

NATURE OF MAN video #30

PARMINDER BIANI

24/01/2020 Part 2

We were directed to 1T300. We went there because Ellen White speaks about the work of the 3<sup>rd</sup> angel. It's in these 3 parts.

**SABBATH    NATURE of MAN    TESTIMONY of JESUS**

We began to explain how the issue with the church was the rejection of these last two parts of the 3AM. They accepted the Sabbath and rejected the other 2 parts. And because of that issue, the message became broken or corrupted. Now what I mean by that is that it became a legalistic religion or a legalistic doctrine. We addressed all of that. Jones and Waggoner came to correct that mistake and they end up empowering the 3AM. We've addressed that issue. And the reason why we're looking at this is because we discussed in the book of Deuteronomy, is it good advice or is it law? And in English it's really straightforward whether it's good advice or legal issue. We start coming to these doctrinal concerns or our religious walk, the distinction between the two is not that straightforward to deal with because most people struggle with the concept of things being good advice without having repercussions.

We did a short review of the Nature of Man. What we did was a quick review of the existing studies in the movement that address this subject. Few years ago, a major series was done called the Nature of Man, it's about 65 presentations. It dealt with the subject at hand. Now people think that the subject was finished and they received a great blessing from it. But at the time, if you go back and review it, what people miss and it was brought up,

was the fact that it was only half the study. **It was only half the study on the subject of the nature of the human being.** What was being addressed was this half here (pointing to board of **Romans 6) GLORY 1 or symbolic resurrection.** Or, the **baptism of the person or the renewal of the heart.** And the key passage, we didn't actually read it, but which I directed you to, was **Romans chapter 6.**

And what I'm saying is that it's half the study that you need to do to tackle this issue. **The other half is the other one here (pointing to 1Cor 15 on board).** I just gave you the chapter because I wanted you to see the context. Again, I didn't read the chapter. It's a long chapter and, there are so many things that are in there that are of importance to us.

The point I wanted us to see was what I call here **GLORY 2 and it's called the LITERAL RESURRECTION.** And it's the **physical resurrection, the 2<sup>nd</sup> advent of the human shell, the human body.** And it's understanding both parts of the resurrection. **The Bible speaks about from GLORY to GLORY. It speaks about the 3-fold nature of the human being.**

The Bible doesn't explicitly state it as such. Ellen White does. **It's dealing with this concept that we are 2 parts: we are physical and we are nonphysical.** And it is an extremely complex relationship between the two. Many feedback mechanisms in both directions. So the studies that are currently being set out in the movement, address this subject here (pointing to GLORY 1). And if we were to use a singular word to help us fix the concept that we want to understand when it comes to this subject, the one word that I would ask you to put into your brain when it comes to **GLORY 1 is WILL.** What we might call WILL POWER. So, I call it "**THE**

**WILL “.** That’s what you need to understand about the whole first series on the NATURE of MAN.

Ellen White speaks about the true force of the will. Now people have gone away from this study thinking that now I have all the tools to deal with my SIN PROBLEM. It’s all about “THE WILL”. But the problem is that it’s only half the story. And even that part of that half story there are many complexities. It’s not that easy to define how a human being operates and how they are constructed. But we want to try to keep it simple so it’s workable, it’s useful. You make something too complicated, and it’s not useful and it doesn’t help us. The point of all of these studies is to simplify complex machinery- complex issues. **So this is the study of “THE WILL”.** Are we okay with that?

So there’s a whole different study that needs to be done which is not being done in the movement properly. I don’t mean that people are not aware of it. People have not spoken about it. Health lecture perhaps. But as a prophetic subject, that work has not been done. And that’s the literal resurrection – **GLORY 2 – the human shell, the BODY, or what we might call the OUTER MAN.** So the key word that I want us to think about in that, so we’re doing things backwards, we’re not even doing the study yet and I’m already giving you all the framework and the key thoughts for whenever that work would be done, by whomever it will be done.

**SO GLORY 1 was “THE WILL”. Does anyone know what word I want to put for GLORY 2? “HABIT”.**

**So there are 2 things we need to consider when we discuss the human being. THE WILL and THE HABIT.**

Now this is not a study on the HABIT. This study is not going to be done. I’m pointing it out. This is the framework of what’s to be

considered to do a complete study on the nature of the human being. And I think it was in private conversation or in class, this study was all called the NATURE of MAN. Who is the MAN? Who is that MAN? What MAN was that? The inner man? I want his name. Adam? CHRIST. So if it is your name, my name, Adam, Eve or it all works the same. People have missed that point. So, this is a generic title, MAN. If you go to 1COR 15, what's the foundational logic that Paul is going to use to develop his argument? **ADAM 1 and ADAM 2**. What's the difference? There is no difference. That's the point. He can use them interchangeably. We know that because what are their names? Adam. He's changing the name of Christ to Adam, Adam 2.

Now there are some comparisons and there are some contrasts. But essentially, they are the same person. So, this could have been equally have been called the Nature of Christ. That becomes significant because the church does not understand the humanity of Christ; what it looks like; how it's put together. Why did we even look at all of that? Why did we look at that besides Deut. Bringing this issue to us; beside the issue of good advice, like it says in Duet., be nice. And I say, I don't want to be nice. And then, what's the punishment going to be? You can't punish somebody for not being nice, can you? You don't even know what being nice mean. Why did we look at it besides that issue? What's confronting the movement today? That ugly or beautiful word depending on how you or what your view point is? How do we approach those vows, those 4 vows? This is the subject or the conflict between two world views, apparently. **The Conservatives and the Liberals. Liberalism**. What can we wear? How we suppose to dress?

