



"Watchman, what of the night?"

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

NOW IT IS BEING TOLD IN PART

In the most recent issue of Adventist Heritage (Vol. 4, No. 2, pp. 35-46), Elder T. E. Unruh discusses the conferences that took place during 1955-1956 between the Evangelicals and Seventh-day Adventist Church leaders which resulted in the book - Questions on Doctrine. His involvement in these conferences places him in a unique position to state what took place; who all were involved; and what the issues were. He writes - "I served as moderator or chairman throughout the series." (p. 37)¹ During these years, he was president of the East Pennsylvania Conference with headquarters in Reading. He sparked the whole episode by writing a letter to Dr. Donald G. Barnhouse commending his radio messages on the book of Romans as a true presentation of righteousness by faith.²

When the results of these conferences were finalized in the book - Questions on Doctrine - no author's name appeared. It was presented only as a work of "The Editorial Committee," which also remained anonymous. (See Questions on Doctrine, p. 10) Now in this historical review, Unruh names the people who were involved - many of whom were suspected at the time. He writes - "Froom, who had a facile pen, took the responsibility of composing the initial answers" to the questions advanced by the Evangelicals. This was a document of "twenty pages." (Heritage, op. cit., p. 38) This accounts for the basic similarity in doctrinal heresy between the book - Questions on Doctrine - and Froom's book - Movement of Destiny. It needs to be noted at this point - while much detail involving personalities who were behind the book, Questions on Doctrine, is being revealed by Unruh, all the questions involved in the controversy resulting from its publication cannot be answered until each of the documents leading up to the final draft are released for careful analysis. And this has not been done yet.

Others involved in the initial confrontation with the Evangelicals were Elder W. E. Read who in 1955 was Field-Secretary of the General Conference. R. Allan Anderson, editor of the Ministry, whom Unruh describes as possessing a "gift for diplomatic dialogue with leaders of other communions," joined the group at Froom's request. (Ibid., p. 39)

Following the initial conferences which involved only Walter R. Martin and George E. Cannon, a professor of theology on the faculty of Nyack Missionary College (New York) for the Evangelicals, the whole confrontation broadened with the prospects that Dr. Barnhouse was planning to become personally involved with a series of sessions in his own home at Doylestown, Pennsylvania. At this point, Elder R. R. Figuhr, president of the General Conference, "gave the support of his office to the conferences and the publication of the definitive statement of Adventist belief which resulted." (Ibid., p. 39) After the sessions at Barnhouse's home, "it

was planned to demonstrate consensus" within the Church "by submitting the questions and answers to Adventist leaders in North America, and then around the world, using a mailing list of more than 250 names." The document had grown from the first draft of twenty pages to book size involving some sixty questions and answers. (Ibid. p. 41) At this juncture a committee of fourteen members was appointed with the General Conference approval. They were - R. R. Figuhr (chairman), A. V. Olson, W. B. Ochs, L. K. Dickson, H. L. Rudy, A. L. Ham, J. I. Robinson, W. R. Beach, C. L. Torrey, F. D. Nichol, and the four Adventist conferees - Unruh, Anderson, Froom, and Read. (Ibid.) It will be noted by those who remember the make-up of the General Conference hierarchy at that period that these men were the officers of the General Conference - president, vice presidents, secretary, and treasurer, plus Figuhr's personal secretary, and the Editor of the Review. This fact dare not be overlooked, for the apostasy presented in the book - Questions on Doctrine - carried the approbation of the highest spokesmen of the Church. When the book was being prepared for publication an editorial committee chaired by A. V. Olson was appointed with W. E. Read, M. Thurber, W. G. C. Murdoch, R. Hammill, L. E. Froom, and R. A. Anderson as consultants. (Ibid., p. 44) These names are revealing for Murdoch served for a long period of time as Dean of the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, and Dr. Richard Hammill has been president of Andrews University. Thus the involvement in the book - Questions on Doctrine - reads like a Who's Who among the leadership of the Church at that period.

