

This is a transcript of a discussion led by Dr. Hoeh at an outdoor location (likely Camp River Glen) in the Pasadena, CA area on Sep 4, 1977 (Labor Day weekend). Many thanks to Craig White for the original; this version has been reformatted and edited for accuracy and clarity.

[start of sermon may have been cut off]

...state of affairs with the United States, during that period of three-and-a-half years that we think of as the tribulation, I would like to define that the Church has viewed what would happen to this country on the premise that those who would constitute a system that is a revival of the human concept of the Babylon of Nebuchadnezzar, things done in the image of man, man's law, man's social structure, with certainly an authoritarian system that's distinct from democracy.

This system that is called "Babylon," we have assumed would take certain action, on the premise that this is the way that most wars have recently been fought. That is, you attack a country, much as was done in the Second World War, or the First World War, or for that matter in the Napoleonic period. We go back a little further, you [would] subdue a country militarily, and those whom you desire you [would] cart away.

We have tried to explain world news or prophecy – as Mr. Armstrong worded it on the old "World Tomorrow" broadcast, that is..., a commentary on today's news in the light of the prophecies of the World Tomorrow. That is, today's news is to be seen in more than one way. You can see it from the point of view of your own political party, your own desires or heuristically. You can also look at it from the point of view of the Bible..., and it has been expressed by those who were the remnants of the Third Reich, those who were the remnants of thinkers of a generation ago.

Now, however, I would like to propose that we rethink the question of the nature of the demise of the United States.

(Mr. Houston, you are welcome. I appreciate very much the service you have rendered, and all the rest. You deserve public acclaim.)

Two men have written about what is going, in their mind, to take place in order for Europe to survive. Franz Josef Strauss wrote the book in German, and it appears in a good English translation, "The Grand Design." Otto von Habsburg has written a book about which I have... heard but not read.

I would like to draw attention to the fact that we are now in the late 1970s, and as for practical purposes, there is no one of the generation of Hitler and Mussolini who are in any position of power, responsibility or ability.

Now with this in mind, I think we should take a new look at the nature of the plan that is being called for.

Now we don't know yet who is going to fulfill it. No one would have drawn the conclusion necessarily – a wild guess, maybe so – that in 1923 when Germany had a very great inflation, there was a revolution that sent Adolf Hitler to jail, because it was a failure. The Munich Putsch

failed, and while in prison, he had help, and a book was written called, “My Struggle.” “Mein Kampf.”

Now in his struggle, Hitler outlined what he proposed to do, which was to reshape the whole of Europe.

No one took Hitler serious [*sic*]. In 1928, he was written, even in the encyclopedias of contemporary events in England, as a passé politician who had made no headway in this era of growing prosperity – 1928, mind you. 1929 came, and 30 and 31 and 32, and by 33 he was elected Chancellor. That is, he was elected to parliament and/or the Reichstag, and in parliament he was elected to the Chancellorship.

Here was, then, a book written 10 years before a man came to power. Hitler said that when he was convinced, he has never had to change his mind or his plan. From this, one should have learned that if he had come to power, there was no reason to doubt that he would do what he said he would do.

Stalin had written a book. Lenin had written works, not necessarily a book, many books.

There is little reason to doubt that there are men who lay out their plans, and if we're going to “understand world news in the light of Bible prophecy,” to use Mr. Herbert Armstrong’s old phrase of the Second World War, what I would like us to think through again is that we should take note of the prophecies, and instead of approaching them from what we think people ought to do to fulfill it, we should look again at what the Scripture says, and ask what these men are saying who want to accomplish what we say is going to be done. And that is, to restore Europe to greatness.

Franz Josef Strauss has written a book. I’ve said that there is one fundamental flaw in it. His book is based on the premise that the coming Colossus is going to be a link between North America with the United States and/or Canada on the one side of the Atlantic, and Western Europe, the Common Market, on the other. His book takes no note of religion. Therefore, it has a fatal missing element.

Nevertheless, Franz Josef Strauss has said something that I think should not be overlooked.

Europe recognizes – and I think we need to be realistic – that is, it’s one thing to dream, it’s one thing to assume or to believe that a nation or nations will do such, but it’s another thing to be realistic, to see what those nations themselves are saying.

Europe is saying that it wants to have the American atomic weaponry as the umbrella of protection. Europe is saying it does not want to develop a separate strike force. It wants to have the protection, and linked up with, all that the United States militarily stands for.

Franz Josef Strauss’ idea is that it’s to be a vast economic union, based on the capability and strength of both Europe and the United States – and Canada not excluded.

Now the point is very important. If the United States were to disappear suddenly as a nation, and the British Commonwealth were to disappear – Canada, Great Britain, parts of South Africa in a sense, Australia, New Zealand – I think to be realistic, it would be impossible, forgetting the

military, but just looking at the economic, it would be impossible to conceive of a successful world, to fulfill the economic statements made in Revelation 18.

