

“Make it Plain: Does God Care What We Eat” was posted on YouTube by Power of the Lamb on 6/1/21. The speakers are Nefer Nitty, Esq. who contributed very little, Dwayne Lemon, who is said to be an evangelist, Lance Wilbur and Pastor Ivor Myers. Since Ivor is the pastor, he deserves most of the credit for what is said. The purpose of the discussion is to show that the food we eat can affect our salvation. I think it’s pretty clear what we eat can affect our spiritual life for good or for evil and it’s not just the meat. Where Seventh-day Adventist ministers get into trouble is when they try to prove, using only the Bible, that the Levitical laws about clean and unclean foods apply under the new covenant. If they use a fake bible, they increase the difficulty in proving this immensely.

At 4:30 Lance uses Acts 16:30 from a fake bible to discuss what one must do to be saved. What he read could have been the New International Version (NIV) or the English Standard Version (ESV). Less than five minutes into the discussion, Lance has started to dig his hole. As the discussion progresses it may become clear which “the Bible” he is using.

At 16:11 Lance reads 1 John 5:11-13 and now it’s clear that his “the Bible” is the New American Standard Bible (NASB). He reads 1 John 5:11 from his “the Bible” and then up on the screen is posted the passage from the King James Version (KJV) and he reads from that.

At 17:34 Ivor reads from Mark 7 where the disciples were berated by the Pharisees for not washing their hands before eating and were defended by Christ. Ivor reads from the KJV but a precedent has been set because Lance already has already used the NASB twice with no objection of any kind by Ivor. Here is the pertinent passage from the real Bible and from Lance’s fake bible.

“And he saith unto them, Are ye so without understanding also? Do ye not perceive, that whatsoever thing from without entereth into the man, it cannot defile him; because it entereth not into his heart, but into the belly, and goeth out into the draught, purging all meats?” Mark 7:18-19 from the KJV.

“And He said to them, ‘Are you so lacking in understanding also? Do you not understand that whatever goes into the man from outside cannot defile him, because it does not go into his heart, but into his stomach, and is eliminated?’ (Thus He declared all foods clean.)” Mark 7:18-19 from the NASB.

The KJV says food goes into the digestive tract, then goes into the “draught” (sewer) and that all “meats” (foods) are purged (gotten rid of). The NASB clearly and without hope of refutation says Jesus declared “all” foods are clean.

Ivor read from the KJV but things went downhill from there since he apparently doesn’t understand Levitical law and is having trouble with ENGLISH even though he is a pastor. At 20:36 he says, “Nothing you put in your mouth can defile you; can make you, um, unclean before God. Nothing, nothing, ah right? Watch this ya’ll. Because it entereth not into his heart, but into his belly. What kind of uncleanness is Jesus focused here with? Uncleanness of the heart or uncleanness of the belly?” He goes on to say, “What you eat, can’t defile your heart.” Really? Part of the title of this presentation is “Does God Care What We Eat?” Isn’t it a bit

contradictory to say “nothing you put in your mouth can defile you?” What he should have said was that the issue was about ceremonial hand washing which had been invented by the Pharisees and had no legitimate part of doctrine.

“They that sanctify themselves, and purify themselves in the gardens behind one tree in the midst, eating swine’s flesh, and the abomination, and the mouse, shall be consumed together, saith the LORD.” Isaiah 66:17 from the KJV.

I think God does care what we eat and what we put in our mouth can defile our body and our heart but that doesn’t include a little dirt that might be on our hands.

At 21:57 Ivor says, “I’m going to read this to you out of a different translation.” I can hardly wait.

Ivor then wanted to know if the same thing was true in the Old Testament. He asked at 23:18, “Was it the tree of knowledge of good and evil, was that tree, eating of that tree, is that what defiled Adam and Eve? Come on now. Or was it something in their hearts, that led them, to eat something that God asked them not to eat?” Well, their heart was defiled by disobedience to God but the difference is, there is no place in the Old Testament or in the New Testament where it says accidentally eating a little dirt is sinful. Really, nowhere, and that was the whole issue in Mark 7. It had nothing to do with clean and unclean meat; the issue was handwashing ceremonies invented by the Pharisees.

