

*"Watchman,
what of the night?"*

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

(Matt. 25:6 RSV)



"PRECIOUS MESSAGE" PACKAGED IN JOURNALISTIC DECEPTION

We awaited with keen anticipation the publication of the Nov-Dec., 1988 issue of The 1888 Message, the official organ of Wieland and Short. We wondered what their reaction would be to the various 1888 centennial celebrations. The headline declared - "Mixed Results." It discussed only the Andrews University and Minneapolis observances. Neither Wieland nor Short, or any member of their "Editorial Committee" were present at the John W. Osborn Lectureship series on the West Coast as far as I was able to observe. Since this editor was not present at the Andrews University celebration, he can comment only from information supplied by other observers.

In reading through the article on the Andrews University celebration, two facts as presented do not jibe with information I have in writing, and from reliable sources. It is not that certain statements in The 1888 Message are not verifiable but the omissions from these statements give a different picture than the reader is left with by the editor, Helen Cate. This is not only the case on this report of the centennial celebration at Andrews, but it has been a consistent pattern which can be documented from previous issues of the publication. It is indeed sad when the "most precious message" - a phrase constantly repeated in the newsletter - is packaged in journalistic deception. The message of Christ's righteousness is to be "pure, unadulterated truth." (TM, p. 65)

Here is some documentation: While on the West coast, I first learned of Wieland's invitation to take part in the Andrews University centennial. He had been asked to speak on "The Cross." This assignment he refused, which is understandable. Then he was given the opportunity to choose his own topic. He chose to speak on "Agape" love.

This I verified in a personal conversation with Wieland at Minneapolis. Yet in the newsletter, one is led to believe that Wieland did indeed speak on "The Cross." The presentation he gave is summarized in the Newsletter by a question - "What Happened on the Cross in My Place?" (p. 6) If it is indeed a newsletter, let us have the facts as they are, and not be given managed news and commercials. Since Wieland insisted on his own choice of a topic, and refused to speak on the Cross, the readers have a right to know why, when he has written - In Search of the Cross. Has he not found it yet!

Two other comments are in order. The invitation to speak at Andrews can only be looked upon as a "sop" for compromising his original position on "denominational repentance" and muting the doctrine of the incarnation. One of the leading planners of the Andrews University centennial celebration was Dr. Mervyn Maxwell. He also is the one who reviewed in the "Special Edition" of Ministry on Righteousness by Faith, the revised edition of 1888 Re-Examined. Here is his evaluation:

The original edition was almost too intense to read. But the new edition speaks lovingly of wayward brethren, hopefully of an erring church, and thankfully of God's invitations to repent.

Mercifully, no mention is made of "corporate repentance" and very little of "the sinful nature of Christ," terms that have been stumbling blocks to many erstwhile Wieland and Short admirers. (Feb., 1988, p. 63)

Maxwell also spoke on the West Coast at the John W. Osborn Lectureship series. He revealed that he had had on several occasions extended conversations with Wieland. He also claimed to understand just what Wieland really meant by "denominational repentance." But when Maxwell defined the concept, supposedly Wieland's, he was far afield from what had been written in the original edition of 1888 Re-Examined, and how "the brethren" who reviewed that edition perceived its meaning. (See A Warning and Its Reception, 2nd Printing, Blue Sec., pp. 7-9) All of this leaves open some very interesting questions.

With Wieland removing the "stumbling blocks" by compromising his original message which the Lord gave to him and Short, should he not be "rewarded"? Who would be in a better position to grant that reward than an "erstwhile admirer" who had a hand in putting together the Andrews University celebration? Neither Wieland nor Short spoke at the West Coast celebration - and Wieland closed his active ministry in the Pacific Union Confer-

ence. At Minneapolis, they were ignored, though present. A highly placed source told me that some of "the brethren" in the General Conference are not among the "erstwhile admirers" of Wieland as Maxwell is, even with the compromised position taken by the two men in their revised publication. There was no way from their viewpoint that Wieland and Short could be heard at Minneapolis, and Minneapolis was controlled by the General Conference.

