

It was erased for space but I would remind you on this board we did the line of the counterfeit. So we traced the counterfeit from 2001, 2005, 2013, 2019, Panium. Comparing and contrasting that with the reform line of the priests. So restoration of modern Israel, restoration of modern Babylon. We've erased that for space. Over that we'd laid the third Diadochi war and why did we do that? Why did we go to the third Diadochi war?

Brother Rogers: To say show that the papers he has a role to play in the Sunday law history.

Anyone else? Sister Dorkus?

To show the work that the papacy is going to do and how the line counterfeits.

To show the rise of the papacy at the end of the world.

So the third Diadochi war introduces the papacy at what waymark?

Time of the end 1989 a relationship between John Paul II and Reagan and what happens to that relationship? It's destroyed how quickly? Straight away and then you can trace that relationship completely destroyed all the way from the history of 1990-91 all the way through to what way mark? When do they interact next? So the relationship has been destroyed. Then what when it comes to Seleucus? Meet it Panium? What begins to happen at Panium? my sister? show us what the third Diadochi war teaches us about the papacy. I miss the last half of what you said sorry.

So it says a war between the king of the north the United States and the papacy. Antigonus and Seleucus, and how in that Babylonian war Seleucus carves out his empire and it begins at Panium and it ends at the Sunday law. Now two years ago when we saw a war how would we have applied that? How would we have applied war two years ago? So we would have seen a literal physical battle in Daniel 11 and when we made application we would have seen we went from literal war, literal battle. That's what we've done now. What did we do before? Two years ago? what were we doing? We were looking ahead to Raphia and to understand Raphia we looked to Raphia in Daniel 11. We saw a literal hot war battle between the king of the north and the King of the South at Raphia and so how did we apply that literal hot war battle and what have we had to learn? A war in our time but the model changed. So you're talking about application now. So what was the mistake of what we did before? So we're taking a literal history and making literal application. So going from literal to literal, and now we know better than that yes? So when we look at the Babylonian war what do we expect is there going to be a war between Francis and Trump? So we can call it a war?

Sister Jennifer?

But hot war between Seleucus and Antigonus? Make application? What do you think it'll look like? Sorry I missed the last part?

An information war. So you're not expecting physical fighting yes? Physical fighting? No you're not going to have hot war between Trump and Francis. So I just want to make sure in our minds that we we're not tempted to go literal-literal. We need to think about what that war symbolizes. What it looks like. So we've drawn up there the history of the counterfeit. The resurrection from 2001, 2005, arrival of the second angel, death of leadership, 2013 transfer from Benedict's to Francis first angel, second angel, and then we traced 2014 to 2019 our dispensation, is the restructuring of the Catholic Church.

So I want to, I want to just do some revision of what we did yesterday. Perhaps drawing it a little bit more simply. Pretty much taking this concept and putting it over each other. We were to take the reform line of the priests and we say 1989, 911, 2014, 2019, 2021. 1999 is the time of the end and we begin the work of plowing and who's raised up at the time of the end? Jeff FFA. And who is opposing them? Who are the two sides versus Adventist structure? So at the time of the end these are the two sides in opposition. 1989 to 9/11 there's going to be an increase of knowledge. 1991-1996 it's going to be formalized with a publication. Does that make sense?

What is said in the time of the end magazine regarding the king of the south? What happened to it? It's dead. When did we see that happen? So the time of the end magazine, it's explaining what two events? 1989 fall of the Berlin Wall; 1991 dissolution of the Soviet Union. Does that make sense? So this publication is to explain the time of the end & the increase of knowledge. Is that okay? We come to 9/11 again, there's going to be an increase of knowledge, formalization, test.

2014, what happens there sister? 2014 internally, what happens? Transition of leadership from elder Jeff to elder Parminder. So there's a transition of leadership in 2014. 2014 there's going to be another increase of knowledge, 2016, 2018. 2018 those messages are presented from Fatima through to the counterfeit. The whole encapsulated set of messages begins to be presented in September and finishes in early October. Does that make sense? We talk about October 3, October 13, but they began to be presented in September beginning with the message of Fatima September, in October of 2018. And then we found first of all this history is Jeff FFA vs. Adventist structure. What's the theme of our reform line that we spoke of yesterday from Daniel?

Sister Fiona? I can't hear you sorry, what's the theme of our reform line? This is the reform line of the priests. Go back to Daniel chapter 2, what is God doing through these reform lines in Daniel chapter 2? You have two structures yes? Don't speak to her. In Daniel chapter 2 you have two structures; a mountain and a statue, and these reform lines. In this reform line is God dealing with the mountain or the statue? The mountain. So what is God doing through this reform line? What happens to that mountain? What happens to the statue? It's cut. What cuts it?