Today, we're in a brand new dispensation. So Ellen White said, in her dispensation you're not allowed to eat fish. Can we eat fish

today? In our dispensation? Why not? We got this perspective that we misread everything, and the law is past and now it's only good advice. You don't have to take the advice, do you? Why is it in certain minds of people that it's ok to do that and you say that it's not ok? **Because it has an effect on GLORY 2. And GLORY 2 has a feed-back mechanism to GLORY 1.** And GLORY 1, how did you get this **new heart**? What does it mean to get a new heart? There are various ways to express it. We always want to remember, whatever the subject is, almost on any issue, there are various ways to approach or conceptualize the subject at hand. We did that with the 1<sup>st</sup> angel. We did that with the 3<sup>rd</sup> angel. Many ways to see it. Some more, some less.

So, what is a new heart? How's that work? A sanctified life. Another way to see it. Give me a Bible verse; another concept. Change of habits? Not change of habits. It's too far along the road. Simple ones. You're technically correct. You have to be. Better understanding of truth? How can you better understand the truth? Where does the truth have to be for you to better understand it? Far away or next to you? Next to you. That sounds like a parable. You get the truth and you did what to it? What do you do with the truth? You threw it next to the person, and now it stands next to you, and now you can do what? Check the truth because it is next to you. And now what are you going to do? Compare yourself to the truth. The truth needs to be next to you but not so, not literally next to you. Where does it actually need to be? In your heart. Why? To understand. The only way to understand the truth if it's next to you. If it's far away, you can't see it. To understand the truth, what do you need to understand? You're going to compare two things. **What you going to compare? Truth and yourself.** You cannot compare truth and yourself when truth is far apart. So, you bring the truth next to you. **Definition of**

**parable is to throw something near. We should all know that Greek definition of parable.**

The purpose is so that you can compare. So, where does the understanding reside? We'll just say in the heart. So, you need the law in your heart, we'll call it the truth. When it's in your heart, now you can begin to have an understanding of what is happening. **It's compare and contrast between your actions and the truth.** You can say the law. It needs to reside in your heart. That's the classic definition of a new heart, isn't it? **I will write my laws in their heart. It's a new covenant. The new deal. New agreement.** It's that the end of the agreement? No. That's part one of the new agreement. What's part two of the new agreement? New bodies.

In the time of Christ, they got this backwards. What do they want? They want new bodies, GLORY 2. They want this all visible stuff without this. They want to skip this (GLORY 1). One more approach. One more perspective of what this new heart looks like. We've done two thus far. What's the two we just did? **The law in your heart. That's the classic one. The first one we had was sanctification.** One more. It's found in the Adventist Home, I think. It's all about the study done here, GLORY 1. What's the problem when you're going to deal with this issue? What's the problem? The Will. What's the problem with the will? No problem with the will. What's the problem? **The problem is exercising the will. Exercise doesn't mean to strengthen it. It means to put it to work. What's preventing us from doing that? What's preventing the will from being exercised? The lower passions.**

So there's the clue. Lower passions, that's the clue I've just given you. What's the problem? **Govern.** The lower powers are governing. Is that enough clue? What is this? How does it happen? The lower powers, where do they live? They live in the

body but specifically, they live here (pointing to the heart). What needs to happen to them? What are they doing when they are there? They're governing. Who governs? Is it a committee? There are three forms of government, basically. What are the three forms of government? Monarchy, democracy, and? No. Monarchy is dictatorship. So, these lower powers, are they in some kind of committee? Is there a committee? No. there isn't. They work by themselves. They rule. They govern. One says what? There it is. Adventist Home 127. It's one of the passages we brought up frequently. They have their seat here (pointing to the heart). It's the same seat found in Rev 13:2. **Gave Him POWER, SEAT and GREAT AUTHORITY.** Seat is a throne. Who sits? KING. Another word for King? Dictator. He, or she does, run everything. They rule. There's this seat here. What happens when you have a new heart? What happens to that seat? Does the seat change?

Pagan Rome moves from the city of Rome to where?

Constantinople. When he moves from Rome to Constantinople, does he leave his seat in Rome? What else does he leave in Rome besides his seat? His throne? The seat is the throne. What else did he leave? What makes a seat a throne? What gives you the visible authority to govern? How do you know who's governing? What's the visible symbol for governance? What's the visible thing you can see if you know someone is a king? How do you know someone is a king? What do you see? They wear a **crow**n. What makes a seat, a throne? What turns a normal seat into a throne? A crown. So when pagan Rome leaves the city of Rome, did he take his seat with it? No. What did he leave? The seat. What seat is that? Throne. If it was a throne, what was left with the seat? The crown. What did it say on the crown? What title did it have? It tells you whose crown it is, isn't it? Like a label. What did it say on the crown, then? This crown belongs to King of the North (KN). Did it get left there or

did it get taken to Constantinople? It got left there. And someone came to pick it up. Who was that? Who picked up the crown and sat on the chair? The papacy did. The pope said I'll take off my crown and put this one on or put it on top of my hat.

