

"Watchman, what of the night?"

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

Eze. 7:6 (Moffatt)

HISTORICAL DATA REVIEWED

Page 2

"An Image to the Beast"

Page 5

"AND THE BOOKS WERE OPENED"

Page 7

Editor's Preface

A new generation of Seventh-day Adventists have arisen which have little or no knowledge of events which transpired as a result of the compromises made with the Evangelicals in the 1955-1956 Conferences. Some of that new generation have already ascended to union administrative positions. When one adds to this the large number of new members who are uniting with the Church through the annual Net outreach programs, it means that the vast majority of the Church today know little of the doctrinal changes and the conflict that took place four decades ago. Some of the "voices" speaking for what is called "historic" Adventism led compromising lives until they felt it "safe" to take a stand. Their past experience still colors their present perception of truth. In this issue, we continue to cover historical data which we began last month. We include key quotations from documents which were published in response to the compromises made at the SDA-Evangelical Conferences. We need to be mature in our thinking, and that cannot be until we honestly confront our past history, and are willing to make the decisions which that history indicates should be made. We can, if we choose, ignore the facts, and continue to day-dream in blissful expectancy of that which will not be. Such is not an expression of faith, but a denial of God's revealed will in history and prophecy.

The last two articles are written to stimulate thinking. There is so much shallow thinking in, and surface teaching from, the Scriptures by professed "voices" of truth. One seeking to continue as a genuine Adventist, by listening to what these "voices" are saying, and not thinking nor studying for himself is in spiritual jeopardy. The concepts expressed in the two articles are not considered infallible, but the basis in Scripture for each idea is noted, and the reader, it is hoped, will carefully study each text for himself, as well as read what is written. The crescendo is rising in the attack on the American experiment of separation of church and state which guaranteed to all "religious liberty." That liberty is being challenged under a new name, "religious freedom." We plan to monitor this development of the "image to the beast."



Historical Data Reviewed - 1

With the release of the book, *Questions on Doctrine*, controversy and dissension broke out in the Church. Elder M. L. Andreasen, a respected theologian, and Bible teacher, wrote a series of mimeographed, "Letters to the Churches." These were reduced to six letters and published by A. L. Hudson, a printer, serving as first elder of the Baker City, Oregon, church. The leadership of the Church, under Fighur moved swiftly and harshly against Andreasen revoking his ministerial credentials and cutting off his retirement benefits. The latter was restored to him quickly when Andreasen applied for welfare, and the State of California learned the details of that which had taken place.

The rumor was circulated that Andreasen was senile. I went to California personally to check on this allegation. Knowing the president of the Pacific Union at that time, I called him about visiting with Elder Andreasen and the charge of senility. His response was, "Andreasen is not senile; go and see him. I have warned the brethren that unless they get this thing settled, they are in for some real problems." I visited Elder Andreasen, taking by brother-in-law with me. He was as alert as I had seen him in previous years when he spoke at ministerial retreats. My brother-in-law stepped out of the room for a few minutes and Elder Andreasen inquired as to his spiritual experience. I told him, and Andreasen had some personal words with him upon his return. Before we left Andreasen prayed with us. I, as he prayed, was conscious that he had a personal connection with the One to whom he prayed. The presence of the Lord came into that room.

During, this time, A. L. Hudson was not a quiet bystander merely printing Andreasen's *Letters to the Churches*. He became actively engaged in the controversy. Among the patrons of his printing business were lawyers for whom he printed legal briefs for submission to the Supreme Court of Oregon. Borrowing the format of these briefs, Hudson prepared a "Supporting Brief" for a proposed Resolution to be submitted to the Delegates to the Forty-eighth General Conference of the Church who would assemble in Cleveland, Ohio, in 1958. It read -

Let it be resolved, that in view of the evidence presented, the book *Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine* does not represent the faith and belief of the Seventh-day Adventist Church and is hereby repudiated on the following five points:

(1) It contains specimens of scholastic and intellectual dishon-

esty.

(2) It contains duplicity.

(3) It is inadequate.

