

"Watchman, what of the night?"

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

Exe. 7:6 (Moffau)

The Search for Identity

- 6 -

Page 2

THE IMAGE TO THE BEAST

PAGE 5

THE COMMANDMENTS of God

PAGE 7

Editor's Preface

To those Adventists whose connections with the Church go back to the 30's and 40's of this past century, the name of M. L. Andreasen stands for a devoted Christian scholar and theologian. He was a saintly person in whose presence you felt at ease, yet conscious that he knew the God you wished to know better. His legs were short, and his body long, so that when he would speak to ministerial groups sitting down, which he often did, the toe of one shoe touched the floor, and the other shoe crossed over the heel of the first shoe. He spoke with a Danish accent but with precise English diction.

Knight has much to say negatively about Andreasen, even though he admits that it is "impossible to overestimate the influence of M. L. Andreasen on twentieth century Adventist theology." The one theological concept with which Knight takes major exception was the doctrine of sinlessness which the "last generation" living must confront. Andreasen taught the doctrine clearly and forcibly. In this issue of *WWN*, we discuss Andreasen's teaching; Knight's problem with it; and then apply the principle which Knight himself set forth in the first chapter of his book, "the dynamic nature of truth."

Because of questions raised by readers regarding the special issue on the "Image to the Beast," we have written a Biblical Analysis of the subject within the context of the prophecies which form a unit with Revelation 13, where the "image" is introduced. This section of Revelation also focuses on the doctrine of "the last generation."

The final article is on the "commandments of God." Is sin an act, one's nature, or both, and what did Jesus say?



The Search for Identity

- 6 -

When we began this series of critiques on the book, *A Search for Identity* by Dr. George R. Knight, we commented on the cover designed for the publication. As we have reached the final chapters, it is obvious that those designing the cover truly sensed the emphasis of the book. Looming largest among the portraits displayed of the men and woman of Adventist history, was A. T. Jones, next was M. L. Andreasen, then came Ellen G. White. These three, Knight links together in their influence on the course of Adventism in the 20th Century, especially on how both Jones and Andreasen interpreted Ellen G. White.

Knight's antipathy toward Jones was evident in the book, *From 1888 to Apostasy*, written in 1987. Now his almost equal dislike for Andreasen comes through in this book. As he concludes the discussion of the question, "What is Fundamentalist in Adventism?" he devotes a section to "The Crucial Role of M. L. Andreasen and His 'Last Generation' Theology." He wrote:

It is impossible to overestimate the influence of M. L. Andreasen on twentieth-century Adventist theology. His theological package is so central to modern Adventist development that a person is forced to respond in one way or another to it. Individuals and groups in the church either agree with his theology or they react against it. Neutrality is not an option for those who understand his teachings. [p. 144].

It goes without question that Knight abandons the neutrality usually manifested by an objective historian and reacts negatively to Andreasen. His special vendetta is directed against the chapter, "The Last Generation," in Andreasen's book, *The Sanctuary Service*. He also seeks to link Andreasen and Jones and include Ellen G. White in the process. He surmises:

We should also point out that Andreasen's chapter indicates an extremely heavy reliance upon his understanding of the thought of Ellen G. White even though he does not directly quote her even once. He was apparently following the methodology advanced by A. T. Jones. Jones had claimed in 1894 that the only "right use of the Testimonies" is "to study the Bible through them, so that the things brought forth in them we shall see and know for ourselves are in the Bible; and then present those things to others not from the Testimonies themselves, but from the Bible itself. Whether Andreasen had picked his methodology directly from Jones or whether he had acquired it indirectly from him through the way Adventists were doing theology in the 1930s and 1940s is open to debate. [p. 150]

In his next chapter, "Adventism in Theological Ten-

sion," Knight again launches an attack on Andreasen. He cites an article by Donald Grey Barnhouse, editor of *Eternity*, who asked the question, "Are Seventh-day Adventists Christians?" This article was the result of the SDA-Evangelical Conferences of 1955-1956. Commenting, Knight wrote:

In that article, with apparent approval of L. E. Froom and R. A. Anderson (leaders of the General Conference Ministerial Association) Barnhouse publicly relegated M. L. Andreasen (Adventism's leading theologian in the 1930s and 1940s) and his theology to "the lunatic fringe" of Adventism and implied that Andreasen and his type were "similar" to the "wild-eyed irresponsibles in every field of fundamental Christianity." (pp. 164-165).

