



*"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

SINCE WHEN? — — —

Was PAGAN Rome Followed by CHRISTIAN Rome?

Was ROME Ever CHRISTIAN?

During the time the manuscript on The Times of the Gentiles was being rewritten (See XVIII - 2), a friend in California sent us a copy of a double page from God Cares, Vol. I, which noted an event which had taken place in 1967. The Great Schism of 1054 between the Eastern Orthodox Church and the Roman Catholic Church was healed in 1967. The author of this new commentary on Daniel was Dr. C. Mervyn Maxwell, Chairman of the Church History Department at Andrews University. Knowing what his father, the late Arthur S. Maxwell had said at the 1952 Bible Conference in regard to the prophecy of Luke 21:24, I purchased the book. At the time I failed to recall that Elder Maxwell had altered his prophetic understanding as a result of his visit to Rome as a member of the press corps to Vatican II Council.

Interested in what is now being published by the church's publishing houses on the book of Daniel - the last publication was Daniel, by Dr. Desmond Ford by SPA in 1978 - I turned to the comments on Daniel 8. To my amazement, I read the following:

7. Both pagan and Christian Rome destroyed "mighty men and the people of the saints" (verse 24); that is, they both persecuted a large number of conscien-

tious Christians and even tortured many of them in the process.

8. Both pagan and Christian Rome "took away the continual burnt offering" and "overthrew the place of his sanctuary." Verse 11. Pagan Rome did this literally - but only in a limited sense, as we shall see later - in A.D. 70 when soldiers under the Roman general (later emperor) Titus set the temple (or Jerusalem sanctuary) on fire, causing its complete destruction and forever terminating its services....

Christian Rome and the sanctuary. But did Christian Rome in any sense take away the continual burnt offering and overthrow the place of His sanctuary?" (p. 161, emphasis his)

Then I wondered what had been written in regard to "the little horn" of Daniel 7. In Section III of "The Message of Daniel 7," Maxwell states - "In view of the importance of the little horn, more space will be devoted to this present section than to most, and it will be divided into two subsections: (a) 'Four Principles' and (b) 'Eight Identifying Marks.'" The first of the four principles is - "There is more than one antichrist." (emphasis his) Of this he writes:

Now some Christians today (called "preterists") say that the antichrist appeared long, long ago. Others (the "futurists") say he hasn't appeared yet. And still others (the "historicists") say that the antichrist has operated throughout church history, revealing himself most especially, thus far, in the medieval Christian church.

In some sense or other they may all be right! (p. 122)

[This is the same position which Dr. Desmond Ford took in his book - Daniel. Ford wrote - commenting on these same schools of prophetic interpretation - "It must be said that each of the systems is right in what it affirms and wrong in what it denies." (p. 68, Emphasis Ford's) Yet Ford was defrocked - and not that he shouldn't have been - but - Maxwell is retained in a sensitive teaching position of the Church yet holding the same thing! Is it because who his father was, and who his brothers are?]

After setting forth the other three principles - "2. Daniel's vision purposefully presents a one-sided picture of Rome" which he blames on God! (Believe it or not! See quotes below); and "3. The New Testament also predicted persecution;" and "4. The New Testament also prophesies apostasy," Maxwell comments:

With these four principles in mind - (1) that there is more than one antichrist, and we are here trying to identify not "the" antichrist but only the little horn; (2) that in Daniel 7 God purposefully presented a one-sided picture of Rome as a terrible beast in order to emphasize His displeasure at persecution; (3) that the New Testament, like the Old, foretold persecution for the church; and (4) that the New Testament also foretold serious apostasy within the church - we are ready to proceed with the eight identifying marks of the little horn. (pp. 126-127, Emphasis mine)

Then after listing "the eight identifying marks" - this conclusion is drawn:

Only one entity really fits all eight of these identifying marks - the Christian church which arose to religiopolitical prominence as the Roman Empire declined and which enjoyed a special influence over the minds of men between the sixth and the eighteenth centuries.

