

*"Watchman,
what of the night?"*

"BEHOLD, THE BRIDEGROOM!
Come out to meet Him."

(Matt 25:6 RSV)



1888 RE-EXAMINED EXAMINED

(Part Four)

A Canadian reader of "Watchman, What of the Night?" wrote a few weeks ago telling of questions she had asked Wieland and Short. The letter reads in part:

I asked these men, when they held meetings at the Huntington Park Church in California, "Why didn't you do what God asked you to do?" That letter to Beach tells their position! (See WWN, XX-12, p. 6] Can you imagine men going to W. R. Beach for advice when God tells them to do a certain thing? And then about thirty years later decide to do what God told them to do years before!!!? Why do they think they can do the job they were told to do long ago! (Foss and Foy knew better than to try. They had refused also. That is why God chose EGW!)

Another reader writes from the West Coast:

There is a Western Region 1888 Message Conference in session now up in the Camp above Loma Linda. It started Thursday evening and will close Sunday. I am not attending and neither is -----.

Yes, Elder Wieland has either changed his view about corporate repentance, or he did not make clear what he meant during the early years of his writing and speaking.

Elder Snyman said that all the speakers had met and discussed improving their communication so they would be understood. He felt that many people didn't interpret their message correctly.

These two letters though different in emphasis strike at the heart of the problem. It is a matter of record that Wieland and Short did not carry out God's call to them in 1950, but permitted the message God gave to them to be kept in a great degree from the people. It is

Second Article Commenting on -

FROM 1888 TO APOSTASY

See p. 3

also true that they have not chosen to do what

Foss and Foy did after they refused to carry out God's call back in the 1844 era. But the tragedy is that now when they seek to carry out the mandate God gave them in 1950, they are altering the message so as to make it acceptable to the hierarchy. Besides this, they continue to refuse to face up to the facts which are a matter of historical record since 1950.

A controversial issue - denominational, or corporate repentance - seems now to have become more controversial due to faulty communication of concepts. Are Wieland and Short defining it in the same way they did in 1950, or are they making it mean something different? There can be no question but that the "brethren" in 1950 clearly understood from the original manuscript what Wieland and Short were saying. They were being called upon in their official capacity and not merely as individuals to repent of the rejection of the message God sent in 1888 through two other "messengers." This we have documented in Part Two of this series. (See XX-12, p. 3, col. 2) We also noted in this documentation that two of the statements upon which the leadership of the church based their conclusions were either modified, or deleted in the 1987 edition of 1888 Re-Examined.

However, as late as 1986, Wieland, writing in his widely distributed book - "As Many As I Love" - declared:

We have seen that the Seventh-day Adventist Church is in a unique sense Laodicea. It follows that the "angel of the church of the Laodiceans" is primarily the responsible leadership of the Seventh-day Adventist church on all levels, each segment appropriately responsible. "'These things, saith He that holdeth the seven stars in His right hand.' These words are spoken to the teachers in the church - those entrusted by God with weighty responsibilities." (Acts of the Apostles, p. 586) They are "those whom God has appointed to bear responsibilities of leadership" in the church, "those in the offices that God has appointed for the leadership of His people." (Ibid., p. 164)

In the next paragraph, Wieland makes it abundantly clear what the "nuts and bolts" are of denominational or corporate repentance. He writes:

"The Laodicean message shows that Christ respects church organization. He intends that the "angel of the church" shall repent first, and then minister that repentance to the worldwide church. The Laodicean message is evidence that this is His plan." (pp. 59-60)

Basically, then, as late as 1986, there was no change in what Wieland held and taught as to the meaning of corporate repentance. It was the leadership in their capacity as leaders who were to make repentance for the mistakes their predecessors had made, and this repentance was to be ministered to the members of the church body. This is the concept the leaders of the Church in 1950 understood Wieland and Short to hold, as well as those involved in writing the "Appraisal" to their manuscript in 1958. What now has become the problem?

Between the two paragraphs quoted above from "As Many As I Love", there is a very revealing one sentence confession to truth on Wieland's part. It reads - **"If they [the leadership of the Church] refuse Christ's call, church organization must eventually disintergrate."** What would such an event do to Wieland's concept that Laodicea will go through?! Any possibility of this happening must create horrors among the 1888 Message Committee.

