

991210 Irish Protestantism HLH

The South Atlantic was really not between Argentina and Britain.

It was between a host of nations who wanted to see what their weapons would do.

This is part of the way weapons are tested.

I think we have to be more realistic.

Now I wanted to take a bit of time to ask, as I said early here when many of you were not, we have someone who says he cannot adequately represent the Irish Republican army.

But at least he can tell us what he knows about the psychology of things in Ulster or Northern Ireland, and I'd be interested in your comment if you would like to be basically fairly close.

And if you need it repeated or something like that, we can do that.

Is there anything that from your past experience you think we ought to be aware of, or you might want to summarize the fact that the Ulster area is not now being asked by the Republican the South to become a part of the Southern Republic because in reality the South has no way to bring it about? That's correct.

Well, I guess the big thing is the agreement that I was in last week among the pro-British elements that decided to go ahead with the peace plan whereby the nationalists, including the political arm of the Irish Republican army, was called Sinn Féin, where they actually would have a part in government.

And that government is supposed to be being set up right now. It's in formation.

But there is a catch. The reason, the only condition that the pro-British elements agreed to participating in this government, is if the IRA begins to disarm by, I think it is March or April of next year.

And that of course is something that they have not wanted to do.

And so there's another deadline. In other words, the whole thing could still fall apart if the IRA does not agree.

And of course the IRA up until now has not agreed.

And the Protestants that you put most here mostly are all pro-British.

They say that they will not go ahead with this agreement unless they see some sort of tangible proof that the nationalists are actually going to participate in a democratic government.

So we will see what happens.

The thing about it is that the Northern Irish people are so tired of 30 years of war that they are willing to take a chance on peace.

They've had their hopes dashed time and time again.

And there's probably only about 400 members in the Irish Republican Army.

But yet they have almost ruined the Northern Irish economy to the extent that there's hardly any investment on the outside.

And in the meantime, in the Republic, there were called the Irish Tiger.

It's a miracle.

So the people in the North see the people in the South and they see that they're a tremendous prosperity.

And they want to have a part of it.

So they are very much interested in working out something.

Someone had a comment.

Has Senator Mitchell's efforts been exhausted already or is his part in the negotiations? Well, yeah. He thought that he had finished altogether and they had come back to the U.S.

And then this whole thing ran into the roadblock.

The roadblock was that the IRA would not give up their weapons.

They wouldn't even start.

So he had to come back again. He was big to come back.

And he came back and hammered out this agreement where they would go ahead and start disarming by three months time.

So they have already begun to start up a government.

In fact, the deputy in charge of Sinn Féin is now the new minister for education.

And his number one priority is to get the Irish language taught in Northern Irish schools.

And up until now, the Irish language has only been taught in Catholic schools.

I could comment on that.

One has to realize, by the way, Mr. Cedeno asked that other question and I try to have certain ones identified, one has to realize that there are countries who do have a case, what we call a home language, who really should spend their time on what we might call a major language of world trade and communications.

There's no reason for the Tongans in the South Pacific to teach everything in Tongan and have a few Tongans turn to English or French or Japanese or Chinese as a second language.

They might just as well adopt one of the languages of the great powers and have a home language.

But I'm not one who says you have to completely uproot your past.

Now remember, there is one people who play a far more important role today than perhaps any other for their size.

And the reason they are still a people is that after 2,500 years, they still have heard in the synagogue and in the home and now a whole literature, the Hebrew language.

And when they didn't have the Hebrew language, they had it always as the language of religious tradition.

And they read in it if they didn't speak it and they chose a single other language, which was in Archaic German, that's Yiddish.

And they used their own alphabet, not the West European in which to express it.

So it is important, I think, for us to realize that the different peoples who live on the fringe of the English have different dialects.

And although it may seem not worth it, there is something that makes people focus more on what they can do together than if one only knows English and the other knows too.

I mean, it's like keeping apart not only just in religion but in language.

If the bulk of all the Protestants know nothing of their heritage and relationship linguistically to those who are essentially Catholic, then you really can't break down barriers between them the same way.

If you have only had English in your past, I think it would be more difficult for me to explain.

For those of you who know some other language or Spanish as a typical one in the United States, where our church members in Canada might be Ukrainian, secondarily German or Hungarian or Italian and now Chinese, but in the church, there are things you communicate by that help you understand someone else.

And when people have something they can share in common, I suspect it can help to break down some of the barriers to realize that there was a time when the Scots and the Irish could understand one another.

And there are many Scots who are Catholic, surprisingly.

Anyway, thank you very much. I think that bears watching without a question.

I can only say that it is a small area of the world, but it is an area in a way that the Germans settled in 1648.

It was 1999 and 2000. It took the German princes essentially 30 years of warfare, and the whole of Europe was involved in essentially destroying the Holy Roman Empire between 1618 and 1648.

The rulers, of course, were the Habsburgs. They still stayed, but it was acknowledged that there are two official religions.

One could not dispose of the other. So you had the evangelical Lutheran and you had the Roman Catholic.

Now the Irish are going to have to come to terms. Can two people be side by side? If the Lutherans can do that, can certain other Protestants? If not, you'll just have to see.

