



*"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*

## — THE FINAL QUESTION —

"IF YOUR ANSWER TO QUESTION # 1 IS 'NO,' PLEASE HARMONIZE YOUR OBJECTION TO THE STATEMENTS OF BELIEF AS VOTED BY THE GENERAL CONFERENCE IN SESSION WITH THE COUNSEL AS FOUND IN TESTIMONIES FOR THE CHURCH, VOL. 9, P. 260, WHICH READS: - 'WHEN IN GENERAL CONFERENCE, THE JUDGMENT OF THE BRETHREN ASSEMBLED FROM ALL PARTS OF THE FIELD, IS EXERCISED, PRIVATE INDEPENDENCE AND PRIVATE JUDGMENT MUST NOT BE STUBBORNLY MAINTAINED, BUT SURRENDERED.'"

Editor's Note: On April 20, 1983, we sent to a list of 13 names a Questionnaire to determine how each of these men who profess to be upholding "historic" Adventism stand in regard to the Statements of Belief as voted at Dallas, Texas, in 1980. As noted in the previous Thought Paper (WNN, XVI-9), the Statements of Belief which were voted do not reflect "historic" Adventism in several areas. Two of those who received the Questionnaire - Dr. James D. Wang and Elder R. J. Wieland - recognized this fact and voted "No" to the first question. The others - Lewis Walton, Charles Wheeling, R. D. Spear, Vance Ferrell, Dr. Colin Standish, Dr. Russell Standish, Elder W. D. Frazee, Lowell Scarborough, Wendell W. Gibbs, Elder W. L. Santee, and Dr. Lloyd Rosenvold - either wrote a letter(s) seeking to circumvent responding to the Questionnaire, or gave no reply. This Thought Paper will be devoted to the replies of the two men responding, and comment on the circumventing letters.

The first to reply to the Questionnaire was Dr. James D. Wang, and therefore, we shall quote his response to the final question first. He wrote:

"The quotation as found in Vol. 9, p. 260, is just a small portion of the message sent to and read before the delegates at General Conference in session, Washington D. C., May 30, 1909. The main burden of the message is to discourage independent spirit, achieve unity in diversity, and obey only the 'voice of God.' The Head of the remnant church is always against the kingly power concentrated in 'one man,' or in "a few men," or in "a small group of men' to control the 'work,' or to make 'plans,' and to 'restrict God's work.'

The 'voice of the General Conference,' represented by a few men, should never be regarded as the 'voice of God.'

'The Statement of Belief #23, Christ's Ministry in the Heavenly Sanctuary, is largely unbiblical and in conflict with the Spirit of Prophecy. The General Conference in session has no power to 'vote' or 'legislate' a CREED for the Seventh-day Adventist Church. Among the 1980 delegates, only one lone but loud voice spoken by C. H. Carey, a layman, should be regarded as the voice of God. Brother Carey spoke forcefully and clearly concerning the Day of Judgment, Yearly services performed by Jesus Christ, our Great High Priest, in the Most Holy Place since

1844. This statement made by Brother Carey is based upon 'It is written,' and 'Thus saith the Lord.'"

So that you the readers may know what Brother Carey said in full, we will note his remarks as found in the General Conference Bulletin. He said:

"I am a layman, a church elder of some 40 years. I would like to say that my belief today regarding the Spirit of Prophecy and its relationship to the Word of God is the same as when I became a member. I believe in the historical and fundamental place of the Spirit of Prophecy in the church, both past and present. I do not believe we should weaken this belief [Christ's ministry in the Heavenly Sanctuary] because it is controversial. I suggest the following for sentence four: 'At the end of the prophetic period of 2300 days, in 1844, He entered into the Most Holy Place of the heavenly sanctuary, and began the second and last phase of His ministry.'" (April 27, 1980, p. 15)

The sentence to which Brother Carey referred in the working Statement given to the delegates read - "At the end of the prophetic period of 2300 days, in 1844, He [Christ] entered the second and last phase of His ministry." It is obvious from his remarks that this local elder wanted it spelled out that Jesus in 1844 entered "into the Most Holy Place of the heavenly sanctuary." However, in the final editing and voting of this Statement, only lip service was paid to this suggestion. The final voted Statement in contrast to the one given to the delegates admitted - "There is a sanctuary in heaven, the true tabernacle which the Lord set up and not man."

