

RETYPE 1967

A SUMMARY OF THE MANUSCRIPT

"1888 RE-EXAMINED"Introduction

The following is a resume of the manuscript, "1888 Re-examined" as presented to the General Conference in the year 1950.

Although this manuscript has been condemned by three sub-committee reports, the thesis of the document itself seems not to have been recognized nor evaluated.

The authors believe that the matter discussed is of supreme importance to the world-wide church — that of a contrite, final, and complete reconciliation with the Lord Jesus which alone can prepare the way for the ultimate display of His glory to this dark world. The evidence is clear-cut and impressive that our denominational history requires the honest conscience of the remnant church to bow in deep humbling of heart before the Lord, an experience of repentance and contrition unique in all human history. The authors further believe, that our denominational history is an eloquent commentary on Christ's message to the Laodicean church, an exact historical complement to the prophetic picture of our Lord's distress with the nauseating lukewarmness of His church which must someday "make herself ready" to be His Bride. The full truth must soon be recognized.

If the reticence to deal with this vital matter after eleven years is due to the authors' ineptitude and the lengthy presentation in its original form, it is to be earnestly hoped that this brief summary of the

basic thesis will clarify any existing misunderstandings and place the entire matter in its proper perspective at this critical point in the church's history.

The Background of the Writing of the Manuscript

1. From the beginning, it was a private document written for the attention of a very restricted group of "brethren of experience" who were personally acquainted with the authors. It was an appeal to the General Conference to reconsider what appeared to be a serious misconception of both the facts and the significance of certain vital aspects of Seventh-day Adventist history.

2. It was not presented for eventual publication. It seems that some have had a contrary impression. However, that was never the purpose. It was realized that the historical view set forth therein was diametrically opposed to the popular denominational view of the matter: therefore the desire was for the General Conference to consider the basic thesis of the presentation strictly as to its truthfulness or its error, and not as to its suitability for publication to the church at large. It was realized from the beginning that it was not in a form suitable for general publication.

3. It appears that the General Conference have largely confined their consideration of it to its potential suitability for publication. In so doing, the issues presented have been overlooked. Consideration should be confined to the truthfulness or the falsehood of its basic historical thesis. If this is done, the so-called "critical" tone of the presentation will not prejudice a true evaluation.

The Basic Thesis of "1888 Re-examined"

It appears evident that:-

1. In the inscrutable counsel of God, it was His purpose to bring the Advent movement to its triumphant and glorious fulfillment a full seventy years ago. The hour had arrived according to His divine plan for the finishing of His work on earth, and to this end He endeavoured to communicate to His people the initial manifestation of that light of truth which we as a people commonly understand as "the loud cry", or the outpouring of "the latter rain." Very clear and abundant testimony from the agent of the Spirit of Prophecy attests that the "most precious message" sent to this people at the time of the 1888 General Conference Session was intended to lead directly into the proclamation of the "loud cry" to the world at large in that very generation. Had the message been truly and fairly received, it would have led to the complete fulfillment of Revelation 18 in that generation receiving it, for the 1888 message contained within itself that divine element of inspiration and truth which would have made a people ready for the coming of the Lord.

The manuscript protests what its authors recognize to be an unfair and virtually derogatory evaluation of the 1888 message, which the General Conference apparently encourage in this our generation. The popular view encouraged today is that the 1888 message was merely a re-emphasis of the old Protestant doctrine of justification and righteousness by faith as taught by the Reformers and the early Adventist pioneers of 1844. The word "re-emphasis" is freely used to convey the impression that the 1888 message restored a balance in our experience and presentations of truth temporarily

lost prior to 1888, and assumed to be satisfactorily maintained ever since the decade following the Minneapolis Conference, or at least within limitations not serious enough to call for really grave concern.

