

“PRESUMPTUOUS DRESS CODE”

Second Epistle

Caption I: *“Before I dare to defend EGW’s early idea, the notion that Adam fell in love with a talking flashlight, the non-scriptural idea that Adam could not see his beautiful wife because she was surrounded by a visual force-field, I must hasten to, as a matter of first urgency, defend Christ’s word as recorded in Genesis two which shows that He sought to cure Adam’s loneliness; that He put Adam to sleep; that He removed one of Adam’s ribs; that He therefrom created Eve; and that He presented Eve to Adam and that both she and he were fully and visually naked. To think otherwise, is to teach several deceptions...”*

Caption II: *“The mustard seed claims to have such new light, and it indeed has presented it with EGW’s call for great ‘frankness’. In fact, to address this issue of Dress Code, the below, carefully explained details of human sexuality can be defined as nothing other than the fulfillment of her prediction of the frankness and...can now further refute the teaching that Eve was enshrouded in a blinding light so that Adam could not behold her sensual delicacies. For, simply, but graphically put, men on planet earth are highly visual sexually, and they become stimulated when they see a beautiful woman. Adam’s first commission was to have sex with Eve; he was told, before the fall, to ‘multiply and replenish the earth’. By biological design, such could only happen by Adam receiving an erection and by Eve becoming pre-moistened. Believe you me, no man on earth becomes erect by staring at the sun or any other blinding light...”*

Monthly Dispatch



The below letter is a follow-up to last month’s news release regarding the Seventh-day Adventist doctrine of *Dress Reform*. Several replies have been received, one from an Adventist proponent who uses the pseudonym Aridonas Kondunkas (Ari). After reading the news release to Brother Tony Hall, a Davidian, Ari, a nominal Adventist, and though she was negative to his mission and tactics, she supported his perspective which was that women in the church should not have the power to dress themselves. She advanced the argument with the claim that Adam and Eve, instead of being created naked, were created with a covering blanket of light. This being a long-standing view of Adventism,

yet being in disharmony with the Genesis creation story, it becomes a treasure trove of wealth which we must now discard to follow Christ. To continue in this belief today without discarding it is to give open and blatant support to Satan's original claim, that Christ cannot correctly communicate, that He is not the legitimate Word of God. After all, the Word, in the plainest of terms, states, "**And they were both naked, the man and his wife, and were not ashamed**"—Gen 2: 25. My reply to her accordingly becomes newsworthy as a present-truth revelation.

Reply to the Field

August 3, 2013

To counter the arrogance and the futility of men trying to prescribe to women how to dress, the *Mustard Seed Advent* began this discourse over SDA dress codes by reprimanding a Davidian Seventh-day Adventist brother, Tony Hall, for engineering his own dress code for females and doing so while implementing absolutely no standards for men. The thrust of the MSA's objections was, not to promote nudity but, to appeal for righteousness in our call for reform. It was to strongly emphasize that offenses against which we are to sigh and decry must be predicated upon the Law and not on inherited humanism. Yet the church continues to confuse early eighteen-hundred-English ethics for the voice of God adding to the law their whimsical and capricious opinions about human righteousness and behavior. With these new additions to the Bible, they assail and persecute Eve today, women who courageously dare to wear short skirts so as to expose the God-given aspects of their beautiful and alluring legs, qualities which they aren't/shouldn't be ashamed to reveal. Yet, in so doing, these dress-code Nazis have no equal standards of modesty and concealment for men or for those women who have other allurements—other dimensions of self-exposure of female beauty.

To forestall their zeal to oppress, Adventist enthusiasts, having been told in last month's newsletter, "...**there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus**"(Gal 3: 28), continue to persist in this twisted ethic of partial ministry without regard to the fact that in the Christian age Paul has declared that men and women of the church are equal. Ergo, by this second epistle directed to Ari, more counsel must be delivered to the Adventist

Hypocrites of Malignity.

Today we have arrived at the very day which yields the victory over Eve's rebellion: Today, through Christ's testimony, we, the *disciples indeed*, can, of our own growth in wisdom, learn to choose the good and refuse the evil—the very path that Adam, by partaking of the forbidden fruit, plotted for us (Gen 2: 25). This we, the advocates of the Kingdom, AKA. the *mustard seed*, can do because we have heeded the Lord's testimony (also re-articulated in Paul's work) and have left the "principles of the doctrine of Christ" so as to win perfection (see Heb 5: 12-14, 6: 1, cited below). Correspondingly, each man and each woman can honor God by studying the intricacies of their own divine gifts, in this case, their own body, and accordingly decide the qualities which they desire to accentuate and the ones that they desire to conceal. This, while among the Lord's disciples, they can do without the fear of recrimination, without being denounced as whores. For example, the woman with the unattractive legs, should she so deem, is free to dress herself after the "fashion" of an early-American Puritan so as to gain her own glory by the concealment of the negative and the reveal-ment of the positive, her other favorable qualities. But she must not seek to make others to be yoked by her own "enslavement to fashion": She must not make the church her private sorority seeking to initiate and persecute her sisters by the enforcement of her privately elected dress code; for the Law forbids the sin of coveting/envy, and we are to be judged by the Law. It is just as Paul promised, "²⁹**Being filled with...covetousness, maliciousness, full of envy...malignity...**³²**Who knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death...**^{2:11}**For there is no respect of persons with God...**¹²**as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law**" —Rom 1: 29, 32; 2: 11, 12. God does not judge us by Victorian standards, but by His law, His Pentateuchal morals. Unequivocally then, such women cannot, in covetousness, seek to impose a Puritanical dress code/fashion upon other women. Their cattiness is forbidden; accordingly, they cannot, in a fit of jealousy, preclude their sisters from receiving the attention which all women desire. [REVERSO DICTIONARY: Catty : Backbiting, bitchy, ill-natured, malevolent,

The Mustard Seed Advent, Newsletter, 13: VII

malicious, mean, snide, spiteful, venomous]. To make the matter as plain as can be made, neither men or women are permitted to oppress those who have been differently gifted by creating laws to limit the attention which God has blessed His children to receive.

“...None but those who have fortified the mind with the truths of the Bible will stand through the last great conflict...The decisive hour is even now at hand. Are our feet planted on the rock of God’s immutable word?”

“ But God will have a people upon the earth to maintain the Bible, and the Bible only, as the standard of all doctrines. Before accepting any doctrine or precept, we should demand a plain ‘thus saith the Lord’ in its support.”

“ The truth and the Glory of God are inseparable; it is impossible for us, with the Bible within our reach, to honor God by erroneous opinions. If light and truth is within our reach, and we neglect to improve the privilege of hearing and seeing it...we are choosing darkness rather than light.”

—EGW, *The Great Controversy*, p. 595-597, (Chapter 37: “The Scriptures a Safeguard”)

In the course of this doctrinal discussion this past month, the issue of pleasing God by use of Victorian dress ethics for women, surfaced. Ari, felt that females who wear short dresses displease the Lord. The following question was advanced by the *mustard seed* to its female antagonist, Ari, so as to address her delusion on the issue of *Dress Reform*.

Reply from Derek:

Did Eve please God when she was escorted by Him, in her nakedness, to Adam’s side as they participated in the first religious service on earth? Remember, “where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst.” Let’s stop being phony; let us stop passing non-biblical laws! If you were in the jungles of the Amazon conducting evangelical services, would you deny entry to the females who came in the common attire, nakedness, and only preach to the males who came in the same way? If your laws of Dress Reform do not apply universally on the planet, then they are based on folly and are of no use.

