

## Q & A

### Elder Tess Lambert France SOTP Video 41

Key

A. = Audience

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

Good morning. This is our final morning and it is a question and answer session. We have some questions we have been given. I'm going to rub out our homework. Just remember the names of the people we discussed. You have them written down. Please follow what is happening with project Blitz. these articles are really worth looking at (Article: Jerry Falwell. Article: NYT A Christian Nation? Since when). We went through others but this is the one we didn't do closely (NYT a Christian nation since when). But it is worth reading. Also this issue of Brown vs. Board of education. I would suggest we should look at that more closely. I will rub out our chapters. Spiritual gifts and great controversy. Just remember we connected it from William Miller to the American Reformer. Then she discusses the Sanctuary, The traps of Satan, Spiritualism/covetousness, and then inserted The sins of Babylon. Slavery in one history and Sunday Law in another. Then the Loud Cry, the last warning, the close of probation, the time of trouble, and the second advent. So we have connected 2 different stories that have much in common but the issues in those two histories are very different. I want to start from the last question. We won't do them in order because I think it impacts everything else we have looked at.

That question is asking about Moral verses prophetic. What is a moral subject and what is a prophetic subject. With that question they want to take us to 1 Cor 13. I think the whole chapter. It's what we call the chapter of love. I think the point the person is making is really verse 9 and 10. That we have all of these things but when that which is perfect is come all these other things will be done away with. Whoever asked the question please speak up if I am not representing you correctly, but I think that the suggestion that is made is that all that is before is moral and then what comes is the prophetic. And that we are no longer dealing with moral issues. And when we talk about slavery, homosexuality, and gender it is said that those are moral issues.

How do we conceptualize if something is moral or prophetic?

- A. If I understand when the thing are put on the line it's become a prophetic subject. Something that is moral can be prophetic if the subject impact the line.

Sister C. is that how you see it?

- A. There is a subject that seems to be moral but they can have prophetic impact. So it's a subject that we need to pay attention to because there are coming in fulfillment in regard to what we are expecting in relation that all we see in the past.

So if we were to go to Exodus 20 and you have the ten commandments, which of them are moral and which of them are prophetic? How would you divide between the two? So first you have no other Gods before me, then graven images. Are those moral or prophetic issues? Sister I?

A. *Not audible*

So if we went to number 8 and it said to not steal. We will go to seven. Don't commit adultery. Is that moral or prophetic? What about stealing. I have something and you want it brother A. and you take it from me. Is that moral or prophetic?

A. *No audible*

Sister N.

A. What I understand from the studies that we have is that we have to take the bible as a parable so I understand that there is a moral application but we can also have a prophetic application.

So if we go to the fourth it's the Sabbath day and the Adventists are looking for a Sunday Law. I think people would argue that that is prophetic. But if you put it with the other 9, how can some be moral and some be prophetic?

A. Depending on context in the study.

So seven is about marriage and four is about the Sabbath. They are the two institutions of Eden. So when we deal with the Sabbath and we talk about Sunday Law, we see it as a prophetic issue but if we compare and contrast the two issues, Marriage must be a prophetic issue as well. When we talk about homosexuality and their right to marry we talk about gender, we are talking about marriage. One institution is prophetic so the other must be prophetic. Do we have any other thoughts on that? How do we divide between moral and prophetic?

A. *So God illustrate the relationship with His people with other things. So it will be the moral but God makes a prophetic application so the Sabbath day can also be a subject of prophecy like the other commandments but for me none of the ten commandments can be a prophetic subject. They are moral.*

So the fourth isn't prophetic subject?

