

It is Written and Now?

Elder Tess Lambert France SOTP Video 33

Key

A. = Audience

Italics = difficult to here portion of audio

For much of this week we have been looking through some histories. We have had quite a bit of discussion about the Civil war and about the 1950's. We have brought those histories into our time period. We began to consider what is happening today and the current mindset of the evangelical world as they find themselves relying behind Donald Trump.

I want us to go to some scripture passages and I want us to have a discussion. I want us to go to some passage and consider how we read them and how you feel about them. It would be helpful if everyone had a bible or a device. I want us to go back to Deuteronomy. We will read that.

Deuteronomy

23:3 An Ammonite or Moabite shall not enter into the congregation of the LORD; even to their tenth generation shall they not enter into the congregation of the LORD for ever:

So this is Deuteronomy. We understand it is dealing with organization. What is this verse saying? Put yourself in Israel. What does this verse say to you?

A. The Ammonites and Moabites are not part of God's people and they are not entering into the assembly of the Lord and not worshipping with God's people for ever.

For ever?

A. it is talking about the tenth generation and then it says forever.

So the Ammonites and the Moabites are separate from Israel. Why are they separate?

A. some of them did something that wasn't helpful

All the answers just stated that there is Israel and it is separate from the Ammonites and Moabites. But Israel is separate from a lot of nations. It is separate to Egypt...lots of nations. What point is it making about the Ammonites and the Moabites? So they had conflict, let's say five generations in and I am an

Ammonite, I like what's happening in Israel and I accept their God and I want to join. What do they say to me? They say my ancestors did something and they had a quarrel so I am told, generations later, that I am an Ammonite, one of those people and I am not worth worshiping with.

How would we deal with this today?

- A. I has not always been the case. We have the case of Ruth who was a Moabite and became a part of Gods people.

In that history Israel was under famine and that means that they were not following Gods instructions. They don't necessarily follow what they have been told.

Would we be comfortable today, saying to someone that has previously fought this movement, you and your children and your children's children till the tenth generation, are never allowed to be part of us. Would we do that? They did do that.

Would we design a system this way?

- A. there is the Samaritan women that they rejected.

They rejected her because Jesus told them to. They were just following the instructions of Jesus.

- A. but then Jesus comes and shows them that He acts otherwise.

So he lied to them? He has told them to do this and He never meant it?

We will go to another verse 2 Samuel 11:3

11:3 And David sent and inquired after the woman.
And [one] said, [Is] not this Bathsheba,
the daughter of Eliam, the wife of Uriah the Hittite?

Why does verse after verse refer to him as Uriah the Hittite? He dies fighting for Israel and still verse after verse they make the point that he is not one of them. Today, would you have someone come into your congregation, join the movement, worship with you and say "Oh there is Tess the Australian or Tess the white one" after every single time you say my name to make it clear that I am not one of you even though we are one community? Would we speak of each other that? Why is it laboring the point, verse after verse, that he is a Hittite and never the Israelite even when he dies for them? We don't do that but THEY are making the distinction of who can be one of them and who can't. If you are not one of their race, you are never one of them.

Do we have any thoughts on this?

- A. Would it not be for them to remember the history of the nations that they are separated from? If we say the Ammonite, they were linked with Gods people but separated from it because of sin.

Is Uriah in sin? Compare and Contrast. You have two men in that history. Who is the other man? So you have David and you have Uriah. Who is righteous and who is in sin?

A. Uriah would be the righteous one.

But he still doesn't get to be an Israelite. It doesn't matter his character.

A. I wasn't really thinking of him as an individual but rather him as a Hittite.

So would we treat a gentile different to a Jew? Would we make this strong distinction? We have Israel and then everyone else in a separate category. Some of them can never be part of us and if they do come in we will remind them all the time that they are only strangers in our land. Would we treat people that way? I'm going to take silence as a no because if you would say yes... no one would be willing to day that.

A. I would say there are several elements in this story for the people of Israel. One way to identify someone in the group is to say or tell his origins and it is often used in the Bible. Also I am thinking about the centurion who went to Jesus and so the same way here Uriah is contrasted with David and he has faith despite his origins.

