

*"Watchman,
what of the night?"*

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

(Matt 25:6 RSV)



1888 RE-EXAMINED EXAMINED

(Part One)

This year Elders R. J. Wieland and D. K. Short have published a new and updated edition of 1888 Re-Examined. This has been done after all known supplies of the original edition were exhausted. Further, the release of the original manuscript in a special publication, known as A Warning and Its Reception "prepared specifically for the study and guidance of the members of the Executive Committee of the North Pacific Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists" has for all practical purposes likewise been exhausted. Both the original publication of 1888 Re-Examined and A Warning and Its Reception were limited printings which means simply that the ability of most of the readers of the updated edition of 1888 Re-Examined to compare the two editions will be circumscribed. Because of this, we believe that it is imperative to give a thorough and complete as possible comparison between the two editions wherein major issues are involved in the following areas:

- 1) Omissions, deletions, and out of context quotes.
- 2) The toning down of the thrust of the original edition for greater acceptance.

Besides these comparisons, certain key errors and other omissions in the updated edition need careful consideration:

- 1) The omission of relevant historical data between 1950 and the present.
- 2) The failure to follow through to their ultimate and obvious conclusions, basic premises enunciated.
- 3) Linguistic error in Scriptural application.
- 4) Omission of key references in the Writings of Ellen G. White which cast light on a basic premise adopted in this new updated edition.

It must also be considered that Elder R. J. Wieland has strenuously opposed any reprint of A Warning and Its Reception. This publication not only contained a copy of the original edition of 1888 Re-Examined, but also the "Defense Literature Committee Report" issued in 1951; a "Further

Appraisal of the Manuscript '1888 Re-Examined'" brought out in 1958; Wieland and Short's answer to that report; a third response of the officers of the General Conference to the manuscript; and a "Final Letter of Commitment" written by Wieland and Short to Elder W. R. Beach, then Secretary of the General Conference. All of this data must be evaluated in reference to the new edition to arrive at truth. To write a popular-type version on the history of its rejection, and omit key factors in that history is to commit conscious deception upon the reader. When all the facts are brought into full view, then each individual can and must make a decision that will be eternal in consequence. We do not know at this point in writing how many Thought Papers will be required to present the record in full perspective, but we shall continue to document this issue to the fullest extent possible. This for several reasons: 1) The true message of 1888 is vital and eternal in its results; 2) The complete message as given in 1888 has yet to be considered in its entirety (the updated edition does not do it); and 3) The last four decades of our church history have not been properly examined in the 1987 edition of 1888 Re-Examined.

First, we want it clearly understood that we have no contention with Elders Wieland and Short over the following facts of Seventh-day Adventist Church history:

- 1) The message of Righteousness by Faith given to this people in 1888 was rejected by the leadership of the Church.
- 2) This rejection was "a replay of the Jew's history at Calvary." (1987 ed., p. 198)
- 3) The message of Justification by Faith was not a re-emphasis of that doctrine as proclaimed by the Reformers, but a message related to the final atonement. It involved the "latter rain" experience.
- 4) This latter rain experience "would be primarily a clearer understanding of the gospel." It would be "increased light." (Ibid. p. 14)
- 5) The only solution to the rejection of the 1888 Message was "corporate repentance" if Wieland and Short are saying the same thing today, they said in 1950.

A Comparison of Chapters

The 1950 edition of 1888 Re-Examined contained 13 chapters, while the 1987 edition has 15 chapters, plus a preface and four appendices.¹ The first 9 chapters of the 1950 edition find a parallel in the 1987

edition's first 10 chapters except for the rewording of the chapter titles,² and the separating of chapter 8 of the first edition into two chapters in the updated manuscript. Chapter 10 of the 1950 edition is also made into two new chapters, while chapters 11, 12, and 13 are compressed into one chapter in the 1987 edition. Then two completely new chapters are added supposedly dealing with Seventh-day Adventist Church history from 1950 to the present and beyond. (See page 3 for graphic comparison)

It is interesting to observe that in the chapter entitled - "The 'Alpha' and 'Omega' Crisis" - we were unable to find a single use of the word, "omega" nor a discussion of it. However, in the following chapter - "The Pantheism Apostasy" - the "omega" concept was developed in a very superficial way. It was evident that even with the shallow perception that the authors demonstrated concerning the "omega", they were unwilling to make the application of what they do perceive the "omega" to be. (This will be documented as this analysis continues.)

Throughout the 1987 edition added material appears based on documents, letters, and current manuscript releases from the White Estate which shed further light on the rejection of the 1888 Message and its aftermath. For the incorporating of this new found documentation, the writers are to be commended.