In the article by Barnhouse, Andreasen is not named as one of the supposed "lunatic fringe." The placing of Andreasen in this category by Knight had to come from personal contacts with the Adventist leaders named or recollections gathered from interviews with individuals directly involved in the discussions between the Adventists and the Evangelicals; or it reflects his personal antipathy for Andreasen and his desire to "smear" his character. This is a revelation of the corruptness of the human heart in vindictiveness and jealousy of a man whom all have to admit exerted great influence in the Church. The question can be asked, that if Knight really wanted to be objective as an accurate historian ought to be, why did he not document the source of his inclusion of Andreasen as a part of the "lunatic fringe" of Adventism? Rather he places himself in company with those who wished to defame Andreasen. It is further evidence that Knight has an agenda which he wants to accomplish in the publishing of this book.

Before discussing Andreasen's "last generation" theology which so disturbs Knight, some personal observations are in order. Soon after my mother and I accepted the Truth, we attended the Sabbath services of a campmeeting held on the grounds of the Nevada Sanitarium and Hospital in Nevada, Iowa, the headquarters of the Iowa Conference at that time. The speaker for the morning Hour of Worship was M. L. Andreasen. In announcing his sermon topic, he said, in his Danish brogue, "I want to acquaint you with the Father."

Decades later, I was to see that he knew that Father very intimately. Following the SDA-Evangelical Conferences and the release of the book, *Questions on Doctrine*, Andreasen's strong opposition to the "sell-out" was answered *ad hominem*, by claiming that he was senile. I decided while on vacation to visit Elder Andreasen at his home in California to determine for

myself if such a charge had any validity. I invited my brother-in-law, to accompany me on the visit. We found him very alert, and the time spent was most edifying. When we were about to leave, my brother-in-law excused himself briefly, but while out, Elder Andreasen inquired about his spiritual state. I told him, and then when he returned, we all knelt in prayer. I was made fully conscious that he knew that Father. His prayer for the Church he loved, for us in his home, and my brother-in-law in particular, went far beyond the ceiling of the room to the very throne of the Infinite. He was God's man for the hour even in retirement.

During the years of my ministry, first in New Mexico, and then later in Indiana, Andreasen was the key speaker and teacher at Worker's Meetings. The depth of his perception of the Bible, and yet the simplicity of his explanation challenged my thinking as no other man, in all of the years of my ministry for the Church, ever did. Yet because he dared to stand up and challenge the compromises by those seeking worldly acceptance, he was defrocked by the Jesuitical oriented president of the General Conference, R. R. Figuhr. Now in this book by Knight, he is exhumed, retried and "burned at the stake."

Now let us turn our attention to Andreasen's theology of the "Last Generation." Briefly it is this: God will have a people who will live lives in the last generation free from sinning, and in so doing, will vindicate God before the universe. This group of people will be alive when Jesus comes the second time and thus will be translated without seeing death. This perception is based on certain texts of Scripture found in Revelation 14. In this chapter a group designated as the 144,000 stand with the Lamb on mount Sion, "having the Father's name written in their foreheads" (v. 1). It states that these "were redeemed from among men" (v. 4). This had been interpreted by James White as meaning, "not out of their graves; no, no, - 'from among men.' They must, therefore, be the living saints who are changed to immortality at the coming of the Lord" (*R&H*, May 9, 1854). Further, it is declared that "in their mouth was found no guile ($\psi\epsilon\upsilon\delta\omicron\varsigma$): for they are without fault before the throne of God" (v. 5). This text does not indicate when this state of "no guile" was achieved, nor how; but it does suggest that they passed an investigation - "was found no guile." Then as a result of "the everlasting gospel" (v. 6), a group, designated as "the saints" ($\alpha\gamma\iota\omicron\iota$), are declared to be keeping (not trying to keep) "the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus" (v. 12). This makes a strong Biblical basis that God

has a special objective for those who will be translated when Jesus comes the second time, in other words, "the last generation."

