

960800 Irish Christianity HLH ST B CA

I will give greetings from Mr. Guy Ames, for whatever reason he did explain to me, but it didn't seem critical that I should have to tell you why he couldn't be here.

So he asked if I might come in his stead, and he can explain what happened later.

I would like to just describe two things in advance of a particular subject.

One, since we started a little early, I wanted you to know we came over Route 23, which is a beautiful area.

My wife has never seen a place quite like that.

For much of it, she was on the side that goes down there.

It is a remarkable area indeed, and it gives one some idea that after individuals who came up El Camino Real, that is the now Highway 1, the next solution was how do you break inland to the various canyons that reach the sea.

So this is a classic illustration of a remarkable area.

I am in fact reminded with the rounded hills, not the rugged ones, of the coastal experience in northern California where I grew up.

Someone asked if I had recently taken a trip elsewhere.

The answer is yes.

Ambassador College Board does meet, because that is the name of the institution when we had one in England, and the Worldwide Church of God Board also meets in England.

Regularly, those meetings are held there, and from the United States, the minority on the board go to Britain, because lawfully they should be held there.

For some years, we treated it more traditionally, and we simply signed off, and a proxy was representative for each one.

That usually was the pastor general.

But it's quite clear after I had realized what the legal requirements in England are, and that is that we should regularly attend, and if we can't, we have to make apologies.

So I have made it a practice now regularly to go, because legally I am responsible, and if other people make wrong decisions, I can be legally responsible in a way, even though I am from another country, that would differ somewhat from the responsibility in this country.

Further, we had a major responsibility in the downsizing of the work and the conclusion of the publication of the plain truth.

The major responsibility was how to deal with the larger, long-term lease properties in Borougham Wood.

With that in mind, it did seem very important that we fully understand the situation, which I think we do, and step by step we are trying to resolve that downstream.

Now, you'll understand that in Britain, long-range leases are normally expected, not from year to year, or even short-range, and therefore it was simply unforeseen, both what would happen in the realm of computer science with respect to publishing, and also with respect to the internal changes that have occurred in the Church, and therefore reflected in the work of the Church.

Mr. Halford has become responsible over there with a certain liberty, and I would like to explain that.

I don't think he's been here recently to talk to you, to my knowledge.

He felt that the plain truth should be begun again, that it would be a mistake not to have such a medium, because in one sense of the word he foresaw that the direction the American plain truth would go would not, in fact, mean that we could have a plain truth in England if it were the same thing.

We, as you will see in the magazine, have a different perspective today as to how we distribute the plain truth, what we mention in it, the question of advertisements, the question of book reviews, for example, in the spiritual realm.

All those things need to be considered somewhat differently in Britain, not to mention the mainstream.

So it is important that I try to keep up to date.

Now board meetings are in one sense confidential.

On the other hand, we do say things about the direction of the work as a public matter, whether or not the board may discuss it.

I am speaking now as one who talks outside of the board with respect to what Mr. Halford has been given as a responsibility.

Things that are published, he wants to be within the framework of the instruction that the Church provides within the United States.

On the other hand, we cannot have a magazine in Britain that has what we might call a fundamentally evangelical perspective because our publication here traces some very important traditions in a way that differ from Britain.

For instance, here we trace in the Christian world around us a fundamentalism that has become the evangelical movement.

The fundamentalists of the first half of this century are basically the same people but one or two or three generations removed now and are called evangelical.

When Ambassador College was first founded, the people were known in general who had a certain perspective toward the Bible as fundamentalists.

Now the idea in Britain would never have seen fundamentalists as a significant element of the Christian population.

For today, evangelicals are not a significant element of the Christian population in Britain.

The fundamentalists earlier essentially ceased to have any major role to play in Britain because Darwin had won the debate over there in the public debate and the theologians themselves essentially were Darwinian whereas in the United States we could have a scope trial one generation after the British thought the discussion was passed.

But since that time, liberalism has indeed made many inroads and even among former fundamentalists I'll use that word.