So when you go through Leviticus and Daniels Deuteronomy, are those people given the same rights? Is it equal rights based society? Regardless of their nationality? Because it might be just reminding him that he is a Hittite but if you go to the law it suggests that he doesn't have the same rights. They certainly didn't when Israel was separated as a people. This is not an equal rights based society. Your rights are because you have a Nationality. It separates a Jew from a gentile. When you have that separation, those two groups are treated very differently.

A. I don't what it means but in Deuteronomy 23 the Ammonites and Moabites can never enter the congregation but in the next verses it says that the Edomites and Egyptian can be part of it after the 3rd Generation. So even with the strangers there are two groups.

Would we treat people like that today with the movement? Silence. When did that change? God set up a system with ancient Israel and it kept them separate and superior. When did that change? Or does it not change? Do people want to work like that today? Do we want the movement to look like that? If you don't first of all realize you are going against something that God set up, so think about whether or not you are comfortable with that.

A. A.D. 34. Galatians 3:28,29

3:28 There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus.

3:29 And if ye [be] Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise.

So what is that saying?

A. It says that before Christ there was a distinction but now it must not be considered anymore.

So from the beginning of ancient Israel all the way to the end of ancient Israel, what your degree of rights is determined by your national status and by your passport. We accept that. Then we come to Christ's history and it says, in fact now they are also Abraham's children and they have become one of us. We are Abraham's descendants and the Gentiles are now one of us and equal as the children of Abraham.

- A. Before A.D. 34 it was literal and after it is spiritual. So God's people are according to the spiritual now and not according to the flesh.

Go to Romans 2:10

2:10 But glory, honour, and peace, to every man that worketh good, to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile:

First to the Jew and then also to the gentile. So from that history of Abraham all the way through to Christ's history, if you didn't have Israelite stamped on your passport, you did not have equal rights. Then Christ's dispensation comes and it changes that. Then everyone is Abraham's seed who desires to be so. Go to Genesis 9:25.

I am going to use some quotes, some passages from an old book, I will tell you later when and why it was written, but it's an ancient book and this book is going to defend slavery from the Biblical point of view. In this book, it is over a hundred pages, they start with Genesis 9:25. So you start with 9:25 and what is said about Canaan.

9:25 And he said, Cursed [be] Canaan;
a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren.

Canaan's destiny is slavery. It wasn't just to be him but his children. They are going to be slaves of their brethren. That is a curse given to his family from 9:25. So we have slavery progress through the old testimony. If you were to go to Genesis 16, we won't read it, it is the story of Hagar. Ok we will read verse 1

16:1 Now Sarai Abram's wife bare him no children:
and she had an handmaid, an Egyptian,
whose name [was] Hagar.

What is Hagar's position in that household? She is a slave. Does she have any choice about what happens to her? No. Hagar was a slave. So you have the story of Hagar, one of many slaves, of Abraham and Sarah. go to the next chapter 17: 23

17:23 And Abraham took Ishmael his son,
and all that were born in his house, and
all that were bought with his money, every
male among the men of Abraham's house;
and circumcised the flesh of their foreskin in

the selfsame day, as God had said unto him.

Abraham is going to circumcise his household. Who is circumcised? His own son and those that are born to his household and all those bought with his money. This is buying and selling people. So if I was to read from that book Gen 9 and talk about this curse. I will paraphrase. God pronounced slavery on certain people. He gives no restriction of limitation for this. It was from generation to generation perpetual. Abraham, the father of the faithful and the friend of God, the father of Israel, was a slave owner who owned many slaves. Some born in his house and some bought with his money. You can trace this from Canaan to Abraham the friend of God, down to Leviticus 25. We will start with verse 35. Verse 25:35 is talking about how to take care of your poor brethren. Any poor Israelite. We are going to read from verse 35 through to verse 46.

Leviticus 25: 35-46

25:35 And if thy brother be waxen poor, and fallen in decay with thee; then thou shalt relieve him: [yea, though he be] a stranger, or a sojourner; that he may live with thee.

25:36 Take thou no usury of him, or increase: but fear thy God; that thy brother may live with thee.

