

## H001 Hoeh 1-11-92 Statement of Beliefs

Good afternoon to so many whom my wife and I know, actually in the morning congregation I think we know fewer people personally than we do in the afternoon.

But some of us are morning people, some of us are afternoon people.

In the church of God we don't have night people, generally.

I appreciate being asked to come here.

Would like to give the best wishes of course to all of you from some of those new and unusual people from time to time whom we have met as I did some many weeks ago now in Florida who came from Eastern Europe.

Some of you heard of course of people who were in the realm of the Soviet Union who have expressed interest in what we stand for and of course is in any group you will find among them husbands and wives or children, some of whom do not show the same interest that others do and some who clearly do.

Those people by the way did not actually mature in terms of the cultural experience in the Soviet Union as it then was under Joseph Stalin.

These people's origins go back to a region called Ruthenia.

Ruthenia was the eastern fraction of Czechoslovakia, the eastern part of the Slovak Republic.

And so essentially have their roots among people who read the Bible, who were in contact with Christians and Jews, but Christians of the Western tradition, also the Eastern.

But that's because there may have been people from the East, but they were part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire and didn't pass to the Soviet realm until 1945 when this part of Czechoslovakia or the Slovak Republic was stripped away.

I have not continued to have contact, though my wife and I received thoughtful expressions of appreciation for having met us after I returned to Southern California when I accompanied Mr. Kubik.

It seemed appropriate today that I should address a topic in which I had direct participation that not everybody in this particular case, not Mr. Weber, would have had an opportunity to know firsthand why some things are said as they are.

The statement of beliefs of the Worldwide Church of God you may be aware of.

I presume it has not yet reached the hands of any of you in particular unless you happen to be a local on campus.

But there was a need of such a development, but let me go back to a statement that was made by a friend of Sir Winston Churchill, Professor Rouse, who was an Elizabethan scholar.

I never met him, though he had visited the Ambassador College campus.

I had seen him lecture, and then of all things I stumbled on his presence at Romans on one occasion.

He came from a Cornish family, and Cornish people are known as individuals who have a proclivity for mining hard minerals as distinct from soft minerals like the Welch do with coal.

And so he always thought of himself as someone who mined the library of the Huntington Library and Art Gallery, and he also used some of our literary material that we do have on the subject of English literature in Shakespeare, which is why he came here.

And I introduced myself to him.

On another occasion, my wife and I had the privilege of listening to him when he gave a lecture on the Cornish people in connection with the American Historical Society.

On one of the lectures, the first one I heard, he was commenting about historians who like to criticize Winston Churchill, because they said Churchill doesn't really tell you why some of the decisions were made that were made in World War II.

And the historians, of course, were quite able to know much more.

That is, if you read what the historians were writing.

But Professor Rouse said, gentlemen, may I remind you of one thing? Because you read what was written and your sources were what were written about the meetings, none of you were in the meetings, only Sir Winston.

And before you presume to know why your explanation is correct and Sir Winston's is not, it might behoove you to listen to why he said what he did as to the conclusions that people came to.

And further, he said, you know, sometimes even Sir Winston Churchill, who was there, had to say he didn't know why they came to the decisions they did.

How much less should you presume to know who weren't even there and can only read second hand on the basis of what was said by those who were? So that little story, by a remarkable person, Professor Rouse, who read Sir Winston Churchill's material in his late life before it went to the publisher, is worth considering.

For example, in the 1930s, Mr. Armstrong drew up, Herbert W. Armstrong, a statement of beliefs that would identify those characteristics of the Church of God, then corporately called the Radio Church of God, and it was essentially parallel to the general statement of beliefs that had already been in circulation by the churches of God's seventh day, out of which this work grew because it grew out of the Oregon conference of people, half of whom in general began to support the work that Mr. Armstrong as an individual was doing, from which came the Eugene Church, and ultimately the Eugene Church was made up of people who were new converts, as well as members of the Oregon conference of the Church of God's seventh day, and from that effort with tithing offerings this work developed, now called, corporately, the Worldwide Church of God.

There was a need, and Mr. Armstrong did, on two occasions, one in the 30s and one later after Ambassador College was founded in 1947, address the statement of beliefs.

A point, however, that we should now take note of is that at all times, and in connection with this, and in connection with a personal that Mr. Tkach has submitted for the varied publications, we address the fact that a statement of beliefs does not mean that we are held together here intellectually merely by assenting to all of this, or that the person who doesn't understand any one or more of the statements necessarily must be excluded because intellectually or spiritually you don't

understand it, nor does it mean that the statement of beliefs is necessarily the ultimate limit of the understanding either of the individual or the church.

But there is a need today in the 1990s, quite different from the 1930s or the early 1950s, to have a kind of summary that may be made available to various groups of people, publishers, people in radio and especially television, and for that matter theologians who circulate material and who teach about us.