But there is a problem. Lance has already used the NASB as an authoritative source of Scripture and that “Bible” said Jesus “declared all foods clean.” I’m still waiting for the different bible version quotation Ivor promised.

Finally it came! Ivor’s quotation from a different translation! You better sit down. It’s Murdock’s Translation of the Aramaic New Testament! Murdock’s Translation’s claim to fame is because it’s from the Aramaic and Jesus allegedly spoke Aramaic. Just consider a few things. The New Testament was written ENTIRELY in Greek with just a few references to what the meaning was in Aramaic for just a few words. If you go into any fair sized Seventh-day Adventist Church in the United States of America you will most likely find members that are conversant in more than one language. Jesus had spent time in Egypt, in Nazareth and had studied the Hebrew Scriptures. He even impressed the doctors of the law, who spoke Hebrew, with his knowledge of the Hebrew Scriptures. Why is it believable that Jesus only spoke Aramaic? The Roman Catholic Church would like you to believe Aramaic is what Jesus spoke because then it makes it easier for them to “prove” Peter was made the first pope by Jesus.

I have not gone through Murdock’s Translation in detail but I have at least one verse that shows it to be a fake bible.

“For if Joshua, the son of Nun, had given them rest, he would not have spoken afterwards of another day.” Hebrews 4:8 from Murdock’s Translation.

The legitimate Greek manuscripts have the same word in this place and in thirteen other places in the book of Hebrews and it's always translated "Jesus." Just down in Hebrew's 4:14 the name "Jesus" occurs so it's obvious that the translator took some liberties in saying "Joshua, the son of Nun."

This is a common ploy of blowhards. They tell you what the Greek or Hebrew says or quote something from an obscure bible version which they know hardly anyone will have and you're supposed to take their word for everything they say. In addition, if Ivor can use an obscure translation to teach doctrine because he likes what it says, why shouldn't I be allowed to use a fake bible widely accepted by Seventh-day Adventists as legitimate such as the NASB, the New International Version (NIV), etc? Do you have any idea of how many English full and partial translations of the Bible were written since 1611? From what I believe to be a dependable source, I have heard it's over 1,000.

Since Ivor used Murdock's Translation, he should have no objection if I use the NIV since one was published by Andrews University, the flagship seminary of the Seventh-day Adventist Church.

"Are you so dull?" he asked. 'Don't you see that nothing that enters a person from the outside can defile them? For it doesn't go into their heart but into their stomach, and then out of the body.' (In saying this, Jesus declared all foods clean.)" Mark 7:18-19 from the Andrews Study Bible based on the NIV.

There is a footnote for this verse that reads in part:

"In these verses, Jesus was not declaring that a person can eat anything."

Sadly, there is at least one Andrews University Scholar that has a major problem reading ENGLISH.

But wait; there are more Andrews Study Bibles that should clear up the question nicely (I hope you understand sarcasm). That will be FOUR "Bibles" accepted by Seventh-day Adventist theologians as God's Word as opposed to Ivor's Murdock's Translation which I've never seen used in any Seventh-day Adventist publication nor have I ever heard any Seventh-day Adventist minister except Ivor use it.

"So He said to them, 'Are you thus without understanding also? Do you not perceive that whatever enters a man from outside cannot defile him, because it does not enter his heart but his stomach, and is eliminated, thus purifying all foods?'" Mark 7:18-19 from the Andrews Study Bible based on the NKJV.

"Então, lhes disse: Assim vós também não entendeis? Não compreendeis que tudo o que de fora entra no homem não o pode contaminar, porque não lhe entra no coração, mas no ventre, e sai para lugar escuso? E, assim, considerou ele puros todos os alimentos." Mark 7:18-19 from the Andrews Study Bible based on the Almeida Revista e Atualizada (ARE).