Knight ignores this evidence, and throws it all out because he maintains that Andreasen teaches an achievement of the goal by human effort "closer to the pre-1888 theology of the Butler/Smith faction" rather than a "grace oriented interpretation" of salvation as presented by Ellen G. White. (p. 151). Again Knight's bias against Jones and Waggoner come through for they led in the presentation of a "grace oriented" message in 1888 and after. However, one will find Andreasen writing in his *Letters to the Churches* (No. 6, p. 14) this:

The final demonstration of what God can do in humanity is made in the last generation who bears all the infirmities and weaknesses which the race has acquired through six thousand years of sin and transgression. [Emphasis supplied]

A simple recognition of the eschatology of the book of Revelation demands the conclusion which Andreasen drew. John was shown a point in time when all intercession would cease in the "temple" of God; yet time would continue "till the seven plagues of the seven angels were fulfilled" (15:8). With no intercessor in God's presence, what lives must be evidenced by the "saints"? The only answer is lives in perfect harmony with the "the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus" (14:12). How can this be realized? "Not of works, lest any man should boast." To state it plainly, God is *not* looking for 144,000 perfect people to vindicate His name by their righteousness, but rather 144,000 sinners who recognize their spiritual poverty, through whom He may manifest His power to make them living "saints."

Knight's agenda in writing this biased historical review of doctrinal concepts under the guise of a search for identity comes through in his recognition of Andreasen's influence on Adventist teaching and then his attempt to completely denigrate him without noting the Biblical evidence which sustains Andreasen's basic position. If Andreasen's position in any facet cannot be sustained Biblically, then let Knight point it out; but to ignore certain Biblical eschatological concepts which sustain Andreasen's basic premise on "the last generation" is unconscionable for a professor of church history at the Church's Theological Seminary.

Knight, in the very first chapter of his book, noted "the dynamic nature of 'present truth.'" In setting forth this fundamental premise, he quoted extensive,

from Ellen G. White. However, it is interesting to note carefully how he quoted and what he eliminated in so quoting which would have a bearing on his premise. In the section on "The Pathway of Progressive Understanding" (pp. 24-28), he quoted from *Counsels to Writers and Editors*, p. 37 which states:

God and heaven alone are infallible. Those who think that they will never have to give up a cherished view, never have an occasion to change an opinion, will be disappointed.

Does this mean that when I perceive aspects of what I have held to be truth to be wrong, and need modification, that I throw the whole thing out? In other words, throw out the "the baby with the bath water?" No! Knight omitted the topic sentence which begins the paragraph he quoted. That sentence reads - "We have many lessons to learn, and many, many to unlearn." What then should have been Knight's approach to the teaching of Andreasen that was such an anathema to him? If he thought Andreasen was teaching a "works" oriented approach for the perfection of the saints in "the last generation," then correct that. But why throw out the Biblical basis for a unique "last generation"? Rather, learn and unlearn as the suggested counsel indicates. That would be true "progressive understanding." However, one cannot arrive at truth when he begins with an agenda to accomplish an objective, right or wrong.

It is impossible to arrive at a true evaluation of the "last generation" concept without consideration of another issue which Knight reintroduces in discussing the theology of Andreasen. He wrote:

A fourth concept underlying Andreasen's theology is the teaching of Jones, Waggoner, and Prescott that Jesus became incarnate in flesh just like Adam after the Fall with all of its sinful tendencies. Thus Jesus can in every way be our example in developing a perfect life. (p. 145).

First, one must understand the full import of the "last generation" concept as given in the Revelation "which God gave to Jesus to shew unto His servants things which *must*. . . come to pass" (1:1). In that revelation, it is clearly stated that there will be "holy ones" who will "keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus" prior to the Second Advent (14:12, 14). In other words, while manifesting in life's deeds that they no longer sin, nevertheless they still live in the "vile body" (Phil. 3:21) with all of its tendencies to sin.

This impacts on one's understanding of the incarnation of Jesus Christ. If Christ took a human nature

exempt from its fallen tendencies, then the "holy ones" of the "last generation" would attain a victory greater than Jesus Himself attained. This contradicts the very Revelation itself. In Chapter 12, the "male child" (Gr.), with all that that implies, as the Messiah (Christ) accomplished "salvation" and vindicated God - "the kingdom of our God" was affirmed (vs. 5, 10). How then were Christ's "servants" to relate to this monumental victory? They overcome the devil "by the blood of the Lamb," (not by their works and good deeds). It was for them to give "the word of their testimony," loving "not their lives unto the death" (v. 11). The "last generation" is no exception. Are their lives in harmony with the commandments of God a demonstration to vindicate God, or are they a demonstration of the power of God in a fallen nature that has sinned, when He takes to Himself His "great power" and reigns? (11:17). In other words, they are trophies of His great and final revelation of the gospel's saving power through Jesus Christ! Does not the "everlasting gospel" of the Three Angels reveal how the victory of the "saints" is to be realized? (Rev. 14:6, 12). Is it not of God, rather than of men?

