

## HLH- 780000- Bible \_ Archaeology

is Bible and archaeology.

We will necessarily broaden our perspectives because of the impact of other sciences in terms of how our understanding of archaeology has been over the past years, more specifically in geology.

Participation in archaeology, as far as either the College or the Church, began with us in 1968.

Where it would lead and how it would revolutionize our thinking was at that time undreamed of.

As you all should know, the Church of God, which founded Ambassador College, is creationist in theology.

That is, it recognizes that evolution is not a proven fact.

But at the same time, the Church of God, speaking of the last two centuries, has had no scientific creationism as a part of its tradition.

That is no positive explanation for the facts or data of geology or, for that matter, of archaeology in biblical terms.

And I may say that even creationist literature unrelated to the Church of God, involved with those who observe Sunday as the Lord's Day, they themselves have no way of handling the facts, either of history, geology, or epigraphy correctly in a coherent fashion.

They are usually limited only to an explanation of geology.

The fact that there was, in the Church of God, no positive scientific creationism was obscured because of the argument over evolution.

And the positive recognition of the limits and the mistakes of the theory of evolution, as propounded by various adherents, did not let the Church of God over the past two centuries see the real meaning.

That is, they thought they had an understanding, but it was only negative.

You would not have had a positive understanding of the facts that would be discovered in the world of science.

Creationists have always been able, more effectively, to explain the contemporary world.

They have not been able, effectively, to explain the world that leads up to our present.

Evolution and history were concerns of Herbert W. Armstrong in the 1920s, if you remember the challenges written in the autobiography.

But the Church of God, seventh day, to which he came, offered insufficiency.

And in fact, he had to search out many of the possible answers from other sources altogether.

A related institution, Seventh Day Adventists, for instance, did offer an explanation of geology.

Such an explanation was made available through Adventist published literature, both in his time and through the 1940s, in the works of George McCready Price, whom I have had a chance to speak to and to dine with on an occasion.

So he defined geology, and it was the Seventh Day Adventist understanding of George McCready Price that became the basis for the geological instruction of Ambassador College.

I would point up clearly that we must recognize that there was no work of the Church of God's seventh day, no work of the Church of God that was the basis of geology.

And therefore, there is the need at this time to reevaluate, there has been the need, and it has been acted upon, to reevaluate the whole basis.

Because indeed, it was inherited by individuals, or from individuals who had no understanding of Genesis 1, verses 1, and 2.

And necessarily, their geological conclusions precipitated some problems that we were unable to resolve over many years.

From the point of view of history, the Church of God Seventh Day offered no solid explanation that could, in any sense of the word, support the concept of proof of the Bible.

Thus, the date of the fall of Jerusalem in 585 was derived from literature of the British Israel World Federation at a time prior to the publication of the Babylonian Chronicles by Dr. Wiseman of the British Museum, which, when published, laid forever to rest if there had been no other preconceptions.

The fallacy the Jerusalem fell in 585.

It is an indefensible date.

And irrespective of theology, it is indefensible historically.

So we can say that in the Church of God Seventh Day, there was no tradition that really acted as a solid guide where one generation after another had disciplined the areas.

If you please, the biology, geology, archeology, linguistics, epigraphy, which is, in a sense, the history of written scripts.

Through the Church of God, that is the Radio Church of God, we did learn, in terms of the teaching in Ambassador College, that there were certain fundamental errors in the world's philosophy in terms of history, in terms of the biblical experience as recorded.

But unfortunately, where would we find an explanation if that be the basis? And so what happened is that we can say that, fundamentally, we turned to the peripheral groups, not to men who were scholarly in their areas, but to peripheral groups, such as the Seventh Day Adventists and British Israel World Federation, and individual scholars who were often alone and whose work has since been called in question among Seventh Day Adventists by their own instructors today in their institutions.

I draw attention to the fact that Seventh Day Adventists no longer publish the works of George McCready Price, a leading geologist in the church, Harold W. Clark, summarized only very recently in the Creation Research Society Quarterly of Volume 14 of September 1977 how he came to learn that

George McCrady Price made sufficient mistakes that it is now impossible to find his works published by Seventh Day Adventists publishing houses.

So we have to recognize, and I've had a chance to visit with Harold W. Clark at Angwin, California, and to talk some of the things over, it is clear, even to them, that there was some fundamental error that needed correction.

Ambassador College at least has addressed itself also to this matter.

