



*"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*

## HAVING EYES TO SEE THEY SEE NOT!

**"Let them alone:  
They be blind leaders  
of the blind" - Jesus**

- + -

In the Ministry magazine for June, 1985, the editor, J. R. Spangler, published two articles on the Incarnation. One written by Dr. Norman Gulley (Benjamin Rand) took the position that Jesus in His incarnation took the unfallen nature of Adam. The other written by Dr. Herbert Douglass (Kenneth Gage) supported the concept that Christ when as a man took the fallen nature of Adam. Then in the August issue of the same journal, each critiqued the other's position.

To adequately discuss the pro's and con's of what was presented in these articles and the response of each to the other, would require a manuscript sized publication, and is thus beyond the scope of this monthly Thought Paper. We refer our readers to the two manuscripts previously released by the Foundation, and which are part of the 1986 Special Offer. These are - An Interpretive History of the Doctrine of the Incarnation as Taught by the Seventh-day Adventist Church and In the Form of a Slave, besides the documentary on The Holy Flesh Movement 1899-1901, in which the doctrine

of the incarnation played a significant role.

In announcing the original articles by Gulley and Douglass, Spangler promised to publish on a percentage basis the reaction from the field. (June, 1985, p. 24) The response evidently was so great that the editorial staff found they could not respond to each individually, nor even publish segments of the replies received. Therefore, in the December, 1985, issue of Ministry, they chose to use a question and answer format to cover "the core questions and statements made in the letters" received.

It is Question #2 and the answer given to which we wish to direct this lead article. The question is asked -

Why would Ministry publish pro and con articles on a doctrine that has been established in the Seventh-day Adventist Church? (p. 2)

The bottom line to their answer was - "we fail to find any evidence that the church has ever taken a definitive, voted position at a General Conference session on whether Christ took a pre-Fall or post-Fall, sinful or sinless nature." (pp. 2, 25) In this conclusion, the editors have hedged their response with the words, "definitive" and "voted" at a General Conference session. Let us examine the historical evidence they presented and see what it says.

The first Statement of Beliefs was published in 1872 at Battle Creek. Article II stated among other concepts that the "Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the Eternal Father, ... took on Him the nature of the seed of Abraham for the redemption of our fallen race;"

This phraseology was repeated in every Statement of Beliefs published in Church papers and Yearbooks from that date through 1914. When it first appeared in the Yearbook (1889) the Statement was prefaced by the following paragraph:

Seventh-day Adventists have no creed but the Bible; but they hold to certain well-defined points of faith, for which they feel prepared to give a reason "to every man that asketh" them. The following propositions may be taken as a summary of the principle features of their religious faith, upon which there is, so far as is known, entire unanimity throughout the body." (p. 147)

If the Statement expressed what was believed with "entire unanimity throughout the body," there was no need for any "voted" action by a General Conference in session. The very fact it was included in the Yearbook, did by that fact give it official status. The Yearbook contained "the statistics of [the] denomination, the proceedings of [the] General Conference, T. and M. [Tract and Missionary] Society, and other associations, the financial condition of [the church's] institutions, [the] General and State Conference constitutions, a good calendar, and full directories of all Conferences and various societies throughout the country." (Quoted in SDA Encyclopedias, Rev. Ed., p. 1336)

It is merely a technical point which the editors of the Ministry are seeking to hide behind when they require that a Belief to be official must be voted by a General Conference in session. Such a requirement is only of recent origin, and the editors know that fact. (See page 2, col. 3 of the December, Ministry.) However, the editors' comment on this Statement in regards to the incarnation of Christ is absolutely incredible. They write:

Although church leaders and members may have generally agreed as to a particular view on the nature of Christ, the statement itself, which quotes from Hebrews 2:16, does not specifically delineate whether Christ had a "sinful" or "sinless" - pre-Fall or post-Fall - nature. (Ibid., p. 2, col. 2)

The second Statement of Beliefs examined in the Ministry was the one which appeared in the 1931 Yearbook, and was included in the 1932 Church Manual. This Statement on the Incarnation read:

That Jesus Christ is very God, being of the same nature and essence as the Eternal Father. While retain-

ing His divine nature, He took upon Himself the nature of the human family. . . ."

