



*"Watchman,  
what of the night?"*

*"The hour has come, the hour is striking, and striking at you:  
the hour and the end!"*  
*Eze. 7:10 (Moffatt)*

## AN EXPOSE<sup>1</sup> OF A SATANIC HOAX

Rene Noorbergen, retired journalist, and for Adventists, the author of Ellen G. White, Prophet of Destiny, has released a new publication, The Fatima Factor in the Final Hours. It is "the expose of a Satanic hoax; the Dragon of Revelation 12-13 in final attack!"

Noorbergen became "increasingly interested in the claims and warnings that have been voiced by Pope John Paul II and other leading politicians in recent times." These claims did not come as a total surprise to him, "for while researching the material for this book [he] came across significant Bible prophecies indicating significant future moves in the fields of politics and religion that place the leadership of the Roman Catholic Church in a less than favorable light. Not only have they given many Biblical doctrines unorthodox and controversial interpretations [but] traditions too, have added exclusive measures of confusion to their unique brand of Christianity!" (p. 1)

As a result of these insights, Noorbergen "decided to invite Pope John Paul II to clarify and explain the actions and positions of his denomination in these various areas of [his] concern." He submitted a written list of questions to the Pope's secretariat as a basis for an exclusive interview in Rome or a response in written form. This format Noorbergen had followed many times in previous interviews with heads of State when still an active foreign correspondent. This list includes such notables as Dwight D. Eisenhower, Konrad Adenauer, Charles de Gaulle, Dag Hammarskjold, David Ben Gurion, Paul Henry Spaak, and Emperor Haile Selassie.

In seeking to reach the Pope, Noorbergen used "all available channels at [his] disposal... such as diplomats, friends, as well as distressed members

of the Roman Catholic hierarchy," but to no avail, although some of the initial reactions had appeared promising. Even an appeal to the highly influential Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger was useless." Finally, on November 27, 1993, he gave it one last try and FAXED an urgent appeal for help to Cardinal Rosario Casaroli, the Vatican Secretary of State. It too, was fruitless as had been the other attempts.

It should be noted that when the Pope released his recent book, Crossing the Threshold of Hope, he used the same format as Noorbergen had attempted - answers to a series of questions proposed by a journalist, Italian Vittorio Messori. Messori's introduction to the Pope's book tells why he was chosen. He wrote:

"I was told that I had been chosen to conduct the interview because of the many religious books - especially The Ratzinger Report (1985) - and articles I have written over the years, with freedom of a layman, but also as a believer who knows that the Church is given not only to the clergy but to each of the baptized." (pp. v, vi)

Noorbergen could not produce these credentials. The questions he submitted to the Pope are much more penetrating, and would require some direct answers that the Pope evidently did not wish to give. Noorbergen comments on this point, noting:

"Is it perhaps possible that Rome cannot supply any defensible Bible-based answers? The conclusions contained herein [his book] were forced on me by the lack of meaningful response. I tried." (p. 2)

Here is the final list of questions which he

submitted to Pope John Paul II:

1) Do you endorse the following statement as found in The Catholic National of July 1895 - "The Pope is not only the representative of Christ, but he is Jesus Christ Himself, hidden under a veil of flesh"?

[The reader should note the close parallel between Noorbergen's first more concise question and the first question asked in the Pope's book, Crossing the Threshold of Hope. The Pope's answer comes close to the statement in The Catholic National!]

2) I have been assured by Roman Catholic Scholars that the Bible text in Revelation 12:1 refers to the appearance of the Virgin Mary at Fatima, and that you are supposed to be the man child referred to in verse 6 of the same chapter. Can you please comment on this?

3) Do you see any connection between the crown of twelve stars the woman was wearing in verse 1 and the European Community of twelve nations and the rulership with the rod of iron by the man child and your pontificate? If so, can you please explain?

4) The cooperation between you and former U.S. President Ronald Reagan in connection with the fall of Communism has been widely publicized here in the United States. Are there any other major cooperative projects being worked on?

5) Without my being specific and too inquisitive, can you possibly confirm whether the next major area of focus for your pontificate is in one of the following areas:

- a) International politics?
- b) International social legislation?
- c) Religion or manner of worship?