A. So as it is written in the ten commandments.

*Elder Parminder: Looking at the definition of morality. It says it relates to the practices and behavior of human beings. It is connected to their social relationships to one another. So it's the practice, their relationships, and their behavior in reference to what's right and what's wrong. Moral.....It's also to do with the happiness of the people as they relate to one another. It's connected to the issues of right and wrong. when you talk about prophecy, and say the definition of prophecy is telling of the future, but it's future events. Our understanding is the unfolding of future events. So the question is what events are going to unfold that we are going to look at? In it's most general way the events that are going to happen will be good events or bad events. There is a dictator or there is an earthquake or people get married and they are happy. Prophecy is speaking about the good event or a bad event that is about to*

*happen. The classic definition that we use EGW says the prophecy was seen to be a figurative delineation of events leading down to the close of this earth's history. So it picks up the word events as per the dictionary definition. The question we need to ask is what events are they. The nation comes to power, a king rises up, or a king dies and connected with each of those events you can put it into one of two boxes either a good event or a bad event. This is the exact definition of morality. This difference that we make between morality and prophecy is not as hard and fast as we like to think. When the moral issue becomes an event that is shaping history, it then becomes a prophetic issue. So if you are speaking about what you eat or how you dress, it's a moral issue. But when there is an event that occurs with that particular moral issue, it becomes subject to an important historical event, you could say that you have a path with two choices to make. It becomes a prophetic issue. So the Sabbath is a moral issue but we talk about it as being a prophetic issue because we say that at a certain point in history the world is going to be confronted with this moral issue. And that historical event will be shaping people's lives in the context of the great controversy, hence it becomes a prophetic issue. Every single moral law, at some time at either the past, present, or future, is a prophetic subject.*

2015 we were already making it a prophetic issue. In fact we made two issues prophetic. First of all was gender and second homosexuality. We make both of them a prophetic issue in 2015 when we compared and contrasted. I don't think anyone had a major problem with that but it seems to be coming up now as an issue. You can already see them being prophetic in 2015. We are already doing that, we just did it incorrectly. We compared and contrasted them incorrectly. Do we have any further questions on that?

So I will try and do this by subject. I will go through the subjects by subjects.

There is a question on vaccinations. Someone is saying that we are saying that that is a conspiracy theory and shall we come into agreement on this.

Concretely do we vaccinate our children? I could handle this two ways. I could say it's none of my business what people do. But if we look at it prophetically, the issue of vaccination is a symptom of a much larger disease. The disease is the wrong world view. Like 1865, the wrong world view will kill you. And if you have the symptom you have the disease. So concretely I would say yes. If we want to give an example that we accept the message, we have no reason to not vaccinate. And as the last question demonstrated, it's become a prophetic issue which makes it a test. Any question or thoughts on that?

Another subject. The question says that Nov 9 we are talking about a closed door at the close of probation and we have said that it is symbolic or prophetic. What does it mean? Will we have an intercessor?

So if we go to the line of the 144k and we see 1989, 9/11, SL, COP, 2nd coming. Then we go to the line of the priests. As we construct this line, we use the line of the 144k as our template and see 2019 as a shut door and 2021 as a second advent. Where are you on these lines? On the priests line you are going to say you are here right before COP. But the line of the priests is just one line that we use. This movement is the priesthood but separate to that it's also the 144k. We have demonstrated before that the priests are the 144k. If you are the 144k you are not here before the COP on the big line you are before SL. So if these are both 2nd advent how can you experience that twice. We understand that when we use this as the template, we construct our reform line. It gives us waymarks that resemble the ones in 144k line. So these are all shut doors but we can't bring everything down. We can't say they are all literal 2nd advent because you don't go to heaven twice and we can't say not intercessor and that

you go through that twice. So we don't bring down every element of that way mark. But when we use this (144k line) as a template, we can see that this (COP on 144k line) is test and shut door. And you pass or fail. And this is (2019) a shut door, it's a test, pass or fail. But if you are 144k, you have a test in 2019, you have a test at Panium, Test at SL, Test at COP. SO you don't go through two testing periods, but there are at least four. Some include the thousand years.