It must be pointed out, as carefully noted in the previous Thought Paper, the real error in this particular Statement is to be found in the clause describing the work of Christ in heaven "as making available to believers the benefits of His atoning sacrifice offered once for all on the cross." This concept structured in the SDA-Evangelical Conferences of 1955-56, and so worded to be understood in the framework of Evangelical theology, slipped past the delegates.

Dr. Wang indicated that this one, lone

voice "should be regarded as the voice of God." In this he is echoing the conviction of that great Reformer, John Knox, who "insisted that the proclamation of one man founded on biblical truth was of more authority than an extrabiblical judgment reached by a council of the entire church." (Theology and Revolution in the Scottish Reformation, p. 10)

#### Wieland

Elder R. J. Wieland answered the final question noting four points. They are:

"1) The Statement of Beliefs is purposely vague in places; it is not 'truly representative of [my] confession of faith' because it is not clear enough, specific and unambiguous. Vital areas of truth are, in my opinion, evaded. It does not condemn what I teach.

"2) As a people we are going through a time of great stress and confusion; the Statement reflects this. Many of our workers and people have been deeply influenced by Des Ford, Brinsmead, Reformationist teachings. The Statement is obviously intended to avoid precipitate division in the church in time of confusion. There is no question that there are apostate elements at work within the church to weaken or if possible to destroy it; but I do not hold with you that they have conclusively succeeded.

"3) The 9T 260 Statement in context is not talking about doctrinal beliefs; I doubt that Ellen White ever conceded that any 'General Conference. . . assembled from all parts of the field' could possibly have authority from heaven to change that 'platform of truth' that the Lord gave this people in pioneer days. The context of that statement you quote is management, methods of labor.

"4) General Conference sessions can reverse themselves; they can partake of a learning process."

This is indeed a very interesting reply. Laying aside the matter that we differ on what the facts of our denominational history for the past three decades are saying to the individual church member, certain observations by Elder Wieland need to be emphasized.

The vagueness of the 1980 Statement in certain places is very true. There is a reason for this. The Andrews University Statement of Beliefs voted at the Annual Council in 1979 for recommendation to the 1980 General Session was not vague. The new theology was plainly stated. This action was followed by the Desmond Ford presentation on the campus of PUC under the auspices of the Association of Adventist Forums. Then came the Walter Rea disclosures of extensive copying in the Writings of Ellen G. White. But not until February 21, 1980, less than three months before the Dallas Session was to begin, did a copy of the voted Andrews University Statement reach the laity of the Church through the Adventist Review (pp. 8-10). Immediately following this release, Elder David L. Bauer prepared a paper - "The General Conference Session and the Fundamental Beliefs of Seventh-day Adventists" - in which he documented the deviation certain positions as voted in the adoption of the Andrews University Statement took from historic Adventism. In every area cited by Bauer, there was a change made in the wording of the document which was presented to the delegates for consideration. This resulted in confusion. However, I also gave consideration to the Andrews University Statement, and found other areas which also deviated, but said nothing in writing, believing that the cause of truth is best served when apostasy is permitted to come to full fruition, rather than taking actions which would confuse the issue. Sure enough, in each of the areas which I noted, no change was made in the transmission to the delegates, or in what was voted at Dallas. Only where field pressure was exerted were changes made, and then made in such a way, as Elder Wieland notes, to be ambiguous, and evasive.

