

APPENDIX 1

FINANCES AND MARRIAGE PREPARATION

Dr. Herman Hoeh

23-Jul-1977

(partial transcript)

I presume that this can be heard well enough. Is there any way of checking to be sure that things are in proper order in the other room in terms of hearing? I was passed one question and it is possible that, based on what I am going to discuss there may be questions elicited. There are two ways of doing it: if we find that questions seem especially appropriate that are focused on our discussion today, then I should like to handle those questions; if on the other hand there are questions that you are interested in that do not directly focus on this particular occasion, since we tend to dismiss at approximately noon or a half hour before other services here, I'll be happy to spend a little time out in the area between the Music and the Science areas and discuss any questions of a general nature.

I had a chance two evenings ago to be a guest with my wife with a number of you, some of whom I see here, in the home of Beverly Glenn, and we discussed certain matters pertaining to older people, a number of whom are either widows or whose husbands are not in the church, and not with their families. We had some discussion otherwise, as well, that I thought might be of some help, to give some form to the general statements made in the letter you received. In thinking it over what I would like to do is take an approach that will, as much as possible, avoid any fundamental repetition with material that might have been covered before, and perhaps give an entirely new overview, something much broader in perspective than the general concepts that we have of dating and human relationships.

First, I should like to pose the general question: Is dating itself a fundamental aspect of our human relationships between the sexes, or is it only one aspect that should be seen in a much broader whole. I think this is important. First of all, there are a number of scriptures in the Bible that I should like to dwell upon, many of them in fact deal with the broader perspective and not with dating.

For example, if we were to go through a number of illustrations as well as the law what we would discover is this — that dating is in terms of the acquaintanceship fundamentally not discussed in the Bible. There are certain rules which are discussed in terms of conduct when we meet one another, but there are other aspects far more important that we have generally overlooked, and which, if taken into consideration might well affect the whole view of dating in society, not to mention the Church of God. I am going to deal fundamentally today with an aspect that actually transcends dating, but which is related to it. It is a word that you're all familiar with. It's the subject of money. Because whether you like it or not, the fact remains — interestingly enough — that the question of money and morality are linked together in the relationship between men and women. If each one were properly cared for, questions that often would arise in matters of dating would be much more readily handled. I should, first of all, like to take the Bible as it moves along in a story.

Very little is given until we come to the account in the case of Abraham. Here I would like to give you some indication of situations that existed in times past, so that we can better understand what the picture is of society then, and what God chose to put into the Bible. In a certain sermon, long ago, on the subject of tithing, Mr. Dart made an interesting comment, that one has to bear in mind that what we have in the Bible is there for a reason because there is no reason to assume that God would have wasted time on material that has no bearing on our lives. Therefore, we may take it as important that there is something fundamental in meaning in any event or example that is given in the scripture. We know that society varies from one generation to another, and many of you who are older know to

what extent it probably has varied two or three times in your lifetime. Therefore we may presume that there are variables which, if not discussed in the Bible, are not fundamental, but there may be other things in the Bible that become fundamental so that we may understand better how to cope with the variations in society with which we have to live.

The first and most important one is in Genesis 24. This is the case of Abraham taking his servant, asking him under oath to obtain a wife from Abraham's family in Mesopotamia for son Isaac. I would like to point up a number of things that we perhaps have read over and then focus in on because I think it will help a great deal. First of all, we just picked the story up in verse 4. The servant was asked to take a wife for son Isaac. Verse 5 says, "what if the woman will not be willing to follow me?" What we discover here is something significant in a story. We know that in societies there are those cases where women are completely free to make their own decisions once they are of age, as in our western society, or in strict orthodox Hindu society where women are never free to make a decision of a husband, or let us say, in Christian India where women are free to say "No," but normally do not initiate original recommendations, which are entered into most often by parents. So we have variations. Interestingly enough the first clear example that we have here in detail is one in which it is recognized that a woman has a right to say "No" in terms of any representative of the husband and presumably also therefore in terms of any recommendations of the woman's father. The first thing then we do learn by example in the family of Abraham, as distinct from what it was like in Sodom, what it might have been like in some Gentile country, is that the people whom God chose to use as the beginning of the foundation of His church, nation, and society, has a custom, and that's the way it is presented, in which a woman, irrespective of parents' wishes, does have a right to say "No." It does not say the servant said to Abraham "peradventure the father of the woman." It speaks of the woman's rights herself. Now this is what I want to get over as a beginning picture.

This is important in terms of a situation which we too often do not have, and that is where the implication is also that the parents are involved. Today our society leaves it strictly to the woman. The background of the story will bring the parent in, but in any case, the woman has a measure of freedom that must never be overlooked. We move along now in the story.