25:37 Thou shalt not give him thy money upon usury, nor lend him thy victuals for increase.

25:38 I [am] the LORD your God, which brought you forth out of the land of Egypt, to give you the land of Canaan, [and] to be your God.

25:39 And if thy brother [that dwelleth] by thee be waxen poor, and be sold unto thee; thou shalt not compel him to serve as a bondservant:

25:40 [But] as an hired servant, [and] as a sojourner, he shall be with thee, [and] shall serve thee unto the year of jubilee:

25:41 And [then] shall he depart from thee, [both] he and his children with him, and shall return unto his own family, and unto the possession of his fathers shall he return.

25:42 For they [are] my servants, which I brought forth out of the land of Egypt: they shall not be sold as bondmen.

25:43 Thou shalt not rule over him with rigour; but

shalt fear thy God.

25:44 Both thy bondmen, and thy bondmaids, which thou shalt have, [shall be] of the heathen that are round about you; of them shall ye buy bondmen and bondmaids.

25:45 Moreover of the children of the strangers that do sojourn among you, of them shall ye buy, and of their families that [are] with you, which they begat in your land: and they shall be your possession.

25:46 And ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit [them for] a possession; they shall be your bondmen for ever: but over your brethren the children of Israel, ye shall not rule one over another with rigour.

So in Leviticus 25 God is laying out a set of rules. He is talking about how they will treat people who are poor. You go down about how they would treat their brethren an israelite and then it makes a point in verse 42 that God brought Israel out of Egypt and they are not to be sold as slaves. In verse 44 it says your slaves are not the Israelites. there are other nations around Israel, the children of strangers, the other families. Of them you can make slaves and pass them onto your children as part of your possessions and your belongings. They are making a distinction between free and slave. Between Israelite and none Israelite. Family and Strangers. There are different set of rules, different civil rights, depending whether or not you are an Israelite. Remember when we say Israelite, we are talking about a passport holding member of the glorious land. Those passport holding members of the glorious land had the same rights that they cannot, unless they want to disobey the voice of God, pass onto any other nationality.

Lets go to 1 Kings 9:20-22 I'm just going to paraphrase.

9:20 [And] all the people [that were] left of the Amorites, Hittites, Perizzites, Hivites, and Jebusites, which [were] not of the children of Israel,

9:21 Their children that were left after them in the land, whom the children of Israel also were not able utterly to destroy, upon those did Solomon levy a tribute of bondservice unto this day.

9:22 But of the children of Israel did Solomon make no bondmen: but they [were] men of war, and his servants, and his princes, and his captains, and rulers

of his chariots, and his horsemen.

So all the people of the other nations not of the children of Israel. All the Children that Israel was not able to destroy, Solomon made of them slaves. The children of Israel Solomon did not make slaves. So you can go from Canaan to the forming of Israel to Abraham and Israel, to the kings here at Solomon. That is 1 Kings 9. So the original glorious land. If we were to talk about Glorious land Alpha, if you weren't a passport holding Israelite, what was your social status? Slave. Who instituted that? God.

Now I am going to quote from the pamphlet. "Truth loses none of it's value by age. Just because it is old does not give us the right to call it error. We either accept the Bible as authority and end the discussion."

Then they take it from the point of view of someone who anti-slavery. I will just note that this book was written by a southern pastor in the Civil War but in these paragraphs he is going to talk about it from the point of view of a girl who is anti-slavery.

She says "certainly the Bible is not a pro-slavery book. Surely God is not a pro-slavery God, but here it is in His word. How can I doubt it when I have been taught to believe, reverence, and obey? Can I give up God and my Bible?"

It goes away from her and talks about her now. In her mind is an invisible struggle. She is wrestling in agony of whether to cling to her prejudices that advocate abolitionism. Or to accept with humble confidence the authority of the Bible with all of it's teachings whether she understood them or likes them. In this story she realizes that the Bible is a pro-slavery book. The Alpha glorious land God instituted it. She could not defend her position of Abolition from the Bible. None of us believe in slavery today. We can all see God instituted it in the original glorious land. So what changed and when? Or did nothing change? Is slavery acceptable? Does anyone here want to go back to slaver? No! So something changed or we are all in rebellion. So what changed and when?