Sorry? In the story what cuts it? So we know the statue gets smashed, broken. What breaks down the statue? If you don't understand the question you can tell me. So in Daniel chapter 2 you have a mountain and you have a statue, by the end of the story do you have a mountain or a statue? This mountain? No, so by the end of the story do you have this mountain? Then this statue, the statue is gone, what about the mountain? It's gone. So both of these are going to be gone by the end of our story, so what happens to the statue? You said it's obliterated, it smashed. What smashes it? The stone., and where does the stone come from? The mountain. So this mountain what does it represent? It's the Church of God? Be specific. But the hundred and forty-four thousand exist at the end of our reform line. This mountain doesn't, so [if] the mountain is the movement then what's this stone? The stone is the movement, so what's the mountain? The Church? The Adventist Church structure. So if this is the Adventist Church structure the movement is cut out of that. When does God begin to cut the movement out? The time of the end. So 1989 this story begins to be cut out of this mountain. So when we talk about a reform line and it has the five fingers, five keyway marks, that's the story of God reaching in and he's going to pull out that stone. Does that make sense? Got to gather His people but it's going to reach into the church and pull out the people, that makes sense? So we know that this reform line is all about God cutting the stone out of the mountain or stop cutting out a group of people from the Adventist Church structure. Does that make sense? So I just want to make that clear, that is the theme of our reform line. It is to be cut out of Adventism. I'll say of the Adventist structure. So that's okay. So as we look at how that happened, how God did that, we see at the very beginning He starts to cut out this movement. He starts to raise up elder Jeff and his ministry and they're going to butt heads or come into direct conflict with the Adventist leaders. So you're going to see the very beginning that separation occurred 9/11.

What happens to the Adventist leadership? So what do we say happens? Destroy, killed and then we come down to this history, this is our midnight cry. We come down to our midnight cry and do we see this movement versus Adventism? No, that's not what we see, we don't see this movement versus Adventism. Where is Adventism? It's gone. I know that this gets more complicated because we have priests and Levites. When we go to the world there's no two groups, so I want to discount that added piece of information. Adventism is gone they don't hear the message of equality. Equality has not divided us from the church from 2014 to 2019.

Where was the division within the movement? It was this movement versus Jeff and FFA and when I say movement, I want to say 'new leadership' + the movement. So you have elder Jeff and Future for America versus this Adventist church structure. And this is the theme about a whole reform line but under the midnight cry, what message has been given? We have the message of 'come out' from 2014 to 2019. Most of the people in this movement came out of Adventism and joined this movement but where was the real shaking? The division? We saw our opposition, those who fought us the hardest, our greatest threat was not Adventism, it's elder Jeff and future for America. Those who did the plowing. That all make sense? So all that we're doing

is we're taking this structure and we're applying it down here. I know there's a dynamic of priests and levites, I don't want to think about that right now.

So it's not necessary for our story. This is the church, this is the world. Where we come to 2014-2019 we're dealing with the plowing of the world. 2014 becomes their time of the end, and who's raised up? We'll say Michael Moore, he becomes the symbol of a movement. We'll use Michael Moore but I also want to put under him this movement, and it's him versus who? Steve Bannon. I want to say it's the United States structure. Why do I want to say that? Where do we see Adventism in the United States? Compare and contrast Acts 20:7. So this is us being cut out of Adventism, this is the world being cut out of Trump's America. It's more than Steve Bannon. It becomes, it becomes that whole... he becomes complicated because Donald Trump is his own type of movement but it becomes Trump's America the United States structure which we see replicated in other countries, but if we go to Acts 27 it allows you to compare and contrast the Adventist structure with the United States structure. So we come down here to the world and this is the story of a group of people being cut out in the story of Daniel 2. More beaten out. And what are they cut out of? They're cut out of Trump's conservative America, does that make sense? You can put Steve Bannon in there if you like.

So they're going to have an increase of knowledge 2016 and it's going to be formalized in 2018 and we compare and contrast this history of their plowing with the history of our plowing and also our own dispensation of 2014 to 2019. Does that make sense? So Michael Moore, he releases his documentary in September through October, so the midnight cry was presented through late September early October. Michael Moore releases Fahrenheit 11/9 late September early October, same time frame, and this documentary, what is it designed to explain? 2014, why does it go to 2014 sister Jackie? Why does Michael Moore go back to 2014, what happened here? Sorry that's in 2004 so we have to do our 10 years to get that 2014... suddenly happened in his hometown, the water crisis, poisoning the water in Flint Michigan.

