

# “Watchman, what of the night ?”



“The hour has come, the hour is striking, and striking at you, the hour and the end!” Ezekiel 7:6 (Moffatt)

## ► THIS ISSUE'S READING

**“GOD'S CHARACTER AND  
THE LAST GENERATION”  
- 7 -**

**The 1981 Kenneth Wood Letter &  
an Analysis of it - Revisited pg. 5**

### *Editor's Preface*

“For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning” (Romans 15: 4a). Regarding those who professed to be the spiritual leaders and guides of God's people, Jesus “began to say unto his disciples first of all, Beware ye of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy.”

He then followed this warning with the following assurance: “For there is nothing covered, that shall not be revealed; neither hid, that shall not be known.” (Luke 12: 1-2).

Likewise, as we bring to a close our evaluation of the book *God's Character and the Last Generation*, our Lord cautions us that it is as vital for His faithful disciples today to be wary of the hypocrisy of modern day “Pharisees” among us - those professed expositors and guardians of our faith in responsible positions / offices - as it was at the time of Christ's first advent. Happily, He also reassures us in our day that those things that this hypocrisy attempts to ‘cover’ and ‘hide,’ shall “be revealed” and “be known.”

The two main title articles in this edition of the thought paper are a continuation of our efforts to uncover and expose the duplicity behind the language being used by opponents of “Last Generation Theology” (L.G.T.) and related teachings, by chronicling the historical development of this terminology and the *actual* thoughts, concepts, and meanings veiled behind the ambiguous use of this



phraseology.

The first write-up resumes and concludes Elder William Grotheer's 1980 exposition of the post-1950s progression of this matter. The second write-up is based upon some exchanges, excerpted from a series of mail correspondence between various interested parties, which originally arose in 1981 over an inquiry by "a brother in Australia." This concerned whether or not Elder M.L. Andreasen had renounced his opposition to the book *Questions on Doctrine* by making "his peace with the church." [*Adventist Heritage* (Vol. 4, #2, pages 44-45)]. The dialog, particularly that given in summary to Elder Grotheer by Elder Kenneth H. Wood (Editor of the *Adventist Review* at the time) clearly "revealed" and made "known" the double dealing perpetrated on the unsuspecting laity back then. The equivocal nature placed upon the doctrines under consideration, along with the vocabulary utilized to conceal the genuine meaning and intent of these teachings when defining them, is what has been, and still is, being advanced to rationalize and excuse the deceptive attacks stealthily made upon crucial present truths - largely by those wielding authoritative influence.

## **GOD'S CHARACTER AND THE LAST GENERATION - 7 -**

**Critique: Chapter 10 (conclusion resumed): Pertinent historical data to clarify and place in context the positions taken in this chapter concerning Christ's dual atonement / final atonement salvific work --**

### **THE HERESY OF THE SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST EVANGELICAL CONFERENCES CONFIRMED BY THE ACTION OF THE 1980 GENERAL CONFERENCE SESSION**

[ By Elder William H. Grotheer (concluded) ] <sup>1</sup>

[ *\*Note: The text below begins where WWN # 37 left off. Comments by the present Editor are italicized within brackets. ]*

In all of these statements of belief from 1872 through 1914, it is plainly stated that Jesus Christ as High Priest made the atonement in heaven - not on the Cross which was but the Sacrifice - and that in that heavenly sanctuary atonement, He did obtain something for us - the forgiveness and pardon of our sins as we come penitently to God through Him.

The Yearbooks (1889, 1905, 1907-1914) are likewise very explicit in regard to the priestly ministry of Christ in the final atonement. They read:

"That the sanctuary of the new covenant is the tabernacle of God in heaven, ... [and] is the sanctuary to be cleansed at the end of the two thousand and three hundred days, what is termed its cleansing being in this case, as in the type, simply the entrance of the high priest into the most holy place, to finish the round of service connected therewith, by making the atonement and removing from the sanctuary the sins which had been transferred to it by means of the ministration in the first apartment; and that this work in the antitype, beginning in 1844, consists in actually blotting out the sins of believers ... " [*WWN* (XIII-10), p. 9] <sup>2</sup>

If the types of the earthly sanctuary established by God Himself teach us anything, they teach us that it was not the blood of the sacrifice offered which obtained forgiveness, or cleansing, but the blood of the sacrifice mediated which was efficacious in symbol to the sinner. That which was done in type became a reality in the sacrifice and mediation of Jesus Christ, who after having offered Himself as the victim, ascended into the heavenly sanctuary as the high priest to

make the atonement for the believer.

