

THE GATHERING CALL



"The sheep follow Him, for they know His voice." John 10:4

VOL. 50

Riverside, Calif., Nov.-Dec., 1962

No. 6

CELEBRATING FIFTY YEARS OF CONTINUOUS
PUBLICATION, OUR.....

Jubilee Special

* Eléer Odom asks,—

"WAS CHRIST IN THE TOMB FOR 72 HOURS?" 3
(By Your Editor)

A Review Of "Questions On Doctrine." 8
(By Your Editor)

What The Reader's Say 12
(A Department)

The 2300 Day Hassle In La Sierra 13
(A Conclusion of the Discussion from the floor between the
Members of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, and the
Church of God, 7th day).

Peace On Earth and Good Will Toward Men 22
(A Gospel Message for the year around.)

"NEWS AND VIEWS" 24
(A Department)

Copyright, The Gathering Call Publishing Association, 1962.

*Letter Dickman
PL 3-683*

THE GATHERING CALL

"A magazine published for the defense of the faith once delivered unto the Saints."

OUR NEW MAILING ADDRESS
P.O. Box 4215, Hardman Center Station,
Riverside, California

Board of Directors

- Peter Wagenleitner, Chairman, Fresno, California
- Robert Tower Woodlake, California
- Grace Pirtle ... Sacramento, California
- Forbes Davidson .. Placerville, California
- D. M. Phillips Turlock, California

Editorial Staff

- Editor Donald E. Mote
- Associate Editor W. H. Olson
- Associate Editor Virgil C. Staff

SUBSCRIPTION RATE: \$1.50 PER YEAR

Add 30c for postage on Foreign mailings, except for Mexico and Canada, add 25c. Published bi-monthly (Six times in the year) by The Gathering Call Publishing Association, 3155 Date St., Riverside, Calif. Entered as second-class matter, June 29, 1915, at the post office at Riverside, California, under Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

THE MINISTRY OF THIS MAGAZINE.

The publication of this magazine involves considerable financial burden, the weight of which is perhaps not fully realized by those to whom it is sent. We offer no complaint, for this ministry was inaugurated in love for God and devotion to His Word. We are determined to continue as long as means, time, and ability will permit. We are thankful to God for all whose hearts He has opened to labor together with us in this effort to glorify Him in the furtherance of His Word. We consider each subscriber as a fellow-laborer with us and request an interest in your prayers in behalf of the

work. Pray that God will give the wisdom, the understanding, and the enabling necessary unto a ministry glorifying to our Lord Jesus Christ. "By prayer and supplication with thanksgiving let your requests be made known unto God." (Phil. 4:6). "Pray without ceasing." (1 Thess. 5:17). "Brethren pray for us." (1 Thess. 5:25).

YOUR CORRESPONDENCE AND LITERATURE ORDERS

No doubt many of you are getting impatient waiting for replies to your letters and for the literature that you have ordered. We have been extremely busy, and try as we may, we can't seem to catch up with it. We are literally swamped with unanswered mail.

We realize even more than you do what an important part of the totality of this publishing work the correspondence and literature orders is. We regret that it has suffered some neglect. But, we can only do just so much. Actually, we need a secretary, but there is no money to pay one with. Perhaps more of you would be willing to send us your tithe or donations, so that our operating budget would include at least a part time secretary. We hope that you will pray about this, and that the Lord will lay it on the hearts of you people to use your tithe in this way.

-The Editorial Staff.

"These days all you have to do to find out where your taxes go is to study geography.

—Dave Murray.

ELDER ODOM ASKS, ---

“Was Christ In The Tomb For 72 Hours?”

This question, posed by Elder Robert L. Odom, was the title of an article which appeared in the April, 1961 issue of **“The Ministry.”** A by-line under the writer’s name indicates that the Elder was once editor of the **“Index to the Writings of Ellen G. White.”** This in itself is significant, inasmuch as it does influence his thinking on this subject, as we shall show later on in this study.

The purpose of Elder Odom’s article is to explode what he calls a “theory,” i.e. that Christ was crucified on Wednesday and resurrected on the Sabbath,—that He was a full 72 hours in the tomb. His remarks are directed at Herbert W. Armstrong, and an article by him entitled, **“The Resurrection Was Not On Sunday,”** which appeared in the April, 1954 issue of **“The Plain Truth,”** a publication of the Radio Church of God, an offshoot from the old original Stanberrv, Mo., Church of God, (7th day).

The main purpose of this study is to analyze Elder Odom’s remarks and determine the truth of the matter. Is the doctrine of the Wednesday crucifixion and Sabbath resurrection fact or fiction? As Elder Odom has remarked, we shall **“weigh all the**

evidence,” and we shall evaluate it completely and honestly. Any lesser course is a waste of time and will only result in corrupting our souls. The whole truth, without denominational bias, is the only profitable rule to follow.

In connection with this, the writer wishes it to be clearly understood that he is in no way connected with Armstrong’s group, or the original Church of God, (7th day), or any other group which teaches the Wednesday crucifixion and Sabbath resurrection. In fact, I belong to the Seventh Day Baptist denomination which teaches the view of orthodoxy, that Jesus was crucified on Friday and resurrected early Sunday morning. In speaking out in defense of the doctrine of the Wednesday crucifixion and Sabbath resurrection, I realize that I am going contrariwise to the teaching of my own church. Therefore, I feel that I have proven my sincerity when I say that I am interested only in Bible truth, irrespective of denominational lines or bias.

The first testimony considered by Elder Odom is that of Matt. 12:40; “For as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale’s belly; so shall the Son

of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." Elder Odom begins his remarks by an attempt to find out what is meant by the expression, "three days and three nights," as is used in Matthew 12:40. He makes use of all the old stock arguments used by the Adventists with reference to time periods in prophecy. He states that the Bible writers were not trying to pinpoint the exact number of hours, minutes, and seconds involved in each case. He further points out that "in Hebrew usage," it was common practise to count any portion of a 24-hour day as a whole calendar day. This, of course, is true, and the careful student of the Word should not overlook or minimize this fact.

However, the thing that Elder Odom overlooks, as do all the Adventist brethren, is the fact that when the number of nights is indicated as well as the number of days, it ceases to be merely a matter of "common usage." Since the language is specific with regards to the time element, it becomes a literal statement of fact.

This truth is best expressed in Appendix 144, to the "**Companion Bible**," published by the Lamp Press in London. It says in part, "The fact that 'three days' is used by Hebrew idiom for any part of three days and three nights is not disputed; because that was the common way of reckoning, just as it was when used of years. Three or any number of years was used inclusively of any part of those years, as may be seen in the reckoning of

the reigns of the kings of Israel and Judah."

"But, when the number of 'nights' is stated as well as the number of 'days', then the expression ceases to be an idiom, and becomes a literal statement of fact." (Emphasis supplied)

This bit of information has the effect of a bombshell on the "old dodge" that parts of three days is counted as three whole days with reference to the death and resurrection of Christ. It is clearly indicated in Matthew 12:40 that three nights as well as three days are involved in the interment of Christ in the tomb. This simple fact answers completely and incisively, page after page of "beating about the bush" with relation to the various time elements found in the Biblical writings.