There is another question that will remain unanswered till eternity. It is - What would God have done for these two 1950 "messengers" had they not sold out their original message by compromise in an attempt to be accepted by "the brethren"? There is a difference between compromising a position once taken under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and fine tuning that position by further study. This they failed to do, and took the route which satisfies human nature - compromise!

The section of the Newsletter devoted to Dr. Roger Coon's presentation is so written that the reader is left with the conclusion that the Ellen G. White Estate through its representative endorses Wieland and Short's position on 1888. If Wieland and the editor of the newsletter could forget about being accepted and would be willing to follow truth wherever it leads, they would not have to "package" the "most precious message" in so much deceptive journalism. They quote Coon as follows - all put in direct quotes:

Minneapolis 1888 - if those two words should even stir a flicker of recognition in the eyes of the average Adventist today, it is due undoubtedly to the industry of two loyal Seventh-day Adventist ministers, Brother Wieland and Brother Short... They have through the last three decades been very prominent in keeping before the church and raising its consciousness on the subject of Minneapolis, 1888. (p. 6)

Dr. Coon also spoke at the West Coast celebration at Riverside. From a printed text, which he read, here is what he said without deletions or change:

"Minneapolis/1888!"

That those two words should stir even a flicker of recognition in the eyes of the average Seventh-day Adventist church member a century later, in 1988, is probably and primarily due to the efforts of two Adventist ministers who, almost singlehandedly and for the past three decades, have persistently prodded their church by writing tractates, organizing a study committee, sponsoring field workshops, and publishing a journal devoted to the two landmark convocations held in that northern city a →

hundred years ago, and their aftermath.

Whether one accepts or rejects the basic assumptions and conclusions of Robert J. Wieland and Donald K. Short (and there are many who, while readily acknowledging the industrious, single-minded, persistent dedication, and commendable, undoubted spirit and commitment of these two servants of the Lord, do not view things quite as they do), [Emphasis is Coon's and he made it clear, he was one of the ones who does "not".] yet perforce one must admit, I think, that were it not for Wieland and Short, the interest generated today in our church by Minneapolis/1888 would be substantially less. (Minneapolis/1888: The "Forgotten" Issue, pp. 1, 2)

Just a brief comparison will tell how "managed" were Coon's remarks to give an impression not conveyed in the original text.

There is no question but that the centennial review of 1888 produced some deep study of the issues and events which surrounded the General Conference session in Minneapolis. The stimulus, or the prodding to do so, whichever way one wants to perceive the matter, must be credited to the persistence of Wieland and Short. But now that that has been done, the resulting research must be candidly assessed.

According to The 1888 Message, Wieland in his message at Andrews University based some of his premises on the interview he had with J. S. Washburn in 1950. Washburn, at that time, recalled an interview he had had with Ellen G. White in 1889. While I, too, have on occasion used this Washburn interview to make the same point that Wieland did, I did so with some trepidation. Here is a recall from 60 years previous to the time of the interview given to Wieland. From my own research of the Holy Flesh Movement, I discovered that a "Compiler's Note" in Selected Messages, book 2, p. 31, was based on an interview which told on incidents 62 years previous. The statements of the interview when placed along side of the facts from documents written at the time of the events were in disagreement. The recall was faulty. There is a grave danger in seeking to base a major premise on a sixty-one year recall.

A little heralded presentation, given at the John W. Osborn Lectureship series by Dr. Bert Haloviak of the General Conference Archives, challenges the very foundation of Wieland and Short's premise making central the messages of Jones and Waggoner due to the approval Ellen G. White gave their messages. In his paper, Haloviak chooses two years following 1888 - 1889 and 1899. Interestingly, one of those years - 1889 - is the year in which

Washburn had his interview with Ellen White. Concluding an extensively documented paper, Haloviak stated:

It was Ellen White's analysis of the "new" message that transcended even her endorsement of Jones and Waggoner. While their contributions were limited because of misunderstanding objective righteousness, Ellen White's analysis is still of surpassing importance. As she looked down to the SDA church of today, she made a predictive prophecy: "One interest will prevail, one subject will swallow up every other, - Christ our righteousness." ("After Minneapolis, 1889 and 1899: Three Views of Salvation", pp. 33-34)

Whether the conclusions set forth in this paper will stand up to a critical challenge remains yet to be seen, but that there is contained in that research a challenge to the position Wieland and Short have taken in regard to Ellen G. White's endorsement of Jones and Waggoner, and the significance of that endorsement cannot be gainsaid. In other words, did Ellen G. White give Jones and Waggoner an unconditional endorsement? What did she mean when she wrote to Jones - "My brother, you have had great light. God has made you a lamp that burneth, but your light needs to be more free and clear." (Ibid., p. 31)

There is another area of study which the emphasis on 1888 shed light. The original premise of Wieland and Short was that there needed to be a "denominational repentance" due to the rejection of the message given in 1888 at Minneapolis. The book by Dr. Arnold V. Wallenkampf challenges the Wieland-Short position on that point. (True, the editor of The 1888 Message sought to convey to her readers that Dr. Wallenkampf endorsed what Wieland and Short had been advocating for three decades. He did in some points, but not all, and definitely not some of the theology Wieland is presently advocating. Wieland knows this. This is but another example of the deceptive journalism practiced by the editor of the newsletter. See "Special Issue," Vol. 4, Number 3a, p. 1.)

Wallenkampf in his book - What Every Adventist Should Know About 1888 - after citing references from Ellen G. White, concluded that "whatever sin was committed at the Minneapolis conference was not corporate but personal and individual. In the sight of God, individuals were held responsible for their sin of rejecting God's message of justification and righteousness by faith, and as individuals they had to repent to receive forgiveness for sin and removal of guilt and be restored to

God's favor." (pp. 55-56) Nowhere in the writings of Ellen G. White is to be found a call for "denominational repentance" over the rejection of the message as given by Waggoner and Jones in 1888.

Corporate guilt is a Biblical concept. (Acts 2:36) There was a call for denominational repentance growing out of the rejection of the 1888 message. That call is plainly stated in the Testimonies. On April 21, 1903, Ellen G. White wrote -

Unless the church, which is now being leavened with her own backsliding, shall repent and be converted, she will eat of the fruit of her own doing, until she shall abhor herself. (8T:249; Emphasis mine)

Wieland and Short used this reference in their original 1888 Re-Examined. (p. 203) See A Warning and Its Reception, 2nd Printing, White Sec., p. 196. However, they applied it to the message, rather than to the "backsliding" growing out of the rejection of the message.

When the General Conference reviewed the original manuscript a second time, they cited Ellen G. White's comments in regard to the working of the Lord at the 1901 session of the Church. This was done to refute the charge by Wieland and Short that "we have traveled the road of disillusionment since the Minneapolis meeting in 1888." (Ibid.) It is interesting to note that it is in connection with this charge that the two men quoted the above reference from Volume 8.

When Wieland and Short replied to this "Second Appraisal," they were so intent on defending themselves - a common weakness of us all - that they failed to catch the import of what the "brethren" had cited. These citations need to be carefully examined. The GC recognized the connection between the 1901 session and the counsels arising out of the 1888 message. (See Testimonies to Ministers, p. 363) They prefaced their citations with the following comment:

In the experience of the reorganization of the General Conference in 1901 there was brought about the great changes called for in the E. G. White counsels of the 1890's, and in the words of recognition of changes made, we have the assurance that God was truly blessing and leading His people. (A Warning and Its Reception, 2nd Printing, Mint Sec., p. 32)

From the 1901 General Conference Bulletin, they quoted Ellen G. White as saying:

Who do you suppose has been among us since this Conference began? Who has kept away the objectionable features that generally appear in such a meeting? Who has walked up and down the aisles of this tabernacle? --