So we can take down the elements of a shut door and a harvest, and it gives us a model to track out experience as a movement. But it is only one symbol that we have for that experience. Because after Panium you are still on earth and there is no more line of the priests so who are you? There has to be another symbol to represent you. If it's 144k then that COP is where you have no intercessor not 2019. SO there are elements here. The ending of intercession and literal second advent, that we don't bring into a fractal. When we build up these fractals, these tests are prophetic tests. It's a message that decides whether you pass or fail. In 144k line between SL and COP there is a message. You acceptance of it or rejection, decide whether you pass or fail this test. The subject of intercession is separate to the test. It's a separate subject. Does that make sense? Any further thoughts or questions? Brother A?

A. *Not Audible.*

I think some in the movement have suggested that it is another period of training otherwise we could go straight to a new earth, there is no need for it.

So that is the only question on November 9 or the COP. Then we have the subject of dress.

What is modest and what is immodest?

I want to avoid sounding as if I am telling people specifically what to wear. SO I don't want to get into specifics of saying this is appropriate and this isn't. I think people can know for themselves. But our principles have not changed. When we talk about progression, it is restoration. So we don't travel toward Eden and start eating meat right before our restoration. We start going back to the Eden diet. So we are not losing our principles. When we talk about modesty, people spoke about what is healthy, the principles of health, covering the limbs, taking care of blood circulation, making sure your clothes aren't running along the ground. So there are principles of health, making sure it's not too tight, even what you wear underneath, so that it doesn't constrict the organs. None of those principles have changed. When it comes to modesty it hasn't changed. We can read EGW, she is going to tell us to look for simple clothes, good material. There are principles there that we can hold on to. The issue that we discussed was women wearing pants. I have seen many dresses or skirts that are much more immodest than a pair of pants. But when we talk about pants, people are worried that it shows the form. I would say it shows the form of a man as well. Care should be taken to not lose our principles, that they apply equally to both genders. You can find nice loose pants that aren't figure hugging. Those principles don't change. I think we can all understand what is and is not modest. Do we have any other thoughts on that?

Another question related to this. Is it ok now for women to wear pants at church as well as in the day time? Sister G. is it ok for a woman to wear pants down the street?

A. If it's good it must be good everywhere.

So if it's ok down the street it's ok at church? Sister A. is it ok for a woman to wear pants down the street?

A. It doesn't bother me.

Is it acceptable?

A. Yes.

Is it ok for a man to wear pants down the street in the city?

A. it doesn't bother me.

So you say it is perfectly acceptable for both a man and a woman to wear pants in town? And I say in town because I mean publicly and not just in the privacy of your own home. So a man goes to church and he puts on a suit. Is that acceptable?

A Yes.

And so they are both acceptable in public in town. And when they come to church, he is acceptable, is she acceptable in pants?

A. The man or the woman?

The woman, we have already agreed to the man.

A. It depends

Depends on what?

A. I think it's a crucial one. For me for example when it is cold I cannot understand it. I have been used to wear a dress on Sabbath day.

Despite all that is it acceptable for a woman to come up and take the study in pants?

A. So in my head it must make it's way.

What does that mean?

A. She has to think about it.

I'm still confused. Anyone else? It's ok down the street in public. Brother J?

A. So if it's very cold some place we cannot put a dress? I think that the oppression is when you are forced to do something when someone told you to do something. So when I say that I have to think about it, I understand the principle but I must think about it.

People take the verse about a woman in a mans clothes being an abomination. I want to make the point. The verse doesn't say, a woman's in a mans clothes and define it as pants or skirts, and then say "Except when you are gardening". It give no exception to that definition of an abomination. So if you wear pants when you are gardening then you are already an abomination if that is the way you read the verse. It doesn't clarify it. Then you just see how far you want to take your abomination and how public you want to be about it. But if it's acceptable in public, when you come to church does it become inappropriate? I would suggest, please understand me correctly, culture is more nationalistic than we want to realize. Australian culture is racist. Australian culture drinks a lot. They swear a lot. But when Australian comes into this movement, your culture is worthless. As a movement we need to understand that. If a culture is sexist or has practices that are sexist, even if they are part of their culture, they don't get a tick on their prophetic test. We let go of our culture or we don't make it. Sister R. Is it acceptable for a woman to wear pants in town?