Of course Wieland has proposed a solution. In this 1986 publication, he asks a question - "Suppose the leadership fails, or rejects the Lord's appeal? Israel's history demonstrates that 'the people' can intervene and demand repentance; see Jeremiah 26" This is simply repentance on demand which we have discussed in a previous Thought Paper. (See XIX-12) Thus the present emphasis on denominational repentance could well be an attempt to stir up the people to demand of the leadership corporate repentance, rather than an altering of the basic 1950 perception. In other words, just anything except admitting that Laodicea has been "spued out" as indicated in the prophecy. But beneath this reluctance to follow truth to its ultimate end - the cross - there are some other basic concepts resulting from the fact that Wieland and Short did not pursue God's call in 1950.

A simple fact which is sometimes overlooked is that when God calls a messenger, or messengers, He does not give them the full revelation of the message He wants given at the time He gives the initial call. There is a progressive revelation of that message. This was evident in the Message of 1888. Though called the 1888 Message, it was deepened and broadened in the years following 1888 by both Jones and Waggoner. The denial of this principle at work in God's revelation through chosen messengers is basic in

KNIGHT DESCENDS ON JONES

PART ONE

Editor's Note - In the lead article for XXI-1 - "1988 A Momentous Year for Adventism" - we called the readers attention to the first book of the 1888 Centennial Series being published by the Church. This book - From 1888 to Apostasy - written by Dr. George R. Knight of Andrews University is a devastating attack on A. T. Jones, one of the "messengers" God sent to the Church in 1888. The following article will be the first of a series on the philosophy and concepts woven into this "interpretive" biography by Knight.

- + -

In his attempt to denigrate A. T. Jones, Dr. George R. Knight has pictured him as man who believed - "Truth does not have two sides." (From 1888 to Apostasy, p. 94) Jones was "a man who saw things in terms of black and white." (Ibid.) This supposed weakness of Jones, Knight emphasizes. He writes of him as one who "saw everything in terms of total black or total white." (p. 118) Again, "For Jones, every issue was black or white, right or wrong." (p. 131) In other words, Jones was not like one retired Vice President of the General Conference who told a young beginning worker to keep in mind that no issue he would face in his church work would be all black or white; every issue would be gray. It is understandable why Jones had problems with the "brethren" of his day, if they, too, embraced this concept of church administration. This accounts for many of the problems which plague Adventism today. The refusal to recognize that truth has but one side, and that moral issues, and principles where the cause of God is concerned have no gray areas has led to apostasy in doctrine, and to compromise in standards of righteous living.

This evaluation of Jones by which Knight seeks to diminish his continuing influence on Adventist thinking in regard to the message of righteousness by faith explains why

the true message of 1888 is abhorred and rejected by so many. Ellen G. White defined the righteousness of Christ as "pure, unadulterated truth." (TM, p. 65) Now "pure, unadulterated truth" does not have two sides neither is it gray.

This concept of a clear distinction between truth and error is plainly set forth in another message of the series sent to the Battle Creek Church in 1896. She wrote:

The eternal God has drawn a line of distinction between the saints and the sinners, the converted and the unconverted. The two classes do not blend into each other imperceptibly, like the colors of the rainbow. They are as distinct as midday and midnight. (Ibid., p. 87)

The difference between midday and midnight is not twilight! Admittedly, this comparison between the saints and the sinners is used in connection with life-styles. But when one accepts the position that it is not important what one believes "doctrinally," or one can do what he wants to do - it is a matter of individuality - there remains only a small step to a full compromise with the world whether in thinking or acting.

Furthermore it is also admitted that holding correct doctrine in a theoretical manner only, does not insure a truly vital experience in Christ. On the other hand, holding an incorrect and false doctrine breaks the connection with heaven. The Scripture is plain on this point. It reads - **"Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God."** (II John 9)

Knight in his "interpretive" biography of A. T. Jones, while stating that "basic doctrine is important," holds that contention concerning it was the cause why the leadership of the church did not accept the message in 1888 sent by God through the two messengers, A. T. Jones and E. J. Waggoner. Of course, Jones gets the blame because he did not believe that truth had two sides. Knight's evaluation is written with emphasis:

The meaning of 1888 is to learn its central lessons and to start living the caring Christian life now. The meaning of 1888 is to face forward, not backward. The meaning of 1888 is the call for Adventists to put away their theological disputes as being all-important, and to treat each other like Christians even though they disagree. Only then will they be in a position to testify convincingly that they have Christ's message for a dying world. (p. 71)

This is the basis of ecumenical fellowship.