6) Is one of the major aims of your pontificate making Roman Catholicism the predominate religion of the globe?

7) Do you have any special counsel to be included in my developing manuscript on the connection between The New World Order and the Fatima messages?

8) Does the following statement by the Catholic author, Malachi Martin, in The Keys of This Blood, p. 492, correctly reflect your position?

"John Paul II insists that men have no reliable hope of creating a viable geopolitical system unless it is on the basis of Roman Catholic

Christianity."

9) Does your understanding of "religious freedom" include the rights of the Moslems to keep Friday holy, and the rights of Jews and certain Protestant religions to celebrate the 7th day Sabbath as God's Holy Day on which to worship?

10) How do you react to those Protestants who see your denomination as the Dragon of Revelation chapter 12? Can you please comment on this.

11) Inasmuch as you claim to represent Christ on earth, do you also claim to have received any special personal revelations about His soon return? either from Him directly or from His mother, the Virgin Mary?

12) Can you possibly help understand how and through which channel the social doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church as outlined by your predecessor Pope Leo XIII in Rerum Novarum one hundred years ago, have found their way into the European's Community's SOCIAL CHARTER OF THE EUROPEAN WORKER?

13) Does the third FATIMA message contain instructions or suggestions about how to come to a unity of faith in this world in preparation for the second coming?

14) Can you please have someone confirm or deny a vision reported to have been experienced by your predecessor Pope Pius X in 1909 during which he saw the destruction of Rome and the Pope leaving the Vatican, walking over the bodies of his dead priests.

15) At what age and period in your life did you first realize that the end of this world is closing in on us?

16) What would you consider your most important advice to humanity at this point in time? (pp. 3-6)

‡

Note on Rene Noorbergen - His education was received at La Sierra University, the University of Tennessee, and the University of Groningen in the Netherlands. He is an accredited war correspondent for both the US armed forces and the UNEF. For thirteen years he was a radio correspondent and commentator for a division of the Netherlands Radio Union. He has written nineteen books up to this time among them several

# WHICH CHRIST?

In a recent issue of Christianity Today [CT] (December 12, 1994), J. I. Packer, a leading Evangelical voice, and Sangwoo Youtong Chee Professor of Systematic Theology at Regent College, Vancouver, British Columbia, defended his signing of the statement of accord between Evangelicals and Roman Catholics. The subtitle to the article reads - "The recent statement 'Evangelicals and Catholics Together' [ECT] recognizes an important truth: Those who love the Lord must stand together."

Packer's conclusion is worth noting. He wrote:

"I conclude, then, on grounds of biblical principle, reinforced by current pressures and precedents, that ETC's modeling of an evangelic-Roman Catholic commitment to partnership in mission within set limits and without convictional compromise is essentially right, and I remain glad to endorse it. In days when Rome seemed to aim at political control of all Christendom and the death of Protestant churches, such partnership was not possible. But those days are past and after Vatican II can hardly return. Whatever God's future may be for the official Roman Catholic system, present evangelical partnership with spiritually alive Roman Catholics in communicating Christ to unbelievers and upholding Christian order in a post-Christian world needs to grow everywhere, as ECT maintains. This should be beyond question." (p. 36)

Apart from the naivete of the conclusion, the bottom line is that Rome and the Evangelicals are not preaching the same "Christ" to a "post-Christian" world. The question is, however, "Is the Christ proclaimed by either, the true Christ, or are they both proclaiming a false christ?"

Pope John Paul II in his book, Crossing the Threshold of Hope, devotes a chapter to church unity - "In Search of Lost Unity" (pp. 144-151). He, too, appeals to Vatican II. Quoting John XXIII who convened the Council - "What separates us as believers in Christ is much less than what unites us" - John Paul II comments: "In this statement we find the **heart of ecumenical thinking**" (p. 146; emphasis his). Indicating that the Second Vatican Council continued in that direction, he wrote:

"The Council documents gave a more concrete form to John XXIII's fundamental intuition. **All of**

**us, in fact, believe in the same Christ."** (p. 147; my emphasis)

The question is, Do we? From what is the concept of the Roman Catholic Christ derived? Carefully, observe the Pope's answer:

"This faith is the fundamental inheritance of the teaching of the first seven ecumenical councils, which were held in the first millennium. So there is a basis for dialogue and **for growth in unity**, a growth that should occur at the same rate at which we are able to overcome our divisions - divisions that to a great degree result from the idea that one can have a monopoly on truth." (ibid; emphasis his)

The Christ of Rome is not the Christ of the Bible, but the Christ as defined by the Councils. Keep in mind that the visible unity which the Faith and Order Commission is seeking to project - a Commission dominated by Rome - is the creed of the Church Council of A.D. 381. Admittedly, it is not a Christological statement in the truest sense, but it involves the conception of Jesus Christ in the Godhead.

