

42_771008 HLH Jubilee

For those who are listening in, so I will read my name as it appeared on the Farm Conference 88 Participant Directory, February 5-7, Santa Rosa, California.

There was Herman L.A., Ambassador Foundation, and our address was a phone number.

There were a number of other interesting individuals in attendance, some representing the government of California, some from areas far and wide.

Sometimes you come up with a surprise in an occasion like this and I would like to address the subject of agriculture and the laws of God pertaining to agriculture, business, property, because it's all woven together.

One of the things that struck me, that's unusual, was the number of blacks in attendance.

Now I might have guessed Japanese, but there were, I don't think more than two or so orientals.

But this was not the ordinary money-making program, this was an actual study of the problems of agriculture, sustainable agriculture, organic agriculture, what is taught in schools, was rather one of those unusual opportunities locally where we don't have to travel too far as we often have to to Washington D.C. or New York for certain things.

But we met a number in the black community who are in business and in farming, the business being in connection with the distribution of food, for instance in Compton.

All I can say is this is the first time I have ever had this kind of experience.

And I thought it was an unusual turnaround from the experience that many blacks remembered for several generations the problem of working on the farm in some kind of servitude and then to have been freed only to discover how do you buy land when you are a free slave with no money.

But significant changes have taken place in one of the dinners when we try to attend certain ones.

You sometimes meet people in a social occasion that way you wouldn't think to.

We sat down in an empty area in a logical place on one side of the table where three blacks and three of us sat down on the other side was an opportunity to get acquainted.

And they were all from Southern California.

But a number from Northern California are in the farm business and one man represents the presentation of such material in print and on radio for the state of California.

Anyway, that was an opportunity to have a new perspective of the importance that many blacks are placing on the right direction in this particular area.

I'd like to take a little time before we look into the biblical material to let you know what one learns from places like this.

There was a beautiful large placard.

I think my wife picked one up but I didn't want to carry it here.

It's something you couldn't put in a folder.

But the American Cancer Society.

Now the plain truth, of course, is the good news our publications would have addressed these questions.

In principle, in the 1950s, you know, once they all got started again with the growth of the colleagues, this arm's gone with addressing them in the 1930s and 40s as well.

So what was remarkable about this American Cancer Society placard is that it showed you the food that you could eat which offered, in a sense, defenses against cancer.

Now it doesn't say that it will prevent cancer or that if you have it, it will cure it.

But these foods are those which are considered to be important in the defense mechanism of the body and its fight against cancer.

And of all things, they were all the beautiful vegetables that you grow in the garden.

The suggestion was that you should see them that way rather than in Campbell's soup if I may use a term as my own.

In other words, it was seen in terms of what to get out of the garden as distinct from what you find in a little can or a bottle on the store shelf.

But it says what are the cancer risks? And they point up the things we have already learned.

Stop cigarette smoking. Go easy on alcohol. Have respect for the sun's rays.

Trim the fat from your diet. Moses had something to say about that.

Use of nitrate-cured food.

And then on another section, water-protective factors. And here it gives the list.

And what was remarkable is, in fact, that we were addressing this kind of thing.

When people were paying no attention.

We were addressing these questions 30 years ago.

Just out of the simple principle that this is the way God made the food in the first place.

Now that's a relatively simple deduction.

It's essentially the same as why God's women don't have to wear makeup to look beautiful, but that's another topic.

God made us with certain things that are the natural sources of beauty, the natural sources of health.

Before the function of the meeting formally commenced, we had a chance Friday morning to take a tour.

Normally in a case like this, the assumption is that some people come in early and want to fill up their time, so they provide a tour.

This, however, was one of those remarkable occasions.

Not only did some people come early, but so many did that at the last minute they had to arrange two tours.

One was to a farm run by Mr. Bob Connard, the French defense, who teaches farming at the Center of the Junior College, where he also manages the Center of the Junior College Experimental Farm.

On his farm, what you'll be seeing, he raises a large variety of organic vegetables, which he sells locally to restaurants.

In this case, his primary market is a restaurant in Berkeley.

This area was in Napa County, though the meetings were held in Sonoma County, in the wide area of Northern California, for those of you who are familiar with it.

This man was an unusual person to get to know.

I had a chance to pick up the agribusiness program from the Junior College, and I saw also the schedule of classes, and I was very pleased to see that in this Junior College, they are in fact teaching.

Thank you. They are in fact teaching the fundamental problem as at the University of California Santa Cruz.

I will interrupt. There is a vehicle with lights on and with a battery we have produced.

The vehicle is the Brown Soyota license plate number 427UXG, underground parking lot.

Brown Soyota 427UXG.

Feel free to get up, turn the lights off, and come back, and pick up the story wherever we are, we won't wait.

This man teaches farming, teaches business, and he teaches organic farming.

This town of Santa Rosa happens to be one where I was born.

It has a Junior College that was there before, there was any Junior College in San Francisco.

It happened to be, in years past, one of those areas in the state of California was, I would say, some of the highest educational standards in the state.

I think that the standards are fairly high today. I have no reason not to think so, but it is interesting to see that in this Junior College, about 60 miles, as you would drive from San Francisco or Oakland around, it's in the range of 45 to 60 depending on your route, that they are indeed teaching some of the basic principles of organic farming.

Something that Mr. Armstrong was interested in, when Ambassador College was founded in 1947, and he used to look around, and he realized, though, that he simply couldn't put his time into that and everything else.

And it was many years later that we were blessed with whatever opportunities have been afforded out from the Big Sandy campus.

What was remarkable about Mr. Bob Canard is something that we can all learn.

He's a man who has to make a living. He's doing it partly by teaching and partly by working on the farm.

And to make the farm go, he has a market.

Now, one thing that I think is coming up in television, I just thought today we'll look over the weekend and then have a chat about it, has to do with how to get your first job. It's an interesting topic.

But it is also important to realize that getting a job presumes that somebody else created it.

It is also vital to recognize that you don't always have to have somebody else create your job.

Perhaps you can create your own. Now, it doesn't always start out that way.

But I think it important to realize that the farming business is essentially not just getting your first job, although you may have had many first jobs.

This particular business, which today is only handled by about 3% of the country, 97% live in urban and suburban environments.

This kind of job is essentially self-management and planning.

And you learn a lot by watching men like this.

This man has a restaurant. And the restaurant uses his produce.

