



*"Watchman,
what of the night?"*

*"The hour has come, the hour is striking, and striking at you,
the hour and the end!"*

Eze. 7:6 (Moffat)

LESSONS FROM 150 YEARS AGO

"SHARING THE NEWS"

Sharing the News is a monthly newsletter prepared by The 1888 Message Study Committee [1888 MSC] for its Board of Directors as well as the Advisory Committee Members. The May 17, 1994 issue (Vol. 1, No. 10) was captioned - "EXTRA" - with a note to the Committee Members - "Please Do Not Publish!" This issue was "a private confidential report" of a special four hour meeting in the office of Elder Robert S. Folkenberg on May 12. The principals, Folkenberg, Wieland and Short, were joined by Calvin Rock, Robert Dale, Gerry Karst, and Angel Rodriguez of the General Conference; George Reid of the Biblical Research Institute; Kenneth Wood of The Ellen G. White Estate; and Gerald Finneman representing the 1888 MSC.

The bottom line of the contention between the GC and the 1888 MSC is "a structural issue," according to Folkenberg. Dale was more direct. "The 1888 Message Study Committee as such is the problem." The Church's hierarchy do not perceive the 1888 MSC as a part of the organization. Wieland and Short, however, do so perceive it. Short emphatically stated - "We are part of the organization. The Charter of the 1888 MSC provides that if dissolved the assets would go to the General Conference."

In his opening remarks, Folkenberg had observed that the 1888 MSC is loyal to the Church and its organization, does not "take tithe," holds meetings only in church facilities, and "takes a reasonable position." However, what was not mentioned, and what is a known fact to anyone acquainted with the present attitudes in the Community of Adventism, tithe is flowing into the

To page 3, col. 2

There were two Disappointments in 1844: March 21, and October 22. William Miller's original study of the prophecies of the Bible did not provide any exact date for the Second Coming of Christ. He finally narrowed the time of the event to "on or before" and "about the year 1843." Miller wrote:

"I believe that time can be known by all who desire to understand and to be ready for His coming. And I am fully convinced that some time between March 21st, 1843 and March 21st, 1844, according to the Jewish mode of computation of time, Christ will come, and bring all His saints with Him; and that then He will reward every man as his works shall be." (Signs of the Times, Jan. 25, 1843)

After the Disappointment on March 21, 1844, Miller wished to tone down the enthusiasm connected with time. He did not embrace the new date set - October 22, 1844 - until two weeks before that time.

Miller's study of the prophecies, with a focus on the time for the Second Coming of Christ, was not limited to the study of Daniel 8:14. He developed 15 Proofs from numerous other texts of Scripture to establish his conviction that Christ would come "on or about" the year 1843. (See Appendix III, The End of Historicism, p. 220) The fact is also documented that in the Millerite periodicals from 1840-1843, a total of 123 articles were devoted to the exegesis of these "15 Proofs." Of this number only 34 focused on the prophecy of Daniel 8:14. (ibid, p. 219)

In all of Miller's calculations, he overlooked the fact that there was no Year 0 - 1 B.C. was followed by A.D. 1 - thus arriving at the year 1843 rather than 1844. It also casts doubts on the thoroughness of his "homework." After the

disappointment on March 21, Miller was no longer in control of the Movement, and it passed to the hands of the one who first pointed out his mistake in the calculation of chronology, Samuel Snow.

Snow was joined by George Storrs in a detailed study of various calendars and typology. It was their study leading to the "Seventh Month Movement" which forms the basis of Seventh-day Adventism. Here is where the focus should be centered as we note the 150th Anniversary of the Great Disappointment on October 22, 1844.

While William Miller made the prophecy of Daniel 8:14 one proof of his 15 Proofs, Snow corrected the date to 1844, and by application of horizontal typology added October 22. Because of this, we can conclude that October 22, 1844, was the date arrived at by Samuel Snow, and was connected with William Miller only in a limited way. Tradition has a way of muting the very facts of history.

Reasoning on the basis of typology that the Hebrew festal year was typical of events in prophetic history, and connecting the cleansing of the sanctuary in Daniel 8:14 with the typical Day of Atonement, Snow applied "the tenth day of the seventh month" to Daniel 8:14, setting the date, October 22 as the time for its antitypical fulfillment. However, into this picture, Snow introduced another factor. He applied the eschatological parable of Jesus in Matthew 25, to this period. We thus have the terminology, "The Midnight Cry," added to the Adventist vocabulary and applied to the great religious revival that marked the summer of 1844.