Another subtle suggestion made by the pope involves what he calls "a monopoly on truth." The genuine Christ of the Bible declared for Himself such a monopoly. He stated - "I am the way, **the truth**, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father but by Me." (John 14:6) It was Peter who unequivocally proclaimed, "Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is no other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." (Acts 4:12) Peter's so-called infallible successor says this is the cause of disunity in Christendom.

How are we to relate to truth? Inasmuch as truth is progressive, we may not have all the truth at any one moment of time, but what we can have at any one moment in time is truth, pure and unadulterated. This is the righteousness of Christ. That truth as it is in Jesus will preserve us from accepting a false christ, or a false doctrine about the true Christ.

If the New Testament record teaches us anything, it teaches us that one cannot rely on the dogmas of the Church Councils. The testimony of Paul to the elders of Ephesus is explicit. "For I know **this**," he said, "that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them." (Acts 20:29-30) The whole symbolism of the book of

Revelation speaks this same warning. The Bible also teaches that there is to be an Elijah Message. (Mal. 4:5) Reflecting the spirit and the power of the first Elijah, there will be a clear and decisive call to distinguish between truth and error, between the true Christ and the false christ.

The issue, as to the genuine Christ in contrast to the false christ, is not something removed from the Adventist Community, but is in reality very critical. In the Community of Adventism, and this includes the regular Church and the various "independent" ministries, there are at least four different "Christs" worshiped, or professedly believed in. One "Jesus Christ" is believed to have come in the nature of Adam before the Fall; another in the nature of Adam after the Fall; and a third "Christ" is portrayed as having some of both natures; while a fourth "Christ" is presented as coming "born, born-again." All of these "Christs" cannot be the same. Thus the individual member in the Community of Adventism must determine which Christ he worships; which Jesus is his Saviour. All of the controversy which has been raging within Adventism over the doctrine of the Incarnation during the past four decades has not been mere semantics.

Using the same question Jesus asked the Jews, we ask, "What think ye of Christ? whose son is He?" (Matt. 22:42) At that time, the question was Christ's divinity; today it is His humanity. That question, those to whom it was addressed had to answer it before the week was out. While in the Judgment Hall, Pilate asked them to choose between Barabbas - a name which translated means, "a son of the father," and "Jesus which is called Christ," who is the Son of the Father, the Messiah. (Matt. 27:17) Interestingly, textual evidence indicates that Barabbas also had the name, Jesus, so that the question asked by Pilate could read - "Whom will ye that I release unto you? Jesus, the Barabbas, or Jesus the one called Christ." (See 2nd edition of the United Bible Societies' text of The Greek New Testament)

The issue can be further amplified by the dictum found in I John 4:3 - "Every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is the spirit of antichrist." While John was primarily directing this dictum towards the Gnosticism of his day, it is apropos today regarding the question of what "flesh" Christ took upon Himself in becoming man. Was He made of the seed of David according to the flesh (Rom. 1:3), or was He not? To deny this is to adopt "the spirit of

antichrist. Again, the Greek preposition, anti, does not mean as in English, "against," but rather, "in place of" - a false christ.

This same basic issue should be involved in the thinking of those who are defending their signing of the accord between Evangelicals and Roman Catholics. It is the basis of a deceptive unity held out by the Catholic Church to further the ecumenical dialogue - we all "believe in the same Christ." This simply is not true. While the Evangelicals believe in a Christ different from the Christ of the Scriptures, they do not believe in a Christ born of an "immaculate" Mary. While they do not accept the Dogma of the Immaculate Conception of Mary, they devise another theory - the sanctification of the womb of Mary - to escape the plain confession of Paul that Jesus "was made of the seed of David according to the flesh."