The authors protest the very serious failure to recognize that the 1888 message was far more than a "re-emphasis" of the historic doctrine of justification and righteousness by faith. Views generally endorsed by the General Conference quite largely ignore evidence that the 1888 message was intended to be a revelation of Christ's righteousness more glorious than any previous concept the church had had, a truth parallel to and consistent with the Adventist doctrine of the cleansing of the sanctuary, something far in advance of sixteenth-century concepts, and a progressive fulfillment of the comparatively immature knowledge and experience of the 1844 pioneers. The message was intended to "ripen" the grain for the harvest, and prepare God's people for translation before they should taste death. It was also to provide both the motivation and the effectiveness of that mighty call to God's scattered people to come out of Babylon, a message to make an unprecedented impact upon the world. It was intended to grow until it would reach every honest hearted soul, attended by the outpouring of God's Spirit to make the truth invincible in its appeal to the believing human heart and to meet Satan's final hostility.

(a) However, this major premise of the Manuscript has been entirely overlooked in all three General Conference replies. The 1951 report never alludes to it beyond denying that the manuscript presents "a true evaluation of the message preached at that time." "Appraisal" avoids any consideration of this point, as does the "Committee Report." Why in eleven years of

consideration, should the General Conference ignore this vital premise of the manuscript? It is emphasized and reiterated throughout the presentation. (1)

1. Note: Almost the whole of Chapters III and V (pages 11 - 20 and 39-53), and the conclusion of Chapter IV (pages 37,38), are devoted to it. Reference is made to it frequently thereafter (cf. pages 81, 83, 37, 88, 78, 90, 93, 94, 106, 108, 109, 124, 125, 127, 136, 137, 201-204). "Answer" further emphasizes it (pages 51-55, 5, 8, 10, 11, 15, 16, 18, 20, 29, 36, 39, 43, 44, 48, 69).

(b) The official replies have charged the authors with stating that the church or its leadership rejected the "doctrine of righteousness by faith" at or after the 1888 Session. For example, quoting from the 1958 "Committee Report":

Brethren Wieland and Short maintain that "we" — our church or denomination — rejected the light on righteousness by faith at the 1888 General Conference Session. . . This thought is emphasized again and again throughout the document.

.
Some of us have been a long time in this work, and have visited people all around the world, yet we cannot recall having found opposition to the doctrine of righteousness by faith anywhere. (Pages 1, 11).

It should be understood the authors have never taken such a position (cf. "Answer," page 51). Any isolated statement made referring to the 1888 message as the message of "righteousness by faith" must be understood not as the historic Protestant doctrine, but in the light of the oft-repeated evaluation of the message as the initial manifestation of the latter rain and loud cry.

(c) Therefore this matter should be settled according to available evidence.

QUESTION 1: Was the Minneapolis message, as proclaimed from 1888-1892, the initial manifestation of the latter rain, and the beginning of the loud cry?

Or was it merely a "re-emphasis" of the old historic Protestant doctrine
(2)
as taught by the Protestant Reformers, and the pioneers of the 1844 movement?

2. Note: Reference is made to a compilation of statements from Ellen G. White and contemporaries on this subject, as presented to Elder A. L. White in January, 1959. The compilation includes explicit statements, with other illustrative statements, together with positive statements from contemporaries, that categorically recognize the 1888-92 message as the beginning of the "loud cry." Included in the latter in the recorded judgment of the congregation itself in attendance at the 1893 Session (Cf. Bulletin, pages 243, 167, 188).

2. Closely bound up with this major premise is the question of the reception of the 1888 message. Whilst it is true that all three official replies to the manuscript deal with this point, clear and forceful Spirit of Prophecy evidence is not being given due weight. For example, the 1951 Report asks the authors to accept the testimony of Elder A. W. Spalding, who was personally acquainted with Elders Haskell, Kilgore, Olsen, Prescott, Butler, Morrison, and others, to the effect that the message was well received after a brief time of opposition. "Appraisal" states that "the rank and file of Seventh-day Adventist workers and laity accepted the presentation at Minneapolis and were blessed, "although it concedes that there was some temporary opposition. The 1958 Committee Report takes virtually the same position, and confuses the matter by insisting that the "doctrine of righteousness by faith" was never rejected.

QUESTION 2. Was the initial manifestation of the latter rain and the loud cry accepted or rejected by the general body of the responsible leadership of the denomination between 1888 and 1896?

