



*"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

Adventist Editor Lies to Readers

In the May 14, 1981, issue of the Adventist Review, the associate editor, Wm. G. Johnsson, began a series of editorials on "What the Sanctuary Doctrine Means Today." In the very first article, he presents an assumption which is contrary to fact, and history. He wrote:

The Church in General Conference Session, meeting in Dallas last April, reaffirmed its confidence in this historic doctrine of the sanctuary as it voted the 27 statements of fundamental belief. In August, 1980, the doctrine received further confirmation and elaboration in the consensus statement "Christ in the Heavenly Sanctuary," voted by the members of the Sanctuary Review Committee at Glacier View, Colorado. Thus the Adventist Church of the late twentieth century expresses its continuity with the beliefs of the pioneers. (p. 13)

Two documents are here cited, but no documentation is presented from either to prove his assumption that the Church reaffirmed its confidence in the "historic doctrine of the sanctuary," or that these statements express "continuity with the beliefs of the pioneers." Either Dr. Johnsson doesn't know what the pioneers taught, which is doubtful, or else he is seeking to allay the thinking of concerned Adventists that the Church has in deed departed from the historic faith of the pioneers. This latter possibility is wherein the deception lies, for his concluding sentence of the first editorial reads - "In continuity with the pioneers but in the light of our times, we hope to make the doctrine our own." Truth is timeless; that which seeks to accommodate to the times, is compromise and heresy.

Before analyzing the two documents referred to by Dr. Johnsson to support his attempted covert deception of his readers, we shall first note just what the pioneers stated was their belief in regard to the sanctuary, and the ministry of Christ therein.

In the 1889 Yearbook, the official statement of beliefs,¹ in its second article, declared:

II. That there is one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the Eternal Father, the one by whom he created all things, and by whom they do consist; 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; 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 (Acts 3:19) and borne away from the sanctuary, as shown in the service of the Levitical priesthood, which foreshadowed and prefigured the ministry of our Lord in heaven.

To this statement, an explanatory footnote which is worthy of careful thought was given, which read:

Some thoughtless persons accuse us of rejecting the atonement of Christ entirely, because we dissent from the view that the atonement was made upon the cross, as is generally held. But we do nothing of the kind; we only take issue as to the time when the atonement is to be made. We object to the view that the atonement was made upon the cross, because it is utterly contrary to the type, which placed the atonement at the end of the yearly sanctuary service, not at the beginning, and because it inevitably leads to one of two great errors. Thus, Christ on the cross bore the sins of all the world. John said, "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away [margin, beareth] the sin of the world!" John 1: 29. Peter tells us when he thus bore the sins of the world: "Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree." I Peter 2:24. Paul says that "he died for all." II Cor. 5:14-15. That which Christ did upon the cross, therefore, was done indiscriminately and unconditionally for all the world; and if this was the atonement, then the sins of all the world have been atoned for, and all will be saved. This is Universalism in full blossom. But all men will not be saved; hence the sins of all were not atoned for upon the cross; and if Christ's work there was the atonement, then his work was partial, not universal, as the scriptures above quoted assert, and he atoned for only a favored few who were elected to be saved, and passed by all others who were predestinated to damnation. This would establish the doctrine of election and predestination in its most ultra form,-- an error equally unscriptural and objectionable with the former. We avoid both these errors, and find ourselves in harmony with the Mosaic type, and with all the declarations of the Scriptures, when we take the position that what Christ did upon the cross was to provide a divine sacrifice for the world, sufficient to save all, and offered it to every one who will accept it; that he then, through the merits of his offering, acts as the mediator with the Father till time shall end, securing the forgiveness of sins for all who seek him for it; and that as the last service of his priesthood, he will blot out the sins of all who have repented and been converted (Acts 3:19), the atonement not being completed till this work of blotting out of sin is done. Thus Christ atones, not for the sins of the whole world, to save all, not for a favored few only, elected from all eternity to be saved, but for those who, as free moral agents, have voluntarily sought from him the forgiveness of sin

and everlasting life. And all for whom the atonement is made, will be forever saved in his kingdom. This view in no way detracts from the merit of Christ's offering, nor from the value and glory of his atoning work for men. While on this line, we are not driven into Universalism on the one hand, nor into election and reprobation on the other. (Emphasis his)