It doesn't require the insight of a theologian to see that a "Christ" born of a woman who "in the first moment of her conception... was preserved free from every taint of original sin," is not the same "Christ" as one born of the kind of a mother from whom every other child of humanity is born. This returns us again to the basic question - "What think ye of Christ? whose son is he?" Plus - "Can two walk together, lest they be agreed?" (Amos 3:3)

‡

Postscript - The fact of the incarnation is so simple though surrounded by the mysterious question, "how?" The Divine Logos who "was made flesh" pre-existed "with God." (John 1:14, 1) That Divine Identity united Himself to a body developed in the womb of Mary "made of the seed of David according to the flesh." (Rom. 1:3) This union was accomplished by "the power of the highest." (Luke 1:35) How? That remains a mystery which I accept by faith.

The resulting God-man - a Being never before known in the universe - did no sin. He is set forth distinctly as "the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead." (Rom. 1:4) The fact that Jesus clothed in an identical humanity such as I possess, lived a life free from sin, I accept by faith. Believing, I give "thanks to God, who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ." (I Cor. 15:57)

Why rob God of such a victory, and deny to man the true Christ - a Saviour - who achieved that victory?

# ECT (PART ONE)

In the previous article, we noted the defense that Dr. J. I. Packer of Regent College gave in justifying his signature to the document - "Evangelicals and Catholics Together (ECT)". Last year we commented on an Seventh-day Adventist viewpoint of this document written by Richard L. Fenn, Director of Public Affairs for the North Pacific Union. (WWN 9/94, pp. 5-7) Since that time, we have had an opportunity to read this document carefully, besides the original comments upon it from the Evangelical viewpoint, and also Charles Colson's explanation of the rationale which dictated its formulation.

It is our conviction that this document should not only be read but also be studied by every concerned Seventh-day Adventist who is desirous of obtaining a comprehensive understanding of the trends that are leading to the final conflict between truth and error. In this article, we will document certain details behind its formulation as to participants and its authority as a voice for Roman Catholics and Evangelicals.

The idea for ECT "was born during discussions between Prison Fellowship Founder, Charles Colson and Catholic priest Richard John Neuhaus of the New York City based organization Religion and Public Life. Neuhaus's (sic) organization coordinated the meetings and discussions that produced the document." (Christianity Today (CT), May 16, 1994, p. 53)

In the very first paragraph of the document, it confesses - "This statement cannot speak officially for our communities." However, the stated objective is clearly defined - ECT "does intend to speak responsibly from our communities and to our communities." Though not an official statement from the two communities, Neuhaus indicated that "appropriate parties at the Holy See" gave the effort their "stongest encouragement." (CT, op. cit.)

The participants in the formulation of ECT included two Jesuits, Avery Dulles of Fordham University, and Juan Diaz-Vilar of the Catholic Hispanic Ministries as well as officials of the Church. The Evangelicals were represented by Dr. Kent Hill of Eastern Nazarene College; Dr. Richard Land and Dr. Harry Lewis, both from the Southern Baptist Convention; Dr. Jesse Miranda representing the Assemblies of God; and Dr. John White of the National Association of Evangelicals.

Besides the fifteen who formulated the document, twenty five others signed the statement. These included among the Evangelicals, Bill Bright of Campus Crusade; Pat Robertson of the Christian Broadcasting Network; Dr. Richard Mouw, Fuller Theological Seminary; Mark Noll, Wheaton College; Os Guinness of Trinity Forum and J. I. Packer of Regent College. The Catholic endorsements included constitutional attorney William Bentley Ball; Michael Novak and John Cardinal O'Connor of the Archdiocese of New York.

Colson speaks of the document as addressing "today's culture war." (CT, Nov. 14, 1994, p. 136) The article in CT (May 16, 1994) discussing the release of what was termed "an unprecedented statement of accord," called the present confrontation in the public square a "cultural conflict." It notes the common moral and social agendas of the two communities, which includes "support for unborn life, the preservation of religious freedom, and parental choice in education."

