

*"Watchman,
what of the night?"*

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

Eze. 7:6 (Moffatt)



E & C T - 6B

Page 2

THE UNCHANGED POSITION OF ROME

Page 5

Editor's Preface

With this issue of WWN we conclude an analysis of Dr. J. I. Packer's essay in E & CT. We have been rather detailed in outlining just where he stood in regard to the Roman Catholic Church. It is evident that he understands well the teachings of that Church. How then could he sign the Accord? We give his answer. Yet he appears to have some doubts which he rationalizes away. We have discussed this in the editorial - "Let's Talk It Over." Perhaps you should read this first. Then there is a second question which we have not addressed in this issue. Why was his essay permitted in this book when he was so forthright in his position on key Roman Catholic teachings? John Richard Neuhaus has the last word as his is the final essay. This final essay will be discussed in the next issue of WWN.

While we were in the process of preparing the material for this issue, we received from Western Canada a copy of the paper published in Quebec. The sender asked that it be returned to him, and so we made copies of the two pages which were of primary interest to us. The issue of Rome's unchanged position on Church and State is addressed in the second article. What struck us was the approach, which was used a century ago, of subjugating the Incarnation to this diabolical design of Rome. In Canada, the Roman Church is spelling it out in plain language. In the States, the Church is using phrases - "an ordered society" - "ordered liberty" - to cover their same designs; and the Protestants are buying it.

The interesting experience which some are having in Iowa - see page 7 - you may also have if you desire. We will send to you, upon request, a copy of the ad they used. You will need only to adapt it to an address in your local area. We will work with you. Write or call for details.

E & C T - 6b

In continuing his Essay, Dr. J. I. Packer observed that the "most poignant" criticisms of the Accord came from middle-age and elderly individuals who had once been Roman Catholics and "who cannot believe that Protestants who back ECT know what they are doing." He seeks to answer these Evangelicals and allay some of their concerns.

Packer believes that his objective in signing the Accord has been misread, and that it was not his intention to infer that the Accord signaled an end of the historic war with Rome about the gospel doctrine. When he realized that the statement was being read this way, he with Michael Horton, who is connected with Christians United for Reformation (CURE), produced another statement. The preface of this CURE statement - "Resolutions for Roman Catholic and Evangelical Dialogue" - states that it seeks to identify issues of concern to Evangelical Protestants that the thrust of the ECT document raised. It addresses seven issues:

1) That while Evangelicals and Roman Catholics both affirm "the ecumenical creeds," this is not a "sufficient basis" for declaring that "agreement exists on all the essential elements of the Gospel."

2) "The doctrine of justification by grace alone through faith alone because of Christ alone has since the Reformation been acknowledged by mainstream Protestants as 'the article by which the Church stands or falls,' and the tenet that distinguishes a true from a false Church."

The #2 statement is lengthy, and its amplification of what is quoted above needs to be considered, for at this point, theologies being taught presently in the Community of Adventism enter the picture. "While affirming an indissoluble bond between justification and sanctification, this doctrine insists that justification itself is God's present forensic declaration of pardon and acceptance, and that the righteousness required for this declaration is neither attained by human effort nor infused or worked internally by God in the human soul, but is the righteousness of Jesus Christ imputed to those who believe."

The contrast with Romanism is noted: "The Council of Trent anathematized those who embrace this doctrine, and all subsequent magisterial declarations, including those of the Second Vatican Council, continue to bind Roman Catholics to the conviction that this gospel of free justification by faith alone, apart from works, and the assurance of salvation that springs from it, is not consonant with Roman Catholic teaching" The formulators of this CURE Statement "deny the ade-

quacy of any version of the Gospel that falls short at this point."

It is at a "point" within this point which has caused problems for Adventism, and has led many to reject the Protestant affirmation, and in its place hold the Roman Catholic Tridentine teaching or a modified version of it. What is the "assurance of salvation" springing from "justification by faith alone"? First, it is the realization of a forgiveness whereby I can stand before God as if I had never sinned. The depression resulting from the guilt of sin is removed. I bare it no more! However, it does not follow that once I have accepted this free gift, it can never be denied me, and that an entrance into God's presence is assured me no matter how I live thereafter. The "assurance" is based on two things: a daily crucifixion (I Cor. 15:31), and a growth in grace and knowledge of the Lord Jesus Christ (II Peter 3:18). The problem in Adventism today is that the theologies being expounded by the "many voices" seeking recognition is that in rejecting the concept of "once saved always saved," they in turn reject "the article by which the Church stands or falls," and substitute in its place a form of the Tridentine gospel of Romanism. In freeing themselves from the anathema of Rome, they come under the anathema of Paul. (Gal. 1:8-9)

3) "We radically disagree with the teaching of the Second Vatican Council that unbelievers may be saved by their good works, apart from faith in Christ."