A. Yes.

And a man? When they come to church both?

A. yes.

Anyone else? Brother C?

A. *Isn't she a stumbling block?*

I would suggest it is a stumbling block when she doesn't. Because that person needs a test. If she makes them think that their sexism is acceptable, then she is a stumbling block. She should point out their ugliness and their inconsistency.

A. *Maybe for me it's easier because I have not been Adventist my whole life. Nobody came to me and said don't wear skirts in this way. When I got the message from the bible, I felt that I should change somehow but I also see that Christ is looking to our heart. He wants to look at the character. ....So even though I may dress in way that would cause problems for other people, Christ is looking for my heart. So if you are really wiling to follow the bible and follow Christ, you know how to dress right.*

A. *I am also going to say that what we are starting to say makes me think about when talk about trouser, is not really about trousers but I can see through this that you try to show us we have to change the way we think. Tess wants to focus on pants or to show that some pants are ok and some are acceptable but she want to focus about our mindset. So I see that the way I was thinking before in the regard to the subject of pants was not consistent so if I realize for the pants, it will be easier to realize that for other issues because the point that Tess is making is that we have a way of thinking that is not correct. I think that she want to bring us farther. So we must ask ourselves if the way we are thinking is the correct way and if it is the way God thinks. Maybe Tess should be right about that.*

Elder Parminder?

Elder Parminder: Our brother said that we can do what we want except if it causes a stumbling block to someone. If you go to 1 Cor 8, Paul is dealing with the issue of meat eating and if you are allowed to eat

meat being offered to idols. His point is that you have liberty but you should be careful about being a stumbling block to your brothers or sisters. Brother C. issues is that it is cause and effect which we should not be doing. He will use biblical arguments to show that. The question is how do we actually read this and what does it mean? Go to another passage. 1 Peter 2. This one I will read. Verse 7-8.

2:7 Unto you therefore which believe  
[he is] precious: but unto them which be disobedient,  
the stone which the builders disallowed,  
the same is made the head of the corner,

2:8 And a stone of stumbling, and a rock  
of offence, [even to them] which stumble at the word,  
being disobedient: whereunto also they were appointed.

Jesus is a precious. He is only precious only to those who like him but He is not precious to those who don't like him. In verse 8 it tells you what his word is supposed to be. A stone or stumbling, a rock of offense which those who don't believe in the word, stumble over because they are disobedient. This was appointed. It was designed to be this way. So when we talk about people stumbling over our conduct, if it's a test, we are supposed to trip people and make them stumble. We are supposed to make them fall deliberately to make them stumble for the purpose of the test so that you know who passes and who fails. If it's not a test issue than you are not required to do that in fact you are forbidden from doing that to your fellow human beings. We see example after example of Jesus conduct on this issue. If you turn to John Chapter five there is a man who can't walk. Jesus meets him on the Sabbath and heals him which is fine. Then Jesus deliberately tells the man to pick up his bead and begin to carry it. If you go to verse ten it says they questioned the man. It's the Sabbath and it's not lawful to carry your bead. So why would Jesus make the Jews stumble? There are many other passages where they question why He heals on the Sabbath. They say there are six days to heal, don't heal on the Sabbath because it causes the Jews to stumble. So we have to ask ourselves, is that good behavior from the leader of the movement to make the opponents of the message or those people who don't agree with Him, to stumble? When Jesus does it we say it's ok. Paul says I won't eat meat offered to idols. We use that as some kind of sweeping principle that we should never cause people to stumble. I would suggest, if we decide something is a test which is a moral subject that is being placed in the framework of history therefore making it a prophetic issue. If we determine that that moral issue has now become prophetic and a test, not only are you required to do it, it was designed by God to cause you to stumble.... it comes all the way back to identifying whether or not it is a prophetic subject. I think that is what people are perhaps not seeing. They cannot see that dress is now a prophetic subject.

Brother C.