This remained the "voted" belief of the Church until 1980, when the apostate Statements of Beliefs voted at Dallas, Texas, made no reference to the nature that Christ took upon Himself in becoming man. While no direct comment can be found in the remarks by the editors of Ministry on this 1931 Yearbook statement, the general conclusion which was drawn on our doctrinal history in this area leads to the assumption they do not consider the phrase - "the nature of the human family" - as stating which nature Christ took upon Himself in the incarnation. This is incomprehensible!

The word, family, comes from the Latin - familia - meaning household which included servants as well as kin of the householder. (See Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary) Other dictionaries give the following definitions:

Family - A group of persons, consisting of parents and their children - Funk and Wagnalls New College Standard Dictionary.

Family - Parents and their children. - The Reader's Digest Great Encyclopedic Dictionary.

It was after Adam and Eve fell into sin that children were born to them - that the "family" began. The record is clear that while Adam at his creation was formed in the image of God (Gen. 1:27), Seth born after the Fall was begotten in the likeness and image of Adam. (Gen. 5:3) It has been thus that all the "human family" have been begotten, and the 1931 Statement of Beliefs declared that Christ in being born in flesh "took upon Himself the nature of the human family." And this is not definitive on the nature assumed!! Where did the editors go to school?

I have a granddaughter, Jessica, who is in the second grade. I decided to try out a test on her to see what her response would be. The test was drawn up as follows:

"He [Jesus] took on Him the nature of the seed of Abraham for the redemption of the race..." ( )

"While retaining His divine nature, He [Jesus] took upon Himself the nature of the human family..." ( )

1. Christ took the nature of Adam before the Fall in the Incarnation.
2. Christ took the nature of Adam after the Fall in the Incarnation.

3. The statement does not tell which nature He took in the Incarnation."

I explained to her that "Incarnation" referred to the birth of Jesus at Bethlehem. She asked what "nature" meant. I told her, the word stood for "what one is." Her older brother added his comments and helped her to understand the meaning of the word. I reread the sentences to her, and in each instance she chose #2 as the statement which reflected the meaning of the wording our spiritual forefathers used in the Statements of Belief in defining the nature assumed in the Incarnation.

The editors of the Ministry need to either resign, retire, whatever, and return to the classroom. It is evident at what grade level they should begin.

#### The Simplicity of the Incarnation

Incarnation means the act of coming into the flesh - the human nature and form. A. T. Jones in commenting on John 1:14 - "And the Word was made flesh" - asked the question - "Now what kind of flesh is it?" Then in answering the question, he asked another and amplified the answer. He said:

What kind of flesh alone is it that this world knows? - Just such flesh as you and I have. This world does not know any other flesh of man, and has not known any other since the necessity of Christ's coming was created. Therefore, as this world knows only such flesh as we have, as it is now, it is certainly true that when "the Word was made flesh," He was made just such flesh as ours is. It cannot be otherwise. (1895 GC Bulletin, p. 232)

The text which Jones commented upon is a balanced statement. "The WORD was made flesh." Paul also makes the same assertion - "GOD was manifest in the flesh." (I Tim. 3:16) In these key statements we find the essence of the Incarnation of Jesus Christ, and the major difference between Him and ourselves. It is a point that dare not be overlooked. We are not GOD, and never shall be. We did not have a pre-existence, He did. We had a beginning, but He who became man at Bethlehem had no beginning. He merely changed His form of Being to accomplish the redemption of man.

Paul speaks of this manifestation in human flesh as a mystery. He writes - "Without controversy great is the mystery of Godliness,

God was manifest in the flesh." While our word, mystery, is a transliteration of the Greek word, mustērion - the same word Paul used - in the New Testament, it carries a different meaning from how we use the word. "In its New Testament sense a mystery is "not a thing which must be kept secret. On the contrary it is a secret which God wills to make known and has charged His Apostles to declare to those who have ears to hear it.'" (The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament, p. 420, Emphasis theirs) Thus when proclaiming the incarnation of our Lord, we need to keep the same balanced emphasis of the New Testament - The WORD - God - was manifest in the flesh. Yes, the nature of that flesh needs to be, and can be, clearly understood, but with this the fact, it was God who came and dwelt in that flesh.

