

*"Watchman,
what of the night?"*

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

(Matt 25 6 RSV)



Editor Calls For: COMMON CAUSE WITH CATHOLIC HIERARCHY

In a current issue of the Adventist Review, an associate editor advocates making "common cause with Catholics" to obtain government aid for parents with children in the church's schools. (August 30, 1990, p. 4) This is known as parochiaide, one aspect of which is either tuition grants to parents who send their children to church operated schools, or tax deductions in the amount spent for such an educational choice. This editor suggests that it would be "prudent" to join hands with the Catholic hierarchy in pressing the case "with our political representatives." Then he adds - "Think how much we stand to gain - as parents and as a church!"

Roy Adams in this editorial - "Getting a Piece of Our Own Pie" - calls the failure of not getting government aid a "chafing injustice." He asks, "Would it not be fair that parents who elect to send their children to special schools be allowed a substantial tax deduction or rebate for this expense?" Then he wonders why "the silence of Adventists on this issue" which he terms a "puzzling phenomenon." It is evident that Adams needs to attend some adult education classes in American History, especially that phase of our history which deals with the formulation of the American Bill of Rights and the First Amendment. One begins to wonder if he is an American citizen, or what his background really is. His arguments and stance come right out of the propaganda circulated by the Catholic hierarchy.

The question takes on even greater proportions, since it is difficult for one to perceive that this editorial was written and published without the full approval of the editor-in-chief, William G. Johnsson. Some word should be forthcoming in the pages of the Adventist Review from the editor clarifying the position of the "official organ" of the Church on this suggested abridgment of the "establishment clause" of the First Amendment. It would help matters if this clarification would include the announcement that Roy Adams had been removed from any further connection with the Church paper.

This serious challenge to the Establishment Clause comes at a time when the forces of religious liberty are hard pressed by the determination of the Reagan appointed Justices to breach what Thomas Jefferson perceived the Establishment Clause to be - a "wall of separation between Church and State." We have sent a photo-copy of this article with a cover letter to Dr. Robert L. Maddox, Executive Director of Americans United for the Separation of Church and State. One of the Trustees of this organization is Bert B. Beach of the General Conference, and listed as a contributing editor of Church & State is Lee Boothby, an Adventist legal expert in Constitutional Law. Among the "Trustees Emeritus" is listed Melvin Adams, also a Seventh-day Adventist.

In the eyes of Adams, his getting "a piece of the pie" has "nothing to do with the separation of church and state." (His emphasis) This again shows his complete ignorance of the American Constitution, and his paranoia over "equal treatment under the law." (Again, his emphasis) With the various crises which the Seventh-day Adventist Church is facing at the present time, the leadership can ill afford such a voice on the staff of the Adventist Review. Nothing short of Adam's removal can be understood as a reiteration of the Church's historic stand in defense of the Establishment Clause in the First Amendment of the Bill of Rights in the Constitution. He needs to be fired forthwith.

The first amendment reads in part -

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

In the interest of maintaining a government by the people for the people, education is a vital concern. The government does provide and maintain a public school system. Compulsory educational laws require attendance to a certain age and/or level of achievement, but to parents a choice is granted as to where they wish to send their children. If I, because of my religious conviction, elect to place my children in what is known as a parochial school because of the religious instruction they will receive, then the support of that school is the Church's and my responsibility without government aid or assistance.

In the Everson v. Board of Education case, Justice Hugo L. Black, speaking for the majority stated the broad interpretation of the Establishment Clause as follows:

The "establishment of religion" clause of the First

Amendment means at least this: Neither a state nor the Federal Government can set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another. Neither can force nor influence a person to go to or to remain away from church against his will or force him to profess a belief or disbelief in any religion. No person can be punished for entertaining or professing religious beliefs or disbeliefs, for church attendance or non-attendance. No tax in any amount, large or small can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion. Neither a state nor the Federal Government can, openly or secretly, participate in the affairs of any religious organizations or groups and vice versa. In the words of Jefferson, the clause against establishment of religion by laws was intended to erect a "wall of separation between Church and State." (Emphasis mine) [Quoted in The Establishment Clause by Leonard W. Levy, pp. 123-124]

