



*"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 (Moffat)

THE EVERLASTING GOSPEL

LET'S TALK IT OVER

In this issue, we discuss several topics involved in the "gospel of God," either directly or indirectly. An analysis of one section of the first AnchorPoint essay noting the heresy being taught by the editor of the Adventist Review is to be found on page 7. The first study of a series on the Doctrine of God begins on page 5. The study briefly outlines the history of that doctrine as taught in the Seventh-day Adventist Church from 1865 to the present formulation in the Dallas Statement of Beliefs which reflects the Roman Catholic teaching.

The paper produced by the Biblical Research Institute - "An Appeal for Church Unity" (p. 4) - was noted by Elder D. K. Short in his recent publication, "Made Like Unto His Brethren." However, Short affirms that to declare, as the BRI paper indicated, that the basic doctrine of the human nature Christ assumed in humanity was omitted from the 27 Fundamental Statements of Belief "is emphatically not true." (p. 36) But he gives no documentation to prove his assertion about the Statements, but appeals rather to the book, Seventh-day Adventists Believe.... The fact is that the book has never been voted by General Conference in session as the "norm" for Adventist teaching, while the 27 Statements have been so voted. Also the book teaches as "the orthodox view," the position of the Anglican clergyman, Henry Melvill. (pp. 47, 57)

By this substitution of documentation for his conclusion, Short was able to sidestep the issue of what the abandonment of the "gospel of God" by the Church means. Neither he nor

To page 5, col. 2

The gospel cannot be bypassed, ignored or separated from the proclamation of the Three Angels' Messages. Revelation 14:6 serves as a preface to the messages that all three angels bear to the inhabitants of the earth. It is the "age-long (alouion) gospel." Thayer in his Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament defines its use in Revelation 14:6 as "a gospel whose subject matter is eternal, i.e. the saving purpose of God adopted from eternity." (p. 20)

In connection with this age-long gospel, God indicated certain specific truths to be proclaimed, and these become "present truth" for this time. In the Three Angels' Messages, God has incorporated a message concerning Himself (First Angel); concerning the nations (Second Angel); and concerning the individual (Third Angel). It dare not be overlooked that the three messages conform to the three phases of the ministration of the High Priest on the Day of Atonements; first, in the Most Holy in the presence of God; secondly in the Holy Place, where was recorded the confession of corporate guilt; and thirdly, in the Court, where at the Altar individual confession was made. But all must relate to the age-long gospel adopted from Eternity and revealed in time.

No aspect of any "present truth" can be given apart from the gospel. Basically, that is what 1888 was and is all about. Present truth in 1844 and onward meant an emphasis on "worship Him who made." Perceived in the light of the Law contained in the Ark of the Covenant, and coupled with the fact of the judgment, the message was given concerning the Sabbath with emphasis on keeping the commandments of God. In fact the law was preached until its exponents were as dry as the hills of Gilboa which had neither dew nor rain. (R&H, March 11, 1890) A legalistic proclamation produced legalists in thought and conduct. 1888 was a

call to make the gospel - the saving purpose of God adopted from eternity - central in the presentation of the present truth enunciated in the Three Angels' Messages.

The purpose of God was clearly defined in the first promise made in Eden. The Lord God declared - "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." (Gen. 3:15) The Seed of the woman would bruise the serpent's head. This promise and its fulfillment is symbolized in Revelation 12. There Michael, the "man-child" - the seed of the woman - God's Messiah ("His Christ") - conquered the dragon, "that old serpent." Resulting from this triumphant warfare was heard "a loud voice" proclaiming, "Now is come salvation, and strength, and the kingdom of our God, and the power of His Christ." (verse 10)

This "Seed" is described as "a son, a male." (Greek Text, ver. 5) There are three words in the Greek for man: 1) anthropos, man in a generic sense; mankind (Jesus was "the Son of man"); 2) aner, an adult male, or a husband, 3) arsen, the male sex. It is this last word that is used in Revelation 12 to describe the "Seed of the woman." The Messiah did not come into humanity bereft of the sexual powers and desires that drive human beings. He was not born a eunuch, neither did He make Himself a eunuch. After thirty-three years of human existence, He could thank God that He had been given power over "all flesh" (John 17:2), thus authoring "eternal salvation unto all them that obey Him." (Heb. 5:7-9) Here is the true role model to present to this sex driven generation, the Male Child of Nazareth, who remained unpolluted by His environment. I would remind you, in passing, that to "obey" Jesus Christ means much more than a list of "do's" and "don'ts," an outward conformity to a life-style dictated by human jurists.

