

A question that has arisen in this movement and something that I guess Adventist might ask generally, something that I thought most people believed in and agreed with, but I don't know if everybody does, is the fact that Christ wanted to return in the history of the Millerites. That it was His desire and will to return before 1888. So I just want to read a statement about that, a comment. This is taken from Last Day Events page 37.

The Delay Explained

The long night of gloom is trying, but the morning is deferred in mercy, because if the Master should come so many would be found unready.--2T 194 (1868). {LDE 37.4}

That's just to give you some context of why there was a delay. It is taken from testimonies to the church volume 2 and it was written in 1868. So even in 1868 EGW is explaining why there is a delay. So people ask what would the line of the Millerites look like and many of us have taught in the past that the Millerite line would end in 1844 and begin in 1798. This 46 year history. We know that's not correct. The history of the Millerites did not end in 1844 and in fact it was never going to end in 1844. The reason it was never going to end in 1844 is because thought 1844 is the end of the 2300 day prophecy, we know that it's not the cleansing of the sanctuary that is here as we know it, the earth. The sanctuary that is being cleansed *is in heaven and has* (audio cut out and I put italics because I am not sure if that is actually what he said).. total different meaning. We discussed this yesterday. Hopefully we may get to review this. It was never going to end in 1844 Oct 22. After Christ would begin the investigative judgement Daniel chapter 7, the work would go from the dead to the living and sometimes after the judgement of the living would begin we would have the closing events of the great controversy which would be the National SL, the close of probation and the second advent.

In that history because those events were never fulfilled, there is no accurate way of understanding what those events would have actually looked like. All we can get is some hints based upon hints based upon the themes of what those waymarks actually mean and what they represent. We cannot with accuracy fully explain all the details of what those things are referring to. So a number of us have seen presentations done by sister Tess that goes through that history and explains that it's the issue of slavery which results in the American Civil War of 1861 and 1865, that is really the fulfillment of this history. It's a bit more complex than that of course because in order to have the close of probation and the second of advent, there must be some form of predicting it. We can see that the Millerites are, through 1850 when this chart was produced, they began to lose direction, they began to lose track of where they were going. They enter into a Laodicean condition and because of that Laodicean condition they lose the ability to be able to predict the future with accuracy and with certainty. So even though we have historical events A.K.A the American Civil War, the Issue of slavery, what we don't have is a corresponding work internally in the church. So that punishment as EGW frames it is going to be poured upon the U.S. (The Civil War) because of the sins that they have committed, slavery, we don't have a corresponding work within the church because they have entered into a Laodicean condition and they are no longer fulfilling the gospel mission to tell them the great test is coming, the close of probation is about to happen and Christ is about to return.

We have an explanation of why that was so. It's in that context that we read in these passages but what we do know is that Christ's desire, His will was that He was going to return in that generation which is in the context of history relatively early. Certainly before 1888. We have inspired quotes which I will read to you know which demonstrate He was meant to come back before 1888. We can go back into that

history and put the pieces of the puzzle together and we can show that the second advent would be connected to the American Civil War. We already know based upon a thus saith the Lord inspired quotes that the close of probation was also connected to the American Civil War as well. A problem that Adventists have is that we are fixated by two waymarks in two separate histories. In the history of Christ what is the premier waymark, I say Adventists but I could say Christians but Adventists are a better reference point in our context, what is the premier waymark in the history of Christ that all of us look to? It's the Cross. The cross is the premier waymark in the history of Christ. Without the cross there is nothing. It is the cross that everything gravitates to. It's not just in the line Christ, it's the whole great controversy that gravitates to that waymark. In fact we read a statement that when Moses went to collect the ten commandments at mount Sinai, he was shown two things. The ten commandments and the cross. The glory that shown from his face wasn't just a reflection of God's character, it wasn't a reflection of the light that came from the ten commandments. It was a reflection from the Cross. So it's the Cross that is the premier waymark in the history of Christ.

Come to the end of the world. What is the premier waymark that SDA go on and on about? It's the Sunday Law. Because we got this perspective of both of those waymarks, what we end up doing is creating a framework, a story, a narrative that centers around these two points of history. the Cross and the National Sunday Law. The problem is this. If you take just inspiration whether it's EGW quotes or Paul in the new testament, what is Paul going to go on and on about talking about the work of the Messiah? Which way mark? The cross. If you are going to ask EGW which way mark does she continually want to remind us about and speak to? National Sunday Law. We are messing around in the former rain therefore we are not going to get our lives in order when the latter rain comes and we are not going to be prepared for the close of probation and the second advent. It is all centered around the National Sunday Law. That is what everything is centered around. The problem is when you takes those statements, those "thus saith the Lord" statements, and you analyze them in detail, a problem arises. This is the problem. You cannot take those inflection points in history in an isolated fashion. What do you need to do? If you read inspiration we say you need to read contextually. You need to understand context. The National Sunday Law is not going to happen in a vacuum. There has to be some context around that event. It is the same with the cross. You can't look at the cross in a vacuum it has to have some context around it. What because surprising, if an SDA were to listen to this presentation today they would not believe what I am about to say. Why would they not believe it? Because it doesn't fit in their perspective of a thus saith the Lord. A thus saith the lord would put what way mark as it's premier event? Sunday Law. But when you start looking carefully you actually see that it's not the case. The Sunday Law is not the Premier waymark. In fact it's going to come and go and most people aren't even going to be aware of it.

As I said if you ask a SDA if that could be a reality or a possibility, no one would ever believe you. This is the dilemma that we face.

So I want to ask you a question. If you are familiar with the line of the priests, Levites and the Nethinims, if we were to talk about Sunday laws, how many Sunday laws do we speak about? We will go with the four. There are four Sunday laws that we have to deal with. How many Sunday laws have we dealt with thus far? For those of us who don't know what we are talking about I'm sorry. It is a bit much to explain. For those of us who do know what we are talking about why did you say one? Have you forgotten what today is? Today is the Sunday Law. Sunday Law number two. Already here. We are halfway through everything. People are questioning I can see people faces. Because we are so fixated about 2014, we forget other lines.

This is the line of the priests. We have a time of the end and a close of probation here and a second advent and here we have a Sunday law. We go to the line of the Levites. They are also going to have a time of the end and a second advent, what else must they also have? Sunday Law. If we did the Nethinims they would also have a Sunday Law. So this one in priests line is 2014. The Levites one is 2019. Hence we said there are two.

