



"Watchman, what of the night?"

The watchman said, The morning cometh, and also the night: if ye will enquire, enquire ye: return, come. Isaiah 21:11-12

DO WE HAVE A THIRD CANON OF SCRIPTURE?

The present controversy within the Church regarding the basic sanctuary doctrine has caused the above question to become very real, and its solution will be very painful, far more acute than its diagnosis. While the controversy has swirled around the head of Dr. Desmond Ford, and he has taken the official "rap" for what he said at the Association of Adventist Forum meeting on the Pacific Union College campus, October 27, 1979, a less charismatic figure, Dr. Raymond Cottrell, whose denominational roots extend through several generations of recognized ministers in the Church, has with the same issue - the basic sanctuary teaching - focused attention on the question as to the canonicity of Ellen G. White. Even the most pronounced devotees of the Ellenology which has developed in the Church cringe at the thought of a Third Testament. But when we quote and give to the writings of Ellen G. White the same authority we give to the Bible, we are in essence stating that we do have a third canon of Scripture.

There is also another factor which needs to be recognized in considering the application of the principle of *sola Scriptura*. We have a prime example in the history and present experience of Brinsmead. While Brinsmead during his Decade-I teachings used the Spirit of Prophecy as a canon of Scripture, he is now using the writings of Luther with the same force and authority. In other words, we want someone to whom we can appeal apart from the Bible, to sustain our conclusions, and to clothe these conclusions in a robe of authority, while in reality the Bible itself is sufficient authority. If what we set forth to be truth cannot be sustained by the word of God, then no statement from Luther can make it truth. Well did Paul write: "Therefore thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest: for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest doest the same things." (Rom. 2:1)

Recently there has been published a series of fourteen volumes on the "Makers of the Modern Theological Mind," which includes a brief life sketch and thinking of such men as Barth, Brunner, Bonhoeffer, Bultmann, Neibuhr, von Rad, and others. Thus the group of men we call the theologians of the Church have their own *extra-Scriptura* to which they pay homage, and quote as authority. This is aptly illustrated in an article appearing in *Evangelica* (Dec., 1980). A student from the SDA Theological Seminary wrote on "The Gospel in Hebrews." To shore up a very weak and questionable position, he placed in parentheses - "Westcott's noted commentary argues cogently on this point." (p. 9)

There is only one authority, and that is the Lord Jesus Christ. Through "the scripture of truth" (Dan. 10:21) He not only communicates the principles of holy living

but also through which He reveals the will and purpose of God as set forth in prophecy by the use of symbols and imagery; and the Divine plan of salvation by means of type and shadows which find their reality in the incarnation, death, and priestly ministry of Him who is that living Truth. This should be our study and authority. And this was the authority upon which the Advent Movement was founded, and to which God attested through the means of a "spiritual gift," not another canon of Scripture!

The crisis over the Spirit of Prophecy did not come to the fore because of the research of Elder Walter Rea indicating that Ellen G. White practiced "literary borrowing" to express truth which she believed the Lord gave to her. The hard core reality came when Dr. Raymond Cottrell, after presenting his research on Daniel 8:14, indicated that there was no way to maintain the validity of the Adventist sanctuary teaching except to base it on the inspiration of Ellen G. White. He suggested that as the New Testament writers reinterpreted the Old Testament, even so we have in the writings of the Spirit of Prophecy a reinter-pretation of both the Old and New Testaments. Here are his own words:

The eschatology of Daniel is consonant with all other Old Testament eschatology, particularly that of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Zechariah. A study of Old Testament eschatology as a whole clarifies, and is essential to, an understanding of Daniel's eschatology. We must realize, however, that Israel's withdrawal from the covenant relationship at the cross rendered the fulfillment of the eschatological predictions of Daniel moot, and that - like everything else related to God's covenant with Israel - reinterpretation by a later writer was necessary to reactivate the predictions and to ascertain their fulfillment within the new historical setting with the church as the covenant people and chosen instrument of the divine purpose. For example, Christ and the New Testament writers envisioned His return and the fulfillment of the eschatological predictions of Daniel within their own generation. Also, Christ, Paul, and John provide reinterpretation of Daniel for New Testament times, and Ellen White provides a continuing reinterpretation appropriate for our time. (Spectrum, Vol. 10, #4, p. 20)