In the 1955-1956 Conferences with the Evangelicals, we denied this basic Biblical and Adventist truth, even going to the extent of putting in writing - Questions on Doctrine (pp. 354-355) - that when our spiritual fathers including Ellen G. White, spoke, wrote, or taught this fundamental concept they did not mean it, but rather "that Christ is now making application of the benefits of the sacrificial atonement He made on the cross." This denial of our historic faith we have now confirmed in the Statement of Belief voted at the General Conference Session in Dallas, Texas. The apostasy of the 50's has become the stated faith of the 80's!

*[ And it is still the stated faith today! In the 28 Fundamental Beliefs (2015), the same terminology is used in Fundamental Belief 24, "Christ's Ministry in the Heavenly Sanctuary" as follows:*

*"There is a sanctuary in heaven, the true tabernacle that the Lord set up and not humans. In it Christ ministers on our behalf, making available to believers the benefits of His atoning sacrifice offered once for all on the cross. At His ascension, He was inaugurated as our great High Priest and, began His intercessory ministry, which was typified by the work of the high priest in the holy place of the earthly sanctuary. In 1844, at the end of the prophetic period of 2300 days, He entered the second and last phase of His atoning ministry, which was typified by the work of the high priest in the most holy place of the earthly sanctuary ... " (emphasis added).<sup>3</sup> Again, and certainly not meaning to be redundant, we stress that the emphasized (underlined) terminology has a specific meaning that, since the 1950s SDA / Evangelical Conferences (as documented throughout this exposition) is used to deny the actual*

*efficacy of Christ's dual atonement mediation in the heavenly sanctuary. And while the growing lack of knowledge concerning this may continue to make it appear that this language is in harmony with the biblical understanding of the sanctuary truth as bequeathed in sacred trust by God to the Seventh-day Adventist Movement, it definitely is not! - though the cumulative deceit masking it by using familiar sanctuary phraseology within the same context is increasingly (and in nearly all cases purposely) making this duplicity even harder to detect. ]*

We were warned in regard to the Alpha Apostasy at the turn of the century that:

"The track of truth lies close beside the track of error, and both tracks may seem to be one to minds which are not worked by the Holy Spirit, and which, therefore, are not quick to discern the difference between truth and error." (Special Testimonies, Series B, No. 2, p. 52).<sup>4</sup>

What was true concerning the Alpha Apostasy is equally, if not more so, true concerning the Omega Apostasy. While the delegates to the 1980 Session sought to avoid the use of the words - "completed atonement" - in referring to the sacrifice on the Cross, and deleted from the Statement given to them at the beginning of the session, the phrase - "This act of atonement" [WWN (XIII-10), p. 8]<sup>2</sup> - they still accepted phraseology in another section which means the same thing as that which was deleted in a previous section. The cross is noted as "this perfect atonement" with its benefits merely made "available to the believers" through Christ's heavenly ministry. Thus is confirmed as declared in Questions on Doctrine, that Christ returned to heaven "not with the hope of obtaining something for us," for "He had already obtained it for us on the cross." Yet

there are those who believe that a great victory was obtained in Dallas, Texas, simply because some not so subtle heresies were deleted from the recommended Statement issued at the 1979 Annual Council. But instead of restoring the historic faith which had been committed to our trust, the guardians of the spiritual interests of the people, led by the president of the General Conference himself [ *Elder Neil C. Wilson, father of the current G.C. president, Elder Ted N. C. Wilson* ] voted to confirm the sell-out perpetrated in the Seventh-day Adventist Evangelical Conferences of 1955-1956. How deceived can we become!

