



# "Watchman, what of the night?"

*The watchman said, The morning cometh, and also the night: if ye will enquire, enquire ye: return, come. Isaiah 21:11-12*

## THE HERESY OF THE SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST EVANGELICAL CONFERENCES CONFIRMED BY THE ACTION OF THE 1980 GENERAL CONFERENCE SESSION

When the book - Questions on Doctrine - was published in 1957 following the Seventh-day Adventist Evangelical Conferences of 1955-1956, the Editorial Committee stated in the "Introduction:"

No statement of Seventh-day Adventist belief can be considered official unless it is adopted by the General Conference in quadrennial session, when accredited delegates from the whole world field are present. The statement of Fundamental Beliefs [1931 as amended at the 1950 Session] as mentioned above is our only official statement. The answers in this volume are an expansion of doctrinal positions contained in that official statement of Fundamental Beliefs. (p. 9)

A number, including the late Elder M. L. Andreasen, Elder David Bauer, and this writer, did not consider the book - Questions on Doctrine - an expansion of the 1931 Statement of Beliefs, but rather a departure from the faith once committed to the Church. The response on the part of some of the hierarchy was that since this book was not an official statement, and could not be until voted by the General Conference in session there was no reason to become unduly concerned. However, others attempted to defend the positions taken in the book. One striking example of this defense by affirmation came from the Editor of the Adventist Review. He wrote to one of the laity of the Church:

This book [Questions on Doctrine] in no way changes our fundamental beliefs. In fact, it probably sets them forth more clearly than any publication that has been issued from our presses in many a year. I have been next to this whole program from the very beginning, [Unruh evidently was not aware of this as Wood's name does not appear in the Adventist Heritage Report.] and I have yet to hear any serious reader of this book offer a criticism that can bear examination. [The Editor appears not to have heard of Andreasen's Letters to the Churches.] (Letter dated, February 28, 1968)

Regardless of how the hierarchy seeks to justify the conferences that took place between Barnhouse and Martin for the Evangelicals; and Unruh, Froom, Anderson, and Read for the Church, apostasy of the darkest hue was perpetrated by these men who sought to speak for the Church. And this apostasy was approved by the leader-

ship of the Church. One needs read only Unruh's report in the Adventist Heritage (Vol 4, #2, pp. 35-46) for this verification. [You can obtain a copy of this report, and all the articles in Eternity which give Barnhouse and Martin's reaction to the conferences from the Adventist Laymen's Foundation.]

At the very beginning of the conferences, Barnhouse stated that he and Martin "immediately. . . perceived that the Adventists were strenuously denying certain doctrinal positions which had been previously attributed to them." (Eternity, Sept., 1956) In the same article, he further commented:

The position of the Adventists seems to some of us in certain cases to be a new position; to them it may be merely the position of the majority group of sane leadership which is determined to put the brakes on any members who seek to hold views divergent from that of the responsible leadership of the denomination.

What was one of these "certain cases" which they perceived as a "new position?" Barnhouse has stated it thus:

The final major area of disagreement is over the doctrine of the "investigative judgment," which is a doctrine never known in theological history until the second half of the nineteenth century and which is a doctrine held exclusively by the Seventh-day Adventists. At the very beginning of our contacts with the Adventist leaders, Mr. Martin and I thought that this would be the doctrine on which it would be impossible to come to any understanding which would permit our including them among those who could be counted as Christians believing in the finished work of Christ. (ibid.)

Now what did these Evangelicals hear the Adventist conferees state regarding this basic Adventist teaching? Mr. Barnhouse has written devastatingly:

Mr Martin and I heard the Adventist leaders say, flatly, that they repudiate all such extremes [The literalism of the heavenly sanctuary]. This they did in no uncertain terms. Further, they do not believe, as some of their earlier teachers taught, that Jesus' atoning work was not completed on Calvary but instead that He was still carrying on a second ministering work since 1844. This idea is also totally repudiated. They believe that since His ascension Christ has been ministering the benefits of the atonement which He completed on Calvary. (ibid.)

