

**** REVIEW AND CONCLUSION ** PARMINDER BIA NT ****

**** PRESENTATION BY ANTOINETTE ****

**** UGANDA CAMP MEETING ****

**** BINDING OFF MESSAGES ** 1/25/20 ****

Thou Shalt Not See My Brother's Ox.

Someone said to me the other day, they didn't realize how **interesting** the book of **Deuteronomy** was.

Above everything that we've been looking at, all the **twists** and **turns**, the **intricacies**, the **details**. I hope above all things, that we could all go away with from in this school, **is that sentiment**.

That you **didn't realize** that the book of **Deuteronomy** could be that **interesting**,

I think if we could leave this school with that one thought, a **major milestone** would have occurred in our relationship and in our **understanding of who God is**.

The fact that you can take a boring book and make it an interesting.

A testament to God, to the work of the **Holy Spirit**, that it would serve to perhaps, be an **inspiration** to each one of us as **teachers**, that you can go to **God's Word** and make it **interesting** for people.

That they would see, not only new depths in the sense of like some intriguing information, but they would be **inspired** to see that **meditating** and **contemplating God's Word**, it's not only **necessary** to receive eternal life, but is actually **enjoyable**, it's actually a **pleasurable** task, it's **exciting** and it's **fulfilling**.

And too often the way we think about **God's Word**, the way **we teach** it, is completely **opposite**, it's **dry** and it's **boring**. And I think for many of us, it doesn't have **any value**.

So, that was not my **testimony**, that was someone else's **testimony**. They didn't quite say everything that I just said, but that's what I understood that person to be saying.

That they can now go to the book of **Deuteronomy** and not just know some information, not just this timeline here, that the **50** days at **Mount Sinai** they're doing their work.

The whole story isn't about **men** and **women**, it's about these brave fighting men who are over **20** years old, and how that **theme permeates**, not only through the book of **Deuteronomy** but in other places too, as it **impacts** the book of **Exodus**. And we haven't even looked carefully about how it would **change our perspective of the book of Genesis**.

So, **I found that really encouraging**. But if that's what we've been able to **achieve**, that people have found it **interesting**, and they've been being **inspired** to go away, **continuing to go look at this subject**, I think that's a **testimony** to the work of **God**. And the **blessings** that we've received being **here at this school**

I've seen the study that we're looking at was **Deuteronomy 22** verse **5**.

Now I don't know if you have thoughts about this, spoke to someone else, and they thought, this thing that I'm about to say, **God** said I was **disappointed**, that's probably too strong a word, but I thought **that's sad** that they didn't even pick up, not the point of my studies, but what I was actually **trying to bring forth**, the people see it as **two separate issues**.

So, what I want us to **try and see**, if we go back to the very beginning, when we first came to our school, what was the first things that I began to discuss here on the board?

What was the question that I proposed?

Why are we not **harvesting** the **Levite**?

I framed it in a slightly different way or maybe that was the, and then there was the answer to the question.

How God is dealing with the **church in the world**. **God's** dealing with mankind is **ever the same**. So, everyone receives the **everlasting gospel**, it's the **repeating pattern**.

There are many **symbols** to represent the **Nethinim's**, and why did I want to **highlight** that issue?

Since then we've been discussing all of this here.

And what's all this subject connected to? **It's about the baptismal vows**.

Not any old **vows**, those **four problematic vowels**. And we took from the study of **Deuteronomy**. And what did we learn, what **principle**? The **Law** and **good advice**.

So, **Law** and **good advice** sounds like a new concept.

Let's come back to here, we have a list of all these **Nethinim's**, and the **purpose** of that was for whom, whose **benefit**? The benefit of the **Priests**

I asked a question, what's the question I asked?

I didn't ask the question why did we go to all those lines, but it's connected to them.

What was my question?

So, the answer to the question, this isn't a proper answer. But I want to frame it this way. So, when we do all these lines, what's the purpose of all those lines?

Tell me the two options that we have. One option is,

Someone else. Why am I asking **him** this question?

Tell him **why** I'm asking him the question.

Brother Dennis why am I asking him that question?

Why am I asking him the question and not you?

Someone else, why am I asking him the question?

Because he already gave me two answers.

Why are they there?

Answer one. You already gave me the answer before, I just we need you to repeat the answer that you gave me before.

Answer one, that's not the answer you gave before.

What answer did they give before? The **law** or **good advice**.

That's what we wanted to see when we discussed this.

Sister Schneider, Law version, what does that mean?

We have ten points, what would the **Law** say?

You don't understand my question. **Brother William** do you understand my question?

Okay, what would the **Law** be? If the answer was the **Law** that's why we did it?

What answer is that, what version? Or what would happen? We would die.

You understand everything, or you die.

That's **Law version**.

What's the other version? **Good advice**

So, that's the other answer, **good advice**.

And what's the response we say for that one? **We don't have to understand them.**

How many do you need to understand? **Three**? How much is **enough**?

Two or three? You only need to know **two or three**. And we started off with I think **10** and we went to about **14**.

And the problem is, we can't say its **Law**. Why can't we say its law my brother?

Because **it's not enforceable**. We can't **enforce** that. I can't **force you** to understand all of those.

And, it's not **definable**, it's not **codified**.

Because, how many **symbols** are **Nethinim's**? **12? 15? 50? 100?**

How do we know?

So, it's not **enforceable**, because it's not **codified**, can we see that.

So, can we see right through the very beginning, that our **studies** have been a **uniform thought** all the way through.

It's not changed, we're looking at the **same** issue from **different perspectives**, can we **see** that?

So, I wanted to point that out. That people say, well you're just doing some random studies and they're not connected.

Right from the very beginning we can see, how do we **approach our work** as **priests, prophets**, as the **first fruit**, as **teachers**, how does it work? And it turns out, that a lot of what we do is all **good advice**.

The problem is, **in the same breath we say it's a life-and-death message**.

So, it becomes a **complex issue**, how we deal with **life and death**, which is **Law**. And **good advice** which is **take it or leave it**.

So, can we see that, at least I wanted us to see, that from the very beginning to the very end, **it's been a common theme all the way through**, can we see that?

Then there's another **theme** that's been running all the way through.

So. there's another point that I brought up in those studies.

What was the other point with this picture work here?

What else did we learn?

If I repeat the question, it won't help you. My question was, **what else did we learn?**

If I give you more than that, I'll end up answering the question.