To top this deception, many are now rejoicing in what was voted in regard to Dr. Desmond Ford, thinking that this has now purified our faith [ *This is a reference to his "defrocking" by S.D.A. Denominational leadership in the aftermath of the "Glacier View" meetings held in August 1980* <sup>5</sup> ], when in reality we confirmed at Dallas some of the very doctrine which Dr. Ford had merely carried to its ultimate conclusion. For if the atonement of Christ was once for all on the Cross, then is not Dr. Ford correct in maintaining that there is no heavenly significance to 1844? Why condemn him for teaching what was voted as "the voice of God" in Dallas. So long as anyone subscribes to the apostasy of Dallas, they are as much a partaker in heresy as Dr. Ford is. They should join forces with him. This includes the Editor of the Adventist Review who believed in 1968 - and to my knowledge I have not read a confession of repentance, nor a retraction - that Questions on Doctrine sets forth our fundamental beliefs "more clearly than any other publication that has been issued from our presses in many a year." So he believes with Ford that Christ obtains nothing for us

in the sanctuary, for He obtained it all on the Cross. It is true that one can find from his pen as Editor attacks on Ford's position - this only compounds the deception. It is simply the blind leading the blind. May God help us to awaken to actually what has taken place. The Omega of apostasy has come to full fruition. What was begun in 1955-1956 has now been officially adopted in 1980. [WWN (XIII-10), p. 10] <sup>2</sup> [ *And, sadly, continued and officially re-stated again in 2015.* ] ❖ (WHG) GLP

### **SOME POST-1950s SDA / EVANGELICAL CONFERENCES CORRESPONDENCE DISCLOSING THE SUBTERFUGE BEING PRACTICED ON AN UNSUSPECTING LAITY**

[ *The letter below was written to Elder Grotheer on August 14, 1981, by Elder Wood (Editor of the Adventist Review) in response to some earlier letters that had been exchanged between Elder Grotheer and Elder Eugene F. Durand (Assistant to Editor Wood), in which, among other things, he had - "asked (Elder Durand) regarding Elder Wood's position on the book - Questions on Doctrine." When Durand replied back regarding this point that - "In your note you state that Elder Wood heartily approved the doctrinal issues raised by the book, Questions on Doctrine ... Just in case there is some confusion in your mind on this, let me assure you that Elder Wood disagrees with some of the positions taken by the book, Questions on Doctrine, particularly in the areas of the nature of Christ and the Atonement," Grotheer responded in essence by asking how Durand could harmonize this statement with documentation showing that Wood had indeed agreed earlier with the positions on these topics as set forth in Questions on Doctrine. (Letter dated July 19, 1981).* <sup>5</sup> *The content of Elder Wood's personal reply below, along with Elder Grotheer's "Analysis" following it, we believe*



*Speak loud and clear to the main point which any critique on the attacks made on what foundational, present truth teachings entails - the exposure of cloaked deceit through duplicitous language! ]*

### THE KENNETH WOOD LETTER <sup>6</sup>

[ *Note: All textual underlined emphasis by Elder Grotheer. ]*

In your recent letter to Elder Durand you asked whether I stand by the position on Questions on Doctrine [ QOD ] set forth in Elder Durand's letter or in the one I wrote in 1968. The answer is, I stand by both of them. My personal position has not varied on the book. It is important to recognize, however, that audiences vary. One cannot say everything he would like to say to certain audiences. Jesus Himself made this clear when He said that He had many other things to tell the disciples but they could not bear them at that time. [ *The principle Jesus used here was that which is enumerated in Ecclesiastes 3: 1 - "To everything there is a season, and a time to every purpose under heaven." This is certainly not the double-talk Elder Wood is using in this attempted comparison! ]*

When I wrote the letter in 1968 it was apparent that someone had been seeking to undermine the faith of that person to whom I was writing. Someone was suggesting to this person that the leaders of the church could not be trusted, for they had sold the church down the river in a meeting with the evangelicals; also that the book QOD was full of error. It was apparent that what this person needed was to have his faith strengthened. I could do this honestly because I believe in the leaders of our work. They make mistakes at times as do all of us, but basically they are God's men. Likewise, I could express support for the book QOD because the average person would be greatly blessed by it. The person to whom I was writing

would not have detected any deviation from historic Adventism if someone had not called their attention. Except for those who were extremely well informed on Adventist truths, people would read the book and be blessed. In my letter I was emphasizing this aspect.

Turning to another audience, however, let me say that I have always been critical of the aspects of QOD that in my view represented a departure from historic Adventism. I wrote a 50-page paper on the question and presented it at the Nosoca Pines retreat of the General Conference officers several years ago.