What does Paul say in the book of Philemon about the Onesimus? Go back to slavery. Onesimus is one of those southern slaves and he flees. He runs away. He runs up North and meets Paul. Paul says go back and serve your master. So you can't take this to the New Testament and say slavery ended here.

- A. If we go back to the Civil War we see that God was angry against the churches for slavery but there is no Bible passage here it's just EGW quote.

The point is...You can't go to the Bible. There is no where in the Bible that ends slavery. It's consistent. This is why we get into the Civil War and the South are arguing "The North must give up the Bible and religion, or adopt our views of slavery". Their position is firm. If you want to argue with a Southern Pastor on the Bible alone, he will win. So when does it change? Do we have no thoughts on that?

- A. If we see in the Bible that slavery is named even in Revelation and we see that those in the Civil War who put the Bible aside were against slavery, I am going to make the conclusion that from the time the Bible was set aside and that men started to think by themselves, they saw that slavery was not a good thing and decided to go against. But every time we are basing ourselves upon the Bible it will always justify Slavery.

I would agree with you.

- A. Does it make a difference that slavery in the Bible seems to be completely different from American slavery?

I want to make a point that it is not. If you read through this book from the Civil War is the exact same view as the Bible. Their argument is that those slaves are happy in their rightful sphere. They have a separate sphere, subjugated, and they are happy there. Because wouldn't a person be happiest in the role God designed for them? They say they are treated well, they are clothed, fed, like part of the family, they are loved, but they are in a God designed position underneath another race. So their point is that it is something beautiful, a beautiful order in society that God began in Genesis.

I would agree with Sister Shemem. Sister Shemem made the point, and sister Natasha did as well, that you can't use the bible you have to go to EGW. You have to come to 1798 and a new history. Then you have EGW and the Pioneers and what is their position on slavery? They are against it in violation of clear Bible verses. If you Southern Protestant you have no EGW prophet, so even if you know what she is saying you don't care because they have the Bible and no other form of inspiration and all they can go off of is Bible verses. So you come to the Omega Glorious Land and what is it being judged for? Does that seem fair to you? God instituted it and then He judged them for it. Now we say that God never changes and God is consistent so how do you explain that? Because you are talking about the Alpha and Omega of the Glorious land.

- A. I see a coming together in the verse that says all men are the same in Christ

So this verse what does it mean to be in Christ?

- A. *Meaning that the bible here is not dealing with slavery but it means that Gods promise is for all. This puts the slaves on the same level as the...*

You can't say that here. the slaves in America can be in Christ. Christ is all and in All. That doesn't change their position as slaves.

EGW is against slavery. What is her position on interracial marriage? She is against interracial marriage. Black and White are not to intermarry. What was her position on segregation? She says that the common people should not urge that they be placed on a equality with the whites. They should not push for equality. They need to be separated. She was pro-segregation.

So you come down to EGW and she is against slavery but she is for Segregation. She is against interracial marriage. What's our position on these? What is our position on Segregation? against. What is our position on interracial marriage? For it. Some of my favorite couples.

So we come into our history and we see either the extent of our rebellion or how we understand scripture. Whether we realize it or not, we read everything that we want to as dispensational. This is a dispensation that we do not accept (slavery OT) and we never have. We would never allow it in this movement. Someone who was pro-segregation like EGW I don't think we would baptize them. We don't accept her dispensation. We have come into our own. If you want to take these passages straight as they are read, which is exactly what the South did during the Civil War, we would have to be pro-slavery.

All we are doing is saying Alpha glorious land, Omega glorious land. In Alpha this is what it looks, God ordained it and He doesn't change.

So go through what we have been through. Does God change?

We know God is love but we want to know why He is love because people in the world say "Go to the Bible passages and say prove He Loves me". That is where Protestants fail. They can't do it.

- A. This reminds me of the Bible verse of marriage and divorce where Christ says that because of the hardness of the heart of the people divorce was granted. If we take this example on marriage and apply it to slavery, can we not say it is because the hardness of our heart and that today we have a different conception of things.