Now, the important thing if you're going to have a restaurant use your produce, you have to provide the food.

The restaurant attracts the people.

And if the restaurant that attracts the people has no food, 500 customers a day will not continue to come back to the restaurant.

So this man has learned not only the importance of organic vegetation, vegetable, fruit.

He's learned that it is important to design a farm such as his to provide the fundamental basics of vegetation and fruit that a restaurant will need that has as its fundamental approach organic food to serve the clientele.

It's one of the basic principles that is slowly developing, one of the principles slowly developing in the state of California.

It means that you are growing them according to the fundamental principles laid out by common sense and agricultural science as well as an understanding of the way God designed the nature.

The nature should be self-sustaining, not something where you ruin the soil and simply move on.

Let me tell you a little bit about his farm, even a most unusual person.

He's farming a slope, not a true slope, but it does slope and there are hills, it's undulating.

Not really a hillside, but it is the hillside, it's one of those, you know, slowly moving down the hillside and moving up in a little other direction here and there.

There was once a turkey ranch and being a teacher, he chose this because this is the one place you would never plant fruits and vegetables.

And he has chosen it to show what can be done.

The soil is so fragile on this hillside that it doesn't deserve to be used this way under normal circumstances.

It had been a turkey farm, the turkey sometimes were allowed to run out.

They simply left the hillside denuded of the fault of the fine soil.

So when he got there, he essentially had an eroded, slightly sloping hillside.

That had been so preyed with poison in order, herbicides to some extent, but pesticides in particular, so that they could raise to thousands of turkeys on this ranch in the cramped conditions where you usually find them.

That is in a house and then in a closed yard above the ground or sunshine on one side of the house or turkey houses.

He planted vegetables the first year, essentially the cabbage family.

He had a remarkable crop the first year. They all died.

It got absolutely nothing. The land was so full of pesticides, herbicides that they simply didn't grow.

He had a nice way of putting it. I'm not sure that I have all the notes.

Anyway, I remember to me in this term, let me just check to see.

No, I have lots of notes, but he said when a land is healthy, the plant absorbs from the land and produces the vegetables and the fruit.

It's able to take from the soil because the soil has everything that is needed for its own health.

And so the plant can use what is there, but when the soil is deficient, he put it in very interesting terms.

He said the soil absorbs the plant, and that's what it did.

The soil absorbed all that he planted that first year, what he said to eat, and the soil needed things, the microbes in the soil, breaking it down.

No, people haven't always thought how things work, but in the soil there are various bacteria, microbes, viruses too.

They break down the little particles of rocks, they excrete acid, and it breaks it down so the minerals from the rocks are available.

Actually, what they're doing, you'll pardon the illusion, they're really urinating.

That's their body function, and the acidity from that is what is essential to the breakdown of the rocks.

Now the tragedy on this farm is that the bulk of the rocks were large enough, small by comparison, but they were large enough that it would take a long time to break them down.

The tragedies had to go to areas where fine mineralized rock is available and crush it and actually carry it up in the pickup truck.

In order that there can be the proper mineral resource on the hillside that was there and has since been washed away, because the turkeys sometimes, when they were let out, ate up all the weeds, scratched the surface, but then the water came and what you have, of course, is washed.

Now, he has an unusual approach. Not only did he challenge himself, you might want to think of this in terms of Mr. Armstrong's Seven Laws of Success.

He did not only challenge himself to take a land that was illogical to use, but he challenged himself to build that land up so that it could be used.

And he has done it in an unusual way, as he says, if I uprooted all the weeds, then I would be confronted with the fact that there would be nothing essentially to hold the soil in at length.

So he really has two kinds of crops.

Vegetables that he sells, some fruit trees, and weeds.

Now, a weed is a plant out of place.

So in this sense we'll still call them weeds, even though in this case they are in place. They're necessary.

What he has done is to encourage the growth of weeds wherever he does not have to have vegetation for market purposes.

And he has Mexican Americans, he employs himself and his wife, they have, I think, two children, and he employs four or five Mexican Americans.

Somebody asked him, why do you use them? And he gave the same answer, interestingly, the church members have.

He says, because they do, but I ask them.

I think that's a marvelous statement to make.

That doesn't mean these farmers know the truth about organic growing.

They would do what you ask them if it were right or wrong in terms of farming.

But I think that is something remarkable.

Teach them they will learn more.

But I think that is one of the highest things, one can say, of any people.

They will do what they are paid to do.

They do what you ask them.

And they cut down the vegetation when it gets so high.

But what he does is, of course, plant vegetables close together in what is called the old French intensive method that I have addressed before.

Not so old, but it's known for some time, which prevents the weeds as such from dominating.

And he may have to cut a few weeds around certain areas or uproot them in a few cases right around the planters, but those have to be done by hand.

But otherwise, they simply teach them at a level where they are, in fact, the benefit to the soil by holding it, cut them off, but not uproot them.

And that creates a certain ultimate humus.

The plant provides an opportunity, of course, for greater microbial activity than if it were simply a hot rocky hillside.

He has learned that every kind of land has to be seen in its own light.

There are some who criticize his method, and I would agree I would not use that method on a rich soil.

The next farm that we attended was that.

So this man has to build it up to show what can be done, what are the techniques.

And so he has learned to work with the weeds as a protection for the maintenance of the soil and keeps them as competitors of his vegetables under control.

Now he works hard.

When he departed, he didn't just amble off, he loaked off.

That's the best way to describe it in a hard slope.

It isn't a fast run, it isn't a walk.

He really moves around.

He understands what it takes to be a success.

We visited another ranch owned by Mr. and Mrs. Adamson.

This is a strawberry farm.

50,000 plants.

They bought the land in 1973.

Mr. Adamson had some kind of stroke in 74 and he's had to run it ever since.

Most people would have given up after all.

He has a job with the San Francisco Chronicle.

Why did he do this? She explained it on one occasion.

We were there.

Because I work five days a week with people.

I like people.

She says, you know, it's nice to get out here sometimes away from people and with nature as God created it.

It offers her a change of pace.

That farmland is utterly the opposite.

It is adobe soil.

It essentially holds lake beds.

It is so rich they do not put anything on it.

It would be a mistake to it, perfect as it is.

The soil is absolutely perfect for its job.

They allow it to rest.