“Él les dijo: —¿También vosotros estáis así, sin entendimiento? ¿No entendéis que nada de fuera que entra en el hombre le puede contaminar, porque no entra en su corazón, sino en el vientre, y sale a la letrina? Esto decía, declarando limpios todos los alimentos.” Mark 7:18-19 from the Andrews Study Bible based on the Reina-Valera 1995 (RV95).

Follow the food as recorded in the NKJV Andrews Study Bible. It says the food enters the stomach and is eliminated. Food that has gone through the digestive tract has become feces. This bible says feces has been purified which means the feces has become clean so you could eat it. The other two bibles say Jesus said declared all foods to be clean. All of those bibles also have the footnote that says the verse doesn't mean all foods were made clean even though those same bibles say all foods were made clean. This means the scholars at Andrews University are having problems understanding English, Portuguese and Spanish. Think this over carefully ya'll. Given the fact that Greek and Hebrew aren't the native language of any of them, should you believe them when they tell you what the Greek and Hebrew say?

At 27:28 Dwayne starts to quote Proverbs 23:26. He could be quoting from the New King James Version (NKJV) or the English Standard Version (ESV) because they say exactly the same thing in this verse. I have already demonstrated that the NKJV in Mark 7 says feces has been made clean by passing through the digestive tract and the ESV says Jesus declared all foods clean.

At 29:08 Dwayne quotes John 14:12 but I think he has taken great liberties with it because some words he uses don't fit the KJV and some aren't found in many bibles except the KJV.

At 30:55 Dwayne says, “Adam and Eve ate perhaps one of the most healthiest pieces of fruit in existence.” Really? Is that the reason God said, “in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die?” It doesn't sound too healthy to me.

At 45:05 Ivor allegedly reads “Genesis three verse nine.” What he's reading is actually Genesis 9:3.

“Every moving thing that liveth shall be meat for you; even as the green herb have I given you all things. But the flesh with the life thereof, which is the blood, thereof, shall ye not eat.” Genesis 9:3-4 from the KJV.

Ivor says, “And so people have taken this and said, well, God allowed Noah to eat every, you know, gave man ka permission to eat everything.” Ivor doesn't think this makes sense. He doesn't think God would have told them they could eat every type of meat when He told the children of Israel they couldn't eat certain meats. That is just as logical as saying it didn't make sense for God to say they could eat meat, when at creation man was given just fruit, grains and nuts to eat.

Actually, I couldn't care less if Ivor thinks God made sense in Genesis 9:3-4. The passage for most people, and apparently for Ivor, is clearly speaking of food and God said “every moving thing that liveth” could be their food. No exclusion is made for unclean animals. The only thing

excluded was the blood of the animal and it says “But the flesh with the life thereof, which is the blood” meaning not only should blood not be eaten but blood shouldn’t be in the meat either. You can argue that to the General Conference and back but to almost any native speaker of English, the passage means that ANY animal could be eaten; there was no apparent exclusion of unclean animals. There is a way out of this dilemma with the KJV but not with such bibles as the NASB, the NKJV and many others. I did a write up on this problem that you can peruse at <http://adventiststoday.com/Ritsema2.pdf> if you like.

Ivor thinks the word “every” holds the key to understanding this. He notes that in Genesis 1:29 it says Adam and Eve’s meat was to be “every tree, in the which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed; to you it shall be for meat” while in Genesis 2:16-17 the tree of knowledge of good and evil was excluded. Ivor thinks this means that every doesn’t always mean every. All it means is that like other places in the Bible the full explanation of a verse doesn’t always occur until a few verses later. Sorry Ivor, you whiffed on that one.

Ivor presented two more verses that supposedly mean that “every” doesn’t always mean “every.” The first verse is Proverbs 7:26 which says, “For she hath cast down many wounded: yea, many strong men have been slain by her.” He says the same word that was translated “every” in Genesis 2:16-17 is translated as “many” in this verse. So what? Like English and other languages, the same word can have different meanings depending on the context. A seminary trained pastor should be able to tell that “every” would not be true and would make no sense in this verse while “every” in Genesis 9:3-4 gave the appropriate meaning for that passage.

