

#11 Structured approach

In the last class we looked at William Miller's rule number five

“Scripture must be its own expositor, since it is the rule of itself.”

What does this mean?

You can't use another book to explain it, so the Bible must explain itself, because it's the only guaranteed source that you know, that it follows its own rules, from one portion of inspiration to another portion, or from one book of the Bible to another. If you went to an outside source an external book, what would be the problem what's the problem if you use an external or outside source? You might come with another theory or another rule and that's the problem. The rule teaches that the only safe rule is the rules that govern the Bible, because they're internally consistent, and if you knew some other methodology, or other rule from some other source it's not reliable, it doesn't say another book or another source, it says a teacher. Don't go to another teacher who's using different rules. What are these rules in the example that's given that these teachers using?

First, their own guesswork.

Second, a sectarian creed or a personal opinion.

The third one, showing off, or we might call it pride or Gadal. They want to make a name for themselves, and that's why they're going to explain something, so you can't trust any of those three things. Does that mean you should never go to a teacher? No.

Who are the reliable teachers?

Those who use the principles and rules from the Bible they're safe teachers. We might call them the first second and third angel messengers, we might call them ambassadors, we may call them prophets, may call them priests they come under different symbols but it's those people who are following these rules. Part of the problem is who are these people that are following these rules that you can trust, these guys or these counselors? When you take the biblical stories, sometimes, they're clear. So, would Moses be a safe teacher? Will he fit into bad teacher or good teacher role? If he's 35 years old he's a good teacher or a bad teacher? It's bad if he's 35 years old, if he's 85 years old he's he a good to a bad teacher? it's good? So obviously, he's not improved with age, that's not the point we're trying to make. Because if he's 120 years old is he a good or bad teacher? It's a bad teacher now, so it's all about the time period in which you live, or we might call the dispensation in which you live, that make someone safe or unsafe. Paul was he a good guy or a bad guy? Depends, that one's a bit easier, because he's comes under two names Saul and Paul, so it's easy to divide between the two. So, is Miller the author of these rules is he a safe teacher in 1818? Is he guessing? No. is he showing off? No. Does he have a sectarian Creed in 1818? What are his words in 1818? In 25 years (in 1843) going to be the second Advent. Where did he get that from? From his

#11 Structured approach

sectarian Creed, but the problem is is it a sectarian? What does “sectarian” mean? It comes from the word “sect”, if we say sector, a certain sector of Christianity. The thing is it’s not just a certain sector, everyone believes that whatever sector or sect you’re from all those Christians believe this, that’s why it’s hard to discern. It becomes difficult to have this sectarian concept here, but he picked this up from the church and it’s wrong, so is he a safe guide? He’s not. He is not even following his own rule to do this, the Bible is not the expositor, he has actually included in his own rule a sectarian perspective of what’s about to happen, so he’s already made his message muddy or difficult.

William Miller has the first angel’s message, and he’s got this sectarian view, you go back 1,800 years and John is the first angels’ messenger. Does he show off? Does he guess? Does he have a sectarian creed? What is his perspective that he picked up from his Creed? John the Baptist got a sectarian view that when the Messiah comes, he’s going to come as a conquering King. That is a sectarian perspective for certain. Does that make him a safe guide? No, it doesn’t, so the problem is now we have a real, genuine top-quality prophet who has got a sectarian view, and we’ve also got second tier or second rate or second quality prophet Miller who also has a sectarian view. So, whether you’re a real prophet or a “pretend” prophet like Miller, not a genuine prophet (that’s how most people would consider him) it doesn’t make any difference, because both will have sectarian views. So, what are we beginning these to discover when we think about reformed lines, what’s a problem that we have to deal with? Before you answer that let me put one more piece of information into the mix: was John sent by God? Yes. Was Miller sent by God? Yes. So, they’re ambassadors, we could call them angels, or messengers. They are not just teachers or just normal people. An ambassador speaks for the king. Isn’t that what the definition of a prophet is? When the Prophet speaks that’s the voice of God, but now we discover a problem. The problem is part of their message is not speaking for God, is it? It’s speaking for their Creed, and we know that out of those three characteristics both men have the same problem. It’s not pride, and it’s not ignorance or guesswork, it’s the sectarian view. And we’re going to change the word “sectarian view” to say “the church’s view” which is why it is so difficult. Did John just hold a view that a certain narrow select group of Jews held? No, it was a common idea that the Messiah that was going to come, was going to be a king and everybody thought that. It was widely understood, so that’s the reason why it’s hard to identify the sectarian issue. When **he** says it in the rule it’s easy to see because your choices are you going to take a Catholic perspective, or a Protestant perspective. Which sect a Baptist perspective or a Presbyterian perspective, which sect it’s easy to do that when you have denominational views, but when you don’t have that, when you have something like the Jewish church or the Protestant churches of America, which are just essentially a singular entity, it becomes difficult to apply this rule in its proper way because you can’t identify the sectarian part of that can we see that so