(4) It contains error

(5) It is Satan's masterpiece of strategy to defeat the purpose of God for the Seventh-day Adventist Church. (p. 2)

In the balance of the Brief, evidence was given to support the five charges made. As was to be expected, the Brief was ignored and not presented to the delegates at the session.

Hudson didn't stop at merely writing this brief. He wrote both Martin and Barnhouse, but receiving no reply, telephoned Barnhouse and recorded the conversation which he later published verbatim.

Every concerned and professed Seventh-day Adventist whether still in fellowship with the regular Church, or claiming to adhere to "historic" Adventism should read, or reread this conversation, keeping in mind that Barnhouse had engaged in serious conversation with Adventist leaders in high places - conversations which moved the Church from its foundational pillars. Barnhouse told Hudson that he and Martin had "written and signed [statements] by leaders of the Seventh-day Adventist movement" that they had not misinterpreted Seventh-day Adventists positions. He further claimed that "everything" he had published in regard to Adventists "was read by Seventh-day Adventist leaders before [being] published," and he named Froom as one of the those readers. When this factor is understood, the report of what Barnhouse wrote in the article - "Are Seventh-day Adventist Christians?" - concerning the repudiation of basic Adventism by Adventist church leaders, reveals a crucifixion of the Truth of Jesus as terrible as the Jews' crucifixion of Jesus, the Truth.

In commenting on the book, *Questions on Doctrine*, Barnhouse told Hudson, "In a very nice way, the leaders who have written this book, have moved from the traditional position of the SDA movement." He then suggested that Hudson write an article stating - "Let's face the fact that we have error in our fundamental position. Let's abandon them and go forward to truth."

Here we are face to face with a critically vital issue. In his *Letters to the Churches*, Andreasen forthrightly wrote - "To repudiate Christ's ministry in the second apartment, now, is to repudiate Adventism. That is one of the foundation pillars of Adventism. If we reject the atonement in the sanctuary now, we may as well repudiate all Adventism." (#4, p. 5) However, Barnhouse's suggestion to Hudson is not without merit. Questions can be raised in certain aspects of the teaching where in it does not reflect the Scriptures; but do we "abandon" the foundational pillar as suggested, or do we, by careful study and prayer, bring those aspects into line with the Bible? The Evangelicals did throw at the Adventist conferees a certain text of

Scripture (Heb. 9:12 KJV) which they could not answer in the light of the foundational position held. Instead of reviewing the position, and finding the true force of the Greek text, they capitulated and "abandoned" the truth.

Brother A. L. Hudson not only challenged *Questions on Doctrine*, but he had received several years prior a copy of the manuscript, *1888 Re-Examined*. He urged the General Conference to review the initial evaluation they had placed on the book. However, the second evaluation "was as unsatisfactory as the first." Hudson then appeared before the North Pacific Union Conference Committee and presented a motion requesting that all documents be made available for study in that Union. The result was a publication of *A Warning and Its Reception*. Hudson closed the original edition with Wieland & Short's "Final Letter to the Committee." The edition produced by the Adventist Laymen's Foundation added a letter from Wieland to Short regarding the last hearing on the manuscript by a General Conference committee. The result was the same as all the other appraisals and evaluations - negative. There was, however, a new and different element - the time. The time of the meeting was the very month that the prophecy of Luke 21:24 began its fulfillment, June 1967.

We can deny that prophecy was fulfilled; that it had any relevancy to what was taking place in the Church. We can scoff at the events of history and seek to interpret the words of Jesus contrary to the intent of the context in which they were given. This, however, does not change the facts of history, nor alter God's design for a message which He sent by two "messengers." (*TM*, p. 91) Two questions must be answered: 1) Did God intend that the message of righteousness by faith become "the loud cry" for the finishing of His work in the earth? 2) Was it rejected or accepted? Then there is the final question - Why did God permit the fulfillment of Jesus' prophecy to begin in the very month that the Church at its highest levels of authority rejected the 1950 appeal to reconsider the failure of 1888?

