

AUSTRALIAN PROPHECY SCHOOL, VIDEO 17

PARMINDER BIANI 11-8-2019

THE DIFFERENCES ARE IRRECONCILABLE

One of the main points that I wanted to put across during this camp-meeting is that the differences between what Future For America now believe compared to what we teach is so distinctly different. There really is no opportunity, I don't think, any sensible position of someone to not know upon which side of the argument that they stand. People might think that there is some minor issue about the events that center around November 9th, that basically we agree with Raphia and Panium. We all assent to the Priests, Levites, and Nethinims. So all the language sounds the same and it's very easy, if you are not paying close attention, to think that there aren't that many differences between what we say and what FFA believe.

During these presentations, both Tess and myself, (in fact since the split has started), we have tried to avoid dealing with controversy on a personal level. We've attempted not to go into email correspondence and make public statements about what they said and what we said and how they have been disingenuous in their perspective of what happened in meeting "A" and what was said in a private conversation "B". All of those things we've tried to avoid doing and just to address this issue on a prophetic level. Sometimes it becomes difficult in the mind of the speaker and in the mind of the listener that that principle is being adhered to. We have tried to do that and both of us have really focused our attentions in not becoming personal.

It's easy for Tess to not fall into that trap than myself. Do you recall, she said in the earlier presentation, that since September/ October last year she has only had about one or two email correspondences with Elder Jeff. So it's not that difficult to avoid getting into personal issues,

misunderstandings. I, on the other hand, have had many conversations with him and quite a bit of online correspondence and not only that, our correspondence and our communication stretches back many years. So, there are a lot of things, a lot of baggage that each of us carry in our communications, that it's easy to give a false or to give a portrayal of a person's character and their motivations and what they believe and what they teach. We've tried to avoid doing that. So, when you heard me speak about false prophets, not only in these presentations but in other ones, I want us to realize that this is using a methodology of parable teaching.

I am not making a direct application to say those people are Satanists or they have entered into spiritualism and all that kind of language, which is what they have tended to do, falling into that trap to have name-calling as an example. For example, one of the things that they will call all of you, just the fact that you came here, you'll be called "minions". So I don't know if you know what the word "minion" means. But today, it's a negative connotation. We looked up the word before we came to camp-meeting. We came up with a really positive definition. You can tease a positive one out but you know they publicly say that these minions, who just follow Tess and I, are brainless fools who don't know what they are doing, can't study for themselves. Or, they'll say things like, "because you believe what we teach, therefore you cannot have a love of the truth". You can't have a love of the truth by the very fact that you even listen to us because if you had a love of the truth, it would be obvious that you wouldn't listen to us. So, to me that all seems name-calling. It really seems low and pathetic. There aren't any really good arguments for that. But, I want us hopefully to see there is a distinction between that kind of teaching style, those kind of comments.

Commented [FH1]:

When I say that this is the kingdom of Satan and this is the kingdom of God (pointing to board-work) and there are characteristics in how each of those kingdoms operate. God cannot lie, therefore what He teaches is 100% truth and He obviously can't teach 100% error. Otherwise, He would not be God. It would not be a definition of God, and He is certainly not going to mix truth and error together. So, I have circled what God's kingdom would look like, how it would operate. If you came across someone, who was going to represent Him, His kingdom, it would be this one here. And I gave you a few examples where it's absolutely clear when I read what they're saying about you and about what you believe, you know that some of the things that they have said, half of what Elder Jeff was teaching was true. It's also clear that the other half is not true. We focused our attention on the subject of dispensation, if you recall, when we looked at that subject of dispensationalism, just want to remind us that their position on what they say that we believe is just not true.

Dispensationalism is a valid approach to scriptures. I'm saying that's true. Hopefully, I've demonstrated to your satisfaction it's the true principle dispensation is here (pointing to the board-work). Give me all the definition of what it means. **Ellen White uses it; the Bible uses it. It means how you manage God's house, his church, your hired servant and how you're going to manage that house.** I've given you numerous examples of how the management of the house or the church of God changes from one age to another. We saw it here (pointing to board-work), it's really easy to see there are two scatterings and two gatherings. It is straight out of SOP, EW pg. 74. She says clearly, "if God continued to treat us as He was treating us in this period of time, we would never be gathered". **So you know that He is going to manage His church through His servants in a different way from one time period to the next and that is the definition of Dispensation. And so of course, we think it is the valid approach to scriptures.**

Then he (referring to Elder Jeff) says this teaches that God provides a message for each dispensation which is solely for that generation, which is true. The message that they have in the time of Moses is different to the message that they have in the time of Christ. That's clear, and hopefully we can see that because in **the time of Moses, this is Ephesus. And what's one of the primary characteristics of Ephesus? It's that you conquer.** Isn't that what Ephesus does? You go to **Revelation 6: 1, 2. It's the story of the seals and it tells you the experience of that church.** How this is a righteous church dressed and arrayed in white and conquers it. Isn't that what happened in the time of Moses? In the line of Moses, they leave Egypt and they conquer Canaan. So it has a characteristic of conquering – your enemies, your foes. You go to the **time of Christ. Are they conquering their enemies? No they're not. Their dream is to destroy the Roman Empire, and it's not going to happen. So, you see that there are differences.** Now we can argue that there is a spiritual conquering as opposed to literal conquering. And there is and that's the very argument, **you go from literal to spiritual.** It's really easy to see. I read it again, **this teaches that God provides the message for each dispensation which is solely for that generation.**