If Christ had been raised from the dead on Sunday morning as orthodoxy claims, then there might be some merit in the argument. But, as one minister of the Gospel has expressed it, "the fact that the party visiting the tomb Sunday morning, found it empty, is no indication that He (Christ) rose that morning."

Elder Odom attacks the second testimony of Matt. 28:1, which states that Jesus was actually resurrected late on the Sabbath. Oh Yes! It says just that, when rightly understood, in the light of what the original language reveals. In our King James Version the text is as follows: "In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulchre." Notice

particularly the opening phrase, **"In the end of the Sabbath;"** the Greek text reads, **"Opse de Sabbaton."** Sabbaton is the genitive plural form of the noun. In Thayer's Lexicon, p. 471; it says, **"Opse (late) followed by a genitive seems always to be partitive, denoting late in the period specified by the genitive (and consequently still belonging to it)."**

Two things are apparent here: the Greek word **"Sabbaton"** is plural, indicating more than one Sabbath, and it is also indicated in the original that it was still in the period specified by the genitive, or in other words, still within the time period allotted to the Sabbath hours, even though the Sabbath was drawing near to a close. So, the first visit to the tomb was not on Sunday morning, but late on the Sabbath. Just what these little known facts indicate will be enlarged upon in a moment. Some want to point out that it doesn't begin to dawn Saturday evening. Here again, the King James version is misleading, deviating from the original. George Ricker Berry's Greek-English Interlinear New Testament reads as follows: **"as it was getting dusk toward the first day of the week."** Remember, the Biblical day began and ended at sunset. So, it was nearing the end of the weekly Sabbath, just before sunset that the two Mary's first came to the tomb. Jesus had already risen. There was actually no part of Sunday involved, whatever. This places the entire event in a somewhat different light.

Now, where does all this

leave us? If we accept the popular tradition, that Jesus was crucified on Friday, then He was in the tomb only one day and a portion of another, not over 27 hours at the very most. As we pointed out, when the number of nights as well as the number of days is mentioned, it is no longer an idiom, but a literal statement of fact. Jesus was actually in the tomb three full days and three full nights, just as He said He would be. So, if He was resurrected late on the Sabbath, about the same time in the afternoon that He was placed in the tomb, He must have been crucified on Wednesday. If you count backward from the time of the resurrection, 72 hours, or three days and **three nights**, that would place the crucifixion on the preceding Wednesday, and the interment in the tomb that evening, just before sundown. Elder Odom makes mention of this principle of backing up 72 hours in a critical spirit, as it was employed by Herbert Armstrong in his article. But there is more to it than just the act of backing up 72 hours, from Sabbath afternoon to Wednesday afternoon.

Just as Elder Odom says, the crucifixion occurred on the preparation day for the Passover. His only mistake is in the day of the week on which the Passover fell in the year that Jesus was crucified. Jesus was crucified in the year 31, A.D., and in that year the Passover occurred on Thursday of the week, making the preparation day fall on the preceding day, Wednesday. The basic reason for calling Nisan 14 the "preparation day"

was that it was the day on which the paschal lamb was prepared for the Passover feast. Nowhere in the Scriptures is the day before the weekly Sabbath referred to as the "preparation day," as the Adventists customarily do in this day and age. This malpractice has led them into the mistaken assumption that the preparation day mentioned in the New Testament account of the crucifixion was on the day of the week now called Friday.

As Elder Odom says, Jesus ate the Passover with His disciples a day early, no doubt anticipating His early demise. However, it was not Thursday evening on which He ate the Passover. It was eaten by the Saviour on what we would now call Tuesday evening, after sundown, in the dark part of the preparation day. The light part of Wednesday was the time of preparing for the feast, and it was on that day that He was crucified about nine in the morning. He died about 3 p.m., and His burial was near the close of the day. Luke 23:56 says, "**And that day was the preparation, and the Sabbath drew on.**" But this particular Sabbath was **not** the weekly Sabbath, but the "**high Sabbath**" or Passover sabbath. John 19:31 says, "**The Jews therefore, because it was the preparation, that the bodies should not remain upon the cross on the Sabbath day, (for that sabbath was an high day) besought Pilate that their legs might be broken, and that they might be taken away.**" The Passover Sabbath being past, the women bought their spices on Friday of the week, and prepared them for

the intended anointing, "**and rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment.**" (Lu. 23:56) This is the reason why the plural was used in the Greek, because there were two Sabbaths involved in the crucifixion week, the Passover Sabbath and the weekly Sabbath.

The first visit to the tomb was toward the close of the Sabbath, as mentioned in Matt. 28:1. No mention is made here of the anointing. But the other Gospels, in mentioning the next visit to the tomb, early Sunday morning, refer to the women's intent to do the anointing. The reason this is not mentioned by Matthew is that they would not have anointed the body on the Sabbath.

Elder Odom refers to the rendering of the Revised Standard Version, which translates Matt. 28:1 as "**now after the Sabbath, toward the dawn of the first day of the week; Mary Magdalene and the others, etc.**" But this rendering is wrong on at least two counts, that is, in the use of the preposition "**after,**" and in using the singular instead of the plural of the word **Sabbath**. No doubt the bias of orthodoxy is reflected in the way in which this phrase is translated, and we do not place much confidence in modernist scholars who undermine the doctrine of the divinity of Christ. We feel that their Version is biased and unreliable in many ways. In our humble opinion, the American Revised Version is much better.

Another mistake which Elder Odom made is that he states that this was one of those instances in which the yearly

sabbath coincided with the weekly Sabbath. As we have already stated, in A.D. 31, the year in which Christ was crucified, the Passover occurred on Thursday of the week. This fact is born out by astronomical calculations published by the British Astronomer Royal. And according to their calculations, the Paschal full moon fell on Tuesday night, March 27th, in A.D. 31. The United States Naval Observatory bears out the same thing. Theirs is an exact Science, and irrefutable evidence. The preparation day would have commenced at sundown Tuesday evening. This nails it and clinches it.

A couple of minor problems might be mentioned in passing. Elder Odom quotes Mark 16:9: **"Now when Jesus was risen early the first day of the week, etc."** He contends that this is a plain statement of fact, that Jesus was resurrected on the first day of the week. There are a couple of facts which should be interpolated at this point. In the first place, **"was risen"** is past perfect tense. Used in the preterit sense, it indicates action that is already past. People should pay closer attention to the grammatical construction of what they are reading. A lot depends on where the punctuation is interjected into the sentence. We are told that the original manuscripts were written in capital letters and with only the consonants, **and there was no punctuation.** The comma was inserted by the translators. Suppose the comma had been placed after the word "risen." That would

change the sense of it a great deal. The same principle would apply to the same quotation from the Standard Revised Version that he mentions.

