

TEXT OF THE ADDRESS DELIVERED BY DR. HERMANN L. HOEH AT  
 AMBASSADOR COLLEGE, BIG SANDY TEXAS CAMPUS, MAR. 17, 1977

\*! Two years ago this month I had the privilege of addressing the Assembly of the Big Sandy campus of Ambassador College. At that time I challenged you to investigate the issues that stood in the way of a proper synthesis of science, history and biblical studies on the nature and purpose of man. By the evening of that day a number of your faculty and students had participated in a series of discussions with me. A breakthrough was apparent. And now, two years later, I want to summarize for you both the causes of our past dilemma and the simple solutions.

Our concerns involved the nature and the meaning of the geological record. The validity of archaeological evidence and the implications of written history. The accuracy of Carbon-14 dating and the biblical time frame. And above all, the search for Adam in earth's history, and the implications for today.

I presume that you, as college faculty and students, and by your biblical interests, are concerned with the philosophical contradictions with which we have too long lived. Since the Great God is the Creator of the universe and the Author of the revelation we call the Holy Bible, is there any need for us not to be able to understand both the record of earth history and of man upon it and the record of human experience as recorded in the Bible? Should not a Christian chemist, for example, be able to be both a Christian and a chemist without daily facing unsettling philosophical contradictions? Of course! Then why not a Christian chemist who studies carbon-14? Or a Christian physicist who studies the broader fields of radiometric dating? Did not one God create the laws operating in nature and the laws of the Bible? Ought we not test both -- and examine them and utilize them for our good?

Why, then, has it seemed that there must be insoluble contradictions between Bible, science and history? It is not probable that the difficulties lie in our preconceptions? Our world is full of preconceptions -- approaches to life we take for granted. They may be evolutionary preconceptions and they may also be religious preconceptions. I propose today that we examine our preconceptions. We long ago examined the summary assumptions of evolutionary science. We must now examine the assumptions we inherited from creationists.

The Church of God, which founded Ambassador College, is creationist in its theology. That is, we have proved that evolution is not a proven fact. That it is the religion of secular science. But at the same time we must recognize that the Church of God had no scientific creationism. In the early decades of this century, the \*! argument over creation and evolution obscured the fact that creationism was wholly negative. It was opposed to evolution. What was needed was a positive creationism -- a scientific creationism that not only demonstrated the fundamental weaknesses of evolution, but also positively explained the world we live in. Creationists have as a found little difficulty in explaining the contemporary world. It is in the area of earth history that creationists have stumbled. And it is because the world of religion has been unable to shake off its preconceptions about the Bible record of creation and human history, that we have no solution in the world of Creationists.

Craig White

There are as many schools of thought among creationists as there are among evolutionists. Through Chancellor Herbert W. Armstrong, the creationist studies of the Church of God and of Ambassador College have recognized as a Biblical revelation that the earth has an extensive history before the account of creation week in Genesis 1. That is, a world existed before Adam. This was initially summarized in the Chancellor's article "Did God Create a Devil?" More recent articles in The Plain Truth have expounded upon the Biblical implications of the world before Adam.

But in saying we found the biblical evidence for that world, we are not saying the key to the physical evidence was equally apparent. We must remember that our studies of the physical evidence ~~was~~ not derived from any continuous tradition in the Church of God. Our studies of geology, for example, were based on the books of George McCready Price, a Seventh Day Adventist geologist. I had the privilege of listening to a lecture of Mr. Price and of talking to him at lunch. He warned us in his lecture <sup>at A</sup> always to maintain two compartments in our minds -- one for theories and the other for established fact. And never to confuse the two. Price was an observant geologist, working alone in a field dominated by evolutionary theory. But he saw the physical evidence through a preconceived religious conviction that there was no world before Adam. He did not understand Genesis 1:2 (and parallel verses). He assumed the earth was recent, somewhere in the range of six or seven thousand years old. He was forced both to interpret and to describe what he saw in terms of his preconception which was of the nature of a religious conviction. He assumed the entire geological record must in some way fit the account of the Flood of Noah and the immediate post-Flood world. When we studied Price's books we saw the flaws in his interpretation. We did not see clearly the flaws in his description of the geological evidence. For years we took for granted the validity of his geology and upon it attempted to build up a picture of the world prior to Adam and the world since Adam. ~~One~~ of the most prominent catastrophes in the geological record occurred at the close of the Mesozoic, at the time of the great dying of the dinosaurs (then viewed as reptiles, cold-blooded creatures). It was left to me to try to reconcile the remainder of the geologic record with the Bible and history.

#4  
#5  
We chase the explanation of Genesis 1:2 onl

I cooperated with Mr. Kenneth C. Herrmann of the geology department at the Pasadena campus of Ambassador College. Neither of us were able to produce a model of the geological record what would accomodate the laws of science, the Biblical account and the apparent record of history. We have worked on the problem for a quarter century, never despairing. In the meantime, shortly after the founding of Ambassador College, Immanuel Velikovsky proposed a revolutionary model of earth history commencing with the exodus of Israel under Moses from Egypt. It greatly relieved the pressure of history which seemed to compact the whole of geology since the Mesozoic in an unaccountably short time. I drafted volume I of the Compendium on the basic proposals of Velikovsky.

#6  
In the meantime Dr. Willard Libby of the University of California at Los Angeles developed the method of radiocarbon dating. It seemed to defend some areas of history as traditionally interpreted. In other areas it did not. As with all creationists, to my know-

ledge, we adopted the assumption that radiocarbon activity in the pre-Flood world must have been much different and much less than the present activity rate. We could apparently justify making a model of the Adamic world that could include all the evidence since the Mesozoic. But subconsciously it did seem like stretching the evidence -- or I should say compacting the evidence. Neither Mr. Kenneth Herrmann nor I were satisfied that the evidence and placement of the Tertiary and Pleistocene had been correctly placed. For a time there seemed to be no alternatives. And, after all, many radiocarbon dates for the Old Kingdom of Egypt were apparently too young for historians (one point in our favor) and (a second point) geologists were themselves debating a new catastrophic model of plate tectonics, which is now dominant in geologic thinking in the Western world.

#7 Then, beginning with the International Geophysical Year on July 1, 1957 - December 31, 1958 (when 30,000 scientists from 70 nations cooperated in a worldwide program of geophysical research), a whole series of discoveries commenced. The Leakey family in Kenya uncovered in the Lower Pleistocene evidence of tools and the genus homo. The sea floors were disclosing a dramatic story hitherto unknown to science. The resulting picture seemed to lend support to aspects of our models of earth history from a creationist point of view. We attempted to explain away varve dating as not annual. But radiocarbon dating in the more recent periods proved our proposal untenable. Elsewhere, other methods #8 of radioactive dating were indicating that the Tertiary and the Pleistocene were much older than the time of Adam. No Christian physicist could deny the facts, without also denying his senses. Further, our students -- Robert Macdonald III and Richard Burky -- had examined Prices' interpretation of the geological evidence and found him to be in error even in his physical description of strata in Colorado, Arizona, Wyoming, and Utah.

We laid aside our models for geology. We had to acknowledge that the preconceived views of creationist geologists -- Price, and Whitcomb and Morris (authors of The Genesis Flood) -- which we had inherited from our early studies were totally unfounded.

#9 So it was that in the first two months of 1976 I addressed a series of letters to those of us studying in the area of geology and archaeology. I proposed my old view (with minor adjustments) that the historic evidence and the archaeological discoveries pointed clearly to a break at the close of the Ubaid culture in southern Mesopotamia for the Flood of Noah. Comparable evidence could also be marshalled from around the world (not from the field of geology, but archaeology and soil studies). I also # suggested that we ought to look for an earlier break somewhere in the range of Pre-pottery A/B in Palestine and comparable areas worldwide. There was one primary difficulty I noted in these letters. There was no correspondence between radiocarbon dating and either the Hebrew or the Septuagint Bible.

I should draw to your attention that by this time we had already proposed that the term homo sapiens sapiens needed reconsideration. We once took for granted the idea that anything labeled homo must certainly fit in the range of man of the family of Adam. This is not true. Homo habilis and homo erectus were not part of

the family of Adam, as described in the Bible. Further homo neanderthalensis was not a member of the family of Adam. Though there were artifacts associated with all these forms of homo (the Oldowan artifacts uncovered by the Leakeys pertain to homo habilis; the Acheulean to homo erectus; the middle paleolithic to homo neanderthalensis), none of these creatures or hominids give any evidence of the knowledge and experience of art. And remember, a Christian physicist, utilizing the laws of radioactive decay, is able to determine (within reasonable approximations) both the general time these creatures lived and the duration of their cultures. The time spans range from many hundreds of thousands of years to many tens of thousands of years. The evidence of the laws of physics thus proves impossible the identification of the "giants" or nebulim with homo neanderthalensis. Further, I have to come to the conclusion that so-called Cro-Magnon Man is not true man of the family of Adam. His culture is upper paleolithic, a hunting-gathering culture solely. Though art appears, it is defined as "magic" in its purpose. No agriculture occurred during this entire period of upwards of 20,000 years during the Pleistocene. This conclusion once and for all places the period of the Ice Ages as pre-Adamic.

How, then, did these hominids differ from true man of the family of Adam? The intellect of man is associated with the spirit in man. It is the spirit in man, characteristic of the family of Adam, that was not perviously in any physical creature on earth. Without the spirit there existed no possibility of reaching the planets of our solar system in a mere 6000 years. The purpose for hunting-gathering hominids should be seen in a totally new perspective. Prior to Adam, the world was subject to angels. They were placed on earth as their training ground. Were angels here solely to watch over rocks, and vegetation and brute animals? Hardly. The real development of their skills and character could best be tested by being able to work with creatures only partially governed by instinct -- as, for example, homo habilis. Once we know the Biblical account and purpose for angels, it is not difficult to understand the sudden appearance of varieties of pithecanes and hominids. It is not a matter of biological evolution, but of the creation of greater physical challenges for the angelic world. The angels were being tested on earth to see whether they would maintain the principles of the government of God in running an ever more complex world. They did not all maintain their loyalty to that government. They, it would seem, are chargeable for the fact that the first forms of art are perverted in usage. Upper paleolithic art is not sensible art; it is magic, bidden in caves, with one work of art drawn over another. Their mentality was #11 altogether different from humans. *4,000 years of the*

This stage of our study still left us with one fundamental dilemma. Should the succeeding mesolithic and neolithic cultures in the Middle East be considered at the close of the pre-Adamic world or the earliest period of the Adamic world? I first proposed the latter explanation in my letters of a year ago. For I had placed the Flood at the close of the Ubaid culture (it is named after the site of Ubaid where first found in southern Mesopotamia), and in so doing it would have been logical to include mesolithic and neolithic cultures in the pre-Flood world of Adam's family. Only one problem. The evidence of radio metric dating, particularly carbon-14, and varve dating could not be reconciled with the biblical evidence of time, whether you take the Septuagint or the Hebrew text.

With this dilemma still unresolved, I stopped my letters to Messrs Herrmann and Patton (of our Behavioral Studies department). Now I must explain another matter pertaining to history before I give you the solution. When I first began an in-depth study of history, I found it confused by evolutionary thinking. Every possible biblical parallel was discounted or treated as myth. The theme seemed to be "history versus the Bible." At the time it seemed imperative that all history must be post-Flood since so much of geology had to be fitted into our model of the post-angelic or the Adamic world. When I read in Mesopotamian literature of the Flood and the lowering of kingship from heaven to men, it was natural to associate all accounts of the Flood with that of Noah. Further, the Bible speaks of the walls of Jericho collapsing before Joshua. These walls, as a result of Garstang's excavations in the 1930's, were first assigned to the late Bronze. But by #12 the time we studied the subject, Miss Kathleen Kenyon had proved that the walls discussed by Garstang fell at the close of the Early Bronze age. Consequently I was forced to draw the conclusion that the Early Bronze of Palestine and the parallel culture of the Old Kingdom in Egypt were between the Flood and the Exodus. Furthermore, at that time many radiocarbon datings of the Old Kingdom in Egypt were falling in the 24th to the 20th centuries. These dates were impossibly young for traditional Egyptian history. An article by a graduate of Ambassador College -- Ronald D. Long -- appeared in the Creation Research Society Quarterly of June 1973 pointing out this problem for historians. It was also in the year 1973 that Colin Renfrew of England issued his masterful work titled Before Civilization/ The Radiocarbon Revolution and Pre-historic Europe? How archaeological history has been pushed backward in time by the recent drastic revision of radiocarbon dates....

#14. Do read the subtitle. It was an evaluation of bristlecone pine dating on radio carbon dates. Whereas we had been pushing history forward to accomodate geology into the experience of man, the evidence of God's very own forest in the White mountains of California was indicating that prior to the time of Alexander the Great the level of radioactivity had been greater instead of less. Few creationists have been willing to face this important fact of science. We cannot continue rejecting the evidence of radioactivity as corrected by the bristlecone pine curve. Something was clearly wrong with my understanding of history as laid out in Volume I of the Compendium of World History. The evidence of science had clearly indicated that Early Bronze was not post-Flood in Palestine and the Near East. In the summer of 1976 an article appeared in the journal of the Society for Interdisciplinary Studies. It was devoted to a critique of the book The Exodus Problem by Courville, a Seventh Day Adventist from Loma Linda, California, who took the same view I did -- that the Old Kingdom and the Middle Kingdom of Egypt were contemporary and parallel with the Early Bronze of Palestine. The article demonstrated that the walls that fell at the close of the Early Bronze at Jericho could not have fallen in Joshua's time, because there was a major civilization at Jericho during the succeeding Middle Bronze period. Whereas the Bible had recorded that Jericho would not be rebuilt until a much later period (see Joshua 6:26 and 1 Kings 16:34). The #1

author is undoubtedly correct. My reconstruction was wrong. Jericho during the Judges was at most a military guard station during the judges (II Samuel 10:5). Furthermore, the Bible records that Joshua burned Hazor. As I used to tell my students, when the Early Bronze levels of Hazor are uncovered, there will be a massive ash layer. They have been uncovered. But Joshua 11:13, which records the burning of Hazor, is not fulfilled at the end of Early Bronze. Rather, Hazor was massively burned at the end of Middle Bronze, as also was Jericho. And the walls of Middle Bronze Jericho were the walls of Joshua's time. The walls of Early Bronze Jericho were the walls of the latest pre-Flood city. Further, we had concluded that the civilization of the Canaanites at Ai ceased at the end of Early Bronze, because the site then became utterly uninhabited. And since Joshua made of Ai a heap (Joshua 8) it must have been at the end of Early Bronze. I was now forced to reread an article in the Westminster Theological Journal (Vol. xxxiii, Nov. 1970) titled Location of Biblical Bethel and Ai Reconsidered. In my estimation author David Livingston has clearly demonstrated that the site now labeled Ai is not the true Ai, which lies as yet unexcavated in the vicinity. Thus the three fundamental proofs I had established -- of Jericho, Hazor and Ai -- were in error. The dating of the historians was, in point of fact, reasonable. And because they never thought to look for the evidence of Joshua's conquest at the end of Middle Bronze, I never focused my attention on that period of time. (Most theologians have completely rejecting the time frame and/or historicity of Joshua and are looking for possible evidence much later -- at the close of Late Bronze).

