



*"Watchman,
what of the night?"*

*"The hour has come, the hour is striking, and striking at you,
the hour and the end!"* Eze. 7:6 (Moffat)

TAKING ISSUE WITH ISSUES

LETS TALK IT OVER

In a recent mailing of Freedom's Ring, Trefz included a copy of a letter written to Dr. Wm. G. Johnsson, Editor of the Adventist Review by Dr. Sudhir K. Pandit of Amity, Arkansas. It was read with interest. It was obvious that Dr. Pandit had not carefully reviewed all the documented evidence presented by the "brethren" in ISSUES in regard to the "independent ministries" named, and was writing as a devotee of these men.

We wrote to Dr. Pandit commending him for writing to Dr. Johnsson. He had every reason to challenge Johnsson, because Johnsson is the number one problem that the "brethren" have in the "image" they reflect to the Church through the Church paper. To the "independent," he is the one who could not stand up to Walter Martin on the Ankerberg Show. To the knowledgeable concerned Adventist, he is operating under a facade. Having denied the very sanctuary fundamentals of Adventism in his doctoral dissertation, equalling if not surpassing Desmond Ford's denial, he now is in the place to influence the thought patterns of Adventism.

While some of the details of the documentation given by the hierarchy may be faulty, and will be in turn challenged by the "independents" named in ISSUES, the general picture conveyed conforms to personal experiences one has had with certain of these leaders over the years. During the past year, I had an occasion to speak to a "home church" in the East. After the meeting a family connected closely with Hartland Institute asked the group leaders if I had submitted my message to "the brethren of experience" before giving it.

To page 6, col. 2

Part Two

Following the "gap" in the recital of Seventh-day Adventist Church history which was discussed in detail in the previous issue of WWN, the writer of ISSUES turns his attention primarily to history of the doctrinal teachings of the Church, and spirit in which they are to be discussed. Speaking of the era of our church history from 1863 to 1915, in regard to the proper "spirit," it is stated:

During this era it was the voice and pen of Ellen White that preserved the emphasis on the Christlike spirit as the significant factor in all aspects of church life. Without that spirit, it was not safe to discuss either the content of the faith or church structure. (p. 45; emphasis theirs)

While no one would deny the necessity for a Christlike spirit in all areas of human intercourse, it must also be remembered that when confronted with error, that Christ did not hesitate to tell the religious hierarchy of His day — "Ye are of your father the devil,...he...abode not in the truth." (John 8:44) To use "the Christlike spirit" as a facade to accommodate error is in itself a deception of the enemy. The righteousness of Christ which is our only hope of salvation is "pure, unadulterated truth." (TM, p. 65) To "earnestly contend for the faith" (Jude 3), which was committed in sacred trust to God's remnant people, does not mean that we develop a cozy doctrinal ecumenism under the guise of a "Christlike spirit."

In the balance of the discussion of the era from 1863 to 1915, and in the discussion of the period from 1915 to the present, three key doctrines are noted — Trinitarianism, the Incarnation, and the Doctrine of Character

Perfection. Comments are made on the authority of the various Statements of Belief published during the Church's history, as well as the authority of Ellen G. White. But the bottom line is the final paragraph of this chapter on "Historic Adventism" which reads:

The history of the church reveals that a brother or sister can choose to make a life-or-death issue of any point of faith or practice, no matter how small. When that happens, if all attempts at reasonable and Christlike conversation fail, **then their must be a parting of the ways.** The landmarks must be clear; there must be room for present truth. But the crucial decisions cannot be made by a segment of the church, however devout and intense their convictions. The church as a whole will decide. That is the true heritage of historic Adventism. (p. 51)

Two things mark this paragraph: 1) If the various "independent ministries" do not concede to the dictums of the Church, there is to be a parting of the ways. 2) That which Magan warned the delegates in 1903 in regard to the process by which the Papacy was established comes to fruition in ISSUES. It is the Church which shall be the final arbiter of truth, not the Word of God. This is not the heritage of historic Adventism.