Further, Unruh confirms that this is what the Adventist conferees actually told Barnhouse and Martin. He wrote:

We affirmed our belief in the eternal and complete deity of Christ, in His sinless life in the incarnation, in his atoning death on the cross, once for all and all-sufficient, in His literal resurrection, and in His priestly ministry before the Father, applying the benefits of the atonement completed on the cross. (Adventist Heritage, op. cit., p. 38)

Observe now, how this new doctrine was expressed in the book - Questions on Doctrine - when it was published. It is stated:

When, therefore, one hears an Adventist say, or reads in Adventist literature - even in the writings of Ellen G. White - that Christ is making atonement now, it should be understood that we mean simply that Christ is now making application of the benefits of the sacrificial atonement He made on the cross; that He is making it efficacious for us individually, according to our needs and requests. (pp. 354-355 emphasis theirs)

To underscore that nothing was to be obtained for the believer by the ministry of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary, in this book it is further stated:

How glorious is the thought that the King, who occupies the throne, is also our representative at the court of heaven! This becomes all the more meaningful when we realize that Jesus our surety entered the "holy places," and appeared in the presence of God for us. But it was not with the hope of obtaining something for us at that time, or at some future time. No! He had already obtained it for us on the cross. (p. 381 emphasis theirs.)

With this background, take your previous thought paper [WWN (XIII-10)]<sup>1</sup> and turn to page 10. There at the top of the page begins the statement from the Annual Council of 1979 recommended statement of beliefs, followed by the statement given to the delegates at the Dallas Session, and the third paragraph gives the statement as voted in regard to Christ's High Priestly Ministry in the Heavenly Sanctuary. Observe closely the following sentences from these statements:

That there is in heaven a sanctuary in which Christ ministers in our behalf, making available to believers the benefits of His atoning sacrifice offered once for all on the cross. (1979 Recommended)

As High Priest of the heavenly sanctuary He draws all to Himself and makes available to those who receive Him the benefits of His atoning sacrifice offered once for all on the cross. (1980 Presented)

In it [a sanctuary in heaven], Christ ministers on our behalf, making available to believers the benefits of His atoning sacrifice offered once for all on the cross. (1980 Voted)

By checking closely all previous statements of belief, even the 1931 Statement as voted by the 1950 General Conference in Session, in the areas of "The Atonement" and "Christ's High Priestly Ministry in the Heavenly Sanctuary," no where can one find the phraseology as noted above. Keep in mind that the Seventh-day Adventist Evangelical Conferences came after the 1950 General Conference Session in 1955-1956. Observe closely the wording of the previous statements of belief in the area of the atonement: [WWN (XIII-10), p. 7]

Jesus Christ "died our sacrifice, was raised for our justification, ascended on high to be our only Mediator in the sanctuary in heaven, where, with His blood, He makes the atonement for our sins; which atonement, so far from being made on the cross, which was but the offering of the sacrifice, is the very last portion of His work as priest, . . ." (1872 Tract; 1874 Signs of the Times Editorial)

Jesus Christ "died our sacrifice, was raised for our justification, ascended on high to be our only Mediator in the sanctuary in heaven, where, through the merits of His shed blood, He secures the pardon and forgiveness of the sins of all those who penitently come to Him." (YB 1889, 1905, 1907-1914)

Jesus Christ "died our sacrifice, was raised for our justification, ascended on high to be our only Mediator in the sanctuary in heaven, where, through the atoning merits of His blood, He secures the pardon and forgiveness of all who penitently come to God through Him." (1894, Battle Creek Church Directory)

In all of these statements of belief from 1872 through 1914, it is plainly stated that Jesus Christ as High Priest made the atonement in heaven - not on the Cross which was but the Sacrifice - and that in that heavenly sanctuary atonement, He did obtain something for us - the forgiveness and pardon of our sins as we come penitently to God through Him.

The Yearbooks (1889, 1905, 1907-1914) are likewise very explicit in regard to the priestly ministry of Christ in the final atonement. They read:

That the sanctuary of the new covenant is the tabernacle of God in heaven. . . [and] is the sanctuary to be cleansed at the end of the two thousand and three hundred says, what is termed its cleansing being in this case, as in the type, simply the entrance of the high priest into the most holy place, to finish the round of service connected therewith, by making the atonement and removing from the sanctuary the sins which had been transferred to it by means of the ministration in the first apartment; and that this work in the antitype, beginning in 1844, consists in actually blotting out the sins of believers. [WWN (XIII-10), p. 9]<sup>1</sup>

If the types of the earthly sanctuary established by God Himself teach us anything - they teach us that it was not the blood of the sacrifice offered which obtained forgiveness, or cleansing, but the blood of the sacrifice mediated which was efficacious in symbol to the sinner. That which was done in type became a reality in the sacrifice and mediation of Jesus Christ, who after having offered Himself as the victim, ascended into the heavenly sanctuary as the high priest to make the atonement for the believer.