Paul clearly defined the "Gospel of God," the "power of God unto salvation," the "redemption that is in Christ Jesus." (Rom. 1:16; 3:24) He wrote:

The gospel of God... concerning His Son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh; and declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead. (Rom. 1:1, 3-4)

The "Gospel of God" is two-fold in regard to Jesus Christ. In the flesh, He was of "the seed of David." In character, He was "the spirit of holiness."

We could dwell at length, and with profit, on the nature which Christ assumed in the incarnation. We shall consider only two texts. First, Romans 8:3:

For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh."

The weakness of any religion based on regulations, be they human or divine, is the flesh - sinful flesh dictating to a mind that is carnally oriented. But Christ took upon Himself the likeness of sinful flesh, and condemned sin in that flesh.

The second text is Philippians 2:6-7. Speaking of Christ, it reads:

Who, existing in the form of God, counted not the being on an equality with God a thing to be grasped, but emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men. (ARV)

Here it is clearly affirmed that even as Jesus existed in "the form of God," so likewise, having divested ("emptied") Himself of that form, He took in its place, "the form of a servant" - "the slave form of man." Now it should be clear to all who can read that "the slave-form of man" which Christ took was not the nature with which Adam was endowed at his creation, but rather that nature which resulted from his voluntary choice to accept the servitude of sin. We say plainly - Jesus took upon Himself man's fallen nature with all that that means and implies. Yet He did no sin; He condemned sin in the flesh.

We need to become aware of the fact that at the very beginning of the proclamation of the Three Angels' Messages, the doctrine of the incarnation was catapulted into prominence as an issue by the Papacy. In 1854, the Roman Catholic Papacy, ever at war with the true gospel, proclaimed the Dogma of the Immaculate Conception. It declared:

We define that the blessed Virgin Mary in the first moment of her conception, by the singular grace and privilege of Almighty God, in virtue of the merits of Jesus Christ, the Saviour of the human race, was preserved free from every stain of original sin." (Faith of Our Fathers, p. 171, 88th Edition)

This removal of Jesus from touching mankind at the point of greatest need, prepared the way for the exaltation of Mary as co-mediatrix with

Jesus, and which is today playing an ever expanding role in the final deception of the whole world. Clearly, the doctrine of the incarnation is a key issue in the present theological conflict.

In 1848, Ellen White was given a vision of the great controversy. Ten years later this vision was repeated with specific instruction. The report in Life Sketches reads:

In the vision at Lovett's Grove (1858), most of the matter which I had seen ten years before concerning the great controversy of the ages between Christ and Satan, was repeated, and I was instructed to write it out." (p. 162)

This she began to do. The first volume was Spiritual Gifts, Vol. I. In this recital of events shown to her, she wrote what Jesus told the angels in announcing the activating of the plan of redemption. He said that He would take "man's fallen nature, and His strength would not even equal theirs." (p. 25) Then she was shown Satan's rejoicing over this factor which the plan of redemption would have on Jesus, and boasted to "his angels that when Jesus should take fallen man's nature, he would overpower Him." (p. 27)

With this clear definitive confirmation of the fact that the Biblical doctrine of the incarnation would be a part of the great controversy, there is no way that it can be separated from the giving of the Three Angels' Messages which are based in the "age-long gospel." It is a fundamental concept of the "Gospel of God," a part of the power of God unto salvation, a revelation of the redemption that is in Christ Jesus. Thus from the very beginnings of the Advent Movement, the battle was joined over this teaching.

