

## H008 3-28-92 Hoeh Statements of Beliefs 2 Pasadena

I want to thank those who are responsible for the fine arts part of our development here.

There's a very beautiful presentation.

Since the subject of the Statements of Belief of the Worldwide Church of God is extensive enough, you end up hearing two sermons on the topic.

For some reason, it has been the custom for the congregations in this building to have me finish it, even though I suggest that it always is possible for others to pick up where I leave off.

Presumably what is wanted is that those who don't just give an overview, such as I do, then would cover each of these topics at some time or another as a sermon at her sermon, which would be, of course, a good challenge over a two-year period.

I would like to draw to your attention some fundamental things that we should be in our minds in connection with some things that even were mentioned by Mr. Bill Butler.

We do live in the 1990s, and there are different perspectives, and as I have said before, we have both changes in the society in which we live, and we also have changes in the internal experience of those who are more directly or most directly responsible under Christ.

The most educated person in the churches of God's seventh day in the first third of this century was Mr. A. N. Duggar.

There was no one who had more education than he did, and how he approached the administrative problem of the church had its success and failure.

He did not continue in the accomplishments of the, let's say, first two decades of the church in the later years.

That is the two decades of this present century.

When Herbert Armstrong came to be responsible for the work of the Eugene Church of God, which he was used to raise up in connection with and out of the Oregon Conference of the Church of God, we had a person who was a trained writer and a person who was an advertising man in an age in which world events meant a great deal.

This was the time of the struggle of Italy and Ethiopia, the time of the struggle between Christianity, tradition, socialism and communism in Spain, the time of struggle over the wisdom or lack of wisdom of the Versailles Treaty, and the rise to power of national socialism, the continuing question of how far communism would go.

And so the work began with a clear emphasis on events and men of prominence.

We don't have on the world scene today an Italian who can mold the thinking of Italy, a chancellor in Germany who can get 95 to 98 percent of the vote, or someone who can conduct in the United States the kind of fireside chats on radio and have the attention of the nation at large.

Whereas a British author recently, Mr. Wirsthorn wrote, this is an age in the political realm of pygmies.

And by that he was not speaking of those in Africa, he was speaking of those in the world of adults whose stature is normal, but whose political capacity is remarkably short in terms of being able to move a nation.

That which we see in the earlier work of this decade, I should say of this congregation, this church, that was raised up to do a particular work in the middle 1930s, occurred at a time when there was extreme controversy over anything such as the Sabbath, or the unthinkable such as holy days, or that ridiculous idea of Adventists and Jehovah's witnesses that man is not an immortal soul in a material body, or the concept that there was a second chance, an awful, awful idea, because everybody has had a first chance in this life.

These were great arguments.

If you were to see the literature that this work received in the 1940s, 50s, and into the 60s, I am, as it turned out, the custodians of, I guess, about two boxes of literature that we would receive of various groups, not writing necessarily about us, but just writing about Christianity and religion.

You might find it odd, archaic, old-fashioned.

In fact, I have in my possession some things that go back long before Mr. Armstrong's time in the Church of God that my mother's family inherited from the turn of the century.

That literature was quite different, but there was a great deal of controversy in what we might call the middle third of this century as a result of the impact of Jehovah's witnesses who would have little records and a record player, you know, this was before the modern techniques, and they would go from house to house and play a sermon of Judge Rutherford.

As a result of what Adventists and Jehovah's witnesses, and perhaps later Mormons did, great controversy arose in terms of law and grace and Sabbath.

Now it is quite different.

Now you can take a list of denominations and you can find at least a dozen that observe in one manner or another the annual holy days that at one time would have brought down the wrath of the Christian world, that we were not even Christian, we were near Christian, we were a Jewish sect, we were heretics, and these people simply represent quite a change.

It's possible to read Protestant literature today and discover that Paul indeed was not wrong when he emphasized that according to the mind, I serve the law of God, even if grace does bring about the forgiveness of sin.

For there was a time that many thought that even to try to serve the law of God in your mind was being mosaic, and all you needed was grace.

And Mr. Armstrong's presentation of what kind of faith was required for salvation was regarded as spiritually and theologically nonsense.

And you can find books that in fact correspond in many points to what he wrote 30, 40 years ago, and these can be found in whole books espoused by leading Protestant denominations and for sale in Fuller's theological bookstore.

So things have changed, not necessarily for the better and not necessarily for the worse.

Some things have not improved, some things have clearly improved in the world's understanding.

It is also an age in which it is now possible to think the unthinkable in terms of junior high and high school and AIDS.

It is now possible to recognize that what Hitler did not dare to do in terms of abortion, we do as a result of what is construed as a right based on the Constitution of the United States.

