

# COMMENTARY

WWN

Special 94-1

A CRITIQUE of  
JACK SEQUEIRA'S Book

## BEYOND BELIEF

### BACKGROUND

### LETTER FROM ELLEN G. WHITE

Napier, New Zealand  
April 9, 1893

Brother A. T. Jones:

I was attending a meeting, and a large congregation were present. In my dream you were presenting the subject of faith and the imputed righteousness of Christ by faith. You repeated several times that works amounted to nothing, **that there were no conditions.** The matter was presented in that light that I knew minds would be confused, and would not receive the correct impression in reference to faith and works, and I decided to write to you. You state this matter too strongly. There are conditions to our receiving justification and sanctification, and the righteousness of Christ. I know your meaning, but you leave a wrong impression upon many minds. While good works will not save even one soul, yet it is impossible for even one soul to be saved without good works. God saves us under a law, that we must ask if we would receive, seek if we would find, and knock if we would have the door opened unto us.

Christ offers Himself as willing to save unto the uttermost all who come unto Him. He invites all to come to Him. "Him that cometh to Me I will in no wise cast out." **You look in reality upon these subjects as I do,** yet you make these subjects, through your expressions, confusing to minds. After you have expressed your mind radically in regard to works, when questions are asked you upon this very subject, [since] it is not [organized] in very clear lines in your own mind, you cannot define the correct principles to other minds, and you are yourself unable to make your statements harmonize with your own

To page 7, col. 2

Elder Jack Sequeira, the author of Beyond Belief, was brought to the knowledge of the Advent Message by Elder R. J. Wieland during Wieland's ministry in Kenya. Thus Sequeira not only had as his tutor, in the doctrine of righteousness by faith, one of the two outstanding exponents of the teaching in Adventism today, but he himself has done considerable study and research in the area as is indicated in this book.

While Elder R. S. Folkenberg was still president of the Carolina Conference, at the suggestion of Elder Ben Wheeler, a minister in the conference, and a returned missionary from Africa, he invited Elder Jack Sequeira to give a series of studies at a campmeeting. It was in listening to these studies that Folkenberg says he was converted. Apparently, an excellent rapport developed between these two men. The end result, with Folkenberg now in the presidency of the General Conference, Sequeira has a wide range of influence. For a number of years, Sequeira was a featured speaker at the 1888 Message Conference and Seminars promoted by Wieland and Short in connection with the 1888 Message Study Committee. At present he is no longer doing so. The whys and wherefores of this change are not relevant to this critique.

This book has created a firestorm of opposition among the section of "independent" ministries headed by Spear and Standish; so much so, that Wieland and Short have found it necessary to defend the very message of 1888 itself. In a "Special Report" (Nov-Dec, 1993), five pages of questions and answers were given to the objections voiced by these men. One of the most telling answers to these charges is the documentation of the fact that Standish is teaching Roman Catholic doctrine in his concepts of righteousness by faith. Further, the 1888

Message Study Committee has shown that both Spear and Standish suggest the disregarding of certain statements made by Paul in Romans. In other words, throw the Bible out, if "we, the brethren of experience," cannot understand it in regards to righteousness by faith. Well did Ellen White write about the "lamentably ignorant" persons Jones needed to take into consideration when presenting the message God gave in 1888. (See Letter to Jones) The situation has not changed today.

Dr. Colin Standish berates the book as "the most deceptive book put out in years." He said, "Books like Hot Potatoes are full of error which is readily apparent, but they are crude compared to this." He called it "Satan's masterpiece of deception," in his closing prayer. (October 8, 1993, Paradise, CA) From a telephone conversation yesterday (January 25), I learned that at a recent meeting at Hope International, Sequeira and his book were dissected at their "spiritual" feast.

In recent weeks, I have received numerous calls from the West Coast, and from the heartland asking what I thought of the book, Beyond Belief. I had not as yet read it. One friend who called asked if I had the book. To my negative response, he said he had an extra copy which he would send to me. He did for which I am grateful, and I have since read it with multiple color marking pens at hand.

### **The Book**

First, let me note that it will be impossible to cover all aspects of this book in this brief critique. From the reading of the book, there is clear evidence, that Elder Sequeira did a vast amount of study in preparing this book. Some of his insights into the Word are thought provoking. There is much thought to challenge the reader, and much to upset a surface reader. There are areas which I feel he has not thought through sufficiently so as to state his point clearly. Perhaps he does not at this juncture in his own experience know the full answer and how to relate the parts to the whole, as is the case with many of us. It also struck me that due to this fact, there appeared statements which an antagonist could use as contradictory. Certain key thoughts are left undeveloped which added study could enlarge.