Okay, so we did another one,

PRIEST- LEVITES & NETHINIM'S

So. I'm going to do this, why am I asking her this question now? Because? She's already answered the question. She's already given the answer. Equals? No.

So, you gave the answer already, but you're coming up with a different answer. You got to remember what you answered. And when you give the answer you say okay, now I understand what was being taught here.

P = GOOD

L =

Don't tell me what you said before, give me the answer. If you give me the answer, I know that you'll remember what you thought.

No, **Priest** does not **equal** the **Church**, you didn't say that.

Should I help you? Okay, so this is not the answer. Do you agree with that?

P = GOOD

L = GOOD

So, now my question is, you can either do this as a **math lesson** or we can do it, the answer that you gave before.

The **Priests** are **good people**, the **Levites** are **good people**, so therefore the **Priests** are? **Levites!**

Is that what you said at the beginning? Yes. We are okay with that?

P = GOOD

L = GOOD

P = L = N

That's what we taught.

So, here we had all these signs of the **Nethinim's**, and **we need to know all of them. That's the best advice**, which we thought was **Law**.

Some of us thought that **Law was best advice**.

So, do you want to give everybody the **best advice** or **low-quality advice**?
The best advice.

So, the best advice for a Priest is to learn everything. Is that correct?

Yes

So, what's the job function of a **Levite** sister Jackie?

Before you answer that, **what's the job function of the Priests**? They're to **teach**.

What's the job function of the Levites? They too are to **teach**.

So, we want the **best advice**.

The **best advice** is to learn how much?

What percentage? **5 percent? 10 percent? 100 percent?**

What's the **best advice** for a **Priest** to learn how much?

It depends. What's the **best advice**?

100 % percent, you can't depend.

The best advice is to learn everything.

If someone says, I'm busy, I'll say ok, learn half of it then. But that's **not the best advice. The best advice is to learn everything.** Is that correct, you agree with that?

So, if you're a **teacher**, what's the best advice? **To learn everything that you need to know.**

So, what advice are you going to give to the **Levites**? The **same**.

Are we going to **teach the Netherlands**? We're going to **teach** the **Nethinim's, yes.** That's what that was for.

What's the job function of a **Levite**, to teach who? To teach the **Nethinim's**, it's the same job function.

So, if we need to learn **everything**, that's the **best advice**.

What do they need to learn? **Everything**.

So, what does sister Dorcas **teach** us? That the **Priests** and the **Levites** **are the same**, they're **teachers** who needs to know how much? **Everything**.

Is that a **Law**? **NO**, its **best advice**.

So, once we do that, then we can say that they're all the **same** we didn't extend that study. **But you can develop a logic to show that as well**.

If we're not sure about that, who do **Priest** teach?

How many **groups** did **Priests** teach? I heard two.

How many groups? **Three groups**.

The three groups are; Priests, Levites, are we okay with that?

Levites teach how many groups? **Two groups**.

Nethinim's teach how many groups? **One group**. They must teach **themselves**. So, they're all the **same** they're all **teachers**.

So, the **Nethinim's** need to learn that as well **as they teach other Nethinim's**.

So, what's the difference between these three? **No difference**, they're all good. So, that theme, that idea is what I've been trying to show you in my studies.

And for sure **Elder Tess** has been trying to teach that theme.

Why is that so important? Why have we taken virtually this whole school to deal with **two issues**? The **difference** between **good advice** and **Law**.

And that the **Priests, Levites** and **Nethinim's** **are the same**.

Why do we labor that point? The obvious answer is because we haven't learnt it already in the movement.

We're not repeating something that doesn't need to be repeated.

There's an issue in the movement so we're addressing them.

So, what's the problem in the movement, with respect to this issue, that **Elder Tess** is trying to draw out in her studies.

What's the problem? Don't say the **papacy**. Because she's been talking about the **papacy a lot**.

But I wanted to see what the **issue is that she's trying to identify as opposed to the subject matter**.

Brother Wilson, because there is a thought that's running through our **movement**, that the **Nethinim's only need to learn external events** you said, using events, is that the word you said, **externally events**.

Now whose fault is that, that everybody thinks that. Who taught them that?

So, it's our fault, we taught them that. So, if you're going to blame, and you say, well you did. You said that you taught us that.

And our response is, What?

Okay, we got three options; **either it means we're liars**, which lots of people accuse of.

The second one is just as bad; **we only gave you half the information and we were keeping the rest for ourselves**. We either lied or we kept half the information. In many ways they are the same things.

Or, the last one is probably worse than all of that.

Rule number five. What were we doing?

We were guessing, we didn't even know and now we've worked out some new thing, and we said, oh look we were guessing before, now we know a bit more.

So, you have to figure out which one it is.

There's a belief in the movement that all Nethinim's need to do is just **learn external events**, that's all they need to do. And the purpose, at least one major purposes of our time here at the school, **was to address that issue. That that is an incorrect understanding.**

And if you want to blame someone, if you want to, we could say, it's your fault because you're lazy, you don't pick up all the clues. Or it's our fault because we didn't understand.

So, rather than blame one another of how we got here, let's take knowledge that we're here. And then let's also acknowledge that we are **fixing the misunderstanding**. Let's call it that, **misunderstanding between us**.

And it's taken us, from my observation, several weeks before we've got to the place where, I'm going to state it as a fact, but I'm hoping that it is a fact. That every single one of us here, have now got to the place where we can recognize, not how we got here, because I don't want to blame people, but that we did get to a place where we thought the **Nethinim's were different**. That we believed this.

P = GOOD

L = GOOD

P = L \neq N

So, maybe the accurate story is, we knew all the answers, but we only gave you half of the answer. We weren't lying, that that's everything. But we didn't tell you everything and we're not guessing.

You may or may not believe it, or you may or may not realize it. And then you may not believe it now.

But now I'm telling you, that **Elder Tess and I don't have secret meetings**, where we have this **deep strategy**; **you teach this today and I'll teach this, and I'll watch your back and you watch my back. It's not so, it's not so humanistic.**

If I could venture to say, it's driven by the **Holy Spirit**, by **Providence**, by **direct intervention**.

What I mean by that is, when we came here, I didn't send her a message (because she was obviously in Kenya) I didn't say, so the first thing I'm going to do is a presentation I have, then I'm going to do this one here to set them up for you, to set the class up, to set the theme, and I'll set it out for you and then you go in the coup d'etat and you get them.

It wasn't done that way.