- A. So I think that dress become a prophetic subject but it is also the sign of the times. Only I said women be careful in the distinction of the two. I don't know if I am easy to understand. But if woman wear pants to feel superior.

Does a man wear pants to feel superior?

- A. You would also wear a dress to feel submission or something like that. I think it's what is beyond that.....

So you are connecting a dress to submission.

A. On the contrary.

No you did that.

A. No.

You did that. You compared a dress to submission and pants to supremacy.

A. No no.

You did. Can you see why it's a prophetic subject right now? Cause you went from dress to supremacy and submission. And you linked the two which is exactly why we are discussing dress because it has a link to supremacy and submission. The problem with many people in this movement, including those asking questions, is where they are failing is over the issues of supremacy and submission. Whether it is the Southern states, the Pharisees, or the protestants today. They want to see supremacy and submission on race and gender. You connected that to dress whether you mean to do that. But that's the point. It's because pants can make a woman feel stronger and more capable, that men and women, whether they realize it or not, find something submissive about a dress. When you speak about dress, it hurts people because whether they realize it or not, it's hitting their social order. I'm gonna ask about saying it's a sign of the times, is the medical system a sign of the times? You would say yes. I would say most of that is good. The changes are good. People were dying a couple of hundred years ago, of diseases they couldn't even define. Now they can cure them. We say something is a sign of the times like it's negative, and you are the one that said that line is evolution. I am saying it's progression, restoration. It depends on your mindset, but if we are being restored, not every change is negative. A black president is not negative. A republican system of government after thousands of years is not negative. There is external positive progression. If you look at what women wore a couple of hundred years ago with the corsets and the layers and the feathers, not every advance is negative. So we use "sign of the times" like it covers everything and I think it is an incorrect Application. But if you are going to connect dress to submission and suppression, it's exactly why it's a subject and a test now because it is at that level where people are hurting. Sister N?

A. What I understand about what we are talking about, we can say with our mouth words that we are accepting but when we are to put into practice and to act we are stumbling. So the test is to go in action. If we really accepted the understanding about pants it's not be only in the mouth.

Agreed. You can obey in the hand or in the forehead when it comes to the SL issues. You can obey God in the hand or in the forehead. If you really believe it, you won't keep clarifying. You won't keep saying "Yes.. But".

A. For me we have to believe and to act. We have to believe and to act at the same time. I said that because I can decide I wear pants and I will be uncomfortable and in the same way some young people when they wear skirt or dress and they are uncomfortable. I think that it's important that we have this type of mindset and the action follow. So for me we need both. It's not only to do but also to believe.



Yes. You can have inappropriate skirts and inappropriate pants. We already know what is appropriate pants because we see what men wear. If it's too tight we know it's not modest. I don't think it's difficult to see. Sister M?

- A. *I think that it's not the fact to wear the pants the fact that show you pass the test or not. I can with my words to show if I have the supremacy or submission. For me it goes beyond that. We insist a lot about women's dress and we don't insist about men's dress. The men are sometimes more problem than women in their dress. We push a lot to have longer skirt and now we push in the other way but I think that the real test is deeper and it's time that we act like adults why I do things and in what is God pleased or not. But I don't want to believe that wear pants tomorrow and act means I pass the test and at the same time my character is as bad as before.*

If it's a prophetic subject you don't have to wear pants if you are more comfortable in a skirt then don't wear pants. But if it's because you think it's because it's inappropriate for a woman to wear pants, if that's the reasoning, I'm saying that's failure. Simple.

