

Denominational Control

Zahakiel: Bro. Luke, will you open with a prayer?

Qinael: *Most holy and loving Father, we thank you for this opportunity to gather together before you. We thank you for this time you have appointed for the cleansing of your people, that we might reflect you more perfectly as individuals and as a whole.*

We ask for the blessing of your Spirit on each present as we come together to learn from your Word...

In the name of Yahshua we pray, amen.

Pastor “Chick”: Amen.

Zahakiel: Amen.

Daphna: Amen.

Adriel: Amen.

Giselle: Amen.

Peter: Amen.

Barb: Amen.

Guerline: Amen.

Peterson: Amen.

Zahakiel: Happy New Moon to all. This month, we are going to be looking at a topic that I call “Denominational Control.” For our past few Sabbath studies, we have been doing a lot of heart work. The past three in particular has had Bro. Luke facilitating some meetings that were mostly discussion, designed to get us to reflect on the question, “Am I ready for judgment?”

While this is good, and absolutely necessary, it is also the case that we have a warning to sound to others, and we cannot afford to lose sight of the fact that we have been appointed as guardians and sentinels of the truth in the earth. Of course, one job does not weaken the other. I recall early in my experience as a CSDA, whenever I had a personal issue of a spiritual nature with which I was struggling, my conversations with pastor would always refocus me on the work of spreading the Gospel. We need to understand that the refining of our characters is not only for *our* salvation, but also to make us appropriate witnesses to others. The work of refining the character is not with a goal of focusing on the self, but learning how to lose sight of the “self,” and have it swallowed up in Christ.

Adriel: Amen.

Zahakiel: I think a lot of the issues that we have seen in our past few conversations would be cleared up, or at least begin to be broken apart, if we direct our energies at the Gospel work.

Now for Sabbath meetings, we tend to focus on one of two things, either doctrines taken directly from the Word, or questions of a very personal nature designed to call us to greater heights of personal excellence. On New Moons, however, we have been a bit freer to discuss matters a little more in the “family” of Adventism, examining, for example, the writings of Ellen White and other pioneers. This is quite in order, and toward the goal of seeing where we stand in spiritual matters, and how to best serve others.

The prophetess of the Advent movement has instructed us to set before ourselves the writings of our forefathers in the faith so that we do not lose the wisdom for which they sacrificed and studied so much.

We have already seen, in the mainstream Church, the results of neglecting these inspired words. Our early pioneers had a strong sense of the soon-coming judgment. The current church falls into either the ditch of the sin-repent cycle, or the one of celebration on the other side of the road. Our pioneers understood the importance of prophetic guidance. The current church absolutely rejects any who claim to have a voice of prophecy unless it tells them exactly what they already believe and accept... rendering the messengers entirely useless. Our pioneers had a much clearer sense of the Godhead than the current Trinitarian understanding, while the modern version of Seventh-day Adventism justifies its alterations to these important teachings with the inadequate explanation of “increasing light.”

Our pioneers also, as I have discovered recently, had a much more active stance on the “laity’s” role in Church business. At least... this was true for a time. Giselle recently showed me some documents that she found online, a General Conference bulletin from 1903. It is a rather difficult read, and it took me a while to get through it, but one of the issues they were discussing was the possibility of incorporating in such a way that the denomination would control all the institutions and would instruct them in how they were to operate. The notes I have made on it are not very long, and thus the study as I have outlined it is not very long; however, there is a rich ground here for some good discussion, and I hope that we will indeed experience this today.

Now, one of the things that caught the attention of both Giselle and I was that Dr. Kellogg, of whom Adventists have spoken much recently, was an active participant in the meeting. As I read through the details, I found it ironic that Kellogg, whom we consider to have introduced erroneous concepts into Adventist theology, was actually taking what we would see to be the more correct position on this matter.