The question is asked -

How can we span the distance between the mighty God and a helpless child? And yet the Creator of worlds, He in whom was the fulness of the Godhead bodily, was manifest in the helpless Babe in the manger. Far higher than any of the angels, equal with the Father in dignity and glory, and yet wearing the garb of humanity! Divinity and humanity were mysteriously combined, and man and God became one. (Signs, July 30, 1896)

Herein lies the mystery - using the English sense of the word. The how of that union of God and man is mysteriously enshrouded in the omniscience and power of the Highest. (Luke 1:35) The "infinite cost" and the "painful process" (Ms. 29, 1899) which Heaven devised for the redemption of the lost race should cause us to bow in humble awe, and confess not only our unworthiness, but also our inability to attain to the great Pattern exemplified in such a sacrifice. (2T: 549)

He who became Jesus, in the Old Testament was known variously as Michael, the Lord God, the great I AM - the Self-existent and ever-existent One. As such, He existed in "the form of God." (Phil. 2:6) At Bethlehem, that One "emptied Himself" of the form of God, and took on Him "the form of a bondsman." (Phil 2:7 ARV margin) The word "form" in both phrases - "the form of God" and "the form of a slave" - is the same Greek word, morphe. Even as He had a form of existence which He shared with God, so likewise, in becoming man, He shared

## JESUS AS PRIEST AND HIGH PRIEST

For years I had puzzled over a series of references in the Writings of Ellen G. White which affirmed that while on earth, Christ officiated as a priest. One such reference reads - "Christ emptied Himself, and took the form of a servant, and offered sacrifice, Himself the priest, Himself the victim." (The Southern Watchman, Aug. 6, 1903) Other references including this same phrase can be found in Acts of the Apostles, p. 33, Desire of Ages, p. 25, and Letter 192, 1906. This does not exhaust the list.

I was also aware that A. T. Jones had written in The Consecrated Way:

In the manifestation of Christ the Saviour it is revealed that He must appear in the three offices of prophet, priest and king. (p. 3) ... As He was not that priest when He was on earth as that prophet; so now He is not that king when He is heaven as that priest. (p. 4, Emphasis his)

Besides this there is the article by Crosier on the "Sanctuary" which stated emphatically - "He could not, according to Heb. viii, 4, make atonement while on earth. 'If he were on earth, he could not be a Priest.' The Levitical was the earthly priesthood, the Divine, the heavenly."

How was all this to be reconciled? Even as Asaph, it was necessary to go "into the sanctuary of God" to understand the priestly work of Jesus our Lord. (See Ps. 73:17) In Leviticus is to be found the Law of the Sin Offerings as to what and who was to bring which for his sin. There were four categories. Two involved corporate sin; and two involved individual sins. (Leviticus 4) When the High Priest in his official role sinned in such a way as to bring guilt on the whole congregation, the blood was brought into the sanctuary through the ministry of the High Priest himself. (4:3 NKJV, 4:4-5) Likewise if the whole congregation sinned, the same procedure was followed. The High Priest - "the priest that is anointed" - officiated. (4:13-18)

When the Law specified the ritual for individual sins, two things changed. The blood was not brought into the sanctuary, and the ministry was performed by a common priest. (4:25, 30) However, an additional factor was added. The priest who offered the sin offering for the individual had to eat of it, thus bearing the iniquity in himself. (Lev. 6:25-26) The result to the individual - ruler or common person - was that "an atonement" was made and the sin was "forgiven." (Lev. 4:26, 31, 35) For the individual the whole of the work was done in the court.