You may not realize, of course, but the doctrines and teachings of the Worldwide Church of God would not uncommonly be a subject discussed in certain Christian institutions or maybe more secular institutions in which religion is one of the aspects of liberal arts, and in general they will pick up our literature as we write it.

And what they have picked up is, of course, often as things were written.

That brings up then a recognition of an important fact that we should know.

At any one time you will find that the church is made up of different kinds of people and the leadership in the church accordingly reflects something of that.

For example, when it came to the Jewish nation in Judea in the first century, Jesus gathered together among his disciples individuals whose notable background was not that they were trained rabbinically.

Jesus' disciples included fishermen and friends of fishermen, a tax collector, it's a little dubious, and other individuals who were known by these, none of whom had any major prominence in the educated community in and around Jerusalem.

There was a Levite, that is the tax collector, and then you have essentially a picture of individuals who clearly were distinct from the religious mainstream of the community.

In fact, a number of them seem to have spoken with a Galilean accent, that is they represented the equivalent of a church that came from the Bible belt in the United States.

However, when it came to the Jerusalem church over a period of time, we discover that not one of the twelve, but another person, a half brother of Jesus, came to be responsible for the congregation of Jerusalem for the simple reason that he was of the house of David, for Joseph and Mary were of the house of David.

So when it came to the work for the Jewish nation as a whole, there was a certain choice of people.

When it came to the leadership at the Jerusalem church, the mother church, there was the need to choose someone of the house of David.

Now when you look at the story of how to deal with gentile areas in which Jews were simply a small population, we're not talking here about Samaritans, we're talking about the Greek speaking world, Jesus as a whole did not send to them someone who was a Greek fisherman or someone who exchanged money, tax collector among the Greeks.

He chose not even a Greek but a Jew, and not one from the house of Judah, but one who was a Benjaminite, and not one who was trained parochially in Jerusalem or Judea or Galilee, but one trained in a famous city of Sardis in Silesia, Southeast Asia Minor.

That's that part of modern Turkey, if you want to know where it is, and a man who clearly was literally trained.

Now in the same way in the 1930s, this was an age of such men as Franklin Roosevelt, Benito Mussolini, Adolf Hitler.

One who could communicate with people on a grand scale.

I think we don't realize the nature of the 1930s.

Well in the same way the Greek world needed a Paul, one who knew Greek literature, one who could be seen as Jewish on the one hand to reflect a tradition, who would be useful in the synagogue, but an individual who could be acceptable to the Greeks because he was by any normal standard more educated than most Greeks.

He was trained at the feet of religious leaders in Jerusalem, in particular, Gamaliel, a very well-known rabbi in the earlier part to the mid part of the first century, the present era.

There was the person of Peter and his brother who had friends, John and James.

If you want to know how John wrote, all you have to do is read John.

It's something like this.

Jesus chose John to write certain topics, one of which was written up in his Gospel account and it starts like this.

In the beginning was the word, in the beginning was the word, six, six words in a sentence.

And the word was with God, it's another six, not too long or elaborate.

The same was in the beginning with God and John goes on in little short sentences such as you were told to write and he was comfortable writing like that.

The shortest sentence in all the New Testament John wrote, remember the story of Lazarus? The sentence simply says, Jesus wept.

Paul didn't write like that.

Mr. Armstrong long ago pointed out, any commentary would, that Paul could finish a sentence at the end of a chapter which had started at the beginning as in the book of Ephesians.

In fact, John speaking and writing in Greek simply would not be speaking and writing at the level at which most Greeks would be prepared to read letters.

They wanted someone who could write like Paul because they were a very bright group of people whose average intellect may be estimated by their entertainment.

American intellects today perhaps can be estimated by, what you see on television, especially wrestling.

But the Greek intellect can be measured by the dramas that were prepared that people attended in almost every town.

You would have been in a different world than those who are at some of these sports events in the United States.

Now we have our capable people today but I point up to what extent the right people at the right time.

When Mr. Armstrong wrote in the 1930s, he was writing from an unusual experience.

He was writing from the experience of one who was in advertising and he chose in developing a statement of belief, if you please, to advertise what we believe.

Now advertisers inevitably don't merely make their ads look like the competition or you couldn't decide which product to buy.

Your ads must look sufficiently distinctive to draw attention to people, to shock them into looking again and reading and thinking.

And so it is reflected in a statement made by someone from Berlin who knew English and German who was of the older generation.

That means he was a teenager, Mr. Schallenberger.

All older people have been teenagers.

If we want to understand some of the problems of teenage, we need to reflect on why teenagers became the adults they did.

I appreciate what Mr. Schallenberger has generally written for the plain truth because I do have to go over that and edit it.

I don't go over.

I only read the end product in the other publications as it had been.

But there is something important to know how to communicate to different generations.

This German in Berlin saw the magazine in German and in English, I believe he saw both.

We were interested in having them on the newsstand in Berlin and his comment immediately, oh, your magazine looks like things that were written in German in the days of Adolf Hitler.

