



*"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 POT, THE KETTLE - BLACK

### Church Editor Calls for Action Against Trust Officers and Conference Administrators

A most unusual editorial appeared in the Adventist Review (Oct. 22, 1981) - the 137th Anniversary of the entrance of Jesus into the Most Holy Place of the Heavenly Sanctuary - carrying the initials of the Editor-in-Chief - "K. H. W." It was captioned, "The Davenport Loans." While its forthrightness and call for disciplinary action against trust officers, and conference officials involved in the Davenport scandal is to be commended, a careful analysis of what Elder Wood wrote should not be by-passed. For the benefit of the readers of the Thought Paper - both at home and overseas who do not receive the Review - we shall attempt to give sufficient quotes of what Elder Wood wrote so that the observations made in our analysis will be understandable.

After reviewing the facts of the case, the admitted loss of some \$21 Million of unspecified church funds, and "the confirmed reports that the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC)" had entered the investigation, he states that certain letters had been sent to "trustors and retirees." These letters allege "that the General Conference had not made loans to Dr. Davenport." This has been the "bottom line" of the hierarchy since the scandal first broke. No doubt from the context of Wood's

statement, this is true. He makes the allegation cover only the sustentation funds of the retirees. However, still unanswered is the fact that Davenport in listing his creditors with the Court named - "The General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists Inter-American Division." This fact was not addressed by the Treasurer of the General Conference in his, "Summary of Davenport Loans," appearing in the Adventist Review (Sept. 10, 1981), nor was it addressed by Wood in his current editorial. An article appearing in Spectrum, (Vol. 12, No. 1, p. 55) explains these funds were monies received by the Division which the giver had invested with Davenport. This leaves still other unanswered questions arising from this explanation.

Tentatively admitting that it is possible that none of the funds loaned to Davenport will ever be recovered, Wood states that if certain policies and principles had been followed by those in responsible positions this terrible embarrassment to the Church would not have occurred. He writes - "Only when each member of a committee, board, or other group expresses his convictions freely, questions unsafe financial policies, protests unsound proposals, and is willing, if necessary, to cast a negative vote, will responsible church bodies deserve full confidence." This is a laudatory observation, and some of us who in the past years have done so, know the results of this sort of upright behaviour. But in this particular case, there is an ironical twist. In Southern California when the matter of the Davenport loans came up for discussion, and the interest payments were noted as delinquent, the Los Times (Aug. 9, 1981, IV-11) notes that

Walter Rea and others on the committee did speak up, but to no avail. Now one must ask - Was Walter Rea defrocked only because he gave an interview to a Staff Reporter of the Los Angeles Times regarding his findings relative to the writings of Ellen G. White, or were there some other underlying factors such as his protest involving the Davenport investments? Will this be permitted to come to light should a full scale investigation be initiated by the General Conference? It is known that the President of Southern California involved in the defrocking of Rea has been moved the Presidency of the British Union Conference. Promotion for affirmative reaction to the wishes of the hierarchy, and devastating action against the voice of protest is the rule of the thumb which has been administered over the years. Now the Editor of the Adventist Review says only when this rule is reversed can the church entities deserve the confidence of their constituents. When will Wilson begin to apply this suggestion, and will the previous applications of the "rule of the thumb" noted above be reversed?

Editor Wood calls for the leaders of the various church entities involved in the Davenport fiasco "to give to their constituencies as complete a report as possible on the current situation." He indicates that some have already done so, and implies that in these reports there has been "openness and forthrightness," with no attempt at a "cover up." Evidently Elder Wood has not followed very closely the nature of the reporting done, for right under his nose in the Potomac Conference, there was a report by the President with all the earmarks of a "cover-up," and was exposed as fallacious by the Los Angeles Times. (See WVN, Nov., 1981, p. 2) Before an Editor goes to press involving himself in an issue as volatile as the Davenport case, he should carefully do his home work. Apparently Wood slipped badly in suggesting that the reports already given were "as transparent as the sunlight." We hope that all future reports would be as Wood suggests they should be.