To call this Christian church the "Roman Catholic" Church can be misleading if Protestants assume that the Roman Catholic Church of, say, the sixth century was one big denomination among others, as it is today. Actually the Roman Catholic Church was virtually the Christian church in Western Europe for about a thousand years. Because of this early universality both Protestants and Catholics may regard it as the embodiment of "our" Christian heritage, for better or for worse. (p. 127, Emphasis his.)

Since this is Maxwell's concept of the route of Apostolic Christianity to the

present day, then God have mercy on His professed people when Maxwell gets to Revelation 12 in God Cares, Vol. II, which prophecy states that our heritage as "the remnant of her seed" came via the church in the wilderness.

In view of all of this false coloring given to Romanism - calling the Roman Catholic system - "Christian Rome" - we need to turn our attention to our prophetic heritage, and understand just what God is saying in the prophetic symbolism of Daniel 7. The vision given to Daniel in the first year of Belshazzar, king of Babylon, helps us to place the identity of "the little horn" in an historical setting, and to see how God views this power, not in a biased one-sided presentation, but in reality what it is in the judgment of an omniscient God. [The destruction of this historical setting is what made the "mutterings" of Wheeling so diabolical. (See WWN, XVIII-1) His application of Ford's apotelesmatic concept destroyed this setting.]

Before going into Daniel 7, we need to take a brief look at the word, "antichrist" as used in the New Testament, and how the term is used in our language today. In the Bible, the word - αντιχριστος - is used only by John in his Epistles (I John 2:18, 22; 4:3 and II John 7). It is the word "Christ" prefaced with the preposition, "anti," which in the Greek, means - "in place of." Our word, anti, means instead "against." In this sense - our usage - the term, "antichrist," has been applied to the symbolisms - "the little horn" in Daniel 7, the first "beast" of Revelation 13, and to "the man of sin" as described by Paul in II Thessalonians 2:3. The Greek word for antichrist is never applied in Scriptures to these symbolisms, and for very obvious reasons. These symbols do not represent a power, from God's point of view, as a person in place of the true Messiah, but rather to a power directly opposed to Christ, and energized by Satan himself. This is why to use the term, Christian, and apply it to a power so pictured in Scripture is repugnant and diabolical.

Daniel 7

In the night visions, Daniel beheld "four great beast" come from the sea, diverse

one from another. They did not come up simultaneously, but followed each other in succession. This is indicated by the numbering: "The first was like..." (v.4); "and behold another beast, a second,..." (v. 5); and "after this I beheld, and lo another,..." (v. 6). Then came "a fourth beast,..." (v. 7). To indicate that these arose at the same time, as Wheeling does, is a complete distortion of Scripture, and should serve as a warning sign to - "Beware, the 'mutterings' of men." These four beasts, while seen in vision as coming up out of the "sea", are declared by the angel to come "out of the earth." (v. 17) Their origin is of the earth, from the "sea of humanity."

"The first is like a lion, and had eagle's wings." (v. 4) Daniel never asked for the meaning of this symbol, for he knew, seeing it before him constantly as he ministered the affairs of state for Nebuchadnezzar. George McCready Price in his book - The Greatest of the Prophets - commented that "the winged lion, or the figure of a lion with wings, is one of the most common on the ancient monuments of Assyria and Babylon." (p. 135) Two of the Old Testament prophets, other than Daniel, note these symbolic representations in speaking of Babylon. Habakkuk wrote of "the Chaldeans, that bitter and hasty nation, which shall march through the breadth of the land." (1:16) He described their swiftness of conquest declaring "they shall fly as the eagle that hasteth to eat." (v. 8) Jeremiah pictures Nebuchadnezzar as "coming up like a lion" (49:19) and flying "as an eagle." (v. 22).