The year previous, R. R. Figuhr had been succeeded as president of the General Conference by R. H. Pierson. Pierson had been a delegate to the 1952 Bible Conference as President of the Southern Asia Division. He had heard Maxwell declare, "There is one prophecy concerning Palestine that we should all be watching with special care" and then quoted Luke 21:24. (*Our Firm Foundation*, Vol. II, p. 230) I, too, was there, and heard what Maxwell said; but it made little impression because the traditional teaching of the Church concerning Palestine was so ingrained in my thinking that I was unable to separate Jerusalem as a sign from the fact that Israel was no longer the chosen people of God; and, therefore, events in Palestine were irrelevant. Such, too, may have been Pierson's experience.

It would be of interest if anyone having access to data connected with the Pierson administration could deter-

mine if any study or discussion ensued in the highest echelons of the Church following the fulfillment of Luke 21:24 in 1967. Somewhere along the line some consideration had to be given to the fulfillment of this prophecy for a paper presented at the series of Bible Conferences in 1974 to state, "Adventists do not see theological importance in ... the annexation of Old Jerusalem in 1967," reversing the 1952 Bible Conference declaration. Or was this merely a personal observation of the presenter?

A textual analysis of how Luke recorded what Jesus said reveals a Greek idiom - *αχρι ου* - translated, "until." In the two other places where Luke uses this idiom, the KJV translates it by the words, "till" and "while" (Acts 7:18; 27:33). It indicates that a brief period of time elapses. Such there was in regard to Jerusalem. In 1967, the state of Israel regained control of the old city; and in 1980, an action of the Knesset annexed it, declaring the united city "in its entirety" to be "the capital of Israel (Basic Law, July 30, 1980).

In permitting the final sign given by Jesus to be fulfilled, God was seeking to tell the Church something, even as God used John the Baptist to tell the Jewish Church in its day of visitation, that there was only a brief period of time left in which to bring forth "fruits meet for repentance" (Matt. 3:8). It dare not be overlooked that the "trust" committed to the Church - the Three Angels' Messages of Revelation 14 (9T:19) - was a message to every "nation" as well as to individuals. With the "times of the nations" probation about to close, the Church faced a crisis of the greatest magnitude: either the work had to be finished quickly, or it was finished, or else the Church had failed in its "trust" before God. Further, if the Church had altered the basic beliefs of the Three Angels' Messages, how could they in reality profess before God that they were still able to carry to completion that which had been committed to their "trust"? This is not a theoretical question, and the answer is written with indelible ink on the pages of history.

The Second Angel's Message had declared that "Babylon is fallen, is fallen" (Rev. 14:8); yet the Church through its representatives had entered into dialogue with the Evangelicals so as to alter fundamental beliefs. The Evangelicals were permitted to help in the expression of these beliefs so as to be acceptable with "Babylon"! The application of the term, "Babylon" was redefined, and the concept of the "Remnant" was enlarged so as to include the Evangelicals. (*Questions on Doctrine*, pp. 186-202)

During the second session of Vatican II, a Seventh-day Adventist "observer" and a staff member of the World Council of Churches (WCC) concluded that informal talks between a group of Seventh-day Adventists and an equal number of representatives of the WCC would "fulfil a useful purpose." Why not dialogue with another segment of "Babylon"? Had not the leadership of the Church approved such a dialogue a decade earlier with the Evangelicals? The first informal meeting was held in 1965. This

was followed by formalized meetings with the "blessing" of the Church leadership in Europe. The employing bodies of the Adventist participants funded and authorized their participation. (See *So Much In Common*, p. 98) The results of these meetings were quick in coming.