Following the Great Disappointment on October 22, 1844, the small band which became the nucleus of the Seventh-day Adventist Church added a vertical dimension to the typology of the Jewish festal imagery. They perceived the earthly priestly ministry to be a type of the Heavenly ministry of Jesus Christ as High Priest over the House of God. Instead of focusing on "the tradition of the elders" in their modification of Adventist history, we need to center our attention on the viability of typology as a hermeneutic, and the meaning of Christ's parable of the Ten Virgins, now 150 years down the pike.

To focus on typology brings to the forefront the Church's teaching on the Sanctuary Doctrine. However, by emphasizing traditional historical concepts - right or wrong - the real issue confronting Adventism is muted. The question,

however, must be faced forthrightly - Does the Sanctuary Doctrine have meaning and significance for us today? The answer to this question stands or falls on the validity of typology as a viable method of Biblical interpretation. Then add to this the application of Matthew 25:1-13 to the present hour, and you have more questions than anyone of the ecclesiastical hierarchy wishes to face, as well as many of the leaders of certain "independent" ministries.

In the first study on the "Theology of the Sanctuary," we discussed in detail the question - "Is typology an acceptable hermeneutic?" (WVN, 2(94), pp. 2-4) We found it to be a valid method for Biblical interpretation if we follow closely the limitations placed upon it by the Bible itself. This means simply that the mediation of the priests in the earthly sanctuary were a type and shadow of the Heavenly ministry of Jesus Christ in the tabernacle "which the Lord pitched, and not man." (Heb. 8:5, 1)

In the same issue of WVN, the editorial, "Let's Talk It Over" (pp. 5-7) discussed some of the implications of Matthew 25:1-13. It would seem that this 150th Anniversary year of the Great Disappointment would be an excellent time to square up Jesus' eschatological parable with what has been the on-going history of Adventism. But who has the courage among the hierarchy of the Church to do so? And who among the "independent" ministries is willing to state clearly that The Great Controversy needs to be revised and harmonized with the light given to Ellen G. White following the 1888 revision? Of course, there would arise also that embarrassing question as to why this was not done when the cosmetic revision of the book was made in 1911.

Basic, beyond the revision of The Great Controversy to square it with the additional light given, is the meaning and significance of the light itself. If we hold Ellen G. White to be "the messenger of the Lord" which she claimed to be, then how do we apply the message given in 1896 - "My mind was carried into the future, when the signal will be given, 'Behold the Bridegroom cometh; go ye out to meet Him.'?" (R&H, Feb. 11, 1896)

Further, in 1901, this same "messenger of the Lord" directed attention to Luke 21, in contradistinction to either Matthew 24, or Mark 13, connecting events in the history of Jerusalem to "the scenes which are to take place in the history of this world just prior to the coming of the Son of man in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory." (Letter 10, 1901)

All three writers of the Synoptic Gospels relate events connected with the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, but only Luke quotes Jesus foretelling an event in connection with the history of Jerusalem which would mark the close of the probationary time for the nations. Should we not then ask, "What do these things mean?" and "How must we rectify our understandings of the end-time events to harmonize with this revelation?"

It was Hugh Latimer, the English Reformer, who declared:

"The Author of holy Scriptures is the Mighty One, the Everlasting - **God Himself!** ... and this Scripture partakes of the might and eternity of its Author. ... Let us beware of those bypaths of human tradition, filled of stones, brambles, and uprooted trees. Let us follow the straight road of the Word. It does not concern us what the fathers have done, but what they should have done." (Quoted in D'Aubigne's History of the Reformation, Vol. V, p. 271; emphasis Latimer's)

Think it through carefully - "It is not what the fathers have done, but what they should have done." This applies equally, whether we are considering the Great Disappointment of October 22, 1844, or the General Conference Session of 1888. We need to carefully consider what should have been done, lest we make the same mistake "the fathers" made by not walking in the light given, or else not fully perceiving that light, and seeing "men as trees walking." (Mark. 8:24) Our concern should not be, whether our spiritual forefathers failed to see the light clearly in 1844, but rather, are we seeing "the increasing light" clearly today. Their life's record is closed, ours is not. We should not become so agitated over the rejection of the message given in 1888, and by so focusing, we reject the message for this day. There is still such a thing as PRESENT Truth!

Miller failed to walk in the advancing light which God permitted to shine upon the small band of believers who became the Seventh-day Adventist Church. The Church in 1888 failed to walk in the light which God sent through Elders Jones and Waggoner. But the question "is not what the fathers have done, but what they should have done." The answer is clear, they should have walked in the advancing light. But are we making the same mistake today, yet seeking to cover our failure by glorifying "the tombs of the prophets, and garnish[ing] the sepulchres of the righteous"?