Further, Article X, speaking particularly of the sanctuary, stated:

That the sanctuary of the new covenant is the tabernacle of God in heaven, of which Paul speaks in Hebrews 8 and onward, and of which our Lord, as great high priest, is minister; that this sanctuary is the antitype of the Mosaic tabernacle, and that the priestly work of our Lord, connected therewith, is the antitype of the work of the Jewish priests of the former dispensation; that this, and not the earth, is the sanctuary to be cleansed at the end of the two thousand and three hundred days, what is termed its cleansing being in this case, as in the type, simply the entrance of the high priest into the most holy place, to finish the round of service connected therewith, by making the atonement and removing from the sanctuary the sins which had been transferred to it by means of the ministration in the first apartment; and that this work in the antitype, beginning in 1844, consists in actually blotting out the sins of believers, and occupies a brief but indefinite space of time, at the conclusion of which the work of mercy for the world will be finished, and the second advent of Christ will take place.

Finally, Article XXI speaks of the "investigative judgment." It reads:

That the time of the cleansing of the sanctuary, synchronizing with the time of the proclamation of the third message (Rev. 14:9, 10), is a time of investigative judgment, first, with reference to the dead, and secondly, at the close of probation, with reference to the living, to determine who of the myriads now sleeping in the dust of the earth are worthy of a part in the first resurrection, and who of its living multitudes are worthy of translation, - points which must be determined before the Lord appears.

Before comparing the position of the pioneers with the two documents cited by Dr. Johnsson, let us summarize just what the 1889 Statement of Beliefs declared to be the position of the pioneers on the ministry of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary, and how they looked upon the sanctuary itself. There are seven main points to the doctrine of the sanctuary as understood by the pioneers:

- 1) Christ's death on the Cross was declared to be "our sacrifice." (They did not apply the term "sacrificial atonement" to the Cross in any statement of their fundamental beliefs.)
- 2) Christ is declared to have ascended "on high to be our 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 who penitently come to him."

- 3) The closing portion of Christ's work is to make "the great atonement for the sins of all" who have accepted Him as Saviour, and "their sins will then be blotted out and borne away from the sanctuary." This position was declared to be based on "the service of the Levitical priesthood, which foreshadowed and prefigured the ministry of our Lord in heaven."
- 4) The sanctuary of the new covenant is the tabernacle of God in heaven "of which Paul speaks in Hebrews 8 and onward, and of which our Lord, as great high priest, is minister."
- 5) This heavenly sanctuary "is the sanctuary to be cleansed at the end of the two thousand and three hundred days, and what is termed its cleansing" is "simply the entrance of the high priest into the most holy place" to make atonement and remove from the sanctuary "the sins which have been transferred to it by the ministration in the first apartment."
- 6) The second apartment ministry of Christ began in 1844.
- 7) This time of "the cleansing of the sanctuary" parallels the time of the proclamation of the third angel's message of Revelation 14, and is termed "a time of investigative judgment."

The 1980 Statement of Beliefs

The first document cited by Dr. Johnson in his editorial was the Statement of Beliefs voted at the 1980 General Conference Session in Dallas, Texas. Number 9 on "The Life, Death, and Resurrection of Christ" reads:

In Christ's life of perfect obedience to God's will, His suffering, death, and resurrection, God has provided the only means of atonement for human sin, so that those who by faith accept this atonement may have eternal life, and the whole creation may better understand the infinite and holy love of the Creator. This perfect atonement vindicates the righteousness of God's law and the graciousness of His character; for it both condemns our sin and provides for our forgiveness. The death of Christ is substitutionary and expiatory, reconciling and transforming. The resurrection of Christ proclaims God's triumph over the forces of evil, and for those who accept the atonement assures their final victory over sin and death. It declares the Lordship of Jesus, before whom every knee in heaven and on earth will bow. (Adventist Review, May 1, 1980, p. 25)

Number 23 in the Dallas Statement on "Christ's Ministry in the Heavenly Sanctuary" states:

There is a sanctuary in heaven, the true tabernacle which the Lord set up and not man. In it Christ ministers on our behalf, making available to believers the benefits of His atoning sacrifice offered once for all on the cross. He was inaugurated as our great High Priest and began His intercessory ministry at the time of the ascension. In 1844, at the end of the 2300 days, He entered the second and last phase of His atoning ministry. It is a work of investigative judgment which is part of the ultimate disposition of all sin,

typified by the cleansing of the ancient Hebrew sanctuary on the Day of Atonement. In that typical service the sanctuary was cleansed with the blood of animal sacrifices, but the heavenly things are purified with the perfect sacrifice of the blood of Jesus. The investigative judgment reveals to heavenly intelligencies who among the dead are asleep in Jesus and therefore, in Him, are deemed worthy to have a part in the first resurrection. It also makes manifest who, among the living are abiding in Christ, keeping the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus, and in Him, therefore, are ready for translation into His everlasting kingdom. This judgment vindicates the justice of God in saving those who believe in Jesus. It declares that those who have remained loyal to God shall receive the kingdom. The completion of this ministry of Christ will mark the close of human probation before the Second Advent. (Ibid, p. 27)

Before considering the Glacier View Consensus Document, we should note the contrast between the present statement of beliefs, and the position of our pioneers. The Church is now on record as believing that Christ's life, suffering, death, and resurrection is "the only means of atonement for human sin." This is called a "perfect atonement." Now nothing can be added to something already perfect - it is completed and final.² Lest someone say that I am reading into this concept something not intended, I would remind all, of the arguments used by Adventist evangelists in regard to the Law of God. The Law of God is declared to be "perfect." (Ps. 19:7) Therefore, nothing can be added to it, nor taken from it without destroying its perfection. This same line of reasoning is being applied in regard to the declaration concerning the atonement in the Dallas statement of beliefs. This is not the historic teaching of the pioneers who declared the Cross to be but the "sacrifice," and that Christ ascended to heaven, where, He secured through the merits of His shed blood forgiveness and pardon. This was the beginning of the atonement which would be finalized in "the great atonement."

Nowhere in the Dallas statement is Christ presented as making "the great atonement" as our pioneers taught. He is rather presented "as making available to believers the benefits of His atoning sacrifice offered once for all on the cross." This concept is found nowhere in any previous statement of beliefs issued by the Church, not even in the 1931 Statement which was the first revision of the original position. The first appearance of this concept in Adventist literature was in the book, Questions on Doctrine, pp. 354-355, 381. This book as is known was the result of the SDA-Evangelical Conferences of 1955-1956, those tragic conferences which began the wholesale adulteration of our historic faith. As for 1844, the Dallas declaration has Christ entering "the second and last phase of His atoning ministry." Our pioneers differentiated between the holy and the most holy places of the heavenly sanctuary. The term - phases - as applied to Christ's ministry in the sanctuary above did appear first in the 1931 Statement, and has been used ever since.

Our pioneers taught that the work of the great atonement, "beginning in 1844, consists in actually blotting out the sins of believers." (see p. 3) This concept is omitted in the Dallas beliefs, referring to the "the heavenly things" as "purified with the perfect sacrifice of the blood of Jesus." (see above.) From this point on the Dallas statement does in thought parallel closely the

1889 Statement of Beliefs, Article XXI. Thus no one who wishes to be strictly honest with the facts can conclude that the Statement of Beliefs voted at Dallas, "reaffirmed" the "historic doctrine of the sanctuary" as taught by "the pioneers" of this Movement. It just doesn't!

The Glacier View Document

In considering the Glacier View Consensus Statement on "Christ in the Heavenly Sanctuary," there are several facts which must be kept in mind. One, while voted by the Sanctuary Review Committee, which had been appointed by the President of the General Conference in consultation with his advisors, and which included a wide range of theologians and administrators from the world field, this Statement does not have the force, nor authority of a Statement of Beliefs voted by a General Conference in session. Two, it is a "consensus" statement, or to put it in simple language, a compromise statement. And three, it is declared to be "an elaboration of the Dallas statement" by its own formulators. (Ministry, Oct. 1980, p. 16) We have already documented the fact that the Dallas statement does not reaffirm the historic doctrine of the sanctuary as taught by our pioneers. More elaboration of heresy does not produce truth.