This understanding of the "lion" in Daniel 7, as Babylon, has been the position taken by Seventh-day Adventists from their very inception. In a booklet published by the "Steam Press of the Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association" [Battle Creek] in 1863 - which antedates Uriah Smith's commentary on Daniel by ten years - the unnamed author or authors wrote concerning the symbol of the lion:

Babylon, as described in this vision, is here fitly represented by a lion, the king of beasts, denoting the glory of that kingdom, and corresponds with the head of gold in chap. ii. The eagle's wings represent the rapidity of its conquests, and the soaring pride of its monarchs." (The Prophecy of Daniel, p. 17)

The other symbols follow quickly in the vision - the bear (Medo-Persia); the leopard with four heads and four wings (Greece); and the non-descript beast (Rome). It was this fourth beast and "the little horn" which most concerned Daniel. He said, "Then I would know the truth of the fourth beast... and of the ten horns that were in his head, and of the other which came up." (7:19, 20) In the explanation given, Daniel was told - "The fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom upon the earth." (v. 23) This establishes the historical setting. Rome was the fourth empire in succession from Babylon. Out of this fourth beast was to arise "ten horns" to be followed by another "little horn" which became the main focus of concern and explanation. It should be observed that all the horns came out of this beast or kingdom. (v. 24) Specific statements are made concerning "the little horn" so that its identity cannot be missed. It would "come up among" the ten horns, plucking "up by the roots" three of the ten. (v. 8). "The little horn" would "arise after" the ten were in place, and would be diverse from all the others. (v. 24). These specifications can apply in history to one and only one power - the Papacy, the government of the Roman Catholic church. (For a complete and detailed documentation of this historical record, see Facts of Faith, pp. 34-69)

Our objective in this Thought Paper is to determine how the Bible views "the little horn" - is it Christian as Maxwell states? Keep in mind that prophecy with its symbolisms gives God's viewpoint of human events and powers - and God does not give a "one-sided" viewpoint, but states it as it is! The first thing established in Daniel 7 is that the power represented by "the little horn" arose in the head of the fourth beast - Rome - PAGAN Rome.

In the book of Revelation, chapter 13, the first beast - non-descript with seven heads and ten horns - is pictured as the embodiment of the symbolisms of Daniel 7. It "was like unto a leopard" with "the feet of a bear" and had a mouth "as the mouth of a lion." This is the same sequence as in Daniel, only in reverse order. Daniel was told that the dominion of the lion, bear, and leopard would be taken

away but their lives would be "prolonged for a season and a time." (7:12) God tells us in Revelation that the leopard, bear, and lion lived on in the "beast" with seven heads and ten horns. The time of the "beast" - forty and two months - is identical with the time of "the little horn" - a time, times, and a dividing of time. (Rev. 13:5; Dan. 7:25)

The source of this beast's power - and thus also "the little horn" - is noted as the dragon. (Rev. 13:2) The dragon is declared to be "the Devil and Satan." (12:9) How can a power pictured in prophecy as sustained and empowered by the Devil be called Christian? The beast power is said to open "his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme His name, and His tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven. (13:6) And such a power - Christian? To so assert is to be a part of the blasphemy itself.

Paul in describing this power, who would sit "in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God" - the "man of sin" - declares that his coming is "after the working of Satan." (II Thess. 2:4, 9) Fenton, following closely the Greek, translates this verse thus - "This outlaw's arrival will be accompanied by the energy of Satan." Yet we now state that this is Christian Rome, and "the embodiment of 'our' Christian heritage."!

What needs to be kept forever in mind is that PAPAL Rome is merely PAGAN Rome sprinkled with Christian nomenclature. Well has J. Garnier written:

The priesthood of Rome claim to be the successors of the apostles, but they have been the chief opposers of the truth taught by the apostles and the chief agents in resuscitating the idolatry which Christ came to destroy. On the other hand they have a true and just claim to be the successors of the pagan priesthood. For not only are the title and office of Pontifex Maximus, and the orders, offices, sacerdotal dresses, symbols, doctrines, sorceries, and idolatries of the priesthood of Rome directly derived from the priesthood of paganism, but they are the rightful and direct successors of the supreme pontiffs and priesthood of ancient Babylon and pagan Rome. (The True Christ and the False Christ, Vol. II, p. 92; Quoted in the Handbook for Bible Students, p. 413, 1922 edition)