The servant, in verse 10, took ten camels and came to his master, and necessarily much of this was for feed to take care of the animals en route. They weren't loaded with ten camels of diamonds. When the servant meets the girl, and I'm presuming you have already read the story a sufficient number of times that you remember Rebekah came to the well at an unusual period when this man wanted his camels watered. And the man took a golden ring of half a shekel weight and two bracelets for her hand of ten shekels of gold and gave them to the girl whose family he had inquired of. Rebekah then goes to her brother verse 29, whose name is Laban. Now at this point we will suddenly discover that Rebekah's and Laban's father seems not to have been around and presumably not living, when we see the rest of the story. So Rebekah was essentially under the supervision of her brother. And this brings up an interesting picture of responsibility. I think today, in our society, there is a tendency to have the kind of freedom that we see reflected in single women along streets hitchhiking and accepting a ride even from an unknown single man. There is basically no feeling of responsibility by brother for sister in our society when the father is dead. This is, in my estimation, therefore, around us a society that has gone beyond good judgment. What we are picturing here is a family relationship that, when the mother is alone and the father is dead, the oldest brother therefore, who is at home, becomes responsible for the care and in fact decisions of sisters.

I have an interesting illustration of that where a surviving brother in Fiji, who is a Hindu — my Muslim friend Abdul Azees (sp?) found husbands for his sisters, who were responsible men, who could care for them, because his own father and the sisters' father, was dead. Now, it came to pass when Laban saw the earrings and the bracelets upon the sister's hands, and when he heard the words of Rebekah, that of course his eyes lit up. Laban was an unusual person and very perceptive when it came to things like that. The servant brought forth jewels of silver, we are told in verse 53, and jewels of gold, and raiment and gave them to Rebekah. So, in other words, it's as if in a sense the

prospective husband's father's family does do certain — shall I use the simple term — nice things, in this case reflected in jewelry. It may be reflected in some other manner, or it reflects a certain interest and solicitation for a prospective daughter-in-law. He gave them to Rebekah, but he also gave to her brother, as it would have been the father, and to her mother, precious things. And in turn he was entertained.

Ancient custom has its parallels to this account. In this account it is not called by any specific term, a bride price, but what is found here by example in the society of Abraham is, in fact, essentially equivalent to many of the customs in society that used to be extant and, in fact, are still extant in some lands. I will show you there is a change later that takes place. And that is that when a family loses a daughter the family is compensated, for the premise is that the daughter is responsible for no small amount of the house work that now the mother is not, in fact, doing, but that would have to pass to some servant. In other words, a daughter who is accepted into another family is essentially compensated for. Now, our society has varied very greatly from this, but I would only point up the significance, at least of the custom as it began. We will take a look at various customs. Remember this is not a law. It is a custom. But it recognizes something that I think will help you. The woman was not earning her own living alone, somewhere off in another city. She was, in fact, assisting in the caring of family responsibilities. Now, our society differs appreciably from this because we often live in little apartments and we don't even have room to take care of the children much after high school is finished. The society originally, however, was predicated on the premise that a woman's responsibility significantly was to take care of things in the family that the mother was not always able to do, or it freed her to do certain things that she might not otherwise have been able to.

The next step would be in this sense to present gifts, that whether we think of it in terms of a bride price, or merely a gift that is an estimation of the quality and character of the individual, that is, an extension of the idea of esteem, is incidental. In any case, her family received at this time certain things from a prospective husband's family. Now, the custom in other societies was often that if the woman, for some reason, completely displeased the man, such things as were presented to Rebekah's brother and her mother were returned. That is what is called "bride price." That is not gone into here because I presume we are dealing with a society, freer than the strict enforcement of such rules; this is a family relationship that we find presented. Of course, the woman being a type of the church, did please her husband. In any case, we do recognize that in this environment, and this is what I'm getting to, that the girl played a significant role in her father's or her mother's family, in this case because the father was dead, and she was not at the same liberty that our society is today.

When we go through the examples of the Bible we will find some variations over periods of time. But there will always be a significant theme running through it. That's why I brought out the issue of money in the first place, which might seem rather unusual. You see, there was no opportunity to date but there was a recognition that not only was the father's — in this case, the brother's and the mother's family — to be compensated for such a daughter as Rebekah was found to be. But it implies that she herself had the opportunity while in her father's home to have her own sources, shall I say, of food and clothing and shelter; that she was, in fact, you see, cared for by the brother, and so we have the implication that in going to meet a young man by the name of Isaac, whom she had not yet met, that what was given by the servant in some way also would reflect the care that Rebekah should have in her new husband's home. Thus, whether we think of it in terms of the African concept of Labolo (sp?) or bride price, whether we think of it in terms of the generosity of the groom's parents as reflecting their capacity to provide for her. In any case what is fundamental in this initial situation is the fact that Isaac's got money. I want to point out how many problems in marriages arise, not because of sexual incompatibility but because the money aspect or the ability to care for another is overlooked, and sex is thereafter often used as a tool to punish; the woman denies, the man insists, or sometimes he denies, it all depends on your attitude, but it is more and more a recognized factor that many of the problems surrounding sex in marriage are not caused by incompatibility because we're not properly wired, it's caused by other things, and fundamentally money. I hope I get that over clearly, because indeed you will find this to be far more often true. Ignorance is very unlikely as a fundamental cause, especially in the Church of God with the literature we have available.

