
EDITORIAL PREFACE



With the increasing momentum of events in the religious world, the significance of the recent Vatican II council becomes more and more apparent. Arthur S. Maxwell, editor of the *Signs of the Times*, was among those who attended this gathering. Having returned from Rome, he disclosed his impressions of the council in a sermon given at the University Church in Loma Linda, California.

In this issue of **Present Truth** we present Arthur Maxwell's discourse concerning Vatican II and the impressions received while present at this historic council. Following this sermon report, an appendix of provocative and significant material has been provided for the reader's perusal.

N.J.



The Outstretched Hand

Arthur S. Maxwell
A Sermon Report

Impressions of Vatican II

First, the friendliness of the welcome. You see, I've been there several times—that is, to Rome. Always a sort of an iciness there, but not any more, *not any more*. And it was evident in so many ways. For instance, in the giving of these press passes. Brother Loewen was there from Religious Liberty, Brother Cotrell from the *Review and Herald*, Brother Beach was there from northern Europe, and I was there from the *Signs*; and provided you had a good reason for asking for a pass, you got it. If you were an editor or a correspondent for a real newspaper, they gave the pass, and they gave them to people of all faiths. Here, four Adventists got these passes. I thought you would like to see mine. It's the only document I have which has the crossed keys and the triple crown on it. I have to be careful where I show this. I don't want anybody to think I'm going over to the Church of Rome. But it is a very nice little pass, and it was very valuable. This little pass got me anywhere I wanted to go at the time of the council.

Then, another aspect of this friendliness—the way they arranged for the press of the world to have the best seats at the opening ceremony. I sat closer to the pope than any of the cardinals. I was only forty feet away from him for three or four hours, and I had the clearest view, just as clear as some of you forty feet away. The reason I know he was forty feet away—I stepped it out after the service was over, because I thought, "Nobody will ever believe me, that I sat so long, so near to His Holiness." But I had a wonderful view, and I saw some most fascinating close-up views which I won't tell you now, but I would tell some of you privately—some very, very interesting little human details which you see only when you're very close in.

Then, another aspect of this new friendliness was the pope's opening speech. I have it with me. I'm not going to read it because it took a long time, but it was a beautiful speech. This was at the opening of the final session. Do you know what his subject was? Love. I quote one paragraph:

"The council offers to the church and especially to us a panoramic view of the world. Can the church, can we, do anything but look upon it and love it? Such a contemplation was one of the chief activities of the present session. Again and above all, love—love toward all men today, whoever they are, wherever they are. While other currents of thought and action proclaim other principles for building up human civilization such as power, wealth, science, struggle, self-interest, and the like, the church proclaims love. This council is a solemn act of love for humanity."

I thought of offering this whole speech to our president—that is, to the new president if there is one. You know, that speech of the pope's could have been given at a General Conference session. It might be better than some we've had. You know, the whole thing was a picture of the church loving humanity. Now, we've got to adapt our thinking a bit. There was no condemnation here of Protestants, no suggestion of a persecution of anybody, but love, unfeigned love for everybody—the separated brethren and people who don't belong and all people of all faiths and religions. Very, very wonderful change and a very, very significant change, and I will mention it, of course, later.

An Awesome Power

Then, my second impression—the apparent awesome, and I mean *awesome*, power of the organization. On that very first day, the opening day, we went to watch the Procession of Repentance from the Church of the Holy Cross over to the Church of Saint John Lateran. The distance is about a mile, and everybody present at the council marched in the procession. There were hundreds and hundreds—cardinals and archbishops and bishops and priests. It was a tremendous thing, it really was. And as I watched I couldn't help thinking, "What power this represents!" Here it was passing before my eyes and, you know, I thought of David and Goliath—poor little David, you know, with our little bitsy stones, standing sometimes to confront this tremendous power, and it *is* a power.

We saw it again when the delegates came out of the council about 12:15 every day. (They would sit in council from 9:00 until 12:00, and that was all they did for the morning.) And then, of course, they had subcommittees just like we have—committees and subcommittees by the dozen for the afternoons and evenings. Then the council proper met again next morning. And I would watch them come out, all in their brilliant vestments. They'd stream out by the dozens and the hundreds out of Saint Peter's and across that great theatre there. It was a fascinating sight, and again one felt like David in the presence of Goliath.

The Medieval Aspect

Another great impression was the medieval nature of the organization, far removed from the twentieth century in many, many ways. There was the pageantry at the opening ceremony that I shall never forget. When the time came for that first meeting to open in Saint Peter's, the lights were switched on about twenty minutes before the service was to begin to enable the television people, of course, to take their photographs. And, you know, in the dome of Saint Peter's (many of you must have seen it) they had put all these powerful floodlights. There was no economy on light or on the expense of putting these things there. They knew that the world was going to see what was going to happen below that cupola. And when the lights came on, it was almost like daylight; it lit up the scarlet of the cardinals and the pinkish red of the archbishops and bishops. Then there was the fascinating attire of the Swiss guard; they all were there with their helmets and halberds, guarding the pope.

And then, of course, in the center of all was the pope himself on his golden throne, and he was wearing cloth of gold on scarlet. I couldn't help but think of a passage in a certain book in the New Testament which I won't mention exactly, but you know what I mean. This picture, this vision of gold and scarlet—it was right there. You know what it made me think of? One of these Disney colored TV's. It was a magnificent sight, absolutely fascinating; but I couldn't help saying to myself, "It doesn't belong to the twentieth century." It doesn't, really. It was all right back there in the middle ages, and they have carried this over. All of this paraphernalia has been carried over into the twentieth century, where actually it doesn't belong. But you'll see in a few moments.

