



*"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*

# TRUTH UNDER ATTACK

## Hierarchy Decline To Defend Historic Adventism

On three consecutive Sunday evenings in September and October of 1982, The John Ankerberg Show televised over the Christian Broadcasting Network a program on Seventh-day Adventists at the Crossroads. Special guests on these three presentations were Dr. Desmond Ford and Pastor Walter Rea. Introducing each telecast, the following was stated:

"Many people know Adventists as the people who go to church on Saturday; others know them as the people who don't eat meat. They are perhaps best known for their outstanding hospitals and clinics. But the Seventh-day Adventist Church is in turmoil and stands at the most critical crossroads in its history. Which way will this great church go? Those invited to speak for it but declined the invitation were Dr. Neal Wilson, President, General Conference; Dr. Robert Olsen, Chairman, the Ellen G. White Estate; Dr. Victor Cooper, Associate Director [Communications Department], General Conference of SDA; Mr. Warren Johns, Associate Editor, Ministry magazine, and Dr. William Johnsson, Associate Editor [now, Editor-in-Chief], Adventist Review." (Transcript, p. 1-1)

Besides those named in the telecast, others were also contacted but were "out" and did not choose to return the call, even

though an 800 number was given to call. Among these were Dr. Gerhard Hasel, Dean of the Theological Seminary. The producers of the Ankerberg Show were anxious to have representation from the Church to present what they thought the leadership stood for - the historic position - so the program would have balance, and the audience be able to weigh the divergent points of view. The leadership of the Church was given the opportunity, if they could not come for legitimate reasons, to suggest a person or persons who could speak for them, and present the historic teaching of the Church.

In speaking with a member of the Ankerberg staff both by telephone, and in person, I asked if any of the following persons contacted them and asked to appear in behalf of the Church's historic position:- Ron Spears, Charles Wheeling, Vance Ferrell, Morris Venden, Colin Standish, and Lewis Walton. The answer in each instance was negative. Yet these men, either in writing, or in special speaking appointments, or both, profess to stand for historic Adventism. These seek to assure the laity all is well, and that the Church has not departed from the faith. They would have the laity believe that the only "bad guys" are Ford and Rea; yet when opportunity is given them publicly to defend their faith, other than before a "captive audience," they are no where to be found.

Each of the above noted individuals could possibly plead they did not know such a show was in preparation, or was being aired on television. However, the leadership of the Church did know, and were given an opportunity to name someone to defend

the teachings of the Church. Yet none of these were recommended by the hierarchy and the hierarchy does know of their activities. One, a lawyer, even has paperback books coming from the Church press, and promoted widely in the publications of the Church. This should tell us something. Are these men being used - wittingly, or unwittingly - as a facade for the hierarchy to keep the laity soothed so that their tithe dollars flow through "proper channels"? In reality is the true position of the hierarchy so close to Ford and Rea, that these men who profess to speak for the historic position of the Church could not rightly represent them, and thus they were not recommended? Does this make these men "dupes" as they continue to support the hierarchy and urge the laity to do so? And who shall answer for the deception thus practiced on the laity?

It also needs to be kept in mind that in the immediate area where the telecast was made - Chattanooga - there are two institutions of Adventism - Southern College of Adventists, and Wildwood Institute headed by Elder W. D. Frazee. There are problems at Southern College in the Department of Religion, but these have not been fairly nor accurately presented by Vance Ferrell in his publications. However, the case at Wildwood is different. Their problem is that the Institution has not provided an adequate educational program so that neither the students nor the staff can stand up for the truth in a public challenge, but rely wholly on "quotes" which would only play into the hands of the adversaries.

Before discussing certain fundamental issues raised on the telecast, there are two other items which need to be noticed:- 1) Dr. Desmond Ford in his first remarks on the telecast stated regarding his relationship as a Seventh-day Adventist - "I am one." (1-1) This is true only in a technical sense - he is still a member of the Church in good and regular standing. However, no one hearing him, nor reading his publications could honestly conclude that he was a real Seventh-day Adventist in doctrine and belief. 2) When this whole present controversy began with Dr. Ford's presentation on the Pacific Union College campus at a meeting of the

Association of Adventist Forums, one of his first remarks indicated that from his first contacts with the teachings of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, he had serious doubts in regard to the Sanctuary doctrine. He stated:

"Thirty-five years ago in Sidney, Australia, as an Anglican, or I think you call them Episcopalians over here, in the city of Sidney, in my home in the suburbs, I was reading Hebrews, chapter 9. At that time, I was listening to the Advent Radio Church each Sunday, and I had begun to collect the books of Ellen G. White from second hand book shops around Sidney. As I was reading Hebrews 9 that day, I said, [to myself] 'That's strange, this is different from what the Adventists are saying. There is a problem here.' The problem wasn't solved by the time I was baptized." (From Recording by Adventist Tape Service)