We agree with that and then he goes on to say but must not be understood as speaking the same message to us. You don't believe that. **You don't believe that the message that is given to the Millerites doesn't have an application for us. You know it does. And therefore when he says we don't believe that, that whatever the story of Christ is teaching has no bearing upon our lives, you know you don't believe that.** It's not just me teaching that. That's nothing new. So he's there stating a half truth and a half lie. This is his analysis or someone who is giving him this, I'm not actually sure who's writing this or if it's a summary of his or that group's position. Whoever is making that

statement, I'm just going to put them all together. **We know it's half right and half wrong.** None of you would testify to that. So when they say this is what you believe, this is what this movement teaches, we know it is not true. They're on public record about this statement. This is not my comment. It comes from their side that this is their analysis on what we are currently doing in our movement. And you know this is not true.

They might argue, "Well, if it's not true, correct us". So if they're listening, this is the official correction that they're going to receive: we have 30 + people in this room and all of us are testifying to the fact that their analysis is wrong. So either they're lying or they are not listening to what we are teaching. Or, they're manipulating or twisting what we're teaching. **Whatever three options you want to go: they're lying, twisting, or they're not listening. All of them are not characteristics of God's kingdom.** Because you shouldn't talk about a matter unless you have studied it for yourself. If they have studied it for themselves, they would know that what they're claiming and what we believe is not true. **So hence I say that they're teaching things that are half right and half wrong and therefore they squarely fit into this arena. That's why there's a separation between them and us.**

If you were to ask them and listen to their presentations and go to their camp-meetings, they're not going to say anything different. They would say this is just swapped around and this is us. We have left the platform and walked away. You're falling to the wicked word below. Each of us have to decide who's right and who's wrong. All I can do is give the characteristics as I see it based upon their own testimony. So, I'm reading what they say: "God's interaction with each particular dispensation is unique to that generation". Do you believe that? Of course you do, it's unique. "And it has no bearing on dispensations that follow." I mean that not even Laodicean Adventist would have assent

to that theology. No one you've ever met believe that. **Before you joined the movement, you knew that the dispensation of the past had a bearing upon our lives today.** I'm not even sure if evangelical Christians would even hold to that view. **So that is just a straight lie because all Christians know, except when you get some really crazy ones, that the Old Testament has a bearing upon our lives today in some shape or form, as the New. So we can go over and over.**

There's this document they've got, a 16 point list of all of the things that are bad about what we teach, and it's just a mixture of truth and error. **So, the reason why I wanted to focus the presentation on during this camp-meeting around the word dispensation or dispensationalism is it's because it's the accusation that's being leveled against us and to me, it's the epitome of their new methodology which is to do things that are half right and half wrong.** The reason why anybody does that, whether they do it unwittingly or deliberately, **it is because it's the way that Satan's kingdom always operates.** He doesn't have a choice. He will always say something that's true as a bait to allow you to partake of something that is erroneous or a lie. I'm not claiming that they are saying this deliberately or maliciously or that they've got some secret meetings that they've gone into some kind of alliance with Satan. Obviously that's not true. I would hope they don't believe that we are doing that although some of the rhetoric that they come out with you think that they do believe that.

So, the reason why I want you to look at this is when you go to parables, the simplest definition of a parable is when you go from something literal to spiritual. Now, the concept of the theology of dispensationalism as Protestants understand it was the theology that was developed by Mr. **Darby** and then promoted by Mr. **Schofield**. They're about a century apart. Schofield is probably someone that you

are more familiar with than Darby. He developed what's called the Schofield Bible. It's not actually a Bible in and of itself. It's actually the chain referencing system that he used that was his claim to fame.

But both of these people believed in something called dispensationalism and the word that I want us to understand or go away with is the word LITERALISM.

For what they do, they go the Babylonian captivity and the Hebrews are going to be taken into captivity in a literal fashion and there's a promise that after the captivity, when they return back to Israel, that

they're going to receive a promise. And I want us to read this promise. This is an Old Testament fulfillment. But I don't want to go to the OT fulfillment of this. I want to go to the NT passage to discuss this. This is taken from the book of Hebrews. So if you turn to the book of **Hebrews chapter 8**, basically the story is **Paul's appeal to the Hebrew people, the Jewish nation, to try to prove to them, to demonstrate who and what Christ is, the Messiah. To try to persuade them that everything that they see going on and what's about to happen is a fulfillment of prophecy.**

So the whole of the book of Hebrews is really dealing with who Christ is, the identification of Him and he does it in many different ways. In the earlier chapters, he's going to compare their champion Moses with Christ. So you'll see a comparison between those people. He's also going to compare Christ to angels. It's going to compare Christ to human beings in general. He then goes to develop his logic, his argument to say that having established all of these truths, this is now the time period that God wanted you, the Hebrew nation, to stand up, to rise up to do your commissioned work. And what was that? **What's the work that they were commissioned to do? To give the gospel. That was what they were created to do.**

