



*"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*

COVER UP - HIERARCHY WAY OF LIFE

Source Within Church

Responded to REVIEW Report

[Editor's Note - It was back in 1977 before Elder R. H. Pierson stepped aside as President of the General Conference that he wrote an article in the Review (March 24, pp. 6-8) to explain the why of the litigation in which the Church was involved with the Federal government at that time. Some people who were in a position to know the facts recognized the explanation given by Elder Pierson was an end run around the truth and felt that it should be answered. It was decided to send a response by personal mail to every SDA worker in North America. The cost became a prohibitive factor, but "The Response to R. H. Pierson's Report to the Church" remained - though written, uncirculated. We reproduce this analysis so that the laity might understand that "explanations" coming through the official organ of the Church today - The Adventist Review - are no more reliable than such explanations in the past. The author of this "Response" has asked that he be identified only as "a source within the denomination."]

THE RESPONSE

In his report to the church titled, "When the Church Is Taken to Court," (Review, 3-24-77, pp 6-8), General Conference President Robert H. Pierson seeks to calm the troubled waters of the faithful members of the church by crying, "Peace! Be still!" But there are times when such an instruction is inappropriate.

Now is such a time. Now is rather a time to "let judgment run down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream." Amos 5:24 We are faced here with a General Conference president who is telling the Adventist people one thing through the Review, while through affidavits and General Conference attorneys he is telling the courts of the land, and thus the

public press, something dissimilar.

In the Review he says, "We do not believe that the church is above the law or that the Seventh-day Adventist Church is not subject to the laws of this country, as has been suggested in the public press." Through his attorneys he says, "The Church claims exemption from all civil laws in all of its religious institutions."

(The above quote appears on page 104 of a brief prepared for the General Conference officers by Malcolm T. Dungan, James H. Quirk, Donald McNeil, and Boardman Woland, a General Conference staff attorney and a Seventh-day Adventist. It was submitted as part of the Opening Brief for Defendants in Civil Case No. 74-2025, EEOC vs PPPA and General Conference, to Judge Charles B. Renfrew in the U.S. District Court in San Francisco. This same assertion is repeated word for word in Civil Case No. 75-1792 before the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit Court in a Brief for Appellants on page 77, submitted July 6, 1975.)

In the same appeals brief appear the following claims:

We insist that in doing its holy work, the church is free to ignore, even to flout, measures [laws] which bind all others. (p. 78)

As an organized religious denomination the Seventh-day Adventist Church insists that it is "wholly exempt" from the cognizance of Civil Authority, and that entanglements, practical exceptions, and "reasonable adjustments" [in order to comply with the law] are not be tolerated. (p. 80)

Contrary to what Elder Pierson tells us in the Review, we see that the public press did not mis-report the evidence available to it in publishing church claims of exemption from the laws of this

country. The fact is that they found this evidence in the public record, placed there by attorneys carrying out the directives of the General Conference officers.

The Legal Issue

Elder Pierson makes this statement: "Until more recent years this scale [the traditional plan for remuneration of church workers] provided that the 'head of household' (the wage earner in a family, in contradistinction to a worker with only himself/herself to support) should receive a higher remuneration than a single worker with no family responsibilities."

This statement is unfortunately misleading in two important, basic ways. 1) By applying the term "herself" equally with "himself" to "head of household," Elder Pierson implies that a female sole-family-support had as good a chance as a male sole-family-support to receive "head of household" benefits. Such was not the case. A great many God-fearing, self-sacrificing women church workers were sole-family-support (being widowed or divorced with dependent children or married to invalid husbands). Yet exceedingly few of these women ever received "head of household" benefits down through the years. 2) Just as misleading is his description of the "head of household" as "the wage earner in a family, in contradistinction to a worker with only himself/herself to support." This implies that the considerable "head of household" remuneration was based on need. Again such was not the case.

As a general practice church institutions simply defined "head of household" as "married male" and let it go at that. Thus, the institution paid "head of household" remuneration to all married male employees whether or not they had dependent children, whether or not their wives also earned their own incomes (even if larger than their husbands'), whether or not these men also received (in some cases huge) extra forms of income (such as subscription book royalties, investment income, etc.) Yet to extremely few woman employees did these institutions pay "head of household" remuneration, whether or not they were widowed or divorced with dependent children, whether or not they had to support invalid dependent relatives (including husbands), whether or not they were putting their husbands through school (as was the case with Merikay Silver of the Pacific Press).