Elder Tess didn't ask me, what you are teaching? I didn't say, "oh this is what I'm teaching, and I didn't say I'm teaching this so I'm going to do this would be the introduction to all your classes, so they'll get it, it wasn't that way.

But what I wanted us to see, is if you can see what we were discussing at the very beginning of our class, with me, and when you come to the conclusion of what **Elder Tess has been teaching that it's the same thing**.

So, what people have **struggled** with throughout her class, is amazing really, if those people, "**you**", whoever the "**you**" are. If you had been attentive, maybe you, if you would have fasted and prayed.

And you would have said that this **movement** is being led by **two co-equal leaders**, they say the **same** thing, **look different**, use **different language**, use **different models**, but they're **saying the same thing**.

If you had the faith to believe that, then what you had all the ability to do is, to say wherever **Elder Tess is teaching, **Elder Parminder** must be teaching the same thing**. But people didn't. People disconnected **her**, and **my presentations**.

And worse than that, they disconnected my own presentations.

everything, and I'm saying I'm clean, it's not my fault. All the bad things are his fault.

So, you have to access even why I'm doing that. Which then means you have to go into **my morality**. And try to **understand** what I'm talking about.

So, I addressed that issue back in **Germany last year**, when I said (because people say this, I don't know if it's true or not they say it enough) the fact my **Co-leader says, I'm the second angel**. So, if that's the case, because **Elder Jeff** even said the **same**. Then with the **second angel**, which is different to the first, and the third, is what?

If you remember that statement that I made; he has a **split personality**. This is two separate and opposite things; you're **good and you're bad**, do you remember that?

I used those, if you watch the presentations, in the framework of **schizophrenia, dual personality, bi-polar, however you want to say it**.

And that would explain why one day I can be **nice**, and one I can be **mean**, one day I can **encourage** you, one day I can **tell you off**. And one day I can say, all the problem is your fault, you're not listening to my presentations. Or I can say, in the next sentence, the next day, you know what the problem is, **it's not your fault**, we just didn't give you all the **information you needed**.

Are we okay with that?

What I want us to become **familiar** with, **is that we view a problem or a situation from multiple perspectives**.

So, I'll do presentations that make **Elder Jeff** look **evil, lazy**; I've used the word in the past. And yet, you do another presentation where I have, I still do to show you who he was, **and that all of us were required to obey Him without question**.

So. there's a problem in our movement, that we have come to a place that says, what brother Wilson?

This issue here,

P = GOOD

L = GOOD

P = L \neq N

Repeat what your answer was. The **Nethinim's** only have to learn **external events**.

But we, we have to learn other things. And where will that **theology** take you?

If you believe that, that's all they have to learn, **external events**, where will that take you?

So, we teach by that concept that they're **100%** right. And if they're a **100%** right and we're a **100%** right; then at the end we're going to be best friends because we're all right.

And now we're seeing that, **that is obviously not correct**. And so now we're arguing that they're **half right and half wrong**. And what is it they're **wrong on**?

So, that was the question that **Elder Tess** asked, and she said like a pregnant thought, **half right half wrong**.

And **Elder Tess** said, what are they wrong in? and no one ventured to have an answer.

I'm not trying to resurrect that question and say give me the answer.

I think we could tease out the answer if he wanted to. But that's not my purpose to do that.

What I want us to see is where this **doctoring takes you is**, if they're **100% correct**. and I just said, what did I say about us, we are? Can that be correct, that statement? **It can't be correct**.

Where must we be standing today? **Half right half wrong**.

So, what we're doing is, **we're mixing our dispensations together and we're saying we're half right and half wrong**. If we're **half right and half wrong**, who are we?

Priests can't be **Priests** we must be some, as we're accused of, some kind of **Jesuit demonic organization**. What are we **half wrong** on today, what are we **half wrong** on my brother?

Remember, why am I asking the question? **Because you already gave the answer.**

What are we **half wrong** on? Not that.

What are we wrong on?

What are we not in harmony about?

Everybody, what was his answer?

What are we wrong about?

Do we remember what his answer was?

What are we wrong about? **The four vows baptismal vows, remember?**

So, we're wrong in the baptismal vows. **That's one of the major things that we're not in harmony about.**

And you say, "well that's a minor issue" it doesn't matter what people do, if they **wear earrings or if they braid**, or whatever it is.

What's the big issue, especially seeing, what are those issues dealing with?

Are those issues **Law**?

And what are they?

Okay, seeing its **good advice**, why is there so much **disunity**?

Why can't we just leave it?

Why the big issue?

Because, what's **the ramifications** or **the conclusion** of that?

When you come to the **Nethinim's**, where does that **philosophy take you? It takes you to the world.**

So, we become like the world. Not the world in the prophetic system, like we're understanding it. **We become the classic definition of worldly.**

So, **they're teaching us**. And if you believe that, the question I want to ask is, **why are we here?**

Who's the leader, **us or them?**

Because everything inspiration frames it in, what way, who's the leaders? We are. **We're the leaders. that's how the Bible frames it.**

God's people go out and give a message. This is turning things **upside down.**

Who's giving the message to whom? The world is. The world is saying to us, come out, come out of, I don't know what, Adventism, and join us.

So, we become either **Moab** or **Ammon**. Can we see how we turn things **upside down? It has huge ramifications.**

If you just see it at these simple fundamental messages, but it's not enough just to see it that way. **We need to understand the detail.** Because the **detail will help us not to confirm.**

I'm not trying to do degenerate **Elder Tess's studies**, that's the confirmation of these **principles. You need those details in order to develop the next set of principles.** And in order to walk **faithfully** through this **dispensation** and the coming one, **the details are essential.**

So, it's not a **minor issue** when many of us, even when you're given the answer, in the first two or three classes. the people say, we don't believe that, the **Nethinim's are different.**

P = GOOD

L = GOOD

P = L \neq N

So, we've picked up a number of themes.

First of all, it's the relationship between **good advice** and **Law**. And what I don't want to do, when I want us to see that, even though I brought it in view.

You know **my position** on this. So, you tell me what **your position** is.

All of those **things**, all of those **symbols** that were on the board, how many of those things, do you think, **you are required to learn**?

How many are you **required to learn** of out of those **13 things**?

Give me the number or the percentage. There are **30** things, it was more, we'll do **13**.

How many of those things are you **required to learn**? You're not sure.

None of them?

Are you **required to learn nothing**?

Okay, so, you're sure it's nothing.