There is a tendency now to look at science somewhat differently and even though there are differences within the evangelical movement we would say that a primary emphasis as might have been typical of the Middle Ages with respect to God as creator would not be characteristic of the evangelical movement as a whole even if they do have a special respect for those first eleven chapters of Genesis.

But the fact remains the evangelical movement is a major movement.

It is a plurality perhaps in many areas of this country but not a majority in most.

A plurality means it's probably one of the largest groups.

The majority means more than half.

In Britain this is not so.

There are some very significant people in Britain who are evangelical.

Now an evangelical person, I want to explain this because this is important in terms of the sermon, an evangelical person does not necessarily belong to a single denomination.

There may be evangelicals in England and the Church of England among English Methodists, among English Presbyterians or Scottish Presbyterians.

It is not a question of denomination so much as a point of view.

Now my subject today will not be what that point of view is if you would like to find out.

You certainly could look up in any encyclopedia where it would be discussed.

I think it would be better there than something so simple as a dictionary.

We are not directly addressing the questions that evangelicals in the United States would address in our English edition of the Plain Truth.

Even the question of the title of the magazine now has to be considered in Britain for legal reasons, but that is not something for us today.

Mr. Halford prefers to ask questions that the man on the street would ask.

In America it would be almost unthinkable in much of this country, certainly in the Catholic world and in the Bible Belt, and wherever religious feelings are of some significance.

It would be unthinkable for a girl, this is the actual event in Britain, who walked into a religious store or otherwise, I don't know the background there, and there was a cross and then there was another one with a little figure on it, that is the crucified Messiah, Jesus.

I don't know of any American, if I were to hold both up, who couldn't identify who that was, who traditionally is pictured as hanging on the cross.

But this English person, now two generations or three removed from any significant religious training, she asked or she said, I think I'll take the one with a little man on it, and that hit the newspapers in Britain, you know how they like to show that they've won the day, this child, this teenager, didn't even know who that was who was represented on that cross.

So what we did was run the picture of that cross with a little man on it, and the question is, stated there at the bottom, that is the question in a sense of her statement, I want the one with a little man on it, and there it was.

And we took that as a way of addressing the British audience to show how far they have gotten away from the traditions of their parents or grandparents, or maybe more today, because England has been a secular society for a long time.

We don't do that in this country, our approach is essentially addressed to the evangelical movement, we are not trying to address denominations as such, we're addressing how to be helpful within the evangelical movement in general, and to take the message that the church regards as important today to the unchurched, who may be friends and neighbors, and hence the emphasis on the local church area.

But in Britain, one doesn't essentially market religious goods in a magazine by advertising, rather we are doing some of the more traditional things that we used to do.

We are asking a secular world about questions that they either haven't wanted to face, or they don't know how to answer.

And so the plain truth has become a fundamentally effective publication so far, even if we are having to face the legal matter of what the titles should become.

Anyway, it is important, and I certainly would ask you to pray for the success of the magazine in Britain, because when people respond to that magazine they also tend to respond to the spiritual message that is there, and in fact the income is holding reasonably well.

But we have to have it that way because we still have some very important obligations with respect to least office space, and that is, let's say, where the burden lies.

So there is a need to see how we can resolve that.

England has too much office space, there are places in this country the same thing is true, you see, and it's an older building.

We are quiddling it down step by step when someone at least is willing to come in at fair terms as a sub-lease or sub-let.

Now in the meantime, the meeting was on Friday of the board, so Mr. Halford asked if I might go that weekend and speak to the brethren in Belfast, Northern Ireland, or in Ulster, the six counties that make up Ulster today.

I did accept that before going to Europe.

I had been there at a time before the present crisis broke out between Protestants and Catholics, so it was quite a surprise to what I saw.

The so-called truce situation that we have heard has caused certain walls that are regularly erected when a crisis occurs, has caused those to be stored away, they are iron walls.

They can be erected or taken down, that is, you close roads so people can't come through.