Church remuneration policy has never been based on need. In her day Ellen G. White spoke out against sex discrimination in remuneration: "If a woman is appointed by the Lord to do a certain work, her work is to be estimated according to its value." Not paying women is "making a difference, and selfishly withholding from such workers their due." And, "When

self-denial is required. . . do not let a few hard-working women do all the sacrificing. Let all share in making the sacrifice. God declares, I hate robbery for a burnt offering." Evangelism, pp. 491-92.

Now Elder Pierson asserts that "there is no head-of-household differential, and a women holding the same position and doing the same work as a man receives the same salary and benefits." If this is an assertion that there is no sex discrimination in remuneration, it is doubtful. It is not reasonable to conclude that the Federal government would wage protracted legal battles against church institutions if these institutions were complying with the laws against sex discrimination.

Excuses for Going to Court

Elder Pierson makes a point out of the fact that, "The Seventh-day Adventist Church has not initiated any of the current court cases. We are defendants in every case." This he seems to offer as a claim to virtue and honor. Since, he implies, we do not believe in taking someone to court, being sued is somehow more virtuous and honorable than suing. But this is not always the case. In the instances here discussed the Federal government has determined that the officers of the Pacific Press, the Pacific Union, and the General Conference have been violating the Civil Rights Act and the Fair Labor Standards Act.

To claim that we are the defendants, we are the accused, is no defense. It is no denial of wrongdoing. It is no example of virtue and honor. To claim that we are defendants, we are the accused, is no more virtuous or honorable than the thief's protest that he is the defendant, he is the accused. Certainly there is no honor, no virtue, and nothing praiseworthy in such a claim. To offend is less honorable than to seek remedy for an offense.

"Sometimes a situation develops or deteriorates," Elder Pierson writes, "to the extent that we have no other course than to defend the church when it is sued in court." He here refers to "the current cases" in which the Federal government is suing the Church and some of its institutions for violating Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, a law of more than a dozen years standing, and the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act, amended in 1972 to include teachers. This has given us plenty of time to clean up our remuneration practices. Where, then, is the deterioration that makes costly court proceedings inevitable?

If we were violating child labor laws, fire ordinances, health codes, and safety regulations in our institutions and were sued by the Federal agencies involved, would "we have no other course than to defend the church when it is sued in court?" And now

that we have been found by the government to have been violating anti-sex discrimination laws, do "we have no other course than to defend the Church when it is sued in court?" The answer is that we do have another course. We can obey these laws as the Word of God requires:

Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the king as supreme; or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evildoers, and for the praise of them that do well. For so is the will of God, that with well doing ye may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men. I Peter 2:13-15.

Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same: For he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake. Romans 13:1-5

Elder Pierson lists four General Conference guidelines that determines whether the church would go to court. Do any of the rules apply to the cases under consideration?

1) When government demands constitute a violation of a plain "Thus saith the Lord," the church would go to court. But the government is seeking to enforce laws with which the church agrees. There is no such violation here. This rule does not apply.

2) When the government violates the U.S. Constitution, the church would go to court. But here Elder Pierson provides no explanations of how the laws at hand violate the Constitution. The only laws at issue are anti-sex discrimination laws. The church agrees that sex discrimination in remuneration is bad. How do these laws violate the Constitution? Are laws prohibiting excessive child labor constitutional, while those prohibiting sex discrimination unconstitutional? If so, then how or why? Elder Pierson offers no reasons. Without them this rule cannot apply.

3) When the government operates beyond its rightful sphere, the church may go to court. But again no reasons or explanations are forthcoming as to how the anti-sex discrimination laws intrude unconstitutionally into legitimate church activities. Does

enforcement of anti-sex discrimination law involve an unconstitutional scrutiny, whereas enforcement of health and safety codes do not? Without answers, neither can this rule apply.

4) When the church has problems outside the United States, the church (under modifications of the above rules) could go to court. But obviously this rule does not apply, since all the lawsuits have been brought within the United States.

Since no reasons have been given showing how any one of the four rules would apply to the court cases Elder Pierson discusses, it was pointless to include them in the article. None shows why the church should have gone to court in these cases. After reading such statements as, "It is unusual indeed when we take issue with the ordinances or directives of the Government," one would think that very powerful, very compelling reasons would have to exist to convince the Adventist laity that these court cases were necessary. But we cannot find such reasons. We cannot even find poor reasons. We find no reasons at all.