So, you think you're **required to learn** some of them, not all of them.

Let me ask a different question. **Are you required to be the best possible teacher that you can?**

And what would the **best** possible **teacher** do, **learn some of them or all of them? All of them**

So, what are you **required to learn**; some, none, or all?

So, you're required to learn all of them, that's what we SHOULD do.

So, is it a **Law** that you're **required to learn** all of them? **No, it's good advice.**

But just because someone gives you **good advice**, does that mean you don't have to **listen to the advice**? **There are consequences.**

So, the problem with us, is we're so selfish. Who do we keep on thinking about? **We think about ourselves.**

Now if I said to you, you need to learn **10 symbols of Nethinim's**.

Because how many **Nethinim's** do you need to reach?

You need to learn **10 symbols** because that's how many **Nethinim's** you need to reach. You need to reach **10 Nethinim's**, isn't that right?

One **symbol** for each one. You need to reach the heart of one of those **Nethinim's**, and the only way you can do it is with **symbol** number 10. For **Nethinim** number 10.

And you say, I'm **tired, I don't want to do this**, I'm not **clever enough**, I **can't handle the pressure**. So, I'm only going to learn **9**, leave the **1**. **9 is good enough**.

Can you get to heaven? So, we know the answer is **Yes**.

Now, you tell me **why**?

How can you get to heaven if you're only going to do **9**? Because it's only, **good advice**.

It's only **good advice** to do **10**, you don't have to do **10**, you can do how many you want to.

Because what you say is, **I did my job**. And I say, **did you do it properly**?

So, they say, well, that's what **I can manage**, I've got **responsibilities**.

And, I'll say, good answer

Can you get to heaven? **Yes**

What about **Nethinim** number **10**?

Will they get to **heaven**?

So, **there are consequences**. Will **you** be happy in heaven? **No**.

So, my sister is agreeing, in **heaven** there is no **happiness**.

No happiness for "**her**", **why**? Because of that **10th one**.

And whose fault is that? **It's her fault**.

When will she be **happy**?

Ten years later in heaven, a hundred years, a thousand, a millennium?

When will you ever be happy?

You say, I will be happy in a **million years**. I'll say, in the **million years** I'm going to come up to you. I'm going to say, you know what, **heaven is fun**.

But the problem is, is **my child** isn't here. And she knows that my child was, whom? **Nethinim number 10**, and she'll say, that was **my fault**. 😞

So, after **million** years she still won't be happy. So, it's not **Law**, but there are **consequences** for what we do.

So, when I talk about **good advice** and **Law**, I'm not trying to **degrade Law**. I'm trying to **promote good advice**. And **personal salvation is not enough**, it's not what we're here for, to be saved. **We're here to do the best possible job** that we can. And the **best possible job** is to **reach all 10** of those people, not only **9**.

So, this is obviously just a **parable**. Life is not that **simple**. And I'm not trying to **condemn** or **judge** anybody. But I wanted to use the framework to understand what it means when we speak about **good advice** and **Law**. **And how easy it is to make mistakes**.

So, the **Nethinim's** they **cannot** just have **external events**. **P = L ≠ N**

They need to be **competent teachers**. They need to explain things to people. If that doesn't happen, **we get to the place where we are like the world**. And then the **whole system breaks down**.

So, **there are many misconceptions** in each **dispensation**. But if I could take it to a **unifying theme**, that **connects all of these problems**, that we all have. I don't think I did this here. I think I did it recently in **Germany**.

We've got **four lines**; **Moses**, the line of the **Disciples**, which we call the line of **Christ**. The line of the **Millerites** and **our line**. **And there are two recurring themes through all of those**.

One of them is the **subject of time**. And the other one is the subject of.... You can either use my **symbol** or one that you have of your own devising.

My brother, so I don't know if that was your own that you thought of independently, but that's the one that I've used.

GEOGRAPHY

We know that's a problem because with **Adventists**, what's the premier chapter for **Adventist** when it comes to **prophecy**? **Daniel 2**

What's the problem that **Adventists** have? **It's all about geography**.

They've put the **two kingdoms separate** to one another; **Earth and Heaven.**

And **why** is that **fundamentally wrong**? Because they're **too far apart.**

What does **Jesus** have to do? **He** has to **link them together.**

Where does **Ellen White** described the linking of **Christ**? Between the **first** and the **second kingdoms.**

Christ Object Lessons beginning page **17** chapter **1.** I think it's the introduction. She describes the work of **Christ** and shows how he fixes the problem.

He gets heaven and drags it **down to earth** or does he take **Earth** and drag it **up towards heaven**?

Which one does he do? **It depends, because you have two different versions.**

What is it supposed to be like when you live on **earth**? **Good.**

Let's not use the word **good**, let's use the word **earth.**

Then what's the opposite of **Earth**?

So, what is it supposed to look like here?

Christ came down to earth, to get earth and drag it up to heaven.

Do we agree with that?

But He also did what? **He dragged heaven down to Earth.**

And we only have these **one-sided stories**, So, **Earth** is supposed to look like **Heaven**, isn't it?

I think maybe we could **conceptualize** that, like this school was supposed to be like **heaven**. Maybe you had some glimpses of it or maybe you've had a miserable time here and it's looked nothing like **heaven** for you.

You can't wait until you get somewhere else. And you say, if **Heaven** is like this, I'd rather **live in hell**. Maybe you think that leaving, **I hope not.** 😞

I apologize if you felt like that even for just a moment. Because this place should have been like heaven.

And what are we **require to do** in the discussion like that? **Blame someone.**

Aren't we supposed to go around blaming someone?

Whose **fault** is that if this **school doesn't** look like **heaven**. We've got **multiple answers**. And at the end of the day whoever you want to target, **put yourself** into their place and see how you would have done it differently. And then **put yourself** into your own place and see what blame that you have for that. **So, it's all about self-analysis.**

So, I mention this point here, **it's a very simplified version** of what the problem is, about **Good Advice**

9 > **BAD ADVICE**

10 > **GOOD ADVICE**

Someone gets harmed if you don't follow the advice.

And **Paul** says, what, what's his famous verse that deals with **Law** and **good advice**?

So, I was going to go to **1st Corinthians** chapter **10**. Where were you going to go my brother? **Philippians**.

So, we'll write that down **Philippians** chapter **4**.

Before we go there, I want to go to **1st Corinthians**. So, it's in **2** chapters, **chapter 6** and **chapter 10**.