Again it must be emphasized that the concern is not with the acceptance or rejection of the historic Protestant doctrine of justification, nor even
(3)
with the concept of it as held by our 1844 pioneers.

3. Note: Lest there be any confusion in the discussion, the authors wish to make it clear that they have always maintained that there were "some" who responded heart and soul to receive the heart-humbling message that was the initial manifestation of this final outpouring of the Spirit of God. The important point to be clearly settled is whether the responsible leadership of the church truly accepted the message in a genuine and effective way that removed the obstacle to the complete finishing of God's work in that very generation of seventy years ago. Once point (1) of this basic thesis is settled, it follows that the message would have indeed led to the finishing of the work and the translation of our brethren of that era, as they themselves have left on record their conviction that it would (cf. "1888 Re-examined," pp. 89, 90, 100, 108).

In particular, this second point should be considered in connection with material presented in "Answer", pages 38-50. An attempt is made there to analyse Sister White's use of the words "some," "few", and "many" in her oft-repeated references to the reception of the 1888 message. Especially noteworthy is her retrospective summing up of the whole episode in Selected Messages, Vol. 1 pp. 234, 235.

3. Ancillary to these major points in the premise of the manuscript is the question of the confessions and repentance of those influential and responsible brethren who reacted to unfavourably to the message of Christ's righteousness.

Again the manuscript protests the erroneous view popular amongst us as a people, and encouraged by the General Conference, that all is well as regards our denominational response to the message of 1888. It is assumed by many that the confessions and repentance of these prominent brethren of a past generation cancelled out their initial rejection of the message at and after Minneapolis, and thus cancelled out the effect their reaction had upon the church at large. The authors maintain that evidence indicates this to be a superficial view, and an exceedingly dangerous one in consequence.

The official General Conference replies to the manuscript express a sense of outrage that the authors presume to question the motives and sincerity of these good brethren of a past generation, whose work was so well appreciated

by Sister White in later years. There is such serious confusion about the episode that the real point of Chapter VII is entirely overlooked. The following should be considered:

(a) The motives or sincerity of Elder Uriah Smith or of the other brethren were not attacked. Rather, the manuscript statements expressly say that Elder Smith, for example, was "sincere, and good, and lovable." His subsequent acceptance with the Lord is never questioned in the least.

(b) The real point of examining these "confessions" was to show that they did not remove the obstacle of unbelief which prevented the proclamation of the "loud cry" in power to the world in the decade following 1888 (Cf. General Conference Bulletin 1893, pp. 419, 420; SM I, pp. 234, 235). Hence, the confessions cannot fairly be understood to have undone the evil of the reaction against the 1888 message. No evidence can be found for a change in policy in the Review and Herald following Elder Smith's confession of early 1891 which would enlist the support of the church for the work of Elders Jones and Waggoner. It is clear that blind opposition continued.

(c) The history of the confessions fails to show evidence that the brethren concerned comprehended the significance of the message they had reacted against as being the initial manifestation of the latter rain and the loud cry. Rather, the confessions were entirely personal in character, and their result had to do with the personal spiritual recovery and salvation of the brethren themselves, and not with the recovery by the church of the initial manifestation of the latter rain which would have led to the finishing of the work in their time.

QUESTION 3: Specifically, was there or was there not any repentance on the part of those who resisted and rejected the message that cleared the way for

the untrammelled proclamation of the loud cry in the decade following 1888.

QUESTION 3a: Are we of this generation less likely to resist and reject that light which will enlighten the earth with its glory than were our forefathers of seventy years ago?

QUESTION 3b: Should not the facts be known by our workers today that they might be favoured with a warning lest they repeat the same sad mistake?

4. Chapter VI of the manuscript has never been dealt with in any of the reports. Is it true that the Holy Spirit was insulted by our ministers at and after the Minneapolis meeting? Is it true that Jesus was spurned and insulted in the person of His messengers? Is it true that in the dark decade following 1888 there prevailed a serious disregard of Spirit of Prophecy counsel, on the part of the responsible leadership of the church?