The most critical revelation is how these original conferees - Unruh, Froom, Anderson, and Read - perceived their work and the results of that work. To Unruh, this book which resulted from the confrontation with the Evangelicals "is a definitive statement of contemporary Adventist belief." (Ibid., p. 35) This is emphasized throughout the paper - Unruh declares that the Evangelical conferees "were satisfied that we were presenting contemporary Adventist doctrines." (Ibid., p. 38) Yet the Adventist participants did not conceive of themselves as setting forth "a new theology, but [were] clarifying and amplifying the doctrines most generally believed by contemporary Seventh-day Adventists." (Ibid., p. 44) Herein is to be found two vital points: 1) On the Evangelical side, Walter Martin "acknowledged that all whose beliefs followed the Questions on Doctrine should be counted members of the Body of Christ (the Christian church in the Evangelical definition) and therefore his brethren." (Ibid., p. 35) Again - Martin became "persuaded that Adventists who believed as did the conferees (Unruh, Anderson, Froom, and Read) were truly born-again Christians and his brethren in Christ." (Ibid., p. 38) Even Barnhouse, according to Unruh, came "to see that there were sober, truly born-again Christians among Seventh-day Adventists." (Ibid., p. 39)

What were these beliefs which our conferees presented as "contemporary" Adventist doctrines in contrast to the historical position of the Church? The overall picture involved "correcting misconceptions about Adventist doctrines as to the nature of Christ in the incarnation, the Trinity, and the completed atonement on the cross." (Ibid., p. 42) This brings us to the second vital point: 2) The book - Questions on Doctrine - was supposed to have been merely a clarification and amplification of "The Statement of Fundamental Beliefs of Seventh-day Adventists" first published in 1931, and "later given General Confer-

ence approval and regularly included in church manuals and yearbooks of the denomination." (Ibid. p. 44) Herein is a dilemma. Was this 1931 Statement of Fundamental Beliefs a correct representation of those statements of belief published by Elder James White in the first edition of the Signs of the Times, which he declared to be held "with great unanimity" by the Church? (June 4, 1874, Editorial) Concerning these same beliefs, Uriah Smith wrote - "There is, so far as is known, entire unanimity throughout the body." (R&H, Aug. 22, 1912) Or was the 1931 Statement of Beliefs a change of doctrinal course within the Church? Or did the conferees representing the Adventist Church seek to interpret the 1931 Statement of Fundamental Beliefs in such a way to be acceptable to the Evangelicals? While the possibility the historic faith of the Adventist Church was altered in the 1931 Statement of Fundamental Beliefs needs to be investigated, Unruh's report of the events during the conferences with the Evangelicals leads one to conclude that the latter possibility is a more viable answer. He wrote - "Our friends [Barnhouse and Martin] helped us to express our beliefs in terms more easily understood by theologians of other communions." (Heritage, op. cit., p. 40) Further, Unruh reveals that as a result of these conferences, Frank E. Gaebelein, an official in the National Association of Evangelicals, wrote "stating in his opinion, that the Seventh-day Adventist church would qualify for membership in the evangelical group." (Ibid., p. 42)

Two other observations must be noted in Unruh's report. He traces the original answers from a twenty page document, to a preliminary document sent to at least 250 leaders of the Church in different parts of the world, to a final book of 720 pages. It is known and can be documented that the final result - the book, Questions on Doctrine - is itself a revision of the original answers given to the Evangelical conferees. The book is heretical enough; what were the original answers like? This is still held in secret, and until all the documents are given the light of day, we shall not know how dark was the apostasy committed by the Adventist conferees - Unruh, Anderson, Froom and Read. Unruh does call attention to an article appearing in Eternity, entitled, "Are Seventh-day Adventists Christians?" (Sept., 1956) This was written by Barnhouse himself. Unruh quotes only a non-critical paragraph from the article. This article reveals to some extent how far our leaders went in compromise of the historic teachings of the Church. Barnhouse wrote concerning his view of our understanding of what took place on October 22, 1844 in these words:

It is to my mind, therefore, nothing more than a human, face-saving idea! It should also be realized that some uninformed Seventh-day Adventists took this idea and carried it to fantastic literalistic extremes. Mr. Martin and I heard the Adventist leaders say, flatly, that they repudiate all such extremes. This they said in no uncertain terms. Further, they do not believe as some of their earlier teachers taught, that Jesus' atoning work was not completed on Calvary but instead that He was still carrying on a second ministering work since 1844. This idea is also totally repudiated. They believe that since His ascension Christ has been ministering the benefits of the atonement He completed on Calvary.³

As a final observation - Unruh claims that Elder M. L. Andreasen was the sole source for the controversy which followed the publication of the book - Questions on Doctrine.⁴ He also claims that Andreasen made his "peace" with the hierarchy

and that the "incident was soon closed." (Heritage, op. cit, p. 45) The burden of proof that Andreasen repudiated his opposition to the changes made in historic Adventist teaching as set forth in the book, Questions on Doctrine, rests with Unruh. This he does not give. To our knowledge, Andreasen never backed away from what he had written, and the charges he made in Letters to the Churches. These letters are still available through the Adventist Laymen's Foundation.

¹Following his service as president of the East Pennsylvania Conference, T. E. Unruh came to the Indiana Conference where I served for seven years as a pastor and evangelist. I knew that he was connected with the conferences between the Evangelicals and our men in Washington, but not until this article did I know that he was the moderator and chairman of these dialogues. Now I can understand the vehemence of the reaction which he displayed toward me because of the stand that I took on the book, Questions on Doctrine. I recall vividly one experience. A. V. Olson had been invited to be a key speaker at one of the camp meetings during the time Unruh's and my service paralleled in Indiana. Following camp meeting - mind you during the breaking up of the camp - I was called off the work detail for a private conference with Olson and Unruh. I was asked concerning my position on the Incarnation. I asked these men to define the word - "infinite" - for me. They demurred, and I said that I wasn't trying to pull anything over on them. Then they gave me a definition. I asked them to read from Christ's Object Lessons, p. 388 which stated - "Tell the wanderer of an almighty hand that will hold him up, of an infinite humanity in Christ that pities him." The two men - Olson and Unruh - then got into an argument over Matthew 8:17 - that Jesus "took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses." They discussed whether Christ could catch a cold. I had to smile for it sounded to me like the medieval theologians arguing about how many spirits could dance on a pinhead. This enraged Unruh and he said to Olson - "I want to tell you about this man. He has a very peculiar personality. Whatever he says to the laity, they believe, but they won't believe what I tell them about theology." This embarrassed Olson, who broke up the meeting stating that he had a plane to meet. We had prayer together and Olson apologized that I had been called in before them.

²For a minister of the Seventh-day Adventist Church to commend a Babylonian Evangelical on his presentations from the book of Romans reveals his lack of knowledge of the true gospel and righteousness by faith. It is not very likely that Unruh had any acquaintance at that time with Waggoner's Studies in Romans, or much of a concept of what took place during the decade following 1888. The only publication available on 1888 at the time Unruh wrote his first letter to Barnhouse - November 28, 1949 - was Daniells' book - Christ our Righteousness. Wieland and Short's manuscript - 1888 Re-Examined - had not been written.