In the 1955-1956 Conferences with the Evangelicals, we denied this basic Biblical and Adventist truth, even going to the extent of putting in writing - Questions on Doctrine (pp. 354-355) - that when our spiritual fathers including Ellen G. White, spoke, wrote, or taught this fundamental concept they did not mean it, but rather "that Christ is now making application of the benefits of the sacrificial atonement He made on the cross." This denial of our historic faith we have now confirmed in the Statement of Belief voted at the General Conference Session in Dallas, Texas. The apostasy of the 50's has become the stated faith of the 80's!

We were warned in regard to the Alpha apostasy at the turn of the century that -

The track of truth lies close beside the track of error, and both tracks may seem to be one to minds which are not worked by the Holy

Spirit, and which, therefore, are not quick to discern the difference between truth and error. (Special Testimonies, Series B, No. 2, p. 52)

What was true concerning the Alpha Apostasy is equally, if not more so, true concerning the Omega Apostasy. While the delegates to the 1980 Session sought to avoid the use of the words - "completed atonement" - in referring to the sacrifice on the Cross, and deleted from the Statement given to them at the beginning of the session, the phrase - "This act of atonement" [WVN (XIII-10), p. 8] - they still accepted phraseology in another section which means the same thing as that which was deleted in a previous section. The cross is noted as "this perfect atonement" with its benefits merely made "available to the believers" through Christ's heavenly ministry. Thus is confirmed as declared in Questions on Doctrine, that Christ returned to heaven "not with the hope of obtaining something for us," for "He had already obtained it for us on the cross." Yet there are those who believe that a great victory was obtained in Dallas, Texas, simply because some not so subtle heresies were deleted from the recommended Statement issued at the 1979 Annual Council. But instead of restoring the historic faith which had been committed to our trust, the guardians of the spiritual interests of the people, led by the president of the General Conference himself voted to confirm the sell-out perpetrated in the Seventh-day Adventist Evangelical Conferences of 1955-1956. How deceived can we become!

To top this deception, many are now rejoicing in what was voted in regard to Dr. Desmond Ford, thinking that this has now purified our faith, when in reality we confirmed at Dallas some of the very doctrine which Dr. Ford had merely carried to its ultimate conclusion. For if the atonement of Christ was once for all on the Cross, then is not Dr. Ford correct in maintaining that there is no heavenly significance to 1844? Why condemn him for teaching what was voted as "the voice of God" in Dallas. So long as anyone subscribes to the apostasy of Dallas, they are as much a partaker in heresy as Dr. Ford is. They should join forces with him. This includes the Editor of the Adventist Review who believed in 1968 - and to my knowledge I have not read a confession of repentance, nor a retraction - that Questions on Doctrine sets forth our fundamental beliefs "more clearly than any other publication that has been issued from our presses in many a year." So he believes with Ford that Christ obtains nothing for us in the sanctuary, for He obtained it all on the Cross. It is true that one can find from his pen as Editor attacks on Ford's position - this only compounds the deception. It is simply the blind leading the blind. May God help us to awaken to actually what has taken place. The Omega of apostasy has come to full fruition. What was begun in 1955-1956 has now been officially adopted in 1980.

---

<sup>1</sup>Documentary Notations - In referring to the Key Doctrinal Comparisons from Statements of Belief, 1872-1980 as given in the October thought paper, we shall use the following - WVN (XIII-10). For example, should we be referring to the comparison on the Spirit of Prophecy, and were quoting from the sentences added at the 1950 General Conference Session to the 1931 Statement of Belief, we would note it as follows - [WVN (XIII-10), p. 3, GC, 1950] The Yearbook references will be cited as YB-1889, etc. The most recent statements will be noted as 1979-Recommended; 1980-Presented; and 1980-Voted.

✓

(In the January, 1981 issue of "Watchman, What of the Night?" we shall consider another doctrinal deviation.)

## REMEMBER YE THE LAW OF MOSES MY SERVANT

Remember ye the law of Moses my servant, which I commanded unto him in Horeb for all Israel, with the statutes and judgments.

Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord: And he shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children and the heart of the children to their fathers, lest I come and smite the earth with a curse.  
(Malachi 4:4-6)

The entire chapter in Malachi from which these verses are quoted is eschatological in import - it refers to the last times. It speaks of the eradication of sin - "all that do wickedly, shall be stubble;" for "they shall be ashes." (Mal. 4:1, 3) It speaks of victory and restoration - "Unto you that fear my name shall the Sun of righteousness arise with healing in His wings." (Mal. 4:2) And we recognize that the prophecy concerning Elijah has definite last day implications. This then places in the frame work of the last days every verse of this chapter in Malachi, except the verse which tells us to "Remember the law of Moses my servant." How shall this verse be related?

In the New Testament, these two men - Moses and Elijah - are associated together in the transfiguration of Jesus on the mount. (Luke 9:29-31) The disciples who accompanied Jesus, and who beheld and heard Moses and Elijah communing with him, related this experience with the prophecy of Malachi. (Matt. 17:10) It is of interest to note about what Moses and Elijah communed with Jesus. Luke states that they discussed with Jesus "His decease which He should accomplish at Jerusalem." (Luke 9:31) The word - decease - in the Greek is *εξοδος* which transliterated into English is Exodus - the way out. This recalls the leadership of Moses as he led the Exodus of the children of Israel out of Egypt. But Egypt has long been a symbol of sin, and the text in Malachi specifies - "the law of Moses. . . commanded. . . in Horeb" or at Mt. Sinai. What then was given at Mt. Sinai which typifies the exodus from sin? There was only one thing, and that was "the law having a shadow of good things to come" by which "sacrifices" were offered "year by year continually." (Heb. 10:1) This we are to remember prior to the great and dreadful day of the Lord, as well as the fact that Elijah shall be sent.

The main thrust of the book of Hebrews is centered in the sacrificial laws and ordinances of the law of Moses as God commanded him in Mt. Sinai. Some wish to emphasize only that the book of Hebrews tells us that Christ ascended into the presence of God, and was seated on the right hand of the Throne of the Majesty on high. And so the book of Hebrews states. (Heb. 1:3; 8:1; 9:24) But why make these words any more literal, than the statements that the earthly sanctuary was a pattern of the heavenly. (Heb. 9:23) If one is to be understood literally, should not the other also? Are we not told that "He shall be a priest upon His throne"? (Zech. 6:13) Can we not understand Christ seated on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty as another expression for the fact that upon His ascension, Christ was inaugurated High Priest forever after the Order of Melchisedec? The "right hand" is a Biblical expression indicating favor, and the "throne" is a symbol of authority. All power (authority - Gr) was given unto Him. (Matt. 28:18) Is not the basis of that power the nail prints in His hands as He pleads His shed blood? (See Hab. 3:4 ARV) Why try to literalize the sitting of Christ

at the right hand of God - "hence forth expecting" - when the book of Revelation places Him at center stage "in the midst of the throne" as a Lamb as it had been slain! (Rev. 5:6)

The book of Hebrews is very clear that the earthly pattern had two apartments, and in the first apartment the priests ministered daily, but into the second apartment "went the high priest alone once every year." (Heb. 9:2-7) Further, the writer clearly defines these two apartments, one he calls the holy place, or sanctuary (Heb. 9:2 KJV), and the other within the second veil, he terms "the holiest of all." (Heb. 9:3) Of this second apartment and its services, it is stated - "We cannot now speak particularly." (Heb. 9:5) The whole emphasis of Hebrews pertaining to the priesthood of Christ is directed to His ministry in the first apartment as He appears in the presence of God for us. In the unveiling of Jesus Christ, which God gave to Him to reveal to His people, the Father is pictured enthroned where the golden candlesticks are located. (Rev. 4:5) Lest there be any misunderstanding as to where this ministry as pictured in Revelation is being carried on, John beheld twenty-four elders attired in priestly garb "having everyone of them. . . golden vials full of incense, which are the prayers of the saints." (Rev. 4:4; 5:8 margin) The Scripture is emphatic that the High Priest alone ministers in the Most Holy Place!

To understand this heavenly ministry, God commanded Moses in Horeb a law of sacrifices and offerings, and specified the procedure of offering, and by whom they were to be offered, and what results were to accrue to the offerer in type. While it is true that these sacrifices were fulfilled in the death of Christ, and are now no longer obligatory, they were not meaningless ritual, but specified by God to convey the plan and procedure of salvation devised by God Himself. "The way, O God, is in the sanctuary." (Ps. 77:13) To understand that way of God in the sanctuary above, we must have knowledge of the sanctuary He patterned below to represent what He planned to do, and how He would do it. It was the Gospel in types and shadows. To alter this procedure as revealed by God is to introduce a false gospel.