Elder Wieland questions the application of the Testimony found in Volume 9 as to whether this permits the General Conference in Session to vote a Statement of Beliefs. It is true that the context speaks of methods and qualifications for labor in the cause of God, and clearly states that "the full measure of authority and influence that God has invested in His church, in the judgment and voice of the General Conference" is limited to the planning "for the prosperity and advance-

ment of the work." (p. 261) However, the facts of our history show that the General Conference does assume the prerogative to vote Statements of Belief, and that these become binding upon the ministry and laity of the Church. In the now famous legal case - EEOC vs PPPA - it was stated in a Brief submitted for the Church that the delegates to a General Conference Session have the power to "alter the doctrine" of the Church. (See Excerpts, Legal Briefs, p. 44) This very issue brings us face to face with a single and simple question as to what our reaction should be in the face of this unauthorized assumption of power. Speaking of the changes which would have resulted had the Alpha of apostasy succeeded, Ellen G. White wrote:

"We have our Bibles. We have our experience, attested to by the miraculous working of the Holy Spirit. We have a truth that admits of no compromise. **SHALL WE NOT REPUDIATE EVERYTHING THAT IS NOT IN HARMONY WITH THIS TRUTH?**" (Special Testimonies, Series B, #2, p. 55)

Finally, Elder Wieland indicated that in any future session of the General Conference previous actions can (emphasis his) be reversed. This is true, and such a reversal would be recognized by God unless the Church had passed the point of no return as illustrated in the experience of Esau. (Hebrews 12:15-17) The Bible is replete with illustrations of individuals and nations who came to the point in their relationship with God, where there was no remedy for their healing - no place of repentance could be found.

#### Personal Response

I promised to answer this question as well as the first question. My answer is found in the experience of Peter. (Matt. 16:13-23) Peter made a confession in answer to Christ's question - "Whom say ye that I am?" He emphatically declared - "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." Jesus assured Peter that this perception of truth had been revealed to him by the Father in heaven. In other words, he had been divinely inspired. In a few moments, Jesus began to explain to the disciples that He was to go to Jerusalem - the very center of their religious and spiritual devotion - and there suffer many

things of "the chief priests and scribes" - their church's leadership! What a stigma this would place upon Jesus' disciples to be associated with One who would be so dealt with by the respected leadership of their Church. And besides, their church's leadership would not do anything like that to One who was the Son of God. So Peter takes Jesus and shakes Him a bit to bring Him to His senses. He proceeds to rebuke Him - "Be it far from thee, Lord: this shall not be unto Thee." But to this Jesus responded, saying to Peter - "Get thee behind me, Satan: thou art an offense unto Me: for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men." Peter was not willing to accept the cross as associated with the Messiah, the Son of God. Within moments, he who had been inspired of God, was echoing the sentiments of Satan. When we accept truth - Jesus - as a commitment from Heaven, as the commission to give the Third Angel's Message was, and then because of the Cross entailed, seek to adjust that truth to be acceptable to both the World Council of Churches and the Evangelicals, we no longer continue to express "the things that belong to God, but those that be of men." We have become the voice of Satan. What authority then does such a voice have with the true people of God?

#### Other Comments

Replies by the Standish brothers - one from Wiemar, and the other from Bangkok - were similar. Declining to answer the Questionnaire, they indicated their concern for what was not stated, instead of facing up to the question - Was that which was stated truth or not? Dr. Colin Standish wrote - "As I have reviewed these [The 1980 Statement of Beliefs] I again come to the same conclusion that I did a couple of years ago. In their statements, it's hard to see error in what has been stated. My concern, perhaps, is for what is not there." (Letter dated, May 20, 1983) Dr. Russell Standish commenting on the Testimony in Volume 9, wrote: "This to me seems eminently sensible advice. I see nothing in this passage to indicate that brethren and sisters amongst us cannot believe that more detail could be given to certain items in fundamentals of faith or that

additional items of truth could be included. But I do see in it a warning against a trend which has concerned me, and that is that we are increasingly depending upon a small group of theologians, most of whom are trained in non-Adventist Theological schools, to enunciate for us our statement of faith. As I look at the work of many of these people, it seems to be to obscure the specifications of our truths making our position closer to those of the fallen churches of Babylon." But as a delegate to the 1980 Session, Dr. Standish failed to see that that was exactly what was done in the voted Statement of Beliefs.