Exhibit number two is Jeramiah 48:38 which says, “There shall be lamentation generally upon all the housetops of Moab, and in the streets thereof: for I have broken Moab like a vessel wherein is no pleasure, saith the LORD.” Let me take a wild guess. “Generally” is translated from the same Hebrew word that “every” derived from in Genesis 9:3-4. I WAS RIGHT!!! LOL. That is as good an argument as the one he made for Proverbs 7:26.

At 49:18 Ivor says, “So, an, as we said before God is not going to give a commandment and then rescind it, and then get rid of the whole thing again.” Really? In Genesis 1:29 God gave man “every herb bearing seed” and “every tree, in the which is the fruit of the tree” for food. Then, in Genesis 9:3-4 God rescinded that directive when God said man could eat “every green herb.” “Every green herb” would include broccoli in the approved diet where it hadn’t been before; that change would probably grieve some. God also rescinded his previous dietary restrictions when he said people could eat flesh food. Ivor’s argument falls flatter than a pancake.

Ivor says there should be no argument that there was a distinction made in the Old Testament between unclean and clean animals. I agree, there was a distinction between unclean and clean animals but that doesn’t mean, to most people, that Noah and family weren’t allowed to eat the unclean ones when God said “Every moving thing that liveth shall be meat for you; even as the green herb” in Genesis 9:3.

Lance seems to think he imparts wisdom when he says at 52:47 that God didn’t tell them they could eat humans in Genesis 9. He doesn’t seem to understand that God gave HUMANS animals to eat AND God said, just a few verses down, that man was prohibited from killing man.

I think it's clear enough that God didn't tell them they could eat humans but did tell them that "Every moving thing that liveth" could be their food.

Around 54:31 Lance uses the \$50 word exegesis and alleges that if you just read the Hebrew you will know that when God said in Genesis 9 that you can eat meat, he was saying you can eat it but it's going to kill you. Yea, right. The Hebrew; and Lance probably couldn't read a single sentence of Hebrew but how would you know? Lance should concentrate on English because he's having a problem with it just like Ivor.

At 58:14 Lance imagines that if you get heart disease, cancer, high blood pressure or type II diabetes, "your doctor is going to tell you no more red meat, no more pork, no more dairy, no more caffeine, no more alcohol." Lance must live in La La Land. Though doctors should tell their patients that when it's related to their condition, very few doctors do that and for the patients that are told to do any of those things, few comply with those dietary restrictions. The time people should be told those things is when they're well and when a change in diet would do the most good. The percentage of well people that will comply with those restrictions is less than the percentage of sick people that will comply.

At 1:00:45 Ivor starts to discuss Peter's dream recorded in Acts 10:13 where he saw unclean animals and was told to "kill and eat." It's quite true that the context of Peter's dream does not show we can eat anything we like. That said, just because Peter said he had never eaten anything "common or unclean" just means that Peter, being a Jew, knew the Levitical law and didn't want to violate it. This was the same Peter that was rebuked by Paul in Galatians 2 when he didn't associate with Gentiles for fear the Jews wouldn't like it. The passage doesn't prove that Gentiles weren't supposed to eat unclean meats.

Ivor then goes to Revelation 18:1-2 to show some birds are still unclean.

"And after these things I saw another angel come down from heaven, having great power; and the earth was lightened with his glory. And he cried mightily with a strong voice, saying, Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen, and is become the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird." Revelation 18:1-2 from the KJV.

While the passage can be taken to mean there are still life forms that are unclean it doesn't prove that God didn't really mean He gave "every moving thing that liveth" to be food for Noah and his family in Genesis 9 nor does it mean Gentiles or anyone else were prohibited from eating what the Jews called unclean foods. You can stay right in Galatians and show that the purpose of Peter's dream, or vision if you prefer, was to show him that if God said Gentiles were clean, then they were clean and Peter the Jew could associate with them.

At 1:12:58 Ivor starts to expound on the biology of unclean animals. He says, "One of the reasons animals were considered unclean in the Old Testament, is because they ate other animals." Then Ivor starts to read from Acts 15:28-29.