I will go to another question. The first question asked is people are confused about the issues of equality. This brings up an interesting thought. They are saying that men and women are equal but not equal in terms of function or role. The reason why I find this almost amusing is for the same reason I told people to look at the court case Brown v. Board of education. What they did with race. First of all race is like this (One group on top and one group on bottom). Everyone can see it. When that starts getting broken down, the argument made is, yes equal but separate. So when we go to equal but separate, it's the same argument as segregation. If someone has to say a black and white person are equal but separate they are saying they are not equal. The way we phrase our sentences is interesting. I'm not saying there aren't different job functions in the home that need to be done. Elder Parminder said I think a couple of days ago. If you go to run an organization you need an accountant, you need a secretary. There are different job functions. Depending on someone's skill set, a couple can decide between the different job functions they are each taking on. But when people say they are equal but not equal in terms of function, I'm not sure what that means, but it's the same language that people used to justify segregation. Equal "But". If you have to include a "but" then please don't include the word equal in your sentence. Do we have any thoughts on that? Brother O.

- A. So today we have the gender theory. It's a theory that says that the human being is not woman or man but can choose who they want to be. So the children will be educated for the possibility to be a homosexual. So in France today we have laws that agree on that and authorize that. Long time ago those who were doing that could go to jail but today there is a law that enforces this type of education. I have my way of thinking in regard to this law. I have nothing against homosexuals but I have a problem with promotion of homosexuality as something normal. How can we deal with that in regard to the message.

I would suggest that if you are going to separate church and state, for one thing we recognize that on many issues, the position of the church is incorrect. Regardless of that if you are going to separate church and state, they need to conduct their schools fairly, with equality. If they do that, I see no problem with what they are doing. I think it's reasonable. Particularly when you had generations of forcing into children "math is hard", "you are not going to be good at math", "fit into your specific role". I see it as a positive. When you think that Obama was bringing that about in the United States, I think we need to see the work he was doing as positive.

I want to go back to the question. Question number 2 regarding the position of male and female. It wants to take us to a couple of verses. Everyone knows what they say so we are just going to refer to them. Ephesians 5 says wives submit to your husbands. The husband is the head of the wife as Christ is the head of the Church. Those are the well known verses that we quote. So Ephesians 5 wives submit. Ephesians 6:5-9

6:5 Servants, be obedient to them that are [your] masters according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in singleness of your heart, as unto Christ;

6:6 Not with eyeservice, as menpleasers; but as the servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart;

6:7 With good will doing service, as to the Lord, and not to men:

6:8 Knowing that whatsoever good thing any man doeth, the same shall he receive of the Lord, whether [he be] bond or free.

6:9 And, ye masters, do the same things unto them, forbearing threatening: knowing that your Master also is in heaven; neither is there respect of persons with him.

There was an interesting article in the Washington post. It showed how in the southern states, they would all go to church, the slaves would all go to church but they would have to sit at the back. They would preach on these verses to make sure their slaves behaved during the week. Because it clearly shows that there are those that are free and those that are in bondage. And if you are in bondage then you serve willingly as unto Christ. So slaves serve your masters as if they are Christ with fear and trembling doing it as unto God. They preach on those verses. Many of the slaves were no longer comfortable with that definition. It's still an issue in America today. You can find the black churches and the white churches have a different way of reading. They are still wrestling with that legacy. So if you want to go to chapter 5 then remember chapter 6 race and link the two. And we did a line of progression. Where does race end up in our dispensation? Equality. Where does gender end up in our dispensation? Equality. No I want to make the point in verse 23. The husband is the head of the wife as Christ is the head of the church. When did He become the head of the church? As He is the savior of they body. When did He become the savior of the body?

A. ON the Cross?

Before the cross. The cross was a culmination. But He is promised from when? Eden. Before or after sin?

A. After.

After. So Christ is the savior of the body and that's an after sin condition. From Eden we do not need a savior and we did not need saving... to Eden the new earth. The church sits with Him on His throne. He is not on His throne ruling the church. They rule with Him. Equality. So if we want to go from Eden to Eden, I would suggest that these verses become a subject of dispensation. You can take a parable about the role Christ has played but I would like anyone, if they want to argue, to go back to our two brains. We do not bring every element of a parable into its application and a man's brain has no ability to see the future that a woman's doesn't have. A man's brain cannot look into the future and have infinite knowledge. The two brains are the same. So when we compare Christ and us, we have to be careful with our application. We don't bring every thing down. Some people in this movement say publicly, "I'm grateful for my wife, but she needs me because going from these verse, she can't make decisions". Some of the people saying that are from Africa. So if they want to read chapter 5 in that way then go to chapter 6 and say those in salvery can't make decisions. Read chapter 5 and chapter 6 in the same way. Connect it to progression and recognize this was a sin condition just like slavery. Are there any questions or thoughts?