When in 1888, God sent Jones and Waggoner with the message of righteousness by faith, the Biblical doctrine of the incarnation was emphasized by these messengers both in their books and presentations at General Conference sessions. Waggoner wrote in 1892:

A little thought will be sufficient to show anybody that if Christ took upon Himself the likeness of man, in order that He might redeem man, it must have been sinful man that He was made like, for it is sinful man that He came to redeem. Death could have no power over a sinless man, as Adam was in Eden; and it could not have had any power over Christ, if the Lord had not laid on Him the iniquity of us all. Moreover, the fact that Christ took upon Himself the flesh, not of a sinless being, but of sinful man, that is, that the

flesh which He assumed had all the weaknesses and sinful tendencies to which fallen human nature is subject, is shown by the statement that He "was made of the seed of David **according to the flesh.**" David had all the passions of human nature. (Christ and His Righteousness, pp. 26-27; emphasis his)

Here Waggoner uses the very verse wherein Paul defines the Gospel of God!

In 1895, Jones in commenting on John 1:14 - "The Word was made flesh" - asked, "Now what kind of flesh is it?" In his answer, he stated:

What kind of flesh alone is it that this world knows? - Just such flesh as you and I have. This world does not know any other flesh of man, and has not known any other since the necessity of Christ's coming was created. Therefore, as this world knows only such flesh as we have, as it is now, it is certainly true that when "the Word was made flesh," He was made just such flesh as ours is. It cannot be otherwise. (1895 GC Bulletin, p. 232)

The doctrine of the incarnation became a point of controversy during the short period of the Holy Flesh Movement. In the last months of 1900, a running editorial battle ensued between A. T. Jones as editor of the Review, and R. S. Donnell, president of the Indiana Conference writing in the conference paper, Indiana Reporter. Jones captioned his editorials, "The Faith of Jesus," while Donnell bluntly asked the question, "Did Christ Come to This World in Sinful Flesh?" Donnell's position can be summarized by his comment -

In order to save man, Christ must enter humanity, and because all were sinners, and not a body could be found that was suitable, what had to be done? A body had to be made for the occasion. And so we read in Hebrews 10:5, "A body hast Thou prepared Me." (What I Taught in Indiana, Article Three, p. 9)

The implication of this point was not lost on E. J. Waggoner. The evening before Ellen G. White read her statement to the 1901 General Conference session bringing an end to the Holy Flesh Movement, Waggoner was asked to speak. He spoke to two questions that had been handed to him, one of which read - "Was that holy thing which was born of the virgin Mary born in sinful flesh, and did that flesh have the same evil tendencies to contend with that ours does? To this Waggoner answered:

Did you ever hear of the Roman Catholic

doctrine of the immaculate conception? And do you know what it is? Some of you possibly have supposed in hearing it, that it meant that Jesus Christ was born sinless. That is not the Catholic dogma at all. The doctrine of the immaculate conception is that Mary, the mother of Jesus, was born sinless. Why? -- Ostensibly to magnify Jesus; really the work of the devil to put a wide gulf between Jesus the Saviour of men, and the men whom He came to save, so that one could not pass over to the other. That is all.

We need to settle, every one of us, whether we are out of the church of Rome or not. There are a great many that have got the marks yet,...

Do you not see that the idea that the flesh of Jesus was not like ours (because we know ours is sinful) necessarily involves the idea of the immaculate conception of the virgin Mary? Mind you, in Him was no sin, but the mystery of God manifest in the flesh, the marvel of the ages, the wonder of the angels, that thing which even now they desire to understand, and which they can form no just idea of, only as they are taught it by the church, is the perfect manifestation of the life of God in its spotless purity in the midst of sinful flesh. O, that is a marvel, is it not? (1901 GC Bulletin, p. 404)

In the controversy generated by the Holy Flesh Movement, the men whom God sent with the 1888 Message didn't fail to see the distinction in the great controversy between the Dogma of Rome and the Biblical teaching on the incarnation. Why should we?

Coming now to more recent times in Seventh-day Adventist Church history, we find that the doctrine of the incarnation was one of the two key doctrines which were compromised in the SDA-Evangelical Conferences. Verification of this fact is documented in Andreasen's Letters to the Churches. This peerless Adventist theologian was aghast at the assertion in the book, Questions on Doctrine resulting from the conferences, which read --

Although born in the flesh, He [Jesus] was nevertheless God, and was exempt from the inherited passions and pollutions that corrupt the natural descendants of Adam. (p. 383)

Andreasen well knew that the term, "exempt," was a term used by Gibbons in explaining the dogma of the immaculate conception - "She [Mary] alone was exempt from the original taint." (Faith of Our Fathers, op.cit.)