The Lutherans are moving more and more toward affiliation with Rome in many ways.

And what happens in Northern Ireland, it happens so much later that it's very doubtful that some of these barriers can be crossed without more problems that we don't yet anticipate up there of a religious nature.

But meanwhile, economically, of course, both sides have to do something for each other, I mean for themselves as well as the other, because they're just falling behind.

Now, let's see where everyone is.

Someone brought a map, an old, there you are, that's sorry.

Would you like to explain, Mrs. McAllister, what this is? I think I know.

Well, I thought you were going to be talking about early pacifism and the church develop.

This is a picture of Faroaks, I believe, in 1895.

The main street was Faroaks. The other main street was Colorado.

And the center of town was Faroaks in Colorado.

Do you see how quickly you got into farmland in the back? My comment was that indeed when I came to college, Green Street on the south side, beyond Raymond, really was so underdeveloped that hardly more than one half of the area on the south had any structures, just open, undeveloped lots.

And the north side was incomplete.

By the time one got to Lake, there were some houses in the area along Del Mar, some houses along Green Street, private homes, and of course, California, Colorado and the rest.

But at Del Mar and Lake, looking south on Lake, was one great big building in what was no more than cow pasture, no cows but just grass, weeds. This was called Bullocks.

It was the only impressive building. The rest were just residences or empty lots.

Whoever decided to build there had foresight.

This was 1947. Had foresight that South Lake was a street of the future.

You would be surprised what North Lake looked like.

When I go there, I don't even recognize what I saw in 1947.

High rises didn't exist there. Bullocks was the tallest building.

Now look what's happened on Lake up to Walnut and then beyond.

One has to realize that it was possible to go at Del Mar and to actually come to the area of the railroad that was where the old press building was in the area of St. John.

You remember when Ambassador was developed, some of you remember we had a press building.

There was a lumber yard there. If you went down toward Del Mar, there was a railroad track.

There was a large tree and there was a station where you would have loaded and unloaded freight.

They had a goat tied up there. There were weeds and I picked those weeds that the goat couldn't get to.

They call weeds but it's lamb's quarters that some of you may be familiar with which are very tasty.

If you haven't had them, I can't explain. I think they're better in flavor in most any greens that are cooked on the market.

But they have to be picked at the very end, maybe three leaves or so or four.

You just keep picking at each little branchlet that grows and more will grow out the side and more to pick.

Then when it gets a little tough, it either goes to seed or you pull it up.

But that was my spinach for a long time as we'd go back and forth.

But Pasadena was completely underdeveloped by any stretch of the imagination.

I brought up that not until I came back in the late summer of 1948, I went home at the end of the first year, was would I say that there were any automobiles that had been produced since World War II? See, the war put an end to the manufacturing of automobiles.

The 1942 models were just coming out at the end of 1941. That was the end of it.

And then what you had, what we might say, you might have had some that were producing a 1948 model, but in principle 1949 was the first model that would come out.

But in 1948 there were some because in that time we didn't name the model year on the basis of the next year.

That is, we considered January was when you had the new model, not September or October.

So strange things have happened in that.

But there was a doubling of automobiles just over the summer when I was gone.

The traffic increased immensely.

And all that you're aware of on North side of Green Street was simply completely renovated for the present city center.

That is now, I don't mean city center, but the Pasadena Mall that is now practically useless the way it is.

It's a sad situation.

It didn't seem comfortable, I would have to say. I was never attached to it.

It was something missing.

I've been to other malls and I say, why don't people have more like this? But that was different. It has not succeeded.

So Pasadena had also a large population of relatively underpaid people.

A new population of African Americans, blacks, then still called Negroes, who came during the war from the south.

And they worked and many of them lived in the area up Fair Oaks and West and in and around the area of Fair Oaks West toward Orange Grove.

These are the people who were working in the homes and elsewhere for the wealthier people.

And when my wife in the beginning of the fourth year came after three years, in the end of summer 1950, the bulk of all South Orange Grove was still private residents.

You could go from here to the Pasadena Freeway.

Now, when ambassadors started, the Pasadena Freeway was hardly more than ten years old.

It started in 1947 and you know the freeway was built in the last half of the thirties.

So it was all new and it stopped down there near Figueroa.

And you can imagine the traffic was no problem in 47 but by 48 you would wait and wait and wait getting off this speedy freeway.

Forty-five miles an hour to just simply get on private, what amounts to two-lane roads.

One never got to Hollywood on any freeway.

I mean, this was the first freeway and they didn't build freeways during World War II.

So it was all communicated, all reached by the red cars.

That's the electric train that was the brilliant understanding that could be developed at the end of the last century at the beginning of this one.

That we are now leaving and that was Henry Huntington's idea.

He's the one who designed the whole area.

If you've never seen a map of the red line, you would not understand that practically every town is where it now is.

Because Henry Huntington took a look at the whole thing and linked up essentially San Bernardino and Santa Monica to Long Beach.

So the whole area was linked and the towns were simply along the rail lines as it was easiest to develop.

We had the rail lines operating till about ten to eleven years after Ambassador College was founded.

I regularly went downtown Los Angeles on the red car, down Fair Oaks or the longer route, which was Oak Knoll, Colorado.

