

Clothes Principles

Elder Tess Lambert France SOTP Video 36

Key

A. = Audience

Italics = difficult to here portion of audio OR difficulty understanding translation

So this morning we moved from putting things in columns. We had listed our verses in columns and shown progression. Instead we just drew one long line. We began it with Eden and ended with Eden. By seeing it on a reform line, I am hoping we can see the progression. So beginning in Eden we first traced how different races were to interact. How God instituted slavery whether through Noah, Abraham or ancient Israel. When we trace the history of slavery and take all of those quotes, see that it was an institution that God had brought. We see harsh distinctions between Jews and Gentiles all through the Old Testament. Harsh differences made between Israelites who held an Israelites passport and surrounding nations.

We traced that through the old testament and brought it into the new. We see some changes. Jew or Gentile. What is the problem with the Pharisees in the time of Christ?

A. They said to Jesus that He was braking the law of Moses.

They said that we have an alpha history and we are going to cut it and overlay it and it shows us that Jesus is breaking all the rules. They want to see covenant there and covenant here. Jews verses Gentiles in Moses time and Jews verses Gentiles in their time. Special Nation in Moses time and Special Nation in Chirst time. Sanctuary there and sanctuary here. Male there and male here.

He starts breaking down their old testament verses. They can see it but they are struggling to prove it. They can see it's happening. It's clever how He is doing it because He needs to get through the history without them killing Him until the time is right. So He evades their questions. They try to trap Him on it but He avoids it. So we see their problem that they think Christ is breaking down the law of Moses. When I said what is their problem, I want us to see that what is bothering them, is that after all of their idolatry they are finally come to a place where they are keeping the law. Every part of it. The Pharisees think that they are therefore fulfilling it. When they go to keep that law, just as they read it, they think people have to be stoned. Also that they have special rights because of their passport and a king is going to come who is going to defeat the Romans and restore the social order. Which means the Romans are their Slaves. They are not looking for equality between Jew and Gentile. They have a whole set of books that say Jew...Slave. So when they come to Christ time they are looking for a king who is going to restore their social order. Instead they find Christ, instead of restoring their social order, says they are the problem.

Their ideas of social order are no longer acceptable. So if we consider those thoughts I think we can have some understanding of their position. They have a strong reason to behave the way they do. We come

to Philemon and we see slavery. It still is seemingly approved by God. We can go through the whole of the Bible and make the argument of the South and say the Bible is a pro-slavery book. We come to 1798 and you find that this glorious land is modeled after this glorious land. Old glorious land has slavery and new glorious land has slavery. The old one is instituted by God so the South says "we have the whole of the bible on our side so this is instituted by God". So then you see two different methods for understanding inspiration. The South who is pro-slavery take all of this older history and bring it into their day. The North handles it differently. The Abolitionists and EGW. We have gone from slavery being instituted and permitted to a history where God says that it's the sin of America that will lead to it's destruction.

This line, when we look at race, becomes a history of progression. Some people want to take the negative perspective and say that you are saying God is an evolutionist. My problem with that is that all I have done is write names and dates on the board. So you choose how you read it. If they want to say it's not evolution, that's fine. They define what this means. They don't like it laid out this way, but I don't even have to bring in interpretation into this. It's just words, verses, people, and they can see that it's evolution. I would argue they have chosen an ugly word because they don't like what they are seeing. If instead of saying evolution you would say restoration they would have absolutely no argument.

When we come to race we see a restoration, when you come to a place where everyone knows they are equal. They all know that they are required by God to treat with equality externally in the world and internally with Gods people. Everyone knows that that kind of Nationalism and Racism is wrong. But it wasn't like that at the beginning. It has taken thousands of years to get people to that point.

Then we drew up our columns because you know what we are comparing and contrasting. If you were to summarize how Donald Trump thinks, these aren't his words, but they fit. I'll read what I think he is saying.