Now, we have said that we would show how the fact that Elder Odom was editor of the **Index to the Writings of Ellen G. White**, was significant, as far as his discussion of this subject is concerned. Mrs. White in her writings endorsed the orthodox view that Jesus was crucified on Friday and resurrected on Sunday. So the entire denomination, including Elder Odom, are committed to her alleged inspiration. Mrs. White didn't know any different so she went along with popular tradition. So, the fact that divine inspiration is claimed for the writings of Mrs. White, actually poses as a barrier to accepting new light, and Elder Odom is committed to defending their mistaken position.

This is tragic in another way. The Sunday-keeping evangelicals make much over the fact that Jesus was supposedly resurrected on Sunday. If it can be proven that He was not resurrected on Sunday at all, but on the Sabbath instead, it knocks the last prop out from under the custom of observing Sunday. It leaves the evangelicals without a leg to stand on. What a pity that the Adventists have their hands tied, so to speak, and dare not make use of this very effective weapon. Of such is the rut of alleged inspiration, orthodoxy, and maintaining the status quo.

--by the editor.

A Review Of "Questions On Doctrine."

Question 18

"Historic Concept Of The Mark of the Beast"

Question 19

"When The Mark Will Be Received."

Inasmuch as these two chapters are short ones and both deal with the subject of the **"mark of the beast,"** we will combine our discussion of the two chapters in this one issue.

The major question asked is, **"Why do Adventists differ from other Christians in connecting the mark of the beast with the Sabbath issue? And why do you put so much emphasis on this question.?"** (1)

The book committee have handled the question rather well in one respect. They point out that it is their belief that the Bible predicts a **"resurgence of papal power,"** in the last days with the probability of enforced Sunday observance. It is during this **"last great religious crisis,"** as they put it, that the test comes to all and the **"mark of the beast,"** is received by the vast majority. This, of course, involves the Sabbath as a test.

If all this be true then it would be impossible to over-emphasize the subject. That such questions tend to discomfit the evangelicals also seems evident.

As is often the case, the Adventist brethren are anxious to create the impression that they are **"not alone"** in their interpretations of these things; that their views were firmly establish-

ed by an impressive array of scholars before them.

To us, this is more evidence of trying not to look peculiar to the evangelicals. In the old days of their denominational history they were proud and anxious to be designated **"a peculiar people."** Now they are even more anxious to rid themselves of this stigma. Nowadays, they want more than all else, to appear perfectly normal, in the groove, so to speak, just like everyone else, just like the evangelicals.

But what does it matter, what the reformers taught, or what certain scholars taught, or what the evangelicals would have us teach? This is all beside the point. The only pursuit worthy of our consideration is the quest for truth,—the pure, unadulterated truth. The scholars were often mistaken about many things, even as the evangelicals are today,—sincere, perhaps, but nonetheless mistaken. So the mere fact that a certain reformer, or a certain scholar, taught such and such, or so and so, is neither here nor there. The only pursuit worthy of our consideration is the quest for truth.

One statement that is made in this chapter reminds us of certain remarks that were made in our review of the preceding

chapter. They are as follows: **"Sabbatarian Adventists all recognize that the Sabbath was not a test in centuries past,--"** Perhaps the reader will recall that we mentioned the fact that for centuries the knowledge of the true Sabbath was all but completely lost and obliterated, except for the orthodox Jews, and isolated groups of Christians here and there. And that is the reason it was not a test, if true.

While Adventists trace their views on the **"mark of the beast"** to certain scholars of the past, they honestly confess that none of those scholars made the application of the mark of the beast specifically to the Sabbath issue. The early scholars applied it to various phases of the papal power, such as their excommunicating power, their decrees, allegiance to the beast or the pope of Rome, or just plain subservience to the papacy in general. None made specific application to the Sabbath. The Adventists, of course, make this special application to the Sabbath in connection with the last days, just before the second coming of Christ.

Adventists tactfully explain to the Sunday-keeping evangelicals that it is not their belief that all who now worship on Sunday have the "mark of the beast," but that this mark of apostasy will not come until the test comes in the last days, just before the coming of the Lord.

But, is this traditional Adventism? The evangelicals have asked the question, **"Does not Mrs. White teach that those**

who now keep Sunday already have the mark of the beast?"

In answer to this, the book committee have quoted a paragraph from a book called **"Evangelism."** "No one has yet received the mark of the beast. The testing time has not yet come. There are true Christians in every church, not excepting the Roman Catholic communion. None are condemned until they have had the light and have seen the obligation of the fourth commandment. But when the decree shall go forth enforcing the counterfeit Sabbath, and the loud cry of the third angel shall warn men against the worship of the beast and his image, the line will be clearly drawn between the false and the true. Then those who still continue in transgression will receive the mark of the beast." (2)

This, they say, was penned by her in 1899 and has ever **"been her uniform teaching throughout the years,--excerpts twisted out of their setting by detractors notwithstanding."**

But is this really what Mrs. White taught in the early days, say about the middle of the last century? In the book, **"Early Writing,"** she says, "But now time is almost finished, and what we have been years in learning, they will have to learn in a few months. They will also have much to unlearn, and much to learn again. Those who would not receive the mark of the beast and his image when the decree goes forth, must have decision **now** to say, **Nay**, we will not regard the institution of the beast." (3)

This is quoted from an edition of **"Early Writings,"** published in 1925. However, in the Preface of this book we are told that, "this collection of the early writings of Mrs. E. G. White is made up of two small works, **'Experience and Views,'** which was first published in 1851, and **'Spiritual Gifts,'** published in 1858." The quotation given is from **"Experience and Views,"** page 67, and as the preface says, this was first published in 1851.

Now, what is the significance of what is said here? For one thing, in 1851, it was obvious that they thought time was almost finished and that new members would have only a few months to learn what they had been approximately seven years (since 1844) in learning. At this time, Joseph Bates was teaching that the **"seven times"** of Lev. 26:14 represented seven years that Christ would be in the most holy place, and that Christ would come at the end of those seven years. This would have necessitated receiving the mark of the beast in 1851.

We feel certain that the conclusions we have drawn are obvious enough to all and that we have twisted nothing out of context. This is a favorite plea of the Adventists whenever a quotation from anything written by Mrs. White embarrasses them and they are unable to explain it. We are not **"detractors"** when we tell the truth and we have taken nothing out of context. We leave it to the reader to judge. This seems to be another impression that the Adventists would like to give the evangeli-

cal, that they are constantly troubled by so-called **"detractors"** who twist things out of context. Thus we are discredited before we get started. This tactic is as **"old as the hills,"** so to speak, but it fools only those who are incapable of thinking for themselves, or those who unconsciously want to be fooled.