#11 Structured approach

that's why so many people get deceived get duped or conned into this belief because they say everyone believe that, therefore it must be so.

So, we've discussed John, we've discussed Miller, we mentioned Moses. Moses wasn't safe at the beginning (when he was 35). Why is he not safe? He is not safe in the beginning because of the sectarian Creed, a sectarian perspective. Is he guessing? No. Does he have pride? we'll give him the license to say he's not a proud man even though you can see pride in his demeanor, in his behavior: he's a Prince. All princes have some level of pride. Does he have a sectarian view? What is his sectarian view that makes him an unsafe teacher? So, his idea is God's going to deliver the Egyptians by force of arms. Where did he get that idea from? He makes that up, he's got a military background, and he says I had an increase of knowledge from whom who? His mother. His mother trained him, and what did she say? "God has prepared you for this work." She doesn't know the detail, she just says this work isn't she doesn't know when, but she's training him to go into Pharaoh's house, and she said when you get there, they will train you to be a military leader. So, he's getting all of this from his mother, but he's making it up.

He has another problem, so he's got this sectarian view that he's going to take over and defeat the Egyptians by military force, so he made that one up, because he doesn't understand what his training looks like. Think about that, he doesn't even understand what his training looks like, because he thinks he's been trained for one thing, and at the same time he's actually being trained to do something else. He misunderstands what the true training he's supposed to be receiving, because he receives both (mother's training and Pharaoh's), otherwise he couldn't have done his job, he couldn't have been plowed, couldn't have had a formal rain, increase of knowledge. But there's another problem, a worse problem. I'll give you some clues: does he know who he is? How does he know who he is? He's told by his mother: he has an internal witness. His mother gave him that internal witness. We will call that a feeling; his mother had an awareness that this baby is special compared to all the other babies. We could say the Holy Spirit gave her that instruction or that guidance. She has that awareness and she gave that to him. So, number one, he has a personal internal feeling awareness that he's special. Number two, he looks like an Israelite, so when he compares himself the Egyptians, he says I don't look like them. If we've watched movies on this subject in the movies, he doesn't know who he is. He comes to forty, then someone says "oh, by the way, no one told you, but you're an Israelite." In the real story when you're forty do you remember what you were doing when you were 12? of course you do. you might not remember when you were 12 months, but you know what you were when you were 12 years. He really knew he was an Israelite, so he doesn't discover that then like it's some surprise, he's been planning and scheming for 28 years, if you go right back to his birth. He's been planning for a long time; it is not new to him. He's just waiting, we call it biding his time. There is a second problem, there's something more fundamental. the

#11 Structured approach

question is he makes a mistake about how he's going to deliver the people which is through his training. He has made a bigger mistake; he should know what to do. He has clear evidence. I'll give you the clue: name Moses means "to draw out." What number is he? Four. So, there's a prophecy that Abraham has about the number four, and what does the prophecy say? It says about deliverance. What this deliverance will look like?