The ministry of the priests, who served unto "the example and shadow of heavenly things" (Heb. 8:5) was divided between the daily and yearly services, with only the high priest officiating on the yearly Day of Atonement. It was they alone who made atonement, whether it was the daily or yearly services which were involved. They made this atonement, not as a sinner, but as one who stood in the place of the Christ to come. No one who stood before God as a sinner could make atonement. The sinner could only bring his offering, and having confessed over it his sin, slay it. It was then - and not until then - that the priest entered the picture. Taking of the blood, he obtained the atonement which in the daily service prefigured forgiveness to the sinner. (Read carefully Leviticus 4.)

The annual or yearly service involved the High Priest alone, and the blood of the Lord's goat. The people individually provided nothing - they made no confession - the High Priest alone with blood provided by the Lord himself - obtained an atonement which brought cleansing to the afflicted soul, who was praying, waiting the final consumation of the mediation. (See Lev. 23:27-32; Lev. 16)

These services commanded in the law of Moses, we need to especially understand before the great and dreadful day of the Lord, for when He comes the second time, He comes without sin unto salvation. (Heb. 9:28) "How shall we escape if we neglect so great a salvation?" - is the question of the book of Hebrews. (2:3)

"Divine grace is needed at the beginning, divine grace at every step of advance, and divine grace alone can complete the work." (TM, p. 508) The sinner could not make atonement for himself as he came bringing his sacrifice, by which he said, "I accept my Substitute." As he sought to perceive the meaning of the candlesticks, the table of shewbread, and the altar of incense - divine grace was needed at every step of advance. Then on the day of Atonement - as he came to afflict his soul, no offering could he bring - it was the Lord's goat, and the High Priest alone who could effect the atonement, and cleanse his soul.

"Remember ye the law of Moses my servant which I commanded him in Horeb for all Israel."

✓

#### ADVENTIST LEADER ARRESTED IN USSR

MOSCOW (UPI) The leader of the Seventh-day Adventist sect in the Soviet Union, wanted by the KGB for more than five years, has been arrested in Leningrad, dissident sources said. Rostislav N. Galetsky, 31, was seized July 1 at a railway station in Leningrad.

Galetsky is called "pastor" by his flock of fundamentalist Christians scattered in small congregations across the USSR. They are the True and Free Seventh-day Adventists, an illegal, underground group that refuses to accept any state control over religion.

Galetsky, a native of the Ukraine, became leader of the illegal Adventists following the death in January of Vladimir Shelkov, 84.

✓

#### HIERARCHY PLANS NEW WORLD DIVISION

C. E. Bradford, President of the North American Division of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, announced in the Pacific Union College Church on Sabbath, August 23, 1980, that the Church leaders were planning to form a new world Division of the Church made up of the legally recognized churches in the USSR. The hierarchy of the Curia on the Sligo refuse to recognize, or have any dealings with the True and Free Seventh-day Adventists in the USSR.

✓

#### KGB CLERGY (The Toronto Sun, July 9, 1980, p. 10)

Controversy at the Baptist World Congress in Toronto centers on whether or not the 14 Soviet delegates are true believers in God - or agents of the KGB. In one sense, that the matter is even disputed, reveals the hopelessness of convincing some to be realistic.

Put succinctly and as dispassionately as possible, it is inconceivable that travelling priests or clergy from the Soviet Union are anything but KGB-sponsored.



That is not to say they all are KGB officers, but they are informers, propagandists, talent scouts, recruiters, watch-dogs, or whatever for the KGB. With absolute certainty it can be said that no Soviet delegate to any foreign conference is a free agent. He or she has had to make compromises with the KGB, whether it is informing on comrades or spying on the hosts. And those who repeatedly travel abroad are professional informers and agents, or have sold their souls. This is not a moral judgment, it is cold, hard, provable fact.