What we have now been forced to face is the fact that the broad outline of history for this period is correct for the Middle East, except for the fact that the Bible has been deliberately left out of the account. The historians have completely overlooked the evidence of population decline between Early Bronze and Middle Bronze. I have assumed this heretofore was the period of Joshua's conquest. It was instead the period of the Flood. And the period at which I placed the Flood was in fact that of creation week of Genesis 1. So we are now able to conclude that the Mesolithic and Neolithic that existed in the Middle East following the Upper Paleolithic was also pre-Adamic. It was the time of incipient agriculture and villages. There were not true cities at this period nor the concept of townships. (See Abdul Jalil Jawad's The Advent of the Era of Townships in Northern Mesopotamia.) It is also now clear that there was writing in the pre-Flood world in Egypt and southern Mesopotamia. And at least a few languages and dialects from the time God separated the sons of Adam (Deuteronomy 32:8). Genesis 11 should be seen not merely as a contrast to the massive number of languages that followed Babel, but in contrast to the previous world wiped out by the Flood, in which God separated the family of Cain and other branches, and had given whatever languages were necessary to keep them apart.

We are now also forced to reject Immanuel Valikovsky's reconstruction of the Hyksos and Empire periods of Egypt. Evidence from the genealogy of priests at Memphis exists, which now makes it possible to accept the 18th Dynasty of the Tutmoses as beginning parallel with Exodus 1:8, which is the approximate date normally assigned by historians. Their primary error was in leaving out the Bible record. So it is now possible to reconcile Bible, history and C-14 with a totally new view of the kind of world angels were asked to govern. #

(The preceding was the prepared text, the following was the asides)

1. The subject, as I have written it here, deals with the question of the reconciliation of various disciplines--in particular: Biblical studies, history, archaeology, and geology. Now in a sense I do not propose to be an authority in any one of them, though I have an on-going interest in all of them and have taught materials in two particular areas. On this basis, however, we ought to ask ourselves whether in this century we should be able again to do what was done before the explosion of science, and that is to be able to take a look at these various disciplines and to ask ourselves whether or not there needs to be the kind of conflict that we have wrestled with and assumed for a long time. So I shall begin now with the material I have written and leave it to the discretion of those faculty members who asked me to be here to decide whether any copies could be made available to some few of you who would have a lasting interest or concern in the matter.
- 1-8.5" 2. (which we may define as that period of the history of the Church of God, Seventh Day)
- 4-1" 3. I will break off for the moment and comment on the fact that there is a Creationist College and individuals in this field in San Diego, California. It is very interesting that the bulk of the efforts have been properly devoted to biology, to some aspects of astronomy, to the series of attempts that we are familiar with in Geology. And having attempted to explain the Bible in terms of traditional creationist geology, they have been unable to prepare anything that is sound history. I will explain why this problem exists later.
- 2-3" 4. It is one thing, in other words, to define what the Bible says. It is another thing to expound what must have paralleled that world in terms of material evidence that the Bible does not speak about, but that is left to investigative sciences.
- 2-3.1" 5. There was no positive scientific creationism in any of the literature of the Church of God Seventh Day of the last century and into this. Nor did we derive our premises from any of their literature.
- 2-9.5" 6. I will interject and say at this point, neither Mr. Herrmann nor I over the years have remained static in our views and we have, of course, worked with others intermittently. We have always had that kind of rapore that we could analyze the weaknesses and the restraints of possibilities. I think because of that it is possible to come to a solution, which in a sense should have become more obvious long ago.
- 3-3" 7. So we may say that in the 1950's there was the radiocarbon revolution and the revolution of a whole new view of cause and effect in geology which opened the way for the possibilities for catastrophism and the possibility of assuming that the radio-active rate must be interpreted on the basis of a model that should conform to the Bible, which in fact represented a preconception theologically as to what we expected. That is, we made the assumption at that time that all artifacts, (I will discuss this later) must represent the presence of man and since artifacts exist in the geological sequence long before there is any radio-carbon that can be measured we had to assume that indeed there was this decline to zero of any radio-carbon activity or there could be no harmony with the record of science and the Bible.

- 3-5" 8. For there was an obvious agreement between radio-carbon dating and the varves. Varves are those deposits formed in Scandinavia where the glacier left visible deposits in clay and silt in summer from those in winter. And by evaluating the whole area of Sweden and Finland, McCready did propose a model going back linking up with the Pleistocene. We necessarily had to come to grips and reject it or any model that any creationist had proposed, and we ourselves concluded that it would have been untenable. But radio-carbon, as far as the last 2000 years where we can test the radio-carbon against the written record of the Roman and the post-Roman world was in agreement with the annual presentation of varves on the basis of artifacts associated with those deposits.
- 3-7" 9. I might say I had a chance to talk to Mr. Whitcomb and have heard both him and Morris. I think Dr. Morris is a very responsible hydrologist who is not a geologist. I think that Mr. Whitcomb is a theologian who made a very grave mistake, for, having once understood Gen. 1:2, he rejected it on the premise that the great majority of creationists who would support any adventures in the field, also reject Gen. 1:2 and its parallel verses.
- 3-23" 10. This evidence necessarily, since we are dealing now with sites in the realm of archaeology, did not come from the field of geology. Rather, from the area of soil studies and archaeology. Or, what we may have already come to see as of a year ago and more--and that is the geological record as it is normally defined in terms of the hard substance of the surface of the earth, versus the soft surface normally related to soils that the ...(tape turned over)... If we are going to look for any evidence of the Flood itself, we must find it in the area of soil studies and archaeology and not in the depths of geology. And that is why all creationists up to this point have never been able to propose a satisfying model that would even begin to be recognized in the various disciplines of science.
- 4-23" 11. Now before I go further, I would only state that some of you might have seen, and if not some of you could ask others, the most remarkable study that was done and presented on television--training a chimpanzee to work with and respond to the needs of the computer and the needs of the man working. And one discovers the remarkable thing that a chimpanzee in its nature is very limited in its intellect, but its capacity is far greater, but still, with all its capacity to be able to utilize a computer under instruction, it has no grasp of the meaning of "why?" It only understands what it is doing and nothing more.
- 4-9.5" 12. At the end of the Ubaid we clearly have a total collapse of population in the Middle East. And there we have the basic record to work from because that ties in most directly with any written Biblical account.
- 5-33" 13. The terms "Bronze" and "Iron" age were originally derived from Denmark nearly two hundred years ago. Today we use them, but we really are referring to pottery sequences, because pottery or broken dishes do tend to reflect changes in trends and artistic designs and of thinking more than any other artifact.
- 5-25" 14. So at the very time we were proposing to bolster a post-Flood Early Bronze culture ending at the conquest of Palestine on the basis of radio-carbon evidence, Colin Renfrew finalized a most remarkable presentation, pointing up that radio-carbon dates that for historians seemed so young, in fact must be pushed back in time on the basis of the revolutionary effect of Bristlecone Pine tree evaluation, and a number of us, including myself, have had a chance to visit the laboratory in Arizona.



5-9.3" 15. which was the only way to reconcile it in our estimation. One, I assumed, must be lower, the other upper Egypt.

16. They proposed, and I have to admit we did not face the facts, that after Early Bronze in the immediate succeeding period of Middle Bronze, there was a massive building of Jericho at the end of which another set of walls fell that none of us had ever focused upon. Now Joshua 6:26 records a curse on any who would rebuild it, which was fulfilled in I Kings 16:34 in the days after Israel and Judah split apart, when Heil the Bethelite built it and sacrificed two of his sons. This would clearly indicate the Middle Bronze Jericho, which would have fallen between the time of Joshua and the time of Solomon could not be that period, for there could not have been a building of Jericho at that time. It was to be rebuilt, and anybody who would, would be cursed by sacrificing his sons, and that was done centuries later. Therefore the conclusion we must come to is that Early Bronze was pre-Flood, Middle Bronze was the post-Flood culture to the Exodus, and Late Bronze is the culture of the period of the Judges, and of course its parallels around the world and the Iron Age is therefore that of the period of the Monarchies of Israel and Judah.

17. Not that theologians would accept it, because they don't accept Exo. 1:8 in its historical perspective. But if you read it for what it says and take what the historians have properly evaluated from the literature of the Egyptian period of the 18th Dynasty, we would draw the conclusion that indeed the 18th Dynasty of the Late Bronze and close of the Middle Bronze is the approximate period of the setting of the account of the Exodus. This means that the Pharaoh who had a daughter who adopted Moses was Amenophis I. Having no son, he was succeeded by his general Thutmose I, who had a son Thutmose II, who is the pharaoh who perished in the flood. And of all the Pharaoh's of this time, his is the only tomb incomplete--the only coffin unused--the only mummy never mummified and never found. And he was succeeded after the Exodus by Queen Hatshepsut. So it is now possible to say, with minor adjustments, as all historians and students of the Bible must do to correct any minor errors--it is possible to say that indeed the Biblical record has been demonstrated to be in conformity with the evidence of history (where historians, however, have left out those Biblical parallels--but there is nothing contradictory)--and in conformity with carbon 14 dating as evaluated by bristlecone pine.

\* (NOTE: Dr. Hoeh has since changed his thinking on the Pharaoh's of the Oppression and of the Exodus. See later sermons.)

numbers in margin are page and distance from top of page.

DR. HOEH SERMON IN APRIL, 1977 (paraphrased and shortened)

Mr. Armstrong in recent sermons has commented on that part played in history by spirits, which historians take no note of. The world before Genesis 1 is pictured in Isa. 14 and Ezek. 28, and a reference in Hebrews tells of a world to come that will not be subject to angels. There are a few scattered references in the Epistles and Revelation which tell of the Devil's rule. If the angels were put on earth for a purpose, what was that purpose as revealed by geology? In what sense were they expected to administer the government of God? What does it mean to be given the earth as an inheritance? How did they rule over nature and other angels? There are many points of view and much confusion in Theology, as well as evolutionary science. Some are near and some are far from the truth. We should analyze where the truth is of the world before Adam. Your background may be evolutionary; or it may be religious, or maybe neither. Most people know little about it either way, even though evolution is taught in the schools. Teachers have been as ineffective in teaching evolution as they used to be in teaching the Bible. The minds of the intellectual collegiate teachers are infected with evolutionary thinking, but most students are simply more interested in making a living. Evolutionists have differing concepts of origins. Some say God plays no role and never has. Some say God has played a role in nature but does not now. Some say God has played a role in the world and still is. They might be theistic evolutionists. Some view matter as eternal, others not. There are agnostics, there are atheists. Physical scientists may be religious or not. The world is full of differing ideas. There is not one basic theory or picture agreed upon by all. If there is one unifying concept, it might be that somehow evolution plays a role. Among creationists, there is the Lutheran/Baptist view versus the Seventh Day Adventist view. There are all types of theistic evolutionists. Some say all the universe and the world was created in 24-hour days, with the "beginning" of Gen. 1:1 just 6000 years ago. Others say there was a creation in advance of Creation Week, which was destroyed. Some say Satan sinned after Adam sinned (those who believe in no "pre-creation"). The most vocal of creationists are not pre-creationists. But many other religious and scientific-minded scholars DO believe in a world before Adam. The Jehovah's Witnesses believe it was much shorter than the billions of years assigned by natural scientists. But evolutionists have no agreement among themselves, just like the creationists. But the Church of God has had little to offer to settle the question either. A month ago I went to Big Sandy and discussed this with our faculty there. We have always said that the Bible and true science do not disagree, but we have heretofore been unable to demonstrate correctly just how they agree. For years, since the mid 60's, I did not allow to be presented in the Plain Truth any more an explanation of geology, or archaeology, in terms of the history of man and evolution, because there was no agreement among the science faculty of Ambassador College, nor among expert laymen in the Church. The Church of God has played no role in the evolution/creation controversy during the last century. It had nothing to say. The time has finally come to explain some things. Heretofore we were unable to assemble geology, archaeology, history, biology, the Bible and theology, into a coherent and defensible unit. We have never had men competent in all those areas at once. There are some competent in some areas and others in others. We failed to apply the recent understanding of the "spirit in man" to our anthropological difficulties. A creature which has not this spirit is not "man"--this we failed to think about. Mr. Armstrong was