The time has now come that the Hebrews were meant to give the gospel message to the world but they're not able to do that. So, he interjects the thought to say, even though that was the time, now is the time for you to be teachers, to go give the gospel to the world. What must happen first? We are **in Hebrews chapters 5 and 6**. What must be the first thing that happens? **You must be taught first because you've forgotten who you are. You've forgotten all the rules, all the principles, all your commission. In fact, you've misunderstood all of the OT because if you read the OT and understood it, you would know that now is the time that you should be teachers is really referring to Daniel chapter 9: 70 week prophecy.**

The gospel commission, the time of probation is coming to its end and in these final few moments God wanted to raise up the **Jewish church, the Laodicean church**, and tell them to give a message to the world. But because they are Laodiceans, they have lost their prophetic message. **Before they can do that, God is going to have to teach them.** So you can see how he's developing his argument. Then we come into **Hebrews 7**. That is the key portion of inspiration that we need to understand because it clearly shows you that there is **a transition happening**. Paul recognizes that there has been a transition from one type of ministry to another. This is not the only place where he is going to develop his argument. In fact, the other place, that perhaps he does it in a more, clearer, in the nicer way (we all have our favorite passages, I guess) is in Galatians chapter 4. It's the same argument in Galatians chapter 4.

In **Galatians chapter 4**, he's going to say in a really pointed fashion. He's going to say that **there are two Jerusalems. Just like there were two wives. Just like there were two sons. Two sons. Two wives. Two covenants. Two cities. Two experiences. Galatians chapter 4 verse 21.** He does this back to back comparison and to defend his ability to do this

back to back comparison between those who are in bondage to Jerusalem that's here on earth and those who are free. This is the two wives: Hagar, the one in bondage. Sarai, the free woman. Jerusalem that's here on earth. Jerusalem, in heaven. To identify that there is this back to back comparison, he has to address a significant and important point.

The Jerusalem that's here on earth has a priesthood. And that priesthood had been promised to the family of Aaron. And the covenant that had been entered into between Aaron and God was a permanent covenant that would last forever. That's the way it's worded, which in and of itself becomes significant when we start trying to work out what forever means. But to prove, to put into force, to put into effect,

the theology of Galatians 4, that there's the church that is in bondage and the church that is free. That there's a Jerusalem on earth and a Jerusalem in heaven. He has to show you that the priesthood of Aaron has been destroyed and that's what Hebrews chapter 7 is all about: The destruction of the priesthood of Aaron.

Now there's a lot of things that go with the priesthood of Aaron. And one thing that we've already discussed, already been mentioned, is that it's a **male-centric priesthood**. And what he does here, he doesn't go ahead and prove something in a sophisticated way, he just states it as a fact. The fact that he states is **that God has changed the law**. So the agreement, the law, the deal, the covenant that God made with Aaron, God has just ripped that up and put it to one side and He has gone into another law. Now, **this other law is not with Aaron, it's with His son, Jesus Christ**. And to give some kind of defense of that, what he's going to is the story of Melchizedek. And in the **story of Melchizedek**, this is going to be the proof he gives to us that there can be this change of priesthood and what this new priesthood is going to look like. And it's

this chapter that becomes so significant to this movement where we start banding around the word “priest”.

We all call ourselves priest. It just rolls off the tongue because I don’t think we fully comprehend the significance of what it means to be a priest. Because the only legitimate legal status that you have for being the priest is by understanding the law that’s been destroyed here and the law that’s been instituted in Hebrews chapter 7, if you can understand, **repeat and enlarge**. So all of this is happening in the history of Christ. There’s an old vanguard, an old priesthood, and there’s going to be a new priesthood. And that history, that dynamic has to be brought into our own. **So there’s going to be a destruction of old priesthood which is the priesthood of SDA-ism: the priesthood of men where men lay hands upon one another all through this history and there’s going to be a new priesthood now after the order of Melchizedek. And everybody, anybody, can be that type of a priest.** You don’t need to have some heritage, or some educational training, or any kind of prior history. All you need to do is be righteous in your own stead and that’s the argument that Paul’s going to develop here.

Then he goes into **chapter 9** and he’s going to explain about the development of **this change of location from the Jerusalem that’s on earth to the Jerusalem that is in heaven.** He’s not going to use the symbol of Jerusalem. He’s going to use the **symbol of sanctuary and in between chapter 7 and 9** is chapter 8 where we are at. In Hebrews chapter 8 verse 1, because we’ve got this new priest, this is what we can say. “Now of the things which we have spoken” (Ch. 1-7), specifically Ch. 7, this is the sum, this is the conclusion of everything that I’ve taught so far. “We have such a high priest who is set on the right hand of the throne of the majesty in the heavens”. **He’s going from earth to heaven. That’s the summary of everything that he’s taught from chapters 1-7,** and he explains the logic through that. We’re in Ch. 8 spoken about Ch. 9.