So he's going to go back to 2014, explain the time of the end, 2016 the election of Donald Trump. He's going to tie them all together into his message, does that make sense? So just as the internal explained the time of the end and the increase of knowledge, so his formalization explained the time of the end and the increase of knowledge 2019 to 2021. What happens in 2021? The Sunday law way mark, the middle way mark. What must happen my sister? What must happen here? Change of leadership. So who's the first leader? Michael Moore, AOC. They're leading a movement. 2021 who becomes the new leadership? This movement. How can you prove that? What makes you think we're the new leadership here? It's going to join sides with the papacy but how do you know the new leadership is us? We have the right message for them. When do we give that? This is Panium. This is over Sunday, though over here we have the Sunday law of the 144,000 then we have the close of probation for the hundred and forty four thousand. So here we start to give them a message and what are we saying to them? Come out.

So this is where we need to take this history, our latter rain history, but what happens in our ladder rain happens in their harvest. That makes sense. We understand the difference between the lines of the Levites and Nethinim, compared to the line of the hundred and forty four thousand and priests. So there will be Sunday law at Boston a Concord and Exeter and when we get to the loud cry we're telling people to come out so we need to take the history of the latter rain but for them, because of the difference with the reform line, it becomes the history of their harvest and we're the ones telling them to come out. If we're the ones telling them where to go and what to do we're their new leadership yes?

My sister said that those who did, who were the first angel, who did the plowing work, they're going to join sides with Francis. We all okay with that? When do they join sides with Francis? When are they going to join his side? At their time of the end? Why do you say they started back here? I like his answer, it was what I was looking for. They're going to join Francis properly in the future, we can see that on the reform lines from Panium, as the papacy rises, but he wants to use the methodology of linking the the reform lines. So they're already with Francis here aren't they? How do you know that this is Solange? Because they're liberals? What's peculiar about Michael Moore and AOC? We lined them up with Sean Hannity and Steve Bannon, four people, two of them lead the liberal side two of them at the conservative, both of them lead a movement. What do all four have in common? Sister Solange? They're all Catholic.

So Michael Moore and AOC they're both Catholic, so September/October 2018 lines up with our September/October 2018. It's a formalization of our midnight cry, it's a formalization of their plowing history and what does Michael Moore do in October that he's never done before sister Snyder? He goes to the Vatican and meets with Pope Francis and they have a nice little chat right here. How does that go? What does Pope Francis say to Michael Moore? I was going to work from the start to go forward but that's the point, Pope Francis says to Michael Moore, "pray for me". Michael Moore says do you believe in capitalism? Francis says nope. He says do you believe that the wealthy abusing the poor is a sin? Francis says yes. So they have this little discussion about their ideology and what is it about? Francis's and Michael Moore's ideology, the same things they agreed on. Every point and then Pope Francis says to Michael Moore, "pray for me" and Michael Moore says to Pope Francis, "no you pray for me" and Pope Francis says to Michael Moore, "no but keep making videos". He's encouraging Michael Moore to keep [on] and Francis knows what this is about. He's encouraging Michael Moore to continue production so you know right back here that they have the exact same ideology and they're supportive of one another. Does that make sense? It's not a coincidence that the same month is the formalization of that message. It's the first time Michael Moore has ever met with the Pope. [These] Pope Francis I don't think he ever met Benedict.

Mr. Snyder would... so from the very beginning you have an interaction between this new movement and Pope Francis, then you come down to 2021, next year, what happens to that leadership? It's by-passed. So Michael Moore, AOC by the end of next year, where are they? On

the wrong side. They're in the ranks of the opposition, eighteen months time. Around 2014, did everyone know there's a new leadership of the movement? How many people knew that? No one, no one knew it. Did that stop it being true? Does any of the world know in 2021 that their Nethinim and there's a movement? Who is their boss? No no one knows that. Does that make any difference? Does it brother Willy? No it doesn't. Maybe you mistook my question? Didn't make any difference in 2014. God has identified a new leadership, the people were just slow to catch up, so the nethinim might be slow to catch up but this movement leads them from Panium. We're all ok with that?

So we didn't... I forgot that I'd erased the board work. I wanted to just step through the counterfeit again and pick up a couple of points. The two points I wanted to pick up was Benedict, how he is in the latest sin condition. All of those compare & contrasts, go over this study for yourself, draw notes for yourself so you don't lose the point. What are they arguing over? Dispensationalism. All of those points were there. Where what is within the movement is so accurately counterfeited we're arguing over dispensationalism in inspiration, they're arguing about dispensationalism in tradition, but we have the same points. Benedict is in a [lay?] the same condition he's holding on to, the old the tradition, the old traditions.