*Craig White*

wise not to elaborate on the nature of the pre-Adamic world because the Church heretofore did not have a united opinion. It was not possible for our faculty, our ministers, or our laymen to come up with the truth before we understood what really constituted "man". Scientists have found artifacts (products of brain and hand, of design and not accident, in stone, or bone or wood or pottery) of two to three and a half million years old in Africa--not Mesopotamia. Some even think there are artifacts that may be tens of millions of years old, in the Tertiary deposits along the coast of California--long before the Ice Ages. Creationists generally used to automatically reject the scientist's time measures because they assumed all artifacts had to be made by descendants of Adam. God is both the author of science and the Bible and they do not contradict, yet our former explanations did cause the Bible to conflict with known science. Our theology was wrong. Mr. Armstrong learned from recent conspiracies that they do not take place in a day or a week--it takes years in which you put ideas into the minds of others. You gradually and slowly convince them--they don't change all at once. One man said it took him years to turn his wife's mind around, but now she says that if he ever turns back again, she won't. The Devil didn't organize the one third of angels overnight. The Bible gives no indication of how long ago "in the beginning" was, nor is it important. We see no reason though why it might not be billions of years ago. There is no scientific or Biblical basis for rejecting the scientifically determined age of the earth. We trust the laws of nature and God to be in agreement and constant. Just because the world is old does not mean we have to accept evolution--because they can't explain the gaps between life forms. They can explain small variations within life forms, but the unbridgable gaps require God's creation. There is not one missing link--there are thousands of them, and the atheistic evolutionist does not want to face it. When new forms appear, there may be no "predecessors" of remotely similar form, tho variations have occurred since, in the dog family for instance. Though there are wide divergencies in the appearance of dogs, they are all dogs. There is a bridgeless gap between them and the cat family. The age of the earth has never been a problem for the Church. It need not take a "position" on the question. The function of the Church is theological. The function of the scientist is in the physical realm. We used to get the two areas a bit confused. The theologian has no right to say how old the world is--he has only to say that it was prior to creation week. Based on how conspiracies are conducted, it was apparently a long time. We should listen to men who are knowledgable in their field and not to amateurs. The ministry should realize it's limitations and so speak and act accordingly. If science and the Bible are not mutually contradictory, then they have the right to exist in their respective fields. This is fundamental to our progress in the college and individually spiritually. This might apply to nutrition and agriculture. I have heard enough nutritional nonsense from the pulpits of this Church to know that it is not the function of the ministry to convey this knowledge. They have often been merely attacks on those who sought to do right, or on those who did wrong. The function of the ministry is to tell you it is your responsibility in the spiritual realm to do what the Bible says, and in the physical realm to do in accordance with the knowledge men can find out. Not much nutritional knowledge is contained in the Bible--little more than unclean meats which man could not discover for himself. The more information coming out in a field, the harder it is to keep up with it, and the more likely we may think the field

is going wrong. There are just as many changes in theology as in nutrition--notice recent changes in the Church. Keep your mind open in all these, and forget prejudices, and pay attention to advances in knowledge and understanding. A chemist can soon know the results of his experiments, but a theologian can "get away with" error much longer. Only in the Judgement may one know the full consequences. It is a lot easier to disprove false ideas in the physical realm than in the religious. The more complex the physical problem is, the longer the search for the truth. From discussing radiometric dating with Christian experts, we conclude there is no way to lay aside this evidence of the earth's antiquity, and the artifacts of pre-Adamic hominids. Our old model was wrong--the world of dinosaurs before Adam with Satan ruling, then the Adamic creation of mammals and man after his rebellion. This seemed reasonable at the time before the full impact of radiometric dating proved it all wrong. In the April "Scientific American" evidence is presented that the dinosaurs were warm blooded, but we formerly wanted to associate the angels with cold-blooded creatures, and the world of man with warm-blooded creatures. Tho rejecting this model opened a Pandora's Box of problems initially, it was a necessary step to the truth. Unlike most creationists, we know that the earth became without form and void because of the angel's rebellion, tho the earth was originally created to be inhabited long before. God sits at the throne and decides right and wrong, and the rebellious angels wanted to dethrone God so they would not have to pay the penalty when they did wrong. The Devil would like to have a world of competition, hate, strife, etc. without penalties. At creation week we can be sure we are dealing with the Sabbath, the seventh day of the week, and not any thousand-year period, so our understanding here remains valid. Also that it occurred about six thousand years ago is historically demonstrable. Now the problem is how to reconcile artifacts before Adam and the Biblical record. There is a continuous sequence of archaeological strata. We took for granted from the theologians that if there was an artifact, a human being made it. It has taken a few years to realize there was something wrong with our fundamental thinking, even after we rejected the old model. God created a fantastic and intricate variety of life. Some things were just a temporary creation in geologic history. God "experimented" with life, and with angels to see if they would do his will. He found out that He could not trust them, which is part of the message of the book of Job. In six days God has the power to recreate the world as we know it. But there is no need to assume He disigned it all suddenly. It was not much different from the immediatly preceding creation. Perhaps He just modified the creatures slightly. The major effort of creation was the planning and design of the whole thing (not the manufacture), which had been completed earlier than Creation Week. The Devil had lead us to believe that God was a master magician who said "poof" and there it all was. That is not the way it happened. In writing something, the study and planning takes much more time and effort than the writing itself, and the printing is the least. It is the same with God. And our human minds tend to work the same way made in the image of God, tho more slowly and more lowly. Jesus learned by the things He suffered, it says in Hebrews. Mr. Armstrong has always said there are things that God has learned. The reason Jesus is appointed to deal with mankind is because He knows what it is to live in the flesh, "tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin." He learned what it is like to see the universe from "inside the egg" instead of outside. Man is a soul, and is not an immortal soul. At first we wrongly concluded that there was no spiri

in man. Then in the early 60's we came to see there was a spirit in man that works with the physical brain. It alone makes us different from late pre-Adamic hominids. God said "let us make man in our image". This refers to more than physical looks. You can't press this point too far because of the races, and women also. "Image" therefore refers fundamentally to the powers of God's mind--with no upper limit to thinking in the physical world. (There are things in the spirit world that are not revealed to us) You can't "explain" much to an animal--you can train a few things to them. Chimpanzees can communicate thru a computer and sign language, and reason up to the level of about a 3½ year old human child, according to an article in "Science" magazine in March. That is their upper limit. We don't understand the interface between spirit and brain yet. Perhaps the "soul" of "body, soul, and spirit" is that interface. But this is not in the area of my thinking for the moment. Paul said animals were brute beasts, made to be taken and eaten. Now I respect vegetarians, whether they are in the church or not. Animals have no realization. We knew what man was, and that man was created by God, and that he had no immortal soul but had a spirit, but we could not figure out WHEN man appeared in the archaeological record. Mere skeletons can not tell, even if the skeletal remains indicate the hominid had a tongue that could speak--that does not mean it was a man. Scientists are bewildered at the varieties of hominids, and have difficulty deciding themselves whether it is "man". We invented the explanation that man made the artifacts and lived alongside the unintelligent "ape-men". We now realize that the oldest artifacts are two to three million years old, in Africa. It is scientifically impossible to reconcile this with the age of mankind from the Bible. Some say that nature lies, and was created with "apparent age" or an apparent past, but I don't think so. They say Adam was created a full-grown adult, so God created rings in the trees in the Garden of Eden, and they extend their reasoning to all the rest of creation. But the issue of apparent age is not really a factor because radiometric dating methods measure the acts AFTER creation (not the acts OF creation), such as the chrySTALLIZATION of volcanic rocks and the ingestion of c-14 by living things. Beyond the instincts of grasping and sucking in human infants, and self-preservation (a natural law), man has no instincts. The first man was told to dress and keep the Garden. He had the mentality at least of a gardner. His first sons, twins apparently, were a keeper of sheep and a farmer. This means rudimentary agriculture in the earliest human stage. Adam was not a hunter-gatherer. Cain built a village, only one generation removed from Creation, maybe 100 years after Creation. Man is therefore a communal being. Australopithecines were not. Leakey was right about Homo Erectus not being a man. The theologians are divided on the question. Leakey said "there is nothing there of psycho-social man". Man was made for a family, not a troupe, tho he lives in villages. Homo Erectus could walk and make tools, but made no progress for hundreds of thousands of years. Neanderthal man has been debated whether he was man. His speaking ability is questioned. He had no art or agriculture. However much they may look like man, without the spirit in man they are still brutes like an ape or monkey. Modern Man did not appear until agriculture in the Neolithic just 6000 years ago. Upper Paleolithic "Man" (Cro-Magnon) had a larger brain case and was more robust than modern man. When we thought he was man, we said modern man was a degenerate. He lived for a few tens of thousands of years but never developed any agriculture. From skeletal remains it is very difficult to distinguish him from Modern Man. Under the angels direct supervision, God was creating creatures that

were more and more able to be taught. Chimpanzees can be taught a simple computer language, yet in the wilds you would not recognize that kind of capacity. Mankind started out as gardeners and farmers, but some cultures have lost that knowledge thru degeneration. We can do anything any beast can do, and worse--worse because we know better, and they only do it because it is their nature. Upper Paleolithic hominids did not have races as we know them. He had a more robust structure and even larger brain capacity, but did not have agriculture, so should not really be called "man". Modern man is a refined and reduced Upper Paleolithic hominid. So far as we know, we don't have any fossil hominids alive today--they were all extincted before the Adamic creation. They made no fundamental progress for tens of thousands of years. They remained hunters and gatherers, like the animals, tho they made tools for hunting, unlike the animals. God has created one life form after another without evolution, unless you want to call the small changes in some varieties "evolution". Angels governed the weather as well as life. They apparently also sought to possess the animals. Remember the demons who entered the swine in Christ's day, and the angel who spoke to Balaam thru the donkey. Dr. C.P. Meredith once had to deal with a demon-possessed horse--that had more than "ordinary horse sense". Elephants gather their dead into graveyards, and other animals bury their dead, so it is no problem to our understanding if pre-Adamic hominids buried their dead. Animals even have an "emotional reaction" to a death in the family. Homo Erectus did not bury their dead. God may have intended that the angels teach the hominids things, as they were governed less by instinct than their predecessors. God instructed Adam how to skin an animal to make clothes, and to cook it for food. Some art appeared in Upper Paleolithic man, but apparently there was no exchange of information, so they made no progress in ten thousand years. Their art was "magic". The only way to explain it is thru demon possession. It just does not look like the art of true man. One on top of another, without perspective, in barely accessible areas. This was just before the final rebellion. They perverted creation rather than ruling it according to God's laws, and finally abandoned it. Long after the Pleistocene does agriculture finally come along with true man. If we had understood more of the role of the spirit in man we wouldn't have had such trouble reconciling science with the Bible. The Bible gives some information, and Science gives us some more. Some animals that survived the Pleistocene upheavals died out afterward. We thought it was because of Noah's flood, whereas in fact it was the flood of Gen. 1:2. The real image of God is more in the mind than in the body. An example of a man acting like a beast is Nebuchadnezzar. I do not know if this was caused by the removal of the spirit in man. We only began to understand all this and put it all together in its proper time setting when God revealed to Mr. Armstrong the truth of the spirit in man in the 1960's.

DR. HOEH TAPE OF SERMON GIVEN ON PENTECOST, 1977

(For this tape I decided to reduce and modify Dr. Hoeh's wording somewhat, since this is largely a repeat of tape of 6-25-77. All essentials are retained.)

The subject for this Pentecost sermon is the world before Adam, where angels were responsible, and how it is that God is developing a pattern and a program in which individuals such as you and I are being called with many others as the firstfruits of a very large perspective or work that is taking God more than 7000 years because there is a period of time specified in Isaiah 65 following the Millenium. We are the firstfruits, but it is one thing to talk about the close of the harvest, or how God began to finish the close, and the final harvesting. It is another thing to take a look at a long perspective and ask "How come we're included". When did God decide to make the human family? When do we really pick up the story of the human family? I will present a story that may be a little hard to follow because not everything is laid out in the Scriptures. The Church and the Work grew out of individuals in contact with the Seventh Day Church of God. That church was organized in the United States and grew up in the time of Charles Darwin--when he wrote his two books. And in this 110 years or so since, it has seen its role in the Work of God as "Anti-evolutionary". That is, it has had an attack on a false premise, but has not had a true explanation to replace it. They and we examined the evidence in terms of anti-Darwin and anti-evolution, rather than finding a positive explanation. That church and this are Sabbath-keeping creationists, but that does not mean we developed a scientific creationism--an explanation of creation that can be examined and disciplined by the methods of science. We have never had an explanation of Geology that could stand the tests of science. This is why for the past 12 to 15 years we have not published anything on geology--because everything we knew fell to the ground. The church for 75 years never had qualified individuals who were trained in both Scripture and science. In geology, Ambassador College got its former teaching from George McCready Price, a fine and responsible Seventh Day Adventist whom I met once before he died at the age of 90. He was the lone geologist at the turn of the century who stood in opposition to evolutionary geology. However, his opposition to evolutionary geology does not mean he correctly understood creation in geology. He was subject to the views of Mrs. Ellen G. White, who did not understand Gen. 1:1-2 and related verses. They thought the universe was created about 6000 years ago, so they had to explain all geology by the single catastrophe of the Flood. He explained the Ice Ages as post-Flood geology. These were his two fundamental errors. This is where Mr. Armstrong and Ambassador College came in. We also were anti-evolutionary, but had no positive explanation for geology. We proclaimed that evolution had no answer for the gaps in life forms. We saw the errors of evolution, but did not see all the errors of creationists who went before us and who attributed geological remains to the Flood. We did see TWO catastrophes however--the Pre-Adamic destruction and the Noachian Flood. We tried for years to fit geologic evidence into this conception. This was before we understood the impact of radio-carbon dating. While Mr. Kenneth Herrmann in geology and myself in history and archaeology were puzzling over these things, scientists were discovering many ape-like and man-like creatures that they called "homo". One of the surprises was creatures with increased brain capacity after they began to walk upright. The first theory was that a larger brain lead to walking upright so he could use his brain. We

*Ernie White*



won't bother ourselves with this. The problem has been to define when you have found a real human skeleton. Any coroner could easily determine from skeletal remains whether a murder victim was an ape or a man. But somewhere in between the distinction can become quite clouded. We thought for years that anything called "homo" was a man. We should have realized that scientists meant "something more like a man than a monkey". They only use "Homo Sapiens" if there is evidence that the creature could think like a man. Since tools are used by man today, and were also used by Cro-Magnon man of the Upper Paleolithic (the Pleistocene or Ice Ages), and by Homo Neanderthalensis, and by Homo Erectus, we assumed (as the scientists did also) that man alone is a tool making creature. We thought anything that made a tool must be a son of Adam. We didn't realize that scientists didn't classify all tool-makers as "thinking man". Our thinking was clouded because we had no Church tradition of scientific creationism, and at the same time evolution was clouding the thinking of geologists and anthropologists. Then it was discovered that creatures quite unlike man can make tools, though simple. Australopithecines, not even classified as "homo" (Erectus), could make tools. The evidence proves that no "modern man" type was contemporary with the Australopithecines or Homo Erectus ("Java Man" and "Peking Man" are the older terms). Therefore we conclude that proof of tool-making ability is not proof of the presence of Adam or his descendants. We have taught that angels were on earth before Adam, being trained. What was their primary function? To rule trees and rocks and streams? What were they given experience in? More than merely ruling over each other. We should expand our former concepts and see that they were on earth to govern in a small way (as an opportunity to learn and to prove they could be trusted) before being sent out further into the universe. Their role on earth should be seen as equipping or qualifying them to rule in the universe. This means they were governing nature in great detail. As God Himself is concerned for even a sparrow that falls, so God is concerned for the balance of nature. If God knows the hairs of your head, His is concerned over the intimate aspects of life of every creature. If He rules thru angels, then they also would be likewise concerned with the minute aspects of nature. This is what they were asked to govern--not a barren world, but a world full of life forms thruout geologic history. The Church has a responsibility to teach the role of angels in the world before Adam. But the Church is not necessarily qualified to teach on the nature of that environment, except as it may be discovered by the sciences of geology, archaeology and anthropology. The things I am speaking on are not the primary function of the Church, but I am speaking from my studies and experience apart from but supplementary to the areas in which the Church should speak. Science should be able to discover what part of the world was pre-Adamic. We do not see a world of which we would say that God was "experimenting"--that term has overtones that could be misunderstood. I would prefer the concept that God was "developing" a creation in which angels were being challenged and tested on how they would carry out God's government in guiding that nature, and in ruling over ever more complex forms of life. When Australopithecines appear in Africa (they have not been discovered elsewhere) "late" in the history of the world, we have a creature that can make tools, but not according to a pre-conceived pattern. An outline of development follows. First we have a creature who looked somewhat like apes, who tended to walk somewhat upright, who made tools, but not after a pre-conceived pattern--the form of the tool is after the natural characteristics of the rock. Then we have a creature who walked upright called "Homo Erectus". He had the capacity to make a tool from a pre-conceived pattern, but did not have modern man's