To another prophet were revealed the details of the "how." Zechariah saw the high priest Joshua "clothed with filthy garments" (3:3) standing before the angel of the Lord with Satan at his right hand "to be his adversary" (3:1; margin, Heb.). The command was given: "Take away the filthy garments from him" (v. 4). Here came the moment of truth. To loose his garments would leave him naked. To cling to them he would remain clothed in filthiness. Joshua could not clean the filthiness of his garments, nor could he clothe himself, once he was stripped naked. While the command to take the filthy garments was given to "those that stood before the Lord," it was the Lord who promised to take care of the mortifying situation. He said, "Behold I have caused thine iniquity to pass from thee, and I will clothe thee with a change of raiment" (v. 4). All that Joshua had to do was to "swallow" his pride, and yield to the "work" of those that stood before the Lord. Little have we understood the work of those "ministering spirits" who minister to those who "shall be heirs of salvation" (Heb. 1:14).

The results to Joshua are clearly stated: 1) A "fair mitre" was set upon his head (v. 5). 2) He would "judge (God's) house, and "keep (the Lord's) courts" finding his place "walk(ing) among (those) that stood by" (v. 7) This closely parallels the description of the work and place of the "saints" defined in Revelation as the 144,000 (7:15). Further, these victors through surrender and humiliation, a conundrum from a human

viewpoint, are declared to be "men wondered at" or as the margin reads - "men of wonder" or a "sign" (Zech. 3:8). The attainment is not what they did, except surrender, but what God could do for them in a final confrontation with Satan by surrendering. This is the Biblical basis for the "final generation" concept.

Also in his chapter, "Adventism in Tension," Knight introduces the challenge of Elders Wieland and Short in regard to the Church's rejection of the Message brought by Jones and Waggoner at the 1888 General Conference Session. After commenting very briefly on some of the "positive insights" involved in the challenge, Knight turns to "their problematic aspects." He writes:

For one thing, they teach the concept of righteousness by faith set forth by Jones and Waggoner is greater than and different from the understanding of the Reformers and evangelical Christianity. (p. 182)

This should not be the issue by which to judge Wieland and Short's theme. In the premise held by Knight in the very first chapter of his book on the dynamic nature of present truth, that truth is an advancing truth, then it should be expected that Jones and Waggoner would be in advance of the Reformers' perception. That is not the question. The judgment should be based on the factors of the gospel revealed to Paul by Jesus Christ Himself (Gal. 1:11-12). To teach contrariwise would be to be accursed (v. 8). This whole issue is reduced as to why this message was given through Jones and Waggoner. In fact, this is the paramount question to be answered. The evidence is clear that prior to 1888, the ministry of the Church, for the most part, were preaching a faith plus works plan of salvation. At the General Conference in 1888 and after, these men called for a righteousness which is by faith, and a response motivated by a love for Christ for what He did for man.

The facts of life are simply that not only as man cannot provide the means of his redemption, neither can he live the life required by God of Adam prior to the Fall. The attempt is merely filthy garments covering a vile body. If then there was to be a "last generation" which "kept the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus," the same experience which is involved in justification, must also be involved in sanctification. If man can produce a goodness by which God justifies him, then he can do the same in order to be sanctified. However, if justification is found in the simple prayer, "God be merciful to me a sinner" (Luke 18:13-14), then sanctification is recognizing the fact that I need to be stripped of my filthy garments, and accepting in

their place the garments provided by Christ. This process is totally the work of God in a surrendered soul. We have to learn the first, justification, which is by faith, before we can learn the second, sanctification, which too, is by faith. See I Cor. 1:30-31.

#

A BIBLICAL ANALYSIS

The Image to the Beast

The call to those "that dwell on the earth" to make "an image to the beast" (Revelation 13:14) is preceded by much prophetic symbolism. This symbolism must be noted if a correct Biblical understanding of the "Image" formed is to be achieved. This symbolism begins with the 12th chapter. In fact, Revelation 12:12-17 is the outline which is enlarged in Chapters 13 and 14. While chapter 12:1-11 is devoted to the victory of the "Seed" of the woman over the dragon, the balance of the chapter covers briefly the conflict between the dragon and the woman till the revelation of the remnant of her "seed which keep the commandments of God" (ver. 17). This "seed" is again interjected into the prophecy (Rev. 14:12), where they are called "holy ones."