The first section of the document reviews "The Significance of the Doctrine," and in so doing states how our founding fathers viewed this teaching - as a "key" which unlocked "the mystery of the disappointment of 1844" and which "opened to view a complete system of truth." The second section on "The Sources of Our Understanding" lists the books of the Bible in which certain aspects of this doctrine are taught - Leviticus, Hebrews, Daniel, and Revelation. Then it states - "The writings of Ellen White also contain much material dealing with Christ in the heavenly sanctuary." This is all true, but in what the Committee states the Bible teaches on this doctrine, the compromise and deviation begin to appear. The following sections of the document contain statements to which both those who wish to maintain the historic position of the Church in some form can point, and those who would seek to reinterpret the sanctuary doctrine can agree with. This is substantiated by two facts.

1) Dr. Desmond Ford's position in regard to this Consensus Statement. It states:

I am greatly encouraged by the consensus statement, "Christ in the Heavenly Sanctuary," and the honest, frank acknowledgements it makes. In harmony with its essence, as I understand it, I can gladly teach and preach such to the same extent as the majority of my fellow teachers present at Glacier View. (Letter to Parmenter, President of the Australasian Division, Aug. 26, 1980, Ministry, op. cit., p. 11)

2) An Open Letter sent to Elder Neal Wilson by Concerned Pastors and Scholars at Andrews University Seminary and Graduate School. This letter written in defense of Dr. Ford listed five reasons why the action of the hierarchy against Dr. Ford was improper. Two of these are pertinent to the questions under discussion in this thought paper. They are as follows:

1. These two consensus statements unanimously voted at Glacier View by his peers were accepted by Dr. Ford. He was therefore in harmony with his brethren.
2. These consensus documents actually affirm Dr. Ford's major biblical

concerns. For instance, they concede:

a) The book of Hebrews pictures Christ going "within the veil," i.e., into the Most Holy Place (not the holy place) at His ascension to be our intercessor. The book of Hebrews does not teach a two-apartment or two-phase ministry.

b) The defilement of the sanctuary in Daniel 8 is not caused by our sins but by the desecrating work of the little horn. In other words, the term "cleansing of the sanctuary" in Daniel 8 does not refer to an investigation of our sins but to God's victory over antichrist in our behalf.

c) The year-day principle is not explicitly identified as a scriptural rule for interpreting time prophecies.

d) Under inspiration, the New Testament writers looked for the second coming of Christ in their day. They did not expect to wait 1900 years.

e) Our acquittal in the judgment is based solely on the continued decision we make with respect to Jesus. To have accepted His death on our behalf is to have passed already from condemnation to salvation. (Evangelica, Oct., 1980, p. 10, emphasis theirs.)

Clearly, neither the Statement of Beliefs as voted at Dallas, nor the Consensus Documents voted at Glacier View, reaffirms the historic doctrine of the sanctuary as held by the pioneers. The associate editor's assertion in the Adventist Review that they do, is simply, to put it in plain language - a lie!

What, then, is his objective in writing these editorials on what the sanctuary means today? On this point he is honest enough to tell you. He does not intend to "develop the pioneer's understanding of it." He suggests building on this base, but present "what the sanctuary teaching means to us" in 1980's. To those who might fear any "updating," he argues, "But really we have no choice." Then he writes:

These remarks hold true for all doctrine. Each generation, receiving truths from the pioneers, must find them anew for themselves. That is why the task of theology is never done; the foundations remain from age to age, but their application and personal appropriation have to be discovered fresh in each time and place. (Adventist Review, May 14, 1981, p. 13)

This statement is a subtle, potent mixture of truth in the context of error.

Truth is eternal, even as God is eternal. It is not a matter of adapting truth to the times; it is a matter of surrendering the human soul to the truth. When we do not wish to accept truth because it is not ecumenical, and we might appear as "cultish," or a member of a "sect" - it is then that we seek to adjust truth so that it can become acceptable, and we can be freed from the "scaffold." But when in my inmost soul, I desire truth - pure and unadulterated, even the righteousness of Christ (TM, p. 65)- I do not have to restate it, but can accept it as the truth as it is in Jesus, yes, even in the same language as others before me, who also received it as the truth in Jesus. It is the carnal heart that wishes acceptability with his fellow peers in the theology of the world which wants to

update the truth once committed to the saints. But he who like Paul is willing to glory only in the Cross, has no problem with the historic doctrine of the sanctuary as understood by our pioneers. It needs no updating; it needs only renewed proclamation based on the same Bible texts which our pioneers used, and using only the same Biblical hermeneutics used by them.