-America is the world dominant super power and white Christian males sit at the top of our nations food chain. That's the right and proper hierarchy and it's under threat. -

Behind everything Trump says are the same concepts. The Nations identity as the glorious land, as a peculiar set apart people, is under threat. What makes them peculiar is this hierarchy. At the very top of the world is the U.S. and who runs the U.S. has to be white (racism), Christian (Church and state), Male (Sexism). So it's more than church and state. They have to be white, they have to be male. You can do studies, they have done studies, that what the culture change that has occurred in America that has given rise to Donald Trump, is this feeling of being threatened. That the social order where superior groups dominate inferior groups, is being threatened. And how it's being threatened is by minorities. Even women, many women, are afraid of the breaking down of their social order. So what they want is the preservation of their social order. So white, Christian and male. They can see that break down when they have a black president. This is why from that point you see them mobilize. By the time you get to 2016, they have an election based on Trump and based on fear. Behind his tweets and his rally's, he is feeding peoples fear about the break down of their social order. Through different studies they do, they can connect sexism and racism. They are inseparable. Someone who is racist, they almost always have a problem with women. You get those vaccines. They do more than one thing. They can vaccinate you for more than one disease. I would suggest this is the same. Sexism and racism are linked. If you are going to understand one you are also going to understand the other. If you are going to truly vaccinate against one, you should be vaccinated against the other.

So we mark progression with racism. Then we went to the position of women. At Eden what is Eve's position? Equal. And then what happens? She sinned first. A change comes to that social order. You can see that from Eden. You come to Abraham speaking about a covenant. Only a male can undergo circumcision and go into covenant. God went into covenant with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Their wives are separated from the process. You come into this history of alpha glorious land you have priests and Levites. Purely male roles. Through the history of Solomon. This is the history of Kings. Was is ever in ancient Israel's psychology that they could be safely ruled by a woman? No. That was only a male role. Original glorious land is only led by men. Then you come into the New Testament. Now baptism and covenant can also be undertaken by women. So it's now both male and female that can enter into covenant with baptism. So you immediately know that race is progression and gender is progression.

You come into the history of EGW and women are more involved then they have ever been. And even if she doesn't push her point about herself, the very fact that the one person they have to listen to or die throughout their history from the beginning of her ministry to her death, is a woman. And Every leader of the general conference in any position has to sit at her feet and obey or die. Then we come into our history. Now we have Priests and Levites. Male or female? Now we come to priesthood and it's male and female. So the fear from the conservatives all the way through is as follows. For the Pharisees, Jesus is breaking down their social order. For the American South, the abolitionists are breaking down their social order. The Christian conservative right today, the liberal left is breaking down their social order. It is connected to race and it is connected to gender. Because they are going to go back to their quotes in the old testament history. There is a difference made to race in ancient Israel so you come to the U.S. The mentality behind the South in the Civil War has not changed. They are saying that there is a difference made to race. They cannot be equal. There is a difference made between Jew and Gentile, therefor the American today has to be Christian. There is a difference made in ancient Israel about who can rule. Only a male. So in our history you can't have a female ruler. They have done a very good job at cutting their line and taking all of their cues or instruction from the alpha glorious land. So the Christian right argues that they have all the quotes on their side.

So we dealt with it with race and we saw that what we are marking are different dispensations. While we are used to cutting those up, to see the issue of race, we have to see those dispensations as progressive. When we come down to EGW history, she is against slavery but she is also for segregation, against equal rights for black and white, and against mixed marriage. You can argue why she is. I just want you to see that she is. Which begs the question. Are we happy with her view and following her instructions on race? No. So When we talk about EGW, we talk about our pioneers, they are a different dispensation just as we would consider Moses and ancient Israel. Therefore we need to consider that history as a different dispensation.

The rest of this mornings class was a discussion. I wanted us to consider the differences between black and white. The only differences that people gave me were superficial. The skin is the largest organ of the body. So there is some organ difference. Everyone is content with that. Some people's hair fibers are more flat which makes them curl. Some are more round and go straight. You have those superficial differences. They do not make a differences in the persons capability. Then we went from race into gender. I asked the question what is the difference between male and female. People had a day to think about it. This morning the ones that were given were estrogen and testosterone. Do men have estrogen? Yes. Do women have testosterone? Yes. So depending on the individual they have different rates of both. It's not black and white it is a scale. You can see fairly generally men have more testosterone and women have more of the estrogen. Then you see physically that one is bigger and one can usually be smaller over averages. Then you see that for the purpose of procreation they have some

different organs so that they can make babies. So outside of making children and that mechanism what is the difference?

A. No difference.

Is everyone content with that? I don't think everyone is. I know you are not. I know you are not ok. Why brother Oscar?

A. *So in a point of view of anatomy I would be able to list more than ten point of difference regarding men and women.*

Give us an example.

A. Adams apple

So there is a bump here at the neck?

A. The skeleton regarding your shoulder.

Do you have something I don't have? Because we already have the fact that you are bigger. So if it just an argument of bigger and smaller that is already on the board.