We come now to the present. In a position paper prepared by the Biblical Research Institute [BRI], August, 1989, making "An Appeal for Church Unity," this "think-tank" of Adventist scholarship wrote:

"But while apostasy always takes its toll, one of the heavy pressures on the remnant church today is the divisive effect of some segments of the church, who, however, profess dedication to Christ and the finishing of the mission of the church. These members hold certain positions on the human nature of Christ, the nature of sin, and the doctrine of righteousness by faith in an end-time setting. Since the Adventist people as a whole do not share these views, the former feel that the church has apostatized from the faith of the pioneers. Some would even suggest that the organized church is no longer fulfilling the role of the remnant church as specified in prophecy.

"In some respects the present situation is similar to the experience of the early church and the Jerusalem Council. The world church of Seventh-day Adventists has agreed on 27 fundamental beliefs, summarization of basic biblical teachings, and seeks to rally the membership to the Saviour and this core of Bible truths. The specific topics alluded to above are not a part of these summarizations. The world church has never viewed these subjects as essential to salvation nor to the mission of the remnant church. The Scriptures do not make these subjects central; the data is sparse; and there are sharp differences of view with devoted Christians on both sides." (p. 5)

Consider carefully the last three sentences of this statement in the light of the doctrines specified in the first quoted paragraph. The doctrines listed were:

- 1) "The human nature of Christ"
- 2) "The nature of sin"
- 3) "Righteousness by faith in an end-time setting." (In other words, the final atonement.)

Now consider the three sentences and what they are saying:

1) "The specific topics alluded to above are not a part of these summarizations," in other words, the "27 fundamental beliefs."

This is absolutely true. They were omitted!

2) "The world church has never viewed these

THE DOCTRINE OF GOD

Editor's Note: While on the West Coast in January meeting an appointment, I learned that a large study group of concerned Adventists had been split over the Doctrine of God as promoted by Fred Allebach and Caleb Alonso. We decided to write a position paper on the teaching. Then we received a telephone call telling us that rumormongers in the field were scattering the report that we believed the Holy Spirit to be merely an influence. We were further informed that a voluminous writer steeped in Roman Catholic theology clothed in Adventist vocabulary was also writing on the subject. We, therefore, decided that instead of delaying till a position paper could be formulated, we would proceed with a series of articles on the Doctrine of God or the Godhead.

The doctrine of God that teaches the "Blessed Trinity" is a Roman Catholic teaching. "The mystery of the Trinity is the central doctrine of the Catholic faith. Upon it are based all the other teachings of the Church." (Handbook for Today's Catholic, p. 12) What is this doctrine of Catholicism simply stated? In a recognized catechism, the question is asked, "What do we mean by the Blessed Trinity?" The answer is given - "By the Blessed Trinity we mean one and the same God in three divine Persons." (New Baltimore Catechism, No. 3, Rev. Ed., 1949, p. 20) However, "not until the council of Constantinople (381) was the formula of one God existing in three co-equal Persons formally ratified." (Early Christian Doctrines, p. 88)

The history of the Seventh-day Adventist teaching on the doctrine of God has been varied and progressively Roman Catholic in concept. In the 1865 edition of Thoughts on the Book of Revelation, Uriah Smith, commenting on the True Witness (Rev. 3:14) as being "the beginning of the creation of God," wrote - "Not the beginner, but the beginning, of the creation, the first created being, dating his existence far back before any other created being or thing, next to the self-existent and eternal God." (p. 59) In the 1897 edition of the same book, combined with Thoughts on Daniel, Smith modified his position, indicating that "the Son came into existence in a different manner" than the rest of the creation of God. (p. 400) In the same year, Smith authored a book, Looking Unto Jesus, in which he wrote:

God alone is without beginning. At the earliest epoch when a beginning could be, - a period so remote that to finite minds it is essentially eternity, - appeared the Word." (p. 10)

This is essentially the position taken by E. J. Waggoner in his book, Christ and His Righteousness. He wrote in 1892:

There was a time when Christ proceeded forth and came from God, from the bosom of the Father, but that time was so far back in the days of eternity that to finite comprehension it was practically without beginning. (pp. 21-22)

In 1930, the General Conference Committee authorized the chair [Elder C. H. Watson] to appoint a committee to prepare a new Statement of Beliefs for the Yearbook. (Movement of Destiny, pp. 410-411) This was the first statement to include the word, "Trinity" in connection with the Doctrine of God. In 1980, the Dallas session adopted the same credal statement upon which the Roman Catholic Church bases its doctrine of the "Blessed Trinity." The 27 Statements of Fundamental Beliefs on this doctrine reads:

There is one God: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, a unity in three co-eternal Persons. (No. 2)

[The above historical data does not reflect the theological thinking of the editor. To be continued!]