There is something else about this quote from the book entitled **"Evangelism,"** which we wish to call to the reader's attention. In 1899, Mrs. White said there were true Christians in every church, including the Catholic communion. It is very obvious that she changed her tune considerably from the way in which she wrote of the churches in the early days. In **Early Writings,** she said, "Satan has taken full possession of the churches as a body." (4) "--they have been filling up with every unclean and hateful bird." (5) "--children of their father the devil;--" (6)

Apparently Mrs. White's attitude toward the other churches became much more liberal toward the close of the century. But why all the bitterness of approximately 50 years before? There is a very good psychological reason for this, as we shall show.

While the early Adventists were proclaiming the imminent and eminent return of the Lord in 1844, the Protestant churches in general rejected the Millerite teachings, that the Lord would come in 1844, and which Adventists then claimed was the first angel's message of Revelation 14. Biblical scholars of that era realized that William Miller was

mistaken and tried vainly to warn him of this fact.

In the summer of 1844 the second angel's message became the call for all those who were looking for the Lord to come, to "come out" of the Protestant churches which were branded by the Adventists as "Babylon."

Because devout Christian scholars refused to accept these errors, Mrs. White became vociferously bitter toward them. This bitterness became greatly increased after the "great disappointment" when a great deal of ridicule was directed at the Adventists as a body.

We've said it before, and we'll say it again: much that is written in this book could be called a "snow job," calculated to put the Adventists in better odor with the evangelicals and the public in general. They are repudiating much of what the early Adventists taught; the very things that put them in bad odor to begin with. Moreover, they deny repudiating anything that the pioneers of the movement taught, or that any changes have been or are being made. Their teaching is said to be the same as it has always been. However, there are a great many people, evangelicals and critics alike, and even many among their own membership, who know better, and who are distressed by "the big lie."

Why, oh why, do they fear that complete honesty and integrity will do them any hurt? We find that confession is still good for the soul.

And this policy of gradually dropping their errors, one by one, into the abyss of forgetfulness

over the years, in the hope that no one will notice, or be the wiser, is futile. Many will notice, and capitalize on it to the ultimate degree. Besides, it is not being honest with the people, or with God, or with themselves. Brethren, we appeal to you as we often have before, "to thine own self (selves) be true."

As Thomas Huxley once said, "veracity is the heart of morality."

--by the editor.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- (1) Anonymous, "Questions On Doctrine," p. 179, Review and Herald Publ. Assn., Washington, D.C., 1957.
- (2) White, Mrs. E. G., "Evangelism," pp. 234, 235, Review and Herald Publ. Assn., Washington, D. C., 1899.
- (3) White, Mrs. E. G., "Early Writings," p. 67, Review and Herald Publ. Assn., Washington, D. C., 1925.
- (4) White, Mrs. E. G., "Early Writings," p. 273, Review and Herald Publ. Assn., Washington, D.C., 1925.
- (5) White, Mrs. E. G., "Early Writings," p. 274, Review and Herald Publ. Assn., Washington, D.C., 1925.
- (6) White, Mrs. E. G., "Early Writings," p. 228, Review and Herald Publ. Assn., Washington, D.C., 1925.

The Needs Of Man.

The need for love and security,
The need for self-expression,
The need for recognition and self-esteem.

What The Readers Say—

McAlester, Oklahoma
August 27, 1962.

Dear Elder Mote:

Greetings to you and the editorial staff of the Gathering Call. Greetings, in the name of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. It affords me much pleasure to answer your letter of June 8th, and I ask your forgiveness for not answering before. Now, for the reason that I did not answer sooner; we wanted to get pictures of the house where the paper was first printed. We also went to Bache to see if we could find the little office building. It has since been torn down, or moved from where it was. We found a small building that looked like it about a block from where it was. We failed to get the information we wanted at that time. We were going back to Bache later to find out about it. Before we got to go back, my granddaughter came from Oregon and wanted us to go with them to the Meridian, Idaho, campmeeting, and we did. We then went to Eugene, Oregon, to visit a daughter, and granddaughters, and greats, and then to Everett, Washington, to visit the wife's brother, and from there to Bakersfield to visit a sister, and a daughter, and also some more grands and greats.

We arrived home in time for the General and Oklahoma campmeetings. We arrived home yesterday and found your other letter awaiting us. So, I am writing you a few lines. Yes, you have our permission to quote from the article in the Harvest Field Messenger, and we are glad for you to do it. The wife and I are going back to Bache this week to get whatever information we can about the little building. I will write you our findings in the next few days.

Now, I will give you the names of all that had any part in the founding of The Gathering Call: Lee Eylar and wife, W. J. Rich, W. F. Tolbert and wife, J. K. Feather and wife, Doc Berriman and wife, Mary Smith, R. K. Walker and wife. Lee Eylar was editor and brother W. J. Rich, assistant editor. We had gathered quite a list of names of those who were cast out of the SDA church. We sent the paper to all. We asked for names after the second paper.

We began to hear from others, and the brothers and sisters of our group began to help, and ministers began writing. Brothers A. F. Ballenger and G. G. Rupert came to see us just before we moved the paper (from Anderson) to Bache. After we moved the paper to Bache, there were several preachers who came to see us. Brother J. J. Jobe came too, just before our campmeeting at Bache, which was our second campmeeting. Brother B. L. Thompson came about a week before the campmeeting.

Pardon the writing on both sides of the paper. I was out of paper and I wanted to get this in the mail. So, bye for now.

A brother in Christ,
(Signed) R. K. Walker
523 W. Jackson St.,
McAlester, Oklahoma.

JAMES WHITE ON THE RESTORATION OF ISRAEL.

As I was in the employ of the late J. Edson White for many years, I got to know many things hidden from others, that there was not always harmony on points of doctrine in the White family. Edson usually took the part of his mother, while Willie followed his father and for years after his mother's death, being the custodian of his mother's writings, incorporated in them many of the prohibitive views of his father. It is a long story, but Willie succeeded in getting two whole chapters of the book, "The Captivity and Restoration of Israel." Then because the title told too much it was changed to "Prophets and Kings." All of this you should know along with the commission bestowed upon me by Edson to take up the work where his mother left off. This I attempted to do. Then one day the Lord spoke to me, telling me that the blindness of Israel was being removed, and that they were to be the agency through whom all the covenant promises were to be fulfilled.

—by Walter Reason,
in the "Mount Zion Reporter,"
June, 1962.
(Church of God - 7th day)

The 2300 Day Hassle in La Sierra

A Continuation Of The Discussion Between The Members Of
The Adventist Church And The Church Of God, (7th Day).

(Editor's Note:-- We have tried very hard to bring you readers an accurate record of all that was said at this meeting, but it must be remembered that it was transcribed from a tape months after it happened, and some of it was very difficult to hear and understand because of the immensity of the hall and the poor acoustics. In a few instances, we were obliged to record what it sounded like and let it go at that. Therefore, it is impossible to guarantee 100 per cent accuracy. So, with appropriate apologies to the readers and to those persons involved in the discussion for any inaccuracies, we bring you this report as factual and truthful as we could possibly make it. --the Editor

Brother Coulson: -- Where was God dwelling in the sanctuary of the Old Testament, brother Delafield?

