

*"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 (Moffau)



**UNITED STATES
CONSECRATED
TO IMMACULATE
HEART OF MARY
AT FATIMA**

**ROMAN CATHOLIC PRIEST ACTED ON
DIRECT REQUEST FROM PRESIDENT
REAGAN IN 1985!**

Near Fatima, Portugal, at a spot called Cova da Iria on May 13, 1917, three peasant children, a brother, sister, and cousin reported that the "virgin Mary" appeared to them telling them that she had an important message for all nations, and all men and women. She informed them that after coming on the 13th of each succeeding month, she would come on October 13, and by the power of God perform a miracle to confirm the validity and importance of her message. Not only was the day and month specified, but the very hour was given - "midday."

News of this prophesied appearance was sufficiently spread so that on October 13, 1917, a large crowd of people gathered at the spot. The night of October 12, torrential rains covered the area of Fatima, and a driving rain beneath a cloudbound sky continued on the morning of the 13th. The group that gathered at Cova da Iria stood in several inches of water. At noon, the voice of Lucia, one of the three children, commanded, "Look up at the sun!" The rain suddenly stopped, the clouds broke asunder, and the sun appeared. The sun was not the unbearably bright sun at which you cannot stare lest you damage your eyes. It was rather a fast-spinning pinwheel turning on its own axis casting off beams of colored lights. It maneuvered among the clouds as if in a dance, and then without warning plunged earthward causing fear and panic among the watchers. Its heat was felt as it neared the earth. When the fear of the people reached its peak, the sun ascended back into the sky, and appeared as the normal sun at midday, but the ground was dry and

dusty. The heavy rain soaked clothes of the people were also dry, light and warm.

On May 13, 1981, the day that sixty-four years before, the three children at Fatima had received their first visit from "Mary," an attempt was made on the life of John Paul II. August of that year the Pope was convalescing in Policlínico. He was thoroughly convinced that "Mary," the Lady of Fatima, had intervened and saved him from death. He fell into a mode of prayer to "Mary," and in this mood of total trust in Mary, he had his only known supernatural vision of things to come. What those on-the-spot saw at Fatima in 1917, John Paul "saw in the luminous skies of Latio above the Seven Hills of Rome."

Into this picture - the appearance of "Mary" at Fatima in 1917, and John Paul II's worship of Mary - must be injected the three messages which "Mary" supposedly gave the children. The first two are well known. The first message was general in nature indicating that the whole of society was in a path of sin, and multitudes were heading for eternal punishment in Hell. The second predicted the outbreak of World War II, and called on the Pope and bishops of the Roman Church to consecrate Russia to her. She warned, that if not so done, Russia would spread evil and error throughout the world which would cost many lives. The third message was kept as an official Vatican secret. In 1944, it was written out by the sole survivor of the trio, now a Carmelite nun, sealed in an envelope, and was not supposed to be opened until 1960. It was put in a box and placed on the mantelpiece in the Pope's private apartment to be opened by the reigning pope in 1960.

The pope in 1960 was John XXIII. He considered it irrelevant to his pontificate. Paul VI declined to do anything about it. At first, John Paul II took the same attitude. By this time in 1978, the nature of the third Fatima message was known: 1) a physical chastisement upon the nations, 2) a spiritual chastisement on the Roman Church which would consist of a breakdown of rigid Catholic faith and practice, and 3) a reiteration of the call for Russia to be consecrated to Mary. The chastisement on the nations was because of the wickedness and abandonment of God's laws. But the process could be averted if the reigning pope in 1960 would publish the text and consecrate Russia to Mary. John XXIII did neither even though at the Vatican II Council he had a ready made opportunity to do so. However, resulting from the vision while he was convalescing in 1981, John Paul II decided to move in regard to the third message.

"On March 25, 1984, the world's bishops joined Pope John Paul II, and at his request in a collegial consecration" of Russia, called for "the Virgin Mary's help in combating a host of contemporary threats to human life, ranging from nuclear war to 'sins against life from its very beginning.' [abortion]" (Eastern Oklahoma Catholic, Sept. 8, 1991, p. 15) In 1985, Robert J. Cox, founder of the Fatima Family Apostolate, at the request of former President Ronald Reagan went to Fatima, Portugal, "and there consecrated the United States to the Immaculate Heart of Mary." (ibid.) Today a letter is on display at Cox's parish, St. Mary of Mercy, in Alexandria, SD, from President Reagan verifying this requested consecration.