What does the name Francis mean? Why did he choose the name Francis? Because of Francis of Assisi. What was the job function of Francis of Assisi? What was he told by God to do according to their legend? To build a church. Does someone want to add more to that? It was a church already, they rebuild it. So if we were to look at this structure the one we're in now, what's its problem? What's the problem? Why do we have ten truths? It's not complete in some respects it's broken down, so it wasn't the devil to build a new church, it was that the church they had. Catholic Church was in a state of decay, was broken down, and Francis of Assisi was told rebuild my church. We know him because he loved animals didn't he? That's the whole legend so he believed in social welfare didn't he? It's gonna take care of all the poor and the suffering, all those animals he has. This caring nature the care for the poor, that's the entire [reason?] he chose the name Francis, because of anyone they're going to choose it's Francis of Assisi, who looks like liberation theology. That's why he chose the name but it also comes with this directive to rebuild a struggling church. So the Catholic Church is in disrepair, it's broken down because of the infighting, the sexual abuse crisis, financial mismanagement, and what does Francis plan to do? Resurrect the Catholic Church. So for the first time in 600 years you have two popes living at the same time. For the first time in 1,000 years, a millennium, you have a pope who has chosen to have no number after his name. He will not be Francis the first which he should be. So you have the first in 600 years, first in 1000 years, to fit to make this structure of the counterfeit fit prophec.

So we said that when we come to this history, of 'come out', the theme of this reform line is a stone, or this movement, being cut out of Adventism. Come down to here and what you see is an internal split and shaking between first and second angel. I just want to make the point though,

elder Jeff is the first angel. Does he still carry that title? No. So use that parabolically, but Moses died here, John the Baptist died here. He no longer carries that symbology but that's what you have, the first leader versus the second leader. Two sets of disciples, a split movement. So when we come to this history the theme is come out of Trump's conservative America. That's the theme of the whole line but when we get to this history, of 'come out', it'll be an internal split inside the movement of the nethinim between the new leadership which equals this movement and who? Francis, who will be aided by Michael Moore, quite likely AOC and those associating with them. Does that make sense? So Francis, when he chose the name Francis there had never been a pope in history who had chosen that name. So by tradition he should be known as Francis the first just like Benedict is Benedict the 16<sup>th</sup>. They should always have a number over their name. Francis deliberately chose not to do that. He said I won't have a number after my name. I won't be Francis the first, it'll only be Francis. You haven't had a pope make that decision in 1,000 years. It's 1,000 years going back to where you have a pope who doesn't have a number because there is no Francis the second. Yes it's been 600 years since you've had two living popes existing at the same time. We go back into the reform line of Christ and you don't have two leaders living at the same time. John knew that he must die for Christ to begin his ministry, we read that quote. First leader dies, second leader takes over. Solves a lot of complications. Now we have a problem where we have a first leader living at this time of the second leader, so all those who don't like the second leader, what can they do? Go back to the first leader, the internal condition. So it must be the condition of the counterfeit. We have a living elder Jeff and a living elder Parminder. So there must be a living Benedict and a living Francis. I just wanted to highlight that we haven't had that in 600 years. These things are given to us to explain the internal so it starts to change our dynamic of this Sunday law, a close of probation history.

So if we were to come back to this board what we've done is essentially this, we know that from 2014 to 2019 we lined up these two sides, between Steve Bannon and Michael Moore. We spoke about Francis in this history, Michael Moore in his history. Steve Bannon in his history. So we've gone through quite a few different layers. I just want to add one thing on top of this that's a little bit separate to that study but still becomes relevant when we look at the dispensation of 2014 to 2019. We haven't done this here I did plan on it but we have gone into this subject more thoroughly than I anticipated, which I'm glad for but it meant I didn't do this, but what did we discuss in Kenya? For those of you that were there.

When we looked about 2014 to 2019 we went through a subject after subject and you couldn't bookend it. You could mark it [*be*] the beginning and the end as lining up with the beginning and the end of this dispensation, for those of you that have seen that, we did that with Donald Trump, what does Donald Trump need to take over first to be a dictator? His own government. He needs to take over the Republican Party. You see that begin here before he's even president. What's the name of the Republican purged here? The first one to get purged? Eric Cantor, 2019. How much party loyalty? 100%. So you know that this is the beginning and the end of a purging process.

