

*"Watchman,
what of the night?"*

"BEHOLD, THE BRIDEGROOM!
Come out to meet Him."

(Matt. 25:6 RSV)



"THE DAILY" DEBATE

Hauser versus Wieland

In the Fall issue of *The Layworker* (pp. 5-13), an exchange between Elder R. J. Wieland and Dr. Robert Hauser regarding the subject of the "daily" as found in the book of Daniel was published. Following a rebuttal by Hauser, comments by Elder David Lin were printed which were weighted heavily toward Hauser's position. From a careful analysis of the "exchange" one must conclude that Wieland's interpretation is as far out as is Hauser's application. While Wieland venerates the tradition of the elders, Hauser denies the historic principle of prophetic interpretation upon which God's revelations have rested throughout salvation history.

To bring into focus the subject of the "daily," we shall note: 1) What the Writings of Ellen G. White have stated on this subject; 2) The linguistic questions, such as, the meaning of tamid, the Hebrew word translated, "daily," and the words, rum and sur; and 3) The context itself in which tamid is first used in Daniel. After considering these points, we shall note certain references in the Writings to which Dr. Hauser appeals for his questionable concepts of prophetic interpretation.

The E. G. White Comments on the "Daily"

The first reference to the "daily" question found in the Writings of Ellen G. White is Early Writings, pp. 74-75. It reads:

Then I saw in relation to the "daily," Dan. 8:12, that the word "sacrifice" was supplied by man's wisdom, and does not belong to the text; and that the Lord gave the correct view of it to those who gave the judgment-hour cry. When union existed, before 1844, nearly all were united on the correct view of the "daily," but in the confusion since 1844, other views have been embraced, and darkness and confusion have followed. Time has not been a test since 1844, and it will never again be a test.

Two clear cut statements are made: 1) The supplied word, -"sacrifice" - "does not belong to the text." 2) Prior to 1844, "nearly all were

united on the correct view of the 'daily'." However, on Point #1, a word is required as was done by the translators of the KJV for tamid (the Hebrew word translated, daily) is used in the Old Testament as either an adjective or an adverb. In the book of Daniel, it is used as a substantive, or predicate adjective, and thus logically in translation a noun should be supplied. Ellen G. White did not indicate what noun should be supplied in place of "sacrifice" to give the proper sense. On Point #2, as to the "correct" view prior to 1844, an interesting footnote is to be found in a commentary on Daniel by George McCready Price published in 1955. It reads:

It may be news to some of my readers that at least some of the leaders in the Millerite movement had the correct view of the meaning of the term "daily." In the Midnight Cry, October 4, 1843, this term was understood as meaning Christ's daily or continual mediation in heaven on behalf of sinners, which was "taken away" by the work of the little horn. The revised chart of 1842 by Charles Fitch and Apollos Hale, omits the identification of paganism as the "daily," thus by implication endorsing the correct view. This revised chart was the one which was endorsed (with some qualifications) by Ellen G. White. Crosier's celebrated article in the Day Star, 1846, also commended by her, took the position that the sanctuary trodden down by the little horn is in heaven, not on the earth, the inevitable inference from this being that the "daily" must also refer to events in heaven. James White reprinted this Crosier article several times and expressly endorsed this interpretation of Daniel 8 as applying to the papacy. It was thus that "nearly all were united on the correct view of the 'daily,'" as spoken of in Early Writings, pages 74, 75. Finally, Ellen White herself, in The Great Controversy, 1911 edition, p. 65, specifically applies Daniel 8:12 to the work of the papacy. For further facts and evidence along this line see the paper of L. E. Froom, "Historical Setting and Background of the Term 'Daily,'" September 1, 1948.

I do not know of a single Adventist college in America which now teaches the view that the term "daily" means paganism. (The Greatest of the Prophets, p. 174)

Due to the fact that I do not have available the key reference used in this footnote - the Midnight Cry of October 4, 1843 - I cannot evaluate this "news" but merely cite this summation by Price so that all data on the "'Daily' Debate" can be noted.

Another reference in the Writings to the "daily" question is Manuscript 11, 1910. In this manuscript, Ellen White wrote:

I have words to speak to my brethren east and west,

north and south. I request that my writings shall not be used as the leading argument to settle questions over which there is now so much controversy. I entreat of Elders H, I, J, and others of our leading brethren, that they make no reference to my writings to sustain their views of "the daily."