Therefore, many of the preconceptions that we have had now no longer impinge upon our pursuit of an understanding of the relationship, let us say, of Bible and archaeology, because indeed, with the previous conceptions of geology published not later than 1964 officially in the Plain Truth, we ourselves are no longer boxed in, so to speak, trying to explain the whole of archaeological experience within the limits that geology had imposed on our theological thinking.

Now, in a sense, this material that we developed, Mr. Kenneth Herman and I, were derivatives of the material presented in geology by Mr. Herbert Armstrong to start with, even though the church has, in fact, made no official definition in any case.

And I want to, at this moment, summarize the point that we, as a ministry, must recognize the distinction between what, as a whole, we are asked to speak about and the specific areas of expertise that any one of you may have knowledge of.

For instance, some of you might be linguistically skilled.

Others of you might have a special knowledge of chemistry and nutrition.

Someone might be an explosives expert.

But to ask me to explain in all these areas would be not only improper, but in terms of any work in the ministry, impossible.

It would not be appropriate for that function.

So we must recognize that there may be individuals, and they speak at the level of their expertise.

It is time we recognized that, indeed, there is no way for the church leadership to pronounce on all these areas no capacity or expertise to do so.

At most it would be to define what might be clearly contrary, but it could not define otherwise a positive explanation.

We inherited, in terms of the British Israel World Federation, not merely the date for the fall of Jerusalem.

We also inherited a tradition that came down from that organization that Job assisted in the building of the great pyramid at Giza for Khufu.

With this in mind, it became obvious that if this period of time of pyramid building in dynasty four is to be associated with Job, that a quick analysis of Job's friends showing they descended from Abraham's family and immediate friends would place the pyramid age, the fourth dynasty or the old kingdom, long after the flood and, indeed, after the early patriarchs.

And because of our geological premises, because of this premise inherited not from historical research, but the British Israel World Federation and studies on the great pyramid, we were confronted with a requirement to construct history as a written record only after the flood.

And this required further that our understanding lead us to a grasp of the subject that should not only meet the biblical account, but meet the historical evidence at the close of any period of restoration.

Hence we placed, for those of you who have had some knowledge, we placed the Egyptian old and middle kingdoms as parallel, the intermediate period of the Hyksos as the time of the judges, the period of the great empire of Egypt paralleling the kings, and this required us to place the period of time that we call the Iron Age, normally associated with the kings of Israel and Judah, into the time of the Persian, late Persian, Hellenistic and early Roman.

Furthermore, we were compelled in our thinking to assume that the evolutionists who used the word homo, meaning man, must be referring to a creature descended from Adam.

So we accepted certain ideas from Adventists that were geological, certain historical perspectives from the British Israel World Federation, and in many cases, in fact, the evolutionary definition of homo and then applied it biblically to the biblical family of Adam.

These were all in the background of our thinking, and historically, through the writer Hyslop and the two Babylonians, we came to enshrine the concept that all languages that have ever existed or been written must have occurred not earlier than the time of the Tower of Babel because we read the account from the point of view of the present into the past instead of reading it differently.

That is, the immediate world after the flood in contrast to what had been before.

We read it as if it were a contrast to our today's experience, but I will get to that in a moment.

So having inherited the idea that all languages differing from Hebrew must not precede, and since the earliest languages that are translatable and intelligible go back to the first dynasty of Egypt and the earliest dynasties of Mesopotamia, we were forced to place all of these at a position following the flood itself.

And there were many other aspects, analysis of the idea of what a flood should leave has affected our thinking.

Over the years, we were indeed unable to arrive at a satisfying solution that would resolve some of the problems either of our geological or historical faculty.

If you would like to read in January, February 1964, Plain Truth, I think you will generally have a view how we attempted to explain history and geology in terms of the preconceptions that seemed fundamental to what the church was teaching.

A solution seemed to have been found, as I mentioned, in Emmanuel Velikovsky, who tended to drop history, beginning with the Exodus, some 500 years, which tended to make room.

And here, of course, we come to the problem of whether at the end of the reconstruction it was possible to assemble the material properly.

As a result of our participation in archaeology, our relationship to many of the studies that have been going on over a decade to 15 years, we have tried to evaluate all of the fields that are interrelated.

That is, what is the real positive explanation of geology as we find it? And of archaeology, and how do we understand radiocarbon dating that is C14 and other radiometric methods? And of course, the question of astronomy is not to be lost in this.

We have made a study of stratigraphy and archaeology, which is very fundamental just to define it.