The same month that the Pope and bishops of the Roman Church consecrated Russia to Mary, Mikhail Gorbachev became second in command in the Soviet government. The next year, he became top Soviet leader. While Cox acknowledges that Gorbachev's economic and government restructuring policies "opened the doors" to the fall of communism, he believes that the main reason for the change is that the Russian leader was "'used by the Blessed Mother to fulfill her promise that eventually after much sorrow and persecution' Russia would be converted and world peace would begin." (ibid.; emphasis supplied)

Gorbachev has himself responded describing his own relationship to the Vatican which preceded the present upheaval in Europe. In a column prepared for Western newspapers, he wrote:

I have carried on an intensive correspondence with Pope John Paul II since we met at the Vatican in December, 1989. And I think ours will be an ongoing dialogue. ...

I cannot help but say that we share a desire to move forward and complete what we began together. ...

It is very difficult to describe the relationship which took shape between the Pope and myself because the **intuitive personal element** is always of great importance in such relationships. Simply put, when I was with him, I realized that the Pope had also played a role in what we came to call the **new political thinking**. ...

What I have always held in high esteem about the Pope's thinking and ideas is their spiritual content, **their striving to foster the development of a new world civilization.** (The Toronto Star, March 9, 1992, p. A1)

This article which he had written, Gorbachev asked La Stampa to deliver the text personally

to the Pope "as a token of [his] esteem and as a measure of [his] friendship." He appended his signature at the bottom of the article. The Pope responded to the Press giving his reaction to Gorbachev's comments. He indicated that this article confirms what he had always perceived Gorbachev to be, "a man of integrity." The Pope picked up on the assessment of their relationship as having "the intuitive, personal element." He said, "It is true; there was something instinctive between us, as if we have already known each other. And I know why that was, **our meeting was prepared by Providence.**" This he re-emphasized by adding, concerning Gorbachev:

He does not profess to be a believer, but with me I recall he spoke of the great importance of prayer and of the inner side of man's life. I truly believe that our meeting was prepared by Providence.

The Pope continued his remarks by noting that "perestroika" has as one of its meanings, "conversion." He stressed that the "upheaval which took place and is in progress" has "a spiritual element - an inner change." (*ibid.*, in a special to The Star, p. A4)

There can be no question but there is a spiritual element in all that has and is taking place. Those walking in the light proceeding from the Throne of God can see clearly via the light of prophecy, the working of "the spirits of devils" as they go forth to gather the nations and the leaders of earth to the final confrontation with God Almighty. Ever since John XXIII first opened the envelope in 1960, the cardinal principle of Vatican foreign policy has been to "foment devotion to Mary as Our Lady of Fatima." (Keys of This Blood, p. 633) The apparition at Fatima has been viewed in the light of Revelation 12 - a "Woman Clothed with the Sun, and giving birth to a Son who will rule the Nations with a scepter of iron." (*ibid.*, p. 48)

Since the Pope believed that his life had been preserved because of Mary, and on the very day of the feast of Our Lady of Fatima, he perceived himself in a "divine" role of dealing with Russia as indicated in the messages given to the children at Fatima. Time magazine has reported that in the first meeting between himself and President Reagan in 1982, the two agreed to what has been called, "The Holy Alliance." (Feb. 24, 1992) Richard Allen, Reagan's first National Security Advisor, declared of the Alliance - "This was one of the great secret alliances of all time." The report in Time indicates that "The key [Reagan]

Administration players were all devout Roman Catholics." (p. 31) The article clearly indicates that the American Foreign Policy during the Reagan years was directed by Rome through high placed Roman Catholics devoted as much to the Vatican as to the interests of the United States.

Following the release in Time magazine, the Vatican and the Pope went on record denying any "anti-communist plotting." (Eastern Oklahoma Catholic, March 8, 1992, p. 1) They tried to cover themselves with the use of such words as "formal understanding" and the "whole conception (of the article) **seems** mistaken." The problem is that the journalist, Carl Bernstein, has an excellent "track record." He with fellow Washington Post reporter, Bob Woodward, broke the Watergate story.