Chapter 10 is a continuation of Ch. 9- all about the sanctuary service and what is his appeal in Ch. 11? What do you have to do? **You have to have enough faith to believe everything that he's taught you thus far.** If you don't have enough faith to believe that, you're not going to be saved. And the reason you can have so much faith in this history, this experience that he's speaking about is what? What's the evidence that you can have all this faith? **He's going to list all those people from the past and he's going to say what? They had enough faith to believe all of these things and therefore you can.**

We read a passage a few days ago. What had Moses received when he went up the mountain besides the 10 Commandments? What did he see? What did he receive? It wasn't just the 10 Commandments. It was also the plan of salvation. And the glory that was shone from his face, it wasn't just the glory of the 10 Commandments. What glory was also was that? **It was the glory that shone from Calvary.** Remember that? So we know that **Moses understands the plan of salvation, which therefore means that if he understands the glory of the cross,** he understands the book of Hebrews when he says in Ch. 11 look at the faith of all of these people. He's saying if Moses can believe it, if Abraham can believe it, if all these people can believe it, what problem do you have with believing all of this? Because it is harder for them than it is for you because they had to see by faith. But you, it's happening before your very eyes- all of these things. So you actually don't need faith. That's what Hebrews 11 is dealing with. We're in Hebrews **Ch. 8 and what he is going to do- he's going to give the evidence now the Christ is the new High Priest. Verse 2: a minister of the sanctuary and of the true tabernacle in heaven which the Lord built, created, set up and not human beings.**

I want us to see an important principle here. Is the tabernacle that's in heaven good or bad? How do you know it's good? What does it say in

the verse that makes you say it's good? Because we can see that it's the true tabernacle. If that's the true tabernacle, what is the other one? It's the false tabernacle. Did it say false? Who instructed Moses to build that tabernacle? God. Was it built after a pattern? Yes. Was it perfect? Yes. Why did you call it false then? Why do you call it false if it was so good? The reason you call it false my sister says, parable is because even if he didn't understand parables, even if you don't believe in juxtaposition, even if you don't believe in compare and contrast, see what the point that he is making here. You can see in the verse, if you don't like seeing it in the verse, keep your finger here and go to the book of Galatians because we have to take line upon line, verse upon verse, proof text. Let's proof text this.

If you're not happy to call the tabernacle on earth false because that's the opposite of true, we're in the book **of Galatians Ch. 4**. I already mentioned this but we're just going to read the verse. Chapter 4, v 21: **It's v 23** that I want us to go to but I'm going to pick up from v 21: Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law? For it is written that Abraham had 2 sons, the 1 by a bondmaid, the other by a freewoman. But he who was of the bondwoman was born after the flesh; but he of the freewoman was by promise. Which things are an allegory: for these are the two covenants; the one from the Mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar. For this Agar is Mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children.

I don't know if you remember but a few days ago, it was on this board over here, I think, where we went through how parables would work and we spoke about the sermon by the sea and what can you compare that with? The Sermon on the Mount. That's **Matthew 13**. You're going to compare with **Matthew 5** – the beatitudes. **Beatitudes means good news, good message, good mountain**. So if that is the good mountain,

what can we compare that mountain with? A good mountain. What's another good mountain? The name of that one? Mount Gerizim, and this mountain are not the same mountain. But because they're both good, does a good sermon on them, we can compare them. If you've got Mount Gerizim, which is a good mountain, you can compare that to which mountain? Mount Ebal because Mount Ebal is a good or bad mountain? It's a bad mountain. **It's the blessings and the cursings of the book of Deuteronomy, which takes you to the book of Leviticus: the blessings and the curse. 2520.**

So now you've got from the sea to the Mount of Blessings to Mount Gerizim to Mount Ebal. And then we're in John ch 4, remember? **John ch 4**, they're having a conversation and they are in the valley, and it's Jacob's well there and the Samaritan woman is going to point to the top of a mountain where her temple is and what mountain is that? Mount Gerizim. And she says, isn't this a good mountain? Compared to what? Your mountain – speaking to Christ. What is Christ's mountain? That's Mount Zion. Now, we've gone to a totally different mountain, Mount Zion. So she's going to compare the Samaritan temple with the temple of Mount Zion in Jerusalem. And Christ says that they're both bad. None of them fit for purpose. One of them used to be good. One was the Mount of Blessing. Now Mount Zion, not Mount Gerizim. **Mount Zion was the Mount of Blessing and now Gerizim, your mountain was the Mount of curse because you're a Samaritan and you've got a false religion. Now they're both not fit for purpose and there's a new way of entering into salvation.** Now if you are struggling to jump through all those hoops, that's exactly what Paul does. We just read it. He says you've got these women, two wives, one is a bondwoman and one is a freewoman.

Then he says, v 23 "but he who was of the bondwoman was born after the flesh (so flesh means bondage), but he of the freewoman, by promise

(so you've born after the promise, born after the flesh). If you're familiar with Paul's writing, this is the book of **Romans, Ch. 8**. She's Romans Ch. 8, you're born in the flesh, or you're born after the spirit. If you're going to do that, you need to go to Romans Ch. 6 and Romans Ch 7. So if you want to understand what Romans Ch. 7 is, that man who is doing all those struggles, to understand who he is, you need to understand if he's born of the spirit or if he's born of the flesh. So Paul uses the same imagery in all of these stories. Verse 24: which things are a parable for these are the two covenants. **What are the 2 covenants? Bondage and Freedom. Flesh/ Promise. Old Covenant/ New Covenant.** For these are the 2 covenants: the one from Mount Sinai which gendereth to bondage which is Agar. So the covenant at Mount Sinai, let's not ask Paul, let me ask you: God is going to take you out of Egypt and he's going to give you a covenant at Mount Sinai. Was that good covenant or a bad covenant? That was a good covenant. Would God do anything bad? No. He's not going to enter into a bad covenant. So He, in good faith, is going to enter into a good covenant with you.