Let me ask a different question: where do you live? You live in Egypt, you're going to have a war, where? We would call that civil war, even though it's two nations because Israel is not really a nation, they're just slaves in that nation. Once you defeat all the Egyptians and the royal family, where you're going to live? You're going to live in Egypt. If you were going to live in Canaan, what would you do? you would escape, you would have to fight. But he should have had all the information, in fact, he has all the information to know that that is the wrong way to approach it. Because if you fight, the reason you fight with the royal household is because you want you want their house, you want to take over their house, which means you want to live in their house, and he already knows **the prophecy says what you're supposed to have your own place which is Canaan.** You've already got your house over there so can we see he's without excuse. We can be gentle on him, but **the prophecy says, regardless of the timing, the prophecy says that your home is in Canaan, and to provoke civil war means that you want to stay in Egypt.** This shows you how easy it is to abuse and manipulate prophecy, that's why I'm saying it's far worse than criminality that Moses is doing, he's without excuse, because you don't even have to dig for treasure on that one. What's the promise to Abraham? We're going to give you this land, the one that you're standing on, and Moses ignores that.

We have done Moses, we've done John, and we have done Miller. If you've seen a recent presentation on that subject, you can connect a common theme through all of those three dispensations. What is the one concept that connects all three? What is Moses' s problem, Egypt or Canaan? So, he's got a problem on geography. You go to John, what's his problem? Is it the heart or heaven, or Israel? He has got a problem on geography, because he is expecting Messiah to destroy Romans in Israel. Which is what kind of a war? Civil war, because they're the slaves, the Romans are masters, it's exactly the same kind of situation that Moses has. It is identical. He wants civil war, we kick out the romans, and we take their house, the roman garrison. So, it's on geography. Miller, it's an easy one, has problem with geography, sanctuary.

Every single one of those three stories is also connected by another common theme, subject of time. We have four hundred and thirty years, then John has 490 (Daniel chapter 9), and Miller has 2300 days of Daniel chapter 8. Interesting that everybody said 2300 days and not hook it to 2520, and for those of us who like trapping us, 2520 is not the longest than the last prophecy that's brought to view in the Scriptures, despite what this movement in the past has tried to advocate.

#11 Structured approach

Now we come to our history. Before we come to our history, was Moses reliable? Partially yes, partially not. Is it easy to discern? No. Because the sectarian position is the widely held position. Miller, is he a safe guide? Same issue partially yes, partially no. On certain points yes, certain points no. He holds to sectarian views the problem is sectarianism is really big, so big that everyone's in the mess. So no one can see it. The problem is you can't step out and objectively observe what's going on. That's the problem, it's a common theme in all three stories of John and of Moses. We've got testimony of three now, so when we come to our own history it should be relatively easy for us to see what the dynamics are, and what the problems are, and what the entrapment is. So what characteristics should we be looking for in our history? Name one characteristic or criteria that we need to consider in our own history? Now we're doing line upon line and I want to list them out, that when we view our history, we should be able to see things.

In each one of those three stories are you able to have objectivity? No, the reason you can't have objectivity is that the people who are doing the analysis all live in the sect. They're all in the sect. Do you think it's a coincidence that Miller never had any sectarian agenda, do you think that's a coincidence? We say he didn't have a sectarian perspective. He is going to become a Christian, going to be converted, he's going to give his message, and he says "I never had a sectarian view, my message is for everybody." Why did he say that? We want to say he's a really nice man, lovely Christian, doesn't want to push his sectarian views on anybody, so he says "everyone's welcome into my camp meetings, my tent open, to all." We put positive spin on that. I want to suggest he covers his tracks, he wants to hide his erroneous views, and not look like he is a sectarian. He wants to say I'm going to do something that's erroneous and every sect has that erroneous view. So, it's hard to point out his error. We never give that version, but we could, because that's what's actually happening. It becomes virtually impossible to find out what his error is, because everyone is on the inside, not on the outside. We have three testimonies to that. When you come to our history are we in the same mess, yes or no? We are not in the same mess; we have the ability to step out of that problem. What gives us the ability to do that? We have methodology. The methodology will give us the power to actually step out of this issue and observe things. The methodology that we have allows us to do that. It is parable teaching. The parable teaching gives us the power to come out, and when you come out of that problem, you don't become part of the problem. Let me express it through a parable itself: Matthew 13:24-30 the parable of the tares, the story is about a field. In that field you have two things connected with that field: 1) the servants, 2) the plants. (See how mature we are, because we didn't say wheat and tares. So, we didn't go down that trap, it's not wheat and tares, it's the servants and the plants.) So, is the story about the plants or the servants? If you go on quantity, which one's spoken about the most? what would your answer be? Servants. Check the verses. The servants are spoken of more than the plants are. But

