Thou Shalt Not See My Brother's Ox.

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

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

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

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

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

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

That they would see, not only new depths in the sense of like some intriguing information, but they would be inspired to see that meditating and contemplating God's Word, it's not only necessary to receive eternal life, but is actually enjoyable, it's actually a pleasurable task, it's exciting and it's fulfilling.
And too often the way we think about God's Word, the way we teach it, is completely opposite, it's dry and it's boring. And I think for many of us, it doesn't have any value.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

What was the question that I proposed?

Why are we not harvesting the Levite?

I framed it in a slightly different way or maybe that was the, and then there was the answer to the question.
Maybe that’s more accurate, and what was the answers of the question? We find out that we’re not ready, that we’re not in harmony.

So, that’s where I first began to discuss the subject, and people have said, “oh you asked the question and we never even answered it”.

And perhaps we didn't answer it in a direct fashion. But it was a question to provoke an interest, to think about, I think a vital subject.

Then what I said was, we moved on from that question.

And then we went on to this.

What was this issue, this concept?
How God is dealing with the church in the world. God's dealing with mankind is ever the same. So, everyone receives the everlasting gospel, it's the repeating pattern.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

What was my question?

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

Tell me the two options that we have. One option is, Someone else. Why am I asking him this question?

Tell him why I'm asking him the question.

Brother Dennis why am I asking him that question?

Why am I asking him the question and not you?

Someone else, why am I asking him the question?

Because he already gave me two answers.

Why are they there?
Answer one. You already gave me the answer before, I just need you to repeat the answer that you gave me before.

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

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

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

Sister Schneider, Law version, what does that mean?

We have ten points, what would the Law say?

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

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

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

You understand everything, or you die.

That's Law version.

What's the other version? Good advice

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

How do we know?
So, it's not enforceable, because it's not codified, can we see that.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

What was the other point with this picture work here?

What else did we learn?

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

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

Okay, so we did another one,

PRIEST- LEVITES & NETHINIM’S
So. I'm going to do this, why am I asking her this question now? Because? She's already answered the question. She's already given the answer. Equals? No.

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

\[
P = \text{GOOD} \\
L =
\]

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

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

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

\[
P = \text{GOOD} \\
L = \text{GOOD}
\]

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

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

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

\[
P = \text{GOOD} \\
L = \text{GOOD} \\
P = L = N
\]
That's what we taught.

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

Some of us thought that Law was best advice.

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

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

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

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

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

So, we want the best advice.

The best advice is to learn how much?

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

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

It depends. What's the best advice?

100 % percent, you can't depend.

The best advice is to learn everything.

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

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

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

Are we going to teach the Netherlands? We're going to teach the Nethinim’s, yes. That's what that was for.
What's the job function of a **Levite**, to **teach who**? To **teach the Nethinim's**, it's the same job function.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

How many groups? **Three groups.**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

We're not repeating something that doesn't need to be repeated.
There's an issue in the movement so we're addressing them.

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

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

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

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

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

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

And our response is, **What**?

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

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

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

**Rule number five. What were we doing?**

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

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

**There's a belief in the movement that all Nethinim’s need to do is just learn external events**, that's all they need to do. And the purpose, at least one major purposes of our time here at the school, **was to address that issue. That that is an incorrect understanding.**
And if you want to blame someone, if you want to, we could say, it's your fault because you're lazy, you don't pick up all the clues. Or it's our fault because we didn't understand.

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

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

\[
P = \text{GOOD} \\
L = \text{GOOD} \\
P = L \neq N
\]

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

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

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

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

It wasn't done that way.

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

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

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

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

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

And worse than that, they disconnected my own presentations.
From this question, to good advice.

![Diagram]

They can't even see the connection between that.

So, again we have different versions. Either I'm a bad teacher or you're not good students. And you're not praying and meditating and asking the right questions.

So, again, the reason why I talk about these discussions in the accusative framework, is because I think it's important for every single one of us to pass a judgement, so, we should pass judgment.

I’m not saying you verbalize it; I'm not saying to be rude, but you need to be sure in your own minds, who is at fault.

The reason why this becomes an important subject, is because this is not a new theme of mine. If you've been watching my presentations over the last two, three, plus years, you'll know that, that is the methodology and technique that I use frequently.