The January 1967 issue of the official paper of the WCC - *Ecumenical Review* - carried an article on "The Seventh-day Adventist Church." The Church through its official organ - *Review & Herald* - responded. Its associate editor Raymond F. Cottrell wrote three editorials (March 23, 30 & April 6, 1967). In the last editorial, Cottrell concluded:

It is no small measure of regret that SDA's do not find it possible, as an organization, to be more closely associated with others who profess the name of Christ. On the other hand, 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. Perhaps the same might be done in other areas of Christian concern. On such a basis we could concur with Dr. Hanspicker that the WCC is "one more place" where SDA's might bear their distinctive "witness to the full truth of the Gospel." (p. 13)

Reread this paragraph from the *Review*, and consider the force of what was being said - the expression of "regret" that the Church cannot more closely identify itself with "Babylon"! Had the WCC become converted through the informal and formal talks which had taken place for two years? Who really had been "converted"? Observe also that "with a clear conscience" the Church could approve of a Seventh-day Adventist theologian sitting on the Faith and Order Commission of the WCC in view of the purpose of this Commission which we shall note in a few paragraphs further.

The invitation suggested was not long in coming. The Central Committee of the WCC appointed Dr. Earle Hilgert, then vice-president for Academic Administration of Andrews University as a member of the Commission on Faith and Order. The leadership of the Church endorsed this selection. Events moved so rapidly in 1967 that Dr. Hilgert was able to attend the triennial meeting of the Commission in Bristol, England, July 30 through August 8, 1967 as the first Seventh-day Adventist to serve with the Commission.

The hierarchy of the Seventh-day Adventist Church affirms to the laity that the Church is not a member of the World Council of Churches. This is technically true, but the request and subsequent appointment of a Seventh-day Adventist theologian to the Faith and Order Commission (FOC) has far greater implications than appears on the surface. Cottrell sought to cover his suggestion as "an opportunity to witness." This naive stance betrays either ignorance of, or a purposeful cover up of the real objectives of the FOC.

It must first be clearly understood what the WCC is. It pronounces itself as "a fellowship of churches which confess the Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour according to the Scriptures and therefore seek to fulfil together their common calling to the glory of the one God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit." (WCC Constitution; see *So Much in Common*, p. 40) The WCC does not perceive itself as "a universal authority controlling what Christians should believe and do." However, they are striving as a "fellowship of churches" to "realize the goal of visible Church unity." To assist in 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 believe (By-Laws). (Faith and Order Paper No. 111, pp. vii-viii; emphasis supplied)

This is what the leadership of the Church through its official organ asked to become a part of in 1967. Then they forwarded this whole process towards "Church unity" by placing in the 27 Fundamental Statement of Beliefs at Dallas, Texas, in 1980, the full Constitutional statement of the WCC which is required for membership in that "fellowship of churches."

"Since 1968, the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists has been actively represented at the annual meetings of the 'Secretaries of World Confessional Families.' This participation is largely the result of WCC/SDA Conversations and contacts made at the time of the Uppsala Assembly [of the WCC]." (*So Much in Common*, p. 100) This association led to the separate audience granted by Pope Paul VI to the "participants of the Conference of Secretaries of the World Confessional Families" meeting in Rome in 1977 (RNS, May 19, p. 19). At the audience, Dr. B. B. Beach, Secretary of the Conference of Secretaries, presented the Pope with a gold medallion as "a symbol of the Seventh-day Adventist Church" (*Review*, August 11, 1977, p. 23). Thus in symbolism the Church was given into the hands of the Antichrist. No greater affront could be given to the God of Heaven than for His chosen people through a representative to wantonly defy the message of the Second Angel as was done on this occasion. This act was done with the full approval of, and prior arrangements with, the Northern Europe-West Africa Division Committee. [For full details, see the manuscript, *Steps to Rome*]

The fraternization with the WCC and involvement in other ecumenical groups such as the Secretaries of the World Confessional Families reaches down to the local units of this "community" of churches - the Ministerial Associa-

tions. These Associations while not organizationally linked with the WCC are microcosms of the World Council. One illustration of what can happen at the local level will suffice to show the end result. *Southern Tidings*, the official paper of the Southern Union Conference in the Telex news section for April, 1975, reported that Elder Robert Hunter, then pastor of the Morganton District of the Carolina Conference, joined in the local ministerial association's "Pulpit Exchange Day." The pulpit of the Adventist Church on that day was occupied by Fr. Thomas Burke, parish priest of the Roman Catholic Church. "The theme of the city-wide program was 'Blest Be the Tie.'"