This is exactly where the prophecy of

Daniel 7 begins - with Babylon. Further, the whole book begins with God's revelation of His superiority over the "god" of Babylon. The dream of Nebuchadnezzar could not be interpreted by his college of cardinals - "the magicians, and the astrologers, and the sorcerers, and the Chaldeans" (2:2) - over which he presided as the Pontifex Maximus. Daniel who represented the God "whose dwelling was not with flesh" (2:11) entered the scene. The whole of the book of Daniel is the representation of that struggle between Michael and Satan, both literally during the lifetime of Daniel, and in prophetic symbolism until the time when Michael shall stand up. (12:1)

Because of the court intrigues of the Babylonian priesthood during the early period of the Persian take-over, the priests fled to Pergamos in Asia Minor, and made it the headquarters of their religion. Christ in Revelation speaks of Pergamos as the place "where Satan's seat is." (2:13) The last pontiff king of Pergamos, Attalus III, bequeathed his dominions and authority to the Roman people in 133 B.C. From that time on, the two lines of Pontifex Maximus were merged into the Roman one. Finally in 378 A.D., the Roman Emperor, Gratian, offered the title and office to Damasus, Bishop of Rome, who accepted it. Thus the Pope as the Pontifex Maximus is in Satan's seat. The "dragon" gave him "his power, his seat, and great authority." (Rev. 13:2) By the corruption of true prophetic interpretation, we are being blinded so that we call bad, good, and good, bad.

#

A QUESTION ANSWERED

What I am and what I have - is that what the Lord wants?

He wants me - to witness in me.

I must let go of what I am, and all that I have to be what He is, and to receive what He has.

Credibility Gap in Adventist Community

In the first issue of the 1985 Adventist Review, there appeared an interesting question and answer. The question read: "I have heard that the church pays \$60,000 to the World Council of Churches. Is this correct?" The answer was given - "No. The Seventh-day Adventist Church is not a member of the World Council of Churches and does not give one cent in support of it." (p. 4) This question and answer points up the credibility gap in the Adventist Community as nothing else could do.

Perhaps first, we should define what we mean by "Adventist Community." The Seventh-day Adventist Community is more than the organized church with headquarters in Takoma Park, Wash. D.C. This church organization does, however, represent the most visible, and large central core of the community. However, unified as it might appear it is splintered theologically and conceptually the whole range of the spectrum from left to right. At the recent Annual Council (1984), Elder Neal C. Wilson issued "powerful reprimands;" on to the liberals on the left represented by the Association of Adventist Forums; and the other to what was called "the ultra-conservative" wing of the Church. These two groups are described further as "diverse constituencies within the Adventist Church." (Ministry, Dec., 1984, pp. 23-24)

Outside of this central core, there is a dissident movement. This movement has been growing ever since the SDA-Evangelical Conferences of 1955-1956. The late Elder M. L. Andreasen, who himself dissented decisively, gave the real reason very succinctly in a letter to a brother in Australia. He wrote - "No, I have not recanted. The denomination is departing from the fundamentals. And I must protest."

Within the last decade, there has arisen a number of other voices, with no knowledge of the real issues, who because of personal egotism want to get into the "act." These have brought with them many

side issues, and distorted emphases which have served only to distract and confuse. This has splintered the dissident movement because there was no central core to which they were bound either by allegiance, or by acknowledgement.