CHRIST OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS

Lesson # 12

Faith

<u>Question</u>	<u>Answer</u>
1. What is faith declared to be?	Heb. 11:1
2. How necessary is faith?	Heb. 11:6 (See note 1)
3. What is the basis of faith?	Romans 10:17
4. How are the just to live?	Romans 1:17 (See note 2)
5. By what principle is genuine faith actuated?	Gal. 5:6
6. What is the character of any act not performed in faith?	Romans 14:23
7. Are there any to whom God has not given faith?	Romans 12:3
8. Who gives to every man "the measure of faith?"	Heb. 12:2
For an illustration of faith please read	Matt. 8:5-10
9. What did the Centurion want done?	Matt. 8:6
10. Who did the Centurion want to do it?	Matt. 8:6
11. Did the Centurion feel that Jesus needed to come in person?	Matt. 8:8, 9
12. What did the Centurion expect would heal the servant?	Matt. 8:8
13. What did Jesus say the Centurion had?	Matt. 8:10

NOTES

1. "The knowledge of what the Scripture means when urging upon us the necessity of cultivating faith, is more essential than any other knowledge that can be acquired." (Ellen G. White - R&H, Oct. 18, 1898)

2. "This statement is the summing up of what the apostle has to say about the gospel. The gospel is the power of God unto salvation, but only 'to every one that believeth;' in it the righteousness of God is revealed. The righteousness of God is the perfect law of God, which is but the transcript of his own righteous will. All unrighteousness is sin, or the transgression of the law. The gospel is God's remedy for sin; its work, therefore, must be to bring men into harmony with the law, - to cause the workings of the righteous law to be manifested in their lives. But this is wholly a work of faith, - the righteousness of God is revealed from 'faith to faith,' - faith in the beginning, and faith to the end, - as it is written, 'The just shall live by faith.'

"This is true in all ages since the fall of man, and will be true until the saints of God have his name in their foreheads, and see him as he is." (E. J. Waggoner ST, March 25, 1889 - As quoted from Lessons on Faith, p. 9)

"The Heavens Declare ... and Night unto Night Sheweth..."

Just as Moses prayed in Exodus 33:18, "I beseech thee, show me thy glory," I prayed this morning that in a special way God would show me some of His glory. It didn't take long for God to answer that prayer. When I stepped out my door to walk the kilometer from our house to the library I felt the cool of the early morning that told me the sky was without cloud cover. As I looked up I was given a display of the heavens such as I had never seen in my life. Star upon star was to be seen, the great cloud of the Milky Way was visible, Venus shone out with brightness, but what attracted my attention the most was the great band Orion. The stars in Orion twinkled with a brilliance that I had never seen before. As I looked, my mind went back to the statement in Early Writings, "The atmosphere parted and rolled back; then we could look up through the open space in Orion, whence came the voice of God. The holy city will come down through that open space." (page 41) I also thought of the words of David who said, "When I consider thy heavens, the works of thy fingers, the moon and the stars, which thou hast ordained; what is man, that thou art mindful of him?" (Psalm 8:3, 4)

As I walked on I asked for God to show some more of His glory to me. God did not delay. While walking along the path in the woods I heard a rustling in the brush beside me. Turning my flashlight in that direction I saw two armadillos gently walking. As the light fell upon them, the one closest to me stopped with one front leg in the air and remained motionless. The second stopped and stood upon its hind legs. My thoughts went back to the story of creation that we had read to the children the night before.

As I neared the library I prayed for God to show me some more of His glory. About 50 meters from the library, the still small voice said, "Be still and know that I am God." As I listened to the sounds of the night I could hear small animals in the brush, insects making their sounds, and I realized that this morning God truly had shown me His glory. (Written Sept. 1987)

A. S.

ARE WE SEEKING TO RE-WRITE HISTORY?

In the Adventist Review (Oct. 8, 1987, p. 8), an article written by Ellen G. White was reprinted from the Review and Herald of Oct. 12, 1905. It was listed as a "Devotional." A picture of Ellen G. White (See Exhibit #1) appeared at the top of the first column with the notation - "With Ellen G. White's encouragement at the 1903 GC session, the church reorganized."

The facts are that the 1903 GC session was held in Oakland, California. The picture shows Ellen G. White speaking in the Battle Creek Tabernacle Church at the time of the 1901 GC session. (See Exhibit #2, Christ's Last Legion, p. 28)

We wrote a letter to the Editor which said in part:

Just one question - Was the dating of the picture in the October 8, 1987 issue of the Adventist Review an attempt at manipulation of history, or ignorance? Either way it was inexcusable. ...