#11 Structured approach

we know the story is about the plants, but the servants are connected with the field. So, the problem is the plants. Do the plants have an awareness that there's something wrong? They don't. They're part of the problem. It's only the servants who are connected to the field, but they are outside of that issue that can clearly and objectively understand what the problem is. Can we see the relationship between plants and servants? So, **it's parable teaching that gives us the ability to step out of this issue and make sure that we don't get into problems.** Now parable teachings have been around for a long time. During every one of those reform lines Moses, Christ, Miller, and obviously ours, the problem is when we first start our journey, do we know parables properly? We don't. If you don't know parables properly what problem will you face? You can't get out of the problem, you remain **in** the problem and it's remaining in the problem what can't you? You can't see that there's a Creed that you are following, because everyone believes the same thing. So, we're falling into the same problem as before, but now we have the ability to come out and objectively observe what's going on.

You can see the similar concept in some of the other lines, but it's perhaps not so easy. I would suggest if you go back to the story of Samuel Snow, does he step out of the problem? I would say yes. You can see the same in Christ, he steps out of the problem, they are the easy ones to see. I'm suggesting you could go to Moses and do the same work, the same thing in our history.

Let's go back into those stories and see some points:

- Geography
- Time
- Education (John was trained by his mother, Moses was trained by mother and pharaoh, Miller was self-educated)
- Creed(belief)/Sect(group)
- Literal/Spiritual
- The person (½ right, ½ wrong)

So, we see that as a characteristic every one of these things we should be able to observe in our own history and try to come to terms with what those things mean, whether they mean something positive or negative, and how we would deal with them. We have to understand ourselves at two levels (in the line that you're currently in you should be able to view yourself in two separate ways):

- **You either in the sect or you're out of the sect: you are either a plant, or the servant. You are either in the mess, or you are out of the mess. When you are in the mess, you can't see what the issue is.**

So, the person is going to show you how things are half right and half wrong, and this became a phenomenon, a subject of controversy last year, but it's been here since the time of the end, it's been here all the time, it's not anything new. That

#11 Structured approach

should be able to give you confidence that what was being taught and identified last year was correct, because it was a confirmation of what has been here from the very beginning. But did any of us know that it was already here? Why do we not know? Because we were part of the mess, we were the plants, we were inside, so what changed from then (last year) to now? It's not that we've become servants, because we were servants a longtime ago, but now we've become aware, there's an awareness that we've become servants, or that we are servants, and how did that awareness come? By understanding parable teaching. We were using parable teaching a long time ago, parable teachings, line upon line just another way of expressing it. But now we've refined our understanding, and with that refinement a major development has happened. The major development is that we can now come outside of the problem, and we can identify this issue that someone is half right and half wrong, and that someone is the first angel, or the first messenger. They have a consistent problem. If we really believe that like everyone says that they do, us and those who follow future for America is there anything here that anyone could disagree on?

- Geography
- Time
- Education (John was trained by his mother, Moses was trained by mother and pharaoh, Miller was self-educated)
- Creed(belief)/Sect(group)
- Literal/Spiritual
- The person (½ right, ½ wrong)

Because we just went to those stories in the same way that we've always taught them. I've not extracted anything unusual (I don't think I have). I know it's difficult because we all part of a group now, but think objectively, have we taken any of those histories and twisted them in a way that is not consistent to how we would have viewed them in the past?