³This paragraph is taken from a photocopy of the complete article, "Are Seventh-day Adventists Christians?" as found in Eternity, September, 1956

⁴Unruh's reasoning regarding Andreasen and the agitation following the publication of Questions on Doctrine is typical Unruhism. He wrote:

It came as a surprise to the planners, after the demonstration of a solid consensus from the world leaders in the church and the preview

in the Ministry of what was to come, that Questions and Doctrines should be subjected to attack from Adventist sources. The critics seemed to be saying the same things, suggesting a common source. This was not hard to find. M. L. Andreasen, a respected retired Adventist theologian, author and Bible teacher, had widely circulated eleven mimeographed documents and six printed leaflets addressed to the churches. (Heritage, p. 44)

Such a conclusion was inaccurate. I know from experience of my own concern about the articles appearing in the Ministry, and of a letter I wrote to Elder H. L. Rudy asking for an explanation. It was not until the book Questions on Doctrine had been published, and I was discussing the questionable parts of the book with friends in Canada that I was told about Andreasen's opposition. But this is the way Unruh's mind works. Many people may be concerned, but always there is just one agitator, whom he seeks to zero in on. At a camp meeting in Indiana - one year prior to the experience noted in Footnote #1 - R. Allan Anderson was the main speaker. The laity challenged him over and over again after his presentations of "new look" Adventism. Unruh concluded there could be only one man responsible for this reaction on the part of the laity - that was Grotheer. He called a meeting of the entire working force after an evening service. This meeting was held in the chapel of the old administration building on the campus of Indiana Academy, and lasted till 1 a. m. Three of us ministers withstood Anderson to the face regarding the work of Christ as priest, and the historic teaching of the pioneers in regard to the final atonement, and whether Crozier had the true light on the sanctuary as Ellen G. White indicated he had.

+++++

WHAT HAPPENED TO MAN IN THE FALL?

The restoration of man can be understood only when we understand what happened to man in the Fall. We say that man sinned, and this is true; but what all was involved in this experience? The Biblical account of the temptation and its results is brief. It involved a mental process, a rationalization that perverted the judgment of our first parents. When Eve concluded the tree to be good for food, its fruit pleasing to her senses; and when she accepted the suggestion that it had properties no other tree in the garden possessed, she took of the fruit and ate. (Gen. 3:6) When Adam faced with the choice between the unknown future, and the loss of someone tangible and material whose association had brought the most favorable and pleasant reactions, he chose the material and present for the unknown and future.

It is immediately obvious that the Fall involved the human appetite and inclinations which are a part of the very fabric of humanity. The paramount question then is simply - Were these inclinations and appetites a part of the nature which man received in Creation? Of this we read:

Our natural inclinations and appetites. . . were divinely appointed,

and when given to man, were pure and holy. It was God's design that reason should rule the appetites, and that they should minister to our happiness. And when regulated and controlled by a sanctified reason, they are holiness unto the Lord. Ms. 47, 1896 (Temperance, p. 12)

There is another factor in the sin problem which must be included in any analysis of what happened in the Fall. The account in Genesis states simply that when God asked man to give an accounting of himself, Adam replied, "I was afraid." (Gen. 3:10) This not only reveals a sense of guilt, but also an imbalance in the whole system of man. When Adam was created, "he stood before God in the strength of perfect manhood, all the organs and faculties of his being fully developed and harmoniously balanced." (SP, II, 28) Man because of this imbalance resultant from sin cannot make correct value judgments. Let me illustrate. I recall vividly when about ten years of age, I attended a meeting at the local Baptist church in my home town in Iowa, where my mother, sister and I attended regularly. It was real dark when the meeting was over, and I had three blocks to go to be home. The first block was especially dark, and a cross alley way in the middle had heavy bushes. It had been reported that some folk walking along this particular block had been attacked by thieves hiding in the bushes. However, this block had an exceptionally wide street as the trolley cars which traversed our small town east and west passed each other in this block. I decided to walk in the middle of the street for this first block. When I got to the alley way, I "heard" some rustling in the bushes, and the next two blocks were made in record time. I was afraid. My sense of hearing only touched base with a questionable input, and reacted immediately with my emotions and glands. I did not stop to consider whether a wind was blowing, or possibly a dog that I might have frightened moved quickly through the underbrush producing the rustling sound I heard. This thinking and reacting to our emotions which has increased with the physical deterioration of the race because of continued transgression from generation to generation is a major factor in the sin problem.

