

Wearing Pants

Elder Tess Lambert France SOTP Video 38

Key

A. = Audience

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

Good afternoon. We began our study when I first arrived with looking at reform lines. We drew up a reform line of the priests. We recognized that it comes in four dispensations. You can see 1989 - 9/11. 2014 the midway point. Then 2019 the close of probation. Panium being the 2nd advent. So this is our reform line. Five waymarks and four histories. Within each history what do you find? So in the history of 1989 - 9/11 there is an increase of knowledge to formalization. What is this increase of knowledge? Specifically for this history what message is it? Reform lines and Daniel 11:40-45. I want to focus on that one.

So it is opening up the verses of Daniel 11 that give us our increase of knowledge. What did this mean? That the people hearing this or the people studying it are looking at Daniel 11 verse 40 and what do they come to recognize as they are studying that verse? Without the specifics what do they come to recognize? What do they come to recognize about their understanding of that verse?

A. Brother E. Their close of probation.

They recognize the history that we are in. But you imagine the person studying that verse in 1991. He opens up the bible and studies verse 40 the way he has been taught. What does he come to understand. He came to understand that his position on that verse was wrong. Then he has to convince a lot of Adventists that their position on that verse is wrong. there is an increase in knowledge but if there is an increase of knowledge what does that mean about their previous knowledge?

A. Not complete.

Not complete? It's not that it's not complete, it is that it's wrong. So their prior understanding, when they have an increase of knowledge, is to recognize that their position about that verse at that point in time is incorrect. They have to change their interpretation. 9/11-2014. It is another increase of knowledge. What is this increase of knowledge? Where does it first develop?

A. 2009? 2005?

2009 what is the message? 2520. What is the churches position on the 2520. Rejection. So as people are studying the 2520 what do they have to admit?

A. It's a prophecy?

That there previous understanding is wrong. 2012 there is an increase of knowledge about the 2520 that is now formalized into time setting. What do people have to recognize?

A. Brother J. Their past errors.

They look at verse forty and they recognize that as we stand in 1991 our past understanding is not good enough. They recognize that verse 40-45 has a different meaning than what the church is teaching. They are forced to recognize mistakes. 2009 they are forced to recognize mistakes, the rejection of the 2520. 2012 forced to recognize mistakes. There had been a rejection of time setting. Every increase of knowledge requires us to do what?

A. to recognize our mistakes.

To recognize that our prior position is not acceptable. More is required of us and we have been wrong. So it can shake people when we say that. When we say that we have said things that were wrong. But if we never said that we had a position that was incorrect or not good enough, there would never have been a need for an increase of knowledge. So some people seem to be concerned that we might say something different to what they said in the past but that has been the story of this entire movement. It has been to say don't get comfortable where you are. Can you ever be comfortable where you are?

A. No.

No. You can never be comfortable where you are. The minute that you are and you think that you have arrived somewhere, there is another increase in knowledge and we are left behind. If we think that we are not going to have to change our position on those issues, they begin to open up. So our study at this school is the history of 2014-2019. And we are going to different histories to open up this time period. And come to and understanding of what is happening. Particularly externally to see how that impacts the internal. We recognized from the beginning that whatever our test is in this history, it is not time setting. So it is not Nov 9. But we do recognize that whatever knowledge or light is opening up, it is going to require us to let go of our previous beliefs. we had to let go of our ideas of 2520 and our rejection of time setting. We had to let go of those Adventist Traditions.

When we come to the external and we have traced external histories. When we talk about the Civil war in the 1950's. But they are as much internal as they are external because they impact adventism. When we talk about these external histories and we come down to our time for example, we have two streams of information. CNN and Fox. Left wing and Right wing. Liberal and conservative. Externally where is the threat? Who is wrong? Sister M. Liberal or conservative? Who is right and who is wrong?

A. For us or for them?

It has to be the same for both. You have to compare and contrast. So if you say for one you are saying it for the other. Do you go CNN or Fox?

A. The liberals are right.

So the liberals are right and the conservatives are wrong yes? So bring that internally. Liberal or conservative? Who is right and who is wrong? Our problem is that we are still looking to the conservatives like they are our friends and our allies. Like they are going to have our back when the

trouble comes. We still think it's the Liberals that are the threat that are destroying God's church. If you can't do that externally then you can't do that internally. Externally it's completely clear. But many of us came from conservatism. That can blind our view. That is dangerous. So when we discuss these subjects just keep in mind. If you are worried about the Liberals and becoming like the world you are still looking in the wrong direction to see the threat. So every increase of knowledge requires us to change our position on the subject that God chooses to open up to us.