Derek

Ari, in the furtherance of her serpent-in-the-garden advocacy, the sophistry which declares that Christ needs an interpreter, accordingly rejected the Lord’s simple words and EGW’s mandate for Bible explanations to resolve all doctrinal disputes. This she did by looking past the Lord’s depiction of the first couple’s attire when He unfolded to us, **“And they were both naked...and were not ashamed,”** and by saying the following:

“Adam and Eve were NOT naked as we are in Eden. They did not wear artificial garments. They were naked in the sense of no artificial garments. Ellen White says they were covered in LIGHT as God himself and the angels are. Big difference. this is a basic teaching. God is trying to restore man back to his Edenic creation which means dress reform and health reform not animal-killing, death reform...” —Ari’s E-mail, Saturday, July 20, 2013 9:07 PM.

The *mustard seed*, having been born and raised in the SDA church, is aware of this prominently-regarded thesis that is attributable to EG White, the teaching which states that a light shield precluded the first couple from visually seeing each other. They assume that after Christ awoke Adam from his surgery, that, to cure his loneliness, the Lord blazed him with a blinding light. Accordingly, as a proponent of EGW, as one who recognizes her to have spoken to the church by the divine gift of prophetic inspiration, I will do as Christ, Paul, EGW, and VTH recommended: I will praise the Lord for her work; I will thank both her and Paul, as well as the other NT disciples, for nourishing us with the richness of their sweet, milk shake. Then, as a dutiful rich-young ruler, one who sits at the bar of the Lord’s fast-food restaurant, I will next heed the Savior’s command and sell all my opulently-supplied treasures that I have received from them, all my highly-valued doctrines of yesterday’s immaturity and seek growth-inspiring nourishment by consuming the beef, the strong meat. This I will do so that I can comply with the standards to follow Christ. Today, in the day of strong meat, I am commanded by His testimony to cast behind me their doctrines as I ‘leave the principles of the Doctrine of Christ’ so as to win perfection and so as to win Adam’s aspiration, the ability to refuse the evil and choose the good. **“For everyone that useth milk is unskillful in the word of righteousness: for he is a babe. But strong meat belongeth to them that are of full age, even those who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil. Therefore, leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto perfection...”** —Heb 5: 13, 14, 6: 1.

Presumptuous Dress Code, Second Epistle, 03-Aug-2013

Before I dare to defend EGW's early idea, the notion that Adam fell in love with a talking flash light, the non-scriptural idea that Adam could not see his beautiful wife because she was surrounded by a visual force-field, I must hasten to, as a matter of first urgency, defend Christ's word as recorded in *Gen two* which shows that He sought to cure Adam's loneliness; that He put Adam to sleep; that He removed one of Adam's ribs; that He therefrom created Eve; and that He presented Eve to Adam and that both she and he were fully and visually naked. To think otherwise, is to teach several deceptions:

One: It is to deny that Eve was flesh of Adam's flesh and bones of his bones (Gen 2: 23). To gaze at her nakedness would be akin to Adam gazing at his own body.

Two: It is to teach that it is unlawful and unrighteous for a husband and his wife to see each other in the nude. No such Bible law exists; hence, there would be no logical need for us to add to It, our fables. There were no other people, only animals, on the planet from whom the first couple needed to conceal themselves.

Three: It suggests that a woman's hair, her teeth, her face, her nipples, her buttocks, her waist, her legs, etc, are not qualities of genius design but are instead aspects of Christ-created evil. It suggests that because they are likewise alluringly beautiful, like the flowers of the garden, the birds, the sunset, the trees, the fruit, etc, they needed to be shielded from our eyes. Then one must ask, Why did not God simply create us in blindness to preclude us from the impulse to stare?

In fact, the reversal of blindness to beauty is the theme of the New Testament Gospel; else, the Lord would not have healed the blind by reason of the church being better off not seeing the good and the evil of the planet.

To further illustrate this point: Both Adam and Eve digested food and eliminated waste; both had organs of digestion; of blood flow, of waste elimination, of muscles, etc. All of these things were declared good; yet, they were hidden by a skin covering from our view. And if that covering did not disappear, as you suggested that our light so did when Adam fell, then this fact further discredits your theory for you believe that the remedy for the fall was their full exposure.

Obviously, the Lord knows what things to expose and what things to hide. He hid the organs fully knowing that they had little aesthetic appeal. He could have done the same with man's external organs. He did not do so, because He wanted us to joy in the beauty of His creation.

Having failed the test of obedience to God's word—to further augment the point of the skin as a covering—Christ gave to them skins to cover their genitals (Gen 3: 21). Was it a loin cloth, a girdle, or a Puritanical, full-length dress?—we do not know. The Bible suggests that it was not a long garment for it replaced their apron, a cloth which covers the genitals. But we must ask, with this covering, did He, in so doing, cover His own mistake of creation? If the answer is no, then why would He black-out their mythical lights if such was their original covering?

Four: As a point of slight redundancy, Ari, your bodily-light covering suggests that God did not want us to be surrounded by beauty but only unattractive qualities; hence, you believe that He created beauty with a shield, a cover to keep men from peaking.

Finally: It suggests one of at least two false doctrines: that either human sexual desires are demonic and evil, or they were the result of a haphazard creation, one that was replete with mistakes.

But having exposed your error, we must resolve the underpinning basis which has tempted us to give credence to your doctrine of the *light shield*. We must account for the first-couple's reaction of shyness when they became aware of their nakedness. What then accounts for the first couples

Initial Jitters?!

Think of a newlywed couple, a man and his virtuous, virginal wife. All such newlyweds, even today, become nervous and jittery when, for the first time, they fully behold each other. Only time and experience brings to them peace. Adam and Eve did not take that time, and the suddenness of their spiritual alteration wrought for them their nervousness. Perhaps a six month courtship would have better prepared them. Devoid of that, the reality that, due to the forbidden fruit, or, put another way, due to their opting to violate the Lord's counsel by embarking upon a path to prematurely learn the lessons of good and evil, their minds were too ill-prepared to integrate their first lesson of self-awareness. They had to, without any preparation, decide the social impact of their exposed genitalia. It had nothing to do with loss of a covering of light—but loss of innocent perspective. Young children likewise develop self-awareness in stages, but a two-year-old child would be tormented if he/she, perhaps while having his soiled clothing changed by a stranger, suddenly was enlightened with the self-awareness of a twenty-year-old. Years later for the first family, the same emotional jolt, the same spiritual disturbance occurred with the need to slaughter an innocent animal for sacrifice was mandated,

The Mustard Seed Advent, Newsletter, 13: VII

as Cain was to discover. The same jitters likewise occurred with Israel and the Lord's Law: They too could not properly appreciate its value to their existence. Such, I am sure, could be uncovered with many Bible episodes, for the path of man as he seeks to return to the Lord has been replete with such stories, but one that comes to mind which best exemplifies the lesson is Moses' wife Zipporah. She revolted over the process of circumcision of her young sons (See Ex 4: 20-26) a procedure with which all men and women in Israel, in the course of time, became intimately familiar and comfortable. But only today, the day when the righteous who consume strong meat, can we explain the essential wisdom and purpose of the symbolism of circumcision. A short dalliance with the application of this symbolism will occur below. But now, to forestall further digression, the point must be accentuated that humanity still struggles in the debate between good and evil, it began with Adam and Eve. We all must learn that if Christ provided a thing for us, be it our genitals, our diet, our Sabbath, the removal of our foreskins, etc, then it is good; it is not evil. The first couple became apprehensive after the fall because they were gripped with the feeling of insecurity, the post-lapsarian (after the fall) fear that they would be disdained by both their partner and by the Lord. Hence we have another answer: Christ, as He now does with the MSA, leads us in a way that makes all who are around us, those who spurn His counsel and walk by the flesh, walk by their immature, human instinct, to become appalled—just as Cain was appalled by Abel's bloody sacrifice and Zipporah, by Moses' bloody circumcision ritual. It is victory over this natural impulse of shock and horror which, by Adam's assignment, we must achieve.