“For it seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things; That ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication: from which if ye keep yourselves, ye shall do well. Fare ye well.” Acts 15:28-29 from the KJV.

Ivor wants to know why the Gentiles weren't allowed to eat blood or things strangled. He says, “This, by the way, comes from the Old Testament Levitical law, which said do not eat the blood of an animal, because eh, it is unclean to you; it is the life of the flesh is in the blood eating is an abomination to the Lord and number two, don't eat things strangled. Now what does not eating things strangled mean? Not eating things strangled simply means something that died of itself.” Here is where Ivor demonstrates that he doesn't understand the Levitical law, he doesn't understand English and, despite his alleged proficiency in Greek and Hebrew, he doesn't understand them either. There was a chat going on during this discussion and I posted a comment to the effect that “strangled” doesn't mean something that died of itself. I know Ivor saw the comment because he discussed it briefly, poo poed it, and after a time banned me from making further comments. This is good evidence of a blowhard that wishes to twist the Scriptures for a personal agenda and is not willing to consider any contrary evidence however well documented. Here is the definition of “strangle” from a couple of well respected ENGLISH dictionaries.

“1 a : to compress the windpipe of until death results from stoppage of respiration : choke to death by compressing the throat with or as if with a hand or rope : THROTTLE b “ to interfere with or obstruct seriously or fatally the normal breathing of <the bone wedged in his throat and strangled him> <the tear gas strangled the convicts> 2 a : to hinder the growth of (an organism) : deny a vital necessity (as air, water or food) to : choke off or out b : to suppress, hinder, or halt the rise, expression, or development by extreme restrictions or stringency <expression of biological needs is strangled by social pressure —Abram Kardiner> <the states ~ local initiative —T.C. Desmond> <strangling her trade would neither cause immediate hardship...nor stop an army —John Sparkman> c : to check free utterance of <a strangled gasp of anguish —O.E.Rölvaag> ~ vi 1 : to become strangled : undergo an esp. severe interference of breathing <she chokes very easily, and sometimes~s—Grace Reiten> 2 : to die from or as if from interference with breathing <several prisoners in the hold strangled> syn see SUFFOCATE” From Webster's Third New International Dictionary (unabridged).

“1. To choke ; to suffocate ; to destroy life by stopping respiration. Our Saxon ancestors compelled the adulteress to strangle herself. Ayliffe. 2. To suppress ; to hinder from birth or appearance. Shak.” From Noah Webster's 1828 American Dictionary of the English Language.

Do you see anything in the English definition of “strangle” that can be taken to mean an animal “died of itself?” Animals usually don't end up dead because they strangled themselves. As will be seen, Ivor has no clue what “strangle” means in Acts 15. Ivor wants the Bible to say the

Gentiles were bound by the Levitical law that described unclean foods but the Bible doesn't say that; not even the Protestant Bible.

At 1:14:58 Ivor asks, "Based upon this, can we here clearly see, that the Gentiles were bound to this law that described unclean food?" The answer is no.

Something useful to know is that "strangle" appears nowhere in the real Bible and "strangled" only occurs in only four verses.

"The lion did tear in pieces enough for his whelps, and strangled for his lionesses, and filled his holes with prey, and his dens with ravin." Nahum 2:12 from the KJV.

"But that we write unto them, that they abstain for pollutions of idols, and from fornication, and from things strangled, and from blood." Acts 15:20 from the KJV.

"That ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication: from which if ye keep yourselves, ye shall do well. Fare ye well." Acts 15:29 from the KJV.

"As touching the Gentiles which believe, we have written and concluded that they observe no such thing, save only that the keep themselves from things offered to idols, and from blood, and from strangled, and from fornication." Acts 21:25.

Nowhere in the Bible is "strangled" in any way linked to things dying of themselves or being torn by animals except in Nahum where says a male lion tore meat for his offspring and strangled things for his lioness. It is true that the Israelites were prohibited from eating things torn by beasts but not every animal that has been "torn of beasts" has been strangled.