Millerite History 1798 - 1844. I am going to say primary application is 1989-2019. 1798 - 1844 what message are they preaching?

A. Second coming? Time? Judgement?

Second coming? Jesus is coming back? For 46 years from the time of the end to after their close of probation they are preaching about the second advent of Jesus. After their close of probation light comes and what does that light tell them? Sister I. what comes to them?

A. *Different light depending on.....*

45, 46. So from the time of the end till after the close of probation it has been 46 years they have been preaching about the second Advent of Christ on the wrong day of the week. Now after 46 years someone comes to them and says that you are breaking the ten commandments and worshiping on the wrong day and you are still catholic. Is that easy to hear? This is after October 22. But for 46 years there hasn't been an increase of knowledge on it so it hasn't been a test. But when there has been an increase of knowledge on, those among them that have an honest heart, have to recognize. Our position on the Sabbath is wrong and we need to change. There is never a time to be too comfortable. When we get too comfortable we don't want to move and the movement never stops moving. So if that is Millerite history, you can pass this test and this dispensation and after 2019 you can be assured that our journey is not complete and therefore we have not finished learning or unlearning.

So this morning we went through some revision. All this stepping stones that brought us to this history. The Civil War. 1948-1954. Then tracing our reform line to explain 9/11-2019. To understand that history we went back to 1979. We recognized that everything that we are seeing in our history has just extended from 1979. It's all the same issues. So if we are to thread our waymarks like we are supposed to do, we can connect every year and mark it's progression to see where we are now. Jerry Falwell, Ronald Reagan, Moral Majority. Jerry Falwell, Donald Trump, Project Blitz. It's all repeating. Then we went to our line of progression. We went from Eden to Eden. Over the course of 6,000 years we marked 4 dispensations. Moses, Christ, Millerites, 144k. Beginning and end of ancient Israel, beginning and end of modern Israel. Alpha glorious land, omega glorious land. What we do is to make specific points, we would cut up this line and overlay them. But our subject is about progression and restoration. If we are going to talk about restoration you can't cut your line. You have to see it from Eden, all the way through the old and new testament, through the 1260 and the Millerites. When we lay the reform line out in that way, we also see differences, because if there is progression, the logic must say, that what is happening at the end must look different to what is happening at the beginning. Because progression insinuates change. We covered what's changing when it comes to race. From Noah and Canaan through Abraham and Israel through the history of the Millerites. EGW had no bible verses to justify opposing slavery. But she understands that they are to oppose slavery. So we marked progression when it came to the treatment between Jew and Gentile and the issues of slavery.

Then we went from race into gender. We marked progression from the priesthood, circumcision, to baptism, priesthood, leadership, whether it is rulership in the nation or in the church or in covenant relationship with God. You can mark a progression through this history. That is where we finished this morning. I wanted to come back to where we left yesterday. someone brought up the subject of dress and we had a lively discussion and I want to know if anyone else has something to add or an opinion they are willing to put out. Or I just start asking people again. Sister C. why are you in a skirt.

- A. *Sister C. So I am wearing a skirt because I was convinced, because I understood that I had to be careful with my appearance in front of others. I wanted to please God so I wanted to be rightly dressed and not to attract sight and to be dressed simply. But not appear supper badly dressed like a dirt bag. So I found myself wearing skirts or dresses.*

So the principles you have given, you said you wanted to appear simple. Plain not overdressed. Modest. Sister Shemem?

- A. *So I am wearing skirts or dresses cause I was shown the message of dress reform. I was shown that from Deuteronomy 22:5 it was an abomination in Gods eyes for women to wear men's clothes and men to wear women clothes. I studied the topic of dress reform and I got to the conclusion that God has given His church certain apparel which was first rejected by His people because they wanted the American costume. After that they wanted to come back to the dress that God gave them and God told EGW for them to wear skirts that were coming above the ankle and that we had to cover our limbs for good blood circulation because blood is life. So the principle I understood was for women to wear simple modest and healthy apparel.*

So simple, modest and healthy. You said that you had been taken to Deuteronomy 22:5. Deuteronomy 22:5.

22:5 The woman shall not wear that which pertaineth unto a man, neither shall a man put on a woman's garment: for all that do so [are] abomination unto the LORD thy God.

Brother E. how do you read that verse?

- A. Brother E. So in this verse I understand that a man is not to dress like a woman.