Mrs. White made it plain, however, that we should not be constantly correcting our books because it undermines confidence in the church. Thus, instead of even revising QOD, it was allowed to go out of print. This probably has been a better solution than to focus attention on the mistakes in the book, then offer a revision. [ *\*Note: But it was reprinted in 2003! ]*

As for Movement of Destiny, <sup>7</sup> I feel uneasy about the same matters in it as I did about QOD.

As you know we are living in difficult times. People both from within the church and from outside are attacking the faith. Because of this we are trying to focus merely on the main issues. We think this is less confusing to our people than to bring in many side issues. All truth is important, but obviously some truths are central and some peripheral.

In a time like this it is good to realize that Jesus is the chief Shepherd of the sheep. He has never turned over to under-shepherds the total responsibility of guarding the flock and defending truth. With Jesus as our leader we can have confidence knowing that truth will triumph.

KHW Editor, Adventist Review

### ANALYSIS OF KENNETH WOOD'S LETTER <sup>8</sup>

In 1968, Elder Wood had written to a lay per-

son that the book - Questions on Doctrine - "in no way changes our fundamental beliefs. In fact it probably sets them forth more clearly than any publication that has been issued from our presses in many a year. I have been next to this whole program from the very beginning, and I have yet to hear any serious reader of this book offer a criticism that can bear investigation." Then in a letter written by Elder Eugene F. Durand, Assistant to the Editor, he stated that "Elder Wood disagrees with some positions taken by the book, Questions on Doctrine, particularly in the areas of the nature of Christ and the Atonement." It is obvious that these two positions are incompatible - they are poles apart! Yet in Elder Wood's letter to this writer, he wrote - "I stand by both of them." The first text that comes to mind is James 1: 8 - "A double minded man is unstable in all his ways." Then there are the words of Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount - "But let your communication be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay: for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil." (Matthew 5: 37).

Moreover, the reason Elder Wood gave for this dual position is even more appalling. "It is important," he writes, "to recognize, however, that audiences vary." In other words, when he is writing to a lay person, he could take a position which he knew was not correct, because that person "would not have detected any deviation from historic Adventism if someone had not called it to their attention. Except for those who are extremely well informed on Adventist truths, people would read the book and be blessed." Then he adds - "In my letter [to the lay person] I was emphasizing this aspect."

Since Elder Wood states that "he was next to the whole program from the very beginning" - that program which compromised the historic faith of the Advent Movement - why didn't he take his stand at that time by the side of Elder

Andreasen? Was it not expedient to do so? Why could he tell this lay person that he knew of no serious reader of the book - Questions on Doctrine - who could "offer a criticism that can bear investigation," yet admit to this writer that he "wrote a 50-page paper" on the fact that the book did represent "a departure from historic Adventism"?

If the book - Questions on Doctrine - was so subtly written that the average lay person could not detect its heresy, unless it was pointed out to him, then Wood, who claims he knew this, should have been one of the first to awaken the laity of this treacherous betrayal of sacred truth. But why didn't he? In his own words - "I believe in the leaders of our work." This is simply placing one's trust in man, to follow man wherever he may lead - right or wrong! And the laity must also be kept in subjection to that leadership, even though one in a position of influence - with the true facts before him - has to lie to accomplish the objective. This is tragedy compounded! Then to suggest that the lay person who is not informed can be blessed by the reading of heresy, and teachings which advocate the departure from historic Adventism, creates a credibility gap which cannot be bridged.

Moreover, in the same letter, Elder Wood admits that he feels uneasy about - Movement of Destiny - the second book of the Omega series, because the same teachings are in it that were also in Questions on Doctrine, the first book of the Omega of apostasy. Yet I find nothing in the editorials of the Adventist Review alerting the laity of the teachings to be found in the book - Movement of Destiny. And a second edition of this book has been published ... When are we going to hear the same message at all times come from men in positions of trust whether it be spoken to the laity, or behind closed doors of the committee room. There is

only One God, and He hears both speeches - will He not judge for this?