brain capacity so he was not classified as "Homo Sapiens" because he did not think and reason as man reasons. At this lever (of Java Man and Peking Man) the term "Homo" may be misleading because it is not "man" as a son of Adam. It would be better to correct this misconception of modern evolutionary science to conform to the truth of the world we see. There was no developmental progress or advances in culture of these creatures tho they existed for maybe hundreds of thousands of years. If you examine geology with radiometric dating you will have to conclude that there were steps in creation, with the presence of new forms of life at each step which continue for a very long time without variation (evolution). Now after Homo Erectus we come to the time of a creature in Europe that I will pass over to go on to Neanderthal Man, where "man" is again a misnomer. He made tools, a bed, a shelter--but so can other animals. He could make rather involved tools, but had no sense of art. Man is an artistic creature, but this doesn't mean all artistic creatures are men. But no art is ever associated with Homo Neanderthalensis. And there is also the question whether he could speak or just make sounds with his voice. Then 35 to 40 thousand years ago angels had the responsibility of governing a world that changed from creatures lead primarily by instinct to creatures less and less so. There is thus the indication that angels were being trained not just to utilize the natural world of plants and animals and to supervise the climate and all other aspects of nature, but to train creatures who had the capacity to begin to fashion something out of the nature in which they lived, and in more and more complex form. After Homo Neanderthalensis we come to Cro-Magnon, or Upper Paleolithic "man", who once again should not be called "man" but it would be better to use a term like "hominid" for him. At the close of the Ice Age or Arctic Climate this creature could make tools and houses and could communicate better than any former creature. He could draw--perform aesthetic operations. He could hunt, fish, and make weapons to find his food. Upper Paleolithic hominids are therefore unusual in that they have gone beyond former creatures in many ways such as art and an aesthetic sense, and in the capacity to communicate ideas. For 20 to 25 thousand years they lived on earth and hunted and fished--but they knew no agriculture, they domesticated no animals, they neither sowed nor reaped the fields. While they were here, THESE ideas never penetrated their minds or brains, tho they had the other advancements. In the Bible, Adam and Eve were put in the Garden of Eden and told to "dress and keep it". Adam is therefore of sufficient mentality to be a gardner and able to perceive the fundamentals of agriculture. He could also reason about such things as eternal life and death. Adam's older son Cain built a town and was an agriculturalist and tilled the field or used the plow. Adam's second son Abel kept sheep, and therefore may have kept other domestic animals--at least he was advanced enough of an agriculturalist to tend to domesticate stock. Man has not been on earth more than 6000 years according to the Bible. He starts out capable of thinking of eternal matters, as well as the fundamentals of agriculture and town building. In Isaiah we are told that certain things were engraved with "the pen of Enoch" or, "the stylus of a man". There the implication of the Hebrew text is that Enoch the son of Seth invented the art of writing, because it was named after him. In Genesis we find "The Book of the Generations of Adam", which implies that in the lifetimes of Seth and Enoch men had the capacity not only to write, but to convey, preserve, and perpetuate the written word, not necessarily in scroll or codex form. We should have realized that Homo Erectus did not write, paint, or farm. Likewise Homo Neanderthalensis, Upper Paleolithic hominids (Cro-Magnon) etc. tho they did paint and draw, did not domesticate

4

animals, nor sow and reap, nor build cities, but only preyed on the environment like other animals. Modern man is just a refined and reduced Cro-Magnon man. I used to say that is an evolutionary explanation for degeneration. We should have put aside our own preconceived notions, and listened to the scientists who said Cro-Magnon was cruder and less refined than modern man. We conclude that Adam came on the scene later. Angels had been given responsibility to rule creatures who could clothe themselves with skins to keep warm in the cold, but could not think out agriculture. They were being introduced to gradually more and more complex forms of life. The Bible indicates what Adamic man must be like, regardless of scientific definitions put on fossil men. Science has not been guided by Sabbath or Bible, but by Darwin who is dead. After Cro-Magnon we come to "Mesolithic man". Here we see evidence of incipient agriculture--domestication of one or two grains that were sown and gathered. It started out as gathering, then went to sowing. The archaeological sequence is Upper Paleolithic, then Mesolithic, then Pre-pottery Neolithic, then Pottery Neolithic in the Middle East. These were not terms used when I was going to school because they were not yet dug up, as primarily by Kathleen Kenyon in Jericho, and Braidwood in Jarmo in Iran, and many other places now. Mesolithic man is even more refined than Cro-Magnon. He used tools different from his predecessors, who used just stone. He used bone and wood and jewelry. He also reaped wild grains, though he did not sow, and he domesticated a few animals, but did not yet have pottery. He did live in groups, or tribes, or clans--whatever term we might like to apply from our perspective. Later we have development of the use of clay. There was just about 4000 years from the beginning of gathering (like berries, nuts, and wild grains) to the conclusion of the Pottery Neolithic period. This was 4000 years in which hominids made the most rudimentary developments, slowly but surely. Angels were given charge for the first time over creatures that could think out new techniques of domestication, step by step the gradual making of pottery, the invention of a kind of village or community--only this in 4000 years from about 8000 to 4000 B.C. do these stages occur. Compare this with the progress from Adam to Herod the Great. Humans in only 1700 years progressed to the point God said "nothing shall be restrained from man that he has imagined to do". In the last pre-Adamic phase the hominids lived with little instinct and at a level not unlike the most primitive men live today. Apparently they were not accountable to sin because God did not reveal certain things to them. Though they could not be distinguished skeletally from modern man, they obviously did not have the "spirit in man" which gives him the capability to reach the moon in 6000 years of progress. Something was yet missing though they had incipient agriculture and village life. Even if the angels had not rebelled, presumably the next step would have been the impartation of spirit in man--to create out of matter a form of life which the angels might originally have ruled over. Mr. Armstrong has said that God must have always had in mind the possibility of an alternative. If angels would not do what God wanted done, then He would create creatures capable of doing it. And if spirit beings, the angels, would not do it and be obedient, then He would put His Spirit in matter and test that before it is made spirit. Some one-third of the angels very early on decided to "do their own thing" and rebelled. Two-thirds apparently remained faithful to God. Following Satan, the disobedient angels abandoned this world as their inheritance. While on earth for a very long period of time, they introduced into nature a world subject to tragedies. But Romans 8 tells of a time when the sons of God in God's

government will regulate nature in an entirely different fashion. "The creature is also to be delivered from the bondage of corruption to the glorious liberty of the children of God. The whole creation (not just man) groans and travails together in pain till now". Mr. Armstrong says this is a reflection of the mind (or brain from another point of view) of the Devil. What we are looking for is the "manifestation of the sons of God." In this we will have a world that doesn't devour itself. Today there is no fish, plant, or bird that is not subject to the "law" that reflects the mind of the Devil. We live in the same kind of world as the whole of geologic history. As far as our knowledge goes, the whole of the history of creation revealed in geology shows the same suffering that Romans 8 speaks of, which is unlike the peaceful World Tomorrow. The laws of reproduction have been woven together with the laws of food consumption, so that it reflects the Devil's way of how he thinks nature should be controlled. Now if this were the way God intended it, then the description of the Millenium given by Isaiah would be wrong. But the evidence of geology indicates the Devil was already "doing his thing". When he appeared before God, He didn't listen to him because God said it was wrong, but God let him go ahead. Then the Devil went back and argued and reasoned with the angels until a third of them agreed with him that "God doesn't listen". The final act of rebellion was a crisis in which the Devil and the angels perceived that the next step God had in mind was to terminate their experiment--I see no alternative--to intervene and create a creature like the hominids but one step higher, with the capacity to reason like the mind of God. Higher than the creatures with a "brutish mentality" that is not accountable for sin, but one that has capacity to govern himself and decide for himself apart from any instinct which way he shall go. When the angels perceived that this was likely the case, they decided to abandon this inheritance, to scale the heavens, and dethrone God so they could set up the universe with a nature in accordance with their ideas of competition and strife and keeping in balance by dividing and conquering and devouring--the "philosophy" of nature today. But they were cast down, held in restraint. Then God created Adam, in whom the "spirit in man" was added. He had the capacity to reason and build without limit. Every former man-like creature had an upper limit beyond which he could not progress. Suddenly a creature was created who had no upper limit to his thinking in the natural world, no limit to his speculation. We can contemplate eternity and be held accountable for law and sin. God tested Adam at this point and you know that our first two parents failed the test in the Garden of Eden, and the world once again passed to the realm of Satan, and human civilization instead of being developed under God's law and nature under God's law--everything passed under a curse. Notice in Gen. 3:14 addressed to the serpent: "Because you have done this you are cursed above all cattle and above every beast of the field. Upon your belly you shall go, and you shall eat dust all the days of your life." This can be symbolic, but it can also be literal. The implication is that the curse was not only on the serpent thru whom the Devil spoke, but also on the cattle--one was cursed "above" the other. The curse fell on all nature. The creature that was at one time "more subtil than any beast of the field (Gen. 3:1)" was reduced to crawling on the ground. (And there is the symbolism of the Devil himself being cast to the earth in the past and in the future.) Nature was cursed with the "philosophy" of the Devil--this is the way he wants to run the world. God put man in this world to see what it is like when run by the Devil's philosophy. Also he let a curse fall on man and woman. The ground brought forth thorns and thistles, climatic pro-

blems, toil and sweat. This is the world of the last 6000 years. Man is now responsible for making choices IN that world. God then called out a few patriarchs, prophets, apostles and saints who will be the firstfruits resurrected out of the earth, and assigned a responsibility to restore the government of God on earth, a government which the angels failed to exercise for millions of years. Two-thirds of the angels have maintained supervision of the universe, but the leading angel rebelled. The government of God has functioned thru the Patriarchs, prophets, apostles, and the church, but the leaders of this world have been in rebellion. The government is THRU some on earth, but doesn't rule OVER the earth thru the rulers OF the earth. Only some form of radiometric dating is able to determine this vast time that God's government has not been on earth. We are going to be given a responsibility that the one-third of the angels failed at. We the firstfruits of Pentecost are trained in this world where around us in society and our natural environment where the Devil's philosophy has been at work. We have been selected to do what has never been done before--to reestablish at the highest levels the government of God on this earth, which will bring about a new covenant relationship with Israel and the Gentiles, and even with nature. God is going to make a covenant with beasts of the field, and the earth itself, which will be married as well as Israel. In the Millenium we will have the way that nature should have been operating all along. We are living in a world in which nature has been altered from what God intended it to be, not merely 6000 years ago, but untold millions of years ago where angels were given tests and being trained at all levels of administration, not only to govern creation but to participate in it. Mr. Armstrong alluded to this some months ago when he said that God would be the original designer and the angels were like those who finished (or should have finished) the architecture of the building. He spoke about the "created objects" because I think he was not prepared to lay "physical life". He was not ready to put in print what we must inevitably conclude. I have not spoken to him about it, but I am sure he would say "created objects" means more than "rocks"--it includes nature itself, all kinds of levels of life. Many of these were not recreated with Adam, only some were. To our knowledge, "ape-men" do not now exist on earth, tho there are reports of "big-foot" and the "abominable snowman". This all necessitates some major changes in some areas of our understanding of archaeology as well as geology. I must revise the Compendium in these non-historical areas, and also the historical areas of Egypt and Mesopotamia, but I won't talk about that on this occasion. The evidence for Creation Week and the Flood are not to be found in geology, but in archaeology and in "soil science"--it is found on the surface of the earth, not in the structure of the mountains and the continents. Man and his realm are not more than 6000 years old. His remains are all in the thin upper surface of the earth. There is very little evidence for this time period. Geologic evidence is much more extensive. One creature was replacing another as new ideas were being proposed, and as the Devil turned upside-down God's proposals with his philosophy. Radio-carbon and radiometric dating are essentially sound and not in conflict with the Biblical record. A Christian can be thus a student of physics and not face apparent contradictions between Bible and Science.

...the subject. We came to the conclusion that we should be looking for the evidence of the Flood and examining the validity of radiocarbon dating at that time if possible, and that we should limit ourselves to a period of time that seems to make sense. We had to draw the conclusion that without any question we were within the last several thousands of years going to discover the evidence of man and of the Flood thru history. We would have in fact agreement with the various subject areas. But that I ... a number of letters which were mailed last year. We went to Southwest Africa and I did not ... the study after returning from Southwest Africa. We did draw the conclusion as a result of correspondence that there is no way to lay aside the evidence of radiocarbon dating---that it is fundamentally sound whether you examine the nature of the way the trees are cut and assembled...or whether you have a set of logs that have to be matched. The oldest living tree is probably 4300 years old, and there are others that overlap for hundreds or even a thousand or two years, and they go back further than we have been able to say---that indeed the evidence has been built up very carefully. They cover over six thousand years of elapsed time. And of course we are speaking of radiocarbon years because in fact radioactivity was higher in the past on the basis of bristlecone pine trees. Now I don't want to get into the subject of archaeology, although that I think is going to be critical to our study. I want to put that away till a little later. What I want to do is go back to some of the things that Chris Patten and I were discussing. He was in the Jerusalem office for quite a length of time, and it is Chris Patten's and ...where they connected into the ...because the Grabbe's daughter worked very closely with the Pattens in the Pasadena area in Southern California. We were discussing the nature of tools and the nature of the time parameters that we are dealing with in anthropology. We used to read such statements as "man was an Old Stone Age creature of the Lower Paleolithic", or "various forms of hominids that lived for so many hundreds of thousands of years", and then there was the Middle Stone Age, or Neanderthal period, or Mousterian Culture, which was "a few ten thousands of years", and then the Upper Paleolithic, the Upper Old Stone Age, that might have been regarded as "ten to twenty thousand years duration", and then the Middle Stone Age or Mesolithic that might have been regarded in the Middle East as "four or so thousand years". And we used to laugh at all this (figuratively speaking) and say "how can this be, that man is somehow around 6000 years old and yet this is supposed to take him back 600,000 years". So we literally discounted all this evidence because it did not fit the view of time. We were assuming all along that all creatures in some way either were the victims of the sons of Adam (let's take Homo Erectus, or Java Man or Peking Man--that skeletal type) or the sons of Adam. The problem was if these were the VICTIMS of the sons of Adam, where were the sons of Adam during this time. That is, why did they not leave remains. Also we were confronted clearly with the implication that we were viewing things artificially without sufficient satisfaction of a sound conclusion. We had come to the conclusion that when Mr. Armstrong on one hand said that God made angels for a very great purpose (which I will not define here), and that He also had a backup system in mind, that He did not decide that if He is going to have a backup system, that he would suddenly have started off with Adam. They had no preparation. We also came to realize that there was no way to differentiate between the tools of Lower, Middle, and Late Paleolithic.