The strong contrast envisioned in the Third Angel's Message between those who were to be entrusted with this message, and the power symbolically represented by the "beast" was nullified in a Brief presented in the United States District Court for Northern California. A footnote read:

Although it is true that there was a period of time in the life of the Seventh-day Adventist Church when the denomination took a distinctly anti-Roman Catholic viewpoint, and the term "hierarchy" was used in a pejorative sense to refer to the papal form of church government, that attitude on the Church's part was nothing more than a manifestation of widespread anti-papery among conservative protestant (sic.) denominations in the early part of this century and the latter part of the last, and which has now been assigned to the historical trash heap as far as the Seventh-day Adventist Church is concerned. (Rely Brief for Defendants in Support of Their Motion for Summary Judgment, Civ. No. 74-2025 CBR)

In the same Brief, the legal counsel for the Church's officers quoted from an affidavit given by one of the intervenors in which she had sworn that during her training and instruction in Adventist schools and churches, she had been taught that the Adventist Church strongly disapproved "the Roman Catholic system." To this the reply of the Brief read:

In several ways this illustrates the danger incurred by an individual church member who presumes to deny the authority of the duly constituted officials and governing bodies of the Church. In the first place, it is true that for a period in its history, the Seventh-day Adventist Church had an aversion to Roman Catholicism and especially to the papal form of church government -- an aversion shared by virtually all Protestant denominations. ... While, however, Adventist doctrine continues to teach that church government by one man is contrary to the Word of God, it is not good Seventh-day Adventism to express, as Mrs. Tobler has done, an aversion to Roman Catholicism as such. (ibid.) [See Excerpts - Legal Documents: EEOC v. PPPA]

How must the God of Heaven have felt when the Church to whom He had committed in sacred trust the giving of the Three Angels' Messages no longer shared the "aversion" with which the book of Revelation indicates He holds the

Papal system?

(To Be Continued)

"An Image to the Beast"

"And [the second beast] deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by the means of those miracles which he had power to do in the sight of the beast; saying to them that dwell on the earth, that they should make an image to the beast, which had a wound by the sword, and did live." (Rev. 13:14)

In an analysis of this verse, the first determination must be how the word, "earth," is to be understood. Is it the planetary "earth" that is designated, or is it the symbolic "earth" of Rev. 12:12 - "the inhabitants of the earth." Following this determination, we then seek to understand "the beast" to which the image is made. This is the "first beast" of Revelation 13. While the initial revelation to John describes only that "one of his heads as it were wounded to death," this verse (13:14) indicates that the beast, not just a head, "had a wound by the sword, and did live."

This composite beast resembles in its appearance, a leopard, bear and a lion (13:2). The sequence reflects the vision given to Daniel (chap. 7) except in Daniel these beasts appear in reverse order. One prophetic aspect defined in Daniel indicates that even though these three beasts - the lion, bear, and leopard - were stripped of their dominion, "their lives were prolonged for a season and a time" (7:12). The vision given to John indicates that the three beasts of Daniel live on in the first beast of Revelation 13.

There is a common denominator in the history of the kingdoms from Babylon through Rome in both of its phases - pagan and papal. That denominator is the union of church and state. Two of the human interest stories in the book of Daniel focus on the experience resultant from the State seeking to enforce a religious mandate: the Three Worthies in the fiery furnace, and Daniel in the lion's den.

The first vision outlined in the Book of Daniel - Nebuchadnezzar's metallic man - reveals a similar picture. There Babylon as well as the other three kingdoms are all represented by different metals, gold, silver, brass and iron. Even in the feet, the iron is retained, but clay is introduced. There is a mingling attempted, but in the time when this is attempted, "shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed" (2:43-44). A comment from the Writings, so contrary to traditional interpretation of this part of Daniel 2, invites careful study. It reads: "The mingling of churchcraft and statecraft is represented by the iron and the clay." (4BC, p. 1168:MS 63, 1899) A sentence which follows in the paragraph reads - "This investing the church with the power of the state will bring evil results." This is a reverse picture from our common perception. We have perceived the state as carrying out the mandates of the

Church, and such is indicated in other parts of the paragraph from which these two sentences are quoted. Observe carefully that the mingling of church and state as described in the second sentence simply indicates that the "investing" of such power "will bring evil results." It is a prelude to what will follow.