Two other facets of thought recur from time to time throughout the new manuscript. Wieland's personal theology developed over the years since 1950 is interwoven with the message of 1888. There is also a thread woven through the entire updated manuscript - Laodicea will go through triumphantly! This contention is reiterated again and again in spite of what is written in Revelation 3:14-20, or what the Writings seek to tell us. With the Jewish people of Christ's day, Wieland cherishes the idea that the corporate Seventh-day Adventist Church is the favorite of Heaven, and that it is "always to be exalted as the church of God." He with them defies "earth and heaven to dispossess them of their rights." (See COL, p. 294)

The 1987 Edition Toned Down

We alerted the readers of the Thought Paper when the announcement of the revision of 1888 Re-Examined was first made, that it would be toned down. We wrote:

1888 RE-EXAMINED
Chapter Comparisons

Original Edition

New Edition

1 - Introduction	1 - Why Re-Examine Our Adventist Past?
2 - Leaving the First Love	2 - The Sin of Leaving Our First Love
3 - The "Loud Cry" to Come in a Surprising Way	3 - The "Loud Cry" to Come in a Surprising Way
4 - Was the Message of 1888 Accepted?	4 - Acceptance or Rejection: in Search of a Sharper Focus
5 - What was the Message Presented in 1888?	5 - The Fundamental Problem: How to Evaluate the 1888 Message
6 - The Grave Seriousness of the 1888-92 Reaction	6 - The 1888 Rejection of Ellen White
7 - An Examination of the "Confessions"	7 - A Closer Look at the "Confessions"
8 - The 1893 General Conference Session	8 - Crisis at the 1893 General Conference Session
9 - Why Did Jones and Waggoner Apostatize?	9 - A False Righteousness by Faith: Sowing the Seed of Apostasy
10 - Warnings of Subtle, Internal Apostasy	10 - Why Did Jones and Waggoner Lose Their Way?
11 - Predictions of Infatuation With a False Christ	11 - The "Alpha" and "Omega" Crises
12 - The True Christ vs The False Christ (In Modern Babylonian Teachings)	12 - The Pantheism Apostasy
13 - The True Christ vs The False Christ (In Contemporary Seventh-day Adventist Teachings)	13 - Ellen White's Predictions of Baal-Worship
	14 - From 1950 to 1971
	15 - From 1971 to 1987 and Beyond

Now they [Wieland and Short] come out with a revision, a revision that will say, at least, their emphasis was too strong [in 1950]. The forthright and plain speaking was as "gall" to the hierarchy, and for this cause, they rejected it. Wieland likes to speak from the book of Jeremiah. Has he forgotten what the Lord told Jeremiah when instructed to speak "in the court of the Lord's house" - "diminish not a word." (Jer. 26:2) (WWN, XX-8, p. 5)

In the 1987 edition Wieland and Short did just this even to the point of referring to Jeremiah when they did it!

In the 1950 edition, the authors drew five conclusions as they closed the chapter - "The Grave Seriousness of the 1888-1892 Reaction." (pp. 70-71) The parallel chapter in the 1987

edition - "The 1888 Rejection of Ellen White" - closes with a section which asks a question - "Do the 1890's Have a Message for the 1990's?" (pp. 76-78) That the reader may sense the parallel of these two sections, and note the toned down evaluation, we will quote the first two paragraphs in the 1987 edition, and then underscore in quoting from the 1950 edition the similar wording. In 1987, Wieland and Short write:

Ellen White's ministry to the Seventh-day Adventist Church frequently exhibits this Jeremiah-like quality. [The authors had at the close of the preceding section quoted from a letter to J. S. Washburn with the comment - "Here, like Jeremiah, she writes almost in despair"] The ancient prophet's message is present truth. The 1888 episode is a parable, and God will test us again.

Because the facts of our 1888 history have been so widely garbled, our contemporary attitude is still unappreciative of Jones and Waggoner's work. We are still suspicious lest their message may lead to fanaticism. We still falsely assume that it carried the two messengers away into apostasy. As long as we think thus, should the Lord send any more pearls of truth to be cast before us, we would be obliged to react to such a message as did the opposition of the 1888 era.

In the 1950 edition the lengthy parallel section will be quoted with only deletions where space can be conserved without destroying the sense so the reader can see the gravity of the deletions. It reads:

Therefore, in the light of the findings of this investigation:

(1) We are to learn that any opposition to the work of God, whether that work be done in harmony with our expectations or not, requires a complementary opposition to the Spirit of Prophecy. In the matter of 1888, the rejection of the message from heaven by Jones and Waggoner was a failure to recognize the Holy Spirit; was an insult to Jesus Christ; and required the setting aside of the faithful, humble messenger whom God had used since the beginning of the Advent movement.