Now, there is no question in my mind that this book does contain errors, but hardly as many errors as his accusers in their writings, and publications which I have read and tapes to

which I have listened. To deny the basic concepts on imputed righteousness and imparted righteousness as given by Elder Sequeira in this book is to mark the whole of their "independent" ministries as a deception. If one does not have straight the gospel, and is teaching another gospel than that which Paul taught, he is under an anathema. (Gal. 1:8) Instead of cursing and condemning the book, it would be far better to take time and study carefully some of the advanced thoughts which Sequeira has introduced. If proved from the Bible to be error, then discard it; but if truth, then make the necessary adjustment in one's own thinking and teachings.

This brings us to the preface. Sequeira is very forthright. He tells the reader in advance - "This book presents the plan of salvation in a new light," and asks the reader "to put aside all preconceived ideas." (p. 7) If ever a group of so-called leaders needed to put aside all preconceived ideas, it is the very ones who are leading such a storm of opposition to this book. Ellen White clearly stated that "the truth is an advancing truth, and we must walk in the increasing light." (R&H March 25, 1890) The date of this counsel indicates that she had in mind the truth of 1888. Obviously, those opposed to this message today haven't even reached 1888 in their thinking, or experience. How then can they perceive anything beyond that point? This is really the subtle error in the hue and cry today to join the "Historic Adventist Movement." They are refusing to walk in the advancing light of truth.

The second major point in his preface declares - "I believe the Bible teaches that God actually and unconditionally saved all humanity at the cross so that we are justified and reconciled to God by that act." (p. 8) The word, "unconditionally," bothered me, as do some other words which he uses, such as "finished." (p. 30) It was at this point that my mind recalled the letter to A. T. Jones in Notebook Leaflets which we have quoted on page 1. "There are conditions..." We must believe. This is declared to be "the work" which God requires. (John 6:29) Further, only to those who "receive" Jesus is the "authority" granted "to become the sons of God." (John 1:12) Scripturally, God made provision, without reservations on His part, in the gift of Jesus for the salvation of all who accept (receive) and believe. He gave His Son to the fallen race. Sequeira so teaches in the book - "To be experienced, this gift [of grace] must be received." (p. 56) That is a condition! Is he as Jones not expressing himself clearly? This is the problem which I faced periodically in the book as

I read it. Does this negate the major thrust of the book? Hardly, for anyone wrestling with truth of divine origin knows the struggle to express that truth in adequate words to convey the thought accurately. The antagonists in their surface writing for surface readers cannot appreciate this point.

Now let us move to the heart and core of the firestorm - Romans 5. Romans 5:12 reads - "Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." Does this last clause mean that all have sinned as did Adam, or does it mean that all have sinned in Adam? The conclusion drawn has "important implications" as Sequeira admits. He draws the conclusion that "'all have sinned' in Adam" (p. 52) Then he lists among his reasons the following:

1) "The only explanation for the fact that death is universal is that all sinned 'In Adam.'" (*ibid.*) Death is universal not because of our sinning in Adam, but because we sin as a result of our inheritance from Adam of a fallen nature. There is a distinct difference. Adam sinned actively not because he had a fallen nature and could not help himself. With that sin was guilt. Thus to sin in Adam is to receive the transmission of the guilt of that original sin. However, every child of Adam was born, even as was Seth, in the likeness and image of Adam. (Gen. 5:3) In this fallen nature, no one can keep from sinning, no matter how hard he himself may try. This is well stated: "The result of eating of the tree of knowledge of good and evil is manifest in **every man's experience**. There is in his nature **a bent to evil**, a force which, unaided, **he cannot resist**." (*Education*, p. 29) Therefore, men sin, not "after the similitude of Adam's transgression," and death reigns universally.

2) "Grammatically, the Greek verb sinned in verse 12 is in the aorist tense." This is true; the Greek past tense is used. But it is also used in Romans 3:23 - "All have **sinned** and come short of the glory of God." Is this saying likewise that all have sinned in Adam and come short of the glory of God? That is doubtful. Paul does not say per se even in Romans 5, that "by one man's disobedience, many die," but rather "by one man's disobedience many were made sinners." (5:19) As sinners, they die.