What do you think that means?

- A. *Brother E. I think that when we look at the way a man is dressed and the way a woman is dressed, there has to be a difference.*

Anyone else? Brother V.

- A. Brother V. This might be a verse against transgendering.

Do you think in that verse they are talking about transgender people? Yes or No? If it is no your first step is misapplying without understanding it's context. Brother O.

A. *Brother O. I think that back then the only difference between the man and womans clothes was the fringes on the borders. Because this fringe was a symbol of Gods covenant with Israel by taking into account that the covenant was only made with men for me this text is applying to covenant and not so much about morality.*

So in their history a woman can't be a priest and she can't wear a ribbon on the end of her robe. In our history a woman can be a priest and?

A. Wear pants.

We take this verse and we don't use our methodology. Because what we have done is we have said that everything that we think is prophetic, conservative Adventism can't give us. we have a particular methodology for prophetic subjects. Everything that isn't a prophetic subject we can just take from conservative Adventism. The problem is that conservative Adventists can't read Daniel 11:40 correctly so why do you think they can read Deuteronomy 22:5 correctly. If they can't have eyes to read one they can't have eyes to read the other. Because our methodology must apply to every subject and every verse. So if anyone wants to go to this verse to discuss men and womans dress in context? Sister V.

A. *Sister V. So when you are saying that back then women cannot be priests but now they can be priests what do you mean by them being priests?*

So in the service of the sanctuary who could be a priests?

A. The Levites

The sons of Aaron to begin with. Could his daughters be priests? No. Down in our history can you be a priest?

A. What do you mean by can we be priest? What does it mean to be priest? Because being a priest does not exist anymore today so how would you apply it?

What does it mean to be a priest?

A. Does it mean to preach or to intercede for somebody?

Elder Parminder: Sister in the old Testament who is allowed to receive tithe? Priests. Today who is allowed to receive tithe?

A. Everybody who is fulltime in the message.

Elder Parminder: your church teaches that?

A. Yes.

Elder Parminder: It does not.

A. Pastors

Elder Parminder: Only pastors. So you know what a priest is today. It is a pastor. And pastors are ordained in fulltime ministry so you know what a priest is today.

A. Now yes.

Elder Parminder: And you know that we teach, because of the apostasy of the pastors today, they were bypassed in the time of the end and 9/11. There is the disciples that were given the authority to take of the work of the priests in the time of Christ. Who would have been given the authority to take over the work of the pastors today?

A. Ministries?

Elder Parminder: Which ministries?

A. everyone who has the truth.

Elder Parminder: And the church recognizes that? They do not. They do not have authority to take over the role of pastors. Who are the equivalent of the disciples. they are not independent ministries.

A. It's people

Elder Parminder: Anyone who stand up. The problems which you have is that you don't recognize the authority of this movement because we teach in this movement that the only people who have authority to receive tithes in this movement, because we have taken authority away from the church to ourselves. Do you agree with that?

A. Yes with what you are saying yes.

Elder Parminder: So that you know how to describe what the priests are today?

A. Yes it was my question.

So I have a room full of people and we spent about four or five presentations laying out this line. We have talked about sexism, racism, Homophobia. We have come to see revolution from 9/11 - 2019. We have claimed that there are two streams of information. Conservative side is the one to be feared. Conservative side is wrong. We have said that our position on racism and sexism is a test for this movement. It is a life and death message. We have a room full of questions and quiet people. We have half an hour left in today's class. Sister M.

A. *I just wanted to look at Deuteronomy 22:5. and I am actually surprised at what the text is saying so tell me if you read that way because the text says the woman shall not wear a mans clothes but when you look at the Strongs for men we see the notion of a leader. SO are we actually saying before it was asked for women not to wear the chiefs apparel? So it was a separation made, it was not just a question about dress.*

Is there a separation today?

A. *No. But that's what's special because I always read the texts as only talking about dress and now I look Strongs for men and I'm quite surprised to see what the strong's is leading to.*

So without going into the strong's you can know that Jew and Gentile are separate. Israelite and any other nation are separate. Men and women are separate. In our history same. Israelite and any other nation same. Men and women, same. So how ever you want to read that verse, if you want to bring it into our history and make a distinction we have to read it in it's context. The context is that they are both wearing dresses. Sister S. is it appropriate for a woman in this movement to walk down the street in pants?

A. Sister S. according to what I was shown for the last past days it is yes.

Why?