Following Christ and rejecting the opinions of the world, even if such means the allowance of our women to dress themselves in revealing clothing, is our victory, our power to choose the good and refuse the evil. It is the power of freedom, the reward for continuing in the Lord's word (John 8: 31, 32). Today, we, the saints, have learned that examining, caressing, and enjoying—even in highly imaginative ways—the genitals of our legal, sex partners is acceptable to the Lord. This wisdom is fortified by Paul's teachings: He told us, "**Marriage is honourable in all, and the bed undefiled...**"—Heb 13: 4. Unlike our advantage of higher education, neither Adam nor Eve had ever contemplated upon the genitals of a naked person; they did not have pornography, such likewise would have been considered forbidden fruit. The forbidden fruit to which they availed themselves, tempted them to wonder about their own genitalia; after all, like internal organs, they apparently are not organs of beauty—even in the eyes of their own owners. Before the fall, they saw each other with innocent minds; then, they never considered the new and perplexing issue of embarrassment. Afterwards, under the dawning of this new post-lapsarian ethos, they were caused to doubt Christ, to wonder to themselves, "Are my genitals acceptable to my partner; are they good or are they evil?" After all, though all of their other organs may have appeared to be the same, they noticed that they had different sex organs. Rather than become disoriented, they simply sought to hide them. Such a temptation, they did not have beforehand, why?—because beforehand, they were not slaves to human opinion.

As a side note, the victory over human opinion is the very thing which gives the *mustard seed* its boldness to publish its doctrines, those like the invalidation of the SDA's former, Victorian-inspired dress codes. Such a novel orientation was predicted by the Bible and by EGW:

"I asked the meaning of the shaking I had seen and was shown that it would be caused by the straight testimony called forth by the counsel of the True Witness to the Laodiceans. This will have its effect upon the heart of the receiver, and will lead him to exalt the standard and pour forth the straight truth. Some will not bear this straight testimony. They will rise up against it, and this is what will cause a shaking among God's people."—EGW, *Early Writings*, p.270

"When trees without fruit are cut down as cumberers of the ground, when multitudes of false brethren are distinguished from the true, then the hidden ones will be revealed to view, and with hosannas range under the banner of Christ. Those who have been timid and self-distrustful will declare themselves openly for Christ and His truth. The most weak and hesitating in the church will be as DAVID—willing to do and dare."—EGW, *Testimonies for the Church*, Vol 5 p. 81

The need to properly appraise the value of public opinion and the duty to elevate the opinion of the Lord above that of all others was the disorienting component which caused our original parents to hide. This, their new orientation, greatly perplexed them then in the same way that it compels men today to reject unpopular truth: It forced them to choose between human feelings and God's Word, the very essence of choosing the good and refusing the evil which likewise is now disorienting the Seventh-day

Adventist Church. They too are hiding from the voice of Christ, from the call to receive His servant. But what was the component within the forbidden fruit that caused the couple to realize that something existed which should cause them to be ashamed? The answer is tied to the Lord's account of the events: They partook of the tree of *Knowledge of Good and Evil*; resultantly, living in a day that was 6000 years behind the time of Paul's promised strong meat, they were as the naked two-year old child or the nervous, newlyweds. Many other examples exist in the world today to further illustrate this point, but they will only be beneficial to those who overcome Pharisaism by receiving the Lord's testimony. He made a personal appeal to Nicodemus, a Pharisee, and said, **"If I have told you earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe, if I tell you of heavenly things"** —John 3: 12. Let us examine earthly things that likewise bring to us apprehension. When a man and a woman plan to first meet with the prospects of courtship, before ever doing so, both desire to make a good presentation. How's my hair, my breath, my teeth? —will they like my personality, my histories, my height, my family, my body shape, my cooking skills, my job, etc.?— these are some of the nervous questions which make them apprehensive. Each of these qualities they themselves may truly accept and approve, but it is the opinion of their potential partner that gives to them the anxiety and jitters. Such apprehensions have nothing to do with the loss of a light shield but everything to do with social contact, with the opinions of others, with their assessment of "good and evil". As a result, before the wedding night, each becomes careful to present themselves, to peer from their hiding place amidst the proverbial trees, and do so with great fear. Subsequently, for fear of rejection, they take great care to groom themselves. Adam and Eve did not have such an opportunity of private grooming, and their anxiety was caused by their violation; thus did the Lord inquire, **"Who told thee that thou wast naked? Hast thou eaten of the tree..."** —Gen 3: 11. The last thing for today's newlywed, righteous couple to surmount, having won approval on all of the other qualities, is the critical inspection of their sexual organs. This gives to us an illustration to appreciate the first couple's jitters.

Unlike Nicodemus, the people who actually know the prevailing aspects of the planet Earth, other examples can also help them to understand. We can consider those examples without seeking to add our opinions to the Bible. We merely need to allow the Lord to show us "earthly things", things contrary to Ari's doctrine; for being enshrouded in blinding light is definitely not an earthy phenomenon for humans. To expound, the possibility exists that, even in righteous homes, children can accidentally overhear or even witness their parents enjoying sex with each other. Then, the parents have much gentle explaining to do. Such children, by their ill-advised explorations, have likewise jumped themselves forward in the emotionally developmental and educational schedule and make such an occurrence useful to understanding Adam and Eve's reason for disorientation. After being exposed for doing what the child considers to be "evil" or "nasty", the parental effort to calm the youthful shock and surprise must be described as nothing short of emotional therapy. The child, maybe at age six or ten—even some as old as fifteen—is not prepared for such a revelation. His eyes, formerly concealed—not by a light but by privacy—are now opened. Better had it been had he heeded the parents instructions to go to bed, and this is where the parallel becomes theologically educational. For had he preserved parental privacy, then he would not have been challenged by the need to prematurely discern the vagaries of human sexuality. Such was that which occurred to the first couple: Their eyes were prematurely opened; they became self-conscious. For the naïve child, they must undergo years of parent-wrought, emotional therapy, so as to learn that, though such things are private, they can, under divinely-specified limits to be mastered, be very good. We, the sons and daughters of the first couple, have likewise undergone 6000 years of therapy—not just pertaining to human sexuality but—pertaining to many other various and sundry issues. Today, a day future to EGW's time—as implicit in her above quote, **"Some will not bear this straight testimony"** — the Lord, with the "straight testimony", brings to us our maturation, and with this letter, it expresses the wisdom to allow all adult females the freedom to dress themselves.

At the risk of overkill, another example is in order: Consider the example of a trembling young child after he, against his parents expressed will, watched on television a horror picture. Such is comparable to partaking of the forbidden fruit; for had he not watched the ghost stories, he would not have lost his blanket of innocent peace. Instead, in the dark of night, unable to calm his fears, he seeks refuge in his

The Mustard Seed Advent, Newsletter, 13: VII

parents bed. Similar to Christ's interrogation of the first couple, the parents likewise ask the child, "Who told you?": "Who told you that there were ghosts and vampires; did you break the rules and watch that horror movie?" Then, the only way to calm his newly-inherited demeanor is for him to likewise learn to choose the good and refuse the evil. It is to spend years and years to learn the truth of the *State of the Dead*, of victory over the Devil, of garnering heaven's protection against demons, to learn the hazards of bringing idols and graven images into the home; to learn the peace of God's word. Adam and Eve were given the peace, and they, against counsel, opted to have it disturbed. Had they not jumped the educational syllabus, today they would have learned the MSC's doctrine pertaining to dress codes and done so without the years of torment and mental disturbance. Consequently, Christ was right to recommend that they not partake; and He was accurate to reveal that they were both naked and not ashamed. Also, as a consequence, we can discern the silliness of preaching the doctrine of

Righteousness by Blindness.