The reason dress is a subject is because it connects to this in ways I don't think many people realize. It's a visible exhibition of supremacy and submission, which is why it becomes a test, to make a demonstration. We don't live that way. Sister A.?

A. *What I understand about the dress subject and pants God wants to work in us to restore us and God wants us to get rid of the conservative mindset. He wants to free us from that because it's like fence that we built. He wants to free us from that. I think that it's a personal subject for everyone one of us and we are able to deal with this subject individually with our conscious. I agree with Manuela upon the test, the demonstration and the acting but even we understand that ok if we want we can wear pants but if we don't want to, the fact you see the test is to act that, I think it can be dangerous because it can disqualify those who don't want. When I say disqualify it is not in the eyes of God but in the eyes of the fellowship. Maybe some people will say that this woman she didn't wear pants. Maybe this woman wants to get rid of this conservative mindset but maybe she don't want to wear pants. So maybe we are wanting to be careful about this subject.*

If she is wearing them because she is comfortable with that she is fine. No one judges. But if someone is at the front presenting in pants, she will know whether or not that makes her uncomfortable, and if it does she will know whether or not she can accept that. Elder Parminder?

Elder Parminder: I don't know if people see this connection. When we talked a few days ago that the purpose of the constitution is not to protect the rights of the majority. They can fight for themselves. It's to protect the rights of the minority. This question has come up a few times now. This point has that I don't want to wear trousers so don't judge me. That is not the issue. The issue is the protection of the rights of the women who do want to wear trousers. We are shifting this argument with women who are saying "I don't want to wear trousers, don't judge me". We need to keep to point. The point is that men or women are not allowed to judge women who want to wear trousers. Let's not turn this argument the other way around. It's not a issue of women who don't want to wear trousers. It's to protect the rights of the women who do want to wear them. Because that is the reality of this test that we have in our movement now. No one is going to says "Why are you wearing a skirt?" when you are presenting. The real word is that people will look when a woman in trousers is presenting and their rights are the ones that we are supposed to be protecting. Let's not use this argument that women need to be protected so they can wear skirts. That is not what the issue is. They can protect themselves. The constitution is designed to protect the rights of the minority.

As we have more and more people come into the movement, some from liberal areas, they see our methodology and they fall in love with it. They consider baptism and they are sat down and presented with our old ideas of dress. They can see that the level that our methodology is at, there is an inconsistency. For those women who can see that inconsistency, who are new to the movement, it's for them that we don't present either a witness by our words, by our testimony to them, by what we require of them, that they have to wear skirts. There are women coming into this movement and for them this is a serious issue because they are having to give up pants. They see our methodology and that's it's come a long way and has advanced and they can see that our teachings are inconsistent with our methodology. It's for them that we need to make sure that we don't present for the a test of wearing skirts that does not exist. It's to protect them. Sister A?

- A. I agree with what you said and what Parminder said, but we must be careful of the people who arrive in the movement, the young girls, and we must be careful about that. That's why I thank God that He frees us from that. But is say that because what was being said that you have to demonstrate that you pass the test. I only that I wanted to underline but I agree with what the principle of what Parminder said.

Demonstration can look like total acceptance. If it's someone else's choice. Sister N?

- A. In every dispensation we are tested. So we have been testing upon time and to show that we accept it was to accept the message but it didn't touch us individually. But as we advance in time and the test are becoming more persona, when we are tested on rebaptism, to show that we accept, we act on it. Because we show publicly that we pass the test. I don't see the difference with pants if we are accepting this test to show it publicly, because we show that we understood the message and the same thing for baptism. In this way we act upon that.