A. *because we recognize there is equality between man and woman. If man can wear pants then the woman too.*

Sister I. How come equality between men and women in our history?

A. *Sister I. What does it mean equality between man and woman? For us to be able to say that a woman can wear pants when she is walking in the streets?*

You asked what does equality mean. Are you just meaning dress or other issues?

A. *So your question was if a woman can wear pants while walking down the street and Sister S. answered yes based on everything we saw because there is equality between man and woman. So my question is what is the argument we give to confirm that about equality?*

What is your point of reference? Dress? What subject? Why can't a woman wear pants today? Why do conservative Adventists say they can't?

A. *Can't hear the audience member well*

So we are going to go back to quotes from this history of EGW. Quotes of EGW talk about wearing skirts and not wearing pants. Sister A. can a woman walk down the street in a pair of pants. A woman in this movement, is that appropriate?

A. for me no.

Why?

A. *So for me it was a real fight, it was a real hard time for me to put away my pants. But with time I understood and I really accepted why I am not wearing pants and I find pants really not appropriate. Because it is going to show the persons forms and for me it is not appropriate.*

So you said it was really painful but I made myself do it. I asked you why you would put yourself through that and you said because pants showed form. Is it ok for a man to show his form and to show that he has two split legs and a woman can't show that.

A. In my personal experience I was really able to cross that step in prayer.

I'm not saying that it wasn't hard. You have all kinds of people who do really hard things. Catholics do really hard things praying on their knees that are raw. It gets them no where. The fact that it's difficult doesn't make it right. We punish ourselves unnecessarily. I want a prophetic reason. What ever you choose to wear and why it is inappropriate for you sisters to do that.

A. I am not judging my sisters if they want to wear but me personally I wouldn't do it. I would not be able to do it.

I'm curious why that is because someone in your experience someone brought you a message based on quotes and verses and logic that convinced you that you had to put yourself through that. So what is that logic that you still want to hold on to?

A. So when I did this experience as I told you it was hard. I was alone in my room and I kneel before God.

Catholics do that.

A. But I am talking about something personal that I went through with God in this experience. So whether Catholics do it or not it is the experience that I lived with.

A. Sister V. According to Deuteronomy 22:5 what I see is that there has to be a visible difference between man and womans clothes.

Go to that verse and what is the visible difference?

A. Sister V. It says that a woman should not wear a mans clothes so that the difference is visible between both.

Gen 9:3 God tells Noah to eat meat.

A. What is the link.

You don't need it. God tells Noah to eat meat. Do you eat meat today?

A. No but what is the link?

How do you read that then because God told him to eat meat.

A. But the point is not to say that God said this or not.

It is. Because it comes down to how you read verses. God tells Noah to eat meat. Then they eat meat from the beginning to the end of the Bible. From Genesis to Revelation. So what right does EGW have to tell the Millerites and the Pioneers to become vegetarian? What right does she have to do that?

A. God said it

Through who?

A. Through EGW.

And if you are living in that history and some woman comes to you and says that you need to stop doing what God told you to do in Gen 9, put yourself in that place, what is your response.

A. *The answer is that it comes from God so I don't even ask myself that question. If God is talking I don't have to say. If He said that before and now He changed. It was not my point. So now what is our right to say because I think that is what your are saying. What is our right to say that because men and women are equal? So we can also wear pants. Because both EGW and the bible say the opposite. Now it's not because we are equal that we can wear the same thing and the differences has to be visible.*

My point is that God told you what to eat and god told you what to wear. And you would have no problem discarding that when God told you what to eat. You would have no problems bypassing that verse. But when you see a verse, you think you understand what it means, You make a wrong application and think it's talking about pants which didn't exist in that day. You have discarded the clear one about meat and keep the one about dress. It has nothing to do with pants. My point is that the way Adventists read verses, who don't accept our methodology, are inconsistent. Because your next point is saying Diet and meat eating but EGW said Vegetarian. And because it was EGW that is Ok..But then EGW says don't by a bicycle. Now she has given you a clear instruction. You come to our day and I am sure you would ignore that. So now to you it doesn't matter if it is in the bible or EGW. So what is your methodology determines what you leave and what you keep. Without this movement, no other movement, no other person, no church can do it correctly because these are the verses they mess up. Because even if they want to just keep to EGW, every conservative Adventist I have met has picked and chosen what they keep and what they discard based on their own biases whether or not they even like bike riding.