"Only when matters of conscience," Elder Pierson writes, "conflict with legal requirements would we be unable to comply fully with the laws of the land." Yet he fails to tell the church what specific "matters of conscience" in these cases "conflict with legal requirements." Is it a "matter of conscience" that we resist the legal requirements of equal pay for equal work? This is all that the government is asking. Only lay employees are subject to the Fair Labor Standards Act. The clergy are not involved. There is no collision between these laws and legitimate religious activities than there is between health and safety codes and our legitimate religious activities. Is it a "matter of conscience" that we resist the routine investigation and investigations of specific complaints when and if any of our institutions should violate these laws? There is no more intrusion of the government into church affairs involved in the enforcement of these laws than is involved in the enforcement of health and safety laws.

In the absence of any specific conflicting "matter of conscience" that Elder Pierson could bring forward, and in the absence of any conflicting "matter of conscience" involved in obeying these laws, we must conclude that this massive and costly resistance of the Federal government was baseless and futile.

On December 4, 1974, before the huge Federal Case against the Pacific Union Conference was launched in Los Angeles, General Conference attorneys submitted to U.S. District Court Judge Charles B. Renfrew the following statement:

The elders of the Church are few, and they

have much to do; they have already had to spend too much of their time, and far too much of the Church's treasury, which comes from the tithes and offerings of faithful people, in connection with this case. (Opening Brief for Defendants, EEOC vs PPPA and GC, p. 105.)

One might ask rhetorically, then, Why are they spending the church's treasury, which comes from the tithes and offerings of faithful people, in this way? Why not rather use it for which it was intended -- to pay fair and lawful wages to workers in our institutions?

"First Minister" Explanation

Elder Pierson admits that "the use of first minister" was "applied" to a General Conference officer in an affidavit. He fails to mention that it was he himself who used the term in his own signed affidavit and that he applied it to himself in his capacity as General Conference President. "It is. . . the desire and purpose of the leadership of the Church, including myself as its first minister for the time being," his statement reads, "to identify problem areas and make needed changes. . ." The context of this statement reveals that he, acting as "first minister" of the Church, was thus qualified "to make needed changes." Such a statement carries obvious overtones of "primacy," since "first" literally means "prime," with attendant power and authority to act on that primacy. And when used together with a description of the Seventh-day Adventist church as a "hierarchy" it echoes the term, "primacy of the pope" especially in the ears of judges not familiar with true Seventh-day Adventist church government and authority.

The standard New Catholic Encyclopedia defines "primacy of the pope" as "that full, supreme, and universal authority over all the bishops and faithful of the Church which belongs by divine right to the bishop of Rome as the successor to St. Peter, who received such a primacy among the Apostles directly from Christ." (Vol. 11, p. 779) But Ellen G. White wrote:

God has never given a hint in His word that He has appointed any man to be head of the church. The doctrine of papal supremacy is directly opposed to the teachings of the Scriptures. The pope can have no power over Christ's church except by usurpation." (Great Controversy, p. 51)

Orders of Clergy

In his report to the Church, Elder Pierson also made this statement: "In the Adventist ministry we do not have various 'orders,' with some 'outranking' others."

Here is the president of the General Conference telling the laity of the Church that we have no orders of ministry, yet telling the courts that we do. In his own affidavit, signed by him on November 30, 1974, Elder Pierson told Judge Charles B. Renfrew (EEOC v. PPPA and GC) that "the orders of ministry in the Seventh-day Adventist Church include Ordained Ministers, Credentialed Missionaries, Licensed Ministers, Licensed Missionaries, and Credentialed Literature Evangelists" (page 8) and that "the total number of Seventh-day Adventists in all of the Orders of Ministry is approximately 75,000" (page 9).

Elder Pierson describes some of the duties of one of these "Orders of Ministry" in this way: "An ordained minister is authorized and expected to preach the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to administer the sacraments. . ." (Same document, p. 8)

The Term - "Hierarchy"

"The use of the term hierarchical system by attorneys," Elder Pierson says, "also disturbed a few people." He ignores the fact that people have been more disturbed over the use of the term hierarchy to describe the Seventh-day Adventist church, not by attorneys, but by high church officers. In an affidavit which he signed on February 6, 1976, [then] Vice President of the General Conference Neal C. Wilson said this: "The Seventh-day Adventist Church . . . maintains . . . a hierarchial structure of church authority." (Presented to Judge Manuel L. Real in Case CV 75-3032-R, US Secretary of Labor vs Pacific Union Conference and General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists. On April 1, 1977, Judge Real ruled against the church's arguments that the First Amendment to the Constitution protects Adventist institutions from obeying the Fair Labor Standards Act requiring equal pay for equal work.) And in an affidavit signed on December 3, 1974, by [then] General Manager of the Pacific Press W. J. Blacker, Elder Blacker asserted this: "The General Conference has control over all aspects of Pacific Press. . . through the hierarchy of the Seventh-day Adventist Church." (Presented to Judge Charles B. Renfrew in Case No. 74-2025 CBR, EEOCV v PPPA and General Conference, in U.S. District Court, San Francisco.) Elder Pierson's report to the laity goes on to insist that our "hierarchical system" is really a "'representative' form of government" But a "representative hierarchy" is a contradiction of terms.

