

*"Watchman,  
what of the night?"*

*"The hour has come, the hour is striking, and striking at you,  
the hour and the end!"*

*Eze. 7:6 (Moffatt)*

## THE ELIJAH SYNDROME

Page 2

## The Children of the Resurrection

Page 3

## UNITY IN FAITH & DOCTRINE

### HOW TO BE ACHIEVED

Page 4

### *Editor's Preface*

On various occasions when serving as pastor of the then First Church in Toronto, Canada, I would preach a Sabbath sermon which I entitled simply - "This and That." From time to time in a file which I labeled, "Sermon Ideas," there would accumulate material on several topics but not enough to make a single sermon out of any one of the ideas. Then on a given Sabbath, I would bring several of the ideas into a "This and That" sermon. This issue of WVN is similar - ideas that have accumulated since the first of the year, one of which did turn into a full length article after I started writing.

Using an epithet for a title, I have sought to emphasize that if Paul could declare, I am preaching the only true gospel. Let all who preach otherwise, be cursed, what is our problem with taking a similar position when to us has been committed the everlasting gospel? Then in thinking about it, prophecy has indicated that the Elijah message is to be given in earth's last hour. Should one be any less positive about his conviction than was Elijah? Perhaps we should be as sure before Whom we stand, as he was.

Living as we are in the final hours of human probation, we should be thinking in terms of translation, and what it means for those who shall face the close of probation. During the year as a part of several regular articles, we have discussed aspects of this subject. In the article - "Children of the Translation" - we have reviewed those points.

The article on "Unity in Faith and Doctrine" as well as "Let's Talk It Over" addresses the emphasis this year by various major "independent ministries" as they try to get their heads together. Just as we began this article, we received through the mail a summary of concepts of two other such ministries who are also seeking unity. Several years back, two ministries besides the Foundation met together, prayed and studied until we produced a statement of beliefs built in what we believe to be truth. Ecclesiology took care of itself, once truth was determined - but it must be unadulterated.



# The Elijah Syndrome

At the conclusion of the Sermon on the Mount, Matthew attaches a comment on the reaction of those who had listened. It reads:

*And it came to pass, when Jesus had ended these sayings, the people were astonished at His doctrine: for He taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes. (Matt. 7:28-29)*

What had Jesus said?

*No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon. (6:24)*

*Enter ye in at the strait gate: for wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be that go in thereat: because strait is the gate and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it. (7:13-14)*

The summary is obvious: one Master, one way; no other Master, no other way! In the Gospel of John, to His disciples, He left no lingering doubts as to what this meant. He stated clearly - *Ye call me Master and Lord: and ye say well, for so I am. (13:13)* To doubting Thomas, Jesus unequivocally stated - *I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me. (14:6)* Again, one Master; one way. Did Jesus have "the Elijah Syndrome"? ("*I, even I only*" - I Kings 19:14) But you say, Jesus could so speak for He was God manifest in the flesh. This we will grant, but let us consider further.

*But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. (Gal. 1:8)* So wrote Paul to the Galatians. Plainly, without mincing words, Paul said, "*I, even I, have the gospel. There is no other!*" He was even willing to certify this conviction. He affirmed - *I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached by me is not after man. For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ. (1:11-12)*

Has not prophecy indicated that an angel from heaven was to bring "the everlasting gospel" from heaven and commit it in sacred trust to a people to proclaim? (Rev. 14:6) Has not this prophecy been fulfilled? We have been told:

*In a special sense Seventh-day Adventists have been set in the world as watchman and light-bearers. To them has been entrusted the last warning message for a perishing world. On them is shining wonderful light from the word of God. They have been given a work of the most solemn*

*import, -- the proclamation of the first, second, and third angels' messages. There is no other work of so great importance. They are to allow nothing else to absorb their attention.*

*The most solemn truths ever entrusted to mortals have been given them to proclaim to the world. The proclamation of these truths is to be our work. The world is to be warned, and God's people are to be true to the trust committed to them. (Testimonies for the Church, Vol. 9:19)*

Is there only one final three-part message to be given to the world before the return of Christ? Or are there multiple messages? What does this mean? If only one, then would not God's true people in the last hour be derided as possessing "the Elijah Syndrome"? Can we not be as decisive in regard to the "everlasting gospel" as Paul was concerning the "gospel" which he certified came to him by Jesus? Is it not the same gospel and from the same source?