Not on the pattern of the sabbatical year which I will go into, but they allow it to rest certainly adequately.

They see that the weeds are kept down.

There's no problem of erosion.

They don't have to do with weeds.

What the farmer of Canard had to do.

And they rotate crops.

They don't come back with a strawberry until three years at the last.

I think we should learn a little something about this.

Because people in England who have studied this have recognized that in a sense crop rotation means that you don't come back until three years have elapsed from it.

In other words, if you did it in year one and you do it in year four.

If you did it in year two, you do it in year five.

And that makes me think of the fact that probably, though it isn't said in the Bible, there was the reason that God, besides the financial need, built a pattern of year three and six, as years of tithing in that cycle of seven.

You know, when you had the third year, the year of the tithing for the poor, the needy, the widows, not to forget the Levites, who had need, the sixth year, the seventh year was a sabbatical rest of the land, seven of those, and you had fifty.

In a sense, this implies that there is a connection between the financial implications in the Bible and what can be learned from experience, even about rich soil.

It's worth considering how many implications are distinct from direct spiritual communication we may derive from Scripture in this connection.

There are fifty thousand strawberry plants.

Bob Tenard and the group do all their work by hand as much as possible and only use cultivating or the initial filing method or disking whatever is essential for the crop as little as possible.

They generally do it only once in seven years or so, but they turn the soil over.

Otherwise, they simply have to work it shallow.

They've learned these things.

In the same way, the Adamsons do a lot of hand labor.

Strawberries of this nature are marketed in the countryside up there near the great metropolitan area of the Bay Region.

They are marketed at a very good price, but to guarantee that it is grown right, no pesticides, no herbicides, nothing but to find a soil, and every berry is edible.

There is nothing with a defect.

They guarantee it because everyone is and-takes.

Now, there are different methods of irrigation.

They use the spray method where Bob Tenard's farm is, but in this organic strawberry farm, they don't do what is commonly done in Southern California, where you put plastic on the ground and then you have to use herbicides to combat the mold and other diseases that love the warmth under the plastic on the ground.

Now, the plastic is used because they also spray or in some way irrigated will vary often above the ground and the particles of standard dirt would get on the strawberries.

But the Adamsons have adopted a method that Bob Tenard does not like to use on his farm, and that is what we call drip irrigation.

I can understand both premises, it depends on the product.

In this case, by drip irrigation, nothing gets on the strawberries.

Because they're not irrigating them.

And, of course, it rains, that can damage the crops, so that's irrelevant anyway.

You wouldn't pick them for that purpose.

But by irrigating them with a drip method, the berries are absolutely clean and free of soil particles.

And it is quite remarkable what this family is able to do with this land.

And they can command quite a price.

Because they have something to offer in quality and in character where you don't have to throw away foods like you often do when you get these plastic boxes of vegetables like that or fruits.

Anyway, it was interesting to see the reality and how people work and apply principles in different ways depending on circumstances.

And you, of course, need to think that through living here in Southern California.

Any of you who may have home gardens, they're different principles to apply to the soil you have or with you have.

Because some of you may have something better or worse depending on circumstances.

Anyway, the number of lectures were quite interesting.

There was a remarkable presentation on fruits that my wife attended.

And Mr. Don Schroeder, I think, attended that one.

And I attended the one on New vegetable crops.

But it is surprising what is being done today.

There is such a thing as the heirloom treat.

I have addressed this question before.

I think it's interesting to take note.

There is a nursery devoted to what is called anti-apples.

And they also have other crops.

Today, in 45 years, since my formal studies in agriculture in the Santa Rosa High School, this is something from junior college.

In these 45 years, we have reduced ourselves to certain kinds of fruits.

And I suppose most of you, if you were to name the fruits on the market, could name on two hands all the varieties that you could imagine if you had bought of apples.

But when I was studying agriculture, we could name 120 and more varieties.

Many of these are quite remarkable.

But they depend on care, specifically for the soil and purpose.

It was unusual to see some of these now being reintroduced because more and more in California, there is a growing demand.

And elsewhere, a growing awareness that's on a small scale, probably the same scale that the Church of God is in Christianity.

This is the same scale in agriculture, though maybe we're not even that big.

About 1% of crops grown in this state conform to the legal definition of organically grown, which was also discussed.

That's in accordance with the California Health and Safety Code.

We might call it certified organic farms, organizations, or some groups like that.

Must be subject every year to review and examination.

But to see and to have these things brought there, and to realize that the world is full of remarkable foods designed for different purposes, long since forgotten, or only recently forgotten, that have a significant special purpose.

And much of this, of course, is psychological as well as nutritional.

It has to do with beauty.

It has to do with surviving through the winter season.

But generally the crops that are marketed have to be designed for shipping.

And the shipping on the premise that it is picked green and will still ripen satisfactorily.

It must have a certain look.

One of the curses today in our market place is that when looks are not important, we've made it important.

And when looks are important, we have made them, we have made it unimportant.

Oh, that's the paradox, but it's the way the human mind thinks.

There are blemishes that can be on apples just by nature.

An apple is close to a branch, and it rubs, and it is blemished.

But that doesn't hurt the apple, but it hurts the sales price.

So the middle man, of course, stops the farmer.

That's one of the big problems.

Many things are not at all what they should be, because we've used techniques, especially in fruits, significantly in vegetables, to have a certain appearance.

And we judge by appearance, not by flavors, and not by quality, not by survivability through winter season.

But the opposite happens with eggs, for instance.

Eggs that should vary with the season.

For yellow in summer, greener out here in winter and spring, we don't want those.

They're more beautiful, but we don't want them.

People are led to believe that if an egg looks too yellow, it is somehow diseased.

Now this arose, of course, from a commercial need.

People would go into restaurants who didn't know anything about the farm earlier part of the century, and they said, well, how come these eggs are yellow instead of orange for the yolk? I don't want them. I want orange eggs.

But you can't have orange eggs all the time.

And so in our dictators of people who are ignorant of the nature, the change in the season, because when chickens eat grass, the eggs get more orange in terms of the yolk.

The restaurant, the middlemen, then said, we insist that the birds have the same amount of green seeds throughout the year, so the eggs do not vary.

And now they are limited, in other words, essentially, to the kind of input from alfalfa and other greens in their meshes, so that eggs have this generally pale look throughout the year.