All Europe would have risen up in wrath if Hitler had ever dared to do what the liberation, the women's liberation movement in this country espouses as a constitutional right.

Now these things are important to bear in mind because you tend to live and think that in the world in which you didn't grow up or in which you were very young and may not remember, depending on your age, it was just like the world today.

Some things are.

The gangs of Chicago in the 1920s and 30s, we now have different kind of gangs.

But when it comes to aspects of morality, we would be shocked at how conservative other generations were and other evil movements in the world were.

But we take it for granted, and if we can have a distorted view today in which we safeguard, we might as well speak plainly and understand the state of mind because this will also explain why the general compromise in religion today, why it's possible to accept truth and not argue the same way as it was 30 or 40 years ago, why shall we call it a more clear and precise approach and not knocking the donkey over the face, you know, to get its attention is more characteristic of our generation.

This one that is dominant now, there was a time when we would have said that a criminal deserves the death penalty in society.

That has drifted back into the thinking of a significant number, but in terms of administration doesn't exist, except in a few states.

South Africa has just this week declared the death penalty null and void.

But just look at the implication just so you know how people think.

We choose to have a law that protects an accused innocent.

Call him innocent because we assume that indeed there are such cases, an accused innocent from any such death penalty, because it is wrong, as it would be, to execute someone who is innocent because the judicial system, the court system, the legal system in some way failed to identify the innocent.

And we therefore allow many who are indeed not innocent to be turned loose on society so that for every 10 or 100 who might be killed by the state.

We allow the criminals out in our present system to kill upwards of 22,000 people in this country every year for murder.

Now we kill more than that on our highways, the bulk of which are in one way or another involved in alcohol or drugs.

Even if there is something worse, maybe that's it.

Where we hardly wrap people on the knuckles for murder who should never have been driving under the influence of various drugs.

But we allow it because in society those who didn't do it also are on drugs or want the liberty not to receive a penalty should they drive under the influence.

Now this is a way of thinking and over the generations in a century we have significant variations.

We are in a stage in which in drawing up a statement of beliefs of the church we are using not religious television as a medium of communication, but essentially the non-religious stations that allow for the purchase of time.

We are able to say things in 1990, 1991, and 1992 that Mr. Armstrong in broadcasting on radio could not have said in the late 1930s or 1940s.

But in so doing we have to self-censor what we do.

Because there are things that we do not now find permitted.

We must not sow word things that we have in fact cornered viewers or listeners.

Where they have to face a choice.

Because to compel others to face a choice by a logical argument that in fact makes it impossible to escape their responsibility is considered inappropriate today.

And would require in fact that our program on some stations be removed.

So we must not address the Sabbath in such a way as to make individuals feel guilty of Sabbath breaking.

It must be left to their perceptions to analyze the topic.

And if we do that on television as we must and not let's say corner people or make them feel that they are being put in an awkward position and then right into a television station, which station then becomes concerned, we are careful on these things.

Or we also have to have literature accompanying that in a manner that is appropriate for such telecasts or radio broadcasts where they are given.

What is also imperative is to recognize that whereas we used to have little pamphlets, Armstrongism, maybe 16 pages, now we deal with the church of God as an institution which it is having survived these decades as the Worldwide Church of God doing remarkable things in terms of publishing, being involved with a college and a foundation, a cultural world.

We are not merely just a little group that people write about who send out tracks.

We are in fact the subject of discussion in theological classes at universities where people who are the new group in the ministries of this world, where you have individuals of other religions studying Christianity including ourselves, where people who are in the media acquire information about us and they discover that unlike other groups, we have our own in-house vocabulary in which we use terms that in fact mean something different to those who hear and read us than what we ourselves mean by it because the terms we have used represent an advertising perspective, represent what we would call common speech and are perhaps not precise in terms of how theologians think of something and therefore we have been misunderstood incorrectly so that it became imperative that we should draft material that in fact cannot be faulted in terms of what we mean by what we say, whether or not all the brethren are familiar with these terms or such usage.

We had a general discussion in the PM congregation in this building on the entirety in two sermons and I will pick up early in the booklet, the assumption is some few of you might have it or you certainly should have it at home, but we will take a look and since some of you are visitors or might be seeing others and have some ideas, I again draw to your attention that when we go over material that seems written for a purpose other than the specific needs of members because it is written for a purpose other than the specific needs of members.

It is written to include the needs of members so you will learn how to explain it, but it was also written in a short form not to meet every query of our communications department but it was written so that the entire summary would be a reasonable document that media could identify with in writing up in any newspaper or magazine what we state about what we believe.

So it could be lengthened, it is not lengthened here nor does it have any significant footnotes other than of course the various verses that might be appropriate to explain why we define the teachings of the church in the manner that we do.