1st Corinthians chapter 6 and chapter 10 verses 12 and 23

So, as you're turning there, I'm going to read **Philippians** chapter **4** verse **8**.

Finally, my brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, lovely, etc.

Is that the one you wanted me to go to **4:8, and 9?**

Those things, which ye have both learned, and received, and heard, and seen in me do: and the God of peace shall be with you.

So, I like that verse. I took us to **1st Corinthians** chapter **6** verse **12** which says,

All things are lawful unto me, but all things are not expedient: all things are lawful for me, but I will not be brought under the power of any.

And he brings his story up in a number of different ways. **1st Corinthians** chapter **10**, is a **very similar principle**. So, I want to give a story that is related to **Paul** and the story is about meat eating.

So, when it comes to **eating meat**, what's he going to say? **Meat** is offered to idols. It's **lawful** to do that. But it's **not helpful**. **It's lawful, but not helpful if you do those things.**

So, I don't want to press the point any further because I don't want to keep on going down this route, about the **relationship between good advice** and **Law**.

The only point that I want to make is that I'm not trying to degrade one, as opposed to the other. **And there are consequences if a person doesn't follow good advice**. Someone always **gets hurt**.

In the stories that I just gave from **1st Corinthian**, the story about the **meat** It's flip the other way around. He says, my advice is **don't eat meat even though it's lawful** for everybody to **eat the meat**.

So, the situation is reversed in that **but if the principle is still the same**.

I want to turn our attention back to **Deuteronomy 22** verse **5**.

Now when we looked at **Deuteronomy 22** verse **5**, we approach this in the **English**,

The woman shall not wear that which pertaineth unto a man, neither shall a man put on a put on a woman's garment:

We looked at all of that and the first thing we looked at was the **man**. And we said the **most important words** were **wear** and **pertaineth**.

But we looked at **man** instead. And we were looked at man it then becomes what subject?

Do you say the most correct, is that how we framed it?

We said this is talking about **a brave frightened man who is twenty years or older**. Are we okay with that?

So, this begins to give us the framework.

We then went into **Deuteronomy** chapter **20**, saw how the **priest** and it says the **officer**, who is a **leader**. Not a **military** person it's a **civil** person, is going to give **advice** and **counsel** about going **to war**.

There are **similarities** and there's **differences**. So, we saw a **church** and **state**. We still need to complete that study. If we don't do it here at this school, watch online and no doubt I'll probably bring it up somewhere else to finish it off. Or you can finish it in your own studies.

But it's to show that there's a **difference** between **church** and **state**.

Their **requirements** are **different** yet there is some **overlap**

Now what I want us to look at is, if we were to see this **passage**, and looked at it in the **Hebrew**, you begin to get **different answers**.

The word **pertaineth** in this **passage** means what? It means **to belong**.

Pertain means **to belong**, to be the **property**, the **right** or the **duty**.

And I gave you **two** passages **2nd Corinthians 12:4** and **Acts** chapter **1** verse **3**. You take the **word** in the **English** and it **means to belong to** someone, or **to own**, **to have ownership**. We're okay with that?

And so, we went to the **English** and we said apostrophe S for the **woman**, **belongs to a man belongs to a woman**. Everybody ok with that?

And then we said in the **English**, what is the **garment**? The **garments** are the **women**.

What is the **man's**?

What's the word? "**That**", **isn't it?** The, "**that**" is the **garment**.

If you go back to the **Hebrew**, even if you don't know I'm just going to tell you **“that” is not the man's garment**. In the **Hebrew** the word, **“that”** is not the man's **garment as it is in the English**.

So, you have to approach it in a completely different way.

And that is where our first clue is. What you find is that the word **pertaineth** is **not possession**. It's actually the **thing possessed** in the original.

So, we have run out of time, but I don't want to leave it without giving our first introductory approach to looking at this **passage in the Hebrew**.

Who has done that in their private studies, anyone?

By now you should have done that, you should have gone to the **Hebrew** and looked at that **outside of class**. Now I didn't instruct you to do it, I didn't give you homework to do it, but if you'd come here, so now I'm going to tell you off.

With the right **framework**, with the right **agenda**, you should have **outside of class** looked at that. I've given you enough clues to do that. And **if** you had done that you would have known a number of **different things**.

So, in the **English** it says, the **woman** shall **not wear** that which **pertaineth** unto a **man**. Are we okay with that?

In the **Hebrew** **there's a difference**, it's a **difference** in how many words? You don't know because you haven't looked at it, and you should have done. In one word. which word is that? It's the word **woman**. In the **English** **the word woman is at the beginning and in the Hebrew it's at the end**.

Everything else is in **order**. So, the place of the **woman** changes.

You might say, well that's not a big **change**. And I'm not arguing it's not a big **change**. But the way the sentence becomes **framed** when you see that, begins to **change** the way you **approach** the whole **passage**.

Now what does **“wear”** mean?

1961, remember we made this mistake because I was mixing the two up.

1397 I mix them up in that class, because when you focus so much upon something it comes reflex action. And I was focusing so much upon

something else, that I put it on the board when I should have put something else on.

H 1961 means what in **English**.

What's the word? **Wear**

The word "**wear**" is **1961**.

We already laid that out. You should be in your notes.

What does "**wear**" mean? It means to "**put on**".

So, we're going to take the **concept** of "**put it on**".

What is an **actor**? An **actor** is someone who "**puts on**". **Puts on** a **voice**, puts on an **act**, and to making really convincing, what do they "**put on**"? They **put on garments**.

And if he's a **good actor** what would you end up believing? You end up believing he's **the actual person**.

So, the **garment** does what? It not only **changes** the **perception**, it **changes** the **reality**, it **transforms** who **he** is.

Because you know, if you watch a movie, it's not really that **King**, intellectually, but in your **heart** what you think? **You actually believe** when he said that **thing, that he actually said it**.

When you know this is a **movie**, it's not a problem. But when it comes to a **Bible story**, it **becomes a problem** doesn't it? **Yes**, because in the **movie** version, what's **Moses problem**?

One of his big problems. He's fallen in love, with whom? Some **Egyptian woman**. It's not in the story is it?

So, it becomes so convincing, their love affair, we just follow along with it.

So, "**wearing**" is **garment**, that's what it **means**.

We've already argued **Moses falls in with an Egyptian woman**, that's what the **movies teach**. There's nowhere in the story, it may have happened, I don't know.