I would suggest the reason we know that that is a Sunday law is not just because of those time spans but because you have to go to a thus saith the lord. Which is the one that we went to earlier when we went to 1798, 1844, Sunday Law, close of probation, second advent, is based upon this. It's based upon this model. A Ploughing, former rain, latter rain, harvest. It's based upon this model that we know it's the waymark it is in our time. What you are suggesting is that the reason we know the year is because of some time spans, 2520 and the 126. But the structure itself is taken from this agricultural model because you can't just pluck out a time span, arrive to a day, you need to have some context around it. So if you have some context around this event here the context would be what? The close of probation and former rain. I will put 9/11. So you need to have some context around it otherwise it sits in isolation. The reason why that becomes significant is because a few years ago what were people saying about 9/11? They were saying that 9/11 was a Sunday law. If it's a Sunday law however they arrived at the, rightly or wrongly, what would you have to prove for it to be a Sunday law? What do you have to understand? Context. Context means what's on the left and what is on the right. What do you expect to be on the left of Sunday Law? Former rain. On the right? Latter rain. That is why you can demonstrate that 9/11 is never a Sunday law. What people were doing was taking models from one line and they were projecting that onto 9/11. Just projecting information is not enough.

So what information was projected, just want to run us through this exercise, it's not the direction we want to go to, just want to run through this logic. What information was going to be taken from the Sunday Law here and projected onto 9/11? Great Controversy chapter 38 page 603 I think. We need to know why things were said, why things were done so that we might understand what the correct understanding of something is. What does it begin with? I saw another angel coming down from heaven having great power. What is she quoting from?

"I saw another angel come down from heaven, having great power; and the earth was lightened with his glory. And he cried mightily with a strong voice, saying, Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen, and is become the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird." "And I heard another voice from heaven, saying, Come out of her, My people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues." Revelation 18:1, 2, 4. {GC 603.1}

Revelation 18 she quotes verses 1,2 and 4. She is going to tell you what the premier way mark is by the way. What is the premier way mark? It's in the title. The final warning. Adventists turn that into what? The Sunday Law. So already you know we are doing something wrong. So what we did was we took this symbol here Rev 18 I will do verses 1-3, we took that event which EGW gives us, as thus saith the lord, and what did we do to it? We projected to 9/11. We said the angel of Revelation 18 came down at 9/11 and therefore 9/11 is a Sunday law. That's what we used to do and it's wrong because it's not enough evidence, it's not enough witness, and when you investigate further by using context, you got to use context, which means check what came before and check what came afterwards, then what do you find? It's not a Sunday law. Even though you can throw 2014 into a calculation 126 and you can come to that point, it's not enough. You have to have other information. So we started creating this line so now we can create another line here. This other line can be created using two testimonies or two models. ne

of them is this one. The other one is this one. And also 2019 you can do, not just our 126, you can do many calculations to bring you to 2019, the problem is that if you looked at them, they do not, in fact most of them don't, identify Sunday law. Some may allude to them some may not. So you cancan't understand what he said.... in 2019, after that it becomes a bit more problematic. 2019 is a Sunday law in this line and 2014 was in this line. 9/11 was never one.

Christ was meant to come back before 1888. She explains in 1868 why there has been this delay because people aren't ready.

Had Adventists after the great disappointment in 1844 held fast their faith and followed on unitedly in the opening providence of God, receiving the message of the third angel and in the power of the Holy Spirit proclaiming it to the world, they would have seen the salvation of God, the Lord would have wrought mightily with their efforts, the work would have been completed, and Christ would have come ere this to receive His people to their reward. . . . It was not the will of God that the coming of Christ should be thus delayed. . . . {LDE 37.5}

This has been written in 1883.

For forty years did unbelief, murmuring, and rebellion shut out ancient Israel from the land of Canaan. The same sins have delayed the entrance of modern Israel into the heavenly Canaan. In neither case were the promises of God at fault. It is the unbelief, the worldliness, unconsecration, and strife among the Lord's professed people that have kept us in this world of sin and sorrow so many years.--Ev 695, 696 (1883). {LDE 38.1}

So did God's People fail? Sounds like a failure to me when you read that. So one of the arguments that we have made in the movement is that Christ wanted to come in that dispensation. The reason He doesn't come is because God's people fail. She says the same sins have delayed the entrance of modern Israel into the heavenly Canaan. So we have sinned, we have rebelled, we have failed in our mission. When I say we who is she referring to? Who is this group of people? This is why we say that the Millerite line was a line of failure. They did not accomplish their task.

So God's going to raise up a new movement. We had this generic term calling it the 1888 movement, and what God wanted to do was correct a number of issues. Essentially God's people are teaching the Sabbath which they equate to the third angel's message, but it's a bit more complex than just the sabbath issue. There are other components that are involved in rectifying the mistakes of the past. Come 1888 and that whole history, the church fails in it's mission then to accomplish the work that God had given to it. Not identifying who the failure is. Most people when they analyze that history they have a misunderstanding that the church or the leadership rejected the message of Jones and Wagner and that's why we are in this mess today. You know that cannot be true to blame the leadership of the church for the mess, and what I mean by the mess I mean the fact that we are still here on this earth today. Can't be so can it? The reason is if you go back to the history of Christ, you have two people John and Jesus, If you like we will call them Jones and Wagner, and who are they fighting against? The Sanhedrin, the leadership of the church. Did the leadership of the church in the time of Christ accept the message?

No. They were the leadership of Laodicea. Laodicea is going to be destroyed. John Chapter 2 Christ identifies the temple as my fathers house and I am the son and I am here to clean up your mess in my house. By the time you get to Matthew 23 the same house is now being called in verse 38, your house. It

has already been disowned as we discussed in yesterdays presentations or the day before, about how we deal with the issue of the earthly and the heavenly sanctuary and Christ being the high priest. So we know in the history of Christ that the leadership of the church failed. Did the movement succeed? Yes it did because Ephesus, which began with John and went on to Christ and then to Paul, if we think about it in that context, did the gospel go to the known world? Yes. they accomplished their task. So the line of Christ was a line of success. Everything went right even though some of the people in movement got things wrong. Even though some of the people in the movement were false brethren. The movement itself accomplished its task. you come to the Millerites and it's not like that. You come to the 1888 history and you can't blame the leadership of the church for failing in its mission. The subject is complex but you have to identify the blame and put it where it belongs. Fairly and squarely I would suggest upon the shoulders of Jones and Wagner and those people that joined them. They are the ones that failed the test. They must have the theology right, or at least some of the theology correct, but they don't get everything else correct.