So it is important that we should have a Bible with us.

You ought to have something in the tradition of the King James, the new King James for example, you should have something in the tradition if you wish of a modern version, a modern generally speaking Protestant version, the new international version is perhaps a good illustration, a modern, the King James, the new King James is modern in a grammatical sense but it sticks to the style of another age.

The NIV which I do not have here is a modern version, then there are the more conservative groups where both Catholics and Protestants have worked on it such as the revised standard or new revised standard version.

I simply choose since it is available at the house, the new American Bible which is a Catholic version, the reason I just point these up is that we can look up the quotations and we should not find that the doctrine is based on just one translation as if that translation is right, we have chosen to define it so that almost any modern translation would have supportive material and can be accepted.

If there are controversial verses, we have generally not addressed those things that are controversial yet among commentators in order that we don't have to have footnotes to define it as of course some verses of the Bible would require footnotes.

Then I, in this case I have another dictionary this time, I have a dictionary, now you can find more elaborate, less elaborate ones, you certainly don't need the great unabridged ones, I have here an older edition of Webster's, you could have some very nice modern dictionaries, Oxford Dictionary in a handy form which is otherwise a multi-volume work.

That way if you discover terminology that is not at all clear to you that we haven't customarily used, you can examine it.

So I suggest that you have at least two versions of the Bible and you have a dictionary accessible.

You don't need more than that, you can always look if you wish later to a Bible dictionary and a Bible dictionary is very helpful, I highly recommend Bible dictionaries for that purpose.

But we started out with the subject of God, we covered the subject of God but I will point up that we did it in the following fashion, where we addressed the word God but not God and then God the Father.

We simply did not get to that point or choose to go to that route, go to that route in which we would have a definition of God in an overview and then to define God the Father, Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit.

So it is important to note what we did and did not do.

We chose to define God and to do it in such a way that it leads to the general premise in terms of God as God the Father of all, without identifying the nature of the God realm in its entirety.

We come next, and this is where I will pick it up, with Jesus Christ, whom we identify as the Word, through whom and for whom God created all things.

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

To be manifest in the flesh meant that the life that he had that kept him living was due to the blood encirculation in his body, otherwise he could not die.

If his life was solely that of the Holy Spirit, he could not have died.

But he not only lost consciousness, he slept the sleep of death while in the grave and he was flesh.

And this was done in order that mankind, humankind could be saved.

He was begotten of the Holy Spirit, by which we mean that the Holy Spirit was that power of the God realm that engendered, as my term, that produced, that's a good definition of the old English word begot, that produced Jesus Christ.

The Holy Spirit, in that sense, is that power which transformed word into flesh, the word or logos into flesh, born of the Virgin Mary.

During his earthly life, which we do not define as whether he was in Tibet or England or not, there are always those people who speculate about his youth, Jesus was the Son of God.

That is without question, because God, the Father, became God the Father, otherwise he is simply essentially to be identified as God Almighty.

El Shaddai, but he became the Father by means of the Holy Spirit, which transformed the word, the person of the word, into the fetus and what precedes it in the sequence of gestation, and then to become a child and finally the mature adult.

Jesus Christ was the Son of God, worthy of honor and reverence and the prophesied Savior or Messiah of mankind.

This work is not written in particular for the Jewish audience.

It makes no reference to typical terms like Messiah, such as we would if our audience in the media was primarily that of Jewish interest.

When we went to the state of Israel and developed a working relationship, we developed a particular and carefully written document to identify the teaching of the church and to distinguish the Jesus Christ that we worship and the Jesus Christ of the Bible from that person whose name is the same, but whose ideas in many ways are thought to be quite different from what the Bible says of Jesus, even though people think it is the same person.

Paul spoke of the fact that there were those who spoke of another Jesus, a Jesus who had a different perspective of the law of God.

So we identify Jesus as the prophesied Savior.

We did not speak of him as the Messiah, because the Messiah as a term is not referred to does not mean that we do not think he is.

Let's just note that what is in here is in here for reasons.

What is not in here should be judged on its own merit.

He died for our sins.

He, Jesus, the Son of God, died for our sins, was raised from the dead, ascended to heaven from where he mediates between man and God, man used in the general sense, that includes male and female, young and old.

Man kind, as distinct from horse kind, without arguing the question of whether this is a sexist term.

There are people today who go to extremes and want to make man a term only for the male, and they want to have some other term for woman, which is not based on the intent that man and woman, as used traditionally, are a part of mankind, but that men somehow are men and women are a part of a great sisterhood, which of course is why ultimately we are in what is now called a new period, a period different from the feminist movement.

This is thought to be the post-feminist age, because the feminist movement was in fact captured in many areas by the lesbian community, let's be plain.