The implication, in other words, is that what lies buried under a floor that has never been penetrated since must have been deposited before the floor was placed as it now is.

And as a result of epigraphy, we have had to reevaluate also our thinking.

Epigraphy is the study of texts in terms of the style of script used, speaking as a layman to lay epigraphers here.

For instance, Hezekiah's tunnel referred to in the Bible, not only has been found, but the inscription of the day, defining how it was finally achieved, has been, of course, known to the scholarly world.

Unfortunately, the style of the script of the period of time of which we are dealing, the close of the eighth century BC, we were forced, archeologically, to place into the Hellenistic period.

Similarly, the Misha Stella, the stone of the king of Moab that records his revolt against Israel, that, of course, brings you into the lifetime of the immediate descendants of Moab, has a particular kind of script which properly belongs to that generation after all that was written at that time.

But we were forced to place its parallels in the early Hellenistic period.

And this is because archeology was forced down, and geology, each one, was brought in to a position that seemed to conform to the idea that there were only two destructions that have ever occurred, merely because two were recorded before Sodom and Gomorrah.

Without any recognition of what kind of a record there must have been, both from creation to the final ascension, referred to in Isaiah and Ezekiel, of the angels who were in rebellion, was there any record of the world before the final act? Was there any record of the Adamic world to Noah before the flood? All of this was overlooked because we were only emphasizing the order, and going from the order of Sodom, Noah, and the pre-Adamic destruction, the presumption is, and it was a fear, in a certain sense, to depart from the concept that therefore there must only be specific action at such a time.

And the geology must not refer to any other interim record.

There is no question also that the impact of VARV dating in Scandinavia could not be overlooked.

Having now to reexamine the whole thing and recognizing today that indeed we have evidence that was not extant in the 1940s or 50s or, for that matter, the 30s and 20s, we can have a whole new perception of the field of study that we would say would complement the Bible and would offer far more alternatives than merely one, two, or three sites in the Middle East in terms of proof of the Bible, where we were having to, in fact, alter and re-explain everything in order to make it seem to correspond.

We once worked from premises, therefore, of the unknown past, geological, because we thought that what we had inherited as a result of studies from the 20s through the 50s would be, in fact, a certain measure of inspirational guidance.

The inability to perceive, perhaps, the distinction between the recognition of error and the substitution for it of truth.

It is one thing to unlearn error.

It's another thing to demonstrate that what you're putting in its place is true.

One must not confuse the two.

We do need to lay aside these presuppositions and to have a totally new re-evaluation of the concept of homo or man in the light of not jaw bones and leg bones, but of the spirit in man, which I would say is outside of the realm of the natural sciences and yet, in fact, holds the real answer to the enigmas that science has found and that the historic surface of the earth retains.

We have participated in red and our faculty in the sciences with which we're dealing here in anthropology, archeology.

Without a question would say today that the evidence of the material culture of Babylon in the days of Nebuchadnezzar and his dynasty of the Persian period, the Hellenistic period in the Middle East and the early Roman, are in such a stratigraphical order, let's say at Samaria or at Shachem, and any number of other places I dug with others at Ashdod in 1963 and I had to live for years with puzzles that, in fact, would be unresolvable until we resolved the question of Babel because there was no way to assemble the material and call it any proof of the Bible if we were going to have something that would be believable.

Mr. Lap, an archeologist who has since died, who was unfortunately not a friend of this work and tried to discourage our relationship with Jerusalem, has laid out some very solid material on the Persian period, which requires that the so-called Iron Age normally attributed to the history of the kings of Israel and Judah, which we had tried to place late, in fact, belongs where most historians do place it.

And this would be in conformity with the knowledge of epigraphy and the inscriptions that I mentioned.

William H. Stebing wrote a criticism of Alikovsky's revised chronology, which could be, in a part, equally attributed to anything I have written in the two volumes of the compendium pertaining to Egypt and Mesopotamia.

His material appeared in the journal Ponce, P-E-N-S-W-E, volume three, number three, this was the fall of 1973, on the subject of Immanuel Alikovsky reconsidered.

He made the evidence clear enough that when Alikovsky answered the material, there is no doubt that there was no solid answer.

Israel M. Isaacson, in volume four, number four of Ponce, tried to apply the revised chronology.

Alikovsky tried to reply to Stebing in one of these journals, volume four, number one, which are available in our own library.

And in the end, none of their answers explained the account that Stebing laid out.

That stratigraphically, and in terms of epigraphy, there was no possible way to reconcile the reconstruction of history as Alikovsky had given it.