Another one to whom the Questionnaire was sent who also tried to circumvent direct answers to the questions asked, was Elder Willard Santee. He instead drew up a series of quotations from "Ellen," and signed his name to these. Among these quotations were two from Great Controversy, pp. 598, 595, in that order. In the light of events which have followed this one page letter from Santee, it is now clear why he declined to answer the Questionnaire. After having had circulated throughout the world a series of tapes on "The Circle of Apostasy," he now in his most recent tapes encourages his listeners to return to that apostasy, and to find fellowship therein! He goes so far as to suggest that we should pray daily for Pope John Paul II. Have we thrown to the four winds, the description by Paul of "the man of sin" as the one in whom all iniquity has found its abode? But who knows when one begins playing with the devil in exorcism, to what lengths the Satanic spirit will lead?

Seemingly the one who became the most agitated over the Questionnaire was Lewis R. Walton. He first sent a letter demanding that it be published in full just as written. In the letter was much more than merely the subject matter involving the Statement of Beliefs as requested in the Questionnaire. He even made a very excellent observation, but due to the restrictions placed on his letter, comment cannot be made. It seems that he still is holding rancor over the Ankerberg Show.

To his letter, I replied, and sent him another copy of the Questionnaire, as he

had returned the first with his letter. Several other letters followed. Finally, he suggested innuendo on a personal level, just legally shy of outright libel - then abruptly closed off correspondence, refusing to accept any more letters. For those readers who are interested in the nature of the exchange involving one who has been so highly promoted by the Church, and in harmony with Walton's request to have published his first letter in its entirety, we will make available upon request the entire exchange of correspondence. [Send \$1.00 (US) to cover postage and costs. Ask for the Lewis Walton-Grother Letter Exchange.]

From none of the others was any kind of a reply received. This should tell all who are interested in knowing, something of the fence straddling that is going on in the name of "historic" Adventism. Recent information indicates that one of the most prolific writers in supposedly upholding "historic" Adventism, and who was deeply involved with Brinsmead during his early "Awakening" Message, is seeking to restore this erroneous teaching. He is using the apostasy in the Church which resulted from the SDA-Evangelical Conferences as the bait on the hook of Brinsmeadism to catch the unwary. This is travelling over the same road that Brinsmead travelled. He, too, used the results of the Evangelical Conferences as a spring board for the presentation of teachings allied with the "Holy Flesh" doctrine. Brinsmead had sense enough to recognize this error, but was unable to resolve the theological inconsistencies inherent in his original teaching. This finally led to his complete abandonment of the Truth as it is in Jesus. We dare not go either to the right hand, nor to the left hand, but must stay on the "King's Highway" - that pathway lifted high above the world upon which the children of God are to walk.

‡

#### THE BASIS OF VICTORY

"They overcame [the dragon] by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of their testimony; and they loved not their lives unto death."

Rev. 12:11

## SOVIET PRESS ATTACK ON TRUE AND FREE ADVENTISTS

Marite Sapiets

Editor's Note: Miss Sapiets is senior Soviet researcher for Keston College, and is presently writing a book on Adventists in the USSR.

On July 1, the newspaper Pravda Vostoka, the Russian-language daily of Uzbekistan, published a virulent attack on the past and present leadership of the unregistered "True and Free" Seventh-day Adventist Church. The article by N. Shalamova, entitled "The Truth Behind the Mask" accused True and Free Adventist pastors of being traitors to the Soviet Union and "haters of humanity."