{Lest I be identified with the teachings set forth above by Cottrell, and lest the reader become confused with his assertions, I must interject at this point the following explanation: Cottrell in the above quotes is arriving at his theological conclusions based on an hermeneutic (an interpretation of Scripture) foreign to historic Adventist thought, and thus to sustain the resultant heretical conclusions, he introduces the idea that we must consider the writing of Ellen G. White as a new interpretation of Scripture, hence a third canon. This method of interpretation known, ironically, as "the historical method" was first used in a major Adventist work when the Bible Commentary series were published in the 1950's with Cottrell as one of its editors. We shall discuss the import of this in another section of this paper.}

A quick survey of our Statements of Belief on the subject of "The Spirit of Prophecy" (WVN - XIII-10, p. 3) reveals that not until the General Conference Session of 1950, when the 1931 Statement was formally ratified did the name of Ellen G. White appear as the one through whom the gift of prophecy was manifested in the Church. In fact it did not originally appear in the 1931 Statement but was added

at that Session. While the reason for this is perhaps a different matter, the fact that it had not occurred before is saying something. Our spiritual forefathers did not consider the writings of Ellen G. White as a third canon of Scripture, but a manifestation of "Spiritual Gifts." They did not seek to limit God to one gift, nor the manifestation of that one gift to just one person.

In a discourse which Ellen G. White gave at Battle Creek, October 2, 1904, she stated - "I do not claim to be a prophetess." As a result some stumbled over this statement, and asked, "Why is this?" To their question she replied: -

I have had no claims to make, only that I am instructed that I am the Lord's messenger; that He called me in my youth to be His messenger, to receive His word, and to give a clear and decided message in the name of the Lord Jesus. (SM, bk. i, p. 32. Emphasis theirs.)

In the light of this we dare not forget that when the Message of 1888 was given to this Church, Ellen G. White referred to these men as "His messengers," (TM, p. 95) and that the message which they bore was "sent" by the Lord in His great mercy. (ibid., p. 91) She as the Lord's messenger stood with these who were also "His" messengers. This fact dare not be overlooked.

The events of 1950, and the official action taken prepared the way for the stand adopted at Dallas in 1980 which established the E. G. White writings as "a continuing and authoritative source of truth." (WWN, XIII-10, p. 4, 1980 Voted) We are now on record in such a way that there exists little difference between our understanding and use of the Spirit of Prophecy, and the use made by the Mormons of Joseph Smith, or the Christian Scientists of Mary Baker Eddy. In other words is "the source of truth" the Bible and the Bible only, or is it "the Bible and something else"? To the Mormons, it is the Bible plus Joseph Smith; to the Christian Scientists, it is the Bible plus Mary Baker Eddy; and to the Seventh-day Adventist it is the Bible ---- you must finish the sentence as it relates to your own thinking, and in your answer you categorize yourself. As W. W. Prescott wrote - "It is one thing to accept and repeat as a formula the familiar words, 'The Bible, the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants,' but it is another thing to apply this principle in practice." (R&H, Dec. 16, 1909, p. 4)

What is the solution? Back to the Bible with a clear understanding of the doctrine of "Spiritual Gifts" as taught there. Our founding fathers who first formulated our Statement of Beliefs stated clearly "that those who deny to the Spirit its place and operation do plainly deny that part of the Bible which assigns to it this work and position." (WWN, XIII-10, p. 3, 89 Yearbook) Part of the work of the Holy Spirit was to divide the gifts God provided "to each man, just as He determines." (I Cor. 12:11 NIV) And the operation of that "gift" is also to be as the Spirit determines. The Spirit gives and the Spirit controls.

There is to be in the Church, spiritual gifts, among which is the gift of prophecy. The relationship between these gifts and the Bible is also clearly distinguished in our original Statement of Beliefs. The formulators wrote - "These gifts are not designed to supercede, or to take the place of, the Bible, which is sufficient to make us wise unto salvation, any more than the Bible can take the place of the Holy Spirit." (op. cit., 89 Yearbook.) To perceive this delicate balance between the two, one must go to the Scriptures.