So just giving a text to show that Christ was meant to come back pre 1888. They fail. He was then meant to come back in the 1888 history. I don't have a time frame how or when that would have happened but we do know that life would have looked a lot different. The second advent and the events that precede it, all of that would look different to what it does today. The problem is what we are doing, and this message is being given over and over again now, but some people still struggle with this idea, that the histories that we are dealing with, the histories of the Millerites, the history of the 1888 period of Jones and Wagner when He was supposed to come back, do not look like the history in which we live. It was 19th century coming into the 20th century. This was the Victorian age and the world did not look like the world looks like today.

Even the church itself was struggling. We believe in public evangelism. I am sure we all believe in that. The church, our church, we also believe in public evangelism. Around the 1870 they began to be focused on public evangelism. But there were arguments in the church of what evangelism looked like. The arguments were like this. I have already given a story about this before. The church wanted to send missionaries abroad. They said we need to give the gospel to the whole world. Was that possible? In the mind of Adventism it's not possible because we are already a small people and have very few resources to do that work so they said it was a silly idea to think they were going to convert the whole world by sending a few missionaries here and there and think the work was going to be finished that way. So we came up with this theory. It's a good theory. They said you know all the world has come into this country the U.S. all the world is here so all we have to do is convert all of America and by proxy what have we done? Convert all of the world. So all of our evangelistic endeavors only need to be contained to continental America and we have done our job and Christ can come back. Do you think that is a crazy idea? Today you probably think that sounds a bit strange. Do you think that if you go to the Millerite history 1798, 1844, 1860, 1861,63,65 that the gospel was going to go to all of the world in that short time period? People might say yes but if you look at the history then I think an honest assessment then I think the answer would be no.

Mr. Wolfe, people may or may not have heard of him who was basically considered the missionary to the world. He had been doing his missionary endeavors for many, many decades and even then the whole world had not been fully touched. EGW talks about the gospel or the message of salvation went to every missionary station in the world. The kind of poetic license to say that because it didn't really in real life. It didn't go to every missionary station in the whole world. It just didn't happen. There is not evidence that that was true. So we know that the end would have looked different than it does today. Today we have a world wide phenomenon. In those it wouldn't. Back a 150 years ago it was a serious

proportion to think that the gospel went to the U.S., by proxy it can be understood that it had gone to the whole world. I am not saying that is factually true but what I am saying is that's what Adventists were considering at that time period because they were being realistic about what they were able or unable to do.

So I just want to make it clear that Christ was meant to come back before 1888. The church fails. He was meant then to come back in the 1888 history and the church fails. This is why we speak about being careful of how we take failed models and bringing it into our own history. This is where people begin to have problems. I want to read something that we are being accused of. We have done similar presentations like this for many months now and those people who have left the movement are now reviewing the material that we have put into the public domain, and bullet pointing statements that we have made. Developing those statements into an idea or a point and saying this is what this movement believes. So this is one of the things they are saying.

"EGW's ministry was a failed ministry"

This is what they say we teach.

"She is to be understood as a prophet who's ministry must be relegated to the time in which she lived. Her words and teachings are not meant to extend to us in this dispensation."

Is some of that true? So some people are saying yes. Is all of that true? Do you believe if I said this is what you believe, would anyone say yes I believe all of that? No. If I were to say do you believe some of that? What would you say? Yes. Let me give you an example. "She is to be understood as a prophet who's ministry must be relegated to the time in which she lived. Her words and teachings are not meant to extend to us in this dispensation." Is that correct? Her words and teachings are not meant to extend to us in this dispensation. Depends. If she said, my words and teachings say you are not allowed to buy a bicycle, do those words and teachings extend to our time period? No. Is that her words and teachings? You shouldn't be buying bicycles. Yeah. You shouldn't be spending all you time, money and energy taking photographs. Because portable individual cameras were not available. You had to go to a photographer. He had to set you up and you had to get dressed. It was a whole affair and it cost money. So we know that there are some things we cannot take that she writes, and bring them into our dispensation. So to infer what they are inferring is just a mixture of truth and error. Half right and half wrong. Every single one of the accusations against us always goes down that ditch.

So some of the things are correct and some of the things are incorrect. And the reason why they make these introductory thought that EGW ministry was a failed ministry is because of this. I said it yesterday and I'm going to say it again. So we will just try and do this quickly. for those of us who weren't here yesterday you will have to watch the class. I am going to go through this at fair speed otherwise we aren't going to get through this.

Sardis. This is a church in a particular dispensation. So the church Sardis begins in 1798. Depending on how you would want to do this, I am just going to take it to 1850. Then you get the church of Laodicea. Laodicea we know to certainty that is begins in the year 1850 and goes to the end. Now remember when we spoke about captivity? When is captivity supposed to end? Remember Cyrus? He says Babylon is destroyed and you are free to go home. Captivity should end at the time of the end. Do we agree with that? So that begins to give you the prophetic license that we use to say, "what would you expect to see if you were to come out of the Laodicean condition?" That you need to be released from that Laodicean

condition, you need to be free from it. When does freedom occur? At the time of the end. So we should expect to see a time of the end. It's not that we just take Daniel 11:40 and invent 1989. We should expect to see an event future to 1850 where our church comes out of the Laodicean condition and it's not the Sunday Law where some people think that it belongs. So you have to come out of this Laodicean condition. It begins in 1850.

Laodicea means what? We are going to take a person. This person is built in two ways. There is the inner person, the heart. There is the outer person, EGW calls it the house in which you live. This is the nature of man. We have a threefold nature. I have just shown you two of them. The inside and the outside. We all know how that works. What happens at baptism? The inside is made new and the old dies. What happens at the second advent? Any change to the inside? No change in the second advent on the inside. It remains the same. What changes at the second advent? The outside. So hopefully we're comfortable with that. If you take this idea and we turn it into a coffin, this is Matthew 23. We call it a coffin, the Jews called it a sepulcher. We make them out of wood and bury them 3 meters under the earth. The Jews didn't do that. What did they do with their sepulchers? They were above ground and they are what we call sepulchers. They weren't made of wood like ours normally are. They were normally made of marble and sometimes perhaps of stone and they might paint it white. Matthew 23 Christ is going to give a model of that church. He is going to say you hypocrites, you are like whited sepulchers which appear righteous or clear on the outside because they are white. But what are they like inside? Full of dead men's bones. It tells you what those dead men's bones are. It tells you in Matt 23:27. I will read that verse to you.