A. Adams apple

I'm not putting Adams apple on the board. If you are going to argue about an Adams apple that is a ridiculous argument. I need a real point.

A. *There is differences anatomically between certain organ masculine male and female and skeleton and muscles. It is not only procreation and reproduction. Functionally also it's quite identical for most part of organ. The size and shape of certain organ are different for men and women.*

You know why? Because we have some different organs of procreation which means other organs might have to fit around them differently. I don't consider that a reasonable difference, the fact that they have to fit around an ovary or an Adams apple. But we have already listed that men are larger. There is a skeletal difference. We can go to different races, depending on the race, and see black men are bigger than white men. It doesn't make for a reasonable argument to make them different.

A. Ok so I am just making this point but I don't believe that men and women have a different value and skills.

So you say women have the same skill and capacity as a man?

A. Even though anatomically it's different yes.

So there are some anatomical differences that we already have on the board. That is your point? What else?

A. *This afternoon when I was thinking about this topic I was thinking about this. I don't know if it is superficial or not but I think it will be interesting to address this issue because when I will go back they will ask me the question. the question is, the way we dress. Does it mean if we are following your logic since the beginning we should not be shocked to see man dressed like a woman and woman dressed like a man.*

Why aren't you wearing pants?

A. Because I like dresses.

Because you like dresses? So if I were to stand here teaching in pants you wouldn't mind? Because I don't like dresses.

A. Personally not but because of our baggage and knowledge and what has been taught religiously yes I will think about it.

Anyone else? Sister why are you wearing a skirt?

A. She doesn't want to speak

Ok who else? So we are all here wearing a skirt and we don't know why?

A. Because we have been taught to wear skirt.

Who taught you?

A. Because we have been taught that a woman should dress like a woman.

Who told you a dress is a womans clothing?

A. It's written in the Bible.

In the bible? If that reference is Deuteronomy 22:5 it doesn't count because they al wore dresses.

A. *So in last year we had a class in U.S.A. with Shemem and we talk about dress in time period of EGW and we understood that it was a topic that was not accepted by woman at this time period and it's a topic which has been presented as correct to the woman that the woman should dress a certain way. For all of us wo wear trousers before wearing a skirt or dress maybe it was a way as we were talking to come back to the time period of EGW. If I have to give my personal feeling, I have a feeling that when we are looking at the women in the world, at the first glance of a woman we are asking to ourselves is it a man or female? So we try to restore this physical difference between a man and a woman.*

A. *Biblically the only difference between a man and a woman it was the something at the bottom of the clothes of men that was not existing on the dress of the woman. It is true as the time is running that woman have adopted the dress code of the men and in a certain countries we can see men wearing skirt for example. For example the kilt. Or on the Turkish society they are wearing a skirt and Kazakhstan men wearing a dress.*

Everywhere.

The island Nation of Fiji the men have a traditional skirt. They do not look feminine. They look like strong men.

A. Why do you say that Deuteronomy 22:5 We can't take into account.

Because our brother just said that in that history men and women wore the same thing. But the men has a ribbon around the bottom that the women didn't have. It had a symbolic representation. When we go to a verse like that we take it as a parable.

A. The reason why we are wearing a skirt is because of two point of view physiologically and health. And regarding the society.

Society. Who's society?

A. It's regarding our historical heritage.

So it is not today's society? We are wearing it for a past society? Which past society?

A. It's all the story of the revolution and feminism.

Is feminism a bad thing? Was the feminist movement a bad movement? Short answer. I heard some Yes's. You keep that yes and I'm going to change my question. You remember that you answered yes. Was the Civil Rights movement a bad movement. I didn't see who answered yes but I want to here you say yes. Was the Civil Rights movement a bad movement? Because I am not joking. There were two movements. Civil rights and Feminism. the Church had attacked both but we have grown to accept one and not the other. Why is that? From 2014 there are two movements. "Black Lives Matter" (it's a hashtag on social media). Soon after you have the "Me Too" (it is also a hashtag on social media). Racism and sexism. Two movements originally and two movements now. Racism and sexism. If you want to attack one you attack the other.

A. The sexism is the package is feminism wrong.

What is wrong about that?