In his editorial, Wood calls for a public confession by the leaders of the church entities involved in the Davenport loans, quoting supporting statements from the

Spirit of Prophecy. Then he comments - "Forgiveness, of course, does not mean exemption from consequences. Though forgiven by both God and man, a person may receive discipline or punishment for irresponsible actions. We think that the individuals, boards, and committees that lent funds to Dr. Davenport should be called to account for their actions." He then lists the nature of the offenses for which an accounting should be given: One, if the leadership of the entities did not follow the policy of the General Conference; and Two, "if it can be shown that individuals used their office for personal advantage" to themselves, in other words, was there a "conflict of interest" involved. Admittedly, this should be investigated. It will be of great interest to see what plea will be raised to justify noncompliance with the General Conference policy should such a trial and investigation be conducted by the Curia on the Sligo. Will it be shown that the General Conference's own investment policies which involved the New York stock market since 1967 proved to be so risky for the subentities of the Church that they decided to launch out on their own which has resulted in the Davenport fiasco. When all of this comes out into the open, and we are given the figures on all the investments of all the bodies concerned, including the General Conference - will the color of the pot vary much from the color of the kettle? Won't they both be black?

Finally, the Editor in a very pious - very holy, and very much above the fray - comment states: "Whatever may be the ultimate outcome of the Davenport affair, we think we should remind ourselves that the strength of the Adventist Church is not its money, but its message." And here is where Editor Wood gets involved heavily in the picture. We must ask ourselves - Is the strength of the Church, its message as changed and altered as a result of the SDA-Evangelical Conferences, and which alteration was affirmed in the Statement of Beliefs adopted by the Dallas Session in 1980; or was the strength of the Advent Movement, the faith committed to it following the disappointment in 1844, and in the Message sent to it in 1888? And the affirmation at Dallas, and the commitment given in 1844 are not the same message.

We have already made available for our readers the contents of a series of correspondence in which Elder Wood was involved from 1968 to the present. (WWN, Oct., 1981) In 1968, Wood stated to a layperson that he was next to the whole situation from the beginning regarding the publication of Question on Doctrine resultant from the SDA-Evangelical Conferences (also known as the Barnhouse-Martin Conferences). Further he has admitted that the departure from Historic Adventism was so subtle that only a person well informed in the Truth could detect that departure. He professes to be in that category - well informed in the Truth. But where was his voice at that hour? Did he take his stand with Elder Andreasen? Has he through editorial comment in the Review confessed his error? Has he suggested that all the men involved in this terrible apostasy, including himself by his own admission, be called to give an account of their surrender of the historic faith, and be "dealt with firmly but fairly" as he is suggesting should be done in the Davenport case? He considers the sins of the leaders involved in the Davenport situation in the same light as the sin of Achan which caused the defeat of Israel at Ai. And it is a great sin, bringing reproach on the Church; however, I can read from the same books from which Wood's quoted to justify his call in the editorial, these words:

If God abhors one sin above another, of which His people are guilty, it is doing nothing in case of an emergency. Indifference and neutrality in a religious crisis is regarded by God as a grievous crime, and equal to the very worst type of hostility against God. (3T:281)

There was a religious crisis in 1955-1956, resulting from the SDA-Evangelical Conferences. But where was Elder Wood? As late as 1968, he was writing to the laity of the Church defending the Apostates knowing full well that these conferences did result in a change of our historic truths. Wood was not neutral, nor indifferent, but supportive, and defended this departure in the faith to the laity of the Church. To have been merely neutral or indifferent would have been the manifestation of "the very worst type of hostility against God." How then is Wood's sin to be classified?

From where we sit, the editorial calling for an accounting from all the men involved in the Davenport embarrassment is merely the pot calling the kettle black. Let us have a full clean up starting with the beginning of the Omega of apostasy in 1955 - 1956, and let it include the Editor of the Adventist Review!