There was no reason to collapse the world 500 years at this time, and indeed, we must recognize today that that is true, it is not possible to build a structure as we attempted to.

So now we take one quick look at the Seventh-day Adventists, let's say the work of the Seventh-day Adventist Corveal, and I mention religious conviction here because I think these men have been sincere in the attempt to explain the Bible rather than to neglect it.

I have never met a man, though I believe I've spoken to him and some of our members have, and he drew similar conclusions to mine, and Valikovsky, although he worked quite independently of anything that I did in the subject of history.

His work, unfortunately, had the same basic problems that his archeology has an answer that we could not give with the previous preconceptions.

There came also during this period the impact of carbon-14 dating.

Now the reason I have not dwelt at this point on carbon-14 is the fact that there will be members in the Church of God as well as in all creationist movements, but without a doubt, we'll never have physics straight in their mind, not until the resurrection.

There will be no way to ask them to understand the subject correctly because this is not their field, and I don't propose to make an issue or argument over things that people cannot understand.

I would merely state that if that is the problem with which they have to live, they will have to live with it.

Let me, however, point up some literature.

The creationist research society quarterly, volume 14, again, September 1977, had an article, The Crisis in Radiocarbon Calibration, by David J. Tyler, he was from England.

And this, I feel, is one of the best analyses by a sensible and responsible individual, and when you read it, you have to conclude that he has no way to explain away the evidence other than as it is now understood by physicists.

That is, the idea that we could explain the whole of radioactivity by explaining it away is impossible, or to put it another way, it is now possible for a member of the Church of God, not only to be a baker, but also a physicist, without realizing that all of the laws involved in baking are always extant, the laws of physics somehow vanish as soon as you get in the laboratory and measure radioactive dating.

The fact remains, this is as much a valid science as any other.

I think we have always given a far better and fairer evaluation to the subject without fully understanding it, but without any doubt, having visited the laboratory in Arizona, having attended one of the symposiums of the Royal Societies in England in December 1969, I visited the Bristol Cone Pine Forest, the White Mountains in Eastern California, and I have analyzed the impact of history and archeology in terms of radiocarbon dating.

I can say today that there is no reason to have any divergency between varv dating, epigraphy, stratigraphy, Bible, or any other related science.

No reason to have it.

The problems, of course, that arise are usually of a theological nature that tend to neglect biblical material.

If you should like to have at least a table, one of the most inexpensive works prior to the dropping of the dollar, was this one done by the Edinburgh University, radiocarbon calibration and prehistory, which is a very, very fine, simple work with tables that for the amount of money of three pounds 50, I think would save many an hour if one ever wanted to have an evaluation of the impact of Bristol Cone Pine dating on radiocarbon and therefore on history and archeology in the Bible.

The best summary of the material that that gives you the impact of radiometric dating, that is mostly radiocarbon, would be found in Colin Renfrew's work *Before Civilization*, available both in England and the United, that is English-speaking world, England and the United States Commonwealth and North America.

This is, I hope, available in our bookstore.

If not, it is readily available, both hardcover and paperback.

It's a very fine work, since I'm on this subject, in the *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, February 1977.

You will note how many of these things are up to date.

That is in the sense that we are dealing with material that only now is becoming clearer even in the scientific world, devoted to radiocarbon dating of Palestine in the early Bronze Age, very effectively presented article, which I can highly recommend in terms of the integration of information.

There was an occasion before I addressed a big sandy campus on this subject some little time ago that I needed also to evaluate the genealogies of business people, men in the priesthood in Egypt and Mesopotamia, in terms of whether our previous reconstruction of history would stand.

I found that a particular work on the priesthood in Memphis, which is in Egypt, was not available on the West Coast, and I want to expressly, on this occasion, to thank Mrs. Eleanor Schauer from our Chicago area, whom some of you know, and Mr. George Meeker, who both did the service of going to the University of Chicago Library, and they obtained for me an evaluation of Borchardt's *Ahnenreia*, it is in German, and we made a very fine study of it on the Watts Line, quickly, right to the point, and effectively, and it clearly indicates that the history of the dynasties of Egypt from the 11th dynasty through to the period of the kings of Israel and Judah has a sufficient number of generations of fathers and sons, not only in this area, but in other areas, that we cannot, in any sense of the word, reconstruct the history of Egypt, other than in the fundamental manner in which it has normally been presented by the historians of the world.