We must also consider in any analysis of what happened to man in the Fall, that which is called, "original sin." To my knowledge, the expression is used only once in the Spirit of Prophecy - never in the Bible - and then not in a theological sense. The sentence from the writings of E. G. White in which this term is used reads - "Every sin committed awakens echoes of the original sin." (R&H, April 16, 1901) Like the term - Trinity - which is not found in either the Bible or the Spirit of Prophecy; the expression - "original sin" - is too involved in the theological controversies of the Church Fathers to be usable today in comprehending truth. But because the servant of the Lord did not choose to use the word, Trinity, did not mean that she was an Unitarian. Neither, because she didn't elect to use the expression, original sin, in a theological sense, does not mean that she had nothing to say regarding what we have received from the Fall, which no child of humanity has ever escaped as a part of his human inheritance. We read:

The result of eating of the tree of knowledge of good and evil is manifest in every man's experience. There is in his nature a bent to evil, a force which, unaided, he cannot resist. (Education, p. 29)

What is this "bent to evil" - this force which overpowers man? Is it some different nature that man now has, which he did not have before the Fall? Is it some-

thing that must be eradicated before man can be restored? Just what did happen in the Fall? We read:

In creating man, God gave him noble qualities. He endowed him with a well-balanced mind, and made every power of his being harmonious. After the fall there was not given to man another set of faculties. The powers given him before sin entered the world through Adam were high, and their aims holy; all in perfect harmony with the divine mind. The fall did not create in man new faculties, energies, and passions; for this would have been a reflection upon God. It was through disobedience to God's requirements that these powers were perverted; the affections were misplaced, and turned from the high and holy purpose to a lower aim and to meet a lower standard. (R&H, March 1, 1887)¹

Note the expressions and words from this inspired comment - "The fall did not create in man new faculties, energies, and passions" but these forces of our human nature which were created "high" and "holy" and "harmonious" were "perverted" and "misplaced" and "turned."

The restoration of man is not the eradication of the fallen nature, but the restoration of the harmony and balance with which man was originally endowed - "the kingly power of reason, sanctified by divine grace," bearing sway once again in our lives. (MH, p. 130) We again read:

In returning to God, the inclinations, the taste, the appetite, and the passions are brought into higher, holier channels. The bias to evil is overcome through man's determined effort, aided by the grace of Christ. The faculties that have been warped in a wrong direction are no longer misused, perverted, and misapplied. They are not wasted in selfish purposes, or fastened upon perishable things. The truth has been accepted, has convicted the soul, transformed the character, and there is a purification and elevation of all the powers of the being, and the God-given powers are no longer debased. (R&H, op. cit.)

The key to man's restoration is to be found in his recognition of the fact that the perversion of his faculties and passions through sin has placed within him a "force which, unaided, he cannot resist. To withstand this force, to attain that ideal which in his inmost soul he accepts as alone worthy, he can find in only one power. That power is Christ." (Education, p. 29)

Christ alone will accomplish for man that which he cannot do for himself in the final atonement. He will send forth the Holy Spirit in unlimited and unrestrained power. For this we are admonished to pray:

Pray that the mighty energies of the Holy Spirit, with all their quickening, recuperative, and transforming power, may fall like an electric shock on the palsy-stricken soul, causing every nerve to thrill with new life, restoring the whole man from his dead, earthly, sensual state to spiritual soundness. You will thus become partakers of the divine nature, having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust; and in your souls will be reflected the image of Him by whose stripes you are healed. (5T:267)

With every nerve thrilling with new divine life, the kingly power of reason will control the faculties, energies, and passions of the whole man bringing every thought into captivity to the Lord Jesus Christ. Then will the image of Jesus be perfectly reflected in His own. The Latter Rain will have accomplished its objective.