As we began this article, we suggested that the first determination must be the meaning and use of the word, "earth." The interpretative text is Rev. 12:12 which warns - "Woe to the inhabitants of the earth and of the sea for the devil is come down unto you having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time." As the vision progressed, John beheld the first beast of Revelation 13 "rise up out of the sea" (v. 1) It was this beast to which the image was to be formed. The second beast which was to make the suggestion "to the inhabitants of the earth" was seen by John as "coming up out of the earth" (v. 11). Clearly history indicates the "sea" to be Europe, while "the earth" represents that nation which came into existence, all of European extraction in its beginnings. With this nation came a new vision of government. In 1893, the respected legal authority, David Dudley Field, observed:

The greatest achievement ever made in the cause of human progress is the total and final separation of church and state. If we had nothing else to boast of, we could lay claim with justice that first among the nations we of this country made it an article of organic law that the relations between man and his Maker were a private concern, into which other men have no right to intrude."

The European model of government imaging the first beast is advocated by Professor Jan de Groof, president of the European Society for Education Law and Policy. He assessed the American achievement as "a completely outdated concept" and urged the "European model" where church and state "are not rivals" but work together to achieve "general, spiritual and material well-being." In Europe, churches, church schools and other ministries of the church are generously supported by tax dollars collected by their public officials. We might dismiss de Groof's thinking as an unwarranted intrusion into the American way of life were it not for the fact that he was one of the featured speakers at a conference, February 5 in Washington D. C. sponsored jointly by the Ethics and Public Policy Center and the Bradley Foundation, a wealthy right-wing foundation best known for its advocacy of religious school vouchers.

It needs to be recalled that the president of the Ethics and Public Policy Center is George Weigel, who contributed to the book, *Evangelicals and Catholics Together, Toward a Common Mission*, edited by Charles Colson and Richard John Neuhaus. In the essay which he wrote for the book, Weigel referred to the "wall of separation between church and state" as "a polysyllabic neologism," [One definition of "neologism" is "a meaningless word coined by a psychotic."] He wrote in this essay - The issue here is the direc-

tion that Evangelicals and Catholics together should take in reconstructing the moral foundations of American public life. Not surprisingly, the first item on the agenda is the reconstruction of genuine religious freedom in the United States. (p. 50) What does "religious freedom" mean to this "togetherness" of Evangelicals and Roman Catholics? The exact opposite to what was founded in America - the separation of church and state. Their goal is the union of Church and State - a replica of the European (papal) model. In other words "an image to the beast." This was clearly demonstrated in the conference held on February 5, 1999 in Washington, DC.

[For an exchange of Letters over this Issue between George Weigel and this editor soon after the book noted above was published in 1995, see WVN XXIX - 4(96), p. 5]

To what extent has "the investing the church with the power of the state" been realized? Congress has already approved "charitable choice" funding of churches in some social service programs, and others are under consideration. The State funds public education, but there is a drive by the Catholic Church and the Religious Right for "Voucher Plans" to aid religious schools. The "image" is being moulded.

Madison, writing a half century after the adoption of the Bill of Rights into the Constitution which guaranteed the separation of Church and State, observed that "the prevailing opinion in Europe, England not excepted, has been that Religion could not be preserved without the support of Government or Government be supported without an established religion, that there must be at least an alliance of some sort between them." However, he observed that the American experiment demonstrated that religion "does not need the support of Government and it will scarcely be contended that Government has suffered by its exemption of Religion from its cognizance, or its pecuniary aid." In other words, "an image to the beast" is not needed, but is coming, and already being formed.