But it's interesting to see, in one area, because of ignorance, we don't profit by what would be available, and in the other area, we throw out good food, or we at least throw out food because it

has blemishes, or it might not be able to be picked early and ripe, and many fruits should be picked when they are ripe, and it's not kept at great distances.

That's all part of the problem.

I know, by the way, in this television program, I think it is interesting to see that you can't be a farmer without being a businessman.

You can't be a farmer without knowing the middlemen's and the retailer's problems.

I think we ought to recognize that getting a job is far bigger than nearly what most people think of in terms of a job.

The job that is ultimately most satisfying is one that enables you to learn whatever it is you're learning, agriculture or otherwise, but enables you to learn business management, enables you to learn how to advertise and communicate, something Mr. Armstrong learned many, many years ago, enables you to decide, make decisions.

It's one of the issues in the presidential election this year, decision making, because you have to know what to do.

There are learnings that are paid to store, and not merely to suddenly ship goods that can be kept in order that you don't all market at the same time when the price is lower, but essentially a free market.

Anyway, I attended one lecture on birds, cowl.

My wife did not.

She didn't grow up on a chicken ranch, and I did.

And horror of horrors, I will tell you what's happened.

I thought there were bad enough problems when I left it 40 and more years ago.

Without new techniques for coming, they're able to cross, for instance, certain turkeys, so that the genetic background leads to chicks that have unusually meaty breath.

Wonderful for the marketplace, wonderful for the pocketbook, except that now turkeys are being sold in the market as lost leaders.

That is, these doodlers, to get you into the shop and you buy that and then you buy the other higher price. Good.

So that, in fact, a turkey farmer is having it rough.

Anyway, despite this, one man posed a question he said, and I have thus and such agreed of turkey, and after so many months, about 18 weeks, they tend to die at significant rates, and often they seem to be physically unable to get about and to stand up as they should.

And the woman who was representing the state of California immediately knew what the answer was.

Well, she said those birds were never meant to be kept to maturity.

They are bred up so that they simply won't stand up.

As she said, after they get about 18 weeks old, they walk around, and this is her expression, like old ladies.

Well, old men, too, but she was, after all, the speaking of the woman.

They're not used for reading again their cork breath.

Birds are raised today that have to have certain high-powered nutrition in order to grow normally.

They're designed for that, and they don't have it.

They're stunted. They're run. They'll die.

I think it is a horrid situation to realize that we are already genetically creating creatures that cannot survive to maturity without some serious defect bodily.

This kind of destruction makes me wonder, from time to time, what Josephus would have said if this was what the Gentiles had been doing in that day.

He's a remarkable man for showing what the Jews who were keeping as close to the laws they could did not do.

The one thing he said they didn't do is that poisons around their home.

I don't know how the Romans were using them or the Roman world and Greeks and others, but certainly that's one of the things we have today.

I don't want to go any further in these areas, but we want to keep up with it.

Partly we have an agricultural program in which we are quite interested in the development of sustainable agriculture at different altitudes, as you know, in the country of Nepal, under the general direction there, of General Aditya Rana, a very delightful person, a friend of Mr. Armstrong, a friend of his work, a dedicated Hindu, but nevertheless he sees in us something he sees nowhere else in the Christian world, even though he's been warned by a Hindu that we are a greater threat than any other form of Christianity to Hinduism.

He sent someone over here to check us out and he said that's what he saw.

We really were, because we do what we say.

And of course if you do what you say, you're a threat to anything that doesn't do what it says.

And that's exactly the problem all through the world of religion.

But he's not concerned about that because he understands that we don't tend to be a threat.

But it was interesting how it was understood.

Anyway, we do want to keep up on it.

There's always something unusual, and you meet people you wouldn't have thought of before, that we should get some information that we can send to General Rana, might even be able to make available to our, you know, brethren in some of the more rural areas where the church dwells.

One of the peculiar things, of course, is among people in this field, I guess it's like among the prophets.

There's some who had like Samuel and Samson long hair, for certain reasons.

Samson was a tribe of Dan.

But the man who was responsible for one of these farms was a typical long-haired person.

It's something that is unbecoming, but he doesn't know that as a man.

Of course, that was the symbol that you were under some kind of special authority.

In the Old Testament, the Nazarite vow, it's not what he has, but his hair is like it.

But yet he's a remarkable person. You meet all sorts.

Clean cuts, clean shaven, you know, more traditional types.

But this area gathers people who dare to think.

Those who dare to think as conservatives or dare to think as liberals.

And you have to, in a sense, recognize that not everybody sees everything equally.

And sometimes people in a field like this see things despite having come at it totally apart from the Bible.

Now, I'd like to point out some interesting things in this connection that are in the Bible that might be lost.

It seems an appropriate time to renew our understanding of some things that are written in Scripture about this pattern that I have addressed.

You know, we have a farm, have had in the big, sandy area.

First of all, I will start out with a few comments.

People sometimes ask, what is the church's policy with respect to how we should care for land? Let me state what it is that the church knows and does not know.

People sometimes ask a very responsible, academically gifted Jewish conservative rabbi, Dr. David Winston, who did one of the commentaries in the Anchor Bible series, what it is that the Jews know about how to care for the land, especially with respect to the matters of pruning.

For instance, grapes, that was the initial question.

And he said, one of the great tragedies that the Jews have experienced is the fact that what is not a matter of direct written revelation in this connection is essentially lost, because there has been no continuity in some forms of agriculture, because the Jews never regularly lived in a situation where they were, in that sense, expected to know how to take care of certain crops in the manner of pruning.

And let's say pruning is an art.

Hair cutting is an art.

It's rather obvious when you see what happens sometimes when mothers try to do it on their little children.

Then it becomes modern art.

Anyway, that's one way to learn. Modern artists have nothing to learn, it appears.

They don't change their mind generally, it's just that, instead of improving.

But there are areas like this that you simply have to learn to experiment with.

Now, to experiment, it's important to take note that there are two basic kinds of language that everyone must know to be a success.

You don't have to know it to the level that we can create great dictionaries.

But you learn your mother tongue on the basis of experimenting, saying it.

Mother and father, someone corrects you.

That's how you learn a foreign language.

Anybody who isn't willing to experiment with something will get nowhere.

The difference is that these things are learning experiences, that's a very good term.

And they're learning experiences where the penalty is not a spiritual sin.