This service for the individual typified the earthly ministry of Jesus in the court of earth. Laying aside the "form of God" and taking the slave form of man, He partook of our fallen nature. He officiated in giving Himself as the Lamb without spot - a "most holy" sin offering. (Lev. 6:25)

While on earth, Jesus demonstrated His priestly service for the individual. To the man stricken with palsy, Jesus declared - "Thy sins are forgiven thee." The caviling Jews considered this blasphemy, but Jesus, reading their minds, declared - "That ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins, (He said to the sick of palsy), I say unto thee, Arise, and take up thy couch, and go into thine house." (Luke 5:18-26)

Having completed His work as priest, and having offered sacrifice - whole and complete - Jesus ascended into Heaven to minister His blood as High Priest in the tabernacle which the Lord pitched and not man. It is this contrast that is noted in Hebrews 8:1-4. Being a minister of the true tabernacle in the presence of the Majesty in the heavens, He could not and would not do service in the temple on earth, because that service was only typical - an example and shadow. (Heb. 8:5) His was the reality both as a Priest during His earthly ministry, and as the High Priest during His heavenly service.

(For those who wish to pursue this study further, you can obtain our cassette - "The Agenda of the Sanctuary." The price is \$2.00. If ordered alone, please add 50¢ for postage and handling.)

# Adventist Futurists to Meet Under "Mantle" of the Virgin Mary

We received the following announcement -

ADVANCED SEMINAR ON END-TIME EVENTS

January 31 - February 2, 1986

St. Mary's Center .... Toledo, Washington

The same announcement informed us further:

"SPEAKERS AND PANEL MEMBERS INCLUDE:

Robert Hauser, Marian Berry, Charles Wheeling,  
Joe Maniscalco, R & R members, Warren Wag-  
gerby, Milton Crane."

Our request for identification of the Saint  
Mary's Center was answered by a "Mission  
Statement" which read as follows:

St. Mary's Center is a Catholic facility offering Fran-  
ciscan hospitality to groups and individuals of all  
ages, of all faiths and creeds; allowing a re-creation  
of spirit under the mantle of Our Lady to occur within  
the hearts of all who visit; and providing the means  
for Christian educational activities. (Drawn up by the  
St. Mary's Advisory Board, March 1983)

The Adventist Futurists having divorced them-  
selves from the historic Protestant inter-  
pretation of prophecy and accepting in its  
place the Jesuitical methodology of Futurism,  
now propose to advance that study under the  
"Mantle" of the Virgin Mary. What "re-crea-  
tion of spirit" will they receive? What  
"spirit" will be present in such an institu-  
tion?

Of course the Futurists have not been the  
first to use this facility. The same paper  
which headlined the "Mission Statement" was  
happy to show a picture of "The Seventh-  
day Adventist Marriage Encounter couples"  
enjoying their "cook's abundance and vari-  
ety" of food. It is interesting that in  
this advertising "Bulletin," only the Seventh-  
day Adventist church is mentioned by name  
of all the groups using the facility.

No other Protestant Church is named in this  
explanatory "Bulletin" except the Baptists,  
who as a matter of historical record oper-  
ated it for a period four years - 1978-1982.  
When the Franciscan sisters acquired pos-  
session again in 1982, they began a new type  
of program. Franciscan sister Grace Monroe  
moved to St. Mary's and with "the advice,  
guidance, and assistance of many residents"  
of the surrounding area "devoted endless  
hours to returning the facility to a Catholic  
building in atmosphere and appearance." All  
"Catholic" items which had been stored in  
the friary of the Franciscan fathers were  
brought out in the mammoth task of restora-  
tion.

It is in this atmosphere that the Adventist  
Futurists will bring forth their advanced  
Jesuitical interpretation of prophecy.

Comment: It is significant that of all the  
Protestant denominations, only the Seventh-  
day Adventists were named and pictured as  
using the facility. Further, the group pic-  
tured were participants in the Church's Mar-  
riage Encounter Program. This adds to the  
significance for the program was borrowed  
from the Catholic Church even to the adapta-  
tion of its logogram.



This was taken from a brochure pub-  
lished for the Catholic Dioceses  
of Central California advertising  
their Marriage Encounter program.