If Adam and Eve were created with a shroud of light to preclude them from seeing each other, then, though blind to each other physically, such a presentation of their images, for reasons fully explained below, would still require a component of sensual allurements—the very thing that Adventists seek to nullify. Is not exposed sensuality the very same aspect of dress today that inspires them to oppress female free choice in clothing? What then would be the benefit to concealing them from viewing each other so as to suppress the human sexual impulse if they must be allured by other qualities, light, so as to evoke the desire for sex? Yet, consider the impact of the blinding light from even another dimension: If the goal was to destroy human-sexual allurements, then that blinding light would require that all of Eve's other qualities which likewise reveal her sensuality, her sexy voice, her curly hair, her beautiful eyes, her sculpted features, her enticing walk, her lovely feet, her melodious songs, her perfectly formed lips, etc., would all require visual blockage by light. Ari's doctrine, the SDA position, as she argues, does not object to any of these qualities, only to the exposure of the females legs as made visual by short dresses. Such an attire, to her, is a sin in violation of principles installed at creation. She cannot tie her heresy to the writings of EGW because EGW gave to the church an overriding position to all of her teachings: She told us to secure all doctrines upon the Bible. Hence, Ari, Tony Hall, the SDA ministry, and all who teach this doctrine of *Righteousness by Blindness* must take private ownership of it for both EGW and VTH, by citing to us the following statement, make a different claim:

“It is the duty of ministers to respect the judgment of their brethren; but their relations to one another, as well as the doctrines they teach, should be brought to the test of THE LAW AND THE TESTIMONY; then, if hearts are teachable, there will be no divisions among us. Some are inclined to be disorderly, and are drifting away from the great landmarks of the faith; but God is moving upon His ministers to be one in doctrine and in spirit.”

“It is necessary that our unity today be of a character that will bear the test of trial. . . . We have many lessons to learn, and many, many to unlearn. God and heaven alone are infallible. Those who think that they will never have to give up a cherished view, never have occasion to change an opinion, will be disappointed. As long as we hold to our own ideas and opinions with determined persistency, we cannot have the unity for which Christ prayed.”

*“When a brother receives new light upon the Scriptures, he should **FRANKLY** explain his position, and every minister should search the Scriptures with the spirit of candor to see if the points presented can be substantiated by the Inspired Word.”*—EGW, *Testimonies for Ministers*, p.30 (Ellipses [...] belong to quote)”

The *mustard seed* claims to have such new light, and it indeed has presented it with EGW's call for great “frankness”. In fact, to address this issue of *Dress Code*, the below, carefully explained details of human sexuality can be defined as nothing other than the fulfillment of her prediction of the frankness and the “straight testimony” to be wrought by the true witness. The doctrine that has been attributable to EGW cannot stand the test that she herself recommends, the “Law and the Testimony”, which is, simply put, the Pentateuch and the *Testimony of Jesus*. Those who have heeded the Savior's commission to Nicodemus, the requirement to master “earthly things”, can now further refute the teaching that Eve was enshrouded in a blinding light so that Adam could not behold her sensual delicacies. For, simply but graphically put, men on planet earth are highly visual sexually, and they become stimulated when they see a beautiful woman. Adam's first commission was to have sex with

Presumptuous Dress Code, Second Epistle, 03-Aug-2013

Eve; he was told, before the fall, to “multiply and replenish the earth”. By biological design, such could only happen by Adam receiving an erection and by Eve becoming pre-moistened. Believe you me, no man on earth becomes erect by staring at the sun or any other blinding light. But many, most, if not all become erect by staring at a disrobed, beautiful woman. In view of these findings, I restate my question to you regarding your doctrine of *Dress Code*, I ask the following question again:

Dear Eddy (Ari), It is a non-biblical and false standard, just as warned by EGW, to tell women how to dress, in this hour of maturity. 95% of the women in church today cannot, with short dresses and tight pants, distract men. The dirty little secret is that your Dress Reform only hinders the young women who, as did Eve in the Garden, come with the Lord to church to find a husband. Why restrict those who have nice bodies? Where are the regulations for those distractive women who have beautiful faces, long hair, good singing voices, witty personalities, Bible-teaching skills, etc?

Your doctrine sounds reasonable until it is carefully inspected by wisdom; then, we can all see that it is part of the delusive powers of spirits of darkness. What do you say to a 35 year-old woman who heeded your dress-reform counsel from age 0-35 but now who yearns for a husband, yet, no longer has the appealing body that she had at age 25? Now because of your delusions, she is unhappy. Such is the case with all people who elevate false standards above the Bible. —E-mail, Derek West, the Mustard Seed Advent, July, 2013.

Ari, again seeking to elevate her opinions of self-righteousness, issued the following reply,

“It's not about being attractive [to] find a husband it's about pleasing god.” —E-mail from Ari (answering to the name Eddy).

Your response points to the fundamental issue at hand; you presume that finding a husband is an endeavor that is divergent—if not mutually exclusive—from the goal of pleasing God. To you, our hypothetical, 35-year-old, lonely female should ignore the sting of her delusion, forget that she spent her life complying with the doctrines of men, and continue to abide in presumption by assuming that, without her biological needs being fulfilled—needs placed within her by Christ—that she is pleasing God by the fading of her alluring beauty. She must assume that Christ cares not for her as He cared for Eve: that He will not allow a man, in worship of Him, to become sexually excited by her presence in church. How cruel is your false doctrine?! You have taken a second bite of the forbidden fruit. As proof against your fallacy, you have been reminded, by the Bible, the test of all of our doctrines, that the Lord brought Eve to church, in the nude, to find a husband; such was the first religious service. Consequently, He must have been pleased when they, without a light shield, discovered each other's seductive qualities. Adam already had a bright-light companion, the sun. It was with him all the day, but such could not cure his loneliness; it could not inspire in him the earthly thing that we mature adults call an erection. Eve served that purpose; thus, as part of that religious service, that pre-lapsarian communion with Christ, Adam and Eve were encouraged to have children, a gentle way of commissioning them to enjoy each other as playmates, to have sex. This is the irrefutable straight testimony. You reject it because, after 6000 years of education, you still have failed to learn earthly things; consequently, you can never understand heavenly things. You have failed to choose the good and refuse the evil. For this reason, you are like the example cited above, the child who requires therapy because one evening his eyes were opened, and he discovered that his high and mighty parents do not sleep in separate beds, are not enshrouded in heavy clothing, but that they get naked and then they have sex, or in your immature mind, “they do the nasty.” Rather than this, you dash Christ's righteousness, the joy of His creation and teach *Righteousness by Blindness*. These sentiments you harbor, because just as with Adam and Eve's commission, you likewise seek to pervert

The Mission of EG White.

I will concede the quote to her; I feel confident that, as you, Ari, claim, EG White did indeed say that our first parents were enshrouded in light. In harmony with this concession, we likewise agree that her communications were the result of her divine inspiration; in other words, God led her to broadcast that claim. As one who respects her counsel, I can bring into peace that doctrine by heeding to her recommendation and correspondingly relegating such statements to be one of the ‘many lessons that we must unlearn’. First we learned it; it made us wealthy; now to follow Christ as proverbial, rich-young rulers—young meaning most recent saints—we must sell it along with our other enriching wealth.

The Mustard Seed Advent, Newsletter, 13: VII

In my initial epistle on this issue of *Presumptuous Dress Reform*, the letter written to Tony Hall, a Davidian leader and thus an “ultra-wealthy” and “young” saint, I reprimanded him for attiring a manikin and using it as a prop to teach women how to dress. Therein I quoted counsel from EGW which will help all to understand why the Lord inspired her to take one position pertaining to *Dress Reform* yesterday, while He fully knew that an opposite position would be inspired by Him today. The reference reads as follows:

“When light goes forth to lighten the earth, instead of coming up to the help of the Lord, they will want to bind about His work to meet their narrow ideas. Let me tell you that the Lord will work in this last work in a manner very much OUT OF THE COMMON ORDER OF THINGS, and in a way that will be contrary to any human planning. There will be those among us who will always want to control the work of God, to dictate even what movements shall be made when the work goes forward under the direction of the angel who joins the third angel in the message to be given to the world...” —EG White, *Testimonies to Ministers*, p. 300.