We will, sorry, he will come, Jesus Christ, again to reign as king of kings.

We did not include Lord of Lords, that gets to be a more clumsy term.

It doesn't mean that he is not also coming as Lord of Lords, but we are speaking here of king of kings over all nations in the kingdom of God.

So we are addressing what we would call the governmental aspect, not Lord of Lords in terms of the religion aspect.

So the acknowledgement of the kingdom of God is made clear in the second subject.

That it is going to be on earth and over all nations in conflict distinction to the Adventists is also made clear.

The Holy Spirit, third topic, the Holy Spirit is the Comforter, promised by Jesus Christ.

Christ refers to the Spirit of God as the Comforter, by the way the word Comforter in Greek is a noun of the masculine form and hence it is in terms of grammar appropriate in Greek to refer to the Comforter by the word he.

The word spirit is neuter and it's therefore appropriate in Greek grammar to refer to the Spirit as it.

That is a grammatical problem, it has nothing to do with the question of personhood.

The Holy Spirit is the Comforter promised by Jesus Christ, sent from God to the church on the day of Pentecost, otherwise undefined.

Most Christians are at least aware of the word Pentecost.

God's Holy Spirit is, and here we have a definition, is the power that transforms man through repentance.

It's the power that transforms man and woman of course, but people have to have women today because they want man only to mean males.

We do not choose to yet limit ourselves to that kind of non-sexist vocabulary with quotes around that.

It's a very strange age when we cannot refer adequately in writing a book to a child and we have to say the child was in the crib, he, she, is because we can't use she if it's he and we must not use he because it insults the she in the reader.

The fact is that this is nonsense and our language has not solved the problem that this nonsense has generated.

The Germans solved the problem long ago, the child, it.

But once you've been introduced to it, then you can identify whether it's a male or female.

But when you write, you know, when you write it is no problem because we don't have to identify the sex of the child, but when you have identified it as Maria versus Wilhelm why then you can identify it as she or he.

So much for the problems of grammar.

The Holy Spirit is the power that transforms man through repentance on the human part, through baptism and continual renewal, both of the Holy Spirit and of repentance.

Though the sense of it here, the continual renewal is that of the Holy Spirit.

The Holy Spirit is the source of inspiration and prophecy throughout the scripture without identifying how further.

We simply say it is the source of inspiration and prophecy.

We don't say whether it's a source and a vision, a dream or orally.

In fact, you can see that some prophets had dreams, some some nonprofits had dreams.

That there were visions, there were oral statements, but we don't need to get into that.

And it is the Christians constant guide to all truth.

That is the Holy Spirit is the Christians constant guide to all truth without a capital T. That essentially is a theological way of identifying spiritual revelation that cannot be acquired in the test tube.

The next subject is the Holy Scripture because it seems appropriate that we should address it from our perspective rather than a historic perspective.

If it had been a historic perspective, then we really couldn't separate God, Jesus Christ and Holy Spirit, but we would go from there to the angelic realm.

But it's done on a doctrinal perspective and logically the subject of the Holy Scripture should be next.

The Holy Scriptures comprise the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments by saying Old and New Testaments.

We automatically differentiate ourselves from the Jews who have the books of the Old Testament.

We do use the terms Old and New Testament, and I would only privately comment that there is no other way to communicate with the world around us.

But when Christ comes back, I think the one question he's going to introduce very soon is, where did you ever get these terms? For the two parts, Greek on the one and Hebrew and Aramaic on the other.

Before there are no such terms, it came down as inspired terminology to clarify that.

It is simply Holy Scripture, but common terminology within the theological and non-theological world use the term the Old Testament, then the New Testament.

The Old Testament, of course, is an unusual term to apply, for instance, to Genesis, which represents such a long period of time before anybody ever heard of a covenant that became Old.

But that's the way it has turned out.

We choose to use the words that enable us to be understood.

It is not a term that would be used in the Jewish community.

The Jews do not say, we have the Old Testament.

If they did, there would be also thinking of a new.

To be the canonical books means that we exclude the Deuteronical, which you will find in the Catholic version, because these are defined as Deuteronical in the normal sense of the term.

Let me see how a Catholic version has it here, and it doesn't hurt you to know how this is done.

Here on the introductory area, we have the story of the various books of the Bible.

I can separate the page here.

It says the books of the Bible, the Old Testament, and in this, they divided in the following ways.

Pentateuch, historical books, wisdom books, prophetic books, that's the way it was done in the Alexandrian library, and they make no distinction between, as sometimes it is done as in the Revised Standard version, when the Apocrypha is there, between the canonical and the Deuteronical.