Levy also observes that "the dissenting justices in the Everson case, while disagreeing with the majority on the question whether the "wall of separation" had in fact been breached by the practice at issue, concurred with the majority on the historical question of the intentions of the framers and the meaning of the establishment clause. The opinion of Justice Wiley B. Rutledge, which all the dissenting justices endorsed, declared: "The Amendment's purpose was not to strike merely at the official establishment of a single sect, creed or religion, outlawing only a formal relation such as had prevailed in England and some of the colonies. Necessarily it was to uproot all such relationships. But the object was broader than separating church and state in this narrow sense. It was to create a complete and permanent separation of the spheres of religious activity and civil authority by comprehensively forbidding every form of public aid or support for religion." (ibid., p. 124; emphasis mine)

This should put the question asked by the associate editor into proper perspective, and give him a brief lesson in the field where it is evident he is totally ignorant. Perhaps, if he would stop "day dreaming" - see his last paragraph - long enough to think beyond his own pocketbook, such selfish orientated suggestions as the abridgment of the wall of separation between Church and State for his own benefit would not have even been placed on paper. This editorial represents a dark, sad day in the history of the Adventist Community.

"FROM IRELAND TO THE URALS"

John Paul II's Objective

The Ecumenical Press Service (EPS) for the period covering August 21-31, 1990, published an "Ecuview" on the Papal perception of Europe as it effects Vatican-Anglican dialogue toward unification of the two communions. This "Ecuview" consisted of an abridged report found in Ecumenical Trends, published by the Graymoor Ecumenical Institute in New York state. The author of the article in the Graymoor publication was R. William Franklin, a teacher at St. John's University in Minnesota, and an Anglican member of the Anglican-Roman Catholic Consultation in the United States. The concern of Dr. Franklin is that Pope John Paul II's view of Europe will "have the potential of leaving the ecumenical movement even more sadly divided and weakened than the arguments over the specifics of ordination and papal primacy." While this was Franklin's thrust, what he revealed concerning the Papal objective for Europe is of vital concern to us. But first some brief historical background on the historical connection between Rome and Canterbury.

Into the picture of what John Paul II envisions for Europe comes Benedict of Nursia (c. 480-553), who established the Benedictine monastic order of the Roman Catholic Church. On a mountain overlooking Cassino, Italy, he built a monastery which for centuries was a chief center of religious life for Western Europe. Pope Paul VI elevated Benedict as "patron of Europe." From this Order, Gregory I who had been an abbot in the Order, sent Augustine (not of Hippo) and his fellow monks to England in 596, establishing the first permanent links between the Church in England and the Roman See. In fact, Augustine became the first archbishop of Canterbury. To this history, Pope John Paul II has appealed in his conversations with the present Archbishop of Canterbury, Robert Runcie.

Now we proceed to the objectives of the

present pope. "No pope has spoken so often of 'our continent Europe' as has John Paul II. In his inaugural encyclical, "Redemptor Hominis" of March, 1979, the pope envisaged a uniting Europe in some degree of détente, with cultural and ecclesiastical organizations transcending ideological and political boundaries... The pope's recent diplomatic addresses are filled with reminders of the papal legacy in achievement of one European culture from Ireland to the Urals." One has only to remind himself of what took place so rapidly in the European Communist world to see to what objectives the present pope has devoted himself from his elevation to the Papal chair till the "iron curtain" which had divided Europe was not only penetrated but pulled aside. Because of his pan-European motivation, the pope established a Pontifical Council of Culture in 1982 with close ties to the Council of Europe. This papal council has "the specific task of addressing the textures of European life at the deep level of economic and political culture."