Cars ran right in the middle of Colorado Boulevard.

A completely different concept today that was all destroyed, replaced by the automobile.

So we now have, instead of going another route, we adopted the automobile and we discarded the above-surface red car system.

Granted, it needed to be improved.

But now we pay the price.

That is, we simply have to live with the automobile.

And the bus system is the only thing.

They even had a large bus system accompanying the red car for a long time, electrical or just on wheels.

But today, where did the population go? Pasadena was as populous in 1947 as it is in 1997.

It hasn't grown any.

The population has been maintained despite the large growth of commerce and the large growth of apartments by building those and destroying the private homes in which black Americans from the south and some Latin Americans were living wherever the freeway has now been built.

That is the East 210, West 210, and the freeway going in the direction from Ambassador College out toward the area in which we live.

All of that in this whole section around Ambassador to the northwest, that had hundreds and hundreds of homes, poor older homes, that were completely demolished.

So you'd have to have lived then to know what that was like, what it was like to come here.

Pasadena was a large country town.

That's what it amounted to.

A large country town.

125,000 people, but we lived different lives than we think of today.

And how different can best be explained that along with such archaic views, I went to the Pasadena Civic Auditorium after I came back.

I think it was in 48.

I don't believe it was in 47 in the first year, but let's say it would have been true.

In 1948, I came in 47 to hear the Messiah performed.

And still remember it because it was so memorable.

I had a suit and tie.

I was the only male with a suit and tie.

All others, all older than I.

I was the youngest one there.

In 1919, they had black tie and the penguin suits that we associated with men.

Everyone was formally dressed and all the women were formally dressed.

No one went to anything like this in the Pasadena Auditorium except in formal garb.

Now no one picked on me, but after all, the fact that I wasn't yet 20, I think, gave an excuse.

I've never seen so many formal suits.

There was a time, if you didn't have a suit and a tie, you wouldn't even be on an airplane able to pay for a flight.

Now you should see what gets on an airplane.

And buses, the poor, might be dressed somewhat like you this evening.

But we would have assumed, if at all possible, you wore a nice sweater or a coat, a sport jacket for men I'm talking about, or had a suit if you rode to buses.

This was a different world.

It's hard to imagine the changes that have taken place in standards.

So we have multiplied some things.

Now, it was a community in which Ambassador, of course, even after three years when my wife tried to come here at the Fort, couldn't even find the place because the taxi man didn't know where it was and spent the first night in the YWCA, as I spent the first night in the YMCA when I came.

But that gives you an idea.

And sometimes I have mentioned this before when Mr. Armstrong didn't find me on the campus, he knew where I'd be.

And all the librarians at Pasadena, they looked for me.

That's how we communicated in those days.

It was a world out of the past.

1918-1948, 30 years since the end of World War I.

Just to use a figure that is 30.

Now we go 30 years, 48 to 78, or do the other way at 2000, 1970.

How many of you realize there are 30 years between 1970 and next year? 30 years.

It's hard for me to quite think in those terms of how many that have moved on.

So we have to realize that the one inexorable thing is the passage of time, which when measured in human flesh is called aging.

This is simply the reality.

Think of how long it has taken Europe to build, how long since the Great War of 1945, 50 years next spring.

50 years.

The time between World War I and II, because World War I was never decided on the battlefield.

It was decided back home in Germany.

It was a collapse and a surrender.

1918-48, let's say.

Between the two wars, it was much less.

That was, let's say, 1838, you know, so you had one more.

It was 21 years.

1918-1939.

Just look at all the time.

See now, what has been happening instead of all the crises that we then associated ourselves with the depression, we have had growing, growing, growing prosperity.

To put it in simple terms, so you know where we are prophetically, there was no such thing.

Before recent times, very recent, not even 1950 or 1960 or 1970, Revelation chapter 18 is now possible.

This is the whole world, the merchants of the whole earth.

Do you know what we did when we were producing in the 20s and 30s? We were basically producing for ourselves.

Most countries bought as little as they could.

They weren't trying to market everything in order to have jobs.

We were working at what we could produce for each other.

That was the way things were done.

The idea that we were all tied together came as kind of a shock in the late 1920s that in fact we could harm each other.

If one nation went down, another would go down and down.

You know what happened? The stock market essentially collapsed in Austria, collapsed in Germany, then it collapsed elsewhere in Italy, and then it collapsed over here.

In 1929.

Then we had the Great Depression and then we had terrible weather, which my wife could comment on.

But California was a remarkable state.

Mr. Armstrong, as I mentioned in the other time, the meeting in the Sunland to Hunger area, for which I want to thank the McAllisters, that area in terms of the whole country was a kind of oasis, California.

All these people who were suffering in the dust bowl went westward to Oregon, some in Washington, out here.

There was no reason to stop in Nevada then.

But this land also was the alternative to New York.

In terms of communications, Los Angeles was the city.

But the cultural city in Southern California was Pasadena without a question.

The communications town was a part of Los Angeles called Hollywood.

And this state and Oregon had, especially Oregon, had all sorts of crops.

You know, in the Midwest today, tragically, you're limited, they're not all the same, but you have corn and soybeans and wheat.

