged till today.

Now, YM uses the 1932 meeting, that “having a part with the Lord was not decided then, What is his motive so doing so? He says that now, footwashing matters, but it’s alright, we will not say that the past is wrong, but the truth is more and more enriched, it becomes clearer and clearer, So today it’s a case grace upon grace – you are baptized and you already have a relationship with the Lord., and you need to wash your feet for a closer relationship with the Lord ..

(5) This seems quite a good explanation.- s that foot-washing is grace upon grace and is deepening a relationship with the Lord. But

such a statement is different from the statement of the Lord Jesus. The Lord says that if you don’t wash your feet, you have no part with the Lord. We say that foot-washing is to have a part with the Lord. It has a direct and absolute relationship with salvation. It is not just grace upon grace or a closer relationship with Christ.

**(D) YM did not say this in the past. In 15/12/2005, he wrote an essay reaffirming the relationship of foot-washing and salvation.**

You can look at Appendix 2. I kept this essay right up to today. It is not in preparation to attack him. At that time, I felt that this essay was very well written and that in the exposition of foot-washing what he wrote was the clearest and most affirmative. That is why I kept it. Because his essay is very long, I have only included some points here. Please take note of these points, because in the argument for foot-washing, these are very powerful. Back then, there were some preachers in the church who raised same question on whether foot-washing is that important. That is the reason why he wrote this article reaffirming foot-washing and salvation. *(Below are some key points from the article)*

Look at point 1. He says, “I do not know when it began. What originally was very sure now suddenly is being doubted by some people. I do not know what the intention. Whatever the bible has clearly and plainly proclaimed, can now no longer be taken in. We keep thinking that we have made a new discovery. Don’t tell me this is the result of popular theological research? Or should we not rather say that this is partial loss of faith of some people in our history? It is largely because we have lifted up scholarship and looked down on the words of God.”

His second point is from John 12:48-49. “He who rejects my teachings, there is One who judges him on the last day. What I have spoken I do not speak of myself, but it is from Him who has sent me. He has given me this commandment to tell me what to speak, and so I speak.” He follows by explaining, “The Lord Jesus does not speak out on the impulse of the moment. His words do not have an absolute relationship with the context (that is to say, the space and time) in which they were spoken. We can even say that it is the Father that has given to the Lord Jesus what to speak even before it has happened, to direct us onto the right paths of salvation. We can even say that when the Lord speaks, the corruptible becomes infused with wonder and power. This is why the Lord says whatever He says to us is Spirit and is life.

Third point, the words we speak have no value because they have no life. We are so used to listening to words that are not judgmental and trying to analyze the context and intentions hidden within the words. Therefore, words spoken by the historical Jesus becomes captured within the confines of historical space and time. In this seemingly logical way of thinking, we have committed an error that is unredeemable. That is, we take the words of God as if they were the words of men. We forget that the words of God are eternally settled in heaven. We have forgotten the absolute power of God’s words. When God says something, it is established.”

Fourth point: “Because of all these factors, when we hear what the Lord says that when He does not wash you, you have no part with Him, not only do we not have the anxiety and shock that Peter had, but rather, we display the remoteness and coldness of Judas that night. There are a number of people who use historical context and other factors to deny the power of the Lord’s proclamation. And so, the attempt to use teachings to replace ‘you have no part with me’, which is an important proclamation. The Lord said to Peter, if I do not wash you, you will have no part with me. With just one word, Jesus has made it clear that in this moment, they will have no part with each other.”

Fifth point: “Some people think that what Jesus did at that night was just an example of humility and has nothing to do with whether one has a part with Christ or not. The Bible tells us differently: Jesus Christ said ‘if I do not wash you’. It is an absolute “I” and “you” is a one-directional thing. “If I do not wash you, you will have no part with me.””

Sixth point: “On that night, only the Lord Jesus washed the feet of the Lord Jesus. They did not wash the feet of Jesus. They also did not wash each other’s feet. It was a one-directional thing, Jesus washing His disciples’ feet. This was for them to have a part in Him. Only after doing so did He instruct His believers to wash each other’s feet to love one another.

Seventh point: Therefore, Jesus has differentiated two different kinds of foot-washing in essence. One is the one-directional foot-washing Jesus Christ executed for His disciples to have a part with Him. Another is instructed for the disciples to serve one another; it is the mutual foot-washing. The first one has a direct relationship with salvation while the second has to do with Christian living and nurture. The former one you see Jesus executing it in John’s gospel. The second one we do not see in the Bible’s records.”

What YM wrote here is good and I find no errors. However, I want to highlight a few points. In 2005, what YM said about foot-washing is that it has an absolute relationship with salvation. Seven years later in 2012, in Taiwan, he said that he really did not know if foot-washing is really that important.

Next, he committed what he himself criticized in his essay. “We have committed a very grave error that is unredeemable, that is we look at the words of God as if they are the words of men, forgetting that the words of God are eternally settled in heaven.” YM has forgotten what he said that there is nothing above the words of God, which have absolute power since what God has spoken will be. If he still believes in what he himself had written, will he then say what he said later about being unsure of foot-washing and its relationship to salvation? He forgot that the word of God is eternally settled in heaven.

YM also mentioned earlier in 2005 that “because of this, when faced with the words of Jesus, if I do not wash you, you have no part with me. Not only do we not have the shock of Peter and his anxiety, but we have the remoteness and coldness of Judas that night.” This has an uncanny resemblance to what YM says now. According to what YM taught earlier, foot-washing and salvation have an absolute relationship. He has, however, deviated from his own words spoken in the past. According to what he said in his own article, “I do not know since when but what was very sure in the past, suddenly, someone has cast doubt on it. I do not know what his intention is, but what the Bible has clearly and plainly proclaimed, he cannot take in. He keeps thinking he has new discoveries.”

If you look at what he himself had previously written and what he currently preaches, I find this greatly regrettable. He has changed. He has deviated from what he himself believed in the past. Direct and absolute relationship with salvation – I did not coin this term, but it was taken from YM’s own writing. I think this is a clear and powerful statement. Not only does it have to do with salvation, but it is a direct and absolute relationship. He reaffirms the truth of foot-washing, writing this with those who doubted foot-washing in mind. Yet today, he himself no longer holds this belief and casts doubts on it. I believe he has already deviated from our basic beliefs with regards to foot-washing.