That is, it's not a spiritual matter and it doesn't lead to sin.

It may lead to a mathematical error or a bad grammar.

I used to think bad grammar was sin, now it's something commonplace.

That's why I was taught to look at language.

I haven't changed my mind, but I realized today that there is a greater area than I thought, not just black and white, hence who and whom no longer are used as terms, as they used to be in formal distinctions with respect to case and grammar.

But there's some things we have to learn from God.

And the Bible gives us those things which we need to learn.

And it tells you what we would say is right from wrong, because if you didn't do these revelations, you wouldn't know, and you could physically, as we say, burn your fingers, which has a meaning, you say, that you could definitely do harm to yourself.

The scripture says you shall not commit adultery, you shall not lie, you shall not steal, etc.

And so you recognize there that you don't do that.

But there are other things where you learn that you can experiment with.

So now I want to address some of the things which we shouldn't experiment with.

First, let me say one of the primary questions that people often ask, is what is the Church's policy with respect to this matter of letting land rest? And in this country, of course, we have produced so much that land is being allowed to rest, interestingly, in more than one way.

The government pays you not to work it, or city fathers simply allow you to cover it over.

With tar, or foundation for building.

As my wife says to me, you regularly say that it's a tragedy, we're not using some of the finest land, but we're bearing it under tar-max cement industrial buildings and housing.

She said that the other side of the coin is at least a threat, and we'll have to clear it off later.

But that's the case, that's the reality.

Anyway, it's a sabbatical year.

The Church has, as a policy, something like this.

It recognizes the impact of the revelation of God in this matter, for the good of the soil, for the good of what is raised on the soil, and for that matter, for the good of people who do farm the land.

It's good to have a break in order to repair the breaks and the bends.

In other words, there are things that really need to be done after seven years on a farm that you may not have gotten to during the previous six.

And so, there's also the opportunity to learn to do things that you might not otherwise have been able to do, because you can't always leave the farm and go somewhere on vacations or educational breaks, whatever it may be.

Now, we did not grow up in the Jewish community.

We are not a direct part of the Jewish community as the New Testament Church was.

The New Testament Church actually grew in the synagogue and grew out of the synagogue.

The Church of God today was not called out in the last century and this, that today's the William Millersonal now.

There's not been called out, essentially, of Judaism.

It has been called out of Christianity.

And so doing, there are contacts we do not have in tradition in the Christian world from which many have been called out to become God's sons and daughters in this life.

It's commonly thought that the sabbatical year is lost, and I want to at least address that question properly.

The Church has recognized that you were called from year to year.

And we're not living in Palestine. The Jews don't apply certain of these outside of Palestine or outside of areas that once were significantly Jewish in greater Syria, parts of Mesopotamia, where certain principles were also applied for the general population with Jewish.

But in any case, we are called out from year to year, from month to month.

In many cases, not as owners with any title, but as renters.

Farmer Canard is a renter. He didn't want to have to own that land.

He just wanted a renter to show what can be done.

And therefore, the Church drew the conclusion that much of our land is being bought.

Banks have acclaimed, relatives have acclaimed as to what you should do with that land from year to year.

So we have encouraged the brethren to let the land rest or to divide the land up in such a way that it does rest, if not all at once.

Because we cannot tell a man he must let his vineyard rest this year, and the banker comes out and says, if you don't work that, if you don't strangle those grapes and make them produce more this year, that's what they do.

They call it girdling, strangling.

A nicer word to tell the real truth makes the grapevine think it's going to die.

So they want to produce more.

New techniques they've learned, or things they have.

Anyway, the banker says you let this rest, I'll simply foreclose.

Because it says that you're to keep producing, that's what the original contract requires.

So the Church must recognize that we cannot impose on people what they are not prepared to follow through with, in the same way that the Jews later no longer found themselves in a position to enforce the jubilee year, which would be a wonderful thing in solving most of the problems of agribusiness today that they would banish.

Nevertheless, the Jewish community has preserved a tradition, and I will merely cite it.

It is understood from the Jewish community that in the Middle Ages there were Jews who lived in ghettos of Europe who lost the knowledge of the seven-year cycle and it was essentially redefined by Moses Maimonides on the basis from what he understood of Jewish tradition and an examination of the Jewish communities in the East that had been observing the sabbatical year and continuing seven-year patterns without the fiftieth year of the break.

And his conclusion agreed on the basis of all the documentation available to the Jews in the West and Spain for the practice of the Jews in the East.

It is therefore true that we can say the knowledge of the Jewish sabbatical year has been preserved to this day, not only intellectually, but in practice.

Furthermore, there's a simple way to figure it out.

Seven-sevens of forty-nine plus one is fifty, so you would have two-fifty-year cycles in a century.

That's an even number, but when you have only seven, then you have forty-nine and forty-nine in a century or ninety-eight years because you don't have two Jew beliefs.

So you drop back two years every century.

Now, if you want to know where we are, easy to figure.

You take a historic fact preserved in Jewish intellectual literary traditions and in Jewish practice that the year preceding the fall of Jerusalem in AD 70 was a sabbatical year.

That is the year from the autumn and the September and early October, or for simplicity, let's say early October, in sixty-eight to sixty-nine of the present era.

Sixty-eight to sixty-nine.

So you take the last part of it and you merely go back three months to see October, November, December.

So AD 69 ended a sabbatical year before the fall of Jerusalem.

Now, this is in the nineteenth century, so nineteenth centuries have gone by.

That means you lose two years every century in the cycle of seven, in the cycle that is made up only of seven.

So they're nineteenth centuries.

So we've lost thirty-eight years that would otherwise have been counted.

That means this.

That if you want to have a quick way to figure, you want to know how many times ninety-eight there have been.

That is two forty-nine without the Jew belief because the Jew belief has never been counted from that time to this and from before then.

So AD 69, we have nineteenth centuries.

You lose two every century.

There are only ninety-eight years in a series of fourteen cycles of seven.

Seven times fourteen is ninety-eight.

We have nineteenth centuries, so if you've lost two per century, that's thirty-eight years.

That means if it were AD 69, with the Jew belief it would have been AD 1969, but there were none.

So you lost thirty-eight from the year 1968-1969, which would correspond if there had been Jew beliefs, but there are no Jew beliefs.

So you subtract two down to nineteen.

You're nineteen centuries.