This is the primary production of many states, great emphasis on so many things.

If you were to look at the Department of Agriculture brochure that is published on weather, the best way to understand agriculture in the U.S. is simply to have a look at the weather bulletin, what things are being harvested, what things being planted, what things being reaped.

And some states have such an agricultural list that it's this long.

And the whole section is finished.

That's so few crops.

Let's say North Dakota's a nice illustration.

Then there will be states that have this much.

The longest list anywhere in the whole of the United States of diverse crops can be animal, as well as plants, trees, you know, root crops.

The largest is California.

It's the greatest diversity for one simple reason.

We extend so long from South to North.

We are much further South than Oregon.

Oregon is a kind of agricultural extension of California.

Washington less so, but many things in Oregon and Washington will grow down here.

And many more things that cannot survive so far North, even in this state, grow.

Then we have the largest inland two valleys joined together by two rivers in any part of this country.

You know, during the time that people were leaving and fleeing the state, there were people in Pasadena.

We were renting a unit for storage and people were throwing things out and throwing things out.

And throwing things out and throwing things out because they didn't want to take them to Florida or somewhere else where they were retiring to.

And somebody had a beautiful, almost undamaged map of the United States that was designed for a school situation or a business situation, but primarily the academic world, I would think, and it's all raised plastic.

And if you look on it, you will say without a question, there's no place anywhere in the world like California.

You know, what is the heartland of Australia? It's desert.

What's the whole of Africa north of the black area as a whole? And there are blacks living up there too, by the way.

Well, it's simply desert.

And what do you have with Swampland where the Congo is? And the Amazon, South America, is an awful situation.

It's either too high or too low.

And if you've ever flown from Mexico City to Los Angeles, you will say, what are all these volcanoes doing in Mexico? Just astonishing.

And then you look at Europe, and then you look at California with the waters coming, the rain coming down from the north, sometimes in the summer coming up from the south, with an astonishing barrier on the east that captures snow that can give us water for a decade or half a decade, or tragically less sometimes.

But that's tremendous storage.

California has the greatest ability to store water of any equivalent part of the world.

If Russia could handle the drainage, but their rivers flow into the Arctic, so it isn't any good.

It's all lost.

We have a remarkable agricultural area.

And so I mentioned that.

It may not seem related, but it is, in fact, related.

That's why California in the south, because we got the water, bought it, cajoled people.

And that made Los Angeles.

It made Hollywood.

It made communications.

It gave us, therefore, a Caltech.

It gave us a Pasadena, as well as the center of communications outside of New York.

And that's why ambassadors started down here.

I think it's important that you...

Mr. Armstrong couldn't find other Pasadenas.

It could only be here.

And remember, as far as he was concerned, there were only two places that would either be in Switzerland or it was in California.

Because if the work was going to have languages, there could have been such, and we ultimately ended up with one in Britain, with access to the continent.

Anyway, all that feeds into this situation of how ambassadors got started.

So much for some things I would like to address, however, a part of the question that is important that I chose not to the last time.

And that is the topic that we, presumably, as a group here, have not all come to fully understand in one way or another the nature of God.

I speak plainly, and I would tell anybody, please take note that I have said that we are not here because we all agree on everything.

There was a country that was described like this.

There was a businessman who said to his wife, why do we have to have so many shapes and sizes and colors? Why can't we have just a few? And she says wisely, well, yes, that's possible.

I know of a country just like that.

Very few choices.

Albania! Well, the fact remains, we don't all progress at the same rate.

There are sometimes people who progress more, but there is an area that needs to be examined.

I do not say that the way the nature of God is explained today is necessarily as clear as it can be made.

I am addressing, per the request of the minister, in the three congregations that I attend.

That is, I'm asked to attend.

I attend one regularly, and I just visit the others.

But I want you to know something, because Mr. Armstrong lived from 34 when the work formally began to 47 and 48 for some 12 to 14 years with people who had different views, including the Trinity and the church.

The church never had any formal definition.

I met people who were outright Aryans, which we never were.

The idea that Christ in some way was not really God, it only became divine as a result of being the first one created.

Of course, the devil then made it appear that he was next, or sometimes he reversed the order.

But in any case, Mr. Armstrong was still thinking about the nature of God, because he had never settled on how to explain some of the mystery.

He knew that the average Protestant, and remember, he was not reared in religious arguments.

If there is any silent kind of church, it is a Quaker church, where you don't go to hear a lot of talk.

So, he was still asking himself how to explain it.

He saw that in Scripture, the one who became Jesus Christ most certainly is to be identified in some way with the God of the Old Testament.

And there, the average Protestant would have faulted him right away.

The average one.

No, no, no, they would say this is the Father.

The God of the Old Testament is the Father, and the Son was revealed in the New.

Now, the church operated then, when I came, on an understanding of what we heard and read in the Protestant literature.

We, of course, knew the doctrine of the Trinity as it was worded, but in the doctrine of the Trinity, the average Protestant thought.

And now, I have told Mike Feasel this so that he understands and agrees.

I want you to know that.

The average Protestant had 40, 50, 60 years ago a view that God is a person, and the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit are three persons in one person.