But look at the strange phenomenon here; we don't have Isaac and Rebekah dating at great length, getting acquainted, each comparing the other with a list of 60 things you must find in your mate. What is fundamental is the ability to care for the needs of the woman financially. I think you have to bear this in mind. You can't overlook it even though there may be variations in the background of the story compared to another one I'm going to read. This is fundamental.

We're going to move now to an entirely different situation, not picture of the wealthy, but a picture of the poor, in the law as distinct from in an example, and I think it is interesting that when it came to family exchanges and relationships among those who have money, that is who are able to provide, we have an example; there's far greater freedom. When it comes to poverty we have law, because when it comes to poverty there is the need to be sure that certain things are not misunderstood and they're properly enforced. Poverty— Exodus 21: "If you buy a Hebrew servant six years he shall serve you and the seventh he will go out free. If he comes in by himself he shall go out by himself. If he were married his wife will go out with him. If his master has given him a wife"— I think this is significant, too—"and she shall have borne him sons or daughters, the wife and her children that she shall have from this man shall be her master's." It doesn't say her husband's. "And he, at the end of the six years, or in the seventh, shall go out free." He has, in part, been paid by having a wife and children; he has, in part, been paid in salary whatever it seems to have been required on the basis of his job. "Now, if the servant shall plainly say—I love my master, my wife, and my children; I will not go out free, then his master shall bring him to the judges and he shall be brought to the door of the court—so to speak—and his master shall put a hole in his ear, like women who have earrings, and he shall serve him and the Hebrew forever" is a clear reference in Jewish tradition to the jubilee. That is, he shall serve him to that point in time with the family until the jubilee is up and he shall have the chance to return to his inheritance. You see, he's a Hebrew servant in the first place. He returns to his inheritance, at which point he can provide for her.

Now let us note the impact. Let us reverse the law and see what we like to think it to say, which it does not. "If the master give him a wife and she has borne him sons or daughters, the wife and the children shall be the servant's and he shall go out with them" is not what it says, but it's what most people would think. The premise of the latter would be predicated on (1) that it is more important for a man to have a wife for reasons of sex than it is to have the woman and the children properly cared for, because the presumption is the man not only not returning to his inheritance yet, he in fact has little to support her and further didn't even have the money to buy her freedom. The law therefore, interestingly, presumes that it is more important for the children to be cared for and the wife by the master than to have the marriage continued. We don't have a servant-master relationship. We have the corporation-labor union relationship today, but the principle that underlies it is very significant. We have too many fathers who have turned over their daughters to a man who could not provide either for his daughter or the children properly. The law presumes that there is a fundamental right of a woman to have herself cared for even as a servant. Now granted, the woman belonged to the master and she could have been free if, indeed, some one of her relatives or the young man's had come into money somewhere in the past six years and could have bought her freedom. That is not discussed. The presumption here is that there was no such money. What is significant is that the history of many church decisions in the past was a situation in which the church took over the responsibility of caring for a woman and her children while she was living with a ne'er-do-well husband. We felt, for instance, that the tithe we call the third tithe for the poor and the needy and those who are otherwise incapacitated should take care of situations because we assumed the marriage had precedence over this responsibility. And I can cite you a case that I am aware of where a man probably didn't earn any more than \$75.00 in a year because he couldn't get up off his chair often enough to get to work. His problem was not in his legs; it was in his brain. And Paul said such a man if he will not work should not eat. The church misunderstood. A woman has a right to be cared for, not to be a sexual servant to a husband—I'm speaking plainly—where she has to earn her living, take care of her children for a husband who can do neither, while she serves him in bed. This kind of thing is not what the law gives as an example. I want to make it plain because, indeed, we have often emphasized the thing that was not clear.

Now, all scripture is given by inspiration. We do look at the law today not in terms of a covenant which was administered then by Levites and Judges, but in terms of the intent and purpose of the law. And the intent and purpose is to tell us when there is such poverty that a man has to sell himself like a servant, which is equivalent to say that when young men are in debt and want to get married, and really can't get out of debt, the father is not using very good judgment when he turns his daughter over to such a man. The example of the law is given. What a father does in terms of permission granted, or what the girl wants to do, may indeed be her decision, but I think it is fundamental here to recognize that the issue was not whether they liked each other and got acquainted with each other through dating, the issue really is whether this man had the capacity to take care of her needs, and the order in which they are listed in verse 10.

A man has a duty to the woman sexually. That is the third in order; the first is food, and the second raiment, and raiment certainly would include housing, but the fact you live with a man already presumes that in the first place. This means that she is properly to be cared for, and any man who feeds himself, as some do, and do not take care of the wife and children in terms of food and clothing, is not doing his duty. In which case, if he fails in any of these, even a servant woman was allowed to go free if, of course, this was the master's son. Not someone else's.