QUESTION 4: If evidence indicates that these things are true, is it not reasonable and obvious that there must come a deeper work of reconciling our sinful hearts with the righteousness of Christ than has ever taken place in any past generation of God's people? (5)

5. Note: The authors find evidence to believe that the 1888 history illustrates a normal reaction of our human nature to the principle of the Cross. The authors do not sympathize with the view that our brethren of seventy years ago were less worthy than ourselves. Rather we of this generation are just as prone to error and love of self as they were. We see ourselves in history; yes, we see ourselves at Calvary. History is the story of our own poor hearts. The authors conclude, therefore, that the 1888 history is a parable of profound import to this generation, even as Calvary. Underlying the conscious strata of our Seventh-day Adventist heart today is the same buried root of enmity against God and His righteousness as prompted our dear brethren of a generation ago to spurn the love of Christ and insult the Holy Spirit.

5. The history of the 1893 General Conference Session figures

prominently in the basic thesis of the manuscript. Yet this chapter has not been dealt with in any of the General Conference replies to it.

The problem to be settled is not whether the meeting was a blessing to our people; the fact that it was is clearly recognized.

The problem is simply whether or not the 1893 Session corrected the tragedy of the reaction against the 1888 message and consequently ushered in the successful proclamation of the "loud cry" to the world at large. The view that the 1893 Session resulted in a "victory" for the 1888 message predominates today. (See the account in The Fruitage of Spiritual Gifts, by L. H. Christian).

If this is true, it follows that the "loud cry" has been going forward satisfactorily for the past seven decades. Large baptisms in certain mission fields have been cited in support of this view.

The manuscript chapter on the 1893 Session presents the following:

(a) The dominant issue which hung over the Conference from beginning to end was the problem of how to correct the sin of the reaction against the 1888 message. The thought breaks out again and again in the record of the Bulletin (Cf. pp. 16, 38, 66, 67, 72, 87, 93, 104, 105, 164-170, 183, etc; see also 1888 Re-examined, pp. 89, 90).

(b) The chapter quotes the principal speakers at the Session as expressing concern whether the meeting would result in a programme of lining up with Heaven's plan for the finishing of the work in that generation then and there so that no further Sessions would be necessary in view of translation being imminent; or whether they would fail to face the issue rightly, be "deceived by the devices of Satan," and be left out in darkness (Cf. Bulletin,

pp. 346, 377, 386).

(c) The chapter notes the failure of the Conference to come to grips with the problem. It examines the beginning of A. T. Jones' confusion and fanaticism at that meeting, consequent upon his assumption that the sin of the 1888 reaction was cancelled, and the "loud cry" must inevitably follow immediately upon the end of the 1893 Session. The Chapter notes incidentally an analysis of certain significant differences between the view of "righteousness by faith" as preached by Jones and Waggoner, and the popular view then held by Protestant and Catholic theologians and some Seventh-day Adventist ministers, illustrating one aspect of the current opposition against Jones and Waggoner's message.

To the authors, certain facts appear indisputable: (a) The brethren of that Session were not translated; (b) nearly seventy years have gone by since that Session, and the general consensus of opinion of our people around the world is that the glorious finishing of the work under the power of the loud cry is still future; (c) instead of the glorious outpouring of the Spirit with the sick healed, dead literally resurrected to life, raising up of other prophets besides Sister White, etc., (see Bulletin, pages 498, 499, 461, 386), fanaticism, formalism, lukewarmness, and apostasy dominated the next ten years after the 1893 Session, including the apostasy of Jones and Waggoner, and the pantheism heresy. True, the work of God made progress in spite of all its setbacks; but the marvellous predictions made at the Session were not truly fulfilled in that generation, and the loud cry did not truly take place in any way consistent with the scope inspired prophecy had marked out for it.

QUESTION 5: Is it true that the 1893 Session marks the end of the Minneapolis era with a virtual defeat of God's plan to enlighten the earth with the glory of the loud cry message in that generation?

QUESTION 5a: Does the statement in SM I, pp. 234-235 shed light on the actual results of the 1893 Session?

QUESTION 5b: If the loud cry had gone forth as the speakers at that Session hoped it would, would Sister White have been able to make this statement in 1896?