And I think it is very important that we can, in fact, document, not only here, but in other areas, genealogies which require that the sequence of events is normally given, are given correctly, and that indeed, there is a total need for reevaluating the history of Mesopotamian Egypt, which were the primary areas in which reconstruction occurred.

From archeology, now we can draw the conclusions of the following nature, that Archbishop Usher, in his work, had in fact lengthened the history of Israel and Judah by 40 years or so, or in comparison to the reconstruction that I gave in the last revision of the compendium, a length was assigned to the contemporary history of Judah and Israel that would have been 44 years longer than the evidence actually extant.

That is, from the days of Ahab through Hezekiah, so-called biblical, in quotes, view.

There is no way to get around the fact that Ahab was still living in the year 853 BC, or that Joash, in the year in which Adad and Erari invaded the western area to the Lebanon, paid tribute to the Assyrian king in the year 802, and not at any other year.

That in fact, Hezekiah's 14th year did correspond to Sennacherib's invasion in 701, that the fall of Judah has to be seen as having occurred on a spring to spring calendar in 587.

That Thiele, a Seventh-day Adventist scholar who did work in his book, *The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings*, heard only slightly, but was very near in his restoration.

He did not have the full evidence because he had overlooked the relationship of Joash, of Israel, to the Assyrian king, which is made very plain in the work *Archaeology and the Old Testament*, in a work that those of you who like Mr. Meeker read German would have, is not available in any other language.

The only study that I know of has been done in German on the subject.

In any case, such a restoration is imperative, and we're not dealing with critics who have abused the Bible, it is possible to take the Bible just as Thiele did, who treated it with respect, and to come up with an explanation that in fact is in complete harmony, not only with the chronological statements, but with such peculiar historic statements, such that Uzziah, you see, recaptured a lot, after that the king was dead.

Now normally I've had to read it over and puzzle why it would say that, because we always assumed that after all, Uzziah came to the throne after the king was dead anyway, but in fact he did not.

He in fact was a joint ruler, and only after his father died did this event happen.

And so we have to look at these other statements as well.

We are at the place today, where we do need to do a thorough evaluation of the subject, and I am happy to say that in works that William Dever has contributed to, and Paul Lapp was deceased in the *Near Eastern Archaeology* in the 20th century, or the one most recently done called *The Mighty Acts of God in Honor of George Ernest Wright*.

We have very thorough documentation, even for the period that is the transition, let's say, from the pre-flood to the post-flood world.

I will be able also to say that we can highly recommend the *Cambridge Ancient History*, in terms of the third revised edition, where the first two volumes have become now four fat volumes at a prohibitive price.

We may draw the conclusions today.

That Tutmosis, the third, came to the throne.

As the *Cambridge Ancient History* gives it, now it's not of course possible to demonstrate this to you, but I am merely saying that I can supply the documentation, so there isn't any question.

The *Cambridge Ancient History* is correct.

Tutmosis came to the throne in 1504.

Now in connection with that, the strongest evidence is available, again only in German, in a small two-page section, *das Datum der Schlacht von Megiddo*, the date of the Battle of Megiddo, which

shows that astronomically it is not possible to entertain any other idea in the realm of the framework of time that one is limited to.

This was, I think, clear proof that the American scholarly intention of placing Tutmose the third in 1490 is now impossible.

He did what any sound scholar ultimately does when he makes a contribution.

Professor Helk went back and said that the attempt to amend the text is incorrect to read it as it was originally given is the way to read it, and that leads to the only conclusion of 1504.

And therefore, in connection with that, we have a work that was in honor of John Wilson, in which a professor Parker interrelated the fall, I should say the end of the reign of Tutmose the third and his son in such a manner that it is possible to date the Exodus as the very year after which no army expedition was able to hold together the eastern part that is Palestine, Syria, Lebanon of the Egyptian realm, which I would date, therefore, in the 10th year of Aminofus the second.

We may date the date, we may date the reign of Hammurabi, as also the Cambridge ancient history gives it, to 1792 BC, not at some lower date, William Foxwell Albright.

We may date, therefore, dynasties one through six of the old kingdom in the earliest pyramid age, not the only pyramid age, because there were pyramids built later.

But of that period, as altogether pre-flood, as also all the material from the written record of Mesopotamia from the earliest dynasties through the dynasty of Akkad with Sargon the Great, all being pre-flood, and the evidence now being found at Ebla is indeed parallel to the late generations just prior to the flood, I know of at this moment no other way to reconstruct the archeological, the radiocarbon, the stratigraphic, and the epigraphic material.