However, in this paragraph is a statement of vital concern - "The landmarks must be clear; there must be room for present truth." The landmarks have been set, but how does "present truth" come to a people? Through the decree of the Church, or by the Spirit of truth? How is it to be checked to determine if it is truth - by the Church, or by the Word of God? This determination is critical for no church can grow spiritually without an advancement in truth. Herein, the "private" ministries named in ISSUES create deception for the concerned people of God. They are crying, stay with "historic Adventism" apparently unaware that in so doing they are putting a period to their Christian experience, whatever they may have. It is not "historic Adventism" that is needed, but a progressive Adventism built upon the basics given in the beginning. "We have **many** lessons to learn, and **many, many** to unlearn." But many of the "private" ministries will not "unlearn" so that they **can** "learn."

In this analysis of ISSUES, we shall note the doctrines introduced, the history of our Statements of Belief, and how these statements are interrelated to the continuing authority of Ellen White.

TRINITARIANISM

This doctrine is drawn into the discussion as a challenge to those who hold the basic concept of the Incarnation as taught by the Church until recent decades. If we have changed our thinking in regard to the Trinity, what is wrong if we now hold differing views from the pioneers on the nature that Christ assumed in the incarnation? There is no question but that many of our pioneer leaders were semi-Arian in belief, some were entirely Arian. This concept needed to be brought into line with the Scriptures, but the question is, Did the Church need to adopt the Trinitarian concept of the Church Councils - a concept reflected in the Constitution of the World Council of Churches and the basis of Roman Catholic doctrine? But the challenge of Trinitarianism is what the writer of ISSUES throws at those advocating "so-called historic Adventism." He wrote:

For those who would wish to define "historic Adventism" in terms of specific doctrinal content, the 1872 date [statement] presents a real dilemma. To accept what Adventists considered binding at that time would exclude any reference to the nature of Christ [?] or to a particular type of obedience. If one wishes, however, to claim additional content from that era and make that content binding in our day... the question is: Would one be willing to accept all the content from that earlier era? Are the modern defenders of so-called historic Adventism really prepared to return to a non-Trinitarian position? (p. 39; emphasis his)

First let us note what the 1872 Statement of Beliefs said in regard to the Godhead. Statement I declared "that there is one God, a personal, spiritual being, the creator of all things, omnipotent, omniscient, and eternal... and everywhere present by his representative, the Holy Spirit." Statement II read "that there is one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the Eternal Father, the one by whom God created all things." Here indeed is the recognition of "the Heavenly Trio." (Evangelism, p. 315)

The writer of ISSUES declares this 1872 Statement to be "remarkable" in that it is "non-Trinitarian." (p. 45) In a previous reference to the Statement, he points out that nowhere does it identify Jesus "as God or as eternal." He is simply the 'Son of the Eternal Father.'" But let it be also noted that this statement does not refer to Jesus as being a created Being. One of the co-authors of this 1872 statement, Uriah Smith, had in his first edition of Thoughts

on Revelation published in 1867 declared Christ to be "the first created being." (p. 59) He did not project his personal belief into the Statement. The Statement reflects the Pauline position as found in Ephesians 4:4-6. While the eternal pre-existence of Jesus Christ, and the fact that He was the I AM, as claimed, is set forth in the Bible, the formulation of a "Trinity" concept did not come until three centuries later. J. N. D. Kelly in his Early Christian Doctrines notes:

The doctrine of one God, the Father and creator, formed the background and indisputable premiss of the Church's faith. Inherited from Judaism, it was her bulwark against pagan polytheism, Gnostic emanationism and Marcionite dualism. The problem for theology was to integrate with it, intellectually, the fresh data of the specifically Christian revelation. ... Even at the New Testament stage ideas about Christ's pre-existence and creative role were beginning to take shape, and a profound, if often obscure, awareness of the activity of the Spirit in the Church was emerging. No steps had been taken so far, however, to work all these complex elements into a coherent whole. The Church had to wait for more than three hundred years for a final synthesis, **for not until the council of Constantinople (381) was the formula of one God existing in three co-eternal Persons formally ratified.** (p. 87-88; emphasis ours)

Herein lies the problem. It was not until 1980 when the 27 Fundamental Statements of Belief were voted that this formula of the Church Council of A.D. 381 appeared. Number 2 - The Trinity reads - "There is one God: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, a unity of three co-eternal Persons." The problem is complicated further by the fact that this Statement is found in the Constitution of the World Council of Churches, the confession of which is made a part of the basis for membership in that Babylonian body. (See So Much in Common, p. 40) The "issue" does not end here. The Faith and Order Commission of the WCC - on which there is Seventh-day Adventist representation - still holds as its objective the achievement of "the goal of visible unity in one faith and one eucharistic fellowship." To this end the Commission has prepared a study - "Towards the Common Expression of the Apostolic Faith Today - through which it is asking churches today to "celebrate in common...the same apostolic faith that was expressed in Holy Scriptures and summarized in the creeds of the early church."