On the one hand, a representative (delegate) by definition is not one who holds authority in his own right. To the contrary, he is the instrument of those who hold the true God-given authority, the constituents, the local church members, who have elected and delegated him. On the other hand, a hierarch

is literally a "sacred ruler" or "high priest," one who receives his spiritual authority directly from God and governs the church by divine right. In representative church government, God-given authority rests ultimately with the body of individual believers and expresses itself through the representatives or delegates of the believers.

The SDA Church Manual recognizes the Adventist system to be representative rather than its opposite, hierarchical: "Authority in the church rests in the church membership" (page 46). But the General Conference attorneys, acting under the directions of President Pierson and Vice President Wilson portrayed the Seventh-day Adventist church as a hierarchy: "A 'hierarchical' church is one in which final decisions are made at the top of the organizational ladder." (Reply Brief for Defendants in EEOC v PPPA and GC, p. 28) They were applying this term, not to the Roman Catholic Church, but to the Seventh-day Adventist church. "The General Conference Committee," Vice President Neal C. Wilson testified under oath in the U.S. District Court for Northern California (EEOC v PPPA & GC) on March 20, 1975, "is the highest authority in the Seventh-day Adventist Church."

Judge Charles B. Renfrew, unfamiliar with the original structure of the Seventh-day Adventist church, received a picture of "hierarchical" Adventism from the General Conference officers that showed the General Conference Committee wielding "hierarchical" spiritual power sufficient to secure the excommunication of two SDA church members in good and regular standing by "hierarchical" determination alone. Testified Elder Wilson on this same day, "The General Conference Committee felt that this discipline [disfellowshipping Lorna Tobler and Merikay Silver, two women who sought equal pay for equal work under the law] was necessary in this case. . . The Church (that is, General Conference Committee) felt that inasmuch as these ladies were at variance with the Church [as determined by the General Conference Committee], the local church of which they, where they hold membership, should be informed of that."

This drift toward hierarchical rule in modern Adventism has gone so far that the highest General Conference officers have been able, through their own Adventist and non-Adventist attorneys, to deny the historic Seventh-day Adventist stand against the kind of spiritual authority claimed by the Roman Catholic Church, and to label as "false doctrine" our historic position. Thus did General Conference attorneys sweep away our historic position, a position adopted by the pioneers, including Ellen G. White:

Although it is true that there was a period in the life of the Seventh-day Adventist Church when the denomination took a distinctly

anti-Roman Catholic viewpoint, and the term "hierarchy" was used in a perjorative sense to refer to the papal form of church governance, that attitude on the Church's part. . . has now been consigned to the historical trash heap so far as the Seventh-day Adventist Church is concerned. (Reply Brief, EEOC v PPPA & GC, p. 4)

Further the leadership of the church labelled as "false doctrine" Lorna Tobler's statement of this position:

"In their zeal to deny the organization and structure [hierarchical] of the Seventh-day Adventist Church [Elder Pierson's court version of] in order to be enabled to deny the authority [hierarchical] of the General Conference Committee, the intervenor-plaintiffs [Lorna Tobler and Merikay Silver] fall into the error of teaching false doctrine, which is contrary to the doctrine and practice of the [current] Church. Thus Mrs Tobler swears: 'I have frequently heard the term 'hierarchy' used among Adventists when reference is made to the Roman Catholic system, of which I have always been taught that Adventists strongly disapprove. I have never heard of the term 'hierarchy' used to describe Adventist ministers as it is done in the defendants' brief. . . and I find it strange and contradictory to all I have ever learned in Adventist schools and churches.' In several ways this illustrates the dangers incurred by an individual church member who presumes to deny the authority of the duly constituted officials and governing bodies of the Church. . . It is not good Seventh-day Adventism to express, as Mrs Tobler has done, an aversion to Roman Catholicism. . . The term "hierarchy" or "hierarchical" has no such adverse connotation in Seventh-day Adventist theology as Mrs. Tobler suggests. (Same Brief as above, pp. 29-30)

The blame for bringing the term "hierarchy" into Adventism cannot be placed upon the legal counsel, although Elder Pierson suggests that the terms in questions were selected by non-Adventist lawyers. The attorneys - both Adventist and non-Adventist - represented him and the other General Conference officers and it as their job to do the General Conference Committee's bidding. The General Conference president is responsible, no matter what he claims. The Adventist delegates in Vienna did not intend to put an irresponsible man into the presidency of the Church.