And that was wrong.

To use another term if you prefer, though that was typical, but they didn't normally use this three beings in one being because the Trinity doesn't say that there are three beings.

There's one.

Protestantism has described Father and Son and Holy Spirit as three persons, and then they turned around and said that God is a person.

And Mr. Armstrong saw, as Dr. Starr Bernadies did, that this is not logical.

That is, there's something wrong with it.

And generally speaking, whenever the God of the Old Testament was described, it was pictured as the Father.

That is, the description of God was like, the Father gave the Ten Commandments, Jesus Christ gave us grace, the Son.

And we concluded on the basis of what is clear, that there could be no doubt that Jesus of Nazareth is a person.

And we all used the term, and many people did, without a question, and not saying theologians, but many people spoke of God as a person.

He's a personal God.

And we were not incorrect in interpreting this street Protestant doctrine for what it was saying. It was saying something illogical.

I have said before the congregations, when I was asked to define and the three that we're associated with, Port Waenimi, that's the old San Luis Obispo, the old Santa Barbara, and then the combination in the San Fernando Valley area, that is the Canoga Park.

I have said that what we need is to face the fact that in the 1940s, the primary book on theology that is used as a textbook in the evangelical world, defined the correct theological definition, as it has been traditionally cited.

That is, whether you think it's correct or not, or whether I do, that is at least the correct definition given by theologians to determine the nature of God under the word Trinity.

Yet in the index, which the author did not develop, I looked in the index to where to find this, because this is a book out of print and then reprinted, in the index it said God, three persons in one person.

Nonsense. This is why the church rejected what it did in the end of the 1940s.

It rejected the doctrine of the Trinity that was falsely represented, and we did not know what the correct definition was.

I didn't, because I kept reading this stuff.

If I had read it and turned to the index of that book, I would have said, why does the author say this and the text and the index say this? Well, you see, the index isn't prepared by the theologian.

It's prepared by somebody who thinks he knows, looks at the material, and he does this for the publisher.

But it tells me that the theologians never conveyed the concept of the nature of God to the average person who was even working in the field developing indices for these books.

I don't mean illiterate people, I mean people who would have attended church, the evangelical churches for that matter.

They never got the picture.

Now, I think it is important that we realize that when this book was republished, in the 1970s, the index was changed.

They finally realized, I have 30 years teaching it.

The next edition corrected that.

Now, we simply also noted, and something very important, because it's related to the question of conversion, we also noted that most people thought that being born again was not being born again at all.

It was simply what we might call, and I don't mean repentance, and I don't mean penance.

In the Protestant world, it could be best looked upon as simply reforming your way of thinking.

It was a kind of alcoholic person reforming.

It was simply described, not in terms of, you must be born of the Spirit, born from above.

Now, I think a better word, but I won't discuss now, would be to find something other than born.

That was the, but that's not the subject I want to introduce.

However, it came early, but I want to finish the one on the Trinity.

We had the wrong definition of what people have called the Trinity.

I am not satisfied with that as the best way to describe God.

It's a way to describe God in contrast to somebody who thought that Jesus Christ was not God, only raised to the divine level. That was the Aryan idea.

But you see, Mr. Armstrong noted that we could become the children of God.

And 50 years ago, this would have been unthinkable.

50 years ago, you could not have read that we should inherit the nature of God.

It's in the scripture, right? I don't have to debate that with you.

Now, that, however, is to be seen, not quite as we understood it then, but when Mr. Armstrong saw that people had drawn a conclusion in the Protestant world, they drawn a conclusion in the Protestant world that God is three persons in one person, and God cannot have any more than that.

Completely distorted so that if you were a son of God, you were the son of God in this sense that God is the Father of everybody, he's the Creator.

But folks, that doesn't mean we can have the Spirit of God in us and thereby his nature.

So the world's Protestants, and we were using Protestant literature, and I don't mean propaganda.

I mean Bible dictionaries, concordances, translations.

You know, the King James is not a Catholic translation. You all understand that.

Now, that didn't mean we didn't have access, but this is what the situation was.

We were living in a world in which, however wise the Protestant theologians were, they had never been able to convey their knowledge, or lack of it, to the average minister in the Protestant world so that there was a clear understanding both of what it meant to be produced of God as distinct from born, because we're dealing with the male, God is called Father in this sense.

And so it was within the first year of Ambassador College when Raymond Cole and I, Dick Armstrong and Betty Bates Michael were students.

The second semester we came to understand what happens. Something happens here.

We misunderstood the sense of birth with respect to the flesh.

But that's a separate question I've addressed.

But I want you to know that the subject was addressed in the church.

The church from 34 to 48 did not have an understanding.

Any clear understanding of born again.

And we came to understand some of it, but we had to correct some of it, because we were reading it as if it were a description of a woman's experience instead of a male's relationship to an heir, H-E-I-R.

If we are talking about birth, or like the chicken out of the egg, then indeed we're dealing with something that has to be evaluated differently than what happens, let's say, in Mary's womb, where the statement is made that which is produced in her before birth is said to already have been born, if you want to give that translation.

But that child was already ganal in Mary's womb, not out of it, but in it.

So produce is not limited to what happens at birth.