You lose two every century.

You subtract thirty-eight from sixty-nine, and that leaves you with thirty-one.

That means that there was a sabbatical year in nineteen thirty and nineteen thirty-one.

Now that you know that, you could add, say, to nineteen thirty-one, you add forty-nine years.

Seven-seven. Forty-nine and thirty-one is nineteen eighty.

It's a simple way of doing it.

So nineteen seventy-nine, nineteen eighty was a sabbatical year.

Nineteen eighty-six, nineteen eighty-seven.

That was just completed, just passed on.

Was a sabbatical year in the Jewish reckoning.

And you go on from there.

Nineteen seventy-nine, nineteen eighty-eight, nineteen eighty-six to nineteen eighty-seven.

That's going on, and we simply say that the church has never adopted that as a requirement for everyone, because we have had no direct continuity with the Jewish community.

It's always an administrative question, it's not a doctrinal question.

If the church administratively were to come to a decision that we should all have the same one, then we'd at least have to have a financial base in order to enable some people to make decisions and letting the land rest that they would have been unable to financially because it did not prepare.

Hans-Mister Armstrong's decision is a non-farmer.

He loves to farm as a visitor.

He said we'll just make it simple so the brethren do not have any basic problems, and each one simply figures it on the basis of when the knowledge came to him as to what he should do, rather than as a collective group or a church or a nation.

That's the state of the bear.

Now we may proceed backward in time, and we come to some interesting things in the Bible.

Let's say that we have the story, both in Chronicles and in Kings, from Jewish tradition, not directly stated in the Bible, but some things of Jewish tradition that have significant merit.

It makes sense, and you work with it, and if it does make sense, fine.

If for some reason it was a misunderstanding, then it is not something that is basic.

But if you take the story of Josiah, he came to the throne when he was eight years old.

Now we learn that later in his reign, he made certain decisions in the 12th year and then in the 18th year.

In the 18th year of his reign, he purged the land.

Second Chronicles 34-8, you can also follow in 2 Kings.

I'm just looking here, in King James' version.

At this time in the purification of the area of the temple that had been closed up in the days of Manasseh, they found the book of the law, and it was so shocking.

Now they had other scriptures, but apparently the circulation of the book of Deuteronomy had in fact ceased during this period, and it was a shock to find it.

Now the German higher critic said that this was essentially when the priesthood imposed the book of Deuteronomy, and the priesthood on the nation for some such nonsense.

Anyway, they made a covenant, and it is in the tradition that the 18th year, autumn to autumn reckoning of Josiah the king was in fact treated as and understood to be a jubilee year.

And now we may know when that year is, because we know that Josiah was slain in the battle that didn't have to take place, but did nevertheless, when Pharaoh Neko was coming up against the new Chaldean king of Assyria, the Chaldeans and the Medes having overthrown Nineveh.

And we have, of course, the Babylonian Chronicle record that was published by the British Museum, and earlier was known, but it was really published after the war, even though it was known before, that people didn't have access to it.

And it shows very clearly that there was a potential meeting of the armies in the year 609.

That is, the Egyptian army had come to Palestine in the very year that we would have expected the death of Josiah.

And once we know that the 31st year of the king ended the autumn of 609, for the Egyptian army had marched through the land in 609 in the summer, and they confronted the Egyptians in the city of Khartymi on the Euphrates River.

That means that we can begin the reign 31 years earlier, 609 and 31 is 640, and the 18th year would therefore be 623 to 622, 623 BC to 622.

Now, that is the actual date. That is not the traditional date that the Jews have assigned it.

So let me explain a little further. It is understood in Jewish tradition that the Jubilee was kept as a 50-year pattern in the Old Testament up through the time of Josiah and through to the fall of Jerusalem and afterwards, so that the story of Ezekiel chapter 40 introduces the year that would have been a Jubilee, which was 50 years later than the 18th year of Josiah.

But now we have a problem. I just wanted to let you know.

We do know from Jewish tradition that there was just such a Jubilee.

Let's see now if that is correct from the Bible.

Let us take note that in chapter 34 of Jeremiah, in chapter 34 of Jeremiah, there was a point in time in which the rulers of the land released the Hebrews who had been reduced to servitude.

But all the princes were standing all the people, which had entered into the covenant, heard that everyone should let his servants go free, then they obeyed and let them go.

But afterward, when the Egyptians came up in the Babylonian army left, they immediately changed their mind and turned and caused the servants and the landmaids, whom they had let go free, to return and brought them again into subjection.

So God comes and said, didn't I tell you that at the end of seven years, you were to let every man, his brother and Hebrews, go to you, which has served you, or who has served you six years, to let him go free, but your fathers are cannot, they just obeyed.

Now this was in a year of the siege.

This was in a year of the siege.

Now Josephus says the siege lasted one and a half years.

Therefore the kings at this time, unlike Josiah and earlier, the kings at this time are wrecked, according to the Babylonian method of spring to spring reckoning, which may be established firmly and clearly for the house of Judah at this time, in the book of Jeremiah, where he speaks of the seventh month as continuing the same year.

There are places you will find in the same year, in the seventh month, which means that the year did not end with the previous month, the sixth year, and begin with the sixth month of the year and begin with the seventh.

It began in the spring with the first month and ended with the twelfth to thirteenth.

Now at the end of seven years, you were to let them go.

Now this event is clearly in a year that we would define on the basis of the fact that the Babylonians were besieging them and this commenced after the siege began.

The siege began, according to the Babylonian document in the biblical records, in the winter at the beginning of the year 588.

So this sabbatical year that the Jews were going to keep was 588 to 587.

Now if you also take a look at another place in the book of Jeremiah.

In the same year, the beginning of the reign of Zedekiah, not during the siege, near the end of his reign, but at the beginning of the reign of Zedekiah, the king of Judah, in the beginning of his reign, but in the fourth year.

Now the beginning of his reign is the commencement of it, not three to four years later.

But in the fifth month, it was the same year that had been described before, where there was this transition to King Zedekiah.

Now he came to the throne at such a time in the month of Adar that his first year would have begun with the spring of 597, confirmed by the Babylonian Chronicle, which is quite clear.

It is also confirmed by the astronomical record.

We don't need to go into that, if that has to be a necessity we can do so.