4) "The extent of the creedal consensus... warrants the making of common cause on moral and cultural issues in society"

5) "Christ's prayer for unity" means visible unity. "We deny that this prayer refers merely to the spiritual or invisible Church. ... We deny that the defined doctrines of the [Roman] Church's infallibility, Papal primacy, justification according to Trent, transubstantiation and eucharistic sacrifice, and the immaculate conception and assumption of Mary, can be proved from Scripture, and we cannot approve any form of joint action that appears to imply agreement with them. Also, we deny that visible unity has been or can be achieved where a common confession of the Gospel in all its essential elements is lacking."

6) "We affirm that individual Roman Catholics who for whatever reason do not self-consciously assent to the precise definitions of the Roman Catholic magisterium regarding justification, ... but who think and speak evangelically about these things, are indeed our brothers and sisters in Christ. ... We deny, however, that in its present confession [the Roman Church] is an acceptable Christian communion, let alone being the mother of all the faithful to whom every believer needs to be related."

7) "We affirm that the Great Commission of our Lord requires every Christian and every congregation to be engaged in witness to Christ, and that this is concerned not merely with conversion, but with catechesis, nurture, and discipline of converts. Therefore, ... we insist that every Christian, Roman Catholic no less than Protestant, needs regular exposure to accurate, Christ-centered preaching and exposition from the Bible."

Packer hoped that this statement, signed by 35 Evangelical leaders including three who had signed the ECT Accord, would remove all doubt as to where he and others stood in regard to the teachings of Roman Catholicism. It did not, and there were some sharp exchanges on the leadership level. The result was that on January 19, 1995 a group of leaders and theologians met with Chuck Colson, J. I. Packer and one other signer of the ECT Accord at the Coral Ridge Presbyterian Church in Ft. Lauderdale, Florida. This opposition group included John Ankerberg, John MacArthur, R. C. Sproul and D. James Kennedy, pastor of the Coral Ridge church. Out of this meeting came a statement drafted by Packer and signed by other Evangelicals who also signed the ECT Accord. The preamble declares this new statement to be an elucidation of their understanding of what they were signing in committing themselves to the Accord. It reads:

1) *Our parachurch cooperation with evangelically committed Roman Catholics for the pursuit of agreed objectives does not imply acceptance of Roman Catholic doctrinal distinctives or endorsement of the Roman Catholic church system.*

2) *We understand the statement that "we are justified by grace through faith because of Christ," in terms of the substitutionary atonement and imputed righteousness of Christ, leading to full assurance of eternal salvation; we seek to testify in all circumstances and contexts to this, the historic Protestant understanding of salvation by faith alone (*sola fide*)*

3) *While we view all who profess to be Christian - Protestant and Catholic and Orthodox - with charity and hope, our confidence that anyone is truly a brother or sister in Christ depends not only on the content of his or her confession but on our perceiving signs of regeneration in his or her life.*

4) *Though we reject proselytizing as ECT defines it (that is "sheep-stealing" for denominational aggrandizement), we hold that evangelization and church planting are always legitimate, whatever forms of church life are present already.*

5) *We think that the further theological discussions that ECT promised should begin as soon as possible. (E&CT, p. 161)*

Two things need to be noted in this statement: 1) The emphasis on "eternal security" ("once saved always saved") in #2. By connecting this concept with "sola fide," they draw an unwarranted conclusion in regard to the meaning of the atonement of the Cross, and the failure to separate this combined concept by "historic" Adventists leads to the acceptance by them of a modified form of the Roman Catholic Tridentine gospel. 2) After clearly defining his perceptions of Roman Catholicism in the CURE statement, how could Packer include in this statement a call for early "theological discussions" with them as in #5. Further, why should the dissidents to the ECT Accord want this as well?