At 1:15:32 Ivor says, "One of the reasons, why God says, do not eat unclean animals, is because unclean animals, ate dead animals." I would ask, if they ate live animals, would they then be clean? Snakes eat live animals. Iguanas and some turtles are vegetarians and never eat dead animals. Does that mean they should be clean? If you've ever had chickens, you will know that chickens eat various unclean things like bugs. Should chickens be considered unclean for that reason? Fish that are called in the common vernacular "suckers" have fins and scales so would be clean under the Levitical code and yet are bottom feeders and eat various abominable things including dead stuff. Was God wrong in not singling out suckers as an unclean fish? I once caught a large black drum on a dead shrimp which proves that species will eat dead things. The black drum has fins and scales. Does the fact that it ate a dead shrimp have anything to do with whether it's clean or not?

Dwayne Lemon pipes up and tries to make a distinction, which is meaningless, between an animal being "unclean to you" versus being unclean to another animal of the same species.



Starting a little before 1:24:00 you can see my first post in the chat which said, “Gentlemen you need to check some of the words you’re discussing in an ENGLISH dictionary. “Strangled” does NOT mean torn of beasts, died of itself, or found dead.”

Around 1:24:44 I posted, “Big clean fish also eat dead things.”

Around 1:25:36 I posted, “A chicken is thought to be clean. If you have ever had chickens, should should know chicken will eat unclean things.” Yes, I’m embarrassed; I did by mistake put should twice in there.

At 1:25:46 Ivor indicates “someone” (that would be me) posted something about strangled not meaning something that died of itself. His advice was to “check some commentaries” and it would be seen that “the word strangled refers to a a an animal that was not killed correctly or that died of itself or was torn by other beasts.”

Lance tries to help and says faithful Jews and Muslims won’t eat meat that isn’t prepared properly. What do you know? Lance is right. The whole issue of strangled centers around eating blood. Jews and Muslims, if they are going to follow longstanding tradition, kill the animals by a cut across the throat and the animal bleeds to death thereby pumping out as much blood from the body as possible before it dies. My wife’s grandmother, long before I knew my wife, cut the head off chickens and then hung them upside down on a clothesline to drain all the blood from them. When an animal is strangled, dies of itself or is torn of beasts, it dies before blood can be effectively removed from it. The WHOLE ISSUE of not eating things strangled in Acts is because strangled meat still has blood in it that you cannot remove. The issue IS NOT about clean and unclean animals IT IS ONLY about consuming blood. Let that sink in. This is a good time to go back to Genesis.

“Every moving thing that liveth shall be meat for you; even as the green herb have I given you all things. But the flesh with the life thereof, which is the blood, thereof, shall ye not eat.” Genesis 9:3-4 from the KJV.

Read that a couple of times if you have to. It says the life is the blood and it says not to eat “the flesh with the life thereof.” That means you are not supposed to eat meat unless all possible blood has been drained from it otherwise you are eating the flesh with the life (also called blood) still in it.

Let’s put the “strangled” thing to rest from another authoritative source. This is from Strong’s Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible. First is the Hebrew word for “strangle” which is found in one place in the Old Testament. That is followed by the meaning of Greek word translated as “strangled” in Acts.

“khaw-nak’; a prim root [comp. 2595]; to be narrow; by impl. To throttle, or (reflex) to choke oneself to death (by a rope):-hang self, strangle.”

“pnik-tos’; from 4155; throttled, i.e. (neut. concr.) an animal choked to death (not bled):-strangled.”

Around 1:31:50 I posted again. It says, "Sorry, look in an ENGLISH dictionary. Strangled does NOT mean died of itself, torn of beasts, etc. Don't try to make the BIBLE say something it doesn't say."

Around 1:32:20 I posted, "If ya'll want to reference "commentaries" I can find things in commentaries you wouldn't like at all."