Some other questions need to be asked: If we are proclaiming "the everlasting gospel" - the only gospel for earth's final hour - why must there be invited, by the leadership of the Ministerial Department of the General Conference, a Presbyterian and Baptist minister to join in proclaiming the resurrection of Jesus Christ? Or do we no longer believe that the second angel's message has relevancy? If God did indeed commit in sacred trust the final and only message for this hour to the Seventh-day Adventist Church for the inhabitants of the earth, why has the church leadership been involved with the World Council of Churches (WCC), and its Faith and Order Commission? If the Three Angels' Messages are unique, and they are, why did we need to craft the Dallas Statement of Beliefs in 1980 to conform to requirements as set forth in the Constitution of the WCC for membership in that body?

Now one further key question: Do not our actions negate our belief in the Three Angel's Messages, and thus constitute a rejection of them? Yet the Church says that it is preaching those Messages.

For a few moments consider how the Bible presents Elijah. We perceive him on the Mount of Transfiguration as a symbol of those who will be translated without seeing death, while Moses represented those who will be resurrected. Perhaps we have overlooked a more significant perception. Luke indicates that both Moses and Elijah "spoke of His decease which He should accomplish in Jerusalem" (9:31). When we understand that the Greek word translated "decease" is *εξοδος* (*exodos*), we easily understand why Moses was appointed to come. But why also Elijah? The reason is more difficult to perceive. Jesus, as He faced His final hour in Gethsemane, realized that He and He alone must drink it. What would be gained by accepting the cup? He had come unto His own, and His own had not received Him. They would give Him over to the Romans to be crucified. One of His own followers was

even then leading a group to seize Him. One, who was closer to Him than the betrayer, would deny Him. All would forsake Him and flee. (Read the picture in *Desire of Ages*, p. 687, and note the sentence; "In its hardest features, Satan pressed the situation upon the Redeemer") It was in reality, "I, even I only." Did Jesus need the "Elijah Syndrome"? Was this why Elijah was sent with Moses?

The Bible also pictures "Elijah" as coming before the great and terrible day of the Lord (Mal. 4:5). While John the Baptist, the *sole voice* raised up to prepare the way of the Lord, answered this prophecy at the first Advent (Matt. 11:14), we have interpreted it to mean that in the final hours it will be a group of people who will fulfil "the coming of Elijah." If such is the correct understanding, every individual member of the church will face the "I, even I alone" experience. Speaking of the final hour of crisis, the messenger of the Lord wrote - "The faith of individual members of the church will be tested as though there were not another person in the world" (Ms. 1a, 1890). In other words, you alone have the truth, and everybody else in the world has rejected it. The evidence of sight will be against you; the preponderance of numbers will be overwhelming. Faith alone will triumph, but it must be a faith with conviction. You will need to know the meaning of Elijah's repeated conviction, "The Lord before whom I stand" (1 Kings 17:1; 18:15).

Elijah was translated and did not experience death. Is this telling us something? God loved Elijah and wanted him to be forever closer to Him? Is it also indicating that this derisive epithet - "the Elijah Syndrome" - is telling you what the meaning could be of the description of that group in whose mouth is no *ψευδος* - "perversion of religious truth." (Rev. 14:5 - KJV translation, "guile.") Indeed, is not this group - the 144,000 - clothed with "the righteousness of Christ, which is pure, unadulterated truth" (TM, p. 65).

Perhaps we had better be speaking and writing even as Christ spoke - with conviction, and not as the scribes.