Moses. He has a prophecy that says when you're born, you need to leave. Now in case you don't have access to that prophecy (maybe he didn't have the books) what does God do gives them? A second witness. Which is what? It is something that he carries all of his life - his name. What does his name mean? It means "to draw out". What does it mean "to draw out"? We always connect the water bit because of the Nile, but it means to draw out, to take out or come out. So, his name says come out of Egypt. That's what his name means. If you're going to say come out of water, what is water a symbol of? The world. What is the symbol that we most often associate with the world? - Egypt.

So, you can show that through symbology, but his name means to come out. The prophecy tells him, that he's supposed to take the people out. He has all of this information

#11 Structured approach

is that an incorrect understanding? Have we extended or stretched anything? Could someone who follows FFA sit in this class and say, “we agree with that” ?

So, Moses forgets all of that, his military training kicks in, and he wants to enter into civil war, and he wants to remain in Egypt. All of this is wrong. You go to John the Baptist, John the Baptist wants to elicit Civil War, people might say let's not call it civil war, because we're not all brethren. I get that. But we're all cohabiting, the Romans and the Jews in the same country, and the Jews want to remain in their country. They don't want to leave somewhere else; they don't want to escape; they want to kill the people who are oppressing them. So, John the Baptist has got a problem very similar to Moses' , it's all about taking control of the situation by force of arms, and he's wrong on that. It's all about geography. Is the kingdom of heaven on earth or in heaven? In heaven. Jesus says it's in your heart, cause it is the kingdom of grace. You go to Miller he, too, has a time prophecy. He has a problem; everyone holds on to that issue about geography where the sanctuary is and depending on where you think the sanctuary is completely changes your message. Turns it inside out upside down, and now you're going to turn the final atonement of Christ into the second Advent. So, we can see all of that so when we take all of that and bring it into our history here all of those points (below):

- Geography
- Time
- Education (John was trained by his mother, Moses was trained by mother and pharaoh, Miller was self-educated)
- Creed(belief)/Sect(group)
- Literal/Spiritual
- The person (½ right, ½ wrong)

we shall be able to see. And this is where problems begin to arise, because we can identify in 2019 that this person is half right and half wrong. We can say “oh this is the first time it's ever happened, therefore the person has fallen.” But they were half right and half wrong from the very beginning, weren't they? Doesn't line up online teach you that? So, what are they half right and half wrong about? To identify that go back to the sect and the creed, and find out what agreement this person has with the sect, he must have a common perspective, or common understanding that the person holds with the sect, that he got from the sect. Then we'd have to understand about their education, which is really connected to the creed. Where they get their Creed from? The education. The Creed and education is essentially the same thing. Then we have to understand the subject of time, and then we would have to understand the subject of geography.

Now when we come to the subject of time, we know that when you go to the Millerite history, even though there's some apparent acceptance some emotional response to the

#11 Structured approach

subject of time does the sect, the church really believe in the issue of time? They don't. They don't accept the time, and how do we know that? The unsealing of the Book of Daniel was the message of Daniel 8:14 in relation to time. So, brand-new phenomena, a brand-new issue, that has never confronted the church before and even though at first, they kind of warm up to it, when he says in 25 years all these people begin to gather, they soon waver on this issue. So, there's not a proper acceptance of time. You go to the story of John, Ellen White says it clear that if they had understood the time in which they lived, they would have been better prepared to accept the message of John and Jesus. So, there's a level of rejection of time even in that history. And then you go back to the story of Moses and again you can argue the same subject, the same issue.

Part of the problem in the first two stories is what? How do we mark the beginning in those two lines? By the birth. Is the birth marking the prophecy the time prophecy? It's not. The birth and the timing are disconnected in both stories, and in the story of Moses it's really bad, because it's 80 years between the birth and the prophecy that's connected to time. And you work out how many generations you can fit into 80 years, it's a couple, at least. If you're a mature person or mother of Moses here at the birth, you may not be around when the fulfillment of the prophecy comes in. Same problem in the story of John, the birth is not marking 27, 31, 34. They're out of sync so becomes really difficult for the church to even entertain this subject of time.