Europe alone, with fragments of Africa, with no real power in North America, and only Latin America standing against communism, I think that we see here the potentiality for a misunderstanding in terms of Revelation 18, which is the greatest trading power – it's pictured this way – that has ever been seen. And, if you please, it trades significantly in the raw materials that are characteristic of the United States and Canada. Food stuffs, the very lifeblood of the whole of Western civilization, not automobiles. And the other things, for instance, that Japan and parts of Europe manufacture.

So, what one says is that there is a man like Strauss – we're not pointing any fingers, except that he is working for what the Bible says is ultimately going to happen, a revival of Europe, and a revival of a system that is called Babylon. And he looks at it from the point of view that North America must play a role with Europe; that Europe cannot stand alone against the Soviet Union with the potentiality of India and China.

Now the Arabic world is incidental because they're going to have to supply oil to any number of groups – the Soviet Union, Europe, Japan, South America in part, and certainly some states of Africa. They play a separate role in prophecy.

Von Habsburg now says something else. He says that to have a revival of Europe, there must be a common denominator. Strauss said it must be economic. Strauss is not wrong, but he doesn't tell the whole story. Von Habsburg says economics alone will never solve anything. The German Empire was built not because the Customs Union was a success, but because an empire was politically built out of Prussia.

The Common Market will never succeed to be a military power so long as it is run by faceless economic bureaucrats.

Strauss didn't see – doesn't understand yet, [as indicated] in any written statement – the full implication of the need of religion to play a role. But von Habsburg, of course, being of the Catholic Austrian dynasty, believes that the Roman Catholic Church should be an instrument in the uniting of the nations that are to form a great political power in Europe, in contradistinction to Eurocommunism on the one hand, and the Soviet Union on the other.

I think von Habsburg totally overlooks the fact that the Catholic states of Europe, as they are now constituted, could never stand up against the Soviet Union. There is no foreseeable technological breakthrough. The Russians are marching as fast as they can after us. We are still in the lead. And there is no reason at this point to think that the technological structure will so change, that Europe would be able to withstand the Soviet Union for three and a half years after achieving such a victory over the United States through a military war, as we have hitherto viewed the probability.

To do so, would bring up the question: If Europe has the power to destroy the stronger of the two, why doesn't it also destroy the weaker of the two at the same time?

Rather, I propose that we should take a look at these thoughts – that is, a tying up of the economic structure of the North Atlantic powers on either side, and the Roman Catholic Church as the basis for a unity that is not provided now with the present situation of Catholic, Protestant, agnostic, democratic, Euro-Communist, Republican states that make up this whole array of nations. You see, it is a North Atlantic alliance which is military. It is the Common Market which is economic. And the actual unity cannot avoid the economic. It cannot avoid the military. And it cannot avoid religion. And yet there is no structure that has welded the whole thing together.

So, what I am going to suggest, is that we open our minds not only to other possibilities in terms of world events, but also to reconsider some verses in the Bible, that would seem very difficult to have fulfilled, if the previous view of “how” is going to occur.

What I am suggesting is something that occurred to my wife and me as we were returning from a Wednesday night Bible study recently. We were invited to the Los Angeles Church. My wife was reminding me of certain things, and we said, “Now look, since there is reason to think that the Germans will have a role to play,” which they have for a long time, “why don’t we ‘think German’ for the moment, and analyze what it is that one would have to do to succeed?” That’s always a good premise.

At this point, in reading what the best German minds – and there is no doubt, the Germans have said that in a crisis, Strauss will have to be their man. There is no question, whether from the left or the right. As long as he is alive, Strauss will be their man. Therefore, some of his thoughts must not be neglected.

Germany, in order to dominate, and Europe, in order to become a great nation or empire, is in some way going to have to bring the United States within the orbit of what we think of as a greater Common Market, or a North Atlantic alliance, in which the dominance of power, politically, shifts from Washington to Europe, though militarily may still reside with the United States as a country.

But politically, I would draw attention to the fact that the United States has a history in which military leaders play no major political role. Truman could dictate and oust MacArthur. We have a history unlike other nations in which the political power, the civil political power, determines the direction of the military, whereas in other countries it is the reverse.

This means that if one is going to have access to the military might of the United States, which is viewed at this time by Strauss as essential, there must be in this sense a very close relationship between Washington and Europe, so that the political structure will be weighted in the favor of Europe, as it is now weighted in the favor of Washington, D.C. That is, Europe cooperates with us, not we cooperate with Europe.

At this point in time, there is no way, clearly, to justify the role of the Roman Catholic Church or the fulfillment of Revelation 17 on the world scene, unless there is a major change in the state of religion.