There was another subject we taught, we tackled. What else does Donald Trump need? What does he need to do to bring in a Sunday law, whatever that law looks like? What does he need to have control of? The judiciary, the judicial system. That begins when what happens, in 2014 before he's ever president? Brother Rogers? So Mitch McConnell can't write [mmm] who look like Michael Moore, Mitch McConnell, starts blocking Obama appointing any judges. So from 14 to 19 you have, first Obama can't appoint any judges and then Donald Trump starts flooding the judiciary with conservative judges. In 2019 you have a situation where there are so many conservative judges they're saying, you know if Bernie Sanders wins the 2020 election what difference does that make? Not actually that much difference. You might have a liberal president but when the whole court system, the whole judiciary system is conservative, the Supreme Court is conservative, all those different circuits are conservative, you have all those court cases come up regarding civil rights, Human Rights, equal rights, and when that system is led by conservative judges what they're saying in a panicked fashion in the news media, is that whoever wins Trump has left the United States in such a condition it won't recover for a generation not in your [or] in my lifetime. Maybe if we got really old, but it's changed the judiciary system in such a way that it cannot be reversed at least in the next 40 years. Does that make sense? So that's the take over the judiciary system from 14 to 19 and you can bookend it.

...want to bring that to the counterfeit, what does Catholic, what does Pope Francis have to do first take over the Catholic Church and what's the best way to do that? What's the best way to make sure sister Emma? Purge. So what does he need to bring in? Liberal priests. The lower levels matter but what's, the what's the ultimate that he has to change to make sure if he dies tomorrow his legacy is irreversible, at least in the next generation? Trump needs to impact the judiciary system, what does Pope Francis need to impact? I want to read from a newspaper article, this is the New York Times. See if I can fit it here, the New York Times, it's written October 4 2019 and it says Pope Francis may not change the world but he is reshaping the Catholic Church. Pope Francis may not change the world but he is reshaping the Catholic Church. They're saying how externally you have this rise of populism and that is in a way holding him back but it says inside the Catholic Church is a different story. In a ceremony in St. Peter's Basilica on Saturday Francis will create 13 new Cardinals who reflect his pastoral style and priorities on a range of issues including migration, climate change, the inclusion of gay Catholics, inter-religious dialogue, and shifting Church power away from Rome to bishops in Africa, Asia and South America. The appointments are a landmark for Francis who now reaches a tipping point of influence to shape the future Church in his image. After Saturday Francis will have named more than half of the voters within the College of Cardinals. I want to suggest here that what Donald Trump needs to do is change the the judicial branch after his own image. What Pope Francis needs to change is the College of Cardinals. What's the job function of the College of Cardinals? One of them, Pope Francis dies, who picks the next Pope? The College of Cardinals. The longer it lasts the more there will be Cardinals in the spirit of Pope Francis said Archbishop Jean-Claude choleric of Luxembourg who will be one of those made a cardinal this weekend. Francis has by now made his agenda abundantly clear. Francis wants an inclusive

church that welcomes back into the fold Catholics who feel geographically pastorly and ideologically alienated.

This is an article from 2017 National Catholic Reporter. If it's a National Catholic Reporter is it likely to be for Pope Francis or against Pope Francis? People said for? For? Who said it is it's against? Who said it's against sister Elizabeth? National Catholic Reporter is it for or against? It's for. I'll double check that now because now I'm not sure. What's the one that's against him? National Catholic Register. So you know that this one is to be for him. So this is quite, this is quite a positive worded article but the title does not paint him in the best light. It's called, "Francis Stacks the College of Cardinals". Do we know what it means to 'stack' something? Like to 'stack' the Supreme Court?

So if there's, how many people are on the Supreme Court? Nine. It's meant to be four conservatives, four liberals and one someone middle-of-the-road. So there's nine on the Supreme Court. Roosevelt wanted to stack the Supreme Court, what did he want to do? He was going to add people to that Supreme Court, so let's say the Supreme Court is six liberals and three conservatives. They all are members of the Supreme Court for as long as they live... You can resign if you want but otherwise it's a position for life. So if Donald Trump wants to turn that conservative he can't fire anyone, can't legally kill anyone, so what's the only way he would be able to turn that conservative? If you have six liberals, three conservatives, what presidents have tried to do is add positions. So what Theodore Rosen, not Theodore, the other Roosevelt, sorry Franklin, Franklin D. Roosevelt tried to do is this. It isn't the literal situation but if there are six liberals and three conservatives it's going to say we didn't have a nine/nine member Supreme Court, we have a 15 member Supreme Court and then he's going to add six conservatives. Can you see how he just switched it? Swayed the Supreme Court from liberal to conservative. You're going to pump it with your allies. So this is an article from 2017 and I won't read it all but it just talks about how Pope Francis has made revolutionary changes to the College of Cardinals. He's not changed the system so that a pope can [?] the college with bishops who support his views... says this change will have an impact on the church for hundreds of years. If we were to go on that long one of the most common changes made by the Popes has been increasing the number of colleges in the College of Cardinals.