The emphasis by Rome that "the world will recognize in due time that the defeat of communism came at the intercession of the Mother of Jesus" (Time, Dec. 30, 1991), dare not be overlooked. The sainted doctor of the Roman Church, Alphonsus Maria deLigouri, in his work, The Glories of Mary, wrote:

All graces are dispensed by Mary, and all who are saved are saved only by the means of this Divine Mother, [therefore] it is a necessary consequence that the salvation of all depends upon preaching Mary, and exciting all to confidence in her intercession. It is well known that it was thus that St. Bernadine of Sienna sanctified Italy, and that St. Dominic converted so many provinces. (p. 8)

Even as in 1854, the promulgation of the Dogma of the Immaculate Conception set the stage for the doctrine of the incarnation to be a key issue in the final struggle between truth and error, so with the Dogma of the Bodily Assumption of Mary into Heaven, promulgated in 1950, has set the stage for the final deception to be accomplished through Spiritism. The parallels of historical events starting in and around 1950 cannot be overlooked with impunity. The World Council of Churches was placed in operation in 1948. The Jewish State of Israel was formed the same year, and events in the history of Jerusalem since 1948 have served as warning signals as to the import of what we are now seeing happen on the world scene. The call for denominational repentance to the Adventist Church was made in 1950. The sad history that has followed in its rejection can be viewed in the deliberate intertwining of its fortunes with the Evangelicals, the WCC, Roman Catholicism, and Spiritism. It

has deprived the Church of that uniqueness which God designed should characterize the sacred trust committed to the Church in the giving of the Three Angels' Messages. (9T:19)

To make the most of the changes taking place in Europe, John Paul II convened a synod of Catholic bishops on Europe from November 28 to December 14, 1991. To this synod were invited "fraternal delegates" from other major religions on the Continent. While assessments may vary, "no matter how one judges the gathering, there was a strong sense that it came at the kairos moment for Europe." (One World, March, 1992, p. 6) This synod was brought together to formulate an evangelistic thrust for all of Europe. Here is where the first problem arose. A number of Eastern Orthodox Churches declined the invitation to be present. The patriarch of the Russian Orthodox Church indicated that to attend "would give a misleading impressions of actual relations between Moscow and Rome." (ibid.) This evaluation may well point up the fact that even though both Gorbachev and Yeltsin have invited the Pope to visit Moscow, John Paul's response was - "There is still work to be done on this trip before it can take place." (The Toronto Star, op. cit.)

Another factor which surfaced in the "New Evangelism" theme of the synod was the fact "there are now 20 million Muslims on the continent" of Europe. This is also a factor which has now entered the pluralistic nature of the United States, and was not present 100 years ago when some outlines of end-time events were drawn up. However, in the light of the thrust of Mariolatry, it is noted that the Koran praises the faith and chastity of Mary.

The synod of Catholic bishops issued a final declaration which stated that "those who wish to participate as Christians in building a new Europe should know the social doctrines of the [Roman] church, including the tenet that the church, though it favors a 'correctly understood' democracy, can never be linked to a particular political system." (One World, op. cit., p. 7)

One speaker summarized the enclave well when he said:

Europe has been renewed through the intercession of our Lady. The new Europe is being reborn by God's hand through the heart of Mary. That is what brings us together here. (ibid., p. 8)

To put the whole picture into proper perspective one must review certain events which preceded the present unleashing of the power of

Spiritism in the form of Mariolatry. First, there was the visit of John Paul II to the United States, and his reception in the White House by then President Jimmy Carter. RNS reporting the significance of this event, noted that this "was the first time, not only that a pope visited the White House, but the first time any pope called on a government leader anywhere." (Oct. 8, 1979, p. 1) Time magazine caught the significance of the event in a photograph of the two leaders in a "handclasp" on the North Lawn of the White House. Over the photo was the caption - "In brilliant sunlight on the North Lawn, a President welcomes a Pope to the White House for the first time." (Oct. 15, 1979, p. 14) [See The Hour and the End, Exhibit #6] Carter's remarks to the Pontiff were - "I welcome you to the White House the symbolic home of all our people. On behalf of every American of every faith I also welcome you into the nation's heart." (RNS, op. cit.) At this public welcome were dignitaries from Congress, the Cabinet, the judiciary and other public arenas - a veritable ranking of "the rulers of the land... on the side of the man of sin." A reception followed, at the conclusion of which, "the pope surprised the audience by saying, 'the pope wants to bless you -- with the permission of the president of the United States.'" (RNS, ibid.)