Around 1:33:25 "Nirky" responded to me saying, "I believe they are referring to the Hebrew word and how it is used in other scriptures." Nirky is wrong as you can see from the above quote from Strong's Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible. Unfortunately, I had now been banned and couldn't respond to Nirky.

Around 1:34:46 Lyla Whalen wrote, "MARTIN! Biblical meanings don't always have the same meaning in OUR DATA's it was BACK THEN" If that is true we can have no idea what God said.

At 1:36:52 Ivor begins to read from Romans 14:1-4, 10, 14-15.

"Him that is weak in the faith receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations. For one believeth that he may eat all things: another, who is weak, eateth herbs. Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not; and let not him which eateth not judge him that eateth: for God hath received him. Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth. Yea, he shall be holden up: for God is able to make him stand. But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou sat at nought thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ. I know, and am persuaded by the Lord Jesus, that there is nothing unclean of itself: but to him that esteemeth any thing to be unclean, to him it is unclean. But if thy brother be grieved with thy meat, now walkest thou not charitably. Destroy not him with thy meat, for whom Christ died." Romans 14:1-4, 10, 14-15 from the KJV.

Ivor believes that 1 Corinthians 8 says why someone would be grieved with someone else's meat.

"Now as touching things offered unto idols, we know that we all have knowledge. Knowledge puffeth up, but charity edifieth. And if any man think that he knoweth any thing, he knoweth nothing yet as he ought to know. But if any man love God, the same is known of him. As concerning therefore the eating of those things that are offered in sacrifice unto idols, we know that an idol is nothing in the world, and that there is none other God but one. For though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or in earth, ((as there be gods many, and lords many,) but to us there is but one God, the Father; of who are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him. Howbeit there is not in every man that knowledge: for some with conscience of the idol unto this hour eat it as a thing offered unto an idol; and their conscience being

weak is defiled. But meat commendeth us not to God: for neither, if we eat, are we the better; neither, if we eat not, are we the worse. But take heed lest by any means this liberty of yours become a stumblingblock to them that are weak. For if any man see thee which hast knowledge sit at meat in the idol's temple, shall not the conscience of him which is weak be emboldened to eat, those things which are offered to idols; And through thy knowledge shall the weak brother perish, for whom Christ died? But when ye sin so against the brethren, and wound their weak conscience, ye sin against Christ. Wherefore, if meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to offend." 1 Corinthians 8:1-13.

Dwayne and Ivor believe that both passages are discussing food offered to idols. I can't see how either passage, even if they are both about idols, has anything to do with what type of flesh food Gentiles were permitted to eat.

At this point I would like to make one thing perfectly clear. I have been an ovo-lacto vegetarian for over 50 years and fully endorse the Seventh-day Adventist health message as given by inspiration to Ellen G. White. While a discussion of clean and unclean foods is appropriate for Seventh-day Adventists, the only support for the teaching that the Levitical code regarding clean and unclean foods is still in effect, comes from the Spirit of Prophecy. Exactly ZERO of the passages quoted prove that people are required to follow the Levitical code for eating today. If you wish to recruit the Spirit of Prophecy to support the vegetarian life style, you will find it's not just the meat. For starters you should read *The Ministry of Healing* and other books through from cover to cover and follow through on such items as spices, butter, etc.

At 1:47:16 Dwayne says, "It's irresponsible and kind of reckless to take these little passages whether Colossians or Corinthians or Romans or Timothy and to then try to make um mean something they not mean." Too bad they didn't consider this in the discussion of the Genesis passages and the word "strangled."

Around 1:50:24 Ivor starts to discuss 1 Corinthians 10.

"If any of them that believe not bid you to a feast, and ye be disposed to go; whatsoever is set before you, eat, asking no question for conscience sake. But if any man say unto you, This is offered in sacrifice unto idols, eat not for his sake that shewed it, and for conscience sake: for the earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof. Conscience, I say, not thine own, but of the other: for why is my liberty judged of another man's conscience? For if I by grace be a partaker, why am I evil spoken of for that for which I give thanks? Whether therefore ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God. Give none offence, neither to the Jews, nor to the Gentiles, nor to the church of God: Even as I please all men in all things, not seeking mine own profit, but the profit of many, that they may be saved." 1 Corinthians 10:27-32.