[It] goes on to explain how Francis has manipulated this and to give some history of where this has happened before, but to give some idea, Pope Francis has created Cardinals every year since 2014. So in 2014 he, I don't know what they call it, he elects his first Cardinal by 2019. What has he done? He's switched the College of Cardinals from independent or conservative to liberal, so he swayed the College of Cardinals just as Donald Trump from 14 to 19 switched the judiciary system. You can bookend it. This is just Wikipedia. The Wikipedia article titled "Cardinals Created by Francis" that has its own Wikipedia page. Pope John Paul the second appointed how many Cardinals? 19. Pope Benedict appointed 42. Pope Francis in seven years has appointed 67. John Paul in all of his years from 1978 to 2005, those decades he only appointed 19 Cardinals.

Pope Benedict 42. Pope Francis has already brought in 67 and counting. So can you see how he has changed the Catholic Church in a way that the next, even if they were to get a conservative Pope in, he's going to have problems. They've both set up the system. I just wanted to highlight that bookend why we're still speaking about Francis and what he's done in this dispensation. We discussed repair, we discussed the Synod on the family, but it's also how he is restor[ing] the Catholic Church from 14 mostly conservative, to the first Cardinal he appoints in 14 to 19 when they're already noting that you've reshaped the church in a way that is irreversible in the next, [at] least in the next generation.

So we come back to our study. I want us to think about the impacts of what we're saying now, about what this looks like when we talk about this history of calling people out and we all said at the beginning, that the division would be between conservatives and liberals and the purpose of our studies that we've done for the last three weeks is to question this. That the split that we see as much as this is people being cut out of Trump's America, this split is between the leadership, this movement versus our greatest threat. Our greatest threat is not Donald Trump in conservative America. Our greatest threat is Michael Moore, AOC, lining up with Francis the counterfeit. That becomes the division, the reason that we need to challenge this. When we said it'll be conservative versus liberal it's because what we see, this division to be, is what starts to impact what message we think we're giving them. Does that make sense? People are, I don't think they're realizing that but they're building their idea about what this history looks like and what we do for these people based on the two groups that they think are forming.

That makes sense so I have this thought. I'm not sure how to wear it when we talk about the first angel. Go back to Moses. Moses is raised up at the time of the end. Does he have a correct understanding of the nature of Christ's Kingdom? No. What's his problem with his message? He goes and kills the Egyptian. He has a problem. He's half and half. Come down to John the Baptist. What's John the Baptist's problem? Does he understand the nature of the kingdom? Come down to William Miller. What's his problem? There are two most accurate histories to compare and contrast. Is Christ & 144,000 a history of success? History of success? So it comes down to elder Jeff and what is the problem. What he's attacking this movement for, is what he would say is lightly regarding the messages he gave in the plowing time and we say we understand. They were important just like the messages of John the Baptist were important but John did not understand the nature of Christ's Kingdom and elder Jeff did not, does not understand the nature of Christ's Kingdom. Does that make sense? The consistent problem with the first angel.

So if this is the modelling what's the problem with Michael Moore and AOC? They must be half right and half wrong. When you come down to the history of the second angel [you] go to the history of success. Second angel becomes who? Christ. Christ represents this movement yes? I want to say Christ represents the second angel of this movement does that make sense? Because he doesn't represent elder Jeff. We're all ok with that? John doesn't then understand the nature of

Christ's Kingdom. He's half right, he's half wrong. Does Christ understand the nature of the kingdom? Yes he's 100% correct. So when we compare and contrast this history we have the plowing of the world and we have the latter rain of this movement, of the priests. All of this occurs, this is the beginning of the work of Christ and this is the crucifixion. That okay? And Christ represents this movement, the faithful of this movement. He represents the second angel. So does the second angel and the giver of the midnight cry understand the nature of the kingdom? Yes are they 100% correct on that subject. Yes?

So the problem that I have with how people are now thinking, I'm gonna word what they're thinking and they might say they don't agree with this but I believe that's what they are saying in their conclusions, even if they don't like the way it's worded. They're saying look at us. This movement of wicked conservatives. We need to go to the world, to Michael Moore, to understand the nature of Christ's Kingdom because we didn't understand about equality and they had it already figured out. So now we're down here. We're here after the cross and people are still saying, they're posting on Facebook, music videos of pop singers, links to secular movies, because they're saying look this pop singer understands equality, we should learn from them. Look at the great good AOC is doing and then they're building this model where they think they're going to come down to this harvest period and this is why they think we're going to give them no other requirement except a political message because what else do they need? They have it all figured out. Do we understand that's their train of thought, even if they don't understand that's their train of thought? That's their train of thought. Look at those good people, Michael Moore, AOC, they get it, we don't get it. We need to learn from them and then when we learn from them, someday in this history, we'll join forces because they have it all figured out. We just need to get the same political message as them and then we're all going to come into harmony. First thing we need to do is break down that idea of harmony. They are not our friends. When we get to the harvest period they are our mortal enemies. In the harvest period we need to separate those two, then we need to think about the other impacts of that. Michael Moore and AOC, they're half right and they're half wrong. They don't understand the nature of this kingdom.