[All unreferenced quotations in the above article are from the editorial appearing in *Church and State*, March 1999, p. 15]

#

Freedom has only the meaning with which men endow it. It is not enough to pay lip service to the concept of religious liberty. We must pay heart service to it, as well, else it remains an empty phrase instead of a living reality.

Kenneth B. Keating

“And the Books Were Opened”

A fiery stream issued and came forth from before Him: thousand thousands ministered unto Him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before Him: the judgment was set and the books were opened. (Daniel 7:10)

Nowhere in Daniel is it indicated that the books were closed. The “one like the Son of man” comes “to the Ancient of days” and receives a kingdom (vs. 13-14). The books still remain open. In the continuation of the vision, Daniel sees that “judgment was given to the saints of the Most High (v. 22). This same thought is found in Revelation - “judgment was given unto them” (20:4). We have interpreted this same thought two different ways. In Daniel, we have said that this was “judgment rendered in behalf of the saints” because of the war waged against them by the little horn (7:21), while in Revelation we have interpreted the same concept as the saints sitting on thrones and rendering judgment. We have Biblical justification in concluding the latter: Jesus own words (Matt. 19:28), and Paul’s statement in First Corinthians (6:2). The question then arises - Is the judgment which was set in Daniel 7:10 recessed at some point until the saints can sit in that judgment? The books remain open.

These books appear again and “the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books” (Rev. 20:12). They are called “dead” though portrayed as standing before God in the judgment of the “great white throne” (v. 11). They have no “eternal life” in them (John 6:53). It is evident that in the “books” have been recorded “their works.” This factor of the judgment is doubly emphasized - “according to their works” (vs. 12, 13). The condemnation will be “the second death” (v. 14). With this the books are closed. Justice has been met.

We picture the recorded acts - “the works” - as heinous crimes and gross sins. True, such will be recorded. But also, there will be the records of those who while saying, “Lord, Lord,” did not do the will of the Father in heaven. While claiming to have done many “wonderful works,” even preaching in the name of Christ, and casting out devils, their lives were laced in lawlessness (Matt. 7:21-22). Many of the “dead” had sought to do “the works of God” but failed to do the single “work” required by God. Jesus said - This is the work of God that ye believe on Him who He hath sent” (John 6:29). The second death will claim many who “rich and increased with goods” thought they needed nothing (Rev. 3:17), as well as those Pharisees who could thank God that they were not like other men and who could recite to Him their accomplishments (Luke 18:11-12).

However, there is a further factor to consider. Introduced in Revelation is another book - “the book of life” (20:12, 15). It is a book which has been kept by one Person - “the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world” (13:8). In that book are the “names” of those who have confessed

Him, accepted the provisions He has provided, in other words, “believed” in Him. Interestingly, there are no “works” recorded, only “names.” They are those who nothing in their hands could bring, but simply to the cross did cling. These “feared the Lord and thought upon His name” (Mal. 3:16).

The Book of the Lamb was begun early from the moment the Word dedicated Himself to become flesh. The first name recorded is simply “Abel bar Adam.” He had accepted the “more excellent” sacrifice. The promise Jesus would make in the flesh was his by faith: He that heareth my word, and believeth on Him that sent Me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation [Gr. “judgment” (κρισις)]; but is passed from death unto life. (John 5:24)

Many of us at some time in our experience have filled out a resume. These we slanted as much as truth would allow to make the most favorable impression upon the one reading it. The Lamb’s Book of Life contains no such resumes, only our names. We have nothing by which to merit heaven; in fact, more to exclude than to include us. Even our prayers must be offered with “much incense” (Rev. 8:3). All heaven echoes one song, “Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing” (5:12). Some of those who had been recorded in the Lamb’s Book of Life, judged, and who are now ministering with Him in the sanctuary above join the chorus singing - He “hath redeemed us” (v. 9) How can we ever expect to unite our voices in that chorus, “Worthy is the Lamb who hath redeemed us,” if we continue to trust in and boast about our works? We will be judged by those “works.” Who is willing to face the judgment seat on the merit of those works? Where must our faith be? In them, or in the Lamb that was slain?

#

+++++

“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