These all - whether organization orientated, or dissident - have one thing in common - a credibility gap. Let us consider first the question. Interestingly, this question came to our desk at least six months ago. We were asked to produce the documentation to support this statement which was made by an ordained minister who was one of the leading voices in the dissident movement, and a professed authority on the Church's involvement with the WCC. It was an embarrassment to us, because the statement had been made - it was on tape - without documentation, based on pure assumption. Sensational, yes; appealing to segments of the dissident mentality, yes; playing to the bleachers, yes! These are not worthy motives for those who profess to be holding forth the "fundamentals." This is what is bringing this movement of protest, fathered by that man of God, M. L. Andreasen, into disrepute. In all honesty, let me suggest what some of these men need, and definitely what the "pip-squeaks" who have come upon the scene in the last decade need, is to take time out and at least audit a course in research and documentation, learning how to give proper evaluation even to that which might appear to be factual evidence. While at Andrews University finishing work for a Master's degree, I took a number of courses, some very profitable, others enlightening as to the theological trends in the Church, but the one which has been of most service to me was the course in Research and Bibliography taught at the time by Dr. Leif Kr. Tobiassen. Until those who are dissenting are willing to come to grips with facts, and desist in sensationalism, and "grand-stand" playing, the credibility gap will increase, so also the deception that those who are using such techniques are foisting on concerned laity.

Now to the answer given: In the editorial section of this first Review for 1985, the editor himself had called attention to this question and answer feature of the forthcoming issues of the official organ of the Church. He wrote: "We will

give a full page each week to From Our Readers (p. 4) This means we can run more letters - a popular feature. On this page we will also provide factual answers to readers' questions." (p. 2, emphasis mine) Here in the first such section, the editorial staff has not given a factual answer, but only a half truth - which is method of deception. To say that no money is given to the WCC is just a plain lie. In a letter dated, February 28, 1984, Elder A. J. Patzer, Administrative Assistant to Neal C. Wilson, stated -

"In the approved world budget which budget is voted at each Annual Council, a small token payment is included for useful information made available to the General Conference by these organizations [WCC & NCC]. The appropriations for payment are as follows:

Inter-Media Services	\$ 300
Communication Commission	1100
Departmental Administration	1000
Audio Visual Communications	550
General Administration	3000
Emerging Technologies	550
Trust Services Information	1500

. . .

"Let me repeat - the appropriation is not for membership in the World Council of Churches or National Council of Churches, but for available information."

This makes a total of \$8,000 appropriated toward the work of either the WCC and/or the NCC. This is a far cry from either the \$60,000 figure used in the dissident's assumption, or the "does not pay one cent" allegation in the Adventist Review. In either case a credibility gap is created.

There are two items listed by Patzer which create questions. Half of the amount appropriated - \$4,000 - goes toward the Administration costs of either the WCC and/or the NCC. This needs to be amplified and explained.

The part of the answer which could be considered truthful - "The Seventh-day Adventist Church is not a member of the World Council of Churches" - has some problems. Technically, this is so; but what about what could be called a "back door" access? In the letter which Elder Lewis L. Szerecz sent to the Editor of the Adventist Review, he indicated that the

status of the Seventh-day Adventist church leaders present "was of a more intimate nature than that of the Roman Catholic Church, which had only 'Delegated Observers' present at the recent WCC Assembly in Vancouver, British Columbia. (See WWN, XVIII - 2, p. 5, col. 1) This deserves a fuller exposure.

There can be no question that a Seventh-day Adventist sits on the Faith and Order Commission of the WCC. Dr. Earle Hilgert was first appointed in 1967. He has since been replaced by Dr. Raoul Dederen of Andrews University. Here again there is a technicality. The Church per se is not represented. The Central Committee of the WCC picked the Seventh-day Adventist to serve. The choice was approved by the leadership of the Church. He thus sits as an individual, and not as a representative of the Church.

When Raymond F. Cottrell, as Associate Editor of the Review in 1967 expressed a deep "regret that SDA's do not find it possible, as an organization, to be more closely associated" with the WCC, he at the same time suggested that "if the Secretariat on Faith and Order, for instance, were to invite SDA's to appoint someone competent in that area to meet with their group from time to time and represent the SDA point of view, we could accept such an invitation with a clear conscience." (R&H, April 6, 1967, p. 13) He tried to cover this suggestion as "an opportunity to witness." But much more was involved.