It has been presented to me that this is not a subject of vital importance. I am instructed that our brethren are making a mistake in magnifying the importance of the difference in the views that are held. I cannot consent that any of my writings shall be taken as settling this matter. The true meaning of "the daily" is not to be made a test question.

I now ask that my ministering brethren shall not make use of my writings in their arguments regarding this question; for I have not instruction on the point under discussion, and I see no need for the controversy. Regarding this matter under present conditions, silence is eloquence. (Selected Messages, bk. 1, p. 164)

Two points stand out in this reference: 1) The Writings are not to be used to determine the correct view of the "daily" by those on either side of the "debate." ("I cannot consent that any of my writings shall be taken as settling this matter.") [This is good counsel for all theological questions under discussion at any time.] 2) "Silence is eloquence" on this subject only "under present conditions" that is, as they prevailed in 1910.

It must be remembered - "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine." (II Tim. 3:16) No one less than Gabriel is involved in the matter of the "daily." He was instructed - "Make this man to understand the vision." (Dan. 8:16) It is Gabriel who with Michael who has authority to explain "that which is noted in the scripture of truth." (Dan. 10:21) As a part of "the scripture of truth," the "daily" cannot be considered as unimportant at the present time, controversy or no controversy. The basic point Ellen G. White urged was that her writings not be used to settle the question.

However, to this controversy is added more confusion by reference to Manuscript Release #1425. Wieland refers to it in his reply to Hauser (Layworker, op.cit., p. 9), as strong evidence that Ellen G. White held to his view of the "daily." Not having a copy of this Release, both Dr. George Rue and Mrs Lee Coleman graciously responded to my request for a copy. Far from contributing in a substantial way to this "debate," it

rather furnishes more fuel for the fire over A. G. Daniells' administrative idiosyncracies and can only heighten the controversy over Ellen G. White herself. However, her state of mind as revealed in Manuscript Release #1425, does lend credence to Daniells' recollection as related at the 1919 Bible Conference.

The question of the "daily" was introduced at the 1919 Bible Conference when the discussion turned to the use of historical data by Ellen G. White in writing about the fulfillment of prophecy. Daniells indicated that he had visited with Ellen White over the matter of the "daily." He took with him the "old chart". C. P. Bollman interrupted and asked - "The same chart that Elder Haskell sells?" To this Daniells replied -

Yes, it was the same chart. I took that and laid it on her lap, and I took Early Writings and read it to her, and then I told her of the controversy. I spent a long time with her. It was one of her days when she was feeling cheery and rested, and so I explained it to her quite fully. I said, "Now here you say that you were shown that the view of the 'daily' that the brethren held was correct. Now," I said, "there are two parts here in this 'daily' that you quote. One is this period of time, the 2300 years, and the other is what the 'daily' itself was."

I went over that with her, and every time, as quick as I would come to that time, she would say, "Why, I know what was shown me, that the period of 2300 days was fixed, and that there would be no definite time after that. The brethren were right when they reached that 1844 date."

Then I would leave that, and I would go on about this "Daily." "Why," she said, "Brother Daniells, I do not know what that 'daily' is, whether it is paganism or Christ's ministry. That was not the thing that was shown me." And she would go into that twilight zone right away. Then when I would come back to the 2300 years, she would straighten right up and say, "That is the thing we never can move away from. I tell you, you can never move away from that 2300 year period. It was shown to me that that was fixed." (Spectrum, Vol 10, #1, p. 35)

[Note: Hauser quotes this same source but indicates it to be Light Bearers to the Remnant, a publication prepared by the GC Department of Education, and published by the Pacific Press, (See Layworker, op.cit., p. 11) Wieland should never have introduced Release #1425 for it only evidences how desperately he is grasping at straws to sustain his position in regard to the "daily."]