For all to sin in Adam means simply for one to come in man's fallen nature makes him a sinner without even sinning. Yet Sequeira does not believe this. (p. 42) He teaches in the book

that Christ took upon Himself the fallen nature of Adam at the Incarnation. He insists - "We must **not** teach that in Adam all humanity also inherits his guilt. This is the heresy of 'original sin' introduced by Augustine and adopted by the Roman Catholic Church. Guilt, in a legal sense, always includes personal volition or responsibility, and God does not hold us personally responsible for something in which we had no choice." (p. 54; emphasis his)

Does the fact that Sequeira errs in his interpretation of Romans 5:12 nullify his analysis of the Two Adams motif which is clearly taught in both Romans 5, and 1 Corinthians 15? Is it not true that "the death sentence pronounced on Adam when he sinned was the second death - eternal death"? Is it also not true that "it is this death - the second death - that has passed to all mankind 'in Adam'?" (*ibid.*) Paul plainly states that the first Adam "is the figure of Him to come." (Rom. 5:14) It is equally clear that not one of us contributed one iota to "the holy history of Jesus Christ." He lived a victorious life. Have we not taught that when we accept Him as our Saviour, His life is accounted to us instead of our life of sin? We are freed from the "in Adam" state, to enter the "in Christ" state. Does not the Bible teach "there is salvation in none other"? (Acts 4:12) Why do we then continue to believe that we must contribute something to our salvation?

Those who had the opportunity to become acquainted with Elders Wieland and Short when they came home at various times on furlough from the mission field, can testify to the fact that the presentation of the Cross was a key part of their message. I recall to this day, when pastoring the Adventist Church in Marion, Indiana, having Wieland as a guest speaker one Sabbath. He spoke on the cross as revealed in Matt. 16:13-25. I took careful notes, and prepared a sermon of my own from those notes. Elder Short also gave some deep insights of sin in relationship to the Cross at a conference several of us had at the time. He showed clearly that sin is the will to kill God. These concepts coupled with the (agape) love of God form a major portion of the book, Beyond Belief. When that love is perceived works follow, not for merit but in devotion.

There is a section in the book that requires more study, and perhaps even better elucidation. One chapter is captioned "Spirit, Soul, and Body." (pp. 143-154) In this chapter, Sequeira defines the "spirit" as the "component" formed by

God to be "His point of contact with us - His dwelling place in us." (p. 144) He prefaces this concept with John 4:24 - "God is a spirit." To conclude that it "was primarily this aspect of our being - the spirit - that He had in mind" when He made us in His likeness comes perilously close to the concept of a "spark of divinity" in man. This needs to be re-thought and re-phrased. The "spirit" could well refer to the individual "identity" by which through the soul the character is revealed. "Every human being, created in the image of God, is endowed with a power akin to that of the Creator, - individuality, power to think and to do." (Education, p. 17) "God is spirit" is similar in grammatical force to "God is love." (I John 4:8) In contrast to the essence of God being "spirit," man is "flesh." "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God." (I Cor. 12:50) That is why it was necessary for Christ to become one flesh with us that we might become one spirit with him. (See DA, p. 388) To have this accomplished, we must choose to be "in Christ" so that the Holy Spirit may be "in us" renewing our very "identity." "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creation." (II Cor, 5:17 NKJV) This "new creation" is not of the flesh, but of the "spirit." (Eph. 4:23-24; Col. 3:10)

In this same chapter, Sequeira teaches that "we come into the world without the indwelling Spirit of God...." (p. 144) Then three pages beyond, he writes - "However, Christ was born of the Spirit from His very conception. So from the very beginning of His life on earth, Christ's mind, or soul, was under the full control of the Holy Spirit, who dwelt in His human spirit." (p. 147) This is nothing more than the same teaching that the "Holy Flesh" men of Indiana taught as their position on the Incarnation. I have often wondered how R. J. Wieland could attend that unity meeting at Hartland in 1986 and sit there and say nothing at the presentation by Thomas Davis on the Incarnation. This position of Sequeira casts some light on the question. Dr. Ralph Larson declined to attend because he did not want to clash publically with Davis who was presenting this same "holy flesh" teaching at the conference. Yet Sequeira writes emphatically, "Even God Himself, great as His power is, will not transform the flesh into something that is pleasing to Him." He does not believe in "holy flesh," for he says, "The flesh belongs to the realm of Satan, and God had condemned all that belongs to that realm to destruction." (p. 149)