The emphasis therefore is clearly on something commonly overlooked. Too many young men in the church today have a list of many things they would like their wives to be. I think we ought to analyze and think as to what kind of personality, what kind of mind, what kind of family and all, but I think we need to take note that what is required of the man is not to decide what he wants in the woman, but to decide what he is going to do to make it possible for her to live in a situation that is comfortable and pleasant and will be good for the children. The responsibility of the man is not so much the judging of what kind of woman he wishes; it is that he has taken care of his part in terms of his capacity to earn a living and to prove what he can do. Yet I frankly think that the average person in our American society has gone in another direction. We have, instead, emphasized and glamorized handsomeness, beauty — with respect to the two sexes — a vacation in the sun, and then all the other possibilities, you know, that you can enjoy without ever realizing or showing on TV how you pay for what you are using. You know, all the products are shown, but never how you work to earn the money to buy the products. And I do believe that very little of men's minds today have been properly educated as it should be in terms of realizing whether the job you have is going to please you and resolve, I think, three areas — financial, which is important; the intellectual, so that you are happy with your job; and a third component for converted people, that it also provides some special need and service, which is the spirit of love, agape, to others and to society as a whole. Now, if a man thinks of those things and is prepared, you see, to keep himself, that his mind is alert and he has the ability to work with other men or women on the job, then I think it is quite clear that he has the capacity to do his part, but we so often want to think whether the woman is going to do her part, and I'm sure many women, of course, are thinking on what the man's responsibility is, but I think we need to focus in — and I'm speaking as a man here — I think many men need to focus in more on their responsibility, and they're likely to find that they will discover a woman who is taking care of hers also.

Now, with this in mind, we will go to another area which I think is significant. There is always the chance that in a society where there is freedom to date, that emotional difficulties can arise and we have moral problems. In Deuteronomy 22 I will pick up one in particular of a number of illustrations. We are given law but we are also given here manners of administering judgment in order to prevent, in a carnal minded society, the continuance of any fundamental problems. And to start with one that is very late in the sequence in Deuteronomy specifically verse 28. "If a man find a damsel who is a virgin, is not betrothed, and lay hold on her and lie with her and they be found," or discovered, not necessarily in the act, but that it be discovered that this has occurred, then the man who has done this shall give to the damsel's father a certain sum. In this case 50 shekels of silver was the sum. She shall be his wife because he has humbled her. He may not put her away all his days.

I want to take a look at some of the implications of this. First implication, the girl is a virgin.

That's not merely an implication, it's a statement of fact, but it implies that we are not dealing here with a prostitute or a loose woman in the village, or in the city today. And this one is not betrothed. That is, not involved with someone else. And involved in my term here means interested in although I find that the term involved today means practically anything up to sexual intercourse; at least that's the way it finally comes to me when young people tell the story. And I have to say, well, will you explain what involved means. And then you finally get the picture.

In this case an interesting thing occurred that I think is very important and, in fact, might well be a solution to an increasing problem among young people in the church and/or any college campus, whether Ambassador or any public institution. In this case, we are clearly told that a man who is involved with a young woman who has previously not had sex relations with anyone, is required to marry her, and he was not allowed thereafter to divorce her all his days. Which presumes that there were other kinds of situations in which a man could divorce a woman. This is a very significant matter. In another verse, which I won't turn to, there is a further statement — well, maybe I can, just quickly — so you see also one other part of the story — in Exodus 22, "if a man entice a maid" — verse 16 — "who is not betrothed and lie with her, he will endow her to be his wife." The word "endow" here is the equivalent of the 50 shekels of silver which forty years later was a fixed sum, but here he implied that a certain sum of money again was given to the girl's family, a certain sum of money was given to the girl's family in compensation for their loss of her work, services. If her father utterly refused to give her to him, he shall pay money according to the dowry of virgins, he still had to pay, but nevertheless she then was not given to him. This implies an added thought, once stated was not repeated in Deuteronomy, which was given about forty years later. It implies something significant that a father had the right to say "no" to a prospective marriage, and to make it stick. Now remember this is God's society. In our society once a girl is of age whatever a father may wish doesn't necessarily carry through, because there is no way to enforce it, you understand. So what we're saying is, that there are some examples in the Bible that show what would be best in handling problems of such a society, and they may have equivalents today, and there are characteristics of our society that would be so different it wouldn't even be done. But in a situation like this, a father is apparently one who has authority to say no to a young man because he is responsible to see that his daughter is cared for. There is no indication anywhere that I know of in the Bible that a father had to exercise such a right in terms of his son. He exercised it in terms of his daughter. I want you to get the point. I believe that one of the fundamental weaknesses today in the Church is this — that parents are not concerned for the financial welfare of their daughters as they should be.