The city, Belfast, is quite an imperial appearing community because it was a great shipbuilding city in the world, not just a local one.

The streets had some unusual repair work, and if you look carefully, you'll notice that in the most recent riot, many of the streets had about the size of an automobile heated and burned out, you know, where the tar essentially was burned and there was a serious rough spot.

Place after place was the same thing, and indeed this is where automobiles were set afire and burned throughout the town in the recent riot.

That's being repaired.

Then I was taken through the Catholic and the Protestant communities where it is safe to go, and I think at this point it was safe to go most everywhere, not everywhere, but most everywhere.

The reason for that is, of course, the Olympics had the people's attention as distinct from the local problem.

The Olympics having their attention, I could see things that sometimes tourists might not.

There was graffiti representing the Catholic message.

It essentially looks like graffiti.

Guests are a minority.

It is written normally in clear script.

It is not the crazy quilt of figures, some of which are legible, some of which may not be in the greater Los Angeles area.

These were simply slogans that we would normally term graffiti.

One would not speak of them as art.

It represented a radical element of the minority view.

That is, much of the graffiti would not have reflected even the mainstream of Catholics in Ulster, though some of it most certainly would.

But then it was the Unionist radical element, that is, the radical Protestant element that I want to tell you a little bit about, because I've never seen anything like it.

There are housing structures that I think in a simple way you could picture.

There are long series of attached homes, much like an apartment structure that goes this way, and you enter in the front doors of house after house, and you could go out the back door.

But at each end of these essentially block-long houses, at each end there was a solid wall, no windows.

That's just the way they built them.

Now the radical Protestants go through this block and invite people to contribute to a work of art that will appear at either end.

You don't know what it is until you see it.

If you want to continue to live there, you pay.

If you don't wish to pay, you will soon learn why you will want to leave.

Do I need to say more without defining details? What goes on at the end of these long blocks of houses is something to see.

It is not graffiti, it is art.

Every indication that it represents essentially the sense of government.

There will be a banner, there will be a shield, there will be a slogan, and in everyone will be either the head of a person or the torso, and with the torso also a weapon.

And in either case, the figure is large and is garbed in black from the top of the head to whatever dimension of the body is represented with holes for the eyes and the mouth.

It is a symbol that the people represented here do not identify who they are but go masked.

The warning is, don't separate Britain from Northern Ireland.

It is, I would say, a form of illegal state terrorism because this represents illegal organizations as many of the graffiti in the Catholic area also represents many of the forms of graffiti represent the illegal organizations, that is, they are those that are considered legal that enter into politics and those that simply resort to arms and are not lawfully represented in government.

That was really something to behold, but the biggest surprise of all is how this is very often not necessarily entirely because money is collected other ways too.

The primary source of money is through the sale of drugs by both Protestants and Catholics on the radical fringes of each group.

And some of our members, and of course this is known elsewhere in the press as well, but you don't dare say much, at least, and identify yourself.

The leaders of the radical Protestant Unionists who are functioning illegally with weapons and the leaders of the radical IRA that is not involved in government from time to time meet together, believe it or not, to decide what part of the town each group will collect its drug money.

Those who represent the Catholics will often insist on having certain areas.

You see, there are Catholic areas, there are Protestant areas, and then there are mixed neighborhoods.

And so these groups are in fact involved in the drug trade and are themselves functioning criminals, gangs, in the garb of religion.

That's what is in fact the case.

You would be surprised how many, many violent movements in the world are supported by the sale of drugs, and that's why it is not stopped because there sometimes are people of prominence in lawful movements who are supported and get their votes from those who support unlawful movements.

Now I want you to know this is not Islam, this is not Hinduism, this is not Buddhism, this is Christianity today in Northern Ireland.

Good people like the good Germans who said nothing.

Good people in Northern Ireland who say nothing.

Because unless all good people spoke out, the few who would be dead.

That's what it amounts to.

And so the status quo remains.

And each one may have certain valid premises.