Religion is especially ludicrous. Here is an atheistic, anti-Christ system where preaching, or teaching Sunday school, entails a five-year prison sentence. Yet some churches in the West still insist there is religious freedom in the USSR and refuse to believe that all state-approved clergy are penetrated by the KGB. From the Soviet viewpoint the wisdom of the KGB infiltrating world religious bodies is seen in the reluctance of, say, the World Council of Churches, the Vatican, or the World Baptist Alliance [and the Seventh-day Adventist leadership] to criticize Soviet persecution of religion. Some who should know better prefer to accept KGB assurances that there is no religious persecution rather than listen to their victims. (Emphasis theirs) - An Editorial -

#### "ADVENTIST ALCOHOLICS ANONYMOUS"

Yes, this is the title of an article in the Ministry (August, 1980, pp. 22-23) In it the doctor-author wrote:

It is time for us as Seventh-day Adventists to recognize that we too have a problem among us with alcohol. In too many Adventist homes alcohol is being served, not only at parties, but as a refreshment at the dinner table! Wet bars can be seen in some Adventist homes. Nor should we think that only professional people are involved in the problem.

Some of our own young people are growing up in this tolerant atmosphere regarding alcohol. They are using alcohol and other drugs and thus getting into the same problems as other students in spite of our church's influence. Peer pressure, of course, is very strong, but so is parental example. Young people today are not deceived by their parent's attitude. What can we expect of young people when their parents take a social drink or have beer or wine in their refrigerator? Or what can we expect if their Adventist minister agrees privately that "a little wine is all right," using Paul's advice to Timothy as his Biblical authority? (p. 22)

Yet, no signs of repentance are visible from the Curia on the Sligo. Could it be that we have passed the same unseen line as did Esau, and now can find "no place of repentance" even if we should seek it carefully with tears? (Heb. 12:17) Did we not sell our birthright for a morsel of approval by the Evangelicals in the 1955-1956 Conferences with them? And has not God spoken in the fulfilled prophecy of Luke 21:24? Could it be that we are closer than we think to the fulfillment of the warning which reads - "The day of God's vengeance is just upon us." (5T:212)

### KINSHIP KAMPMEETING

A campmeeting sponsored by the Kinship Group composed of Seventh-day Adventist Gays was held August 5-10 in a high desert resort area outside of Phoenix, AZ. In response to the group's appeal, the General Conference permitted three professors from Andrews University to attend and speak. Also, Elder Londis, pastor of the Sligo SDA Church, conducted the Sabbath worship service, and Pastor Josephine Griffin Benton of the Rockville, Maryland, SDA Church spoke at the Sabbath afternoon meeting. In addition to these, the General Conference paid the way for Colin Cook, an "ex-gay SDA pastor" who "is practicing psychology at the present time" to come and give his testimony. Whatever the merits or demerits of the General Conference action, their position was to seek to help these people, some of whom have been disfellowshipped, and others who are still in good and regular standing with the Church. There are some clothed in their garments of self-righteous works who will criticize the officers of the General Conference for responding to this appeal from SDA Gays, being unmindful that Jesus himself ate with Publicans and sinners. However, the Research Committee of the General Conference is preparing a paper on Human Sexuality. The position taken in this paper will reveal much as to the thinking of the leadership of the Church in this crucial area. Then it will be time enough to comment.

The sad part of this present picture is that these of the Kinship Group have for the most part been raised in Adventist homes, attended church schools, academies, and our colleges, rather than having been half-converted statistics through our quantity evangelistic programs. Perhaps the allegations that have at times surfaced in the past of gays serving as resident deans in our academies and colleges may have been too true. When this writer has in the past heard of such gossip, he has seriously questioned its veracity because of personal experience he has had. In the Florence, Mississippi, area where we lived for ten years, there was a teacher who was a strict disciplinarian, and who made the boys behave even in their rest room behaviour. So to get rid of the teacher, someone wrote in big letters on the sidewalk in front of the church school - "Mr ----- is a homosexual." It accomplished its purpose - the teacher left. No proof could be produced which justified the slander and libel. The character of the teacher was above reproach.

✓

### OPEN-ENDED THEOLOGY

This summer a young evangelist was called in before some of his peers and the local conference president. He was questioned as to his convictions. When the evangelist raised some questions as to present doctrines as voted in Dallas, the response was - You can believe what you want to believe, the Church now has an open-ended theology. Just press together behind the leadership, and keep the tithes coming through proper channels. Evidently, this conference president was unaware that Sister White wrote - "The Lord has not specified any regular channel through which means should pass." (Spaulding-Magan Collection, p. 498)

✓

"Watchman, What of the Night?" is published monthly by the Adventist Laymen's Foundation of Mississippi, Inc., P. O. Box 178, Lamar, AR 72846