

# SENTINEL PUBLISHING COMPANY

ROSMEAD AVENUE, KENILWORTH, CAPE PROVINCE

TELEGRAPHIC ADDRESS: SENTINEL KENILWORTH



March 20, 1961

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

Dear Elder Figuhr:

We appreciate your letter of February 10th. We agree with you that the Lord does overrule as He sees best. We have faith in His guidance and we are certain that His purposes will be carried out. This was and still is our understanding of the matter we have placed before the brethren. However with all of this, surely no one would wish to be guilty of delaying the purpose of the Lord.

Obviously you as our chief executive officer of the church, do not have time to oversee every matter that comes to the General Conference. This we understand. However for the record it should be clearly understood that the manuscript we presented to the brethren has not to date been considered for content insofar as any reply we have received indicates.

The first reply in the form of a letter signed by Elders W. D. Read and the late F. H. Yost, does not deal with the content of the manuscript. Rather it points out that the authors are "critical."

During the some six years following their reply, the field did read and consider carefully the content of the manuscript. Church members of low rank and of high rank in our midst and denominational workers of sundry departments and varying positions considered (and still consider) that the manuscript contains the key to unlock the increasing number of problems facing the denomination today. More than this, the manuscript brought to them an appreciation of why they were Seventh-day Adventists and an understanding of the great truth which the Lord has given to us that they had not had heretofore. Growing out of this was the plea from the field that the General Conference allow the matter to come out into the open and that our whole history be studied in the light of the manuscript and that the manuscript be taken out of the realm of the clandestine. In brief, what was really wrong with the manuscript.

The outgrowth of the situation was the document released by the General Conference in the fall of 1958, "Further Appraisal." This treatise, though touching on several points in the manuscript, does not deal with the content of the manuscript and only considers these several points in an endeavour

*R.R. Figuhr*  
R. R. Figuhr

Elder R. R. Figuhr

- 2 -

March 20, 1961

to establish that the authors of "1888 Re-examined" were disloyal to the denomination (pp. 47, 48) and dishonest in their use of Ellen G. White quotations. In all, their manuscript "is a serious reflection upon the literary ethics of its authors," (p.48) and thus no consideration is given to the actual content of manuscript.

At a later date Elder A. V. Olsen prepared a report for the committee which likewise does not deal with the content of the matter we have presented. It affirms that what we have presented is not true simply because it is not true. It misses the point that what we failed to accept in 1888 was not merely a doctrine—the doctrine we had then and we have it today—what we spurned was (a) a closer, more intimate fellowship with the Lord Jesus than had been offered any other people; (b) we rejected the beginnings of the latter rain and loud cry; and (c) the practical results of the cleansing of the sanctuary were misunderstood and rejected, namely that message which was to have made a people ready for the coming of the Lord.

Over the years we have not precluded the possibility that we are fools. But as ministers in God's remnant church we would like to believe that we are honest fools which is in contrast to the implications against us as found in "Further Appraisal." In our "Answer" we endeavoured to supply additional Spirit of Prophecy statements, and in some cases the brethren did not know these existed but have confirmed them at the White Estate. Ought these not to be considered along with the original presentation of 1950? Does not the hour demand that these facts be faced squarely?

If we are heretics or evil men we should be dealt with accordingly—which certainly means that we should not be workers in the cause. If on the other hand we are honest and reasonable men is it not time that there be granted a reconciliation based on a mutual regard for truth and honest research? This is not a matter of semantics or minor theological interpretation—which we believe current events support most emphatically.

With a prayer for you in your terrible responsibilities, and looking forward to further word on this matter, we remain,

Yours sincerely,

R. J. Wieland  
Central Kenya Field  
P. O. Box 1352  
Nairobi, Kenya

D. K. Short  
Sentinel Publishing Company  
Rosmead Avenue, Kenilworth  
Cape Town