It has punch.

It has certain big letters.

It draws attention.

And so we have to recognize that there was a time that people gave heat to a man who could communicate in a wheelchair through radio during fireside chats.

That's when people listened to the radio while they were at the fireside.

That's why they recalled that.

They were not looking at television.

They were listening to Franklin Roosevelt in the United States.

Now there was another man in Europe who also could communicate.

But instead of communicating specifically to a group of people at the fireside, he was communicating to them at another level in the beer halls of Bavaria.

There was another man who was communicating from the balconies of Italy.

And the people stood out in the piazzas listening to a man who promised that they too could have an empire.

So it is interesting to realize the environment in which certain things are created.

This is not the age of the fireside chat.

Because most people wouldn't know what the fireside looked like except in Christmas cards.

They don't have that experience.

This is not that kind of world in which advertising was the fundamental means, advertising in the written word, the fundamental means of communication.

This is an age of pictures.

This is an age in which people don't want to be that different.

An analogy is given by one of those famous comments Mr. Armstrong mentioned.

The man who hit the donkey over his nose, we would say.

And the person asked why he did that.

And the answer was that's to get his attention.

That's not how you drove the animal, that only drew the animal's attention.

But as you really clobbered them.

And so it was an age in which later a person like Winston Churchill could write as no one this century has used the English language and literature.

Nor had anybody communicated in German to a nation as did Adolf Hitler and those who helped him write my struggles, or my struggle to use the singular Mein Kampf.

So in the same way, in a world with denominations, we had to address the teachings of the church of God so it would have attention.

It would be distinctive.

It would be something that other people hadn't given thought about.

Because if they had seen only where the church of God might generally agree with the Christian world, where would the difference be? And there was a difference.

One difference is why you're here today and not tomorrow.

But in the 1930s, it would be very difficult to have said anything about the Sabbath.

So there were things in the teachings of the church, however boldly stated, however challenging, however untheological, however much like advertising, that couldn't be said for the simple reason people did not want to imagine that you kept the Sabbath.

They could not have imagined that there would be any group other than Jews who would keep God's holy days.

Now it is possible to have the church festival written up in the leading papers where we observed the Feast of Tabernacles, absolutely unthinkable when I came to the church and attended the festival for the first time in the autumn of 1948 because the college opened after the festival was over in 1947.

Those are the things you kept private.

You had to reason and argue with teachers why your children should go to the festival to take the children out of school in those days meant you were an enemy of the school system.

You were trying to disrupt the classes because they belong in school.

That brings tax money.

Now today, if parents are doing their responsible things and children are doing their responsible things in the classroom, the teachers almost everywhere are happy to cooperate because as parents you are there, or should be, when there is open house because your children are respectful because they are willing to do whatever homework is necessary.

Our children are not those wielding knives and other weapons.

They are not those on drugs.

They are not those who work at night in order to pay for a car to meet their drug dealing friends and therefore are half asleep in the classroom next morning.

This is a changed world and that's what I want to get to by way of background.

It is a changed world in that world in which we had to knock on doors in order to get on radio and later on television.

We had to seem to be different from other religions.

We had to essentially reach a secular world in which religion was looked down upon.

We have a different kind of world today.

We give more public service to religion than we did them, lip service, that is.

Yet we have to be sufficiently different only to show that we can present religion for the general audience in a dignified, proper way that makes for compatibility with the general format of radio and particular television.

We do not now find it possible to challenge people and to back them into a corner where they had to decide that they would either say no or be willing to consider saying yes.

Today that would be looked upon as inappropriate.

You must never back anyone into a corner.

Advertising men try to back you into a corner.

That's so you make decisions.

Today people are not interested in pushing others into making decisions.

We have the nice method of letting people make their own mind up without stress.

That's the general way it is done today.

Your product is better.

Your product is cleaner.

Your product is whatever.

But they don't say in comparison with what.

If we're going to be on television we have to be aware of these realities.

We also have to be aware that there is now in circulation still literature that does not reflect and never did reflect a clear understanding of the church of God.

That has to be combatted.

The statement of beliefs was not drawn up in order to persuade brethren or to persuade new listeners.

It is drawn up in order to make clear to people who write about us and to help you understand in simple terms what we are saying today, not to people who are specifically on our mailing list because they want to read the publications, but to people who may comment about us on radio, television, in the academic institutions.

People who write about us.

So we now read in the introduction, the Worldwide Church of God with its administrative center in Pasadena, California has members in 120 countries and territories.

Now we're not too big, we're not too small, we merely tell you who we are by name, where we are centered, and how extensive the work is.

The mission of the church is to proclaim the gospel of Jesus Christ around the world.

We don't define gospel in the introduction and to help members grow spiritually, a reference is made to Matthew.

As a spirit led body of believers, the next paragraph begins, the church is exhorted, grow in the grace and knowledge of our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ.