¹While researching the Holy Flesh Movement, I discovered among the papers of S. S. Davis, originator of the teaching, this quotation. The sheet of paper on which it was typed had the notation - "Copied from Missionary Magazine, June, 1900." (It was not until later I verified it as first being published in the Review & Herald, March 1, 1887.) You will observe the date - 1900 - which was the year of the high tide of this Movement. In all of the published writings of Davis - which are few - and in the exchange of correspondence between him and the officers of the Indiana Conference following 1901, nowhere is this statement alluded to - even though Davis does use references from the Spirit of Prophecy in seeking to defend his position. Neither does R. S. Donnell who was president of the Conference prior to 1901, and who actively led out in the Movement, use this reference in any of his papers. It is quietly ignored by the Holy Flesh Movement so far as can be ascertained. And the reason is obvious. It strikes directly at the tenet upon which the whole teaching of Holy Flesh rests - the eradication of the fallen nature. To teach this doctrine is to teach holy flesh.

This basic teaching of the Holy Flesh Movement was also taught by Brinsmead during Decade - I. It is still being advocated by Fred Wright, which he states is "the cross in [his] message." (News Review, May, 1973, p. 2) Brinsmead discovered that you cannot harmonize the teaching of the eradication of the fallen nature and the teaching regarding the Incarnation that Christ in His humanity took upon Himself our fallen nature. He abandoned first this historic Adventist position and went over to the same teaching on the Incarnation that the leaders of the Holy Flesh Movement advocated - that Christ took the nature of Adam before the Fall. This led to his complete change from all that he taught during Decade - I. This was inevitable. When one forsakes the only foundation upon which man's salvation rests that Jesus is the Christ, what is left? (I Cor. 3:11) And we need to remember that Jesus is the name given to that unique Person who at Bethlehem accepted the fallen nature of man with all of its risks. (Matt. 1:21; DA, pp. 48-49) A complete picture of the Holy Flesh Movement can be obtained by writing the Adventist Laymen's Foundation for the manuscript - The Holy Flesh Movement, 1899 - 1901.

+++++

(April, 1978) XI-4

SPECIAL ISSUE - Many have written for a copy of January, 1978, "Watchman, What 'of the Night?" in which we discussed the Papal audience in which B. B. Beach participated as a representative of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. This issue, though we ran extra copies, has been depleted. Rather than reprinting it, we are planning a special issue on this subject alone. We have heard from Elder W. Duncan Eva. While he refused to answer certain questions, he did clarify a few points. We have also received a "fall out" from some files in Washington, which we will share with our readers.

NEW GUIDELINES

As of January, 1978, we put into operation some new guidelines. We believe that we should inform our readers what these are as it might effect them.

RE: New Names - When we receive one new name, or a list of names from our readers (no church lists, or conference directories, please), we will send each one a copy of the current thought paper with a cover "Memo" giving them the opportunity to request that his name be placed on the regular mailing list. As far as possible this will be mailed "first class" - and on the envelope will be imprinted - "Important!" All who write themselves and request the monthly thought paper, "Watchman, What of the Night?" - will be entered on the regular mailing list and will start receiving the thought paper with the current number.

RE: Change of Address - If you change your address, and fail to notify us, we will receive back from the postal authorities the thought paper with a postage due of 25¢. Sometimes due to the slow response of the postal service, it may be two month's issues before we catch the change - this means 50¢. We upon the receipt of such a change notification remove the name from our mailing list. When this occurs, we are charging a \$1.00 service fee to reinstate the name again. This will cover the postage due fees, the added cost of time and materials in making a new plate. We regret that this otherwise free service must now have this regulation, but added costs do mount up as the mailing list expands.

RE: Manuscripts - Our work load has increased to the point that we cannot take the time to read and critique manuscripts sent to us, unless prior approval is obtained before sending them. If, however, you still want us to read and critique your manuscript, please write an one page summary giving the main thrust of your burden so that we can quickly evaluate it. Unless such a page is on the face of the manuscript, we will file it, and read it as time permits. If you believe that you have some research written up, which you believe we should read, write us, telling us about it, and if we can work it into our schedule in a reasonable time, we will tell you. Or, if you wish it only evaluated and critiqued, we might suggest someone else who could do the job as well as we. We are not infallible, neither does all wisdom reside with us.