Immediately following this Statement, Packer wrote - "At this point I must state explicitly that I am not and could not be a Roman Catholic because of certain basic tenets to which the Roman system, as such, is committed." He then notes these tenets:

1) The claim of Rome as the only "Church of Christ." This for two reasons: a) "In the New Testament the Church is not a sacramental and juridical organization sustained by priests channeling divine life through set rituals, but it is a worldwide fellowship of believers who share in the resurrection life of the Lord Jesus Christ..." b) "Bowling to Peter among the apostles as having definitive personal and pastoral authority over all congregations" as defined by Rome, "is not however part of the New Testament picture. Nor does the fact that John Paul II ... has done a wonderful job as a world Christian ambassador make the papacy a credible institution or the Catholic claim to conciliar and *ex cathedra* infallibility at all plausible." (pp. 161-162)

2) The papacy which is supposed to be the essence of the Roman Church "was a relatively late development," and not through apostolic succession.

3) The papal teaching on the Mass and on merit "cuts across Paul's doctrine of present justification ... in and through Jesus Christ." "All modes of the Marian cult, of the invoking of other saints, and of the belief in purgatory, and all reliance on the disbursing of indulgences (which still goes on, as in Luther's day, and is explained and justified in the new *Catechism*) have the effect of cutting across, and damping" the fruitage of justification. (p. 162)

4) The doctrine of papal infallibility "claimed for all church teaching, and the insistence that the faithful take their beliefs from the Church rather than the Bible" makes self-correction and spiritual growth impossible within Roman Catholicism.

Because of these tenets, Packer declares, as stated in the CURE statement, he is not able to affirm that the Roman Church "in its present confession is an acceptable Christian

communion." Then he adds - "What I mean by that is that Rome's official doctrinal disorders, particularly on justification, merit, and the Mass-sacrifice, so obscure the gospel that were I, as a gesture of unity, invited to Mass - which of course as a Protestant I am not, nor shall be - I would not feel free to accept the invitation." (pp. 162-163)

This is a most interesting observation. He perceives what the "sign" or "mark" of Rome is, more clearly than many Adventists. Further, he declares, he will not accept this "mark" of Rome. However, he should not be too sure, that he will not be offered the opportunity.

Then comes *the* question - "Why then should I, or any Protestant like me, want to develop mission activity in partnership with Roman Catholics? What reason is there to abandon the historic pattern of isolationism?" (p. 163)

Packer perceives a renewal within Catholicism which has brought to individual Catholics the same experience as the Evangelicals, even to the point of holding some of the same doctrinal teachings which he considers basic. His conclusion is that, therefore, with these "evangelical" Catholics, there can be a working arrangement as envisioned by the ECT Accord for the purpose of bettering the moral character of society. He calls this a "Parachurch Association." By this designation, he means a company of Christians - be they of different denominations - pursuing together churchly goals. This is what he perceived was the joint action envisioned by ECT, and because of this perception he signed the document. Then he wrote a very significant paragraph:

ECT is tentatively feeling its way towards a pattern of this kind that would involve Roman Catholics and would do so on a principled basis, without compromise on either side. The difficulties are obvious; but should the desired cooperative action prove to be practical politics, it would be an event of watershed significance. What form the pattern might take is not yet clear to anyone; what is being explored is whether the quest for such a pattern is not an idea whose time has come. (p. 166)

Packer goes so far because of his own experience and belief to question - "Is God ... starting something through ECT?" Then he answers - "I do not know, but I think it is worth giving time and labor to find out." While he declares there is no problem with working together for "Christian moral and cultural values in society," yet when it comes to the point of proclaiming Christ the Savior, the case is different. Neither Evangelicals nor Roman Catholics can stipulate the distinctives they believe as the basis for partnership. Then what follows - compromise - "ETC lets go Protestant precision on the doctrine of justification and the correlation between conversion and new birth, just as it let go the Roman Catholic

dogmas of baptismal regeneration and the sacramental structure of the doctrine of grace."

This picture of what is contemplated - implementation through joint action of "Christian moral and cultural values," but with an admittedly compromised perception of the gospel - is ominous. While "the form the pattern" might take may not be clear to some of those who are advocating its trial adoption, it should be clear to the student of Bible prophecy. None dare take what is beginning to surface, lightly.

First, we need to be sure that we believe that we have a truth which admits of no compromise. We need to understand that only truth that is pure and unadulterated is the righteousness of Christ. Then, on these premises, how do I relate to that which is not such a truth? This brings us to the second Scripture with which shocked evangelicals challenged Packer - II Cor. 6:14-15. Packer quoted it from the NIV. Note what it says:

"Do not be yoked together with unbelievers. For what do righteousness and wickedness have in common? What harmony is there between Christ and Belial? What does a believer have in common with an unbeliever?"