Then, of course, there was all the elaborate ceremonial. There was one most interesting thing that happened there which signified a change. Right after the service of the mass, the pope was given an illuminated New Testament which he took and held in the air, and he walked all around the high altar, all down the nave of Saint Peter's and back again. It must have been a strain on his arms holding it there, and, you know, they've done that every day, every day throughout the council to indicate the new attitude of the Catholic Church towards the Bible. Right after mass every day, somebody takes the New Testament like that all around the church. Most significant! Tremendously significant!

Another aspect of the medieval was the use of Latin. Every speech given in that council had to be in Latin. Every document had to be translated into Latin despite the fact which was brought out by one of the Catholic fathers in the press conference—the fact that some modern phrases and concepts are completely wrecked in the effort to translate

them into Latin. Latin simply won't carry some of these modern concepts, particularly some of the fine expressions that you get in the French language. That was mentioned specifically. And here is the church, laboring under this load of medieval language, trying to put its thoughts into an old, antique language which has gone out of use as far as the world is concerned. And, you know, one of the things that doesn't want to be quoted, but it was admitted by one of the fathers in the press conference that some of even the cardinals and bishops don't understand that Latin. They have professionals translate their speeches, some maybe from American into Latin, and they read them there. They know enough to read them, but they don't understand them in the Latin. Now I wouldn't have dared say that, I wouldn't have dared say it, but this Catholic father said to a group of us journalists, "Some of the reverend fathers don't understand what they're reading." That is a little sidelight not for publication, but it indicates how the church is laboring under this incubus of an antique, out-of-date, worn-out language.

Then, one other thought on the medieval nature was the frequent assertions over and over again that the Catholic Church is the one true church and that on matters of faith and doctrine it has not changed. And, of course, this is true. In all the changes I have referred to this morning which I shall mention in part again this afternoon, there is no change in doctrine. We've got to remember that; we've got to keep our balance, you see. The attitude towards Protestants has changed, but the attitude toward their great doctrines of the church has not changed, and this was asserted and re-asserted over and over, and I'll mention that again. And yet, despite the fact that there is no basic change, there are many signs of change. As I said this morning, this ancient organization is creaking in every joint as it tries to ride the hurricane of twentieth century thought—absolutely true. I don't know whether you noticed in *Life* magazine, just the other day, this statement concerning the pope's visit to New York:

"Pope Paul lives with risk while administering his church. Risk is the very essence of this whole church council and of the church's adventure in re-entering the modern world. In some ways, Pope John opened a Pandora's box. Catholicism, whose seemingly monolithic structure conceals a wide spectrum of opinions and temperaments, is in a ferment of public and private argument about everything from birth control and the meaning of the Eucharist to the quest for common ground with Communists, a married clergy, the psychoanalysis of monks and what Paul himself has criticized as an altered notion of sin. The views of some of these swinging Catholics, notably in Holland, are pretty far out, and if the progressives' stampede into modernism is not reined and governed, the Catholic faith itself is in danger of a tenuousness on the one hand or a schism on the other."

This was in *Life* magazine—tremendous statement, and a very true one, of what is going on inside the Catholic Church at the present time. Pope John said he wanted to open a window and let in a little fresh air, and he did; but he didn't reckon on the force of the wind, and now nobody can shut the window, and the force of the wind rises every passing day.

Freedom of Discussion

Now I'm on another impression which is the signs of change that I noticed—for instance, the freedom of discussion. We're not ready for this. I've told some people about it. They said, "You mean to say that they were allowed to differ?" Oh yes, they differed totally, completely, on every subject that was brought up. There would be cardinals for and cardinals against. They were free to say what they wanted from the floor of the council, and that's more than you can say . . . Oh dear, dear, dear, I nearly said it, didn't I? Oh, my dear, but you know what I mean. If some of us were to publicly differ, it might be our last speech, you know what I mean. We have a way of, you know, sending people abroad. But don't ever say *they* don't have democracy. I confess I thought they didn't have it. I've had to correct my impression. They had absolute democracy. Now true, I understand that the speeches were all read by a group before they were given. I suppose that was to protect them from things which shouldn't get into the council, but they were still allowed to say what they wanted to. And we pressmen there, we were given a resume. Every day at 12:30 we were given a resume of every speech that was given in the council that morning, all translated for us into English, and we were able to see how they had differed—violently differed—right that very morning. Fascinating! It's a new day, friends. It's a new day!

Then, the presence of the press. You can hardly imagine the press being present at the Council of Trent back in the sixteenth century. This will give you an idea of how things have changed. Every important journal in the world was represented at the Vatican during this council. There were hundreds of pressmen there, and they weren't all Catholics. There were Catholics and Protestants. I noticed Lowell was there from POAU (Protestants and Other Americans United), and Blanchard was there who has written those violently anti-Catholic books, and men from *Time*, *Life*, *Newsweek*, you name it, he was there. Everybody was there!

And there were two press conferences every afternoon. One was at 12:30 at which time we received the resume of what was said, and we could ask a few questions but not many because of the time limit. But then we all were to come back, and we did come back every afternoon at three o'clock for what is called "the bishop's press conference." I think this was the most fascinating thing I ever attended. I wouldn't

have missed that for anything in the world because the questions were fired from these leading journalists from all over the world, and there was a panel of fathers on the platform. They had chosen, believe you me, some of their brightest men, their keenest minds, to sit on the rostrum; and they were the ones to whom was delegated the task of answering the world press. Just think what a privilege it was to sit there, hear the press asking the questions, and hear the fathers answering. I never thought the day would dawn when such a thing would ever happen. But I saw it, and I heard it, and pretty soon I was in the middle of it. Yes, that was right down you-know-where, right down my--thank you, I didn't know whether you used the term here, but alley is a good word--because I thought to myself, "What an opportunity to ask a few questions myself!"