I will say that I believe some parents are. I chanced, as I said it, to have my eyes fall on Miss Herrmann, here, whose parents I know very well, and since her father does correspond with me in lengthy epistles, I respond with postcard length items. I know that he has been very careful in this society to see that they were all able to earn their living, that is they were able to sustain themselves. I think this is a very important aspect that too many parents overlook. Either you provide the money, or you provide the skills for earning a living. You see that a daughter is properly educated and able to make her way and never need to be unemployed. Now I am emphasizing this because I know some girls marry fellows because they have no other way to turn. It's a whole lot easier just to rely on the first fellow who comes along. If a father properly cares for his daughter in terms of, first, financial survival — we could say, you know, blessings and prosperity in a wealthier society, but now it's practically a matter of survival, we'll use that term, she is therefore not forced in the same manner to find some man. I know young girls, I've dealt with cases that involved divorces, sometimes girls were turned loose at 16, 17, 18 to work in restaurants, on tables, and I don't say that's a wrong occupation, I'm coming to a point, these were usually the 24-hour types where you're working your shift, where truck drivers and all sorts of people came in who were really the riff-raff of society, and they would be dated sometimes by the people who would come through, and one of the first, second, or third fellow who comes along they married because they didn't want to have to wait on table this way all the rest of their lives, which was a very, very menial living. I think this is very unfortunate, when girls are turned loose by parents. And this goes back and forth to another aspect — family planning. Families should plan the number of children that they are about to care for, not merely provide for them, until they get

of age and then they have to earn a living, for the simple reason that there is no further way for father and mother to care. I think this is very sad. But it's the way many of our own people have come into the Church with this kind of background.

What I am setting up here, in fact, whether we realize it or not, are some interesting views in terms of parental responsibility that takes some of the financial pressure off individuals when it comes to dating. You would be surprised how often that's a factor in terms of decisions that girls rush into. Not the only one, but it is a factor. So here we have a situation, again indicated in these two verses, that if the man has a daughter who is a virgin, not otherwise interested in someone else, or spoken for, and if she has been involved, it was the requirement of the society of God's state, God's Church, that they be married except that a father who felt that the man was so worthless wasn't even worthy to be his son-in-law or to take care of her, and he had the option to say "no," why we have emphasized the option. But we do see here now one other thought. It is my view that we would cut down quite a lot on fornication among young people in local churches, and in society as a whole of course, and in the college, if this were enforced and if the young man suddenly discovered that the girl he ruined, and I will use that term, hurt emotionally and/or physically, who has previously been a virgin, he now has to marry. We have never enforced this. Naturally, a father can say "no," but there was a time when we dealt with it only in terms of expulsion. But I think we have not seen to what extent, when God gave this judgment He didn't merely impose a penalty, He imposed a penalty plus the fact that any man who would do that deserved to have no other choice, not only at the present time forced to marry her, but for the rest of his life. I am going to have to draft a letter. I'm drafting it to Mr. David Antion because we've talked on the phone in response to last Sabbath's sermon of his in which he pointed up the importance of the subject and our need to evaluate what to do. It may or may not be the basis of the discussion of some administrators in the College, that's not for me to decide at all, but I do believe that it is significant now for us to realize that the law in fact gives an example of how you solve a problem that can happen on dates.

Thus far nothing is said as to whether you should or shouldn't date. It is presumed you get acquainted, it is presumed that there are marriages in which you haven't gotten acquainted, and here is a case where you do get acquainted — the date itself is incidental. Society may have it or may not have it in terms of opportunities that are available. That is not a question of black or white or yes or no. It is a question, rather, of the capacity to provide for the girl — that's the financial aspect — and, on the moral aspect, the responsibility that if any fellow does this to a virgin he doesn't deserve any other choice. And he ought to be required to marry her apart from the one option. Now, there are necessarily in our society or, there is another option — the state cannot enforce it nor therefore can the Church, but therefore another penalty is going to have to be in some way exacted that has been far too laxly thought of. That's not my responsibility, but it clearly involves what we would recognize as this and I believe that some of our problem would disappear.

Over the years, as we have already seen between Abraham and Moses, there is a great variation between the capacity of the fathers, of the boy's family to compensate, which might be parallel with the bride price. There develops later in society — and here you note you shall endow her — let me go back here to Exodus again; the terms will vary but the implication here in Exodus 22 he was to pay money according to the dowry of virgins, the sense of it here is that any woman has a right when she enters marriage to have a certain amount of money. Now, first the implication was the husband's father's family provided for it and compensation was given to the bride's family. Later the development went from bride price to a kind of dowry where the girl's family provided certain sums for the girl, when it became commonplace that many men could not do their work and also take care of some of the more necessary and personal things and the need for survival. That's why in the case of Exodus 21 you have the implication that the master provides. The master provides, and if the young fellow cannot he has no right even to continue with her in that particular kind of situation. In our society regulated by the state that could not be enforced. But we are dealing here with a very strong implication that, indeed, a woman has rights. Now there we discover that there is the need, in other words, of a woman to have a certain sum set aside. The damsel's father got the 50 shekels in this case. It's called

the dowry of virgins in the other. The meaning of the term, in terms of custom, is that at first the father kept it as compensation for the loss, and later on it was the girl who received it from the father in order that she would have what she needed that would take care of her needs. Now, this is what we call, later on in society, the dowry, which enabled a woman who was married in many cases to take care of herself in terms of her own needs.