The leadership of the Church - and this includes the Editor of the Adventist Review - profess to believe in Righteousness by Faith, and loudly proclaim that they accept the 1888 Message - BUT in their conduct, and public utterances, deny the message in reality. The reason is simply stated - "They are not willing to exchange their own righteousness, which is unrighteousness, for the righteousness of Christ, which is pure, unadulterated truth." (TM, p. 65)<sup>9</sup> ❖ WHG

1. William H. Grotheer, *"Watchman, what of the night?"* (Lamar, AR: Adventist Laymen's Foundation of Mississippi, Inc., XIII - Nov. 1980), 1-5.
2. Grotheer, *"Watchman, what of the night?"* (XIII - Oct. 1980.). [Documentary Notations - In referring to the Key Doctrinal Comparisons from Statements of Belief, 1872-1980 as given in the (1980) October thought paper, we shall use the following - WWN (XIII-10) ... The Yearbook references will be cited as YB-1889, etc. The most recent statements will be noted as 1979-Recommended; 1980-Presented; and 1980-Voted.] [http://www.adventistlaymen.com/WWN%20Text%20Versions/wwn\(80\)10/wwn10\(80\).html](http://www.adventistlaymen.com/WWN%20Text%20Versions/wwn(80)10/wwn10(80).html)
3. General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, *28 Fundamental Beliefs* (Silver Spring, MD: [www.adventist.org](http://www.adventist.org), 2015), 10. <https://>

[www.adventist.org/fileadmin/adventist.org/files/articles/official-statements/28Beliefs-Web.pdf](http://www.adventist.org/fileadmin/adventist.org/files/articles/official-statements/28Beliefs-Web.pdf)

4. Ellen G. White, *Testimonies for the Church*, Series B, No. 2 (Published For The Author: 1st Edition, "Letters to Physicians and Ministers," 1904), 52.
5. Spectrum magazine, *Sanctuary Debate Documents* (Vol. 11, no. 2: Nov. 1980 - "The Final Decision," September 19, 1980), 78. <https://web.archive.org/web/20071117082127/http://www.spectrummagazine.org/spectrum/archive11-15/11-2documents1.htm>
6. (Note: For the fuller context of this communicative exchange see) - William H. Grotheer, *"Watchman, what of the night?"* (Lamar, AR: Adventist Laymen's Foundation of Mississippi, Inc., XIV - Oct. 1981, "Correspondence"), 6, 7. [http://www.adventistlaymen.com/WWN%20Text%20Versions/wwn\(81\)10/wwn10\(81\).html](http://www.adventistlaymen.com/WWN%20Text%20Versions/wwn(81)10/wwn10(81).html)
7. LeRoy E. Froom, *Movement of Destiny* (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1971)
8. Grotheer, *"Watchman, what of the night?"* (Lamar, AR: Adventist Laymen's Foundation of Mississippi, Inc., XIV - Nov. 1981, "Analysis of Kenneth Wood's Letter"), 6-7. [http://www.adventistlaymen.com/WWN%20Text%20Versions/wwn\(81\)11/wwn11\(81\).html](http://www.adventistlaymen.com/WWN%20Text%20Versions/wwn(81)11/wwn11(81).html)
9. Ellen G. White, *Testimonies to Ministers and Gospel Workers* (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1962), 65.

\* All Scripture quotations are from the King James Version unless otherwise indicated.

"Watchman, what of the night?" is published by the Adventist Laymen's Foundation of Iowa, Inc., P.O. Box 665, Nora Springs, IA 50458-0665, USA.

Founder	Elder William H. Grotheer
Editor, Publications & Research	Gary L. Patrick
Associate Editor	Dennis J. Tevis
Proofreader	William E. Caloudes

#### WEBSITES

[www.alfiowa.com](http://www.alfiowa.com)  
[www.adventistlaymen.com](http://www.adventistlaymen.com)

#### E-MAIL

Editor - [alfia@myomnitel.com](mailto:alfia@myomnitel.com)

Webmaster - [webmaster@adventistlaymen.com](mailto:webmaster@adventistlaymen.com)

This Thought Paper may be duplicated in its entirety without permission. Any portion(s) can be reproduced by adding the credit line - "Reprinted from WWN, ALF of Iowa, Nora Springs, IA, USA."

Current copy free upon request; previous and duplicate copies - \$0.75 ea. (USA) ; \$1.50 ea. USD (outside of USA).

Office phone # (641) 749-2684.



Follow us and like us on Facebook @ <https://www.facebook.com/wwniowa>