So bluntly, the first question is, Is Rome Christian? If the viewpoint of Heaven as revealed in prophecy is valid - and it is - the answer is emphatically - No! What about the voices of renewal heard in Catholicism today as noted by Packer? Do they lead to a renouncement of the Papacy or to a greater devotion to the Pope? One needs only to be reminded of the Papal acceptance of the Charismatic (tongues speaking) movement in the Catholic Church because those involved manifest a deeper devotion to Rome.

This working Accord between Evangelical Protestants and "evangelical" Roman Catholics moves toward the fulfillment of certain Adventist perceptions of the end time confrontation. There is an uniting upon such points of belief which are held in common. Packer lists these "common" beliefs. Observe them carefully - "the Trinity, the incarnation, the Atonement, and the historic Resurrection, present heavenly reign, and future personal return of Jesus Christ." (p. 163) Further the universal and increasing depravity of humanity, which horrifies even the ungodly, has become the motivating factor for common cause in an attempt to alter the downward course of society. This unity, based on common beliefs and goal, is perceived as God working - an "idea whose time has come." However, behind this Accord is a compromised "gospel." Herein is indeed the "great controversy" - the false "gospel" versus "the everlasting gospel." The community of Adventism is not exempt for the battle is joined even within the community itself. #

The UNCHANGED Position of ROME - CHURCH and STATE

The "Michael" Journal published in Rouhening, Quebec, covered Canada with 13 million copies of a 16 page offprint calling for the Prime Minister of Canada to exercise his authority and reorganize the monetary system of Canada. On pages 14 and 15 of this paper in bold type was this caption - "**Jesus Christ, King of all Nations**" A subheading indicated that this "kingship" was social and political. The article is excerpted and translated from a book written in 1923 by a French priest, Theotime de Saint Just - The Social Kingship of Our Lord Jesus Christ according to Cardinal Pie.

First a word about Cardinal Pie. He was Bishop of Poitiers, and made a Cardinal by Leo XIII in 1879. Keep in mind that Leo XIII had no love for the American form of government. To refresh your mind recheck the chapter - "Americanism Versus Romanism" - in Facts of Faith, pp. 256-272. Saint Just begins his book with direct quotes from Cardinal Pie which stated:

Jesus Christ is the cornerstone of the structure of society. ... Put in the hearts of our contemporaries, of our officials, this profound conviction that they can do nothing to strengthen the homeland and its freedoms as long as they do not establish it on the cornerstone given by God; Petra autem erat Christus.

Then he questions - "Our Lord Jesus came on earth to sanctify souls. Did He come also to impose His will upon social institutions, codes, parliaments, even monarchs, and thus become the supreme King of nations and peoples?" To his own question, he replies - "There is no question of more paramount importance than that of the social Kingship of Christ." Such a Kingship would produce the true peace so longed for by the world. [Keep in mind that this book was written in 1923, following World War I, and the establishment of the League of Nations] To emphasize his point, Saint Just quoted from Pius XI's Encyclical, *Ubi arcano Dei*, which reads:

Once cities and republics follow the teachings and precepts of Jesus Christ in their domestic and foreign affairs, then they will enjoy true peace. ... The peace worthy of its name, that is to say, the longed-for peace of Christ, will never exist if Christ's doctrines, precepts, and examples are not kept by all, in public and private life as well, and if the Church, in such an ordered society, does not exercise her divine role, protecting all the rights of God over individuals and nations. This is what we call "the reign of Christ." (Emphasis supplied; underscored, his)

Two more questions are asked - "Is this social Kingship of Jesus being accepted by nations and peoples? Is Christian law - the code of the social reign of our Lord - the rule of conduct of human societies?" In answer, Saint Just cites Bishop Pie's observation of the past when for many beautiful centuries, the social Kingship of Christ had been recognized by the family of European nations. Then he quoted Pie direct - "Christian law had been for a thousand years the general law of Europe." This is nothing short of calling for a return to the Dark Ages!

How is this to be accomplished? Note the following carefully: Saint Just declared:

Now we must speak about the supreme duty that is incumbent, not upon the intellectually elite, but upon the leaders of nations. They must carry out the program of the Christian government. According to Bishop Pie, this program requires the civil power to remain united with the Church, and make legislation in accordance with Christian principles.