The God of heaven and His angels. And they did not come here to tear you to pieces, but to give you right and peaceable minds. They have been among us to work the works of God, to keep back the powers of darkness, that the work God designed should be done and should not be hindered. The angels of God have been working among us. (p. 463)

From the Review, they cited:

During the General Conference the Lord wrought mightily for His people. Every time I think of that meeting, a sweet solemnity comes over me, and sends a glow of gratitude to my soul. We have seen the stately stepplings of the Lord our Redeemer. We praise His holy name; for He has brought deliverance to His people. (Nov. 26, 1901)

If language and inspiration mean anything, this is saying that the 1901 General Conference Constitution was a divinely inspired instrument. It was totally rejected in 1903. It was then that Ellen G. White said the Church "was being leavened with her own backsliding." Over this issue and in this context was the call made for the Church to repent. This was the call for corporate or denominational repentance. (See 8T:247, 249)

If Wieland and Short had only caught this point and restructured their original 1888 Re-Examined in the light of the connection between 1888 and 1901, what a different course our church history might have taken. But instead, when confronted with the challenge of the Centennial, they compromised and a sad picture has followed. It is not too late at least to straighten up the facts, and in humility confess an unwarranted stubbornness (I Sam. 15:23). It perchance could lead to a blessed experience at the foot of the Cross "without the camp." (Heb. 13:13)

WHG

IN THE NEWS

National & International Religion Report, Vol. 2, No.25, p. 4.

Is "Seventh-day Adventist" a brand name or a generic label like "Methodist" and "Baptist"? After firing charismatic-minded intern pastor John R. Marik for insubordination in 1981 and barring him from his church in Hawaii, the Seventh-day Adventist denomination registered the words "Seventh-day Adventist" as a trade name with the U.S. patent office. Meanwhile, Marik founded a tiny splinter congregation, which named itself the Seventh-day Adventist Congregational Church of Kona. When Marik and his people refused to stop using the SDA descriptive, SDA leaders filed suit in April 1987. The federal district court in Hawaii

JUDGING - - OR FRUIT INSPECTING?

Allen Stump

Jesus said - "Judge not, that ye be not judged. For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged: and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again." (Matt. 7:1-2) Also, in the same sermon, Jesus said - "Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. Ye shall know them by their fruit." (7:15-16a)

Where do we draw the line between judging and fruit inspecting? This question has caused much perplexity to sincere Adventists who wish to check the evils in the Church, and yet fear of being perceived as being judgmental. In seeking an answer to this question, let us be guided by the directive of Jesus: "Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." (Matt. 18:3) Laying aside our own opinions, let us hear the words of the Scriptures, and the counsel of the Writings as wisdom for us.

Numbers 16 records the rebellion of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram. These men with 250 of the princes of Israel accused Moses and Aaron of assuming too much responsibility. What was Moses' first reaction? "He fell upon his face in silent appeal to God." (PP 398) Was Moses angry? Yes, Moses was "very wroth." (16:15) Although caught by surprise, "he arose sorrowful indeed, but calm and strong." (PP, Ibid.) What does this tell us? It is not necessary for a servant of God to be a wimp when dealing with rebellion! The truth must be spoken and spoken plainly. Yet as in the case of Moses, the servant of God must be both calm and strong. Had we been living at that time, we might have advised Moses and Aaron to try to keep the matter as quiet as possible - and by all means don't name names! Yet this public rebellion had to be dealt with in a public manner. Within the sight of the congregation, God caused "the earth [to open] her mouth and [swallow] them up, and their houses, and all the men that appertained unto Korah, and all their goods. They and all that appertained to them went down alive into the pit, and the earth closed upon them: and they perished from among the congregation. And all Israel that were around about them fled at the cry of them: for they said, Lest

the earth swallow us up also. And there came out a fire from the Lord, and consumed the two hundred and fifty men that offered incense." (16:32-35)

Korah and his companions in rebellion "had spoken flattering words and had professed great interest and love for them, and the people concluded that Korah and his companions must have been good men, and that Moses had by some means been the cause for their destruction." (PP 402) Korah and those who rebelled were nothing less than "wolves in sheep's clothing." Of such, Jesus said - "Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them." (Matt. 7:20) Jesus then declared:

Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven. Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye workers of iniquity. (7:21-23)

Many will profess works for the Saviour; yes, even many wonderful works. The prophecy found in the Writings finds its fulfillment in the "many voices" being heard today. It reads:

After the truth has been proclaimed as a witness to all nations, every conceivable power of evil will be set in operation, and minds will be confused by many voices crying, "Lo, here is Christ, Lo, he is there. This is the truth, I have a message from God, he has sent me with great light." (Review & Herald, Dec. 13, 1892)

Many will profess great interest and love for the people as did Korah and his companions, yet the answer to them all will be - "I never knew you."

These are sobering thoughts which should help to awaken, even some who profess to be awake, out of their Laodicean stupor. How easy it is to use Neal Wilson, or John Carter for their spiritual dart board (not that their apostasy should be left uncovered) and yet fail to expose those who speak "flattering word" and profess a "great interest and love" for the people of God. The reason is - they themselves are "wolves in sheep's clothing." To the average concerned Adventist, most of the "many voices" who are confusing

them are perceived by them as very pious. They are deceived by the smooth words and the "professed great interest and love" expressed for them. Satan well knows that the more informed God's people become, the more difficult it will be to deceive them. Therefore, his deceptions become more subtle, subtle enough to deceive if possible the very elect! Thus, he inspires these "many voices" - some even speaking "historic Adventism" yet tinged with deadly error. How are we to know if their message is from God? How is the fruit to be inspected? By the standard from Heaven's Bureau of Standards and Measurements - "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." (Isa. 8:20) In other words, by a plain, "Thus saith the Lord" - not human opinion!

The Bible is replete with illustrations of God's spokesmen not only denouncing sin, but also denouncing those who were instrumental in leading into or condoning sin. Sometimes specific persons were mentioned. Examples of such instances would be Elijah and Ahab; Samuel and Saul; John the Baptist and Herod; Paul and Alexander the coppersmith; Peter and John before Annas and the kindred of the high priest. Many denunciations were general. Almost all the prophets gave messages of warning against the apostasy of their times. A reading of the following texts will illustrate this well:

For the leaders of this people cause them to err; and they that are led of them are destroyed. (Isa. 9:16)

His watchman are blind: they are all ignorant, they are all dumb dogs, they cannot bark; sleeping lying down, loving to slumber. Yea they are greedy dogs which can never have enough, and they are shepherds that cannot understand. (Isa. 56:10-11a)

My people have been lost sheep: their shepherds have caused them to go astray. (Jer. 50:6a)

Many pastors have destroyed my vineyard. (Jer. 12:10)

(Also read the 34th chapter of Ezekiel.)

Even though Jesus spoke often in parables, the meaning of His messages was so clear as to whom He meant that the Jewish leaders desired His death. As one reads the story of the wicked husbandmen (Matt. 21:33-46) there is little doubt as to whom Jesus had in mind. The woes that Jesus pronounced against the scribes and Pharisees (Matt. 23) would never be used for illustration in a book - How to Win Friends and Influence People.

We, as a people, have believed the Three

Angels of Revelation 14 are symbolic of a people carrying a message to a dying world. That message is not all nice and spice. The chapter - "The Seal of God" - speaks of a people who "will not hold their peace to obtain the favor of any." (5T:210) Their message is not one of "peace and safety." God's true messengers carry an Elijah message. John the Baptist carried the Elijah message for his day. Both Elijah and John were very clear and specific not only about sin and deception, but also about those who were perpetrating the error. John was the forerunner of Christ's first advent, as we are to be of Christ's second advent. Of John, we read:

The forerunner of Christ's first advent was a very plain-spoken man. He rebuked sin, and called things by their right names. He laid the ax at the root of the tree. He thus addressed one class of professed converts who came to be baptized of him in Jordan: "O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come? Bring forth therefore fruits meet for repentance." (1T: 321)

This is immediately followed by this specific counsel:

In this fearful time, just before Christ is to come the second time, God's faithful preachers will have to bear a still more pointed testimony than was borne by John the Baptist. A responsible, important work is before them; and those who speak smooth things, God will not acknowledge as His shepherds. A fearful woe is upon them. (Ibid.)