The idea that they couldn't peaceably meet together and analyze whether the Protestant should be a minority in United Ireland or whether the Catholic should be a minority in a portion of that island yet related to Britain, that is something that political leaders, diplomats could resolve, except for the fact that a radical element on either side is involved in drug money and holding the rest of the population hostage.

That's what it amounts to.

This is what is happening in the Palestinian movement.

There are certain groups that have held the rest hostage.

Now you don't do it in the normal way, you simply do it with threat, the threat of death, the threat of burning you out, beating someone up.

Whatever it is, you soon learn what you can and cannot do.

Now what to remind us? The Christian world is participating in this.

This is not the way the whole of the Christian world is.

This is not the way the whole of the Islamic world is.

When we go to India, we discover this is not the way most Hindus are.

But on the other hand, one finds a violent streak when human beings allow their natures to run wild irrespective of their religious teachings.

Some people have better control of themselves.

The radical military Buddhists in Myanmar, we formerly called it Burma, are not a very sensible people.

But you can find many responsible people in the Buddhist community, as I know that we have as friends in the Hindu and Muslim communities as well.

But it's a tragedy.

And I thought that I should report on this.

It is not something we would want to put in print, specifically.

But you cannot imagine, these pictures generally will be twice the height of this building, at either end, let's say.

That is, the building will be, you have your lower living room, your bedrooms may be upstairs.

So it's not like somebody lives up here, somebody lives here.

You simply go up and down.

There are different structures, of course, but for dimensional purposes, they're probably as wide as this and about twice as high.

And then the family lives here, another family lives there, and so forth.

But when you see these remarkable structures, and they're far greater than life-size, masked, garb person with a gun and with any other weapon that can be attached to it, and he stands there on guard.

That's the sense that you get.

It's intended to put fear into anybody who would try to depart.

So you have what I would call a much less imperial profile in the Catholic propaganda, the IRA propaganda, and not every Catholic supports the IRA, just like not every Protestant supports these radical Unionists.

So it is.

The brethren are, however, as safe as in Los Angeles, as safe as in New York.

I think they're safer than in Washington, D.C.

They are certainly safer than in South Africa.

The capacity of the government to resolve.

I would like to give a brief summary that I think is helpful so that we can understand some of the background that might puzzle one as to why the church has made certain decisions with respect to the magazine, with respect to turning authority and responsibility to the local congregation, with respect to the demise of television, not to mention the doctrinal discussions.

In a few minutes I could summarize what it is that I would like you to understand.

And I want to be fair.

In doing so, I might on occasion offer a perspective because I would not assume, and you should not assume, that every perspective that a pastor general has is shared by everybody in the church.

In thought, this church was monolithic from 1933 to 1986.

Let me tell you that you have not been reading The Good News Great Fine, which would tell you very much that people could sit next to one another and not realize the world of thought in which this person was living.

There were people who thought of this day as a burden, who sat side by side with people who thought it was a blessing.

And we understood that we were brethren.

Now when the cover is lifted, I can tell you we weren't all thinking the same thoughts.

Now sometimes it is thought that everyone thought alike in an incorrect manner.

The fact is, we didn't all think alike, and we don't all think alike today.

And I would like to give a simple outline of a way of looking at things that would represent how Mr. Tkach had to face problems that came to his mind after he inherited the responsibility of the office of pastor general.

First of all, let me say something that is important.

We used to recognize that there were people who were baptized in years past who came upon our broadcast, radio or television, or our printed literature, and came to us made inquiry of their baptism and of the way of life that the church expounded.

And we recognized their baptism as valid.

Now even though that was the case, there were people who assumed that the only Christians that existed were in our fellowship.

So let me tell you that was never the teaching of the church.

Now on the other hand, we didn't assume that all who were called Christians are in the body of Christ.

Any more than all Muslims would assume that all are practicing Muslims.

And for that matter, Catholics distinguish between one another.

Muslims who are practicing Catholics as distinct from those who were not.