QUESTION 5c: Does not the 1893 Session present a modern parallel to ancient Israel's abortive attempt to capture Ai after their stubborn unbelief manifested at Kadesh Barnea?

The authors consider that the issue discussed in this well-documented chapter is far more serious than the previous replies to the manuscript seem to recognize. The authors are gravely concerned lest the confusion which prevailed at that Session be perpetuated today. They believe that a candid investigation of that part of our denominational history will help the church to understand a more reasonable and truthful doctrine of how to prepare for the reception of the final outpouring of the Holy Spirit than prevails in our midst today. (6)

6. Note: Lest there be any confusion on one point, it should be understood that the manuscript clearly recognizes the Lord's continued presence and blessing upon the Seventh-day Adventist church since 1893. The contemporary charge of some fanatics in 1893 that the church had become Babylon is refuted in the manuscript. The Lord's blessing and presence with the denomination following 1893 is likened to His blessing and presence among Israel during their 40 years wandering in the wilderness following Kadesh-Barnea.

6. The chapter on the apostasy of Jones and Waggoner presents important evidence having a vital bearing on the plea of the authors for the publication of an anthology of their writings. The chapter illustrates the nature of the opposition to their message, and makes clear that their subsequent apostasy must not be interpreted to cast any discredit upon their previous ministry and their message concerning Christ's righteousness. The view expressed therein clears up a perplexing mystery in our denominational history. The chapter has not been touched upon in any reply to the manuscript.

QUESTION 6: Is this analysis of the cause of Jones' and Waggoner's apostasy true? Is it not in order, therefore, that the denomination consider publishing a carefully edited anthology of their more important writings?

7. None of the official reports has mentioned the principle enunciated in chapters X and XI, that rejection of heaven-sent light inevitably leads to an infatuation with counterfeit "light" sent by the enemy to confuse God's people. The reason this matter has not been dealt with may be due to the prevailing idea that the 1888 message was well received by the brethren of that time. The following are the main points of the chapter:

(a) The principle is established from Bible and Spirit of Prophecy evidence that infatuation with error of necessity follows upon a rejection of truth.

(b) The grace crisis of pantheism could not have arisen as it did amongst us had the "loud cry" been proceeding in a satisfactory manner. The proper receiving of the truth of Christ's righteousness effectually fortifies against unrighteousness. If the 1901 General Conference Session had indeed corrected the unbelief and spiritual declension of the decade following 1888,

the cancer of pantheism and disguised Spiritualism inherent in it could never have made the tragic headway it did before Sister White was commanded to "meet it."

(c) The pantheism apostasy is declared to be the "alpha" of "false theories and erroneous ideas" brought by Satan in an effort "to involve the remnant church in the general ruin coming upon the earth." Thus the "omega" cannot be said to be the loss of a redundant institution as the prevalent view maintains. Rather, the "omega" is the full development of Satan's masterful efforts to defeat God's purpose in the remnant church by an exceedingly clever plan to lead us into confusion and virtual apostasy just before the end. He must attempt to prevent the gift of the "latter rain" and the proclamation of the "loud cry," and if possible, forestall them by a counterfeited.

QUESTION 7: How did the gravely serious crisis on pantheism come about if the loud cry was proceeding in a satisfactory manner and, if the 1901 General Conference Session effectively corrected the spiritual unbelief and declension of the decade following the 1888 Session, how could the cancer of pantheism make such tragic headway as it did, being disguised Spiritualism?

It is important that attention be given to the manuscript analysis of the pantheism crisis as being the "alpha" of "false theories and erroneous ideas" brought by Satan in an effort "to involve the remnant church in the general ruin coming upon the earth."

QUESTION 7a: Specifically, was the "omega" predicted by Sister White the loss of the Battle Creek Sanitarium or is it the full development of Satan's efforts

to defeat God's purpose in the remnant church by a masterful attempt to lead us into confusion and virtual apostasy just before the end, and in an attempt to prevent the outpouring of the latter rain and the proclamation of the loud cry?