\*\*\*\*\*

## COMMENTS IN SPECTRUM

Commenting on why General Conference policy was ignored, Tom Dybdahl, writing in Spectrum (Vol. 12, No.1, p. 61) gives his explanation. and then asks some probing questions. We quote:

"There are several reasons why - in violation of the guidelines - leaders often invested their own money, and the church's money with Davenport. He had a good track record, he was a fellow believer, and he paid top dollar, at least to influential individuals. A good many people, often personal friends of Davenport, simply felt that in this case the rules could be ignored.

"The situation appears to be different with respect to the General Conference. As early as 1968, the treasury department began discouraging investments with Davenport, and in April 1979 Emmerson and Osborn were strongly urging church organizations to shun any connection with Davenport. The department's actions, particularly the Emmerson letters to W. J. Blacker and Harold Calkins, make the General Conference look blameless. Still, however, there is reason, in light of claims it has recently made in court, to ask whether the General Conference was unable to do anything about the Davenport matter except give warnings. In the legal case involving the Pacific Press Publishing Association and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, the church had argued that it was of the 'hierarchical variety,' with 'orders of ministers,' and a 'first minister at the top.' In the press' reply brief, this had been explained to mean that 'a 'hierarchical' church is one in which final decisions are made at the top of the organizational ladder, in contrast to a 'congregational' church organization in which every local group, like the Baptists and Unitarians, is free to go its own way.' This reasoning was then used to justify the action of the General Conference Committee when it reached all the way down to declare that two women employees of the press were 'at variance' with the church and therefore should be fired.

"If such is in fact the church's organizational structure, it is difficult to believe that the General Conference was as impotent as it wishes to appear. Indeed, from Emerson's letter it is clear that the threat to withdraw support from Loma Linda University made any traffic with Davenport suddenly unattractive. It would be interesting to know if such tactics were ever considered in dealing with other uncooperative units, or what role Davenport's friends - and creditors - in the General Conference might have played.

"If there was really nothing the General Conference could do but plead with the union brethren, to whom are the union leaders accountable? The answer should be 'their constituents,' but given the secrecy with which church financial matters are generally handled, most laymen know little about them. And those who try to find out, such as John Adam and Walter Rea, often meet a stone wall. Or if the General Conference could not actually enforce its guidelines, could it not have ordered an audit and then informed the appropriate constituency of the problems and conflicts of interest, a strategy which would likely have resulted in some changes? And finally, if the General Conference is powerless in such matters, it does not inspire confidence that better rules and procedures will prevent any repeats. For despite all the negative publicity and the General Conference pressure, church organizations were reportedly loaning Davenport money as recently as March 1981."

\*\*\*\*\*

## MERCHANDISE - "SOULS OF MEN"

Many a Seventh-day Adventist whom the Davenport fiasco has aroused are concerned only with the fiscal irresponsibilities of the hierarchy. They see only a mismanagement of funds entrusted to the Church and they believe that if business-minded laymen could assume responsibility of the Church's internal and business operations, all would return to normal. In so doing, these conscientious, business-minded laypersons appear to forget the power and effectiveness of the Apostolic Church. It was Peter who said to the lame man who laid daily at a Temple gate - "Silver and gold have I none; but such as I have give I thee." (Acts 3:6)

It was never the intent of the Lord Jesus Christ to have His professed people in the final age of human history listed in Standard and Poor as a great business cor-

poration with assets of over \$4 billion. (The Washington Post, Aug., 24, 1981, B7) It was our Lord's intent that the last Church, instead of being "rich and increased with goods" would be even as its Apostolic predecessor - "the church of the living God, the pillar and the stay of the truth." (1 Tim. 3:15 margin) The Lord's messenger wrote:

The most solemn truths ever entrusted to mortals have been given us to proclaim to the world. The proclamation of these truths is to be our work. The world is to be warned, and God's people are to be true to the trust committed to them. They are not to engage in speculation, neither are they to enter into business enterprises with unbelievers; for this would hinder them in their God-given work. (9T:19)