Do we understand the nature of the kingdom? Yes. Do the second angel and the giver of the midnight cry understand the nature of the kingdom? Yes. So we understand the nature of the kingdom. Do they? So what do they have to teach us? Nothing. We're going to a group of people that are half right and half wrong and the people that are saying this, that we give them nothing else because they haven't figured out, it's us conservatives that are needing to sort ourselves out, I would ask them the question, "Where are they half wrong?" Where are they half wrong? Where are they half wrong because you know that if elder Jeff was half wrong and John the Baptist neither of them knew what that kingdom looked like. You know that these two, they don't know what this kingdom looks like. They haven't got this figured out. There's major errors through their message. What's wrong with their message if we don't know? Do you think it's safe to be following them compared to the priesthood God raised up 30 years ago? No I would suggest that's dangerous. It's foolishness to go to them to lead us when we can't even clearly identify

where they're half wrong but you know that they can't be the ones to teach us because if they taught us, and we don't know what's wrong, why don't we just go to imbibe the half wrong of those who plough the world? The point of bringing a people out from 1989 to 2014 is to actually prepare a people who don't have something half wrong. Who know how to lead this movement. This movement is not capable of leading itself. Come the end of next year and when we first of all, when we look to them, the world, their movies, their movie stars, their pop stars, all of these different things as if they're going to teach us, not only are those people not even on this level, how much are they actually caring about equality?

I'll use an example. Beyonce, we all know who Beyonce is. You picture her, you all know what she looks like. You all know what her husband looks like. You line up Beyonce and her husband. Which one, let's be fair, which one's attractive, more attractive? Beyonce. She's known to be just like the ultimate ideal of what a woman should look like. You compare and contrast her with her husband. What does she live for? Why does she do all that? Her body, her makeup, everything about her, that image. Why does she do that? Does he have to do that to be famous and popular? He can walk out in a sweat shirt, no make-up on. Why do people follow and like her? It's because of what she looks like isn't it? People [*don't*] follow her because of her brain, because of her organizational skills, because she's a good leader, people don't even follow her that much because of her voice! People follow her because of what she looks like.

Line up AOC and Michael Moore. If AOC looked like Michael Moore do you think people would care what she said? No! Does Michael Moore have to concentrate on what he looks like to get people's attention? People don't care. Do you think if she looks that way people would give her the attention they do? So how much do they understand equality? This is the problem, when we start talking about adornment why are we doing that if it's to follow someone like AOC? I would suggest that the equality that we're trying to learn from them is not even a very good equality. This movement understands equality when we say we don't care what you look like. It's nice to be presentable. We don't care about that bodily perfection, we care about your voice and your mind and your spirituality don't we? That's the message of equality. It's a counterfeit equality when we start thinking that they have that all figured out. They got equality before we did. Those liberals don't understand equality because to listen to a woman even as liberal, they still want her to look like Beyonce and then we want to listen to her music videos, because in her music videos she speaks about equality, and I'm saying she doesn't know what equality is. Does that make sense? Do we have any thoughts or questions so far?

My brother, we made the point yesterday. Why can't we go to the world now? Why can't we go to the world now? We know the ugly reason, which is we also don't get equality. That's been evidenced every day. We don't get equality so we can't go to the world. We're not in unity, we're not fit for duty, that's our ugly reason. What's the other reason we can't go to the world right now? The message would harm them. How would it harm them? So they're still in the history when Michael Moore and AOC see the first angel is leading them. Do they need to trust him if

we had gone into the history of 1996 and said by the way elder Jeff is going to be your worst enemy? There's heaps of things he hasn't figured out yet. Would people have trusted him? As they needed to know, people needed to trust *[if]* this was the ministry of John, and if we had gone to the disciples and said, "Be careful with this fellow, he's teaching you error. He's teaching you about a kingdom that isn't coming". Would they have followed John as they needed to? They wouldn't have. So when we come down to this history, one of the reasons we can't go to the world is those that are doing their plowing, that are doing the work, that work they actually need to trust in and we have the ability of prophetic sight, so we can see prophetically that they become the enemy, if we were to tell them that now, we'd damaged them. They cannot yet have our prophetic foresight as to what's going to happen. That needs to wait for God's timing. So they need to trust particularly in this history. They need to have implicit trust in these people, in that movement, so you know that to some extent then they're trustworthy. We know that they're doing a good job.