It should, furthermore, be clearly noted that nowhere

in his report to the church did Elder Pierson renounce or abandon the terms "first minister" or "hierarchy" as applied to himself and our church respectively. And nowhere did he admit that he made any mistakes. He said, "If we have erred. . . we will try to do better next time." (pp. 7-8, emphasis writer) He said, "We are only human. We may make mistakes. (p. 8, emphasis writer) He did not say he erred. He did not say he made a mistake. Nor could he. For all of these arguments and assertions continue unabated and in full force in the legal documents to this very moment.

The good Seventh-day Adventist people will either have to accept them or to shoulder their own responsibilities as members of a non-hierarchical fellowship of believers, a democratically-based representative church, to rid these things from our midst.

+++++

CORRESPONDENCE

Kenneth H. Wood, Editor,
Adventist Review

Back in May, 1981, a brother in Australia received from Elder Eugene F. Durand, Assistant to Elder Kenneth Wood, a letter in reply to his inquiry about Elder M. L. Andreasen's supposed recantation. Durand wrote - "You are correct when you state that Elder Andreasen did not change his mind on the issues of the atonement and the human nature of Christ. Elder Unruh meant, therefore, when he said that 'the author of the criticism made his peace with the church' [See Adventist Heritage, Vol. 4, #2, 1977, p. 45] was that Elder Andreasen agreed not to continue agitating his views publically even though he did not personally change those views. It was, therefore, what we might call an administrative agreement rather than a theological one." (Letter dated, May 6, 1981) Upon receipt of this letter forwarded to me from Australia, I wrote to Elder Durand asking for documentation. In his reply to me, he stated: "We do not have documentation for this here in the REVIEW office. This is Elder Wood's understanding of the situation as he observed it at the time." (Letter dated, July 16, 1981)

In the same letter to Elder Durand asking for documentation, I also asked regarding Elder Wood's position on the book - Questions on Doctrine. On this point Durand's reply read - "In your note you state that Elder Wood heartily approved the doctrinal is-

ues raised by the book, Questions on Doctrine. I am not quite sure what you mean by this statement, whether you are saying that Elder Wood agreed with Questions on Doctrine or not. 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, Question on Doctrine, particularly in the areas of the nature of Christ and the Atonement." (ibid.)

My reply to Elder Durand on this point is as follows:

Now in regard to the other item - Kenneth Wood's position on Questions on Doctrine. Enclosed you will find a copy of a letter signed by him. Please harmonize the comments made in paragraph #3, with what you have written concerning his position in this most recent letter to me. Perhaps, I have missed his public confession in some editorial of the Adventist Review where he disavows that which he avowed in 1968.

Then since you have written what you believe his present position to be, and since the book Movement of Destiny affirms the same positions on the incarnation and atonement as Questions on Doctrine, albeit more bluntly stated, what is Wood's official position on this book by Froom? (Letter, July 19, 1981)

Before giving you Wood's reply to my letter to Elder Durand, background data is necessary. Paragraph #3 of Wood's letter dated Feb. 28, 1968 read:

The book to which you refer is undoubtedly Questions on Doctrine, published in 1957. This 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 examination. It is always possible that some statements might have been expressed more clearly to avoid misunderstanding, but rightly understood, the delineations of doctrine in this book are in harmony with historic Adventism. If you are able to point out any error in the book, I would appreciate hearing from you.

Prior to this - May 1, 1967 - Elder Wood had written to the same individual on behalf of Elder Pierson, the following:

I have travelled to a good many places to attend workers' meetings, and I have asked at these meetings if anyone has found any

point of major doctrinal error in the book, Question on Doctrine. I have found none as yet.

With this background material, we can better understand the significance of Elder Wood's reply to me as a result of my inquiry to Elder Durand. Wood's letter follows in its entirety. (All emphasis is mine.)

August 14, 1981

Wm. H. Grotheer
Adventist Laymen's Foundation
P. O. Box 178
Lamar, Arkansas 72846

Dear Brother Grotheer:

In your recent letter to Elder Durand you asked whether I stand by the position on Questions on Doctrine 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.

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.

As for Movement of Destiny, 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.

Very sincerely,

(Signed)

Kenneth H. Wood
Editor, ADVENTIST REVIEW

Since fundamental principles are involved in the position taken by the Editor of the Adventist Review, we shall discuss our reply to Elder Wood in another thought paper.

++++