First let us consider the Canon of the Old Testament. Interestingly, the Old Testament was composed of three divisions - The Law, the Prophets, and the Writings. In the Jewish mind these three divisions had different authoritative values. To Christ, the authority and the unity of the Old Testament rested on the fact that all the Scriptures testified of the work and mission He was to accomplish as the Messiah. To the Jews, Jesus stated - "Ye search the Scriptures. . . and these are they which bear witness of Me." (John 5:39 ARV) To the two despondent travelers to Emmaus, Jesus "beginning at Moses and all the prophets, . . . expounded unto them in all the writings the things concerning Himself." (Luke 24:27 Gr.) To the Apostles, Jesus declared "that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning Me." (Luke 24:44) {Psalms was the first book of the third division of the Hebrew Old Testament.} "Then opened He their understanding, that they might understand the Scriptures." (ver. 45) It must be noted that Jesus in calling their attention to the Old Testament Canon as a revelation of Himself, did not open their minds to a "reinterpretation" of the Old Testament, but to an understanding of it. The truth was already there - "the Spirit of Christ" had already testified through the Old Testament instruments - but that truth had been buried in a maze of human speculation. They needed not to "reinterpret" it, but to "understand" it! Interpretations which had been given to it were in error, while a true understanding of it would bring forth truth in its purity.

Besides the prophets whose writings are included in the canon of the Old Testament, there are other prophets mentioned - Gad (I Sam. 22:5); Iddo (II Chron. 13:22); Nathan (I Kings 1:22); and then there was Elijah honored with translation. These all served a Divine purpose as "messengers" of the Lord.

As to the New Testament Canon, its primary thrust is the same as the Old - a testimony of Jesus - not what He was to do, but what He did, and would continue to do as High Priest over the House of God. It likewise has divisions, and the first division is the Gospels. What is interesting is the fact that in this first division is placed a book, written not by a prophet, nor an apostle, but by a convert, who made no claim to inspiration. Luke's Gospel was primarily a research document, yet it carries the force as a part of the Word of God, and is so quoted. Likewise the lone book of history in the New Testament, written by the same author following the same methodology. Its force, and acceptance is based upon accuracy of detail, and truthfulness of its statements. There can be no doubt that the Holy Spirit guided in the selection of material and composition. This should tell us something about "inspiration." It is in the Acts of the Apostles that we find recorded practical application of the working of "spiritual gifts" in the Apostolic Church.

In the book of Acts, various gifts are noted as possessed by different individuals who performed various ministries in the early Church. Stephen was a man "full of faith." (Acts 6:5, 8; I Cor. 12:9) Philip, a fellow Deacon, manifest "signs and great miracles." (Acts 8:13, margin; I Cor. 12:10) In the Church at Antioch were "certain prophets and teachers." (Acts. 13:1) To this group was entrusted the implementation of the decision of the Holy Spirit to "separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them." (ver. 2) And this was done without a concurring committee action from Jerusalem. A common experience was noted for both Peter and Paul - they were "filled with the Holy Ghost." (Acts 4:8; 13:9) There were also prophetesses - the four daughters of Philip.

(Acts 21:9) Then there was Agabus the prophet.

The incidents in which Agabus was involved in the on-going history of the early Church are most instructive. To the Church at Antioch, Agabus brought a message "that a severe famine would spread over the entire Roman world." (Acts 11:28 NIV) He proved to be a true prophet for it says it "came to pass in the days of Claudius Caesar." (See Deut 18:22; Jer. 28:9) On the basis of this counsel, the Church responded with a welfare ministry. Basic salvation was not involved; but there was a response because of the saving work in the life of each member of the Church. (Acts 11:29-30) Agabus again appears in the history of Acts at the close of Paul's Third Missionary Tour. He comes with a special message to Paul - who had, or would author fourteen books of the New Testament Canon prior to the close of his life's work. (Acts 21:10-11) Knowing Agabus to be a true prophet, those who were of Paul's company, and those who were of Caesarea urged Paul not to go up to Jerusalem. (verse. 12) But Paul did not heed this counsel. He went up to Jerusalem. His public ministry was cut short. He suffered much both at the hands of his own people, as well as "the results of envy and jealousy cherished" by his professed fellow believers. (Sketches from the Life of Paul, p. 231) All of this could have been avoided had Paul heeded the warning of the prophetic voice. Yet the Lord did not forsake him. "The Lord stood by him, and said, Be of good cheer, Paul." (Acts 23:11) Does this experience give license to ignore the voice of one who possesses the gift of prophecy? Absolutely not, but it does tell us that one's relationship to the Lord is not based on one's reaction to counsel coming through one possessed of a spiritual gift. It harmonizes with the supreme message of the book of Acts - "Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." (Acts 4:12)