Ok. We will step through this. God pronounced the Curse on Canaan and said to him that his position is that of slave. That continued through their generations, Abraham bought and sold slaves. Come to Solomon and you have the same things. All the way down to through the Old Testament. There is no word against slavery. It's endorsed. Come to EGW and now she is against it but she is still pro-segregation. Come to our history and we are saying complete and total equality. There is not difference and no segregation, no changes in marriage. How equal is this equality? Would you be willing to make any difference? Is anyone here willing to make any difference based on race?

We have gone through successive dispensations and seen change. You come through this history. You come to the Protestants in the Omega history of the Glorious land and they take all of these pro-slavery verses regardless of dispensation. God proclaimed it. He doesn't just say that allowed it because your heart were hard. He said those people are to be slaves. They take those verses and bring them to our time and apply them. Then when that fails, they say, they are "separate but equal". They have separate roles, separate positions in society, not saying they are worthless. They are equal but they are separated from us. This is the doctrine of segregation. They have gone from a position of slave, which they failed to hold on to, and in this document when they are talking about someone who is a slave, they are talking about someone who is happy because they are in their God ordained sphere. They are clothed, they are fed, they are loved, but they cannot, by Gods order, have an equal position, equal rights, equal voice, and make their own decisions.

Genesis 17. Is everyone ok with that story line? You understand that you are reading it dispensationally? Unless we want slavery that is the only choice we have. It brings us to today where we are saying total equality.

Genesis 17:9-11

17:9 And God said unto Abraham, Thou shalt keep my covenant therefore, thou, and thy seed after thee in their generations.

17:10 This [is] my covenant, which ye shall keep, between me and you and thy seed after thee; Every man child among you shall be circumcised.

17:11 And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin; and it shall be a token of the covenant betwixt me and you.

So what do those verses say? What is God saying in those verses? He is going to go into covenant with a group of people. What is the sign of that covenant? Circumcision. It is a sign of Gods covenant as a people or an individual. The sign of the covenant is circumcision. Who can go into covenant with God? Only Men. So if we were to go to Genesis 17, God is saying that the only people I will go into covenant with are men. Women cannot go into covenant. God says to Abraham that you for your children and for your generations, every man child will be circumcised because God is recognizing their generations based on son after son after son after son. What is the woman's position in that family? It is non-existent. You were owned by your father, sold by your father, owned by your husband. I have heard that taught in this movement.

Numbers 3:39 We go here with Acts 27.

3:38 But those that encamp before the tabernacle toward the east, [even] before the tabernacle of the congregation eastward, [shall be] Moses, and Aaron and his sons, keeping the charge of the sanctuary for the charge of the children of Israel; and the stranger that cometh nigh shall be put to death.

So who could be a Levite? Men.

Go to exodus 28:41

28:41 And thou shalt put them upon Aaron thy brother, and his sons with him; and shalt anoint them, and consecrate them, and sanctify them, that they may minister unto me in the priest's office.

So God is saying, He is talking about their clothing, the clothing of the priest we will place it on Aaron and his sons. We are going to consecrate them to the priests office. So Aaron, his sons, and their sons, generation after generation. Who is the priesthood? Male. Generation after generation you are only part of the covenant if you are male. You are only part of the priesthood if you are male. If you want to go to a prophecy school with Elisha, there is they are the "sons" of the prophets. So if you are a woman you don't go to prophecy school?

The arguments for race is to go back to these quote. We can go back to Genesis. If we were to go back to Genesis God makes a proclamation and what does He say to Eve? Genesis 3:16

3:16 Unto the woman he said, I will greatly

multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow
thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire
[shall be] to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee.

We are out of time but I want us to think about it. When we started our series of meetings I made a point. I said we have a set of methodology, we use it selectively. That isn't good enough. We need to use it consistently, we are going to talk about how we see race and how we see gender. How come is it that we are not willing to take these quotes of slavery and come into our history and see it as disgusting. But we are taking the other passage of Eve. Think about it between now and tomorrow. Think about how you read and how you are willing to read. How you are willing to defend your positions based on verses and quotes.