It is being produced from conception on.

Anyway, we misunderstood some of that, but we understood what the Catholic Church, please, has never lost sight of and the Protestant world did.

And our literature to the ministry has lightly, L-I-G-H-T-L-Y, addressed this topic as the divinization of man.

That is rejected by the Worldwide Church of God.

The Catholic teaching, and in the Catechism out of Vatican II, citing Thomas Aquinas, citing Eusebius and Augustine, say clearly that man should inherit the nature of God, and that Christ, the Son of God, became a man, that humans may become God divine.

Thomas Aquinas went so far as to say that the Son of God became man, that men quoted in the Catechism might become gods.

Now, you know I've addressed this.

Some of you will remember I brought the Catholic Catechism from Vatican II to tell you how many remember that.

All right, thank you.

If you weren't there, that's of course nothing to it.

But what I'm getting at is the early church.

At the time of the Council of Nicaea, the early church understood that something happens.

Now, the distinction that we never dreamed of is that the Bible definition of what God is as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in Matthew 28, you baptize into the name of, and the term name is certainly a translation from the Jewish equivalent of the word the name Hashem, which is used for God.

When the Jews asked people not to speak the name Yahweh, they simply said, call him the name, that is the one who's named in Scripture, or you remember the name.

That's the sense of it, but don't say it.

And to this day, any Orthodox Jew, any responsible Jew, even when writing in English will use G, D with a little hyphen in between.

To let you know, you should not pronounce the name, which had Y-H-W-H or Y-H-V-H, that is Yahweh, the eternal one.

Now, we had no grasp that Matthew's definition, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, is referring to the Son in an entirely different way than Jesus Christ, who is a human being, God dwelling in the flesh.

We assumed that if Jesus Christ was a being in the flesh, we had a picture of God as a being about the same size who was Spirit.

We simply did not know how to look at some Scripture, one of which says, I think we had no problem with that, does not my Spirit fill heaven and earth? It also says, do not I, says Yahweh, fill heaven and earth.

God is Spirit. God is not six foot or six foot two.

He is Spirit and he fills the universe.

God doesn't dwell in a structured body that is composed, quote, and unquote, of Spirit.

He's simply Spirit.

You don't assemble Spirit as cells are assembled, flesh.

We had to learn more about what it meant to be God, but now Jesus Christ, interestingly, what is he called in Hebrews? He's still called God in the New Testament after the resurrection, my Lord and my God.

Remember what Thomas said? He is God. He's also Lord.

But Jesus dwells in a glorified body.

The Son of God now dwells in a glorified body.

He has the glory that he once shared with the Father, but he dwells in a glorified body in the presence of the light that is eternal, because God as Spirit is light.

He is love. He's goodness.

But that world in which God dwells is absolute spiritual light.

There is no darkness there.

It's quite different from our world.

Anyway, we have a lot to learn.

I do not think that our fellowship at the highest levels has really understood what we did and didn't know, and that we can point up.

I can tell you what we did and didn't know by reading the literature of those who left.

And I can read the literature of those who left and realize that there were people who came among us as early as the second year who had no real understanding either of what the Bible is saying to us today or what, in fact, we should have understood then.

That is, you have to know what we understood incorrectly if you're going to know what it is that we think we understand as a church today.

And the past has not been clear to many.

For example, we had to recognize that the term father and son, as used in Matthew 28, is not talking of beings or persons.

Persons equal beings.

But we thought in terms of a person being a being.

A human being is a person.

Therefore, a person is a human being.

But you look at the definition of being, B-E-I-N-G.

And then you look at the definition of person.

And the last definition, which means one of the latest, having no real root in meaning, is that a person is an individual being.

But otherwise, there is an entirely different origin of the term.

Unfortunately, from my point of view, I've told Mike Morrison and others, I say I think that having changed what we originally had, which might have been a little obscure, we at least owed it to people to say every time we hear the word person what it actually should mean in English to us.

For me to say person does not mean what you think it is, doesn't tell me.

I don't know what you think.

What then is it? And here is where the Greek word translated, you know, the theologians in Greece as well as Rome.

The summary of what is used in the terminology would mean that a person is a permanent mode of being, a permanent way in which God is.

And if God is one and he is a father, if God is one and he's a son, then there is some internal relationship as well as external.

That is, I can perceive of God as a father.

I can perceive of God also now as an elder brother.

Never thought about that.

God reveals himself as an elder brother in Jesus of Nazareth.

He reveals himself as a father to Jesus of Nazareth and to us, because he was the father also of Jesus of Nazareth.

But in God, we completely misunderstood one word and that's Logos.

Mr. Armstrong and when Global published their material, they did the same thing.

I read it carefully. I don't know if you've ever read what Global said.

Global said the Logos is given to have these meanings in the Greek language.

All kinds of related meanings.

But none of these are correct.

The only one that is correct is Spokesman.

And we understand this to be correct because God revealed it to her with Armstrong.

And that's the basis of the doctrine.

This was written by Raymond McNair.

Therefore, I say it respectfully because I took for granted also.

The relationship of God the Father to Jesus Christ is quite different from the relationship of Father to Son as a part of the nature of God.