Therefore, there may be some reason why, when Nehram's son of the dynasty of Sargon said that when Ebla fell, it was the first time that it fell not since the flood, he said, but since creation, a very significant point in time.

We confused in reading much of the literature, we confused the word flood with the flood of Noah when in fact sometimes references to the flood that occurred in literature prior to the days of Noah's deluge was in reference to the flood of chaos before Adam, and we did not distinguish.

But the reason we could not distinguish is we assumed that every language that existed must have occurred not prior to the Tower of Babel.

When we overlooked Deuteronomy which said that God divided the sons not of Ish but of Adam, and in dividing the sons of Adam, the only way you could ever keep them divided is to give them other languages.

And when the world was wiped out by the flood and one family was left, we were left with a family that had one speech, very simple deduction.

And it doesn't explain what the pre-flood world was like, it explains that in contrast to a world in which there was more than one, now the human family had one speech.

They may also have had a knowledge of other languages that's incidental story.

But we have read it as if everything before the flood was equal to the state of affairs and the first generations immediately after.

These are all presuppositions you see.

That indeed led to a condition where we could no longer publish anything in the name of proof of the Bible.

So now we come then to the question if the early bronze, speaking of Middle Eastern terminology, not measured on the basis of metals but of pottery, is essentially pre-flood, and the flood comes somewhere in the earliest phases of early bronze IV, and I will not define that further in middle bronze, late bronze, and the Iron Age as defined by pottery and not metals.

Those terms are unfortunate, but we live with them.

Or post-flood, then we are confronted with the fact that all of geology is pre-edemic and that all of the tertiary is pre-edemic, that all the Pleistocene is pre-edemic, that Homo erectus is pre-edemic, that Homo neanderthalensis who knew no art, though he buried his dead, is pre-edemic.

That indeed, Homo sapiens chromagnol, which is my technical definition as distinct from merely Homo sapiens sapiens, is also pre-edemic, even if art was known, that upper Paleolithic hominids were as much a part of their environment and did not alter it during the upper Paleolithic any more than deer that eat the foliage of a forest.

That the timeframe that parallels all of this as well as the Mesolithic and pre-pottery Neolithic and earliest pottery Neolithic represent the state of the physical environment governed by angels who were put here to do more than observe the rocks that God made.

But we're made to be a challenge to the angels to govern a more and more complex world correctly.

And at this point in time, we may now draw two fundamental conclusions that are important.

Civilization, good or evil, did not coalesce or crystallize until the beginning of what we would call the proto-urban or early bronze one in the Middle East.

That suddenly, just like that, individual traits that have been found for centuries or even for a few thousand years made no basic impact here a little and there a little was added under whatever new creation there was because we're not told the nature of the pre-adamic creation in terms of the physical world.

We have to observe that.

We only know there were angels and we know angels were not here merely governing each other.

They were here in governing each other also to administer a physical world and God's government on it in preparation for planting the heavens which they will no longer do in the manner that they could have.

That they were being tested and trained and suddenly there comes a time in history when everything coalesces, crystallizes.

It is this point in time, not many centuries before the beginning of writing, that we ought to place the presence of man, Homo sapiens sapiens in its correct definition.

Now, the way to distinguish is not in any other manner than a recognition that with the spirit in man, man now knows what he's doing and is held accountable in a manner that no other creature governed in part by angelic instruction or instinct was ever held accountable.

And I believe the contribution Mr. Herbert Armstrong made beginning in the 1960s in this direction is fundamental to an understanding of why we have the level of culture or its lack extending over a period of thousands to tens of thousands to hundreds of thousands of years during which there were no solid evidences of progress except jumps as a new creature made its appearance on earth.

The spirit in man I think is fundamental to our understanding of what the proper explanation of the skeletal remains and the cultural remains prior to roughly 4,000 BC.

I'm just using a round figure there, actually represent.

That crystallization of civilization did not take place until about that time, just shortly afterward, and it has led to the present crisis in 6,000 years that we now face in the world today which would have been impossible by any creature without the spirit in man.

That man today is essentially a refined creature and we may distinguish of course the fact that whereas creatures who were not accounted to the law lived essentially in accordance with their abilities, that when man becomes accountable, he knows no limit either upward or downward.

That we can do anything downward that any brute has ever done and choose to live at that level if we want to.

But it does not prove what the level of actual ability of the creature may be who is on earth today which knows no actual limit upward except that most people prefer not to look in that direction.