Elder Delafield:--If it isn't asking too much, I would like to to ask brother St. John to say a word or two here,--in answer to that question.

(Jumble of voices in background, indistinguishable.)

Elder Padilla:-- If you would like to answer that,--where did God appear in the sanctuary of the Old Testament? Just answer, Holy, or Most Holy.

(Brief silence)

Elder Delafield: -- The brother here says that it was in the Most Holy place.

Elder Padilla:--The brother says that it was in the Most Holy place.

Brother Coulson:-- Amen! That is what I wanted to bring out,

because it's doubtless there that God dwelt, in the Most Holy place. Now, the prophecy tells us that this king, -- it doesn't say a pope or anyone else:-- it says a king,--that he would defile that Most Holy place, right in the presence where God dwelt at that time in the tabernacle, in the earthly tabernacle. Not the heavenly tabernacle, but the earthly tabernacle. That's what Daniel is so concerned about. He fainted because of the terrible vision that the earthly tabernacle of God was going to be defiled and trodden down, and that his people were going to be scattered and divided. He fainted because he was under pressure. This man was under pressure because he realized his people were going to have to undergo great hardship as Antiochus and his army marched into that place, at that time, and that he would offer swine's flesh and the abomination there in the place of the altar of God. Elder Padilla:-- Allright, we've mentioned this much, now--that the feeling of brother Delafield and the Adventists is that this little horn that came out from one of the four horns here, was Rome, which came out in 168, B.C., I believe brother Delafield said, wasn't it?

Elder Delafield: -- That's the time that we understand that Rome, pagan Rome, succeeded in conquering Grecia, becoming

the fourth world power.

Elder Padilla: -- Allright, then, may I ask you this question, brother Delafield? You can answer it after I get through mentioning it here. If this horn came out of Grecia in 168, and this horn you claim was the pope of Rome, who defiled the heavenly sanctuary, then why do you go back to before the Grecian empire ever existed, to 457, -- to claim that this little horn went back 300 years in time, to claim something that never happened in 457, and from 168?

Elder Delafield:--We don't say it that way, -- anything like that, brother Padilla.

Elder Padilla: -- You don't? Don't you start counting the 2300 days from 457?

Elder Delafield: -- That's right.

Elder Padilla: -- Wasn't it the little horn that defiled the sanctuary for 2300 years?

Elder Delafield: -- Yes, brother Padilla.

Elder Padilla: -- And, wasn't it in 168 that--

Elder Delafield: -- We're not saying, brother Padilla, that for two thousand and three hundred years, from 457, that Rome was defiling the sanctuary. We're not that---- I don't know how to say it. We're not quite that dense, brother Padilla. We don't make such a foolish assertion.

Elder Padilla: -- Well, my question is, don't you start counting the 2300 days from 457?

Elder Delafield: -- Right!

Elder Padilla: -- And then---

Elder Delafield: -- We don't say, brother Padilla, that during that full 2300 day period, that Rome

is casting down God's sanctuary, from 168, for Rome itself has not even come into existence.

Elder Padilla: -- That's exactly right. I'm glad you said that. Rome wasn't even in existence in 457, B.C., so how can you count from 457,--2300 years, when you claim that this little horn that defiled the sanctuary, according to Daniel 8:14,-- it was the little horn in 168, according to you. And you go back to 457, 2300 years before 1844.

Elder Delafield: -- Well, the beginning of Rome in 168 has nothing to do with the counting of the 2300 days. It is the events that occurred in 1844, that mark the end of the 2300 day period, or the cleansing of the sanctuary.

Elder Padilla: -- Oh? When?

Elder Delafield: -- We have to get a starting point.

Elder Padilla: -- When was the sanctuary defiled?

Elder Delafield: -- Where does it say the sanctuary was defiled?

Elder Padilla: -- You! Didn't you say a little while ago that Rome defiled the sanctuary in heaven?

(Brief silence)

Elder Delafield: -- "And it waxed great even to the host of heaven; and it cast down some of the host and of the stars to the ground, and stamped upon them." (Vs. 10)

Elder Padilla: -- That's Rome, isn't it?

Elder Delafield: -- "Yea, he magnified himself even to the prince of the host, and by him the daily sacrifice was taken away, and the place of his sanctuary was cast down." (Vs. 11) And at that time, he magnified himself

against the prince of the host, and verse 25 says, -- "he shall also stand up against the prince of princes, "but he shall be broken without hand."

Elder Padilla: -- Allright, in what year was it that Rome defiled the heavenly sanctuary? In what year was it, brother Delafield?

Elder Delafield: -- What was your question?

Elder Padilla:-- What year was it, brother Delafield, that Rome defiled the sanctuary in heaven?

Elder Delafield: -- The prophecy doesn't state, brother Padilla.

Elder Padilla: -- Well, you have to have a starting place somewhere. If Rome defiled the sanctuary in heaven, when was it? What year was it? That's what I want to know.

Elder Delafield: -- It would have to be some time after 168 B.C., at which time Rome began to rule the world.

Elder Padilla: -- Allright!

Elder Delafield: -- But that has nothing to do with the 2300 day period, the 70 weeks, the 69 weeks, the 7 weeks, the sixty-nine and one half weeks, that period of which 457 is the starting point. That's how we know that 1844 is right, because it is proved out by the other four dates.

Elder Padilla: -- Brother Delafield, you're not answering the question. I'm asking you; it says unto 2300 days, then shall the sanctuary be cleansed. Now, when was the sanctuary defiled in heaven? Tell me that, so we can count 2300 years to the cleansing of the sanctuary. You claim that this little horn was

Rome and I want to know when did Rome defile the heavenly sanctuary?

Elder Delafield: -- Some time after 168 B.C.

Elder Padilla: -- Now, name me the date, because you have to have a starting point to count 2300 days, brother Delafield.

Elder Delafield: -- No, that has nothing to do with it.

Elder Padilla:--Why? (A jumble of voices in the rear in which Elder St. John apparently interrupts with a comment which we could not hear).

Elder Padilla: -- Allright, brother St. John, can you answer that, please?

Elder Delafield: -- Elder St. John is a little hard of hearing.

Elder Padilla: -- Well, maybe one of the other brethren here can.

Elder Delafield: --Will one of you other brethren. -- uh--

Elder Padilla: -- Can you answer me this question? If the Roman empire defiled the heavenly sanctuary, what was the date? -- so that we can start counting 2300 days from then?

Unidentified voice -- possiby that of Elder D. P. Harder:--Brother, he doesn't feel like answering it because he can't hear it.

Elder Padilla: -- Well, maybe some of you brethren can answer it for him.

Same unidentified voice: -- Why don't you write it out and we will give it to him.

Sister Padilla: --He wants you to write out the question.

Elder Harder: -- He doesn't hear well what we're saying.