It must be recognized that Ford and Rea present a two-pronged attack on the historic position of the Church. Rea's approach is very simple - Ellen G. White is the source of the Church's teachings, and since she is a fraud, the whole doctrinal schema is fraudulent. On the other hand Ford professes to respect Ellen G. White as an inspired writer, but states that the Church's position on the Sanctuary doctrine cannot be defended from the Bible. This leads to the same ultimate conclusion as Rea, for if the Church's position can't be defended from the Scriptures, then Ellen G. White's approbation of the fundamental teaching of the Sanctuary doctrine places her in contradiction to the Bible, and therefore, a false prophet.

The bottom line is, therefore, reduced to simplest terms, do the unique teachings of the Church rest solely on the Bible and the Bible only, apart from any confirmation given in the writings of Ellen G. White? This issue came through clearly in the telecasts.

Ford was asked to define the Adventist "Sanctuary Doctrine." Concerning this he stated:

"The Adventist Sanctuary Doctrine affirms that in 1844 our Lord Jesus Christ entered the second apartment of the Heavenly

Sanctuary, or as some would say entered upon a 'second phase of His ministry,' this being a work of investigative judgment - a work that has now been in procedure [sic] for over 140 years, which is to determine who shall be saved and who should be lost. A review of the saints, the way it is often presented, has taken assurance from the vast membership of the church." (1-1, 1-2)

Then, the Moderator, John Ankerberg, sought to clarify and amplify the position as stated by Dr. Ford. He noted:

"For those who are not Seventh-day Adventists, let's pause here to clarify what Dr. Ford just said. Seventh-day Adventists believe that Daniel 8:14 supports their view that Jesus moved from one compartment of the Heavenly Sanctuary to another in 1844. At that point, Jesus began an investigative judgment of all Christians. Ellen White wrote: 'Attended by heavenly angels our great High Priest enters the Holy of Holies and there appears in the presence of God to perform the work of investigative judgment and to make atonement for all who are shown to be entitled to its benefits.' But a number of Seventh-day Adventists, like Dr. Ford, are questioning this. They believe the Bible teaches that the atonement was completed at the cross through the shed blood of Christ and that believers' sins are forgiven once for all at the moment of salvation. However, Ellen White has written, 'The blood of Christ, while it was to release the repentant sinner from the condemnation of the law, was not to cancel the sin. It would stand on record in the Sanctuary until the final atonement.'" (1-2)

It should be observed that the impression given is that the sanctuary teaching of the Seventh-day Adventist Church is based solely on the writings of Ellen G. White.

As the discussion continued, involving William Miller and the Great Disappointment in 1844, Ankerberg asked - "In other words, would you say that it was a face-saving device?" referring to the resulting understanding of the antitypical work of Christ as prefigured by the Day of Atonement. (1-3) This question reveals some of the possible background reading which Ankerberg did in preparation for the

telecast - Barnhouse in Eternity, September, 1956, "Are Seventh-day Adventists Christians?" The answers and exchange involving both Rea and Ford are interesting at this point, and revealing as to emphases. We quote:

Ford: Most theologians from outside looking at it have drawn that conclusion, particularly inasmuch as Adventists had several other explanations -- shut door, going into the marriage, receiving the kingdom -- there were a number of other theological devices that were tried for a while, found wanting and given away before this one was adopted. James White, husband of Ellen White, opposed this one in print in the church paper when it originally came out, but in 1857 it took control.

Ankerberg: Okay. And so, Jesus was supposed to come back to the earthly sanctuary, or the earth - He didn't come; and so, was it Ellen G. White that said? ....

Ford: No. Ellen White did not devise a single doctrine of the Adventist church, but she did write on it after it had been accepted by the church.

Ankerberg: Okay. But she accepted and....

Ford: Promogated [sic] it.

Rea: She endorsed it.

Ankerberg: She endorsed it, that Jesus had not come to this sanctuary but had just switched compartments in the heavenly. (1-4)

At this point we come to the bottom line of the whole issue. The name, Seventh-day Adventist, is distinctive, noting two fundamental beliefs - the binding obligation of the Fourth Commandment, and the recognition that Jesus promised to return again. However, these beliefs are not unique, as there are others who likewise believe the same things, who are not Seventh-day Adventists. Seventh-day Adventism is unique for two basic concepts - 1) The prophecy of Daniel 8:14 indicating 1844, as the terminus of the prophecy given and explained to Daniel by the angel Gabriel as recorded in Daniel 8 and 9. And 2) That in 1844, Jesus Christ as High Priest began a ministry in the second apartment of the heavenly sanctuary. Now the question is simple - What part did

Ellen G. White play in the discovery and foundational presentation of these two doctrines unique to Adventism? The answer is equally as simple - None! This is not stated to cast in anyway a question mark on the possession or use of the prophetic gift by Ellen G. White, but merely to call attention to the facts as they are. This is important.