(2) Our contemporary attitude is still unappreciative and mistrustful of Jones and Waggoner's work from 1888-1892. We are still suspicious of the precious message which they brought us from heaven in "clear, distinct, lines", which was "the truth as it is in Jesus". We still think it tended toward being radical and extreme. We still suppose that it carried the two messengers away into fanaticism, resulting in their apostasy. As long as we think thus, should any more pearls of truth be cast before us, we would be obliged

To page 5, col. 1

CHRIST OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS

Lesson # 10

The LORD Our Righteousness

Question	Answer
1. What does God delight in?	Micah 7:18
2. How great is God's mercy?	Psalms 103:11
3. How is the mercy of God made manifest?	Psalms 103:12 Micah 7:19
4. Read Luke 18:9-14. What did the publican ask for?	Verse 13
5. How did the publican return home?	Verse 14
6. If we confess our sins, will God forgive us?	1 John 1:9
7. How many have sinned?	Romans 3:23
8. How many shall be justified by the deeds of the law?	Romans 3:20
9. How are we justified; or made righteous?	Romans 3:24-25
10. Is righteousness really a free gift from God?	Romans 5:17
11. Upon whom is the righteousness of God put?	Romans 3:22 (See Note 1)
12. What is this righteousness witnessed by?	Romans 3:21 (See Note 2)
13. When we are in Christ Jesus, whose righteousness do we have?	Phil. 3:8-9
14. Can God be just and justify the sinner at the same time?	Romans 3:26
15. What would the Shepherd be called who would save Israel?	Jeremiah 23:6

NOTES

1. "It is because righteousness is a gift that eternal life, which is the reward of righteousness, is the gift of God, through Jesus Christ our Lord." (Christ Our Righteousness, p. 63)

2. "But what about the 'righteousness of God without the law'? How does that accord with the statement that the law is the righteousness of God, and that outside of its requirements there is no righteousness? There is no contradiction here. The law is not ignored by this process. Note carefully: Who gave the law? Christ. How did He speak it? 'As one having authority,' even as God. The law sprang from Him the same as from the Father, and is simply a declaration of the righteousness of His character. Therefore the righteousness which comes by the faith of Jesus Christ is the same righteousness that is epitomized in the law; and this is further proved by the fact that it is 'witnessed by the law.'" (Ibid., pp. 64, 65)

to react to such a message precisely as did the opposition in 1888.

(3) All our pretensions to the contrary, we will show a complementary mistrust of the Spirit of Prophecy, which if it were analyzed in Heaven's infallible tests would be revealed as a varnished unbelief. Most of us would be candid enough and intelligent enough to run for shelter if a Righteous Being were suddenly to appear in the Temple for a thorough-going investigation with the Spirit of Prophecy as the completely authoritative blueprint, and began probing into the complete whys and wherefores of our educational, medical, and evangelistic work.

Woe to us, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! Because we write books about the deceased prophet, and garnish the memory of the pioneers, and say, "If we had been in the days of our fathers..." Wherefore, we be witnesses unto ourselves, that we are the children of them that spurned the prophet, and wise men at and after Minneapolis.

(4) We would do well to make sure of our present heart attitude toward the ministry of the Holy Spirit, in the greater light of intelligence which now shines unmercifully upon the hidden motives and evil machinations of our ego, id, self. ...

(5) We would do well to study the Scriptures recommended to us so earnestly in Testimonies to Ministers, p. 76 - "if God has ever spoken by me, these scriptures mean very much to those who shall hear them," said Mrs White. [John 7:19-23, 27, 28; Luke 11:37-52] We should then inquire what guarantee we have that we are any more capable of recognizing Jesus Christ than were the Jews. Perhaps we are, through some cause best known to God, unable to distinguish between the sacred fire of God's own kindling, and the strange fire which we offer. (TM 356) Perhaps we are, after all, "not able to distinguish the precious ore from the base material", and "will take the great leader of apostasy and name him Christ our Righteousness." (Leaflet Series, #3, Apostasies) We might discover to our horror that "false phases of Christianity are being received and taught, which bind souls in deception and delusion. Men are walking in the light of the sparks of their own kindling." Perhaps in our educational institutions we are infatuated with "specious reasonings", which "give utterance to opinions that betray sacred, holy trusts," because we are "charmed with men and women who are not converted." (TM 86, 87, 465) Perhaps, as the consequence of our shameful insult to the Son of God at Minneapolis, we have become so self-confused that the following words make sense:

Shall the ark of the covenant be removed from this people? Shall false principles and false precepts be brought into the sanctuary? Shall antichrist be respected? Shall the true doctrines and principles

given us by God, which have made us what we are, be ignored? ... This is directly where the enemy, through blinded, unconsecrated men, is leading us.