Inasmuch as many of the statement's primary drafters are better known for their contribution to public and international policy than for theological expertise, some media outlets portrayed the effort as "a marriage of convenience." Neuhaus strongly rejected this interpretation and stated, "By far, the document's most important single statement... is the affirmation that evangelicals and Catholics are brothers and sisters in Christ. Everything else flows from that." (CT, May 16, 1994, p. 53)

The primary opposition to the statement came from among the Evangelicals. Packer in his defense for signing the statement wrote - "I was surprised at the violence of the initial negative Protestant reaction." He charged that these Protestants said, "bleak, skewed, fearful, and fear-driven things about this document - for instance, that it betrays the Reformation; that it barbers the gospel for a social agenda; that it forfeits the right to share Christ with nominal Roman Catholics; that by saying 'we are justified by grace through faith in Christ' it abandons justification by faith alone; and that its backers should be dropped from evangelical fellowship." (ibid., Dec. 12, 1994, p. 34) Bob Jones III forthrightly defined the statement as evidence that "the ecumenical church, which will be the church of the Antichrist, is rapidly forming." Evidently this opposition was perceived as possible by the formulators of the document, even though Packer was taken by surprise. Neuhaus indicated that early drafts of the document

"sought to distinguish between evangelicals and fundamentalists," but was abandoned. (CT, May 16, 1994)

The document - ECT - not only states what its objectives are, but also what it does not attempt to do. The formulators wrote - "We do not presume to suggest that we can resolve the deep and long-standing differences between Evangelicals and Catholics" By this, it is understood to mean, theological differences. However, as Randy Frame, one of CT's Senior News Writers, comments, "Either stated or implied throughout [the document], is the assertion that these differences do not have an impact on Christianity's core essential beliefs and thus should not prevent the communities from working together." (ibid.; emphasis supplied) Colson in his defense of the accord states that "ECT calls all orthodox believers to unite on the great truths of the faith against both secular modernism and theological liberalism." (CT, Nov. 14, 1994, p. 136)

Colson's rationale is most revealing. He indicates that "today's cultural war is taking place at a level much deeper than politics. At root, it is a battle for truth - and to fight effectively we need a distinctive Christian presence and world view." He cites the thinking of the Dutch Calvinist Abraham Kuyper who indicated in such a war where secularism is involved, "Rome is not an antagonist but stands on our side, inasmuch as she recognizes and maintains the Trinity, the deity of Christ," and other fundamental doctrines. Then Colson adds, "Likewise, when Catholics battle the church's internal enemies - theological liberalism - the great divides within Christendom no longer fall along denominational lines but between conservatives and liberals **within** denominations." He then cites J. Gresham Machen, a defender of Protestant orthodoxy, who at the turn of the century wrote:

"We should not obscure the difference which divides us from Rome. The gulf is indeed profound. But profound as it is, it seems almost trifling compared to the abyss which stands between us and many ministers of our own church."

Colson closes his defense by stating - "Let's be certain that we are firing our polemical rifles against the enemy, not against those fighting in the trenches alongside us in the defence of the Truth." (ibid.)

(To Be Continued)

## LET'S TALK IT OVER

The rationale for, and the defense of, the ECT document leaves one dazed. Colson quotes J. Gresham Machen, and in Fenn's "Viewpoint" analysis of the document, he quotes, Pat Robertson as saying - "Frankly, I feel I have a lot more in common with this pope than with liberal Protestants. The real battle is not between Protestants and Catholics anymore; its between conservative Christians fighting for the fundamental truths of the faith, and liberals who deny the central truths of Christianity." (Gleaner, June 6, 1994, pp. 2-3)

These phrases, "fundamental truths," "central truths," and Colson's decisive conclusion - "in defense of the Truth" ("Truth" in caps) are phrases from Adventist's vocabulary. We are familiar with the fact that in the final conflict, the counterfeit will resemble the true (GC, p. 593); and that "the track of truth lies close beside the tract of error" (Spec. Test., Series B, #2, p. 52). But now that which is set forth as the objective of ECT is called "the defense of the Truth." We say we are proclaiming "the Truth." There are not two Truths! Does this mean then that we are facing the same choice that the Jewish nation of old faced, Jesus that is called the Messiah, and Jesus Barabbas, the son of the Father? (See page 4, col. 1)

We see in ECT a uniting on such points of doctrine as are held in common by the two communities, but were there compromises made on the part of the Evangelicals? Some Evangelicals think so. They believe that the historic teaching on justification by faith alone, was diluted in the agreed phraseology - "we are justified by grace through faith because of Christ." Or is it just semantics?