The spirit of God leads the church into all truth.

Accordingly, this statement of belief does not constitute a closed creed, there happen to be 28 points in it.

We used to have fewer points, I think somewhere around 20.

It now has 28 points, some of which used to be in, some are new, and some that used to be are not there because we have to ask what it is that people really want to know about us that doesn't upset people unnecessarily.

So it does not constitute a closed creed, the church constantly renews its commitment to truth and deeper understanding and responds to God's guidance in its beliefs and practices.

Now that seems a nice church.

Not one where we try to define every single thing, we simply give a summary.

One thing you notice of course is, as you go through this, it is not written to the Hebrew community, it is not in particular written to the Catholic community.

If this statement of beliefs were to be drawn up for the Jewish nation, the state of Israel, because we want it seen in Hebrew Union College as a source of what we teach, or if we were to write to the minister of culture and tourism, as Mr. Armstrong did then to Moshe Cole, well we would address it rather differently.

We wouldn't leave the words Jesus Christ undefined.

We wouldn't leave the word gospel undefined.

We would define certain things that are left undeveloped here or not even mentioned.

Our purpose at this moment is not to address the teachings of the church with respect to the Jewish nation.

It is to address the question of the teachings of the church with respect to people who are essentially in control of education in this country, wherever there is a discussion of religious groups, usually among evangelicals, fundamentalists, and for the media.

The subject matter that is discussed here would be under the following titles, normally three to a page, one page has four, and there are nine pages, so there are 28 points.

God, Jesus Christ, the Holy Spirit, the Holy Scriptures, the angelic realm, Satan, man, salvation, grace, and then in an area in which both Mr. Mike Feasel and maybe others and I would feel that we perhaps should have reversed an order of one or two things, that doesn't matter here, sanctification, justification, conversion.

We move to another page, repentance, water baptism, the church, church leadership, the Christian, the gospel, prophecy, the law, the Sabbath, the festivals, tithing, those used to be red flags.

We'd have to be very careful.

Now we don't have to be that careful, we can make them plain, open.

The second coming, the millennium.

Last page, the inheritance of the believer, the fate of the unrepentant, and to summation the kingdom of God.

This is, in a sense, now, a particular work in which, if I may be permitted to do so, we might say it could be dedicated to the memory of Mr. Harold Jackson, who was in almost all of the meetings.

The group was selected by Mr. Tkach, who would make up the meetings.

Some people are less often there.

I am usually there, once in a while, I'm away.

That's true of most, but some are way more often.

They include those involved at the highest level in church administration.

Mr. Neff, myself, Mr. Feazell, chairs it on behalf of Mr. Tkach, responsible in the other areas are Mr. Kelly, and then Mr. Bernard Schnippert, in terms of the whole area of media services.

Less often there, Mr. Hume.

We have those who assist Mr. Feazell.

We have, at the other end of the telephone, and we have a telephone and a screen, or screens, so that we have two, three, or four faculty members, as well as the president of Ambassador College.

They listen, they comment.

Dr. Stabranidis, when he's over there, would be usually listening.

When he's here, he would also be available.

We have individuals who more recently been brought here, who also serve in church administration.

I would guesstimate that, on average, there are anywhere from 10 to 20 people who are, or have been participants.

The Spanish department's leadership plays a small role once the Spanish department was transferred, a larger role when here, because from Big Sandy there are closer contacts with Latin America that can be maintained, and therefore we have Mr. Walker less often available.

The material, essentially, is looked at by Mr. Takat, step by step, and the general concepts as to what we want to discuss are looked upon in terms of, are we leaving out something that is important, that needs to be said, not to you in the Pasadena East PM congregation specifically, but to people who might write about you and me in the local newspapers.

So let me read now a few of the statements with some comment.

Since they're 28, I don't know how many I will get to.

That depends on what kind of comment I wish to give, but I cannot imagine that Mr. Weber would not want to address either the subject again or those that remain.

Definition under God.

God by the testimony of Scripture is the only one, sorry, is the only true God and Father of all, eternal, immutable, omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent.

I'll read the first one in entirety.

He's creator of heaven and earth, sustainer of the universe, and source of man's salvation.

God is love and infinite goodness.

The Church affirms the oneness of God and the full divinity of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.

There are three lines below in which the Scriptures are listed.

The Scriptures are entirely separate from the text that I read, because when most people write it up in the newspaper, the one thing they don't want to include are Scriptures.

So those are separate and selectively chosen to be the most effective and useful.

We sometimes added one.

We sometimes removed one.

This will be a matter of recognizing that sometimes a useful verse for you may have another section associated with it that needs significant explanation.

So we try to limit ourselves to those verses which alone seem sufficient and don't administer further questions.

Now when we look at this, we do note that it is written in simple form.

Let me just say that three, six, nine, you might have anywhere from seven to twelve or thirteen lines.