Elder Padilla: -- Oh! Well, then

maybe one of you brethren can tell me, possibly. Allright, brother Leonard, is it? Is that your name?

Brother Leonard: -- The reason we begin to count the time from 457, is that we are told that from the time of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem,--

Elder Padilla: -- Thank you.

Brother Leonard: -- That is our starting point.

Elder Padilla: -- Allright, brother Leonard, did the little horn, or Rome, defile the sanctuary in 457?

Brother Leonard: -- The devil has been defiling it ever since.

Elder Padilla: -- Well, who defiled it at that time?

Brother Leonard: -- People. Uh-

Elder Padilla: -- No. Rome. Uh, wasn't it Nebuchadnezzar who threw down the sanctuary in 606?

Brother Leonard: -- The Roman empire, he defiled it much more. That's the point.

Elder Padilla: -- Allright. When did the Roman empire defile the heavenly sanctuary, brother?

Brother Leonard: -- That's -- uh. There's no point in that. It doesn't say that.

Elder Padilla: -- No? That's the whole thing, brethren. We go from then, 2300 years to find out when the heavenly sanctuary was cleansed.

Brother Leonard: -- No. It does not say that. The books of Daniel and Revelation are latter day books. They weren't to be understood until the last days. We read in Daniel 12:4 -- "But thou, O Daniel, shut up the words, and seal the book, even

to the time of the end."

Elder Padilla: -- Allright, then.

Brother Leonard: -- Now, the time of the end, we understand, in Daniel, the time of the end that God has revealed to Daniel. We read here in the 10th verse, "And many shall be pure and made white and tried; but the wicked shall do wickedly: and none of the wicked shall understand; but the wise shall understand."

Elder Padilla: -- But the wise shall understand.

Brother Leonard: -- Yes. That is the most important thing about this sanctuary question. We are living in the time of the investigative-judgment, and the work is going on of the investigative-judgment, and we should make special preparation to meet our God. It is just received since the time of Christ. We read here in Malachi, the third chapter, and the first five verses, "Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: and the Lord whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold, he shall come saith the Lord of hosts. But who may abide the day of his coming? (That's the question we should ask) and who shall stand when he appeareth? for he is like a refiner's fire, and like fuller's soap: and he shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver: and he shall purify the sons of Levi. (The sons of Levi are the priests and the ministers of us today, who should represent the preachers and the teachers of the Word of God, and -- (Break

at the end of the tape. We pick up Elder Delafield speaking again at the beginning of the next tape).

Elder Delafield: -- I'm saying this with all respect, but I'd like to say this, brother Padilla, that you're trying to make the prophecy say something that it does not say.

Elder Padilla: -- Alright, explain it.

Elder Delafield: -- I'll try to. If you look at chapter 8, and the 14th verse, there is no place that it says, that for 2300 days the sanctuary would be defiled. You're trying to make it say it, but it doesn't say that. The only place that the 2300 days enters into it is to tell when the defiling of the sanctuary would end. It doesn't say it will last for 2300 days. It says that at the end of 2300 days, it would be cleansed.

Elder Padilla: -- Alright, now the question is, when was the sanctuary defiled? Because, it was after 2300 years, according to you that it was cleansed. Alright, when was it defiled?

When was it defiled?

Elder Delafield: -- The point is this, it was cleansed at the end of the 2300 days.

Elder Padilla: -- Alright, when was it defiled?

Elder Delafield: -- That has nothing to do with it.

Elder Padilla: -- But, why not? That is the meat of the whole thing, brother. If you can tell us when it was defiled, and then count 2300 years to get to 1844, don't you? Why do you start at 457 B.C.? Was it defiled then?

Elder Delafield: -- No, it was not.

Elder Padilla: -- Then when was it defiled?

Elder Delafield: -- It was defiled some time after the beginning of the 2300 days, but it does not say when.

Elder Padilla: -- Then why do you start at 457 then? Brother Coulson--

Brother Coulson: -- 457 marks the date of the rebuilding, in other words, it marks the cleansing of the sanctuary. How long then,-- (His voice is drowned out by several others interrupting).

Unknown Voice: -- May I say a word, brother Padilla, please.

Elder Padilla: -- Alright, if he is through, you can go ahead. We don't want to keep interrupting one another.

Unknown voice again: -- He asked a question.

Elder Padilla: -- Alright, go ahead then. Answer it.

Unknown Questioner: -- You say that 457 marks the beginning of the cleansing of the sanctuary?

Brother Coulson: -- The decree went forth to rebuild and establish the sanctuary in 457. This decree sent Ezra the priest down to Jerusalem to begin to restore and rebuild Jerusalem. In 457, Right?

Unknown Voice: -- Correct!

Brother Coulson: -- Alright. 49 years ended in 408. By this time Jerusalem was rebuilt and restored.

Unknown Voice: -- Correct.

Elder Padilla: -- Alright. The question is, did the "little horn" defile the sanctuary in 457?

(Jumble of voices--indistinguishable.)

Unknown Voice: -- I didn't hear that, brother Padilla.

Elder Padilla: -- Did the little horn here, which is Rome, defile the sanctuary in 457?

Unknown voices chorus the words: -- No, brother Padilla.

Elder Padilla: -- Thank you. I know it didn't.

Unknown Voice: -- It has nothing to do with that.

Elder Padilla: -- So, you can't count 2300 years from 457. Go ahead, brother Coulson. I'm speaking out of turn here.

Brother Coulson: -- We know that in 457 they did start to rebuild because we are told that Nebuchadnezzar entered into the city of Jerusalem and that he utterly destroyed everything. He broke down the walls, demolished the city, the sanctuary; everything was destroyed. He took away the golden vessels. He entered into the holy place of the temple, did he not? Who alone, was allowed to go into the holy places of the temple, once a year?

Unknown Voice: -- The high priest.

Brother Coulson: -- In other words, this man defiled the temple of God by entering into the most holy place, did he not?

Unknown Voice: -- Who did?

Brother Coulson: -- This man, Nebuchadnezzar. He defiled the temple by entering in, did he not?

Unknown Voice: -- You mean 538?

Brother Coulson: -- Yes, or whenever it was that Nebuchadnezzar entered in.

Unknown Voice: -- When Nebuchadnezzar entered the temple, it was around 605, or 606, or

607, around there.

Another voice: -- When a man enters the sanctuary, whether it is 606, or 538, or any other time he is polluting God's sanctuary.

Brother Coulson: -- In other words, this decree by Artaxerxes, that went forth in 457, was to restore what this man Nebuchadnezzar had done; to restore the city of Jerusalem and the temple, and the worship of all of it. They were permitted to return and restore and continue their worship. Right? They had been cut off from their land. Right? They were 70 years in Babylon.

In captivity. Were they not? According to Jeremiah. Right?

Unknown Voice: -- 606 to 536.