Two chapters are devoted to "Law and Grace." (#16 & #17) Having emphasized through the first part of the book, the agape love of God,

Sequeira seemed to have missed a cardinal point of his primary thrust in the whole book. If I have read him correctly, those "in Adam" are sinners continuing in sin, while those "in Christ" are declared righteous (justified) and through cooperation with the Holy Spirit receive imparted righteousness (sanctification). If this is his position, why did he not in discussing the Law, note that the Law was not made for a righteous man, in other words one "in Christ," but rather for one "in Adam"? (I Tim. 1:9-11) This fact, Paul declared to be a part of "the glorious gospel of the blessed God," which had been committed to his trust. (v. 11) Then what law governs those "in Christ"? Jesus stated it plainly - "Thou shalt love (agapao) the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love (agapao) thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets." (Matt. 22:37-40) The same love which motivated God to provide "the redemption that is in Christ Jesus," must be our response to Him and to one another. But who can love as He loved? Only as "the love (agape) of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Spirit which is given to us." (Rom. 5:5) Who, then can really keep the commandments? Only he who has surrendered his heart to the Holy Spirit. Away with that boasting which lifts the works of men to the status of merit. "Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? of works? Nay: but by the law of faith." (Rom. 3:27) "God forbid that I should glory (Gr. boast - kauchasthai) save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world." (Gal. 6:14)

There are several other points which could be discussed, such as, what cross am I to bear, His or my own? No man can bear His cross and accept the second death, as Christ did, and return. Jesus said, "If any man will come after Me, let him deny himself, and take up **his** cross and follow Me." (Matt. 16:24) Then on another point, am I crucified in Him, or with Him (KJV)? In the Greek text of Galatians 2:20, "Christ" is in the dative case, and the verb "crucified" is in the perfect passive tense, which denotes the present state resultant from past action. Then whose action?

Other issues in the book could be discussed, for example, the question of the "church" and the conflicting concepts of Paul and James. There are areas introduced in Beyond Belief which needs to be studied much more thoroughly.

## SEQUEIRA WRITES:

"Scripture teaches that Christ actually did **assume** our condemned sinful nature as we know it. But He totally defeated 'the law of sin and death' that resided in that sinful human nature and then executed it on the cross. Had Christ consented, even by a thought, to the sinful desires of that nature which He assumed, then He would have become a sinner in need of a saviour Himself. That is why, in dealing with the human nature of Christ, we must be exceedingly careful not to drag His mind or His choice into sin or to say that He 'had' a sinful nature." (p. 44)

### What is wrong with this?

"Before the Fall, Adam surely knew nothing about the first death. Therefore, the death sentence pronounced on Adam when he sinned was the second death - eternal death. It was goodbye to life forever. Had there been no 'lamb slain from the foundation of the world.' Adam would have forfeited his life forever the day he sinned, and mankind would have died eternally in him. It is this death - the second death - that has passed to all mankind 'in Adam.' In Adam the whole human race belongs legally on death row. It is only in Christ that we can pass from eternal death to eternal life." (p. 54)

### What is wrong with this?

"All of us by creation are 'in Adam.' This is the hopeless situation we inherit by birth into the human race. Hence we are 'by nature the children of wrath.' But the good news is that God has given us a new identity and history 'in Christ.' This is His supreme gift to humanity. Our position 'in Adam' is by birth. Our position 'in Christ' is by faith. What God has done for the whole human race in Christ is given as a 'free gift,' something we do not deserve. That is why the gift is referred to as grace or unmerited favor. To be experienced, this gift must be received, and it is made effective by faith alone." (p. 56)

### What is wrong with this?

"According to I Corinthians 15:21-23, 45-49, there have been only two heads of the human race - Adam and Christ, who is the 'last Adam'. The destiny of the entire human race rests upon these two. Adam is the prototype of unredeemed humanity; Christ is the prototype of those who are 'in Him,' and what is true of Christ is true

also of those who are 'in Him.' Adam's situation after the Fall is the situation of all the unredeemed. That which Christ realized for all mankind will be the situation of the redeemed. 'As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.'" (p. 60)

### What is wrong with this?

"At the cross, Satan was given full control of Christ to do with Him as he pleased. Satan's hidden desire, cherished in secret so long, could come into the open in no other way. Now the entire universe would be able to see what sin really is and what it will end up doing if it has the opportunity. Sin is rebellion against God and His law of self-sacrificing love. If allowed to have its own way, sin will actually murder God in its hatred of Him." (p. 69)

### What is wrong with this?

"Christ's death on the cross was 'unto sin.' This simply means that as our substitute and representative He experienced on the cross the 'second death,' the eternal death that the Bible describes as 'the wages of sin.' As Hebrews 2:9 puts it, He 'by the grace of God should taste death for every man.'