The "trust" responsibility of the hierarchy is not to be the monies of the "saints" but rather "the most solemn truths ever entrusted to mortals." There has been given to us "a truth that admits of no compromise." (Spec. Test., Series B, #2, p. 55) We take alarm when monies entrusted to the Trust Departments of the Church are lost in speculation - and we have yet to know the full extent of the involvement in the Wall Street stock market. But are we just as concerned when the truths committed to us are compromised and altered? Are material and temporal losses to be compared with the loss that will be sustained over the altering of sacred, divine truth? One concerns the pocket book, the other the souls of men! Babylon the great is charged with trafficking in the "souls of men." (Rev. 18:13) But the divine "Instructor" asked - "How has the faithful city become a harlot?" And the answer is given - "My Father's house is made a house of merchandise, a place whence the divine presence and glory have departed." (8T:250) Not only have we trafficked in the stock market, and in mortgages on Post Offices and Telephone Company buildings, but we have also speculated in the theology of Babylon, and are now offering to the laity "trust deeds" secured by "doctrines of devils." (1 Tim. 4:1) By so doing, we are likewise trafficking in the "souls of men."

Lest these allegations appear to be without valid documentation, let us cite specific examples. Consider first, this doctrinal statement in Questions on Doctrine:

How glorious is the thought that the King, who occupies the throne, is also our representative at the court of heaven! This becomes all the more meaningful when we realize that Jesus our surety entered "the holy places," and appeared in the presence of God for us. But it was not with the hope of obtaining anything for us at that time, or at some future time. No! He had already obtained it for us on the cross. And now as our High Priest He ministers the virtues of His atoning sacrifice for us. (p. 381, emphasis theirs)

Now follow closely the Statement of Belief published in the 1889 Yearbook which declared that Seventh-day Adventist then believed:

That there is one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the Eternal Father, . . . that He took on Him the nature of the seed of Abraham for the redemption of our fallen race; that He dwelt among men, full of grace and truth, lived our example, died our sacrifice, was raised for our justification, ascended on high to be our only mediator in the sanctuary in heaven, where, through the merits of His shed blood, He secures the pardon and forgiveness of the sins of all those who penitently come to Him. (Emphasis mine)

Now compare the statement found in Questions on Doctrine where it states that Christ went into the Father's presence without hope of obtaining anything for us then, or at any future time; with the truth entrusted to us which declares that Christ upon His ascension to the Father's presence obtained for us "pardon and forgiveness." These two concepts are in complete contradiction; yet the Editor of the Adventist Review wrote to a layperson - "This book in no way changes our fundamental beliefs. In fact, it probably sets them forth more clearly than any publication that has been issued from our presses in many a year." (Letter dated Feb. 28, 1968) This is simply trafficking in the "souls of men." Yet the Editor would have those who have betrayed fiscal trusts called to task, while he who has dealt in the "souls of men" go free.

Another example - in Movement of Destiny an heading for a statement reads: "'Complete' Atonement Made on Cross." Then the second paragraph contains this comment by Froom:

Referring to it as the "great atonement,"

Ellen White declares, "The seal of heaven has been fixed to Christ's atonement. His sacrifice is in every way satisfactory." It is "sufficient" and "efficacious" and "complete." (p. 501, emphasis his)

Where did the phrase - "great atonement" - come from? Now let us return to the 1889 Statement of Beliefs, and see. We continue to read, with enough back up to keep continuity:

. . . ascended on high to be our only mediator in the sanctuary in heaven, where, through the merits of His shed blood, He secures the pardon and forgiveness of the sins of those who penitently come to Him; and as the closing portion of His work as priest, before He takes His throne as king, He will make the great atonement for the sins of all such, and their sins will then be blotted out and borne away from the sanctuary.