But it helps to make what? It makes the **person to become credible**, and **believable**, to make it a normal person.

So, when he **dresses up as an Egyptian or a Hebrew** you say, **Charlton Heston** was really that **person**, that's who **Moses** was. He becomes so convincing.

If you go to all of our posters, and you have picture of **Moses**, **9** times out of **10**, what picture is that going to be? A picture of **Charlton Heston** isn't it.

I'm not saying it's evil, I'm saying it shows you the **power of persuasion** or the **power of the garment**. It really is real, it works.

So, this idea of "**wearing**" in the **English** becomes some **benign irrelevant thing**.

Is the **woman** a real woman, is she a **woman or not**? **Yes**. All she did was what, "**put on**" a **man's** clothes.

Does that make her less of a **woman**? **No**. We don't believe that, she's less of a **woman** because she "**put on**" a **man's** jacket. Our **framework** is to **moralistic** to **literal**.

Now if a **woman** "**puts on**" a **man's** garment does that make her different? Does that make her **less of a woman**? **Yes**, it does.

If **Charlton Heston** "**puts on**" a rough **garment**, or an **Egyptian** hat, what would it make him? Does it make him more **Egyptian**? Of course, it does. If it didn't the movie would have been a flop.

You would have said, I'll give it a rating **two out of ten**, because he was a **bad, actor**. He's not a **convincing Egyptian**. **Yes or no?**

So, when the **woman** "**puts on**" a **man's** garment, what is she becoming? Less of a **woman**, more of a **man**. And it's because we look at it that way, we say it's **forbidden**.

So, I don't know why people say **it doesn't make you more of a man**, because **it does**.

Because **Ellen White's framework** says, there'll be **confusion** now, because people think you're a **man**, you behave like a **man**, you look like a

man, when I see you from the back, I don't know if you're a **man** or a **woman**.

You say, "oh I fancy that person". you turn around, you say, "oh that was terrible". I just fell in love with a **man** or **vice versa**.

A **woman** sees this **woman** dressed up in a **man's** clothes, she goes. "oh he looks really attractive", and when she looks and it's another **woman**, she says, "oh dear" that's crazy, reject that. So, it makes you into a **man**.

If you go back to the **Hebrew** and you **see what that word means**. It's not as **simplistic as putting on a jacket**. It actually means, what?

So, I'm not going to be using the **Strong's definition** now, we've run out of time.

So, I'm going to tell you what the intent of the word is. Not the dictionary definition of the word.

It means, "**to become**", that's what the word means. It means "**to become**"

So, if you say, "**wear**", is that an accurate translation? **Yes**, it is. **It's an accurate translation**.

I would say it's accurate. Because when you "**wear**" something, it means that you "**become**", they're **interchangeable thoughts**. The problem is, "**to become**" is a very **strong phrase**.

Just to "**put on**" or **look like**, or I **put it on** to keep warm, is a very **benign** way of **expressing** the **same** thought. So, one is a very **powerful strong** statement and one is a **very benign** statement.

And what we want to do is, take the **benign** statement, and **Ellen White** wants to do what? She wants to take the **strong** statement. She wants to say, **we don't want women to dress like men**.

Because, what do the **women** want to do? They want to take the **role of men**.

She knows what that is serving what the reason behind that is. **And that's what the intent is as well, the original intent understands that**.

The people who are not persuaded are people like us. You might call us **liberals**. We say, not just because you **wear men's clothes** doesn't make you **less of a woman**.

I would venture to say, the **reason** why **women** were **changing** their **dress** in **Ellen White's** day, is because what did they recognize? If you **wear** a **dress** it makes you **more like a woman**. And if you **wear trousers** it makes you **more like a man**.

Now this is not **transgender**, this is not **foolishness**, this is about **power** about **control**, about not only **controlling** other people, but **controlling your own destiny**.

Because if you're a **woman**, what can you **not control**? You can't **control your own destiny**. You're at the **behest of your husband** because they work, they've got all the money. You stay at home; you've got no money.

So, you say, I've had enough of this relationship. And he'll say go, and you say, where to? And he'll say, nowhere, **you're stuck here because you're my slave**.

And so, this **issue** is about **power control**. Control of your own **destiny** and **controlling other people's destiny**.

And it's a desperate attempt by **women to change society**.

And they're going to do that through the **symbol of dress**.

So, this is not a study on the **rights and wrongs, the trousers, or dispensationalism**.

I just wanted us to see what's going on in the mind of the women.

Because when we're **approaching it**, most of you say, it doesn't make you **less of a woman or more of a man**; and I'm saying, **it does**. That's why they did it.

Because **these women** recognized the **symbolology of dress**. Because it **changes who you are**.

So, in the original, **this is a very strong statement**. And I'm saying **Ellen White**, whether she knows it or not, **intellectually**, she comes up with the **right answer**.

She says, **women** shouldn't wear **men's clothes** because it will turn them into, **men**.

Let's reframe that. If you go in **disguise** and you **dress up as a man**, and **you're a woman**, what will you be allowed to do when the elections are coming. **You're allowed to vote**

So, that's all you need to do, go in **disguise**, paint a beard on, and go and vote. So, it's a silly **example** of what the **reality** is.

They want to show that they're **equal to men**, to get **rights to vote**, then **rights to have equal power**, then **rights to work**.

So, it will take a **generation** and more, to **achieve** their goal. But it gets to a place where a **woman**, can now walk away from a bad relationship, if she chooses. And not be held **hostage** because **she has control**.

So, I want to say, that in the original, this is "**becoming**" and what do you want to "**become**"? You want to "**become**" a **man**.

Now again this **word 1397** is a **brave fighting man** who's over **20**.

So, I just want to **reframe** that **statement**. The **reframing** of that **statement**, a simplified **one-word version** that I want to give, this is not the **Hebrew definition** now.

I'm the **translator** now. So, I'm going to use the **word Master**.

So, what this **verse** is talking about, is the **woman** wants to "**become**" the one who's the **Master** or the one is who is in **control** of the situation.

And **God** is saying, or what the **verse** is saying, "we're not going to be doing that" Now if that's the case, and it is, that's my **understanding** of what these **verses are teaching**.

When you put the **woman** at the end, it helps to **clarify** and **see**, this is the point.

So, the **verse** is saying, the **woman** should **not** become a **man**, and it's going to be done through the **symbology** of the **garment** or the **dress**.

The **woman** is not going to **have** the **same role** as a **man**.