So I can wear a double hat and sit on the chair. The chair is here, a throne, and it doesn't get taken away. Does the crown remain? Yes. Someone is going to get kicked out? Who's going to get kicked out of here? Lower powers. Who sits on the seat and puts on the crown? Christ does. Christ comes and does that. There are various ways of looking at this. If Christ sits on the throne, He says "I'm not sharing this throne with anybody". What does He become? A dictator. I don't know why we think a dictator is an ugly word. So, what does Ellen White say about habit? What's this favorite quote that Ellen White talks about? What does she say? When you do something a lot, frequently, it becomes a habit – you repeat something often. And then **habits become character**. That's the SOP quote.

So repeated actions become HABIT and HABIT becomes CHARACTER. And CHARACTER is that? GLORY 1 or GLORY 2? Can you touch CHARACTER? I don't want GLORY 1 to be the answer. CHARACTER is what? I asked the question a few moments ago and give me the various description of this thing. What were the various descriptions that we had?

**SANCTIFICATION. THE LAW. THE HEART**. Christ on the throne. We looked at it 3 ways. The same issue. Now my question is, ACTS turn into HABITS, HABITS turn into CHARACTER, and what does that point to? **CHARACTER=HEART**. It's the same issue. CHARACTER is what? Classic definition: **Thoughts and feelings makes MORAL CHARACTER**. What are the thoughts and feelings? Where do they live? Right here – points to HEART on board.



So you're going to fix, say habits and do this in a positive sense, you get this big feedback mechanism that comes right back to here – it's the new HEART. Reference: **ChL (Christian Leadership) 60.3** People are already nervous because we're saying Deuteronomy, all these rules. Some are laws, some are good advice. So when we start talking about law and good advice, who is the judge? On these matters, these issues. We always give you a choice. **The two choices are you and God. You and God. If we start talking about law, who's the judge? GOD.** When someone kills someone in the book of Deut, who sorts out the mess? Where does the murderer have to go? To the sanctuary city, within the days march wherever you live in the land. Why does he/ she go there? So they don't get killed. They have a sanctuary protecting them until what happens? Until the case is brought up by the judges and they work out what has gone wrong.

So it's all about human people. Are you okay with that? All the judgments, all the issues are all about humans. We start talking about good advice, what we've done is the following. We say, okay, don't eat eggs. They are very bad. You should quit eating eggs. But if you eat an egg, what's going to happen to the person? God's going to look down and say look at that wickedness he did. He scored and ate an egg and we have to deal with that problem, don't we? Because we're not supposed to eat eggs. We're the 144K. So, what's going to happen? We can't kill the person, can we? So, who's going to kill the person? GOD. When? In the last days. Sometime in the future, He's going to kill the person for eating an egg. That's how we process it. We turn everything into LAW. Someone has to die. Now should we be doing that? Is that a good methodology? No. What's the methodology that we should be using? ONE WORD. Begins with P. KN and KS do it all the time. Not Practice. Where

are they fighting? They don't like fighting in their own country.  
**PROXY.**

Everything is done by PROXY. If the LAW and the JUDGMENT of sin is PROXY, do we agree with that? It's all PROXY. Book of DEUT, you check there, it's all proxy. Why do we turn the good advice into something that's not PROXY? Because you and I know we can't touch anyone for eating an egg. So we say that God will sort that out. Same mess, same problem in which we do in which book? Which chapter? **DANIEL 2**. What do Adventists do with that chapter? **They say that the mountain is heaven and the statue is earth. They don't understand how to compare and contrast.** Could you do that? Does that even work? Heaven and earth. No. Why doesn't it work? What's the problem? They're too far apart. How do you fix the problem? What does Jesus have to do? He has to come here to become one of us, to come next to us. That's one of the primary theological reasons why HE has to. You can't fix the problem from that distance. So you know conceptually that it's wrong. So we're left with the problem about this good advice issue. You can't enforce it. If you can't enforce it, then it becomes, I'm saying, a good advice. Therefore you can do it. And you're going to find almost all of those reform issues all fall into that category. And so people are going to say that it's only good advice, we can do what we want. And we're going to say, we're all conservatives, or are we liberals? (Asking the audience) According to REV 3, you are...in the middle.

So you mean you're balanced? That's what he meant (speaking to audience). Don't be extreme. So, this issue has confronted this movement because we don't even understand what LIBERALISM is and what CONSERVATIVE-ism is. It's degenerated to what? Eggs. Your clothes. Is that what we're defining or what we're supposed to do? NO. Where do we take

all that idea from? Straight from the world. There are too many of us that have looked at the world for so long we have become worldly. And we want to cloak that worldliness and call it LIBERALISM. The problem is that worldliness isn't even liberalism today. It's something else we've already defined that. So, when this movement started talking about liberalism and unlocked the pad lock and took it off and all this stuff came out. What came out? Did a pair of earrings fall out and say this looks nice. Let's put them on. Or, this looks good- lipstick, it's locked in the box for so long I've been missing it. Is that what came out of that box? NO. What came out of that box? It was a pair of ladies trousers that came out of the box and we became confused.

Because when you look for the trousers, what do you want with it? A pair of earrings and some lipstick. We thought that's the package deal. What else came out of that box? A nice certificate that says: "Sister X is an elder". So we start giving certificates out. That's what came out of that box. **That's what LIBERALISM is.** It's not about these 4 issues about how you eat, how you dress, and where you live. **That's not what liberalism is that we're confronted with in this movement.** We seemed to be confused on this issue.