Some Questions

I began to notice that there were only about a dozen fellows asking the questions. The rest sat there and listened and chuckled, you know, and carried on like the pressmen do, but there were only a few asking the questions, and I thought, "Well, this is our chance." And then I noticed something else. They had a very, very splendid chairman. He was excellent, and he would listen to the question and memorize it and repeat it aloud so everybody could hear it. I noticed also that each person who asked identified himself, but after a while this very fine chairman would recognize the men. Now the man from *Time* had evidently been there on other occasions, so when the man from *Time* put his hand up, why, the chairman said, "Jenkel, *Time* magazine." He didn't even have to say anything. And there were a few others like that, and the chairman would say, "Oh yes, *Life* magazine," or "*News-week*," or so-and-so.

And after I had asked a few questions, imagine my thrill when he said when I put my hand up again, "Maxwell, *Signs of the Times*." Oh brother, I knew I had arrived! Oh boy! In the presence of the world press, and *Time* and *Life* and all the rest of them, and he knew the difference: Oh, that was good! That did my soul a lot of good when he said, "Maxwell, *Signs of the Times*." It didn't do the *Signs* any harm at all to have that publicity in the presence of the world press. And I was particularly pleased that all the Protestant friends including Lowell enjoyed some of these questions. Here, would you like me to read one? Now I took great care to write out these questions because you couldn't take any risks, not in front of that crowd, either from the point of view of the newsmen or of the fathers or in the presence of the tape recorder which I spotted that was taking down everything everybody said. So I made up my mind I wouldn't say anything I shouldn't, and that's a good resolution for us all to make from time to time.

Religious Liberty

So, one afternoon I put my hand up and I said, "Since coming to these meetings which I have greatly enjoyed, I have detected an effort on the part of distinguished theologians and doctors of canon law to prove that the church was never really wrong about religious liberty but has been slowly but surely evolving towards this present happy situation. Would it not save these learned brethren a great deal of trouble and be a lot nearer the truth to say that during the Dark Ages the church was indeed dead wrong on this matter and that it is deeply indebted to its separated brethren for bringing it into the light?" The whole place shook at that one!

Well, they were most courteous, very gracious, and tried to prove that the church actually did discover this before the Protestants. Now I would love to have said, "Then why didn't you act on it when you discovered it?" One of their great—well, he was the man I mentioned this morning, John Courtney Murray, a famous Jesuit theologian, historian—he got up and actually tried to prove that it wasn't the Protestants but the Catholics who discovered the principles of religious liberty. Here's a subject for the next *Liberty* magazine. Did they? Didn't they? He made the assertion that the Catholics discovered it, and I was dying to get up, but of course I wasn't allowed a second question. That was to save endless argument, you see. You could have one question and start the ball rolling and others could follow, but you couldn't go back and follow it yourself. But I did want to ask another question, "Why didn't you act on it if you discovered it?"

Then, another question. I only had one a day, like those vitamin pills, you know, one a day. But the next thing I asked was this: "More than once at these sessions it has been said that there exists in the church a certain measure of regret for infringement against the principle of religious liberty in past centuries, as for instance, shall we say, the Inquisition and other persecutions." I said it very gently. "How extensive is this regret? And secondly, would it be correct to say that the Procession of Repentance of last Tuesday included repentance for these breaches of religious liberty in the past?" Oh dear!

You know, it was interesting to hear the chairman take this, repeat it perfectly without change to the crowd, and then he'd say, "Let me see now, father, I think you should answer this one." And the poor father, he had to get up and do his best to answer it. Now, here I saw a most amazing and amusing—if I could use that word properly—exhibit of the Jesuit mind, for the answer to that one was this: "There is a difference between regret and repentance." Have you ever thought of that? I'd never thought of it. "Now," this good father said, "it is

possible for us to regret and not repent. Repentance is a personal thing. A body could not repent, an individual can repent, so the church couldn't repent what it did in the Dark Ages." Isn't that a good one? I never thought of that. That's a real . . . And so he said, "Of course we do regret, but we cannot repent." Isn't that a beauty? I thought that was about the subtlest thing I'd ever heard.

Well, the next day I tried this one. It was this one that brought what I told you, "Mr. Maxwell, *Signs of the Times*." "If divine revelation is a mark of the true church," which had been stated many times during the council, "and if it is a requisite to the perception of truth," which they had claimed, "How do you explain the fact that the separated brethren discovered the glorious concept of religious liberty three hundred years before the one true church adopted it, and would not this suggest that the doctrine of the one true church is another obsolete concept which should be updated?" And the whole crowd chuckled at that one, too, because they are deadly questions when you stop to think them through. They go right to the base of this whole thing. And it was at this time that one of the men got up and said, "Now on this matter of the one true church, we want to make it absolutely plain that that is our teaching. The Catholic Church is indeed the one true church." And I don't know whether you noticed it, but some weeks after this, just three weeks ago, they had a further study on this declaration of religious liberty, and they had inserted into the document (which will be promulgated by the pope at the close of the session) that no matter what is in this document, it does not in any way alter the teaching that the Catholic Church is the one true church. So it does spoil the thing, doesn't it. That is, you have total freedom in your basic human right to choose, but you'd better be careful and choose the right one! And it kind of limited the religious liberty declaration in session. And do you know, it was done out of an act of condescension to the conservative element. In fact, when this thing was being discussed, and the possibility of putting in this change, someone asked, "Is the clause relating to the one true church being added in order to placate the conservative element in the council?" And the father on the rostrum said, "I think, Sir, that may be a very true insight." That's exactly how he said it. "I think, Sir, that may be a very true insight." A delicious answer to a difficult question.

Are They Sincere?

Well, now we come to some other matters in connection with these questions. Here's another one: "Will the declaration on religious liberty be obeyed in all countries?" Somebody asked me that here at the close of the morning service. Will it be obeyed? That's a very good and proper

question, and I think we should treat it. You see, together with that goes the question which I have had asked me by dozens of Adventists, "Is the Catholic Church sincere in this declaration of religious liberty?" Now, my personal view is that they are sincere—they are utterly sincere in making this declaration at this time. But they are also clear on this point, that it is going to take a long time for this to percolate through the whole church.