What people might call from where I come from, “the blame game,” because I want to blame people.

And people say, the only reason why he wants to blame people is, so that he could look innocent. Before, all I do is keep on blaming Elder Jeff for
everything, and I'm saying I'm clean, it's not my fault. All the bad things are his fault.

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

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

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

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

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

Are we okay with that?

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

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

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

This issue here,
$P = \text{GOOD}$

$L = \text{GOOD}$

$P = L =/= N$

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

So, what we're doing is, **we're mixing our dispensations together and we're saying we're half right and half wrong.** If we're **half right and half wrong**, who are we?
Priests can't be Priests we must be some, as we're accused of, some kind of Jesuit demonic organization. What are we half wrong on today, what are we half wrong on my brother?

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

What are we half wrong on? Not that.

What are we wrong on?

What are we not in harmony about?

Everybody, what was his answer?

What are we wrong about?

Do we remember what his answer was?

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

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

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

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

Are those issues Law?

And what are they?

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

Why can't we just leave it?

Why the big issue?

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

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

So, we become like the world. Not the world in the prophetic system, like we're understanding it. We become the classic definition of worldly.
So, **they're teaching us.** And if you believe that, the question I want to ask is, **why are we here?**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

\[
P = \text{GOOD} \\
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\]

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

First of all, it's the relationship between **good advice** and **Law.** And what I don't want to do, when I want us to see that, even though I brought it in view.
You know my position on this. So, you tell me what your position is. All of those things, all of those symbols that were on the board, how many of those things, do you think, you are required to learn?

How many are you require to learn of out of those 13 things? Give me the number or the percentage. There are 30 things, it was more, we'll do 13.

How many of those things are you require to learn? You're not sure. None of them?

Are you require to learn nothing?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Now if I said to you, you need to learn 10 symbols of Nethinim’s. Because how many Nethinim’s do you need to reach?

You need to learn 10 symbols because that’s how many Nethinim’s you need to reach. You need to reach 10 Nethinim’s, isn't that right?
One symbol for each one. You need to reach the heart of one of those Nethinim’s, and the only way you can do it is with symbol number 10. For Nethinim number 10.

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

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

Now, you tell me why?

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

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

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

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

And, I'll say, good answer

Can you get to heaven? Yes

What about Nethinim number 10?

Will they get to heaven?

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

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

No happiness for “her”, why? Because of that 10th one.

And whose fault is that? It’s her fault.

When will she be happy?

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

When will you ever be happy?

You say, I will be happy in a million years. I'll say, in the million years I'm going to come up to you. I'm going to say, you know what, heaven is fun.
But the problem is, is my child isn't here. And she knows that my child was, whom? Nethinim number 10, and she'll say, that was my fault. 

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

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

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

So, the Nethinim’s they cannot just have external events. \[ P = L \neq N \]

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

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

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

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

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

**GEOGRAPHY**

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

What's the problem that Adventists have? It's all about geography.
They've put the two kingdoms separate to one another; Earth and Heaven.

And why is that fundamentally wrong? Because they're too far apart. What does Jesus have to do? He has to link them together.

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

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

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

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

What is it supposed to be like when you live on earth? Good. Let's not use the word good, let's use the word earth.

Then what's the opposite of Earth?

So, what is it supposed to look like here?

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

Do we agree with that?

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

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

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

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

I apologize if you felt like that even for just a moment. Because this place should have been like heaven.
And what are we **require to do** in the discussion like that? **Blame someone.**

**Aren’t we supposed to go around blaming someone?**

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

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

1. **9 > BAD ADVICE**
2. **10 > GOOD ADVICE**

Someone gets **harmed** if you don’t **follow the advice**.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Finally, my brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, lovely, etc.**
Is that the one you wanted me to go to 4:8, and 9?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

We looked at all of that and the first thing we looked at was the man. And we said the most important words were wear and pertaineth.
But we looked at man instead. And we were looked at man it then becomes what subject?

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

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

So, this begins to give us the framework.

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

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

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

Their requirements are different yet there is some overlap

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

The word pertaineth in this passage means what? It means to belong. Pertain means to belong, to be the property, the right or the duty.