The Linguistics

As we noted previously, the word translated, "daily" is the Hebrew word, tamid, which is used either as an adjective or an adverb, meaning, continual, or continually. In the book of Daniel, the word, tamid, is used as a substantive, or as we would say in the English language, a predicate adjective. Let me illustrate. Should I write - "He is good" - "good" is an adjective, and the sense of the sentence is clearly - "He is a good (man)," the noun being supplied. The question is what should be supplied in Daniel to give the full sense and meaning for tamid? So far, I fail to find where Wieland addresses this point. In his reply to Hauser (Ibid., p. 10), Wieland cites "the law of first mention" as a principle governing interpretation. This is a good interpretive tool. Let us use it. The first use in the Bible of the word, tamid, as an adjective is found in Ex. 29:42 where it refers to the morning and evening sacrifice as a "continual (tamid) burnt offering." In Ex. 30:8, the incense used on the Altar of Incense is described as "a perpetual (tamid) incense," which was to be offered day by day. The law of first mention would indicate that the word to be supplied in Daniel 8:11-13 could be, "ministry" - "the daily ministry."

This is what Elder A. T. Jones used in his explanation of these verses in Daniel. He wrote:

In Numbers 28 and 29 alone, the word [tamid] is used seventeen times, referring to the continual service in the sanctuary.

And it is the continual service of Christ, the true High Priest, who continueth ever," and "who is consecrated forevermore" in "an unchangeable priesthood" - it is this continual service of our great High Priest, which the man of sin, the Papacy, has taken away. It is the sanctuary and the true tabernacle in which this true High Priest exercises His continual ministry that has been cast down by "the transgression of desolation." It is this ministry and this sanctuary that the "man of sin" has taken away from the church and shut away from the world, and has cast down to the ground and stamped upon; and in the place of which it has set up itself "the abomination that maketh desolate." What former Rome did physically to the visible or earthly sanctuary, which was "the figure of the true" (Dan. 9:26, 27; Matt. 24:15), that the latter Rome has done spiritually to the invisible or heavenly sanctuary that is itself the true. (Dan. 11:31; 12:11; 8:11,13) (The Consecrated Way, pp. 99-100; Emphasis his)

But here we have a conundrum. Wieland does not believe what Jones has written on the "daily." He considers Jones' interpretation as apostate. Thus he is seconding the "motion" made by Dr. George Knight in his book on A. T. Jones - From 1888 to Apostasy. Yet Wieland takes issue with Knight over his thesis. It is the conviction of this editor that Jones wrote a very inciteful and accurate interpretation of the "daily."

In the exchange between Wieland and Hauser, two other Hebrew words used with tamid in Daniel are debated - rum in Daniel 8:11, and sur in 11:31 and 12:11. The main contention concerns, rum. The context of Daniel 8:11 is definitely a sanctuary setting. The series of verses close with the promise - "then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." (Dan. 8:11-14) This Hebrew word, rum can be found in the instruction regarding the sanctuary ritual as outlined in Leviticus, but one finds sur also used in the same instruction. Observe the following text:

And the two kidneys, and the fat that is upon them, which is by the flanks, and the caul above the liver, with the kidneys, it shall he take away (Hiph'il form of sur), as it is taken off (Hophal form of rum) from the bullock of the sacrifice of the peace offerings; and the priest shall burn them upon the altar of the burnt offering. (Lev. 4:9-10)

The same combination of rum and sur can be found in Lev. 4:31, 35. In Leviticus 3:4, 10, 15, the word, sur, is used to translate, "it shall be taken away." Thus both words as used in Daniel in regard to the taking away of the "daily" are found in the sanctuary instruction, and used practically as synonyms. In their sanctuary use, there is no evidence that rum ever means "exalt," nor "corporated into" as Wieland contends in his endeavor to make the "daily" a Biblical symbolism for paganism.

[Note: Hauser in his presentation also notes the above same relationship between rum and sur. Wieland's reply is the admonition that "Dr Hauser must not try to rewrite the book of Daniel." The close relationship between Daniel 8:11-14, and the sanctuary ritual as found in Leviticus speaks for itself as well as the words of Jesus in Matthew 24:15.]

The Context of Tamid in Daniel

The dream of Daniel 7 and the vision of Daniel 8 are parallel prophecies. Since the issue is over the question of what is the

symbolism used to represent pagan Rome, we need only to center our consideration on the fourth beast in the vision of Daniel 7. Concerning this fourth beast, Daniel wrote:

Then I would know the truth of the fourth beast, which was diverse from all the others, exceeding dreadful, whose teeth were of iron, and his nails of brass; which devoured, brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with his feet. (Dan. 7:19)

Out of this fourth beast arose the "little horn" which symbolizes the papacy of history. At no time is the "little horn" ever separated from this beast. It ever receives its nourishment for life from that beast.