I would say at this point all the people whom we know as personal friends who were Catholic are practicing Catholics.

And I would say the Muslims whom I know, in fact, when I was in Northern Ireland, there was a Muslim who came, Adli Mukhtadi, whose name you have seen for years off and on in the world tomorrow, a person representing the King of Jordan.

Just by chance, he was in town the same day I was and where I was staying was the, that is, visiting the home of a minister who knew him because he had worked in connection with the Middle East.

And so Adli Mukhtadi was also there.

And for any of you who remember the work that has taken place for many years, he was fundamental in its accomplishments.

Adli Mukhtadi, in fact, has addressed the ambassador students from time to time.

Anyway, it is important now that we recognize that there was a time that we did understand the difference would be perhaps as to whether the Christian world at large is or that there were people within it on a much smaller scale.

But the Church has never assumed the other, that there were no Christians elsewhere.

We have met people who for twenty to twenty-five years had pursued the Christian life because they read what was in the Bible.

And that may be a larger number than many may have thought of in the past.

Nevertheless, Mr. Tkach, when he came to responsibility, came to think in his mind that more and more people were indeed within the Christian community.

As he used to say, there are many who, within the Christian community, listen to our program, treat our television program as their church home, and in fact seek to do the will of Christ as they understand it.

Do not fellowship with us, though they might write to us.

They may or may not attend a local church, very possibly they were, or as someone wrote to Mr. Kelly, one of the speakers, your program has made me a better Presbyterian.

That's far better than a worse one.

I mean, that ought to make sense to anyone.

But that led to a problem in Mr. Tkach's mind because many people who were writing these things, who were appreciative and seeking in what they wrote us to do God's will, simply had no grasp of the Sabbath or certain other characteristics that came to be identifying marks of the Worldwide Church of God fellowship, or the fellowship of the Church of God in general.

So it troubled him how people who didn't observe the Sabbath, let's just focus on that, who didn't observe the Sabbath could be Christians if Christians must keep the Sabbath.

Now that would never have, let me put it plainly, that would never have troubled me.

When Mr. Armstrong began to preach, he recognized that there are some parts of the divine instruction which human beings essentially incorporate into law.

The world has some understanding, now I won't say they understand any of these correctly all the way.

They have some understanding in law that stealing is wrong.

But not everybody looks at it quite the same way.

They understand the adultery is wrong.

But not everybody practices it, even in the Christian world, you see.

So what I'm getting at is indeed there are certain parts of the general overview of God's instruction that human beings would understand.

To lie, to dishonor parents, to steal, we don't like liars, and yet how many people understand it perfectly, that is, they would perhaps fudge here or there.

So it's very important to recognize that when it came to the question of a day of rest, even though that might have started as long ago as Genesis 2 in God dealing with man, the idea of a day of rest from your work really didn't take hold until the modern labor movement stopped the idea of working sometimes six days a week, sometimes seven, and around the clock, fourteen hours a day.

Labor movement had as much to do with the fact that we have a weekend off, so to speak, as much as religion had anything to do with it, and the interesting thing, whatever the labor movement might have said, whatever religion might have said, there is nobody who would know which day, you see.

Because there's nothing natural in the world that would tell us if there should be a day of rest, or if there should be a series of rest days in a week, some getting off here, some there, or one at the middle, one at the end, of course nobody ever asked how come we have a week to be that as it may.

Mr. Armstrong understood that some parts of the instruction you have to ask God about or you wouldn't know, and how would I know that God thought it should be one in seven or maybe like the Egyptians, none in ten, because they just worked them, worked them and worked them, but they did feed them well.

And the Egyptians had a kind of ten days, ten and ten, and thirty-day month.

Many places around the world still do not understand in their religious traditions that there is a week.

They only do certain things in a month, something at the new moon, something at the full moon, and they function that way.

Even the Buddhist community functions that way in its religious tradition.

Only the Jews had a day of rest, none of the ancient nations did.

And apart from any biblical statement, you could not find out by checking the stars, you could not find out by any means whether God had chosen one or another.