The Scripture promises that those who have accepted by faith their position in Christ, and who will be raised in the first resurrection, will escape the second death. ... Why do these avoid the second death? It is because Christ, their Sin Bearer, has already 'tasted' the second death for them. On the cross, Christ actually experienced the second death on behalf of fallen humanity. It was this that constituted the supreme sacrifice." (p. 75)

### What is wrong with this?

"Under no circumstances will God enter into partnership with the flesh (our concern for self). The flesh belongs to Satan, and therefore must be crucified. When we give up all confidence in the flesh and live by faith alone, then God can produce godliness - genuine righteousness - in us. And He will do so. God did not give us His only-begotten Son so that we could **copy** Him, but that we could **receive** Him.

"Our lives will become pleasing to God only as we completely surrender ourselves to Him who so loved us and gave Himself for us. God is not looking at us to see how good we are or how hard we are trying to keep His law. There is only one thing that God looks for in each of us

- how much of His Son Jesus does He see in us?" (pp. 97-98)

["We are not to be anxious about what Christ and God think about us, but about what God thinks of Christ, our Substitute. Ye are accepted in the Beloved. The Lord shows, to the repenting, believing one, that Christ accepts the surrender of the soul, to be molded and fashioned after His likeness." SM, bk ii, pp. 32-33]

What is wrong with this?

"When a person accepts the gospel and is united by faith to Christ, immediately all that Christ has prepared and provided as humanity's substitute is made effective for that person. The history of Christ now becomes lawfully the history of the believer because he is in Christ by faith. God looks at such a person as being perfect in obedience, justice, and nature, since all three were obtained for him in the holy history of Christ.

"Such a person is no longer under condemnation; he has passed from death to life. God looks at the justified believer as if he has met **all** the demands necessary to qualify for heaven and eternal life. Justification, then, is the work of a moment - a heart response to what Christ has already accomplished.

"Sanctification, by contrast, is an hourly, daily experience that continues throughout the lifetime of the believer who continues to walk by faith. The gospel not only freely gives us the righteousness of Christ in order to deliver us from the condemnation of the law; it gives us the righteousness of Christ as a personal experience so that we can reflect His character.

"Anyone, therefore, who stops with justification and makes it the entire gospel experience has received only half of the good news. God did not send His Son merely to legally deliver us from sin so that He could **declare** us righteous. He sent His Son in order to also **set us free** from sin and restore His image in us. This work of restoration includes sanctification, and it, too, is part and parcel of the good news of the gospel." (p. 102; emphasis his)

What is wrong with this?

# LET'S TALK IT OVER

Just as I was contemplating whether to add to this first "extra" issue of WVN for 1994, an editorial comment, the telephone rang. When I picked up the receiver, the voice said, "Have you read that book yet?" I replied in the affirmative and told him that I had just finished a critique of the same, but I wasn't sure he would be happy with what I had written. "Oh," he said, "you agreed with some of what was written." I added, "And disagreed with some." His response - "I was talking to Kenneth Wood the other day, and he took the same position, some of it good, some of it not so good." The conversation quickly ended. I was a bit amused because I never thought I would find myself in the same corner with Kenneth Wood, at least not in this life.

Shouldn't a book be either all good, and if not, isn't it too bad to be read? I, for one, have inveighed in times past against a number of books and articles which are modern day trees of the knowledge of good and evil. I will no doubt do so again in the future. But why make an exception to this book? For at least two reasons, one being, that the message of 1888 is so desperately needed in all of its fullness, that something needs to jar the concerned people of God in order to get them to study their Bibles so they can understand just what is involved in "the hope of righteousness by faith." (Gal. 5:5) The book, Beyond Belief, is Bible-based, and our answers should show plainly from that Word wherein Sequeira has erred.