Because there was a time that the Son did not dwell in a human body and we never grasped the implication of that.

If the Son never dwelt in a human body and God is one being.

See, we came up with a false idea that God is impersonal.

I don't know if you know that. Mr. Armstrong said, God is impersonal, but he is personal in the sense of three beings.

Three God beings. That's our two God beings in the Holy Spirit.

So I'm going to correct that how he thought.

But he thought of two beings.

I told my wife years ago after, while Mr. Armstrong was still living, I said, we're going to have to address the question sometime.

When Yahweh says, if I, Yahweh, am the one who becomes Jesus of Nazareth and if I am God and beside me there is no other, then we have a problem about the Father.

That's what I said.

We have a problem there.

See, we focused on God said, let us make man long after the angels were here and long after all sorts of beings were on earth.

Then God said, by our own definition, in the beginning, Moses one, two and three brought us to this creation week that was only comparatively recent.

And so God said, let us.

But in the same context, God said through Moses, so God made man in his, not there, but his image.

See, we have to answer both how do you explain the plural and even more.

If I have a plural verb, I don't have a big problem with the plural Elohim.

See, but if I have a plural Elohim and a single verb and a single pronoun of reference, I can't let that pass.

But we did.

We did.

Let's face it.

Now, you see, if I was not asked to explain the nature of God to all the ministers, I like the German expression, Gott sei dank, God be thanked.

Nevertheless, I had to come to recognize that we needed a whole new understanding of logos.

And there we discover the remarkable things and problems.

To the Jew, wisdom is equivalent to the Greek logos, because wisdom is one of the characteristics of the logos.

The logos meant the mind of God that created the universe.

The philosophers said, you know, either the universe is eternal and there is no God and no logos.

The philosophers came and said, look, these idols folks, you know, they, they aren't doing anything.

The philosophers changed the thinking of the Greek world, prepared the church, the ground for the church.

That's what happened.

And so they, they said, now, look, this appears to be a rational universe.

That is, there is reason, there is logic behind it.

And the word logos has the sense of thought, reasoning, logic, and so forth.

And then I read of wisdom in Proverbs and wisdom speaks is personified.

Wisdom speaks and one should read it.

I won't go through it. I'll just turn to it.

I think it's quite important in the Proverbs chapter eight, beginning with verse 23 on to the end of the chapter.

And you can find elsewhere like the statement like this.

I was with him before anything was created of the natural world.

I was with him as a confident, a source of delight every day rejoicing before him at all times.

Sounds like Jesus talking.

All right, we're near the end of our evening before we won't go any further there much.

But you catch it right away.

We were dealing with the sense of father and son, not in terms of beings reproducing one another, but in the sense of God, both producing and generating God generates thought.

If we're in the image of God, we're doing something that God does.

God generates wisdom.

The father is what is characteristic of God that generates the thought.

And now what I think, I can distinguish my thoughts from my ability to think.

This is a simple statement I've repeated again and again.

But it's all a part of my mind.

And I even have a part of myself that I can do by extension here.

And I have used to call it subconscious or unconscious today.

They call it the unconscious mind that regulates my internal body.

But the function of the spirit of God has its parallel.

If the Lord speaks, the Lord, that's like the father, and he speaks, if God is the one who does that, that's the utterance, that's the logos.

And what happens is the action.

And what you see is the spirit of God creating movement in the natural world.

Right there in the first three verses, you have God, the origin of what is spoken and the origin of the activity of the spirit of God.

So we didn't understand, truly, either the doctrine of the Trinity because the Protestants on the street often didn't.

We didn't realize that the early church for centuries in the Catholics even to this day have understood that man should be raised to a different level.

And it's possible through Jesus of Nazareth where we can dwell in the presence of God.

And be his sons.

And Jesus Christ now is not like the Son was and is.

God has always been full of thought and reason and wisdom.

But perhaps our modern word download is one of the best, yet God chose to download his mind and his mind dwelt among us so that we could know the mind of God.

We're told that this mind be in each of us as was in Jesus Christ.

He doesn't said the Father became flesh or the Holy Spirit became flesh.

It said the word the logos did.

And took upon a self-flesh so that the Father-Son relationship is thinker and thought.

And when Raymond McNair criticized our explanation, he said that we thought, or said, or at least I did, that the logos is a mere thought.

A single, a mere thought.

Well, my comment would be something like this.

If God fills all, if God fills the heaven and the earth and you can't go where he is not, and God is spirit, God's mind is not located in God in some corner.

God's mind is what God is.

He's divine.

He's divine mind.

He's divine.

He's spirit.

His mind is not centered in a skull, in a six-foot man.

His mind is everywhere, folks.

In him we live and move and have our being.

He sought us out, and in his mind we're all here and is awfully real to us, and we're not an illusion.

But we live and move and have our being in him.

As Paul said, quoting the pagan writer correctly, he is not far from any one of us.

The reason we live is that his spirit sustains, the spirit of God makes possible the universe and physical life in it.

And he knows what's going on in your mind because his spirit is there and can read it.

Isn't that marvelous? He doesn't have to have angels with a telescope trying to figure out what's there, what's going on in your mind.

He knows.

It's right there.

It's wonderful.