If you go back and check, so, I'm going to take a leap of faith. Hopefully, you can jump with me. When we talk about liberalism, I want to frame it in a certain way. So, like I did here, the will, the habit. I want us to take a key thought and hold on to that. Use that as our anchor or framework of the subject. So, **liberalism is about how you treat other people. That's what liberalism is. Liberalism, other people.** You go to those four vows, that people are attacking now, in the name of liberalism, and what's the common thread through all of those four? What connects those four vows? Whose lifestyle? Yourself. So, **liberalism is about**

selflessness; other selves. And these four vows are about self.

So, what we've done is to change a selfless message into a selfish message. And mixing the two has caused this fanaticism that has entered into this movement. And the reason it got in is because people have mistakenly, I'll say it in an ugly way, they have deceived the movement in the name of methodology.

Fanaticism has entered into the movement through the disguise of methodology, and it's not methodology. It's utter selfishness.

And I don't mean it in an ugly way, selfishness. I'm not trying to say, you're so selfish. You don't care about other people. It's not, I'm not using it that way. But it's all about the self. But these changes is what happened. **We can call it the MC message. It's never about self. There about other people.** So, it's not selfish like you don't care about people. It's not about that. I'm not using selfish and selfless in that moralistic framework that we tend to. It really is about how you conceptualize your relationship with other people. How do you see them? The tools that we were given, primary one, were a pair of female trousers. And when that happened, things started to go wrong. Because people expect a whole outfit to come out. If you're going to do that.

But what they missed, if they wanted to, people wanted to start talking about methodology, is not to say what's associated with the pair of female trousers is liberal. Earrings. Make-up. All the adornments that are attached with it. It's not that. **The methodology is about thinking about others and not thinking about ourselves.** Should we be thinking about ourselves? Should we be selfish? Of course we have to. Where do we see it? What's the key word? **Selfish is HABIT.** Why is that so important? Because acts turn into habits and habits turn into character and character turns into thoughts and feelings, and the thoughts and feelings are the new heart. It's critical that we understand what habits are.

ACTS -----→ HABITS -----→ CHARACTER -----→ THOUGHTS  
& FEELINGS =

NEW HEART

And if anyone tried it, eggs are addictive. They are addictive on many levels, the protein profile of eggs, in fact many meat products. Do you understand the profile of the protein profile of a food? The amino acids? Then we talk about the eight essential amino acids. There's more than eight. But they have a profile. Beans have a certain profile. We call it a pattern. So, if this is a line of protein, they have a pattern. Does that make sense? A protein profile. Animal products have a different profile. And the profile, we'll just talk about eggs, the profile of those proteins, when they enter into your body, they become addictive. There are certain amino acids in there that we like. Our body responds to it in a certain way that it doesn't respond to in a certain way with the amino acids profile, say rice. There are differences. And so, eggs become addictive at number of levels: chemical level, hormonal level, at taste level. Even though not eating eggs is a good advice, you can't enforce that. I want to say, you can't say "Don't worry. God will kill you in the end for eating eggs because He is the judge." You break the rules of proxy or parables.

The people who are judges are us. And we can't judge someone for eating eggs, can we? No. So, it comes to this area about **HABIT**. You eat eggs a lot. It turns into a habit, becomes an addiction, if you want to call it that. **It changes your character which is your thoughts and feelings, and begins to affect your heart**. And this is why Ellen White says, if you eat meat, you will become animalized, if you've heard that phrase. I think that the

phrase she uses. It will animalize you. And that is super spiritualistic. If you think about that. Because what you're saying, if you're not careful, you take on the spirit of a cow. Cow has a spirit; you take on that spirit. It's not that mechanism, which is a new age understanding. And I'm not saying that it's some kind of evil understanding. It's a new age or a false conception of a truth.

The act: you eating the cow. **You do often enough, it becomes a habit. It changes your character. It changes your thoughts and feelings. They begin to change at a heart level, which is spiritual.** The animalization of a human body because they continue to eat animal products is a real life phenomena. It's not that the cow had some spirit to it and you're eating the spirit of a cow. That's a new age concept. That's a concept of cannibalism. Cannibals don't eat human bodies because they are hungry. They got plenty of food in their culture. They're not starving to death. It's not like you have a plane crash in Antarctica and all you got left is your neighbor and you eat them. That is not cannibalism. In the same way, looking at dispensations is not dispensationalism. Dispensationalism is a doctrine. Cannibalism is a doctrine. When you are a cannibal, you eat the brain of your enemy or portion of their body. The reason is because you want to take their spirit. And you wouldn't eat the brain of the weak person. You eat the brain of who? H1397 person, a brave fighting man.

The reason why this becomes significant is we have misunderstood our relationship to the vows. Particularly **the four vows which deal with reforms**. You can do it this way. **The four ones are here (GLORY 2) and the twenty-two are here (GLORY 1).** I think we can express it that way. So, even if it's good advice, and it's not enforceable, the problem arises here (HABIT). You have this problem and Jesus says what? If you do all these wrong things, you are going to have bad thoughts and bad feelings. And

who's sitting there? The lower power is sitting there which means He won't sit there. So, there's this dictatorship model that's built-in this issue about those four vows. Simply put, the vows are still intact. They've been assailed but they still have integrity.

Those issues about modesty which become, which you can't enforce because no-one knows what modesty even means. Who knows what modesty means? How can you tell? Modesty is in the eye of the beholder. I'm wearing a modest pair of earrings. And I say, it doesn't look modest to me, and he says compare to someone who wears the big hoops in their ears, mine is pretty modest. So, it doesn't look as bad as that. Everyone knows that there's a degree of modesty. But it's not definable. When I use the word selfish, I want us to remember that I didn't use it in a moralistic framework, that it's evil. I didn't mean it that way.