¹Some have maintained that the Church did not have an official Statement of Beliefs prior to the authorized 1931 Statement which was affirmed at the 1950 General Conference Session. The Editorial Committee for Questions on Doctrine used this hedge, stating - "No statement of Seventh-day Adventist belief can be considered official unless it is adopted by the General Conference in quadrennial session, when accredited delegates from the whole world field are present." (p. 9) But this criterion is of recent origin. Our spiritual fathers strongly affirmed that "Seventh-day Adventists have no creed but the Bible," but they were equally as positive in asserting that they held "to certain well-defined points of faith." (1889 Yearbook, p. 147) By placing these "well-defined points of faith" in the Yearbook, they gave them official status. The Yearbook was authorized by the General Conference Committee at its 21st Session in 1882. An announcement of its issuance stated that it "contains the statistics of our denomination, the proceedings of our General Conference, T. and M. [Tract and Missionary] Society, and other associations, the financial condition of our institutions, our General and State Conference constitutions." (SDA Encyclopedia, 1976 edition, p. 1336) How more official could any Church document be? Into this book, in 1889, they placed the "Fundamental Principles of Seventh-day Adventists." This statement of belief, unchanged appeared in the Yearbook for the following years, 1905-1914. From 1895 - 1903 no Yearbook was issued, it being during those years, replaced by the General Conference Bulletins.

²The Adult Sabbath School Lessons for the Second Quarter, 1981, contains the following teaching:

On the cross Jesus cried, "It is finished." Before Him was the tomb, the resurrection, the ascension, His priestly ministry, the second coming, the millennium, the executive judgment, and the new creation. It is obvious therefore that the sacrificial atonement for the sin of the race was "finished." There would thereafter remain no more sacrifice for sin. (See Heb. 10:26) (p. 57)

The text - Hebrews 10:26 - used to support this teaching of neo-Adventism is torn completely out of context. The book of Hebrews teaches that Christ ever lives to make intercession for us. (Heb. 7:25) And what is the basis of this intercession? - the merits of His shed blood. There does remain a sacrifice for sins - to all who do not continue in willful sin - till that priestly ministry ceases. Jesus is presented in Revelation as "a Lamb as it had been slain," securing for us from the Father "the seven Spirits of God sent forth into all the earth." (Rev. 5:6) This Divine Spirit convicts of sin, righteousness, and judgment, presenting at the judgment bar of the human heart, as the great Paraclete, the virtues, merits, and glory of the Lord Jesus Christ, saying to each wayward child of humanity - Come, follow Me, I will guide thee home.

✓

NEWS FLASH! The General Conference has authorized the placing of seat-belts in all pews of all SDA Churches. The Curia on the Sligo had just received a divine revelation that God intends to use the pews for the grandstand around the Sea of Glass.

The Case of the Russian "Robin Hood"

An urgent appeal for a world campaign to free a Russian "Robin Hood" held in prison since July 1980 reached the West recently.

Rostislav Galetsky, a leading pastor of the True and Free Seventh Day Adventist Church, eluded the KGB for five years. While his wife lived in the central Russian town of Voronezh, he flitted invisibly round the country, comforting the oppressed, issuing samizdat reports of arrests and searches, and appearing in Moscow to speak at press conferences for foreign journalists. Each time the KGB arrived too late: he had slipped away to his next assignment.

The appeal is signed by his Church's governing council and calls for the release of 39 church members in all and of other jailed Soviet Christians. "We are deeply convinced," the council writes, "that only an intensified campaign by the world community to defend these unjustly persecuted Christians can produce a breakthrough in our struggle for our legal rights, in freeing the prisoners of conscience and in achieving genuine freedom of belief."

Galetsky, now aged 32, became well-known in Moscow in 1977-78 when he gave an interview to the *New York Times* and publicly supported leading dissidents who had been arrested. In February 1978, he spoke out on behalf of Alexander Ginsburg at a press conference and as a result was strongly attacked in the government paper, *Izvestia*.

Following the arrest in March 1978 of Adventist Church head Vladimir Shelkov, Galetsky's role grew still more in importance. Shelkov died in January 1980 in a Siberian camp, aged 84.