Now note this: "For the study, the Faith and

Order Commission has chosen the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed of A.D. 381 - already officially recognized by many churches - as a summary of the apostolic faith." (One World, No. 132, p. 15) The Seventh-day Adventist Church recognized it in the 27 Statements of Fundamental Beliefs as voted in 1980!

THE INCARNATION

The author of ISSUES wrote emphatically that "all formal statements of belief - the 'unofficial' one of 1872, the first official one in 1931, and the one fully discussed and voted by a General Conference in session in 1980 - have specifically avoided defining the precise nature of Christ as either pre-Fall or post-Fall, the one point that seems so very crucial to the critical independent 'holiness' movements in Adventism." (p. 49)

This is a blatant falsehood. If the leadership of the North American Division, and the presidents of the various unions do not understand the English language, then they are in no position to lead the Seventh-day Adventist Church in an area where the English language dominates. The 1872 "unofficial" statement declared:

There is one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the Eternal Father. ... He took on him **the nature of the seed of Abraham for the redemption of our fallen race.**" (Emphasis ours)

This same position was repeated in the 1889-1914 Statement. The Battle Creek Church statement of 1894 read - "that He took on Him **the nature of man**, for the redemption of our fallen race. The 1931 voted statement declared that **"He took upon Himself the nature of the human family."** The question is simply - "What kind of nature did the human family possess, and what was "the nature of man" when Christ came to redeem "the fallen race"? It is obvious! And then, the Church never took an official position on the nature Christ assumed in the incarnation? Who is trying to deceive who?

CHARACTER PERFECTION

Besides the doctrine of the incarnation, the teaching of "perfection" is scored as not having a basis in historic Adventist teaching. The writer of ISSUES states, placing his remarks in emphasis - "Neither has the church ever 'formally' adopted a position on perfection and the precise nature of human obedience." (p. 47)

It is true, there is no statement on the subject of perfection as direct, or as clearly stated as on the doctrine of the incarnation. However, the author(s) of ISSUES seeks to cloud this teaching. Twice, a similar statement is made:

Early Adventists linked the sanctuary and judgment doctrines to the Sabbath, the keeping of the commandments, and the three angels' messages. (p. 47)

Among the early pioneers, the cleansing of the sanctuary itself was seen primarily as the means by which God focused the attention of the Advent believers on the Sabbath and the importance of God's holy law. (p. 49)

All one has to do is to read the statement of what constitutes "basic" Adventism - the landmarks (p. 36, col. 2), to know that "the cleansing of the sanctuary" headed the list, and was not related to the Sabbath or the Law of God, but focuses on the very experience which ISSUES now seeks to deny. That foundational teaching in "basic" Adventism reads - "The passing of time in 1844 ... [opened] to our astonished eyes the cleansing of the sanctuary transpiring in heaven, **and having a decided relation to God's people upon earth.**" This is the very heart of the teaching of perfection - the decided experience that the final intercession of our Great High Priest will have for the people of God on earth. The sin record of God's people cannot be wiped out in Heaven until God's people stop sinning here below, for to close human probation under such conditions would close them out. Herein lies the major controversy in Adventism today.

There has been a denial of the doctrine of the final atonement with the insistence that all was completed on the Cross. While lip service is still being given in some quarters to the prophecy of Daniel 8:14 and 1844, it comes across as only a doctrinal theory inasmuch as the perfection of God's people is denied. The message has been gutted with the denial of the reality of the final atonement.

On the other hand, the "private" ministries named in ISSUES refuse to "unlearn" certain traditional concepts which are without Biblical support, so that they could "learn" some truths God would have His people know. Neither will they avail themselves of the opportunity to study and discuss this most crucial issue in Adventism today. Thus as blind leaders of the blind they are heading for the "ditch." (Matt. 15:14) But tragically many sincere souls are going to be lost

because of that willing blindness.