It must be kept in mind the emphasis on de-  
votion to the "Virgin" has been given added  
impetus because of the regard with which  
the present Pope, John Paul II, gives such  
worship. The sainted doctor of the Roman  
Catholic Church, Alphonsus Maria de Liguori,  
declared in his book - The Glories of Mary:

All graces are dispensed by Mary, and that all who are  
saved are saved only by the means of this Divine Mother  
it is a necessary consequence that the salvation of  
all depends upon preaching Mary. (pp. 7-8)

Now come the Adventist Futurists, who are  
using the prophetic methodology of the Jesuit  
Ribera, to this facility - a facility dedi-  
cated to the elevation of Mary and with the  
objective of "allowing a re-creation of spirit  
under the mantle of Our Lady." This should  
alert and alarm all sincere believers in

## NEPOTISM?

[Nepotism - favoritism shown to a relative (as by giving an appointive job) on the basis of relationship.]

### The Saga of N. C. "Ted" Wilson

At the 1985 General Conference session, "Ted" Wilson, son the General Conference president, was elected Secretary of the Africa-Indian Ocean Division. Ten years ago in 1975, his name first appeared in the Yearbook (p. 702) as a licensed minister serving in the Greater New York Conference (p. 29). The 1976 Yearbook carries the same data. In the Review and Herald (Oct. 21, 1976, p. 24) a news article by Elder Neal C. Wilson, then Vice President of the General Conference for the North American Division, told of a new organization to be under the Division jurisdiction and known as Metro Ministries for New York City and the adjacent metropolitan area.

The 1977 Yearbook lists Metro Ministries with a Board of Directors, chaired by Neal C. Wilson with two Vice Chairmen, Elder J. L. Dittberner, president of the Atlantic Union, and A. J. Patzer, Wilson's Administrative Assistant (31). The administration of Metro Ministry was composed of E. W. Hon, "a veteran evangelist and health educator retired from Australia," as Director. N. J. Satelmajer is listed as associate director with "Ted" Wilson as assistant director. Both Satelmajer and Wilson had been "pastors in the Greater New York Conference prior to this appointment.

The 1978 Yearbook again noted "Ted" Wilson as a licensed minister (p. 826), this time holding that license from the Atlantic Union Conference (p. 40), but still serving as the Assistant Director of Metro Ministry. During this year a change took place, for the 1979 Yearbook lists "Ted" Wilson as an ordained minister of the Atlantic Union Conference (p. 847). He has also become the Director and Treasurer of Metro Ministry with A. J. Patzer chairman of the Executive Committee of Metro. It must be kept in mind that Neal C. Wilson had become president of the General Conference with Patzer continuing as his administrative assistant.

The first director of Metro Ministries, E. W. Hon, became a member of the faculty of Weimar Institute. The Associate Director

- Nikolaus Satelmajer - was given the office of Secretary-Treasurer of the New York Conference, thus clearing the way for "Ted" to take over as Director.

The 1980 Yearbook entries remain the same for both "Ted" Wilson and the administration for Metro. In 1981 a change was made in the chairmanship of the Executive Committee. Elder C. E. Bradford took over from Patzer. (Yearbook, p. 36) Here also is a factor that must be kept in mind. Elder Bradford was Wilson's hand picked successor to be Vice President for the North American Division, and he still operates as Wilson's "side-kick."

In the 1982 Yearbook, the Metro Ministry is no longer listed. We are unable to find any "write-up" in the Review telling of its demise as was written when it was organized. However, the Adventist Review (Dec. 10, 1981) carries the following entry under its column - "To New Posts" -

Norman Clair (Ted) Wilson (N.Y.U. '81), to serve as ministerial association and health director, Africa-Indian Ocean Division, Abidjan, Ivory Coast.

Then again in the Adventist Review (May 31, 1984) young Wilson is listed as "returning to serve as ministerial associate director, health director, Africa-Indian Ocean Division (p. 20)

### Rewards for Those Who Assisted?

The record indicates that "Ted" Wilson was ordained in 1978 (Review, Sept. 28, 1978, p. 23). The recommendation for ordination, if regular procedure was followed, would originate with the Board of Directors of Metro Ministry chaired by Neal C. Wilson, and then approved by the Atlantic Union Committee chaired by J. L. Dittberner.