Why did we choose to have something like this and nothing more written on a topic? One, because most people in writing about us would not generally be expected to explain our teaching beyond a minimum number of lines in a newspaper or a magazine.

That is, we had to say to ourselves, if the church of God believes and a person writing it up would pick some things out, now if what the church of God believes were written on a piece of paper, let's say this size, anyone you can understand that this would take too much in the newspaper, it would lead to the following problem.

The person writing it up would pick and choose and misinterpret and not know how to word it properly.

So we purposely kept this section small, so for practical purposes it could be the summary which anyone could use in a quote explaining a topic.

God by the testimony of Scripture, this then means that the church is explaining that the source of its knowledge of the Creator lies in Scripture, yet to be defined that is Scripture.

God of whom we speak is the only true God and Father of all.

We all spoke in one case, there is one God, the Father, and one Lord Jesus Christ.

So from this point of view, under the term God, we are addressing the perspective of God and Father of all, the one whom we commonly refer to as God the Father.

There is no separate term for God and another one for God the Father.

We have simply defined God in terms of its usage in reference to the one whom we know as the Father.

The nature of God as Father of all can be perceived as by generation and by creation, but we don't go into those things.

We can be the children of God having been born of God through the Holy Spirit, angels are the sons of God by creation, an act of creation, not because the Holy Spirit dwells in them in a unique way.

We analyzed it and perceived that we could say that God is by nature eternal, he is immutable in the sense that James says that God changes not, he is omnipotent in the sense that there is no one who has power over him, he is omniscient not in the sense that he chooses to know all, but he can know all if he chooses.

Omnipresent there is no place you can ever go to escape from God.

He is omnipresent through his spirit.

We define him as creator in the simple biblical terms that are used to heaven and earth.

He is also sustainer of the universe which implies the universe cannot exist on its own with God emeritus as the one who is around.

Also the source of man's salvation.

God is pictured as love and good.

The church affirms the oneness of God.

That is there is something unique about God in the sense that the word one or oneness seems applicable.

We do not define the nature of oneness.

We have verses of the Bible that are given here which one can read and I won't read those.

I suggest that you will receive a copy and you can look up the verses.

There are three, six, or eight separate citations, eight different books of the New Testament are cited.

So there is a oneness.

Jesus spoke about this oneness when he said, my father and I are one.

This oneness is also manifested in nature when we learn that God is spirit.

That spirit is not divisible in the sense that it has a separate origin.

The oneness that is characteristic of God, and it does not say God the Father in this text here, it simply says of God, is that there is unity and harmony on the one hand and spirit at the God plane on the other.

Which spirit is not divisible in the sense that you separate one angelic spirit from another angelic spirit.

And in looking at the oneness of God in its broadest sense, we affirm the full divinity.

This is a new term of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.

And now the reason I have these books, normally I just have my little Bible, but I want you to know how to proceed.

Now the one thing that this immediately draws attention to is the church is using the term divinity here in a way that might be unusual.

So that what I would suggest you have is a dictionary.

Now I happen to be here with Webster's dictionary.

I got this long, long ago, copyright 1965, it's amazing that's a quarter century old.

Definitions are not always changing of that nature, but we are writing here to people who are arguing matters, discussing matters, thinking in matters of theology.

Mr. Armstrong was writing to other people, advertising men, church members, and used a different vocabulary, he was an advertising man's vocabulary.

Here we are addressing terms that must be used correctly.

So when we affirm the full divinity, the question necessarily arises, does divinity equal the sense of person? And the church clearly elsewhere answers that question.

Here it merely says that contrary to people who say we acknowledge the Father and the Son but deny the Holy Spirit, which is a lie, but because of how we worded things there were people who said and theologically could justify their statement that we deny the Holy Spirit which the church never has.

It's because we use non-theological terms.

We propose therefore that it must be made clear that we do not deny that which is fundamentally the characteristic of the Holy Spirit, which is divinity.

Now to give you an idea, you may have your own definition of divinity.

The question is, does that mean a person? Is that which essentially characterizes the divine necessarily equivalent of the idea of person? So let me just take the time here.

I will look up the word divinity.

First of all, you must know how to spell it.

But happily, and this is spelled correctly, so we have no problem.

There we are.

Divinity.

I note in this definition that it says the quality or state of being divine.

It doesn't say the third person of the Godhead.

It just says that divinity is a quality or state of being divine.

So now we must understand what it means to be divine.

We look at the term, and this is the adjective, of or relating to or proceeding directly from deity.

Of or relating to or proceeding directly from deity.

If the Holy Spirit is divine, that is we affirm the full divinity of the Holy Spirit, it means that we affirm that the Holy Spirit relates to is of or proceeds directly from deity.

That has been the teaching of the church all along.

So this is not an improper use.

Now I think that's a very important point.

So we have therefore, in that sense, pointed up that divinity is not an inappropriate use.

We examine carefully how theologians use the term, how it is defined in English, and there is no reason to simply define the Holy Spirit solely as some energy or power only.