This is the covenant at Mount Sinai. Was it a good or a bad one? It's a good covenant. What does Paul say it is? It's a bad one. He says what is good, he's going to turn it into bad. So you need to understand why he says that. I don't want to make that point. Just observing that the things that are good can become bad. Just like Gerizim can be good, then become bad. Mount Zion was good and becomes bad. Can we see from **John Ch. 4 that Mount Zion, Jerusalem, the temple becomes a bad mountain because you can't find salvation there?** So it's not in your mountain and not on the Jews' mountain. You can't find salvation and you find a new route. So we can see that that mountain is not good. It's going to make the same point here. So the Mountain of Sinai becomes a mountain of bondage. Then he says for this Agar, Agar is the wife of bondage. Then she has a son called Ishmael, bondage, born of flesh. This is Mount Sinai, bondage, which is in Arabia. Then he says which

answereth. So what does it mean which answereth? If you've got marginal reading, in my Bible it says "same rank as, or equal to". **What is Sinai equal to? Jerusalem which is Mount Zion. So can you see how he jumps from wives to children to covenants to mountains to another mountain.**

So, is Mount Zion a good or bad mountain? It's a bad mountain. Right here it says which equals Jerusalem, which now is and is in bondage with the children. Who is the children of Jerusalem? The Jewish nation. There all in bondage. So, this is his argument that he uses over and over again. There are two children.

What are their names? Ismael and Isaac. Two boys, two mothers which are symbols of two covenants; good and bad. So the children of Jerusalem which now is, literally, they're in bondage. So, if you believe in literalism, what covenant are you under? What relationship do you have with God? You are under the old covenant, the covenant of Mount Sinai, and you are in bondage. What church is that? In the time of Christ? This is the Sanhedrin. This is Caiaphas, Annas. We call it Laodicea. **Are the Laodiceans in bondage? Of course they are in bondage.**

You go to **Mt. 23:38**; this is speaking about the temple, **the temple we just read in Heb. 8. He does not say the word temple. What does he say? Your house.** Now that house which He says is your house is the same house that He speaks of in Jn. 2. In **Jn. 2, beginning around v. 17 to 20, whose house is that in Jn. 2? He says that this is My Father's house.** What are you doing to My Father's house? The same house, 21 chapters later, in a different book, the book of Mt. He now says, who has ownership of that house? You; it's your house. It's not My house. It's not My Father's house. How come this is not My Father's house? Where is His Father's house now? In heaven. If we are going to say that it's the temple in Jerusalem, we didn't quite get this, v. 26, Gal. 4:26, But Jerusalem, which is above, This is the true tabernacle which the Lord

pitched, which we just read in Heb. 8. So, **this Father's house moved location from earth to heaven. And has Christ died yet? He hasn't even died yet and you already have a new temple up there in heaven.**

When you have a temple, what do you need to have? You need to have a high priest. Christ is already the high priest here on earth, and He hasn't even died yet. I just want us to see that. So, when He goes into the trial, who is He confronted with? Caiaphas and Annas. Caiaphas is the high priest. You have a high priest standing in front of a high priest. One is in bondage and one is free. They are standing before each other. This high priest, is he recognized? No. Does He recognize Caiaphas? Kind of because in Heb. 7, that law has already been destroyed. So, Caiaphas isn't even the high priest. But Christ, if I can say it this way, gives him lip service because everybody thinks, all those people in bondage, thinks that Caiaphas is the high priest. If you think he is the high priest we'll play it your way. So, He offers him this respect, but in reality, **Caiaphas is not the high priest, even before the cross.** Hopefully we can see that. So, I'll just read Gal. 4:26. But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all. Who is us? Paul. This is Ephesus.

Ephesus is comprised of the Hebrews, the disciples that have joined, and the Gentiles. So, you got two groups of people. **You got the children that are in bondage, Laodicea. You got those who are free, Ephesus.** So, let's go to Heb. 8 again, v. 2. Christ, the minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched and not man. So, **man's tabernacle is the false one.** Now, people have a problem when you use this kind of black and white inflammatory language. And they say that this is error that you are teaching. Did Paul use inflammatory language? When he says, all of you people, you are in bondage. Your mother is an Egyptian, and you were created through fornication. You are all in bondage to whom? To Satan. That's the only one you can be in bondage to. This is the old covenant you're under. Everything bad. That's pretty

inflammatory language. And what's his argument? What's his defense? Somewhere up there beyond Orion, there is another temple that you haven't seen; you may not even believe in, especially if you are a Sadducee. If you are a Sadducee, you don't even believe in that.