The canonical Old Testament means those books arrived at by the Jewish nation, the Deuteronical, those Old Testament books, so incorporated, done at a time essentially in the Christian world.

They are the inspired, and the Christian world means the world of what we would call the Catholic Church of God, a term that was applied in the early centuries of the church when there was only the proper name Church of God that represented the bulk of those that became later Catholic in the West and Orthodox in the East.

They are the Holy Scriptures, the inspired Word of God, the foundation of truth, so we don't identify inspired more than this.

If you want to know what inspired might mean, you simply have to look it up in the dictionary.

We don't say it is the inspirational Word of God.

All Scripture is inspired of God.

We just use the statement, and it is your responsibility to study, to find out in what manner that may have been so.

The foundation of truth, that's what Holy Scripture is.

It's the foundation of truth, in the sense that truth grows out of it.

We perceive it from it.

We do not assume automatically that if something is not found in the Bible, it is never true.

If something is found in the Bible, it corresponds to what we wrote on Ambassador Hall a long time ago.

The Word of God is the foundation of knowledge.

It is not all knowledge.

The foundation of truth, that's what Scripture is, the accurate record of God's revelation to mankind, the accurate record of God's revelation to mankind.

And it is for all mankind, though it has not yet reached all mankind as it is intended to.

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

So let us note the importance of this.

The Holy Scriptures constitute ultimate authority.

Now we cannot go beyond the Scripture in terms of identifying the evidence for authority.

There may be controversy over what a Scripture says, even within the church.

And if that is so, there is authority for the church to make a decision administratively.

And that authority itself is derived from the authority of Scripture.

So nothing can proceed beyond that except that God Himself communicates to man directly.

And that is the direct means by which He communicates presently to the church.

It covers all matters of doctrine.

The Scriptures embody, that's a good term, the infallible principles.

Now we call them principles, that includes law, includes all sorts of instruction.

A principle is a general word, it's a positive term.

It doesn't mean if something is a principle it cannot be a law.

Let's understand that for sure, that govern all facets.

It embodies what governs all facets of Christian living.

It may be by way of example the principle it is given is not necessarily always a law, it might be simply an example.

The angelic realm, now we look at the realm of the creation.

Angels are created spirit being.

Now we will note here the importance of the term beings for angel.

Each angel is a separate created spirit being.

Each human being is a separate being, a person.

Created would not be the word to use for us in that sense, in the sense that we have come by birth as distinct by direct creation.

But we note that the separateness is unique in the word that is used here, of being.

When we refer to God as a being we do not mean the concept of person.

We may find that on the God plane of being we are dealing with persons such as the person of God the Father and the person of the Son.

But there is something distinct with the God realm in contrast to anything else.

What unites the human family and the whole biological realm is the fact that we all have one breath.

But that one breath said Solomon we simply do not retain.

God is unique in the sense that God is spirit, if you please, holy spirit.

And there is only one holy spirit.

That spirit which is God is manifest in the person of God who became the Father of the Word and manifest in the Word from eternity.

When I say that God became the Father, became the Father of the Word, I am referring to that point in time in which the Holy Spirit transformed the Word to flesh at the command of God who became through the Holy Spirit the Father of the Word in the flesh whom we know as Jesus the Messiah.

So there is a unity, God the Father and Jesus Christ the Word are unseparable from Holy Spirit.

In this manner we differ for we are separable from the air that we breathe and we can die.

There is the parallel where we all in fact have as our source of life the breath we breathe.

But that is only a vague representation.

So it is important to note that we speak of God in the sense of being not being plural, but we speak of angels as separate spirit beings.

Our literature before written by Mr. Armstrong as an advertising man used the word being in a sense that theologians by logic of their definition and the historic definition of being could find fault with.

So we speak of the person of Jesus Christ the Word, the person of God the Father and God the Father and the Son as persons, but we speak of God as a being.

God is one being in the sense that it is one plane or realm of eternal Holy Spirit existence that has had neither beginning nor shall have an end.

Angels have a beginning and each one is a being, well it is having personality.

The Holy Angels serve God, well let's finish the first sentence.

These spirit beings are endowed with free will.

We chose the words free will because that is the traditional theological term rather than something else.

Angels have free will, humans have free will.

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.

Now listen carefully, the Holy Angels serve God.

We didn't say the angels because they are those who don't, those who are in a state of rebellion.

It is the Holy Angels who will accompany Christ at His return.

If you will read carefully, you will note that the King James Version, the New King James and the traditional Greek text that is Byzantine says that Jesus Christ will return with all the Holy Angels, but the texts that have underlain most all other modern translations have struck out the word holy, I say it from that point of view.

Those who follow that text think that the Greek Byzantine text from which the King James and the New King James are derived have added the word holy.