John Paul II has also created a Council of European Episcopal Conferences. This aspect of the papal objectives for Europe is a new dimension "entirely unique to this pontificate." To this Council, John Paul II clearly stated that the ecumenical task must now focus on Europe. "Continental ecumenism represents 'a necessary dimension of evangelization and a factor in the peace of Europe.'" On the eve of the Archbishop of Canterbury's visit to Rome in 1989, L'Osservatore Romano underlined the particular significance of this visit for Europe by stating -"The recurring point is that the re-evangelization of Europe depends crucially on the re-establishing of the full communion of faith and sacramental life. The prerequisite of this is unity at the level of faith which involves the reclaiming of our common heritage." (Sept. 29, 1989) And in the pope's view as explained to Runcie, this meant things as they resulted from Gregory I sending Augustine to England with his band of Benedictine monks. The pope further reminded Runcie during their dialogue that his own visit to Canterbury was a "pilgrimage to the shrine of the martyr, Thomas Becket," the 12th-century predecessor of Runcie who had died to protect the ties of the English Church with the Roman See. It was the first thousand years when relations of the English bishops with Rome was uninterrupted which the pontiff wants to be the model for future ecumenism.

Besides his unique emphasis in regard to European ecumenism, and the role he perceives

for the Benedictine monastic order as the "symbol of a united Christian Europe," there is another objective of the Pope in his relationship to this new Europe, and that is, "Ultramontan-ism."

"Ultramontanism arose in 1820. Its main purpose was to assert the papal supremacy. All religious and moral authority and power should center in the office of the pope at Rome. It asserted that the pope's decisions regarding faith and morals were infallible. The typical Ultramontanist reasoning was that without an infallible pope there can be no Church; without a Church there can be no Christianity; and without Christianity there can be no religion; and without religion there can be no civilized society. The Jesuits were powerful advocates." (A History of the Christian Church (Quaiben), p. 367)

Commenting on this aspect of the Pope's objective for Europe, the "Ecuview" in the EPS states - "Building on a papal tradition that can be traced back to the reigns of Gregory I in the sixth century and Leo III in the ninth century, and powerfully restated in the 19th century,... John Paul II expects the bishop of Rome to lead an ideologically divided Europe in recovery of its common roots in Christian [papal] verities." To understand the force of the papal tradition upon which John Paul II is drawing and its significance, one must note certain aspects of the pontificates of both Gregory I and Leo III.

Gregory I, or the Great, was Rome's greatest pope. He was the last Church Father, and the first medieval theologian. He was the last Roman bishop and the first medieval pope. When he ascended the papal chair, "the Franks had established a national Church which, at best, recognized the pope merely as a moral authority. The Christianized Visigoths in Spain took a similar attitude. The prestige of the bishop of Rome had almost reached a vanishing point in Italy itself. The Church was torn by internal dissensions, while a deep-seated moral corruption prevailed." (Quaiben, *op. cit.*, p. 148) But when he died in 604, he had established the power of the Roman bishopric, and his successors assumed the title of pope. Under Gregory I, the Roman See became the acknowledged head of the Western Church. (See Historical Studies, pp. 26-30)

Leo III was the pope who crowned Charlemagne emperor of the Holy Roman Empire on Christmas day in 800, thus setting the legal precedent that the pope alone can confer power upon

heads of State. Putting this picture together, one can begin to see the ends to which the present pope is directing his efforts - the re-establishment of a medieval papacy, the return of the Dark Ages!

There are also some doctrinal issues involved that should be noted. Gregory I was a theologian, and developed the doctrine of Purgatory, good works, and the mass and the eucharist. In the revival of papal power under Ultramontanism during the pontificate of Pius IX, the dogma of the Immaculate Conception was promulgated, which placed "the Virgin Mary as a mediator and intercessor with God." It must be remembered that the present Pope is a devotee of the Virgin Mary.

Pius IX went further and published a "Syllabus of Errors." "This encyclical refuted eighty serious errors [from the Papal viewpoint], including freedom of conscience, freedom of the press, Protestantism, Communism, Bible societies, civil marriage, free scientific investigation, separation of church and state, non-sectarian schools, and religious toleration. The Syllabus of Errors closed by condemning the claim that 'the Roman Pontiff can and ought to reconcile himself to, and agree with, progress, liberalism, and civilization as lately introduced.'" (Quaiben, *ibid.*, p. 368) You can put this together and then see what the nature of the time of trouble will be like, and how imminent it is in the light of a projected United Europe which the political leaders and the Pope envision.