Dr. Kellogg, as most of us here know, wrote a book called *Living Temple*, and within it he outlined a view of the Godhead that struck many of his contemporaries as being pantheistic, which is to say that, “God is in everything.” In fact, the book was mentioned in the Bulletin. But this concept introduced, while subtle, we believe led to the development of the mindset within Adventism that allowed for the eventual adoption of the Trinity as an official doctrine. In fact, in 1904, the very year after this document was produced, Ellen White wrote, “*Living Temple* contains the alpha of these [heretical] theories. I knew that the omega would follow in a little while; and I trembled for our people.” [Ellen G. White, *Special Testimonies*, Series B No. 2 Page 53, ‘The Foundation of our Faith,’ 1904]

In another place she worded it thus (as I have quoted in my article on Pioneers vs. Trinitarianism): “In the book *Living Temple* there is presented the alpha of deadly heresies. The omega will follow, and will be received by those who are not willing to heed the warning God has given.” [*Selected Messages Book 1*, page 200, paragraph 1]

Zahakiel: So the years during which this document was created seem to have been a pivotal time for SDA beliefs and practices, and for more than one reason, and that may be significant. But, on this matter of denominational control, even Kellogg, who was out of harmony with key theological principles that we have come to accept as accurate, understood the dangers of the proposed actions.

In fact, W.C. White (of whom we have also heard) and Dr. Kellogg were both arguing that where the burden of labor is within an institution, there also should be the burden of control. This agrees with what Ellen White wrote; that in terms of the labor of the Gospel here on earth, it is not in Yah's plan that a single man or group of men should have control over all the branches. This was the very problem with the papacy – well, one of them; too much temporal power over spiritual institutions was invested in one individual, and that power was then made subject to abuse.

We, as CSDAs, also take issue with a denomination, as an artificial entity, “owning” anything. The individual members of the Body own things – land, a building, etc., and this is shared with the Church according to the congregation's needs. But as soon as a denomination owns something, then those in charge of the denomination's activities begin to think of those institutions as “theirs,” not in the sense of stewardship, but in the sense of control. It is easy to see how this kind of thinking was later extended to the very name of the faith, leading to the Mark of The Beast in this last generation... and the seeds were planted all the way back then.

Does everyone see what I mean by that?

Qinael: Yes.

Adriel: Yes.

Peter: Yes.

Pastor “Chick”: Yes.

Barb: Yes.

Qinael: I'm not remembering the year, but hadn't they incorporated much earlier with Ellen White's blessing in order to own property in the publishing work? Was this a different kind of ownership, or am I not remembering that accurately?

Zahakiel: I am not sure about the timeline perfectly, but... I believe that there was an earlier incorporation for the mere purpose of holding land. While that, by itself, may not always be a bad thing, I think in this case it led to problems. Such that, it was being discussed that there be controlling stakes in all the institutions by the ones at the “head” of the Church.

Does that answer your question? And if any others have a clearer recollection, feel free to share it as well.

Qinael: I think so, yes.

Pastor “Chick”: Ellen White had no objection to “holding companies,” i.e., corporations owned by the denomination to hold denominational property.

But...there were various “self-supporting” ministries over the years, and the “leading men” wanted ALL of the work to be owned and controlled by the denomination. I am not sure if this was discussed in the documents you are drawing from?

Zahakiel: Right. And the fact that there was a debate about this going on at all after that setup was already in place indicates that they were trying to change something about the way that already worked.

In fact, the discussion seemed, from the wording, to be getting quite heated at times with people backing up to try and clarify, explain, etc. This is one of the reasons I said it was a difficult read :) But it is clear

that while the holding companies were not the issue, this concept of “ownership” was sort of coming to the fore.

One portion of Kellogg’s argument was quite interesting, for reasons that will become clear when I share a bit of it below, and I would like for us to discuss its implications. Look at this, stated by Kellogg:

“Suppose there stands up in a town a church here that says, “We are Seventh-day Adventists,” and here is another church in the same town saying, “We are Seventh-day Adventists;” will you tell me which one of these shall be recognized? And how are you going to find out? Suppose it comes before the courts to decide. They would say, “We cannot tell you, because you have no standard by which to decide.” The court could not possibly decide which of those churches was a Seventh-day Adventist Church. You have got two institutions, each one claiming to be the denomination. How are you going to decide who owns it? All the courts could do would be to do what Solomon proposed to, - to split the baby in two, don’t you see? It is the only possible way the court could ever settle such a question. So we should have to sell the whole thing out, and divide the proceeds. There is no other way to settle the quarrel. There is no creed to use, no way to tell which is really the true Seventh-day Adventist Church, and which is not. Both claim to be it, and the court would have to split the thing in two and divide it. That is the difficulty.”