Without any question, the word holy has been deleted because when Christ comes back, He is not coming back with the Holy Angels and the fallen angels and the devil.

He is coming back with the Holy Angels.

And those things that clarify in the Byzantine text, the New King James or the King James when verified in the Byzantine text can be seen as having greater weight than the mistake as in the NIV, the RSV and most all other modern translations who like to remove these terms and don't understand the implication.

We learned also that the disobedient angels are called demons.

We didn't address the question of origin of terms like that, we just make the simple statement.

Satan, Satan is a fallen cherub.

We do not use the word archangel, archangel is a general term means a great angel like an archbishop is a great bishop, arch enemy is a great enemy.

More specifically, Satan is a fallen cherub who heads the evil forces in the spirit realm.

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 and God of this world.

We chose to clarify all of these points so that if you were to look at any one of them, you could trace the origin of these problems of temptations, thievery, lying, murder, adversarial attitude by the way we have a judicial system in this country which is called adversarial.

It is not based on the pursuit of truth.

You come to defend yourself and you come to accuse.

That's adversarial.

You don't come to find out what the truth is.

Now, if the truth serves you as the defender or as the accuser, then you use it.

That's the way this world is.

And when it doesn't serve you, you obscure it as much as possible, or your reason why it has no bearing on the topic.

How can we see such a system as other than having derived from the devil? Satan is in constant rebellion against God.

That's a state of mind.

We do not address the question of whether he can change his mind.

In the sense of free will, there is no doubt he is responsible for not changing his mind.

As somebody said long ago, who left us in 1973, he believes that Satan is going to be reconciled to God.

What do I believe? My answer to anybody who asks, who follows that train of thought, is this.

If God can think of some way of reconciling the devil and changing his mind, who am I to prevent God from doing it? So far after all these billions of years, God hasn't yet found a way to change this being's free will, from that of adversarial to that of the spirit of cooperation.

So we say that he is in constant rebellion against God.

Through his influence, Satan generates discord, deception, and disobedience among human beings.

So obviously we say that the devil has influence among human beings.

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

That is not to mean at that second, at that minute, or at that hour.

But it is referring to a general period of time when Christ returns.

That was one of the first things after the return of Christ.

And before the millennium, which don't occur at the same moment, is the putting away of Satan for a period of time called the millennium, Revelation 20, man as a subject.

Man was made mortal.

Now that, of course, flies right in the face, gently, but it really hits you in the face if you think that man was not made mortal, that somehow man's body in the garden of Eden could live forever and ever and ever, and only when he sinned could man die.

Man was made mortal.

He was not an immortal, fleshly being.

He was made mortal also in the image of God.

We don't define that further here.

That is left to those who read it to understand.

God formed him that is man of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, endowing him, as a result, I say, with mental and spiritual faculties.

We had a great deal of discussion.

We don't generally consider that what are in these meetings are essentially within the, let's say, mode of discussion are confidential and we don't normally discuss outside.

I think that is proper, all the details, but it doesn't hurt once we have a product to at least address that we came to a certain conclusion after a very lengthy discussion.

The question would be, is man sufficient if he is endowed simply with mental faculties? Is it sufficient to say he is endowed with spiritual faculties? And I would have to say that I could not have found either term alone, fully acceptable for the reason that there is no, for this reason, although there are no spiritual faculties that can exist without mental faculties.

We have by nature, from the creation of God, now come to the point that all our mental faculties do not allow adequate grasp of spiritual things without a marvelous transformation.

Some had mental and spiritual faculties, and when the spirit of the devil influences human beings, there is not only a distortion of our mental faculties in many areas, not that we cannot reason straight, but we don't know where to reason from.

But most certainly there are terrible distortions of our spiritual faculties, so that in the spiritual sense, we by nature wander around as blind, whereas Adam did not.

And when we are converted, our spiritual faculties in some way are altered.

The word is healed, for certainly the presence of the spirit of the devil influencing the bizarre religions of this world, the misunderstandings and the errors of reasoning, certainly damage the mind.

So we concluded that in giving man physical life, there was also the resultant presence of those faculties which are natural to man and woman, one of which represents the broadest aspect, our mind, and the other that which in fact gives us spiritual grasp of things.

Each grasp has to be made possible by the influence and the presence of the Holy Spirit to undo and to alter the present state of our spiritual faculties.

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

Because he chose sin, now we decided that that was the shortest, most direct term.

Very often we would come to alternatives, did he choose to disobey? Yes, we could have said that.

We simply chose something short.

We could have said he chose the way of sin, that's correct too.

We simply shortened it right to the point.

Because he chose sin, that was in a sense what he chose as his goal.

Disobedience, rebellion, another way of looking at life.