After referring approvingly to the activities of the 1982 World Peace Conference organized in Moscow by the Russian Orthodox Church, Pravda Vostoka mentions "other voices" who want to continue the arms race and increase military spending. Among these, it seems, are the True and Free Adventists - somewhat surprisingly for a religious group whose original quarrel with the Soviet authorities was based on conscientious objection to military service. However, their real crime is stated in the following sentence: "Full of hatred for anything Soviet, they write and secretly send abroad all kinds of distortions, which they describe as appeals."

They try to "blacken the Soviet laws on religious cults" and even send their "filthy slanders and baseless attacks on our socialist system" to the White House. (This is undoubtedly a reference to the 800-page document sent to the Madrid Conference in 1980 by the True and Free Adventists, describing their treatment at the hands of the local Soviet authorities, and the letter to President Carter by V. A. Shelkov, the late True and Free Adventist leader.)

The True and Free Seventh-day Adventist leaders are accused of setting themselves up as "apostles" and "little Christs," [Where have we heard this before?] of living on the earnings of their followers and terrorising them by threatening to call

down curses from heaven. Despite the fact that the Soviet Constitution allows freedom of conscience to believers "as long as it is not against the interests of our people and state," True and Free Adventist pastors are said to be calling on their flock to break Soviet laws, to indulge in anti-Soviet activity and obstruct the construction of socialist society. None of the laws allegedly broken is cited nor are the accusations explained in further detail.

The slanders of the True and Free Adventists against "our system and our country" consist of allegations that believers in the USSR are persecuted. The article explains such allegations by the hatred of the Adventists for the benefits of education and employment granted to them by the Soviet system and their desire to be "martyrs for the faith."

The central theme of Shalamova's article is that the True and Free Adventist leaders, such as the "notorious Shelkov," were really all collaborators with the German occupying forces during the last war and must be unmasked as such. V. A. Shelkov himself, who was tried in 1979 for slandering the Soviet system, sentenced to five years' imprisonment and died in a labour camp in 1980 at the age of 84, is presented as a cunning pro-German agitator, like the former Adventist leaders Manzhuira and Gadiukin. Gadiukin is even said to have been recruited as a spy by the "fascists" in 1918, after graduating from a Bible college in Germany. The "collaborationist" activities of all three True and Free Adventist leaders are listed: they lived under German occupation in Pyatigorsk and organised religious activities, including church services, they learned German, confirmed publicly that the NKVD (Soviet secret police) had brutally murdered people and preached conscientious objection to army service (in itself hardly very useful to the Germans). This is described as "treason to human morality and conscience."

The fact that Shelkov and other True and Free Adventist leaders, subject to arrest under Soviet law since 1929 as pastors of unregistered religious organisations, lived on false passports without resident permits, is presented by Shalamova as fear of "just punishment" for their supposed

treason during the war. Shelkov's campaign for human rights in the 1970's is presented as hypocritical in view of his supposed wartime "treason" and his "co-operation with foreign intelligence services" (a suddenly introduced new charge).

Shelkov's trial in 1979, together with his fellow "traitors" is described as if it had been treason, instead of for publicising the facts of anti-religious persecution of a pacifist group.

The reason for this new official attack on the true and free Adventists, whose activities have certainly decreased in the past two years, is revealed at the end of Shalamova's article, when "a certain Leonid Murkin" is subjected to abuse. Murkin, although not previously prominent as a True and Free Adventist, now seems to have become the Church's new leader and Shelkov's successor. He is described as Shelkov's former assistant and has been an Adventist since childhood. The article accuses him of avoiding the military call-up during the last war, of forging documents, masquerading as a Soviet soldier (?!) and of living as a "parasite." In other words, he is following the usual pacifist traditions of the True and Free Adventists and is forced to lead an underground existence because the state will not recognise these congregations as legal.