If you would truly want to give an honest report on "organization" tell the whole story - 1901, 1903, and what Dr. P. T. Magan had to say about the 1903 Constitution. (Dated, Oct. 11, 1987)

To date (January 5, 1988), we have not seen in the Review, a correction. (We have looked but we may have overlooked it. Nevertheless the issue remains.) What took place in 1903 and how did Ellen G. White really respond?

First, we must know what Ellen G. White called for in 1901. She stated in unequivocal language:

That these men [the leadership in Battle Creek] should stand in a sacred place, to be the voice of God to the people, as we once believed the General Conference to be, - **that is past**. What we want now is a reorganization. We want to begin at the foundation, and to build upon a different principle. (1901 GC Bulletin, p. 25)

The call was for "reorganization" not for no organization. It did not call for the tearing down of the "foundation" but to "begin at the foundation" and build on a new

Exhibit #1



With Ellen White's encouragement at the 1903 GC session, the church reorganized.

Exhibit #2



Mrs. Ellen G. White Addressing the History-making General Conference Session in the Battle Creek Tabernacle, 1901

principle. This should cause the anarchists on the West coast to pause and do some rethinking.

In 1901, the Conference session produced a beginning. They kept organization, but adopted an entirely new Constitution with no General Conference president, but rather what was intended to be a rotating chairman of an enlarged committee. In 1903, this was all reversed.

P. T. Magan, who was a member of the 1903 Committee on Plans and Constitution, signed a minority report in opposition to the

Knight on Jones - from page 3

While Knight makes application to "theological disputes" within the Adventist community, it is but a step to adopting the same attitude to other professing Christians who hold different view from us. It comes down to a very basic issue - Does it matter what we believe? Is there but one side to truth, or does truth have two sides? Are there really no black and white areas; is everything just gray? Simply stated, are we to have an "open-ended theology" just to keep the machinery of organization functioning in a semblance of unity? Is this the unity for which Christ prayed, or is true unity based only in truth, pure and unadulterated?

Paul told Timothy plainly -

Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine; continue in them: for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee. (1 Tim. 4:16)

He also warned him -

Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils. (4:1)

The advocacy that it doesn't really matter what one believes in regard to the incarnation, for example, as does Knight in his book (p. 150), and as does the Editor of the Adventist Review (July 2, 1987, p. 4, col. 2-3) is as much a "doctrine of the devil" as is the teaching that Sunday is the Sabbath of the Lord God.

In the light of the philosophy advocated in this "interpretive" biography, one cries out - "Give me Jones's philosophy that truth has but one side, and that there are black and white areas in the issues that confront the Church today - one is of God, and the other is of the devil." Nowhere in the life of Christ do I find that He perceived doctrine or one's life-style as having gray areas. He declared - "I am the way, the truth, and the life." (John 14:6) There is no other way; no two sides to truth! And because Jones believed and maintained this is why God could choose and use him to be one of His "messengers" in 1888!

WHG

1988 ANNUAL FELLOWSHIP

August 1 - 6

Write for Information

Plan Now to Attend

1888 Re-Examined - from page 2

Knight's thesis as found in the book - From 1888 to Apostasy. He charges that the doctrinal issues involving "the divinity of Christ, the human nature of Christ" and the idea of "sinless living" were not topics to be found in the 1888 Message but rather read back into the message as a result of "subsequent developments in Jones and Waggoner's treatment of righteousness by faith." (p. 37) Factually, this is, to some extent, true. However, this cannot deny the fact that these topics became a part of the on-going revelation given to both Waggoner and Jones as by the Holy Spirit they were led into deeper understandings of the Word. As light given is proclaimed, more light is given. Wieland and Short would not deny this basic premise as Knight does. What then happened in their case?

At the 1950 General Conference Session, God gave these two young missionaries to Africa a "Spirit of discernment" so they could accurately evaluate what they saw and heard. They perceived the true doctrinal message of 1888 in contrast to the Protestant doctrine of righteousness by faith they were hearing. God sent them with the only possible solution for the Church - corporate repentance. After writing out their message, and sensing the reaction of the "brethren," they turned from the direct call of God to the call of men, and returned to mission service in Africa promising a "vow of perpetual silence" in a letter to the Secretary of the General Conference. (See XX-12, p. 6) [A call to mission service though through men can be considered a Divine call through His church; but a direct call from God takes the precedence.] As a result God has given them no further light on the full scope of the 1888 Message. In fact, Wieland has been in the front ranks of those who have opposed the practical application of the Message. It is also a fact, that a speaker at the 1888 Message Conference at Andrews University in 1986 was just as denigrating of Jones as Knight in his book.