So, he wants you to put all your faith in something that you have never seen, and there is this person who comes from Nazareth, and there is nothing good that comes from Nazareth. And this person is meant to be the Messiah. He doesn't meet any of the criteria, of what a real Messiah would be like. Wasn't born in the right place. He doesn't have the right characteristics. He is a nobody. All of this evidence Paul offers and says, you make a choice. Can you see how hard and difficult it is for someone to actually have enough faith to do all of that. And he is going to use all of this, really, I am saying, inflammatory language. So, he is going to say, everything that Moses did, that whole tabernacle was what kind of tabernacle? False. It was not real. It was not genuine. Can you see how upset people would be; why they want to kill this man? Who said such poisonous words to them, and not only to them, what is he saying about Moses? It's bad. He is some kind of a fake prophet. He is not holding him in the highest esteem that he should. **So, when we use parables today and we start making those kind of comparisons, people who are in bondage get upset.**

Let me show you. Rev. 3:14, this is the story of what church? Laodicea. Now, is Laodicea a church that is alive or dead? Dead. Can you have something that is in between? Black or white or grey, something that is hazy? No. It's black or white. Right or wrong. So, you are either alive or dead. There is no midway point. We don't believe in evolution, do we? God speaks, and it is so. You come out of death and you enter into life. We are all OK with that? So, what do Adventists pretend to be? Alive. What are they really? And therefore, they have the appearance of being lukewarm. So, I want to contend, if you never thought about this before, **that SDAs are not lukewarm. There is no such condition.** That might be

like a zombie. You're dead but you are walking. The walking dead. There is no real zombies in this world. They don't exist. It's a fragment of people's imagination. So you can show that. Go to Mt. 23. You've got dead people who are in a coffin and they are all rotten, all decay. And what does this coffin look on the outside? They don't call them coffins. They call them sepulchers. They are all white. So, they give this fake impression that they are all clean and righteous. But inside are dead men's bones. **And dead men's bones equal two things: hypocrisy and iniquity.**

That's what SDA is. Hypocrisy and iniquity. We're doing sin. What sin do SDAs do? What criminality are they doing? They don't understand the time in which they live. It's simple as that. It's not what they eat, not what they wear. They have no idea what their job function is. Because when the time comes, when we are supposed to be teachers, what do we need? We need someone to come and teach us. The same story we read, or we spoke about in Heb. 5 and 6. The history is repeating. **So, we are people who don't understand our job function. Teachers. That is the iniquity that we are committing. We are supposed to be teachers and we are not. That is sin. Hypocrisy. What's their hypocrisy? We claim to be good but we're bad. We came to be the solution to the problem and what are we? We're the problem. We say that we are free, but what are we? We're in bondage. This is the criminality of a Laodicean.**

Now, that was Rev. 3. If you go to **Rev. 3:1, this is Sardis**. So, I want to put Sardis on a time line. **Sardis is the church that comes in at the TOE, 1798, if you like.** And unto the angel of the church in Sardis write; "These things saith He that hath the seven Spirits of God, and the seven stars; I know thy works, that thou hast a name that thou livest and art dead." So, works are what you do; the things that you do; the actions that you practice. What condition are you in? Last part of the verse. Dead. So, your actions are actions of what kind of a person? A dead person. So these are

all actions of a dead person. Can dead people move around? In real life they can't. But spiritually can they? Yes. If you are dead for any length of time, what do you turn into? Bones. **What's the definition of bones? Iniquity and hypocrisy.** So, you are dead people. But what do you claim to be? You have a title on your forehead. What's your name? Sardis. **And what does Sardis mean? Last part of the verse, it says, thou hast a name that thou livest, and thou art dead.**

Your name says that you're alive, but your work says that you are dead. What are the works that you are doing? You're supposed to be.....teachers, and you're not teaching. So, these dead works are not what you eat or drink, or what you wear. These are prophetic important subjects. Sardis is the time period of what we call the Millerites. Now the Millerites, where do they come from? What denomination are they? What group of people are they? The Millerites? They are Protestants. So, they get cut out of Protestantism. What's the name of that mountain? Rev. 3:1. Sardis. So, they are going to get cut out of Sardis. (Drawing of a stone being cut out of the mountain) What's Sardis' problem? They're dead. Their works are dead. What's the job function of Sardis? What are they supposed to be teaching? What has just happened?

Hold that thought there, go to this board. Where are we? Where are we, that little picture of a mountain with the stone? **We are here; 1798. And this is the TOE.** Remember, that the TOE is not the end of something. It's the beginning of something. This is the beginning of the end. It's the beginning of the end. How do you know that you are the beginning of the end? You are a teacher so you're going to teach people that we are at the beginning of the end, and they are going to say, how do you know? And you're going to say, if you stand on the top of the parapet of the castle, take your binoculars and have a look, what can you see? What can you see? You can see the end now. Could you see the end before? You couldn't see the end before. **Now you come to a point in time where**

you can now see the end. That's what TOE means. It doesn't mean that you come to the end of the previous history. This is ignorance. Ignorant people don't do what? They don't teach.