Somebody asked, "How about Colombia? How about Spain?" Don't think that those questions were overlooked. They weren't. They were asked by a lot of these people who are not Catholics. They were frank to ask, "What will happen in those countries where there has been persecution?" And one father answered it this way: "Because a doctrine is agreed upon here does not mean that every Roman Catholic in the world will obey it. God promulgated the Ten Commandments, but not many people observe them." Very interesting answer. What an interesting answer! But that's what he said. I wrote it down.

But another man got up and said, "There is the practical side of this. Now, when the pope declares that this is church policy," (and he will do it, and I don't think there's any doubt he will do it) "it is the right and the duty of every Catholic around the world to obey it. But," he continued, "this will not happen overnight. And we mustn't expect that in certain parts of the world where the church has been dominant and has held everything in its power,—we mustn't expect that in those places this will change things overnight." And I thought that was a very reasonable statement.

A Tremendous Change

This is such a tremendous change that the Roman Catholic Church has embarked upon. It's so totally different from anything thousands of priests have ever thought of or contemplated, and it is possibly asking too much, that all of a sudden, every priest all around the world will suddenly adopt what are really Protestant ideas. But while I've said that, I also would say this, that we shouldn't minimize what the Catholic Church has done. It's a great step forward, there's no question. It's an amazing thing that the church has done to set itself alongside Protestants in declaring that every man has the basic human right to choose his own religion and follow the dictates of his own conscience. Whether the church will stay by that forever, I don't know. No, I'm not predicting the future—I couldn't say—but it does alter the situation in the Catholic Church and should alter our own attitude towards that church as I would like to mention in a few moments.

I spoke of the freedom of discussion in the presence of the press, and the questions, and I've mentioned again this religious liberty declara-

tion. There's one other thing on that which I would like to mention to you. There are two great reasons why this declaration has been made. You may not have thought of them. It took me a little while before I tumbled to them.

The first reason is that the Catholic Church today is being persecuted in many, many places. Wherever Communism is in power, the church has lost all its privileges. You think about that. Over a vast area of the world's surface—China, Russia, some of the eastern European countries—the church was once dominant. It isn't any more. It hasn't any power at all. And I have felt that one big reason why the church is advocating this religious liberty is for its own interest. You see, it has to advocate liberty for all in order to get back some of its own liberties. That's worth thinking about. I believe I'm right. That's one big reason why the church has suddenly become so interested in religious liberty. It's because it is itself persecuted. This makes a lot of difference, doesn't it? It makes a lot of difference whether you're persecuted or not.

And then the second reason why is the fact that the gospel of freedom is percolating into every level of Roman Catholic life—into its high schools, its seminaries, its universities, so that some of its leading scholars and writers have become champions of the principle of freedom so long advocated by Protestants. So there is a twofold reason why they have adopted this declaration on religious liberty.

Now this morning I mentioned this other change which has come—very real—the crisis of obedience. Nobody wants to obey anybody any more. The leaders command, but the others won't obey. And that crisis of obedience, or, as some call it, the crisis of authority, is also breaking the church up and allowing other influences to come in, making it possible for the people to read and study the Advent message. Isn't that right?

A New Freedom

There's going to be a new freedom. People are going to say, "Well, I've got a right to read this if I want to, and you can't tell me not to." And that is going to spread all through that organization which for so many, many generations has resisted any infiltration of truth from outside its ranks.

And then as I mentioned this morning, this new attitude to the Bible. What a wonderful thing that is—the Catholic Church advocating publicly and by the authority of the Vatican council, not only the reading but the study of the Bible by scholars. They have resisted that down the years for fear it would lead the church astray. Doesn't that sound a bit like some Adventists—scared to death we should have any scholars to study the Scriptures very thoroughly in case they lead us

astray? But the Roman church now has sanctioned scholarly study of the Holy Scriptures in every version, looking back into the old manuscripts and what-not. It is now the policy of the church to do it. That is a new thing. It was not agreed to, it was not even considered thee, four, five years ago. Tremendous change!

Then, too, this other thing which I mentioned, this advertising of Protestant books in their magazines. Somebody said to me this morning, "What was it that was advertised in *The Priest* magazine?" And I must have failed to tell you properly. But what was advertised in *The Priest* is the ten volume set of *The Bible Stories*, printed and published by several Adventist publishing houses. Brethren, this is the Lord's doing and should be marvelous in our eyes! And this is going on—why, do you know that other Catholic magazines, hearing about this advertisement, are actually begging for the privilege of printing it? They are competing with each other to get this advertising from the Seventh-day Adventists. Isn't that interesting? Isn't that a new day when they come and say, "May we advertise your books, please?" Oh brethren, what a day to be alive! I never dreamed I'd live to see this day, but I thank God that I see it now and that you see it.

The Outstretched Hand

Well, I must close. I've kept you much too long, but I do feel this very sincerely that we, as a people, must rethink our approach to these dear people. We must rethink our approach to our Roman Catholic friends. How can we reject an outstretched hand and be Christians? How can we say that they belong to antichrist when they reveal so many beautiful Christian attitudes? Does that shock you very much? I hope it does! I just hope it shocks you, because we need to be shocked into a new, more friendly, more loving attitude towards these dear people. I believe that we would have double the membership that we have now if we'd treated these people as God has wanted us all along to treat them, if we'd loved them instead of hating them. Did you hear what the little boy said on a television program? He was asked what he knew about Seventh-day Adventists. And the little boy said, "Well, they don't eat meat and they hate Catholics." On television—went all over California! Isn't it a terrible thing? Isn't it a terrible thing?