So, we've addressed these issues, and then it comes to the subject of geography. When we come to our history the person is half right and half wrong. What are they half right on? They're half right on time, and what are they half wrong on? Geography. so they're right on time, wrong on geography. We have three witnesses to this. So, this is what we should observe in our own story, in our own line.

- Geography
- Time
- Education (John was trained by his mother, Moses was trained by mother and pharaoh, Miller was self-educated)
- Creed(belief)/Sect (group)
- Literal/Spiritual
- The person (½ right, ½ wrong)

It becomes a relatively easy task, and I'm not sure why people don't see this if you're remain in the movement this long. And what I don't mean just us, I mean those people who followed Future for America. If you stayed this long in the movement up to September 2019, why you can't you see this methodology? I think this (case for ½ right, ½ wrong) was introduced into the movement way back in the spring of 2019. People misunderstood that as a slanderous attack upon the leader of the movement. Isn't that how they saw it? It was not that (it was not a slanderous attack). This was the voice of God speaking to his people, saying "we're going to formalize the

#11 Structured approach

concept of half right and half wrong, it's going to become an issue that is going to test us, everyone." The subject comes up again in the summer, and then its culmination comes in September last year, with those people who are unwilling to understand what this issue is about, walk away from the movement. And now we've come full circle, and still explaining this issue.

So, the issue of time is correct, the issue of geography is wrong. So, to reiterate what is said:

So, we've gone through these points that we've listed out from these previous lines and the focus of our attention is on the message. There's two components time and geography. Time is an easy one to see, but I've chosen to call the second "geography". I've explained why in each of their histories you can see a subject of geography going all the way through those three stories. But in each of those stories we would tend not to call it the subject of geography. In Moses we've called it "the Exodus". For Christ it would be the gospel, and for Miller it would be the second Advent. I would think that they would be the defining titles or issues for those generations, those dispensations, those lines. So, I asked what was our one. And someone says **the Sunday law**. I'm happy with the Sunday law, but I'm going to put a synonym with that "close of probation". So, this is the theme for our dispensation. When we say geography, geography is a symbol or a word that I'm using instead of the "Sunday law" or "close of probation".

- Geography X
 - Exodus...Moses
 - Gospel...Jesus
 - 2nd Advent...Miller
 - Sunday Law/Close of Probation ...144,000
- Time
- Education
- Creed(belief)/Sect(group)
- Literal/Spiritual
- The Person (½ right, ½ wrong)

(Somebody said "equality") - He is wrong to say it is "equality" that that's the title that should be there. Let me suggest whatever should be here (under ½ wrong) should it be a correct idea or an incorrect idea? Something that's light or something that's wrong? It should be something that's incorrect because it's wrong. Now, is the subject of equality correct or incorrect? It's correct, so it would not fit the criteria to put equality here, there has to be something in the message that's wrong. So, the subject of equality is the correction of an existing mistake. So, what we're trying to look for is the thing that's wrong. What is Moses' mistake? The Exodus is his problem. What is John's problem? What is the definition of gospel? Go back to Genesis, what does the gospel look like? "I will put enmity", another word