In this quote we can see the truly enriching value of EGW’s work as we analyze it the next three subtopics:

{A} The Church’s Place.

From this EGW/VTH quote, the operative word, for our purpose now, is “when”. We were to anticipate a new day, and when it was to arrive, the efforts to restrict or bind upon its mission the inherited and narrow ideas that would prevail and be “common” in that same day, futuristic to EGW’s work, would become an affront to the new, heavenly inspired, God-the-Father-appointed mission. Essentially, she says things are going to change “*when light goes forth to lighten the earth*”. The SDA ministry has never reached this long-anticipated crescendo, the lightening of the earth with her/their doctrines; they, in a world of seven billion, still struggle to merely enlighten their own congregation of nearly 10 million. Obviously, their doctrines represent the narrow ideas with which they, as spiritual Lilliputians, seek to attach or bind to the Lord’s glorious, final work. In point of fact, as evidenced by this letter, the well-established members of the church are not even enlightened by their own gospel. They have had the writings of EGW for decades, and they still do not discern their duty as declared by her most vociferous theme: “Secure all doctrines from the Bible.” Ergo, that very doctrinal theme from EGW—one that, itself, was brought fully to the light by the MSA—is an exception; it is not common; it resultantly must not be abandoned for, though shouted by her from the proverbial mountain top, it has never resonated within the SDA Church; it has not been included within the lexicon of Adventist or even Davidian Adventist doctrinal portfolio so that today it could be considered common amongst them. Beyond that, if American Adventists are not converted—their favorite cliché is, “God is not finished with me yet”—then you can believe that those in foreign lands, the students of SDA ministry, are exponentially more ignorant and even less converted. To reach the world, the *mustard seed*, the straight-talking servant of Christ, must do things exactly as EGW promised, “*out of the common order of things*”. Yesterday, the day of EG White and VT Houteff’s inspiration, the church prevailed within the common order of things, the light did not go forth to lighten the earth; it was a day before the earth was to be enlightened. Thus, her counsel pertaining to the dress and to diet, as well as various and sundry other doctrines, were all to be considered aspects of Adventism which must be abandoned; they must become reformed. I use the strictest definition of that term, “re-form-ation”.

The SDA Church, under God’s appointment and authorization, has been headquartered in the shadow of our nation’s capital; such was her ordained place. Not for the lack of effort, she, the church, has, all these 170 years, failed to convert the world, but heaven has not given up, for remember, “For God so loves the world.” Instead of world conversion, this period of time was a period of grooming for the takeoff of her next assignment, the mission to illuminate the world by the “third angel”. Remember, the proverbial woman of *Rev 12*? She is a perfect icon of triumphant Eve, “the mother of all living” (Gen 3: 20), the ministry who feeds the church and who will ultimately extend to the world everlasting life when she gains her victory over the dragon (likewise described as her arch nemesis in *Rev 12*). This woman who represents the church that left her old Hebrew culture and journeyed into the wilderness, the gentile world, is described as follows:

“¹And there appeared a great wonder in heaven; a woman clothed with the sun...⁵And she brought forth a man child, who was to rule all nations with a rod of iron: and her child was caught up unto

Presumptuous Dress Code, Second Epistle, 03-Aug-2013

God, and to his throne. ⁶And the woman fled into the wilderness, where she hath a place prepared of God, that they should feed her there...¹⁴And to the woman were given two wings of a great eagle, that she might fly into the wilderness, into her place, where she is nourished..." —Rev 12: 1, 5, 6, 14.

In fact, “a place” within the world, we are told, was prepared for her nourishment and development. Such could only mean that this woman, a church of transition, was settled by heaven to abide within the confines of one particular culture. All who were to join her so as to win LIFE (so as to be born again by “*the mother of all living*”) were required to unite with her in her place, the one prepped for her; they were to leave their own spiritual ethos —bastions of death— and embrace her abode. But that culture, that place prepared for her, was not her eternal, earthly home. She was to be forwarded to yet another place. In a nutshell, what this means is that just as the wilderness is full of many forests, deserts, oases, ponds, hills, glades, meadows, valleys, etc., just so does the world have many cultures. From those vast, proverbial and spiritual topographies, the evangelized saints were to journey to the divinely appointed site of the woman, a walk to her newly defined, post-Palestine culture. Heaven chose for the woman —not the Spanish nor the French, not the Chinese nor the Aborigines, not the Nigerian nor the Kenyan, but— the English-speaking culture to forward its light preparatory to ‘the last work’. Correspondingly, the gospel, has been dominated by her cultural ethos. The things that her icon of light, the American culture, deemed “improper” has become superimposed upon the church. Dress standards is foremost in this regard. For as cited already above, EGW said,

“It is the duty of ministers to respect the judgment of their brethren; but their relations to one another, as well as the doctrines they teach, should be brought to the test of the law and the testimony; then, if hearts are teachable, there will be no divisions among us. Some are inclined to be disorderly, and are drifting away from the great landmarks of the faith; but God is moving upon His ministers to be one in doctrine and in spirit.” —EGW, *Testimonies for Ministers*, p.30, recited from above

God, she says, moves upon us to be one in doctrine and spirit, this singularity was to be from the perspective of the woman *Rev-12*, and would be the goal until the day of the ‘uncommon order’ arrived. Unity, the removal of “*divisions among us*”, was a preliminary goal intended to grow more fully in the day of Bible-based doctrines, the day when Eve learns to correctly cite to the serpent’s seed her full compliance and abidance in Christ’s word. It would come when the ultimate goal of heaven, the forging of doctrines by the Law (the Pentateuch) and the Testimony, (the *Testimony of Jesus*) ripened amongst us. Jesus called that day, “the last day” (See *John six*). Until this maturity could occur, the church, the woman, would need to achieve unity by the customization of her work to her surroundings as described in the next **Subtopic**:

{B} The Anglo-Centric Gospel.

In those days, the brethren were all culturally monolithic including EGW; they were presented as white, Anglo-Saxon, Protestants, and most were men. The Lord said that their views must be respected until the new day dawned. Accordingly, all converts were metaphorically transformed to abide in that serene, yet temporary place, that cultural setting, that was prepared for the woman. Such abidance would continue until the woman of *Rev 12* inherits her rightful place, Palestine, in the day when she receives her next assignment, that of international acclaim. Hence, we were told, “*When light goes forth to lighten the earth...the Lord will work in this last work in a manner very much OUT OF THE COMMON ORDER OF THINGS...*”. Necessarily then, EGW and the SDA Church were required to discern the proper limits of cultural domination; that is, they needed to determine which Anglo-ethics to embrace and which ones to disdain. Such was not limited to *Dress Reform*: They chose diets, doctrines, work ethics, health principles, church finance, Sabbath observance, tithing, etc. As a point of illustration, in 1902, the American political forces, as a trap, sought to impose *Sunday Blue Laws* mandating that people not work on Sunday. They presumed that Adventists would not comply and accordingly be persecuted by the state. EGW manifests her heavenly skill to walk that tight rope; she, as a resolution to guide the church, deemed that the brethren should heed the law and not work on Sunday, and, as a counter strategy, they should use it as a day of missionary evangelism.

“Dear Brother: I will try to answer your question as to what you should do in the case of Sunday laws being enforced. The light given me by the Lord...Seventh-day Adventists were to show their wisdom by refraining from their ordinary work on that day, devoting it to missionary effort. Give them no occasion to call you lawbreakers...they will see that it is not consistent nor convenient for them to be strict in regard to the observance of Sunday. Keep right on with your missionary work, with your Bibles in your hands, and the enemy will see that he has worsted his own cause.” —EGW, *Testimonies for the Church*, p.232.