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

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

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

What is the man's?

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

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

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

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

Who has done that in their private studies, anyone?

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

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

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

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

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

Now what does “wear” mean?

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

1397 I mix them up in that class, because when you focus so much upon something it comes reflex action. And I was focusing so much upon
something else, that I put it on the board when I should have put something else on.

H 1961 means what in English.

What's the word? Wear

The word “wear” is 1961.

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

What does “wear” mean? It means to “put on”.

So, we're going to take the concept of “put it on”.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

So, “wearing” is garment, that's what it means.

We've already argued Moses falls in with an Egyptian woman, that's what the movies teach. There's nowhere in the story, it may have happened, I don't know.
But it helps to make what? It makes the person to become credible, and believable, to make it a normal person.

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

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

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

So, this idea of “wearing” in the English becomes some benign irrelevant thing.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Because Ellen White's framework says, there'll be confusion now, because people think you're a man, you behave like a man, you look like a
man, when I see you from the back, I don't know if you're a man or a woman.

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

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

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

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

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

It means, “to become”, that's what the word means. It means “to become”

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

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

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

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

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

She knows what that is serving what the reason behind that is. And that's what the intent is as well, the original intent understands that.
The people who are not persuaded are people like us. You might call us **liberals**. We say, not just because you **wear men's clothes** doesn't make you **less of a woman**.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

So, in the original, **this is a very strong statement**. And I'm saying **Ellen White**, whether she knows it or not, **intellectually**, she comes up with the **right answer**.
She says, women shouldn't wear men's clothes because it will turn them into, men.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

It's all about Deuteronomy chapter 20.

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

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

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

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

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

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

And why do we think it’s ordered, who's in charge? God. We think, everything that God is in charge of, is order. And that can't be correct.
Is God in charge of nature? Yes. Is nature ordered? It’s totally, completely out of control, at every level it’s out of control. And yet God is in charge of that, and it’s not ordered.

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

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

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

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

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

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

And what would be shown here?

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

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

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

It's a bad situation that's controlled.

Is this Earth ordered? No, it’s not ordered. It's totally out of control and God is managing, it he has certain controls.
What would Satan want to do to you? What would he want to do to Elder Tess? Kill her. Why doesn’t he? What stops him? Control. There's control that has been put in place to stop him.

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

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

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

When we get to heaven, yes or no?

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

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

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

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

Hopefully as time goes on, it becomes more orderly

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

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

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

So, when people talk about those two, what was Eden like? Was it a controlled situation or was it an orderly situation? It was order.
So, I want us to think about not just Eden to Eden, I want to think about order and control?

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

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

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

Brother Benjamin what does the verse say, women don't become men. Tell me how do you apply that today? How do you put that into practice? How do we put the verse into practice?

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

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

   WE DON'T

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

The verse says what? Inequality.

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

We can learn something from that. But we're not going to apply the verse, either that, or, you and I don't understand what apply means.
Unless I'm wrong, tell me if I'm wrong. To me, **apply means do it**, put it into **practice**. And I'm saying, I don't think we're supposed to put it into **practice** anymore. This verse is **redundant**, it has no **relevancy** to us.

Why does it have no **relevancy**?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**It happened then, is it happening now? Yes**

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

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

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

In some shape or form, whatever these **spiritual applications** would be, what are **women not allowed** to do? **Become men**, that's what the **verse** says. You can't **manipulate** the **passage**; this is what a “**Thus saith the Lord**” is about.
People misunderstand it. You can't manipulate the data, that's what we keep on doing. And we manipulate the data because we're using, wrong rules.

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

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

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

But that is not the same as application.

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

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

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

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

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

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

If we're talking about Eden to Eden, and Eden was order, I'm not trying to say equality or inequality, it's not even what I'm trying to do. I'm just trying to take a fundamental principle, because I want to make a fundamental point; you cannot take all the verses and just bring them to the end of the world, it does not work that way.
And the reason it looks so good so far, is because we have cherry picked our verses, we pick all the verses that do that. And then we say, “Oh the other ones, it must be the same, because where two or three a thing is established.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

THIS IS THE CONCLUSION OF OUR PRESENTATION
Let's pray.

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