Matthew

27 Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye are like unto whited sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness.

Then he is going to tell you what a dead man's bone is.

28 Even so ye also outwardly appear righteous unto men, but within ye are full of hypocrisy and iniquity.

So there is the coffin. It is white on the outside and in the inside what is it? It's full of dead men's bones on the inside. And dead men's bones is hypocrisy and iniquity. If you take that model, it says in verse 28, "even so ye". So this (Coffin) is an example of this (The person). What do we look like on the outside? We look righteous and what do we look like on the inside? You have dead men's bones on the inside. You are dead on the inside, you are alive on the outside. That is what the condition of the church is there as they are going to come to judgment. If you go to Revelation 14 and onwards it's talking about the SDA church in a Laodicean condition which is lukewarm. Lukewarmness is this in-between state of life and death because you look like you are alive on the outside. If you look like you are alive on the outside does that mean you look good or you look bad? You look good because you're all white. That means you dress right, you speak right, you behave correctly, your hands and legs all do the right things, you eat correctly. This is the life of reforms. This is a life of a Pharisee. Everything is done correctly. So when you go to a Laodicean condition, it's not a subject of reform. But these people what

are they like on the inside? They are cold on the inside and hot on the outside. Cold is death, hot is life. So when you combine life and death together what do you get? Luke warmness. It's not a real condition, it's a fake condition. What's the Biblical term for fake? Hypocrisy, acting. We act as though we are good but we are bad. What Adventists want to do, they you to understand that to be morally. If we were morally so bad, how could we look so good? Cause you could spot us. We are morally good people Go to the Pharisees, they tithe, they fast, they do everything correct. They dress properly, they eat properly, that's Pharisees and they are in a really bad situation because they are dead on the inside. So this is Laodicean condition.

If you go to Revelation 3:1. We are going to Sardis now not Laodicea. Sardis is in what condition? They have a name, what is their name? Sardis. It tells you in the verse. William Millers rule number 5, what does Sardis mean? Don't go to a dictionary because a dictionary will give you different answers. I will give you the dictionary definition. Sardis means red and Sardis means to come out. We will use the dictionary definitions and go to Revelation 3:1 what are they coming out of at the time of the end? Captivity. Babylonian captivity. That's why Sardis says come out because Sardis means to come out. It also means red. What does that word red come from or ruje or blushing? If you check all that it goes back to the book of Genesis because what does Adam mean? Red. Adam is red. Red means that you got blood flowing through your veins so you look red. As they say of David he was of ruddy cheek or ruddy visage or semblance. So Sardis means red, it means come out, but if you look at the word itself in the verse it explains itself. What does Sardis mean? It means to live. So do you have a name that says you live. Can you see that? Your name says you are alive but what are your works saying? That you are dead. So we can see, hopefully, that Sardis is actually a mirror image or copy of Laodicea. Sardis and Laodicea are the same so you can compare and contrast the two. We will just put an equal there. Sardis and Laodicea are equal to each other. They have the same problem. Can we see that? So now you know why the Millerite movement was a failed movement, because they come from Sardis. And that's why Laodicea is in the same mess because they have the same problems. You have two failed movements in two separate dispensations which are the dispensations of Sardis and Laodicea. That's why they have similar characteristics. For you to have a successful mission, a successful movement, you need to come out of what condition? Sardis and Laodicea. You need to come into a new situation. In the history of Sardis what is that time period called? Philadelphia. We discussed all of this yesterday.

So we know that the Millerites have two problems. Here is the eye of Miller. Miller is prophet of this dispensation. He is the prophet of Sardis. There are spirit of prophecy quotes that say Angels directed his mind. That's the definition of being a prophet, that God directed him. Where is he supposed to be looking to? Heaven. Where does he end up looking to? Earth. After 2,300 days then the sanctuary shall be cleansed. Which sanctuary is that? This one here Daniel 7. Which one does he think it is? This one on Earth. So he leads everybody in the wrong direction. He says look here (earth) when he is supposed to be telling everyone to look up here (Heaven). We call this geography. We said he got his geography wrong. And also he got the timing wrong didn't he? There is a problem with time. In fact if you go to the history in 1844 itself in the last few months. When he starts arguing with Samuel Snow what does Samuel Snow say? Time. Yes. What does William Miller say? No man knoweth the day nor the hour. He actually uses that argument against Samuel Snow saying don't say Christ is going to return on the 22nd of October because no man knows when that's going to happen. He actually uses that argument to attack his own movement. So they have a problem with this issue.

If you come to our history... this is Ellen White. This is why people are going to say that I teach that Ellen Whites ministry is a failed ministry and I'm not saying that. What I am saying is that you can compare and contrast these two histories. Ellen White is going to tell you what? No time. She is going to tell you

there is no time and no man knows when anything is going to happen. And, there is a problem with geography in this history. What is the problem? Where are Adventists looking? We are looking here on earth. We call it Earthliness or worldliness or the Laodicean condition which is covetousness. So geography is a problem in the ministry of Ellen White. Can you see they are dealing with the same problems. So what you need to do is, when you start dealing with these two histories, you need to handle them in a very careful way. First of all if we are going to come to our history we are going to have to deal with two subjects. Time and geography. Time. Ellen White says there is no time. The Millerites, they get the time wrong. Not only do they get the dates 1843-1844 wrong, They are actually failing their mission of knowing when Christ's second advent is. So it's a whole mess that they get themselves into and we know they have a problem with geography because they don't know where the sanctuary is. All of that distorts and manipulates the first angel's message. That's that history.

You come to our history, the history that we call ours which is the history of Ellen White. The history of SDA church and they have a problem because they are going to say there is no time. Is there no time in Ellen White's dispensation and the period in which she is ministering? There certainly is no time she is correct in that. The question is, is she observing what's happening or is she predicting what's happening? Often when she says no time, we mean that to say there is never going to be a time. This is again where we begin to differ from what Adventism teaches and where those people who have left the movement are now stuck in. That when she says no time that is only going to be understood for a certain time period. Because there must come a time where the issue of time setting comes back into the message that God's people are to give to the world.

So Ellen White is in this dispensation where there is no time and the geography is wrong. The geography is the Laodicean condition. The Laodicean condition is captivity. I want to read a quote. It's one that I think most of us are probably familiar with. It's taken from the book Spirit of Prophecy volume 4. 4SP 235 p2.