According to Ivor, whether or not they could eat pig was never a debate in the New Testament. That is true. In the New Testament there is no record of a debate regarding whether Gentiles

could eat pig but remember that the ONLY dietary prohibition laid on the Gentiles was that they couldn't eat things offered to idols, they couldn't eat blood and they couldn't eat things strangled. As noted previously, the prohibition on eating things strangled was because the blood can't be effectively removed from things strangled and that had nothing to do with whether the animal was a pig or a cow.

According to Ivor at 1:51:40, in the New Testament, "the debate was always shss, can we eat this food that has been dedicated to idols, or idols, or not?" Allegedly "you will not find any issue where the Jews accused the Gentiles of eating unclean foods." Really??? You can go up above and review all three places in the New Testament where the dietary practices of the Gentiles were discussed and it says the ONLY three things they were required to comply with in dietary lines were not eating things offered to idols, not eating things strangled and not eating blood. There clearly WAS a discussion about the dietary practices of the Gentiles and if Ivor thinks none of the Gentiles had been used to eating pig, he is also in La La Land.

At 1:53:09 Lance starts to discuss 1 Timothy 4:4.

"For every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving." 1 Timothy 4:4 from the KJV.

Lance thinks James 1 will help in understanding this.

"Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth, that we should be a kind of firstfruits of his creatures." James 1:18.

Lance believes this verse shows humans, even though they are called "creatures," could mistakenly be taken to mean humans could be eaten if we believe "every creature of God is good" to be eaten. This is despite the fact God said in Genesis not to murder and said the same thing in Exodus. No person of reasonable intelligence would think that nor would anyone not wishing to twist the Scriptures come to the conclusion that that's what James meant. Let's just tell it like it is; Lance is finding fault with what Paul said. Lance and Ivor would be much happier if God had said not to eat pig in the New Testament but God, apparently ignoring their desire, didn't do that. God actually let Paul say, "every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving."

At 1:55:27 Dwayne says, "I think, ah, the Lord was glorified, it was very Christ centered and really helping us really get down to the issue. And one thing I'm especially grateful for is how it was made very clear it's not the articles of food, tha, that's not the focus. You know. But it's really about the condition of the heart and from the condition of the heart it's producing these actions by which we are violating the very things God told us not to do and otherwise. That was very good and I think we need to build on that next week."

The floor opened for questions.

The first question was from ALPHA MATTER who asked, "I'm Having a hard time giving up meat and fish. Is there a way to transition to this thing?"

According to Ivor, clean flesh foods are permissible. There is nothing in the New Testament that says that unclean foods per Levitical law aren't permissible. If the early church wished to say unclean foods weren't permissible, Acts would have been a good place to include that along with the stuff about not eating blood, things strangled or things offered to idols. You have to use the Spirit of Prophecy and the Old Testament to support that teaching and if you believe and practice what the Spirit of Prophecy says, you shouldn't be eating any flesh food at all.

Here is an inspired statement from Ellen G. White written to brother and sister "A" in 1858 nearly five years before the great vision that dealt with health.

"I saw that your views concerning swine's flesh would prove no injury if you have them to yourselves; but in your judgment and opinion you have made this question a test, and your actions have plainly shown your faith in this matter. If God requires his people to abstain from swine's flesh, He will convict them on the matter." *Testimony for the Church* pages 206 to 207.

At 2:00:50 the question discussed is from George Hines Jr. and is, "Are Christians able to eat shrimp and crab." The questioner was told that would be discussed in more detail next week but that God didn't want Christians to eat shrimp or crab.

I won't be watching.

[SatanIsDead.com](http://SatanIsDead.com)

[InfallibleBible.com](http://InfallibleBible.com)

[DeathConfusion.com](http://DeathConfusion.com)

[AdventistsToday.com](http://AdventistsToday.com)

[SabbathSchoolGuide.com](http://SabbathSchoolGuide.com)