God is spirit, said Jesus.

And in the sense that God is spirit, the spirit of God is holy because that spirit is holy.

And that spirit exists not at the level of spirit in man, not at the level of created spirits that is angels, but at the God plain level.

Now what also we note is that in a simple summary like this, the next thing you need is a commentary, so to speak, or an exposition where we analyze not only what is said here, but the words that are involved.

The next subject is Jesus Christ.

This was the word through whom and for whom God created all things.

He was God manifested in the flesh for man's salvation.

He was begotten of the Holy Spirit and born of the Virgin Mary.

Here we don't use the argument that if God was his father, then he couldn't have the Holy Spirit as his father.

We simply point up that the Holy Spirit overshadowed Mary, and God through the Holy Spirit, the divine spirit of God, impregnated a Virgin Mary.

We do not call her ever virgin.

We simply call her the Virgin Mary because that was her state at the time.

During his earthly life, Jesus was the Son of God.

We carefully do not discuss the question of whether the Word was the Son of God from all eternity, but do emphasize that Jesus was the Son of God in connection with his earthly life.

There was no connection made with something earlier.

Worthy of honor and reverence and the prophesied Savior of man, he died for our sins, was raised from the dead, and ascended to heaven from where he mediates between God and man.

Between man and God is the order here for reasons I don't need to dwell on.

It's written from the human perspective.

He will come again to reign as king of kings over all nations in the kingdom of God.

That I think is reasonably clear without further commentary at this time.

The Holy Spirit is the comforter promised by Jesus Christ sent from God to the church on the day of Pentecost.

God's Holy Spirit is the power that transforms man through repentance, baptism, and continual renewal.

The Holy Spirit is the source of inspiration and prophecy throughout the Scriptures and the Christian's constant guide to all truth.

Then I read about the Holy Scriptures.

The Holy Scriptures comprise the canonical books of the Old and New Testament.

We do not mention as to whether there are deuterocanonical books, meaning that there are books out of the Hebrew Aramaic that are canonical, and then as Orthodox and Catholics have a second canon.

I purposely said, well, I'll use the King James if I need to, but I will have a Bible called the New American Bible, Collins, it's a publication.

I note that this is sponsored by the Bishops' Committee in the confraternity of Christian doctrine.

I also note that when I turn over to the next page that it says here, Imprimator Patrick Cardinal O'Boyle, and I begin to realize this is a good Catholic translation, and then there is Paul, the Pope, that is Papa the Sixth.

In this Catholic translation, I find different books in addition to what typical Protestant versions have.

We have not chosen to make an issue of that subject and merely define them as the canonical books.

Normally the others are treated as deuterocanonical, Protestants would call them apocryphal.

We don't make an issue of everything unnecessarily.

Catholics who can write it would probably assume that we mean the Protestant canon.

They are the inspired word of God, the scriptures, the foundation of truth, the accurate record of God's revelation to mankind.

The holy scriptures constitute ultimate authority in all matters of doctrine and embody the infallible principles that govern all facets of Christian living.

So we note that the ultimate authority in all matters of doctrine would be the Bible, not a particular human being's office.

So in this sense, it would be quite clear there is not a particular office that would supersede the authority of scripture or any office in the church, apostle on down, historically or present, would be subject to what is in this book, not an office above the law, but an office constituted by the law, if you please.

We have not addressed the question beyond the simple statement, the accurate record of God's revelation.

We are not addressing the question of verbal inspiration.

We are not addressing the question of the care of preservation.

We are talking about the Bible as God intended it, or the holy scriptures, to be conveyed to mankind.

We move into another area, the angelic realm.

Angels are created spirit beings.

Now you notice we did not call Jesus a being.

We did not call God the Father a being.

We did not call the Holy Spirit a being.

And here is where there were some problems in our earlier use of the term.

Angels are created spirit beings, that is, spirits, but being in the sense that each one is separate and independent, separate and independent, whereas God the Father, the Word or the Lord Jesus Christ and God's Holy Spirit are not independent.

We therefore would have to conclude today that it was a mistake to refer to Jesus Christ as an eternal spirit being, as distinct from the one whom we know as El Shaddai or God Almighty who became the Father, who would be an eternal spirit being.

That is an incorrect use of the term being in theology.

There is only one God in the sense that the God-plain existence is composed of one spirit.

By one spirit we are all baptized into Jesus Christ, not by different spirits.

And this is a very important aspect.

That spirit, that level of being that is God, can be manifested in more than one person.

That's already apparent by the use of the term El Shaddai, that is the Almighty, and the Logos or Adonai and the Hebrew.

So we learn that now we need to be careful of how we use the term beings.

There are human beings, though we do descend from a greater family genetically, going back to one, nevertheless we become in a certain sense independent in a way that we can all be individually judged.