And so this work began long ago with the premise that some things, if they are for us, may not be naturally understood but spiritually understood.

That is, not everybody would understand it in the same way just by reason, as they might reason about stealing, reason about murder, reason about adultery.

Therefore, it never would have been for some people in the church a problem to recognize that it might indeed be possible for someone to be in the first resurrection who had heard about the Bible, who had sections read to him, who never observed the Sabbath because nobody had ever mentioned it.

I will tell you that, and if you thought otherwise, you didn't understand, and frankly, Mr. Tickhott didn't think in those terms, that it was possible for God to reveal himself to people, for people to have the Spirit of God who were baptized and only years later come upon something that the Worldwide Church of God, or the earlier Radio Church of God corporate name, was teaching.

We never assumed that a person for twenty years who never heard about the Sabbath but who was doing everything according to what they knew, living according to every word they had discovered as they discovered it.

We never assumed that those people had to know everything to be in the first resurrection.

However, there were many people in the church who thought that was the case, and hence there were people who thought that you were forgiven by grace and had to do one thing or another or several things in order to be saved.

That's not my makeup.

That's laid out in the messages from the ministry, from the lay people that went to Tulsa, and that the minister there, Mr. Lord, made available to the churches in the Good News grapevine, which I recommend that you all reread, if you don't have to read everyone, half a dozen would be enough to

tell you that there were people who didn't understand things like others in the church, and it doesn't mean that everyone understood it all incorrectly or all correctly.

But when Mr. Tkach, who was essentially among those who assumed that a Christian should not be and in a sense was expected to be a Sabbath keeper, he did not know what to do with so many who were seeking to do and doing God's will as he perceived it, and I would perceive it in accordance with what they were finding in this book, who were living as much as they were able by every word of God.

Let me tell you, without identifying two people, I was in the state of Montana, and I was in the car of two people whom I had met some months earlier in Southern California, and I happened to be there during the last day of the Festival of Unleavened Bread, and I said to them, what we do, and then with respect to the Passover, I will address the question only at the moment, and I said, well, what do you do with respect to the subject of the 14th, of the first month, and when Jesus was crucified or commemorating his death? Now, the answer was very simple.

The answer was, you know, these are evangelicals, by the way, and I said, well, what do you do with respect to the subject of the 14th, of the first month, and when Jesus was crucified or commemorating his death? The answer was, you know, these are evangelicals, by the way.

That is something we haven't yet looked into.

Now, we have identified the carnal mind.

The carnal mind would normally say, well, here's the way I look at it, but this person and his wife did not say it that way.

So I want you all to know that this institution, from the beginning, recognized that we don't all walk at the same rate on the narrow path.

That some understand some things that others don't yet, but in the end, the forgiveness of sin is by the grace of God, through Jesus Christ.

I draw your attention to the song that Mr. Ross Judson wrote that we sang near the beginning.

I think that was number three.

The book was copyrighted in 93, and the songs were written not later than 92 or 91.

The church understood that, or should have, not everybody perhaps did.

But that song represents where the church actually stood.

Now, once Mr. Tkach, and I want to be fair here, because there were many who took this view.

How could there be people who were Christians who didn't do all the things we did? And the conclusion that he came to is that these things that we might practice are either not essential or optional or whatever term you would like to use with respect to a number of things.

The question of tithing being one, we're talking about practice or sabbath or annual festivals or dietary questions that the church has always defined as pertaining to physical matters in any case.

And if there is lust, that's a more serious question of sin that is spiritual.

As a result of that, the church basically has concluded.

And I want you to understand the why, you see.

That is, if there are so many Christians that don't do what we did and yet are seeking to do the will of God, and if these things are required for salvation, I say if, because I never took that view, if they are required for salvation, then those people cannot be saved when they die because they haven't done these things in their life.

Now, our account of the thief on the cross should long ago have answered the question.

But not everybody thought this.