The Mustard Seed Advent, Newsletter, 13: VII

Accordingly, by the church heeding the judgment of the brethren, they defeated the devil (See *Journey Through the Murky Bogs*, 124). Such a rendering, as also was the case with *Dress Reform*, was not a Bible law; it was a cultural accommodation, one which preserved the church in her place, her wilderness-abidance experience. The Lord fully knowing that the English tongue would dominate the world, accordingly ordained men and women who could best represent His work from that perspective until the day of unity, the day when all of God's children, from every quadrant of the wilderness, can worship Him. Hence, EGW and the "founding fathers" carried the customary standard of this land and extended to the flock their refinements thereto pertaining. In so doing, they properly dominated the church's doctrines from their perspective. Knowing the Victorian ethic and her pretentiously squeamish views of human sexuality, a people not unlike their first parents, Adam and Eve, who culturally were very fretful about self-exposure, EGW accommodated that ethos and unified the church standard by the teaching that Adam and Eve were shielded from viewing each other by a shroud of light—lending her theological credence and gravitas to their dress ethics. Her doctrine, as shown below, was proverbial and not literal. By so exposing it, she honored the prevailing opinion of the English-speaking world which presumed that the human, naked body was evil. She did not lie to us; for, superimposed above all her writings was the overriding duty, the requisite to establish all doctrines on the Bible. She sent a double message for the wise, the MSA, to translate in this hour.

In this lesson from 1902, we see in synopsis the work of EGW: It was to make the woman of *Rev 12* to be comfortable in her place. Comfortable means free of persecution, of strife, of ridicule. VTH forwarded this same work. To teach the then futuristic lesson that the naked human body is an extension of God's handiwork, was disorientating to the ordained Euro-centric, gentile power. After all, their bodies and many others, in their age of degeneration, were not manifestations of beauty as were those of the first couple. The best of them barely enjoyed a few years of youthful beauty whereby their bodies had a glimpse of its original glory. This is why the Assyrian world is consumed with the goals of fitness and the most successful of them can be found regularly in the gym or the exercise sanatoriums. To them, until they reach their goals of Adamic and Evenic fitness, the more clothes the better. Their frustrations are assuaged by the notion that Adam and Eve's bodies were covered with light. Yet, when they finally reach a goal of total fitness, then, being naturally duplicitous, they seek to do as do the mini-skirt wearing women who, on rare occasions, grace the men of the church with their presence: They display the alluring qualities of their beautiful figures. In the meantime, the inspiration of our Adventist prophets, sought to accommodate the woman of *Rev 12* as more fully described in the following **Subsection**:

{C} The Hand-Crafted Fig Leaf.

The story of Eden was a literal and historic event, but the church in her victory, the one that will be sent to enlighten the earth, or, put another way, the one to finally receive the cure for her blindness that has beset her from birth, will discern the proverbial applications from the Edenic story. This new vision will explain the victorious plight of the woman of *Rev 12* when she defeats the serpent. Only in this fruition will they fully appreciate the work of EG White and VT Houteff. Just as Adam and Eve then had two successive garments of clothing to cover the beauty of their created nakedness, the garment of fig leaves and the Christ-designed garment of "skins", likewise today will the application come to fulfillment. The coverings, be it the sun, the leaves, or the skins represent doctrines. Accordingly, the garment that covered that small church in the beginning, before the fall, was not a literal light; it was the proverbial sun, the symbol of the *Word of the Lord*, the commission to unabashedly procreate and to trust Him, not the *Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil* nor the serpent who dwelt therein, but Christ to educate them. This we can know because, when they violated the Word of the Lord, they lost their innocence—their covering of doctrinal abidance in Christ's word—it is only in this sense that we vindicate EGW's explanation of the created covering of light. Before the fall they were—not blinded to beauty but—enshrouded in the Lord's word; they trusted Him and accordingly viewed themselves to be acceptable. Quite ironically, this trust in the Lord is revealed in the words of the world's first evangelical outreach, in Eve's testimony, her sermon to the beguiling serpent. She made a sweet, but naïve attempt to teach Christ's righteousness. Of this the Bible says, "*And the woman said unto the serpent, We may eat of the fruit...But of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God*

hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die” —Gen 3: 2, 3. All good ministers quote the Word, but Adam —not Eve— was told, simply, not to eat the fruit; no command pertaining to touching it was given. Sad to say, today ministers who battle with the devil and “his seed” also misquote Christ; lest they “reform”, they do not stand a chance. As a consequence for not learning to trust the Word, they again offer many addendums and accommodations which seem right in their blinded eyes, eyes which cannot yet discern between good and evil. They have not learned from the Edenic icon of the Church and the ministry, for, being devoid of Bible light, the dress code promoted by the SDA Church is merely a second attempt to sew for man his own fig leaves, man’s doctrinal solution for his plight of estrangement from the Word.

To deepen the metaphor, the woman of *Rev 12* fled from her home in Palestine with the same clothing, the *Word of the Lord*, the teachings handed to us by the mouth of Jesus. No space for digression on this point —instead, it must be simply said that Christ’s testimony, promised in the Old and fulfilled in the New-Testament, proclaimed that there is no death or shame when one walks in Its revelations. He said, “**Verily, verily, I say unto you, If a man keep my saying, he shall never see death**” —John 8: 51. But, unable then to discern the value of the Lord’s word, for He promised to raise it up only in the last day (John 6: 39, 40), they had to subsist, just as Adam and Eve so did in the type, by hiding themselves amongst the trees, the proverbial wilderness. The “milk doctrines” that Paul disdains as non-efficacious for maturation, are the doctrines which are prefigured by the handmade garments, the fig leaves which the first couple used for a covering. True, the doctrines were inspired of heaven, but so were also the literal fig leaves; they too were created by the Lord —to expand the proverb and deepen the type, so also was man’s uncircumcised foreskin. Righteousness demands that these inspired coverings, painful though it may be, must be shed before the work goes to the world. Such shedding is the work, not of EGW nor VTH but of Moses and Zipporah, the foreskin-removing *mustard seed*. Back stitching the hidden-and-now-revealed works of Jesus into this lesson, discerning the meaning of His miracle when He healed the man who was, by “**the works of God**”, born in blindness, we, the wilderness-dwelling, gentile church must receive the same miracle to perfect her doctrines; this is to become our restored vision. In other words, to finally garner our sight that has been absent since our birth, we must wash away the spittle clay. Spittle clay —it is the Lord’s saliva mixed with dirt which Jesus deployed to cover the blind man’s eyes (*John nine*). When we do this, we will stand alone as did that formerly blinded man of *John nine* and be scrutinized by the governing elders of the church. But we will have become victorious; we will have won the victory that Adam lost, victory over human opinion. Beforehand, huddled amongst the trees in the wilderness depicted in *Rev 12*, the woman, formerly clothed with the sun, must abide in her own designer clothing until she learns to choose the good and refuse the evil, until she learns to accurately claim the Lord’s words. This is the price to be paid for partaking of the forbidden fruit.

The final stage of the revelation which depicts the wilderness-dwelling woman, the Lord’s church, is perfect in its application herein described. Laodicea today suffers from the curse won for them by Adam and Eve; they suffered under human opinion and from the resulting sting of it. This is the price that the woman of *Rev 12*, in all her years of gentile dwelling, has endured. Does not her persecution prove this point? She will not win relief until her day of victory, her day of circumcision, for this wilderness was never to become her eternal destiny on earth.