And then it says, (we're going to just juxtapose that), the **man** isn't going to **have** the **same**, if we could say it, the **same role** as a **woman**. But the wording is different.

So, when you go to the second one, even though the **conclusion** becomes the **same** the **approach**, the **nuance** or the **essence** becomes slightly different when we **approach** the issue between the **man** and the **woman**.

We already know what the **framework** of this discussion is, it's in the clue given here, **brave fighting men**, and over and over again we've seen that.

All this story here is about who? **Brave fighting men**, not just any kind of men, **brave fighting men**.

It's all about **Deuteronomy** chapter **20**.

This is the **framework** about how, I think, how we should **approach** this **verse**.

We should **understand** enough now about **dispensationalism**. How from **chaos**, **God** wants to bring **order**, or from **disorder** **God** wants to bring **order**.

Now **Deuteronomy**, this story may sound like a very **ordered** society. Do we believe it's an **ordered** society?

Let me ask a different question. Is it a very **controlled Society**? **Yes**, if you go to the book of **rule** and **regulations** it's very **controlled**.

But is it **ordered**? So, I would suggest it's **not ordered**. It's a **society** that is **disordered**, it's not **functioning** properly. And so, in a society that's not **functioning** properly, there's going to be **rules** and **regulations**.

Now what I think our **mistake** is when we've **approached** these **passages** generally, as **Christians**, conservative **Christians** particularly, either we ignore the **passage**, or we say that was a **symbol** or a **story** about an **ordered** society.

And why do we think it's **ordered**, who's in charge? **God**. We think, everything that **God is in charge of, is order**. And that can't be correct.

Is **God** in charge of **nature**? Yes. Is nature **ordered**? It's totally, completely **out of control**, at every level it's **out of control**. And yet **God** is in charge of that, and it's not **ordered**.

So, I want to suggest, and there's other **examples** that **God** can be in **control** of a situation that is **out of order**.

So, when we view this history, we should not **assume** that it's an **ordered** situation, it's a **managed situation**, it's in **control**, it's being **controlled**, but it doesn't **mean** it's **ordered**

So, if that was the case then we should know that **God loves order**, the first **Law** of **heaven** is **order**. And we think that **means**, when your parents, the first **Law** of **Heaven** is what? **Control**.

And so, when you don't get **control**, what do you do? You get a stick, and you create what appears, to be **order**, **but it's just control**. That's not what **Heaven's** like is it?

If **Heaven** look like that, would we be here today? **No**, because there would have been bloodshed in **Heaven**. And the **controversy** would have ended there.

The **Law** of **Heaven**, which is the **Law of order**, is not the **Law** of **control**.

And what would be shown here?

Whether you call it **good advice** or **Law** is basically a **society that's under control**.

And **why** do you **need** to **control** things? Because they're **out of order**.

So, a whole **approach**, of the **conceptual approach**, of how we look at that history, I'm saying it's **fundamentally wrong**. We **assume** because **God's** in charge, it must be **ordered**. And I'm saying it's **not ordered**, it's **controlled**.

It's a bad situation that's **controlled**.

Is this **Earth ordered**? **No**, it's not **ordered**. It's totally **out of control** and **God** is managing, it he has certain **controls**.

What would **Satan** want to do to you? What would he want to do to **Elder Tess**? Kill her. Why doesn't he? What stops him? **Control**. There's **control** that has been put in place to stop him.

Is this an **ordered** situation? Of course, it's **not ordered**. If it was **ordered** the way you would have **order**, first of all, get rid of **Satan** and get rid of all of his **followers**. We'd have the first steps in **order**, wouldn't we?

And then we would have to **repair** all the **damaged** people who are on **God's** side. Once all that's happened then you begin to have **order**, yes or no.

Not understanding this **issue** brings us to **another point** where we have a **wrong concept of heaven**. When we get to **heaven** will there be **order**?

When we get to heaven, **yes or no**?

Okay so, some people are already beginning to say **no**.

When we get to **heaven** will there be **control**? There will be **control**.

You won't be **allowed** to do what you want, there will be **controls** put in place, **but that is not order**.

Because you're going to have people go into **heaven** who have crazy ideas, like, "you", you've got crazy ideas and you're still going to get to **heaven**. So, it's going to be a place that doesn't have **order**, but it has **control**.

Hopefully as time goes on, it becomes more orderly

If you go back to the **original model**, was there order in heaven? **Yes**, because there were no **damaged** or **defective** people in **heaven**.

So, the reason why we're going to approach this **passage** differently, today, is what's the **fundamental difference**?

It's the **issue** of what subjects' **control** and **order**? What is **God** trying to do today? **Establish**, he's trying to **establish order**, **not maintain control**.

So, when people talk about those **two**, what was **Eden** like? Was it a **controlled situation** or was it an **orderly situation**? It was **order**.

So, I want us to think about not just **Eden to Eden**, I want to think about **order** and **control**?

So, if we're supposed to be in the situation that has **order**, what I want us to try to **understand** is how we **approach** the verse. We wouldn't **approach** it in the wrong way. we would **approach** it to see this command is given in the **framework** of an **out of order** situation that needs **controlling**. And therefore, if we come to our **dispensation** and we read the **same passage**, we need to **understand** what that **means** for us, and we can't **apply** the **passage**.

It's not even that we can't even **apply** the **passage** in the same way, what do we do with that **passage**? How do we fix it for us? How does this **passage apply** to us, let me ask it that way, how does this **passage apply** to us?

My question is, how do we **apply** the **verse**? **Apply means put it into practice, isn't it?** is that what **apply** means? How do we put the **verse** into **practice**?

Brother Benjamin what does the verse say, **women** don't become **men**.

Tell me how do you **apply** that today? How do you put that into **practice**?

How do we put the **verse** into **practice**?

I only what **two words** for the **answer**. How do we put the **verse** into **practice**?

That's not answering my question, the answer for me;

WE DON'T

We don't put the **verse** into **practice**. We say, let's throw away the **verse**. We **do not** put it into **practice**.

The **verse** says what? **Inequality**.

So, we say, we're not going to do that. So, we don't put the **verse** into **practice**, there's no **application**.

We can learn something from that. But we're not going to **apply** the **verse**, either that, or, you and I don't **understand** what **apply** means.

Unless I'm wrong, tell me if I'm wrong. To me, **apply means do it**, put it into **practice**. And I'm saying, I don't think we're supposed to put it into **practice** anymore. This verse is **redundant**, it has no **relevancy** to us.