STATEMENTS OF BELIEF

ISSUES comments on three Statements of Belief: 1) The 1872 Statement which it insists was "unofficial" (p. 39) and "nonbinding" (p. 45); 2) The 1931 Statement declared to be "the first official Adventist statement of Adventist beliefs" (p. 46); and 3) The 1980 27 Fundamentals voted at the Dallas session of the General Conference. However, there are other key statements of belief which have been formulated besides the three noted in ISSUES. The question raised focuses on the meaning of "official" and the intent of the Statements.

In 1946, the General Conference voted that a Statement of Beliefs, as well as the Church Manual, could only be revised at such a session. It was at that session and not before that the 1931 Statement was voted with certain cosmetic changes plus, for the first time, the addition of Ellen G. White's name in such a statement. The question remains, what then makes a statement "official."

ISSUES points out, and rightly so, that the Church did not design that these statements of belief be looked upon as a Creed which would tend to solidify the thinking of the Church doctrinally. All statements prior to the 1931 statement carried a preamble which stated in some form as did the 1872 Statement - "we wish to have it distinctly understood that we have no articles of faith, creed, or discipline, aside from the Bible." But still, the question remains, what makes a statement of beliefs - "official" - reflecting the basic positions held doctrinally?

Consider the 1872 Statement: It was first issued as a pamphlet from the Battle Creek Press. It was published as an editorial in the first issue of the Signs of the Times, July 4, 1874, by James White. The same year it appeared in the Review & Herald (Nov. 24), the official organ of the Church. It had various subsequent reprintings. While not a creed, it did express "with great unanimity," the beliefs held by the Church. How much more "official" does one require a statement to be?

Between 1872, and 1931 two statements appeared. In 1889, the year after the 1888 session, and continuing till 1914, the year prior to the death of Ellen G. White, a Statement of Beliefs, written by Uriah Smith was inserted into the Yearbooks of 1889, 1905, 1907-1914.

It should be noted that the Yearbook was not published every year during the period between 1889 and 1914, but General Conference Bulletins served as substitutions and did not contain a Statement of Beliefs. How "official" was this Statement? It was never challenged by Ellen G. White. How official was the Yearbook in which it appeared?

The first Yearbook resulted from an action of the General Conference Committee in December, 1882. When published, it contained "the statistics of our denomination, the proceedings of our General Conference, T. and M. [Tract and Missionary] Society, and other associations, the financial condition of our institutions, our General and State Conference constitutions, a good calendar, and full directories of all Conferences and various societies throughout the country." (SDA Encyclopedia, RV Edition, p. 1336) The Yearbook was an authoritative voice of the Church's position and standing.

Further, the Statement of Beliefs which was placed in this Yearbook had an altered preface which stated not only the fact that the Church had "no creed but the Bible," but also that "the following propositions may be taken as a summary of the principle features of their religious faith, upon which there is, so far as is known, **entire unanimity throughout the body.**" (1889, p. 147)

The other statement of beliefs was issued in 1894 by the Battle Creek Church, the headquarter's church as well as the largest church of the denomination, for inclusion in their Church Directory. Froom in his book, Movement of Destiny (p. 412) comments that "the 1,521 member Battle Creek church had taken the lead [in this Statement] in dropping the lingering contention that the Cross had nothing to do with the actual Atonement." This assertion can only be evaluated by a complete study of the Atonement concept in the history of Adventism. For the phrases, "the merits of His shed blood," and "the great atonement" in the Yearbook statement, the Battle Creek Church statement substituted, "the atoning merits of His blood," and "the final atonement."

In considering the 1931 Statement, which had no preamble, one must again take note of Froom's evaluation of this time period. He wrote, "the year 1931 stands out as a really momentous yet little-heralded transition point" in Adventism. (ibid., p. 409) Since 1914 no Statement of Beliefs had appeared in the Yearbook. The Statistical Secretary of the General Conference, H. E. Rogers, became concerned. Finally by

the action of the General Conference Committee on December 29, 1930, a committee was appointed by the chair "to prepare ... a statement for publication in the Year Book." According to Froom, the Statement was written by F. M. Wilcox, the editor of the Review, and with the approval of the appointed committee of four, it was passed on to H. E. Rogers who inserted it in the 1931 Yearbook. (ibid., pp. 410-415) The 1931 Statement was published "without any formal denominational adoption, ... and was by common consent, accepted without challenge." Is this what makes a "Statement of Beliefs" official?