Man was alienated consequently from God and can be reconciled only through the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, that is the Messiah.

When we don't refer to the role of Messiah, the word Christ is simply an English form of the Greek word that meant what the Hebrew word Messiah means.

But we are not addressing this to the Jewish clergy, let's say.

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

We needed a statement of the ultimate once one is reconciled to God in the simplest form is to indicate we inherit eternal life, not that we are imbued with it as a result of being immortal soul.

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

Well we chose this and I, it's not that my wording was exactly this at the end, but I would point this up.

We do sometimes use the word eternal death, but we will have those who argue falsely that if the wages of sin is eternal death where the word eternal must magnify death, the question will arise then, if Christ paid the penalty, why could he live again? And if he lives again, then he didn't pay the penalty of eternal death.

To avoid that needless and inane argument, it is much better simply to say that we are delivered from the bondage of sin, that is the state in which we live, and from the ultimate penalty of sin, the ultimate penalty, not the temporary penalty which is the first death, but the ultimate penalty of sin, death.

That's all the Bible says.

Now that death happens to be eternal because nobody will awaken you out of it, because when that death occurs it is no longer the sleep of death.

That death is what the Bible calls as the separation of soul and spirit.

Jesus said, don't fear him who can destroy the body and the soul.

Rather, sorry, but not the soul, that's man, I got that mixed up.

Don't fear him who can destroy the body and not the soul, but fear him who can destroy the body and the soul, in this case in Gehenna fire.

Paul defines man as body, soul, and spirit.

We have not gone into anything like that here, we simply point up that the penalty is death.

The second death is not simply a sleep, it is a death for all eternity in which the human being can never be assembled again.

It is that is salvation, it is the gift of God by grace through faith in Jesus Christ.

It is a gift of God, it is by grace.

If you want to know what grace is, there are several definitions.

So you should have a dictionary, in this we won't take the time, I only encourage you to have the dictionary to use it.

And it is through faith in Jesus Christ, there is no grace from him if you don't believe him, if you make him out to be a liar.

And it is not earned by personal merit or good works.

There's nothing wrong with personal merit or good works, but it's not earned that way.

That's only what you should be doing, even if salvation hadn't been promised.

It's a lot better to do good and to die than to do evil and to have to live with it.

But God has promised also salvation.

So it is not earned by good works or merit.

Hence the Jewish view, the Buddhist view, the Catholic view, as often thought of but doesn't mean that the churches or the religions I have mentioned necessarily have defined it this way.

But the idea was that in many ways good works compensate for some of the penalty that you get for having done evil works.

Compensate, no.

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.

So we are offered salvation.

That salvation is offered to us now, and we share in it now, by not being immortal, but by having a new life, by experiencing understanding that would not happen without that new life that is made possible through the coming of the Holy Spirit.

And that salvation is also for eternity following Christ's return when we will also be immortal.

We now have salvation in a body of flesh in terms of the new inner person, in terms of the state of mind that is at peace with God and forgiveness.

But the salvation we have now is not as full as it will be at the resurrection when we will move about in a body that is not mortal and handicapped, as we have to sometimes in this life.

In the broadest sense, salvation encompasses even the creation, a remarkable statement to which we all should give ascent.

Salvation is not just something involving human beings.

Salvation in a broadest perspective even involves the transformation of creation such as the parallel that in this life we share in salvation and in eternity, and in the millennium, the world shares in salvation in the sense that the animal world is at peace and not devouring as prey and predator, and the nations are at peace.

And ultimately, there is a whole new creation.

We now live in the present world, and there is coming a new heaven and a new earth.

And that is equally an aspect of salvation because eternal life, immortal in the kingdom of God, would be incomplete unless there were also a new heaven and a new earth in which dwells righteousness.

For in the present heaven and the present earth, we will forget heaven for the moment because there dwells righteousness once the devil is cast out, he is the accuser, that much is still allowed.

But in the present earth wherein righteousness does not wholly dwell, that is why we pray, that I will be done on earth.

You still have, even in the millennium, the presence of sin, and after the millennium, the presence of sin, and at the resurrection of the wicked, the presence of sin.

And until all that is transformed in the broadest sense, salvation is not yet complete.

In some ways, some of the statements here have never been said by the church of God more carefully in shorter terms.

They have been described often at article length.

Grace.

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

Free and unmerited, it's bestowed on a sinner who repents.

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

Grace in a sense is manifest in God's having given us Scripture.

That is, it's a blessing, an unmerited favor.

By grace, man comes to know God.

Man is justified and is saved.

We come to know God, to be justified and to be saved.

Through faith, the Christian remains always under grace.

Through faith, the Christian remains under grace.

And that always is because God's favor is never changed in that sense toward us.