In 1980, Reagan was elected to succeed Carter in the White House. Time magazine reports that Reagan set as one of his earliest goals as president the recognition of "the Vatican as a state" and to "make them an ally." (Feb. 24, 1992, p. 31) The attainment of this goal, and how it was accomplished with an assist from Billy Graham is now a matter of history. The present unfolding of the secret activities and actions of the Reagan Administration only confirm the significance of what has taken place.

Into this series of events, God registered His judgment on them by permitting a prophecy of Jesus to reach its complete fulfillment. Jesus had declared on the Mount of Olives, during the last week of His earthly life - "Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the nations, until the times of the nations be fulfilled. (Luke 21:24; "Gentiles" and "nations" same word in the Greek) On July 30, 1980, the Knesset of Israel confirmed the position that "Jerusalem united in its entirety is the capital of Israel." Jerusalem, instead of Tel Aviv, became "the seat of the President of the State, the Knesset, the Government and the Supreme Court." The

"AnchorPoints" - II

Editor's Note: It was not our intention to comment on each "AnchorPoint" developed in the Adventist Review when we noted the heresy in the first article by Dr. Johnsson. It is still not our intention to do so. However, when two articles, one following the other, discuss the two main doctrines of Adventism which were compromised in the SDA-Evangelical Conferences, and discuss them in harmony with that compromised position, we have no alternative but to alert sincerely concerned members of the Adventist Community.

A common approach marks the first two discussions of "AnchorPoints." Both are discussed behind a facade of being Christ-centered, and in theory, they are. The first article by Dr. Johnsson was captioned - "Jesus - Center of All Our Hopes." The second is titled, "Heaven on Our Side" by Martin Weber, an associate editor of Ministry. But herein is the first danger. To fail to present Christ as He is set forth in the Bible, is to present a false Christ. Our doctrine of Christ determines the Christ in whom we believe, the One in whom we place our hope.

The second "Anchor-Point" article is discussing the "Pre-Advent Judgment." Along with the article is published #23 of the 27 Fundamental Beliefs of the SDA Church. (AR, March 26, 1992, p. 9) This fundamental belief does read in part concerning "the Pre-Advent Judgment" -

In 1844, at the end of the prophetic period of 2300 days, [Jesus] entered the second and last phase of His atoning ministry. It is a work of investigative judgment which is a part of the ultimate disposition of sin, typified by the cleansing of the ancient Hebrew sanctuary on the Day of Atonement."

This means that the typical services of the Day of Atonement as described in Leviticus 16 tell what is taking place today in the presence of God, and what must be our attitude here on earth toward that ministry. But nowhere in the entire article by Weber is Leviticus 16 discussed or even mentioned. How can a true perspective of the "pre-Advent Judgment" be given and the typical service of the Day of Atonement be omitted? The answer is frankly, they cannot!

There are certain challenges in the article which are worthy of notice. Weber admits that if "the sanctuary and the judgment" are done away with, the "Biblical mandate" for the Church's existence is undermined. This is true. But the undermining can be accomplished in different ways - outright denial, or omission of key factors as Weber has done.

Weber points out - and correctly - that "few Adventists are able to defend this doctrine from the Bible alone." He writes:

"When confronted with honest, probing questions about 1844, they quickly drop their Bibles and resort to the writings of Ellen G. White.

"Thank God for the prophetic gift given to our church. But let's not abuse it. If we take our prophet seriously, we will accept her admonition to make the Bible our only rule of faith and doctrine. Everything we present as testing truth must be provable from the Scriptures. Otherwise, we make ourselves seem like a nonbiblical cult."

Herein, Martin Weber has made a valid and tragic observation. This tragedy is compounded by the fact that this cultic mentality is displayed by most of the "voices" involved in the "independent ministries." Leaders of these ministries - Spear, Standish, Grosboll and Ferrell - are unable to meet the challenge of Ford to the doctrine of the pre-Advent Judgment by the Bible alone. This ought not to be.