#

"Sharing the News" from Col. 1, p. 1

1888 MSC! There is no reason to put one's head in the sand and deny this fact.

During this four-hour session, Elder R. J. Wieland, who authored this "Extra," recorded himself as stating - "Some of you brethren have the idea that Donald K. Short and I have initiated this 1888 MSC, organized it, etc., and that is not true. We have not taken the initiative! ... When we finally returned from Africa to retire, [we] were prepared to play shuffleboard. But a little lady who had experienced a spiritual conversion within the General Conference offices through reading the 1950 manuscript [and] had also retired, phoned us [asking], 'Can't we do something? People need to know this message! Would you come and tell us about it?' Thus came the initial 1888 Message Study Conference at Camp Mohaven. All we did was to respond to this invitation; we took no initiative ourselves; we cannot refuse when someone asks us to share the gospel and the truth about it. Thus, the organization of this 1888 MSC is nothing of our doing." (p. 2)

This is a flawed statement on several counts. The Camp Mohaven meeting was not the first conference with the objective of getting the 1888 Message to the members of the Church. The first conference was held following the General Conference session in Cleveland, Ohio, in 1958. Conceived by A. L. Hudson, then the first elder of the Baker, Oregon Seventh-day Adventist Church, the discussions took place in the Seventh-day Adventist Church at Marion, Indiana, where this editor was serving as Pastor. One other Indiana Conference pastor joined us. At this conference, Hudson revealed that he planned to start publishing a magazine to meet the need of concerned Adventists over the recent SDA-Evangelical Conferences. He, too, had obtained a copy of 1888 Re-Examined, and was prepared to push its message to the forefront. This he did.

On February 3, 1959, Hudson placed a motion before the Pacific Union Conference Committee with certain allegations and representations. With this motion, he included a series of documents, one of which was 1888 Re-Examined. The whole was published under the title - A Warning and Its Reception. By this means a knowledge of the original document presented to the General Conference by Wieland and Short in 1950 not only became known but was widely circulated. Upon the exhaustion of the first printing, the Adventist Laymen's Foundation printed the material under the same title, but

with an additional letter by Wieland to Short which is very revealing, and significant in point of time.

At the conference in Marion, Indiana, Hudson invited Wieland and Short to write for his new publication, but they demurred. They had no objections to the publication promoting their message. In fact, they encouraged it; but their reaction was, just don't involve us directly, please. Here in this meeting in Folkenberg's office, the same "out" is used. "We didn't initiate the 1888 MSC," but all must know who has dominated the committee, apart from the initiator, who in turn has dominated Wieland.

(Editor's note: I, too, was invited to write for Hudson's publication. I should have written forthrightly in my own name, but compromised thus avoiding at that time direct confrontation. I used the pen name, "Ben Ezra II" It had significance telling the Church that as the former "Ben Ezra" could not write openly in the Roman Catholic Church, so the same situation had developed in the Seventh-day Adventist Church. Another writer used the name, "Dr. Luke.")

There is something more basic in this twice revealed attitude of Wieland and Short. Aside from the fact that these men waited until their full sustentation was assured before "going public" on the message which God gave them for the Church, is the question of how they regarded the stewardship entrusted to them, and the results of that attitude.

In all my contacts with these men over the years, and there have been many, it is my conviction that they have never fully grasped the concept that God sent them to the Church with a message as verily as He sent Jones and Waggoner in 1888. Because of this, they could not bring themselves to lay their future on the life. However, it is my conviction that had they been willing to work closely with Hudson, the deepening apostasy and turmoil which has taken the Church captive might have been averted. They might have seen their heart's desire of the Church turned around before it faced the judgment of the sanctuary (8T:249). As it was, Hudson joined forces with Robert Brinsmead, and Brinsmead obtained the 1888 material of Wieland and Short. The reproduction of this material by Brinsmead greatly troubled Elder Wieland. On one occasion while both he and I were at the Seminary during the school year of 1964-65, Brinsmead came to Berrien Springs for some meetings. Wieland asked me to accompany him to see Brinsmead. At this confrontation, Wieland

emphatically told Brinsmead that he had no permission to publish any of his writings.