Then we come to the subjects of sanctification, justification, and conversion, and it is probable that we should have a little alteration of the order in which these ultimately ended up on the page.

Sanctification is the state of holiness imparted to the believer through the indwelling of God's Holy Spirit.

That's the word sanctification.

Now this is a word that, for a long time, we avoided.

Because in the first place, it's a long Latin word coming to English through the Norman French.

It's not a simple Anglo-Saxon word, and it sounds to our ear as very religious.

And hence we avoided it and sometimes attributed the meaning of sanctification to other terms that were more palatable to our ear, and we should correct the matter.

Sanctification is the state of holiness imparted to the believer through the indwelling of God's Holy Spirit.

It's imparted through the indwelling of God's Holy Spirit.

It is a state of holiness.

The reason we don't address a religious leader as your holiness is that we do not perceive that that person has been sanctified by the indwelling of God's Holy Spirit.

Though all Christians sin, God's Holy Spirit leads them to a life of repentance and obedience.

So a new direction, of course, is required.

A life evidenced by the fruit of the Holy Spirit.

Sanctification follows conversion.

As it turned out, of course, conversion followed sanctification on the page.

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

That's also the truth from salvation.

Sanctification is made possible as a gift of God by grace through faith in Jesus Christ.

But the same thing is true of the state in which we live.

Justification.

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

So it's God's act of making you now acceptable.

You are pronounced a believer who is righteous in God's sight.

That is not guilty.

Justification is a not guilty verdict because the penalty has been paid by someone else and you are not chargeable.

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

I want to finish with conversion.

We don't have to finish the whole thing.

Others can cover the topics later.

I am taking enough time and there's no use going beyond in this congregation.

We can do this more as we go.

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

So we are discussing a state of mind that is reflected now in some transformation of the direction in which you lead your life.

A turning away from the way of sin to the way of God.

Now when Adam chose sin, he had yet to walk in that way.

We didn't use way of sin in case of Adam.

But here we are not talking simply of turning from sin or sins, but from a whole way of living that is the way of sin to the way of God and not merely to God as a person.

So it is important that way appear here twice.

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

That is, when you stamp something with a seal, that is, it signifies the Holy Spirit, the gift of the Holy Spirit makes it plain that conversion has taken place.

Conversion is manifest in godly thoughts, attitudes, actions, all three thoughts, attitudes and actions that form the basis of the believer's life in Christ, not merely the believer's life.

So conversion in a sense represents the general perspective of turning around and going the other way as we have said.

That state of mind leads to justification.

And the state of having been justified makes possible not the use of the word conversion, but the use of the word sanctification.

That is that you now are in a state where your conduct is to be holy conduct.

Paul talks about the church members being holy brethren.

Now I suppose most of you are.

It's just that we haven't thought about it.

We haven't said it in that sense.

You all ought to be, of course, but we don't here make an issue of those who haven't yet matured to the point of baptism and the receiving of God's Spirit, though the state of mind is still there and manifest through obedience to your parents and the instruction of the church.

And nevertheless, the reason the church has somewhat avoided these terms, such as holy brethren or sanctification, goes back to the fact that there was a movement in the first decade of this century called the Pentecostal Movement that just loved these terms and abused these terms, so much that many people, not just ourselves, thought of these terms as aspects of Pentecostal thinking and behavior.

It is now wiser to just recognize that they abused the terminology and that indeed we should understand to sanctify means to howl for a very special purpose.

Now we have five pages to go.

I've taken plenty of time here.

We've covered three, one, two, four.

I will certainly the next time say that we should have some of this when it is appropriate from Mr. Washington and from Mr. Butler, or whomever might be appropriate, and to carefully go over it.

But I hope that in giving you this kind of outline, and if they want me two months from now or something like that to continue, I should be also pleased to do so because I think it would be good to at least have some comments.

The one advantage of, let's say, my covering the topic among those who were here is that I was there and know why we chose the word.

I will end up with just for a couple of minutes at most a thought that I have repeated before a Professor Rouse, a historian and Elizabethan scholar had written on Winston Churchill also, and there were historians in a meeting that my wife and I attended.

These historians criticized Churchill for having drawn conclusions about why the military made certain decisions in World War II.

Professor Rouse reminded the military that if they thought they knew better, they should bear in mind that they were not there and Sir Winston was.

And then he ended, and when Sir Winston Churchill could not remember why, it would behoove us who were not there to be very careful about deciding why those decisions were made.

And I think you will see that there is a legitimate reason for why we emphasized some things in the way we did when you start to look at what would happen if another form of the expression had been used.

Now, of course, you can expand on these things and make whole articles out of them.

But if you reduce it, what is the logical minimum that would still enable us to make the story accurate and clear to the readership in general?