It would appear from Daniel and especially the book of Revelation, that you have a remarkable arrangement between a man who is a political leader above and beyond the 10 who give power. I mean, there are 10 kings, and then there is a beast. The beast is not one of the 10. We have already said this for a long time; there's every reason to think so.

But there is also a religious leader.

Strauss has for some years been making pilgrimages to Rome. It does appear that he is more aware, as Otto von Habsburg is aware – has been for years – that religion must play a dominant role.

Now, we're not here talking about the source of the miracles. We're only talking about the possibility of what a miracle-working religious leader, what a military man linked up with him, making proposals to solve the Middle East problems, to ease the tension between East and West, and to resolve the question of conflict between Catholic and Protestant, as in Northern Ireland; between Islam and Christianity, which is taking place in Lebanon. And I think we're coming to the point where there are men who are going to rise and make proposals to solve the problem, lest it get out of hand.

Now, we don't know what role – who these men will be, or in what sense how the devil will use them. That I don't want to discuss for the moment. But I propose that if Europe, and in particular a German-Austrian role, is to be played, (and this doesn't exclude the role of others in Europe), that we have to have a situation in which the United States – if you listen to me carefully, this is the premise that I am proposing we do not close our ears to – in which the United States becomes the greatest military, Roman Catholic, Gentile nation – single nation – in the world.

Now, if you listen carefully to each of the three: militarily, and economic, we already are. Religiously, we are not. And in terms of Gentiles, we are not.

Now this might seem very strange, but let's go back to some things Moses said. Moses said that... our grain would be eaten by others. We'd work, produce, and others would eat. That we would be besieged within our own cities. That the Gentile would rise high above us.

Now when we learned of these verses, this was the time when the American black in the 1950s – when we were thinking of these things, the American black was demanding certain freedoms and rights that, in practice, had not been his, despite the results of the Civil War. Yet we knew during that time that the nature of the structure didn't make sense.

Now, listen carefully. Whenever there is a strife between black and white, the black man is besieged because he lives in the ghetto. You will never find – it's not possible to have the reverse. The besieged will be the black man. The white man – "Gentile" or "Israelite" is not the issue at the moment. What I'm trying to do is get away from a mistaken concept. The black man, by living as a whole in the inner cities, as he does and will continue to, can never play the role of the Gentile who rises high above. Now, individuals there may be; this is not the issue. But as a people, they cannot besiege the white man. They are besieged. Take the case of

Watts. I think that's a classic illustration. What would happen in New York? It's the same thing. They would be ringed off.

What we are dealing with, indeed, is the Gentile who is non-black as the issue. The Gentile who is Roman Catholic. The bulk of blacks are Protestant.

I think we're going to see, in the end, that this country is going to swing in the direction of a political leader who may start out as a vice-presidential candidate and be elected. He may be a presidential candidate. Right now we have a Southern Baptist. But I think in the long run – we had already a presidential candidate, and one who was elected – Kennedy, but he was assassinated.

But I think that once we saw that it was possible in America to have a Catholic president, it is also probable that Europeans can see, who feel that religion should play an important role. That it is very likely – that it is possible to elect a Roman Catholic president, either through the vice presidency or directly. And that such a man must be one who would respect – and in this case, follow – the higher dictates of conscience.

I think Robert Kennedy was such a man, but he is dead. Robert Kennedy said – you know, he's a brother of the former president – he said, "The best form of government is the government under God. But since we cannot have that, the next best," he said, "is a man who follows God, and who holds to the highest standards of the Constitution and human rights. And that's the reason you should elect me." In other words, next to God, he viewed himself as the most responsible person. I rather like some things he said. I was rather concerned with other things he said. I think it was premature.

But I think that the situation is such that before we draw some conclusions, we open our minds to a possibility that the United States will have an elected, or an appointed – because of the death of a president; this can happen – a Catholic president before the crisis, who will indeed cooperate with a great leader in Europe, and where the role of Catholicism and the concept of unification of Christianity to stamp out the growth of Eurocommunism, which could threaten France and can threaten Italy, and could so disrupt Western Europe that the Europeans know they would have to rely on the military strength of the United States.

But suppose the military strength of the United States was in the hands of a Roman Catholic president who was in cooperation with Western Europe.

For that matter, we can have something similar in Canada with a very grave question of Quebec, a very grave question of whether Canada can maintain unity, and how to work out the problem of French and English in that country.

Now, suppose as a whole, the miracles, the role of Europe comes to the place where many Protestants would give credence to what they see. We are told, of course, that there is such a man coming on the scene.

I propose that what we may discover is that, in the United States, we have now approximately 50% who descend from nations we recognize as Israel. And right now, whether we like to

believe it or not, there are Protestants and Catholics who are Gentiles – some may be of Latin background, some of black, and many are white – who are Gentiles in this country.