Things have gone as far as they should without someone protesting against them in plain words. The Lord's time to set things in order has fully come. (Ms. 29, 1890; CtoE, pp. 95-96)

We wouldn't like to admit that those words do make sense today, but if the whole investigation of Minneapolis and its aftermath focuses the picture more sharply, we may find that we have developed a curious, distressing mental hyperopia that permits us to see evil if it is sufficiently farfetched and distant in the past, but blinds us to it when it is under our very nose.

Whether we will be pleased to contemplate it or not, the following will take place:

Without the enlightenment of the Spirit of God, we shall not be able to discern truth from error, and shall fall under the masterful temptations and deceptions that Satan will bring upon the world.

We are near the close of the controversy between the Prince of light and the prince of darkness, and soon the delusions of the enemy will try our faith, of what sort it is. (R&H, Nov. 22, 29, 1892)

If we spurn and insult the true Christ and the true Holy Spirit, what power can possibly preserve us from an infatuation with the false Christ and really modern Spiritualism? (1950 edition, pp. 70-72)

All of the above, except what is underscored, and the last quotation from the Review and Herald, has been deleted from the 1987 edition. The last quotation is introduced by this non-controversial sentence - "God's word has been true from the very beginning." (p. 77) Here alone is sufficient evidence for the intelligent mind to see that Wieland and Short have toned down the 1987 edition to make it more acceptable to the hierarchy!

If Elijah had toned down his message, would it not have been more acceptable to the Baal-worshipping Ahab? If John the Baptist would have softened his message could he not have escaped the wrath of Herodias? God's messengers are not to consider self, but to faithfully proclaim the message given to them. If Wieland and Short really believe that they were called of God in 1950, then should they not realize that God's Spirit was with them as they phrased a needful message to the leadership of the Church? What then is this toned down "update" in the eyes of God? There is more than one way to "insult" the Spirit of God!

Footnotes:

¹Appendix A - "Did A. T. Jones Teach the 'Holy Flesh' Heresy" - appears to have been set in a different type style from the other appendices as well as the main section itself. This is left unexplained. However, in recent months there has been some agitation over this issue. See Commentary, I-2, pp. 5-7, 14. It is reported that a new book on the life of A. T. Jones is due out in 1988 which will seek to negate Jones' influence by supposedly documenting this charge. Did this information get to Wieland and Short late in their revision and updating of 1888 Re-Examined, so that this appendix was written after the rest of the manuscript was ready for the press? Or did someone else have a major role in writing it? It is interesting that they acknowledge their indebtedness to Jeff Reich (p. 191). Was this after his "turn-around"? See "1888 Message Newsletter", Feb., 1987, p. 4.

²The change in title for Chapter 6 from - "The Grave Seriousness of the 1888-92 Re-action" - to - "The 1888 Rejection of Ellen White" - is suspect. The first two sections in both editions are captioned the same: "The Holy Spirit Was Insulted" and "Jesus Christ Was Spurned and Insulted." The content of the chapter in both editions is similar except for additional materials regarding Ellen G. White's exile to Australia in the new; while omitting documentation from the original concerning the rejection of her counsel.

Wieland and Short's position is that to reject the heaven-sent messenger is to reject the One sending the messenger. They quote - "To accuse and criticize those whom God is using is to accuse and criticize the Lord who sent them." (TM, p. 466; 1888 Re-Examined, 1987 ed., p. 67) "Men professing godliness have despised Christ in the person of His messengers." (FCE, p. 472; Ibid., p. 68) This hypothesis of Elders Wieland and Short is correct. (See also John 13:20) Because of this they could justify the change of title. But against this backdrop another factor must be considered.

The 1986 Annual Council voted to hold a Centennial Celebration in 1988 at Minneapolis. In reporting this action, the Adventist Review quoted Robert Olson of the White Estate as stating that the 1888 session was "the only session where Ellen G. White was publically defied." (Oct. 30, 1986, p. 12) Do Wieland and Short think

that the recognition of this fact and its possible implications will constitute a "denominational repentance" and that the insult and spurning of Deity can be thus bypassed? Does this account for the change in title?