We've got to love these dear people, and they are the most lovable. I met some there in Rome. Dear! I'm going to follow them up. They were so gracious. I went to them, to the man in charge of that press conference. I said, "Friend, I am overwhelmed by your kindness—the way you listened to my questions even though they were perhaps a little bit penetrating. You never lost patience, you were always so brotherly." I said, "I do thank you for your brotherliness," and we

shook hands. And then I went to this man I mentioned this morning, this Father Malley (he's the editor of the new Catholic magazine, *The Bible Today*), and I had a lovely time with him. I told him about *The Bible Story* and how it appeared in *The Priest*, and he said, "Oh look, if you'll let me see those books, I'll write them up. I'll give them a good write-up in *my* magazine." Here's a Catholic father offering to give us a write-up in his Catholic magazine.

Oh friends, we can't shut these people out of the kingdom, we can't condemn them, we can't stamp them with the mark of the beast. What a terrible thing we've been doing all these years, and then wondering why they don't like us. Why, bless your hearts, we haven't tried to like them, and I say the time has come for us to go out and love them. You know what I suggested as the slogan for the *Signs* campaign next year? I suggested that we put on our list next year, Catholics—Catholic friends by the tens and the thousands. You think up all your Catholic friends and acquaintances and put them on your *Signs* list next spring when the *Signs* campaign comes around.

I think that the time is here, the hour has struck for us to reach out in loving tenderness towards these dear people, who in God's providence have suddenly been liberated, set free to think as they want, to choose as they want, and told by their own hierarchy to read the Bible. Why, brethren, what else did you think God was going to do to open up that great organization to the penetration of this message? What else *could* God do? I ask you. He's done His utmost! It is for us to move into this marvelous new situation that He has opened up to the remnant people. And I just hope we do it!

A New Approach

Now, there's one other thing. These things are going to make us think, they really are—this new situation. I think that a lot of our preachers are going to have to throw away a lot of old sermons. You and me—a lot of old sermons. I scrapped a lot of them already. You know what I think is going to happen? We cannot go on preaching about these dear people like we did thirty, forty, fifty years ago. We simply can't do it. The facts are all against us. How can we go and talk about them persecuting, burning the Bible when they're not doing anything of the sort? We've just got to get some new sermons, haven't we, Brother ——? Sure have!

You know what I think? I think we shall have to produce new, better, more thorough Bible students to meet this critical, new situation that now confronts us. You think that one through. You see, these dear friends are now going to begin to study the Bible. They've already set up their own Bible correspondence courses to help their own people

study the Bible. They're going to become experts in the Bible, and this is going to become the great challenge to the Advent Church. Just when we are getting a little bit indifferent to the Bible and too lazy to take the Bible to church any more, they're coming on the scene with a new enthusiasm for the Bible. Look at them putting out a magazine like this, a periodical promoting the popular appreciation of the Word of God. We wouldn't dare put that out today. We'd say it wouldn't sell, you know what I mean. But they are moving into this thing. They're going to become, if we don't look out, better Bible students than we are. Their priests are going to become good Bible students. They're good students anyway, but they're going to be better ones. They're going to have some of the greatest Bible experts in the world, and we're going to need men of the same high quality to meet them. And so what I see coming is a battle of the Bible. Do you see it? I can see it. A battle of the Bible—not to burn the Bible, but to study it, to find out what is truth, what is God's will, God's message for today. And God help us to be ready for it! We all need to be better Bible students than we've ever been before, and I see that this is what must come out of these amazing developments of the past few months and years. We are moving into something which will challenge us to think our best, to pray our way through this into a better and wiser understanding of the Scriptures of truth. So we must not only match these dear people in friendliness and good will, but also demonstrate that we have something better to offer. We must go all out to win them by the power of love and the power of the Word, and God bless the one with the strongest message and the best understanding of the Bible as the Word of God.

That's where we are, friends, and it's a mighty challenge to us to study anew the foundations of our faith—not that we will change them, but that we will understand them better and be the better able to communicate them not only to the Catholics, but to the Protestants and everybody else. It's a mighty moment to which we've come—God moving into the world situation that all things might be finished and finished soon. This is the crisis hour. God make us ready for it for His name's sake. Amen.

Appendix

4 Saturday, October 28, 1967 *The Hanford Sentinel*

'Disregard for Truth' Blamed for Separation

By LOUIS CASSELS

United Press International

Charles Davis, the ex-priest who once was Britain's leading Roman Catholic theologian, has written a book to explain why he left the church.

It's a thoughtful, well-reasoned book which should put to rest any innuendoes that Davis was just another mixed-up priest who wanted to get married.

In "A Question of Conscience," published this week by Harper & Row, he says bluntly that "I left the church because I had ceased to believe in it."

He makes clear that he has not ceased to believe in Christianity. His faith in God and devotion to Jesus Christ shine forth from every page of this remarkable personal testament.

Questions Hierarchy

Like Martin Luther 450 years ago, Davis ceased to believe in the infallibility and even the honesty of the Roman ecclesiastical hierarchy of which the Pope is the head and visible symbol.

He says—and again the parallel to Luther is striking—that it was a visit to Rome which disillusioned him. During the second Vatican Council, which he attended as an expert consultant, he was shocked by what he felt was a cynical "disregard for truth" among high Vatican officials and many bishops. In Rome, he says:

"Words are used not to communicate truth, but as a means of preserving authority without regard for truth. Any suggestion of questioning or lack of knowledge or humble searching after truth not yet possessed is carefully avoided. Above all, there is never an admission of past error or a frank avowal that present statements contradict past teaching. . . . What is aimed at with the general public is to have an aura of supreme, unquestionable authority around all documents from the Holy See."