**HABITS are all about self. It's about looking after number 1.** And I'm not saying that we're not supposed to do that. We are required to do that. We are required to look after ourselves.

We are required to be selfish. Of course you are. Otherwise, you wouldn't function. I didn't want us to see selfish and selfless as, you people are being so selfish, not caring about other people. This is the framework we used before. The women who wear mini-skirts don't appreciate the pain the brothers are put through. It's not that. It's not what we're speaking about. We're speaking about selfish here (GLORY 2). We're talking about taking care about ourselves. We're supposed to take care of ourselves. We're supposed to be selfish. This was a study, **this MC message was about looking out for other people.** If you want to think about it this way. You're here and this person's here. Far away so you can't check them. You bring them close to yourself and you can check them. What do you find? There's disparity. And what are you required to do when there's disparity? You're required to

bring them up. To be your equal. That's what essentially what the MC message is all about. It's not about, can I wear this; can I now live this way; can I make some changes to rules and regulations of my dietary or my living arrangements. **That's not what the MC message was about. It became confusing because the symbol of that seem to be attached to those four vows: dress.**

I think the people, I don't want to read into people's hearts because I don't have the ability to do that, I don't know why they are doing this. I'm not saying it's not an objective study. I'm not trying to infer that the only people talking about this are the people who secretly love eggs. This is their excuse. They found an argument to eat that. I'm not suggesting that. So I don't want to go down that route to say that they are going to be bad people. This is the doctrinal study and I think it's not the right methodology. That's the level I want to leave it at and when a person says something and don't realize what they are saying, I don't want to use the word attack. People are not attacking those vows. But I suspect I have probably have said that in the course of this study. I don't want to mean it in a sense that people have a hatred towards these things and they don't see common sense in following a vegan diet or living sensibly in a decent location.

(Inaudible question from audience) When babies are born, Jesus is not the King of their heart. Sinful means full of sin and a baby hasn't formed any thought or feelings. They work at a subconscious, or hormonal, or chemical level. Most of it is automatic. They don't process this thing. They don't do what you do and say, "Oh, stop the conversation, I want to go toilet". They don't have a consciousness of that. They just go toilet. They don't say, "I'm feeling cold I need to put something on". They have no ability to do that and function properly. So they don't have a sinful heart in a way that you and I do. It's not packed with sin. It's



empty. It's a clean sheet of paper that needs to be written upon. They need help to make sure that the writing is on there. Their testimony, their biography is a good one. Most of the time parents do a really bad job. In rare circumstances they do a good job. Sometimes those hearts are already not the right shape. They're deformed in some way. So it becomes very difficult even for some good parents to write a good testimony on their heart. Children are born with certain tendencies or bent, but they're neutral when they are born. It fills up pretty quick, it doesn't take that long. But they are certainly not born with a new heart.

(Inaudible comment from audience) Did someone find the reference to this (pointing to ChL 60.3 on board)? MyP 72.1 So I like that quote and it explains what I think we've spoken about. The quote is intact but what I want to do is to take out the last 2 words that was used there, which was: **SELFISHNESS and PRIDE**. Because I didn't want to have this discussion and put a label on my brothers and sisters who are struggling with this issue and say that they are selfish and prideful. I don't believe that they are. But the quote is intact and I'm not obviously trying to wrestle the quote. But I wouldn't want to use that as a proof text to say that brother Wilson and I are saying that if you are eating eggs you are prideful and selfish. That wasn't what the purpose of this study was about. And that's what the purpose of why he found that verse. It was the bit that came before it. It was more about the mechanism or the theology or the methodology of how this is working, that you're selfish. If you can read it again and leaving the selfishness and pride out because I want us to see the mechanism and the feedback loop that she's talking about. I think that we are in complete agreement with what she's saying.

(Inaudible comment from audience) A child dies, it depends on the record, they would check the record on what happened with

that child. Its life. It's a fair question but I didn't want to go down that route. The problem that happens is what have we added here? (Parminder pointing to board written: "a brave fighting man- who is 20 years or older"). What's the important word on this line, this sentence? In relation to his (student in audience) question- what's the rule 1? 20 years. They (children) are not accountable on multiple levels. One of them is a hormonal, chemical level. The brain development has not occurred.

So, whatever they did they are not even accountable for that. So you can get a baby and say "there's a selfish baby because every time it's hungry they demand something. Feed me. I'm the center of attention." Pure selfishness. You can write on the record this is a selfish child, which would mean they don't go to heaven if you use that. So it's not a simplistic way to approach this subject. When you start talking about young babies, when you go to that extreme. Because there's no way to assess the issues of accountability. If you want to do it at a simple level, they're not accountable for their wrong deeds. So, if they're not accountable, it's not held against them, they don't know the difference between good and evil. So, therefore they're going to heaven if you do it that way.

(Audience's questions) So, is your question about platting of hair? If you're going to approach this problem, and we're going to say, platting of hair. So, is there one standard form of platting of hair? No. Is there one reason to plat? No. So, the problem becomes an unmanageable subject which puts it into a category of good advice, not law, and if that's the case, it fits here. You do it long enough it becomes a habit. And once it becomes a habit, it changes your character. So, if someone is adorning themselves, or doing anything that those vows discuss, it effects them for good or for bad. So, if people want to adorn themselves, and if they

want to plat or jewelry, or any issue, the end result of all of that is, it will affect the heart.