Another vital point raised by Weber put in proper perspective the record of "sins" in the sanctuary. Although he did not allude directly to the daily services, wherein the sinner made confession and placed his whole dependence upon the "substitute," he did note that it is this record of forgiveness, finger printed on the horns of the altars of the sanctuary in the type, which is kept by God. [The "altars" of Jer. 17:1 were Judah's altars of idol worship, and thus by sacrificing on them, they engraved their sins. See verse 2. The application of this verse to the sanctuary was a Brinsmead error]

It is on this note of forgiveness alone that the article by Weber ends. But the Day of Atonement in type was more than the forgiveness resulting from the atonement of the daily services, it was a mediation that brought cleansing. While the High Priest alone affected the cleansing, the worshipers were commanded to "afflict" their souls. (Lev. 23:27) If they did not, they were cut off from among the people - they were lost! (23:29) While the final atonement is not based on our "character attainments" - we have no power to cleanse ourselves - the intercession of Jesus based on His merits, gives to the one who afflicts his soul, victory over the "evil one." (Rev. 12:11)

It is not the "cheap grace" nor a false "assurance" wherein we rest because of a

misapplication of the "passover" experience, but we are rather to trust in the mediation of Christ in the Most Holy Place of the Heavenly Sanctuary with its results for and in us. It, too, is grace, a cleansing grace, rather than a forgiving grace - a grace that realizes in each afflicted soul, righteousness and holiness. (Rev. 22:11)

"Divine grace is needed at the beginning, divine grace at each step of advance, and divine grace **alone** can complete the work." (TM, p. 508) But unless there is advance, there is no work to be completed. If we wait until "Christ comes in the clouds of heaven" for the realization of the work of the Final Atonement, as is suggested by Martin Weber, we will have waited too long. So again in the second "AnchorPoint" article, the original faith committed in the sacred trust has been betrayed.

‡

THE DOCTRINE OF GOD

PART TWO

Our Bibles open with the words, "In the beginning God ..." The word, God, is in the plural form, Elohim. The use of the plural in referring to God is called by Hebrew linguists - "a plural of majesty," or "the majestic plural." This is taken by some to mean that the word, Elohim, when used of God is not intended as a true plural. The fact is noted that this plural noun is consistently used with singular verb forms and with adjectives and pronouns in the singular. However, this hardly holds for the use of Elohim in the rest of Genesis 1 "where... the necessity of a term conveying both the unity of the one God and yet allowing for a plurality of persons is found." (Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament, Vol. I, p. 44) When the design for man was revealed, it was the Elohim who said, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness." (1:26) Further, the plural form, elohim, occurs only in Hebrew, and in no other Semitic language which languages express Pagan cultures. (ibid.) This makes the revelation of God in Genesis unique.

Of interest is the fact that one man represented the "image" and "likeness" of the Elohim. Again, when sin entered, the text reads - "And said Jehovah God (Elohim), Behold the man has become as one of us." (3:22)

The Shema of Israel reads - "Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God is one Lord: and thou shalt

love the Lord thy God with all thine heart..." (Deut. 6:4-5) A translation designating the singular and plural would read - "Hear, O Israel, Jehovah (singular), our Gods (plural) [is] One Jehovah (singular). You shall love Jehovah (singular) your God (plural) with all your heart..." What is the force of **ONE** (echad) Jehovah? When a strictly singular sense is emphasized, the word is yachid as in Genesis 22:2 - "Take now thy son, thine only son, Isaac." Echad on the other hand as used in Genesis 2:24 - "and they shall be one flesh" - conveys the sense of oneness in duality.

In Isaiah, we read:

Thus saith the Lord the King of Israel, and his redeemer the Lord of hosts: I am the first, and the last, and beside me there is no God (Elohim) (44:6)

This duality is carried forward into the New Testament. In the book of Revelation, this concept found in Isaiah is attributed to both the Almighty and Jesus Christ. (1:8; 22:13)

Zechariah in his Messianic description of "The BRANCH" quotes "the Lord of hosts" as saying that "the counsel of peace" was between "the Two of Them." (6:13, Heb) This raises the question as to the relationship existing between the Elohim.