This "first official Adventist statement of Adventist beliefs" according to ISSUES, used the word, "Trinity" for the first time in reference to the Godhead, a word not found in either the Scriptures or the Writings. Actually, apart from the use of the word, "Trinity," the statement varied little from previous statements on the Godhead. The omissions which ISSUES noted as being in the 1872 Statement (p. 39) making it "non-Trinitarian" are likewise omitted from this 1931 Statement. Jesus Christ is declared to be simply, "the Son of the Eternal Father." What is ISSUES trying to prove or introduce by their "sloppy" scholarship?

It was the 1946 General Conference session which finally voted the 1931 Statement as the official position of the Church. Two sentences were added at that time to Article 19. These read:

That the gift of the Spirit of prophecy is one of the identifying marks of the remnant church. They recognize that this gift was manifested in the life and ministry of Ellen G. White.

This is the first time that Ellen White's name was placed in a Statement of Beliefs. All previous statements had recognized the Biblical teaching of Spiritual Gifts, and had set them in their proper relationship to the Scriptures, declaring "that these gifts are not designed to supercede, or take the place of, the Bible, which is sufficient to make us wise unto salvation,..."

What ISSUES has to say about the current Statement of Beliefs as voted at Dallas, Texas, in 1980, is significant. It reads:

The 1980 statement is like the 1931 statement in that it is fully Trinitarian, but departs from both [all] earlier statements by describing Scripture as the "infallible revelation of His

will," rather than "the only infallible rule of faith and practice." (1872) or "the only unerring rule of faith and practices [sic]" (1931) **The deletion of the "only" from the 1980 statement reflects an attempt to preserve an authoritative role for the writings of Ellen White in Adventism.** Fortunately, from the standpoint of "historic Adventism," the "only" still appears in the preamble, even if it is absent from the explicit statement on Scripture. (p. 46)

This is simply "new theology" as much as the doctrine that the atonement was completed on the cross, or that there will be no cessation of sin prior to the second coming of Christ. It is not simply, the removal of the word, "only;" it is the added insertion in regard to the Writings, not found in any previous statement, which compounds the problem and contradicts the use of "only creed" in the preamble. Article 17 - The Gift of Prophecy - declares Ellen G. White's writings to be "a continuing and authoritative source of truth ..." This is setting up a third canon of Scripture. Why?

While ISSUES would have one believe that they are interested in preserving "an authoritative role for the writings of Ellen White in Adventism," they do not tell you that this is to preserve their authority as the "voice of God to the people." The last direct quotes from the Writings, as ISSUES finalizes the discussion of the period of Adventist Church history covering Ellen G. White's lifetime, has as its last sentence - "God has ordained that the representatives of His church from all parts of the earth, when assembled in a General Conference **shall have authority.**" (p. 44) This doctrinal authority is expressed in the 27 Fundamentals voted at Dallas in 1980.

But the irony of this "new theology" is that the "Private" ministries named in ISSUES likewise accept this "new theology" even carrying it to new lengths. The Standish brothers, with the full approval of Spear speculated in OFF, that in Heaven Ellen White would be seen as "a major prophet," writing - "The acceptance of the prophetic gift in the ministry of Sister White is essential not only to the preparation of God's people for the eternal kingdom, but also for the acceptance of the Scriptures as inspired." (April 1989, p. 15) Ellen White did not teach this. She stated that "in the Word of God is contained everything essential to the perfecting of the man of God." (ST, Jan. 30, 1893, article, "Benefits of Bible Study.") Further, I learned from my mother, before we had ever heard of a Seventh-day Adventist, that the Bible was the inspired

word of God. This blasphemous teaching carries the overtones of Roman Catholic doctrine: 1) the Roman Catholic Church determined what writings were inspired (The Faith of Millions, p. 142); and 2) there are two streams from Paradise (Catholic Belief, Di Bruno, p. 45).

This very point - this "new theology" - gives evidence as to who the people of God are **not**, for Ellen G. White has plainly written:

God will have a people upon the earth to maintain the Bible, and the Bible only, as the standard of all doctrines and basis of all reforms. (SP, IV, p. 413; GC, p. 595)

This does not mitigate nor mute the ministry of Ellen G. White as a "messenger of the Lord" as designated by Him. It must be kept in mind that Spiritual Gifts were not one of the landmarks of Adventism. The original statements of belief from 1872 to 1914 - the lifetime of Ellen G. White - placed them in their proper relationship to the Bible. This must be maintained by those who wish to follow in the light of basic Adventism.