Now what are the facts? The first doctrine unique to Adventist theology - the significance and meaning of Daniel 8:14 - was developed and promulgated by William Miller, before Ellen G White was even born. This doctrine resulted from a serious study on the part of Miller using only the Bible and a Cruden's Concordance. Bliss in his Memoirs of William Miller, quotes Miller himself in describing how he studied the Scriptures. It reads:

"I determined to lay aside all my presuppositions, to thoroughly compare Scripture with Scripture, and to pursue its study in a regular and methodical manner. I commenced with Genesis, and read verse by verse, proceeding no faster than the meaning of the several passages should be unfolded as to leave me free from embarrassment respecting any mysticisms or contradictions. Whenever I found anything obscure, my practice was to compare it with all collateral passages; and by the help of Cruden, I examined all texts of Scripture in which were found any of the prominent words contained in any obscure portion. Then, by letting every word have its proper bearing on the subject of the text, if my view of it harmonized with every other collateral passage in the Bible, it ceased to be a difficulty. In this way I pursued the study of the Bible, in my first pursual of it, for about two years, and was fully satisfied that it was its own interpreter. I found that, by a comparison of Scripture with history, all the prophecies, as far as they have been fulfilled, had been fulfilled literally; . . ." (pp. 69-70)

It was in 1818, at the close of the two years of study which included the prophecy of Daniel 8 & 9, that William Miller came "to the solemn conclusion, that in about twenty-five years from that time all the affairs of our present state would be wound up." (Ibid., p. 76) Further Bliss, in his biography of Miller listed ten

prophetic interpretations which he taught, among these are listed - "The Commencement of the Seventy Weeks of Dan. 9th," and "Their connection with the 2300 days of Dan. 8th." Commenting on these prophetic positions and the reaction of Miller's enemies to them, Bliss stated:

"Mr Miller laid no claim to originality in his position respecting any of the above [Ten] points; but maintained that they were established opinions of the church, and, being so, that his conclusions from these premises were well sustained by human as well as divine teachings. While his opponents attacked the view he took on these points, no one of them assailed the whole; but each admitted his correctness on some of the points; and, among them, the whole were admitted." (Ibid., p. 185, emphasis his)

#### THE SECOND UNIQUE TEACHING

In noting the second unique teaching of Adventism - the ministry of Christ in the second apartment of the Heavenly Sanctuary - we find some complications, not because the facts which could have been known were not clear, but because we did not consider these facts, but rather relied on what we thought Ellen G. White referred to in a Special Testimony. In this understanding, I have likewise been guilty. When on general principles that all doctrine must be based solely on the Bible, I stated in a question and answer session that Ellen G. White was not involved in the basic formulation of the High Priestly ministry of Christ in the second apartment of the Heavenly Sanctuary, I was publicly challenged by a respected minister who used the Special Testimony as the basis for the challenge. It was at that point, I began a thorough research of the origin of this unique doctrine.

First let us note what this Special Testimony states:

"Many people do not realize how firmly the foundation of our faith has been laid. My husband, Elder Joseph Bates, Father Pierce, Elder Edson, and others who were keen noble and true, were among those who, after the passing of time in 1844, searched for truth as for hidden treasure. I met with them, and we studied and prayed earnestly. Often we remained together

until late at night, and sometimes through the entire night, praying for light and studying the word. Again and again these brethren came together to study the Bible, in order that they might know its meaning, and be prepared to teach it with power. When they came to a point in their study where they said, 'We can do nothing more,' the Spirit of the Lord would come upon me, I would be taken off in vision, and a clear explanation of the passages we had been studying would be given me, with instruction as to how we were to labor and teach effectively. Thus light was given that helped us to understand the scriptures in regard to Christ, His mission, and His priesthood. A line of truth extending from that time to the time when we shall enter the city of God was made plain to me, and I gave to others the instruction that the Lord had given me." (Special Testimonies, Series B, #2, pp. 56-57)

This statement written at the time of the Kellogg controversy constituted an historical recall of what took place "after the passing of time in 1844" as the various doctrines of the Church were being worked out through prayer, Bible study, and the confirmation of the Holy Spirit. Two questions, therefore follow: - 1) When was the basic formulation of the ministry of Christ in the second apartment of the Heavenly Sanctuary worked out? On this basic foundation all other doctrinal concepts pertaining to the Heavenly ministry were based. And 2) When did the meetings as described by Ellen G. White take place, if they were not at the same time?