So, if a person is platting their hair, to keep it tidy, from their perspective, they have a legitimate reason to do that, that's up to them. If they don't have a legitimate reason to do that, that is basically the glorification of the human body. Then it will begin to affect them, right here at the heart level. The problem with all of this issue is that we're not comfortable with the people to self-manage. It becomes an issue of self-management, or self-determination. And the problem that any organization is going to be confronted with is that how does any person have self-determination on these issues compared to the standard, this body or God would have us follow? People see a contradiction in that. I don't think I see a contradiction in that. I like to work on simple models so people can have a feel for. So, I want to just go for the subject of eggs.

So, God says, we shouldn't eat eggs. The vow reflects that: Don't eat eggs. That's good advice. If you eat eggs, it will harm you. It will harm you in multiple levels. It will harm you on the physical level. It's going to harm you on the spiritual level. Because of this feed-back, we can say. We don't even understand our relationship to food: when we eat, how we eat what we eat. It's so complicated that no human being understand that. We just follow the basic rules.

So, the question is, why would we want to do something that is damaging? God says, "Don't do it. It's not going to be good for you." So, His church, His body, in agreement with His direction: don't do that. If an individual says, I don't care what you say, which means they don't care what God says. I want to do it anyway. They choose not to take heed to the advice. And it's up to them to work out the consequences of that. Now, that is just

being framed in a rebellious perspective, the way I just said that.” I don’t care what the church says. I’m going to do it anyway.”

So, I’m going to say the same thing. There’s these parents and their crops have failed. They live in the middle of nowhere, and they got some chickens that laid some eggs, and they’re going to say, Lord, I don’t care what the church says. My child is going to die. I have to feed him eggs, and I have to cook them myself. Is that rebellion? No. We wouldn’t consider that to be rebellion. But the act is the same, and the physical damage will be the same. And I will venture to say the damage to the heart will also be the same. And I don’t mean to say that in the perspective of one was rebellious and the other was forced into the situation. There’s a chemical reaction that occurs on multiple levels that affects our spirituality. It’s not the fact that you eat meat or you don’t eat meat. Whether you eat meat for rebellion or you eat meat for good reasons, it will still effect your heart. It animalizes you whether you like it or not. Eggs will do the same.

So, I don’t want to put in a frame-work of people doing things that are rebellious. So, if you want to come back to the subject of platting the hair, or braiding, the counsel says that we should not braid our hair. So, if a person says, “I don’t care what God says. I want to look beautiful. And in my definition, braiding makes me look beautiful. I’m going to do it anyway”. You’re going to go through all of this and you’re going to get in trouble. If another person says, what I have to do with my hair is functionally necessary, it becomes a functional matter. Functional means necessary in order that my hair doesn’t get wrecked or destroyed. It needs to be managed and taken care of. Treated respectfully. So, there are numerous sisters who will plat or braid their hair to respect their hair. To treat it properly. Which is why they will use shampoos and conditioners to take care of it. Because we’re

supposed to take care of our bodies. So, it's now about stewardship. So, how do I know why someone is doing something? Stewardship or vanity? The advice is that we shouldn't do that. The person comes to the place where they say that braiding is the right thing for me because I have a certain hair situation. They are free to do that. There is no problem with the people braiding their hair or not braiding their hair. When I say people, I'm exclusively talking about sisters. It's about the **motivation**. We could have a discussion on hair braiding but I found in my experience that it never ends up going anywhere.

And the reason that it never goes anywhere is that, discussions with the sisters, is that one thing they always tell me is that I don't understand the necessities or the dynamics of hair braiding. So, I got to the place where I actually say, you're right. I don't understand. Actually, it's none of my business. Because I'm not a woman who has to deal with this issue. If I was, I'd probably have a better feel for it, probably give a more meaningful input on the subject. Because I don't, I take the word of my sisters. The sisters, the ones I spoke to over this issue, over decades, the consistent story is that you just don't understand how our hair works. And I say, I don't think I do. So, I think it's **better for you to self-manage the situation**, and if you need to braid your hair, or plat it, then go ahead and do that. There's no problem. The advice that is being given is the advice to not have vanity. That's what that good advice is. If you're doing it for vanity, you're going to end up getting hurt, here, at the spiritual level. But if someone is not wearing for vanity reasons, there's not going to be any damage to them. And who am I to know which of the two it is? So, it falls into this realm of good advice. **People need to allow everyone to exercise their own judgment on this subject.**

Often in the discussion when these things come up, people want someone like myself, or a leader of some form, to pronounce a judgment. It can or cannot be done. And I don't think that I want to, I don't think I'm allowed to, and I don't think I have the ability to. And so when someone wants to comment, say, what's your opinion on this, and **my opinion is, that it's good advice not to be vain**. If a person is sure that it's not vanity, there's no problem. If the person believes that there is a reason for doing this, is for vanity or they're a slave to fashion, maybe they want to reconsider what they are doing. Maybe they ought to take the braiding and the plating out. If that's where their motivation is. Because it affects the heart at a really serious level.