When this picture is placed against the elementary prophecy of Daniel 2 where the iron and the clay are mingled, and we recall the comment that "the mingling of churchcraft and statecraft is represented" thereby, we can see how near we must be to the revelation of the "ten toes" of the image as depicted and enlarged in Revelation 17:12.

‡

Rome Calling. Pope John Paul II discusses world affairs on the telephone with George Bush and Mikhail Gorbachev at least once a week, according to Prof. Malachi Martin, a Roman Catholic theologian and Vatican insider. In a new book, The Keys of This Blood, to be published in September by Simon & Schuster, Martin describes how during the crisis over Lithuania's declaration of independence the Polish-born Pontiff and the embattled Kremlin leader had intense conversations, sometimes several times a day. The

LUTHERAN-RC ACCORD

Three major "Christian" communions dominate Western Europe - Roman Catholicism, Anglicanism and Lutheranism. In the previous article, we noted the approach that is being used by John Paul II toward the Anglican Church in England to achieve his goal of one united religious force in Europe. The reapproachment toward the Lutheran communion which broke away from Rome in 1517 began prior to the pontificate of John Paul II. In 1967, as the Protestant world celebrated the 450th anniversary of Martin Luther's Ninety-Five Theses criticizing the Roman Catholic Church and pointing to a fresh understanding of God's grace, Roman Catholics met with the Protestants in the celebrations honoring Luther's heroic stand. (World Book Encyclopedia, 1968 Yearbook, p. 468) In the same year - 1967 - an international bilateral commission named by the Lutheran World Federation and the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity began working toward the objective of restoring ecclesial communion between the Roman Catholic and the Lutheran churches of the world.

As early as 1972, the international commission's first statement, "The Gospel and the Church" noted that "a far-reaching consensus is developing in the interpretation of justification." (EPS 90.08.83, 2) However, it was the US Lutheran-Roman Catholic bilateral dialogue which produced a statement which permitted a Jesuit priest on the faculty of theology at Gregorian University in Rome to write in Ecumenical Trends - "the consensus does in fact seem to be sufficient for church fellowship between Lutherans and Roman Catholics. (ibid.)

The consensus document - "Justification by Faith" was completed in 1983 after five years of work by the US bilateral dialogue. It was the seventh release of the dialogue. The other six releases "regularly structured by a sharp division between a common statement marking out an area of consensus, and a two-part series of reflections on problems" remaining between the two communions. "Significantly, 'Justification by Faith' is a single document agreed to by all the members." In March of this year, the Administrative Board of the US National Conference of Catholic Bishops authorized the publication of an evaluation of this document on

Justification by Faith. The evaluation had been worked out by the Bishop's Committee on Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs (BCEIA). The bishops acknowledged "that the bilateral commission [did] pioneering work in an area where many, beginning with Martin Luther himself, thought that Catholics and Lutherans were deeply opposed in belief and official doctrine." (ibid., p. 1)

The basic affirmation of the document - "Justification by Faith" - reads:

Our entire hope of justification and salvation rests on Christ Jesus and on the Gospel whereby the good news of God's merciful action in Christ is made known: we do not place our ultimate trust in anything other than God's promise and saving work in Christ.

BCEIA in its evaluation declared - "A Catholic can and should affirm this fundamental conviction unreservedly." Not only this, but the bishops find that the twelve doctrinal points listed in "Justification by Faith" accurately express truths which Catholics also espouse. These twelve doctrinal points were, to them, elements of significant material agreement. Five of these were listed by EPS as being - "original sin and the fall, God's pure initiative to convert the sinner, justification as God's effecting what He promises, faith as trustful and self-involving response to the Gospel, and the fruitfulness of justification in good works." Apart from "original sin" - no doubt the Augustinian view - every Seventh-day Adventist could make the affirmation and declare that he or she also espouses four of these beliefs.

