

September 25, 1959

Elder R. R. Figuhr, President  
General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists  
Washington 12, D.C.

Dear Elder Figuhr:

Your letter of June 29th has been here for a number of weeks. We appreciate your time in writing to us. It is not certain if you expected that we should write further, or not. Recent developments in the church indicate that we should. It seems apparent that very serious matters are pending. Surely it is time for the cleansing of the sanctuary to be completed.

You speak, in your letter, of the desirability of our having sincere confidence in our General Conference brethren as they attempt to handle the manuscript matter; and that we should place it in their hands "solely to be guided by their counsel." Surely there is not a president, king or potentate in all the world that holds a position of responsibility that remotely compares with yours; and in this the responsibility of the Committee as a whole is not lessened. You are the designated leaders of God's people in a time to which all the prophets of old looked--the time of the end. We believe that the doctrine of the cleansing of the sanctuary requires faith in the ultimate triumph of the corporate, organized Seventh-day Adventist church; and that the time will surely come when the General Conference will submit to a complete reconciliation with the Lord Jesus, and gain the victory over the enmity against God and His righteousness which was the root of the 1888 tragedy. We believe most earnestly that the Lord Himself respects the General Conference and will patiently wait on them.

Therefore, when your letter gives the assurance that the manuscript has been given very careful consideration by the brethren, the conclusion must follow that "Further Appraisal" represents the final and therefore irrevocable decision of the General Conference brethren on this serious matter. Hence to leave the manuscript "in the hands of the General Conference brethren," "solely to be guided by their counsel," must mean to abandon it and its far-reaching implications. Any further consideration must perforce be only a reiteration of its condemnation. This we are willing to submit to, leaving the matter to posterity to judge, for surely the present generation will never finish God's work in a state of impenitence. If this generation fails to face the issue, it means that another generation must face the decision and submit to that "great humbling of heart before God" that all must experience who remain "faithful and true to the end." (MS. 15, 1888)

Accordingly with respect, we are constrained to point out that while it has been stated that the manuscript has been given careful consideration, a near decade of attention to it has thus far failed completely to provide a report that deals with its subject matter. This subject matter

which the manuscript presents includes: (1) Evidence that the beginning of the latter rain and loud cry was rejected in 1888, not accepted. (2) A serious analysis of the significance of the 1893 Session. (3) An analysis of the reasons for Jones' and Waggoner's apostasy, which has bearing on our request of nine years ago for the publication of an anthology of their writings before they lost their faith. (4) A presentation of the principle of self-deception following the rejection of light. (5) An analysis of the pantheism heresy in that pattern of denominational history, with relation to the cleansing of the sanctuary. (6) The clear-cut and explicit predictions of the "omega" test. (7) The warnings of infatuation with a false Christ and very subtle Spiritualism. (8) An investigation citing evidence that these warnings have been justified in current Seventh-day Adventist history.

Point (1) was dealt with in the first two official reports, and denied, though certainly not proven. Points (2) to (8) have not been dealt with in any of the three official reports; and to be frank, they have not even been mentioned or touched upon. If the brethren have given careful consideration to these eight points, they surely must have more than a mere denial to support their stand and refutation--or else they would not have voted approval to "Further Appraisal." Thus it seems the Committee has considered these very serious matters to be unimportant and unworthy of a statement of reason as to why the premise of the manuscript is rejected.

We appealed from your decision in 1952 to the "Investigative Judgment," now in session in heaven. That is our appeal today also and for this reason we stated in our letter of January 21, "we resign the whole matter to the disposition of Providence." We know that you would not want to be understood as equating His disposition of a matter with the decision of the General Conference brethren necessarily; although that thought is reiterated in your letter. We believe that we can have confidence in our brethren, and still recognize the possibility that the omniscient God can overrule them. Recent developments make us wonder if perhaps Brother A. L. Hudson is not an agent to this end--independently of and even contrary to our express desire. We do know that the coming of Christ can be in our day if we so desire it. It is just as near or as far away as the church wants it to be. At any time since 1844, He could have come, but He cannot come in the face of impenitence and unbelief and a rejection of our past history.

Perhaps the hour is later than we had thought.

With kind and prayerful regards,

Sincerely yours,

D. K. Short

R. J. Wieland