There was no way to distinguish. Their tools were all in association. Thus we came to the conclusion that all Australopithecines were tool-making creatures altho their culture in the Olduvai Gorge in East Africa that there was no doubt that the Lower Paleolithic culture was to be associated with Homo Erectus, that the Middle Paleolithic we have always taken for granted to be associated with Neanderthal, and we began to realize that the tools were to be associated with the skeletons always in association with these sites. Now we had stopped with Neanderthal, but we might have gone back one step further, but we didn't know what to do with earlier periods--all this prior to Neanderthal is unmeasurable, even by radiocarbon. So we had to draw to conclusion that we needed to go over and look to see what kind of a world it was that angels ruled. Now, with this in mind, what we did was to say to ourselves (we are only talking philosophically here), Mr. Armstrong has pointed up that God used angels to complete the creation--you may remember such a statement as this of more recent date. Now Mr. Armstrong has been very careful (he tends to be very careful on how far he commits himself)--he said that the angels were given a responsibility to complete the creation, and Mr. Armstrong uses the terms of what angels were completely creating--he called them "created objects". He did not use the term "life" because he was yet not prepared to. But I am persuaded he didn't mean "rocks". The only thought that we can possibly deduce from Mr. Armstrong's statement philosophically is that ultimately we are going to have to use the term "physical life" in place of "created objects". Now let me then make a statement here. God is not an experimenter who, after botching up one experiment tries one after the other failure until he succeeds. But God, on the other hand, is not a master magician who says "poof" and the whole universe and all life is suddenly here without forethought. What we are going to discover is that if the angels were created spirits with the need of developing character so that God had not yet finished the creation of angels when He made them, then that should be noted in Mr. Armstrong's statements. And we recognize it, because we have said it, that there had to be this period of testing, and God found that he could not trust some of the angels. But what were the angels doing?? Were they merely watching over the rocks, and the water running in the streams? Were they watching the waving branches of the trees...? I mean, was this the carrying out of the government of God? The government of God is not merely one angel trying to lord it over the other. Government has a purpose. That one angel is over the other is not because he is merely to RULE the other, but that he has a greater responsibility than another angel might have. But the function of the angels was in fact made clear--that they would have been responsible for the supervision of the created universe, and having this responsibility they needed training. And now to discover this, geology suddenly begins to make sense. We have in fact over many years come to accept the idea of the geological sequence. But I challenge anybody to go to the Grand Canyon and avoid the impact of such a sequence. And you cannot arrive at any other conclusion at the second largest "Grand Canyon" in South Africa. There is a sequence in geology, and what we discover is that there are "Simple" life forms--"simple" if you want to take an artist's view, very complex if you have to do it yourself maybe. But that is a distinction. Now whether an evolutionist speaks of "simple life" he is taking an artist's view. That is, there are fewer involved characteristics. There are just simple forms with few cells and not many elaborate, complex relationships, as in a human being. But they are by no means simple if we were forced to have to design and create it. But the word "simple" is unfortunate because it conveys a wrong idea,

but in defining terms what we are saying here is we are not yet at a level of complex sculpting, that God indeed starts at the level He wants to see if a rudimentary or an earlier kind of form doesn't work toward...but that He also had in mind the angelic participation IN the creation. And in so doing He created various life forms over lengthy periods of time--the lengthy periods are to be measured thru various forms of radiometric dating (not like radiocarbon which is only a few ten thousands of years to be measured, but something that may be measured in very long-range terms like millions of years). We learned in 1974 that it does take some time for some people to poison other peoples minds. And it takes time, as Mr. Armstrong said, for the Devil to persuade angels, who were greater in knowledge by far than human beings. And the Devil was going back and forth, and he kept arguing with God over the necessity of the creation being patterned after a different philosophy than God's. But God never listened, and the Devil always came back and told the angels that "God never listened", just as "Mr. Armstrong never listened"--you've heard that. Well God never listened to the Devil either. And that is how we came to realize that some of the things that have been happening as of that time indeed have given us an understanding of what may have happened before. Now was the world that we uncovered in geology, the world of God's creation, governed by angels who were carrying out the government of God? I will answer the question by simply stating "no". We are told in the book of Romans that the whole creation groans and travails in pain, waiting for the manifestation of the sons of God. We are told that when the sons of God are manifest, that certain things are going to be restored. But the world that we see in the future thru the eyes of the prophet Isaiah--the world in which a child can play on the hole of a poisonous snake without being poisoned because it is no longer poisonous, that the lamb and the leopard and the bear and the ox and the lion and the little child shall all be together--they are not devouring one another. Now you all know how the Millenium has been pictured--the whole of nature will be subject to the government of God. Now this may sound very strange to our ears until it has taken root. The whole of nature is to be subject to the government of God, and instead of one creature devouring another for survival, we are going to have an entirely different system of nutrition and a different system of birthing because the two are interrelated. The world today from nature is not a reflection of the kind of government God intended to be exercised by the angels thruout nature. It is in fact a reflection of the Devil's idea of competition, of devouring, and keeping in balance by each thing competing with something else. Now Mr. Armstrong long ago conceived of the idea of competition as being the lifeblood both of our economy and business and society and government. He said this is, as far as he is concerned, the fundamental characteristic of the Devil's philosophy, whatever each individual may have been personally (?). That the angels may have their problems that way that they have had to wrestle with and decide whether they were to let vanity take root we'll never know. But they were not motivated by selfishness such as human beings are where we are not in control of to start out with but born without information, born without knowledge, but the angels had knowledge and could see the picture clearly as far as what they were going to do and who they were going to listen to. As God started out He said "I want to make sure the creation reflects the spirit of love, and it's going to be a beautiful world. We are not going to have competition." Therefore the pattern of nutrition and the pattern of birth will not need to have competition to keep everything in that order we see it in. Can you imagine a World Tomorrow in which mice reproduce at the present rate with no cats to catch a mouse? I just



have to question. What would happen in Africa if we took away competition and left the birth rate the same? We see the whole of nature is going to change, both in terms of what an animal eats and in terms of the reproductive systems, because they are all tied together. All right, what we are saying then in no uncertain terms is something I would say doesn't pertain to a Church teaching or doctrine because it lies outside the scope of theology, outside the scope of the Bible--that we can't ask our men who are ministers to also be geologists and anthropologists and archaeologists and physicists. But in this we are clearly with a Biblical statement: the world that we see around us Mr. Armstrong has said reflects the Devil's philosophy. It does not reflect the government of God. It reflects the Devil's government of competition and strife and devouring. Yes you can look at the whole of geology, and you will not find a single period, geologically speaking, that corresponds to a nature such as will be in the Millenium. It is all a nature such as we have it today--creatures were devouring in the Tertiary, they were devouring in the Cretaceous, they were devouring in the Mesozoic, they were devouring in the Archaeozoic and the Plaeozoic. And for all we know, in the earliest forms we can probably assume the same thing. There is this competition because it goes hand in hand with the statement Jesus made that the Devil was a murderer from the beginning. That is, the spirit of competition such as we viewed it reflected itself in the spirit of murder. And Jesus did not say the Devil was an adulterer from the beginning because that was not possible--it came with mankind. He said the DEVIL was a MURDERER from the beginning. And indeed murder--the spirit of it--is the consequence of the philosophy of competition. And he said "I'll work to take the patterns that God has given and instead of exercising God's government I am going to design it in such a way that nature is in balance by competition, by devouring, by strife--the way of the survival of the fittest--the swiftest mouse getting away most of the time, the slowest cat doesn't survive. Now think when we see that we have a whole new view. That when we talk about the Devil's government we can in fact extend the Biblical account and we have looked at nature and we have to conclude that the WHOLE of the geologic history that we can uncover reflects a world that had gone astray, and therefore there was no reason anywhere along the line to view that there should not have been some catastrophe--local or of wider range--during this whole period. The Devil may have gone so far with certain things, and he may have wanted to change certain things, but then God (also) may have said "Well look, I want a change. I want certain new life forms to be produced. I will see what you will do with them." And so there is no reason to discount what you see when you travel down the walls of the Grand Canyon. One period after another that cannot be accounted for by anything we know of except major periods of time--major only as angels can comprehend time... Now presumably not more than a third of the angels followed the Devil. The other two thirds profited by the experience and took no part in the spirit of competition as developed in the biological world, taking, if you please, the patterns that God was setting out saying "this is what I want", and in completing them in fact turned them around to reflect the philosophy of the Devil. Now when Adam sinned at a much later period in time, God Said "Well because of this I am going to bring then a curse on the earth and you are going to see what kind of a world the Devil's world is that you yourself have opted for". And He said "Cursed is the serpent ABOVE the rest of the beasts of the field" with the implication immediatly that the rest of nature was cursed, because in the Garden of Eden we don't have this experience. Adam saw all these animals, and there were no feelings in the Garden of Eden that he



had to be careful of the lion who was getting hungry at nightfall. There was no fear that we sense in that account, and yet it is a world, a very real world, and in the World Tomorrow, that is going to be changed. So God allowed this to be in nature. He cursed the earth, and whether He acted (I presume he would have done so, although He may well have allowed the angelic beings who had fallen to bring about biological change at that time) so we have the world that we have been seeing similar to this because God saw to it that the Egyptians lost their first born, as it says in the book of Psalms: "He sent an evil angel". He didn't send a righteous one. He sent an evil one to do it. There were plenty of them who would. So He sent a few angels, good or bad. The angels that are bad tend to want to do these things--they get glee out of it. Now what we are saying is that God was testing them not only in skills as a creator with more and more involved forms of life, but He was testing at the same time the character of the angels to see how they would supervise it. And apparently all this time God allowed the Devil the chance to see whether after he had examined the nature that he was governing (or abusing--whatever term you want to use), whether he would change or whether he would not. And they finally came, as Mr. Armstrong said, where spirits apparently do set their character, and you can go only so far in the realm of spirit until your attitude so poisons you that it can never be altered. And the angels then finally ascended when they came to a place in the creation that they sensed that the time had come to act. Now what I am supposing at this point is that angels were here not only governing the world we once thought was only reptilian, but was also governing a world of mammals, and that God gradually introduced creatures such as the Australopithecines (that is "Australo-" meaning "southern"--and they could have been in other places in the world but that is unimportant) who were somewhat ape-like creatures, in South Africa. But for the first time He introduced a creature on earth that used a tool but could not shape it after a pre-conceived idea. And while the angels were here He also introduced Homo Erectus, a creature that could make the tool after a pre-conceived idea. That is, suddenly there was an emphasis on the capacity to generate an idea in the brain and to execute it. You have to have some kind of a hand that will enable this to be accomplished. And of course we have every bit of evidence that these creatures also came to be abusive and lived by competition and devouring. The interesting thing that Mrs. Leakey investigated in the Olduvai Gorge, and found at the lowest levels stones that could not be stones where they were chipped in such a way that it always responded according to the character of the stone--there was no preconceived idea. And then suddenly with the arrival of Homo Erectus (this is Java Man or Peking Man, whatever he was called--they were not "man", but that was the term first used in the United States), but you are dealing there with a situation in which these creatures had preconceived ideas and could in fact execute a change in the shape of the stones so that it no longer responded according to the nature of the stone but responded to the idea of the creature's thinking. And the Australopithecines saw and attempted to duplicate it but could not. But suddenly we have changes that seem to be attempts to copy by the Australopithecines what the Homo Erecti were doing because they had no preconceived ideas (?). But science is finding creatures like this that are more involved in their complexities than chimpanzees and are far below man. Initially nature was essentially guided by instinct, but we come then to what we might call "creatures of the next order" in the Lower Paleolithic, but higher than Homo Erecti (or Homo Erectuses), and we come to Neanderthal. And angels are still here governing. But again I would view

it from my perspective, that the angels were given a charge and should have indeed guided and shown certain things to these creatures, and they indeed may well have. They were not human beings. They were not parallel with Adam, yet we are in the time range of say 50, 60, 70 thousand years ago, to maybe 30 to 35 thousand--somewhere in that time range--and it is that time range that we have creatures--Homo Neanderthalensis (the word "Homo" is translated from the Latin and means "man" but it doesn't mean a human being as we know man)--this creature had no art. Now you know I never noted that before, and only after a long time did I begin to realize that something was very peculiar that this creature had no art at all, because man is essentially in all forms of life an artistic creature. It may be the art in the absurd or the abstract or the beautiful, but man is essentially an artistic creature. This creature was not--he had no sense of art. That fact should tell us something. The creature had a larger brain capacity but by no means as refined. And we had to conclude that even Upper Paleolithic creatures, called "Cro-Magnon", were indeed preceeding Adam--and that was of course the biggest surprise. But there is a question of the time ranges as well before 6 to 7 thousand years ago. These creatures were limited to hunting and gathering. There was however the art that we call "magic"--they painted in dark caves, they painted one picture over another, they painted stuff that could never be seen in light, they painted stick creatures such as demons sometimes manifest to people. And I would suspect that in fact demons put in their brains ideas, and that their so-called "painting" which is called "magic" is indeed reflections of the minds of rebellious angels because man does not paint like this. The only creatures that attempt to produce paintings of this nature like the Australian Aboriginees receives all his thinking information from spirits, and the spirits convey to him that the art that they are doing is from the world of the "dream time"--that is, the world before the Australian's ancestors were around, which I think fits the story very well, that the angels in fact put ideas such as this artistically in the brains ("minds" if you please) even of Cro-Magnon men (as he was called in Europe). The Upper Paleolithic, the Mesolithic creatures--while angels were still here before Adam--these creatures then must be seen as without the spirit in man. Creatures governed less and less by instinct, subject more and more to the purpose and influence of angels who could then have manifested themselves, showed these creatures what they could do. In other words, God was creating beings on earth who I shall for the moment call "pro-hominids". That is, "similar to man". That indeed skeletally were similar, but were not as refined as modern man is refined. That is, modern man is just a refined Upper Paleolithic hominid. That that was something I think we're coming to see much more clearly in the total revolution of everything that we have viewed before. Now by this time that the angels were governing not only the world of reptiles and the world of early mammals, but the world of tool-making creatures, the world of tribal creatures, the world of creatures in which there can also be tools made--these creatures all ante-dated Adam. Now let me state this very clearly. When Adam was put in the Garden, he was told to dress and keep it. His son Abel was a keeper of sheep. His son Cain was a tiller of the field, or "used the plow" as Josephus said. The first human being was therefore at least a truckdriver or a gardener of some sort--he had that capacity immediatly, and his sons were full-blown agriculturalist Yet the fact remains that hunting and hunting alone was a characteristic of Australopithecines, Homo Erectus, Neanderthal (a man named after the Neander Valley, for "tal" in Germany near Dusseldorf), and even Cro-Magnon was wholly a hunter-gatherer. Then you have