The union of the Church and the State is the primary condition for a Christian government. The perfect agreement between the priesthood and the empire is common law and the normal state of Christian societies, says Bishop Pie, along with the whole Catholic tradition, and he rejects energetically all ideas of separation. (Emphasis supplied)

The example cited for union of Church and State is the incarnation of Jesus Christ, the God-man. "Jesus Christ has indissolubly united in Himself the natural and the supernatural order, and that He has set a similar union for Christian society." The two natures were kept distinct without merging, "similarly, Christian society is made up of two elements: the Church, and the State, which must remain distinct, and not merged, but united, not separated." Then the conclusion is drawn - "that since the two natures of Christ are unequal, and consequently, one nature is subordinated to the other - the human nature to the divine one - [so] the two elements of Christian society must also be subordinated: the State must be subordinated to the Church."

Bishop Pie went so far as to declare those who would separate State and Church as antichrist, and the dissolution of Jesus Christ Himself. A version of I John 4:3 was quoted which read - And every spirit that dissolves (disunites) Jesus Christ is not of God; and this is the Antichrist." Thus the power which is indeed the Antichrist turns the epithet on the form of government which reflects the separation which Jesus enunciated - unto Caesar the things of Caesar, and unto God, the things of God.

Calling the American system of government "eternally illegitimate," Saint Just declared "the normal state and salvation

for governments can be found only in union with the Church." And why?

Once fully realized, the union of the Church and the State would imply Christian laws, since the State would then receive moral guidance from the Church, and would strive to apply it.

In the light of this forthright declaration of the Roman Catholic position, we can better understand the force of the phraseology being used by those engaged in the defense of the ECT Accord when they call for "a new understanding of the First Amendment religion clause" of the American Constitution; when they use the words, "ordered liberty;" and call "for the right ordering of civil society." (See WWN, 4(95), p. 4; 4(96), p. 3) Rome is forthright when she feels she has nothing to lose; deceptive when she believes she has much to gain. Tragically, Evangelical and professedly Protestant voices are ignoring the prophecies of God's word which unmask the facade of Rome. #

LET'S TALK IT OVER

Consider for a few moments what you have just read, especially what Dr. J. I. Packer has written as he has endeavored to justify his signing of the ECT Accord. Keep in mind who he is - Professor of Theology at Regent College in Vancouver, British Columbia. Review in your thinking what he knows and what he said about Roman Catholicism. He has carefully studied the thinking of Rome in the Vatican II Council, and as expressed in their new *Catechism*, noting that even now they are defending the disbursement of indulgences which was the spark which ignited the Reformation. Yet with this knowledge, he believes he can work with them on social issues, and remain unscathed. And what do "social" issues mean to Rome? Rethink the second article. "Social issues" means simply to Rome an "ordered society" in which the Church dominates the State, so that the dogmas of Rome become the Constitution of the nations. Does Packer not know this?

Packer thinks there are good Catholics, and there are bad Catholics. This is true in most any category you wish to suggest. He believes that he has signed this ECT Accord with "good" Catholics. Man looks on the outward appearance, but the Word of God reveals the reality of the matter. We need to remind ourselves that "except those who are kept by the power of God through faith in His Word, the whole world will be swept into the ranks" of the final deception of the devil. (See *Great Controversy*, p. 562)

Packer realizes, as all must, that the moral decay of society

has reached intolerable depths and that something must be done. He perceives ECT as a possible working arrangement to accomplish a desired goal. He sees a realignment of forces from the time when "Western Christendom's deepest division" was between Protestants and Roman Catholics, and now, when in his words, "the deepest and most hurtful division is between theological conservatives, who honor the Christ of the Bible and the historic creeds and confessions, and theological liberals and radicals who for whatever reason do not." (*E&CT*, pp. 171-172) Then after being unable to affirm that the Roman Church "in its present confession is an acceptable Christian communion," Packer can write - "domestic differences about salvation and the Church should not hinder us from joint action in seeking to re-Christianize the North American milieu." (*ibid.*, p. 172) How can you re-Christianize with that which is not Christian?

This reveals the confusion of mind which can even effect recognized religious thinkers. But Packer does have some doubts. In *Christianity Today*, (May 30, 1996, p. 15) is a full page advertisement for Peter Kreeft's new book - *Ecumenism and the Cultural War* - in which he calls for "all God-fearing Christians, Jews and Muslims to unite together in a 'religious war' [a "Jihad"] against the common enemy of godless secular humanism, materialism and immorality." The advertisement uses brief comments from three names - all involved in the essays of *E&CT* - J. I. Packer, Chuck Colson, and Richard Neuhaus. Packer writes - "Catholics, Protestants, and Orthodox alike need to ponder Kreeft's vision of things." Then he adds a question - "What if he is right?"