In considering Daniel 8, we turn our attention to the "he-goat" whom Gabriel declared to be "the king of Grecia: and the great horn that is between his eyes is the first king." (ver. 21) [This is the one and only interpretation Heaven ever gave for this symbol.] When the "great horn" was broken, in its place "came up four notable ones toward the four winds of heaven." (8:8) Then appears a "little horn" again which waxed "exceeding great." (8:9) This horn is Rome, both pagan and papal, even as the fourth beast and little horn of Daniel 7 represents the two phases.

It is in connection with this "little horn" that the "daily" (tamid) is introduced. (8:10-14) Here begins an interesting comparison. Nowhere in Daniel 8 do we find the "daily" doing what the fourth beast of Daniel 7 was pictured as doing - devouring, breaking in pieces, and stamping the remainder with his feet. (See 7:19 quoted above.) Rather the "daily" is being acted upon, not acting. Further, it is being acted upon by the symbol which represents both pagan and papal Rome. The very language is used - "the little horn" of Daniel 8, not the "daily" - "cast down of the host and of the stars to the ground and stamped upon them." (8:10) On this point, A. T. Jones was very clear. Note again:

What former Rome did physically to the visible or earthly sanctuary, which was "the figure of the true," that the latter Rome has done spiritually to the invisible or heavenly sanctuary that is itself the true. (See above.)

Tragically, Wieland is teaching only a part of the truth which Jones espoused. Would to God he had the courage to teach all of it.

Hauser's Misuse of the Writings

Dr. Robert Hauser is very forthright in stating his objection to the sole use of the prophetic hermeneutic which was the basis of the Advent Movement - the historical approach by which history is but the response to the voice of prophecy. He calls it a "horse and buggy" approach. Here are his words in the "Introduction" to his book - Give Glory to Him:

The historical approach has served us well in the past, but like the horse and buggy, no longer fits our needs. This is not to discard the historical approach as untrue. It is, like the horse and buggy, no longer as relevant!" (p. 2)

Sadly, too many are either unwilling to wait the "unrolling of the scroll" or to accept the fulfillment of prophecy as the scroll unrolls now as it has throughout all past history. These would rather purchase a "sports car" and race down the freeway to hell.

Hauser in a footnote in his "Introduction" to the book noted above, quotes Dr. Kenneth Strand of Andrews University listing the various approaches for the interpretation of the book of Revelation - "preterist, futurist and continuous-historical." He notes variants within the "continuous-historical" approach besides subdivisions within the variants, and then concludes - "Therefore the approach used herein [in his book] does not fit any of the previous models but is a combination." (*Ibid.*, p. 3) Strict honesty would have served the reader much better had Hauser simply stated that his approach to the interpretation of the book of Revelation, and now Daniel, was a combination of the Jesuitical futuristic approach coupled with Dr. Desmond Ford's apotelesmatic theory. In other words, it is a betrayal of the basis of prophetic interpretation which undergirded the Advent Movement.

To make matters worse, Dr. Hauser has invoked the Writings to sustain the discarding of what he calls "the horse and buggy" approach. Let us note some of these references and see what they really are saying. Much emphasis is placed on the concept that "history... will be repeated." (See *TM*, p. 116; Letter 103, 1904) This does not say that prophecy will be repeated. Anyone knows that the "deadly wound" did not convert the papacy! In her healing, the same policy will be manifest toward those who oppose her teaching as was manifest during the heyday of her power -

the 1260 years. Those who seek to make the sentence which says history will be repeated to read - prophecy will be repeated - know full well that it will not be another 1260 years; therefore, they seek to interpret the 1260 prophetic days as literal time. If it is literal, it is no longer prophetic; neither can the symbols be considered prophetic, but **must** become also literal beasts! No wonder confusion reigns when the prophetic basis of the Advent Movement is abandoned for human speculation.