Cites Intrigue, Manipulations

He also was disenchanted by a close-up look at the backstage

power struggles, the bureaucratic intrigues and Machiavellian manipulations which take place when a major papal document is under preparation.

"Groups achieve their aims by the insertion of suitable paragraphs or clauses, by modifying statements during the process of their translation into Latin, or even by successfully fattering whole speeches or documents," he says. "Exposure to the inner workings of the Roman system destroyed my respect for papal authority . . . These were not methods that showed any respect for the truth. . . They were methods of power, which distorted doctrine into prejudice and defended fixed positions by any means available."

Why did he leave the church instead of staying in it to work for reform?

Revolution Necessary

He has been asked that question many times since last Dec. 4, when he announced his break with the church at a news

conference which profoundly shocked the Catholic world.

His answer is that he does not believe it is possible for any internal reform movement to achieve "more than superficial adjustments" in the church so long as it is governed by an authoritarian hierarchy.

Davis disclaims any desire to encourage a mass exodus from the church. But he voices the conviction that "only a revolution could now bring the Roman Church into the modern age."

This is a controversial book, with which many persons of intelligence and integrity will profoundly disagree. But its sincerity cannot fairly be questioned. Davis himself says that his arguments should be subjected to criticism and, if possible, refuted. He asks only that they be taken seriously and met with substantive replies rather than condescending speculations about the motives or "psychological state" of the author.

That seems a reasonable request.

Editor's Note: *Only those pages have been selected from Chapter 35 of Great Controversy which seemed to be the most significant in the context of the foregoing sermon report. It is recommended that the reader study the entire chapter to appreciate its full import.*

CHAPTER 35

Aims of the Papacy

ROMANISM is now regarded by Protestants with far greater favor than in former years. In those countries where Catholicism is not in the ascendancy, and the papists are taking a conciliatory course in order to gain influence, there is an increasing indifference concerning the doctrines that separate the reformed churches from the papal hierarchy; the opinion is gaining ground that, after all, we do not differ so widely upon vital points as has been supposed, and that a little concession on our part will bring us into a better understanding with Rome. The time was when Protestants placed a high value upon the liberty of conscience which had been so dearly purchased. They taught their children to abhor popery and held that to seek harmony with Rome would be disloyalty to God. But how widely different are the sentiments now expressed!

The defenders of the papacy declare that the church has been maligned, and the Protestant world are inclined to accept the statement. Many urge that it is unjust to judge the church of today by the abominations and absurdities that marked her reign during the centuries of ignorance and darkness. They excuse her horrible cruelty as the result of the barbarism of the times and plead that the influence of modern civilization has changed her sentiments.

(563)

Have these persons forgotten the claim of infallibility put forth for eight hundred years by this haughty power? So far from being relinquished, this claim was affirmed in the nineteenth century with greater positiveness than ever before. As Rome asserts that the "church *never erred*; nor will it, according to the Scriptures, *ever err*" (John L. von Mosheim, *Institutes of Ecclesiastical History*, book 3, century 11, part 2, chapter 2, section 9, note 17), how can she renounce the principles which governed her course in past ages?

The papal church will never relinquish her claim to infallibility. All that she has done in her persecution of those who reject her dogmas she holds to be right; and would she not repeat the same acts, should the opportunity be presented? Let the restraints now imposed by secular governments be removed and Rome be reinstated in her former power, and there would speedily be a revival of her tyranny and persecution.

A well-known writer speaks thus of the attitude of the papal hierarchy as regards freedom of conscience, and of the perils which especially threaten the United States from the success of her policy:

"There are many who are disposed to attribute any fear of Roman Catholicism in the United States to bigotry or childishness. Such see nothing in the character and attitude of Romanism that is hostile to our free institutions, or find nothing portentous in its growth. Let us, then, first compare some of the fundamental principles of our government with those of the Catholic Church.

"The Constitution of the United States guarantees *liberty of conscience*. Nothing is dearer or more fundamental. Pope Pius IX, in his Encyclical Letter of August 15, 1854, said: 'The absurd and erroneous doctrines or ravings in defense of liberty of conscience are a most pestilential error—a pest, of all others, most to be dreaded in a state.' The same pope, in his Encyclical Letter of December 8, 1864, anathematized 'those who assert the liberty of conscience and of religious worship,'

also 'all such as maintain that the church may not employ force.'

"The pacific tone of Rome in the United States does not imply a change of heart. She is tolerant where she is helpless. Says Bishop O'Connor: 'Religious liberty is merely endured until the opposite can be carried into effect without peril to the Catholic world.' . . . The archbishop of St. Louis once said: 'Heresy and unbelief are crimes; and in Christian countries, as in Italy and Spain, for instance, where all the people are Catholics, and where the Catholic religion is an essential part of the law of the land, they are punished as other crimes.' . . .

"Every cardinal, archbishop, and bishop in the Catholic Church takes an oath of allegiance to the pope, in which occur the following words: 'Heretics, schismatics, and rebels to our said lord (the pope), or his aforesaid successors, I will to my utmost persecute and oppose.'"—Josiah Strong, *Our Country*, ch. 5, pars. 2-4.

It is true that there are real Christians in the Roman Catholic communion. Thousands in that church are serving God according to the best light they have. They are not allowed access to His word, and therefore they do not discern the truth. They have never seen the contrast between a living heart service and a round of mere forms and ceremonies. God looks with pitying tenderness upon these souls, educated as they are in a faith that is delusive and unsatisfying. He will cause rays of light to penetrate the dense darkness that surrounds them. He will reveal to them the truth as it is in Jesus, and many will yet take their position with His people.