If I were to ask you, as an Adventist, what the criminality of the Papacy is, what's wrong with the papacy and what is wrong with Babylon, you would tell me they have two problems. The two problems are Sunday sacredness and State of the dead or spiritualism depending on how you would want to explain that. So the state of the dead and Sunday Sacredness is what makes Babylon, Babylon. I would say that you are wrong in that. If you believe that that's what makes Babylon Babylon then you are incorrect.

We dealt with this issue a few days ago and what was the subject? Dispensationalism because it is all connected to dispensationalism. Our code word for dispensationalism, the left behind series that we are familiar with, the rapture. One word we didn't use was the millennium. So when they start thinking about the millennium, they take that from the bible but they have a misunderstanding of all of that. So dispensationalism is dealing with what subject? Literal to literal. You need to go back and review those classes if you weren't here to listen to that. Connected to all of this, I spoke about two men. Darby and Scofield. Connected to those two men who were Protestants there was something called the counter reformation. The counter reformation was the work of the Jesuits after Martin Luther had come and gone. They began to develop this whole new theology that was basically going to take Christianity off track. All of those issues all come together in this subject. It's all to do with the problem of the Papacy. They don't just have a problem with Sunday or the state of the dead. So I am going to read this. 4 SP 235 P1. It begins with the word Prominent. What does prominent mean? Outstanding, the most important.

Quote

So there is a premier false doctrine and it's what? It's the millennial doctrine or the one thousand years of peace. This is the Rapture. This is the argument that it's going to be used in the history of the Millerites. In this history here. Look at the chapter title. What is the chapter title? Second Angels message. It's this argument that the protestants are going to use to say not time. We don't know when Christ is going to come. The Millerites are going to say we do know. Because the Millerites, which are the precursors of Adventism, is going to take this Church, step by step out of captivity.

So three points. It is the issue of time, the issue of Sunday, and the issue of spiritualism or the state of the dead. We know that.

Quote paragraph 2. Universalism.

That is the state of the dead if you picked that up.

Continue quote.

There you have the three doctrines. The one that is prominent in this dispensation is the subject of time. That's why the Millerites are going to deal with the subject of time.

So when we go into a Laodicean condition, what I'm saying the Laodicean condition is, is we are going to go into captivity to who? To the Papacy. We are going to imbibe Papal doctrines. The reason why Adventists are so secure is because we didn't imbibe two of them. We didn't imbibe the doctrine of Sunday Sacredness, we rejected that and we didn't go into spiritualism or the state of the dead. We weren't going to be lost on any of those two issues. The reason is because we were going to hold to the word of God and we weren't going to get hold up in the mockings that were happening in that dispensation. And the third angels message which is the Sabbath. We Adventist got trapped in is the subject of time. We lost our prophetic message and we began to teach what? That there is no time. This is what Laodicea is. The Laodicean condition is the idea that there is not time. That is why the Laodicean condition ends at the time of the end which is 1989. If you go back to the story that we read a while back about Zachariah does everybody leave at the time of the end when Cyrus says go? They don't. They don't leave captivity. This Laodicean condition is being captive theologically to who? To the Papal Roman doctrines. But they weren't fed to us by the Catholic church who fed it to us? Apostate Protestantism. We actually read here....And we came to a paragraph it says.

"Besides the Roman errors etc. etc. It has led many protestants to deny the resurrection and the judgement."

It goes from Catholicism to Apostate Protestantism. Then from Apostate Protestantism we have imbibe that doctrine. The doctrine that we have imbibe is that there is no time setting. All Ellen White is doing is just commenting on the fact that as Laodicea we have no idea what time is. We need to come to a point in history where we get to the time of the end where time kicks back in. As it was in the time of Zachariah, after the first group of people come out, what do they need to do? They need to give a message to the remaining Adventists to say what? Ho, ho, flee from the doctrines of the king of the North. The doctrine of the king of the North is what? Time setting dispensationalism or secret rapture. Depending on who you ask they frame it in a different way. So this is what I am being accused of when they say I say this. Ellen White's ministry was a failed ministry. That's not true. Ellen White's ministry was

not a failed ministry. Her ministry is, God is raising up someone to take care of his church when they are in what condition? The Laodicean condition. In the Laodicean condition you have no idea about time. What is an Adventist who wants to make a name for themselves going to do? They are going to say i have tis really neat study that i think i can predict when Christ is going to come back of the close of probation of the Sudnay Law. Fanaticism rises up. Who is the fanatic that we read about? 2 SM page 80-81. What was her naem? Anna Philips. She has a false prophetic message and it's connected to what? Time setting. She has a component of time setting in her message. So Ellen White is going to have to deal with people like Anna Philips thourghout her ministry. Becuase everybody wants to make a name for themselves and say we know when things are going to happen. So she is going to have to say there is no time setting in the history of the Laodicea. That's what all this no time is that Ellen White is reffering to.

This has to be understood dispensationally. It cannot be understood in any other way than that. So come the time of the end 1989 you cannot hang on to those spirit of prophecy quotes and use them the same way she did. So let's go back to the accusation.

"Ellen White's ministry is failed".

It's not failed.

"She is to be understood as a prophet whose ministry must be relegated to the time in which she lived".

I'm saying her comments of bicycles, which is obviously trivial, can only be understood in her dispensation. It cannot be understood in the period in which we are living. Hopefully we can all agree with that. Her words and teachings are not meant to extend to us in this dispensation. Her words of no time setting must be understood properly in their context and then understood that they don't apply in the hisotry in which we live. From 1989 to the second advent. They cannot be applied in that context. That is extremely significantly important for us to udnerstand. The reason for that is becuase all of this issue revolves around how you approach inspiration. Are you going to approach inspiration contextually or are you going to take things out of context whithout understanding what is happening when those comments or those statements were being made.

The subject is more complex of course becuase you have to go to all of those passages and read them carefully to apply them properly. Now if we know that they have a problem with geography and these people have a problem with geography, they both have a problem with time, then what i want to say, which is is guess the premier argument that these people have against us (FFA and the people that follow them), the problem that they have is that not only were we saying there is a problem with geography and time but that we need to be careful how we read. When you read yo need to do two things. Understand progression and understand repeat and enlarge. It affects how you deal with literal statements. Literal statments must be understood spiritually. If you don't understand them spiritually you will make a mistake.