The historical records indicate that on the morning of October 23, 1844, Hiram Edson of Port Gibson, New York, and some others who had gathered together the previous day, went to Edson's barn for a prayer season, and remained in prayer "until the conviction came that their prayers had been heard and accepted, and that light would be given and their disappointment explained." Following the prayer service, Edson invited one of his companions to go with him to encourage some of the brethren who had left for their homes at dawn. "They shunned the road to avoid scoffers and crossed Edson's field, where the corn was still in the shock, and the pumpkins were on the vines.

Suddenly Edson stopped. As he stood there an overwhelming conviction came over him 'that instead of our High Priest coming out of the Most Holy of the heavenly sanctuary to come to this earth on the tenth day of the seventh month, at the end of the 2300 days, he had for the first time entered on that day the second apartment of that sanctuary and that he had a work to perform in the Most Holy before coming to this earth.'" (SDA Encyclopedia, p. 364) His companion - thought to be Crosier - who also deep in thought had continued walking on until he missed Edson by his side. He turned and asked him why he had paused. To this Edson replied - "The Lord was answering our morning prayer, giving light with regard to our disappointment." (Ibid.)

The winter of 1844-45, Edson, Dr. F. B. Hahn, and O. R. L. Crosier, a protégé and younger associate of these men, joined in a study group to explore from the Bible the concepts which had impressed the mind of Edson. Their joint conclusions were first published in the Day-Dawn of Canandaigua, New York, and then more fully in the Day-Star, which was issued at Cincinnati, Ohio. The initial articles came to the attention of Bates and White. This led to correspondence between the New England Adventists, and these brethren in Western New York. A meeting was arranged between the brethren which Bates attended, while White was unable to go.

While Ellen G. White, in 1847, wrote that the Lord showed her in vision a year previous that Crosier had the true light on the sanctuary (Word to the Little Flock, p. 12), the internal evidence of the Special Testimony clearly reveals that she could not have been present at the time Edson, Hahn, and Crosier were studying the Scriptures in search for the truth in regard to the ministry of Jesus Christ in the second apartment of the heavenly sanctuary. The Special Testimony stated, "my husband, Elder Joseph Bates" as being present. Ellen Harmon did not become Ellen G. White till 1846 (Life Sketches, p. 97). She had not even met Bates until the same year. (Ibid, p. 95) In fact, neither Bates, nor White learned about the study of the New York trio until it was published in the Spring of 1845. To what meetings then was Ellen G. White

referring when she recalled the events "after the passing of time in 1844"? To the Bible Conferences of 1848! Of these we read:

"Such men as Joseph Bates, Hiram Edson, James White, Father Pierce, and others - about fifty in number - came together in a series of Bible conferences at Rocky Hill, Connecticut, April 20-24, 1848, in Albert Belden's house; in Volney, New York, beginning August 18, Brother Arnold's barn; in Port Gibson, New York, August 27, 28, in Hiram Edson's barn; again at Rocky Hill, Connecticut, September 8, 9; and in Topsham, Maine, October 20-22 in Brother Howland's house." (Our Firm Foundation, Vol. I, p. 32)

From these past experiences, we can learn some very valuable lessons, and blunt the attack on truth. While Miller had faithfully studied the Scriptures, he did not perceive the point that the "sanctuary" to be cleansed at the close of the 2300 day prophecy was the heavenly. He thought it was this earth. Edson, Hahn, and Crosier building on the foundation laid by Miller - recognizing his prophetic explanation as unquestionable - developed the truth to a higher plane of perception. There are details in the study of the New York trio that need to be amended to be brought into line with Scripture, but this doesn't justify or give cause for the tearing down and repudiation of the foundation laid by careful Bible study and prayer. The two unique teachings of Adventism stand upon the Bible and the Bible only. To quote Ellen G. White to prove these doctrines is to cloud the issue. To do so undermines how well the foundation of our faith has been laid in God's excellent Word.

It is true Ellen G. White "endorsed" the study of Edson, Hahn, and Crosier, but she did not influence that study, but in fact, it can be shown she was influenced rather by it.