#11 Structured approach

for enmity is “hatred”. What do you do with people you hate? You fight with them. So, here it is, the gospel. You don’t understand how you are going to fight with your enemies, how you’re going to escape from them. We come to Miller, what’s his mistake? Second Advent, he’s mistaken the second Advent with the opening up of the judgment. I didn’t contrive this, I didn’t in my room yesterday plan how can I get everybody to see that there’s no real Sunday law, and trap or trick everybody. This is why I’m saying we need to be objective to see is all this accurate. Have I accurately given titles here that everybody would say a reasonable? Our message from the very beginning has been the time for the Sunday law, the close of probation for God’s church is here, you should be afraid, you should be scared, and get ready. That’s what our message has been. You go back to each one of those it’s the same story all the way through, and I’m saying they’re the correct titles for those ones. I didn’t even guess them just taking them straight from inspiration. This one (SL/CoP - 144000) can’t get from inspiration because this one that we manufactured; these are ones that we came up with but it’s the one that the movement has taught. Go to the magazine *Time of the End*, what are we saying in that magazine? It’s the time for verse 41 to be fulfilled leading on to Daniel 12:1. It’s all about verse 41. All the other verses they’re just details. verse 40 he tells you how to get to verse 41. And verse 42 to 45 told you what’s going to happen in verse 41. Verse 40 lead you to verse 41, and the other verses tell you what’s going to happen in the history of verse 41. It is a repeat and enlarge. It is all about the Sunday law. So, if you were just use common sense, rule number two, what have we got half wrong? what in our message is that’s half wrong? It’s the subject of the Sunday law, close the probation. This is the mistake that’s been in our movement from its very inception. This is not an attack on someone, this is not against inspiration, this is line upon line methodology. And people will say “well that stands in opposition against all those inspired quotes, putting your salvation in peril if you were to hold on to this (½ wrong = Sunday Law). So, the question is, and we used to frame it in the following way, you either believe inspiration, or you believe the lines.

People accuse us of that. Which one wins, which one trumps, which one do we be guided by, the line or the word (those statements, those paragraphs, those verses)? Which one are you prepared to be guided by? The lines. We say the lines. But when we say lines that’s the intelligent answer to an intelligent question, if you’re prepared to see it, because what is the question really asking? In Luke chapter 10 verse 26 a Thus Saith the Lord, how do you read? and do any of us know how to read? No. Because we’re Pharisees, we’re lawyers with doctors of the law, we don’t know how to read, we need to be trained, we need to be educated in how to read. And when you learn how to read, then you begin to see what the help or the rule is that you have: “line upon line”

So, it’s the line upon line methodology that is the tool that will help you to understand those passages. You cannot approach them; you **dare not** approach them

#11 Structured approach

without line upon line. So, if people want to accuse us and we say ok accusers if you want to choose one or the other, line or inspiration and we say we'll choose line what we're saying is "by the way, what is a line? it's the structured verse." You have got a verse on its own, and then you've got a structured verse, that's what a line is. Because if you do a line, any line:



This line here, this is a line of prophecy. Is it a line of history? Which one? Because they're different, why is it not a line of history? What makes it a line of prophecy rather than a line of history? Because 2019 is the historical date, and it's a prophetic date. What makes it prophetic? What do we say? We say an inspired statement was fulfilled at this date, that's what makes it prophetic, so that inspired statement was found in an unstructured book. If I could dare say it that way, it was just the verse that was found in the Bible, we take that verse out put it onto a historical line and then that way mark becomes prophetic. So, when we say lines trump inspiration, what we mean is a structured inspired statement, as opposed to something that is unstructured. And you dare not rely upon unstructured quotes because you don't know what order to put them in. They don't make any sense. That's what we mean when we say the lines trump inspiration, or a verse, or a spirit prophecy quote, it's because what we say is a spirit prophecy quote on its own just on a piece of paper is no good. You have to get that piece of paper and put it onto a historical line and you need to know where to put it, you put it in the right place then the line the structure statement is better than what the unstructured statement. What I don't understand is why those people who follow the Future for America cannot see this. I mean, it's clear if you take a structured approach. What are they now doing? They are taking an unstructured approach, and what the Adventists call a "Thus Saith The Lord". No context, no structure, nothing. We need to be absolutely clear on that. Those who are following Future for America they should be aware of what's happening, there's a lot of noise, there's a lot of innuendo and rhetoric that's spoken, but this is the simple reality. You take line upon line, you take the three histories, you see that the first messenger is always half wrong from the very inception of their message, therefore we should expect to see it in our history. Do we see it now in 2019? It becomes a repeating theme, repeating concept, because it gets formalized there, and at the same time we can see it theologically like this, structurally, we can also see in the world. You can already see in the world what this issue of the mark of the beast or the Sunday law really looks like. So, we have multiple lines of evidence but the primary one the simple one is the one that we've discussed just now.