A. As soon as we are making a segregation between men and female it's bad.

So in EGW day they separate black and whites. Then you come into the civil rights movement ad these brave people, Rosa Parks, Martin Luther King Jr., are fighting for equality. We lift them up as hero's. EGW says they were not to fight for their equality. EGW says women are not to fight for equality. Don't go into politics. Don't try to gain the right to vote. Women stood up and fought. They were dragged to prison. They had pipes forced down their throats and force fed day after day, they were raped, they were beaten, and they fought for decades until they had the right that every woman in this room is used to. Some women were very angry and went to far. Some black people were very angry and went to far, but it shows how deep our problem is when we defend the Civil rights movement and attack feminism. Any other thoughts or questions?

So we have connected race and gender. Difference between black and white, difference between male and female. We have looked at the organs, the external, the skeleton. Does anyone have anything different to add?

- A. Question.. Maybe I was discreet and I didn't understand the answer or the question concerning has not been answered yet.

Sister do you want to answer his question? Why are you in a skirt?

- A. *Sister N. So I am wearing skirt because when I come into this movement, the study has been done in the year 2012, how the dress and the skirt that we are wearing now today was looking like prostitute clothes and our difference in regard to the world we should mark the difference by dressing modest. When we come into this movement our target is to put in reform. But because we understand that in some ways the clothes that represented us my target was to please God and to adopt this dress reform. This dress reform put aside the trousers.*

- A. *My sister just said something. She said that we wear dress that represent us. I remember just before I come to the school of the prophet last year that I often wear suit but at the level of the knees. Some skirt and shirt with short sleeves. I thought that this dress represent me correctly and in accord. I didn't understand everything but I change all my clothes when I came to the school. So maybe it is difficult to say that someone who is wearing a suit with good length is not represented you. Or I will give a simple example. I work with my parents, I'm white or black. So I coordinate the company of my parents with all the other partners and I meet a lot of men. I always have a longer skirt. Sometimes I have to carry heavy things and several times I almost fall. But because I decided even though I didn't understand to wear long skirt to continue to do it and I am not rebellious. I just accepted it that I have to wear long dress. But now I think in these circumstances I think that wearing trousers, not a slim one but a modest one, will allow me to work better at my job or for example in the garden.*

Sister N. do you believe that is reasonable?

- A. To wear long dress in the garden?

To wear trousers.

- A. Yes she can but we said no here.

Why do we say no?

- A. *So before I never wear skirt or dress. I would wear only trousers but it's true that society and fashion the trousers that they propose for women are really tight. This show our form and for other men it could be so my body can be a stumbling block for men.*

We say there is not difference between male and female. And we had a discussion after class. We discussed how women can also be immediately attracted to a man. The conclusion was yes. So if women can be a stumbling block for a man because their trousers are tight can a man be a stumbling block for a

woman because his trouser are tight. So why don't we both just stop wearing tight trousers. If we are thinking that a dress gives us some type of uniform as a movement you will find dozens of other movements, I can assure you, they are all almost all the exact side we don't want to be associated with. Conservative Protestantism or Adventism. So people aren't going to see us walking down the street and say oh there is one of those good people. It does not make us stand out in a positive way at all. When you are in a school and it is beside a road, people are driving past and you are wearing a long skirt in the rain gardening, people aren't going to drive past and think oh there are one of the nice reasonable group. If that's the reason we are doing it, not saying it is the only, but it is not a positive effect. Do we have any other thoughts.

- A. So today we say no for women to wear trouser because at the time period of EGW there is a tendency to confuse the gender.

Ok I will stop you there. Were they confusing the gender?

- A. at the level of clothes

How does that confuse a gender?

- A. *In the quotations I have she doesn't really explain it more. She rebukes the fact that women tend to imitate the men because at this time period there is this tendency that does not exist anymore. It's like the bicycle. We keep the principle now because now a woman will wear a pants and will not say to herself that I dress like a man. She is going to the department of women in the shop and she buy trousers that are for women.*
- A. *Sister G. mention the health issue regarding the dress reform and we have not address it so far and it is argument we talk a lot about dress reform.*
- A. *This sister did not understand the meaning of your answer when this brother mention the fact that the way we dress can be a stumbling block for men and also same in the reverse and you reply that it is equal and also a woman can be attracted by a man the way he dress.*

So when I have talked to the women I associate with and you ask them. You keep asking until they give an answer. Women can be immediately attracted to a man. We think that's just a male trait. They will see a woman and want her but women do the same thing. What the studies that they are doing are showing is that women have always been the same but they never admitted it because like many things it is not socially acceptable for women to feel that way. It is acceptable for a man to show that he is attracted and not socially acceptable for a woman. But over a couple of generations that has changed. Women are admitting that they feel the same way. Which means that if we dress so as not to be a stumbling block that applies to men and women. Yet men in this movement walk around with no shirt on. Or shorts or tight pants. No what I ask is that fair? If we are going to talk about health and modesty, those principle are equal. Male and female. That was my point.