Another reason is the caliber of those who are opposing so vehemently this book. These men are going up and down the country fanning their egos, and bragging about the number of "deep pockets" they are getting their hands into, yet know little of what righteousness by faith is. Spiritual things are spiritually discerned. One of these "voices" speaks on John 3 about the night conversation between Jesus and Nicodemus. He states that no one can be born of the Spirit, unless he is keeping the commandments of God, citing, out of context, Acts 5:32. This is a form of Roman Catholic teaching. Who wants to be identified with such teaching and/or teachers? So if Sequeira's book is a mixed theology, do two wrongs make one right? What we need is the genuine article - the righteousness of Christ, which is pure unadulterated truth. Hopefully, the discussion that is being aroused over Beyond Belief will cause sincere hearts to study to see

**Note:** These are selections from only 102 pages of the 188 page book.

what is truth. But so long as we look to man, and expect much from man, we will not realize this objective.

In this morning's mail, I received a letter written to Elder Wieland by a man with questionable literary ethics. In this letter he cites the communication Ellen White sent to A. T. Jones which we quote in part in this special issue of WWN. He emphasized the fact that Ellen White told Jones that there were conditions to salvation quoting from a section which we omitted due to space. We had already quoted that counsel, and saw no reason to repeat the same. However, this antagonist sought to portray a gulf between Ellen White and A. T. Jones on the subject of righteousness by faith. He garbled what Ellen White said - "You look in **reality** upon these subjects **as I do.**" This misuse of the prophetic gift is appalling. I would hope that this controversy would cause those sincerely wanting the truth to either study for themselves, or in small groups, from the Bible just what God has done in Jesus Christ, and in turn, by faith, will do in us.

In gleaning an overall picture of the book, Beyond Belief, I sensed that had Sequeira presented more of the sanctuary truth especially in the light of the ministry of the High Priest on the Day of Atonement, his case concerning the fact that we can contribute nothing to that which Christ has already obtained and is now obtaining for us, would have been strengthened. Ours is to humble ourselves before Him, and cease to trust in our own works, lest we be cut off.

On the other side, there has been added by Elder R. J. Wieland to the 1888 messages of Jones and Waggoner much which was not in the original presentations. This has both plus and minus points. Minus if that which has been added detracts from the message, and plus if that which has been studied is an on-going revelation of truth. I fear there is some of both in the present 1888 Message Study Committee's outreach.

This is a time for study, and not a time to cheer for our particular "man" in the arena of public discussion and debate. Let us at least in this present conflict learn one lesson from the 1888 Message - "Cease ye from man whose breath is in his nostrils; for wherein is he to be accounted of?" (Isa. 2:22)

whg

Letter - from page 1, col. 1

principles and faith. ...

Then when you say there are no conditions, and some expressions are made quite broad, you burden the minds, and some cannot see consistency in your expressions. They cannot see how they can harmonize these expressions with the plain statements of the Word of God. Please guard these points. These strong assertions in regard to works, never make our position any stronger, for there are many who will consider you an extremist, and will lose the rich lessons upon **the very subjects they need to know.** ...

My brother, it is hard for the mind to comprehend this point, and do not confuse any mind with ideas that will not harmonize with the Word. Please do consider that under the teaching of Christ **many of the disciples were lamentably ignorant;** but when the Holy Spirit that Jesus promised, came upon them and made the vacillating Peter the champion of faith, what a transformation in his character! But do not lay one pebble, for a soul that is weak in the faith to stumble over, in overwrought presentations or expressions. Be ever consistent, calm, deep, and solid. Do not go to any extreme in anything, but keep your feet on solid rock. O precious, precious Saviour. "He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth Me; and he that loveth Me shall be loved of My Father, and I will love him, and will manifest Myself to him."

This is the true test - the doing of the words of Christ. And it is the evidence of the human agent's love to Jesus, and he that doeth His will giveth to the world the practical evidence of the fruit he manifests in obedience, in purity, and in holiness of character. ...

Letter 4, 1893 (Emphasis mine)

\*\*\*\*\*

"Watchman, What of the Night?" is published monthly by the Adventist Laymen's Foundation of Mississippi, Inc., P. O. Box 69, Ozone, AR 72854, USA.

Special editions are published as the need arises. This issue 94-1 is such.

Editor

Elder Wm. H. Grotheer

[The old Commentary masthead sheet was used since we had a supply on hand, otherwise the regular WWN masthead would have been used]

\*\*\*\*\*