Now this is quite different from the modern American society, but it is very significant because we're drifting into a direction — and remember many of the differences in society are matters of drift and circumstance — we're coming to the place and where commonly today we have the husband/the wife both working. Right? And the children are cared for by third parties — the schools, or babysitters, and then later on we pay taxes to take care of social workers to supervise our delinquent children. This is the way things develop. Now the way God set it up is that the girl is cared for, and later on the term dowry of virgins had reference to moneys from the girl's family that went with the daughter to care for her so that she would be cared for when it became more commonly difficult for every man to take care of every need, and in this case what was very interesting in Jewish custom, which I think is important for you to know, that the woman's dowry could be loaned to her husband, in which case she got title to any land he had and compensation for whatever cash or jewelry or other things he used of the dowry. This meant that if the man, in any case, repudiated his wife for whatever cause, she was able with that dowry to take care of her needs. Today it might be reflected in a woman's capacity to earn a living.

The unfortunate problem about earning a living when you have children is the fact that you also probably earn money and the potentiality of delinquency in the great metropolitan areas of our society. But you could do it both ways. A man may well find that his wife has justified reasons to work, and I am not opposed to women having to work so long as they are not reflecting against the well-being of children. It is my conviction in this case that if children do come that a woman has the responsibility to take care of those children, the man to work, and it should have been analyzed in the first place by her parents to see that she had enough so that her living standard, and the style in which the children would be reared is a good example, would be appropriate for your family. There is a great responsibility then that should have rested on the parents of the girl when the responsibility or the onus for it passed from the boy who married, you see. At first the responsibility seems to have been on the boy and his family to make the proper provision. When that varied it came to be the responsibility more of the girl's parents or uncles — that is, family — to care for those extra needs. There is no basis here of what we would call alimony, that when the woman left, the man was not constantly having to pay alimony and be reminded of the past marriage if he remarried. I think that's one of the unfortunate things of the concept of alimony. It is based, again, on the idea of credit. You are constantly having to put into the future payments that ought to have been made in advance. Alimony is the basis of caring for a woman on credit, that's what it is. You're paying after the divorce to care for her, where in reality the law, the example, and many traditional societies put an emphasis on the parents, to see that the girl was cared for in this kind of situation where the responsibility was not so much on the man. In either case whether it fell to the boy or girl's family the implication is that the responsibility was the parents. I think this is what has been neglected in our society. We have passed almost every duty to children and not to parents. Thus it became possible to multiply children to take care of the parents' work and yet never to have enough to set the boy or the girl up, shall I say, in business or in homes. I think this is one of the tragedies of the black ghetto, one of the greatest tragedies of the black ghetto. It is a growing tragedy in the non-middle and upper class white community. It is even an increasing problem in the middle class society, black or white, or Chicano, or whatever you wish. We are coming today to a place where more and more the capacity for a boy or girl to survive is dependent on the boy or girl and there is nothing that has been set aside. I think it's very difficult to set it aside today. Therefore an alternative, and the only valid alternative, to follow the implication of the examples of scripture, is to see that the boy or girl are properly trained and educated and have the proper personality and skills and initiative — they all go together — to be able to earn a living independently. I do not recommend this, in my estimation, as the best but in our society it is the only alternative to the fulfillment of a requirement. We have placed far too much responsibility on chil-

dren to get started. This is one of the reasons, by the way, that most young people do nothing but rent for the first ten years of their lives, or twenty, and some never get out of renting. I think it would be very helpful in this case for parents to be able to provide for the daughter either a husband who has the capacity to own property, or to provide in money the capacity to invest so you no longer have to rent and live like poverty-stricken people for the rest of your life.

As it's turning out, I don't want to reveal unnecessary things — my second daughter was engaged the night of her graduation from high school. She is not a member of the Church. She is not baptized, as our older one. She hasn't made up her mind to be, and she is engaged to her hairdresser. She actually does artwork for him and her artwork, through him, has been exhibited in Palm Springs and Beverly Hills and locally here in Pasadena. It was one of those things that, you know, happens with dates. Many things can suddenly happen, but in this case he happens to have the kind of judgment where he's buying his own property, he is able to care for himself, he is quite able to sell what his skills are to others. In this case her skills are incidental except to support his. I am very happy at least that the situation is such that we are, in this case, dealing with a proper establishment of the home that will never have money as a fundamental problem. It is one of the great problems and sources of irritation in a family, even to this day even after people are converted.