QUESTION 7 b: Again, the authors would ask that specific attention be given to the question whether or not it is the duty of the leadership of the church to warn our workers of the danger of another serious attack of Satan conceived and executed after the pattern of the pantheism episode, but more insidious and desperate as surely as "omega" follows "alpha".

8. A very serious question raised in the Manuscript is the matter of Baal worship. Admittedly, the subject is an unpleasant one to investigate, and one would prefer to try to bury it and forget it. But certain facts cannot easily be dismissed. The 1951 Report said: "Such a charge that the ministry is in any sense of the word, following the pattern of Baal worship, is entirely false and unfounded. It is our conviction that this charge is not only without foundation, but that in making it, you have done a gross injustice to many of our trusted, honoured, and Spirit-filled workers." "Appraisal" affirms that the chapter on the "True Christ vs. the False Christ" "is honeycombed with so much fallacious reasoning that the reader utterly fails to discover what the authors are attempting to prove. . . . Anyone reading this chapter would never discover the differences between the so-called "false Christ" and the true Christ. At no time in her twenty-seven years of ministry following 1888 does Mrs. White suggest that we were worshiping a false Christ." The 1958 "Committee Report" seems to deal with the subject with more restraint and objectivity, acknowledging the possibility that some may have, through the

years, "erred on one or other point when dealing with the theme of righteousness by faith, or the person of Christ," but "this certainly cannot be taken justly as an indication that the denomination has strayed from truth and is worshipping Baal or following a false Christ. Must not it be that a presentation that leads, even unwittingly, to such sweeping conclusions is wrong in fact and in spirit, and suggests the need of greater discernment and restraint?"

It is appreciated that this aspect of the thesis of the manuscript was discussed in all three Reports, it is respectfully pointed out that in general the discussion is limited to an unsubstantiated denial of the grave danger of infatuation with a false Christ. The idea is naturally abhorrent to contemplate; it is thought that it just cannot be. But the factual exhibits from the writings of Sister White presented in the manuscript discussion of the matter are apparently ignored, it being assumed that the authors must have been either dishonest or unreasonable in their use of her writings.

Therefore, the General Conference should give consideration to the following specific points:

(a) The Manuscript never makes a "sweeping conclusion" or "charge" that the denomination as such in an official or total capacity has been or is worshipping Baal. Specifically, it likens our present state of confusion to Israel's confusion of old, when there were always those loyal to Jehovah who were the dominant party in the community of God's people, despite the confusion and tragic failure brought by the apostate element. (Cf. Manuscript p. 144; "Answer", p. 56).

Certain plain and pointed predictions of the frightful danger of

infatuation with Baal or a false Christ are most certainly found in E. G. White writings. The authors submit that they have not lifted these statements out of context. For example, particular attention should be given to statements found in TM 467, 468, where Baal worship is said to follow the tragic insult to the Lord Jesus inherent in the reaction to the Minneapolis message; and TM 138-141; GC Bulletin, 1901, p. 267; GC Bulletin 1893, pp. 420, 421; 5T 707; 5T 79, 80; 8T 291-299. These statements are cited on pages 143-145 of the manuscript.

QUESTION 8: Are these statements taken out of context, or twisted and if so, does the context of Sister White's writings give an over-all impression that there is no need for grave concern?

(b) Can the basic point be settled as to whether there is or there is not a false Christ in the world? Is it really true that Satan will clothe himself in garments of light as we approach the final stages of the great controversy, and seek to deceive the world by both misrepresentation and impersonation of Christ? If so, will he succeed eventually in deceiving the popular churches which Inspiration terms as Babylon? If there is agreement thus far;

QUESTION 8a: Will Satan make a serious attempt to involve the remnant church, the denominated Seventh-day Adventist Church, in this frightful ruin coming on the world, which is directly consequent upon mistaking the false Christ for the true? (There is no need for a fruitless discussion as to whether or not Satan will eventually succeed in his plan to involve the Seventh-day Adventist Church in ultimate apostasy; the authors of the manuscript emphatically and consistently have taken the position that he will not succeed.