It is imperative to note that Wieland and Short in their call in 1950 for corporate repentance based this call on the statement found Testimonies, Vol. 8, p. 250. They prefaced this quote - and it is in the final "Recapitulation" of their whole research - with these words - "The following prophecy has been fulfilled, and awaits only its realization by the church." The prophecy is

To page 7, col. 1

then quoted - Just one sentence:

Unless the church, which is now being leavened with her own backslidding, shall repent and be converted, she will eat the fruit of her own doings, until she shall abhor herself. (See 1888 Re-Examined, p. 203, 1950 edition)

What Wieland and Short did not see in 1950 - and which God could not disclose to them because of their rejection of His call - was that the "backslidding" with which the church was then being leavened was organizational apostasy. As we have noted previously, this testimony was written within two weeks of the 1903 General Conference Session which turned back the organizational progress of the 1901 Session. The fact that in the new edition of 1888 Re-Examined, the call for corporate repentance is not associated with this prophetic testimony, indicates they now perceive its context, but wish to ignore its import. In the new edition, they have even gone so far as to deny that a corporate repentance involves the reorganizational principles Ellen White called for in 1901. They write:

The solution to our problem does not consist in destroying or changing the mechanical system of our constitutional organization, but in finding repentance and reconciliation with Christ within it. (p. 206)

In other words, the very actions of the General Conference which caused the Lord's messenger in 1903 to declare that the church was "being leavened with her own backsliding," Wieland and Short now state that these need not be altered to achieve repentance. They seek to infer that any "weaknesses or error in organization" would be rectified overnight if repentance were forthcoming. Have they been so inflicted with Laodicean blindness themselves that they cannot see how the corporate body through its actions at the 1985 Session so completely locked themselves in that such an "almost overnight" rectification would be impossible. Are they totally unaware of what Magan said about the 1903 Constitution? Are there to be no fruits observable in the corporate repentance called for by Wieland?

What needs to be done is to candidly and honestly - free from Laodicean blindness and presuppositions based on faulty exegesis - explore the facts of history from 1950 to the present to see what God did to offset the failure of Wieland and Short to carry through God's call to them in 1950. This we shall do next.

WHG & AS

Re-Writing History from page 5

setting aside of the 1901 Constitution. He told the delegates why. He said:

It may be stated there is nothing in this new constitution which is not abundantly safeguarded by the provisions of it; but I want to say to you that any man who has ever read Neander's History of the Christian Church, Mosheim's, or any of the other great church historians, - any man who has ever read those histories can come to no other conclusion but that the principles which are to be brought in through this proposed constitution, and in the way they are brought in, are the same principles, and introduced in precisely the same way, as they were hundreds of years ago when the Papacy was made.

Further: This whole house must recognize this, before we are through with this discussion, that the proposed new constitution,...in principle, as far as the head of the work is concerned, it goes back precisely where we were before the reformatory steps of two years ago. (1903 GC Bulletin, p. 150)

In two weeks, Ellen G. White would write that in this act - the "proposed constitution" was voted - the Church was "being leavened with her own backsliding." (Vol. 8, p. 250) Yet the Editors of the Adventist Review would want you to believe that Ellen G. White approved the introduction of papal principles into the organization of the Church. How desperate have deceivers of God's professed people become that they would seek to re-write history! Or, is it the "blind" leading "blind Laodiceans"?

WHG

"Absolutely nothing which does not bear the test of truth will be triumphant in the Judgment." (1888 Re-Examined, 1950 ed. p. 2; omitted in 1987 edition)

"Watchman, What of the Night?" is published monthly by the Adventist Laymen's Foundation of Mississippi, Inc., P. O. Box 789, Lamar, AR 72846, USA.

For Canada, write - The Adventist Laymen's Foundation of Canada, P. O. Box 117, Thorne, Ont., POH 2J0.

Editor
Associate Editor

Wm. H. Grotheer
Allen Stump

Any portion of this Thought Paper may be reproduced without further permission by adding the following credit line - "Reprinted from "Watchman, What of the Night?" - Lamar, Arkansas, USA.

First copy free upon request; duplicate copies- 50¢.