#

## Children of the Translation

Among the verses cited in affirming the "New Birth" [See WWN - 8(98)] in the first Statement of Beliefs by Seventh-day Adventists in 1872, was Luke 20:36. These words of Jesus read:

*Neither can they die any more: for they are equal unto the angels; and are children of God, being the children of the resurrection.*

The Third Angel's Message closes with a call to behold an exhibit - a group of people in contrast to those who wor-

ship the beast and his image - "Here is the steadfastness of the holy ones: the ones who are keeping the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus" (14:12; lit. Gr.). But lest one should forget the faithful respondents to the other angel's messages, another voice from heaven declares, "Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth" (14:13). After these two groups are identified, John sees the coming of the Son of man to reap the harvest of earth (14:14-15). Then the children of the resurrection and the children of the translation become one family of the redeemed. However, the point is - since we are living so near the final hour when the harvest of earth is fully ripe and will be harvested, why are we not hearing emphasized the fact of "the children of the translation," and what that means and requires?

Twice previously this year we have raised this question in the setting of the Atonement (See "The Atonement," Part II, 6(98), p. 3-5), and when we discussed the early Adventist teaching on "The New Birth" (See 8(98), pp. 3-4). If as all events indicate, and fulfilled prophecy confirms, we are in the final period of time, our minds and our thinking dare not be side-tracked by programs which are seeking to repeat that which was to have been, and should have been, the main emphasis prior to the end time. The attention is to be riveted on "souls affliction" as our great High Priest comes to the last act of the final atonement. (If you have not studied carefully, the taped transcription of "The Last Act of the Final Atonement," I suggest that you do so immediately) Let us once more review the Biblical basics upon which the urgency of this hour is founded.

1. The seven last plagues of God's wrath fall on the inhabitants of earth prior to the coming of Christ as King of kings and Lord of lords. (Rev. 16:1; 19:11-16)

2. During this time, there is "no Man" in the temple of God. (Rev. 15:8) Intercession has ceased. (1 Tim. 2:5)

The conclusion cannot be avoided that acts of sin will have ceased in the lives of those who will escape the wrath of God and be translated without seeing death when Jesus comes as King of kings and Lord of lords. This makes mandatory that attention in the final hours of human history be directed to the forming of that group which can be designated as "children of the translation."

Further, there is pictured a decree which is issued prior to the coming of Jesus:

*He that is unrighteous (ο αδικων) let him be unrighteous still: and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still: and he that is righteous (ο δικαιος), let him be righteous still: and he that is holy, let him be holy still. And behold I come quickly;..."* (Rev. 22:11-12)

A simple analysis of this verse indicates two categories of people - the saved and the lost - and two divisions in each category. The Greek text, as indicated in the above para-

graph, clearly reveals that between one division of the two categories, it is simply the unrighteous in contrast to the righteous. The second category - righteous and holy - reflects the same two divisions of the saved as is found in Revelation 14:12-13 and I Corinthians 15:52-53 - the incorruptible, and the immortal.

If the comparison is valid between these three verses - Revelation 22:11; 14:12-13 and I Corinthians 15:52-53 - then "the holy one who is to be holy still" is describing a "child of the translation" in contrast to "the children of the resurrection." It is a fact that in Revelation 14:12 the same word, only in the genitive plural, is used for "saints" (των αγιων), as is used to define him (ο αγιος) who is to remain "holy still." It is at this point that some careful consideration needs to be made. How can I become "holy" so that the decree will keep me "holy"? Is this to be the basis of a works program in this final hour, so that I will be ready for translation? Can I make myself so holy that God will merely confirm it? The phrase "holy still" is αγιασθητω επι. The 29 places in the New Testament where hagiasmetho is used, 26 times it is translated, "sanctified." (See I Cor. 1:2 where "sanctified" is used in connection with "saints") The key to its force in Rev. 22:11 is that it is in the passive voice - the subject being acted upon. The "holiness" confirmed is from outside the recipient. But coupled with this fact is the Greek word - επι - "still." The same power which confirmed him holy, is the power that made him holy initially. The single conclusion to be drawn is that that holiness which makes one a part of "the children of the translation" is the holiness which is in Christ Jesus, and which in the final atonement He ministers through the Holy Spirit to the living who are "in Him."