The point is simply that in order to avoid unnecessary loss both of time and of souls, the facts of our history should be recognized for their true significance, and these inspired warnings be brought to the attention of our workers the world around.

(c) If the General Conference recognizes that there is a point in paragraph (b) above;

QUESTION 8b: Does it not follow that the appeal for a reconsideration of the righteousness of Christ in the light of the 1888 message as presented in the writings of Jones and Waggoner is highly in order? And should an appeal for study of this matter of Baal worship be dismissed as an outrageous and impertinent attack on the Seventh-day Adventist ministry, of which the authors are a part?

9. The General Conference reports on the manuscript have never alluded to the warnings therein in respect of confusing a highly refined species of Spiritualism with the reception of the Holy Spirit. This is dealt with specifically in the Manuscript, page 122, and 71 and 72, and 139-141. In the light of the prediction that the "omega" of deception would follow the "Alpha" of fifty-six years ago;

QUESTION 9: Can it be maintained that warnings addressed to us in that former generation are irrelevant today?

10. The over-all burden of the manuscript from beginning to end is an appeal for restoring the principle of the Cross to our preaching of the third angel's message. The Manuscript is virtually an historical investigation into the place of the Cross in our ministry. The Minneapolis reaction is seen to be due in reality, to an ignorance of the principle of the Cross.

Our contemporary confusion and spiritual impotence (usually spoken of as "lukewarmness"), is seen to be likewise due to this same ignorance of the place of the principle of the Cross in genuine Christian experience. The principle of the Cross is set forth as the only antidote to modern Baal-worship, which is specifically defined to be the worship of self disguised as the worship of Christ.

The authors do not profess to be capable of glorifying the true Christ in the preaching of the Cross, as the ultimate power and wisdom of God, which will enlighten the earth with His glory.

Thus, they appealed to the General Conference eleven years ago to publish an anthology of the writings of Jones and Waggoner when they were straight in an effort to begin to present the Cross to our workers. These writings were termed by Inspiration as "a most precious message," "just what the people needed." But their message was not appreciated by that generation, due to the prejudice and opposition continually exerted against it. The authors submit that this generation, having the benefit of history's perspective, will find a genuine stimulus in them to a greater appreciation of the Cross.

To date, the General Conference have refused this suggestion, categorically. It seems that their insistence that the writings of Sister White are sufficient is illogical and self-contradictory, inasmuch as she definitely appealed for their message to be given favourable consideration! However, if the General Conference continues to maintain that an anthology of Jones and Waggoner's writings cannot be published due to their subsequent apostasy, —

QUESTION 10: Would it not be possible to prepare for the world field a more suitable presentation of the principle of the Cross which will effectively

speak to the hearts of God's people in this critical time today, presenting the wisdom and power of God which will truly finish God's work in this generation?

11. Lastly, should not the General Conference consider the authors' analysis of the real significance of our past history in the light of the marriage of the Lamb to His Bride, the "New Jerusalem." Dominating the thesis of the manuscript and the "Answer" is the oft-repeated concept of the 1888 message as constituting the appeal of Christ to His denominated people as their Lover and their Bridegroom, which tender appeal they, personified as the Bride, apurned and repulsed (Cf. Manuscript, pages 5-7, 42, 48, 49, 50, 60, and "Answer", pages 51-54). This dominant thesis of the manuscript has never been touched upon in any of the General Conference replies to it. However, it is in this light that the call for "denominational repentance" should be understood. It seems to the authors that the General Conference have misunderstood this very serious matter. The Bride who will eventually have "made herself ready" can come to her Lord and her Bridegroom only in contrition, for hers has been the sin of the ages. Do not doubt that she will do so: the issue is simply whether the "blessed reality" will come in this our generation, or whether we must all be laid in our graves as were our brethren of 70 years ago, and a new generation come to this place of heart-felt contrition and reconciliation with the Lord Jesus that will make it possible for Him to return for His people.

QUESTION 11: Should we not do everything possible to bring this reality in our generation?

Respectfully submitted,

D. K. SHORT

R. J. WIELAND

July, 1961.

THIS ADDITIONAL COPY TYPED in March, 1967.