- A. *Sister S. So in fact what you want to say through your answer is that it is at the level of men that men didn't put dress reform in place for themselves or health issue. What I understand about what you say that we women in our dress style... That means what you are saying that we keep our reform dress code and men are the ones that have to change.*

So you are saying that men have to put on skirts because that is more modest?

A. No lets be reasonable.

A. *While I understand regarding dress reform women and man are not equal. So we force women to do reform in dress but the men they did nothing. But we are not saying that reform dress of women is not valid anymore.*

I am saying that sometimes in application we are not fair. We think dress reform is an issue of women and skirts. Based on peoples answers and not what I have said, the principles are health and modesty. We have to ask both our sisters and our brother if what they are wearing healthy and modest. Is that ok? Sister S. why are you in a skirt?

A. So all the answer has been given and I agree with them.

I didn't hear any answer given that said why they are in a skirt.

A. So I found myself in health and modesty.

I said that applies to men. Then you said that I suggested why aren't they in a skirt. Then you said that wasn't reasonable. So I want to ask why it is reasonable why you are in a skirt?

A. Because for me a skirt is not a man clothes simply.

Is pants a mans clothes?

A. In my culture yes.

Is pants a womans clothes?

A. It depends

Depends on what?

A. I don't know.

Sister A.?

Sister M.? Is pants a mans clothing? Yes or no?

A. In our dispensation yes.

are pants a womans clothes?

A. No.

Based on what?

A. *The reason why pants has been created in our society, we will say regarding the shape of the trousers.... But I understand that the trousers was not made for a woman.*

So originally you are saying that trousers were a male attire. I am asking about right now. Are trousers mens clothing you said yes. Are trousers womens clothing? Is it yes or no? They say No. In our day and age you are telling me that trousers are not womens clothing? For who?

A. Yes in our time period we can wear everything.

So in our time period trousers are womens clothing. Sister M.? Are trousers women clothing today?

A. yes for me yes.

Brother A.

A. *I would like to know why the trousers are not good for the health of the woman and the trousers would be good for the health of the man? So Sister G. said that trousers are not good for women or men.*

Ok so why did men start wearing trouser in the first place?

A. To ride horses.

To ride horses?

A. *So we will focus on western world. We stay in France. It was for the practical reason why men wear pants. They said to wear trousers in dark ages men wear clothes with trousers and in this time period women wear dress. End of 1700 century women start wearing trousers and then it became general.*

A. *Brother V. The logical conclusion of this study would show that women can wear trousers.*

You are going to break down our Alpha history? Who gave you the right to do that? (audience laughs)

A. *It would put aside the fact that women are to wear skirts and we apply this in our time. This would show to me that women can wear trousers.*

Coming back to these points. We said that with dress there are two principles. Health and modesty and no one has given an argument that doesn't come down to health and modesty. Sister M. said that pants are currently in our society part of womens clothes. She is not comfortable with skirts because of quotes. Correct? So why aren't you comfortable sister M.?

A. She is agreeing that pants are not clothes for women and in 19th century after the French revolution the women choose to act like men.

Are pants clothing for men?

A. I said that today there are pants for women and men.

Answering the question are pants acceptable clothing for men?

A. Yes.

But they weren't in the history of Noah. In his dispensation it would have been strange and new. In Solomon's dispensation it would have been strange and new. All through their dispensation and Christ's dispensation it was strange and new for men. So why is it that we want to go to this dispensation in 1798 and take that one. Because the dispensation you want to go to, as I said before, is a specific one. It is this dispensation that Adventists are using quotes to decide what is and what is not acceptable. EGW says that men wear pants and women don't because for women to wear pants in that history was strange and new. But you don't see Christ in pants. So why are we going to her dispensation to decide what to do in our own?

A. *Because in our dispensation when you look in chic fashionable woman and has a lot of means to dress, will dress in a suit but with skirt.*

Was Hillary Clinton poor? No. She was the first person of her position in society to stand on stage in a pants suit. She showed her strength and conservatives didn't like it. And she showed class. So it comes down to what we think shows class that is not a prophetic argument.