“**¹⁰Moreover I will appoint a place for my people Israel, and will plant them, that they may dwell in a place of their own, and move no more; neither shall the children of wickedness afflict them any more, as beforetime...¹²I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels. and I will establish his kingdom**” —2Sam 7: 10-12.

“**For from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same my name shall be great among the Gentiles; and in every PLACE incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering; for my name shall be great among the heathen, saith the Lord of hosts**” —Mal 1: 11.

His name will be great when the message goes to lighten the earth from another headquarter. The woman of *Rev 12* has an ultimate place ordained for her. One day her ill-deployed doctrines, her impure offerings, must be discarded. Leaves detached from the plant always deteriorate in time suggesting that such man-stitched oracles, though inspired, prefigured, all New-Testament doctrines garnered by the

The Mustard Seed Advent, Newsletter, 13: VII

woman, the spiritually wealthy, that must be sold. They are aspects of the Lord's work corrupted by the inspired hands of man to substitute for a covering until Christ provides for them their peace, until they learn to fully trust in His word. This we must know for a certainty for the day is now upon us whereby the faithful in the church, the *disciples indeed*, will grow up out of their current place and be free of public opinion as they are made servants to the Law and the Testimony, made obeisant only to God. **"...Thus speaketh the Lord of hosts, saying, Behold the man whose name is The Branch; and he shall grow up out of his place, and he shall build the temple of the Lord: Even he shall build the temple of the Lord; and he shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon his throne..."**—Zech 6 : 12, 13. When this occurs, Bible prophecy will meet the promises handed to us by the *Spirit of Prophecy*, the work of EGW and VTH, the work will proceed out of the common order of things. Then we can discard our enriching fig leaves, the things that won for us social acceptance yesterday, and we can walk with Christ as He abides with His branch of righteousness. Preparation for the arrival of this day was the mission of EGW.

Notwithstanding, when the light is ready to be flashed upon the entire globe, it will be so done being

Free of the Standards of Bigotry.

Father, not being Anglo-centric, Chino-centric, Afro-centric, et-al, but instead being the God of all people (See John 3: 16), does not desire the narrow, social standards of one pocket of the globe to dominate people of other cultural engenderations. Remember Moses' declaration thereto pertaining: **"When the most High divided to the nations their inheritance, when he separated the sons of Adam, he set the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel. For the Lord's portion is his people..."**—Deut 32: 8, 9. Father regards all the quadrants, the bounds of the globe, not just the place that He provided for the Palestine-fleeing woman of *Rev 12*. Of course then, to answer my question to Ari, in the day when the light of the *Three-Angels' Message* blazes the globe, the faithful must extend their evangelism even to those of the jungle who come to them for salvation and do so dressed as their historic culture has so deemed—even if they are as scantily attired as was Elijah who wore only a leather girdle (2Ki 1: 8). As did Peter, when he recognized the Lord, he, on his own volition, covered his nakedly-exposed body with a coat so as to, in his mind, properly greet the Lord. However, his fellowship with his brethren, beforehand, was comfortably done being fully disrobed (John 21: 7). The people to be redeemed by the *church triumphant* will also, without your laws, receive the Lord with the same conviction. In other words, if any standard is to prevail, it will be founded in the Law of Moses and the *Testimony of Jesus*, not in the Victorian Crown of England nor the Puritanical findings of her subjects; the day of control of the church from that narrow boundary has now forever passed.

Do not fret: For those who desire to "ego trip" for the Lord, the saints who **"will want to bind about His work to meet their narrow ideas"**, there is relief; they simply must qualify as disciples and have, as commissioned, the 'law and the testimony' bound to their hearts (See Isa 8: 16, 20), then they can, as a matter of duty, become legal judges (See Matt 7: 5), and they can impose upon the new converts their Bible-and-Law-centered ethics. The Bible forbids the consumption of unclean foods, the wearing of tattoos, self-mutilation, the worship of images, the calling upon the names of false gods, work without a Sabbath rest, etc., all issues of reprimand to the primitive people of the jungle. There will be an enormous amount of binding within the confines of the Law and the Testimony that will be required, but no where will they be required to wear literal garments of light, and nowhere are the women to be told to shield their beauty, even if such beauty includes their legs.

Those who have studied the day of the Loud Cry with the greatest fervor, Davidians, men who have examined **"the day when the light goes forth to lighten the earth"**, understand that the Gospel call will be made—not from London nor from Washington DC but—from Jerusalem. Jesus said as much when He promised,

"There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth, when ye shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets, in the kingdom of God, and you yourselves thrust out. And they shall come from the east, and from the west, and from the north, and from the south, and shall sit down in the kingdom of God"—Luke 13: 28, 29.

The Gospel will not be Anglo-centric but Zio-centric. People will come, to **"sit down in the kingdom"**

so as to learn the Law of Moses (See John 5: 45), and if there is any cultural emphasis beyond that foundation to be imposed, the people will be free to choose. Believe you me, women love to shop: The scantily clad women of the world will joy in the lavish choices of clothing that they will have. But, for heaven's sake, let the women, the experts of their own bodies, make the choice without your "*covetousness, maliciousness*" impulses of mind domination. They do not need Brother Hall's manikin nor do they need Ari sticking the culturally-dominating noses of EGW, VTH, or Queen Victoria into their lives. With God, there will be no aloof presumption of inferiority or superiority; He will not say to those who join His kingdom that they should deny their own instincts so as to favor those of the Anglo-centric culture. Today, such is not the case, the world is dominated by that very bastion of bigotry, and to boot, they ignore the Law of God. Hence, losing their divine ordination, they will not be graced with the power to define for the redeemed "the oracles of God". The work will expand "*out of the common order of things*". Love for the Law, for Christ, for His testimony will then prevail, and nations will rush to Zion to learn of its light:

"But in the last days it shall come to pass, that the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be established in the top of the mountains, and it shall be exalted above the hills; and people shall flow unto it. And many nations shall come, and say, Come, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, and to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths for THE LAW shall go forth of Zion, and THE WORD OF THE LORD from Jerusalem" —Mic 4: 1, 2.

There you have it: The Law shall go forth of Zion, but It will have a partner that ancient Israel did not have, a companion oracle as a teaching tool; this will be the church's shroud. It will have the Word of the Lord. This is a reference to the *Testimony of Jesus*; it shall be declared from Jerusalem. Speaking of this promise, the Lord assured as much to Israel at Sinai; He made reference to the wilderness-dwelling, woman's shroud, her sun clothing; He spoke of the day when He would clandestinely rest and abide upon Jesus to give us His perfect doctrines. He said, "*I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee (Moses) and will put my words in his mouth: and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him. And it shall come to pass, that whosoever will not hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him*" —Deut 18: 18, 19. Today, it has come to pass; the Lord's testimony is now being reiterated. We have our clothing of bright light. Any counsel that you have to teach people how to walk, which way to abide, must come from the lips of the teacher, Jacob, the *mustard seed*. He will teach his ways. Jacob today, as was the case with Jacob of old, loves beautiful women, and he wants them to be happy with their gifts. Hence, he will give them the freedom to reveal their beauty as they so deem; he will not make them slaves to Victorian fashion.

News-Release Conclusion:

True indeed, the issue for the moment is the need for dress reform, but the one emphasized by traditional Adventism —the common order of things— whereby they hypocritically seek to heap their inherited, cultural ethics upon women is passé. It is nothing more than a hand-made, man-made presumptuous code of ethics. The story of the Garden of Eden conveys, in proverb, is the dress-reform message of the hour. For, as was the case then, the Lord holds the man responsible. He must overcome his perversities even in the hour of his greatest temptations. He cannot gain victory by blaming the husband-seeking woman whom the Lord has sent to assist him.

Subsequently, the Lord comes a calling —not for Eve but for Adam. And He comes at the end of the day, the time when the sun is setting upon the gentile Church, upon the SDA Gospel dispensation.