If men are called of God to be His "messengers," they have a direct responsibility to give that message, and not seek to hide behind someone else to do it for them, or to run interference for them. The Scripture is clear that when Moses sought to avoid his call, and requested that the Lord use someone else, "the anger of the Lord was kindled against Moses." (Ex. 4:14) Further by waiting for another to open up the way, the possibility becomes a reality for the enemy to select his own advocate, and thus misdirect the thrust which God intends should be realized. Wieland indicated at the recent committee meeting in Silver Spring that Short and he were willing to come back to America in retirement and play "shuffleboard." He must have said this facetiously for this is unbelievable. The tragedy of this whole situation is "the little lady" who supposedly singlehandedly sponsored the conference at Camp Mohaven.

There are two factors here that need to be clarified. To have been converted by the reading of 1888 Re-Examined is one thing; to have been convicted of the correctness of the position taken in the document is vastly different. My contacts with this "little lady" have not led me to believe that she evidenced in her life the righteousness of Christ. She has been deceptive and not above prevarication. Her style reflects worldly techniques of communication. If I have correct information, she was an employee in the Department of Communications of the General Conference at the time that Department became involved in the acquisition of a medallion to symbolize the Church. Designed by a Roman Catholic who introduced Catholic symbolism into the layout, it was produced in gold, silver and bronze medallions. One of the gold medallions was ultimately given as a symbol of the Seventh-day Adventist Church into the hands of Pope Paul VI. This is not saying that "the little lady" was in any way responsible for this medallion, but it is suggesting that one working in that department would be influenced by the methods employed in communication by that Department, in other words, managed and edited news releases. God's method in setting forth the righteousness of Christ is "pure, unadulterated truth." (TM, 65)

The second factor is the time element. The Church at the beginning of the 1980s was not the Church which began the 1950s. The thirty years saw a changed Church doctrinally. The doctrinal

A TEN THOUSAND WORD CRITIQUE*

THE NATURE OF CHRIST

(As Exhibited)

By DR. ROY ADAMS



* "One picture is worth more than ten thousand words." - Chinese Proverb (See Editorial, p. 6)

LET'S TALK IT OVER

There are a number of things which we should talk over. Time has not stopped while we focused our attention on a Theology of the Sanctuary which harmonizes with the revelation of Scripture.

There was published earlier this year a book by Dr. Roy Adams of the editorial staff of the Adventist Review - The Nature of Christ. In this book he made a vicious attack on Wieland and Short, declaring them to be in the same "continuum" with Jim Jones and David Koresh. (p. 110) While we may differ with Wieland and Short on method and approach, and believe they have been deceived by false advisors, one dare not overlook the fact that these men gave the greater part of their lives in devoted mission service to Africa. During his ministry what has Adams been doing? From his dissertation at Andrews - The Sanctuary Doctrine - through his editorship of the Canadian Union Messenger, and now with the Adventist Review, he has done little else but vomit out heresy. Now, to so viciously attack Wieland and Short, men to whom he cannot even hold a candle, is nothing short of journalistic cannibalism.

In this same book, he exhumes M. L. Andreasen and villifies him, citing a document alleged to be a confession by Andreasen. He quotes the late Arthur White of terming it a "death-bed confession." He holds up for ridicule Andreasen writing out his feelings and convictions in "Letters to God." (p. 53) Such attacks are unacceptable journalism and reveal a hatred akin to that manifested by Lucifer toward Michael. On the back cover of the book were endorsements by George Knight, William H. Shea, Raoul Dederen and Robert S. Folkenberg. Folkenberg, at the meeting in Silver Spring on May 12, expressed regret that his name was associated with this book, and declared that if "reprinted, [it] must be rewritten." But more than this is required before justice is done. Adams must be removed from the editorial staff of the Adventist Review!

Also early in 1994, the publishers of SDA Press Release (Feb. 26) called for the resignations of Jack Blanco, who had been appointed to the Ellen G. White Memorial Chair at Southern College, as well as the other professors in the Religion Department which would include Dr. Norman Gulley. The president of the College, D. Don

Sahly, was also included in the resignation demand. The Board of Trustees of the College responded in a March report to the constituency. One item in the report should cause an individual devoted to truth to take a second look, and do some serious thinking. Dr. Jack Blanco gave an affirmation as an appointee to the Ellen G. White Chair. He wrote:

"I affirm my faith in the fundamental teachings of the Seventh-day Adventist Church as stated by the General Conference in the Church Manual." (p. 7)

Here is a serious flaw of commitment. If the teachings of the Seventh-day Adventist Church are based on the perceptions of the General Conference, and not the Bible, the Church is in apostasy. One may affirm that the General Conference has stated in the Church Manual its beliefs in harmony with the Bible. This, however, is open to serious question. Does Blanco really know this, or does he personally hold differing perceptions from the General Conference in certain doctrinal areas; but to occupy the Chair, must acknowledge the authority of the General Conference in the matter of doctrine?