Let's Talk It Over - from page 1, col. 1

Wieland can bring themselves to face up to the force of the message of the True Witness to the Laodiceans - "Because thou art lukewarm and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth." (Rev. 3:16)

While checking out the early editions of Uriah Smith's Thoughts on Revelation for the historical data on the Doctrine of God, I decided to see what Smith had to say about Revelation 3:16. I knew that Wieland swears by this book in certain of his concepts of prophetic understanding of symbols found in the books of Daniel and Revelation. In both the 1865 and 1897 editions, Uriah Smith made the same comment on the sentence - "I will spue thee out of my mouth." He wrote:

Here the figure is still further carried out, and the rejection of the lukewarm expressed by the nauseating effects of tepid water. And this denotes a final rejection, and utter separation from his church." (p. 402, 1897 edition)

The 1888 Message was and still is a most precious message. But it is sad when this message is being encumbered with so many additional concepts which were never in the

The Gospel of God - from p. 4, col. 2

subjects as essential to salvation nor to the mission of the remnant church.

This is absolutely false. (The documentation was given in WWN, 3(92)

3) The Scriptures do not make these subjects central; the data is sparse; and there are sharp differences of view with devoted Christians on both sides.

This is a mixture of truth and error. It is true, there are "sharp differences of view" even as there is a marked contrast between Christ and Satan. One cannot harmonize the dogma of Rome with the Word of God. But to say the Bible does not make these subjects central is a tragic error. From the first promise in the Garden of Eden to the prophetic picture in Revelation, it is the "Seed" of the woman which is revealed and defined. This "Man-child" was caught up unto God and His throne, there to be the One mediator between God and man, the **Man**, Christ Jesus. (I Tim. 2:5; Heb. 7:25; Rev. 12:10) Without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness, God was manifest in the flesh, and that flesh was the slave form of man. (I Tim. 3:16; Phil. 2:7 Gr.)

The implications of what these conclusions of the BRI means goes far beyond the mere recitation of the facts. The gospel of God has been clearly defined by Paul. It concerns the manifestation of Jesus Christ who was made of the seed of David according to the flesh. This "gospel" is declared to be "the power of God unto salvation." To remove this "gospel" from the Three Angels' Messages is to leave the message powerless, and devoid of salvation. The mere recitation of the truths of these messages - the hour of judgment, the fall of Babylon, the worship of and mark of the beast - can save no one. In Jesus Christ, and in Him alone is to be found redemption. The action of the Church in 1980, in adopting the 27 Fundamentals of Belief was to divorce the Church from the Gospel of God, the very foundation of the trust committed to the Church. (Testimonies, Vol. 9, p. 19) It has now become a gospel-less Church. Well did the messenger of the Lord write of the Church - "The glory of the Lord had departed from Israel; although many still continued the forms of religion, His power and presence were lacking." (5T:210)

There is a second part to the "Gospel of God" and it is no less important than the first part. Jesus Christ is declared to be "the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead." (Rom. 1:4)

The true Christ is not the "christ" of the crucifix; we serve a risen Saviour! He is not in the world today. He is at the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens, and He has sent forth the Holy Spirit to be the paraclete, the Advocate of truth, to guide us into all truth.

"Delivered for our offences," Jesus our Lord "was raised for our justification. Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God" through Him. (Rom. 4:25-5:1) This peace with God means that we are no longer at enmity with Him, but rather at-one, an atonement, an at-one-ment. We are to consider the High Priest of our profession. What He began by coming to earth as a man who could die, He has now returned to Heaven to complete as the Son of God. Begotten first in the flesh, begotten a second time from the dead, He was called to be "a high priest forever after the order of Melchizedec." In this dual role of Son of man and Son of God, He became the Author of eternal salvation. This is the Gospel of God, the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.