What I would quote... problem is, one of the reasons we got to this place in the first place is you talk about the wickedness of conservatives and people fly into the other ditch and think we're all these liberals. I want to use an example for that. We did this message, dispensationalism from Eden to Eden. What did this teach us? What was the purpose of doing this my brother? Restoration. When it comes to gender equality a woman can equal an elder and on that point alone how many conservatives do we lose, and that everyone says, "Oh we're liberals now". Then you do another line of progression and you say, "Eden we were vegan, so what are we going to be down here? Vegan." How many liberals does that make happy? That's a conservative position by the way, so *[are]* we conservatives or liberals? Conservatives here, liberals here. There's a problem with using these titles. I get why people are saying they're liberals but we need to be careful and our definition of what liberalism is, because liberalism is not freedom in the way it can be framed. The same line that taught us women are equal taught us we should all be good vegan health reformers. That's not a position that liberals in the church hold to. So a conservative or liberal?

The reason I bring that up is where I think we become endangered is when we think that down in the history of Christ we're half right and half wrong and somehow in their plowing they have it all figured out because that type of mentality alone is twisting people's idea of what is right and wrong, and of what message we bring to people, and how we lead them, what we require of them, because if they have it all figured out all that we need to do is have a political message here that brings the two movements into unity and meshes them into one, but we know that can't be the case. Do we have any thoughts or questions on that subject so far?

Sister Snyder? The message we were given here, if we had have been studying properly and I had a discussion yesterday, there's lots of men all over the world who think that it's a woman's job to cook and men shouldn't have to cook as it's women's work, and they speak degradingly of it or they think degradingly of it. Like it's women's work in some type of 'beneath them' caste

system. Ellen White says first of all we should never ever look down or speak down against a woman's work. Second of all she says all men should cook so one of the reasons we have issues in our dispensation is because we haven't even followed the equality of the last dispensation. We don't even have the equality Ellen White introduced. How hard is it for people to get their equality of this dispensation but there is enough in Ellen White's writings for us to know that men should cook. If we were reading properly there is enough in this message if we were studying inspiration fully, we don't need the world. We could look to what they're doing because it makes it easier. This is the cheap version. So we could look to them as some type of cheap version and come to that conclusion much more quickly. It makes sense but the non-cheap version is we have it all within our message, in a pure, unadulterated form. Correct equality, and what I'm trying to highlight is first of all this is the cheap version we already had it in. This message. Not only that but it's flawed. They don't fully get it. I don't believe if they fully got it you wouldn't have someone like AOC who gets attention and Michael Moore because if you swapped what they look like *[it]* would look very different. Just like if you swap Steve Bannon and one of the ladies of FoxNews. There's a picture! Every one of them to be blonde. There's a pattern that they have to have to feel the same way. You don't get Beyonce and her husband if you switch them. They don't understand equality. They get it to a point, to a level enough to get through the plowing but we know from our own history that this message, the plowing, the message that plows them is half wrong. They don't understand the nature of the kingdom, so we need to know what they have wrong and we need to not be taking their error into this movement, like somehow that's meant to lead or teach us. So in answer to your question I would say we have it in its pure form. The reason the only cases where we don't have it in its pure form is for the exact same reason some men don't want to cook or wash their own dishes or wash their own clothes, because they don't follow the instructions of the prophet from the last dispensation, not because she didn't lay all that out in front of us. As a movement we understand it. Any other questions or thoughts?

Brother Robert, some questions plurals? You might need to write them down with the Lord, that's what I'm asking you. I want all those people who said that we bring them no other requirement but coming into unity on a political message, I want them to tell me where they're half wrong. I don't want to tell them that. I want other people to tell. I want them to think about it and then to tell us because again, first of all they have to acknowledge that they are half wrong, and then half wrong about what? We'll take one more question and then we might close. Four, there's four hands up. I think we need, we're about out of time. I'll take one more and then maybe if we close and we'll come back to this tomorrow, but in that same case they're also half right so you need to be able to separate those two.

I might close there and everyone can think about that before tomorrow's class. You kneel to close in prayer do you?

Father in heaven thank you for our blessings. Lord we do not want to be lifted up inside, we know that we have a long way to go to fully implement the requirements you made for us. We know Lord that many will not do this and fall away but Father we know the high calling, we know that we are created to serve the world, what this leadership looks like Lord as a selfless service for them. We don't mean to ridicule them Lord but in love for them we see that there are major errors even as they go through their ploughing time as you bring them out there, are things that you wish them to leave behind. I pray Lord we'll understand more clearly so that we can right ourselves that we can be protected from danger and that we can do all that we we must to help them, to bring them into your kingdom. Lord I pray that you prepare your people. We know that you have in your kindness given us this time to to wrestle with these things and understand these things. I pray Lord that we are not slow to understand but you give us this clarity, in Jesus' name I pray. Amen