Now this little phrase here "from literal to spiritual" is the definition of parable teaching. Hopefully we all know that it geos from the natural to the spiritual. But it's also one of William Millers rules. He says, you read a passage and how are you supposed to read it? Literally. You read it literally and if it doesn't do any disservice, it stays literal. But then you have to be careful becuase if you see any problems with making it all literal, you don't have to now consider that passage in spiritual context if you want to make any use of that passage to yourself. No the reason why that becomes significant is becuase if said to you,

Thou shalt not steal, are you going to spiritualize that away? No. In fact you can go to any moral statement, which is how most of inspiration is understood. When you look at it morally, it will always go from literal to literal. It will always do that. Lying 2000 years ago is the same as lying today. Stealing is stealing, adultery is adultery. It's always the same, it never changes. Literal to literal. But when you start dealing with prophetic subjects, you can never ever go from literal to literal, it always has to be literal spiritual when you see things prophetically speaking.

So let's go to Exodus chapter 20:9-11. You don't need to turn there you already know the verse. This is the Sabbath. It's the sabbath commandment. Verse 8 tells you to remember and verse 9 tells you what to remember. It all ends in verse 11. No coincidences that it's Exodus 20:9-11. So there is that Sabbath commandment. Now is the Sabbath commandment a moral issue? Yes of course. All the ten commandments are moral issues. So if it's a moral issue what do you need to do? You take the literal seventh day 2000 years ago and you take it and keep it literally. What are we supposed to do in our history? Take it literally because it's a moral commandment, therefore what are you required to do? Keep the seventh day sabbath, we call it Saturday. We have to keep Saturday because it's a moral issue and you go from literal to literal. We are ok with that?

Is that the only way to understand the ten commandments? Of course it's not. The ten commandments also have to be understood as being prophetic commandments. Therefore when you take the sabbath commandment which was literally we now have to understand it spiritually. So when we start dealing with the Sabbath commandment spiritually then that opens a whole different avenue of research. Now we are dealing with this thing prophetically therefore we cannot take it literally. What is the sister of Sabbath if I can say it this way? Sunday. The arch nemesis if you don't like sister. So if it's literally Saturday 2000 years ago the next day is literally Sunday. Let's deal with it morally. Morally today if you are keeping Saturday, what should a Catholic keep? Sunday. It's a moral issue. They understand it's a moral issue. That's why they tell you that your not doing well in God's eyes if you don't come to church on Sunday. They understand that morally speaking. But what we have confused ourselves in is that when we start dealing at a prophetic level, that is when we begin to become confused. But we think we can take Saturday and Sunday Morally, make it into a prophetic subject and still keep it as Saturday and Sunday. Prophetically speaking.

So I have introduced that thought and I haven't finished it but I need to add another thought. This is the complexity between progression and repeat and enlarge. Because Ellen White is going to deal with her message progressively. Not with repeat and enlarge the way that we do. So she is going to take you with this one line and she is going to say, today what do we need to do? Literally keep what? You literally keep Sabbath. Where did she learn that? In 1844. It's not in 1844 that she learns that. It's in 1845 into 46. This is Joseph Bates teaching her. All I want us to see is they are dealing with a literal Sabbath on what day number? 7 in that history. Now when is Christ going to come back? In her life time. How many generations is that? One generation. So how many lines is that? 1 line. There is this one line here so what she is going to do is she is going to see in one line. You are not going to jump from literal to spiritual. In her history everything remains the same. So her story in the future there is going to be a test and this test is going to be on the Seventh day Sabbath and it's going to be literally. It's all literal. What country? Literally America. It's all literal. She dies, that generation passes away. A second and a third generation comes and the we are born. And now we are talking about an interdispensational issue. Now we are going from one dispensation to another. And when you jump from one dispensation to another, you can't go from literal to literal. You cannot do that when you take a prophetic subject. So that's why when we come to our dispensation, we will call it the history of the 144k, we can't take things literally, we take things spiritually. If you take the Seventh day Sabbath at a moral level, we will keep the seventh

day sabbath for sure, but when you start dealing with it on a prophetic level, you cannot understand her writings, which was for her dispensation to be understood literally, and bring it into our dispensation and understand it the same way.

Does that mean we throw her writings away? Of course it does not because without her writing we don't even know that there is going to be an issue. Not only her writings. Obviously the Bible itself. We can't separate the two. But we have to understand them and read them in the correct way. So when she says no time, we don't take that statement and bring it into our one do we? We can't do that. We can't take her writings and make them apply in this literal fashion in our own history. So when we are accused of saying Ellen White's ministry is a failed ministry, of course it's not failed. Is she taking care of a failed church? Is SDA that is in a Laodicean condition a church that has failed its mission? Of course it is. She is just the prophet of a failed church. The church is in failure and she is the prophet of that church. So it's not that she has a failed ministry, it's that she's got a failed flock. The household of God has failed. And we looked at the word dispensationalism if you remember. The rules and regulations of a failed church or a scattered church, are they the same rules and regulations of a successful church or a church that is going to be gathered? No. Early Writings page 74. If we looked to the scattering to see how God would deal with us today, what would not happen? We couldn't be gathered because the rules are different. So the rules of scattering, the rules of Laodicea are what? No Fanaticism, which is no time setting. Don't do time setting because if you time set, it's a fanatical experience.

She is residing over a failed church.

"She is to be understood as a prophet whose writing must be relegated to the time she is living in".

That's crazy. Everybody knows all these things were written, all these happened for our admonition upon whom the ends of the world are come.

So we are going to take her writings and we are going to apply all of them to our own history it's just that we need to do that carefully. Hopefully we can all agree to that. We don't take the writings of Moses in Leviticus where he says you need to make a sacrifice and apply it literally to our time do we? How many of you check the labels when you buy clothing? If it said 50% cotton and 50% polyester you would say I'm not buying that? Perhaps you won't because you don't like polyester but what if it said 50% Cotton and 50% wool perhaps you would because they are both natural fibers. But you know in the old testament you are not allowed to wear a clothing which is comprised of mixed material. You are not allowed to do that. We don't take those things literally and bring them to the end of the world. Why don't you do that? We don't stone people who misbehave. It's not even that the law stops us from doing that. We just think it's wrong to do that. We don't read the old testament and bring all those statements literally. We carefully pick and choose what we are going to do.