Herein, lies our problem. The Bible "is sufficient to make us wise unto salvation" through faith which is in Christ Jesus. (See II Tim. 3:15) And if sufficient, then nothing need be added to provide for man a relationship with his Lord and Saviour. Why then, spiritual gifts? For counsel, for guidance, for remedial help to meet immediate situations in the present world in which we find ourselves. Interestingly, the Statement of Beliefs recommended by the 1979 Annual Council, but which was never presented to the General Conference delegates in session at Dallas in 1980, reflected this position portrayed in the book of Acts. It read:

As the Lord's messenger (Ellen G. White) provided guidance to the church, instruction in the Scriptures, and counsel for spiritual growth. Her writings uplift the Scriptures as the standard of faith and practice, and function as a continuing source of divine counsel. (Adventist Review, Feb. 21, 1980, p. 9)

It must never be forgotten that "spiritual gifts" are not, and never have been a test of fellowship - a test of one's relationship to the Lord Jesus Christ - but one's relationship to Jesus Christ is the great test for eternal fellowship in the age to come.

✓

"OUR SALVATION DEPENDS UPON OUR KNOWLEDGE OF GOD'S WILL AS IT IS CONTAINED IN HIS WORD." (Messages to Young People, p. 260)

CONFLICTING BIBLICAL HERMENEUTICS

Hermeneutics is defined as "the study of the methodological principles of interpretation." This simply stated means a study of the methods used to understand the Sacred Scriptures. In the present controversy in the Church over the doctrine of the sanctuary and the prophecies of Daniel, two methods of interpretation are in direct conflict. The one method used during the first one hundred years of the Advent Movement has been dubbed "the proof text method." An antagonist of this method - Raymond F. Cottrell - has defined it in these words:

The proof text method of Bible study consists essentially of a study of the Bible in translation (English for instance), of reliance on the analogy of Scripture on the verbal level with little if any attention to context, of giving, at best, inadequate attention to the historical setting of a statement or message and what it meant to the people of its own time, and of permitting subjective preconceptions to control conclusions arrived at deductively. (Spectrum, Vol. 11, #2, p. 18)

What is Cottrell saying those who use the "proof text method" do?

- 1) They use a Bible translation, such as the KJV.
- 2) They ignore, or at least give little attention to the context, or historical setting of the text.
- 3) They do not consider the meaning of the reference to the people to whom it was first written or spoken.
- 4) They go to the Bible with preconceived ideas, and seek support of those ideas from selected Bible verses.

Is Cottrell suggesting that the Adventist pioneers were a group of uneducated men with biased and prejudiced concepts because of their experience arising out of the Great Disappointment, and to sustain these concepts they sought supportive Bible references using a method of Biblical interpretation no longer valid?

The other method called "the historical method" is defined thus:

By contrast, the historical method consists of a study of the Bible in its original languages, of accepting the literary context of every statement and message as normative for its meaning, of determining what the messages of the Bible meant to the various reading audiences to whom they were originally addressed, in terms of the intention of the inspired writer and the Holy Spirit, of accepting that original meaning as a guide to an accurate understanding of the import for us today, and of reasoning inductively, arriving at conclusions on the basis of the evidence. (ibid.)

Reduced to common terms, the student using this method -

- 1) Studies the Bible in the original languages.
- 2) Accepts the literary context as the basis for determining the meaning of the verse or verses under consideration.
- 3) Seeks to find the intent of the Holy Spirit and inspired writer by noting what that passage meant to those who first heard it.
- 4) Permits what is determined to be the original understanding to guide

THE ARCHBISHOP MEETS THE ADVENTISTS

The Messenger, April 11, 1980



ON FEBRUARY 18, Adventists hosted a dinner in honour of the new Archbishop of Canterbury, the Most Reverend Robert Runcie. The reception was organised by Dr. B. B. Beach, secretary of the Northern Europe-West Africa Division, who was a friend of the Archbishop while he was the bishop of St. Albans. During the farewell dinner, the Archbishop expressed appreciation of his relations and contacts with Seventh-day Adventists in St. Albans. Among those present for the evening, together with their wives, were Pastor W. R. L. Scragg, president of the Northern Europe-West Africa Division; Pastor E. H. Foster, president of the British Union Conference; Pastor P. Sundquist, departmental director of the Northern Europe-West Africa Division; the Bishop of Hertford; the Vicar of St. Peter's and Dr. S. Reid, secretary of the South England Conference. ##

Dr. Beach addressing a few words of welcome and appreciation to the Archbishop. Left to right: Mrs. A. H. Medforth, Dr. B. B. Beach, Mrs. W. R. L. Scragg, Pastor Scragg, and Archbishop Runcie. The table wine was strictly non-alcoholic.