But what if Kreeft is wrong? Here is where "the sure word of prophecy" enters the picture. The prophecies of God's Word were effective weapons used by the Reformers. So effective were they, that Rome responded with two schools of counter interpretations by the Jesuits, Alcazar and Ribera. Antithetical to each other, they nevertheless directed the fulfillment of the prophecies away from Rome. This same technique was used in the paper reviewed in the second article of this issue. The "Antichrist" is to be understood as one who opposes the union of Church and State, instead of the Antichrist being the Papacy, which is the union of Church and State.

The prophecy of Daniel 7 clearly identifies in history who the "little horn" is. The Revelation of Jesus Christ tells the reader specifically that the "dragon" symbol of the 12th chapter is the devil. It is this "dragon" who gives the "beast" of chapter 13, "his power, and his seat, and great authority." (ver. 2) This beast is also "non-descript" as is the fourth beast of Daniel 7 which nourishes to the end "the little horn." The beast of Revelation 13 is a composite made up of the symbols of Daniel 7 in exact sequence, only in reverse order

reverse order. Its prophetic time parallels the "little horn" of Daniel 7 - "forty two months" and the "time and times and the dividing of time." Paul likewise identifies this power in his second letter to the Thessalonians as "the man of sin," the "Wicked [One]" (2:3-9) The well known and respected Lexicon by Thayer defines the force of the Greek word translated "the Wicked [One]" as "he in whom all iniquity has fixed its abode." [art., *anomos*]

To those who would have exercised faith in God's prophetic Word, the decision to sign or not to sign the ECT Accord would have been simple. Did Christ parley with the devil so as to work out the redemption of the "kingdoms of the world"? Did not Christ plainly state to Pilate, "My kingdom is not of this world"? (John 18:36) It is true that "society" has hit an all-time low. The depravity of man is manifest over all the earth. There is only one solution - not the evangelization of the third millennium as is anticipated, but the coming of Jesus to put an end to human history as it is now being written. There is only one message that should be proclaimed, and that message is the message of the final atonement being consummated both in the courts of heaven, and "the everlasting gospel" which makes it possible - "the redemption in Christ Jesus." The line has been drawn by Heaven, and the nations of earth have been given over to Satan to work his will, which he is doing "with all deceitfulness of unrighteousness" gathering them together for the battle of the great day of God Almighty to a place called in the Hebrew tongue, "the mount of the congregation." (Rev. 16:14,16; Isa. 14:13) whg

Of Interest

In an endeavor to circulate the booklet - The SIGN of the End of Time, the Remnant Seventh Day Adventist Church of Nora Springs, Iowa, ran a two column six inch advertisement in the Mason City Globe-Gazette offering it free to all who would write to their postal address. The ad was headed in bold type - "Jerusalem" and stated "The Pope's Plan for Jerusalem" quoting Daniel 11:45. Next they listed Lucifer's design and quoted Isaiah 14:13. The question was asked - "Will they support each other?"

Among the responses they received was a letter from the Roman Catholic priest of the Forest City parish. He also sent a similar letter to the "Editor's Mailbag" of the Globe-Gazette, which included an additional paragraph chastising the editor for permitting such an ad to be published. The letter to them read:

I was rather amazed at your ad in Friday's Globe-Gazette. I had hoped we were beyond the days when the papacy and

the Catholic Church were alleged by some to be in league with Satan. I hope that you will read the enclosed brochures; they might be helpful in explaining the scriptural basis for the papacy and the Church's role in its formation and interpretation of the Bible.

If you wish, you may send me your booklet - my parishioners and I are always interested in learning about various attacks on the Church.

They did, and included the tract - "Antichrist - Who Is He?" - although he might have written for it after receiving the booklet. The tracts which the priest sent - "Peter and the Papacy" and "What's Your Authority for That?" - based primarily on the Bible, need careful analysis. The latter is aimed directly at the Evangelicals in its closing challenge. This is interesting in the light of the ECT Accord. We hope to say more concerning this tract in another issue of WWN.

+++++

FYI - The 800 number listed below is primarily for questions and discussion concerning the issues of WWN. Those who support the Foundation on a regular basis have unlimited time to the number. Other calls are limited to 15 minutes, unless there are extenuating circumstances. You may call to have your name placed on the mailing list of WWN, but we accept no orders for publications via telephone as we do not invoice. These must be mailed using an "Order Form." For other business items you may use the number - (501) 292-3721. Your cooperation with these guidelines will be appreciated.

+++++

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

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

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

Editor

Elder Wm. H. Grotheer

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

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

+++++