

The Gospel is the only thing about which we can afford to be impatient. Christ does not want to bring us out of sin “someday,” and after much effort on our parts. He has made the day – the day of the Cross; He has made the effort – the infinite sacrifice He provided, leaving the glories of Heaven to be mocked, abused, and nailed to a wooden frame – to suffer in body and (especially) spirit for the wrongs that we have done. The work of establishing the faith is over. The Church has been gathered, and is being gathered; and She is preparing Herself to meet Her Husband. The time for those yet on the outside to gather is *yesterday*; for already the Groom appears to delay His coming. But we, who have brought extra oil, await the surprising, but long-awaited cry, “He cometh!”

We have all that that is required for our sanctification, because Christ has given to us all we need, and has done no incomplete work. The true Bride has the Law, the Testimony, the Good News, and... we who are Her members have the means of knowing when we are hearing a message with which She agrees. That is how we recognize the House of God.

Can you recognize It?

— D.P. Aguilar

Tolerance *vs.* **LIBERTY**

One of the issues heavily discussed among the founding fathers of the United States was that of tolerance vs. liberty. The distinction might come as a strange one to some in our day, as the topic is usually one of “tolerance” vs “intolerance” as related to matters of personal opinion.

During the writing of the Constitution, however, “intolerance” had a far more severe meaning than the relatively sensitive definition given it today. For those who came to America in it’s founding stages, “intolerance” did not mean a verbal or perceived insult directed at ones heritage or beliefs – it meant being driven from country to country, imprisoned, tortured, suffering confiscation, taxation, and death for that heritage or belief.

For most today this is an unfamiliar concept. As a result, the line between “tolerance” and “liberty” has become greatly blurred, if not lost altogether – yet the difference is one that is critical to understand, particularly in these last moments of Earth’s history.

As George Washington wrote, “It is now no more that toleration is spoken of as if it were by the indulgence of one class of people that another enjoyed the exercise of their inherent natural right, for happily, the government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance, requires only that they who live under its protection shall demean themselves as good citizens in giving it on all occasions their effectual support.”

For a man to offer tolerance to another man for his faith is to say, in essence, that the man has the power and authority to show tolerance or intolerance at his own discretion. Tolerance is something given as a favor, an indulgence of a sort, given of grace by one of greater power.

Liberty, on the other hand, is a God-given right, and at that an inalienable one – one that no man, no matter his station or position, can in any way ever take away. So in religious things, there is a great difference between “religious tolerance” and “religious liberty.” Tolerance is freedom allowed until revoked – liberty is freedom inherent and irrevocable.

As Christians, we must assert our religious liberty, not our religious tolerance. No man can assert tolerance because tolerance can be taken away at will by the one tolerating. It is upon this principle that we take issue with the idea of “concessions” in matters of religious liberty, and specifically in regards to the name Creation Seventh Day Adventist.

Most who have been following the Seventh-day Adventist trademark controversies from their beginning are familiar with Rafael Perez and the Eternal Gospel Church that were involved in a lawsuit in Miami, Florida in the late 1990s. Despite the firm protests at the beginning that they were Seventh-day Adventists and would not be giving up that name, they conceded out of court to a very specific and exact set of rules and restrictions for how they could use their name. A brief excerpt of this agreement follows:

“4. GENERAL CONFERENCE and PEREZ agree henceforth PEREZ shall use only the language (or its foreign equivalent), format, size, and style contained in this paragraph and as set forth in Exhibit “A” to this Agreement and GENERAL CONFERENCE agrees that such use will not violate the Court’s Order of April 27, 2000:

Line 1: “ETERNAL GOSPEL CHURCH” – This first line will be in all upper case letters.

Line 2: “Founded in (1990 or any later year) by Seventh-day Adventist Believers” – This second line will be in upper and lower case letters precisely as quoted, will be in the same color as the first line and words “Seventh-day Adventist” will not be emphasized in any fashion, e.g. will not be in a different color, will not be in a different type style, will not be bolded, etc.

The second line will not be more than 60% in size of the first line.

The first and second line will be positioned one on top of the other and centered, exactly as they appear in the example attached as Exhibit A hereto.” – As quoted in *Landmarks magazine*, June 2001

No reasonable man can possibly consider the terms of this agreement to be anything synonymous with “freedom” or