A. Because she wanted to show that she was as strong as a man.

And we don't?

A. No me I am good as a woman.

But your arguments are not prophetic. An argument about style and what makes someone look stylish is not prophetic.

A. *So at this moment we will say something modest because as a man I will not wear long dress because at this moment we just show up. So in our day the woman who dress with skirt or dress is not shocking people.*

Is a woman in pants shocking people?

A. depending on what you want to show.

I will show you if you walk out into society, if I go to my catholic family on a hot Australian summers day in a long skirt, I look ridiculous and they know it. It does not set an example. It does not look classy and it is not prophetic so that is not an argument.

A. *Brother E. I would like to give an argument regarding the health. I am still in the quotation of Selected messages volume and 2 and she acknowledge that women who adopt the masculine dress code can be right in the general sense in the health issue so I don't think that wearing a dress is more healthy than wearing the trousers. We have the idea that it is the reverse.*

If it were a health principle men would be required to wear dresses. Because pants would be bad for their health so I agree with you.

- A. *Sister P. I just want to address what sister M. was saying because wearing a long dress now it is not shocking anymore but in the movement sometimes the way we are dressed I think that it can give the wrong impression of the movement. For me the principle that we have to follow is modesty and health.*

Yes.

- A. *Sister M. I would like to talk about my case. When I am going to a shop and when I look to trousers the same way I am looking to at skirts. If I look to see the principle of health and modesty are applying to this clothes and in my mind I don't have the thought that I want to dress like a man. I just want to wear something where I feel comfortable and I don't shock people. That is why for me a woman can wear trousers. Also because in our time period we can find a dress and trousers that help us be in good health and in modesty.*

If we came to Christ's history they say He is breaking down Moses. Was He? No. He understood what Moses meant and what He meant through Moses. He understood what he wanted Israel to be. He is not going against the instructions that He gave but He does believe that they have misunderstood Him. So He has to educate them. Part of that is by showing them the principle. There is progression between Moses' history and Christ's history. There is progression between Millerite history and our history. Christ did not break down the writings of Moses. We are not to break down the writings of EGW.

- A. *Brother C. Since this morning his mind is burning. He will ask two questions. ... 1 how do you deal with go back to the old paths and 2 What about the scripture is our only safeguard?*

Elder Parminder: Go back to the old paths and wear a dress mu brother. Like Jesus did. Our only safeguard is not the scriptures it is reading the scriptures correctly. As a movement we have a proven track record of not doing that. Those are the answers to both your questions. Wear a dress and read properly more or less.

One final point for our brother. The Pharisees would have said that scripture is our only safeguard. The South would have said that the scriptures are our only safeguard. Trump's base is saying that the scriptures are our only safeguard. If you want to read them the way they are reading them the same way Adventists read, we know that we are on the wrong side of SL. The final quote is HL 119.1. Do I have to point that out?

November 9 point one. End of the paragraph.

525. A plain, direct testimony is now needed, as given in the word of God, in regard to plainness of dress. This should be our burden. But it is too late now to become enthusiastic in making a test of this matter. There were some things which made the reform dress, which was once advocated, a decided blessing. With it the ridiculous hoops, which were then the fashion, could not be worn. The long dress skirts trailing on the ground and sweeping up the filth of the streets could not be patronized. But a more sensible style of dress has been adopted, which does not embrace these objectionable features. The

fashionable part may be discarded, and should be by all who read the word of God. The dress of our people should be made most simple. The skirt and sack I have mentioned may be used, not that just that pattern and nothing else should be established, but a simple style as was represented in that dress. Some have supposed that the very pattern given was the pattern that all should adopt; this is not so, but something as simple as this would be the best we could adopt under the circumstances. . . . Simple dress should be the word; try your talent, my sisters, in this essential reform. . . . **Let our sisters dress plainly, as many do, in having the dress of good material, durable, modest, appropriate for the age; and let not the dress question fill the mind.-- U. T., July 4, 1897. {HL 119.1}**

What age are we in?

A. the age of trousers sister I said.

What age are we in?

A. The last.

If we were to just go to the world they would say 1989, the big bang of the information age. 1888 is not the information age. So we are not breaking EGW when we go to her quotes because she tells us that the principles are all there. Dress appropriately for the age. Our age is not Abraham and it is not Solomon and it is not Christ. Our age is not 1888.

If you kneel with me we will pray.