Some questions remain. Will the Pope be as willing as the US Catholic Bishops to endorse this consensus statement worked out in the United States and make it the basis for accomplishing his objective for Europe? The answer would appear to be, Yes. The article written in Ecumenical Trends, as noted above, was written by a Jesuit priest on the faculty of theology at Gregorian University. Further in 1989, twice, at Trondheim, Norway, and Turku, Finland, Pope John Paul II "reminded Scandinavian listeners that in the face of the failure of many Europeans to acknowledge the reality of God, citizens of this [European] continent in particular would do well to face up to how much they have in common in Christianity." (EPS 90.08.84)

For Seventh-day Adventists, this agreement presents a challenge. We need to settle the question of "original sin" once for all time. While we cannot accept the Augustinian view,

LET'S TALK IT OVER

The writings of "the Messenger of the Lord" were given to serve a very definite purpose. They are **not** to be used to establish doctrine, the Bible does that; **neither** are they to be used in a papal context as an inspired interpreter of Scripture, the Bible being its own interpreter. The messages are God-given warnings that we may know how to meet the perils of the last days successfully.

In a "Testimony for the Church" (SG, Vol. II, p. 277), this warning was sounded: "The power of Satan now to tempt and **deceive** is ten-fold greater than it was in the days of the apostles." I double emphasized one word - "deceive." It needs to be noted repeatedly that each of the three accounts of Jesus' discourse on the Mount of Olives (Matt. 24, Mark 13 and Luke 21) begin with the same warning - "Take heed that no man **deceive** you. For many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ; and shall **deceive** many." (24:4-5) Borrowing from this same discourse (24:23-24), Ellen G. White wrote in 1892:

After the truth has been proclaimed as a witness to all nations, every conceivable power of evil will be set in operation, and minds will be confused by many voices crying, "Lo, here is Christ, Lo, he is there. This is the truth, I have a message from God, he has sent me with great light." (R&H, Dec. 13, 1892)

While there were "many antichrists" in the days of the apostles (I John 2:18), the power of the "many voices" at the present time to deceive is ten times greater than all of them. They have clothed themselves as "ministers of righteousness" (II Cor. 11:14-15). This should cause us to pause and do some real soul searching. What can we do to keep from being deceived?

Again the Lord's Messenger has given us some counsel. After the last sermon she ever presented to a General Conference session, "she moved away from the desk and started to take her seat, then turned and came back, picked up the Bible from which she had read, opened it, and held it out on extended hands that trembled with age. She admonished, 'Brethren and Sisters, I commend unto you this Book.'" (EGW, Vol. 6, p. 197) But this is not what the "many voices" sounding today in the community of Adventism are doing. This past weekend a would-be "voice" was lecturing near here. I talked to a brother who had attended Sunday morning (I had been there on Sabbath afternoon), and he told me that all morning long, he

could count only two texts from the Bible being used. Who are most likely to be deceived by such "voices"? Those who do not know their Bibles, but are able to cite references from the Writings with facility. Why? Because the "voices" who quote profusely from the Writings are perceived by such to be of God.

Another sophistry prevalent is the self-deception that one can listen to all of the "many voices" sounding in Adventism today and select truth from error. It may be possible for those who make this claim to do so, but very doubtful. The tragedy results when unsuspecting, but trusting invitees, attend meetings sponsored by those who think they stand fast. These guests unable to differentiate, but trusting in "men" - those who invited them - are deceived. At whose hands will the blood of these souls be required?

It must be kept in mind that "error cannot stand alone, and would soon become extinct if it did not fasten itself upon the tree of truth." (Evangelism, p. 589) Thus the most dangerous deceivers today of the "many voices" are the ones who have only a small quantity of the strychnine of error laced into their presentations. We have been warned that so closely will the track of error lie beside the track of truth that only minds worked by the Holy Spirit will be able to discern the difference. We should be trembling before our God, praying for "the Spirit of discernment" instead of boastfully believing ourselves secure and sponsoring many of the "many voices" who are confusing the minds of concerned Adventists. Unless we know our Bibles and understand the truth as it is in Jesus, **therein** revealed, we should tread softly with **hesitant** steps for fear of being deceived and becoming an instrument by which others will be deceived.