As Blanco continued his confession of "faith," he declares that "it is from the Scriptures that I understand the value of the gifts of the Spirit that God has bestowed upon the Church, including the gift of prophecy. This gift - the call to prophetic office - I firmly believe was manifested in the life and work of Ellen G. White, not as an addition to Scripture but as a derived, authoritative source to lead men and woman back to the Word of God as the norm of all morality and faith."

Blanco's omission of a phrase makes one wonder if indeed he really subscribes to what he affirmed in the first paragraph noted above. The Church Manual adds to "authoritative source" the words, "of truth," and declares it to be "a continuing" source as well. (p. 40, 1981 ed.) This makes the Writings an addition to the Scripture, but Blanco distances himself from that concept by stating, - "not as an addition to Scripture."

Then we might also question, does a "gift" create an office? Along with the "gift" of prophecy are the gifts of apostles, evangelists, pastor-teachers. Does this make the one having the gift of evangelism, holding the "office" of an evangelist? There can be no doubt that in this area of perception, we have created for us a problem in

relating the Writings of Ellen G. White and the Scriptures.

Blanco has written instead of an affirmation of faith, a position statement trying to say, "yes" and "no" at the same time. It is pure, unadulterated duplicity. Somebody really should resign, the one making the statement, or the ones creating an intellectual environment which creates such a stance? Perhaps all, as was suggested.

whg

+++

TWO CASSETTE TAPES

Only two messages from the 1994 Annual Fellowship were recorded on cassette tapes:

Why Study Hebrews?
The Roots of Adventism

These two are available for US\$5.00 postpaid. Write for them from the Foundation office, P. O. Box 69, Ozone, AR 72854.

The actual studies in the book of Hebrews were recorded on video, and their availability and cost will be given in the next issue of WWN.

+++

PERES ON JERUSALEM

Israel's Foreign Minister, Shimon Peres indicated that Israel was "open to proposals" on determining the status of the Moslem and Christian Holy places in Jerusalem. In June, Moroccan King Hassan had "remarked that only God can have sovereignty over Jerusalem's holy places." This concept has intrigued Israeli officials.

Peres told reporters:

"If we reached an agreement with the Vatican on conducting their religious affairs, I am sure we can reach an agreement with other religions. I have said Jerusalem is closed politically and open religiously. This means it will remain unified, and only as Israel's capital, not two capitals. It will remain under Israeli sovereignty."

The Jerusalem Post (Int. ed., p. 2) July 23, 1994.

"Sharing the News" - From page 4, col. 2

change struck at the very heart of the message of righteousness by faith. This Wieland has either refused to perceive, or else has been blinded by advisors so that he cannot see it. Two cannot walk together unless they be agreed.

Out of this meeting a committee was formed for the objective of creating a dialogue between the 1888 MSC and the General Conference. Anyone reading the names on the committee appointed who has any insight at all can be impressed only with its futility. This is not saying that some statement will not be forthcoming, or that a compromise will not be reached by which the objectives of the General Conference will be realized. For example, to this committee was appointed George Knight, the author of From 1888 to Apostasy, an attack on A. T. Jones. In your mind try and reconcile Knight's position on Jones, and the position of the 1888 MSC. What can dialogue do?

It is evident from this report that the objective of the General Conference is either to absorb the 1888 MSC, or to so alter its thrust that it will be an acceptable adjunct to the Church such as Amazing Facts or Quiet Hour. However, there are some basic factors which differentiate the 1888 MSC from the two above named organizations. Only time will tell the outcome.

‡

++++

"Watchman, What of the Night?" is published monthly by the Adventist Laymen's Foundation of Mississippi, Inc., P. O. Box 69, Ozone, AR 72854, USA.

In Canada, write - The Adventist Laymen's Foundation of Canada, P. O. Box 117, Thorne, ON P0H 2J0.

In Australia, write - The Adventist Laymen's Foundation, P. O. Box 846, Belmont, Victoria 3216.

Editor

Elder Wm. H. Grotheer

Any portion of this Thought Paper may be reproduced without further permission by adding the credit line - "Reprinted from WWN, Ozone, Arkansas, USA."

First copy is free upon request; duplicate copies -- 50c.

++++

Our 800 Number is 800-4-LAYMEN (800-452-9636)
FAX - 501-292-3745