#

## Unity in Faith & Doctrine How to be Achieved?

Within the fractured and splintered community of Adventism, this year has witnessed an attempt to achieve unity among certain major independent ministries. As reported in Landmarks (Feb., 1998) a meeting in New Smyrna, Florida, from January 8-10, brought together twenty leaders from seventeen different ministries. They achieved what could be termed an "Eucharistic" unity. This was followed by a meeting near Denver, Colorado, April 12-14, which was attended by thirteen representatives from seven of the seventeen independent ministries which had met in Florida. From reports available in both *Our Firm Foundation [OFF]* (June, 1998), and *Landmarks* (May, 1998), the primary emphasis was on ecclesiology, or how they were to relate to the Seventh-day Adventist Church. The Statement released indicates that the group adopted a one foot in, and one foot out policy.

In the light of known doctrinal differences between partici-

pants at the conference, it was quite startling to read as a part of their statement - "we concluded that our differences in no case involved the pillars of our faith, the essentials of the gospel, or the three angels' messages." In the light of this assertion, we would ask two questions: 1) Do the attendees at the Denver Conference consider the incarnation as one of the "essentials of the gospel"? 2) What is their present position on the doctrine of the incarnation? If the answer to the first question is affirmative, then they do need to clarify the second question.

It is a supportable fact that certain "voices" present at the Denver meeting hold the same teaching on the Incarnation as did the leaders of the Holy Flesh Movement at the turn of the last century. Back in 1986, Dr. Larson declined to attend a conference at Hartland Institute where this teaching was presented and promoted. Now he is meeting in unity with them. Who has changed? This needs to be clarified.

There are three editions of *Waymarks of Adventism* by Ron Spear, one original, and two second editions, one second edition released in "July, 1981," and the other a "cover-up" of the first. At least one of the attempted "cover-up" was in regard to the incarnation. Each edition has a forward by Dr. Ralph Larson, and in each edition is the teaching which Larson declined to meet head-on at Hartland in 1986. (See pp. 38, 39, 42 in the respective editions) In a preamble to the report on the "Denver Statement," Spear wrote - "Hope International stands behind the messages of our past sermons and publications" (*OFF*, June, 1998, p. 6).

[For documentation of the parallel current teaching under question, and the same teaching by the leaders of the Holy Flesh Movement, see *WWN - XX - 2(1987)*]

The picture is further complicated. In a publication released by Steps to Life on "The Tithe Problem" by Dr. Ralph Larson, he writes - "My theology is precisely and specifically the theology set forth in the book *Seventh-day Adventists Believe*" (p. 3). In the book cited, the teaching on the Incarnation is "precisely and specifically" the teaching of an Anglican divine, Henry Melvill who taught - "Christ's humanity was not the Adamic humanity, that is the humanity before the fall; nor fallen humanity of Adam after the fall. It was not the Adamic because it had the innocent infirmities of the fallen. It was not the fallen, because it had never descended into moral impurity. It was, therefore, most literally our humanity, but without sin" (p. 47). Melville considered this to be "the orthodox doctrine" (Footnote #13, p. 57). It would be helpful if Dr. Larson would harmonize his acceptance of the Melvill "orthodox doctrine" with the conclusions at which he arrived in his monumental work, *The Word Was Made Flesh*.

The Incarnation is not the only doctrine wherein those involved in this "unity" dialogue differ on "the essentials of the gospel." Spear and Colin Standish have both sug-

gested that certain Biblical statements by Paul on "the redemption that is in Christ Jesus" be "disregarded" (See Special Report, Nov.-Dec 1993, *1888 Message Study Committee Newsletter*). Because one may not be able to comprehend all that Paul has written, and cannot harmonize what he has written with their own modified Tridentine doctrine of salvation by faith plus works, is no justification to disregard what Paul has written under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. How can there be unity when some of those involved in the process want parts of the Bible disregarded? Surely Dr. Larson does not "buy" this position.