The counsels placed in God's Word are not merely "bedtime stories" reading material. The counsel of John in his day when "many antichrists" were operating is for us **now!** He wrote:

He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son. If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed: for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds. (II John 9-11)

Remember Paul places "heresies" as one of the "works of the flesh," in other words, "evil deeds." (Gal. 5:20)

How can we distinguish a true voice from "the many voices." God does not leave Himself without a witness. He has spoken in salvation history. The days of the antediluvians were 120 years; Israel left Egypt on the very day the prophecy given to Abraham was fulfilled. (Ex. 12:41) Christ in announcing His mission declared - "The time is fulfilled, the kingdom of God is at hand." (Mark 1:15) While prophetic periods ceased to be a test with the fulfillment of Daniel 8:14, fulfilled events as prophesied still indicate clearly God's purposes for His people. A God-sent message now will be in keeping with the way God has operated in salvation history. The "many voices" will seek to devise a way around the import of fulfilled prophecy either by spiritualizing it away, or by projecting a fulfillment of God's purposes as still to come in some awe-inspiring manifestation.

As a result of a request to see a copy of the tract - "United States in Prophecy" - in last month's issue of WWN, the publisher sent me a number of copies. I also called and talked with him directly. The last half of this 48-page tract contains unmarked quotes from The Great Controversy. The other part is from a tract by Vance Ferrell on the Mark of the Beast.

Now we have a stand-off. The Arkansas Catholic (July 29, 1990), quoted headline hungry Allabach as stating the tract was "a condensation of 'The Greater Controversy' (sic), written by the 19th-century Seventh-day Adventist founder and prophet Ellen G. White." The Indianapolis Star (July 13, 1990) quoted Shirley Burton, head of the General Conference Communication Department as calling the tract - without seeing it - - "trash." Burton lost her "cool" and Allabach clouded the issue with his inaccuracies causing the focus to turn on "devotion" to Ellen G. White rather than on the change of course in the thinking of the hierarchy toward the Papacy. The latter factor is the present overwhelming issue to which concerned Adventists should be focusing their attention because of the fall-out within Adventism and on the periphery with its speculative interpretations of the prophecies of Daniel and the Revelation.

1990 Annual Fellowship tapes on the Seminars - "The Elijah Message" and "The Incarnation and the Conflict of the Ages" - are now available.

3 Tapes - \$6.00 postpaid when ordered separately.

Rome Calling - From page 4, col. 2

Pope advised Gorbachev against violence; in return, he counseled Baltic and Ukranian Catholics against "pushing Gorbachev into a corner." As for talks with Bush, Martin says the Pope offers the President informed analyses prepared by the Vatican's intelligence network about developments in Eastern Europe and his personal assessments of the new leaders there as well as in the Soviet Union. ("Washington Whispers," U.S. News & World Report, August 13, 1990, p. 18)

Lutheran - RC Accord, from p. 5, col. 2

we cannot continue to ignore the fact that the Bible plainly states of Adam, he "begat a son in his own likeness, after his image." (Gen. 5:3) Further, and interestingly, the statement puts works in its proper place as the fruit of justification. **BUT**, it does not deal with the trust committed to the Church in the sanctuary truth - the final atonement. The reformation begun by Luther cannot be completed by the Advent Movement and the final atonement discarded or ignored. Thus as the final movements unfold before us, we are brought face to face with our own apostasy from the Everlasting Gospel. Our nakedness is self-evident for all to see who are not blind.

RC-Pentecostal Dialogue Resumes - The first meeting of the fourth phase of the international Roman Catholic-Pentecostal dialogue took place last month in Emmetten, at the headquarters of the Swiss Pentecostal Mission. Co-chairing the meetings are Kilian McDonnell, a Roman Catholic priest from the US, and Justus du Plessis, a Pentecostal minister from South Africa. (EPS 90.08.75)

"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. P0H 2J0.

Editor

Elder Wm. H. Grotheer

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¢.