And by the way. I don't if you are aware of this, but when we started dealing with the health message in the 1860's, in the 1850's a brother called Haskal said from his reading of the old testament we are not allowed to eat pork. So he said no more pork eating. You know why he said that? Because it said it in the book of Leviticus. He said if it is in the book of Leviticus and it applied then then it must apply now. So he wanted to take Leviticus, he ceremonial law, and bring it into their dispensation and what did Ellen White say? No. So when we actually introduced the subject of pork eating, it's just one issue, the leading people in the church are aware of what the issues are and they say, "we don't eat pork not because it's a ceremonial issue that Moses brought up, we don't eat pork because we believe it's physiologically unhealthy." They use the health argument not to eat pork. They don't use the ceremonial

law which is in Leviticus to make their point. You know why? Because they say if we did that those protestants are going to shackle us. Because they are going to say you can't pick and choose which bits you and like and which bits you don't like. They are well aware of those arguments. So their argument was that we don't that we don't eat pork because of physiological reasons not because of the ceremonial law that's given in the book of Leviticus. Because if we did that then they would say well you don't treat your fields that way and uhm you have a bull and goat pulling your plow or you have this mixed fabric. You are doing all these things which are breaking all these Levitical laws, why did you pick on the issue of swine flesh? So they are aware of this issue and they laboured to make sure that people understood that it was not because of the ceremonial laws in Leviticus.

I think we don't know that today and often when people have these arguments you take straight back to Leviticus and get yourself into a huge mess when you do that. So all I want to say is when you start going back into Ellen Whites writings and start projecting them in a literal fashion into our history, you get into problems. Ellen White didn't have that problem in her dispensation. So when she says it's all going to happen America, it's all a done deal, it would have been if Christ would have returned in her history but He didn't. He never returned then and the world is a different place and there is no way that we are going to have a Sabbath Sunday argument across the world with 7 billion people. The reason we are not going to have is because of the subject of fractals. Fractals mean scalability. Saturday Sabbath works for you because you are a Seventh Day Adventist. They work for the church. They might even work for the United States which is Protestant America, they might even work for a few countries in Europe, but you can't take that scale and project it into other countries across the world. They don't even have a concept of Sabbath and Sunday. They don't even have a religious framework. It's just not going to work. Their issues are completely different. Point one.

The other point is not only are we dealing with progression, we also have to deal with repeat and enlarge. This is where FFA get into a huge mess. If you remember here they get into a mess because they want to take 2019 and make it what? Daniel 12:1 Which is Repeat and enlarge. They don't want to deal with progression. Remember that? What comes first 2019 or Daniel 12:1? 2019 comes before that. It's a progressive history. Remember that?

Then they say

let's go to 2014 and we'll put in quotation marks...it's a "Sunday Law". No real. Fake. Whatever it means. We will just call it a symbol of a Sunday law. As we step through history what are we going to arrive at? The real Sunday Law. We are going to go from pretend to real.

What does that sound like? Repeat and enlarge or progression which one? They say we are going from this one and then progress to the real Sunday law. So sometimes they want to use repeat and enlarge only and sometimes they want to go for progression only. This is the ditch that they have entered into. They are not willing to take both concepts and deal with a prophetic issue correctly. So here is the Sunday laws that we have. We said there are four of them. Are they going to be progressive? Yes of course they are going to be progressive. Are they going to be repeat and enlarge? Yes. Of course they are going to be repeat and enlarge. You have to have both characteristics not one.

FFA if they are listening, what you are doing wrong is you are taking this model and you are saying it's only progression and you take this model and you say it's only repeat and enlarge. What our movement, the true movement of God is saying is 2014 is the Sunday Law progression. Correct and it's the Sunday law repeat and enlarge. Which means if it's repeat and enlarge this Sunday law (2014) is the same as this

one (2019) and this one (Panium) and this one (National SL). They are all the same. They are all the same characteristics.

Two weeks ago we had a big problem in this movement. The Bible says upon the testimony of two a thing is established. How many testimonies for SL did we have yesterday? 1. We only had one witness, one testimony. Now we have two. We have two testimonies. Upon the testimony of two a thing is established. We have now established, unequivocally that there will be no Saturday Sunday law test for the next two. It just can't happen. If you the rules you have to take progression and repeat and enlarge. Is the subject going to escalate? It will. It will become increasingly pointed. The fight the struggle but it will be the same issue because you have to factor in progression and you have to factor in repeat and enlarge.

We come to Daniel 12:1. Do we say that Daniel 12:1 is a shut door? For sure. Is 2019 a shut door? For sure. You go back to the original model. Is there a work to do for the people who pass Daniel 12:1? There is. In this time period, Jacobs time of trouble, is that talking about someone good or bad? It's someone good because his name is Jacob. It's Jacobs time of trouble, it's not the time of trouble for the world. That's the plagues. Jacobs time of trouble is he needs to do what with his life? He needs to get his life in order doesn't he? Isn't that what Jacobs time of trouble is about? He needs to get his life in order. So however you want to argue that Daniel 12:1 is the close of probation, he that is righteous shall remain righteous, is your life in order yet? It is not. I'll give you two witnesses. Elias life isn't in order. His life is a mess. Jacob is struggling because he is fighting against God and he has to get assurance that everything is good between him and his lord. So when we take 2019, we have this shut door, it is a shut door. Is there further work to be done in the lives of God's people? Of course there is. So we know that 2019 is progressive. There are four closes of probation which FFA refuse to accept, 2019, 2021, The National Sunday Law and Daniel 12:1. Those are the four closes of probation and you have to work your way through all four of those and get to this final one which is the one that inspiration speaks of. It's this progressive nature, they all have the same characteristics. Plus it's a repeat and enlarge. So if there is a shut door at the end then the others are a shut door. Then there is an experience to go through and so the others also have an experience to go through. So it has all the same characteristics. You have to factor in progression and repeat and enlarge for every single one of these waymarks.

Let me ask you a simple question. Is 1989 the time for the end? Don't say yes because it depends. The time of the end is 1798. Here is 1989. Can you see how I have two stories here? I am going to join them. This is the Story of the SDA church. In the SDA church how many beginning can you have? 1798 is the time of the end. So then this one here 1989 stuck in the middle somewhere, is that the time of the end? It cannot be. What are we doing? Repeat and enlarge and progression. You always have to factor both of those in. If you don't you end up in a place where future for America now is. They are off the path and have fallen into the wicked world below.