But in terms of Holy Spirit, when we receive the Spirit of God, which gives us that extra plane of relationship where we all have linked with the Spirit in man, we all have Holy Spirit if we have repented, believed in our baptize, that makes us uniquely one.

And the word beings would not any longer be appropriate.

So we've been careful in these points.

The Holy Angels are created spirit beings endowed with free will, endowed with free will, that's a theologically correct term.

They made their decisions, they are making their decisions.

The Holy Angels serve God as messengers and agents, are appointed to minister to those who will obtain salvation and will accompany Christ at his return.

The disobedient angels are called demons.

Now comes subject Satan.

Satan is a fallen carib.

No further definition of carib.

Check it in a dictionary.

That's what it's for.

For a Bible dictionary, but I use this one instead of a Bible dictionary because we're using other terms that are not just found in the Bible.

He is referred to in the Bible in various ways, including the devil, adversary, evil one, murderer, liar, thief, tempter, accuser of the brethren, prince of demons, the God of this world.

He is in constant rebellion against God through his influence Satan generates discord, deception and disobedience among human beings.

His domain and influence as God of this world will cease at the return of Jesus Christ.

His domain and influence as God of this world will cease at the return of Jesus Christ.

We do not conclude that this means that Satan's dominion and influence will cease at the moment that Jesus Christ returns.

We are simply using a general statement without defining any relationship other than it's connected with it.

It doesn't speak of a second, a minute, an hour, a day or a year.

I draw that to your attention just so you know how it is written up.

Because it's quite clear that the coming of Christ is associated with the festival on the first of the seventh month and the binding of Satan is pictured in connection with another ceremony nine days later.

Man was made mortal in the image of God.

We don't see anything more about the image of God.

That is sufficient where people want to argue, let them argue.

Read the scripture yourself, Genesis 1, 20, 6 to 28 and 2, 7 and 16 and 17.

God formed him of the dust man here is used.

We do not use feminist terms.

God formed him of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life endowing him with mental and spiritual faculties.

He was given dominion over all the earth and the freedom to choose whether to obey his Creator.

Because he chose sin, man was alienated from God and can be reconciled only to the sacrifice of Jesus Christ.

Man's destiny is to inherit eternal life in the kingdom of God.

We never mention the plan of God.

No such topic I read to you as a separate title.

But if you want to know the plan of God, it is summarized in the simple sentence, man's destiny is to inherit eternal life in the kingdom of God.

Eternal life is to participate in the nature of God for all eternity.

That's what it means, the nature of God for all eternity.

That's the meaning of inheriting eternal life.

We have chosen not to be here a part of the argument over whether man means a male or man is something different from woman.

Our meetings were held on the basis of this.

Mr. Tkach went over the whole thing, wanted to be sure, and any time he felt there was something still not quite clear, we went back and tried to make it clear to meet everybody's satisfaction.

It was a kind of common denominator.

We would say we do respect the role that women are playing, but I think we're playing with words when we assume that man as well as the word God can only have some specific instead of a broader meaning.

We were not, therefore, influenced by the new terminology that is influencing people where they speak of God as he or she.

Salvation is deliverance from the bondage of sin, from the ultimate penalty of sin, death.

That is the gift of God by grace through faith in Jesus Christ, not earned by personal merit or good works.

Through our acceptance of the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, God offers salvation, not only for the present life, but for eternity, following Christ's return.

You note that we did not define death beyond the simple use of the word death.

In the broadest sense, a very important conclusion, salvation encompasses even the creation, not merely the human family.

Sin is expressed and manifest in the sense that even creation groans and travails under human sin, and there will be a new heaven and a new earth in which dwells righteousness.

So we cannot avoid the implication that in its broadest sense, the experience of salvation sets the universe and not merely man.

You will not live forever in this world.

This world also will be changed.

Grace is the free unmerited favor God bestows on a sinner who repents.

In its broadest sense, grace is expressed in every act of God's self-disclosure.

By grace, man comes to know God, is justified, and is saved.

Not was saved, but is saved.

It's a state of being.

Through faith, the Christian remains always under grace.

Then there is an explanation of sanctification.

Grace is a word that, generally speaking, dropped out of the church vocabulary and was confused with the word conversion.

Sanctification in my judgment here, I'm going to alter its position in explanation and just go over very slightly.

I won't finish it.

I'll just stop with this page.

And I'll go to the subject of conversion.

Conversion is turning away, sorry, is turning from the way of sin to the way of God.

It is closely connected with God's calling, repentance, and baptism, and is sealed by the gift of the Holy Spirit.

Conversion is manifest in godly thoughts, attitudes, and actions that form the basis of the believer's life in Christ.

Justification is God's gracious act of pronouncing a believer righteous in his sight.

It is dependent upon repentance, made possible through faith in the shed blood of Jesus Christ, and acceptance of him as Lord and Savior.

And justification, I've reversed the order because I think from time point of view it should be.

Sanctification is a state of holiness.

The reason the church shunned this word sanctification, one, it's long and Latin.