Why does it have no **relevancy**?

Because we're living, when? **In the time period of order**. And that is only **applicable** to a situation that is **out of order**. You can't take **verses** that were created for **out of order** situations and make them **apply** to situations that are **in order**. Are we okay with that?

So, now I'm going to be **reported** by saying, we're going to **cut out verses** of the **Bible**. And so now I'm saying not all of **inspiration is profitable** for **doctrine, reproof** and all the rest of that. I'm saying that, **not all of it is, only some of it is**.

So, take it as you want to, because I can't defend myself, because I've run out of time. So, take how you want to, but I'm saying we're not **allowed to apply** the **verse**, there is no **application** to the **verse**.

You can learn a lesson from that, but you can't **apply** it, if, **application means** put it into **practice**.

12 Disciples, are we going to **apply** that? Yes or No? We're not?

12 Disciples mean a **Church**, are we going to **apply** that?

Do we have an **application**, that means we're going to put it into **practice**, that means **God** is going to get **12** people, and make a **Church**?

It happened then, is it happening now? Yes

So, do we **apply** that **passage**, that **story**, that **concept**? **Yes**

So, we're so familiar with saying **application**, we come to the **passage** and we say, we do the **same, default position**, let's **apply** it, can we see that?

And now I'm saying, hold on, who said we're supposed to **apply** this, we're not **applying** this, if we **applied** it what would we be saying?

In some shape or form, whatever these **spiritual applications** would be, what are **women not allowed** to do? **Become men**, that's what the **verse** says. You can't **manipulate** the **passage**; this is what a "**Thus saith the Lord**" is about.

People misunderstand it. You can't **manipulate the data**, that's what we keep on doing. And we **manipulate the data** because we're using, **wrong rules**.

We're taking one **rule**, and using it, like a paintbrush, and everything looks the **same** color, **and we can't do that**. You must go to a **story** and say that is not **applicable** today.

That means scrap the verse, it has no relevancy to us.

And then you have the question, well what it is therefore; because all these things were **written for our admonition** upon whom the end of the world to come, fair point.

But that is not the **same** as **application**.

I don't want to leave that thought half hanging, does everybody **understand** what I'm saying?

Whether you agree or disagree, I want my point to be made clear.

There's a **verse Deuteronomy 22** verse **5**, and I'm saying, get the **verse** and **scrap it**; has no **relevancy** to us. We **don't** have an **application**, we have no use for it, it does not **apply, application apply**.

And the reason is, because we, are **in order**, and that society is **out of order**. That is the **verse** for people who are **out of order**, not a **verse** for people who are **in order**, so it has no **relevancy** for us.

What I haven't addressed is, what lessons can we learn from that, how would that help us, which is not **applicable**.

So, I'm assuming for many of us, that will **shake** you, cause **confusion**, our enemies will love this. But for us, who are thinking people, ask yourself, is this reasonable, does it fit in with the **model** that you already had, **or** is it **totally contradictory**.

If we're talking about **Eden** to **Eden**, and **Eden** was **order**, I'm not trying to say **equality** or **inequality**, it's not even what I'm trying to do. I'm just trying to take a **fundamental principle**, because I want to make a **fundamental point**; you **cannot** take all the **verses** and just bring them to the **end of the world**, it does not work that way.

And the reason it looks so good so far, is because we have **cherry picked** our **verses**, we pick all the **verses** that do that. And then we say, "Oh the other ones, it must be the **same**, because where two or three a thing is established.

So, we'll take this one and try to **spiritualize** it somehow and it just becomes **a mess**, or we've come to crazy **conclusions**. To me, the simple one is, you just **scrap** the **verse**, it does not **apply** today.

And if that's the case, I don't have to explain why it doesn't **apply**, because I've **proven** that already, I've made the case for it.

What I do then have to **demonstrate**, is why all **Scripture is profitable**, how this can be a **profitable verse** for us to have. Not to explain, like doing some gymnastics, oh this **verse** applies to us, but we misread this thing, and it actually means this thing, that we didn't mean.

The words are there, they're plain, in the **Hebrew** or the **English** or the **Greek**, always **means** the **same** thing; **men** and **women** cannot **mix**, cannot **do the same** thing, cannot **be the same thing**, it's easy to see. Let's not **manipulate the truth**.

To me the only logical conclusion is, if I follow **Miller's** rules and go to the most obvious answer, to me the most obvious one is, it doesn't **apply**, or this **movement** isn't the one that's led by **God**, and that **women** should go back to wearing skirts and dresses, that's your two options. Either we've got it all wrong and we're **not in order**, we're just in **control**, or we are **in order**, and **God** is **reestablishing the truth**.

I know we're right, how do I know we're right? Because when you get your new bodies, and you get your new clothes, what will be the difference? **It will be the same**. We all know that, everyone knows that.

And then it comes back down to the study of, the **Nature of Man**. It always comes back down to that subject.

It explains it's the unifying Law that permeates through our message. If you get that, all of these things fit into that and they make sense.

THIS IS THE CONCLUSION OF OUR PRESENTATION

Let's pray.

Our Heavenly Father we thank you for your goodness, for your loving watch care over your people. We ask Lord that you would be with us and bless us, help us to have clarity on the work that you have given us to do. Lord help us to have clarity on your methodology. Father I pray that every single one of us learns to have confidence in rule number five, to allow the Bible to be its own expositor, and yet the rule is not so simple because it also says to trust in your ordained workers. People don't see that, help us to see that, that that's what that law is teaching. If we can have confidence in our leaders, we would know further, that when they speak. they speak on your behalf, and that all the instruction is profitable. Help us Lord to meditate upon the words of life that are being given to us at this moment, that we might not lose even a crumb or a scrap of food. Help us Lord to not be distracted by other things, by other issues, help us to turn to you. and to trust in you. Father if we can do that, we can see that at this school you have tried to show us over and over again through different models the same thing. Lord you're given us rules and the applications and laws to abide by, help us to follow these rules, whether they're the rules of prophetic interpretation, the rules that govern us, and if we can see that it's my hope and my desire that every single one of us Lord would realize that this is a people who are coming in to order not of people that need to be managed who are out of order and need controlling. if that be the case help us to come to a unified position on, what this verse means to us how we should indeed apply it in our own dispensation. May this be our desired this day father to grapple and come to realization of what this verse means for us. We pray in Jesus his name, Amen