In audible question/ statement

EGW says that if America doesn't end slavery He is going to make them by destroying their country in a Civil War. So God cares and He can look at their hearts equally for generations leading up to that time. But when you get to the Civil War you know how much God has cared about whether you have had slaves or not. America burns because they do.

In audible question/ statement

I Would argue that they didn't need EGW they could have just known. They should just know that it's even wrong. Then they have to decide what methodology they are using to defend it. Because we have no EGW today saying segregation is a sin *because I think you and I would say that it's a sin if we try and do that in this movement.*

In audible question/ statement

We are not taking our model of her history. We are making up our own story.. if I follow what you are saying. Cause if you just want to go back to her quote you will still have trouble. We need to consider how we are reading those passages.

Parminder: The North did not go to war because of EGW. They went to help themselves. They had abolitionists who were working for many years. So they don't need EGW to make that decision.

- A. So you are referencing a lot slavery from Canaan but from Adam to Noah there was no slavery. How can we deal with that?

So from Adam to Noah there is no slavery? How do we know that? God skips over all that history but it seems to me that that history was survival of the fittest. A survival of whoever was strongest. That is how I read that history. If it is survival of whoever is strongest there is a lot of abuse of power.

- A. Yes but if we go through Adams line with Seth to Noah, it's Gods line so we have Gods people.

And then they are all destroyed. You have Noah left. He starts everything again and institutes slavery.

- A. How do we know how to read the quotation of EGW in our dispensation. How shall we know this apply. You know there is a different application of her quotes.

If you are living in EGW day and Harriet Tubman shows up on your door, would you do what Paul did and tell her to go back to the South? Would anyone in this room do that? So if you are in her dispensation you are ignoring Paul. You have your own set of rules. So this is our dispensation. Why are you going back to her dispensation if she can't go back to Paul's dispensation?

A. *I speak in general because it seems to me that we went wonky on her quotation*

We read some correctly. I want us to look behind what we are doing and learn to do it consistently.

Parminder: The question is what methodology are we supposed to use. I think that is the back of what your question is and how do we learn to deal with these issues. Follow the basic Adventist rules or begin from what you know to what you don't know. Go to a story from or a model where it is clear and then use consistent methodology in the places where you don't know. That's how you know you can be safe. If you don't know how to deal with a certain subject you go to another subject that is similar and do that and then follow the same methodology.

So to reword that, if you want to know how to approach gender, consider seriously how you approach race and be consistent.

A. I had already read quotes from EGW about interracial marriage and she gives reasons because of the racisms that kids are going to face. But I don't find anything about segregation. Would you have passages or would you know why she would want segregation?

I will read those passages tomorrow.

A. Because for me it seems when she is against interracial marriage it is because of the context.

Yes and it's the same here with segregation.

A. I was thinking about the different dispensations and I was looking at it kind of like the week of creation and the week of redemption. I am talking about the 7 thousand years. I see that the process God did not create everything in one day. It was a process. but after that there was sin. That's where based on the passage where it talks about the harvest of the hearts, because we harden ourselves on certain things, God's people back then, and then generation after generation little by little I see that God is waking up His people and introduces changes, not because He changed but because His people that have changed. Another example Jesus ate meat and fish but us we don't eat animal products. We do that because we want to obey God. Jesus was part of the Passovers from his childhood and Passover is with meat. He took meals with the disciples but He was fateful to the Laws God had put for that dispensation. I think the great revolution for our dispensation is methodology because it helps us to see things differently. I think we must work hard to see it.

I agree with most of that, but I have a different perspective about ?????? *I think every dispensation has had to correctly interpret the one before otherwise EGW has no right to be anti-slavery. The Principle of what you said that God told Noah all of these animals are your food, and then we have baptismal vows. If you are doing what God told you to do in Gen 6:9... We can see nearly 6,000 years of progression dispensation after dispensation?*

We are out of time. When we come back tomorrow we want to revise how we deal with race and as Elder Parminder said. If you understand what you are doing with Race. It is one subject you do understand. Turn that to a subject you don't understand and you explain how you understand women's rights externally and woman's positions internally.