Brother Coulson: -- Yeah! And here they are going back to restore the temple, because it had been defiled. But, in this 2300 day prophecy the temple had been restored previous to this. They had already rebuilt the city and the temple, and here another man enters the sanctuary to defile it, under the Greek empire, many years later, according to this prophecy.

Elder Padilla: -- Yes, 300 years later.

Brother Coulson: -- This is in the time of the Greek empire; not in the time of Babylon, or Nebuchadnezzar, but in the time of Antiochus, under Greece, many years later. The city had already been rebuilt and established and the temple restored, and this man Antiochus enters into the temple and defiles it. Now, which defilement are we going from, --to establish the beginning point of the 2300 days?

Unknown voice interrupts: ----

Excuse me, (his voice is drowned out by a jumble of voices interrupting in the background. -- Apparently, some reference is made to a 1150 day period.)

Brother Coulson: -- As far as dates are concerned, I'd like to make this one comment, right now. I don't claim to know any dates of the Bible. And I don't claim that there is anyone who does know the correct dates of the chronology of the Bible. I don't know of anyone who can claim that all the chronological dates given in the Bible are correct.

Unknown Voice: -- But the prophecies are correct.

Brother Coulson: -- Absolutely. The prophecies are correct. In other words, the prophecy of the 1150 days, or the 2300 days is correct. Is it not?

Unknown Voice: -- Yes!

Brother Coulson: -- Yes. That is absolutely right. In other words, the prophecy is correct, even though we know that man has made mistakes in setting the chronological dates of the Bible. Therefore, the prophecy is right but the chronology shows that man has made mistakes, therefore you cannot depend on man or chronology in all these different things.

Elder Padilla: -- This man had his hand up.

Barely distinguishable voice: -- Then it could be 2300 days, or 5 000 for that matter. In the date 457 there could have been a big difference in history. I'd like to read here-- (Reads a quotation from some book or document. Unable to hear it all):-- (There is some discussion in the

background at this point about how the date 457 was established. Unable to make it out.)

Elder Padilla: -- This man had his hand up. We want to give everyone a chance to say something. We don't want to rush, but it is already time. It is 10 o'clock and past, and so we want to hear from this brother for just a minute or two,--and you are probably wanting to go home.

Brother Mote: -- Very briefly, it is this: I believe the brother over here said that the beginning of the 2300 days had nothing to do with the casting down of the sanctuary. That is when the sanctuary was cast down.

Unknown voice in answer: -- It doesn't say that.

Brother Mote: -- If you take that position, you are missing the point of the whole thing. First the prophecy tells of the sanctuary being cast down by the "little horn," and the question is asked, "How long shall this be?" And the answer is given-- 2300 days. It is as simple as that. And if you take the point of view that there is no relationship there, you are missing the point of the whole thing. You break into the sense of it. I might add something else. Someone said something about the sacrifice and oblation ceasing at the crucifixion of Christ, but actually I know that the problem hinges on that from the Adventist point of view, but what actually happened was that when the veil of the temple was rent in twain the priests patched it up and the sacrifices and oblation continued until Jerusalem was destroyed

by the Roman army under Titus in A.D., 70. Actually, that was what happened and I would like to make another brief observation. In this prophecy, we are not talking about days. We are talking about evening and morning sacrifices in the Jewish temple.

Unknown voice interrupts: ---- That isn't exactly the gist of the Hebrew text.

Elder Padilla: -- What Hebrew text is that?

Same unknown voice: --I'm afraid I don't have the Hebrew text with me, but.--

Elder Padilla: -- What is the text you are referring to? Is it a Bible or Hebrew text?

(Answer indistinguishable).

Another unidentified voice: --- Strong's and Young's gives it.

Elder Padilla: -- The Septuagint translation, --is that the one?

(Answer indistinguishable).

Elder Padilla: -- Allright, brother Carlin, you had your hand up. (Declines) Let's see, the man in the corner over there. I believe you had your hand up.

Unknown voice: -- I think it is about time to quit. Instead of getting together we are getting farther and farther apart.

Elder Padilla: -- Yes, allright.

(Same voice): --- I would like to see the pastor up there, and brother Padilla come together and study together, and bring the facts and study it with prayer, and when they have decided, let the rest come and be in on it.

Elder Padilla: -- Well, I am open-minded, brethren. I would not close my mind to anything. If we can jot down dates and facts according to the Bible and history, and then get together,

I'm willing, brother Delafield.

Elder Delafield: --- Brother Padilla, I have nothing more to say, but I'd like to take counsel with this dear brother. Brother Padilla, I would be happy to sit down, you and I, and as God's servants we love our same Lord Jesus, and if we can sit down and study over some of these things, we may not always be able to see eye to eye, but we can all love one another, can't we. (Chorus of "Amens") and have the right spirit. God bless you, brother Padilla, in your great work. You have been kind to us. I think the brother is right about this --- there is no point in prolonging this. We don't see eye to eye on everything, but I think that if we pray together and study together, God may help us to see more light from each other, and help one another in getting to the kingdom. (Chorus of "Amens") Satan is after all of us. He hates us. He wants to divide us. We are united on one great theme. We love the Lord and we endeavor to keep His Commandments. I believe He is going to guide us in our study of these prophecies of Daniel 8 and 9, and other prophecies of the Bible. Thank you again, brother Padilla.

Elder Padilla: -- Thank you, brother Delafield. Thank you very much. The trouble is that certain brethren were kicked out because they believed differently in the 1844 doctrine, brother Delafield. The same love that you spoke of should have been manifested to those who were kicked out. I believe that we should have love one for another,

as you just said. We should have that love that God has given us and not use the Word of God to divide or for strife. But let us have that love when we come together, and then bow on bended knees together. The brother here will now close the service.

Thank you very much.

Brother Victor Youngs: -- Let's all stand together and sing that old chorus, "Thank you, Lord, for saving my soul." (Afterward, brother Youngs gave the benediction).

(Editor's Note--This feature has been slightly condensed, some of the repetition being deleted so that we might conclude it in this issue. We also want to apologize to the readers for the long, drawn-out running of this article. We had no idea to begin with that it would be so long. But once it was started, we felt we had to finish it. We believe, however, that it will serve a good purpose after all in revealing the evasiveness and side-stepping of the issue on

the part of the Adventists. This is a fair sample of how difficult it is to tie them down to a straight-forward answer on this subject. How much good it accomplished we will never know until the judgment day.)

"Yawning is an involuntary opening of the mouth when you wish others would close theirs." --Selected.

"Only the enslaved are of equal equality."

--Aristotle.

THE GENERAL CONFERENCE SPECIAL — The most convincing presentation of shocking facts regarding the teaching and practices of SDA founders and leaders ever appearing in one document. 68 pages. Price 25c.

MRS. WHITE'S WILL — Everyone familiar with Mrs. White's instructions regarding the disposition of property should read how she disposed of her estate. Duplicate of a certified copy, 10c.