That's what those vows are trying to teach. It's dealing with a very narrow subject and some of them, in fact most of them, have two facets. Is it evil to eat eggs? Are eggs evil? We can't say that. Far too many medical missionaries will tell you that cow's milk is a poison. I don't know how many of us believe that. But it's craziness in my opinion. It's crazy to treat food product as a poison, like meats, eggs, or cheese, or any of those things. They are not poisons. You can eat them and you can survive. But they come with a price. It's the same with anything we do. What we would call adornment. Is plastic surgery evil? Or bad? It depends. If a man, perfectly normal man, has a perfectly reasonable body but he looks at the body but he doesn't like what it looks like, and he says I'm going to go into a plastic surgeon and get some implants into my biceps and make them look bigger, or in my chest, to puff myself up. Is plastic surgery good or bad? In that context? It's bad.

Now, if someone gets burned and their face is scarred and they receive plastic surgery, is that bad? Isn't it vanity? You say you've got big scars, that's not a problem. Live with it. Why do

we say it's not vanity to have plastic surgery? Why do you say it's not vanity? All it is a scar in the face. It's just tissue, so it's not a problem. Why are you saying it's not vanity? They care about what they look like, don't they? Isn't that almost the definition of vanity? So why do we say it's not vanity? Because we realize, scientifically, medically, even on a religious level we understand that if someone is disfigured, even though they can't even see their face, if I had a big scar here and I can't even see my face, unless I look in the mirror. So, why am I even bothered? The reason why we're bothered is because it affects us. **It affects us on a level that comes right down to here (points to the heart on board).** The world recognizes it. Christians should recognize it and I think all of you do. The person was damaged that way and would say, "Sure spend \$10K on plastic surgery and fix your face so that you can look, what I would say, normal, average as best as you can in society". That would be a waste of money. It wouldn't because it affects you. **It affects your inner being.** There's this feedback.

So when we start talking about make-up, is make up evil? It would depend. Because there's just pure vain make up and depending on make-up that I would say is used for medicinal or medical reasons that would cover or hide someone's deformities. Teeth. People lose teeth. Is it wrong to put in false teeth? Is it vanity? Or, is it functional. Some of these issues are not that straight forward to deal with. So that's why it becomes problematic. It has to be left to the individuals, at its most basic level, to decide why they are doing what they are doing. There are some cases where it's obvious why someone is doing something and in that situation when they are standing in opposition to what the vow teaches, the church has the ability to make a judgment on that issue because it is so clear what the motivation is. **Then it comes from the realm that moves away**

from good advice to law. But it is very infrequent and it's not that easy to deal with. It's a complex subject. We can talk a lot about it. But the reason why I bring this up is to say **that it is all connected to the subject of the NATURE of MAN about the outer body.** You can't just dismiss this subject under the guise of liberalism or wrong methodology. It's not that straight forward to deal with.

(Directing to audience) Your question was about jewelry and braiding. What was behind your question? Why were you asking the question? What's your concern? The example of your country. Your country is different than other countries? From your observation is your country different from other countries? According to the methodology, who are you referring to when you say "we"? The Sudanese people? The world movement? What's your position in all of that? Your understanding? So you're against plating? So before, did you plat your hair? So why do you plat now? Why do you want to plat the hair? (Inaudible answer from audience) What's your position? Are you talking about braiding or just generally?

So people are now doing what they want and they say they can do it because of the methodology. Is that wrong? The problem with that argument is that God doesn't tolerate women wearing trousers either. And God doesn't tolerate women in leadership positions. And God doesn't tolerate women being equal to men. God doesn't tolerate all of those three things in the SOP. And we say not only that in our history today, He does tolerate it and He didn't tolerate it. We can't just do that. I don't think we can just say that it was tolerable then and that relationship between men and women and now it's no longer acceptable. Women can do all those things that they couldn't do before. I don't think it's as straight forward as dealing at that level. We need to understand



is why it was not acceptable then and why is it acceptable now. We need to have some models, some explanation of what the issue is. I think that many of us are missing that. We're missing why it was like that and why it isn't like that today.

So, when you say that it says in SOP that this is not acceptable, therefore, it is not acceptable. You have to take all of that with that perspective and you end up rejecting the MC message. And so, I think we have to look at it much more carefully, and as people are looking at it much more carefully, for sure we might make some mistakes, but we're also making a lot of progress and we're doing things that are not mistakes; that are correct. I think we should be acknowledging what we're doing correct much as we are acknowledging what's incorrect.

So, when it comes to the issue of braiding, if someone says I'm going to do it for vanity, they need to realize what the Scripture says about vanity. They need to make a position for themselves. Vanity will not harm me. Now who am I to say there's a difference between looking smartly dressed, looking respectful, like we do on Sabbath, and vanity, people want to look beautiful because it makes them feel good. Which really is vanity. It's not easy to work out the differences between the two as an outsider, and sometimes I'm not even sure how we do it ourselves. Why am I doing something? Is it because I want to be tidy; I want to look respectful in front of you; or do I really care what you think because I want people to like me. Or I want to look good. It can really easily degenerate into something that's bad. And that's what these vows are trying to bring forth, a principle that when you start going into these areas, and the problem is that you can't avoid going into these areas. We live in those areas.

**These four vows can control the whole being.** So, when you're there you need to know why you're doing things. And you need to

know that you're doing things for a reason that's not good, and it will affect you. In fact, even if you're doing something for a good reason it will affect you. If you're hungry and you got no other food but eggs, will they damage your body? Yes. They will damage it at the physical level, and they'll damage it at the spiritual level. Even if you did it for a good reason it can still damage you. Now if you ate eggs for a wrong reason, the damage is even worse. Because then it begins to **seal your conscience**. And that's another area in this issue. When you're actually rebelling, your conscience begins to get damage. Now eating eggs for a good reason will not damage your conscience. It will affect you in other ways. So, there is this degree of harm.