But Romanism as a system is no more in harmony with the gospel of Christ now than at any former period in her history. The Protestant churches are in great darkness, or they would discern the signs of the times. The Roman Church is far-reaching in her plans and modes of operation. She is employing every device to extend her influence and increase her power in preparation for a fierce and determined conflict

to regain control of the world, to re-establish persecution, and to undo all that Protestantism has done. Catholicism is gaining ground upon every side. See the increasing number of her churches and chapels in Protestant countries. Look at the popularity of her colleges and seminaries in America, so widely patronized by Protestants. Look at the growth of ritualism in England and the frequent defections to the ranks of the Catholics. These things should awaken the anxiety of all who prize the pure principles of the gospel.

Protestants have tampered with and patronized popery; they have made compromises and concessions which papists themselves are surprised to see and fail to understand. Men are closing their eyes to the real character of Romanism and the dangers to be apprehended from her supremacy. The people need to be aroused to resist the advances of this most dangerous foe to civil and religious liberty.

Many Protestants suppose that the Catholic religion is unattractive and that its worship is a dull, meaningless round of ceremony. Here they mistake. While Romanism is based upon deception, it is not a coarse and clumsy imposture. The religious service of the Roman Church is a most impressive ceremonial. Its gorgeous display and solemn rites fascinate the senses of the people and silence the voice of reason and of conscience. The eye is charmed. Magnificent churches, imposing processions, golden altars, jeweled shrines, choice paintings, and exquisite sculpture appeal to the love of beauty. The ear also is captivated. The music is unsurpassed. The rich notes of the deep-toned organ, blending with the melody of many voices as it swells through the lofty domes and pillared aisles of her grand cathedrals, cannot fail to impress the mind with awe and reverence.

This outward splendor, pomp, and ceremony, that only mocks the longings of the sin-sick soul, is an evidence of inward corruption. The religion of Christ needs not such attractions to recommend it. In the light shining from the

save them." Luke 9:54, 56. How different from the spirit manifested by Christ is that of His professed vicar.

The Roman Church now presents a fair front to the world, covering with apologies her record of horrible cruelties. She has clothed herself in Christlike garments; but she is unchanged. Every principle of the papacy that existed in past ages exists today. The doctrines devised in the darkest ages are still held. Let none deceive themselves. The papacy that Protestants are now so ready to honor is the same that ruled the world in the days of the Reformation, when men of God stood up, at the peril of their lives, to expose her iniquity. She possesses the same pride and arrogant assumption that lorded it over kings and princes, and claimed the prerogatives of God. Her spirit is no less cruel and despotic now than when she crushed out human liberty and slew the saints of the Most High.

The papacy is just what prophecy declared that she would be, the apostasy of the latter times. 2 Thessalonians 2:3, 4. It is a part of her policy to assume the character which will best accomplish her purpose; but beneath the variable appearance of the chameleon she conceals the invariable venom of the serpent. "Faith ought not to be kept with heretics, nor persons suspected of heresy" (Lefant, volume 1, page 516), she declares. Shall this power, whose record for a thousand years is written in the blood of the saints, be now acknowledged as a part of the church of Christ?

It is not without reason that the claim has been put forth in Protestant countries that Catholicism differs less widely from Protestantism than in former times. There has been a change; but the change is not in the papacy. Catholicism indeed resembles much of the Protestantism that now exists, because Protestantism has so greatly degenerated since the days of the Reformers.

As the Protestant churches have been seeking the favor of the world, false charity has blinded their eyes. They do not see but that it is right to believe good of all evil, and as the

inevitable result they will finally believe evil of all good. Instead of standing in defense of the faith once delivered to the saints, they are now, as it were, apologizing to Rome for their uncharitable opinion of her, begging pardon for their bigotry.

A large class, even of those who look upon Romanism with no favor, apprehend little danger from her power and influence. Many urge that the intellectual and moral darkness prevailing during the Middle Ages favored the spread of her dogmas, superstitions, and oppression, and that the greater intelligence of modern times, the general diffusion of knowledge, and the increasing liberality in matters of religion forbid a revival of intolerance and tyranny. The very thought that such a state of things will exist in this enlightened age is ridiculed. It is true that great light, intellectual, moral, and religious, is shining upon this generation. In the open pages of God's Holy Word, light from heaven has been shed upon the world. But it should be remembered that the greater the light bestowed, the greater the darkness of those who pervert and reject it.

A prayerful study of the Bible would show Protestants the real character of the papacy and would cause them to abhor and to shun it; but many are so wise in their own conceit that they feel no need of humbly seeking God that they may be led into the truth. Although priding themselves on their enlightenment, they are ignorant both of the Scriptures and of the power of God. They must have some means of quieting their consciences, and they seek that which is least spiritual and humiliating. What they desire is a method of forgetting God which shall pass as a method of remembering Him. The papacy is well adapted to meet the wants of all these. It is prepared for two classes of mankind, embracing nearly the whole world—those who would be saved by their merits, and those who would be saved in their sins. Here is the secret of its power.

A day of great intellectual darkness has been shown to be

—John Dowling, *The History of Romanism*, b. 5, ch. 6, sec. 55. This is in harmony with the claims regarding the power of the Roman pontiff “that it is lawful for him to depose emperors” and “that he can absolve subjects from their allegiance to unrighteous rulers.”—Mosheim, b. 3, cent. 11, pt. 2, ch. 2, sec. 9, note 17. (See also Appendix.)

And let it be remembered, it is the boast of Rome that she never changes. The principles of Gregory VII and Innocent III are still the principles of the Roman Catholic Church. And had she but the power, she would put them in practice with as much vigor now as in past centuries. Protestants little know what they are doing when they propose to accept the aid of Rome in the work of Sunday exaltation. While they are bent upon the accomplishment of their purpose, Rome is aiming to re-establish her power, to recover her lost supremacy. Let the principle once be established in the United States that the church may employ or control the power of the state; that religious observances may be enforced by secular laws; in short, that the authority of church and state is to dominate the conscience, and the triumph of Rome in this country is assured.