These are only a few of the accusations that they level against us. But hopefully you can do a self check. If you believe that the accusations that they are leveling against you are valid or not, we looked at disensationalism, we looked at the ministry of Ellen White. What they do is they twist and manipulate what is being taught. When I say this, Miller and Ellen White when they are compared together where this is bad church and this is bad church, they are going to say you are teaching that Ellen White is a bad prophet, it's not the case. All of us, including FFA know that when she says no time setting we just say we are going to ignore it. However you want to phrase that. I might phrase that in more costic language but they believe the same thing. They are not going to take her statement and bring it into our dispensation. What they do is they take this concept of time and they twist and manipulate it.

It's well worth your reading 2SM Page 80-81. I am not going to reread it but as we close now i just want to read one portion from that, that we didn't read. 2 SM Page 81. The letter is sent to someone called Mr Garmire. Garmire has a problem. No only does he have a problem, he had a problem, his daughter had a problem, his wife had a problem and his children have a problem. The problem they have is with Ellen White. We stopped there. She says, "there are many ways to evade the truth (to Mr. Garmire)." And then she says this thing. "You seem to have a special bitterness against Elder Uriah Smith." Why would he have a bitterness towards Uriah Smith? No if you want to take that literally maybe Uriah Smith had snubbed him, done something to him, there was an issue between them. I have no idea what the literal issue is. Do i care? No. I don't care, but what i do want to do is i want to take this passage and bring it into our history and we are going to go from the literal to the spiritual.

Have i take Uriah Smith from his literal setting into a spiritual setting in the studies that i have done today? Yes because you have heard me use his name. So Uriah Smith is the premier person that is going to teach us Daniel 11:40. Today what does this movement have in relationship to Smith? We have bitterness towards Uriah Smith because we say he teaches error.

He goes to Daniel 11:36 and what he is going to do is he is going to say "the king shall do according to his will" he is going to change that king and turn it into "A" king. Go and read his work in Daniel and Revelation and you will see where he does that. What he is going to do is go from verse 35 and he is going to go down and change everything that you know about those verses which is in disagreement to what we teach in this movement. So we have a special bitterness towards Uriah Smith. Who is we? This movement. His name is Mr. Garmire. Mr. Garmire is this, we have a problem with him. We are making a spiritual conotation. I told you that you shouldn't blame Smith. Who should you blame? Litch. You should blame Litch because he is the problem.

So we are going to start having a problem with Litch now. We are going to have bitterness against Litch, Bitterness against Smith. Are you ok with that? SO the reason why this becomes significant is that a few months ago we began to relook at this work and, i can't say the movement, I don't know how to say this discreetely. I began to look at this. It's about me, that's why i didn't want to talk about it. The bitterness that I had with Smith, because i had a lot of bitterness with him, melted away when i began to realize the quote that we read in last day events page 37. Christ was meant to come when? In the history of the Millerite Movement. This means how many time of the ends would you have? 1. It would 1798. That means you don't have two time of the ends. So 1989 would never exist. We would never get to be born. We would never even get to that year. So that means what Uriah Smith was teaching was it true or false? It would be true. The reason why i knew it would be true is because it was not Uriah Smith, it was Josiah Litch. Josiah Litch writes this statement about Daniel 11:40 in the year 1841. The reason why that becomes significant is because that year comes just one year after 1840 which is our explanation, our understand of Revelation chapter 9. Because Revelation chapter 9 takes you to august 11, 1840.

So this subject of Daniel 11 is connected to that history. That history is the MC history of the Millerite movement. 1840 is the MC. You may have never heard of that before but they have two MC because you can go to their history and cut it into two. They had one in the summer of 1844 and they had one year 1840. You got two dispensations int that Millerite history. So Daniel 11:40 is connected to the subject of the MC. That's why it caught my attention. So Smith, Litch's message of Daniel 11:40 is connected to the MC message and we have bitterness with what? Smith. Therefore you have bitterness with Litch. Therefore you have bitterness with the MC message. Who has got bitterness with the MC message today? FFA. This is how you go from literal to spiritual. That is just that one line. If you go to

that whole passage about what she says about Mr. Garmire and his relationship with Anna Philips and it all fits.

But i want to make one more observation. August 11, 1840 what waymark is that today for us in our line? 9/11. So we have tough for a long time now, 14 years, 15 years about that august 11 is 9/11. Now i'm not saying that's wrong. But what i am saying is that i don't think that that is the primary waymark for august 11, 1840. You can show that. The study was done earlier this year in Tahiti in May or June time perhaps. So August 11 can also be 9/11. What else can it be understood to be? 2020. The reason why that becomes significant is because 2020 is connected to the message of the MC. Now the reason why this becomes significant is because if you go the story of Daniel 11:40 the subject matter is what? The geographical backdrop is what? Islam. Syria. That's it's original context. So if you take that and bring it into our history what we are saying is that there is going to be some prophetic fulfillment dealing with Islam in the story of the subject of the Syrian war or the proxy war that is going on in the middle east at the moment in 2020.

The reason why that becomes important to understand is because the true movement is coming to a point in 2020 using all of this, because we aren't bitter against Smith now. Now we love him. Now we like him. He is a good man. But there is FFA which are not the true movement and they are headed to the same year 2020 to a false path through the Ministry of who? Anna Philips. False Time setting. We are not saying they don't time set because they do time set. We are saying they do it in a false way because it's Anna Philips. They have a problem with Ellen White and they also have a problem with Uriah Smith. You can't take these things literally. You have to understand how to do them symbolically. Today we now love Smith because we understand what he meant when he wrote what he wrote because we understand what Josiah Litch wrote what he did. And it's all connected to the message of the MC.

So the Subject of 2020, when you go from 2014 to 2019 and you have the MC in this history, and we speak about 2020, to reject our version, our understanding of this, it's because you have bitterness or anger or hatred towards Uriah Smith. And Uriah Smith becomes a symbol of the MC message. That's why there is a difference or a parting of ways between what we understand 2020 to be and what FFA understands 2020 to be. Therefore you know sometime next year, there is going to be something that arrives with Islam and you are going to have two different stories, two different narratives. This subject is not going to die away that easily come November the 10th 2019. These arguments are not just going to go away. They are going to be with us for a time to come. So if you want to know what side you should be on, you already have all the information you need already here. You just have to understand a few principles. Half right, half wrong, the issue of dispensationalism and also the issue of combining progression and repeat and enlarge. If you keep to those rules and you follow them precisely you can be kept safe. If you don't you will fall into the wicked world below which is where this ministry (FFA) has already gone and they are dragging a whole group of people with them.

Let's pray.