The True and Free Seventh Day Adventist Church is not officially recognized by the Soviet state. Since breaking away from its parent body, the official Adventist Church, in the 1920's, it has refused to submit to the extensive controls which the authorities

try to impose on all religious communities. The True and Free Adventists argue—along with other unofficial churches—that these controls violate a basic principle of the Soviet Constitution which decrees the separation of church and state.

The official Adventists have been tolerated in recent years, while since early 1978 the KGB has been waging a strong campaign against the unofficial wing. "In the last two years," the appeal says, "more than 200 police searches have been carried out in Adventists' homes, involving confiscation of purely religious and human rights literature, and 39 people have been imprisoned."

Even before this campaign, which has been conducted in a dozen localities from Tashkent in Central Asia to Riga on the Baltic, Galetsky was evading the police to avoid arrest.

"As a true and conscientious pastor" the appeal says, "he helped persecuted believers with sensitivity and compassion. By his active pastoral witness and participation in the human rights struggle, publicizing acts of violence and



persecution by the state atheists against innocent believers, Galetsky incurred the special hatred of the KGB." Eventually he was caught in Moscow, where he is being held in Batyrki prison on charges of circulation of deliberately false fabrications and slandering the Soviet State and social order.

The Right To Believe, No 1, 1981, p. 1

Note:— It was in 1977 that Elder Alf Lohne of the General Conference visited Russia, including Tashkent, to prepare the way for the recognized "state visit" of Elder R. H. Pierson. Elder Lohne in the Review (July 14, 1977, p. 4) noted "there were many believers" in the Tashkent district, but Elder Pierson never visited there. Was it merely coincidental that the preliminary and official visit of the Takoma Park based hierarchy paralleled the beginning of the "strong campaign against" the True and Free Seventh-day Adventists in Russia?

As soon as we can find out, we will let you know how you can help in "a world campaign to free" Elder Galetsky.

INDEFINITE LEAVE FOR LITERATURE EVANGELIST

On May 21, 1981, Mr. Barry George, Publishing Director of the Oklahoma Conference, and Mr. Ralph Sellers, Assistant Publishing Director of the Southwestern Union, came unexpectedly, and unannounced to the home of Brother and Sister Ray Cutts of Oklahoma City. These directors indicated they had been checking the church records, and discovered that the Cutts had not paid any tithe for three months. However, just one month prior to this - April 27 - Sister Joy Cutts received a letter from Mr. George commending her on the fine job she had done for a certain "ladies meeting." In this letter, George wrote: "Tell Ray I said Hi, and that I appreciate him too. God is truly blessing him in his sales in his district. We are truly happy to have you both here in Oklahoma. You have really helped our program here."

The Cutts indicated surprise that these men had access to confidential church records - this should tell all the laity something - and stated that they had made out their tithe checks but had been holding them questioning whether to pay them to the conference because of the misuse of funds by the Church. [Reports are available of the involvement of local conferences in unsecured loans to the Davenport Financial enterprises, plus reliable reports that the General Conference still have approximately 140 Million dollars in the Wall Street stock market.] The Cutts are convinced had they turned their tithe checks over to these men, they would have received warm hand shakes, and words of encouragement to keep up the good work they were doing in sales.

However, these Directors began attacking the beliefs of historic Adventism. The Cutts showed them Andreasen's Letters to the Churches, and the Documentary on the SDA-Evangelical Conferences of 1955-1956. These men replied that even if true, because they criticized the hierarchy of the Church, they were of the devil. Other documents showing the departure of the Church from its historic position were also shown to these men, but they had no answer. As a result, they advised Brother Cutts to request an indefinite leave of absence. He was assured by these representatives of the Church's hierarchy that should he become a "modern Seventh-day Adventist," he would be welcomed back into the literature ministry.

In response to this Brother Cutts on May 22, 1981 wrote to HHES the following:

On May 21/81 you came to my house and requested that I ask for a leave of absence indefinitely from the Oklahoma Conference of Seventh-day Adventists. This came, you said, because you required me to be a 100% Modern Seventh-day Adventist and to support the church in this context. In all conscience I must be a traditional Seventh-day Adventist following faithfully in the footsteps of our Seventh-day Adventist forefathers.

As of the date of this writing, Brother Cutts is owed by HHES the sum of \$1,310.76, which has not been paid, even though the law of the State of Oklahoma forbids the withholding of any such funds due. (All supporting documents upon which the above article is based is before us as we write.)

✓

"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