incipient agriculture... But the sons of Adam did not appear on earth until the story of full-blown agriculture. And soon the presence of writing occurred, because we read of the "book of the generations of Adam". We read in Isaiah of "the pen of Enoch", which implies the concept of writing, which goes back practically to the lifetime of Adam, the lifetime of Seth, and probably was invented by Seth's own son Enoch. Now on this basis we have therefore to draw the conclusion, that when we find incipient agriculture existing from radiocarbon dating for maybe three to four thousand years in the Middle East, hunting and gathering existing for maybe twenty thousand years, hunting with practically no sense of gathering at all for many thousands of years before that when radiocarbon dating runs out--that all of this is incompatible with the Biblical account of man. When we had taken for granted (what you probably all had taken for granted) that because when scientists used the word "homo" it must be a son of Adam, when in fact they meant "homo" nothing like the sons of Adam until they added the word "sapiens". In other words they said "these are men" and then "these are thinking men". And then they have a problem because they discovered that "thinking man" was still different from modern man so they defined modern man as a "thinking, thinking man"--Homo Sapiens Sapiens. And we were fooled by these terms. But we failed to realize that their description was sound--that these creatures didn't look like man, they didn't live like man, they didn't act like man. But we thought they must be man because they were making some kind of primitive tools. And I puzzled for years how to explain why we should have all of this pre-agricultural sequence--without any question a stratigraphic sequence--and still not come to the levels in which we should see Adam and Eve, and Cain and Able. And then to discover that there was even writing in the days of Adam--the "book of the generations of Adam" as I pointed out--a stylus or "pen" by which you could write on clay (not an ink pen as I said although that may have been developed very soon). All this must go back to the pre-Flood world. Now there are many things I could say but I don't want to take the time now because we have gone nearly our 25 minutes already for my part. What we have come to conclude is (and this is within those of us who are outside the ministry; this is not a requirement or a traditional teaching of the church; we are dealing with individuals who study in the areas of anthropology, archaeology, and geology), what we have come to conclude is that there came a time when God had already placed on earth creatures that were significantly governed by less and less instinct and more and more they had to learn by copying each other or doing what angels would teach them, or whatever thoughts were put into their minds, or brains. There was no spirit in man. They were not held accountable for the judgement or the law. They were creatures that were being trained at the highest levels thus far. That is, God had created creatures that indeed were approaching (and I will use that term carefully)--approaching broadly the characteristics physically of angels and divinity. And the next step that any angel could have figured out, and that this could be an alternative route, that all God would have to do was put spirit IN such creatures, and He could make out of THEM beings that could replace them. And I would suspect that when we get to the judgement we will discover that the angels rebelled\* when they did, and decided to dethrone God, when they saw that the pattern of creatures that God was making on earth (and certainly in which the two-thirds of the angels who didn't rebel were participating) when the government was still under the Devil with all manner of competition and hunting and strife. We tried to find this for years in the violence in the pre-Flood world. In fact it was the

violence in the pre-Adamic world which reflected the rule of angels over this world. But that these creatures were not at such a low level of ... and potential for happiness but without spirit that the angels could see that the very next step could be "competition" of a nature that they were not going to allow. And the intent was to abandon this earth as a responsibility--they were going to go on and scale the universe. But above all they wanted to topple God from the Throne so they would never have to have the penalty of the consequences of their spirit and attitude: that they therefore could determine how the world should be governed and the laws that could be set in motion. They were going to replace love by competition and strife--and indeed the spirit of murder--which is the basis of all archaeological and geological evidence up to this time. Now this is a revelation of no mean proportion in terms of the sciences, but what it also means is that it is possible for the first time to say radiometric dating is not incompatible with the Biblical account--that in fact if we don't use it we are confronted with trying to call creatures human which in fact **are** pre-human, and we are defining a world that doesn't correspond with the Biblical account. Because... (end of tape)

(This tape was incomplete and of poor quality. Some words I could not make out at all, and some I probably misunderstood. The punctuation is mine, and may not always convey Dr. Hoeh's intent.)

Bible is in principle the revelation of Essential Knowledge, otherwise unknown to man. Other aspects of understanding are only mentioned in passing, are not spoken of directly. Some vague prophecies are like this. Many books need an extensive background knowledge for a good understanding, particularly prophetic books like Amos. The Bible is not a nutrition textbook, or a world history book. Its parallels with history are about as close as to any other science or art--rather sketchy. Some of our preconceptions need re-evaluation. Former conclusions are invalid. Anthropology, Archaeology and Geology in particular. The Worldwide Church of God, and \*The Radio Church of God received no traditional explanations in these areas from the Seventh Day Church of God. They early combatted Evolution, but since they had no schools and not much scholarship, they had no depth of knowledge to hand down in tradition. There has never been in the Church of God a traditional explanation of Geology and Archeaeology because these are relatively new sciences, only coming along in the last century. The Bible has been misunderstood by the "world" all along, and so also by the churches, including the Church of God. The World came up with evidence which obviously contradicted Scriptural (mis)understandings, so the world soon rejected the Bible as a source of knowledge. But then, the Bible really has no bearing of Archaeology and Geology. Earlier in this century \*the Church of God had no school to study the advances in these two sciences. Mr. Herbert Armstrong found that only Mr. Andrew Dugger in the Church of God was well-educated. Most were not at all educated. Mr. Armstrong read Seventh Day Adventist literature on Creation and material from the British Israel World Federation to get many of his ideas. Early books in Ambassador College were from the Seventh Day Adventists, and dated from before World War II. George McReady Price gave us our preconceived ideas about Geology. \*Mr. Armstrong studied from Bible Dictionaries and Commentaries which have since become very outdated. New information is coming out all the time and there is no way any man can keep up with it and be an expert in every field of knowledge. I (H.L.H.) don't do it either. Hence Ambassador College was limited in available material to use to teach truth. We didn't have our own body of material to work with. We had no doctrine of Creationism of our own--it was all borrowed from others. Mr. Armstrong only perceived that there had been a world before Adam--he could not define it any further than that. Mr. Armstrong never put any official stamp of approval on any Historical or Geological theory of individuals in the Church, such as Mr. Herrmann or Dr. Hoeh. The Bible is not being added to today--our ideas have not been inspired. Government in the Church is necessary until we all come to the unity of the Faith. Not everybody has the same depth of knowledge in all areas. Some are competent in different areas. We are all accountable to God for what we know. No man can go over everything and pronounce absolute dogma on truth in everything. The Church has the responsibility to define Biblical and Non-Biblical areas, and to speak where the Bible speaks, and not to exercise authority where non has been given it, or pronounce Doctrine where the Bible has not spoken it. Some things in the Bible are revealed only in vague principles. Nutrition is a good example. This is a legitimate area of extra-Biblical study where no doctrines of vitamins or food can be properly promulgated by the Church. Individuals can pursue in depth in this field without fear of contradicting Revelation, and it is not necessarily under the authority of the Church. Archaeology and Geology also fit in this category--they are beyond the scope of the Ministry. A year and a half ago in Big Sandy I broached the need to re-evaluate previous conclusions. The first fundamental error we made may have been the assumption we made in History and Archaeology that Genesis 11 gives the origin of Languages--that there was only one language before that. This is similar to the fundamental error of assumption in the Pentecost change. We had thought all those 38 years that the translation "from"

was the best. And the facts confronting us then in Archaeology were that the Early Bronze Age and parallel ages in other parts of the world show languages and some dialects. The deduction we made then was that Early Bronze must therefore be Post-Flood, and Post-Babel. I won't go into the origin of these archeological terms, but the Old Kingdom of Egypt equates with the Early Bronze age, and that these were supposedly Post-Flood we derived from Hislop--"The Two Babylons", in the late 1940's and early 1950's. We looked for the Adamic Break in Geology at the division between Dinosaurs and Mammals. We received no guidance from Mr. Armstrong on this point. And besides, geologists themselves have changed their thinking since then. We put the Adamic creation at the "Cretaceous" boundary, and squeezed the entire "Tertiary" age into the Pre-Flood world, but it should all have been Pre-Adamic. We saw only two world-wide destructions--Satan's and Noah's--mentioned in the Bible, so we tried to explain all geological evidence by them. Nevertheless, Mr. Herrmann and Dr. Hoeh could not come to agreement on the certainty of this understanding. Then Libby's method of Carbon 14 dating came out. It indicated that C-14 only appeared after the "Pleistocene" epoch, which we took to be Noah's flood. Therefore we assumed that the Pre-Flood world had no C-14, and was not accurate even in the Post-Flood world. But we knew that this really was not a completely satisfactory explanation. Our faulty pre-conceptions were challenged severely in the late 1960's with the publication of Bristlecone Pine studies which began to prove how accurate C-14 was. We could no longer ignore the evidence. Our Bible misconceptions and presumptions did not fit. Then we concluded that most "Geology" must therefore be before Adam--the Flood left little geological damage. Adam and mankind therefore come into only the realm of "Archaeology". But Geology did reveal a world of competition and strife in its life, just as today. Satan's role in the world was reflected by this then as now. He ruled that world too, so his rebellion was not after the dinosaurs, but before. It seems he may have finished the pattern of creation that God gave him, only he perverted it. So we finally have concluded that the Bible has nothing to do with the realm of Geology, except for Satan's role. The age of Adamic man is within what the Geologists call the "Recent", and Archaeology, the "study of old artifacts" is the branch of science which we can use to improve our understanding of early man. Archaeology can elucidate many places where the Bible is unclear. Immanuel Velikovsky in the early 1950's added further to our misunderstandings. He came out at a time when most historians outright were rejecting the Bible. The others were simply ignoring early Bible history. Velikovsky, on the other hand, was quite a student of the Bible. Dr. Hoeh thought his scheme looked good because it moved Egyptian history down later in time by about 500 years. This gave more room for Post-Flood history to be fit in, which was needed. Remember we were thinking back then that there was only one language till after Babel, and that all of Egyptian history must be after Babel. Since Velikovsky moved history down 500 years, we could equate the age of the Patriarchs of the Bible with the "Old Kingdom" of Egypt--Dynasties 1 thru 6. Carbon 14 dating actually helped in this at the time because it was reading Egyptian history younger by just about the same amount. But Bristlecone Pine dating blew all that. We were forced to put the "Old Kingdom" before the Flood of Noah, which turns out to be the place, in terms of B.C. years, that historians have put it for the last 75 years. It seems there were several languages then before the Flood, before 3000 B.C. even. It turns out that Bristlecone pine proves that there was more C-14 in the air in those early times than there is now--which is exactly the opposite of what we earlier thought. This means, for instance, when C-14 testing yields a date of 2000 B.C., it was really from about 2350 B.C. according to Bristlecone Pine Recalibration. After reading "Radiocarbon Calibration and Prehistory in Palestine" a year and a half ago, I came to realize that our problems with correlating history, archaeology, and geology were solved. The Compendium construction of history was wrong.

5

We had read Genesis 11 with our 20th century preconceived notions, and not from the 2300 B.C. perspective. "Now the whole earth was of one language and one speech..." can be understood as a contrast to the Pre-Flood world, indicating that there were many languages before the Flood. We read the wrong meaning into this Scripture. Also consider Deut 32:8--"The Most High divided to the nations their inheritance, when he separated the sons of Adam..." We used to think this referred to the separation of races by language at the Tower of Babel confusion, but now we think it most likely refers to the Pre-Flood world. Radiocarbon dating now requires we recognize the dispersal of Adam's immediate descendants into racial and language groups. God used the same technique of segregation before the Flood as after. False religions appeared before the Flood, and before Nimrod. He only continued the Devil's pre-Flood counterfeit religion. It seems also that similar languages were given to the same races before and after the Flood, so that they could settle in the same areas as before. We used to think that "cave men" hominids were degenerate Adamites, but actually Adamites are post-hominid. Pre-Adamites hardly differed at all physically from Adamites. They could use symbols, but they did not have writing. Historians realized long ago, and now we recognize, that modern civilized type man did not appear before about 4000 B.C. The "Chalcolithic" age ends the Pre-Adamic world. The Ice Ages were a few millenia before Adam. The Old Kingdom and Early Dynastic Period was before the Flood. Middle Kingdom and Middle Bronze Age in Palestine were Post-Flood. If you want to read further on this, try an article in the February 1977 "Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research" by Calloway and Weinstein, pages 1-16. It proves that Early Bronze cultures in Palestine agree in dating with the Masoretic Text of Bible Chronology (not with Septuagint chronology which adds a millenium to the pre-flood chronology.). So these cultures appear about 4000 B.C. and die out about 2400 B.C. This is about the same dates of the Adamic Creation and the Flood in Scripture. This solves our former problems of Archaeological Ages. Even W.F. Albright, a foremost Palestinian archaeologist, was frustrated in the 1950's because of lack of correlation between C-14, History, and Archaeology. But now there is no disagreement in these areas in their broad applications. One God is the author of Bible and Science. These three can now all elucidate each other. Velikovsky is wrong, and we can accept the basic historical understanding that has been current in the past 75 years. History has progressively been falling better and better into Bible parallels. Velikovsk is still laboring under false notions, trying to defeat C-14 evidence. Dr. Hoeh is still not sure of Nimrod's placement, tho he suspects who he is in Mesopotamian history--a certain king who is known to have built many "ziggurats"--towers. Dr. Hoeh is certain of the placement of Egypt in relation to the Flood tho. Noah's family apparently married wives who knew different languages, tho they basically used just one. Most Jews know more than one language today. Dr. Hoeh knows several. The Compendium will be re-evaluated. Many areas show "remarkable parallels", but were not proven facts, and now appear not to be well-founded. These parallels now appear to be just similarities. Chinese Archaeology is falling into place with their excellently preserved and accurate history. Dr. Hoeh is now looking for parallels between History and the Bible that have been overlooked by other scholars. Along with this, Bible Chronology as formerly understood has had to be revised--it was never official church doctrine anyway. Some books and articles are helpful here. In 1969 William Hallo in the Biblical Archaeologist Reader had an article on the parallels of Assyria with Israel. A Seventh Day Adventist named Edwin Thiele has written a book called "The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings." Howell and Simpson have a book called "The Ancient Near East". What they all say is that Usshur's pattern of the kings of Israel and Judah which was accepted for three centuries was wrong. Forty or forty-one years need to be removed from the B.C. date of the death of Solomon. The date that the Church of God has used as the fall of Jerusalem--585 B.C.--came from the British Israel World Federation