The sanctuary of the Heavens is the very center of the redemptive work for man. There God has placed a Man, Christ Jesus, who ever liveth to make intercession for all who come to Him. And this Man is able to save to the uttermost. The pivotal point centers in the incarnation, and the nature that Christ assumed in that incarnation. Had He not come as a man, there could have been no cross. Had He not condemned sin in the flesh, there would have been no resurrection. Had there been no resurrection, there would now be no Intercessor at the Throne of God for us!

To summarize, the import and meaning of the Gospel of God, I review certain Biblical revelation:

1) It was the "Man-child" - a child possessed of the same drives that possess every child of Adam - who was caught up unto God and His throne. His destiny was to rule all nations with a rod of iron, but first He ruled the flesh of nations with an iron rod - He was the Son of mankind.

2) At the throne of God, this "Man-child" ministers His blood for the victors of earth overcome the dragon "by the blood of the Lamb." (Rev. 12:11)

Consider thoughtfully, the following verses. Note the emphasized words.

"Neither by the blood of goats and calves,

but by **His own blood** He entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us. ["thus securing an eternal redemption" - RSV] For if the blood of bulls and goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh: How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit **offered Himself** without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?" (Heb. 9:12-14)

"But if we walk in the **light**, as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth us from all sin." (I John 1:7)

"We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a **light** that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts." (II Peter 1:19)

The light of prophecy comes from the Throne through Jesus Christ. (Rev. 1:1) It is an integral part of the whole picture, and its revelations become "present truth" to a given generation. The Three Angels' Messages are linked forever with the "age-long" Gospel of God, "for therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith: as it is written, The just shall live by faith." (Rom. 1:17)

‡

The 27 Fundamental Statements of Belief, though omitting the Biblical and pioneer position on the nature Christ assumed in the incarnation, still doesn't proclaim the heresy of the Editor of the Adventist Review. The Dallas statement reads - "Forever **truly** God, He became **truly** man, Jesus the Christ." A little thought would reveal that if Jesus was "fully man," He was a sinner; and if "fully God," He could not have died. AnchorPoints' anchor in its first article is leaving the Church adrift, and without chart or compass.

‡

Let's Talk It Over - From page 5, col. 2

original message, and some of these very questionable. In reality, it is no longer the 1888 Message, but rather the Wieland-Short Message, and then not even the message which God asked them to give in 1950.

A recent issue of the paper published by the 1888 Message Study Committee (Vol. 8, #2, pp. a, d) contains a list of "churches" being set up by those harmonizing with the Committee in various parts of the United States, Canada, and South Africa. There is nothing wrong with such "home churches," for the Bible plainly teaches this. But why does the Committee continue to parade itself as fully in accord with "our beloved Seventh-day Adventist Church" and yet sponsor these separate enclaves? This is pure deception. How can such a deceptive stance rightly represent the righteousness of Christ, which is pure and unadulterated truth?

whg

"AnchorPoint" - 1

One of the associate editors of the Adventist Review announced in the March 5, 1992 issue, that the editorial staff "is convinced the time is here for a new emphasis on those eternal biblical verities that have made us what we are - the fundamental teachings of the church." (p. 4) This series of essays will continue until 1994, the 150th anniversary of the Advent Movement.

The first "AnchorPoint" appeared in the same issue, written by the editor-in-chief, Dr. Wm. G. Johnsson. It concerned "Jesus, Center of All Our Hopes." The closing section of the article was on "How Adventists Understand Jesus." (pp. 10-11) He wrote:

Adventist faith makes the following affirmations: (1) Jesus was **fully** God; (2) Jesus was **fully** human; ... (emphasis supplied)

1992 ANNUAL FELLOWSHIP

August 2 - 8 on Campus

Seminar Study - Revelation 12 - 22

++++

"Watchman, What of the Night?" is published monthly by the Adventist Laymen's Foundation of Mississippi, Inc., P. O. Box 69, Ozone, AR 72854-0069, USA

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

Editor Elder Wm. H. Grotheer
Assistant Editor Woodrow W. Oliver, Jr.

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

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

++++