The John Ankerberg Show was based upon an assumption in the Time magazine which stated that when Christ did not come as expected on October 22, 1844, Ellen G. White "a 'messenger' of God and interpreter of the Bible, said she received a vision explaining that on October 22, Christ entered a new 'sanctuary' in heaven

to begin 'investigative judgment' of the lives and works of believers." (Time, Aug. 2, 1982, p. 49) It was to this article in Time that John Ankerberg referred as he opened his three-series telecast - "Seventh-day Adventism at the Crossroads." (1-1) Thus perhaps unwittingly, the emphasis of the Show supported a distortion of history, and abetted by Ford and Rea became an open attack on Truth as it is in Jesus. For the hierarchy to decline to defend truth under such circumstances - and the invitation was still open after the first show had been broadcast - is the highest kind of treason against the God of heaven Who committed this truth to the Advent Movement.

Note: All references such as "1-1," or "1-4," etc., are from a transcript of the Telecasts, and can be obtained for \$5.00, by writings to The John Ankerberg Show, P. O. Box 8977, Chattanooga, TN 37411. Tapes of the audio part of the telecasts can be obtained from the same office.

#

## BACCHIOCCHI "WRITES" AGAIN

In a letter dated, June 25, 1982, Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi, Professor of Religion at Andrews University, wrote the following comments to Dr. James P. Wesberry, Editor, Sunday, the quarterly publication of the Lord's Day Alliance of the United States.

"You will be pleased to know that my book Divine Rest for Human Restlessness has already been reprinted four times in English and has been translated in seven languages. The French edition is being prepared by a Belgian Benedictine monk in cooperation with a Catholic publisher in Paris. . . .

"I will be glad to mail to you some additional complimentary copies which you can freely use for you outreach endeavors. Moreover, you have my full permission to quote at any length or any portion of the book or of my message given to the Alliance. Words fail to express my appreciation for all you have done for me, especially through your most gracious and generous foreword to my book. I always read with eagerness your Sunday magazine.

"You will be pleased to know that I am presently engaged practically every week-end in conducting what we call 'Festival of the Sabbath Seminars.' The purpose of this seminar is to help the believer discover how the proper celebration of the Sabbath can help them in experiencing divine rest and peace in their lives.

"We fondly remember your visit to our campus and the gracious words that you spoke.

"May the Lord continue to richly bless your life and leadership."

#

### GEORGI VINS COMMENTS ON SHELKOV

In a letter dated, September 13, 1982, to a member of the staff of the Foundation, Georgi P. Vins makes this comment regarding Shelkov:

"The Adventist leader Vladimir Shelkov (who had spent 23 years of his life in labor camps) died in January, 1980, at a strict regime labor camp where I also had been imprisoned. Shelkov was from the southern part of the Soviet Union and was sent to Northern Siberia where extreme temperatures are equal to death sentences. There was very little food in this camp and the only type of meat was pork (intestines). Due to his abstinence from this type of food, he was on a near starvation level."

Elder Rostislav N. Galetsky is in a labor camp near where Shelkov was confined. So far we have received and forwarded to the proper Russian authorities 28 petitions with 477 names coming from Canada, Australia, and the United States. Non-Adventist friends have sent us 110 petitions with 2,112 names. These are now in the process of being duplicated and forwarded. We appreciate what has been done by those receiving the thought paper, and say, God bless you for your efforts.

What if all who receive the thought paper had responded as did the few, or as did concerned non-Adventists?

+++++

"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.

### THE NATIONAL SUNDAY LAW

This was the subject of a book (#18) which formed a part of the The Sentinel Library. This book contained the argument of Alonzo T. Jones before the United States Senate Committee on Education and Labor, December 13, 1888, against the national Sunday bill introduced by Senator Blair. This publication has been facsimile reproduced by the Paradise View family. It contains material we all need to know. It can be obtained on a donation basis by writing to:

Mr. Ralph Hinchman  
Paradise View, Rt. #1  
Barronett, WI 54813

We are happy that God has placed a burden on the hearts of His children to reproduce some of these valuable publications of the past, that we might be benefited as we face the issues before us.

#

### E. HARMON - A PEN NAME?

The following announcement appeared in a recent issue of the paper published by the SDA Missionary Foundation of Phoenix, Arizona, - "In two of our books with the new titles - 'Man of Destiny' and 'Universe in Conflict' we have used E. Harmon as a pen name for E. G. White. We have done this to get away from prejudice toward our literature. We have received a favorable response to this change."

No one can question the title changes - they are good. But why a "pen name" never used by Ellen G. White herself. Are we unable to face reality? One branch of the Shepherd's Rod is reproducing Houteff's writings with his name omitted - no doubt for the same reason.

Perhaps we should publish Psalms 23 & 51 under a pen name. Would that help our appreciation of those Psalms?

#

"Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." (I Thess. 5:21)