While they, the ordained beacons of light to the wilderness, the Adventist movement, the end-time church is found huddling in the wilderness, as Adam and Eve, the beginning-time church, hid themselves amidst the trees, the voice of the Lord God —not Christ Himself— beckons to them.

"⁷And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked; and they sewed fig leaves together, and made themselves aprons. ⁸And they heard the voice of the Lord God walking in the garden in the cool of the day: and...hid themselves from the presence of the Lord God amongst the trees of the garden. ⁹And the Lord God called unto Adam, and said unto him, Where art thou?" —Gen 3: 7-9.

Yesterday, as the church fled Palestine, they discovered that, amongst the wilderness-dwelling gentiles,

The Mustard Seed Advent, Newsletter, 13: VII

they were unpopular; as a solution, they made accommodations so as to therein peaceably abide. The sun for our clothing, A.K.A the *Testimony of Jesus*, was, in our eyes, an insufficient shroud. No longer having its miraculous power, subsisting only upon its words; the Lord's testimony—as witnessed by Its low estate even among Adventists—made us, amongst our neighbors, embarrassed and ashamed of our Christ-ordained initiation, our creation. Hence, we receive the compromises to the Word; we covered the gospel with fig leaves. This trek, we must not despair, for it was the journey of man along the path of maturity, of learning to choose the good and refuse the evil. But as the Lord is faithful, His voice was promised to make an appeal to us. This voice, we can now know today, the day of international enlightenment, is the man whom Christ promised to send after He had final communion with His disciples. Speaking of their, the original-disciples, years of paltry doctrine to come before their day of enlightenment and to likewise reveal the proper perspective pertaining to human nakedness, the Testimony reveals the Lord's words and actions:

“⁴He riseth from supper, and laid aside his garments...⁷What I do thou knowest not now; but thou shalt know hereafter,¹⁴If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet; ye also ought to wash one another's feet,²⁰He that receiveth whomsoever I send receiveth me;... and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me”—John 13: 4, 7, 14, 20.

Thankfully, the laying aside of the Lord's garments by the Lord Himself is symbolic. It is our dress reform for it speaks to the final work which the SOP promised. After all, for a divinely appointed leader to publically disrobe is definitely, if taken literally, out of the common order of things. Has not the symbolism of its meaning, that is, the abandonment of the milk, of all New-Testament partial prophecies and doctrines, proven to be divergent enough? Such an historic episode speaks to the beginning of the Kingdom of Heaven, the *mustard seed*. He is to become fully exposed meaning his life becomes an open book, and his sins and reproaches are to be fully uncovered to his disciples, the *disciples indeed*, as they commune in the upper room. But for any seed, especially the *mustard seed*, to proceed in its growth to glory, it must begin beforehand of a germinated seed—“...**they twain shall be one flesh: so then they are no more twain, but one flesh**” (Mark 10: 8)—it must comprise of a united, male and a female germ. After all, this is the knowledge of Botany, which is part of the things of the earth that Nicodemus was required to discern before he could learn heavenly things. Of a necessity then, both the man and his wife must be compliant with the Lord's prescribed symbolism, both must figuratively become disrobed. When this occurs, we can then see the application of the long-sought victory promised from the literal, Genesis story.

The news release for today is that the hour has come. The Lord's voice, the germinated *mustard seed*, the man whom He sends in His stead, has made his call, and he looks for Davidia, the leaders, he looks for Adam to respond. Remember, the Lord promised to send a man to make His final call to the church. Those who receive that man, according to the Life-restoring promise of His testimony, receive both Christ and Father. In this light we can solve the conundrum: How can another person, a human, be added to the symbolism of the Lord's original call to Adam and Eve? Another person, with his wife, does indeed fit into the symbolism because he represents Christ calling to the church, the “**voice of the Lord God walking**” amongst them. He calls them for communion, for victory, for change of their garb. He seeks to remove their temporal garments of expiring fig leaves and to hand to them their dress reform, their garments crafted by Christ. As was the Lord in the type with His disciples in the upper room, so also the man whom He sends: He is not embarrassed to serve them in nudity because He is enshrouded in the righteousness of Christ, the Words which Father conveyed to Christ so that He may, through the lips of Jesus, deliver them to the disciples. Consequently, he, the *mustard seed*, begins the *Church Triumphant*, the victory promised to Eve and her seed. He takes the light which enshrouded the Woman of *Rev 12* when she left Jerusalem, and he makes it his own covering. For only in so doing does he thusly discern that the woman will bruise the serpents head. They make their final call to Laodicea; “**and they (are) naked (but) not ashamed**” (see Gen 2: 25). They stand before them in naked glory because they have put on the white raiment, the same clothing recommended to Laodicea to cover her shame (see Rev 3: 18). Now, Eve triumphant, the Lord's elected ministry, seeks to reform the wilderness-huddled church so that they can purvey the Gospel of Christ's righteousness to the world. To make the metaphor more simply put, the words which Jesus spoke during His ministry, those spoken

[Presumptuous Dress Code, Second Epistle, 03-Aug-2013](#)

after the Dove, Christ, clandestinely rested and abode upon Him, were the words given to the world by Father, the Highest, Himself. Thus is it, the voice of the Lord God walking amongst them. To receive that voice is to receive Christ, and to receive Christ is to receive the Highest. He will change their clothing.

Adventists have done a great work in service to the world. Their medical missionary work is without comparison in the entirety of the wilderness experience. They can do exponentially better if they reform their dress codes by embracing the shroud of the sun. If they, in this late hour, refuse, they will be rejected. They will cite their great work of healing in His name; of prophesying, in His name; of doing many wonderful works, in His name. The Lord's response will be, "...*I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity*" (see Matt 7: 21-27). The Lord only knows His sheep, the ones who respond to His call in the day when He, by the presence of His ordained representative, walks among them. He said as much, "*My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me*" —John 10: 27. Will you my dear Sister, Ari, heed this call of the Lord? Will you cast aside your *presumptuous dress code* and exchange your garments of fig leaves for those of His provisions? Will you continue in the wilderness-wondering bashfulness and thereby reject the symbolism of the nakedly-exposed Lord, the Lord of communion or unity? Or will you finally enshroud your nakedness in the brilliance of His light? This you and all the sisters in the church can do, regardless of the length of your literal dress. As disciples you will be empowered to celebrate the gifts of the Lord's creation that have been endowed to you without regard to the echoes of petty objections from the wilderness quadrant in which you now abide.

Sincerely,
Derek.

[OTHER NEWS](#)

The *mustard seed* has continued in its travel schedule listed in last months letter. After the Toronto retreat of July 5th, the next weekend, the 12th, it conducted a weekend retreat in Edmonton Canada. It was well attended and the saints were graced with two studies, a Sabbath afternoon dinner, a communion service, and several personal consultations. On July 26, the *mustard seed* retreated with the brethren in the nation's capital. We likewise had several eye-opening studies. We thank the Lord for His wisdom, protection, His love, and His guidance. Truly, He has anointed our heads with oil and our cup runneth over.

Due to the length of the above letter, space demands that I do not exhaust the reader attention further.

[RESOURCE LIST](#)

<u>DATE</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>TYPE</u>	<u>LENGTH</u>
06-28-2013	<i>Plight of the Dragon's Woman</i>	<i>Audio Study</i>	61:00 Min
06-18-2013	<i>Earth Dashes the Dragon, Part II</i>	<i>Audio Study</i>	70:00 Min
05-31-2013	<i>Earth Dashes the Dragon, Part I</i>	<i>Audio Study</i>	62:00 Min
04-19-2013	<i>Antidote to the Beast</i>	<i>Audio Study</i>	62:00 Min
04-05-2013	<i>Battle with the Beast</i>	<i>Audio Study</i>	76:00 Min