In the announcement of the birth of Jesus, it was stated by the angel Gabriel that "God shall give unto Him the throne of His father David." (Luke 1:32) David was promised that to his son who was to build the temple, God would be "his father" and that he would be his "son." (II Sam. 7:14) Likewise, "the Man whose name is 'The BRANCH,' who was to build "the temple of the Lord," and who was to "be a priest upon His throne" (Zech. 6:12-13), that Man whom "the Lord of hosts" designates as "my fellow" (13:7) is the One to whom God said, "Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten Thee;" and "I will be to Him a Father, and He shall be to Me a Son." (Heb. 1:5-6) This was by decree. (Ps. 2:7)

In the Messianic promise which declares that "unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given," is defined the eternal association of the Two between Whom was the "counsel of peace." The Child, the Son, was "the Father of eternity" ('abi-'ad) Isa. 9:6. Jesus in His conflict with the Jews defined Himself as the I AM - the self-existent One, I am; the ever-existent One, I AM. (John 8:58)

To Be Continued

LET'S TALK IT OVER

Martin Weber in his article on the Pre-Advent Judgment speaks of the "1844 Judgment" as having become "a scorching hot potato in some circles of the Adventist Church." (AR, March 26, 1992, p. 8) There is no question, the sanctuary teaching has caused a fissure to develop in the Adventist Church. Some have concurred in Barnhouse's assessment of the doctrine as "stale, flat, and unprofitable!" Notable among those denying the sanctuary truth has been Ford who though still a member of the Church has been defrocked. Even a few of the "many voices" on the periphery of Adventism reject the teaching, for examples, Dr. James Wang and Charles Wheeling.

Admittedly, there are questions. For now almost 150 years we have been teaching that the omniscient God has meticulously gone over the records of the dead to determine who will be saved and who will be lost. Have not the angels kept accurate records? Has God been unable to create a "computer" which would close each day's record with the current balance on each life? Does the commitment of Jesus to the confessing thief need to be reviewed in the judgment? Do these questions call for the abandonment of the sanctuary teaching which is a major stone in the foundation of the sacred trust committed to the Seventh-day Adventist Church? Absolutely not! What is the solution?

Our spiritual forefathers when confronted with the Great Disappointment of 1844, and perceiving the light from the Throne of God, did not deny, nor abandon all for which William Miller stood. Rather, they corrected that which was error - that the sanctuary was this earth - and kept that which was truth. This is the same attitude which should mark the study of the sanctuary truth today. In other words, we need to clean up our doctrine without denying its basic Biblical tenets. We need to face up to Leviticus 16 with some deeper study without ignoring it as Weber did. We need to get our heads out of the sand and make some hard decisions which the leading "voices" on the periphery refuse to do. Instead of making the structure and furniture of the earthly type the "hobby horse" of our study, we need to take seriously what the book of Hebrews states - the priests "served unto the example and shadow of heavenly things." (Heb. 8:5) This requires a perceptive in-depth review of the daily and yearly services as outlined in Leviticus, chapters four and sixteen.

whg

Mary - from page 4, col. 2

"times of the nations" was fulfilled. If the fulfillment of this prophecy means anything, it means that God has removed His restraint and guidance over the nations, and Satan has now full liberty to work his will. The Bible is clear as to what that will is - the gathering of the nations and their leaders to the battle of the great day of God Almighty. (Rev. 16:14)

Tragically, too many of God's professed people are still envisioning the present in the light of how the final events would have taken place 100 years ago had the Church responded differently to its "Kadesh-barnea" than ancient Israel did. Now over a decade from God's warning "signal" (R&H, Feb. 11, 1896), with the results of the working of Satan breaking upon us as an overwhelming surprise, we still continue in our Laodicean blindness. How much longer will it take us to see that the woman of Revelation 17 is now portraying herself as "the woman clothed in the sun"? God in prophecy tells us one thing; Satan through the "virgin Mary" is telling us another thing. Soon, very soon, "she" will introduce her "son" to the world. Only those heeding "the sure word of prophecy" found in the Bible will be safe. (II Peter 1:19)

‡

1992 ANNUAL FELLOWSHIP

August 2 - 8 on Campus

Seminar Study - Revelation 12 - 22

+++++

Our "800" number - 1-800-452-9636 - is also available to our Canadian readers.

+++++

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

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

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

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

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

+++++