You can talk to him about it.

So it was a misunderstanding that the world had, and we accepted some false ideas.

And when we came to understand more about the nature of God and the nature of the Hebrew language, which was simply when Abraham came to Canaan, he spoke the language of Canaan.

That's what modern, that's what ancient Hebrew was.

Otherwise, he spoke a language much more like what we call East Semitic or Aramaic.

But without any question, you know the language of the Jacobs in-laws was quite different.

That was the language of Abraham's family was much more like Rebecca's brother spoke.

But when they came down into Canaan and lived there, the children of Abraham spoke the language of Canaan.

It was a dialect you could understand it like Italian or Spanish.

Italian, Spanish, not that difficult or Portuguese and Spanish.

But the natural word Elohim was the doctrine of the nature of God is not built on the word Elohim as if it was a revelation from God like a name.

It simply was a word that was used in singular and plural because there were Canaanites and others who used a plural form to refer to a singular being.

And some to refer to a host of beings.

It was a word that simply was transformed on the basis of one's own philosophy and religion.

And the Hebrews turned the plural and the singular into fundamentally a singular when the Scripture came to be explained.

So the two most important things, the misunderstanding of born again, secondly, and the misunderstanding of the nature of God.

And yet on the other hand, we made progress as to the nature of the role of spirit in being born from a God.

That is what we thought happens that we called conception up here or the first stage of conversion is what Jesus was referring to.

That's what he was referring to as being produced again.

It's gone on here and if you're not converted, then you haven't been produced again.

And if you are converted, you have been produced again.

A new life has begun in your mind, spiritual, where the spirit of God now dwells and that spirit of God needs to be understood as a way.

It is just as important that God dwells in you as the Jesus Christ now is the resurrected Son of God in heaven.

The God in you is as real in the mind of God influencing your mind.

That's the Holy Spirit.

That's why the church could have it without fully understanding the nature of God because we understood that it was the spirit of God that makes possible this conversion.

But now we realize that the Son was like that too and the Father was like that or is like that, a way of being.

So God communicates to you through His Word.

Jesus came to reveal that there is God who is a Father and He is now representing the Father.

And He was, in fact, the Father dwelling in Him, the very thoughts of God.

So God is functioning as a Father and a Son and a Holy Spirit, or Holy Spirit, let's leave the word A off.

He is functioning as Father and Son and Holy Spirit.

If He doesn't function as Holy Spirit, then of course you couldn't have God as a Father.

But we have tried to think of the Son as if it was a kind of being.

Jesus Christ is a being.

The Son became a human being and He's now a glorified human being.

But it's God's mind in Him so that Jesus Christ was everything.

He has already become everything.

Let's say that God Himself was.

The Father continues to show Him as a glorified man, all that He thinks.

And He will show us as well in the resurrection.

But all that the Father chose to put and all that the mind of God, the Son, chose to put in Jesus of Nazareth came to be in Jesus of Nazareth.

But some things were not in His mind, one of which is defined how the exact day and hour will be decided.

That was not put there.

Jesus said, that is in the mind of the Father and I am the Son and it has not yet been shown me.

Because when God was there, God's mind chose not to do it and when Jesus was born it wasn't there.

But so much for the evening.

But I think you need to realize what the church didn't understand before 48, 47, 48, what the church came to and what the church needed to rethink.

And also I will say how we are still to help others who think they understand think even more clearly.

It's very important that you don't just communicate only with those whom you think are friends.

I mean we all need to learn to communicate with one another with discretion.

But nevertheless to give some serious thought to letting yourselves better understand the Word of God and help others.

When clearly if the church is right, it's nothing like moving along.

And if the church has in some way, as certainly the Catholic Church stumbled and the Protestants have stumbled, our church would admit both of those things.

The Orthodox have.

Why? So our own church fellowship within and any other can still be stumbling on some things.

And if we can be of help, we don't push things that might be misunderstood.

But I think the question of let's say how the law of God is manifested in us is something that our example rather than our words will have to speak for us.

There are some things we can talk with others about more freely.

And I think that if we have thought through very carefully the nature of God, we can even communicate to others who sort of taken for granted well if the church says so it's okay by me.

I am not that kind of person and I should hope you are not.

I'd much rather talk with somebody who doesn't yet understand than to talk with somebody who doesn't know why he thinks he understands.

Exactly.

I mean that's the issue.

I want to thank our host family for this occasion.

And I want to thank all of you for your example.

The more you reach out and encourage others and encourage yourselves and to ask.

You can ask God in prayer and otherwise.

And I want to thank Mrs. McAllister for a view into the past.

It's quite something.

A different world.

It will be, I'll leave it here on the table.

It's just amazing what happened before 1882 of this essentially farmland.

The city didn't really exist before then at all.

It was just founded.

And something like this was only a couple of decades at most.

It's a long time since then.

If our city has gone through a little over 100 years, I have been here for 52.

So I have been here nearly one half of the life of the city.

It's hard for me to think about that because when I first came, it was like this.

And now it's gotten to be this.

And the longer I live, the more likely I will live through half of the life of the city so let's say a certain time into the future.

Death or otherwise.

It's called resurrection.

Thank you.