A. *So I am not going from the principle that EGW said something it's just that when EGW says somethin she speaks from God. If she had existed in the time of the Bible she would have been in the bible.*

In this history no one spoke for God. God spoke directly from heaven and said eat meat. In this history God spoke through Moses and said you are all to own slaves. Everyone who doesn't have an Israelite passport can be your slave. He instituted slavery. But you wouldn't bring that to our day. Moses spoke for God just as much as EGW did. So how to you know what to leave and what to take?

A. So God gave me a brain and so I think and I see that today slavery is not for today.

How do you know that? It just feels wrong?

A. It's not even a question for us.

But why was it ok for Israel than?

A. We are not living in the same time. It's like if you were talking about polygamy.

But we are also not living in EGW time.

A. Yes but what was written stays still.

From EGW but not from Moses? Even though it's 150 or 200 years ago?

A. So I am not saying....So when God is bringing new light He is bringing new light to add to the others was my understanding.

And when God brings new light that says no slavery, it is not in addition to what He said in the old Testament it breaks it. It doesn't say slavery and then additional slavery. It doesn't say slavery and additional slavery. It doesn't say patriarchy and then more patriarchy.

Elder Parminder: The church has a problem with this movement because they say we stand in opposition to the bible and the SOP. This is.....inaudible..... every single argument that you are making now is that the presenter is standing in opposition to the spirit of prophecy. You are making the identical arguments that the church makes. I want to remind everyone that if you really believe this message who is the 1st 2nd and 3rd angels are they literal or are they symbolic? Are they sent with a specific message commissioned from Jesus and if they are then are they not the voice of God. This is the argument that you are using. If EGW says it you don't question. But EGW is not alive today and we know the 1st 2nd and 3rd angels messengers are here. The questions that we have to ask ourselves is are those angels the voice of God or not. If they are not then we go back to the churches and we continue to follow EGW in a random ad hoc fashion. Picking and choosing what we like and what we don't like. We know that the only difference between us and the church is methodology and now many of us are entering into dangerous territory because when the subject changes we want to change the methodology. If you do that you are going off the line and entering on to enchanted ground.

We have brought up the subject of dress. We know it's a prophetic subject for our time. It is not a moral issue. It is related to the test for our dispensation which is the same test being faced externally. Levites and Nethinims are being tested on their stream of information. Our stream is our methodology. It is the only thing that keeps us safe. It is a prophetic subject. So if we are going to talk about dress, the only principles that people have so far given are simple, modest, and healthy. that applies equally to male and female. So when we bring up the issue of pants, it seems to surprise people that an increase of knowledge would require any form of unlearning or change. But every increase of knowledge in the past has required exactly that. So if people have a reason in a comfortable environment and a safe environment to discuss their thoughts on their issues it's now. Because whether it is now or Germany or the future, the subject of both a woman's role and dress is not going to leave this movement. It's a good opportunity to discuss. Do we have any other thoughts on this subject? Brother O.

A. *Brother O. I started to get sensitive with that truth when I started studying John 15. It is the parable of the Vine and the branches. I understood that it was a prophetic message. It is one of the reasons why I got disfellowshipped from the church is because I preached that it was a prophetic message. I understand that it is vital for us to stay in link to the bible. Because what gives life to the branches is because you have the sap that runs through it. But what if the sap stops? What happens with the branch? it is going to dry off and fall and die. For me to be in this movement it is to stay in link to the bible and to continue to keep to have access to the sap. So it is a movement. If it is a movement who stop is not a movement for me anymore. So for me it's normal that there are*

changes. I saw so many changes. I don't know if at one point I will be surprised but for me I was not really surprised I was kind of waiting for it.

Thank you. Sister M.?

- A. *For me what I understand is that this test of unlearning is not telling us that tomorrow we all have to wear pants. It is not what it says. Because I hear good reasons not to do it and it is understandable. Some were talking about modesty and also about beauty. Some prefer skirts. I think we can understand it, but the problem is when we say to women not to wear it. There we fail the test because we say we have to have the character of God and God wants us to treat men and women equally. In this way it would be failing the test to force women to wear such a specific type of clothes. But I understand the reasons. Personal reasons. Me I understand I don't have any problem. It doesn't mean that tomorrow I am going to wear pants if I don't want to but I am not going to say to my sisters from the Reunion island not to wear pants.*

Brother J.