The position of judge in the judgment is to be left to God alone. He only can read the motives, the thoughts and intents of the heart. However, God has left the fruit market open for inspection by those who hold truth to be dearer than the fables of men. Some fruit that is obviously spoiled can be readily passed by. Other fruit appears to be quite nice on the outside - even some of the professed "elect" think so - yet when opened by the sharp two-edged sword of God's word, it is exposed for what it really is, using Jesus' illustration, a wolf in sheep's clothing. Finally, there is fruit that not only bears the marks of heaven, but is also the real thing. For those whom God has called to inspect fruit, let them first fall upon their face as did Moses - seeking God's Spirit of discernment. For those who question that calling of others, let them use the simple test of God's word to inspect the inspector!

One final observation on fruit inspection: To those who do not feel the burden to speak out, and who do not believe in others speaking out, especially when a favorite personality of theirs is mentioned by name or inference, the counsel of Gamaliel is apropos: "Refrain from these men, and let them alone: for if this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to nought: but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it; lest haply ye be found even to fight against God." (Acts 5:38-39)

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Note: The same day that Brother Stump's article was in P.O. Box 789, the following letter from the West Coast was also there.

Since the old saying is, Confession is good for the soul, I have a confession to make to you.

I have been guilty of not only seeing you in my own mind as a "Danite", re: the 144,000 of Rev. 7, but have on occasion expressed that opinion to ... [others] ...

I not only confess but wish to state as my present conviction that you are not a "Danite" but rather one who is dedicated to truth above everything else. Certainly you have your way of working and expressing your convictions, to which you have a perfect right as a free moral agent, and it may not set well with everyone. Not that I am among the latter. I see you with such a love for truth that you are constrained by that love to express it at times in ways that seem too strong to others.

I'm sure you will accept this in the way in which it is offered, and still consider me a friend and brother in the Lord Jesus.

From AFRICA - also the same day.

Greetings in Jesus' Name. I am grateful that I am getting your unique articles "Watchman, What of the Night?" As said by the pen of inspiration, I quote:-

"...If I think I have light, I shall do my duty in presenting it." TM 534 "I must speak to my brethren nigh and afar off. I cannot hold my peace..." TM 347

This is exactly what you are trying to do. It is truly the fact that you are presenting to us here, and you have obviously shown that

we are all brethren no matter the colour or races. Thank you so much for helping us here to know how to stand for the Lord in this last days.

I did not appear or attend any [Wilson's] meetings as it was mostly political. Many heads of other denominations have visited.. .., but Elder Wilson and Pope only were given the State 'Army' guides in all their visits. And it was sad to see an Adventist head eating with the Christian Council officers or heads and pastors of other denominations including Catholic and Moslems. What are these Religio-Political leadership in the Adventist Church?

Please kindly try to help me to know... the seven named Independent Ministries so that I can study well about them with other brethren. For as we have just begun this Reformation work, we may be mislead if you do not help and guide us.

IN THE NEWS - from page 4, col. 2

ruled against Marik and his church, then issued a warrant for his arrest on contempt charges and levied a \$500-a-day fine against the congregation. Marik has been in hiding for over a year, according to a Los Angeles Times account. A SDA attorney, Max Corbett, has been pleading the "generic" argument on his behalf without fee -- and without success so far. SDA officials say only four of 40 contested usages of the SDA name have gone to court. Two small congregations settled out of court and stopped using the name. A dispute involving a 600-member homosexual group, Seventh-day Adventist Kinship International, is scheduled for trial in Los Angeles in February.

Question: If the issue is simply that the name, Seventh-day Adventist, is "generic," what position will Max Corbett and Vance Ferrell take on the Kinship trial?

"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 Elder Wm. H. Grotheer
Contributing 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¢)