Upon the victory of the "Man-child" (12:5), the dragon came down in "great wrath" for his time had been circumscribed. John recorded a voice in heaven speaking with finality. This voice directed its message to three different groups (12:12): 1) To the "heavens, and ye that dwell in them." They were to "rejoice." Why? Because the dragon prevailed not; "neither was there place found anymore in heaven" for him (12:8). But to the "inhabiters" of "the earth and of the sea" a woe was given. This division of the "inhabiters" is significant. It is symbolic and has a bearing on what follows in the unfolding of the prophetic outline. The first beast of Revelation 13 "rises up out of the sea" (13:1), while the second beast comes "up out of the earth" (13:11).

The non-descript beast coming out of the sea combines the symbolism of Daniel 7 in the reverse order as it was given to Daniel - leopard, bear, and lion (13:2; cmp with Dan. 7:12). It is related to the dragon before it, having "seven heads and ten horns" (12:3; 13:1). This is papal Rome, and the "sea" is the "Old World" or Europe in which it arose. (A more restrictive interpretation could be that "the sea" repre-

sents the Mediterranean Sea, known as "The Great Sea" in Bible times. Rome in both of its phases, Pagan and Papal, arose in the Mediterranean World.) One of the heads of this beast was to be "slain" (13:3, Gr. margin), and yet it would be resurrected. This becomes a key factor in the interpretation of the "image to the beast." The worship of, and the image of, was of the beast after its resurrection. (13:12,14)

The second beast comes up out of the earth as the first beast goes into captivity and is slain. (13:10) The date for the captivity of the Papacy is easily determined -1798 - when Berthier, under orders from Napoleon took the Pope a captive from Rome to France where he died in exile. The Papacy was extinct. (See *Facts of Faith*, pp. 57-60 for documentation) The nation that was arising away from the turbulence of the European "sea" was the United States in a "New World," symbolized as "the earth."

The description of the beast is of import. It was to be "lamb-like" with "two" distinct and separate horns of power. In Daniel, the Papal phase of Rome was a single horn exercising both religious and political dominion. Further, this second beast is designated as a "false prophet" (Rev. 19:20), which deceives by the "miracles" he performs. A descriptive miracle is borrowed from the Old Testament - the fire which consumed the sacrifice in answer to Elijah's prayer (13:13). In other words, this is a false Elijah, and not the one predicted in Malachi 4:5-6, but will have overtones of the first with a special agenda, restoration of family values.

Often this "false prophet" is interpreted as "apostate Protestantism." However, we need to keep in mind that the mainline bodies of Protestantism began in the area of "sea" - Europe, and not the United States. Coming from the "earth" it must represent a new form of Protestantism. It is this "false prophet" that urges those "that dwell on the earth" to make an "image to the beast" that was resurrected. (13:14). This suggestion is removed in time from the events in Europe that brought about the "deadly wound." Further, it is given as a democratic suggestion. The populace are to make an image. The way the populace speaks is by its voting power. The United States did not begin as a democracy, but as a republic. It became truly a democracy with the implementation of the one man, one vote rule.

The healing of the "deadly wound" from a political point of view began in 1929 when Mussolini signed with the Papal Secretary of State, Cardinal Gasparri,

the historic Roman Pact. The pope once more became a civil ruler. This was followed by the attempt of the appointment of an American Ambassador to the Vatican by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, which ended with a personal representative, Myron C. Taylor, being sent. Under Carter, the Pope was welcomed to the White House; and under Reagan, there was an exchange of Ambassadors facilitated in part by Billy Graham. Then came the revelation of a secret working between the American government and the Papacy toward the demise of the Communistic government of Russia. Under John Paul II, the wound of 1798, has been completely healed. We can therefore look for the formation of the image of the resurrected "head."

During this same period of time when secret workings were transpiring between the US government and the Vatican, a new form of Protestantism was making its presence felt. It is covered by the term, "The Religious Right." The names, Falwell, Robertson, and Kennedy, through their TV ministries, loom large. It was Robertson who "reached across the gulf to grasp the hand" of the late Cardinal O'Connor of New York. Two other TV Ministries, either now defunct, or greatly limited, due to moral indiscretions, represented a group who now have a representative in government in the person of the Attorney General of the United States. Couple with this Dr. Dobson's Focus on the Family and his ability to marshal thousands of voters to bring pressure on either the executive, or legislative branch of the American government, and you have a volatile mix.