Photo: British Union Messenger

RELIGIOUS NEWS SERVICE

-19-

TUESDAY, APRIL 29, 1980

**BEWARE OF ECUMENISM,
ADVENTISTS ARE TOLD**

By Religious News Service (4-29-80)

DALLAS (RNS) -- A longtime observer of ecumenism warned fellow Seventh-day Adventists at the church's 53rd World Congress here that moves in that direction often signal a decline in church membership and evangelism.

"I think we can almost establish an ecumenical law," said Dr. Bert B. Beach, the secretary for the church's Northern Europe-West Africa Division. "The more a church is declining in membership, the more it tends to be ecumenical."

"And I think we can then establish another law saying that the more ecumenical a church becomes, the more it tends to become stationary in its evangelistic advance. It tends to concentrate on socio-political issues."

- * -

"Then spake Jesus to the multitude, and to His disciples, saying, The scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses seat: all therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do ye not after their works: for they say, and do not."

(Matt. 23:1-3)

- in how the reference is to be understood by us who are living today.
- 5) Draws conclusions on the basis of this evidence regardless of where it leads.

Based on these interpretations, Cottrell draws this conclusion:

Use of the historical method by the decided majority of our Bible scholars, and of the proof text method by most non-scholars, has been responsible for practically every theological difference of opinion over the past 40 years, including that posed by Ford. The traditional Adventist interpretation of Daniel 8:14 and Hebrews 9 were formulated by the proof text method. Prior to about 1940, a very few Adventists - among them A. F. Ballenger, W. W. Prescott, L. R. Conradi, and W. W. Fletcher - had begun to use some element of the historical method; it was this that made them aware of some of the problems of exegesis of our traditional interpretation, and precipitated their individual crisis. (*ibid.*)

(In other words, the apostates, or near apostates, were the "good guys" while those who have held to the faith committed to their trust were really the "bad guys." Such are the imaginations of those who have drunk deeply at the broken theological cisterns of this world.)

As we seek to weigh these two methods one against the other, let us not be confused over the names given to each. The "historical method" is not the method which was used in determining the doctrines of the Advent Movement, but rather a method borrowed from the theological seminaries of Babylon the great. The name - "proof text method" - is a name chosen to describe what could be better called a summary approach to the study of the Bible. In other words, what does the Bible say, for example, about the Second Coming of Christ? To find the answer to this question, one assembles those texts which speak of Christ's second return, and then formulates what these references teach into a doctrine. This is in reality a very sound approach, the same type of method used by a scientist in a laboratory - assembling the data, and then drawing the conclusion.

While it is true that one who has not been schooled in Biblical languages must reply on a translation for his study, there are now available several literal interlinear renderings of the Greek and Hebrew texts which can be used in Bible study. While this approach may not be completely satisfactory, a true understanding of the Bible can be arrived at.

All of this really begs the question underlying the whole contention. The real issue is how was the Bible given, and for what purpose. Were the men who wrote the various books of the Bible groping to find God, or were the men who wrote selected by God in His endeavor to reveal Himself to men? While the prophets did speak to the people of their own time, and spoke to the existing conditions, was this the limit of their revelations? Is it justifiable as Cottrell has done to classify the eschatology of Daniel with the eschatology of the other Old Testament prophets, and state that Daniel's message was primarily to the generation in which the book was written? (See quotes from Cottrell on p. 2) The book of Daniel was unique, and within its contents is the definite specification by the angel Gabriel that the messages were for the "time of the end." (Dan. 8:17; 12:4)

This news article from the Student paper of Canadian Union College was written from a press release supplied by the Kinship group to all editors of Adventist College newspapers. (It is not known how many Student Editors used it as in the case of CUC of Canada.) This news item and release cast new light on the involvement of the General Conference in the Kinship Kampmeeting. Note the titles of the subjects presented - "It's OK to Be Gay," and "Ethics for Gay Christians." Can a "Gay" be a Christian any more than one who practices adultery? Then notice that the youth were invited to make contact with the president of the Adventist Gays. And this type of a news article was permitted by the leadership of a major SDA College - a place where the youth are suppose to find a "haven of refuge." What next?