There is more to unity than merely a common ecclesiology, determining what constitutes the church. That has already been defined. It reads:

*"Where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them." (Matt. 18:20) Where Christ is even among the humble few, this is Christ's church, for the presence of the High and Holy One who inhabiteth eternity can alone constitute a church. (Letter 108, Oct. 28, 1886)*

The question is simple. Where is the presence of Christ? In answering this question, the testimony, "The Seal of God," (5T:207) needs to be carefully read and the sentence - "But the glory of the Lord had departed from Israel; although many still continued the forms of religion, His power and presence were lacking" (p. 210) - thoughtfully considered. If this were done, then those formulating the "Denver Statement" are back to square one - "the essentials of the gospel."

In 1890, the messenger of the Lord wrote - "The truth is an advancing truth, and we must walk in the increasing light" (*R&H*, March 25, 1890). In all seriousness, I ask, where is one principle of advancing truth which the signers of the Denver Statement have received from the Spirit of truth since the beginning of their ministries? What ray of increasing light are they now walking in, in which they did not walk from the start?

Now another question: In 1892, the same messenger wrote - "We have many lessons to learn, and many, many to unlearn" (*R&H*, July 26, 1892). What understandings of truth have these men projected since beginning their ministries that they did not hold before? What have they unlearned? From the statement, there are at least twice as much to unlearn as there is to learn. The evidence suggests that there has been no move forward, but a manifest resistance to any rethinking of what is assumed as fundamentals, to see if all positions held can be sustained by the Word of God. Yet, the messenger of the Lord wrote clearly - "As long as we hold to our own ideas and opinions with determined persistence, we cannot have the unity for which Christ prayed" (*ibid.*). Why then call a meeting and sign a unity statement, when the characteristics of true unity are lacking?

What is the answer? In the same time frame, the messenger of the Lord has given us the answer if we will only heed the counsel. Each of those involved in the unity meetings noted, profess great reverence for the Writings. Now it is time to act out that profession and follow counsel. First, some questions were asked:

*How shall we search the Scriptures? Shall we drive our stakes of doctrine one after another, and then try to make all Scriptures meet our established opinions, or shall we take our ideas and views to the Scriptures, and measure our theories on every side by the Scriptures of truth?*

The warning was given - "It was the unwillingness of the Jews to give up their long established traditions that proved their ruin. They were determined not to see any flaw in their own opinions or in their expositions of the Scriptures; but however long men may have entertained certain views, if they are not clearly sustained by the written word, they should be discarded."

What guidelines are given?

*Those who sincerely desire truth will not be reluctant to lay open their positions for investigation and criticism, and will not be annoyed if their opinions and ideas are crossed. This was the spirit cherished among us forty years ago. We would come together burdened in soul, praying that we might be one in faith and doctrine; for we knew that Christ is not divided. One point at a time was made the subject of investigation. Solemnity characterized these councils of investigation. The Scriptures were opened with a sense of awe. Often we fasted, that we might be better fitted to understand the truth. (R&H, July 26, 1892)*

We believe providential events opened this Spring to erect on the campus a dormitory which, with other facilities available, provides a place for such "councils of investigation" as marked the beginning of the Advent Movement. If indeed, those who have signed the various statements truly want the unity for which Christ prayed, and believe that the Writings are the work of the Messenger of the Lord, we challenge them to come into line with the counsel given. We open our facilities for such a fulfillment of Christ's intent for His people. Not only does this apply to those who are seeking unity in regard to the ecclesiological questions addressed, but also to those who are setting forth various concepts on the Godhead which they call present truth. It is time that the many dissident voices in the Community of Adventism resonate as one on the truth as it is in Jesus.