Another reference from the Writings is quoted - "The prophecies of the eleventh of Daniel have almost reached their final fulfillment." (*R&H*, Nov. 24, 1904) First, "final" does not mean, "dual." There has been a progressive fulfillment of that chapter. Three kings **did** stand up in Persia with the fourth "far richer than they all." (verse 2) Alexander the Great **did** "rule with great dominion." (verse 3) One could continue through the chapter and note the prophecies which have been fulfilled. We are living in the time when the last verse of that chapter will be fulfilled - it will reach its "final fulfillment." There are other references in the Writings to a "final fulfillment" of certain prophecies - all will be fulfilled; that which has and that which will be. The word, fulfillment, itself indicates a continuum, a progression in time to an ultimate end.

While Dr. Hauser wants to challenge Wieland's use of the Writings in his attempt to define the "daily;" he assumes that he has perfect right to use the same Writings to attempt to justify his anti-Adventist interpretation of prophecy. (I use the word, anti, in the strictest Greek sense - "in place of.") We dare not misinterpret the "daily" contrary to Scripture evidence as Wieland is doing, neither dare we misapply a correct understanding of the "daily" by adopting a false interpretive schema as Hauser is doing.

It must be admitted that there are some questions in the book of Daniel concerning the "daily" which are difficult to understand and explain. We do recognize that Daniel is the prophecy and that Revelation is just what the name signifies - a revelation. However, we have not perceived all of the ramifications of this thesis. The content of the book of Revelation was revealed after the Cross, when "the kingdom of our

LET'S TALK IT OVER

The Editor of the Adventist Review summarized the 1989 Annual Council of the Church in a recent issue (Nov. 9, 1989). His final section was captioned - "A Decade of Healing." He indicated that Elder Neal C. Wilson "broke with tradition" and instead of giving a full summary of the achievements of the Church during the preceding year, "spent most of his time in developing a spiritual theme as he called for 'a decade of healing and reconciliation.'" (p. 9)

In getting to "specifics," Wilson is quoted as saying - "In dealing with people, too many times we are willing to hide behind a legal judgment to escape a moral responsibility." We wonder how much of this specific type of "healing" did Wilson attempt to do personally prior to his "preaching" of the objective. Has Wilson forgotten the Merikay Silver case and the deceptive role he played during it? (See Betrayal, pp. 205-210) Has Wilson forgotten his threatening of "Elder Mills" at the trial, and the charges that were trumped up against him? Is Wilson's memory so short that the Dederick Proctor injustice is no longer recalled? There are other events that could be recited. Should not the example for a "decade of healing" begin with the top officer of the Church?

The Editor does not place in quotes as attributable to Wilson, but implied, that "healing and reconciliation do not mean compromise of principle." The Bible does set forth certain principles regarding restoration. If the "broken relationship" resulted from irresponsibility in "that which was given unto him to keep" (Lev. 6:4-5), certain things had to precede restoration. But in announcing the restoration of Elder Desmond Cummings, Sr., who was deeply involved in the Davenport Scandal, Wilson does not indicate that Cummings has complied with any Biblical requirements which precede restoration even in a "token" manner. The basis for his restoration was that through this whole experience involving questionable fiduciary decisions, Cummings has "remained loyal" to the organization.

The use of "loyal" or "loyalty" has an interesting background. Lillian Smith in her work, The Journey, comments:

As totalitarianism [hierarchical authority in the case

of the Church] increases - in a school, or a country, or a church - the use of the word loyalty increases. A strange and frightening word. The mob's word. The gang's word. A word people shout in unison - while honor and responsibility and integrity are words an individual can speak, and act out.

How does one measure the quality of a man's relationship with a large entity such as a church or school or government? It is an interesting fact, and one many of us have observed all our lives, that people demand loyalty of us only when they are doing something to us (or somebody else) of which we don't approve and cannot wholeheartedly participate in, and which weakens our love and admiration. Let's admit it: **loyalty** is a verbal switch-blade used by little and big bosses [hierarchs] to force us quickly to accept a questionable situation which our intelligence and conscience should reject. (pp. 223, 224)

Now let us talk over the meaning of this call for healing and reconciliation in the light of the examples cited by Wilson. Are we to accept each one whom Wilson designates as reinstated when there still remains some serious questions, and in this one case as noted, an administrative fiduciary "wash-out" without even a "token" repayment.