Two, it was abused theologically.

And three, we didn't want to be connected with false ideas about it, but it is time to go back to this very important word in the New Testament.

Sanctification is the state of holiness.

You've heard of the saints.

Sanctification essentially simply means one, the state of being saintly or holy.

According to the believer, through the indwelling of God's Holy Spirit, though all Christian sin, God's Holy Spirit leads them to a life of repentance and obedience, a life evidenced by the fruit singular of the Holy Spirit.

Sanctification follows conversion and is made possible by God's grace through faith in Jesus Christ.

We felt it was important for you, as well as for others, to point up that sanctification follows conversion.

It defines your state of being after you have turned from the way of sin to the way of God.

Sanctification is the process of turning around and heading in another direction.

Justification now is the state in which you are vis-À-vis the Creator, guilty or justified before Him, and able to stand before Him.

Sanctification describes the, shall we say, inner state of mind and conduct that defines the way you walk after the conversion or turning takes place.

So conversion has reference to not a lifelong process, but a change that is made that introduces not only the state of justification, but the condition of sanctification through life.

And at 4.32 I will stop, and this means I have covered 3, 6, 9, 12, and Mr. Weber has 16 more to go.

I think that's where we should stop.

Now in answer to the question, what's going on at headquarters, well, this is one of the things that has gone on.

And I suggest when you see it commented on in the World Wide News or any other piece of literature that you ask to obtain a copy.

Let me then summarize a thought here in terms of how we do things.

One, take a Bible you're familiar with.

Take that Bible, I'm looking for a clip while I'm talking, and have it available to have a dictionary available so that when you meet a word that you may not be familiar with, you look it up and see what is said.

Then it would be good to have a translation that reflects a wholly different perspective.

Thus, I could have chosen, normally I would say I would use the New King James as as close to possible, but modern language of the King James, but I would also want to see what kind of terminology the conservative or liberal Church of England might have.

I don't have a book from them, but there is such a one, the revised English Bible.

Then I could look at the mainstream Protestants, the New Revised Standard.

I might look at the evangelical and the New King James or the more general perspective given in the New International.

I thought that I would choose here the Catholic version, because it's interesting to see how Catholics who represent the large, a single group would translate something.

Let me just read a verse here in conclusion where Peter addresses the church, and in addressing the church in the Book of Acts, what shall we do, brothers? Peter answers, now the old translations would have here, do penance and be baptized.

The new translation says, you must reform and be baptized.

So it's interesting to take note at how others define their thoughts.

The footnote says, you must reform and be baptized.

Repentance is a positive concept, a change of heart toward God reflected in the actual goodness of one's own life.

I would hardly find that our definition.

There is no one who is good but God, and that which now becomes what we are to be is due to the presence of God's Holy Spirit, so that once we have the Holy Spirit and are born from above, and a

new inner man and woman develops, living first of the milk of the word and then the strong meat, an analogy that goes beyond the concepts of conception, all the way to maturity, which implies that being born from above leads to the whole maturing process, till we come to the full stature of Jesus the Christ.

No, I wouldn't want to define it this way, but I think it important that you take a look, because Catholic versions will definitely have some footnotes that most Protestant versions now do not have.

So you should take note of how some things are translated.

We're leaving it to the individual.

We don't quote any scripture.

We cite what chapter and verse would be useful.

Therefore, we are not allowing any translation.

We simply show that a translation of a particular verse is fundamental to understanding the various doctrines.

So I suggest you have a common version you're comfortable with, one that you may not be comfortable with, but let's at least keep it cheap, get a used one.

You don't have to have an expensive one.

I would say I would go to the Burbank Mall, and there you will find various translations of the Bible, older or newer.

You can go to the used theology of the bookstore here in Pasadena, on East Washington, within the first block west of Hill, the archives.

I'm not trying to sell any one book place, but that's a very good one for used Bibles of various sorts.

So you can get them new.

And then there is the alternative, go to Salvation Army, where the little book places.

But generally speaking, Bibles don't last too long there and wouldn't be what you would find, let's say, in a used bookstore.

So with that, you have a number of things yet to go through, and you will find that you will not read some things so specifically that a doctrine is built on them.

They are simply worded without further comment.

You need to bear in mind they do not at all points define anything more than what is said.

And you must read further to understand time and place and activities.

But I think you will see here a new way of presenting the church's teaching to your children, to others who ask, to relatives.

And we are no longer in another age in which religion was presented in terminology and in a world that shunned certain ideas, and that was more controversial.

This is a world today in which we have to, in a sense, be careful of the choice of words we use, which enhances, listen carefully, respect to the work for having chosen the correct words in order that we

may not be misconstrued and may have as much access as is possible to the media and not have needless assaults from those who in the field of religion have attacked us here to fore and made our reputation unfortunate and, of course, incorrectly assessed.

And to express again my appreciation to church administration for asking that I should come over here to this delightful group.