But if he came in the spring, beginning in Adar and then his year, that was the exception month, and he comes to the throne in his first year, it begins in 597, then he is in a year that in the autumn to autumn reckoning would have begun 598 to the end of summer 597.

And we know that this is a year that is called the fourth year.

Now the fourth year of what? Well, what is interesting of course is that if the year of the sea, beginning in 588, has a sabbatical year beginning in the autumn of 588 to 587, then let's look what would happen.

A sabbatical year would have ended in 587.

Another one would have ended in 594.

Another one would have ended in 601, seven years earlier.

Now if the sabbatical year ends in 601, four from 601 is 597.

Therefore we know what Jeremiah is saying here is clearly that the beginning of the reign of the king was the fourth year of such a cycle, and that confirms of course the pattern that the 18th year of Josiah was a jubilee.

Just so you have that down, it's in the Bible.

You can look it up if you want to.

It is not fundamental to the practice today, but I think it important that we can say the evidence is there if you wish to look.

Now the problem is, if a jubilee was in a year BC, 623 to 622, and then 573 to 572, when did the jubilees stop to be observed? Because there was a Jewish tradition that the jubilee was not observed after the Jews returned to the land, after the Babylonian activity.

But it was observed on a 50 year pattern, let me state that.

The jubilee on a 50 year pattern was observed all through the time, even if it wasn't always properly enforced, but the counting continued through the entire time from the beginning of the settlement in the land all the way to the exile.

But when they returned, the Jewish tradition is that no formal sabbatical, sorry, no formal jubilee in numberings of 50 to 100 to 150 to 200 that way was observed.

Now, this leads to a question.

I've given you the actual date that can be confirmed for the kings.

But in Jewish tradition, they have not started the biblical chronology where it ought to be in creation weeks, near 4,000.

I'm only giving you around figure near 4,000 BC.

The Jews start the story of Adam and Eve with the year 3760 BC, at the beginning of the Hebrew calendar.

And they made a false assumption long, long ago that the Hebrew calendar commemorates the events of creation weeks, when in fact the date of the Hebrew calendar reflects the reality that it took man 10 to 11, 19 year cycles to determine by calculation the average length of the month.

And it couldn't have been determined for sure much earlier than that.

All right, the Jewish tradition is not that Zedekiah was overthrown by Nebuchadnezzar and the date that I have given you approximately here.

I didn't give you the date of the fall, I gave you the date of the year in which the sabbatical year began during the feast.

But the Jewish tradition would say that the exile to Babylonia took place, interestingly, 70 years before the return.

And they would have the last sabbatical year observed in the year 422 BC, 23 to 22, 423 to 22.

And then they said you add 70 years of exile, that year 423 to 422 they associated with events in Ezekiel chapter 40.

We don't need to turn to that now.

But they said that Jews were 40 years, sorry, 70 years in exile, 422 minus 70 was 352.

And so they allow only 20 years from 352 to 332 for the arrival of Alexander in Palestine, Jerusalem, I'll use the Arabic term.

It was in Israel in that day for Judah, Judea.

But historically we tend to use in the Christian world the non-Vionist term.

And so the Jews completely compressed the Persian period into 20 years because they started creation weeks with the beginning of the Hebrew calendar instead of where it should be.

Because the calendar did not begin with creation weeks, the calendar began when man learned how to determine the average length of the month.

And that took 10 to 11 cycles in order to be sure.

But now this leads to an interesting question.

On the one hand the Jews said there was no cycle of 50 years after the exile.

And when the Jews returned 70 years later and thereafter there was no further keeping of a Jubilee making the count 50, 100, 150.

Sometimes the Jews would formally say the year after year 49 is an unimportant Jubilee just to have what we would call a practice to remember it.

But it was never enforced and the count was only a series of seven.

Now look what happened.

When we get the picture, we have a situation, if it was AD 68 to 69, then there was a sabbatical year in AD 26 to 27.

27 from 69 is 42, 6 times 7. You can figure that out.

There was one in the year 38 to 37.

37 and 27 would be 64.

Know your zero, subtract 163. That's 9 times 7.

So you know that's correct.

38 to 37. Then there was another one in 136 to 135.

98 years earlier. That is you go 100 and drop down 2.

So 136 to 135. Then you would have had 234 to 233 BC.

And then 332 to 331. That year began that Alexander came and met the high priest in Jerusalem.

Opened up the sabbatical year, the Jews brought up the question to him.

We implore that you would let us recognize the law that we regularly observe to let the land rest.

332 to 331. And then you would have 430 to 429.

And then what you have would be 423 to 422. That's the next sabbatical year.

7 years coming down in our direction. That's not a problem.

Because the Jews said that 423 to 422 was the end of a jubilee.

That could be a problem. But at least you start numbering 7 from there.

But if you were to go back from the year 572.

7372 BC. Described actually in the book of Ezekiel chapter 40.

And to come down to 423 to 422. Then look what happens. You are actually counting by jubilee.

But if you were to go back from 423 to 422. To 521 to 520. 520 from 572 is 52.

And that's not a multiple of 7. So there is some problem in the general understanding.

But there really is. Because people have overlooked the fact.

That on the one hand the Jews said. The last jubilee ended in 422 BC.

But they associated that date with the events of Ezekiel 40. 50 years after the 18th year of Josiah.

The Bible was describing the year 573 to 572. And the Jews associated that with the year 543 to 542.

And between there is no cycle of 7. So we have a problem of how the count continues.

After the story of the exile began. Till it was picked up. That has become the present cycle.

So let me show you what the evidence of the Bible is. Because there is no way to link up the cycle of 7.

With the cycle of the jubilee of the Old Testament.

Unless. There is some evidence in the Bible. As to when the last jubilee was actually observed.

Let us now look at the book of Nehemiah. How did the Jews get the idea. That the last jubilee.

Which if they went to Ezekiel was clearly. In the 570s. How did they come to the conclusion.

That the last jubilee was the year 423 to 422.

Well now if you look in the book of Nehemiah. You discover something. You know sometimes these books that we seldom read.

Have some very interesting answers. And we start out in Nehemiah to make an established fact.

In the month peace left in the 20th year. Nehemiah 1 1. Nehemiah 2 1. In the month Nissan in the 20th year.

The King Arthur C. Same year. But you move from peace left. In the area of November December. To Nissan March April.

And that's the first month. As distinct from the ninth month. And yet you're in the same year.