With this issue we place "the ball" in the court of those who declare with their lips that they believe what the Messenger of the Lord has written. We challenge them to utter more than just words. Rather we urge them to come into unity so that all that is said and written in their publica-

tions is in indeed in harmony with the written Word of God. Let us come together and "open our Bibles with a sense of awe" even with fasting if need be. The hour is too late to play tiddly-winks with eternity, and deceive God's concerned people with a profession of trying to achieve unity. Rather, it is long past the time that we find that "righteousness of Christ, which is pure unadulterated truth." #

## Lets Talk It Over

In the adjoining column, we have reproduced in full context a statement from the *Review & Herald* (Dec. 13, 1892). This is in the same time reference with the statements quoted in the above article relative to progressive truth and advancing light. In the second paragraph are three conjunctive adverbs of time - "after," "then," and "while" (underscored). These indicate a sequence of events as well as a simultaneous happening. A careful consideration of these paragraphs could do much to free the community of Adventism from its splintered condition. It could also help concerned Adventists evaluate correctly the present siren call for unity.

The consequential second paragraph begins - "After the truth..." The "truth" if taken in the context of the preceding paragraph is the "Sabbath" truth. After this truth has been preached to "as a witness to all nations," certain things are to occur: 1) "Every conceivable power of evil will be set in operation." 2) "Minds will be confused by many voices" each with a supposed "message from God" containing "great light." "Then there will be a removing of the landmarks and an attempt to pull down the pillars of our faith."

The "independent voices" in the community of Adventism today are based on the premise that apostasy has overtaken the main body. The verification of this apostasy is based on the compromises resulting from the SDA-Evangelical Conferences which were confirmed in the 1980 Dallas Statements of Belief. Now we face an "either/or." Either this assessment is valid, which means "the truth has been proclaimed as a witness to all nations" or else it has not been so proclaimed, and the changes in our doctrinal teaching introduced by the SDA-Evangelical Conferences constitutes "advancing truth" and "increasing light" to facilitate the giving of the loud cry. This conclusion would justify the coziness of Adventism with the Evangelicals, and nullify the basis for the existence of any "independent voice."

It is obvious that certain aspects of this prophetic "testimony" have not been fulfilled as yet. But who can say that Satan is not now working "with his lying wonders"? This brings us face to face with the fact that while

As God called the children of Israel out of Egypt, that they might keep his Sabbath, so he calls his people out of Babylon, that they may not worship the beast or his image. The man of sin, who thought to change times and laws, has exalted himself above God, by presenting a spurious Sabbath to the world; the Christian world has accepted the child of the papacy, and cradled and nourished it, thus defying God by removing his memorial, and setting up a rival Sabbath.

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, we have the message from God, he has sent me with great light." Then there will be a removing of the landmarks, and an attempt to tear down the pillars of our faith. A more decided effort will be made to exalt the false Sabbath, and to cast contempt upon God himself by supplanting the day he has blessed and sanctified. This false Sabbath is to be enforced by an oppressive law. Satan and his angels are wide-awake, and intensely active, working with energy and perseverance through human instrumentalities to bring about his purpose of obliterating from the minds of men the knowledge of God. But while Satan works with his lying wonders, the time will be fulfilled foretold in the Revelation, and the mighty angel that shall lighten the earth with his glory, will proclaim the fall of Babylon, and call upon God's people to forsake her.

At the time of the loud cry of the third angel those who have been in any measure blinded by the enemy, who have not fully recovered themselves from the snare of Satan, will be in peril, because it will be difficult for them to discern the light from heaven, and they will be inclined to accept falsehood. Their erroneous experience will color their thoughts, their decisions, their propositions, their counsels. The evidences that God has given will be no evidence to those who have blinded their eyes by choosing darkness rather than light. After rejecting light, they will originate theories which they will call "light," but which the Lord calls, "Sparks of their own kindling," by which they will direct their steps.

he is thus working, the "fall of Babylon" is proclaimed, and "God's people" are called "to forsake her." This brings us face to face with the ecclesiology question which the Denver Statement sought to address. At this point is where some of the admonition found in the references noted in the above article from the same time frame as this statement comes into play. We have "many lessons to learn, and many, many to unlearn" (R&H, July 26, 1892).