Now, you come to a time period where ignorance stops. You come to a time when you can identify the end, and what are you supposed to do? **Teach.** We saw this in Hebrews. If you go to Isa. 28, line upon line, that's v. 10 and 13. You've got 11 and 12 in between them. In 11 and 12, **what is God going to do? He is going to raise up teachers to teach you. It's always about raising up teachers to teach you. You raise up teachers at the TOE.** These teachers get raised up, the people who is supposed to do all this teaching, what's their problem according to Gal. 4? They are in bondage. **So, you got to have people who are free who are going to try to take this people who are in bondage, bring them out of bondage so they could become teachers, and therefore they can do this great work.**

So, you're here in the TOE. And what do you know? The end is coming. Someone is going to say, "When"? And you're going to say, in 46 years. Depending on how accurate your message is. It's obvious that's not the right answer. But that's what they would have been saying. 1798 to 1844. You have different numbers. But you know when it's going to happen. **So, it becomes a subject of time. What are you teaching? Time. What was Paul teaching? Time. What was John the Baptist teaching? Time. What was Christ teaching? Time. What does it mean when something is fulfilled? Time is being fulfilled. What time is being fulfilled? Dan. 9. Dan. 9 is being fulfilled. Part one of Dan. 8:14. 2300 days.** The sanctuary is about to be cleansed. Was that sanctuary cleansed at the time of Christ? Mt. 23:38. Was it cleansed? Christ attempted to clean it how many times? Twice. What does He end up doing? He says, your house is not going to get cleansed, you're going to sever it; your house is left unto you desolate. We're going to go where? To heaven. So, He's going from earth to heaven.

There is a heavenly sanctuary. It's all about the 2300 days, the cleansing of the sanctuary. 490 years. The time has been fulfilled. So, the problem with Sardis is that they are dead. Dead equals what? They got to do a work. What's the work they got to do? To teach. What are they supposed to teach? Time. So, if you're dead, it's no time. Alive means time. So, in order to give the world a message about time, this dead church has to have something done to it. **What needs to happen to that dead church? A stone is going to be cut out from that and that stone is what we call the Millerite movement, and are they alive or dead? They are alive. What name have they got? Philadelphia. Church number 6. They are Philadelphia. We're not going to put a waymark to that for the purpose of this study. I'm not attempting to do that. But, they are Philadelphia. What's the problem with Philadelphia? Nothing. They have everything correct.**

We might call that, the Bible says brotherly love. What does brotherly love look like? Is it giving each other hugs and treating each other nicely? That's not brotherly love is. **What is brotherly love? It means everyone being on the same page, having the love for the truth. What is the truth? Time. So Philadelphia is the love of time, which is the truth. This is the brotherly love that they have one for another.** They can argue; they can fight; they can do what they want; they can mock each other. But they have this one thing that binds them together. And it's the subject of time. We're in Heb. 8. (There is a question or a comment from the audience) Elder Parminder answers, Yes, it's the culmination of an event. In this story here is time of the 2300 day prophecy, the 1335, the 2520. It's a prophetic time period. Yea. **It's all about prophecy.**

So, we got a problem with Sardis. Who is the prophet of Sardis? Miller. Are we not sure about that? Or we don't like calling him a prophet? God's angels came to this person's mind and directed him to the right place; to

give the right message in the right way. So, you got Sardis, and he's a prophet. This is Miller. Miller is the prophet for Sardis. Obviously, he comes into Philadelphia. Why would we say that he is the prophet of Sardis? He's got somethings right, and he's got somethings wrong. **Because connected with this love of time, you got to have a love of what other issue? Geography. You got to know what the sanctuary is. He gets all the timing correct, but what does he make a mistake on? On the sanctuary; on the geography; which is connected to the time prophecy itself.** So, he's not doing things correct. So, I've got time here, but there's also the subject, I'm going to call it, bad geography. **Geography is the location of the sanctuary.**

So, don't get tripped up by what I mean by geography. Is the sanctuary in heaven or is it the earth? It's not the sanctuary on the earth. It's the earth itself. We're OK with that? **When you clean the sanctuary, you're going to destroy the earth by fire.** Peter speaks about that. He's going to get this, there's a problem here about geography and time. Sardis got both of this problem, haven't they? Because this is where Miller got this idea from. So, he is the prophet in this dispensation. Even though I said that the Millerites -are in Philadelphia, Sardis is this time period- 1798 and I'm going to go to 1850. I'll put 1844 here. And Philadelphia would cut into this history here as well. So, he's the prophet for this time period; if we're OK with that? Which prophet follows him? Ellen White. And this is the prophet of Laodicea. So, what's the problem with Laodicea? They're lukewarm. They're dead. **What makes you dead? You're not teaching.**

You're not doing the job that you are supposed to do. **They have a problem with two issues: Time and geography. So, geography here is a code word for what? (Pointing to Miller's time) Sanctuary. Geography here, (pointing to EGW's time) is code word for what? This one's a bit tricky. So, I'm going to put a few words here to give an idea: Laodicea,**

covetousness, and the word I want us to have in our minds is what? What is covetousness? Worldliness. So, I'm going to put worldliness, which comes from the word, world. So, where are you looking? At the world. Where should you be looking? To heaven. Where were these people looking, (pointing to the Millerites)? To the earth. Where should they be looking? Heaven. And

you see that we've got the same problem (pointing to the EGW's time). Problem with geography. Here is the earth. This is these people. Sardis. Here's heaven. Where should they be looking? Up here (heaven). Where are they looking? Down here (earth).

This is the sanctuary. **This is us. Laodicea. Where are we looking? We're looking on earth. We're covetousness.** We're looking at the dollar signs. We're looking at our houses, our cars, our education; everything that makes life comfortable. That's what the Jewish people did, isn't it? I think we read this, I think, with Sister Brittany's presentation, when they went to Babylon, what should they have done? Because God says, don't resist, don't fight. You're going to stay in Babylon for 70 years. So, make your homes there. Did God want them to go all the way and become Babylonian citizens? To get their passports? No. Have they made that mistake before? (Yes, from the audience) Where? Egypt. Good. This is Joseph. He says that you can stay for a little while, but they settled down and they became Egyptians.