To take the expression - "great atonement" as found and used in one of our historic statements of belief, and apply it as was done by Froom is to completely annul truth committed to us - a truth which admits of no compromise. But who approved this altering of our faith? None other than Neal C. Wilson, who at the time was President of the North American Division, and who served as "Chairman of the Guiding Committee for Movement of Destiny." (p. 16) It is only natural now that Elder Wilson would prefer to have the attention of the laity directed to the financial scandal - which on the surface leaves the General Conference clear - rather than face the fact that he chaired a committee which published a book altering a basic truth of historic Adventism. Furthermore, as the elected president of the General Conference at Dallas, Texas, he led the discussion and voting of a new Statement of Beliefs, which was supposedly a re-affirmation of historic Adventism, but which in reality was a confirmation of the apostasy perpetrated by the compromises of the SDA-Evangelical Conferences. Can we trust our souls anymore than we can trust our monies with those who have showed such callous disregard for truth? Is it still to be questioned whether God has weighed the Seventh-day Adventist Church in the balances of the sanctuary, and that the judgments now falling upon it are the results of His findings? See 8T:247.

\*\*\*\*\*

## "ADVENTISTS FACE SUIT ON SEX BIAS"

WASHINGTON (UPI) - The Seventh-day Adventist Church, already embroiled in internal and external controversy, has another problem: A sex discrimination suit filed by a magna cum laude graduate of its top school.

Carole Rayburn, a clinical psychologist with a masters degree from Adventist Andrews University and a doctorate from Catholic University, charges the church with denying her employment because she is a woman.

The case was brought in U.S. District Court in Baltimore and names the denomination's top officers as well as its Potomac Conference, its regional group. The denomination is headquartered in Takoma Park, MD, a suburb of Washington. The civil rights suit raises delicate church-state questions and could test just how far anti-discrimination provisions of the law can be applied to religious institutions without constituting excessive government entanglement in religious affairs.

The denomination, with 3.5 million members worldwide, has recently been involved in public controversy over the writings of church founder Ellen G. White. An Adventist minister in California - since thrown out of the church - has claimed Mrs White committed whole sale plagiarism in her 70 books. At the same time the church is involved in an internal audit to determine how much money its various regions and agencies have lent a prominent Adventist who has filed for bankruptcy after his real estate dealings collapsed.

The discrimination suit asserts that Miss Rayburn was denied employment as an associate pastor of the Sligo Seventh-day Adventist Church in Takoma Park and as an associate in pastoral care internship with the Potomac Conference "because of her sex (and) because of her race, in that she was a white person who had associated with black persons. . ." Although the church does not ordain women to the pastorate, Miss Rayburn said she was eligible for both positions neither of which are closed to women by the denomination.

Rayburn says she was never given a reason for not being hired, but points out that the internship post was filled by a 21-year old son of a minister on the selection committee who "was just out of college where he had completed his B.A. degree." "I have three degrees in psychology and have finished seminary," she said.

Miss Rayburn made public an internal memorandum from a top Potomac Conference church official in which she was described as "a crusader." "You will notice one of the activities she joined in at Andrews is

the Black Forum. She will constantly be working for 'the underprivileged,' trying to better their situation from a material standpoint," the memorandum said.

\*\*\*\*\*

## WEIMAR INSTITUTE CHAPLAIN TAKES PART IN BLASPHEMOUS SACRIFICE OF THE MASS

Unashamedly, the editor of the Weimar Institute Bulletin (October, (1981) heralds on page one, the acceptance by the Director-Chaplain of the Retreat Ministry at Weimar, Elder Dick Winn, of an invitation to speak at a gathering of Catholic priests at the Treasure Island Naval Base. The meeting was a monthly gathering of the Catholic military chaplains around northern California called "The Day of Recollection." The day closed with the celebration of the Eucharist, or Catholic Mass, at which service Elder Winn presented the homily.