First, the Biblical basis of this clear statement relative to forsaking "Babylon" is found in Revelation 18:4. Other references in this section of Revelation, for example 16:12, indicate a type and antitype hermeneutic to understand the relationship between the past history of Babylon and the present. It is clear that Babylon was *never* "God's people," even though Nebuchadnezzar was declared to be God's servant in carrying out the judgment of God upon His rebellious people (Jer. 25:9). The "people of God" got into Babylon through captivity. The call for them to "come out of Babylon" was to build again the Temple to which "the desire of all nations" would come (Haggai 2:7).

Modern Israel went into "captivity" by its own choice in adopting the theology of the Evangelicals in crucial areas which muted the uniqueness of Adventism. The call to forsake Babylon is a call to come out of the Evangelical theology and rebuild again the temple of truth - even "the righteousness of Christ, which is pure, unadulterated truth" (*Testimonies to Ministers*, p. 65). If the message of 1888, brought by two messengers, had been accepted, the revelation of "Christ in you the hope of glory" would have been realized and Christ would have returned for His "temple people" long ago. Further, if the call in 1950 by two other messengers had been heeded by the hierarchy of the Church, the tragedy of 1955-56 of our captivity to the Evangelicals would have been averted.

The issue of ecclesiology is only secondary; the issue is truth, a truth that will free God's people from their captivity to Babylon. The "temple of truth" must be rebuilt on "the righteousness of Christ, which is pure, unadulterated truth." To possess such a truth will require that we start unlearning "many, many" lessons based in tradition, and in their place learn "many" other lessons so that the truth will be "pure" and "unadulterated." In this "temple" will need to be enshrined "the advancing truth" that has been neglected so that the freed people of God may "walk in the increasing light." AND, the *only* way this will be realized is to accept the counsel given to adopt "the spirit cherished" by God's people in the beginning of this Movement as they sought to escape the captivity of Babylon in their day and thus heed the Second Angel's message.

Time is fast running out; the end is upon us, but the greatest tragedy is the shambles in that part of the Community of Adventism professing so-called "historic" Adventism obsessed with a desire for unity, and missing the mark as to what the real basis of unity is - TRUTH - pure, and unadulterated" even the righteousness of Christ. whg

## OF INTEREST

In the Spring (1998) issue of Sunday, the official organ of the Lord's Day Alliance of the United States, there was reprinted an article from The Providence (RI) Journal-Bulletin (Dec. 19, 1997). The author was writing on "Slow Down Sundays." He began this feature article with the sentence - "Bring back the blue laws." Then as he described the "Sunday" he knew as a boy growing up free from "traffic jams on the way to hideous malls," he asked a question of himself - "Do I think the blue laws are coming back? No. America's pneumatic love affair with commerce is too powerful" (p. 6). However, Robert Whitcomb closed his article commending a nonbinding referendum by the town of Pembroke, MA, requesting the State to bring back the blue laws. Sunday has not reported on the outcome of this referendum.

In the summer issue (p. 12), following an article by a former Seventh-day Adventist, was the footnote -

"While we believe that Sunday is The Lord's Day, we believe that the constitution of the United States protects the right of all Americans to practice their religious convictions, including the choice of their day of worship."

+++++

On the campus is a three-bed room home for rent or lease. If interested, contact the editor.

+++++

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

In Canada, write - The Adventist Laymen's Foundation of Canada, P. O. Box 117, Thorne, ON P0H 2J0.

In Australia, write - The Adventist Laymen's Foundation, P.O. Box 846, Belmont, Victoria 3216.

Caribbean Contact - P. O. Box G M 537, Castries, St. Lucia

Editor Elder Wm. H. Grotheer

Any portion of this Thought Paper may be reproduced without further permission by adding the credit line - "Reprinted from WVN, Ozona, Arkansas, USA."

First copy is free upon request; duplicate copies - 50c.

+++++

Our 800 Number is 800-4-LAYMEN (800-452-9636)  
FAX - 501-292-3745 Regular Calls - (501) 292-3721