And for those who essentially took the view that these things were required, then a decision had to be made if these people are going on the path that Jesus laid out for us and if they do not observe the things that the church had observed before, then those things had to be understood as optional or as unnecessary.

And it goes back to the premise that in some way they were seen or understood to be required.

Now, some of us have talked to those who have left our fellowship, and some who have left our fellowship would say that certain things are required.

Now, they don't say it with clarity.

And is that lack of clarity that led Mr. Tkach to the conclusion that he came to or felt he needed to come to? I say to this person, what do you mean are required? Well, a person says, if I knew that tithing or giving one tenth is not required, he said, I wouldn't.

Or if I knew the Sabbath were not required, I wouldn't keep it as a rest day.

I took strong exception to that.

That man is very prominent among those who are no longer in our fellowship.

That's not how I understood it. It is how he understood it.

But within the church, there were those who thought these things were required.

And as a result, when they realized that God can call people and not everybody walks with the same pace, the church declared that, indeed, certain things are optional.

Now, when you understand that, then we can take the next step, which is something like this.

Therefore, there are many Christians indeed, and I will not argue the percent nor does anybody need to, but just there are many Christians in the Christian world who are seeking to do the will of God.

Therefore, we are not asking them to come into our fellowship.

We want to help them be better Christians within the understanding that they have and hope that what we also say will enable them to be, quote, better Presbyterians, whatever their religious views may be.

As a result of this perspective, we could no longer continue a World Tomorrow program, which was an instrument for building the work and the fellowship of the Worldwide Church of God, or simply the Church of God.

The World Tomorrow program was indeed terminated for the very fundamental reason that it was structured in its previous message to bring people to Christ and to ultimately have them participate at some level, either as readers, as coworkers, or as members.

Now we are not seeking to transform people who come to a knowledge which has always been understood as possible.

Is it possible for a Baptist to read the Bible and find its meaning and seek to do the will of Christ and be forgiven and be baptized? The answer has always been yes.

That's why we have some members whom we never be baptized.

You were 25 years Baptist before coming among us, and I can name you.

The classic example is Mrs. Herbert Anderson of our Fresno Church.

And she had a sister who was a member.

Her husband came to be a member.

She has a daughter.

And her husband, so the families were members.

And yet we never thought she wasn't a converted mind.

She didn't come to understand.

She was baptized.

She didn't come to understand some things.

She was baptized around 1923.

Long long ago, but anybody who knew her knew that she was seeking to do the will of God.

As a result, therefore, of the view that our unique features before should not be treated as requirements in any sense of the word.

We, therefore, are not now seeking to do others than to help people become better Christians within the fellowship where they are.

Our work, therefore, in the United States and elsewhere is essentially addressed to bringing people who are not otherwise in the Christian fellowship into a relationship.

With other Christians or with ourselves.

And I'm trying to summarize it so you know where the church stands without necessarily assuming that every step in this process of viewing the scripture has to be the view of everybody.

But I want to point out that if it isn't all together in my view, my view is not in any case similar to many who have left the church.

Who assumed that these things were equally required for salvation as well as having the grace of God.

You see, we need to realize that there are things yet to be learned in the Bible.

And the more we read, the more you find what you should do in loving your neighbor as yourself.

And if you didn't know how to love your neighbor before, you're not going to be held guilty, kept from the first resurrection, because you only knew some things, how to love your neighbor, and you've learned some things since.

Well, what if you haven't learned all the rest? Because we can always learn how to love our neighbor.

Better.

I'm sure that you could look back on occasion.

I think we all can say, well, you know, if I knew then, but I know now, I would have handled it in this manner, not in that manner.

We've learned more how to love our neighbor who's an alcoholic.

We did not know how to love our neighbor who was an alcoholic in times past who sought to do the will of God and not every minister does today.

We have learned how to love our neighbor who has become a member, who is a homosexual, but a non-practicing homosexual.

There was a time I was looked at with dubious eyes because I did make it my job to try to understand the mind of the homosexual and gave a lecture in the early 1980s on this topic to the ministers in the Refreshing Program under Mr. Tkach's supervision.