Adventist Church officials meet with kinship

(by C. Roberts)

Sacramento, Calif.--Seventh-day Adventist gays from throughout the United States together with six official representatives of the Adventist church attended the first "kampmeeting" held for gay Adventists this August in Payson, Arizona.

The week-long conference was sponsored by SDA Kinship, the international organization of lesbian and gay Seventh-day Adventists and their friends.

Workshop topics for the Kinship Kampmeeting included, "It's OK to be Gay," "Ethics for Gay Christians," "Relationships," and "Being Gay and S.D.A." In one workshop, a group told the church officials of their personal struggles to accept their sexuality in the light of traditional Adventist teachings. In another workshop, the seminary professors discussed their interpretation of seven biblical texts pertaining to homosexuality.

Also during the meetings the board of directors for Kinship was enlarged from five to sixteen, reflecting the growth of Kinship. Vern Schlenker, Jr. of Sacramento, California, was elected president. Ron Lawson, New York, was elected to serve as special liaison to the Adventists church administration.

Dr. Larry Geraty, professor of archeology and Old Testament at Andrews University and Josephine Benton, Rockville, Md., first woman minister of an Adventist congregation, were asked to serve as chaplains for Kinship.

Other officers and regional directors were elected at the meetings as well.

More information on Kinship can be obtained from Vern Schlenker, Jr., P. O. Box 4768, San Francisco, California 94101.

AURORA

Once the time sequence of God's purposes are determined based on the revelations given to the prophet Daniel, then the eschatological passages of the other Old Testament books can be fitted into this framework. The same applies to the book of Revelation, which gathers the fragmentary concepts of the Old, and unveils the purposes of God in the events which "must come to pass." (1:1)

We are going to have to determine in our thinking whether the Bible is one book or sixty-six books. Does the Bible reveal one God, or sixty-six gods? Is there one Plan of Redemption or sixty-six plans? To adopt a method of Biblical interpretation which permits a book to be understood in such a way that it contradicts all that God has given prior to, or after, is to use a method which questions the very revelation of God as given in the Bible - a God "with whom there is no variableness, neither shadow of turning." (James 1:17) This has been done and is being done in regard to Daniel and Hebrews. God's way is revealed in the sanctuary. (Ps. 77:13) The book of Hebrews states emphatically - "For unto us was the gospel preached as well as unto them {ancient Israel}." (Heb. 4:2) Then to teach the book of Hebrews in such a way that it contradicts the plain and simple lessons of the type which God Himself patterned is a travesty on truth.

The fallacy of the so-called "historical method" is revealed in the way the book of Daniel is interpreted. {This should not be confused with the Historical School of Prophetic Interpretation.} The "little horn" of Daniel, the abomination of desolation, is interpreted to be the work of Antiochus Epiphanes, because the Jews to whom it was first given so interpreted it, and so stated by Josephus. (SDA Bible Dictionary, p. 243) But Christ plainly declared that the abomination of desolation in relationship to the temple services was still future in His day. (Matt. 24:15) Am I, therefore, going to use an interpretation of the prophecy as perceived by Josephus, or one that conforms to the pronouncement of the Lord Jesus Christ? I choose to be a follower of Him who is the source of truth, not Josephus! The so-called "historical method" of Bible interpretation is a denial of God's overruling design in revelation, and that He chose to reveal that design at different times and in a fragmentary manner. (Heb. 1:1) It further denies that there is a "present truth" for a given generation which needs to be discovered from previous revelations and proclaimed. The adoption of such a hermeneutic from the cesspool of Babylon is striking at the very foundations of the Advent Movement. May God help us!

NOTE on Article on page 7 - Let the reader keep in mind that Dr. B. B. Beach is now the head of the Public Affairs and Religious Liberty Department of the General Conference. Further at the recent Annual Council (1980) he was elected Secretary of the newly formed Interchurch Relations Council. You cannot go two different ways at the same time. Somebody is talking out of both sides of their mouth.

"WATCHMAN, WHAT OF THE NIGHT?" IS PUBLISHED MONTHLY BY THE ADVENTIST LAYMEN'S FOUNDATION OF MISSISSIPPI, INC., P. O. Box 178, Lamar, AR 72846, USA. (It is free upon request.)