The Bible has no consistent chronology after Zedekiah and the fall of Judah. From this we can infer that it was intended that we go by historical chronology. Events are dated in the years of Persian kings. But even before the synchronisms with foreign kings are given, we cannot properly construct the kings of Israel and Judah without the help of Assyrian chronology, and a half dozen or so synchronisms with their histories in common. Assyrian history has been established with certainty ever since Ptolemy's canon nearly two millenia ago, and ties in directly with Babylonian chronology. This has further been supported by the record of an eclipse in Assyria in June of 763 B.C., which astronomical calculation verifies. Also "limnu" years for every year prove that Assyrian history has been accurately preserved back to Shalmaneser III, who had two significant synchronisms with Israelite history in the early days of the divided monarchy. This is how we know that 40 or 41 years should be removed from our former understanding of the chronology of the kings of Israel and Judah. Thiele is not right in all things, but is the closest to the truth. He overlooked a couple of things for reasons unknown to Dr. Hoeh. Dr. Hoeh rejected his scheme until it was apparent that the rest of history also fit the scheme. The fall of Jerusalem has had to be re-adjusted, and the fall of Samaria also. Thiele assumed the Bible was wrong in a couple of places, but he need not. Since the date of creation is thus moved down 40 years, this means we are not at the very end of 6000 years of history. This does not mean that Jesus must wait till the time is up till He returns. These factors are related but not fixed. The more important factor is the time when men are ready to annihilate themselves, and Jesus MUST intervene. There is no Biblical statement that exactly indicates the validity of the 6000 year theory of man's history--it is a Jewish tradition attributed to Elijah, and only hinted at in the 1000 years equals one day in I Pet. 3:8. If we had though that the end would not come till 2020 during these past two decades, it would have greatly changed the nature of this Work. We have not lost other Biblical parallels either. The 2520 years of Israel's punishment could still date from 720 B.C., though the seige of Samaria was a few years earlier, because apparently there was another uprising after the captivity of Samaria. Sargon, in the second year of his reign (720) mentions that he put down a revolt in Samaria and took some Israelites captive. Likewise in the case of Judah. Final revolts may not have been put down till a year or two after the fall of the city of Jerusalem in 587. So their 2520 years could still have begun in 585. The climax may still come soon. The times of the Gentiles, 539 to 1982 may be fulfilled in that Babylon will \*arise only after 1982, and not end there, as we formerly thought. A spring calendar in Judah gives a better answer to the problems.

(NOTE: In his sermon at the Feast as related above, Dr. Hoeh was thinking of lowering the date of Creation, Flood, Exodus, Temple, and surrounding events by "about 41 years." Since the Feast he has now firmly fixed the drop to 44 years below his former understanding. Therefore, instead of Creation in 4024 B.C., he now thinks it was in 3980. Instead of the death of Solomon in 972 B.C., he now thinks it was in 928. All the events in between are dropped down accordingly, and the Divided Monarchy is squeezed up, just as scholars have proposed it needed to be.)



MESSAGE OF DR. HOEH AT MINISTERIAL CONFERENCE, JANUARY 1978

The subject is: the Bible and Archaeology, which I was asked to discuss. We will necessarily broaden our perspectives because of the impact of other sciences in terms of how our understanding of archaeology has been over the past years, more specifically in geology. Participation in archaeology as far as either the College or the Church began with us in 1968. Where it would lead and how it would revolutionize our thinking was at that time undreamed of. ¶ As you all should know, the Church of God which founded Ambassador College is Creationist in theology. That is, it recognizes that evolution is not a proven fact. But at the same time, the Church of God, speaking of the last two centuries, has had no scientific creationism as a part of its tradition--that is, no positive explanation for the facts or data of Geology or, for that matter, of Archaeology, in Biblical terms. And I may say even that creationist literature unrelated to the Church of God--involved with those who observe Sunday as the Lord's Day--they themselves have no way of handling the facts, either of history, geology, or epigraphy correctly in a coherent fashion. They are usually limited only to an explanation of geology. The fact that there was, in the Church of God, no positive scientific creationism, was obscured because of the argument over Evolution, and the positive recognition of the limits, and the mistakes of the theory of evolution (as proposed by various adherents) did not let the Church of God, over the past two centuries, see the real meaning. That is, they thought they had an understanding, but it was only negative. You would not have had a positive understanding of the facts that have been discovered in the world of science. Creationists have always been able more effectively to explain the contemporary world. They have not been able effectively to explain the world that leads up to our present. ¶ Evolution and history were concerns of Herbert W. Armstrong in the 1920's, if you will remember the challenges written in the Autobiography. But the Church of God Seventh Day to which he came offered insufficiency, and in fact he had to search out many of the possible answers from other sources altogether. A related institution, Seventh Day Adventists, for instance, did offer an explanation of geology. Such an explanation was made available thru Adventist published literature, in his time and into the 1940's thru the works of George McCready Price, whom I have had a chance to speak to, and to dine with on an occasion. He defined geology, and it was the Seventh Day Adventist understanding of George McCready Price that became the basis for the geological instruction of Ambassador College. I would point up clearly that we must recognize there was no work of the Church of God Seventh Day--no work of the Church of God--that was the basis of geology. And therefore, there is the need at this time to re-evaluate (there has been the need and it has been acted upon), to re-evaluate the whole basis, because it was indeed inherited by individuals, or from individuals, who had no understanding of Genesis 1 verses 1 and 2. And necessarily, their geological conclusions precipitated some problems that we were unable to resolve over many years. ¶ From the point of view of history, the Church of God Seventh Day offered no solid explanation that could in any sense of the word support the concept of proof of the Bible. Thus the date of the fall of Jerusalem in 585 B.C. was derived from the literature of the British-Israel World Federation, at a time prior to the publication of the "Babylonian Chronicles" by Dr. Wiseman of the British Museum, which when published, laid for ever to rest, if there had been no other preconceptions, the fallacy that Jerusalem fell in 585 B.C.

It is an indefensible date, and irrespective of theology, it is indefensible historically. ¶ So we can say that in the Church of God Seventh Day there was no tradition that really acted as a solid guide where one generation after another had disciplined the areas, if you please, of biology, geology, archaeology, linguistics, & epigraphy (which is, in a sense, the history of written scripts). Thru the Church of God, that is, the Radio Church of God, we did learn, in terms of the teaching in Ambassador College, that there were certain fundamental errors in the World's philosophy--in terms of history & in terms of the Biblical experience as recorded. But unfortunately, where would we find an explanation, if that be the basis. And so what happened is that we can say that fundamentally we turned to the peripheral groups, not to men who were scholarly in their areas, but to peripheral groups such as the Seventh Day Adventists, and the British Israel World Federation, and individual scholars who were often alone, and whose work has since been called in question, as among Seventh Day Adventist's by their own instructors today in their institutions. I draw attention to the fact that Seventh Day Adventists no longer publish works of George McCready Price. A leading geologist in that church, Harold W. Clark, summarized only very recently in the "Creation Research Society Quarterly," Volume 14 of September of 1977, how he came to learn that George McCready Price made sufficient mistakes that it is now impossible to find his works published by Seventh Day Adventist publishing houses. So we have to recognize. (and I've had a chance to visit with Harold W. Clark, who lives in California, and to talk some of the things over) that it is clear, even to them, there was some fundamental error that needed correction. Ambassador College at least has addressed itself to this matter. Therefore many of the preconceptions that we have had now no longer impinge upon our pursuit of an understanding, let us say, of Bible and archaeology. Because indeed, with misconceptions of geology published no later than 1964 officially in the Plain Truth, we ourselves are no longer "boxed in," so to speak, trying to explain the whole of archaeological experience within the limits that geology had imposed on our theological thinking. ¶ Now in a sense this material that we developed, Mr. Kenneth Herrmann and I, was derivative of the material presented in geology by Mr. Herbert W. Armstrong to start with, even tho the church has in fact no official definition in any case. And I want to at this moment summarize the point that we in the ministry must recognize the distinction between what as a whole we are asked to speak about, and the specific areas of expertise that any one of you may have knowledge of. For instance, some of you might be linguistically skilled. Others of you might have a special knowledge of chemistry and nutrition. Some one might be an explosives expert. But to ask me to explain in all these areas would be not only improper, but, in terms of any work in the ministry, impossible. It would be inappropriate for that function. So we must recognize that there may be individuals and they speak at the level of their expertise. It is time we recognize that indeed there is no way for the Church leadership to pronounce on all these areas--no capacity or expertise to do so. At most it would be to define what might be clearly contrary, but it could not define otherwise positive explanations. ¶ We inherited in terms of the British Israel World Federation not merely the date for the fall of Jerusalem, we also inherited the tradition that came down from that organization that Job assisted in the building of the Great Pyramid at Giza for Khufu. With this in mind it became obvious, if this pyramid time of building in the 4th Dynasty is to be associated with Job, that a quick analysis of Job's family and immediate friends would place the pyramid age (the 4th Dynasty, or the Old Kingdom) long after the Flood, and indeed after

the early Patriarchs. And because of our geological premises, (because of this premise inherited not from historical research, but from the British Israel World Federation and studies on the Great Pyramid) we were confronted with a requirement to construct "history" (as a written record) only after the Flood. And this required further that our understanding lead us to a grasp of the subject that should not only meet the Biblical account, but meet the historical evidence at the close of any period of restoration. We placed, (for those of you who have some knowledge) we placed the "Old" and the "Middle Kingdom" of Egypt as parallel, the "Intermediate" period of the Hyksos as the time of the Judges, & the period of the great Empire of Egypt paralleling the Kings. And this required us to place the period of time that we call the "Iron Age" (normally associated with the kings of Israel and Judah), into the time of the Persian, Late Persian, Hellenistic, and Early Roman. Furthermore we were compelled in our thinking to assume that the evolutionists who used the word "homo" (meaning "man"), must be referring to a creature descended from Adam. ¶ So we accepted certain ideas from Adventists that were geological, certain historical perspectives from the British Israel World Federation, and in many areas in fact, the evolutionary definition of "homo"--then applied it Biblically to the Biblical family of Adam. These were all in the background of our thinking. ¶ And historically, thru the writer Hislop in "The Two Babylons", we came to enshrine the concept that all languages that have ever existed or were ever written must have occurred not earlier than the time of the Tower of Babel--because we read the account from the point of view of the present into the past, instead of reading it differently--that is, the immediate world after the Flood in contrast to what had been before. We read it as if it were a contrast to our today's experience. But I will get to that in a moment. ¶ So having inherited the idea that all languages differing from Hebrew must not precede Babel, and since the earliest languages that are translatable and intelligible go back to the First Dynasty of Egypt and the earliest dynasties of Mesopotamia, we were forced to place all of these at a position following the Flood itself. And there were many other aspects, analogous of the idea what a flood deposit should leave, that have affected our thinking. ¶ Over the years, we were indeed unable to arrive at a satisfying solution that would solve some of the problems either of our geological or historical Faculty. If you like to read in the January and February 1964 Plain Truth, I think you will generally have a view of how we attempted to explain history and geology in terms of the preconceptions that seemed fundamental to what the Church was teaching. A solution seemed to have been found, as I mentioned, in Immanuel Velikovsky, who tended to drop history, beginning with the Exodus, some 500 years, which tended to make room--and of course we come to the problem of whether at the end of the reconstruction it was possible to assemble the material properly. ¶ As a result of our participation in archaeology & our relationship to some of the studies that have been going on over a decade, in ten years we have tried to evaluate all of the fields that are interrelated. That is, what is the real positive explanation of geology as we find it, and of archaeology, and how do we understand radiocarbon dating (that is c-14 and other radiometric methods)--and of course the question of astronomy is not to be lost. We have made a study of stratigraphy and archaeology which is very fundamental. (Just to define it, the implications in other words of it is that what lies buried under a floor that has never been penetrated since must have been deposited before the floor was placed as it now is). ¶ And as a result of epigraphy, we have had to re-evaluate also our thinking. Epigraphy is the study of texts, in terms of the style of script used. (Speaking as a layman to "lay epigraphers" here.) For instance, Hezekiah's tunnel referred to in

the Bible not only has been discovered but the inscriptions of the day defining how it was finally achieved has been known of course to the scholarly world. Unfortunately the style of the script of the period of time of which we are dealing, the close of the 8th century B.C., we were forced archaeologically to place into the Hellenistic period. Similarly, the "Mesha Stele"--the stone of the king of Moab--records his revolt against Israel. That of course brings you into the lifetime of the immediate descendants of Moab, & has a particular kind of script which properly belongs to that generation. After all, it was written at that time. But we were forced to place it's parallels in the early Hellenistic period. And this is because archaeology was forced down, and geology you know--each one was brought into a position that seemed to conform to the idea that there were only two destructions that have ever occurred, merely because only two were recorded before Sodom and Gomorrah, without any recognition of what kind of a record there must have been both from Creation to the final ascention (referred to in Isaiah and Ezekiel) of the angels who were in rebellion, was there any record of the world before the final act, was there any record of the Adamic world before Noah, before the Flood. All of this was overlooked because we were only emphasizing the order, and going from the order of Sodom, Noah, and the pre-Adamic destruction, and the presumption is, and there was a fear in a certain sense to depart from the concept that there must only be a specific action at such a time, and Geology must not refer to any other interim record. ¶ There is no question also that the impact of varve dating in Scandinavia could not be overlooked. ¶ Having now to re-examine the whole thing, and recognizing to day that indeed we have evidence that was not extant in the 1940's or 1950's (or for that matter the 30's and 20's), we can have a whole new perception of the field of study that we would say would complement the Bible, and would offer far more alternatives than merely one, two, or three cites in the Middle East, in terms of proof of the Bible. We were having to, in fact, alter and re-explain everything in order to make it seem to correspond. We once worked from premises therefore of the unknown past--geological--because we thought what we had inherited (as a result of studies from the 20's to the 50's) would be in fact a certain measure of inspirational guidance. The inability to perceive perhaps a distinction between the recognition of error and the substitution for its truth. (It is one thing to unlearn error, its another thing to demonstrate that what you are putting in its place is truth. One must not confuse the two.) We do need to lay aside these presuppositions, and to have a totally new re-evaluation of the concept of "homo" or "man" in the light of--not jaw bones and leg bones, but of--the spirit in man, which I would say is outside of the realm of the natural sciences, and yet in fact holds the real answer to enigmas that science has found and that the "historic" surface of the earth retains. We have participated & read, and our Faculty in the science in which we are dealing here--anthropology & archaeology--without a question would say today that the evidence of the material culture of Babylon in the days of Nebuchadnezzar and his dynasty, and the Persian period, & the Hellenistic period in the Middle East, and the early Roman, are in such a stratigraphical order, lets say at Samaria and at Shechem and any number of other places, (I dug with others at Ashdod in 1963). I had to live for years with puzzles that in fact would be unresolvable until we resolved the question of Babel. Because there was no way to assemble the material and call it any proof of the Bible, if we were going to have something that would be believable. Mr. Lapp, an archaeologist, (who has since died, who was unfortunately not a friend of this work, and tried to discourage our relationship at Jerusalem) has laid out some very solid material on the Persian period which requires that the so-called Iron age nor-