While the WCC does not perceive of itself as "a universal authority controlling what Christians should believe and do;" they are, however, striving as a community of churches to "realize the goal of visible Church unity." To assist this "community" "towards this goal, the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council provides theological support for the efforts the churches are making towards unity. Indeed the commission has been charged by the Council members to keep always before them their accepted obligation to work towards manifesting more visibly God's gift of Church unity. So it is that the stated aim of the Commission is 'to proclaim the oneness of the Church of Jesus Christ and to call the churches to the goal of visible unity in one faith and one eucharistic fellowship, expressed in common

worship and common life in Christ, in order that the world might believe.' (By-Laws)* (Baptism, Eucharist, and Ministry, pp. vii & viii; Faith and Order Paper #11, Emphasis mine)

This is what the Church through its official organ asked to become a part of in 1967. Then we forwarded the whole process toward "Church unity" by placing in the Statement of Beliefs voted at Dallas, Texas, in 1980, the full Constitutional statement of the WCC required for membership in that organization. Sure, the editor of the Adventist Review can write, we are not members of the WCC, and be technically correct, but to leave it there is deceptive. He was at the World Assembly of the WCC, and so cannot plead ignorance as to our status, and relationship to the WCC.

There is still another aspect to this relationship between the SDA Church and the WCC which has not been explained. Dr. B. B. Beach in the co-authored book - So Much in Common - wrote:

"As a kind of corollary to the Geneva Consultations, Conversations began in 1969 in the United States between Seventh-day Adventists and a WCC appointed group. While each Conversation will follow its own style and choose its own subject matter, those responsible for the Conversations on both sides of the Atlantic are keeping in touch with each other." (p. 101)

Various segments within the Adventist community have some decisions to face. Those within the central "core" must decide even as a segment of the ministry and laity decided in Hungary as to where they stand on the SDA/WCC relationships. The dissidents both within the body and on the perimeter face a different choice, but equally as vital. All involved in the issue over the "departure from the fundamentals" - as well as many who are still unaware of what has taken place - are looking for the Lord's return and Heaven. Their allegiance is being tested. They today are standing, as it were with mother Eve,

before two trees - only this time the tree of the knowledge of good and evil has been greatly multiplied. One tree is the tree of truth, pure and unadulterated, the tree of life. The other trees are represented in those voices which profess to be proclaiming righteousness by faith, and loudly voice their adherence to fundamental Adventism, but who mix in their publications and/or their presentations, error, disguised as truth. We have been counseled that we need to know that we know what is truth. When a message comes to us, - we are advised to "go to the Bible, . . . and if it does not bear the test, it is not true." (R&H, Feb. 18, 1890) This was excellent counsel back there when the message of righteousness by faith was being questioned, it is sound counsel now with every wind of doctrine blowing - Go to the Bible, and know that you know that book.

‡

**WORTHY IS THE LAMB
Revelation 5:6-13**

IF we are not humble, He cannot lead us;
IF we are not willing, He cannot feed us;
IF we are not grateful, He will soon leave us;
IF we are not trusting, He will not shield us.
LET us be humble; SO He can then lead us;
LET us be willing, SO He can then feed us;
LET us be grateful, SO He can approve us;
LET us be trusting, SO He can protect us.
WHEN we have been with Him a trillion years,
OUR grateful song shall ever be: - -
"WORTHY, WORTHY, IS THE LAMB:" --
THE LAMB SLAIN FOR YOU AND ME!

Mrs. Opal M. Yapple

- * -

A saint is a child of God growing up into a mature holy one, because He who begat him, is Himself a Holy One. John 1:12-13.

+++++

"Watchman, What of the Night?" is published monthly by the Adventist Laymen's Foundation of Mississippi, Inc., P. O. Box 178, Lamar, AR 72846, USA. It is sent free upon request. For Canada write - The Adventist Laymen's Foundation of Ontario, P. O. Box 117, Thorne, Ontario P0H 2J0.