The Gathering Call

Needs Your Tithes And Offerings

PLEASE MAKE CHECKS OR MONEY ORDERS PAYABLE TO

"THE GATHERING CALL PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION"

P.O. BOX 4215, HARDMAN CENTER STATION

RIVERSIDE 4, CALIFORNIA, U.S.A.

**HELP THIS REFORM MESSAGE TO GROW AND EXPAND
AND ACCOMPLISH THE MISSION IT WAS CALLED TO DO.**

Peace On Earth And Good Will Toward Men.

Glory to God in the highest, and on earth Peace and good Will toward men! This was the Song of the Angels the night when the Prince of Peace, the Son of God, was born as a little child to become the Son of man, and to restore Peace upon earth!

The Prince of Peace came to earth to destroy the prince of this world. The Prince of Peace mentions the prince of this world three times in the Gospel of St. John, chapters 12:31; 14:30; 16:11.

Great peace have they that love thy Law. Psalms 119:165.
For he that loveth another hath fulfilled the Law. Rom. 13:8.
Love worketh no ill to his neighbor; therefore love is the fulfilling of the Law. Romans 13:10.

Where there is LOVE there is LAW and there is PEACE.

The prince of this world taught our first parents to disbelieve God, to disobey God, and to disregard the Law of God, which is the very foundation of Peace.

The prince of this world took away the dominion over the earth which was given to our first parents by the Creator. Instead of obeying the Law of love, they obeyed the law of hatred, the law of him who was a murderer from the beginning. Brother murdered brother, and war and bloodshed was on earth from that time until now, and now more so than ever before.

But we have a sure promise of God, that the Prince of Peace, through His death, has earned the right to destroy him, the prince of this world, the devil, who has the power of death. Hebrews 2:14. And the kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of His Christ; and He shall reign for ever and ever. Revelation 11:15.

For unto us a child is born, and unto us a Son is given: and the government shall be upon His shoulders: . . . Of the increase of His government and Peace, there shall be no end. . . . Isaiah 9:6, 7.

But with righteousness shall He judge the poor, and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth: . . .

And righteousness shall be the girdle of His loins, and faith-

fulness the girdle of His reins.

The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them. Isaiah 11:4, 5, 6.

And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: Revelation 21:1. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away. Revelation 21:4.

Eternal Peace in the kingdom of God and His Christ. Peace because of the eternal Law of God. Love God above all things, then thy fellow man as thyself.

.. STONES IN THY TEMPLE ..

We thank thee, Father, for the church of Christ,
Built solidly on rock, not shifting sand.
We thank thee "gates of hell shall not prevail"
Against this building which Thy wisdom planned.

Forgive that in our blindness we've confused
Thy church with groups that men have organized.
Forgive the time spent on creedal fences, Lord-
The building halted while we dogmatized.

Lord, add us to that unseen church whose names
Are written up in heaven. Make us pray
As living stones in thine own temple, Lord,
Not merely staging to be cast away.

--by Alice Schrammeck.

CHRISTMAS, - - -

deemed it important to us to know the date and to celebrate it, He would have revealed it in His Word and commanded us to do so. The fact that it is not revealed to us predicates the certainty that God, at least, did not consider it important. But, we are presumptuous. We like our own traditions better.

Not only that, but if the Christmas celebration is the only contact that some people have with Christ, then heaven help them! It isn't enough!

-D.E.M.

THE ONLY ONE-WORLDISM THAT WE ARE INTERESTED IN IS THE KINGDOM OF CHRIST, WHEN HE COMES. WE DON'T BUY ANY OTHER.

--the editor.

THE SANCTUARY SPECIAL — The SDA Sanctuary teaching is the most unscriptural doctrine to be found in any Protestant creed. It is so unreasonable and so contrary to the Bible that no intelligent minister dares to defend it in public or private. 25c per copy.

News and Views

**Doctrine of--
"NO SALVATION OUTSIDE ROMAN
CATHOLIC CHURCH," - Gets Airing At
Ecumenical Council.**

The local newspaper recently contained a re-hash of an item from the N.Y. Herald-Tribune News Service in which it was stated that the doctrine has often been misunderstood.

There seems to be indications that the modern-day papacy is endeavoring to water down some of its characteristically dogmatic teaching.

They are now saying that a modern-day application of the doctrine does not mean that non-Catholics are automatically doomed--that someone who wants God's will to be done cannot be denied salvation. According to modern R. C. Catholic teaching, someone who wants what God wants is showing an implicit desire to be a Roman Catholic.

This may be some improvement over the historic Roman Catholic concept, but not much. Its the same old story; every religious group seem to think that they have the inside track with God.

The Adventists are endeavoring to improve on their teachings, so why should not the Catholics and other religious groups? Maybe it is a modern-day trend.

--the editor.

PUTTING CHRIST IN CHRISTMAS

Another recent news item tells of a renewed campaign to put Christ back in Christmas this season. To someone in the know, this seems absurd. Christ was never in Christmas, in the first place. To those who know of the true origin of the Christmas tradition, this effort on the part of perhaps sincere but nonetheless misguided ones, is ludicrous in the extreme. Christ was not born on December 25th, as any Bible scholar worth his salt knows.

Your editor first came to know something of this fact years ago when I was a youth of perhaps 14 years of age. Every winter I would trudge for miles along the country roads of Oregon, from farmhouse to farmhouse, selling Christmas Greeting cards to earn a little Christmas money. On one such occasion I went up to the farmhouse of the only

Catholic family in that farming community. The lady of the house answered my rap at her door and I stated my business. To my surprise she asked if they were not Protestant cards. Puzzled, I managed to stammer that I supposed they were. I hadn't realized there was any difference. After assuring herself that the cards were Protestant cards and that I was a Protestant, she surprised me with another question. "Why do you Protestants observe Christmas," she asked? I managed to stammer that I supposed it was because Christmas was Christ's birthday. "Well, but it isn't," she replied. "No one even knows what day He was born," she went on. "That observance was fixed by a Roman Catholic church council many centuries ago. December 25th was simply agreed upon to celebrate it on because it was not known when he was born." She told me much more but my stunned ears could stand no more. I forgot about selling cards for the moment and hurried home to ask Mother about it. Imagine what an impact this made on an impressionable youth of 14. But, years later, I learned that the Catholic lady had been 100 per cent right, when the opportunity came to do some research on the origin of Christmas.

The truth is, the Reformers didn't go half far enough in their abandonment of the doctrines and traditions of Rome. A certain minister of the Gospel preached a Christmas sermon, admitting that the celebration had certain Pagan aspects and that it was not really known when Christ was born. But he appealed to the congregation to consider that if we did not celebrate the birth of Christ on December 25th, as it is now done, that probably no notice would be taken of the birth of Christ at all. He felt that it should be celebrated, and if not on December 25th, then "When?" He also pointed out that many people's only knowledge of Christ comes through the Christmas celebration.

This would no doubt sound quite logical to most people, but there is just one thing wrong with it. I for one, feel quite certain that if our heavenly Father had (Turn to "**Christmas,**" page 23)