God's word has given warning of the impending danger; let this be unheeded, and the Protestant world will learn what the purposes of Rome really are, only when it is too late to escape the snare. She is silently growing into power. Her doctrines are exerting their influence in legislative halls, in the churches, and in the hearts of men. She is piling up her lofty and massive structures in the secret recesses of which her former persecutions will be repeated. Stealthily and unsuspectedly she is strengthening her forces to further her own ends when the time shall come for her to strike. All that she desires is vantage ground, and this is already being given her. We shall soon see and shall feel what the purpose of the Roman element is. Whoever shall believe and obey the word of God will thereby incur reproach and persecution.



"God's Word in the Golden West"

CENTENNIAL 1868-1968

Recorder

ARIZONA • CALIFORNIA • IDAHO • MONTANA • UTAH

VOL. 67

ANGWIN, CALIFORNIA, MAY 13, 1968

NO. 43

FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF CHURCH ORGANIZATION

This is the second of a series of five articles by the Pacific Union Conference president on subjects of importance to every church member.—THE EDITOR.

Church to Accomplish Commission

The Seventh-day Adventist Church was organized for the purpose of uniting the forces of the family of God so that the commission of proclaiming the third angel's message could be accomplished more effectively.

In our country the individual is free to join or not to join, to remain in the organization or not to remain. Before he joins the church he has no obligation to the body. Except for being answerable to the rules and regulations governing society, he is answerable only to himself. If he has not joined the church he is free from the rules and regulations of the church fellowship. If he has not surrendered his will to the church family he is not under the influence or authority of any church committee. He can come and he can go as he pleases. He can oppose, he can condemn. He does not belong to the fellowship.

However, the time comes when he desires to become a member of the body of Christ. He will then come to the church and ask admittance by baptism. When he does this he also manifests a willingness to surrender to the church of Christ. A life surrendered to Christ will have no problem surrendering to the church of which Christ is the head. "For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church; and he is the saviour of the body."—Ephesians 5:23.

Belonging to Creative Fellowship

The one who joins the church says in effect, "I will accept the decisions of the church body in matters of doctrine, church discipline, and promotion of church inter-

ests. I will surrender my individual opinion." "Submitting yourselves one to another in the fear of God."—Ephesians 5:21. He will still have a voice but he will now accept the voice of the majority. He will abide by the will of the actions of the body. He belongs to a creative fellowship.

As one individual of the family he will not attempt to impose his will upon the family against their will. He will place the interests of the fellowship above his own. If he has a mind contrary to that of the church he will let himself be governed by the voice of the church. This he realizes is the only way that the local church can function effectively.

Now going a step farther let us take a look at the individual church. If a local church would not join the sisterhood of churches, that church would be free to act independently of the sisterhood of churches. Such a local congregation could say, "We are a self-governing body. We can vote as we please. We can believe and teach anything we please. We can follow any form of church government we please. We are a unit by ourselves. We do not belong to the sisterhood of churches."

Churches in a Covenant Relationship

When a church joins the body of churches, that church becomes part of a fellowship of the local churches of the entire conference. The churches belonging to the fellowship understand that in matters of church government, church standards, church policies and beliefs, they will accept the voice of the conference which is the voice of the body of churches. When the local church is taken into the sisterhood of churches at the constituency meeting she surrenders her will to the will of the body and enters into a covenant relationship.

FROM

THE MINISTRY

"We see here that his [Aaron's] principal responsibility was to act as a mediator, as a link between the holy and the profane, between God and man. . . .

"In like manner the minister of the gospel today is the high priest. . . .

"Today we [the ministers] are the high priests. . . .

"God desires that we who are His high priests today learn the same lesson. . . .

"What a tremendous responsibility to act as mediators between God and man!"—*The Ministry* (an official organ of the Seventh-day Adventist Church), December, 1961.



SPECIAL TESTIMONIES

by Ellen G. White

"I ask our people to study the twenty-eighth chapter of Ezekiel. The representation here made, while it refers primarily to Lucifer, the fallen angel, has yet a broader significance. Not one being, but a general movement, is described, and one that we shall witness. A faithful study of this chapter should lead those who are seeking for truth to walk in all the light that God has given to His people, lest they be deceived by the deceptions of these last days."—*Special Testimonies*, Series B, No. 17, p. 30; as quoted in *S.B.A. Bible Commentary*, Vol. 4, p. 1162.

Editor's Note: *In its context, this statement from Special Testimonies Series B, No. 17, p. 30, is evidently referring to the omega of apostasy.*

That night I dreamed that I was in Battle Creek looking out from the side glass at the door and saw a company marching up to the house, two and two. They looked stern and determined. I knew them well and turned to open the parlor door to receive them, but thought I would look again. The scene was changed. The company now presented the appearance of a Catholic procession. One bore in his hand a cross, another a reed. And as they approached, the one carrying a reed made a circle around the house, saying three times: "This house is proscribed. The goods must be confiscated. They have spoken against our holy order." Terror seized me, and I ran through the house, out of the north door, and found myself in the midst of a company, some of whom I knew, but I dared not speak a word to them for fear of being betrayed. I tried to seek a retired spot where I might weep and pray without meeting eager, inquisitive eyes wherever I turned. I repeated frequently: "If I could only understand this! If they will tell me what I have said or what I have done!"

I wept and prayed much as I saw our goods confiscated. I tried to read sympathy or pity for me in the looks of those around me, and marked the countenances of several whom I thought would speak to me and comfort me if they did not fear that they would be observed by others. I made one attempt to escape from the crowd, but seeing that I was watched, I concealed my intentions. I commenced weeping aloud, and saying: "If they would only tell me what I have done or what I have said!" My husband, who was sleeping in a bed in the same room, heard me weeping aloud and awoke me. My pillow was wet with tears, and a sad depression of spirits was upon me.