So, when we start saying, for instance, the issue of braiding, and now we're saying that's good advice, just because something is good advice, doesn't mean it is right to do it. It just means that **it's not enforceable. And just because something is not enforceable, does not mean that it won't have consequences**. The consequences are written there.

So, you know that Ellen White says that the Ten Commandments are like the law the gold standard, if we can call it. And normally, people say that health comes, like down here; good advice, if you like. What does Ellen White say? It's as sacred, and so, when we say as sacred, or we go a little bit further and say, equal, if you break the stealing commandment, what will happen? You die. Because the health laws are risen so much and now they are equal, they're as holy, we say that if you're going to break that law, what's going to happen? You die. And I don't think that's the case. I don't think you die because of those things. How do I know that's correct? You know, God says thou shalt not kill. He doesn't say, you know what? What's happening is we're getting too many people in the world today and they're living too long. What

happens is, when you get over the age of 80, what has to happen? We'll kill you. Population control. Does He do that? No. How does He control population? What does He tell you to do? Eat meat. Population control. Go and check. That's what it was for. It's population control. Meat eating. That's why it was introduced. It was not introduced because they didn't have enough fruits and vegetables. It was introduced for population control.

And the ultimate reason for that was what? Because God doesn't like lots of people getting old? No. It's because He knew that the problem is here (pointing to the heart). When you live on this earth for five hundred years, it is sickening. Not only are your children lost, your grandchildren, your great grandchildren. Everyone around you is dying in rebellion, and you just want to die. You had enough. You hate the world. So, in mercy, He says, eat meat. But He doesn't say, when you get to a certain age, kill the people.

There's a distinction between the laws of the Ten Commandments, Thou shalt not kill and killing people with the meat eating. It has differences. It doesn't have the same properties. When we start talking about, it's as holy, therefore the consequence is the same. It doesn't work that way. What God is identifying is, you eat meat, it will have consequences because you're breaking the law. What law are you breaking? The laws of nature. And the laws of nature will bite back, if I can say it that way. It will hurt you back. But it's not in the same way as the moral law. If I steal something, will nature attack me back? No. Of course it won't. It's a completely different mechanism. God will intervene. Supernaturally. He will deal with that issue.

**So, when we start elevating the health laws to the same status as the Ten Commandments, it's not to introduce that**

**God kills you. It's to show you that there are consequences.**

There are laws that are set in place. Whether you eat meat for good reason or bad reason. It'll affect you the same way.

(Audience question) **Answer-17-20---What you eat, what you**

**dress, your leisure time, and where you live. These are the four**

**things that fundamentally control your lives.** That's what

Adventism is expert on. We're so expert, just like the Sabbath, we

became so expert on Sabbath, we became legalistic, and that's

what we've done to those commandments. We've turned them

into legal rules. And the problem is, when you give people

freedom they can abuse the freedom. And it becomes virtually

impossible to police. The issue becomes unpolice-able. In some

unique circumstances, you can police them, when the rules are

defined. And some issues are pretty well defined. Others are not,

In fact, most of them are not, **those four vows, at multiple levels,**

**because there are so much circumstantial issues you have to deal**

**with; that it becomes unmanageable.**

So, you just leave the people to their own devices. And say, go

ahead and do what you want. So, we have a rule-When you come

to church, no eggs. Is that a law or good advice? That's law, not

good advice. You bring eggs, they're not going to be accepted in

our building, on our table. We say, we don't want that. It's easily

definable; eggs or no eggs. Now you say, if you eat eggs on

Friday, you're not allowed to come to church. Is that enforceable.

Of course not. You don't even know if someone is doing it. It's

good advice. So, it really is subtle, the more you think about it. So,

I wanted to keep the study simple. When you do a simple study,

opens up many questions. I understand that.

**So, good advice looks dangerous. Looks like we can do what**

**we want. You can't do what you want just because it's only**

**good advice. It will come back to hurt you if you don't follow**

**the advice. And because it's not a legal system, it hurts you even worse. Because you don't even realize that it's doing the damage.** It's like when you eat bad food, it's corroding your system and you don't even know it. 20 years later, you get cancer. And you ask, how did that happen?

# **QUESTION 1**

**IN THE STUDY OF NATURE OF  
MAN, HOW MANY PARTS ARE  
THERE AND WHAT ARE THE  
PARTS?**

**ANSWER 2**

**2 PARTS**

**GLORY 1 AND GLORY 2**

**OR THE HEART AND THE BODY**

## **QUESTION 2**

**WHICH PART HAVE BEEN  
STUDIED AND PRESENTED AND  
WHICH PART NEEDS MORE  
EXAMINATION?**



**ANSWER 2**

**GLORY 1 THE HEART HAS BEEN  
STUDIED**

**GLORY 2 THE BODY NEEDS  
MORE EXAMINATION**

## **QUESTION 3**

**WHAT IS THAT ONE WORD  
THAT ELDER PARMINDER SAID  
TO PUT IN OUR MIND WHEN  
WE THINK OF GLORY 1?**

**ANSWER 3**

**THE WILL**

## **QUESTION 4**

**WHAT IS THE KEY WORD THAT  
ELDER PARMINDER WANTS US  
TO THINK ABOUT FOR GLORY  
2?**

**ANSWER 4**

**THE HABIT**

## **QUESTION 5**

**REPEATED ACTIONS BECOME  
WHAT?**

**ANSWER 5**

**CHARACTER**