- A. *Brother J. Me since everything I heard, when I look at the line from Eden to Eden, God wants to restore His people. I see the 6,000 years spent on earth. We had blurred image of God. And God is restoring light for His people to be fully restored. It's true we are to attach ourselves to the line and that is where I go with brother O. because even the external events are speaking to us. But we have to have the prophetic glasses, the methodology which is going to regulate and put the line straight. I don't know if people understood. Meaning our image is blurred but because of methodology I can rectify the line. That is how I understand it.*

Thank you. Sister N.

- A. *Sister N. I see that through our discussion and ever since we talked about this topic it is a way for us to experience if we really believe in the Line or not. Because if we say that we believe in line upon line and if we line up our line with the disciples line, they were faced with things that were really hard to accept that were written in Moses law and still to pass their test they had to accept to lay this aside and start now with the new ideas they had received. Maybe it was a shock for them but it was their test. Our test is about race and sexism. We could have been faced in this community with racism but today we are tested with sexism. It's difficult to put aside our beliefs and new light but like the disciples we have to mourn about all the things we have to go through accept the new light to pass the test. And we are living in acceptance or not if we really believe in the lines.*

Sister I.

- A. *Sister I. What I wanted to say is that in the story of Moses, from what I was able to see and understand, men were wearing the same clothes as women in the sense as they had dresses. Perhaps when we were seeing them from a far we could not even distinguish them. We took the text from Deuteronomy and we saw it says that men cannot wear the same dress as a woman and vice versa, and if it is the case then it is an abomination to God. But still when we look at the past and the history of Moses, we see that it was the case. So was it really an abomination for God? for God's people to dress the same way? My second point is about what sister V. said. We go back to the Millerite history and she said that what God said to EGW we have to follow it. She believes that*

what EGW is saying comes from God but what God said to Moses also comes from God. So does it mean that God changes? Because He said one thing to Moses and He said another to EGW. It is clear the God does not change. He is the same yesterday, today, and forever. So perhaps we are the ones not understanding something. Are we ready to question ourselves and to go back and look at the teachings that we thought were right. To go back upon our understanding. Are we ready to think that there is a possibility for us to unlearn because Christ does not change. Christ came and said things clear, and the disciples had to unlearn. So is it not the same for us today, if we do repeat the history of the past. God is teaching the end from the beginning.

And were the Pharisees damaged by the viewpoint of the liberals or the conservatives?

A. conservatives.

Conservatives. It was the conservatism that they had to unlearn. Not the Sadducees. My sister in the back.

A. *So I am hearing a lot of things. So it seems to me that when we read the Bible and we talk about women generally we say that the woman is representing the church or that the woman is representing the woman. It is the case in revelation. So when we hear equality man and woman and knowing that the church represents the woman and therefore is the bride of Jesus, do I have to understand that the woman, the church is equal to Christ?*

Where are we meant to sit in heaven?

A. We are meant to follow Christ wherever He goes.

And then in Heaven? He sits on His throne but it's our throne. We sit with Him on that throne. So I would say total equality. Any other thoughts?

A. No that fines.

Sister Shemem.

A. *I have a question on equality not regarding Christ. So if at the professional level should equality between men and women be the same especially on the role of the education of the kid? Or shall the woman go back to work and put the children at school?*

We are five minutes over time. I am not sure if it is a good time to bring in a different subject. I would ask why not.

Elder Parminder: The discussion about the role of men and women, people are continually attempting to take it off the path that it is heading in. When a couple decide to have children they enter into a covenant between themselves of what responsibility each one will bear. It is not an issue of equality whether which one will take which role. The question is a wrong bad question to say that this study teaches that women have to go to the work force and render their children to the state. That is like saying in your ministry everyone has to be the president and you can't have a treasurer or secretary because you have to have equality. The question itself is flawed. When we start talking about the issue of equality it is not talking about the various job functions a man and a woman do in the family.

Brother C.

- A. *Brother C. So I have the intuition that we are like Peter when he found himself before the sheet of unclean animals and God told him to eat. It seems we are in the same dilemma. it takes time to think. Perhaps by my question I am going to annoy or disturb people but once I understood I positioned myself and I believe that we are in this time. Where God is asking us to do something that is impossible for us to understand and here we really have to ask ourselves questions because the game is not to come out of the church or to quit the movement but it's the test of eternal life.*

Final point. Of all the arguments we have had we come back to these three principles. None of them make an argument that require women to not wear pants. No one has presented an argument using our methodology to say women cannot wear pants. And final question. What was Adam wearing in Eden?

- A. Glory of God.

What was Eve wearing in Eden? They are wearing the same thing. It wasn't an abomination then. If you will kneel with me we will pray.