It is not true that this country is, in terms of population, overwhelmingly of the House of Israel. It is true that the dominant element has been traditionally White Anglo-Saxon Protestant, or “WASP.” That's the word that's commonly used. This is no longer true. It is a “has been;” it was true up to the 60s.

Now, if we're going to be besieged in our cities, if we're going to be carried captive, if Babylon is the greatest economic and military power, I think we should consider the fact that the most important states – apart from California – the most important states of the Union are now some of the most heavily populated states with Gentile people. That the Israelites tend to be in the farming and the lesser important states.

In fact, California also is drifting very heavily in the direction with the inflow of Asians, with the inflow of Latins, with the presence of blacks, with the presence of peoples of Central and Eastern and Southern Europe in this very state, that I doubt that Anglo-Saxons and other Israelitish peoples of Northwestern Europe even represent half of this country – half of this state, rather.

Now, the Jewish community can tip this [statistic] one way or another in New York or California.

Now, this is not to say that there's any objection to being one people or another. That's not my issue. The issue is the instrumentality that can work through the dominant Gentile white element, which is the Roman Catholic Church.

At this point, I can say assuredly that 95% of all those who are in the FBI belong to the Roman Catholic Church. This is no surprise, and has been known for years. If the CIA is under the direction of the presidency, if the FBI is Catholic dominated, if the majority of judges in the United States of importance (outside the South) are Roman Catholic – I think we are coming to the place where we need to think through the question as to whether, indeed, this country, (this was my wife's and my thought), should be destroyed from without, or can be captured from within.

The element of religion is crucial. And I think this is why indeed the Bible shows that, in the long run, it is.

This will explain – suppose we have internal strife that does involve religion. I think it's going to be processed through the courts. It's a mistake to think that the Roman Catholics went out just butchering people, unless it was a crusade. In the Middle Ages, these were brought to trial. There were charges drafted, just like Hitler drafting charges against the Jews who were socialists and communists. They were found guilty, and they were executed.

What is going to happen is that if there are people who will disrupt the trend to unification, to a bringing about of harmony in the varied Christian sects, I think we're going to find numerous people brought to trial, and a tribulation could become – well, let's put it this way: First, the Bible in Revelation 12 says, after the devil is cast down, that one, he persecutes the woman. And this is before the woman flees for three and a half years; therefore, before the tribulation

of those days. That means that it's possible to have a certain persecution, that might even involve the courts as well as local bad attitudes, that still would not be a real tribulation. And it is bound to take some time before a tribulation can get started even in Europe.

I would say that you couldn't just suddenly start a religious persecution in Italy today – it's unthinkable. When the Roman Catholic Church has to acknowledge divorce because of the pressure in the state – I think you are face to face with the impotency of religion at this moment, apart from the possibility of a man who works miracles that will so astound the world that they will give heed.

So, in a democratic system such as you have in all the states now making up the Common Market – I don't mean Spain, Portugal, but they're drifting in the direction – I think we have to realize there is a prelude of persecution before a tribulation. And I see no reason why, if the brethren in Germany of the Church of God could be persecuted there, prior to a tribulation, and in France or Belgium or Holland, Luxembourg or Switzerland or England, or southern or northern Ireland – there is no reason, if it can happen in Ireland or England, it cannot also happen here. And if it can, it opens up the possibility that this country could be captured from within, instead of having to be smashed from without.

Then I think we have to bear in mind Moses' statements about certain peoples, Gentiles – in this case, I would see them as essentially Gentiles of the Catholic background. There will be Israelites who will go with them, the Irish element in this country. We are told "you are to come out of Babylon," so there's some Israelites in it. But I see no reason why in Canada, in England, northern Ireland, certainly Denmark, (we will worry about Scandinavia later because politically they're off the track of the main thrust of these things), why Catholicism shouldn't be able, with the election of Catholic leaders in this country.

And for all we know, it may even be that Prince Charles might marry someone of royalty who is of Catholic background. I think we have to bear this in mind as a possibility. And if not, then there isn't any question England can be so economically tied to the Common Market that, step by step, a juridical system could be set up that would actually change the judicial system in England, to bring it subject to the traditional Roman law that we know of in Europe instead of the common law now operating in the British Commonwealth and the United States.

We have never reconsidered what the great men of Europe are saying. And the more we look on the scene, the more we puzzle as to how it will ever happen. And the more we get away from these verses in Deuteronomy, where Moses tells the children of Israel what would befall them in the last days, in terms of the curses and the blessings. So I would like us to consider that we need to open some doors in our thinking of how this country, and other countries in Northwestern Europe, could be maintained economically within the framework of the West, militarily within the framework of the West, and where the political leaders would become Roman Catholics, and fall in line even in a semi-democratic system with prominent religious and political men – two of them, in particular, in Europe.

Now, this does not mean, in my estimation, that we are finding 10 over here, including the United States; that is, if there's so many in Europe and the United States and Canada. All we

know is that the beast does what he does before 10 kings receive power. And the 10 who receive power are receiving power for a very short time – one hour; and if you try to interpret it, it really couldn't be more than 15 days or half a month. And their purpose is to destroy the religious power that has indeed had a stranglehold in Europe – and/or this country. It is not to give their power to the beast to introduce a tribulation. Because they have power such a short time, that it ultimately brings down – just like the conflict between Napoleon and the Church; there was a conflict between Hitler and the Church; there was a conflict ultimately, even with respect to fascism and the Church. And I think in the end there's going to be a conflict between the new concepts in Europe and the Roman Catholic Church. This is just what happens; the beast throws the woman off. It's a strange thing, but it's what God says.

Now, the implication, then, is that we're not having to worry about "the 10" including the US, one way or another. Because in reality, the military power today or the North Atlantic Alliance is far more than 10. The Common Market is less than 10, as it presently is structured. It may well become more than 10, but ultimately 10 are involved in a particular function. And I think we have overlooked the fact that much of what the beast will have done, and the false prophet, precede the time that those 10 gain political power; that seems to shift it from the influence of the Catholic Church to present political leaders.

I don't know of any other way in which it would be possible to introduce what is called "persecution," or to introduce legal trials against those who are disrupting the state of affairs. We don't know how the judicial system in this country could be altered, but we have recently had a decision of the Supreme Court – Mr. Houston was just mentioning shortly before the Bible study – that now it is a question sometimes whether people can take tests on some other day other than the Sabbath to qualify for jobs.

Because someone who was really hardly baptized as a member initiated a decision, unfortunately, that went the reverse because the Supreme Court judges according to the Constitution, not the Bible. And we're already beginning to pay the penalty of that across the country.

It was not – Mr. Armstrong once said, "no one should enter judicial proceedings without the approval of the Church." This man did. There is a breakdown in discipline in the Church, and this is one of the consequences.

Now, we must keep our minds open. I think we should look at leaders who are Roman Catholic advisors to the president, and see what role is occurring in this country. And we need to watch the decay of the Church, because when the Church is decayed to the point that the devil has to intervene to save it, then I think it is a very serious time in world affairs.

But if we're going to be carried captive, if Protestants are not going to go along with it, these Protestants may include Adventists, the Church of God, Mormons, some Baptists. It doesn't matter. I think there will be a persecution of many people. In the Middle Ages, there were persecutions of others than the Church of God. There were persecutions of untold millions. Therefore, the Church is persecuted, but it isn't the only one that is.

When you look at the fall of Babylon in Jeremiah 50 and 51, you discover that whole nations are, let's say, forced to conform. And if the Arab world ultimately doesn't, there are a series of nations in Jeremiah 46 thru 49 that are smashed by the military power of Europe. Because they want their way in the Middle East, and the Europeans are strong enough to prevent it.

But I think we have never dreamed of the possibility that this country could be transformed into a country of a dominant religion, and of an element that once was the small minority migrating, that becomes ultimately the dominant majority, and that those who don't agree will ultimately, under a Roman judicial system instead of the common law, be sent as slave labor and be removed out of this country, be removed out of Canada, out of England, out of Ireland, or wherever.

The Bible implies a captivity. We assume this captivity could only occur – mind you, could only occur – after a military blow. But I am proposing that we reconsider the picture in terms of what the Europeans themselves are planning.

Now this is something that we should keep open. It is no decision. The point is, the Bible hasn't told us how; it only tells us that something happens within the country itself.

Franz Josef Strauss said – in the event of civil strife, he feels that the American army should protect the world because we have the military might; that we should protect the world. Listen to what Strauss said in "The Grand Design." With our troops abroad, as in, shall we say, South Korea or Japan, or perhaps as far as he's concerned, Southern Africa, or the Panama. And if there is civil strife within the United States – he was looking at it more or less in the black/white crisis of the 50s, the student crisis of the 60s – he said it would be Europe's role to become the policeman within the United States itself. That Europe would give the military might to the United States to play its role against the Soviet Union, and Europe would be the internal policeman to keep civil order within the whole western world.

Now that is an interesting thought. At this point, we would say, "well, how strange." But if we had a Roman Catholic president; if we had members of the cabinet and others who favored the decisions that Europeans were making. Right now they have to conform to our views, more or less, in the Middle East. Russia tried its hand to solve the Middle East and failed. The United States is trying it. I suspect that Europe is ultimately going to have to try, and it will appear to have succeeded. And when they have said, "peace, peace," then of course the sudden destruction comes, and if this country then is tied into Babylon in Western Europe, and South America would be, and parts of Africa, not to mention perhaps elements of Southeast Asia, not on the mainland, then the fall of Babylon is the actual destruction, at the very last, of all the great western powers in North and South America and other places of the world, and most certainly Europe – and that would come at the hands of the Soviet Union, as we have seen for a long, long time.

But instead of the tribulation and the day of the Lord all following the collapse of this country, and the tribulation and persecution, it would mean that it would be possible that the Church, described in Revelation 12, flees to a place of safety; part remains behind; and that in fact the

destruction of this country is a part of the fall of the whole economic system the world over – Revelation 18 – and not something that cuts a great hole in the whole... [gap in recording]

...to whether or not the Church is going to be in the United States during the tribulation – even those who are left behind, as distinct from being carried immediately into captivity. And I think it's very possible that it will be a process of "de-Israelitizing," shall I use such a term, this country and removing the Protestant Anglo-Saxon WASPs who don't conform, and this would I think be the logical development. More and more people would obviously be coming in from other countries. It would mean that the United Nations wouldn't suddenly be blown up with New York, and all the prophecies about gathering all nations would be the ultimate fulfillment of a viable United Nations that continues till the very climax of the whole thing.

I must look at the time now. We've gone for 50 minutes. The fire is still lovely.

Anyway, I felt that on this occasion, we still have time to chat and ask questions, and I have dealt with a number of questions and occasions around here, that I would introduce you to something I will want to talk about at the Feast of Tabernacles here in Pasadena, and not all of you will be here, but I thought it might be of some value to open up possibilities, since you might not hear a discussion if you're somewhere else during the Festival.

And anybody who comes here, I think, deserves to hear some of the things that are, I think, critical in terms of our views and what we're going to have to deal with.

Are there comments or questions any of you would like to ask relative to this matter for the moment?

That is Mr. Thomas? "Yes.

"Well, you mentioned that the Church may be removed as a result of a judicial order, but yet, at the same time, those who remain behind..., let's say, for lack of a better word, the Laodicean Church. What would the status of their spiritual condition be? Would they compromise with the beast power?"

Well, it would appear that when God says, "buy of Me gold tried in the fire," He is telling them not to compromise. Some will, some will not. This will then be the – in other words, God does not want to try people beyond what they are able. It does appear that some people are unwilling to change their ways and behavior, unless there is a crisis. There are people who would rather do their thing in this life and then go to the wall. I think it's much better to do what Moses did; that is, to deny certain of the pleasures of this world, and put the reward in its proper perspective.

I'm sure that there will be people who will compromise, and then there will be people who will not. If you want to deal with the question of the state of mind of the Church, as Mr. Herbert Armstrong recently said, you know – Laodicea becoming a viable, separate group – I have no objection to that, at the time of the tribulation. Well, it's the same as saying that if God were to take all people in the Church away to a place of safety because they didn't deserve to go through a tribulation – they had done their duty; they had warned people; nobody's blood was on their head – then the question is, in the tribulation, who was going to bear witness, see?

I think that what God has done, in fact, is [to have] called a group of people who are willing to compromise with the world now, so that when the time comes, they're going to have to stand up for God throughout a system of trials. And I mean formal legal trials, because that's the way the Germans have operated.

Now, right at the end of the war, the Germans merely gassed the elderly, the children, and Gypsies. But, if you were to go to Auschwitz in Poland, you would see on the walls: the reports, the birth, the party affiliation, the racial background, the date of the trial, the judgment, and the execution, that every single Jew for years – and other people who were Communist Polish, and then of course the Gypsies were not really treated in this fashion – but all of these people were brought formally to trial before the judge; the name of the German judge is even given there. The cause of the crime, and what constitutional law was being violated by being a member of the Communist Party or the Socialist Party in Poland. This was not done in any other but a legal manner. And I think that we'll have to see that that's the nature of the tribulation that is coming, to start with. And then finally it gets so bad that they really don't bother with it, but that's the beginning.

Yes?

“So when we do go to trial, we'll be going with the Mormons and the Seventh-day Adventists, and there'll be nothing really special about the Worldwide Church of God.”

I would say in a time of persecution, prior to the time the devil goes to make war, which might be likened to the traditional crusades, it would seem unthinkable to me, if I know Mormons, Seventh-Day Adventists, Jehovah's Witnesses, some Southern Baptists, maybe even a few Missouri Synod Lutherans, I think that some of these people will not go along, and it isn't just the Church of God as distinct from everybody else. It is a broad spectrum of whatever group.

Now remember the persecution in the last war included Jehovah's Witnesses, some Roman Catholic priests who didn't go along with fascism. It included, of course, the majority of Jews and Gypsies. It included any number of Poles and Ukrainians who, because they were Poles and Ukrainians, “deserved extermination,” especially if they were politically oriented against fascism.

And I don't see why this should be other than a mass persecution again. When you read Jeremiah, whole nations are happy when it's over, because they have been smashed – not because they were members of the Church, but because they didn't agree with the system.

Someone there?

“Tom Davis.”

Thank you.

“To what degree, to what crescendo does this Work have to rise before we have completed our mission?”

Ezekiel says that there are some people who have blood on their hands, and there are others who don't. (Or on their heads.) That would imply that Ezekiel is saying that there are some

people who haven't done their part, and there are others who have. I would draw the conclusion that the Work is, from some points of view, unsatisfactorily done, because there were people who should have participated and did not. On the other hand, God may well let this go as long as He has, in order that sufficient witness be made.

Now, Mr. Herbert Armstrong didn't think this was a valid suggestion. I would only propose that it would be a very effective one. And that is for someone who God does use, to speak before the United Nations. Not merely the assembled, learned, responsible people in Japan or in South Africa. I think it's possible that it may indeed go as far as the United Nations itself.

I would not write this off, even though they are political individuals. The United Nations is a very important forum. They may not make certain political decisions, but they are a significant body of world leaders to which even the President of the United States comes, and the Pope comes to the United Nations assembly on certain occasions, and I don't see why it might not be so.

I am sure that when Ezekiel says that "when a person sins, and no one warns him, he dies in his sin, and the person who didn't warn him is also guilty," that Ezekiel is telling us that there are some people who will not have been warned. Because Ezekiel says that some are going to die having known certain things and not repented, and others are going to die not having known. So it does appear that indeed we have this kind of situation.

I would draw attention to something I don't think we fully realize. When ancient Israel fell, it was not an attack from without. The Assyrians under Sennacherib and others had already possessed Israel. It was a part of the Assyrian Empire. And because the king rebelled, certain people were carried away captive, and finally when the city itself rebelled, the whole city of Samaria was removed.

It is a mistake to assume that it was a blow from the outside against the sovereign state. You read the Old Testament and you will discover the Israelites were paying tribute from the days of Menahem – and it is quite clear that even Judah had been incorporated in, and Hezekiah first said, "I have offended, I will pay you tribute."

We have never seen the extent to which the Assyrians had already incorporated Israel and Judah. And it was rebellion, or the failure to cooperate, that led to the ultimate expulsion of the people. And this is what I am saying, that instead of being a massive blow without, that destroys the economic and military power, it is the fact that the bulk of White Anglo-Saxon Protestants, or WASPs, are not oriented to Roman Catholicism, are not oriented to fascism, are not oriented to cooperating with the Roman concept of law, but the common law as we know it in this country.

If you want to ask someone about it, you should talk to someone who knows what the Roman system of law is, that dominates in the main part of Europe, like Mr. Apartian. Mr. Kennedy's wife may have some knowledge of this matter, being Frank's background, a woman of legal mind. [Response: "I don't know."]

Anyway, there is a difference in the concept of guilt.

Well, it would seem that in fact when the bulk of this country doesn't agree, it could happen from within, instead of the whole nation. All Gentiles as well as Israelites being carried away. We used to think of it that everybody pays a penalty whether he's Catholic or Protestant, but I'm beginning to see that we may well see it's not like that at all. That it is a particular group within the country that is removed, and in fact the country maintains itself, and the whole of the western world maintains itself, till the day of the Lord, in which case the struggle between the West and the Soviet Union ensues.

Now this is quite a different view, but it is not a different view in terms of what the prophecy ultimately says, but only a recognition that the beast may operate differently from what we have thought, to fulfill the prophecies themselves.

Mr. Thomas.

"Oh, well then, would it be possible that we'd have standing armies from the United States at the Battle of Armageddon?"

Sure it would. Who may or may not include Israelites.

"It does say that Jews will fight at Jerusalem, I know that."

That could be Judah; that is, the state of Israel. But I would view it now quite differently, that indeed we may have a complete change of perspective, and that will help us better understand what is taking place in Europe.

Mr. Lu.

"Dr. Hoeh, is it a possibility that John Kennedy and also Robert Kennedy were moving toward this religion-critical Gentile government too soon? ..."

Well, I don't think they knew they were, you know, "too soon." But I think that your question is correct. I think it was too soon. And I think it was premature. But there isn't any question; Robert Kennedy made it very plain that he would enforce the Constitution, and would not risk – I don't mean Robert, but John Kennedy – and would not risk any decision from an outside power that might differ from the Constitution. He would have to uphold the Constitution. That is what he swore to do.

Candidly, I see in the Governor of California another kind of mind. [Exclamations; "Wow."]

Listen, the Governor of California is the only one who, when the chips were down, won in Democratic primaries on the East Coast like New Jersey against Carter. I see no reason why Governor Brown could not run against Carter, and succeed, because I think Carter has not won the white vote of what we call the industrial area of New England in the Middle Atlantic states. I think he hasn't won. In fact, when you look at it, it was the Negro vote that made the difference. Those people voted for Ford. And therefore, Carter got in, really, apart from the white majority.

And it is my conclusion that the Democrats are likely to find that the president may not be the man who will be succeeding himself in 1980. And the only one that I can see who is strong, and

who has a vote-getting potential, and who could hold California in the Democratic column, is the present Governor of this state, who said that in a constitutional decision, he would vote his conscience.

*[inaudible comments]*

He had Jesuit training.

Now, he may be, and I respect many of his decisions. The beast is a man. There's no connection here, please. *[laughter from audience]*

You know, Daniel talked to Nebuchadnezzar and found him quite an exciting fellow. And I've talked to Franz Josef Strauss, I've sat next to him, and I find him a remarkable man. And he respects us, and we respect him, at the present time. I think it's that way.

Nebuchadnezzar, of course, was playing this role initially, could honor Daniel on the one hand, and, you know, would think nothing of burning Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego on the other.

It's very possible that we will have men who will conform to their religious consciences apart from the Constitution. And there is no question now that the concept of Nixon, of strict construction is gone, that the role of the Supreme Court has been to define the Constitution in terms of social change. And I think that this is what is going to take place, and it is not going to be as surprising as we think.

Does that answer part of the question anyway, Mr. Lu?

"Yes."

*[Inaudible; apparently a question about Prince Charles potentially finding a Catholic wife.]*

I am unable to answer the question. I do not have enough information. I only know that on occasion he has dated someone, and I think that this might be a very strong possibility of how something could turn out unexpectedly. That's the only way I would put it: unexpectedly.

"The king of England, though, is the head of the Church of England..."

And he should be a Protestant, but a woman sometimes rules a man. And furthermore, the Archbishop of England is seriously considering overtures all the time, and they can't agree, but I would have to conclude that it is unthinkable for the Archbishop of England to reject a role within the Roman Catholic Church for the Church of England, if the Pope shows that he has, without any question, "the presence of Christ," with miracles and everything else, as they would view it. I think it would be difficult for many Christians who are not of the Church of England in the United States to turn down such a remarkable man. Because we live in a world of science that denies miracles as a whole, and for something like this to be so spectacular would, I think, sway the Christian world into unity, especially if communism in Eurocommunism had become more and more of a threat.

I have told our brethren, I was reading the news bulletin, that if the Socialist Communists get control in France, as distinct from the present power, they would turn France's atomic weaponry, not – they would not obliterate it as they had previously demanded; they would

actually use it against Germany – that is, to aim the French atomic force against Germany, just like the Soviet Union has aimed it against Germany. And this would tear up Europe right in the middle, and Europe couldn't take something like this. The [Roman Catholic] Church could not stand a situation in which Italy and France practically are swallowed up with Eurocommunism.

Now, remember in the last war, after the [Catholic] Church broke with Hitler, the Pope seriously considered moving the Vatican to North America, to Canada. He seriously considered moving the Vatican to Canada. Now this, you know, is astounding.

He has come to the place right now of saying that Rome should not be considered a holy city in the tradition, that Italy does not now have an established religion. This is a part of a new Concordat that disenfranchises the Catholic Church in Italy, so that the Church is free to move, if you please, from Italy, if need be. I think this is what is developing. They are seeing the handwriting on the wall. And therefore, I think we underestimate the problems that the Europeans are facing, if we think that they can sit blithely by while all this is happening around them.

Well, I hope this gives you some food for thought for the occasion. It's not anything because we still are looking, and we're listening, we're watching, we are asked to blow the trumpet, and I think the Church has a responsibility. And when we do see that trends are moving in directions that make no sense from previous views, but do make sense in terms of political leaders in Europe, then I think we ought to reconsider whether indeed what is happening in the middle 70s is so different from the middle 50s, that we have a new world to deal with, and new kinds of proposals to warn about.

So, I will limit it to that, and some of you who might like to get to bed soon, and others who might like to sit and chat on any number of subjects as you wish around this lovely fire.

I certainly would like to extend my appreciation, and I know Mr. Davis and all who worked with him are very appreciative of the remarkable number who have stayed here, and I think this was a very nice opportunity for a part of this Church to get together with, if you please, so many children, which was the big comment about how many turned out last night to the social occasion. I think that was really astounding. But I think it was a family occasion, and that's the strong point in the Church if there's ever going to be a viable continuity.

I want to thank those who suggested the kind of occasion like this, this evening, and I hope that some of you, or most of you who feel up to it, can exercise and chat along the way, and see a part of God's nature, and learn a little bit about C. John Thomas' skill as a tour guide, at 9 o'clock.