(To Be Continued)

Lets Talk It Over - from page 1.

By "brethren of experience" this family meant, Standish and Spear. I didn't know whether to laugh at such a ludicrous suggestion, or cry at the deception of these devotees. A very perceptive friend, to whom I related this experience, commented that I should probably do both. This same attitude came through in the exchange of correspondence on the part of Spear in his reaction to the "ordination" carried out by Steps to Life. (See ISSUES, p. 194)

In the documentation supplied by the hierarchy relative to John Osborne is to be found a very enlightening "Confidential Memorandum" which had been sent to Spear. (ISSUES, p. 370) To the credit of the church's leadership, they included Osborne's reply to this Memorandum. (pp. 372-373) However, one must also carefully read and evaluate the letter written by Dennis McKeever. (pp. 392-395) The direct quotes are a real revelation of John Osborne. (p. 394, col. 1) One wonders how Dr. Ralph Larson feels now after having ordained Osborne, finds that "he was only used for credibility." (p. 370)

As various rumors kept coming through about activities at Prophecy Countdown, I believed the only honest thing to do was to talk to Osborne

himself. I dialed "HIS LOVE," but could not get further than a secretary and/or office manager. In answer to the first question about an allegation coming from the Florida Conference, the response was that they had not had time to evaluate the letter and could make no comment. When I asked about the "restaurant" incident, I was transferred to the office manager who stated that she had a prepared statement. I asked if she would send me a copy. The reply was a resounding, "No, not under any circumstances;" but she would read it to me. She did in a very measured manner permitting me to ask questions for clarification which I appreciated.

I next introduced a matter of which I had personal knowledge. It involved the purchase of a mailing list. The purchaser was given the assurance that it was current and up to date. We had helped underwrite this brother's outreach program, and helped him get the mailing out. The commercial mailer told me there were thousands of duplications in the list as he worked it through his computer equipment. I personally checked some of the names listed, and found my own daughter's name at an address she had some five years previously. This was only one of a number which I discovered. When I related this to the office manager, she said, "Just a moment." When she returned to the line, her comment was, "You are not talking to me as a Christian," and "HIS LOVE" evaporated in a click of the receiver.

This is not the only incident of deception and lying of which I am personally familiar. I can understand why the Hartland Administrative committee asked Osborne to take a polygraph test as related in the documentation found in ISSUES. (p. 394)

The issue comes down to a bottom line. What is a sincere, concerned, professing Seventh-day Adventist to do? There is only one answer - know for one's self from the Bible, what is truth, and walk in that light, claiming the precious promise - "If we walk in the light as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth us from all sin." (I John 1:7) When this is done, then each one having such an experience will find that ministry in which they can fellowship and through which they can work in fulfilling the prayer of Christ in John 17:21 - "that they all may be one; as Thou, Father, are in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent Me."

whg

"It is twice as hard to crush a half-truth as a whole lie." - Austin O'Malley

TOO MUCH OF A GOOD THING

Nutritionists used to staunchly defend fat's role in the diet, saying that fat provides a fatty acid (linoleic acid) that the body can't make by itself, that it provides fat-soluble vitamins (A, D, E, and K), and induces satiety (a full feeling). That argument may have been appropriate for subsistence-level societies, but not for well-fed Americans, who are never more than a Big Mac away from satisfaction. No one we've ever heard of suffers from nutritional deficiencies because he or she eats too little fat.

On the other hand, plenty of people suffer from eating too much fat and cholesterol. Saturated fat promotes heart and cardiovascular diseases, as does the fatlike substance, cholesterol. High-fat diets contribute to obesity and are implicated in colon and breast cancer. It is ironic that after centuries of fighting starvation, much of humankind is suffering from the ravages of food excess.

Fat supplies calories in more concentrate form than protein or carbohydrate. Ounce for ounce, fat has more than twice the calories of protein or carbohydrate. These concentrate calories are vital for infants and toddlers but they cause problems for many of the rest of us.

Face the Fats, p.

"Eat that which is good, and let your soul delight itself in fatness." - Isa. 55:2

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

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

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

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

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

Our 800 Number is - 800-4-LAYMEN or
800-452-9636

#