With respect to the fact that there are some women who really want to earn their own living to get independent of their husbands, I am not addressing this as wisdom. That is not what I am referring to. We recognize that some women want to get a job so they can get some money so they can leave their husbands. That's one of the problems when a woman has to earn, as distinct from a society in which a woman is essentially cared for by husband and parents in the various stages of life. Nevertheless the implication is that a woman should have a certain measure of independence in terms of her capacity to survive. That is, she needs to be assured that she will be taken care of no matter what happens to her husband. We do it today in terms of insurance. That again is the credit system. Whereas God's would have had the sum of money initially provided, but this is the next best solution and therefore I think in the Church it is unfortunate if women have children, husbands are barely able to make food, clothing and rent, and there is no provision in case there is a loss either of the wife — who's going to care for the children when the father's working? — or the husband. So we have too many who have thrown themselves onto the Church when better judgment in advance could have been had. We grant that the purpose of this fund is to enable people who have difficulties and to help those people, but what we should do is to try to obviate the need in the first place of third tithe usage.

In the Book of Proverbs there is an interesting implication: Who can find a virtuous woman, her price is far above rubies — verse 10. The heart of her husband safely trusts in her. He has no need of spoil — that is taking money from somebody else who had abused his wife while he was gone — she will do him good and not evil — that is, she isn't going to use sex to get her way to deny her husband — she seeks wool and flax and works willingly in her hands. She has the capacity to shop. She is like the merchant ship. She brings her food from afar. She does the shopping both in terms of food and clothing. It doesn't preclude a man's function. She rises also while it is yet night and gives meat to her household and a portion to her maidens. Her husband, apparently, or she, had the capacity to hire somebody to do some things — we have people who hire people to work on lawns or care for other needs — this woman also got up early enough that breakfast was there in time and wasn't served to her in bed. She considers a field and begs her husband money to buy it? Is that what it says? Now this is what — look at this, we say this is a great chapter, but uh uh. We don't want this to happen to women. I'm speaking of too many men. This woman has her hands on sufficient money that she considers a field, may not even have said anything to her husband, and buys it. That's what is said here of a virtuous woman, who didn't spend her money, if you please, at movies and restaurant meals before they married until it's all gone. And with the fruit of her hands she plants on it a vineyard. That is, whether she did the planting, it's the fact that what she did with her money enabled her, shall I say, to buy the labor and buy the plants so that there was even a vineyard and she's apparently turning her money into a profit, or if you want to put it another way, she's putting her dowry to work. She girds her loins with strength and strengthens her arms — there are dainty women, as I say, my women at

least can push a piano around, and as I say, that's when I'm gone, then she pushes the piano; when I'm there it's amazing how much help she needs even with the light things. Now either she likes my company or she thinks I need the exercise. She perceives that her merchandise is good, her candle goes not out by night — that could have varied meanings. One can say she works into the night, you know they had to provide candles, there was no electricity in that day, but if a woman is so poor she doesn't even have candles and half the night is that we would now work, you know, the night averages 12 hours — you normally don't need more than 8 hours sleep, there are a few exceptions, that means that roughly one third of what we call night for an average year would be spent with candlelight in such a society, or electricity today. And this woman saw that that part of the time was available.

There are very poor and wretched societies where people sit outside of huts, there is no electricity, there is no candle, there is no work, there is only gossip. She lays her hands to the spindle and her hands take hold of the distaff — now in this case we have a woman who works at home, and I think one of the problems in our society is that we have created one in which women work away from the home instead of being able to do things in the home with the children if they're there. Now I grant when they're at school you might have an outside job successfully. But if you have to educate your children, and you're responsible as this society was for their literacy, then many of the things you make money from you would do at home. She stretches out her hand to the needy, not afraid of the snow, for her household — she works in the winter you see as well as the summer — and her husband is known in the gates. He apparently was a man who was a judge, or some fundamental function through the day, where he sits among the elders of the land. She makes fine linen and sells it, delivers girdles to the merchant. She's making money and it doesn't tell you how much she had to turn over to her husband. I think this is an interesting picture because we never looked at it. So I think it is important and it varies with the way families want to handle their needs. I think sometimes husbands handle most, sometimes wives do, and it will depend on whether you want to take the time as a man, or whether you want your wife to. Dr. Meredith was always very careful to see that most of the regular duties of the home passed to his wife and she was very capable of going out and buying furniture, very capable of buying clothing and food, and paying the bills and all things like that and they pooled their money. But in any case our family operates differently. My wife prefers that I pay the bills out of my money, which is proper. Her children rise up — verse 28 — and call her blessed. Her husband also, and he praises her. Many daughters have done virtuously but you exceed them all. This is really a slightly different picture than. I think many women in the Church have had of themselves. But, look, her motive was not to get even with her husband, to get a job to leave him, and to take the children, her motive went hand-in-hand with the character to utilize this money which meant that it was also something that could pass to her children, not to give her independence. You see, her motive is here proper. I'm mentioning this because we've sometimes had women who deliberately had another motive and purpose.