There was a time I wouldn't have known how to help such a person.

All those whom I have been in contact with have been able to stay within the body of Christ because there are ways we can do this and make them and ourselves help them in a way that we could not have before because we can learn more and more how to love one another.

Now, if that is the case, then we need not break up fellowship merely on the basis that the administration draws the conclusion that certain things are not required.

The Church, in fact, does not really tell us what is required.

This is from the point of view that people get the idea, therefore, they have to have a certain set of views and must do them.

I say loving your father and your mother is not going to make you immortal even as observing the Sabbath day in whatever manner one may be going to make you immortal.

Immortality is a gift of God through grace.

How we should live, the way of life we should live, has always been voluntary.

And if the Church imposed certain things, then the Church did need to reevaluate those impositions, make up by to be a classic illustration.

The Church does not now regard it as required.

The Church makes no issue.

But we will have to, each one of us, give an account about what the Bible may say about how we conduct our speech, how we conduct ourselves physically in terms of the presence of others, how we conduct ourselves in dress, how we conduct ourselves with respect to a day of worship.

And the Sabbath has always been more than a day of worship in the Bible.

The Church has never said you could only worship God on one day, and the other six you are not allowed to.

That's nonsense.

The Sabbath is more than a day of worship.

The question then has never really been addressed as to whether or not it is a day of rest and how that may play an important role in our relationship.

Today we happen to be meeting on said day.

I met with the brethren who are refugees in Thailand from former Burma, Karen, who cannot meet on Saturday regularly or Sunday or Monday, who cannot meet in the same place regularly or the same hour because they are still treated as enemies.

And the Burmese have spies inside Thailand on the border and they cannot leave the border area.

Nevertheless, I will end with a statement that we are each going to be held accountable for what we know.

And you're going to have to give an account for what you know out of that book, not on the basis of what I say or what any pastor general may say.

Now, it is important that you listen to the pastor general, to your minister.

It is important that men listen to their lives.

There was an interesting Jewish joke that I heard the other day that a Jewish man should never, never allow his wife to dominate.

He, in fact, if his wife starts to explain something, he should put his hand down on the desk and make it clear where he stands and then listen to his wife.

That's why they are where they are, because they listen to each other and talk to each other.

Well, God is going to expect you to listen and to read and to give an account.

And you cannot use me as an excuse, Herbert Armstrong as an excuse, or Joseph Tkach, or Mr. Ames.

You think I was naming some Trinity.

Or Mr. Frill.

You must learn that the responsibility is yours.

I happen to have the New Testament.

There are those who don't bother with the old, but I do have one.

There's much to be learned in every word of God.

I am grateful that God forgives, because surely there are things that I will have overlooked when this life comes to a conclusion.

I learned that very often when I happened to be in the office, even though I'm formally retired, and my wife brings something to my attention that perhaps neither she nor I had perceived before.

So we can learn and learn that we should always be able to build on that foundation, which is Jesus Christ.

I'm glad to see that all of you who are here are here and others who regularly meet here that couldn't be here today are still within our fellowship.

It is unfortunate that those who have left now have their own problems to deal with.

We have problems within our own personal lives.

We have to work with our problems.

All those who left have potential problems.

You don't run away from problems merely by separating.

You think you have solved some area of stress.

But the fact remains you create others, because you suddenly discover that not everybody in any such group thinks alike.

That's true of the family.

That's why it's good to get to know somebody.

I got to know my wife well enough that we're still married after 42 years.

And her skills have not decreased.

And spiritually, she has made significant strides over the years, because I wouldn't have wanted to find someone I was married to who wouldn't walk the same path.

As to that couple who said, we haven't examined this yet.

My wife and I just a very few years ago visited their home and picked up in a sense the conversation pertaining to Bible or any other topic we wanted to just where I left off in 1975.

For your interest, that is Robin Lee and Patty Graham.

He was the boy who sailed around the world alone.