What about the changes that must be faced in the area of doctrine which has produced "brokenness"? Or does "loyalty" for the sake of "unity" mean we must consider the changes in basic truth merely semantics, and thus find ourselves in the end as really loyal to apostasy for the sake of personal acceptance? This next decade (if time lasts that long) - with Wilson's call for "healing and restoration - will be eternally critical for every Seventh-day Adventist because the "rotteness" beneath is being covered by "garments of so-called righteousness" under the guise of mercy and healing. (See 8T:250)

---+---

It had been my intent to talk about another item in the second part of this new editorial feature - "Let's Talk It Over." But the mail which came yesterday changed the whole picture. In Wilson's report to the Annual Council, he had named another individual along with Elder Desmond Cummings, Sr., - Elder Morris Venden. I had intended that the paragraph following the quotation on "loyalty" be enough said in regard to Venden - "there still remains some serious questions." But as I just wrote - all of this was changed by yesterday's mail.

→ → →

A colleague from Madison College days sent me a whole packet of material from Pilgrim's Rest. Among this material was "WM 261" and with it an insert on blue paper - "Special Announcement." This brief announcement claimed that "WM 261" was intended for "only limited circulation" and not the whole mailing list to which it was sent. With Ferrell's track record for accuracy and honesty, this is questionable. But it does appear - so he writes - that he has received "a sizeable amount of appreciation for papers sent out" on the Venden affair.

It has been my understanding - so those who have defended him to me declare - that Ferrell's objective is "to keep the saints informed." Do we have to use "septic tank" journalism to accomplish this objective? How can those who "appreciate" this, regaling themselves in this filth, really believe that they are "saints" and support this "cess-pool" mentality? Are not the saints to bring "into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ"? (II Cor. 10:5) Is it obedience to Christ to "appreciate" the immoral and the filth of human lives? What about publishing that filth - even if only a "limited" circulation was intended?

Ferrell in his "WM 261" quotes Dr. Charles Wittschiede as saying that all Venden would have to do was "just have a doctor give him an examination and end the whole matter." Now a doctor has done so, but Ferrell will not get out of the "septic tank." He is still dredging through the foul sediment to continue to regale his "appreciative" fans.

From this report - "WM 261" - I was amazed that William Parks, a college roommate of Venden's chose to second the allegation. I, too, have lived in a college dormitory for four years, and had several roommates. I could not this day under oath tell which ones had hair on their chest and which ones didn't, let alone what Parks is willing to testify about. We did try to maintain a degree of modesty even in a men's dormitory!

There is another aspect to this whole sordid affair that is being overlooked. The American Bill of Rights has more than just the first amendment which guarantees freedom of the press and religion. Article V reads: "No person shall be held to answer for a capital or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury..." Ferrell has been conducting a "Grand Jury" investigation, impersonating himself as the

Next column

The "Daily" Debate - from p. 5, col. 2

God" was firmly re-established (Rev. 12:10) It was so firmly re-established that prophecy ceased to be "conditional." It could be declared that God gave to Jesus a "revelation" of "things which **must** shortly come to pass. (Rev. 1:1) Thus those who seek to emphasize Dan. 12:11-12 are left with the problem of why these two "times" are omitted from the book of Revelation of things which **must** come to pass. The 1260 prophetic days are repeated several times in Revelation as well as the prophecy of the experience of God's people - when the 2300 days reached its final year. But nowhere are the 1290 or 1335 days even alluded to.

The place called in the Hebrew tongue - Har-Magedon (Rev. 16:16 ARV) - amplifies Daniel 11:45, but the time given in Revelation is but "one hour." (Rev. 17:12; 18:10) Much more study needs to be given but not study based upon the Jesuit's interpretive schema, nor the theory of Dr. Desmond Ford.

WHG

Let's Talk It Over - from previous column

legal counsel. Venden ought to take Ferrell into Federal Court and charge him with malicious slander with intent to destroy him professionally. Then the saints(?) who have "appreciated" the "septic tank" journalism indulged in by Ferrell could contribute to a legal defense fund.

1990 ANNUAL FELLOWSHIP

July 30 - August 4 Plan **NOW** to Attend

"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.

In Canada, write - The Adventist Laymen's Foundation of Canada, P. O. Box 117, Thorne, Ont POH 2J0.

Editor Elder Wm. H. Grotheer
Contributing Editor Allen Stump

Any portion of this Thought Paper may be reproduced without further permission by adding the credit line - "Reprinted from "Watchman, What of the Night?" - Ozone, Arkansas, USA."

First copy free upon request; duplicate copies --- 50¢.