I agree with those sentiments. We are over time. I just want to finish one thought. I will move on from the issues of gender and I might answer these question fairly quickly.

One question. Why would God allow this issue of race and slavery? Was it to teach us something?

God seems to allow a lot of things, bad things to happen that we now use as parables. Talk about the life of David and use elements as a parable. We still would not blame God for those actions. So I agree that we can learn something, but I would be cautious with it saying that the original action was Gods will. All through the bible He uses the other peoples bad behavior to teach us lessons and I would place this in the same category.

Then there is the question of the SL issues. They go to some Great Controversy quotes. Particularly they want to go to 604.3. I will just paraphrase the first couple of sentences.

There will be those who will trample upon Gods law by obeying a human law, they call the mark of the beast, they choose to obey another power instead of God. As this is the Great controversy, the whole issue it the subject of Sabbath and Sunday. You can go a couple of paragraphs down and see that. She is saying that the trampling of Gods law is the violation of Sabbath, the fourth commandment. The question is asking, how do we read that in our day.

As we drew up the chapters, we recognized that the great controversy was written for 1888 history and what they were doing was trying to bring in a law that didn't give you freedom to worship according to your conscience. We bring that to our day. But in the history of the civil war they also brought in laws. The primary one is the fugitive slave law. There are a couple of questions that are being asked that are quite similar. How it is phrased in revelation is that we are going to be caused to make an image to the beast and we can obey in our forehead or in our hand and they will make everyone participate in this according to their own conscience. If we bring that into the history of the Civil War, the primary law I would say is the 1850 fugitive slave law. This was a compromise between the North and the South. I have a couple of external sources. This compromise did not long delay the Civil War. It didn't solve the issues between North and South but what it did do as part of that compromise is force those in the North, who were against slavery, to aid in catching fugitives. If I was in the North and I was an abolitionist and helped a run away slave, I could be punished by the government. They made that illegal. And if someone came to me and said that a slave escaped, he is in this area and we need your help to catch, and I refuse to give my help, I could be charged by the government. So you are forced to also aid in the actions of slavery in violation of their own conscience. You can support slavery in the hand because they forced you to or the forehead. This compromise did not succeed because so many in the North refused to abide by it.

So we can connect this issues of slavery, we are out of time, but I would say it fulfills the same verses upon closer inspection. The same verses she uses in the argument of Sunday Law.

Last question that we will deal with. In the Israelite dispensation, they just had the bible. With the Millerites it was Bible and EGW. They are asking do we now have the bible, EGW, and external events. I would suggest that they had the bible, EGW and external events as well. Just to form this Millerite reform line they also needed those external events. They also need those external events for the 1888 history reform line as well. I think we fail to see their dependents on external events partly because we can go to their writings now to see those external events. So it can make us feel like it came from the but they are as dependent as we are. When EGW talks about movements currently underway they had to look externally to see those movements which is the same thing we are doing. Our history it can look much bigger. We are dealing with a few more issues than just Sunday but you can see that it is already spreading world wide. So it becomes probably a broader subject for us when we bring in Islam and proxy wars and Israel. Those things are prophetic subjects. But they had to depend on the external sources as much as we do. Any questions?

So we will finish there. We have gone through quite a few subjects and I would like to remind everyone these subjects will be presented again in Germany and expanded upon. We are laying a foundation. If people can see it now and it's still a little hazy, we will be presenting it again. We have presented about the issues of race and gender. We have seen our reform line from the history of the moral majority. What we are beginning to understand more clearly is the sin of the United States. That you can take slavery and Sunday law into our own history. In this fashion we understand what gave rise to Donald Trump, why the country is closing it's probation, why the ship is destroyed at SL in Acts 27. I would really like to encourage people not to stop looking at the external sources. See whats happening in the middle east, with project blitz. See what Trump is sayin with the mass shootings. There are major external events that are happening all around us and what we are discussing will become much more firmly planted in our minds if you can see the significant of those things for yourself. If you will kneel with me we will pray.