mally attributed to the history of the kings of Israel and Judah, which we had tried to place late, in fact belongs where most historians do place it, and this would be in conformity with the knowledge of epigraphy in the inscriptions that I mentioned. William H. Stiebing wrote a criticism of Velikovsky's revised chronology, (which could be in part equally attributed to anything I have written in the two volumes of the Compendium pertaining to Egypt and Mesopotamia). This appeared in the Journal "Pensee", volume 3, number 3, in the fall of 1973, on the subject of "Velikovsky Reconsidered". He made the evidence clear enough that, when Velikovsky answered the material, there is no doubt that there was no solid answer. (Israel M. Isaacson in Volume 4 Number 4 of "Pensee" tried to apply the revised chronology.) Velikovsky tried to reply to Stiebing in one of these journals--Volume 4, number 1 (these are available in our own library). And in the end none of their answers explained the account that Stiebing laid out--in terms of stratigraphy and epigraphy--there was no possible way to reconcile the reconstruction of history as Velikovsky had given it. There was no reason to collapse the history of the world at this time. And indeed we must recognize today that this is true. It is not possible to build a structure as we attempted to. ¶ So now we take one quick look at the work of the Seventh Day Adventist, Donovan Courville, in his book "The Exodus Problem, and it's Ramifications". I mention his religious affiliation here because I think these men have been sincere in their attempt to explain the Bible, rather than neglect it. (I have never met the man, though I believe I have spoken to him, and some of our members have.) He drew similar conclusions to mine and Velikovsky, although he worked quite independently of anything that I did in the subject of history. His work, unfortunately, had the same basic problems. That is, archaeology has an answer that we could not give with the previous preconceptions. ¶ There came also during this period the impact of radiocarbon dating. (Now the reason I have not dwelt at this point on c-14 is the fact that there will be members in the Church of God, as well as in all creationist movements, that without a doubt will never have physics straight in their minds---not until the resurrection. There will be no way to ask them to understand the subject correctly because this is not their field, and I don't propose to make an issue or argument over things that people cannot understand. I would merely state that if that is the problem with which they have to live, they will have to live with it.) Let me however point up some literature. The "Creation Research Society Quarterly", volume 14, September 1977, had an article "The Crisis in Radiocarbon Calibration" by David J. Tyler. He was from England. And this I feel is one of the best analyses by a sensible and responsible individual. And when you read it you have to conclude that he has no way to explain away the evidence other than that it is the way it is now understood by physicists. That is, the idea that we could explain the whole of radioactivity by explaining it away, is impossible. Or to put it another way, it is now possible for a member of the Church of God not only to be a baker, but also a physicist. All of the laws involved in baking have always been extant, and the laws of physics do not somehow vanish when you go into the laboratory and measure radioactive dating. The fact remains that the one is as much a valid science as the other. I think we have always given a far better and fairer evaluation of the subject without fully understanding it. But without any doubt, having visited the laboratory in Arizona, having attended one of the Symposiums of the Royal Societies in England in December 1969, I visited the Bristlecone Pine forest in the White Mountains in eastern California, and I have analyzed the impact of history and archaeology in terms of radiocarbon dating, and I can say today there is no reason

to have a divergency between varve dating, epigraphy, stratigraphy, Bible, or any other related science--no reason to have it. The problems of course that arise are usually of a theological nature that tend to neglect Biblical material. ¶ If you should like to have at least a table, one of the least expensive works, prior to the dropping of the dollar, was this one done by the University of Edinburg: "Radiocarbon Calibration and Prehistory", a very fine and simple work with tables, that for the amount of money £ 3, 50s. I think would save one many an hour if one ever wanted to have evaluation of the effect of Bristlecone Pine on Radiocarbon dating, and therefore on history, archaeology, and the Bible. The best summary of the material, that gives you the impact of radiometric dating (which is mostly radiocarbon), may be found in Colin Renfrew's work "Before Civilization". There is a very fine work in the "Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research", February 1977, (you will note how many of these things are up to date--we are dealing with material that is only now becoming clearer, even in the scientific world) devoted to radiocarbon dating in Palestine during the "Early Bronze Age", effectively presented in this article, which I can highly recommend in terms of the integration of information. ¶ There was an occasion, before I addressed the Big Sandy campus on this subject some little time ago, that I needed also to evaluate the geneologies of business people--men in the priesthood in Egypt and Mesopotamia--in terms of whether our previous reconstruction of history would stand. I found that a particular work on the priesthood in Memphis (which is in Egypt), was not available on the West Coast, and I want to expressly thank on this occasion Mrs. Eleanor Schauer and Mr. George Meeker, who both did me the service of going to the University of Chicago library, and they gave me an evaluation of Borchart's "Ennenriah" (?) (it is in German), and he made a very fine study of it right there on the spot on the WATS line, and it clearly indicates that the history of the dynasties of Egypt from the 11th Dynasty thru to the period of the kings of Israel and Judah has a sufficient number of generations of fathers and sons, not only in this area but in other areas, that we cannot in any sense of the word reconstruct the history of Egypt in any manner other than the fundamental manner it has normally been presented by the historians of the world. I think it is very important that we can not only document here but in other areas geneologies which require the sequence of events as normally given, are given correctly, and that indeed there is a total need for re-evaluating the history of Mesopotamia and Egypt (which were the primary areas in which reconstruction occurred). From archaeology now we can draw the conclusions of the following nature: that Archbishop Ussher in his work on Bible Chronology had in fact lengthened the history of Israel and Judah by 40 years or so, or in comparison to the reconstruction that I gave in the last revision of the Compendium, a length was assigned to the contemporary history of Israel and Judah that would have been 44 years longer than the evidence actually extant. That is, from the days of Ahab to Hezekiah... (tape turned over)... so called "Biblical" view. There is no way to get around the fact that Ahab was still living in the year 853 B.C. or that Joash in the year in which Adad Nirari invaded the western area to the Lebanon paid tribute to the Assyrian king in the year 802, and not at any other year. That in fact Hezekiah's 14th year did correspond to Sennacherib's invasion in 701. That the fall of Judah has to be seen as having occurred on a spring-to-spring calendar in 587. That Thiele, a Seventh Day Adventist scholar who did the work "The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings" erred only slightly, but was very near in his restoration. He did not have the full evidence, because he had overlooked the relationship of Joash of Israel to the Assyrian king, which is made very

clear in the work "Archaeologie von Alttestament", in German and not available in any other language. It is the only study that has been done in German on the subject. In any case, such a restoration is imperative. And we are not dealing with critics who abuse the Bible. It is possible to take the Bible just as Thiele did, with respect, and to come up with an explanation that in fact is in complete harmony, not only with chronological statements, but with such peculiar historical statements such as that Uzziah recaptured Elath after the king was dead (II Kings 14:22). Now normally I have had to read it over and puzzle why it would say that because we had always assumed that Uzziah came to the throne after the king was dead anyway. But in fact he was not. He was a joint ruler and only after his father died did this event happen. We have to look at these other statements as well.

¶ We are at the place today where we need to do a thorough evaluation of the subject, and I am happy to say that in works that William Dever has contributed to, and Paul Lapp, deceased, in the "Near Eastern Archaeology in the Twentieth Century",<sup>or</sup> the one most recently done called "The Mighty Acts of God" in honor of George Ernest Wright, that we have very thorough documentation of the period that is the transition from the pre-Flood to the post-Flood world. I will be able also to say that we can highly recommend the "Cambridge Ancient History" in terms of the third revised edition, where the first two volumes have become now four fat volumes, at a prohibitive price. We may draw the conclusion today that Thutmose III came to the throne as the Cambridge Ancient History gives it. Now it is not of course possible to demonstrate this to this group, but I am merely saying that I can provide the documentation so that there is not any question that the Cambridge Ancient History is correct. Thutmose III came to the throne in 1504. Now in connection with that, the strongest evidence is available, again only in German, in a two page article "The Battle of Megiddo", which shows that astronomically it is not possible to entertain any other idea in the realm of the framework of time that one is limited to. This is I think clear proof that the American scholarly intention of placing Thutmose III in 1490 is now impossible. He did what any sound scholar ultimately does when he makes a contribution-- Professor Helk went back and said that the attempt to amend the text is incorrect-- to read as it was originally given was the way to read it, and that leads to the only conclusion of 1504. Therefore in connection with that we have a work that was in honor of John Wilson, in which a Professor Parker interrelated the end of the reign of Thutmose III--and his son in such a manner that it is possible to date the Exodus as the very year after which no army expedition was able to hold together the eastern part (that is, Palestine, Syria, Lebanon), of the Egyptian realm which I would date therefore in the tenth year of Amenophis II. We may also date Hammurabi as the Cambridge Ancient History gives it, to 1792, not at some lower date of William Foxwell Albright. We may date therefore Dynasties I thru VI of the Old Kingdom of Egypt and the earliest Pyramid Age (not the only pyramid age, because there were pyramids build later), but of that period as altogether pre-Flood, as also all the material from written records of Mesopotamia from the earliest dynasties thru the dynasty of Akkad with Sargon of Akkad all being pre-Flood. And the evidence now being found at Ebla is parallel to the late generation prior to the Flood. I know of at this moment no other way to construct the archaeological, radiocarbon, the stratigraphic, and epigraphic material. Therefore there may be some reason why where Narim Sin (of the same dynasty as Sargon) said that when Ebla fell, it was the first time that it fell, not since the Flood, but since Creation. A very significant point in time. We confused, in reading much of the literature, we confused the word "flood" with the



Flood of Noah when in fact sometimes references to the flood that occurred in literature prior to the days of Noah's deluge was in fact a reference to the "Flood of Chaos" before Adam. And we did not distinguish. But the reason we could not distinguish is because it was assumed that every language that existed must have occurred not prior to the Tower of Babel, when we overlooked Deuteronomy 32:8 which said that God divided the sons, not of "ish" (man), but of Adam. And in dividing the sons of Adam, the only way you could ever keep them divided is to give them other languages, and when the world was wiped out by the Flood, and one family was left, we were left with a family that had one speech--a very simple deduction, and it does not explain what the pre-Flood world was like, it explains that in contrast to a world in which there was more than one, now the human family had one speech. They may also have had a knowledge of other languages, but this is incidental to the story. But we have read it as if everything before the Flood was equal to the state of affairs of the first generations immediately after the Flood. These are pre-suppositions, you see, that indeed lead to a condition where we could no longer publish anything in the name of proof of the Bible. ¶ Now we come then to the question, if the Early Bronze (speaking of Middle Eastern terminology, not measured on the basis of metals, but of pottery), this is essentially pre-Flood, and the Flood came somewhere in the earliest phases of Early Bronze IV--I will not define that further. And Middle Bronze, Late Bronze, and the Iron Age (as defined by pottery and not metals--these are terms unfortunate, but we live with them), are post -Flood, then we are confronted with the fact that all "geology" is pre-Adamic and that all of the Tertiary is pre-Adamic; that all the Pleistocene is pre-Adamic; that Homo Erectus is pre-Adamic; that Homo Neanderthalensis (who knew no art, though he buried his dead), is pre-Adamic, that Homo Sapiens Cro Magnon, (which is my technical definition, as distinct from merely Homo Sapiens Sapiens) is pre-Adamic (even if art was known), that Upper Paleolithic hominids were as much a part of their environment and did not alter it any more than the deer that ate the foliage of the forest, that the time frame that parallels all of this--the Mesolithic, the Pre-pottery Neolithic, the Pottery Neolithic--represent the state of the physical environment. They were put here to do more than observe the rocks that God made. But were made to be a challenge to angels to govern a more and more complex world correctly. And at this point in time we may draw two fundamental conclusions that are important: Civilization, good or evil, did not coalesce or crystallize until the beginning of what we would call the "Proto-Urban" or "Early Bronze I" in the Middle East, but suddenly, just like that, individual traits that have been found for centuries, or even for a few thousand years, made no basic impact, here a little and there a little was added under whatever new creation there was, because we are not told the nature of the pre-Adamic creation in terms of the physical world--have to observe that--we only know there were angels, and we know the angels were here not merely to govern each other. They were here in governing each other, but also to administer a physical world and God's government on it, in preparation for planting the heavens (which they will no longer do in the manner that they could have). But they were being tested and trained. ¶ Suddenly there comes a time in history when everything coalesces and crystallizes. It is this point in time, not many centuries before the beginning of writing, that we ought to place the presence of "man"--Homo Sapiens Sapiens is the correct definition. Now the way to distinguish is not in any other manner than a recognition <sup>that</sup> <sup>with</sup> the Spirit in Man, man now knows what he is doing and is held accountable in a manner that no other creature governed in part by either angelic instruction or instinct was ever held accountable.



And I believe the contribution of Mr. Herbert Armstrong made beginning in the 1960's in this direction is fundamental to an understanding of why we have a level of culture, or its lack, extending over a period of thousands, to tens of thousands, to hundreds of thousands of years, during which there were no solid evidences of progress except jumps as a new creature made its appearance on earth. The Spirit in Man I think is fundamental to our understanding of what the proper explanation of skeletal remains and the cultural remains prior to roughly 4000 B.C. (I am just using a round figure here) actually represent. That crystallization of civilization did not take place until about that time--just shortly afterward--and it has lead to the present crisis in 6000 years, that we now face in the world today, which would have been impossible by any creature without the Spirit in Man. That man today is essentially a refined creature, and we may distinguish of course the fact that whereas creatures who were not accountable to the law lived essentially in accordance with their abilities, that when man becomes accountable, he knows no limit, either upward, or downward. That he can do anything downward that any brute has ever done and choose to live at that level if he wants to. But it does not prove what the actual level of ability of the creature may be who lives on earth today, which knows no actual upward limit, tho most people prefer not to look in that direction.

END

Some of the works that Dr. Hoeh referred to above are available [REDACTED] [REDACTED] for those who may be interested in pursuing this.

- ✓ Dr. Hoeh's address at the Big Sandy campus
- Donovan Courville's book "The Exodus Problem"
- ✓ "Pensee" magazine's series on "Velikovsky Reconsidered"
- ~~"Creation Research Society Quarterly"~~
- "Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research"
- Dr. Hoeh's paper "When Did Nebuchadnezzar Conquer Jerusalem"
- Thiele's "Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings"