

THE PAINFUL TRUTH

hwarmstrong.com

A Letter to Mother

by
J. Orlin Grabbe

Dear Mother,

THE PAINFUL TRUTH

BY ORLIN GRABBE

APPROX. SEPT. '73

REC'D 4 SEP 94

AT LEAST NOV 73

This will undoubtedly be the longest letter you will ever receive from me, so be duly appreciative of this historical moment.

From the date and content of your second letter, I surmise that either ~~one~~ or ~~the other~~ conveyed to you my reaction to the first one. So I will let it go with this affectionate comment: please, no more moralizing or religious persecution (particularly--what is a nice way to say this?--when you may not know what you are talking about). Aleta is my wife and if the Worldwide Church of God, or anyone else, doesn't like that, then they can take their opinion and do you-know-what with it.

I think that expresses my feelings rather clearly.

I was terminated (somewhat illegally) from my job about three weeks ago, and two local handicappers (Dr. Robert Kuhn and Alfred E. Carrozzo) estimate that the odds are 20 to 1 that I will be put out of the Church (i.e. taken off the Worldwide Church of God's computer-maintained membership list). The latter possibility doesn't bother me one whit (for reasons I will explain), but I was upset at losing my job. Dr. Kuhn, who I was working for (he is Garner Ted Armstrong's assistant), was quite opposed to my dismissal (and in fact did not take issue with my getting married, etc.). Alfred Carrozzo (in the Theology Department and a pastor of one of the Headquarters churches) told me he was "profoundly disturbed" that I had lost my job (not at me, but at the fact that I had been dismissed, for obviously invalid reasons).

I will quote to you most of a letter that I wrote to Albert Portune, which sums up the reasons I was terminated, as well as the reasons I will not trust my life and the future to the "Divorce Committee".

But first I will need to explain some things, to give you a background to even understand the letter. Some of this is esoteric information--known only to a very few, so don't be surprised that you knew nothing of it. People who work at HQ and the ministry will be privy to a lot of it. But a lot of it is know only to a handful of people, in the top levels of administration (where personal and political information is concerned), and among the theological scholars (where Biblical information is concerned). (Let's face it, the average minister in the field is largely a Biblical illiterate, who has been told what to teach regarding the Bible, and what to say regarding events in the Work.) Here is the background:

1. You have often heard Herbert Armstrong say, "Just show us where we have been wrong, and if we have, we will change." There is no statement issuing from the Worldwide Church of God with greater untruth. In fact, a current catchword around the church is "God wouldn't have let Mr. Armstrong be wrong". (In other words, we are right because God wouldn't have let us be wrong. We are right, because we couldn't be wrong. Of course, any church could make the same claim, and it would be just as true or untrue; we are right because we couldn't have been wrong, God wouldn't have let us. However, for those who are willing to read the Bible, the Bible clearly shows in example after example that God never kept anyone from being wrong at anytime.)

Over the last few years, an increasing number of people--evangelists, pastors, scholars--have come to see that there are a great many mistakes and errors in the doctrines and ways of doing things of the Worldwide Church of God. Efforts at reform, however, have been heavily resisted. Certain changes, on Biblical grounds, have been attempted from time to time by men like Garner Ted Armstrong, Albert Portune, David Antion, David Jon Hill, Robert Kuhn, Earnest L. Martin. These changes

THE PAINFUL TRUTH

(2)

were resisted, sometimes with good reason, but often with no more reason than the unwillingness to change, or to admit that we may have been wrong. People like (Hermann L. Hoeh) and (Raymond Cole) have insisted on adhering to "the faith once delivered". They, too, are sincere, but here "the faith once delivered" has meant what they personally have always thought to be the truth. (In fact, one might well argue that the Bible is the faith once delivered, so let's see what the Bible says. But these men are, to a great extent, against Bible study, arguing that it is wrong to study the Bible further, and that we should just accept Mr. Armstrong's interpretation, because "God wouldn't let him be wrong"; meanwhile, these same men continue to proclaim that "we believe only what we can plainly see in our Bible".) So church leadership has split into different camps, based on differences in theological perspective.

resisted changes and have

To give you a further feeling for the problem, let me quote a section from a paper titled "The Problem of Inspiration and Authority" which was circulated among certain top administrators and scholars, which briefly summarizes the history of the problem:

"Since the time of the original apostles most of the controversies of Christianity have revolved around the related questions of inspiration and authority."

"It has been assumed that those in ecclesiastical authority have been inspired by God to one degree or another. This inspiration comes to those in highest authority and their authority comes as a result of their "obvious" inspiration! A circular piece of reasoning indeed.

"The Pope has claimed infallibility on matters of faith and morals. Luther denied papal infallibility and proceeded to act as though he alone was capable of correctly interpreting the Word. As the Reformation spread, all leaders claimed inspiration and at least some authority, and yet most disagreed on major points. Christianity has since been fragmented into hundreds of disagreeing sects--all claiming authority and/or inspiration!

"Others, realizing the need for updated revelation, have claimed direct contact with God and Christ or angels. Joseph Smith, Mary Baker Eddy, Oral Roberts and others are examples.

"The result of all of this has been a confusing picture of a divided Christianity with an uncertain and less than harmonious theology! To the Layman it's a discordant din of doctrinal dissonance.

"Enter the Church of God

"It is against this undesirable background that the modern phase of the Church of God makes its appearance.

"Born during the Great Depression, the 'Philadelphian' era struggles to life under the leadership of an aggressive ex-advertising man. [Philadelphian is in quotes] Because practically none of the college scholars believes in church eras: they are a myth created by Dr. Hoeh, and based on bad research and circular reasoning." Herbert W. Armstrong--disillusioned by the close-mindedness of his fellow ministers of the "Sardis" era--strikes out on his own.

"Many doctrines are inherited from the Sardis group--i.e. the

Sabbath, Passover, healing, etc. But a large portion of our body of beliefs has been developed in the years between 1931 and 1947. This is especially true of prophecy. (3)

"Doctrines such as Church government (including ranks of the ministry), makeup, the "Work" philosophy, apostleship, and others seem to have emerged since the founding of the College and the addition of other ministers. Some doctrines were even introduced when these men were in their teens and early 20's.

"In the 1950's intense persecution fans the fires of militant doctrinal defense. An authoritarian truculence emerges--needed to insure survival against the verbal onslaught of critics and persecutors.

"Rapid growth takes place in the early 60's and this authoritarian dogmatism becomes the official Church personality. As the burden of administration grows--theological research is left to lower level people. In the late 60's and early 70's a "new breed" of lower and middle echelon scholars emerges. These are both ministerial and educated lay people. Their studies begin to produce concepts, papers and reports which rock the theological boat. Galatians 3 becomes an issue. Earlier--in 1961--Pentecost had been an issue.

"As long as our in-house scholarship backed or bolstered the doctrinal status quo, it was welcomed. But suggestions that we could have made errors in any doctrinal questions was met with stiff resistance or at best, suspicion. God would not have allowed major errors to be made [it was asserted].

"Sooner or later everything boiled down to a question of authority. God only works (or always does) from the top down it was asserted. Even though some doctrines were apparently poorly explained and badly "proven" it was assumed that those who formed them were inspired to do so in that manner. The conclusions were undoubtedly correct though the manner of arriving at them was lacking in some way!" [The last is a tongue-in-cheek statement. It used to be an editorial joke that in our articles sometimes the facts were all wrong, and the reasoning was all wrong, but the conclusions were always correct! In fact, the conclusion was the only thing that was correct! So the joke went. The truth is, if the facts and reasoning were wrong, there was no guarantee that the conclusion wasn't wrong also. But people went on pretending it was, because that's what the church had always taught.]

[END OF QUOTES]

Let me give you a practical illustration, mother. For years you have heard Mr. Herbert Armstrong relate how he first proved that God exists, then that the Bible is His Word. HWA's way of "proving" the Bible is given in the booklet "The Proof of the Bible". This booklet cites prophecies about Tyre and Babylon, and about their historical fulfillment, to prove to thousands of others that the Bible is God's word. I have heard it said many times on old World Tomorrow broadcasts that anyone who doesn't believe the prophecies should try to settle on the sites of ancient Tyre and Babylon! God wouldn't allow it! In fact, it was said, anyone who wanted to disprove the Bible or God's existence could do so by settling on the sites of ancient Tyre and Babylon.

The fact is, it turns out, the booklet was totally wrong. Have you heard anything about that? No, the old booklet was just quietly discontinued. Was Mr. Armstrong decided God doesn't exist, because by his own statements the existence of God and the correctness of the Bible have been disproved? No, Mr. Armstrong goes blissfully on his way, telling

people how diligent he was in proving the Bible and God's existence, and how they ought to do the same. Has Mr. Armstrong made a retraction, letting people know of the mistake, in repentance for bringing discredit on God by sloppy and mistaken research? No, not at all. (4)

There are several reasons why the statements about Babylon are wrong: 1) Arabs are pitching their tents in Babylon; 2) Three towns are inside the central walls of the ancient city--with a continuous population of 300; 3) A modern hotel has recently been built next to the museum--with a permanent staff of 18; 4) A military camp of 200 men exists inside the central walls; 5) Businessmen of Hillah have several permanent homes in Babylon. (Some are luxurious and compare favorably with our office in Jerusalem.); 6) The area has many domesticated animals--but no wild ones, as the prophecies require. (A number of resident Arabs said there were no snakes or dangerous animals there.); 7) The prophecy said that no brick from Babylon would be used for other buildings. But much of Hillah and other villages has been built from stones of ancient Babylon.

The booklet claimed that the site of ancient Tyre was supposed to be a totally desolate site. (Mr. Armstrong talks about a fishing village on the island, but assures us it was "on the other side of the island".) 1) Today there is a city of 12,000 completely covering the island. And the ruins on the island are primarily from the Hellenistic, Roman and Crusades periods, showing a continuous population on the island. 2) Ancient Tyre was destroyed, and was made ~~it~~ like the top of a rock. But the site did not long stay desolate. Subsequent cities called "Tyre" have been built in the same location. Moreover, Mr. Armstrong's "Tyre-will-never-be-rebuilt", proof-by-prophecy ignored the fact that Tyre was prophesied to be built again. (Isa. 23:13-18)!

How has the church leadership reacted to these facts? Everyone was afraid to tell Mr. Armstrong, that he was wrong, so they blamed the mistakes on the Seventh-Day Adventists, since it was known that Mr. Armstrong had plagiarized the material about Tyre and Babylon from the Seventh-Day Adventists' book Prophecy Speaks.! But, of course, blaming it on the SDA's only begs the question: 1) HWA was just as wrong as were the SDA's; 2) There is the additional fact of HWA plagiarizing other people's ^{material} and palming it off in a way so as to make appear that this is "truth" that "God has revealed" to His "true church", meanwhile implying that such things will not be found in other "false churches" to whom God has not revealed this "truth"!!

What will happen is that the old booklet, having become "out-of-print", will be replaced by a "new, improved" one, which will ignore Tyre and Babylon completely. In fact, after the above facts came out, and it was decided to kill the booklet "Proof of the Bible" (proof of the Bible!!!!), 50,000 copies still on hand were still sent out, because having recently advertized the booklet, it was decided it would be unwise to disappoint and thus antagonize the customers! (Obviously, a great regard for truth, huh?)

(Tyre and Babylon is not an untypical example. Another idea which Mr. Armstrong plagiarized, mostly whole-hog, was that of the modern identify of the lost ten tribes of Israel. HWA has asserted that the modern identity of Israel is the "lost key" to understanding the Bible, which the Worldwide Church of God has, while the rest of the world is in "total ignorance". This lost key which God revealed to HWA c. 1934 can be found in British-Israelism books dating back to the 1600s. In fact, large sections of the book The United States and British Commonwealth in Prophecy are quoted almost directly from a British-Israel

book by J. A. Allen entitled Judah's Scentre and Joseph's Birthright. Except for arrangement of material and the doctrine by HWA on the Law and the Sabbath and the modern predictions, you will find that they are the same book. HWA says: "And WHY have these prophecies not been understood or believed? Because the vital KEY that unlocks prophecy to our understanding has been lost. That KEY is the IDENTITY of the UNITED STATES and the BRITISH PEOPLES in Biblical prophecy." (USBC, p. xii.) Allen wrote in 1902: "The very understanding of this difference is the KEY by which almost the entire Bible becomes intelligible, and I cannot state too strongly that the man who has not yet seen that Israel of Scripture is totally distinct from the Jewish people, is yet in the very infancy, the mere alphabet, of Biblical study, and that to this day the meaning of seven-eighths of the Bible is shut to his understanding." (p. 79, his book).

(The basic problem with the whole USBC theory is a. It is based on faulty (terrible!) historical research; b. It is based on faulty (ridiculous!) Biblical exegesis. Dr. Earnest Martin, until recently the Chairman of the Department of Theology at the Pasadena campus, feels quite sure he can totally disprove the theory. Gunar Freiburgs, presently Chairman of that department, feels the same. I have not studied the history, but know from a Biblical point of view it is totally erroneous. More on this later . . . but for the present this will give you an idea of the types of problems that exist.)

2. This second point of the background I am giving you for my letter to Albert Portune gets into a specific area, the whole question of divorce and remarriage. Divorce and remarriage is another area where the current teaching by the church is unbiblical--quite clearly so. More evangelists and more scholars are agreed on the need for change in this area than in perhaps any other. Yet no change is forthcoming. Why is this?

The problem involves Garner Ted Armstrong, in two different ways. a. Most of those advocating change have found GTA somewhat more sympathetic to their viewpoint, because GTA has himself seen the need for many changes. b. But GTA has messed up and cast in a bad light the whole concept of "change" generally, and change in the divorce and remarriage field particularly, because of his own personal problems.

On one hand is HWA who is impressed with his own importance and with his beliefs in his own inspiration and who is therefore resistant to change. HWA's alarm is justified (he thinks) because his son GTA (advocate of some changes) got involved in some personal sins: "see what such ideas lead to?" etc. Meanwhile there are other evangelists, who see the same needs for change that GTA does, but who were not involved in GTA's sins, yet who cannot press the matter because a. It would antagonize HWA, especially since the GTA affair; b. It might lead to the political downfall of GTA, whom they see as the hope for the future (whether their hopes are justified is another matter).

In no area of study is this more true than in the area of divorce and remarriage. Here is why (I am going to tell you more, probably, than you want to know--but you need to know). GTA has had a problem, from time to time, of getting involved with girls (committing adultery). Or rather, he has had a problem of getting involved, emotionally, with some girls, and he was committing adultery with a girl a couple of years ago. When GTA was confronted by others with the fact of the sin, instead of immediately repenting, as did King David, GTA tried to justify what he was doing by citing different arguments. Exactly what his argument was, I don't know, but the whole issue of divorce and remarriage has

6
been so clouded since, that I assume he ~~has~~ invoked some of the scriptures regarding divorce and remarriage.

HWA has taken recently to citing Deut. 22:28-29 about a case of pre-marital intercourse, saying "she shall be his wife, because he has violated her; he may not put her away all his days". HWA strongly emphasizes the last phrase "he may not put her away". Now-- it was common knowledge in the early days of the college that GTA and his wife "had to" get married ("had to" I assume because they were found out, and HWA insisted they get married). So HWA has in recent months continued to cite that verse, Deut. 22:28-29, because he was afraid GTA and his wife might split up.

Specifically, HWA has made Mrs. GTA promise him^(HWA) personally, that she will not leave his son. (She was apparently inclined to do so because of his adultery; plus they are really two quite mis-matched individuals, with widely divergent interests, and so he spends much of his spare time out with friends like Jim Thornhill, etc.)

This, for example, is the reason that HWA refuses to admit that porneia (the Greek word translated "fornication" in the KJV New Testament) can include adultery as well as fornication (which it clearly does, as can be proven from the biblical and extra-biblical literature of the time where the word porneia was used)--because if he admitted that, then there would be biblical grounds that would allow Mrs. GTA to put away her husband. (Not that there is necessarily any possibility of that, now, but HWA has to justify his own position; he is still reacting to his own personal fears about his own family and what might happen to the church if GTA and wife were to split up.)

Now, before quoting the letter to Albert Portune, one more thing is in order. HWA has recently been the source, because of the above reasons, of so much flack about divorce and remarriage (I am sorry, mother, but that is exactly what it is) that I am going to quote, as one example, from a paper prepared by Dr. Charles Dorothy and Dr. Robert Kuhn, entitled: "Divorce and Remarriage: A Biblical Analysis and Appraisal". There are other papers done by other Pasadena researchers which have come to the same general conclusions, but this one is especially clear. It points out, in an extremely tactful manner, some of the problems with HWA's D&R guidelines (notice that I did not say "Biblical guidelines").

"Approach: We will emphasize those areas of our D&R doctrine where questions have arisen. We will attempt to treat each area with an open mind--though perhaps emphasizing the opposing viewpoint in order to stimulate fresh thought. . . .

"Present D&R Theology: We teach that the New Testament does not allow divorce under any circumstances. This means that once a marriage has been bound in heaven, there is absolutely no circumstance that can dissolve the marriage other than death.

"As a result, the essence of our present D&R investigations is to determine whether a marriage--or which, if any, of several marriages--was bound by God. We believe that God will lead us to determine what was already bound in heaven (Matt. 16:19). If we find that a marriage was not binding, what we in fact do is not grant a divorce with permission to remarry, but rather annul the marriage by saying it was never bound.

(2)

"We first use scriptures such as Matthew 19:6-8, Romans 7:2-3, etc. to show that God does not permit divorce and remarriage.

"We then confront Matthew 5:32 and 19:9 which say that "fornication" is the only cause for which a man can put away his wife. And since the meaning of "fornication" is restricted to pre-marital intercourse, only such pre-marital activities can cause an annulment.

"Next, we make some logical judgments. First we broaden fornication to mean extreme sexual activities, even if technical virginity is maintained. Next, we reason that it would be of course ridiculous for one marriage partner to be able to use one instance of his or her spouse's fornication as an excuse to terminate the marriage at any time throughout the marriage. It also seems ridiculous to use fornication as an excuse to dissolve a marriage if it really wasn't that important to the spouse. Consequently, we further restrict the usage of Matthew 5:32 and 19:9 to pre-marital sexual fraud--where one partner deceives the other as to his or her virginity at the time of the marriage. The principle of fraud, rather than technical fornication, has become the primary issue.

"Next, we extrapolate, quite logically, even further to include all types of serious fraud--e.g. alcoholism, mental problems, not wanting children, etc. However right these procedures are--and they are--let us recognize that they are judgments, indeed extrapolations, based on the word "fornication" in Matthew 5:32 and 19:9.

"Finally, we have added other scriptural directives concerning marriage to help decide troublesome D&R cases, such as the necessity to have parental consent for the binding of a marriage between very young husbands and wives. We are basing this regulation on an Old Testament directive--there being no New Testament allowance for this rule.

"Problems Concerning Present D&R Theology: Why have we extrapolated from the word "fornication" in Matthew 5:32 and 19:9 to include all types of serious fraud? Why have we added some Old Testament statutes such as parental consent?

"The reason is obvious--and without much doubt inspired by God. God's ministry needs the proper scriptural statutes on which to base their judgments. God's ministry needs whatever scriptural and spiritual tools God provides in order to make righteous decisions.

"Most do not disagree with the scriptural tools that God has heretofore provided for his ministry. But an increasing number of Church members and ministers alike are wondering if perhaps God is now providing further understanding and more scriptural tools for His ministry so that they might continue to render righteous and merciful D&R decisions in an age fraught with marital trauma and complexities.

"Some ministers are known to feel that the present D&R guidelines sacrifice the spirit of the law for the letter of the law. They feel that merciful and righteous judgment in a spiritually-discerned sense must not be subjugated to technical constraints.

"Some are wondering if it is the will of our Creator to allow one marriage to be 'annulled' due to one incident of fornication.

8
while another (almost identical) marriage cannot be "divorced" even in the light of extreme and continuous and perverse sexual debauchery. They feel that it seems inconsistent with a God concerned with principles, attitudes, character and intent.

"As a result, some ministers have come to feel that the whole task of rendering righteous judgment often comes down to finding a loophole in our present law by technical detective work. Hence, there have been an increasing number of original decisions which have been reversed.

"As a hypothetical example, the only way to save a 20-year successful marriage between prospective members would be to find that the spouse who had been married previously, say for two years when he or she was 20, had been involved in an incident of pre-marital intercourse. If such an event can be determined, the present union can be saved; if not, it must be dissolved.

"For the sake of the discussion, let us consider three almost-identical, very happy, 20-year, 4-children marriages between fine prospective members. Each has a D&R problem since the three husbands had all been previously married between ages 20-22.

"In the first case, it is discovered that the husband's first wife had had one incident of fornication before the marriage and that the husband had specifically asked if she were a virgin and was deceived (and it honestly would have stopped the marriage if he had known). Here is a clear case of fraud in the first marriage, giving ample reason to secure the second happy marriage.

"In the second case, the husband had known about the one incident of his first wife's fornication, and although it had bothered him, he forgave her and married her. Here the first marriage must be judged to be binding and the second marriage must be dissolved. (It seems as though this man is almost being penalized for forgiving his first wife.)

"In the third case, there was no fornication involved in the first marriage, but within six months after the marriage, the wife literally became a whore, so flagrantly flaunting her debaucherous activities in front of her husband that he finally divorced her. Here again the first marriage is binding and the second one must be dissolved.

"All other things being equal, some ministers find it incongruous to conclude that the second marriage in cases two and three is not binding, while at the same time the second marriage in case one is binding. Does God really consider the present marriages in cases two and three to be adulterous unions, while at the same time fully approving the present marriage in the first almost-identical case?

"Wrestling with these problems, some ministers find themselves looking for loopholes within our present constraints, even stretching our D&R regulations somewhat out of shape in an attempt to render what they intuitively feel are merciful and righteous decisions. Since some ministers are frankly trying to find loopholes and stretch our present constraints--which is why we have opposite decisions in similar cases--it makes us wonder if perhaps there are broader scriptural understandings and more opportunity for the use of spiritual discernment than we have heretofore been led to see.

"No minister wants to open the floodgates to allow divorces and remarriages. That's not the issue. What is wanted is simply definitive scriptural guidelines and overall spiritual principles--tools that God has provided for His ministry in order to render merciful and righteous and consistent and permanent judgments. (9

"Organization: The following sections are frankly a search to determine if God has allowed His ministry more comprehensive tools--in terms of broader scriptural understanding . . .

"There are five basic sections:

"1) Matthew 5:32 and 19:9: The Meaning of "Porneia"--a Broader Meaning of "Fornication"?

"2) I Corinthians 7:15: What Happens When the Unbeliever Leaves the Believer?

". . . [I will skip the other three sections here and later on, mother, for the most part--as I have to keep the letter within reasonable lengths.]

"Section I: Matthew 5:32: "But I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication (Matt. 19:9: "except it be for fornication"), causeth her to commit adultery; and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery."

"In the examples given above, the reason why the husband in the first case could stay with his second wife and family while the husband in the third case had to leave his second wife and family falls solely on the definition of "fornication" in Matthew 5:32 and 19:9. In the first case, the one incident of pre-marital intercourse enabled the husband's first marriage to be declared "annulled". In the third case, not even an egregious amount of extra-marital debauchery and perversion could enable the husband's first marriage to be declared "divorced".

"The crucial issue in Matthew 5:32 and 19:9 is plainly the question of remarriage.

"In this regard, the word 'fornication' is obviously the key. And to understand the English word 'fornication' we must go to the original Greek word from which it was translated--"PORNEIA."

"Every Greek lexicon, word study, commentary, etc. shows that "porneia" has the very broadest of meanings describing all types of sexual immorality and debauchery--the vast majority of sources specifically including adultery (extra-marital sexual activities) in their definitions.

"In both classical Greek and early Christian literature--written just before, during, and just after the New Testament period--porneia often refers to sexual debauchery by married persons. In the Jewish Apocrypha, the same is true: e.g. Ecclesiasticus 23:23 speaks of a wife who "commits adultery through her fornication (porneia)."

"More significantly, the Septuagint (the Greek translation of the Old Testament used by the apostles and quoted in the New Testament) also uses porneia when referring to extramarital sexual relations.

(10)
In Ezekiel 16, Jerusalem is described as God's wife married in verse 8, committing adultery in verse 32, and breaking wedlock in verse 38. Yet porneia is used to describe her sexual relations in verses 15, 26, 29! Porneia is also used in the Septuagint to describe the sexual sins of Hosea's wife (2:3) and what would happen to the wife of a man confronting Amos (7:17). (Some feel that porneia in the context of these scriptures should be restricted to mean either harlotry or sexual desire.)

"In Proverbs 6:24-35 the married man is admonished not to have intercourse with a harlot (pornē in the Septuagint translation of verse 26). Proverbs 7 counsels the young man not to let himself be captivated by the charms of the prostitute (verse 12). Note that 7:19 proves that the prostitute (pornē) was married!

"Now to the usages of porneia in the New Testament itself. This is the most crucial area--how did God inspire this word to be used? In I Corinthians 5:1, porneia is used to describe the situation involving the sexual sins between a man and his married stepmother. (Some use II Corinthians 7:12 to show that his father was still alive.)

"In I Corinthians 6:15-16, Paul shows that sexual intercourse with a harlot (pornē) joins the man and the harlot together as one body and one flesh--and he labels such relations fornication (porneia) in verse 18. In this context, there are no indications that Paul was directing these instructions, indeed restricting these instructions, to unmarried men exclusively.

"I Corinthians 10:8 and Revelation 2:14 describe the sexual sins of Israel in the wilderness (induced by Balaam with the daughters of Moab) as porneuo--the verb form of porneia. Did only the unmarried Israelites get involved? Were none of the 23,000 who died married? For porneia to exclusively refer to pre-marital sexual sin, we must answer both questions in the affirmative. Yet Numbers 25 gives no such restrictions.

"In the light of what seems to be rather definitive evidence that we have perhaps been somewhat limited (not wrong) [Drs. Kühn and Dorothy word it this way because it is not wise to ever tell HWA that he has been wrong!] in our definition of porneia, it is now time to ask the question recommended in the overall guidelines for these doctrinal analyses:

"What was the original basis for the setting of the doctrine?

"Could it be the reading of Matthew 5:32 and 19:9 and then the simple application of the present day meaning of the English word "fornication" as being exclusively limited to pre-marital sexual intercourse?

". . . Strong confirmation that we have overly-restricted the meaning of the word "fornication" comes from the Bible itself. Remember we are trying to understand this English word by its connotations extant in the mid-1900's, whereas we should recognize that "fornication" was originally chosen by translators in the 1600's. Notice again from Ezekiel 16 that the editors of the King James Version felt perfectly free to use "fornication" (vs. 15, 26, 29) to describe the sexual sins of a married woman (vs. 8, 32, 38). If the translators of the

King James Bible felt that the word they chose to describe the situation in Matthew 5:32 and 19:9 had an exclusively pre-marital meaning, they could never, and would never, have used it in Ezekiel 16.

"Consequently, in light of what must be considered overwhelming evidence for at least a somewhat broader understanding of porneia [that must be the understatement of the year!] in Matthew 5:32 and 19:9, we must inquire how we currently uphold our present doctrine limiting porneia to exclusively pre-marital sexual sins.

"What we now do--as do the few other commentators who subscribe to a similar D&R doctrine--is to admit that there is a broader usage of porneia, but at the same time argue that it must be the context of the word in the sentence which determines the precise meaning of porneia.

[There follows a further discussion, including a discussion of the word moicheia, translated "adultery". Here is their conclusion for this section:]

"Take, once again, two 20-year happy marriages in which each husband had been married before. Upon investigating the first marriage, we find that in each case, the husband had had sexual experiences prior to his first marriage--but in one case it was with an unmarried woman (which we define as "porneia") and in the other case, with a married woman (which Matt. 5:32 describes as "moicheia"). As a result, we seem to be forced to conclude on the basis of our present understanding of Matthew 5:32 and 19:9 that since porneia can annul a marriage under certain circumstances, while moicheia can never do so under any circumstances, that the one man (pornos) can be loosed from his first wife and remain with his present wife, while the other man (moichos) must be bound to his first wife and must separate from his present wife!

"This strange (ludicrous!) circumstance is the logical (albeit pharisaical) result of our present concept of completely differentiating "porneia" from "moicheia".

[Further discussion, then]

"We now define and describe porneia and moicheia in a manner which we suggest captures the flavor and the intent of the New Testament usage.

"MOICHEIA involves the breaking of the marital bond of fidelity, trust and union. This can happen by one or more incidents of sexual sin outside of marriage. These specific incidents, although they are acts of infidelity, can be merely slips due to weaknesses and are not a permanent attitude of mind. . . .

"PORNEIA describes the attitudes of extreme and continuous sexual lusts and the acts of excessive and illegal sexual gratifications. The uses of "porneia" in the New Testament indicate egregious immorality, wanton debauchery, and even perversion. . . .

"In this light, only extreme sexual lusts and wantonly immoral sexual gratifications on the part of one of the marriage partners would enable his or her spouse to obtain a divorce with rights to remarry. . . .

12
". . . . In conclusion, if porneia can indeed describe the gross sexual sins of married as well as unmarried persons, this would not open the floodgates of divorce and remarriage. It would not enable single or even multiple acts of adultery (moicheia) to terminate a marriage. But it would give God's minister further tools to render righteous and merciful decisions in certain extreme cases.

[As Dr. Kuhn said to me, this is a very "mild" paper.]

"[Section II] I Corinthians 7:15: "But if the unbelieving depart, let him depart. A brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases: but God hath called us to peace."

". . . . We have traditionally taught, in accordance with our D&R doctrine, that I Corinthians 7:15 teaches that a brother or a sister is not under bondage to live with the unbeliever, and that the issue of divorce and remarriage is not even under consideration.

"Recently, strong feelings have once again surfaced about our understanding of this verse. The people are sincere and their questions are honest.

"Our current explanation starts in verses 10 and 11 where Paul tells the wife not to depart from her husband, but if she did depart, 'let her remain UNMARRIED or be reconciled to her husband.' The same is likewise true for the husband: "and let not the husband put away his wife." Then in verse 14 Paul tells the Corinthians that if the unbelieving husband or wife depart, "let him (or her) depart"--the Christian cannot force his unbelieving mate to live with him (or her). Then concerning the key phrase--"A brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases"--we currently teach that the Christian husband or wife is not under moral or spiritual bondage to try to live with his or her mate by following after them in an attempt to continue the marriage. We maintain that the admonition of verse 11--let her remain unmarried--is still very much in force here in verse 15. This, in fact, is the crux of our present argument. Furthermore, we point out that the word "bondage" is not the same Greek word translated "bound" in Romans 7:2, where a woman is bound by the law to her husband until death.

"Let us now look at the opposing explanation of this critical verse. To accurately do this, we must clearly ascertain and delineate its exact context.

"Paul is writing to the Corinthian Church in response to certain ideas regarding sex and marriage which they had written to him. Paul immediately states his position: "Nevertheless, to avoid fornication (porneia), let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband. Verses 3-5 give strong positive commands regarding the necessity of sex in marriage, which are then tempered by verses 6-8 which state that it might be better to remain single ("for the present distress," v. 26). In verse 9, Paul concludes: "But if they cannot contain, let them marry: for it is better to marry than to burn." This, then, is Paul's attitude toward sex and marriage--inspired by God--as we begin the crucial section, verses 10-15.

"We now look closely at these verses. Remember Paul is writing to the converted members of God's Church. (This is proved by v. 1: "Now concerning the things whereof ye wrote unto me.")

"And unto the married" (verse 10)--which married? The married in God's Church! So this section--verses 10 and 11--are addressed to the married in God's Church: The husband or wife should not leave his or her mate, but if such an occurrence is unavoidable, then they can separate but can never remarry. This is clear--no remarriage is possible "unto the married."

"But notice how verse 12 begins: "But unto the rest" Who are the rest? Verses 12 and 13 tell us: those converted men and women in the Church (brothers and sisters) who have unconverted mates. In other words, there is a clear distinction between verses 10-11 and verses 12-15. The audience being addressed is different, and, as we shall see, the instructions given by Paul are also different.

"The differentiation between verses 10-11 and 12-15 is perhaps the cardinal issue in the whole discussion. If there is no difference, if the audience addressed is the same, then clearly the command, "let her remain unmarried" reigns supreme. If there is a difference, if the audience addressed is different, then the instruction "a brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases" must be viewed in a different light.

"There are five concepts which certainly seem to differentiate verses 10-11 from verses 12-15:

"1) Verse 10 begins with "And"; verse 12 begins with "But."
(The Greek is the weak "but", de.)

"2) Verse 10 is addressed "unto the married"; verse 12 is re-addressed "to the rest."

"3) In verse 10, Paul is not speaking of himself, "not I." (He is quoting Christ almost directly--whether the Bible itself or when Paul was personally taught by Christ); in verse 12 Paul is speaking of himself, "speak I," (as God was inspiring him to make a judgment in a new situation--more on this later.)

"4) In verse 10, the Lord is commanding (directly through the Bible or directly to Paul); in verse 12 the Lord is not commanding (just inspiring!)

"5) In verse 10, the married are both in the Church; in verse 12, one spouse is an unbeliever.

"There can be little doubt that there is a fundamental difference between verses 10-11 and 12-15. Verses 10-11 are addressed to the married couples, both of whom are in God's Church. Verses 12-15 are addressed to those mixed marriages where one spouse is a believer and the other is an unbeliever.

"Paul then addresses this latter group by first advising (verses 12-14) that if the unbeliever wished to remain married, the believer was obligated to continue the marriage. (Perhaps this is Paul's response to some in the Corinthian Church who were thinking that God required a believer to separate himself or herself from his or her "unclean, pagan, sinning mate!")

"Now verse 15: "But if the unbelieving depart, let him depart." The Greek word translated "depart" (chorizo) is the same word used

THE PAINFUL TRUTH

(14)
In both ancient Greek records (marriage contracts in the papyri) and in Matthew 19:6 ("What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder") to mean divorce! (But chorizo does not, of course, of itself give permission to remarry.)

"Finally, the critical clause: "A brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases." The Greek verb translated "under bondage" (dedoulotai) is α in the perfect tense--which mean that it expresses the present and continuing effects of past actions. Dedoulotai ("under bondage") is derived from the Greek word meaning "bondslave" (doulos).

"A bondslave in the ancient world was considered property-- it was the most extreme form of servitude; so great was the bondage that a master had the power of life and death over his bondslave. In fact, the master had a legal document maintaining the relationship of complete bondage.

"The analogy to a marriage license seems hard to resist. (But analogies, of course, don't prove anything.) Now it is interesting that the "writing of divorcement" referred to by Christ in Matthew 5:31 is precisely the same term--apostasion--used to describe the procedure a master had to go through to release his slave. And once the slave was so legally declared "not under bondage," his former owner had no further claim on him whatsoever. This tends to support the concept that the bond between a master and a slave was looked upon as very similar to the bond between a husband and a wife . . . , thereby strengthening the explanation that the phrase "not under bondage"--built upon the Greek word for slave (doulos)--means that the marriage bond was indeed severed in these peculiar situations,

"Kittel's Theological Dictionary of the New Testament defines the verb in I Corinthians 7:15 as expressing "total binding by another" with the meaning of the verse clearly referring to divorce.

"With such strong meaning to the term bondslave, it is hard to comprehend why Paul used this analogy if he only meant that the believing mate did not have to follow his unbelieving spouse around the country. Why would it be considered bondage (doulos) to try to live with your unbelieving mate? Either you could or you could not. Remember, the other party was the one who left. . . .

"Frankly, it would seem obvious that you could not force someone who wanted to leave to live with you--especially an unbeliever. In fact, the inclusion of verses 12-13 indicate that the Corinthian Church felt, if anything, the reverse. Not that a believer had to follow an unbelieving spouse around the country, but that a believer (being, in fact, self-righteous) should leave his unbelieving spouse.

"Now let's compare and contrast the instructions of verses 10-11 in marriages where both husband and wife are in the Church with verses 12-15 where one is in and one is not. In both cases, we have one of the partners departing. In verse 11, with both in the Church, the command "let her remain unmarried" seems to be contrasted with the command in verse 12, when one is an unbeliever, that "A brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases." This contrast of remaining unmarried and not being under bondage for the separate groups is the crux of the matter.

"In verses 10-11, the concept of not being under bondage is not

used--yet, if our current understanding (not being under bondage to try to live with one's mate) would be correct, it should have been. Likewise, in verses 12-15, the concept of remaining unmarried is not used--yet, if our current understanding would be correct, it should have been. If Paul is giving the same set of instructions to both the marrieds in the Church and the mixed believer-unbeliever marriages, why did he first separate the groups so clearly and then proceed to give each what seems to be diametrically opposite instructions: remaining unmarried in the former; not being under bondage in the latter?

"If not being under bondage only means not being required to live with one's mate, then the statement in verse 15 is repetitious and confusing since the group in verses 10-11 was also told that they did not have to live with their mates.

"From a different point of view, if being under bondage only means not being required to live with one's mate, then those in verses 10-11 are likewise not under bondage. But such are not their instructions--they are plainly told to remain unmarried. . . . Only in the situation where the unbeliever voluntarily leaves the believer are the instructions given that in such cases a brother or a sister is not under bondage.

"Paul knew that the instructions he was giving concerning believer-unbeliever marriages were entirely new. He was of course basing these instructions on a thorough understanding of God's Law and was being led by God's Spirit. Nonetheless, Paul knew that he himself was making new judgments. This is why he said, "But to the rest, speak I, not the Lord." Jesus had never addressed this situation. In fact, there had never been a similar situation in all biblical history. Never before had there been a congregation of converted individuals--and surely never before had there been marriages between Christians and non-Christians. Paul knew he was setting new precedents by adding a second exception to the no divorce law of Matthew 5:32 and 19:9. This is why he affirmed and ratified his decision by stating in verse 17, "And so I ordain in all the Churches".

[There is some more discussion on another point of this passage and then a detailed case history, for the sake of example. Finally, I will quote three paragraphs from one of the remaining three sections of the paper.]

"Not only do we see two apparent [tact!] allowances for divorce with the option to remarry in the New Testament (1. porneia, 2. unbeliever leaving a believer), but there also seems to be some evidence to indicate that divorce and remarriage might be allowed in the millennium!

"In Ezekiel 44, which is clearly describing the situation after the return of Christ, verse 22 states that priests shall not "take for their wives a widow, not her that is out away" These are special provisions of higher purity for the priesthood to follow. And the clear implication is that the common man would be able to marry a widow or her that is out away.

"Why? If there was not going to be any putting away in the millennium at all, why make the special point that priests could not marry divorced women? And why equate not marrying a widow with not marrying a divorced woman? Certainly, it is permissible for an

THE PAINFUL TRUTH

ordinary person to marry a widow (I Tim. 5:9-14). Furthermore, these instructions in Ezekiel 44 almost exactly parallel the instructions for the priests given in Leviticus 21:7, 14--the priests couldn't marry divorced women, whereas the common people could! As a result, it seems as though the same D&R regulations, in force after the return of Christ. This means that, under certain circumstances, God could unbind a marriage (or allow the marriage to be unbound) in the millennium, just as He did (or allowed) in ancient Israel."

So, mother, I think you can see that there are MAJOR problems with the Worldwide Church of God teaching on D&R. The above is only a small part of the evidence: I have a thick file of other papers and other material.

With this background, let me quote most of my letter to Mr. Portune, dated Oct. 8.

"Robert Kuhn informs me that I am to be terminated from my job at your request. I asked the reasons why, and he was unable to give me any reasons, since I have not been suspended from the church. (Rather I am supposed to keep a "low profile" in church. What does this mean? I asked. That I am supposed to sit in the back row in services, or what? Robert was not able to explain what it meant.) It was clear, however, that the reasons for my termination had nothing to do with my job performance, but were church-related. Yet I am being terminated, not from the church, but from my job.

"I have worked part-time and full-time for Ambassador College for seven years--since the Fall of 1966. During this time I have always tried to be loyal to Ambassador College, especially in times of problems or supposed problems. Yet, apparently based on the possibility of an adverse church decision, a decision not yet made, I am summarily terminated from my job. I think this is both unjust and a reflection of a low degree of loyalty on the part of Ambassador College. Not only do I think that this is unethical from a biblical standpoint, but illegal according to our national laws: Ambassador College wants understanding, loyalty when things appear to go wrong--but apparently this practice is a one-way street.

"Firstly, I am writing this letter to your conscience.

"Apparently my great sin, as was passed along to me, is that I have said I will not abide by a decision from the divorce committee, if the committee decides I am bound to Sharon Gibson. That does sound like a terrible attitude on my part, doesn't it?--a cause for righteous indignation?

"Or does it? The consensus seems to be that true Christianity means doing what you are told. Since I am not willing to abide by the committee's decision, regardless of what it may be, I am not a Christian, God is removing His Holy Spirit, and therefore I am out of the church.

"So secondly, I am writing this letter to state the reasons why I cannot abide by an adverse decision from the divorce committee.

"Here are other crucial factors which that consensus conveniently ignores: 1) the fact that I appealed to the church for a

year and a half for a decision, and was never able to get one ("there are too many political problems" I was told from early 1972 to as late as Sept. 1973); the church didn't care then, so why should it care now? (17)

"2) The fact that during this time I was told by an evangelist of God--the only one who knew the facts of the situation, and the only one who knew both Sharon and myself personally--that he felt strongly I was not bound; he said, later, that as far as he was concerned I was free to marry (just what is a "decision" if not this?).

"3) The question of individual faith: I know I am not bound to Sharon; I have taught Bible classes and written biblical articles-- I am not ignorant of the Bible, and God's law, and the biblical grounds for marriage or annulment.

"4) A further question of my covenant obligations before God to my wife Aleta: I know I am bound to her, and I will not affirm to any committee anywhere on earth that I will leave her if they so decide (this, apparently, is what Dr. Zimmerman found offensive).

"5) The fact that the church, as a unified body, can render no divorce decisions--because the church is divided, confused about the biblical grounds for marriage or divorce (e.g., the disbanding of the doctrinal committee on D&R because the findings of most committee members were not palatable--nor palliating).

"6) The fact that the political atmosphere in the church influences the D&R decisions being made because people, even evangelists, are afraid to too strongly go to bat for their opinion on certain cases (where they feel the couple is not bound) for fear of arousing Mr. Herbert Armstrong's ire, if he were to hear they are "getting liberal" (because of Mr. Armstrong's private fears in this area).

"1. The politics of divorce. Let's consider the last point first. How can you, Mr. Portune, as a man who knows the political atmosphere in the church concerning divorce, take issue with my unwillingness to submit myself to a decision of the divorce committee--when the decisions of the divorce committee often reflect little more than a political compromise? Or, if you don't agree with that statement, will you at least grant that I might have cause for concern?

"Here is what well-informed sources tell me about Dr. Zimmerman's appointment as divorce co-ordinator. They say that most of the high-level people are in disagreement with, or have doubts about, the current divorce regulations. For that reason, they are pleased that Dr. Zimmerman, as opposed to one of them, was appointed as divorce co-ordinator, because they themselves could not do the job in good conscience if they had to co-ordinate the D&R decisions according to current regulations. That being the case, Mr. Portune, wouldn't I be a fool to place my future in the hands of the divorce committee?

"Let's be frank, Mr. Portune. I was told for a year and a half that there were "too many political problems over divorce" for a sound decision to be reached in my case. [Those political problems, mother, are those I listed under points 1. and 2. in the beginning of the letter.] Have these problems disappeared? No, they continue, as you know. I have discussed this issue at length with high-level people. And this is the crux of the problem, as I see it: top people are afraid to act on what they feel is right. They are afraid of antagonizing Mr. Armstrong.

"Mr. Armstrong, meanwhile, is likewise not impartial on the question of D&R--to a certain extent he is afraid. He could be afraid to face the possibility he might have been wrong all these years regarding divorce, and that he might have been responsible for breaking up hundreds of perfectly legitimate marriages. But clearly he is afraid for his son and daughter-in-law--and what would people say or what would happen to the church if they split up?

"I don't mention these personal matters because they are intrinsically any of my business (they're not), or because they have anything to do with my salvation (they don't), but because they are influencing many, many divorce decisions. Again and again I have been told "there are too many political problems". There is no way I can properly ignore these realities--because they directly affect me. I have, unwillingly, been caught in the cross-fire. I think it is a terrible injustice that Mr. Armstrong lets his personal concerns for his own family determine, in a direct way, the future of hundreds of other families.

"A recent illustration of the situation appeared in the first Sabbath service during the 1973-1974 school year. It was an orientation sermon for the new students. What subject comes up in Mr. Herbert Armstrong's sermon? Divorce and remarriage. He quotes Deut. 22:28 about a man who lies with a virgin who is not betrothed. Mr. Armstrong emphasizes strongly the latter part of the verse, "she shall be his wife . . . he may not put her away all his days". This verse has little application to entering students. But it does have application to those things on Mr. Armstrong's mind. [I might mention, mother, that when HWA quotes this verse to prove that GTA can't put away his wife because of the particular circumstances of their marriages, he is overlooking the fact that this verse is strong proof that a man could put away his wife in other circumstances. Otherwise, there would be no need to specify that in this case "he may not put her away all his days".] What is on his mind is obvious. So divorce remains a touchy subject. Therefore no one is going to intervene for any one individual case, although they may strongly disagree with either the administration of the D&R policies, or the policies themselves. Their concern (as I was clearly told) is primarily to maintain a shakey political balance regarding Mr. Ted Armstrong and his associates, by not upsetting Mr. Herbert Armstrong.

"For if they too strongly stood up for what they believed regarding a D&R situation, someone--be he Raymond Cole or whoever (acting to defend "the faith once delivered", i.e. what he has always personally believed)--might carry a message to Mr. Herbert Armstrong of what the "liberal, almost satanic" elements which surround Mr. Ted Armstrong are up to. [Those are Mr. Hill's own words, mother, that men like Raymond Cole and Hermann Hoeh look upon people like Jon Hill himself and Robert Kuhn as being "not (just) liberal, but almost Satanic". That was obviously their viewpoint, and Mr. Hill didn't have to tell me that, but he did; so this analysis is not just mine.]

"In fact, Mr Portune, I was told by high-level sources that a number would probably have no issue to take with my actions--but that no one would "for the present distress" intervene on my behalf.

~~Mr. Armstrong's personal concerns for his own family determine, in a direct way, the future of hundreds of other families.~~

19
"All right. I accept a person's right to admin. the way he feels is best. What I don't accept is the fact that I can be summarily scrapped, even disfellowshipped, so as not to cause embarrassment.

"I am too much a student of the Bible, history, sociology, and psychology to be terribly surprised, much less shocked, at the political problems that exist. But I am saddened by them. And most of all, I know that I cannot let politics dictate the way I live my life and work out my salvation.

"Can you accept, at least from my viewpoint, that it is politics that decide D&R cases? And so understand my unwillingness to commit my future to the divorce committee? If God is not the author of confusion, then how can God be the author of current decisions?

"Can I look forward to a righteous, rational decision reached in a logical manner?

"Take, for one example, the case of Norma Dennis. Norma was following the advice of the superintendent of ministers, Mr. Antion. Did that have any relationship to the treatment she received? No. First Raymond Cole declares "I'm fighting Mr. Antion on this thing", then goes around behind his back to Mr. Armstrong, and Mr. Antion almost loses his job. It all had to do with the possibility that Norma might obtain a civil divorce (remarriage not even being considered). Next Mr. Armstrong calls up Norma and--not even attempting to listen or get the facts in the situation--says he may put her out of the church if she obtains the divorce. Why did this happen? Because Mr. Armstrong is utterly devoid of human compassion? No, not at all. But rather because Mr. Armstrong was clearly not thinking about Norma (or else he would have at least bothered to find out the facts of her situation), instead he was thinking about others, not the least of whom is his daughter-in-law. Mr. Armstrong is clearly not himself when the subject of D&R comes up.

[I might interject here, mother, that the above example is especially egregious, because Norma Dennis might well have been HWA's daughter-in-law. Dick Armstrong proposed to her; she turned him down, not because she didn't want to marry Dick--she did--but because HWA had made it clear she was not welcome in his family, even embarrassing her in front of a college class. When another fellow named Bernard came to college, HWA decided he was the one for Norma. They got married, and Norma and the children practically starved for the next fifteen years--literally he provided almost nothing for the family (even though Bernard was making a good salary; he kept well fed--he weights well over 200 pounds). This is only one example of the fruits of HWA's match-making.

"2. The Biblical Teaching. Supposedly doctrinal research has made the subject of divorce and remarriage crystal-clear, and so Mr. Armstrong has written a book. Has the subject really been properly analyzed and discussed? If so, then why did the names of all members of the doctrinal committee on D&R--with the exceptions of Zimmerman, Neff, and Berg--appear on a black list Mr. Armstrong had with him on his return from England? [Names that appeared on the list included Dr. Robert Kuhn, Dr. Charles Dorothy, Dr. Earnest Martin, Gunar Freibergs, Lester Grabbe, Olin Degge, Lawson Briggs.] (This is reminiscent of the White House "enemies" list--as though our real enemies were our fellowman rather than sin, injustice, and pride.) Why was doctrinal study, that all knew was far from complete, not

allowed to continue? are we afraid to study the Bible?

THE
PAINFUL
TRUTH

[As you may know, mother, Dr. Martin resigned over this particular problem. Time magazine in its Sept. 3 issue talks about the Jerusalem Dig and says: "The originator of the program, Theology Department Chairman Ernest Martin, considers the Jerusalem dig one of the largest and most exciting archaeological active work sites in the world. 'Here the Old and New Testaments come alive for the students,' he says." It is ironic that that same week, on August 30, Dr. Martin had resigned from his job as Theology Department Chairman. In his letter of resignation to HWA he says that when they were assigned "to investigate Divorce and Remarriage, our discussions were cut off half way through the major points". He goes on to say that "when free and open discussions are not being permitted on any important biblical teaching, this becomes, to me, a very important infraction of my deepest of principles. . . . having to work within an environment which does not allow this becomes quite impossible for me". As you can see, mother, there is very little official open-mindedness around the college. The Work says to those people on the outside: "Don't believe us because we say it; check up on it and prove it to yourself"; to people in the church, the Work says: "Believe us because we say it; don't research because that is 'questioning God's truth' or 'relaying the foundation'" etc. etc. ad nauseam. The truth is, mother, if the doctrines of the church cannot stand the test of good research and careful logic, then the church is hypocritical. Dr. Martin stated that ". . . I am leaving my job because of policy differences and differences in biblical understanding."]

"The assurance of John 16:13 is that the Holy Spirit will lead us into all truth. It is an assurance that if all have the Holy Spirit, all can voluntarily come to a common understanding on the important matters. But the church is conducting no official search for truth by doctrinal research--instead the current political opinion is being imposed on all. I say "political opinion" because there are top men who think current attitudes and beliefs in the D&R area are not scriptural, yet who go along with them for political reasons.

"Actually my 'case' is completely decidable under the current regulations, which include "fraud" for religious reasons, including the situation of one eventually leaving a mate, because of unconversion at the time of marriage (e.g., the case of Jim Williams, Fayetteville, Arkansas, c. 1971). But any doubt is completely cleared up by a proper understanding of 1 Cor. 7 where Paul says an unconverted mate is sanctified only while he or she remains with a believing mate. But if the unconverted mate departs, the other is not bound. (Hod Pomeroy's case was a classical illustration of this. I mention him, because I would like you to feel personally involved enough to investigate this matter.) I have no need to expound 1 Cor. 7, because studies already exist on this subject, done by members of the doctrinal committee.

"A study of the New Testament shows that God recognizes two classes of human beings. Those with His Spirit are "alive". The rest are spiritually "dead" (Matt. 8:22; Eph. 2:1-5; 5:11, 14; Col. 2:13; Heb. 6:1; 9:14; Rom. 7:1-4; 11, 13; 8:6; 2 Cor. 2:15-16; 2 Cor. 4:11; 1 John 3:13-14; 5:16; Jude 12, 19; Rev. 3:1; 1 Pet. 4:6; 1 Cor. 7:14). Paul judged in 1 Cor. 7 that a marriage may be lawfully annulled by the 'death' of an unbeliever occasioned by his/her breaking the marriage covenant relationship with the believing mate. The unbeliever, having been viewed by God up to that point as in a

(2)

(21)

sanctified (set apart) state because of the believing mate (v. 14), by his/her own volition decides to end the covenant relationship. In doing so, he/she renders himself/herself "unclean" (no longer set apart to carry out God's will in any way) and "dead". The believer would not be enslaved in such a case and would be loosed to marry any believer whom she/he desires (cf. vss. 15, 39). She/he would not be allowed to enter again in an unequally yoked relationship with an unbeliever (2 Cor. 6:14).

"But there exists today no free and open discussion of this biblical subject. How can I trust my salvation to a committee which seems more intent, for the present, on preserving tradition than in uncovering the biblical foundation for righteous decisions under the New Covenant? Perhaps your viewpoint is different, but can you understand mine? I would think that it is easier to live with the D&R situation "for the present distress" if you don't happen to be a D&R "case". Remember, I am not telling others how to act, or passing judgment on them; rather, my great sin has been in having an opinion about my own personal situation. I hope you can appreciate that turning my future over to a committee would be high folly, considering the circumstances.

"3. I did get a church decision. A divorce committee can only render decisions on the basis of a few scribbled facts on paper, usually about people they don't know, and often have never seen. First the reality of a person's life is boiled down to a few pages--the write-up of the case. Then a committee member, with his preconceptions, bias, etc., sets out to reconstruct that reality in his own mind, all from these few pages written by someone else, in order to come to a "decision" about that case. As the basis for his decision, he uses scriptures which may or may not be clear to him, and whose application to the case at hand may or may not be clear-cut.

"Is it not possible that something gets lost in the translation? It is a fact that opposite decisions have been made in what turned out to be identical D&R situations, as you well know.

"Mr. Jon Hill knows me personally. He knows Sharon. He performed the wedding ceremony. He (along with Mr. Al Carrozzo) was involved in the events of my case as they transpired. His knowledge of the situation is vastly greater than anyone else could even hope to have. He is not limited to scribblings on paper for his understanding. He has plainly said that I am not bound. (I am told that Mr. Carrozzo believes the same.) This is a church decision based on knowledge and first-hand experience.

"So what does a committee have to do with my situation? At the committee level, in current circumstances, politics enter the scene.

"Mr. Herbert Armstrong has written about the fallacy of letting politics rule one's life--and that there are times not to follow a committee. The following quotes are from the February 1939 GOOD NEWS, article "Did Christ Reorganize the Church?"

"We must be continually ON OUR GUARD, never trusting any man, or even a board or group of men, but God alone, thru His Holy Word!" (Page 1, emphasis Mr. Armstrong's throughout.)

22

"Church authority was given ancient Israel, but: "Israel was DIVORCED! This cut off the GOVERNMENT, the ORGANIZATION, from among God's people, and TURNED IT OVER TO THE GENTILES FOR 2520 LONG YEARS-- until the very present generation!" (p. 2)

"Jesus' disciples understood that the KINGDOM, with all authority to GOVERN, whether civil or church government, had been taken away from His people, and turned over to Gentiles. You'll remember how they asked Him, "Lord wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" (Acts 1:6). But He did NOT restore it, then. He did NOT bring the government, the organization, the authority to rule, back from the Gentiles to His people! Consequently He did NOT reorganize His people, or establish any government, ecclesiastical or civil, among them! This the New Testament Scriptures, also, abundantly prove!" (p. 3)

"First, did Christ ever set up an ORGANIZATION, with its boards of HEAD MEN, with authority to GOVERN over the "spiritual affairs," or the "FINANCIAL AFFAIRS" of the Church?" (p. 3)

"Answer: "There is not one single HINT in the New Testament of any Church BOARD with authority to rule, to govern, to decide doctrine, or to handle tithes and church finances (the whole church)." (p. 5)

"All authority and power to rule is limited solely to each LOCAL congregation. But there is NO BIBLE AUTHORITY for any super-government, or organization with authority over the local congregations!" (p. 5)

"Thus it was CONSTANTINE--the "BEAST"--who injected and introduced into the church the idea of a BOARD to decide doctrine, and to rule.

"Thus it was that CONSTANTINE made doctrine, as decided by a higher-up BOARD, the basis of fellowship and unity in the Church!

"Jesus never said "By this shall all men KNOW that ye are my disciples--if ye all speak the same thing the BOARD OF THE TWELVE vote on." That is the policy of some today--but it is NOT BIBLE POLICY! Jesus said we should be known to be in the true Church IF WE HAVE LOVE one to another! And doctrine has only brought STRIFE!

"In the next century, came the PAPACY in full bloom, starting the idea that the CHURCH is an ORGANIZATION having CHURCH GOVERNMENT!" (p. 6)

". . . the "BEAST" injected the idea of church BOARDS to decide what doctrines the rest of the church must believe. And thus the very PRINCIPLE of CHURCH GOVERNMENT becomes THE IMAGE OF THE BEAST!

"The whole thing is FALSE! It is NOT ACCORDING TO THE BIBLE! It is part of BABYLON! Those who are IN, and MEMBERS of such an organized church government, submitting to doctrines declared by unscriptural boards as a fellowship test, are IN BABYLON, and actually worshippers of THE IMAGE OF THE BEAST!" (p. 6)

"The New Testament Church is not a kingdom--not a church government --but an assembly of individuals CALLED OUT--Spirit-filled individuals, and therefore a SPIRITUAL ORGANISM, not an organization." (p. 7)

"The CHURCH is God's instrumentality thru which, and in which, He is selecting a people for His name--gathering OUT of 'babylon'-- OUT of worldly ways, worldly organizations, various individuals-- one here, and one there--to repentance. faith in Christ. receiving of

and being led by the Holy Spirit, thus having HIS LAWS written in their minds and hearts--living, individually, a life of trial and test, of OVERCOMING, that they may be thus fitted and trained for positions as kings or priests in the KINGDOM OF GOD, after Christ's second coming!" (p. 7)

"And this MARRIAGE will not be made with some one organization! It is THE INDIVIDUAL SAINTS--not some organization--which shall possess the government, and rule (Dan. 7:18; Rev. 2:26-27; 3:21, etc.)" (p. 7)

"What has split and divided up the saints in the Church of God? Nothing but ORGANIZATION--which has led to politics, ministers lusting for rule and for power--striving against each other, lining up the brethren on THEIR side, against the other! It is SUCH PREACHERS who have split up and divided our brethren!" (p. 7)

[I hardly need to point out that that last quote, mother, describes very accurately what is going on in the Worldwide Church of God today. HWA's article says: a. That if I go along with the Divorce Committee's decision, I am worshipping the Beast. b. Salvation is an individual matter, and has nothing to do with whether I belong to some organization

[Now, mother, the first thing someone is going to say is that that "old" article is totally wrong. Whoever says that a. Cuts his own throat--for if HWA was wrong in that article, then he was not only wrong but totally and utterly wrong, since he said that church government--which today the Church says is holy, righteous, ordained of God, and is to be obeyed with fear and trembling--that church government is the image of the Beast. And if HWA was totally and utterly wrong in so important a matter as church government, then HWA can be equally wrong regarding divorce and remarriage, and a host of other doctrines. b. Whoever claims that article is wrong, also condemns this Church at its origin, for if HWA was wrong in that article, then HWA's flagrant rebellion against the church in what he was teaching, in taking people's tithes, etc., cannot be covered by a biblical excuse that there is no church authority, except the Beast's.

[In fact, mother, this is a typical example of an overall syndrome in the work. The Church writes very strong articles concerning various doctrines which it teaches, using vast amounts of Scripture in doing so, to "prove" its points--while it is convenient to believe that doctrine. In this case, HWA was defending his position against "Sardis" ministers. But then when circumstances or economics make it easier to believe something else, something else is taught, with just as many scriptures, and the previous position is conveniently forgotten. HWA later found it much easier to believe in Church authority, when he had his own church, and when he was the authority. The point is, mother is not that scriptural reasons induced us to change our position regarding church authority, or to modify our position, nor was it the case that we were uncertain about church authority and needed to study it further and then finally came to "see" the truth--all that had nothing to do with it. On one hand, HWA was ABSOLUTELY DOGMATICALLY CERTAIN that church government was the image of the Beast; and then later, he was JUST AS ABSOLUTELY DOGMATICALLY CERTAIN that church government was one of the most important truths God had revealed to us.

[One thing for certain: there is no real search for truth involved in all this.]

"4. My faith. I am assuming that Heb. 11 for example is still part of the Bible and that it is still true that a Christian lives by faith--not by blind obedience (if obedience at all costs is the criterion of a true Christian, then officials in the Nazi government of Hitler, and U.S. officials involved in Watergate must be recognized as church members in good standing). . . . 12

"... [Am I bound to Sharon?] I had to know. I could not have accepted a decision from the church that I was not--if I thought I was. . . . The issues involved where my personal faith was concerned were AS CRUCIAL AS THOSE INVOLVED IN BAPTISM. I am not bound to Sharon. That is a conviction at the root and core of my faith. If I am willing to throw away that knowledge and belief to please someone else, then there is no extent to which I will not compromise with my beliefs: in which case it doesn't make any difference whether I claim to be in the church or not--for my "membership" would not mean anything: I would not stand for anything. Sharon is simply not my wife, and I have lived according to my absolute belief since that time. . . .

"5. Aleta is my wife. What more is there to say? I asked Dr. Zimmerman what would he do if the church told him to leave his wife. (It was a sincere question.) He said that he had "already made that decision. I would leave her." He paused, then added, "If I was sure." The latter statement, from my point of view, is a huge qualification.

[Of course Dr. Zimmerman is the type of person who, in order "to be right with God" would leave his wife, and would for the same reasons have no qualms about destroying someone else's family. As John Portune said, referring to people of his type (in specific reference to Raymond Cole and Charles Hunting), "These men would have, if they had lived in the Middle Ages, have taken part in burning witches at the stake for heresy, burning their bodies in order to save their souls." The book of I John points out that one loves God by loving his neighbour. But these men, in service to God, hate their neighbour, and call it "righteousness". It is a common religious phenomena. To quote from Tomorrow's World (my own article): "Few people, when they are baptized, or when they adopt some church as their own, feel it necessary to get rid of their own preconceived religious opinions. Few approach Scripture with the approach of 'correct my misconceptions'. Rather, like ancient Israel, they simply 'choose new gods' (Jud. 5:8). Look at history. Long centuries of man's conflicting ideas of 'God' have demonstrated that each nation gives to its god its peculiar characteristics, and every individual gives to his god his personal characteristics. One observer noted: 'Each nation has created a god, and the god has always resembled his creators. He hated and loved what they hated and loved, and he was invariably found on the side of those in power. Every god was intensely patriotic, and detested all nations but his own . . .'" In the same way, HWA's god has hated church authority when HWA hated church authority, and loved church authority when HWA loved church authority. And HWA's god feels about divorce and remarriage exactly the same way HWA does. What the Bible says is something else again.]

"It is strange that the church could care less about my marital or sex life for a year-and-a-half, but suddenly when I marry Aleta it gets highly concerned, apparently excited by the faintest whiff of possible adultery. Somehow I get the impression of eager exponents of the Protestant-Puritan ethic which believes that the Seventh is the greatest of all Commandments, greater than all the others combined, and so possible violations must be checked out with the greatest care, but who meanwhile couldn't care less about justice, mercy, and faith. This is just a fleeting impression, and of course is not true, but . . . you explain the phenomenon.

"6. Am I a biblical illiterate and such a complete slob who is to be dismissed with a curt "he disagrees--fire him, disfellowship him"? Perhaps. Nevertheless, I have taught Bible classes at Ambassador College; I wrote articles for Tomorrow's World; including a popular feature News of the Work which presented the Work to around 2,000,000 people. And so on. [You may have noticed that the November issue of the new GOOD NEWS came out with my name listed as a contributing editor--the same week I was terminated. Dr. Zimmerman was also made a contributing editor. But, as Dr. Kuhn mentioned to me a long time ago, "Power in this organization depends on one thing: access to Mr. Armstrong." So Dr. Zimmerman runs the Divorce show. (Sort of like a TV series: "Divorce Game"--"Who will win a divorce on our show today?")] This doesn't make me any less a sinner, but I would think that when Dr. Zimmerman talked to me he would have had the courtesy to have asked at least ONCE what were my reasons for my actions, and then would have carefully considered them before forming an opinion. Instead, I was treated like a schoolboy. And the only thing that Dr. Zimmerman wanted to know was if I would abide by a committee decision if it meant leaving Aleta. "No?--then you're not in the church and I see no reason to even consider your case, . . ."

"Mr. Portune, we were asked to pray for your wife when she had her accident. I did so. But, if your wife had been treated in the same spirit as this "case" has been, she might well have been put out of the church for negligence. My accident was in not getting an "official" (?) decision from the church, though I tried to get just that for a year-and-a-half. Now the church is going to punish me for not getting the decision it wouldn't grant. . . ."

"I do have authority over my own life. David didn't take action to remove King Saul of ancient Israel (the oft-cited example, to demonstrate that it is God's duty to correct the church leadership, and only God's). But, on the other hand, David lived his own life. . . . he didn't sit around forever waiting for Saul to tell him what to do.

"I'm sorry that it causes pain to others that I have a personal opinion about this crucial area of my own life, and a personal regard for my wife Aleta. Let me add that he who attempts to come between me and my wife blasphemes God and makes a mockery of the Holy Spirit. God will repay such a man personally in his family the evil he has thought to do to me and my family.

"I have very high regard for you, Mr. Portune. I am sorry to be writing you a letter like this."

And that's the end of the letter.

THE PAINFUL TRUTH

26

I was amazed, mother, at your gnostic repudiation of the physical, and affirmation of the impending End ("Things are changing quite rapidly now in many places. The daily news leaves one in wonder! Brings to mind how temporary this physical life really is. We surely can't put any stakes upon it."). So I think it might be appropriate to make some remarks about the time of the end, and the Worldwide Church of God's analysis of world news "according to Bible prophecy".

To start with a concrete example, recent issues of the Plain Truth have proclaimed the Catholic Church as the force that will shortly unite all Europe. The logic and research is incredibly bad: 1) The bulk of those same articles has been taken up with the problems and divisions in the Catholic Church itself! It is ridiculous to suppose that this chaotic church organization is going to unite Europe. 2) The very basic assumption is erroneous: supposedly a Pope who "carries a big stick" and who "will crack down on" church members will unify the church, and then enable the church to unify Europe. Do you know why the Catholic Church is undergoing such a crisis, mother? Because Pope Paul is too authoritarian, too inflexible. Pope John was much more lenient, and started to draw the church back together. But Pope Paul, with all his straight-and-narrow one-way-of-doing-things inflexibility, his "big stick", is what is bringing the church to the verge of revolt. 3) Religion never united anything! Two things have historically brought about unions: a. military force b. common economic interests. It is economics, common monetary interests, that is slowly uniting Europe. For the sake of trade the European nations are gradually foregoing some of their personal nationalistic interests, because it is to their advantage to do so. But religion? Religion in Europe is at an all time low, and any religious revival would only divide the countries again into Catholic and Protestant and different warring, fighting sects.

Alan Watts describes the latter process well: "Religions are divisive and quarrelsome. They are a form of one-upmanship because they depend upon separating the 'saved' from the 'damned', the true believers from the heretics, the in-group from the out-group. Even religious liberals play the game of 'we're-more-tolerant-than-you'. Furthermore, as systems of doctrine, symbolism, and behavior, religions harden into institutions that must command loyalty, be defended and kept 'pure' . . ."

4) The whole analysis is based--not on a true and honest evaluation of what is really happening in the world--but a biased, pre-conceived "I-already-know-what-is-going-to-happen" opinion, which forces world news to fit in a pre-fabricated framework. Listen, the whole News Bureau is little more than a Department of Self-Fulfilled Prophecy. The people there basically depend upon newspapers (the worst source, because of necessity they are put together and printed on a 24-hour basis). What a person does is clip out the sections he thinks fulfill prophecy, and then ignores the rest which might modify or contradict his clippings. He does this daily until he has a whole file of clippings that prove, say, that pestilence is going to sweep the country the following month. Of these clippings, he quotes only the "important" parts (the parts that "prove" his point). Remember the neo-Nazi party? They got 3% or so of the vote in a German election, and the PT ran reports of this startling development (the "news behind the news")--meanwhile ignoring the other 97% of the votes! The vote level rose to 6% for neo-Nazi's! The PT went wild!! Then the neo-Nazi's began going down hill. The PT reported nothing of this. The whole idea was based on the belief that the Nazis had gone underground in Germany. You got the picture of warlords in subterranean caverns (some people's conception of the word "underground") who were gathered around tables discussing master plans to destroy the United

States. Of course when this, like a dozen other basic ideas, turned (27) out to be wrong, people totally forgot what they had said, or perhaps privately admitted a mistake (but no printed retractions, or up-dates on the latest developments!--but they continue to follow the same way of interpreting world news: i.e., not analyzing the news, but rather forcing the news to fit into their pre-conceived prophetic schemes.

5) The story on the Catholic Church was run in the first place because HWA has said for years and years that the Roman Catholic Church is the great whore of Revelation 17. Where did HWA get this idea? From 19th century Protestant commentaries on Revelation. It is simply the old phenomena of people finding their enemies associated with the Devil in the Bible, while they themselves are clearly revealed to be on God's side.

We claim to let the Bible interpret the Bible, and the Bible clearly identified the harlot, not as a false church, but as a CITY.

a. The comparison is the woman of Revelation 17 with the ancient city of Babylon. Rev. 17:1; the whore "sitteth upon many waters"; Jer. 51:13 (JV) Babylon "dwellest upon many waters". Rev. 17:2: "With whom the kings of the earth have committed fornication, and the inhabitants of the earth have been made drunk with the wine of her fornications"; Jer. 51:7: "Babylon hath been a golden cup in the LORD's hand, that made the earth drunken; The nations have drunk of her wine, Therefore the nations are mad". Rev. 17:4 "a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication"; Jer. 51:7 "A golden cup in the LORD's hand that made the earth drunken".

b. Verse 5 says that on her forehead "was written a name of mystery: Babylon the great . . ." (RSV). The structure of the Greek passage allows the word "mystery" to be either a part of the title itself ("Mystery Babylon . . .," as in KJV) or as part of the introductory words ("a name of mystery") as in RSV quoted here. It is simpler to understand it as introducing the title, "a name of mystery," meaning that the title is not necessarily to be taken literally, but spiritually as in 11:8 where Jerusalem is "spiritually called Sodom and Egypt". (So the interpretation would be that the capital city of the beast is meant--Rome--of which Babylon is the spiritual archetype.)

c. In Rev. 17:18, the woman is specifically designated as a city: "the woman that thou sawest is that great CITY, which reigneth over the kings of the earth".

d. Rev. 18:2 continuing in context uses the same title as Rev. 17, "Babylon the great". It "is fallen", an expression used of a city or nation (not a church).

e. Rev. 18:3 repeats Rev. 17:2: "All nations have drunk of the wine of her fornication, and the kings of the earth have committed fornication with her, and the merchants of the earth are waxed rich through the abundance of her delicacies." This is descriptive of a city or nation, not a church. It is the same description of the whore in 17:2, which is called a city in 17:18. The description of the city-whore thus continues here in Rev. 18.

f. Rev. 18:9-21 is without any question a thorough description of a great mercantile city with whom the kings have committed "fornication" (v.9) by their commerce (fol. verses).

g. The style of the book of Revelation reflects rough Hebraic Greek. The author is clearly, from the style and the O.T. allusions, saturated in the Old Testament. There are many grammatical and syntactical irregularities. The Revelation is thoroughly rooted in the Old Testament (not in Paul's epistles, which HWA tries to use to show a false church is meant). Notice the use of the analogy of the "harlot" (whore) and her "fornication" (merchandise) in the Old Testament

and her

"fornication"

in the Old Testament

THE
PAINFUL
TRUTH

In the O.T., the metaphor of adultery ($\mu\omicron\upsilon\chi\epsilon\iota\omicron$) was frequently used of the nation Israel as God's faithless wife who had proved unfaithful by turning to false gods. (Hos. 3:1 fol; 2:4 fol; 4:12 fol; Jer. 2:1; 5:7; 9:1; 13:22, 26 fol.; Eze. 16:32, 37; 23:37, 43, 45).

Sometimes Israel's sin is also described in terms of harlotry ($\eta\omicron\pi\omicron\rho\epsilon\iota\omicron$): "How the faithful city has become a harlot" (Isa. 1:21; see Jer. 2:20; 3:1; Ezek. 16:15; Hos. 2:5; 3:3; 4:15).

The metaphor of harlotry is used also of heathen nations. Tyre is called a city who "will play the harlot with all the kingdoms of the world upon the face of the earth" (Isa. 23:17). The idea here is not one of spiritual faithlessness, but of the prostitution of every-thing to commercial gain. (Again, this applies to a city or nation--not a church.) Ninevah is described as a harlot (Nah. 3:4) because of the way she enticed weaker nations by her display of power and splendor only to scorn and enslave them.

Here in Rev. 17, the harlot is spiritual Babylon, the symbol of human civilization, "the city which has dominion over the kings of the earth" (verse 18), Rome.

I use this as one example of the Worldwide Church of God's (WCG) misuse of the Bible, on one hand, and general intellectual dishonesty, on the other hand. The purpose of my relating to you all this, mother, is to explain very clearly my feelings about the Worldwide Church of God. As I have said, it was conveyed to me that it was almost totally ^{CAUTION} that I would be put out of the church for marrying Aleta. And I couldn't care less. Because there is something fundamentally wrong with the WCG: 1) The WCG is in basic error in a strictly Biblical framework in not following the truth on basic points and not being open to change; 2) The WCG is in basic error from a broader standpoint in the general search for philosophical truth.

The political chaos that reigns with the WCG organization is only a reflection of the doctrinal chaos that exists. To give you an understanding of exactly what I mean, I have already given you some of the picture. I will approach this systematically; 1) Political problems; 2) Areas of Common Biblical Questions; 3) General.

I. Political problems. Despite all the co-worker letters, the Worldwide Church of God News, the announcements in church, etc., the Work is NOT going forward in greater power and greater harmony than ever before. This is pure propaganda. Propaganda is a strong word--but don't forget that I have long worked in editorial areas, and I know what I am talking about.

AUGUST 21, 197L (BY AL CORROZO)

Here are some of the feelings that exist around Headquarters, as given to HWA in an official report entitled "Employee Frustrations at Headquarters". These are NOT just gripes and complaints--people are sincere, they have sacrificed, yet they can't forever ignore the reality they see around them. This report was made about a year ago--and things have not really improved since then.

"As the eyes and ears of the Headquarters churches, we feel it is our responsibility to report on matters of major importance.

THE PAINFUL TRUTH

(29)

"There is a widespread feeling of discontent toward the ministry and a growing frustration about the Work. The problem has been building up during the past year or so and is epitomized by a simple comment from a sincere woman in the Glendale Church: 'There seems to be so much confusion and uncertainty in the Work. The ministers act like they don't care about the people anymore. They seem to be more concerned about themselves, their cars, their homes, and their positions.'

"End of the Work: Despite everything we have said, people really did set their hearts on 1972 being the end of the Work. Now that January 7, 1972 is past, people are wondering how much time is left. People are questioning the validity of Mr. Armstrong's repeated emphasis on "the gun lap", "the final phase of the Work", "the last push", etc. They are asking, "Are we really in the gun lap?" "Is this really the final phase of the Work?" "What does Mr. Armstrong mean when he says the Work is beginning all over again?"

"Credibility: Questions and comments from numerous people indicate an erosion of confidence in what Mr. Armstrong says from the pulpit and in Co-Worker and Member letters.

"The ordeal involving Mr. Armstrong's explanation for Mr. Ted Armstrong's leave of absence gave rise to much of the initial comment about a credibility gap between Mr. Armstrong and the brethren and Co-Workers. People noted the progressive unveiling of the story--with each Co-Worker letter generating more questions than answers--and were only sure that they still did not know what had happened or what to believe.

"Many people have expressed their resentment at what they feel is Mr. Armstrong's condescending 'dumb-sheep' approach to the Headquarters congregation.

"They understand that at times Mr. Armstrong tries to encourage them by his optimistic approach to a given situation. However, they say that this approach often produces the opposite effect and creates a widening credibility gap.

"For example, many comments were made about the Bible Study in which Mr. Armstrong read the letters received in response to the Time magazine article regarding Mr. Ted Armstrong. Mr. Armstrong read many letters which were very positive toward the Work and very negative toward Time. He made the comment that these exemplified the vast majority and that only a very few letters were critical of the Work. Afterwards, there were many concerned comments from employees in the Mail Department who said that the majority of the letters were critical of the Work.

"A similar situation arose with reference to Mr. Armstrong's comments on the Conrad Comeau tape [he was one of the original pilots]. Afterwards, those people who had heard the tape themselves were disturbed that Mr. Armstrong had stated that the tape was a total fabrication from beginning to end. [It wasn't--I read the script of the tape]

"Many continue to express their concern over the emphasis in sermons on buildings, trips, skirt lengths, and men's hair styles. People say that these issues are minor when compared with the uncertainty about the future of the Work. Even more concern is ex-

pressed over the so-called 'conflicts' in sermons between Mr. Armstrong and Mr. Ted Armstrong. . . .

30

"People do not understand Mr. Armstrong's comments about him setting the example of self-sacrifice. They say it is difficult to empathize with him when he says that he is the heaviest contributor to the Work [which supplies all his expenses!], that he has only a minimal bank account, that he owns practically nothing--no home, no cars, etc. [The college owns the home and the car. HWA as President and Chancellor "uses" them. This is convenient, because the college thus pays the maintenance costs, the property taxes, etc.]

"Some are wondering if Mr. Armstrong is living in the past. They say he gives repetitive sermons and Bible Studies from old outlines and makes comments that are out-dated and obsolete.

"Many people are saying that Mr. Armstrong is out of touch with the Work. They claim he is gone so much of the time that he can't possibly know what is going on here at Headquarters.

"Some have remarked that Mr. Armstrong's approach, style, and content in booklets and advertisements, while perfectly attuned to the 1930's, 40's and 50's, are out-dated, antiquated, and obsolete in the 70's.

"Increasing comments have been heard regarding contradictions in prophecy. Perhaps the most oft-repeated credibility gap in the area of prophecy concerns the assertion by Messrs. Armstrong after the Rohan incident, that we have never said that a literal temple had to be built in Jerusalem. Yet many members have quoted the June 1967, March 1968, and especially the September 1968 issues of The PLAIN TRUTH--all of which said that there must be a literal temple in Jerusalem--and not some other "temple" in some other areas. (Some religious publications have had articles on this subject.)

THE PAINFUL TRUTH

HWA LIES

"People also wonder about our claims that Britain would not get into the Common Market. And our repeated use of Amos 3:7 (that God will reveal His secrets unto His servants the prophets) is contrasted with Mr. Armstrong's assertion (as stated in the February 1972 TW editorial) that he is not a prophet.

"Finally, many people are beginning to talk more freely about Mr. Armstrong's 'exaggerations'. They wonder among each other if the latest trip around the world really was the 'most important ever'.

"Many say they are aware that Mr. Gotoh sets up Mr. Armstrong's appointments with world leaders, and they feel it is not really true when Mr. Armstrong says he has never sought to meet with any of them. Some ask why Mr. Armstrong implies that these leaders are seeking an audience with him.

"Some of our employees in the academic area are a bit embarrassed about our claims of a Department of Asian Studies, our granting of certain graduate degree and other programs they feel are sub-standard.

"Some feel Mr. Armstrong is stretching the point when he makes such statements as the Ambassador College Press is the second biggest press west of Chicago [it's not], the Glendale Symphony is better than the L.A. Philharmonic, we have the most radio stations, the finest buildings, etc. . . .

"People have openly expressed disappointment about the response to the Reader's Digest ads. They have said they were led to believe and really felt it was going to be the biggest door ever opened to the Work. Now they question Mr. Armstrong's original use of Reader's Digest to justify the January 7th date, ending the second 19-year time cycle. (31)

"The statement Mr. Armstrong made in the TW about the gospel being preached to all the world as of January 1972 provoked a lot of comment from the people at Headquarters. They question Mr. Armstrong's statement that we could not say we had reached all the world before January, 1972, but suddenly [very conveniently!], at the end of the second 19-year time cycle, Matt. 24:14 was fulfilled.....

"Affluence: Some few Headquarters employees have begun to freely express resentment over the necessity of having to subject their families to sub-standard living conditions in order to support the affluent atmosphere of Ambassador College.

"These people now say that it is hard for them to equate 'doing the Work' with big cars, expense accounts, subsidized housing (some of which is in the \$200-\$300,000 class), first-class trips, diamond rings, fur coats, etc. for top executives.

"These employees say that the sermons about around-the-world trips, Steuben crystal, presidential suites, the virtues of carpeting, drapery, onyx, etc. of the multi-million dollar auditorium have come to sound brittle and irrelevant. They say it is difficult to appreciate how God loves such extravagant beauty and quality at Ambassador College when they must go home to little beauty and no quality.

"The Elite: People have characterized the social structure at Headquarters as almost a caste system which has its 'elite'. They say 'the elite' is comprised of all the Evangelists, some Pastors, and some few favored top men such as Stanley Rader, Jack Elliott, Art Ferdig, Dr. Lochner, etc., plus some of Mr. Armstrong's relatives.

"Some complain that these people receive the biggest salaries, new cars, big homes, all-expense-paid trips abroad, and other fringe benefits. People feel some of these men barely do their jobs and virtually never do anything 'above and beyond'.

"The complaint is that they never sacrifice, but rather they wait for the hunting season in Colorado, golf in Australia, skiing in Squaw Valley, etc. Some have joked about the playboy country-club atmosphere of Big Sandy. They claim it is a playground for Mr. GTA and his elite.

"The resentment about the elite is that they receive preferential treatment--physically, financially, and spiritually, such as special gifts from third tithe, first choice to athletic facilities, Imperial Schools, etc. Some have said the elite receive top jobs, regardless of whether or not they are qualified (e.g. Wayne Cole).

"It is almost a matter of common knowledge that there is a growing lack of respect for God's ministry among Headquarters employees due to what are considered 'the special privileges of this special group'.

THE PAINFUL TRUTH

"Opinions are heard that many ministers neither recently serve the people nor devote themselves to Bible study--but nonetheless still have to be honored as superior human beings with great perception and biblical understanding. The Biblical understanding of the average minister is almost a laughing matter.

"Change: People are saying that they are perplexed by repeated changes they don't fully understand. Some say they don't know why we changed from a religious approach to a secular approach and then back to a religious approach again. They ask why we went from the PT magazine, to a PT-TW combination, and then back to PT only. One man noted that the same reasons were given for each change. [!]

"The complaint about changes in men's hair styles and women's skirt lengths have been quite vociferous. People say they are confused by the continuous changes in policy regarding these issues.

"Concerning the rapidity of personnel changes, there was a joke going around campus recently that when people left their office they would say to their secretary: 'If my boss calls, please get his name!' Some overall comments were made about the stability of an organization which has so many major personnel changes, new and complicated organizational charts constantly appearing on the scene, lines of authority altered regularly, and a plethora of musical chairs on the lower level.

"Power Politics: The top executive level is pictured by some as a perpetual political power struggle. People are saying that no one really has the authority to make decisions of any consequence. They say real decisions must rise to Mr. Armstrong's level where they bog down. This situation exists, they say, because Mr. Armstrong doesn't trust anyone.

". . . . Some say we have management by 'image' rather than merit or competency. They ask why ministers have to be in charge of every department. Don't non-ordained men have any brains at all? Does ordination make a man some kind of all-encompassing expert?

"Questions About Mr. SSR: Mr. Stanley Rader is thought to be the most influential man in the Work. People question Mr. Rader's ultimate motivation in the Work. An oft-repeated question is: Why have Messrs. Rader and Cornwall become so intimately involved with the machinery of the Work? Wonderment about Mr. Rader's financial control of the Work is spreading, and displeasure over his total control of all media and virtually all outsiders is resented.

"Our people wonder--and ask--why does Mr. Armstrong willingly surround himself with unconverted people?

"Biblical Knowledge: Repeated comments are heard that the Work is no longer biblically oriented on a day-to-day basis--and that corporate and personal interests have overshadowed the Bible.

"People state that God's ministry has publicly taught virtually nothing new from the Bible in the past 10 years other than the spirit-in-man. In the area of prophecy, some say that we actually know less today than we thought [important word!] we knew 15 years ago.

"An increasing number of people have become disinterested in Bible Study and Sabbath services. Responsibility for this is laid at the feet of the ministry, who, it is said, lack Biblical interest,

THE PAINFUL TRUTH

(33)

enthusiasm and the knowledge and understanding. Comments like 'the same old subjects are presented from the same old points of view' have been heard. People say that repetitive use of old outlines is obvious.

"People feel that even many ministers in the Work have serious and profound questions about one or more of our doctrines and are looking for a proper opportunity to be able to fully express their feelings.

"It is felt that an alarming number of the doctrinal questions coming from critical individuals outside the Church--and even sincere individuals within the Church--are so penetrating that they can no longer be answered fully by God's ministers.

[Let me interject here that the Worldwide Church of God criticizes any and everyone freely, whether justified or not, whether correct or not, and where the person criticizing is qualified to know what he is talking about or not. This is done continually in the PT, GN, etc. etc. BUT . . . let a man write a critical article about us and suddenly we are screaming "persecution!" Persecution!!! An old proverb says that turnabout is fair play. The point is, is what we say, or what they say, TRUE.]

"There is an increasing number of booklets and reprint articles which have been 'killed'--for example, divorce and remarriage and healing. Our people want to know why!

"Even some basic booklets are known to contain error. For example, in 'The Proof of the Bible' booklet, it is said that New Tyre and Babylon could never be built upon. But some have heard that there are hundreds of people living in large, permanent dwellings within the walls of ancient Babylon, and that the whole island of New Tyre has now been completely developed. . . .

"Conclusion: . . . Many people feel we are in real trouble. Most are waiting for Mr. Armstrong to 'do something'."

What Mr. Armstrong had in fact done is to assure people with the authority of his office that everything is lovely, crying Peace, Peace, when there is no peace. (To use Jeremiah's words.) Ezekiel would liken him to one of those fools who whitewash a crumbling wall because they cannot face its ugly cracks (Ezek. 13:8-16; 22:28).

II. Areas of Common Biblical Questions. The amount and extent of doctrinal confusion and error and uncertainty within the church is incredible. What is even more incredible is the fact that any and all efforts at doing something about the lacks, mistakes, problems, by organized and careful research has been systematically opposed.

For years Dr. Hoeh represented scholarship in the Church. We all looked at him as the ultimate in scholarship, brilliant. And all along, it has become clear, Dr. Hoeh has been intellectually dishonest. I think the beginning of this was in college when Hermann Hoeh came to a point where he was about to leave college over the issue of whether Israel departed from Egypt on the night of the Passover (and hence the Passover and the night to be much observed, or much remembered are one and the same night), or whether they departed on the next night (in which case these are two separate nights). In a letter to Robert Neitsch, Dr. Hoeh said that Marion McNair had "explained" the principle to him. What Marion McNair explained, I don't know, but anyway Dr.

THE
PAINFUL
TRUTH

Hoeh decided he was right. (I.e. that Israel departed not on the night of the Passover, but the next night.) In other words, Dr. Hoeh by research had come to see the strong evidence that Israel departed on the night of the Passover, but decided contrary to the evidence that HWA must be right. All of Dr. Hoeh's research since then has been oriented to "prove" that our current doctrines all are right. In other words, instead of letting the facts fall where they may, he assumes we already have the truth, and then does his research, keeping all the facts that support our position, and rejecting all the facts that don't support our position. (34)

You have heard Dr. Hoeh tell how the Jews "changed" the Passover, from one night to the next night. Now, mother, you can look through a thousand reference sources and never find any hint that the Jews did this. If the Jews had changed the night of the Passover, the Talmud would be full of the arguments of rabbi's over whether the date should have been changed or not. There would have been religious schisms, some accepting the new date, some keeping the old one. And so on. The truth is: this supposed Passover change is a fiction created by Dr. Hoeh. Why did Dr. Hoeh create this fiction? Because, having decided HWA was right about the Passover and Night to be Much Observed being different nights, Dr. Hoeh had to create this fiction in order to explain away some of the New Testament passages. Namely those passages which show that the Passover Christ kept was the night before (almost a full 24 hours) the Passover the Jews held that year. (Now, mother, if Christ is our passover, and if the OT passover looked forward to Christ, isn't it logical that Christ died on the same night that the OT passover was held? Of course. Therefore, Christ's last supper was held the previous night, then Christ was taken, beaten all night, hung on a stake the next day, and died that afternoon or evening when the Jews were slaying the passover lamb.) More on this later.

This is the point: having decided that HWA is inspired and is therefore already right, Dr. Hoeh manipulates the evidence to give an air of scholarship supporting HWA. This, of course, is a convenient relationship, because HWA is thus God's apostle, and Dr. Hoeh is his chief interpreter. Or as Al Carozzo says, "Dr. Hoeh has made HWA into the Protestant Pope, and he--Dr. Hoeh--is his prophet."

Others, of course, join Dr. Hoeh in the total resistance to any changes. But if it turns out that the church was wrong all these years in a matter, it is Dr. Hoeh's scholarship that has been defective, while others, not being scholars, don't have any scholarship to defend. Because these others have simply accepted that HWA "must be right". Dr. Hoeh has also done that, but has claimed to verify HWA through scholarship. So if it turns out that the church was wrong, then Dr. Hoeh's academic tower of babilon will be undermined and wrecked, and Dr. Hoeh will have nothing to show for his efforts the past 25 years but a pile of ruins. Obviously Dr. Hoeh isn't going to let that happen.

In fact, mother, Dr. Hoeh is always on hand to remind HWA of the "inspired" statements he made in the past, statements which Dr. Hoeh has accepted as inspired (which might have been off-handed comments of HWA's, and therefore ones which HWA would never remember). Dr. Hoeh will say, "Well, Mr. Armstrong, as you have always said . . ." Dr. Hoeh thus uses Mr. Armstrong to canonize Dr. Hoeh's ideas also. It's a convenient relationship.

Let me give you an example. I will quote to you part of the of a sermon given by Dr. Hoeh which quoted scholarship to--

THE
PAINFUL
TRUTH

prove the 100-year period is described by Isaiah 65. I will then quote the source of Dr. Hoeh's information. Let's not say that Dr. Hoeh was deliberately lying, but--say--unfortunately mistaken. Yet it is typical of Dr. Hoeh's "research" and "scholarship".

35

THE PAINFUL TRUTH

As you know, mother, the church used to teach that Isa. 65:20 speaks of the period following the millennium, and identifies the length of that period as 100 years. Last Feast (1972) HWA said that we should no longer use that scripture, and thus that we don't know how long such a period following the millennium will be, but just that there will be such a period. Isa. 65:20 is a reference to the millennium, speaking of longevity (even a person who dies a hundred years old will be called accursed, because he died so young--this is the idea). Here is why the change came about: first Dr. Hoeh had told Mr. Armstrong about the "problems" of some other scholars, including Dr. Robert Kuhn, whom he accused of denying the 100-year period. (All honest scholars are a threat to Dr. Hoeh.) So Dr. Kuhn wrote a memo to HWA defending his understanding of Isa. 65:20, and telling why he did not feel it "proved" a 100-year period. On this occasion HWA agreed that our interpretation of Isa. 65:20 could not be supported, and so dropped the use of this scripture. Dr. Hoeh has been furious over the matter since. In the sermon I will quote, given this Spring, Dr. Hoeh talks about those who try to change our doctrines, including the doctrine of the 100-year period. (The only trouble is, HWA himself said we should change this!!! But Dr. Hoeh, having decided that HWA was inspired in the use of Isa. 65:20 originally, is not about to let HWA become uninspired through further research!!)

Dr. Hoeh: "But we have to realize that the Church today is given a warning. I want to conclude with this warning, because we often have read in years past everything else, and emphasized everything else to characterize the state of the Church and its work, and now we are at that stage when we must re-examine the last and most important message to this Church.

"Behold," says Jesus in Chapter 3, verse 11 of the Book of Revelation, 'I come quickly. Hold fast what you have that no man take your crown.' Now, we've emphasized verse 12 with the promises, we emphasized all of the preceding, but the state of the Church today is such that what we must focus on is holding fast that which we have. [i.e. don't give up the "faith once delivered"; that is, don't give up Dr. Hoeh's doctrines and ideas. If Dr. Hoeh were concerned with Jesus' ideas, he wouldn't be so hasty in condemning Biblical research, as he does in the next paragraph.] Now Achan took what was not his, what belonged to God. The Church has been passing through a state, if I may speak plainly, and drawing a parallel with many individuals, who, with the emphasis on one hand of Women's Lib and with democracy, are presuming to lay hands on responsibility that is not ours. And so we have gone through, in the last month to three years, especially the last year, a period of criticism, and we could do, as was already mentioned this morning by Mr. Docken, we could criticize Jesus Christ. [Or Dr. Hoeh.] . . .

"But we have come to a place where the Church is in the habit, as never before, or criticizing those who are responsible, . . . of re-examining the foundation [Dr. Hoeh obviously means the Biblical foundation; by "re-examining" he means doing further Biblical research in these basic areas], not in honesty [hopefully not--not Dr. Hoeh's type of honesty, as you will see], but from the point of view often of criticism, no longer building on the foundation in the way that"

too many areas. [What if the "foundation" was sand? I need not this morning name the various areas, because, as I have mentioned to the Glendale brethren, still the majority of people don't know what the minority might be thinking. But there are always those who are in the minority, who are arguing various points. [So, after condemning democracy in the above paragraph, he is now citing the "majority" versus the "minority".]

"I think we should re-examine what this foundation is, but re-examine from the point of view of seeing what it is that Christ laid and why. That instead of being negative and critical, seeking to disprove, to find something new, or to find some fault, that we examine, and indeed reject those mistakes that might have been made, but that we retain that which we have that is characteristic of the Church [in other words, we should reject our mistakes, unless these mistakes happen to be characteristic of the church] -- which has made it what it is. Now, I do take exception to the fact that many of the fundamentals that have made this Church, with respect to the Holy Days, unique in the history of the Church of God since the apostle's day; that we are now in an era when we are again questioning Pentecost; when I suppose there are some that would question the Passover, again; when there are those who have thrown doubt on the meaning of Isa. 65, either because they have assumed they knew of Hebrew what they do not know. [The latter reference re Hebrew is a not too veiled reference to Dr. Kuhn. But the only problem here is that it was HWA who decided we should no longer use Isa. 65! But Dr. Hoeh, having decided HWA was 'inspired' re Isa. 65, is not about this 'foundational doctrine' of the church get away.]

"Let me tell you. I was in Israel in 1963. Dr. Petuchowski of . . . Hebrew Union College was giving a lecture. And before we go off into novel ideas, that Mr. Armstrong was wrong in this, and wrong in that, I draw your attention to something that you have never heard [and that Dr. Hoeh had never heard], and only I have heard, unless you might have had a unique experience in your Israeli background. This man who knows nothing of the New Testament gave a lecture of the Jews' understanding--not today--but what the rabbis knew in Jesus' day. They knew the first resurrection: that for Abraham to be in the Kingdom, he must come up at the time when it's established. They knew of the second resurrection; even, of course, the sisters Martha and Mary did and referred to that event. They weren't really conscious of the relationship of Lazarus to the first resurrection. Now they knew of Abraham. The Jews also knew that there was to be a third one, because there were sinners who were neither worthy of the first, nor neither the second chance, because they already had. Now, he said, the one thing the rabbis did not know was how long the Messiah would reign. Some thought one length, some another. That's why in Rev., Chapter 20, we have a revelation that it's a 1000 years, because it was not known. But he said, the interesting thing is, and he hadn't read any of our literature, never had heard of the Church of God, that the 8th day of the Feast of Tabernacles, the rabbis did understand, was foretold in Isa. 65, and they all agreed it was 100 years. [I am sure that the congregation that day was suitably impressed.]

"Now I dispute the minds of people who think they have some knowledge of Hebrew. I think we'd better get back and re-examine, and instead of being so negative, begin to ask: "Did Mr. Armstrong invent all these explanations [it was HWA who rejected that explanation], or did he learn it from the same source that many others in centuries past had to go to find the answer."" (By the "same source" here, Dr. Hoeh means "God", but he doesn't say that--it is all part

of his posture of speaking cryptically, and appearing to be very profound, so that people look at each other and say, "Isn't Dr. Hoeh so profound", because they can't understand what he is saying.)

Now let me give you the transcript of a phone conversation between Dr. Robert Kuhn and Dr. Jakob J. Petuchowski (the source Dr. Hoeh was quoting) on May 1, 1973, following Dr. Hoeh's sermon.

K: Dr. Petuchowski?

P: Yes?

K. Yes. My name is Dr. Robert Kuhn and I'm calling you from California. Ah . . . let me introduce myself briefly. I have a Doctor's Degree in Brain Research . . . involved in television. I'd like to consult you on a point of personal interest. Would you have a few minutes to discuss some rabbinical information?

P: Why, a few minutes, yes.

K: Thank you. Why, I just heard a lecture, where an individual [Dr. Hoeh] made reference to a lecture that you had given, to defend a certain exegetical understanding of Isa. 65, and I was wondering if the information was correct, and what references there might be in this area. Can I briefly . . . ?

P: Yes.

K: . . . the concept? The concept is, very quickly, that Isa. 65:20 teaches that there will be a 100 year period following the completion of the Millennial rule of the Messiah. At the beginning of this 100-year period, there will be a general resurrection of all people, and all will lead a full life of precisely 100 years in length. In this period of time, there will be no children born, and this 100-year period of time is symbolized by the 8th day of Succoth, the Feast of Tabernacles. Now, that's basically the position. Now . . .

P: Doesn't sound like anything I said.

K: Now, I know . . . I realize that. Some information that you had given was used to defend this position in the following way: You were paraphrased as having said in a lecture in Israel in 1963 concerning the rabbinical understanding of the time of the Second Temple, or more specifically, in the time of Jesus . . .

P: um, um.

K: And, in the lecture, just to give the context . . . you said apparently--this is a paraphrased version--that the rabbis in Jesus' day taught 3 resurrections--1) that Abraham would be resurrected at a time when the Kingdom would be established . . .

P: I didn't say that.

K: . . . a second resurrection . . . Okay . . . a second resurrection when all people would be brought back to life, and a third resurrection of the sinners. Now that's the context. Now this is a direct quote that was specifically said, that the rabbis, you said, did not know how long the Messiah would reign, but that the interesting thing is that the 8th day of the Feast of Tabernacles,

THE PAINFUL TRUTH

the rabbis did understand was foretold in Isa. 65, and they all agreed it was 100 years.

P: I didn't say that; I couldn't have said that.

K: Well, let me ask this. As a result of your research, what did the rabbis at the time of Jesus . . . ?

P: There's one thing for sure: they did not agree on anything.

K: Yeah, yeah, right!

P: In other words, there were various views as to how long the messianic era would last. I did say, I believe, that there's one thing they did agree on, and that is, that there is a limit to the messianic age.

K: I see.

P: But how long the messianic age would last, there was considerable disagreement.

K: Right.

P: So there was considerable disagreement about the time of the resurrection--whether the beginning of the messianic age, or the middle, or at the end of the messianic age.

K: um, um

P: Now, I certainly did not involve the eighth day of Tabernacles in that at all.

K: Hmmm. Well, from your research and all Jewish literature, are there any references to a specific 100-year period of time in any way whatsoever involved with Isa. 65, or involved in a resurrection, or anything like that?

P: I'm not sure about a 100-year; I know 40-year period, 70-year, 700 year, 1000-year period. I'm not sure about 100 years.

K: I see.

P: I can refer you to a good book that has everything in it.

K: Yes, I would like that very much. . . .

P: This is a book by Volz--V-o-l-z, called "Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde von Daniel bis Akiba." He has covered all the relevant material that you want to know. I don't see how anybody could have quoted me about the 8th day of Tabernacles.

K: Well, how about this 100 year period. Have you ever made any reference to that? in any way?

P: Not that I know.

K: Well, could I just talk to you for a few more minutes and go to the verse that is an issue; it's Isa. 65 . . .

P: I don't have a Bible in front of me.

(39)

K: I can read it perhaps--in English, and then Hebrew.
In English: "There shall be no more thence an infant of days nor an old man who has not fulfilled his years, for the youngest shall die 100 years old and the sinner, being a hundred years old shall be accursed." Now, the teaching is that everybody will live precisely a hundred years. Now in the Hebrew "_____", it says, "_____".

P: Um, um.

K: Now, would there be any way that that could say that an infant and an old man would be resurrected at the same time and live precisely for 100 years, both . . .

P: I don't think it deals with the resurrection at all . . . I don't think it deals with the resurrection at all--it deals with longevity.

K: Yes. And what is the issue in longevity? What is the essence of what's being said?

P: The essence of what's being said is that people will live longer.

K: For exactly a hundred years, or ???

P: Oh, I wouldn't press anyone on that. I wouldn't press anyone on that. But, I think this is not a resurrection passage at all.

K: Um, um, Right. Well, what would your analysis be of the scholarship that would interpret this this way and give that interpretation to your lecture? I don't understand that.

P: I don't understand it either, unless somebody has some garbled notes and listened to somebody else lecturing with me at the same time . . .

K: I see

P: . . . and got it mixed up.

K: I see. . . .

P: . . . as far as I know, I never invoked that particular Isaiah chapter at all when dealing with the rabbinic doctrine of the resurrection.

K: I see. Hmmm. And, neither the 8th day of the Feast of Tabernacles?

P: I wouldn't see what relation that has at all to it.

(They say goodbye.)

So, mother, this is typical of Dr. Hoeh's research, and typical of the solid and secure underpinning of many, many of the WCG doctrines. Now, mother, let me quote to you a paper drawn up, listing the areas of history, prophecy, doctrine, and political and social attitudes that are in question, that are wrong, or that need to be

(...attitudes that are in question that are wrong or that need to be)

THE PAINFUL TRUTH

modified. It is entitled "AREAS OF COMMON BIBLICAL QUESTIONS" -- because these are the areas of common questions of the scholars at the college. 40 (Yet HWA goes ahead, affirming that all is well, and forbidding research to go on.) My own comments from time to time will be in brackets[].

"I. Historical and Prophetic

"1. 'Proof of the Bible' booklet (Tyre, Babylon, etc.)"

[I hardly need to say more about this.]

"2. Chronology (time cycles, end of the Work, 6000 years, Babylonian captivity, 70 weeks, dates of Christ's birth and death, Hebrew calendar for first century A.D. and back, internal chronology of Ezra and Nehemiah)"

→ (1) [The 2520 years idea came from the pyramidologists and British-Israelists: 1972 came from Dr. Hoeh and others. The WCG interpretation of the 70 weeks prophecy is clearly erroneous, at least in part. I have a 43-page paper I wrote entitled "The Seventy Weeks Prophecy: An Interpretation in the Light of the Hebrew" which both Dr. Martin and Gunar Freibergs (past and present Chairmen of the Department of Theology) were highly impressed with. Among other things it shows that a "wall" (about which we make such a fuss about in the article) is not even involved in the prophecy (the KJV was a mistranslation), and it shows that it is impossible to apply Dan. 9:27 to Christ. The traditional explanation of the passage makes it a prediction of the Advent (Daniel 9, v. 25) and death (v. 26) of Christ, of the abolition of Levitical sacrifices by His sacrifice, once for all, upon the cross (v. 27), and of the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans under Titus (v. 26). The way some of the expressions in this prophecy were translated into Latin and English gives rise to this interpretation, but in many cases these renderings were interpretations to begin with. (Having decided the prophecy refers to Christ, the translators proceeded to translate the passage so it would 'more clearly' refer to Christ!) And at least one (KJV "but not for himself") is impossible.

[There are several good objections to this traditional Christian explanation: 1) If the crucifixion is to fall (v. 27) in the middle of the last week, the 490 years must begin c. 457 B.C., a date which coincides with the decree of Artaxerxes, and the mission of Ezra. But, the objection is, that decree is silent as to any command to 'restore and build Jerusalem', nor was this one of the objects of Ezra's mission to Judah. 2) Christ did not "confirm a covenant with many for one week" (7 years)--His ministry lasted at most 3 1/2 years. If Christ's ministry was carried on by His apostles, then that lasted for considerably longer than an additional 3 1/2 years. There is nothing to define the close of the period during which the Messiah would "make a firm covenant with many". 3) The destruction of Jerusalem by Titus (A.D. 70), which is supposed to be predicted in v. 26b, follows the date of the crucifixion by some 40 years. It is therefore not only out of place before v. 27, but does not even come within the limits of the 490 years. 4) The natural meaning of the Hebrew of v. 27 does not describe the final abolition of material sacrifices, but their temporary suspension for 'half of the week'. And so on.

[Regarding the 2300 days, and other things, let me summarize that it is very possible to apply ALL of Daniel (except for the advent of the Messiah, Dan. 2, etc.) to the Babylonian, Medo-Persian, Greek empires, and the divisions of the empire of Greece. The Roman

THE
PAINFUL
TRUTH

(41)

Daniel and Revelation is not needed; nor would Daniel then have much of anything relevant for today.

[Without going into great detail, let me show you how Daniel can be interpreted by Daniel, and the reasons against Roman being included in the prophecies. The "little horn" (Dan. 7:8; 8:9), the "prince that shall come" (9:26), the king who will "magnify himself above every god" (11:36), seems to be clearly indicated in Daniel itself as a tyrant whose doings are the climax of the kingdom of Greece. 1) In Dan. 8:21 it is clearly indicated that "the rough he-goat is the king of Greece". Verse 22 further relates that out of the nation of Greece "four kingdoms shall stand up". Then, verse 23: "And in the LATTER TIME OF THEIR KINGDOM, when the transgressors have completed their transgression, there shall stand up a king of fierce countenance, and understanding strategems." Thus, this king, a little horn (v. 9), is said to stand up in the latter time of the kingdom of Greece. (The conspicuous horn of Dan. 8:5, the first king of Greece who annihilates the ram who represents the kingdoms of Media and Persia, could historically have only been Alexander, the conqueror of the traditional Medo-Persian empire.) 2) The little horn of Dan. 7:8 arises from the fourth beast and exercises its power. Dan. 8 shows that the king arises from the kingdom of Greece (the latter kingdom, i.e. the successors of Alexander's empire); thus showing that the fourth beast arises from the remains of Alexander's empire. 3) This could not be the Roman empire because the Roman empire belonged to a wholly different geographical theatre from the other empires--the Babylonian, the Medo-Persian, and the Greek. These, down to the Seleucid kingdom, appeared on the same stage. But Rome was never Asiatic, never was oriental, and was never--therefore--a legitimate successor to the first three empires. 4) Now the parallelism of a system of four kingdoms of Dan. 2 and 7, between the successive series of four metals of the Image, and the four great beasts, is recognized by everyone. Thus the fourth metal, or part of the image, and the fourth beast correspond. And the characteristic of the fourth kingdom was that "it shall be a divided kingdom" (Dan. 2:41). Now the book of Daniel itself interprets the other symbols: The Babylonian empire is the head of gold. The two-horned beast is Media and Persia. The great horn is the first king of Greece, which was broken into four parts. So what divided fourth kingdom does Daniel talk about? Answer: the one that is the subject of Daniel 11--the (king of the north) and (king of the south). V.3 of Dan. 11 says a mighty king would stand up in Greece. Verse 4 says his kingdom was to be broken. This is a complete parallel to the "conspicuous horn" of Dan. 8:5, which was broken and replaced by "four horns toward the four winds of heaven" (v. 8). Verses 21-22 of Dan. 8 absolutely identify this horn as the first king of Greece, and the four horns as four kingdoms to come out of that nation. Then immediately verse 5 of Dan. 11 begins, "And the king of the south . . .". Thus the future developments stemming from the kingdom of Greece are established as the subject of the rest of the chapter. The king of the north (Antiochus Epiphanes) is specified as bringing about the "Abomination of Desolations". In fact, the ten kings of Dan. 7:7,24 are listed in Dan. 11, five of whom are Seleucids and five of whom are Ptolemies. Then Antiochus Epiphanes, the "little horn", comes on the scene as the eleventh king.

[Thus Daniel for the most part has been fulfilled. The same is basically true of Revelation--Revelation discussed the events around 70 A.D., or the events toward the close of the 1st century A.D., for the most part. We can get an insight as to why people apply these prophecies to their own day, by looking at the history of the inter-

[The prophecies of Daniel ended with Greece, awaiting fulfillment of the final events of Dan. 2, etc., culminating in the Kingdom of God. That causes a psychological problem: the person in the meantime is in a prophetic limbo, so to speak. The other events having been fulfilled, there is nothing for him to do but await the final event--the coming of the Messiah. Unless . . . Here is what people have historically done instead: interpreters have simply proceeded to keep the prophecy up-to-date. They have made it apply to their own day. 42

[Thus the Seleucids, or Greek rulers, of Syria are identified with the Fourth Kingdom in the Sibylline Oracles. But at the close of the first century A.D. the prophecy was reinterpreted. Since Syria had ceased to be a world power, the Fourth Empire was identified with the new world power Rome. This is first seen in the Assumption of Moses, where the overthrow of Rome by Israel is predicted. And lest his contemporaries should misunderstand Dan. 7:17-19, 23 fol. as referring to the Greek empire, the Seer in 4 Ezra XII. 11-12 expressly states that this passage refers to the Roman empire. So with other sources of the first century A.D. (2 Bar. XXXVI.-XL; 4 Ezra V. 3-4, XI. 40 fol.)—In the Epistle of Barnabus IV. 4-5 (100-120 A.D.) the Fourth Kingdom is Rome, so in Hippolytus (220 A.D.), and in the Talmud (Aboda Zara, I.b.).

[Thus, the Jews under Roman power identified Rome as the fourth kingdom. This ruling Jewish interpretation was carried over into the Church. Christ had talked about the "Abomination of Desolation" spoken by Daniel. So early exegetes followed the Jewish interpretation of finding the desecration of the sanctuary (Dan. 9:26-27) in the Roman destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. thus Rome was the fourth beast.

[Later, the Jewish commentators found the fourth Kingdom in Islam. In the same spirit, Protestant theologians were content to work out the fulfillment of prophecy through the Middle Ages down to their own day (the feet and toes of the image were German states and what not), and identified the Papacy as the little horn, etc. They were keeping the prophecy up-to-date.

[And so, HWA in the late 1930's applied and interpreted these events as applying to Hitler and his empire, but has since updated the prophecy. HWA of course uses both Daniel and Revelation and applies them to the same events. In short, the entire prophetic framework of the Worldwide Church of God is in chaos.

"3. Prophetic timetables (1972, 2520, 1260, 1150 [2300], 70 weeks, etc.)

"4. Temple rebuilt?

"5. Millennium (jobs, highways, organization, all world flat, 2500 feet elevation, animals all tame and vegetarian [yet prophecies for Babylon speak of wild jackals, etc.] "Wonderful World Tomorrow" booklet)

[The brackets in the quote are in the original. The Wonderful World Tomorrow booklet is currently considered by the college scholars as one of the booklets in worst shape. All the world flat, etc.!!]

"6. Some aspects of the Compendium (documentation, rationale of "proofs"--Egyptian dynasties 12 and 20, Job and Cheops, Assyrian chronology, Abraham and Austrian Chronicle, aspects of U.S. and B.C.)

"7. Historical aspects of horns and heads and beasts (Daniel and Revelation)

47

"Heads--'resurrections' of Roman Empire--historical parallelism breaks down in places. If only one deadly wound, then why repeated deaths and resurrections of Empire?

"Josephus seemed to apply Daniel's 10 horns to 70 A.D. from Julius Caesar to Vitellius (were ten Caesars). Vespasian was the eleventh, and the three previous ones fell in rapid succession--Galva, Otho, Vitellius. Jews expected Messiah to come in time of Vespasian, during the war.

[In other words, mother, Josephus was keeping the prophecy up-to-date, applying it to his day. In fact, the whole book of Revelation seems to be a reorientation of previous prophecy. As Jewish Apocalyptic literature, it uses the symbols of Daniel (beasts, etc.), Zechariah (the two olive branches, etc.), etc. and reinterprets them to apply to Rome.]

THE
PAINFUL
TRUTH

"8. Beast (who, how extensive, what is the 'Mark of the Beast'?)

"'Mark of the Beast'--Can Brian check out how similar our explanation is to E.G. White's?

"9. Identity of countries: each Israelite tribe (subjective, extension of British-Israel ideas. Idea that early dynasties of France and Low Countries stem from Judah is based on one identification of similar names. Irish material needs more critical evaluation.), Assyria (Idea is extension of British-Israel identities. "Proofs" based on interpretation of sources, folk etymology; subjective.), Tarshish (skimpy and circumstantial).

"Our identity of countries is based on several assumptions:

"a. Modern nations are just ancient families grown big.

This assumption overlooks the results of human sin: i.e. ancient nations and families could have perished as a result of war, been exterminated. That is why we hear nothing today of Edom, Moab, Ammon. See what is said about Assyria in Isaiah 10:12, 16-19.

"b. Modern nations of necessity can be traced back to one definite parent stock--when actually they are amalgamations of various peoples.

Spain is a good example: Japhethites, Abrahamites, Phoenicians, Italians, Goths, Slavs, Arabs and North Africans all mixed.

Germany is ethnically heavily Slavic. Some nations, though important today, may be products of later development and not trace their origin back to a person in Genesis 10--e.g., the Japanese are an old nation, but they are probably a creation of events that took place no more than ca. 700 B.C. in China.

"c. Biblical identities are drawn in spite of racial features. E.g. Finns, a most non-Semitic people, are classed as Issachar. Same goes for all other Northwest Europeans and Germans. The French and some English probably come the closest to approaching a Semitic look.

[As Hans Quast told me, mother, he was asked by government officials in Germany--"Do you really think Willy Brandt is the Beast?" The official who asked him that, went on to say, "sure Assyria settled in Germany"--but that the Assyrians also settled in other countries, none of whom we apply the same prophecies to. The German government can, of course, call upon their own scholars, studied in the ancient history of Europe, and who can historically refute such simple-minded ideas such as the identifications of ancient Assyria with modern Ger-many.]

"10. Proofs of U.S. & B.C. in Prophecy (historical evidence, use of scriptures). No comment needed here.

[Many of the scriptures, such as those in Genesis, which we apply to modern America, etc., can be shown to have been fulfilled in the history of Israel, as shown in the Old Testament. Also, a study of the New Testament, particularly Paul's epistles, shows that the promises to Abraham no longer apply racially. Hence, even if we were the modern descendants of Israel, the US and BC in no way represent "fulfilled prophecy. Notice the comments on Galatians in my paper on Paul and the Law included with this letter.]

"11. Church eras (historically, biblically)--Need objective appraisal of:

"a. Rationale--e.g. Matt. 16:18

"b. Historical sources--their value

"c. When is a sect God's Church and when does it cease being that?

"d. Not read into history what is not there.

[It is interesting, mother, that every church which interpretes the seven epistles to the churches in Revelation as 7 eras, always identify themselves as either Philadelphian or Smyrna--because only these two churches escape correction for some pronounced fault! According to R. Tench, in Commentary on the Epistles to the Seven Churches in Asia, 1890, the idea of church eras, of "a prophetic outline of seven successive periods of the Church's history" goes back before the Reformation. The spiritual Franciscans, an order of mystics, "are the first among whom this scheme of interpretation assumed any prominence". After the Reformation, "It was in the Reformed Churches of Holland and Germany . . . that this periodic interpretation first assumed any prominence or importance." Dr. Hoeh, who came up with the idea of church eras in the WCG, naturally decided HWA and Co. were the Philadelphian era.]

"12. Lost century: not as lost as we may think.

"13. Duality of prophecy: How does it apply? To what extent?

THE PAINFUL TRUTH

"14. Sacred Calendar

- "a. Today's the same as in Christ's day
- "b. The extent of change, if any

[The fixed calendar did not come into use until the 400's A.D. This can be proven beyond any reasonable question. Before that, the Jews went by observation.]

"15. Comparison of Matthew 24 and Revelation 6

[It is important to comment here about "signs of the end". The WCG affirms that false Christs, wars, pestilence, and famine ~~and are~~ the signs of the end-time, just as do the Jesus People, and various evangelical groups today, including Billy Graham. Yet, if you read Matthew 24 and Mark 13, what does Christ say to do when you see wars, famines, etc.? Get excited? Be forewarned that Christ is about to return? NO. "And when you hear of wars and rumors of wars, DO NOT BE ALARMED; this must take place, BUT THE END IS NOT YET." (Mark 13:7). But Christians from the first century to today have hailed the return of Christ every time a major war strikes, a famine comes, etc.]

[Of course, ~~any~~ apocalyptic predictions are never proven false; they are merely 'misunderstood', and a new prediction arises which clears up the old one. And so the same old prophecies keep being reinterpreted, decade by decade, to apply to "our day today". And don't think that prophetic failure gives anyone second thoughts. For example the Montanists set a date for the return of Christ in the second half of the second century. The Anabaptists predicted the return of Christ in 1533. Prevalent among European Jews was the belief that the Messiah would come in the year 1648. The Millerites expected the Second Coming in 1843. The WCG expected to flee in 1972, with the Second Coming in 1975. THE SAME THING HAPPENED WHEN ALL THESE DATES FAILED: the delay of the second advent failed to put an end to any of these movements; on the contrary, it gave them new life and form ("the work is starting all over again" etc.) The failure was always followed by greater efforts to win converts, or to expand the work. Why? "If more and more people can be persuaded that the system of belief is correct, then clearly it must, after all, be correct. Consider the extreme case: if everyone in the whole world believed something there would be no question at all as to the validity of this belief. It is for this reason that we observe the increase in proselyting following disconfirmation." (Festinger, When Prophecy Fails, p. 28.)

[Signs of the apocalypse are always around. I suggest you read "History As Mirror" by Barbara W. Tuchman in a recent issue of the Atlantic. It draws an analogy between the 14th century and the 20th. Anyone living in that time would certainly have had plenty of proof that his age was the 'end-time'. "The afflictions of the fourteenth century were the classic riders of the Apocalypse--famine, plague, war, and death, this time on a black horse. These combined to produce an epidemic of violence, depopulation, bad government, oppressive taxes, an accelerated breakdown of feudal bonds, working class insurrection, monetary crisis, decline of morals and rise in crime, decay of chivalry, the governing idea of the governing class, and above all, corruption of society's central institution, the Church, whose loss of authority and prestige deprived man of his accustomed

guide in a confusing world. . . . The fourteenth chapter opened . . . (70)
with a series of famines brought on when population growth outstripped
the techniques of food production. The precarious balance was tipped
by a series of heavy rains and floods and by a chilling of the climate
in what has been called the Little Ice Age. Upon a people thus weakened
fell the century's central disaster, the Black Death, an eruption of
bubonic plague which swept the known world in the years 1347-1349
and carried off an estimated one-third of the population in two and
a half years. This makes it the most lethal episode known to history,
which is of some interest to an age equipped with the tools of over-
kill. The plague raged at terrifying speed, increasing the
impression of horror. In a given locality it accomplished its kill
within four to six months, except in the larger cities, where it
struck again in spring after lying dormant in winter. The death rate
in Avignon was said to have claimed half the population, of whom ten
thousand were buried in the first six weeks in a single mass grave.
The mortality was in fact erratic. Some communities whose last sur-
vivors fled in despair were simply wiped out and disappeared from
the map forever, leaving only a grassed-over hump as their mortal
trace. Whole families died, leaving empty houses and prop-
erty a prey to looters. Wolves came down from the mountains to at-
tack plague-stricken villiages, crops went unharvested, dikes crum-
bled, salt water reinvaded and soured the lowlands, the forest crept
back, and second growth, with the awful energy of nature unchecked,
reconverted cleared land to waste. For lack of hands to cultivate,
it was thought impossible that the world could ever regain its former
prosperity." And so on.

[Or, say America of 1876. Quoting Albin Dearing from the Sept.
1972 Smithsonian: "The United States of the 1870s had a crime rate
perhaps twice that of today. There was rioting among the Irish in
New York, the blacks in Savannah, the Chinese in San Francisco, the
political clubs in Pittsburgh and the coal miners in Scranton. New
Yorkers were discovering that Boss Tweed had mulcted them of million.
Legislators were being bought and sold, Graft reached into the White
House itself. About a sixth of the population was foreign-born
and unassimilated. Thousands of children, aged eight, were recruited
to the ten-hour workday of factories, mines and sweatshops. Pneumonia
and tuberculosis ravaged the population in winter; malaria and typhoid
in summer; diphtheria, scarlet fever and sometimes cholera and small-
pox in all seasons. Public health, like inside plumbing and sanita-
tion, concerned only a few. Traffic hopelessly clogged city streets
by day, toughs roamed them by night. Prostitution plagued urban cen-
ters and venereal disease raged. Gangs of Ku Klux Klansmen
whipped, tortured or murdered hundreds of blacks. The U.S. Navy shelled
the coast of Korea, with whom we were at peace. . . . Young
men went clean-shaven in contemptuous disdain for their elder's hilar-
ious muttonchop whiskers, straggly handlebar moustaches, imperial
goatees and shoulder-length hair. [!!!!] . . . Life was indeed a
drudge and a burden and fast becoming intolerably so as craftsmanship
gave way to mass production. Given half a day free each week, what
escape was there for automatons of the factory and seamstresses of the
sweatshop on starvation wages? In the decade of the 1870s, alcohol
probably made converts faster than at any other period in our history.
As did opium. Today's "durg culture" had its counterpart in the
American of 1872, only then it was more widespread with respect to
areas and age groups. In 1872, Florida, New Mexico, Texas, Vermont
and New Hampshire all grew poppies for our thriving opium production,
though we imported a sizable tonnage of it. Laudanum, tincture of
opium, was sold in drugstores and many grocery stores as well. . . .
Few nineteenth-century Americans had not tasted opium in some form;
some middle-class and many working-class children died from it."

[In regards to prophecy, let me draw some parallels between the WCG and the Jehovah's Witnesses. The JW's have set dates of 1878, 1881, 1914, 1918, 1925, and--more recently--1975 (though I don't know how definite the last date is supposed to be) for the return of Christ. Notice the similarity of their reaction to these repeated failures to the WCG's. (I am quoting from the American Journal of Sociology, 1970, article "Prophetic Failure and Chiliastic Identity: The Case of Jehovah's Witnesses".)

["The sect's responses to the prophetic failures conformed to the following general pattern:

["1. The initial reaction was usually a composite of disappointment, puzzlement, and chagrin. This describes the reactions of the leaders as well as of the rank and file.

["2. As a secondary adjustment to its dejection and confusion, the group usually regressed for a time to its earlier orientation, maintaining an attitude of watchful waiting for its predictions to materialize. During this interval, the group was likely to adhere to the view that its prior evangelistic mission had been completed, that the harvest had indeed 'closed' on the dates previously announced. Just as HWA claimed that, suddenly, on Jan. 1972, the gospel had gone to all the world, but before that, it had not. Proselytism usually declined for a time but did not cease altogether, its continuation being justified as an "educational" rather than a "recruitment" operation. Such incipient redefinitions of group mission were likely to be temporary, however. This was also the phase during which the doctrinal bases for the previously issued prophecies were reexamined and conjectures entertained as to why the events expected might have been "delayed". [It was heard around the WCG that God had "given the world more time to repent", as one explanation why we "had more time". This explanation is an old one; many groups have used it before when their prophecies failed. As Peter Müller-Goldkuhle wrote concerning early church history, "The delay in the parousia (appearing of Christ) was attributed to the mercy of God, who was offering man one final chance at conversion."]

["3. Sooner or later, the group achieved a fuller resolution of its quandary. The symbolic strategies through which this was accomplished were substantially the same in all five instances of prophetic failure. The group first asserted the claim that its previously advanced prophecies had been in fact, partially fulfilled, or that some event of prophetic significance had actually transpired on the dates in question. [Just as HWA cited the "door of Reader's Digest"--bigger than ever, etc., and the approval of the contract for the auditorium.] The conviction that the Plan of God was, indeed, unfolding in the general way indicated by the belief system was thus sustained. The "events" selected to give substance to this claim were supernatural and hence not open to disconfirmation. Thus, in its effort to convert the prophetic failure of 1878 into a partial "success", the group asserted, retrospectively, that the year marked the point at which the "nominal Christian churches were cast off from God's favor" (Watchtower, February 1881). The year 1881 was said to mark the time when "death became a blessing", in the sense that any saint who happened to die would henceforth be instantaneously changed into a spirit being at the moment of expiration (Watchtower, December 1881). The year 1914 allegedly signified the "end of the Time of the Gentiles", when God's benevolent disposition toward the Christian nations was withdrawn (Watchtower, November 1, 1914). The year 1918 was retrospectively defined as the time when Christ "entered the temple for the purpose of judgment" (Rutherford 1920). A further elaboration of the

(48)

prophetic significance of the latter year was issued on the eve of the prophetic failure of 1925; the year 1918 marked the time when the heavenly portion of the Kingdom was established and when a "New Nation" was born (Watchtower, March 1, 1925). Each of the prophetic failures was thus redefined in retrospect in a manner which provided nonempirical confirmation for the group's chiliastic outlook.

["4. The supplementary strategy used to revitalize the group's millennial hopes was the projection of unfulfilled portions of prior prophecies into the future through the issuance of redated predictions. . . . In addition to renewing the group's chiliastic orientation, this supplementary strategy helped to resolve the crisis in group mission by extending the mandate to proselytize. [Just as the WCG has proceeded to undertake a series of nation-wide campaigns. You would think the problems would make us hesitate to drag others into our doctrinal chaos and uncertainty. On the contrary, if we can convert more people to the same belief, we prove we were right all along. . . . "The gospel is still going out"; "Who else is preaching the gospel" the WCG continues to say--ignoring the fact that much of what the WCG may be pure crap. It's certainly not Biblical.]

["5. Beyond the two basic strategies outlined above, the movement employed a variety of other devices to sustain its chiliastic outlook. These have been used not only in conjunction with specific prophetic failures but also more generally to confirm the group's faith in its image of the future. [NOTICE!] The most frequently used device has been the selective interpretation of emerging historical events as confirming signs of the approaching end (see Russell 1886, vol. 1; Rutherford 1920). The group's negative and pessimistic world view sensitized it to perceive virtually every major and minor social disturbance and natural catastrophe as an indicator of the impending collapse of the earthly system. [This describes the News Bureau to a "t" The varied forms of unrest, generated in a society undergoing rapid industrialization, urbanization, secularization, and other changes, were exploited to affirm the hopeless bankruptcy of the prevailing social system and its disastrous downward spiral. The expressions of vexation, alarm, and impending doom voiced by various outside commentators on the passing scene were similarly drawn upon as validating evidence. A related device has been the effort to interpret the experiences and achievements of the movement itself as confirming signs of the approaching climax and as validation of the sect's conception of itself as an agency of prophetic fulfillment. . . .

[So the JW's, like the WCG, are "seen as an informative case of the process of 'self-fulfilling prophecy'." That is, the groups fulfill their own prophecies, in more ways than one: by interpreting news events to fulfill prophecy, whether the news is doing that or not; and by reinterpreting prophecies in terms of their own religious group ("God is giving us more time to do the Work," etc.)

[Now back to the Areas of Common Biblical Questions.]

"II. Doctrinal

"1. Second and third resurrections (100 year period, Rev. 20)

"2. Tithing (third tithe (proofs and usage), New Testament, etc.)

"Good work has been done on this. Could add research on whether or not other Jewish sects (Essenes, Therapeutae, etc.) and early Christian groups practiced tithing.

(49)

[Let me simply say, mother, that the WCG misunderstands the whole concept of what Mosaic regulations are in force today. This applies to tithing and the holy days. Regarding Tithing, the New Testament does NOT command tithing. For example, to quote from a recent paper Lester wrote on tithing, "Tithing is given little place in the New Testament. Certainly no system of 1st, 2nd, and 3rd is delineated, either by express command or by example. The only real instruction one could draw from the New Testament alone is that the ministry and those spreading the Gospel should be supported by the faithful. Nowhere is tithing (as opposed to freewill offerings) specifically commanded."

[Attached with this letter is a paper Harry Eisenberg did on tithing: "Financing the Work of God". I include it because it is not a technical paper, and is easy enough to follow, yet is essentially correct. But the real context in which to understand tithing is in the entire subject of the Mosaic law treated as a whole. For that, I refer you to my paper "Paul and the Law" included with this letter.]

"3. Divorce and remarriage (the doctrine itself, plus ramifications: porneia, I Cor. 7:15, Deut. 24)

"4. Aspects of the Book of Revelation (e.g. Rev. 12 (At present we explain this in part as history, part as prophecy. Why not do it all either one way or the other?), 13, 14)

Need thorough research on:

- a. When was book written?
- b. Under what circumstances was it written?
- c. For whom and for when written?
- d. Literary structure: paragraph breaks, interruptions between visions--how much is vision or revelation, how much John's own observations or comments?
- e. Imagery: How much is identity with Old Testament and how much just similarity? Why does Satan have 7 heads and 10 horns, just like the beast (Rev. 12:3)? If these are nothing specific, then why put so much interpretation on the beast's heads?

"5. Passover (Christ's death coincident with Passover sacrifice, day of leavened bread after Passover)

- a. Wave sheaf--when did Christ allow disciples to touch Him?

[The paper on Passover attached with this paper shows that the NT passover, or last supper, Jesus ate with his disciples was almost a full 24 hours before Christ was slain, at the time the Jews were keeping the OT Passover. Read that. Then ask this question: if Christ was not keeping the OT Passover, but a new observance, then what about the other holy day? The WCG has claimed for years that Col. 2:16, rather than saying that holy days are not necessary, instead says that we should observe them. Now, mother, let's assume that WCG is correct. Read Col. 2:16--it also mentions new moons. Yet the WCG does not keep new moons. But by our own argument, Col. 2:16 commands that we should.

Therefore Jacob O Meyer and Carl O'Beirn are both more correct and more consistant when they teach that we ought to keep the new moons also. The WCG is purely arbitrary, keeping what happened to strike HWA's fancy, and rejecting things that did not.

[Now I don't mean by all this, mother, that I think new moons should be kept. I don't. Because Col. 2:16 doesn't say what we say it does (but don't obey), or what Jacob Meyer and Carl O'Beirn say it does (and do obey). (Neither Jacob Meyer nor Carl O'Beirn say that new moons are holy days--they simply say they should be observed, as they were in ancient Israel.)

[But, mother, when you realize that Christ was not keeping the Old Testament Passover, that keeping holy days means also keeping new moons, that the WCG has been observing the wrong day for Pentecost (following section), then it becomes easier to accept the Apostle Paul's teaching regarding the whole Mosaic law--namely that it is not binding. Read my paper on "Paul and the Law". The first six pages or so summarize the general principles, then the paper goes through Romans, Galatians, 1 Cor. 5, Hebrews 4, Col. 2, etc. There is no way to briefly say here what the paper says in 62-pages. If it will be any consolation, it is clear that the holy days were suspended during the Babylonian Captivity when the temple had been destroyed (read Lam. 2:6). The idea of worshipping God through sacred persons (priests), sacred places (temples, churches, holy lands), and sacred times (holy days) is all the same package. See what Paul has to say about these things in my paper--I think it will be revealing.

[For comparison let me quote to you a letter from a former faculty member, who is now pursuing biblical studies at the University of Chicago. It will serve as a convenient summary:

"Sabbath before Moses: I am 100% open on this. I do find the mention of the Sabbath in Genesis 2 significant. However, I feel that one point we often miss is that God is still resting. He created for six days and then on the seventh ceased from his work of creation (physically). At least this seems to be the point of Hebrews 4:9-10. Now whether a weekly rest day was instituted before Moses--looking back to that pattern from creation--I am not sure. I suppose one could take the silence of Genesis either way. I think I cover most of the relevant material in my thesis and my paper. What I do think is significant is that later Paul (in Romans and especially Gal. 3) looks back to the time of Abraham as a time before the Torah, etc. had been given.

"Sabbath for Israel. I am not clear as to whether it was ever intended that all men enter the covenant with God--take on the Torah, etc. Of course in passages like Isaiah 56 those who so choose are blessed. Israel did welcome proselytes. But I am not sure Israel felt the Gentiles were sinning by not keeping the Torah (all 613 points). The Rabbis said the righteous of all nations and ages would have a part in the world to come. They felt the Gentiles were under a basic moral code--partly taken from Gen. 9. But they did not seem to expect them to take on the Sabbath, circumcision, the dietary laws, etc. which especially set Israel apart from the nations and preserved her. In N.T. days this concept is important. There were three classes of men who followed Yahweh: 1) Natural-born Israelites--who kept the whole Torah. 2) Those who had received circumcision and thus entered also into the full covenant--proselytes. 3) God-fearers such as Cornelius--who were attracted to the high morality

and monotheism of Judaism but did not decide to go all the way so to speak. These did not necessarily keep all the points of the Torah. There is a lot on this class in the materials I work with. So I am not clear the Jews felt Gentiles should keep the Sabbath, etc. For example--in the book of Jonah--the city of Ninevah repented--but is there evidence that they converted to Judaism? I think not. (51)

"Hebrews 8,9,10,12. Of course you are very familiar with these passages. The basic point seems to be that the first covenant with physical Israel, the tabernacle, the various rites, etc. is now passed--as a shadow--while the true image (the substance) to which these things pointed has now come (8:5; 10:1). I realise that there is no direct discussion of the Sabbath here. Although such points as offerings; tithing, the priesthood, etc. are discussed. However, notice 12:18-29. It does seem quite clear that the reference of verses 18-21 is to the giving of the 10 commandments at Sinai (Exodus 19-20) and the voice spoken of is that of the 10 commandments themselves. He says we have not come to that. But rather, (verse 25) "him who is now speaking" meaning Jesus I would think. The point is not that the 10 commandments are bad or any such thing. But that as God spoke then--and that era has now passed--he is again speaking--giving a new covenant--that includes Jew and Gentile, etc. I would thus expect some kind of restatement of just what God expects of men in the new covenant. And is the Sabbath ever mentioned? Or given? Or stressed? It seems to me that from the passages I will now consider if anything it is spoken of as removed. Or better fulfilled.

"This introduces another area that to me is a crux issue. How do we know what God intends for the Christian to do--as part of the New Covenant? Just to say "follow the Bible" or "live by every word of God" is simplistic! We have 613 (according to Jewish count) commands given to Israel in the Torah. Which are still to be followed? How do we know? What is our method of telling? I know of no group that keeps them all (even Jews) for there is no organized priesthood and tabernacle. The WCG is very inconsistent in which ones they follow and even how they follow them. I could elaborate on this greatly. Many of the laws (even those not having to do with the sacrificial system) cannot be kept literally today because of circumstances. There are problems of place, time, the calendar, etc. etc. So no one keeps the Torah today.

[Let me interject here, mother, to say that Jacob Meyer's group, which observes new moons, keeps the holy days--not according to the fixed calendar--but by observation of the new moons. ^{to the day of the month} ^{again, since} the fixed calendar did not come into use until 400 A.D., this is a more logical way to keep the holy days, or just as logical a way, as ~~the~~ the WCG'S. So which should one do? The fact is, the list of problems goes on and on when one tries to keep Levitical regulations (without a Levitical priesthood and temple.)

"I might suggest that all of God's laws are kept today in principle--i.e. He has never changed what he basically wants, plans for, and expects of all mankind.

"Is it possible that the whole first covenant was removed as a whole and now we are to listen to him who speaks from heaven, as to what God expects of those under the new covenant? This seems to be the point of this passage.

"Galatians 3-4 and Colossians 2. I do feel that these sections should be studied together. They are linked by the all important

concept of the stoicheia of the world (Gal. 4:2, 9; Col. 2:8, 20). (52)
On this I must mention the excellent and scholarly commentary: Colossians and Philemon by Eduard Lohse (Fortress Press, 1971) of the Hermeneia series. This is the best there is. You will find a very extensive discussion of this term on pp. 96ff. as well as much other important material on the letter as a whole. But first to Galatians 3-4.

"Of course the problem in Galatians is whether one who believes in Christ and is in the one body, a partaker of the Holy Spirit--must then go on and take on the yoke of the Torah--i.e. become a Jew--thus Paul uses the word "circumcision" as a convenient term for this whole concept--since it was the entrance point into the nation of Israel. Of course Paul's answer was an emphatic no! He is quite strong in the letter. I think verses 15-29 (of chapter 3) are important. Paul is concerned here with who is an heir--and now. An heir promise was made long before the Torah came. So one can receive the promise without coming under the Torah. This inheritance (verse 18) is not by coming under Israel's covenant. Why then have Israel's covenant (verse 19)? If it didn't bring salvation? Because of sin--but till Christ should come. The Torah was to teach--to be a shadow--of what was to come. It pointed out sin, showed the need for atoning blood, showed holiness and cleanliness, etc. But it was a tutor. It was to teach us the elements or elementary points of God and his relationship with man. Those "under the Torah" were as slaves--no real inheritance--or like children just learning but not receiving the inheritance (4:1-7). Now they are redeemed and made sons--and are heirs. For a Jew (or a Gentile) to turn back to the observances of the Law which were only shadows of the substance or reality now come in Christ--is to go back under bondage--in other words--to go back to a system of elementary teachings--that only pointed to the reality. Thus in verse 10 Paul sees their stress on keeping of days, months, seasons, and years as missing the whole point--going back to something that was a part of the scheme of things once but not any longer. I would translate stoicheia as possibly "rudimentary notions of the world". The reference is to a system God used in the Torah period for dealing with man.

"Now in Colossians the problem was somewhat different I believe. But Paul is more specific as to what days, etc. were the problem. I do feel Gal. 4:10 and Col. 2:16-17 are basically parallel. I can in no way accept Dr. Hoeh's translation and view of Col. 2:16-17. And believe me I tried. Verse 17 clearly sets up a contrast very close if not identical to that of Hebrews 8:5 and 10:1. The implication is clear--questions regarding food, drink, sabbath, new moons, festivals--are part of an era that is passed. The substance has come--the shadow is gone. This contrast of shadow and substance (the Greek words) is well known in Hellenistic Greek. Lohse gives the relevant parallels. I do agree with you that the heresy at Colossae was one of an extreme kind of legalistic Judaism--with disputes about how to carry out the various points of the Torah--diet, holydays, etc. But that is just the point. Paul says none of this kind of thing is important or central now--the substance is come. He is not saying that even those observances of such areas given in the Torah were bad--but that the time is passed and they are now fulfilled in Christ. I find the meaning quite clear. By the way--be sure and notice 2 Chron. 8:13; Neh. 10:33; and Ezk. 45:17 for this sequence of listing. It is possible Paul is making a similar reference--there was a pattern for this kind of thing.

"Acts 15 and 21: What was decided in Acts 15? I see the problem as identical to that of Galatians. The one is a commentary on the other. Obviously we do not have in Acts 15 a summary of Christian ethics. That was not the point. Rather--are Gentile Christians to take on the yoke of the Torah--to become circumcised Jews--proselytes in order to inherit the coming Kingdom? The answer of course is no. Christians are received and cleansed by faith in Christ. But even though this be true four points of the Torah were mentioned for the Gentiles to keep. It is also obvious that we do not have here a summary of the four points of the Torah that were good--the rest being taken away. Rather there was a practical problem involved. The church was made up of Jews and Gentiles! The Jews still maintained their heritage--kept the Torah, etc. Acts 21 makes this clear. How were they then to associate with Gentiles? I think the area of table fellowship would especially be important here. It appears probable that these four areas were minimal expectations (of a ritualistic nature) that a Jew would expect even a Gentile to follow. After all in Genesis 9 God told all men to not eat blood. And worship of idols would be implied in the regular market-place practices of Gentile cities (1 Cor. 8, 10). It is possible that "fornication" here refers to being around Gentile temples, markets, etc. where prostitution was so accepted. The point of verse 21 is that the Jewish cause, the Jewish heritage, etc., will not suffer by this decision. The Jews who wanted the Gentiles to enter Judaism were worried about their heritage--as more and more Gentiles were converted--soon they [the Jews] would be a minority [in the church]. "The niggers would take over" to put it in modern terms. James assures them that Moses will do just fine--for the Torah is preached everywhere and those who want can still become proselytes--but Gentiles are not required to take on the Torah.

THE
PAINFUL
TRUTH

"Romans 14: I consider this a very important passage because it shows the motley nature of the early church--the real problems in making of the two "one new man". There were different views on various points. Some were feeling that vegetarianism (very popular among sensitive minded Gentiles!) was best. (verses 1-4). Others felt that a certain day was to be observed to the Lord. Others observed no day. (verse 5-6). The point Paul makes is that all must give liberty and not condemn. Verses 17-18 are important here. I do feel that in principle Paul covers the observance here of a festival, new moon, or sabbath--or any other "day to the Lord". I feel Dr. Hoeh's explanation of these being fast days is exceedingly weak.

"Future Restoration of the Torah: It is very striking that in many O.T. prophecies seem to tell of a time when the whole Torah will be kept again--by all nations. For example: Isa. 66:20-23 or Ezk. 20:40ff; 40-48, etc. I do not claim to understand these. I have my theories. What must be pointed out is that such passages in no way instruct the N.T. church because they invariably mention sacrifices, the temple, and the full Torah being kept.

"The Law of Christ: Where then are Christians to go for the ethics--what is Christian conduct to be like? In looking at what Jesus taught and at the letters we have from Paul especially--I feel we are to answer this question. I see no place for the observance of any days, festivals, feasts, etc. Rather in Galatians 5 we have the principle set down. The Christian is free from the Torah--but this freedom is in no way to lead to the satisfaction of human nature (the flesh). The works of the flesh are plain--(the Torah only pointed these out--they were known from the beginning--

59

see 1 Tim. 1:8-11). The Christian is to walk in LOVE--this fulfills all that the Torah really was demanding in the first place. See Romans 13:8-10; Galatians 5:13-15, etc. Jesus said the same in Matthew 7:12. We are to bear one another's burdens and so fulfill the Torah of Christ. There are no days, months, seasons, years, etc. In the church there are only two commands: To trust totally in Christ; to love one another (1 John 3:23). One could keep all 613 commands of the Torah without even beginning to get into some of the keep points of human conduct--really "walking in the Spirit" etc. that Paul brings out. This does not mean the Torah is bad. It is good. But as a system it only pointed to the reality now found with the coming of the Messiah. No one keeps it today. It was good in its place in history. It was the custodian. The schoolmaster. It has a lawful use today--for doctrine, reproof, correction, instruction in righteousness.

"Final Comments: . . . please note: As far as basic attitude--what I have said is miles away from the general Protestant understanding (Luther) of Paul and the Law and the O.T.!"

[Being a student of the Old Testament, mother, I know that Paul's teaching corresponds to the teaching of the O.T. prophets--it is not some new and strange thing. And all this has nothing to do with general run-of-the-mill Christianity. As Ernest De Witt Burton says in his famous commentary on Galatians: "Religion, he [Paul] says, in effect, is not conformity to statutes, or non-conformity, but a spiritual relation to God expressed in the word "faith", and an ethical attitude towards man, summed up in the word "love" (Gal. 5:6). Morality, he affirms, is not achieved by keeping rules, but by living in fellowship with the Spirit of God and in consequent love towards men, issuing in conduct that makes for their welfare (5:16-23). Thus he makes religion personal rather than ecclesiastical, and morality a social relation grounded in religion. This is not a new doctrine. It had been announced by the prophets of Israel long before. It is the doctrine which the synoptic gospels tell us Jesus taught. But not even the teaching of Jesus had sufficed to make it the dominant thought of those who early joined the company of his followers, and it was a novelty, indeed, in the Graeco-Roman world. It has never been accepted wholeheartedly by any considerable portion of the Christian church. It is not to-day the real creed of any great part of Christendom." (Emphasis mine.)

[Now, mother, back to the areas of common Biblical questions]

"6. Pentecost (Monday-Sunday, calendar date)

[Here is the crux of the Pentecost issue, mother. There are basically two possibilities: 1) Pentecost is counted from the weekly Sabbath--in which case it falls on Sunday. 2) Pentecost is counted from the first holy day of the Passover season--in which case it can fall on many different days of the week. In any case, the Monday observance of WCG cannot be supported by biblical evidence, nor by any tradition.

[There are three basic issues: 1) (Count) Number 50 days from the morrow after the sabbath (Lev. 23:15-16). 2) From the morrow after the sabbath . . . even unto the morrow after the seventh sabbath (Lev. 23:15-16). 3) Seven weeks shalt thou number unto thee . . . seven weeks from such time as thou beginnest to put the sickle to the corn. (Deut. 16:9).

THE
PAINFUL
TRUTH

[Following those three Biblical guidelines, here is the demonstration of Sunday as the date: 1) God numbers inclusively in the Bible. In counting the 50 days, you must begin by counting the Sunday. The expression "from the morrow after the Sabbath" in Lev. 23:15 is precisely the same in the Hebrew as the expression "on the morrow after the Sabbath" in Lev. 23:11. And since the wave sheaf was offered on Sunday, likewise the counting 50 must also begin on, and include, Sunday. So 50 days, counting inclusively, from Sunday is Sunday. 2) The words and syntax of the phrase "unto the morrow after the seventh sabbath" in v. 16 is identical to the previous phrase "unto the morrow after the sabbath" in v. 15--except for the word "seventh". And since "the sabbath" in v. 15 is clearly referring to the weekly sabbath, it seems logical that the "seventh sabbath" should also be referring to the weekly sabbath. The parallelism of v. 15 and v. 16 seems striking. (Jews are forced to translate "sabbath" in v. 16 as "week" because of their bias which compels them to put Pentecost on a set calendar date, basing their Rabbinic tradition on the interpretation of the Pharisees rather than the Sunday interpretation of the Sadducees.) The morrow after the seventh sabbath is thus Sunday, as Sunday is always the day following the sabbath. 3) The Israelites first began "to put the sickle to the corn" on a Sunday--Lev. 23:11 shows that the wavesheaf was offered on the morrow after the Sabbath. Deut. 16:9 states simply that 7 weeks later was Pentecost. 7 weeks from a Sunday is a Sunday. (The seeming discrepancy between the 50 days of Lev. 23 and the 7 weeks of Deut. 16 is explained by the inclusive counting of the Bible. One week "from" a Sunday is a Sunday, but it takes 8 days counting "from" a Sunday to reach the next Sunday (try it)).

[Other question are these: What day was Pentecost kept in the time of Christ and the events of Acts 2? History seems to indicate a Sunday--certainly either Sunday or a calendar date. Moreover, there is no record of any group in all history giving Pentecost on a Monday. On a different tack, how does the WCG know that the sabbath to begin counting from is during the Passover season? The Bible only states that this critical sabbath is during the harvest (Lev. 23:10). It ^{re}lies strictly on Jewish tradition to tell it that we should count from the sabbath in the Passover season. But then it discounts this same Jewish tradition when it says to either count from the annual sabbath of the Passover season and arrive at a calendar date for Pentecost or to count 50 days inclusively from the weekly sabbath and arrive at a Sunday for Pentecost. I do not know any serious scholar at the college, mother, who believes there is any evidence for a Monday Pentecost in the Bible or history (except for Dr. Hoeh, and you could hardly call him a scholar. He is skilled, not in research, but in propaganda.)]

- "7. Pentecost symbolism--all grain harvest; fall harvest is fruits totally different substance.
- "8. Born again (gennao)
 - a. Much of the world's error is only semantics.
 - b. Through baptism a person is, in a way, born anew. (ACCEPTED AFTER HWA'S DEATH)
- "9. Problematic scriptures (Ezek. 40-48; "men of good will scripture"--Luke 2:14; Luke 23:43; Eccl. 3:21; Gal. 4:10; Eph. 2:15; II Cor. 3:7; Heb. 7:4-15; Rev. 17:10, etc.)
- "10. Geology "Gap Theory"

- a. Genesis 1 in light of Ex. 20:11
- b. Meaning of bara
- c. Meanings of tohu and bohu
- d. Literary relationships of Gen. 1:1 to rest of chapter. cf. Gen. 2:4--if we were as literal in interpreting this as we are with Gen. 1:1 and 2, then it would mean that day existed even before there were heaven and earth.

"11. Galatians

"12. Hell--proofs used to establish"

"III. Practical

- "1. Personal appearance (skirt-length, sideburns, beards, wigs)

[Let me say here that I wrote a 92-page paper about political and social attitudes of the WCG as expressed in PT articles and sermons, which directly oppose biblical attitudes, and historical fact. (Robert Kuhn wanted to use it as the basis for different WT television programs. But it hardly serves any purpose to say one thing in the TV program, then contradict it in follow-up PT articles. Then, of course there are always the sermonette and sermon givers who feel free to express their personal social and political opinions under the guise of "God's truth".)

[But let me pick on hair as one example, and quote a page from my paper: "The growth of long-hair, beards, etc., is an obvious visual proof of the degeneracy of modern America. So one theory says. Let me say that, in the real sense, it is ridiculous for me to even bring up hair as a major point. It's not really. But I do so because it has been made a major point, and illustrates the problem, if only because of the disproportionate furor that makes a huge religious issue over hair.

[Let's examine first the question of beards, sideburns, and mustaches. Degeneracy implies sin. Things that are not sin can be hardly called "degenerate" [HWA's favorite word]. Here are some degenerate men of God that had beards. David had a beard ('he . . . let his spittle fall down upon his beard', 1 Sam. 21:13). David went to war because King Hanun of the Ammonites shaved off one-half of the beards of each of the men he sent to him (II Sam. 10:4). David said, 'Tarry ye at Jericho until your beards are grown'. In the war that followed, David's forces destroyed eight thousand enemy chariots, killed forty thousand men, and seized the Ammonite capital. The point is, the Ammonite king couldn't have picked a more insulting thing to do. Ezekiel had a beard (Eze. 5:1). Aaron had a beard that went "down to the skirts of his garments" (Ps. 133:2). Ezra had a beard (Ezra 9:3). On the basis of these statements, it would be fairly safe to conclude that all of God's prophets, from Moses to Ezekiel, had beards.

[The Israelites generally wore full round beards which they tended scrupulously. The beard was a mark of vitality and of manly beauty (Ps. 133:2; cf. II Sam. 19:24). To shave or cover it was a sign of grief or mourning (Isa. 15:2; Jer. 48:37; etc. Compare Lev. 19:27)

THE PAINFUL TRUTH

21:5, enacted probably against idolatrous practices of leprosy (Lev. 19:9). (We tell people that "long hair is a sign of humility", and make fun of people that way, as though humility were some great sin. To be consistent, we should also make fun of the beardless as being mourners and lepers.) To mutilate another's beard was to dishonor him (II Sam. 10:4; Isa. 1:6). Sideburns? Jeremiah says God will punish those tribes who shave their temples (Jer. 9:26, see commentaries. Best translation is apparently "all those with shaved temples who live in the desert.")

["Let's turn from the question of these Biblical degenerates for a moment, and examine the source of short-haired America. Pull out of your billfold a \$1 and a \$5 bill. First look at George Washington. His hair does not even approach his shoulders--but some zealous church members will call it "long-hair". Look at his sideburns. (Yes, wigs were the style of his day, but George Washington's hair was his own.) I doubt that his hair would bother the apostle Paul. But aside from that, George Washington's hair style is typical of "modern long-hairs".

["Now look at Lincoln's picture. Remarkably degenerate. Beard, sideburns, shaggy in back, even falling down his forehead.

["Modern short-haired America began in the 1870's (not 1770's). And so on. I went ahead to show the history of the controversy over hair throughout the centuries. For example, "Ancient Greek men wore hair so long they had to braid it in topknots on the crowns of their heads and hold it in place with hairpins. The brave Spartans spent hours combing out the long hair before they went into battle. Achilles, although weak in the heel, had such beautiful long hair it was likened to his bravery in the Trojan Wars. Strong man Hercules was pictured as having the hair of a bull, and Homer called the Greeks the long-haired ones."

["With that tradition, it seemed nothing less than a denial of the hairy virility of the heroic past when young men began to shave their beards and cut their hair short. The learned old men were outraged by what seemed to them a sign of effeminate weakness that was undermining the strength of the nation.

["When Diogenes went walking the streets of Corinth, shining a lantern into faces in his search for an honest man, he also searched for those who wore their hair and beards long, as he believed any he-man should. He had plenty of hair on his own head and face and he let those without it know exactly what he thought of them. When Diogenes spotted a Greek youth with the new clean-cut look that disgusted him, his favorite question was: "Have you shaved because you are disappointed you were created a man instead of a woman?"

["Shaving had been hardly known in Greece until Alexander the Great commanded his soldiers to shave in the 4th century B.C. He had good military reasons. In the close hand-to-hand fighting of those days long beards were up for grabs, so Alexander ordered his troops "to remove the handle which the enemy can seize." Civilians quickly imitated the military look and shaving spread through all the Greek dominions." And so on.

["Let me comment on some overall syndromes in the Work, mother, of which ideas about hair are one. (Short hair is deemed "holy" because it happened to be HWA's PERSONAL PREFERENCE, and for NO OTHER REASON.) One of them can be called the "I know the Truth

THE
PAINFUL
TRUTH

(he thinks!!), therefore all I know is truth" deception. This form (58) of prejudice gives a papal blessing to all the previous political beliefs, ignorances, prejudices, and pre-conceived notions, which a person had before he came into the church. A right- or left-winger quickly finds pseudo-scriptural or moral bases for what he already believed, then propounds it with even more vigor, including name-dropping, pontificating, and "proof" with "evidence" gleaned mostly from a short life of dubious experiences.

[Another is the "cynical sin-sick sensationalistic syndrome". Everything in the world is a "rotten, sick, ghastly, abomination". Nobody in the world is sincere; nothing in the world is right. Experts, if they don't agree with us, must be demon-possessed, probably adulterous, queer, definitely vain, especially all those egghead "intellectuals". This naive sophomoric approach is plainly just that to any individual who hasn't had his mind destroyed by a constant barrage of religious cliches. One should love humanity, admire those experts more gifted than himself, and learn the collective lessons of mankind.

[Another is the "my mind is made up; don't confuse me with the facts" syndrome. This common condition arises when a person fits all his research into his pre-conceived beliefs concerning a subject. The true function of research is to search the truth, with an open mind. Anybody can find "facts" to fit a personal thesis, but true research cuts through false data. A person should let the facts teach him, and not try to teach the facts! People ask, "Make a chart which proves this . . ." instead of "make a chart which shows what is happening".

[Another is the "self-made prophecy" syndrome. This includes setting dates, making conditions seem worse than they really are, and other ways of trying to "help" God fulfill prophecy sooner. This includes trying to pin down the end of society mathematically, by plotting curves of existing conditions. Most conditions of social and political events occur rather suddenly, not in exponential curves. This syndrome also includes conditions people assume to be in the Bible, but which aren't really.

[Another: "For every effect there is a cause, and here's the cause (I think)". Welfare relief "destroys character" because it "logically follows" that if people are "given something for nothing" it is "bound to destroy their character". (i.e. no widows on third tithe will make it into the Kingdom, etc.) Knowing the difference between right and wrong doesn't make it necessary to prove that 1) marijuana causes crime, accidents, and addiction to heroin, 2) pornography causes rape, 3) watching TV causes crime, family instability, or mental attrition, 4) poor reading material (comics, novels, fairy tales) causes the same 5) various drugs cause various reactions (remember, coffee and alcohol are drugs the WCG approves of), that welfare causes laziness, the Supreme court rulings cause crime (yet it can be proven that the war in Vietnam, which the WCG refused to condemn, caused crime--because of the effects on returning GI's), etc. 95% of marijuana users don't try heroin--and those that do, do so for social reasons or psychological (meanwhile, tons of tobacco--whose harmful effects have been proven--are freely sold, yet middle-class American is not about to pass laws against it). The problem with pornography is that it degrades sex and it is boring; studies show that rapists are generally unimaginative people who are not interested in pornography, because they don't get any kicks from it, which is why they are rapists; anyway, only an already sick man will attempt rape

tween some of the things listed, but it is not 1/10 so simplistic as the average field minister would like to make it.]

"2. Healing (antibiotics, repair surgery, surgical removal; e.g. lens, appendix, etc. cancer, (clay project))

"Gen. 50:2--Why did Joseph have physicians as servants?

[As much for your own information, mother, as anything else, let me quote you some material--first, from a memo from Robert Kuhn to Stanley Rader: "Four specific broad areas stand out: 1) The question of always equating the righteousness of "trusting in God" with not allowing doctors to operate, prescribe drugs, etc. This means that degrees of righteousness begin to be assigned as one individual Church member's actions are compared with another's. 2) What is permitted and what is not? Where is the line to be drawn? There are many difficulties: open heart surgery is really often just "repair surgery"; cutting a mole off the skin removes "part of the body". According to many ministerial decisions, the latter is perfectly all right while the former is heresy--in direct contradiction to our unofficial theological maxim that repair surgery is OK, while removal of any part of the body is wrong. 3) The inconsistency of ministers (some at high levels) advising a person to have an inflamed appendix surgically removed or to take penicillin for a short period of time--while other ministers label such actions outright sin. (Such inconsistency is most detrimental to faith.) 4) The decision of a few years ago not to tell our people not to go to doctors (a double negative) has not (a triple!) solved the problem. Our ministers specifically and categorically instruct our members to have broken bones set (even if by surgery), to have decayed teeth removed, etc. Consequently, when a person is told "it's your own decision", or "it's according to your faith", etc., the clear implication is that the medical procedure under consideration is not quite spiritually correct--and more righteousness would be accrued by "trusting in God". Simply stated, the inconsistency and clear gulf between recommending certain medical procedures and leaving others up to the individual is tantamount to assigning degrees of righteousness and reward in peoples' minds."

[Secondly, a memo from Lester to Robert Kuhn: "On only two occasions is any connection made between healing and forgiveness of sin: (Matthew 9, with parallel passages in Mark and Luke, and John 9). Yet on the basis of these we say sickness is the result of physical sin and healing is its forgiveness. Even if this explanation of those particular passages may be correct, it [physical sin] cannot be the only cause of sickness (John 9 has already shown this). Otherwise, how could a person recover naturally from a sickness or injury? Can "nature" forgive sin? We have said that in such cases the person pays the penalty for sin through his sickness. Yet we have to admit that the Bible nowhere talks about the concept of "physical sin" nor tells us what its penalty is. The "seven laws of radiant health" are our own arbitrary invention. No such listing is found in the Bible. One cannot find all of the seven mentioned there, much less in our ^{excess} arrangement and enumeration. Can God expect us to repent of physical sin which He has nowhere delineated? If healing is the forgiveness of physical sin, then only God can heal. Therefore, no physician could heal. But then why would it be wrong to go to a physician--they could not possibly take God's place. They cannot remove the penalty of sin. Anything they do would not be what God does. As long as they do not actually harm the patient, what would be sinful about their actions?

59
THE PAINFUL TRUTH

60
[At times we have said that a physician can "work along with nature" to help a sick person--that "natural" substances can be utilized to give him aid. But "natural" means what we subjectively decide it to mean at the time. For example, drugs are generally dismissed as witch's brew or with some similar epithet. Yet most modern drugs are actually substances which occur in nature or were originally isolated from natural substances. This includes such well-known drugs as quinine, belladonna, digitalis, and penicillin. It has been suggested that in case of the flu, one should boil grapefruit rinds for the "natural" quinine. How does that differ from taking quinine in tablet form or some other way?

[It also has been asserted or insinuated that doctors go against nature in their treatments. Again, this is an arbitrary definition of what is according to nature and what is against it. How is destroying bacteria by an antiseptic (such as wine) more natural than destroying bacteria by an antibiotic (such as penicillin)? Doctors simply use the laws of chemistry and biology to regulate the body or to fight whatever is attacking it. It is a biochemical fact that certain substances have a certain effect in the body. Whether this effect is good or bad simply depends on the interaction of certain chemical and biological laws. One can judge only by the results. If the results are good, the treatment is natural. If not, then it must be unnatural. No one can subjectively label it natural or unnatural (such as whether it is "organic" or is a product of nature) without seeing the results.

[In our emphasis on proper observance of the laws of health, we seem to have overlooked the fact that the Bible says extremely little about physical health regulations. Even the instructions about clean meats and about eating blood or fat are not discussed in relation to health. The reasons given for not eating certain meats is that they are an "abomination" to God. Blood is not to be eaten because the life is there. Fat is not to be eaten because it is the food of God. Nothing is said about health. I have no doubt that part of the reason for these instructions was simply for health's sake. But it is quite interesting that the stated reasons do not deal with health--the connection with health is only a deduction of our own, based on medical research and our own logic. I do not mean to denigrate the importance of proper health or of using common sense and proven health rules. But the emphasis of the Bible seems to be more on one's spiritual life. In the time of ancient Israel--when God's laws of health were presumably known and observed--man lived about 70 years. David, a man after God's own heart, lived no longer. In our "degenerate" age, we still find man living about 70 years. Is this an indication that our health efforts are of only minor importance and that many other factors (such as heredity) enter into the picture?"]

"3. Voting: To what degree should we help make this a better world--e.g. participation in Thailand.

[It is somewhat self-contradictory to say that voting is "getting involved in the ways of the world" and meanwhile allocate the men and money to help the hill people in Thailand. (How about voting to help the hill people in the U.S.?) And so on.]

"4. Military service

Violence: spank children, but will not lift a hand against a burglar or mugger

"5. Divorce and remarriage (practical application of doctrine, consistency) (6)

[Here is another example of HWA's cause-effect analysis. First of all he stoutly declares to church members that divorces are illegal, not permissible, forbidden. Then he proudly proclaims to the world that the church has few or no divorces. Now . . . there would be grounds for church pride if divorces were permissible, and yet the church had few or none. But because divorce is forbidden, the fact that the church has few divorces could be fully attributed to the fact that divorce is forbidden to the church. It doesn't prove anything about the superiority of church marriages.]

[His social analysis is just as slanted. The rapidly accelerating divorce rate in the United States is often cited as evidence that the American family is crumbling, but the statistics are misleading (whether or not the assertion is true). All that the statistics show is what are really crumbling are the old-fashioned divorce laws.]

[The number of divorces--and thus the rate--increases every time a state liberalizes its divorce code--but the number of broken marriages does not necessarily increase. For example, when New Jersey adopted a more liberal law in 1971, the divorces granted that year were nearly double those of the previous year (26,289 actions, compared with 14,236). However, it developed that the bulk of those divorces were granted to couples who had been separated for ten years or more but had been unable to obtain decrees under the old 'tough' law.

[When California adopted a law that permitted the dissolution of marriages that had 'irretrievably broken down', divorce actions shot up. But the number of divorces in neighboring Nevada, long an "easy divorce" state, went down. Couples who in the past would have had to cross state lines to win a divorce were able to accomplish the same thing at home.]

[California still has a high divorce rate--it is kept so, in part, by immigrants from other states who come to the coast for a legal decree. When New York made it possible for at least consenting couples to divorce, the state's divorce rate increased, but the then flourishing trade in Mexican divorces fell on hard times.]

[The most worthless divorce statistic of all is the one that claims one in four marriages now ends in divorce. There may be one divorce for each four marriages in any given year, but that divorce should be compared not with just the marriages in that year but to all existing marriages. The divorce rates is 13 per cent--about one in eight.]

[There are now--and undoubtedly there always have been--far more broken marriages than are recognized in divorce statistics. If divorce is a modern phenomenon, marital breakdown surely is not. In Pennsylvania, where divorce is still difficult to obtain if one partner chooses to contest, thousands still legally married live separately in unending warfare. They have done so, in most cases, for five, ten or twenty years.]

[The movement to liberalize divorce laws in this country, while pushing up the divorce rate, may actually be helping families, protecting children.. Social scientists studying family life have concluded that a "clean" divorce is far healthier for children than con-

stant bickering inside the home or an acrimonious separation. Laws which make divorce difficult to obtain and which permit one partner to stall or prevent divorce, are actually destructive of the personalities involved. (62)

⊗ ["To withhold divorce does not reunite the family", stated the New Jersey Divorce Law Study Commission Report in 1970. "Almost never does a defeated plaintiff resume cohabitation with a victorious defendant. He or she merely plans for the next round and sometimes cohabits with a partner of choice. Such is social reality."

[Though many states have instituted reform through the "no-fault" divorce, a majority still adhere to the old codes in which a divorce is granted only to the "innocent" partner who can prove the other "guilty" of a marital crime specified in the law. At best, testimony in such cases can be very messy and lead to permanent bad feelings; at worst, failure to win divorce in a contested case amounts to being 'sentenced' to stay married as punishment for your sins. However, as the knowledge that difficult, adversarial divorce codes create problems becomes more widespread, the likelihood is that more states will move to liberalize their laws. (That will increase the divorce rate--giving the PT material to harp about for years to come-- but, once again, not necessarily the number of marital breakdowns.]

- "6. Women (exaggerated submission to husbands)!!!
- "7. Child rearing (proper use of spanking in perspective).
- "8. Ministerial organization (ranks, offices)
- "9. Relationship between members (people afraid to discuss Bible without minister present, lest it be thought that someone is starting a breakaway group); go to brother when offended.
- "10. Education--What is wrong with world's education, what is right. What we can learn from it. Objectives in building character. Are we teaching people how to live but failing to prepare them to earn a living? To what degree are we a character-selecting institution (by turning down undesirables, letting go those who don't perform up to standards) instead of character building?
- "11. Race questions--how far to go in segregation, and upon what premise."

And so, finally, we come to the end of the list of common Biblical questions. I might quote a sentence which Dr. Hoeh used to be fond of pointing out in 3rd yr. Bible, out of The Bible and the Ancient Near East, and apply it to WCG theology: "The 'fluidity' in this field [the field of Biblical studies] referred to by Rowley may with perhaps less courtesy but more accuracy be called chaos."

I want you to think about these things, mother. You know as well as I do that if a Church member in the 1950's had taken issue with, say, The Proof of the Bible booklet, and had claimed that these so-called "proofs" did not prove the Bible, that person would have been put out of the church for heresy. Because that person would be "questioning" the very "proofs" "God Himself had inspired as proofs of His Word". And so on. In fact, I have seen this very thing happen. As I wrote in a memo to Mr. Hill last year: "In past years I have had

a few OTS students discuss some of these things with me. They came from a more scientific background, other colleges, and were used to thinking somewhat logically. They believed in God and believed in the Bible, but were not baptized. Yet at the same time, the "proofs of God" and "proofs of the Bible" were huge stumbling blocks standing in the way of their conversion. For example, the argument based on Tyre (even aside from current problems--our misunderstanding of the prophecy). They could see the process of reasoning (w/o haggling over details) went like this: 1) You read the Bible prophecies on Tyre. 2) You read an encyclopedia that says Tyre was destroyed. 3) You assume that the Bible was written before the destruction, ignoring the fact that that same encyclopedia might well say the Bible prophecy was written after the destruction of Tyre. 4) You conclude then the Bible was right about Tyre, and then illogically conclude that it is also right about everything else and is God's Word. 5) Then on the basis that the Bible is God's word, you proceed to point out how the encyclopedia--which you used to prove the Bible in the first place--is all wrong, and how it has rejected the foundation of all knowledge, which is the Bible. Meanwhile, you have not checked the original sources, which were the basis for the encyclopedia's information, you have not visited Tyre, you don't know anything about the men who wrote all these things up. Yet, all this is [in HWA's words] "scientific proof". More scientific proof and sound documentation consists in the account that a roadside Arab said no one spent the night on the site of ancient Babylon. (Which raises the question of what sort of God do we believe in? One that sends lightning from heaven to consume Beduins who might inadvertently camp on the site of ancient Babylon?)

... it was almost as if they had to go through a process of autosuggestion, of self-brainwashing, to convince themselves that the booklet proved God exists, and then they could think about baptism. Tragic. And weird. . . . But it's inherent in the system. The counselling formula for baptism says ask them if they have really "proved" God exists. And how are they to have done that? We were told in Advanced Public Speaking to discuss the booklet Proof of the Bible, even review with prospects the examples of Tyre and Babylon and make sure they understand and believe that. That booklet is the example and guideline for all to follow. It is the word from on high."

And another paragraph: "... the year of Christ's death could be a useful date to know. But I deny that anyone has to accept the 31 A.D. date to be converted. Yet we in fact force all to do so, by the following process: First there are many who don't understand the chronology here, but just accept the date, and they get baptized, because their "hearts are right". Others were given more natural ability by God, so they can understand the material. Yet because they do understand it, some may find a problem w/it, and tell their instructors, counsellor, etc., about it. They do not accept the material as absolute proof of a 31 A.D. crucifixion. Because they do not, they are "doubters", their "hearts are not right", as they do not believe this "basic" doctrine. God has not yet "opened their minds". Hence, they could not be baptized, in many people's opinion, because they "have not surrendered to God", and "come to an understanding of the truth". They have not, until they accept this "proof". I would like to say, in all sincerity of feeling, that that is so much crap."

THE PAINFUL TRUTH

The WCG abounds in such dungheaps.

The WCG claims that the Bible is God's infallible word: on that basis the WCG is condemned as not being God's church.

The only serious attempt I have seen to claim that the church, the WCG, is still legitimate, though its teachings are not Biblical, is that done by Robert Kuhn. (There are many, many others who don't begin to see the doctrinal problems, so what they have to say is really irrelevant.) In particular, I have discussed with him the WCG's concept that the Mosaic law should (except for sacrifices) be observed today. Robert frankly agrees that tithing, holy days, etc. were taught by Paul as not being binding on the NT church.

He has offered two proposals. 1) That Paul might have been wrong. I won't even discuss this one. Because if Paul was wrong, then the church is still condemned, as it claims to live by Paul's epistles. In fact the entire NT canon is disrupted (which, incidentally is not an impossibility: the NT in the King James Bible is that accepted by the Catholic Church--but the WCG rejects other claims and traditions of the Catholic church.) If Paul was wrong, then the whole concept of NT Christianity would have to be abandoned. Paul's epistles, after all, are the earliest NT documents, apparently. So we would have to go back to some form of Judaism, with Jesus as the Messiah--but not the pre-incarnate Son of God. (Rejecting Paul would imply also rejecting the gospel of John with its similar Hellenistic ideas.). So, after throwing out Paul's and John's ideas, we've thrown out half of the WCG theology anyway--even if we did keep tithing and the holy days.

2) The other proposal--and this is the only one arguable for a member of the WCG--is "we don't have to do it the way Paul did it", going by Matt. 16:18, the power to bind and loosen. I.e. the church has the power to make, say, tithing a spiritual requirement. And this concept, of course, is exactly what the Catholics teach about Matt. 16:18--and something which we have condemned for years and years.

So let me discuss this last proposal, mother, because it is the BEST that has been offered to explain away our unbiblical practices. Other people are beginning to accept the idea, as a way out of the mess. I will quote to you a letter I wrote Robert about this proposal. It shows that if we don't do things the way Paul did, then there is ABSOLUTELY NO BASIS for the claim to be God's church. And Robert--GTA's assistant, remember--said that he would "be hard put to find something to disagree with in your letter". Here it is:

"I wanted to write this to convey some thoughts on your concept that 'we don't have to do it the way Paul did it'. You are aware of all the problems that exist with the church, especially in the area of doctrine, and I find this concept totally inconsistent with your cognizance of these problems. I have heard the same principle stated by at least one other person, influenced by you, who said, 'On some of these things which we are unsure of biblically, we should recognize HWA's authority to decide what is right or wrong, by virtue of the position he has'.

"When you say that 'we don't have to do it the way Paul did it' you are removing the only basis for any claim to be God's church. Nothing less than the legitimacy of our organization is at stake. We can only properly analyze this in the overall context of principles that apply

THE PAINFUL TRUTH

not only to this concept you stated, but apply to our entire spectrum of doctrinal problems. (45)

"Thesis: Our only basis for legitimate claim to be God's true church is if we do it the way Paul (and the other apostles, subsequent to Acts 10) did it--"do it" being defined as what we teach as the essence of the gospel, namely what God expects of man in order for him to become part of God's kingdom. Here is why:

"1. Circular Reasoning: We are God's church because we practice what the Bible says. How do we know we practice what the Bible says? Because we are God's church. And so on.

"2. Circular Reasoning: We are God's church because in our doctrines we are the historical heirs of various groups from Christ to the 20th century who were God's church. How do we know these various historical groups were really God's church? Because they believed the same doctrines we believe. So they must be God's church because we are God's church. And so on. (Totally aside, this is why no research into the history of God's true church will ever be valid, until we rightly define what the true Biblical doctrines are.)

"3. "We are God's church because we can tell by our fruits that we are". But this same claim is asserted by many churches, especially evangelical ones. They say, like us, 'try it, you'll like it'. In one sense, the principle here--of putting it to the test--is a valid principle. In another sense, it is not. What one tries and what one likes are dictated by religious assumptions. . . . The same type of reasoning would apply to the claim that religious experience is the proof of God's true church, that "the fruits" are the proof. For how do you define the "fruits" if not Biblically? Just a sense of personal fulfillment and happiness is not enough, because men everywhere have found that in all different types of endeavors. So what if you say you have good fruits, even so others say they have good fruits. The truth is that no one can be the authority for his own personal legitimacy. Christ said, "My teaching is not mine, but his who sent me; if any man's will is to do his will, he shall know whether the teaching is from God or whether I am speaking on my own authority. He who speaks on his own authority seeks his own glory; but he who seeks the glory of him who sent him is true, and in him there is no falsehood." (John 7:16-18, RSV)

"4. In contrast to invalid claims to be God's church, three of which are listed in points 1, 2, and 3, here is the only valid biblical claim for anyone's belief that he is of God: "he who says 'I know him' but disobeys his commandments (i.e. the things he had commanded for us to do as requirements to enter His Kingdom--as opposed to things he hasn't commanded) is a liar, and the truth is not in him; but whoever keeps his word, in him truly love for God is perfected. By this we may be sure that we are in him: he who says he abides in him ought to walk in the same way in which he walked" (John 2:4-6). Biblical correspondence is the only test.

"If we abandon Christ's word, we abandon our basis for being in Christ, as members of his body, his church.

"5. Fulfilled prophecy is not proof of a true prophet (Deut. 13). But wrong prophecy is proof of a false prophet. "And if you say in your heart, 'How may we know the word which the LORD has not spoken?'--when a prophet speaks in the name of the LORD, if the word does not come to pass or come true, that is a word which the LORD has not spoken;

the prophet has spoken it presumptuously, you need not be afraid of him" (Deut. 18:21-22). (66)

"By 'false' prophet I mean a prophet whose prophecy represents his own opinion, not God's, as illustrated in the scripture just quoted. Our prophetic failures have shown that we have not been, to date, called as prophets of God. Therefore, our only basis for prophecy is those whom the Bible designates as prophets, who were called by God. [The above verse says more than that, mother. It says there is no need to pay any attention to the WCG: it clearly does not speak for God.]

"Generalizing this specific area of Bible teaching to Bible teaching as a whole, the only basis we have for doctrinal conclusions is the Bible.

"6. HWA's ordination as an apostle by the 'Sardis' church is not a valid credential of apostleship.

"a. First of all, claims that the church in Oregon was God's true church must rest on the same foundation presented in the above points. The conclusion that this was the true church in Oregon is a conclusion based totally on circular reasoning, unless we can show that the teachings corresponded to Biblical teaching.

"b. Christ ordained and taught the 12 apostles--they had no basis apart from the authority conferred from that ordination. They had no basis for authority apart from that ordination. They could not depart from Christ or His teaching and still claim to be Christ's apostles. Paul claimed (Gal. 1) the direct authority of Christ as his teacher. Otherwise he would have had to acknowledge the superior authority of the Jerusalem apostles, or the original apostles.

"Moreover, what Peter learned in Acts 10 about the gentiles applied, from that point on, to ALL the apostles in their teachings--not just Paul, but the others also. Yet, at the same time, Peter did not know about this teaching before Acts 10, though he had been with Christ 3 1/2 years. Which shows that many of the changes Christ's death made were not taught by Christ, simply because they could not apply until indeed He had finished a perfect life and met that death. Galatians further expounds that even though the Jewish Christians could go ahead doing some of the things that were now irrelevant, it was at the same time absolutely illegal to make any of these things requirements even in the case of those Jews who had become Christians before Acts 10, if doing so forced those requirements on Gentiles. This was true for ALL the apostles--not just Paul, as the incident with Peter and the men from James at Antioch shows.

"All this shows that all apostolic authority derived directly from Christ, firstly, and secondly that what was revealed following Christ's death and resurrection was new and applied, not just to Paul, but to ALL the apostles from that time on. THE TEACHING OF CHRIST STEMMING FROM THE TIME OF ACTS 10 APPLIED TO ALL THE CHURCH, AND IS STILL IN FORCE TODAY, AND WILL CONTINUE IN FORCE APART FROM A DIRECT REVELATION OF JESUS CHRIST. MOSES COULD NOT HAVE INITIATED THE ERA OF HIS LEGISLATION ON HIS OWN AUTHORITY. PETER COULD NOT HAVE MADE THE CHANGES IN ACTS 10 ON HIS OWN AUTHORITY, NOR COULD PAUL HAVE EXPOUNDED THEM ON HIS OWN AUTHORITY. THEY, PETER AND PAUL, HAD TO HAVE A DIRECT REVELATION DESPITE THE FACT THAT THEY WERE ORDAINED APOSTLES, ONE BY CHRIST, AND THE OTHER ORDAINED BY CHRIST'S DIRECT REVELATION

THE
PAINFUL
TRUTH

(67)

"This leads us to two conclusions regarding HWA's ordination:
1) Even if we grant the assumption that the "Sardis" church was God's church, then we must grant that HWA has no authority apart from that church, and hence no authority, since that ordination was revoked in 1938. 2) Even if we grant that HWA were an apostle, HWA would still have no authority to introduce any legislative changes that differed from the teachings of the post-Acts 10 church, apart from a direct revelation from Christ.

"Moreover, as yet nothing establishes that the 'Sardis' church was God's church, or that HWA is an apostle.

"Moreover, if the "Sardis" church was God's church, then HWA is not an apostle (as his authority was revoked). But if HWA is an apostle, then the Sardis church is not God's church, as it stood in direct conflict with God's apostle.

"c. If it be argued that HWA was following God in leaving the Sardis church, then it must be admitted that the Bible is the real authority here. For he left as a result of doctrinal conflict. And as he received no direct word from Jesus Christ, the Bible is the only authority that can be cited that he 'followed Christ' in doing so.

"7. The statement that "God wouldn't let me be wrong all these years" is unbiblical. Period. We have seen that the Bible is our, HWA's, only basis for legitimate claim to be in Christ or of God. Therefore any teaching that conflicts with the final and total teaching of the Bible is wrong by definition.

"But there is more. The statement 'I couldn't have been wrong' directly and flagrantly contradicts certain Bible scriptures: "If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us" (John 1:8). ". . . Satan, the deceiver of the whole world" (Rev. 12:9). The assertion that "I have no need to examine the scriptures because I am right" is of necessity the shortest and easiest road to self-deception, and to deception in the overall religious sense. Not only does "I couldn't have been wrong" directly imply "I need not examine the scriptures", and thus repudiate our only claim for Biblical legitimacy, but psychologically it condemns us, as it is easiest to deceive one who thinks he cannot be deceived.

"8. No appeals can be made to authority derived from Mrs. Armstrong's visions. Deut. 13 absolutely forbids this, saying that it is the correspondence of a person's word with God's word that is the real test. This principle is enumerated throughout the Bible, nowhere more strongly than in John's epistles.

"9. I think ^{R. Kuhn} (you) are attempting to rationalize a situation that perhaps cannot be rationalized. Perhaps your thinking is this: 'Here are a great many things that are unbiblical. But . . . perhaps they are really not unbiblical. Rather than us teaching things that are not Biblical, perhaps we really have authority to do these things. So there are two things that we must realize: 1) that we do have such authority; 2) that this authority is our real basis, and not the Biblical teaching (Paul, etc.) per se, and so we should quit saying that the Bible teaches such and such (yet we can by our authority continue to make such things binding on the church)."

"Hans Kung shows in his book Infallible? An Inquiry--acknowledged by many to be the most significant theological work in recent years--that the milieu of the 1870 assertion of Papal infallibility on an ex cathedra basis was the reaction of the Roman church to church problems, doctrinal and otherwise, at the time. I think it would absolutely fatal if we, too, were to try to cover our problems by an assertion of infallibility at this time.

"Even if our slate were clean doctrinally, to assert our authority to decide on qualifications for God's Kingdom would be suspect. To do it with our present record, and under present circumstances, would be disastrous.

"Paul made a decision in 1 Cor. 7 apart from a specific command of Christ. But until Acts 2, and afterward, the circumstances that brought up the situation did not exist--there was no a spiritual church until Acts 2. Moreover, Paul's decision was obviously based on Biblical principles, and applied to the whole church. Even if our claims to legitimacy are correct, we would have no authority to decide on matters already decided on in the past, but only on new historical problems. Evenso--Paul was specifically called by Christ, directly, and had contact with the original apostles. Can we claim the same authority? Or must we rely on the record of Christ and these apostles preserved for us? I think the latter is the obvious answer.

"10. I realize that conversion is based on attitude, not knowledge. But the attitude of being willing to change according to God's word must be present

"I personally see three foci of major problems: political and social attitudes based on American religious tradition; doctrinal ideas stemming from a misunderstanding of the Mosaic legislation; prophetic ideas based on Protestant concepts about the identity of the beast and the identity of the whore of Rev. 17 (this, beyond USBC questions).

"Unless there is some basic idea of the scope of problems that exist, I don't see that the doctrinal committee will ever make any headway. [This was before HWA killed it.] In essence, in accordance with the management-by-crisis symptomatic of the rest of the work, doctrinal study has been study by crisis. Little headway is made regarding specific doctrines, because of the huge assumptions implicit in other doctrinal beliefs that keep us from ever admitting the possibility that we have been in error. We may have been a "teeny" bit in error, but never just plain wrong. [For example, modifying ideas about 3rd tithe--but never even considering tithing as a whole.]

"This is not only true of HWA, who sees essentially no problems, but of those who have access to him, who see specific problems, yet who are convinced of our basic legitimacy, and who therefore are not willing to force the issue on specific problems. At least that has been basically true to present.

"We first have to clearly see the major patterns of circular reasoning which are our basis for calling ourselves "God's church". Though I have enumerated several points here, and though they are the end product of considering many separate individual questions, evenso facing these relatively simple points (though absolutely basic and crucial) has been at the expense of much psychological trauma.

THE PAINFUL TRUTH

"When all else fails we will likely say, 'Well, who else is preaching the gospel'. The answer is, I don't know who is. But I do know that the assertion that we are is one more line of circular reasoning."

So I am almost to the end of this letter. You might ask why Dr. Kuhn, accepting the above points, continues in the work? Well, I think there are several reasons. The first is that, just as Dr. Hoeh set up HWA as the Protestant Pope, Dr. Kuhn believes that GTA has a special calling and commission, and is the hope of the world. He's made GTA into a latter-day Messiah. I am afraid that he is going to be sadly disappointed. I think Al Carrozzo is right when he says of GTA that "his father chastized us with whips, and he's going to chastize us with scorpions". (Read 1 Kings 12.) I have seen GTA give sermons that were almost anti-authority recently (especially when GTA himself was under fire), and then turn around and support super-authority (when GTA's authority was being questioned)--just like HWA did in regard to the "Sardis" ministers, by contrast with today. If Robert wants to stay around in hopes that GTA will eventually (in 15 or 20 years) totally revolutionize (very gradually) the belief-structure of the WCG, fine. But if the new beliefs will be Godly, then is he not supporting ungodliness in the meantime? And if it is all right to preach falsehoods "for the present distress", then why not just as well join the JW's or SDA's or Catholics or anyone else?

OLD TESTAMENT SURVEY

Robert once said in OTS that even if this weren't God's Work, he was having more fun than he could at doing anything else. And in addition, you would have to say that he is somewhat mesmerized by GTA.

Now, mother, if I had told you one-third of the things I have told you, but had said they applied to another religious group, you would be shaking your head at those poor deceived people--and how much they needed God's truth, etc. Now it is a general characteristic of the theologies of all groups that they employ a double standard. One set of standards is employed for reading and interpreting one's own tradition and texts, and analyzing one's self as a religious body; and another set of standards for the texts and traditions and actions of all others. I hope you will not follow that double standard, but face these issues.

I must go along with Dr. Martin in his statement: he said that if he were in the Hall of Administration, at the reception desk; and across the street were ten thousand people, just waiting, hoping, someone would come across the street and invite them in; if that were the situation, Dr. Martin said, "I would not go over and invite anyone. Al Carrozzo related that to me when I asked him if he could, with a clear conscience, recommend to anyone that he get involved with the WCG."

If you want to believe HWA has God's truth, mother, go ahead. But I hope you realize that it represents nothing more than a comfortable philosophy, that gives convenient pseudo-answers to all questions. As Nietzsche said, "Is it really so difficult simply to accept . . . what is considered truth in the circle of one's relatives and of many good

men, and what, moreover, really comforts and elevates man? Is that more difficult than to strike new paths, fighting the habitual, experiencing the insecurity of independence and the frequent wavering of one's feelings and even one's conscience, proceeding often without any consolation . . . Here the ways of men part: if you wish to strive for peace of soul and pleasure, then believe; if you wish to be a devotee of truth, then inquire."

70

Love,

Orlin

THE PAINFUL TRUTH

hwarmstrong.com