Shalamova's attack is based entirely on a "patriotic" condemnation of conscientious objectors and critics of Soviet society and makes not a single precise accusation against Murkin, Shelkov or any other True and Free Adventist except that of forging personal documents. Nevertheless, although the True and Free Adventists have provided much precise evidence about violation of their rights by the Soviet state in documents sent to Madrid, it is their new leader Murkin who is accused by Pravda Vostoka of really violating believers' rights (though it is not stated how).

It is possible that the recent reconciliation between the official Seventh-day Adventist Church and a group of Adventists who left the Church in the 1960's has led to a new campaign against the remaining "unofficial" Adventists.

Keston News Service, #178, July 14, 1983, pp. 12-13

## 1983 ANNUAL FELLOWSHIP TAPES

(Personal Comments of any speaker on a given topic may or may not reflect the position held by the Adventist Laymen's Foundation. We desire to be numbered with that "people" who "maintain the Bible, and the Bible only, as the standard of all doctrine and the basis of all reforms." SP, IV, p. 413)

- "What Is the Church? - Dorothy Hilmer  
Daniel 11:1-30 - Dr. Kirby Clendenon  
(Two Tapes)
- "The Rise of the Papacy" - Kirby Clendenon
- "As A Little Child" - Daniel Werezuk
- "Christ, the Truth" - Elder David Bauer
- "Hope" - Elder David Bauer
- "Promises" - Elder David Bauer
- "The Devil Made Me Do It" - David Bauer  
(Two Tapes)
- "First Angel's Message" - David Bauer
- Seminar in the Book of Hebrews - Grotheer  
(Five Tapes)
- "I Dare You" - Grotheer
- "The Nadir of the Condescension" - Grotheer

Select the subjects you wish to hear, count the number of tapes involved, and multiply by \$2.00 US, add 5% for postage, then send your order to the Adventist Laymen's Foundation of Arkansas, P. O. Box 178, Lamar, AR 72846.

+++++

### NOTE

We recently purchased a new Tape Copier. Improper adjustments of the recording heads caused some faulty tapes to be sent out before we became aware of what was happening. If, during the past two months you ordered and received tapes from the Foundation, and they were not first quality recordings, please let us know, and we will replace them. Do not return the tapes, unless requested. Just give us the titles of the faulty ones.

+++++

"Watchman, What of the Night?" is published monthly by the Adventist Laymen's Foundation of Mississippi, Inc., P. O. Box 178, Lamar, AR 72846, USA. It is free upon request.

Those who ordered tapes during August, or who left unfilled orders during the Annual Fellowship Meetings, there will be a delay in filling these orders due to the time it has taken to ship and receive back from the Company Repair Service to which we had to ship the Tape Copier for adjustment on the machine.

On all orders - please observe the following guide lines:

- 1) Make all checks payable for tapes and publications to the Adventist Laymen's Foundation of Arkansas. Do not mingle gifts and payments for the purchase of materials.
- 2) If the order is for tapes only, add 5% for postage.
- 3) If the order includes publications plus tapes, or if for publications only, add 10% for postage. On special offers of publications, unless otherwise stated, we pay the postage.

#

### QUOTES FROM ADVENTIST LAYMEN'S PIPELINE

"A reliable source in the Northern California Conference has just revealed that the final tally of dollars lost by the Conference and Association on the Stock Market amounted to \$1.7 million. . . .

"Local and Union Conference officials had characterized the stocks purchased as 'all of the blue chip variety' and that they had been selected by 'a group of experts' to whom we gave complete authority to buy and sell in our behalf.' Laymen learned that the 'group of experts' contained not one single Seventh-day Adventist Church member and that the portfolio of stocks described as 'all blue chip variety' consisted of such companies as Ringling Bros., Barnum and Bailey Circus, and among others, a host of small, insignificant, virtually unknown and highly speculative businesses. "Elder James C. Chase was the president of both the Northern California Conference and the NCC Association during the period most of the stock market purchases took place." July 1, 1983

[Chase now heads up one of the GC Depts.]