Wieland and Short should know better - lip service does not constitute repentance. John the Baptist called for more than lip service. His message was - "Bring forth therefore **fruits** meet for repentance." (Matt. 3:8) At the 1988 Minneapolis Conference, Ellen G. White will be affirmed. Besides this, "suggested events for the convocation include presentations for study papers of righteousness by faith and a dramatic enactment of the 1888 session." (Adventist Review, op. cit.)

In proposing this, the General Conference has bit off more than they can chew. There are only two options open to them: 1) They can preach the true message of 1888 and admit that for the last 100 years that the major writings on 1888 (such as Froom, Pease, Olson, and Spalding) were wrong. This they dare not do! 2) They can continue to present a false message of righteousness by faith with all of its "anti-christ centered preaching", such as has been done during the past century. (See Mystery of 1888, p. 90) They may even cite a past General Conference president - A.G. Daniells. Daniells' book, Christ Our Righteousness, acknowledges indirectly that "Ellen G. White was publically denied." (See pp. 62-63; The Mystery of 1888, pp. 9-14)

However, the teachings of Daniells' book are little improvement over pre-1888 righteousness by faith. Wieland and Short have so stated. In their 1987 edition, they declare that the teaching of 1888 as understood by Daniells was "nothing unique" but was "in perfect harmony with the best [non-Adventist] evangelical teaching." (p. 61; quoted from By Faith Alone (Pease), p. 189)

Why the change? That is the question. Was principle involved? Or was it a policy decision?

WHG & AS

To be Continued

In the Next Issues:

- 1) The Gravity of Key Omissions in "Quotes" from the Writings
- 2) The Question of the Omega

To page 7, col. 1

SESSLER "RIDES AGAIN"

In the magazine - Last Day Messages (Sept-Oct., 1987) was a letter written by Robert Sessler to Ron Spear. (pp. 26-27) One would think that after Sessler read the Critique on his Abomination of Desolation in the Commentary (I-1) - and he received a copy - he would be more careful in his research and deductions. But Sessler "rides again"! In his letter to Spear, he wrote:

But she [Ellen G. White] also says: "There is hope NEITHER IN Sardis nor LAODICEA. OUT of this experience must come the victors into that of Philadelphia - brotherly love. He has no promise for Loadicea as a whole. ... But the individual who opens the heart's door and lets Christ in, who comes into that wonderful communion with the Divine Lord, will by that very process come into the condition of brotherly love. THEY WILL CONSTITUTE THE REMNANT." Signs of the Times (sic), Jan. 17, 1911 (Emphasis as in his letter)

Ellen White did not write this!! It was written by the editor at that time, Elder Milton C. Wilcox. The issue is not whether the statement is true, but the matter of accuracy in documentation. And as we wrote in a letter to Sessler about this, we hold no brief for Spear's position.

But the conclusion drawn by Sessler compounds his error. He wrote - "Our leaders just happened to leave this article out of Vol. 4 [of the facsimile reprint Ellen G. White articles in the Signs] but Praise God it got into our hands."

The leaders didn't "just happen" to leave it out - they were only including Ellen G. White articles, not Wilcox's. As we wrote in the Critique, there are enough manipulations by the hierarchy without charging them with something they did not do.

This charge by Sessler points up the basic weakness of his work. He really doesn't know what he is doing, and demonstrates his inability to make valid decisions in evaluating source materials. The tragedy is that many besides Sessler are doing the same "sloppy" research, and the tragedy is compounded because those who read this type of research are deceived by it, and join the "riders" to destruction - the consequences of which are eternal.

WHG

From p. 6, col. 2

- 3) Linguistic error
- 4) Major premises

ANNOUNCEMENT

Starting with the first month of 1988, the Adventist Laymen's Foundation will be offering a new service to the readers of "Watchman, What of the Night?" A monthly cassette tape with a spiritual message and other information will be made available.

These tapes will be designed to be used for "Upper Room" meetings as well as to fill the needs of those unable to meet with those seeking to maintain "the faith which was once delivered unto the saints." (Jude 3)

In addition to Sabbath-type sermons or Bible studies, a section will be devoted to questions and answers on the Bible and contemporary issues in Adventism. Religious news focused on the end-time scenes will be given as well as musical selections.

This service will be available for \$25.00 per year postpaid in the USA and Canada. Others please write for postage rates.

"ABSOLUTELY NOTHING WHICH DOES NOT BEAR THE TEST OF TRUTH WILL BE TRIUMPHANT IN THE JUDGMENT." (1888 Re-Examined, p. 2 original edition; deleted from new 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.

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

Editor Wm. H. Grotheer
Assistant Editor 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¢