It was Dittberner who signed the Partnership agreement which has developed in what is termed "The Pawtucket [R.I.] Nursing Home Scandal." The laity who are still investigating this "scandal" should look into a possible correlation between the ordination of "Ted" Wilson, and the halfhearted cooperation of the NAD prexy. (See WWN, XIV4)

At the Dallas General Conference session the Africa-Indian Ocean Division was created with Elder Robert J. Kloosterhuis as president. At the 1985 New Orleans Session,

Incarnation - From p. 3

the same slave form as possessed by man. "In all things it behoved Him to be made like unto His brethren." (Heb. 2:17)

Adam was not created a slave. He became a slave by yielding to the adversary of God. Christ took upon Himself the slave form of man, "degraded and defiled by sin." (4BC:1147); but while "experiencing in Himself the strength of Satan's temptation," (R&H, March 18, 1875), knowing "how strong are the inclinations of the natural heart" (5T:177), He did no sin. (I Peter 2:22) His "likeness" to "sinful flesh" was so identical that He could "condemn sin in the flesh." (Rom. 8:3)

Here the mysterious "how" again enters the picture. How could Jesus, taking "upon Himself fallen suffering human nature, degraded and defiled by sin," accomplish the feat so that God could say - "This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased" (Matt. 17:5) - and the adversary could not challenge the conclusion? Two confessions of Jesus in His humanity answer the question:

"I can of mine own self do nothing." (John 5:30)

"The Father that dwelleth in Me, He doeth the works." (John 14:10)

Having "emptied Himself" of the powers of God, Jesus realized how impossible it was to break the bondage to which man had yielded himself; therefore, He so completely surrendered Himself to the will and power of God, that all the desires arising from the flesh He assumed - and they did arise (Matt. 11:20-26) - could not manifest themselves in word or deed. Such must be also the confessions and surrender of all who would imitate the Pattern.

#

Comment - from page 5

historic Adventism who have been deceived by the speakers and panel members in other meetings which they have conducted in other places. The deep aversion of true Protestantism to Roman Catholicism is muted when its programs and prophetic hermeneutics are espoused.

-----  
"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. It is sent free upon request. For Canada, write - The Adventist Laymen's Foundation of Ontario, P. O. Box 117, Thorne, Ontario, POH 2J0. Any portion of this Thought Paper may be reprinted without further permission by adding the following credit line: "Reprinted from "Watchman, What of the Night?" Lamar, Arkansas.

Nepotism? - From p. 6

Kloosterhuis became a General Vice President and appointed by Wilson to chair the Andrews University board. Adventist Currents (Oct., 1985, p. 21) comments:

Kloosterhuis was not a particularly successful administrator as president of the Africa-Indian Ocean Division, and he seemed more qualified for a general field secretaryship than the exalted office he received.

#### Some Unanswered Questions

In 1980, an Elder G. S. Valleray was elected Secretary of the Africa-Indian Ocean Division. Why was the Treasurer, J.J.N. Nortey, made President at the New Orleans session rather than Valleray? Did Valleray retire, or were their health reasons - or some other reasons?

At the New Orleans session, the African delegations came through loud and clear that they wanted representation at the General Conference officer level. Finally an Elder Matthew A Bediako, president of the West African Union - a Union in the Africa-Indiana Ocean Division - was elected as a General Conference Field Secretary. Why of all the leaders in Africa, and with no Division experience, was Bediako moved to Washington? Was he a viable candidate for the position of Secretary of the Division? Was the same policy followed in elevating "Ted" Wilson to be Secretary of the Division as was followed in making him Director of Metro Ministry - removal of all other viable candidates so that he is the lone choice left?

#

#### OUR MAILING LIST

It has been a number of years since we checked our regular mailing list. We did it on a regular basis the first several years of publication. We do not want to spend funds to send it to those who do not wish to read it. So this year we will begin to send letters of inquiry on a selective basis to those on the mailing list. If you wish to continue to receive the Thought Paper free, we want to know, and your comments regarding the paper. These letters should start going out this next month. We shall look forward to your responses.