

HUDSON PRINTING COMPANY

First and Valley Avenue  
Baker, Oregon

September 9, 1957

Elder W. E. Read  
General Conference of S.D.A.  
Takoma Park, Washington 12, D. C.

Dear Elder Read:

This will acknowledge receipt of your note of August 29, 1957.

Since you ignore the subject matter of our correspondence for the past few months with special reference to my last two letters, it is obvious that you do not care to go on record with anything pertaining to the matter. Several reasons suggest themselves, but speculation is not only foolish but useless. The only thing I can call a fact at this point is that you have made no answer to rather specific questions.

Should you entertain the thought that I am merely bluffing on my proposed paper, I believe future developments will reveal the fallacy of such conclusion.

Brethren Wieland and Short have started something which is out of their control and that of the General Conference officers as well. I am still of the opinion that God is back of it, which opinion of necessity puts you men in opposition to the purposes of God at this time. Sacred history is not very encouraging as to what may be reasonably expected if my present evaluation of the situation is later confirmed.

A few weeks ago I talked with a leading minister in the Northwest on the telephone and we discussed very shortly the matter of the position of the officers of the General Conference. He said, "Well, Jones and Waggonner were not kindly received in 1888 either." This statement is beyond a mere opinion. It is a fact, if one believes in the writings of Ellen White.

Last Thursday another minister friend stopped in my office to pick up a copy of the manuscript by Wieland and Short. He said, "I want to go over this with a fine tooth comb. This thing is getting hotter and hotter."

I haven't heard from Brethren Wieland and Short for some time, and of course the thought has come to me that you men may follow the same course now that you did in 1951. Should you do that, and should they yield to your pressure, that will not change the ultimate outcome in the least. It might alter what I have in

Elder Read  
Page two

mind slightly but only slightly. And should I drop out of the picture, the fact that the officers of the General Conference are going to have to answer To God and the Church for their treatment of the subject matter of the Wieland manuscript would also not be changed.

Actually, the real answer to the manuscript of these brethren is contained in the two volumes, "Our Firm Foundation." Someday some one is going to compare the teachings of Jones and Waggoner in and around 1888 with this published record of the Bible conference of 1952 in the light of the Wieland and Short manuscript. This comparison will not flatter the present leadership of the remnant church. Whether I do this writing or some one else is completely inconsequential; but whoever does it and whenever it is done, if done properly, the issues will be drawn for the last struggle within the church between truth and error. When that struggle is over Isa. 4:3 will have been fulfilled: "And it shall come to pass, that he that is left in Zion, and he that remaineth in Jerusalem, shall be called holy, even every one that is written among the living in Jerusalem."

The reason for this is clearly stated in the next verse: "When the Lord shall have washed away the filth of the daughters of Zion and shall have purged the blood of Jerusalem from the midst thereof by the spirit of judgment, and by the spirit of burning."

If I am right in my evaluation of the subject matter of the Wieland and Short manuscript and you men at headquarters continue to maintain your attitude toward it, you will bring the judgment of God upon the Seventh-day Adventist church as the leaders of old did upon old Jerusalem. With the light of this manuscript shining upon him, our former General Conference president will surely have to answer for his presentations at the Bible Conference of 1952.

Of course, I may be wrong. In a way I hope that I am; but if I am wrong, the situation is worse than if I'm right. You men at headquarters have no answer. I've known this for twenty-five years. If Wieland and Short are on the wrong track as you men teach, then there is no approach known to me to the answer within the framework of our church.

The language of your note--"the brethren have reminded me that some time ago a special group was set up"--suggests that you are not part of that group or it would not have been necessary to remind you of its existence. This seems a bit peculiar in the light of the fact that your name is on the original "official" reaction to this manuscript.

Your first "note" of August 27th stating that you were "taking counsel" with the brethren and would write again before the week was out led me to think I might receive a letter from you dealing with the subject matter of our recent correspondence. However, the note which came forth following this "counsel"

Elder Read  
Page three

indicates that you are no longer chairman of this "special group" which has been set up to study the problem and were even unaware of its existence at the time you wrote me on August 27th. Further, the counsel apparently suggested that you make no comment at all on the issues in general or on the specific point as to whether or not you still personally hold to the positions you took when you wrote that letter to brethren Wieland and Short. In other words, it looks to me as if you have your name on a document with no way to get it off or to modify your position. Of course, may be you don't care to.

In presenting a background for the controversy arising within our midst it does not seem possible to eliminate the report of the Defense Literature Committee but I suppose it would not be absolutely necessary to include the signatories as it were. If you still held to the positions then taken, it seems to me you would have said so. However, should you have modified your opinion somewhat, it is readily understandable how you would be unable to say so--especially in the light of the fact that a special group is studying the problem of which you are not a member.

In my file which I am accumulating on this subject there is the official section from which I shall feel free to draw in my writing as the occasion demands. Then there is the unofficial or private section from which no quotation will ever be made without express permission. If you should care to write to me as a private individual and not as an officer of the General Conference I can assure you that any such letter would always remain as confidential as the writer indicated he desired it to be. Otherwise, this will terminate our correspondence on the subject we have been considering for the past few months. Again, I want to thank you for your kindness even though you have not seen fit to come to grips with any of the real problems involved.

Sincerely your Christian brother,

A. L. Hudson