We wonder how long it has been since Elder Winn has studied Daniel 7; Revelation 13; of 11 Thess. 2. Perhaps he is unaware of the words of the Apostle Paul to the Corinthians, which state:

But I say, that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God: and I would not that ye should have fellowship with devils. Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils: ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table, and the table of devils. (I Cor. 10:20-21)

However, this act on the part of one of Weimar's administrators should not have come as a complete surprise to the readers of their Bulletin, because of the publication in the Adventist Review of its official position. (Feb. 12, 1981; See WVN XIV-5, p. 9) In the Review, the President of Weimar placed the Institute squarely in accord with the Statement of Beliefs adopted at the General Conference Session at Dallas in 1980. By such an affirmation the leadership of Weimar is standing shoulder to shoulder with the apostasy of hierarchy of the Church. It was this hierarchy, through its then "first minister"

- who has since been a prominent guest on the campus - who directed legal counsel before a Federal District Court to declare in a Brief - "While, however, Adventist doctrine continues to teach that church government by one man is contrary to the Word of God, it is not good Seventh-day Adventism to express. . . an aversion to Roman Catholicism as such." (Second Brief, Filed March 3, 1975, US District Court, Northern California, p. 30) Further in the same Brief, the leadership of the Church told the Court that the position of Church based on Bible prophecy in regard to Roman Catholicism "has now been consigned to the historical trash heap." Elder Winn's act in taking part in the service where the blasphemous sacrifice of the Mass was celebrated is in complete harmony with the position of the hierarchy of the Church. But what an example this sets for students in attendance at the school. We reported previously about a Professor at Pacific Union College taking one of his Bible classes for participation at a Catholic service in Napa, California. (See WWN XIV-1, p. 7) Now the Chaplain of Weimar is openly presented as participating in service celebrating the Mass. Where can concerned Adventist parents permit their youth to go for an education where they can receive a true perspective of historic Adventism?

This boldly proclaimed participation by Chaplain Winn in the service celebrating the Mass is pictured as an extension of the results of the "right arm" ministry at Weimar Institute. On page two of the same issue of the Weimar Bulletin is the testimony of the Catholic Military Chaplain, serving the Presidio in San Francisco, and who extended to Winn the invitation. The Catholic chaplain testified that the time he spent in Newstart Program "reminded [him] of [his] monastery days." He declared - "I didn't feel threatened by the spiritual environment or the services conducted." If this is the result and correct interpretation of the counsel in regard to the use of the "right arm" our apostasy is deeper than we have previously perceived. May God have mercy on us.

\*\*\*\*\*

"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.

## YOU CAN HELP THE TRUE AND FREE SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS

In the July, 1981, issue of "Watchman, What of the Night?" (p. 9), we printed a page from The Right To Believe captioned - "The Case of the Russian 'Robin Hood.'" This modern "Robin Hood" is none other than Rostislav Galetsky of the True and Free Seventh-day Adventists in the USSR. The report revealed that an "urgent appeal for a world campaign to free" Galetsky who has been "held in prison since July 1980 reached the West recently." We indicated at the time that as soon as we had further word as to what the readers of the Thought Paper could do, we would let you know. Correspondence has been exchanged between the Foundation and the leaders of the endeavor to free Galetsky. Keston News Service (Keston College, England) has given further details regarding the arrest and charges against Galetsky. Excerpts from this news service follow:

Rostislav Galetsky was arrested in Moscow on July 1, 1980. (He) had just arrived at the Kazan railway station in Moscow. As soon as he left the train five men in plain clothes began following him at a distance. At the entrance to the metro station one of the men following him ran ahead to block his path.

Rostislav Galetsky was a close associate of the long-time leader of the True and Free Adventist Church, Vladimir Shelkov, who died in a Soviet labour camp at the age of 84, January 27, 1980. (Labor camp officials refused to release his body to relatives because he had not completed his sentence) Galetsky was denounced in Izvestiya (May 13, 1979) as an "agent" of Shelkov and accused of passing "slandorous" materials about Soviet religious policy to western journalists.

There are several ways in which you can help not only Galetsky, but also other True and Free Seventh-day Adventist prisoners in the USSR. (As evident in the recent Adventist Review (Nov. 12, 1981) these faithful souls cannot expect any sympathy from the hierarchy who have now formally committed themselves to an atheistic state sponsored SDA Church in the USSR.) From correspondence received from England, we have learned you can do the following:

- 1) Write letters to (a) prisoners, (b) prisoners' families, and (c) to officials of the USSR.
- 2) Send material aid to prisoners' families.
- 3) Circulate petitions. Write to address below for details.