Regardless of what political persuasion one may be, this last election in the United States saw the forces of the Religious Right say to those that dwell on the symbolic "earth" to elect a certain candidate as President of the United States. Among the first executive orders issued, Bush set up a Religious Office in the White House, which President Jimmy Carter told Pope John Paul II upon his visit there, was the "symbolic home" of all the American people (RNS, Oct. 8, 1979). The establishment of such an office is a first in American history of Church and State.

Some may wish to question the meaning of the term, "earth" in Rev. 13:14, and broaden its application to include the whole world. It is true that the Greek word for earth, γη, does have that meaning, the literal physical earth. However, if John had wished to change the symbolic use to a literal word, meaning all the peoples of the inhabited earth, he would have used the word, οικουμένη. But he didn't, thus it is best to hold to the symbolic meaning in this text.

The Commandments of God

Prominent in the identification of the "last generation" of God's people is the fact that they "keep the commandments of God." Besides this is added the fact that they also "keep... the faith of Jesus" (Rev. 14:12). Jesus in the upper room surrounded by His chosen apostles, said to them: "He that hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth Me" (John 14:21). Do all these references to the "commandments of God" refer to the Ten Commandments as proclaimed from Sinai? Are the "commandments" of Jesus different, an addition to the Ten?

By the analogy of Scripture, we can conclude that He who spoke in the flesh was also He who spoke from the summit of Sinai. According to Paul, He who was with Israel in their wilderness wanderings was Christ (I Cor. 10:4, margin). Since Christ did give specific commandments which had not been precepts before His enunciation of them, such as the washing of feet prior to the communion of the bread and cup (John 13:14-15), what then is the relationship between the "commandments of God" and the "commandments of Jesus"?

It is in the sermon on the Mount that the contrast can be noted, and the full definition of sin perceived. There on the latter Mount, Jesus declared, "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery" (Matt. 5:27). In the act was the manifestation of sin. But Jesus probed the matter more fully, "But I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her in his heart" (v. 28). Here all the world stands guilty before God, and sin is revealed in its complete dimension. Not only by the act is sin revealed; but the very nature of man is corrupt and must be cleansed so as to be in God's presence. Jesus declared from the same Mount, "Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God" (5:8). This man cannot do - cleanse Himself.

Here enters, "righteousness by faith." This righteousness comes only in and through Christ. It was His faith which achieved it. He manifested perfect faith in the Father to keep Him from sin while bearing in His flesh the fallen nature of Adam. "He condemned sin in the flesh" (Rom. 8:3). He placed Himself in the hands of the Father as He entered the shadows of the second death to pay the penalty for all sin (Luke 23:46). In the same act is manifest a faith in fallen man that they would accept His sacrifice and mediatorial power

to become once more what He, the Creator, intended them to be in the first place.

The Holy Spirit is also a witness to us: for after that he had said before, This is the covenant that I will make with them after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my laws into their hearts, and in their minds will I write them. And their sins and iniquities will I remember no more (Heb. 10:15-17). The redemption in Christ Jesus will go to the very core of the sin problem - the thoughts and the intents of the heart. *Now where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin* (v. 18). When this occurs, the "last generation" will have come. The "holy ones" will "keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus." The "men of wonder" will appear as their "iniquity" is removed "in one day" (Zech 3:8-9).

Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into "the holy places in the blood of Jesus" (Lit. Gr.), by a new and living way, which he hath new made (margin) for us through the veil, that is to say, His flesh; and having an high priest over the house of God; let us draw near in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water (Heb. 10:19-22).

#

+++++

Divine grace is needed at the beginning, divine grace at every step of advance, and divine grace alone can complete the work. (TM, p. 5-8)

+++++

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

Editor, Publications & Research

Elder Wm. H. Grotheer

Regional Contacts:

Australia - P. O. Box 5023, Wodonga Plaza, VIC 3690

Canada - P. O. Box 117, Thorne, ON POH 2J0

The Caribbean - P. O. Box GM 537, Castries, St. Lucia

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

Current copy free upon request; previous and duplicate copies - 50c.

800-4-LAYMEN (800-452-9636)

FAX - (501) 292-3745; Regular Calls - (501) 292-3721