++++++

SIGNS OF THE TRENDS

An "Ecumenical" Approach - Every other issue of the Ministry - "the international journal of the Seventh-day Adventist Ministerial Association" - is printed with a view toward reaching the clergy of other denominations. On the January, 1978, issue was a special cover with a letter on the back page addressed to "Dear fellow clergymen" - written by the editor, Elder J. R. Spangler. The last sentence reads - "Since ours is a day of dialogue and ecumenism, we trust that you will receive this gift subscription in the spirit in which it is given."

An Ecumenical Jesuit - "Rev. Irene Beaubien, a Jesuit and one of Quebec's leading ecumenists, will preach in Toronto tomorrow evening to mark the beginning of the annual Octave of Prayer for Christian Unity" - so stated the Toronto [Canada] Star, January 21, 1978 (p. G-5). Jesuit Beaubien "director of

of the Canadian Centre for Ecumenism," was sponsored by the North York Ministerial Association, and the service was conducted in St. George's United Church. North York, a part of Metro-Toronto, is a center for Seventh-day Adventist work, as Branson-North York Hospital is located there. It would be interesting for believers living in that area to inquire to see if the ministers of the Church in the North York vicinity are members of the Ministerial Association which sponsored the Jesuit. We would pray they are not.

Rome - Moscow Affinity? - Malachi Martin, a former professor at the Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome, and ex-Jesuit priest, who was also a close associate of Pope John XXIII has written a book entitled - The Final Conclave. According to the Indianapolis Star (Feb. 20, 1978, p. 15), "it predicts that there is a powerful faction in the [Catholic] church that will favor election of a new pope who will make a deal with Communist leaders of Eastern Europe." The ex-Jesuit also claims that "many cardinals and Vatican officials are pro-Marxist." A Jesuit - in good and regular standing - Robert Graham - who is assigned to the Vatican, labels the book - "pure fiction" and "whatever its literary merits, it is not history or even good journalism." However, Graham admitted - "The question of the Catholic Church's present attitude toward Communism, Marxism, Euro-Communism, etc., and the possible configuration of the next conclave are certainly legitimate subjects of consideration." (Religious News Service, Feb. 17, 1978, p. 13) What are the facts - what is being observed in events taking place at the Vatican? Religious News Service reports:

For the first time in the history of the Italian Republic, Italy's Ambassador to the Holy See invited the head of the Communist Party to the traditional reception marking the signing of the Lateran Treaty. . . . During the reception, Mr. Berlinguer [Communist Party head] spent a good deal of time in conversation with Archbishop Agostino Casaroli, Pope Paul's top foreign aide, who is chief engineer of the Vatican's policy of detente with Eastern European Communist countries. (Feb. 13, 1978, p. 27)

Again:

In his unprecedented meeting with Edward Gierek, Poland's Communist leader, Pope Paul strongly affirmed the Catholic Church's significant role in the history of Poland. . . . Following private talks that included several Polish government and Vatican dignitaries, the Pope reminded Mr. Gierek that from its very beginning, Poland has been "impregnated with Christianity" and has constantly maintained close ties with the Vatican. Mr. Gierek in turn stated that the Polish government wished to work with the Catholic Church as has been outlined in statements to Poland's Catholic Primate, Cardinal Stefan Wyszynski of Warsaw. The meeting between the Pope and Poland's Communist leader was the second in 1977 with a Communist head of state. In June the Pope met with Janos Kadar, who heads the Hungarian Communist Party. (Dec. 2, 1977, pp. 6-7)

Box Score:- Ex-Jesuit - 3; Jesuit - 0

+++++++

ADVENTIST LAYMEN'S FOUNDATION, P. O. Box 178, Lamar, AR 72846