When they were in Babylon, they should've maintained their religious belief system. Did they have the freedom to do that, in Babylon? They did. They were afforded the right to keep their religion. But, they didn't want to. They liked the government schools. They liked the educational system. They liked the wages they were receiving. All in Babylon. They became assimilated. When the time come for them to say we want to leave, all those Jewish children are grown up. What do they say? We're not even Hebrews anymore. **Our affiliation is with the Babylonians.** And

who's the person that you know, by name, fits into that category? They are cousins. Mordecai. Is Mordecai, good or bad? He loves Babylon so much he doesn't want to go. Now is he good or bad? He's bad. He's been assimilated into the Babylonian mindset. He loves it there. He doesn't want to leave his home. Does that sound like a familiar story to you? If you're familiar with the story of Anne Frank, and all those Jews who lived in Germany, what was their problem? Because those people were not dumb and they're not blind. Because they see that in 1931, 32, what could they see? Hitler rising and they know that trouble is ahead of them. What's their problem? They love Germany. You've got a good business there; you've got homes. You can't sell it. I don't think you can even sell it for half price. You're going to have to give your stuff away, and you have to flee, and they don't want to. What is Mordecai's problem? His cousin is just as bad as him. Esther.

So, I just want us to see that it is really easy to lose your track. The reason I say all of that is because Ellen White said that they should've maintained their religious beliefs. They should've established the schools of the prophets while they were in Babylon. They had liberty and freedom to do that so the children would have been educated in the ways of their forefathers. So when it was time to leave, they would've said, yep, we're ready to leave and go home. But they weren't. So, can we see that how it's all the same? **Problem with Adventists is that we look to the world, and we've forgotten to look towards heaven.** Now, I put dollar signs but I want us to be really clear on this. I'm not accusing the Adventists of being selfish, unkind, or money grabbing people, because I don't think they are. When I say they, you, me; I don't experience that. I've never experienced a lack of generosity or watch-care by my fellow brethren and sisters in this church. Adventists are some of the most kindly, generous people that I have ever met. So, even if I put this sign here, the sign of worldliness, that's what Laodicea is.

All this is, is the problem with what subject? Geography. We're looking here on earth. We're not looking at heaven. And what's our other problem? Time. No time; bad geography. Who's our prophet? Ellen White. What is she going to teach us? She'll teach you no time. Good or bad? Bad. It's a bad thing to teach you that's there's no time. She's going to teach you no time and she's going to say, we're not going anywhere quite yet. And if you ask her when are we going to leave, what is she going to tell you? I don't know. No one knows when we're leaving this planet. Only God knows. So, when we start to make this back to back comparison (between Sardis, Miller, and Laodicea, White), does Miller come out looking good here? No, he does not. The problem is, does Ellen White come out looking good here? No, she doesn't.

People do not understand how parables work. Because they see this as a moral attack upon the prophet of the Lord. And they don't understand how we are supposed to understand all of what's gone wrong in our churches history. Paul understands. That's why he can go to Hebrews 8:2 and he says, you know that thing that Moses built was false. Wasn't true. It served its purpose, when? In the time of Moses. It served its purpose then. Here we are, Ellen White, there's a big problem because we're going to come back to this chart. We're here now, 1850. What happened in 1850 according to that chart there? What we're supposed to go into? EW 74. Gathering. Gathering means that we're going to come back together. We've figured out all of our problems in this history, and now we're going to do evangelism. What's the symbol of evangelism? The 1850 chart. They are going to start teaching the Sabbath. They are going to start teaching the world that the second-advent is imminent. Years and years in the future? No. It's imminent. It's about to come.

So, they're going to be gathered on track, on time. You see gathering one, between 1798 and 1844. Gathering one comes back to this history, (Sardis). The Philadelphians, the Millerite movement, what do they have

correct? Subject of time. So, when we start talking about the gathering here, and they say second-advent is about to come, what must they provide? They have to provide time. So, this is using line upon line methodology, dispensationalism used correctly to demonstrate and to prove that they should and would have worked out when the second-advent was coming. They would've worked that out. Then Laodicea would have become a good word or a bad word? It would become a good word. You could take all this understanding and turn it into good.

The church is going to be judged. All is going to bring judgement. All positive. All good. So, when you could show that, what ends up happening is, they are supposed to do this mission, Second Advent is going to come, and what do they end up deciding to do? Turn their attention, because Christ is about to come out of the Most Holy Place and they look where? Here on earth. They are going to get wrapped up and tied up in earthliness. Or worldliness. Who drives that? Who makes that happen? Satan. If you go to EW, and you go to about the middle of the book, the chapter title is called, "Covetousness". If you read that chapter it will tell you that Satan has a business meeting, and in the business meeting, he says, this is how we're going to attack the SDA church. We're going to turn their attention from heaven to earth. Bad geography. And the way we're going to do that is by introducing thoughts and ideas that we don't know anything about time. We're going to have a short break and come back. Let's pray.