The parallel, between the experiences and decisions leading up to the release of the ECT document with the resulting reaction on the part of many Evangelicals and the experiences within the Adventist Community over the SDA-Evangelical Conferences, is evident. Neuhaus indicated the discovery that "evangelicals and Catholics are brothers and sisters in Christ" was the beginning from which everything else flowed. T. E. Unruh in writing of the SDA-Evangelical Conferences said that on the second day there was a breakthrough and Walter Martin confessed his conviction that "Adventists who believed as did the conferees were truly born-again Christians and his brethren in Christ." (The

Adventist Heritage (AH), Vol. 4, #2, p. 38) From this has flowed all the doctrinal compromises which have plagued the Adventist Community since those fateful days in 1955-1956. Even as the conferences between the Evangelicals and the Roman Catholics sought to deal with the "fundamentalists" in the ranks of the evangelicals, so the Adventists sought to isolate the opposition in Adventism by telling Barnhouse and Martin that the Adventist community had a "lunatic fringe" who would be disturbed with the position taken by the Adventist conferees. (Eternity, September, 1956, p. 6)

Even as Packer indicated his suprise at the opposition in the evangelical ranks (p. 5, col. 2), so likewise Unruh revealed a similar surprise to the reaction of many Adventists to another "document," Questions on Doctrine. He wrote:

"It came as a surprise to the planners, after the demonstration of a solid concensus from world leaders in the church and the preview in Ministry of what was to come, that Questions on Doctrine should be subjected to attack from Adventist sources." (AH, op. cit., p. 44)

Some more parallels can be indicated. The formulators of ECT had to decide what were the "core" doctrines, in other words, certain basic theological concepts which they held in common, and consider the others upon which they disagreed, no matter how major they might be, peripheral to their objective. This they did. We did likewise in our accord with the Evangelicals. Froom in his book, Movement of Destiny, writes of "the eternal verities." (p. 33) We define the 27 Fundamentals as "core" doctrine, no matter how far they stray from, or delete in certain vital areas, the pioneer position. Acceptability and common cause appear to be the motivation which these parallels project.

The sequence - discovery of kinship, agreement on certain concepts held in common, a united front (and attack) against the opposition - would indicate a master plan from a single source placed in operation. It is important that we understand what is taking place. In the next issue of WVN, we plan to give a section by section analysis of the document - ECT.

whg

\*\*\*\*\*

"The track of truth lies close beside the track of error, and both tracks may seem to be one to minds which are not worked by the Holy Spirit, and which, therefore, are not quick to discern the difference between truth and error."

Fatima - From page 2, col. 2

international best sellers. His articles have appeared in leading newspapers of the United States, Great Britian, France, Belgium, The Netherlands, Norway and Germany.

You may order your copy of The Fatima Factor in the Final Hours from the Adventist Laymen's Foundation, P. O. Box 69, Ozone, AR 72854, USA - US\$12.50 postpaid; US\$15.00 postpaid to Canada and Overseas.

\*\*\*\*\*

**NOTE:** - With the higher US Postal rates becoming effective January 1, 1995, it is necessary that the minimum postage on any order for publications in the United States, to be \$3.00 instead of the previous \$2.00.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Available:** - Extra copies of the 1994 issues of WVN are still available. Supply is limited. These do include the seven part series on "A Theology of the Sanctuary." Upon request they will be sent for 50¢/copy, postpaid. Also there is available in quantity the tract - "Jerusalem in Bible Prophecy" - 40 for \$10.00; 25 - \$7.50; 10 - \$3.50. All prices are postpaid. (Single copies - \$.50)

\*\*\*\*\*

"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.

In Canada, write - The Adventist Laymen's Foundation of Canada, P. O. Box 117, Thorne, ON P0H 2J0.

In Australia, write - The Adventist Laymen's Foundation, P. O. Box 846, Belmont, Victoria 3216.

Editor Elder Wm. H. Grotheer

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

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

\*\*\*\*\*