That means the year here did not begin in the spring. It is an autumn autumn reckoning.

That is the legal fiscal calendar of the Jews.

Now we move along. In the 20th year. Nehemiah comes up. He describes events after five.

From the time that I was appointed to be their governor in the land of Judah.

From the 20th year to the 30th. There were 12 years there I was. I came up.

I saw all the things that had to be done. Until we got them working on the wall.

The wall was finished. In the 25th day of the month. A. Louis.

After six first 15. Now you come up in the 20th year. And in the month. A. Louis.

They have been able after concentrated effort. To finish it in 52 days. What a remarkable piece.

Now the wall was built. So let's determine when this is.

First of all we have to recognize. When the king came to the throne.

Because this is reckoned on the basis of the reign of King Arthur C.

Well King Arthur C. came to the throne. In such a year.

That is 20th year. Would be by autumn to autumn reckoning. As the Jews were doing here.

445 to 444.

In the autumn of 445. To the end of summer.

For the autumn of 444. And since he came up. In the period of spring to summer.

And built to A. Louis. This occurred at the close of his.

40. Sorry. His 20th year. The king. Which was 444.

That means. That his reign began in 464. Actually he came to the throne.

At the very end of 465. And he was reckoned as having the rest of that spring.

Or sorry. The rest of that winter as his expression here.

And the Persians reckoned spring to spring. And began.

With a month of Nissan in 464. And the Jews the autumn of 464.

And 20 years was complete. In 444.

Now. He finds a record. The genealogy. In chapter 5.

He writes them up. So that everybody knows who should be dwelling in this Jerusalem.

And he goes right on. He's the governor.

And everybody. Is now appointed to various responsibilities.

Some were assigned to live in Jerusalem.

So when the 7th month came. Alul had just been finished.

The 6th month. In chapter 6 verse 15. And now when the 7th month came.

The 7th month came. The beginning of a new year.

On the basis of autumn to autumn reckoning.

All the people gathered themselves together as one man into the street.

And they spoke to Ezra's scribe to bring the book to the law most.

Which the Lord had commanded to Israel.

And Ezra brought this law before the congregation.
And he began to read. To make them know what they should know.
And he read the book of the law distinctly. Verse 8.
They discovered there the story of the festival of trumpet.
Then the story of the Feast of Tabernacle.
They found written in the law about taboo. Verse 14.
All of chapter 8 is very interesting.
They had a remarkable solemn occasion. And a time of great joy.
Now in this case they were reading the law.
The reading of the law occurred according to the book of Deuteronomy.
At the end of 7 years.
You tied for the poor at the end of 3 years.
Then at the end of 6 years. And then at the end of 7 years.
Verse 10 of book of Deuteronomy. Chapter 31.
Deuteronomy 31-10. At the end of every 7 years.
In the solemnity of the year of release.
In the Feast of Tabernacle. That follows in a sense.
The close of the 7th year. That follows the close of the 7th year.
The Jewish statement is very clear in the Hebrew.
At the end of 7 years you release people.
They are not released at the beginning.
But at the end of that year some debtor obligations do.
Up to that time.
At the end of 3 years when you finish the harvest you bring in the tithe.
So at the end of a 7th year.
The law was expected regularly to be read.
Now think about that fact.
Because we are dealing here therefore.
With a year beginning new in the 7th month.
And at the end of a Tabernacle year or a 7th year they read the law.
Therefore. The 20th year of our desert seas was a Tabernacle year.

At the end of which they read the law.

445-44. The reason the governor could do what he did.

Is the people in fact were free to devote their time.

To this emergency need to build the walls of the city.

443-44.

38-37. 31-30.

Then moving down 7 years.

24-23.

424-423.

Another 7th year.

And our count begins today and goes backwards.

Beginning with the year 422.

Whereas the book of Nehemiah says it was a Tabernacle year that ended in 423.

And the answer to the question is very clear.

Under the Prophet.

Under Ezra and under Nehemiah.

The last Jubilee was observed in the year 423-422.

Just as Jewish tradition says.

Even if they misunderstood it.

That that has nothing to do with the book of Ezekiel chapter 40.

But they remembered correctly.

In other words you can take a cycle of 7 all the way back to the year.

Beginning in the autumn of 422 BC till now.

An exact cycle of 7 years.

And you can continue the earlier 50 year cycle.

Through the story of Jeremiah.

All the way through the events that I just read to you here in the book of Nehemiah.

And you come up with that illogical problem.

That those cycles would have ended a Tabernacle year.

With the year 424-423.

Just like you had one in 445-444.

21 years earlier.

And the fact that you have one year in between.

After a Tabernacle year before the next cycle begins to count 1-2-3-4-5-6-7.

Confirms the fact.

Which is therefore in the Bible.

That the last Tabernacle year was not observed.

When the Jews were taken by Nebuchadnezzar.

Away from Jerusalem.

It continues to be counted on the basis of the last Jubilee.

To what I meant to say.

The Jubilees continued to be counted after the captivity.

In the days of Zerubbabel.

In the days of Ezra.

To the days of Nehemiah and Malachi.

All the way as the Jews themselves say.

To the year 423-422.

Even though they saw.

That was the story of Ezekiel chapter 40.

In fact.

That is not at all.

That's what it describes in the Bible.

That is something that took place after the 20th year of our desertity.

So we can say today.

That the cycle of 50 years.

Was the count that was observed from old times.

Through Josiah's day.

And through the last of the prophets.

And by the Jews own tradition.

That ended in the year 423-422 B.C.

And after that time till now.

In preserving the.

Patterns of just a cycle of 7 years.

The Jews have kept the count.

All the way to today.

And this year happens to be the first of the next cycle of 7 years.

587-1988.

The first year of the next 7.

Anyway.

It is interesting to see.

I thought I could address this question.

And to explain what it is that we can know.

Some of you might never realize.

That right there in the book of Nehemiah.

When you get the evidence.

You have a problem that needs a solution.

And the solution is.

The Jews had the answer all along.

And didn't realize it.

They understood what year it was.

But they made the mistake of associating it.

With the end of the captivity.

That period the end of the captivity.

Rather than in the days.

Of Nehemiah.

The governor and Malachi.

That was a mistake.

I used to wonder.

Where was the error? Was the error in the dating? Or was the error in the association of the date of the event? And now we know the error was in association.