He then says, a little later,

“Now you have heard it intimated this morning, and you have talked of it for a number of years, that persecutions are coming; that the time is coming when we are going to be persecuted, when the property of Seventh-day Adventists is going to be confiscated. Just think, my friends, what a state of things would exist, - all the institutions owned by a church corporation, - when that time comes. Every last one of them would go at one sweep. Everything would be tied to one stake, held by one organization; everything would be balanced on one point; and when one would go, all would go. It is far better to have every institution tied to its own stake; far better for every institution to stand on its own legs, and recognized as a separate corporation by the statutes of the state.” [*The General Conference Bulletin*, Thirty-Fifth Session, April 6th 1903] He then goes on to explain in some detail the benefits of this arrangement.

Now, what Kellogg was proposing as a good idea to guard against future persecutions, we have had to do out of necessity in this early time of trouble. In the early days of the CSDA Church, everything was pretty much under pastor’s name. The conference, recognizing this, worded the lawsuit that was filed against us as “Walter McGill, doing business as the Creation Seventh Day Adventist Church.” Because of this, the courts granted them a great deal of latitude in terms of what to confiscate and remove (like domain names for websites, materials in the building, and so on). Ultimately, however, because the language of the lawsuit was also directed at “associates” and even “members,” the fact that other individuals (such as myself and Bro. Luke) own websites did not make very much of a difference.

We have had to go the next step and actually locate these resources in other countries that are not governed by the same laws in an effort to maintain our online presence.

But looking back over those words from Dr. Kellogg, I had a number of thoughts in regard to the way I started this study, speaking of the changes between the SDA Church of our pioneers and the modern

institution that bears that name. Before I share my thoughts, I would like you to share your responses to the above. What do you observe? What are your thoughts when you read the description of the Church in relation to the courts, and the potential confusion of a denominational name? I will open the floor here for discussion.

Adriel: It almost seems as if Kellogg's thoughts about the 2 Seventh Day Adventist Churches in the town was taken as one reason why the Church decided it needed to get a trademark to protect its good name.

Qinael: That actually was how I took it as well... I had to go back and re-read it to figure out how he wasn't coming from that angle. I think the issue was that either Kellogg had a poor understanding of "ownership" when it comes to corporations, or the laws were differently structured back then...

But his point seemed to be if you said "Everything is owned by the denomination," what's the denomination?

So he was saying don't let the denomination own everything, lest a competition as to who that is arises, and the courts "split everything in half."

Zahakiel: Well, his point was, "If everything is owned by the denomination, and the denomination is persecuted, they can confiscate everything at once."

Qinael: <nods.> Well, that was his point in the second quote, yeah.

Peter: I think that Kellogg misled the people with the statement that the courts could not decide which is the true church. If one of the church is living up to the standard that they have to and the courts realize it by the example that is set out by that church, then the true church would be recognized by its fruits.

Zahakiel: How would the courts evaluate that standard and example?

Peter: Based on the foundation that the church was build upon and the principles that is outlined in the scripture as to how his people should live and deal with business.

Pastor "Chick": Two things...

- 1) State corporations were advocated by Kellogg. It is when you have a "federal corporation" (owned by the denomination) that takes over the state corporations that a serious problem can exist that K. objected to (correct me where I am wrong).
- 2) In the USA, in the past, courts heard arguments based on "deviation from original doctrine." That was one of my "affirmative defenses." BUT, that one was defeated in modern times by the "separation of church and state" concept. So, at least, today, the courts could NOT decide between those two churches proposed by Kellogg.

Zahakiel: I think you are correct in No. 1, and No. 2, that was where Peter was coming from, I believe, in terms of the courts being able to decide. But it seems that Kellogg was saying the courts could not, and I don't think he was ignorant of those laws. So perhaps the "deviation from doctrine" concept was one introduced later, but then overturned?

The problem with the SDA Church is... in examining deviation from original doctrine, you must have a “creed” that the court can use as a basis of evaluation.

Pastor “Chick”: The problem in K’s day... was that the SDA Church had no “creed,” so there would be no way to PROVE any kind of deviation from doctrine among SDAs. NOW, in our day, we could quote the SDA Church itself to PROVE deviation from original doctrine (sorry for the duplication).

Zahakiel: Well, I think the issue of a creed having developed between then and now is worth some repetition.

Are there any other comments or questions about that statement?

Guerline: I had one: I think the confusion created today with the denominational name is that instead of the state persecuting them, it rather protects them with the TM.

Zahakiel: Well, yes... Guerline. That is another big change.

For me, I had four thoughts.

First, it is unfortunate that this argument even had to be advanced. It is unfortunate that back in 1903 there were already moves being made to bring the institutions of Seventh-day Adventism under denominational control, such that an individual who wished to have an Adventist ministry would require the “permission” of the General Conference. Nowadays, you cannot even have up a website that claims to be Seventh-day Adventist, that uses the official logo, that makes mention of organizational particulars, without being concerned about legal threats and penalties. This is not, of course, something we would be interested in doing at all, but we have probably all seen cases where individuals who are actually members of the mainstream Church cannot use their own Church’s materials and identifying signs without special permission. The control, at this point, is absolute – and that is a far cry from the Church as described by Kellogg in that outtake.

I am reminded that in 1905 (I believe) Ellen White herself spoke out against the “kingly power” being exercised by the Conference, and it was precisely because proposals such as those that were being discussed in this bulletin were passed, and then strengthened gradually after their passing.

Second, there is a big difference between what Kellogg expected would happen if the issue of the name “Seventh-day Adventist” went to court and what has actually transpired, as Guerline pointed out. You see, the Church knew that the courts would not be able to determine who a true Seventh-day Adventist was, but instead of trusting in the Father to resolve matters of this nature, it decided to MAKE a creed, in direct contrast to the wisdom of the pioneers. This is something pastor and I both noted. But then, through its denominational control, it ensured that if such a court case were ever to arise, the corporation would be a recognized legal entity, able to defend itself against attacks. And here is where the heart of the Dragon really showed forth: They moved from defense to aggression; in order to ensure that there was no confusion at all between groups, the denomination took it upon itself to try and destroy all those who would make the claims that Kellogg describes in his example.

He says clearly, “The courts would have no way to decide,” and even that the church would accept the “splitting” of the difference, like Solomon’s judgment of the baby, and sell things off to deal with such a

calamity. If the SDA Church had remained in this state with regard to legal procedures, it would never have considered bringing lawsuits against others who call themselves “Seventh-day Adventist,” or anyone else. They were expecting to be persecuted for their beliefs. But as the parable says, “Blessed is that servant, whom his lord when he cometh shall find [laboring faithfully]. Verily I say unto you, That he shall make him ruler over all his goods. But and if that evil servant shall say in his heart, ‘My lord delayeth his coming,’ and shall begin to smite his fellow-servants, and to eat and drink with the drunken; The lord of that servant shall come in a day when he looketh not for him, and in an hour that he is not aware of, And shall cut him asunder, and appoint [him] his portion with the hypocrites: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.” (Mat 24:46-51)

There are many parables that we have used to describe the state of the modern, mainstream SDA Church. Some we have drawn directly from Scripture, and others we have been inspired to compose ourselves. Yet I can’t think of any that describe its fall into apostasy so perfectly as this one. The men in power went from a prayerful stance of expecting persecution, to smiting their fellow-servants and to eat and drink with those drunken on Babylonian wine. Kellogg said, to paraphrase, “Let us not have the denomination ‘own’ anything, so that when the persecution comes, these institutions will not all be taken at one swoop, but will be independent entities that can all function toward the common good of the Gospel.”

The modern Conference says, “Let us have the denomination own everything, and we will protect our institution from harm by persecuting others who oppose that idea and would make competing claims on ownership. By maintaining our precedent of trademark protection, we can control the functioning of all the entities under our authority toward a common goal.”

Guerline: That reminds me of the saying: You cannot get both sweet and bitter water out of the same cistern.

Zahakiel: In terms of the change of spirit?

Guerline: Yes.

Zahakiel: Right.

My third thought was this: this concept of “ownership” is a tricky one, and someone briefly commented on that above. Even among those who opposed the idea of denominational control, I was expecting more of an emphasis on Yahweh as the true owner and coordinator of Seventh-day Adventist institutions. The question seemed to come down to a choice between who will own the institutions that went by that name: the people who labored in those institutions, or the general conference. I think that a Creation Seventh Day Adventist could reasonably oppose the wording (at least) of both those options, and instead propose that Yahweh be recognized as the owner of all the institutions, with certain individuals (perhaps some centralized, but definitely many independent) having stewardship over them.

Some may say, “But that won’t stand up in court.” But if you look at the way some of the court’s questions were answered... For example, it is on record in the court that the CSDA Church chose its name because of “divine inspiration,” or some very similar wording to that. How did they come to this conclusion? It is because we told them so. It is a part of the court records because we answered honestly, and forced them to recognize the presence of Yahweh in our decision-making process.

That, all on its own, is a blessing.

Now a word here – independent ownership is not the same thing as embarking on an independent ministry. We advocate cooperation in every branch of the work, and a very close-knit decision making process where all the members have a vote on every proposed change in direction. But at the same time, we recognize the importance of a distributed ownership of property and other resources.

Even in the Book of Acts, where the apostles and the believers had “all things common,” the donations to the common cause were, and could only be, willing. The property was the members’ own, and the decision of what to do with it was left up to the control only of the Holy Spirit, which we understand (because we *maintain* a proper view of the Godhead) to be “control” only in a very loose sense that involves individual cooperation and an exercise of free will.

The Creation Seventh Day Adventist Church is “my” church, not because I own it, but because I belong to it. I think all of us here, even those who own the church building and its surrounding property, even those who have their name on the official documents of our various ministries, would say the same.

Pastor “Chick”: Amen.

Zahakiel: We say often, and sincerely, “This is Yah’s Church.”

My fourth thought is that the actions of the Conference in the early 1900s, and Ellen White’s comments about them, remind me very much of a passage I have read in the Bible, and I will quote it here. It is long, so I will post it all, and you can tell me when you are finished.

“Then all the elders of Israel gathered themselves together, and came to Samuel unto Ramah, and said unto him, ‘Behold, thou art old, and thy sons walk not in thy ways: now make us a king to judge us like all the nations.’ But the thing displeased Samuel, when they said, ‘Give us a king to judge us.’ And Samuel prayed unto Yahweh.

“And Yahweh said unto Samuel, ‘Hearken unto the voice of the people in all that they say unto thee; for they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should not reign over them. According to all the works which they have done since the day that I brought them up out of Egypt even unto this day, wherewith they have forsaken me, and served other gods, so do they also unto thee. Now therefore hearken unto their voice; howbeit yet protest solemnly unto them, and shew them the manner of the king that shall reign over them.’

“And Samuel told all the words of Yah unto the people that asked of him a king. And he said, ‘This will be the manner of the king that shall reign over you: He will take your sons, and appoint them for himself, for his chariots, and to be his horsemen; and some shall run before his chariots. And he will appoint him captains over thousands, and captains over fifties; and will set them to ear his ground, and to reap his harvest, and to make his instruments of war, and instruments of his chariots. And he will take your daughters to be confectionaries, and to be cooks, and to be bakers. And he will take your fields, and your vineyards, and your oliveyards, even the best of them, and give them to his servants.

““And he will take the tenth of your seed, and of your vineyards, and give to his officers, and to his servants. And he will take your menservants, and your maidservants, and your goodliest young men, and

your asses, and put them to his work. He will take the tenth of your sheep: and ye shall be his servants. And ye shall cry out in that day because of your king which ye shall have chosen you; and Yahweh will not hear you in that day.'

"Nevertheless the people refused to obey the voice of Samuel; and they said, 'Nay; but we will have a king over us, that we also may be like all the nations; and that our king may judge us, and go out before us, and fight our battles.'" (1Sam 8:4-20)

Qinael: Finished.

Peterson: Done.

Pastor "Chick": Finished.

Barb: Finished.

Peter: Finished.

Daphna: Finished.

Adriel: Done.

Guerline: Finished.

Zahakiel: Now, this reminds me very much of the earlier parable I quoted, where the evil servant begins to not only smite his fellow servants, but also to "eat and drink" with the drunken, with other spiritual nations. The chosen people of Israel wanted a king over them to be in charge, to make the decisions for them. As I said in the very beginning of today's study, the early Church seemed to have a stronger sense of everyone being involved in the activities of the Church, and not just parishioners who came to the meetings once or twice a week and then went back to their "real lives" for the other six days.

I also found it interesting that the prophet said to them that the king would "take a tenth" of their increase and give it to his officers. When you consider where the General Conference gets its money to pay its "officers of the court," the parallels should become quite striking. They have admitted that the money used in the pursuit of these ungodly, these worldly, goals, comes from the "tenth" that is taken from its members.

Adriel: Wow.

Zahakiel: The people eventually allowed the conference to own the denomination. They wanted a "king" over them, and in so doing they rejected not only the prophet (in this case Ellen White who disdained the concept of centralized "kingly" power for the conference) but also as Yah said to Samuel, "they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should not reign over them."

It has ever been the desire to be like the world that has gotten the faithful in trouble. From Dinah, the unfortunate sister of the Twelve sons of Jacob, to Israel who wished to be like other nations and have a king, to the fallen apostolic Church who invested all their power into the bishop of Rome, to the fallen Adventist Church who let themselves be "owned" by their denominational leaders... in every case, great was the fall of that people.

What has been lacking is a clear hope of Heaven, a deep trust in the Almighty to "reign over them" with infinite wisdom and power. What has been lacking is a lack of weight put on the warnings of those who have come forth with words of inspiration. And as a result of this, of giving up denominational control, the members of the mainstream Church have fallen into two great, but related, evils.

First, they have lost their voice. By acknowledging the General Conference as the “head” of the SDA Church in exactly the same way that the papal office is the “head” of the Roman Catholic Church, they have little authority to make any changes if that head begins to lead them in a way that they do not like. Most individuals who we speak to in the mainstream Church, yes, *most* of them, actually do not like the fact that the Conference has resorted to bringing lawsuits against little groups in an effort to maintain its control. Most say they would rather they had left it to God. Only the most deluded, only the most evil (although they may be otherwise morally pleasant, they are spiritually wicked) have actually taken the mark in their forehead and said, “The Church has a right to defend itself.” But who has given the church such a “Right?” Surely not Christ, her Husband and would-be Protector. But we know that those who take the mark in their hand suffer the same fate as those who take it in the head, and by submitting to the will of a king, those who remain under that king’s authority will follow him into perdition.

The second evil is that, even if they had a voice, most of the members of the mainstream Church have lost the will to use it. By becoming “used to” the Conference making the decisions, coordinating the work, determining who is or is not to have a ministry, they have become “sheep” in the most negative sense. They will follow blindly to the degree that we can show them inspired writing condemning the exact actions taken by the Conference, words that they will *agree* are inspired by God, and they will do everything in their mental power to avoid seeing the obvious implications – that they are following the wrong shepherd. They have started to follow, and they will continue to follow, because regardless of what we can show them, regardless of how clear it is, they have accepted the idea that “the ship will go through,” and therefore no independent reasoning, no personal convictions, no common sense, will cause them to veer away from this death-march.

We... we as those guardians of the truth, we have MUCH to pray for. Let us continue our heart-work, certainly. Let us use the sacred hours that Yah has given to us each week to refine our characters, to cleanse away the filthiness of the flesh and spirit. Let us bear one another’s burdens, rejoicing where one rejoices, and weeping all when one weeps. We are the family of Yah, and agape is our spiritual lifeblood. But at the same time, let us not neglect the reason we have been called to this walk of sanctification, and this royal family of Yah.

We are called to be “kings and priests,” and both of these things involve other people. Godly Kings reign over others, exercising authority in such a way as to lead them closer to salvation. Faithful Priests intercede for sinners, and represent the grace of the Almighty toward them so that, hopefully, their hearts will ultimately be won. We have seen, because the mainstream Adventist Church has accepted the great deception of Denominational Authority, they have lost their voice, and the will to use their voices. What can save them now? What can possibly turn them from their course? What can wrench them away from the Mark of The Beast?

For many of them... nothing can. They have become so used to following that it no longer matters who the leader is; and they simply choose the familiar, the convenient, rather than the appointed. But let us be fervent in prayer that our efforts to reach out to them will find a few more souls before probation closes forever on this groaning earth. Let us seek the lost with new efforts, for we of all the generations are the most responsible for bearing the light of the Gospel in the darkness. May the Spirit guide our steps in these closing minutes of earth’s history.

Are there any final comments or questions before we close?

Zahakiel: Ok, pastor, will you offer the closing?

Pastor "Chick": Let us pray...

Dear Father in Heaven,

Thank you for Your Holy management of Your work. We have missed certain souls whom we love and desire to have with us here in our meetings. Please draw near to them and inspire them toward your people. Thank you for showing us from history how things have come full circle and that nothing is new upon the earth.

Bless us with soul prosperity as we continue seeking the cleansing and sanctification required to see your Face in glory.

In YAHSHUA's holy name, AMEN!

Zahakiel: Amen.

Qinael: Amen.

Barb: AMEN.

Peterson: Amen.

Peter: Amen.

Guerline: Amen.

Adriel: Amen

Daphna: Amen.