Now, when you look at this you are setting out, both in terms of finances and moral responsibility, a very remarkable difference in the background in which dating may occur, than most of us have ever thought. Am I coming clear to you? This implies a great responsibility on parents so that fellows and girls are not forced into situations due to finances. You know, the idea that two can eat cheaper than one. It's not true. Two eat more expensively than one, but less expensively than two separately. Two can live cheaper than one, no, but less expensively than two separately. And too many young people have been forced by finances into marriage situations. Now, in contrast, this doesn't mean that marriages necessarily are postponed. An interesting thing in society is, in the Jewish community, which represents the continuity of the Church of God, that marriages were often sometimes arranged when children were quite young — I say arranged — by parents. Normally, it was expected that the average Jewish man would have married, young man, would have married by age 20. We would regard today that marriage should be postponed until the earlier 20's toward the middle 20's. The reason for this is — and I think Mr. Armstrong's judgment is right — the reason for that is that we have created a system that enables boys in particular, and girls to no lesser extent, to remain infantile longer than they need to, for the boy hasn't had to work. He's only gone to school and wasted his time in the summer. You know how often this is the case, and the girl hasn't had to grind the food, see.

She's picked up a sack of Post Toasties, and she's gone to the movie and she's sat before television and she's been given money to take care of her little needs, she's had no sense of responsibility as she would have had in another society. So indeed whereas it would be possible for parents to care for things and still to have children marry comparatively young at 20, we have a situation where we have postponed the ability to make decisions, the ability to grow up, so that it is wiser to marry after college age.

I agree with Mr. Armstrong's evaluation of today's society, but in so doing we are also eating foods that tend to make for sexual maturity earlier, thus studies made in the armies of Napoleon and the Polish armies and the German armies a century and three quarters ago indicated that most women did not enter the state of puberty until about age 17. And many boys not until that age. And that maturity today is coming earlier and earlier, so it is down to the period of 13 to 14. This imposes, now look what happens, (1) we don't provide the financial resources, (2) we have fed ourselves food that enables us to mature earlier biologically, (3) we tend to postpone marriage which places a sexual emotional burden on young people for upwards of 5 to 7 years instead of merely 2 to 3, and then we turn our children loose to date freely without chaperones, in movie houses, in automobiles, they can go to Lake Arrowhead, or whatever it is that young people go in this area, see? And we turn loose of moral responsibility, we may talk about it briefly, but then we turn them loose and we are creating problems for ourselves. I haven't said that chaperones are necessary, I am saying that when we look at all this we are actually pulling all the underpinning out so that dates become sources of emotional problems. There are far too many. Therefore, dating, you see, is an incidental part of the picture if you have your moral and emotional control of yourself as you should have, and if you know in a sense financially the kind of person you're looking for and you see something of the quality of the other family, it wouldn't be very difficult at all to make right decisions after you get acquainted with people. So dating is an opportunity, but so many more things should be thought of apart from just the issue of dating. Then you will discover, in fact, that most of the problems that do come up will be so much more minimalized that you will be able I think to be more concerned for other people, you will have taken care of those things that worry you — or maybe that ought to — too many people don't let these financial things even come into their minds. But if we have taken care of — boys took care to see that their pockets were properly cared for and that fathers saw that the boys were able to get a start, and that the girl's parents were also careful and we have these things cared for, where they learn how to spend their money and didn't waste their money and knew the value of the money and used it properly on dates, we would discover that the focus of our interest on dates would be far more what we have come to share instead of merely checking each other out. I think you'll discover how many of these problems literally become incidental because your minds will be on something far more important. You can even therefore share your relationship with others because you have a little more to work with, and it makes it even easier if your moral training is right. I am very sorry we have so many weaknesses that do show up in this manner because we have focused in on dating too often as a social situation in which mates are hunted for, and in fact I think parents have a very great responsibility to even find out who the children are dating and to encourage proper choice of dates. It's very easy to make some mistakes, for young people get so emotionally attached that it's difficult to shake someone. I've dealt with a situation where a girl can hardly say no to a fellow who shouldn't marry her. Emotionally they are so different, but there's no parent around. Our college system is fundamentally wrong. I'm talking about the whole nation, not just Ambassador College. When it (1) divorces our whole dating structure away from or divorces them from any parental knowledge on the one hand — it's quite all right if you live locally here, and (2) when we have an administration, if that ever be the case, that also exercises no real discipline, because any college has, in fact, assumed a parental responsibility, or the society has opted for a premise that I do not hold to be true in the biblical examples, that after a fellow or a girl are 18 their moral and social life are on their own. There is the need to guard because there's always temptation. And because there can be emotional temptation, it's always wise to have proper contact with either parents or near relatives, on the one hand, so you do not lose your moorings or at least have very careful awareness and contact with a college administration. You want to set yourself up in such a situation that morally these things are properly evaluated in advance.