

3268 W Niccoet
Banning Calif 92220
October 4, 1968

Elder L E Froom
General Conference
Washington

Dear Elder Froom:

Please excuse my delay in replying to the body of your letter of September 3. Not possible until now.

You suggest that I have misread you in that I said you maintain that "the 1888 message was well accepted" and that I am the only one so to conclude.

May I comment briefly:

1. The mimeographed "tentative section of a chapter" which you sent in 1964 says: "Many of the 'some' rejecting the message in 1888 made confessions of error . . . and accepted it and/or ceased their opposition thereto--thus reducing the rejecting 'some' to a relatively small percentage . . . [which did not] . . . represent the movement." Again, page 3: "Such an action [appointing Jones editor] neither could nor would have been carried out if the leadership had rejected the message . . ." Is this not a clear implication that they accepted it? It's basic to our understanding of the gospel that if one doesn't accept it he rejects it. We'd be splitting hairs if we said you can refuse to accept Christ and still not reject Him.

2. For four pages you maintain that the "message" was not rejected and then at the end of page 4 you concede that there was a "failure of all to accept righteousness by faith with all their hearts, [and] the Loud Cry was muffled and the Latter Rain restricted." Certainly we can both agree on the complete truth of your next clause: we have been "in this old world many more years." It seems to me that the difference in our positions is entirely semantic, and that there should be no conflict between us: you say the brethren failed "to accept [the message] with all their hearts", all the brethren, at least enough of them to have led the church into an acceptance, so that "the Loud Cry was muffled and the Latter Rain restricted"; and I have merely said in very concise English that the beginning of the Latter Rain and Loud Cry was rejected by the responsible and influential leadership.

3. We have never said that the historic Protestant doctrine of justification and righteousness by faith was rejected by the leadership. We simply presented evidence from Sister White that the 1888 message was a further development of truth parallel to and consistent with the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary and that it was intended by its Divine Author to prepare a people for translation in that very generation. The simple fact that that generation were not translated is prima facie evidence not that God failed but that they failed. This generation and future generations if our unbelief requires that they follow us will surely see this simple fact! The interpretation of our history that Brother Short and I have presented clears God of the charge of unconcern and failure to grant the requests of His people for the latter rain today. We have declared His faithfulness and His salvation and have not yielded to the great temptation to conceal the historical

evidence of truth "from the great congregation".

4. I would suggest with great kindness that your statement on page 3 of the mimeographed document you sent to me, "If Mrs. White were living today she would surely repudiate and rebuke the charge of leadership-rejection" is a clear example of what I meant in my letter of presenting your "particular viewpoint". I realize that this tentative section may not appear in print, but I assumed it represented your viewpoints. I simply hold that the evidence is clear in the over-all contextual picture of her writings that there was indeed a leadership-rejection.

5. Recently I heard one of the most respected ministerial voices in Adventism state that although there was not a "denominational rejection" (the people never had a chance to reject the message!) there was a "leadership rejection". He is only one of many, who when they stop to think of the fact that since we are here 80 full years after Heaven sent a message intended to bring that generation to translation and to finish the work then and there, surely the leadership must not have accepted it! A G Daniells himself said: "The message has never been received, nor proclaimed, nor given free course as it should have been in order to convey to the church the immeasurable blessings that were wrapped within it." (COR 47). I agree with him!

6. By careful count the word "reject", "rejected" or "rejection" occurs at least 26 times in F G White statements relating to the reaction against the 1888 message by the generic term "our own brethren" or by "many" of the leadership; and dictionary synonyms of "reject" occur at least a further 18 times. And she is not in full context discussing "small pockets" or "certain individuals" or "discordant voices" that "do not constitute or represent the movement". She wouldn't waste time and words on such insignificant and uninfluential sectors. Speaking categorically of the reaction at both the 1888 and 1889 Conferences, Sister White said simply of the brethren generically: "There was no reception". (March 16, 1890). Her retroactive statement of 1896 upholds the same viewpoint "in a great measure" and "in a great degree" admitting that the message was "shut away" from our people and from the world (1 SM 34, 35). Elder Prescott said in 1901: "For the past thirteen years this light has been rejected and turned against by many and they are rejecting it and turning from it today." Elder Daniells' statement quoted above was 1928.

7. Lastly we have never said that the rejection was total. Always a "few" did accept. This is clearly illustrated in Scripture which plainly says of the Jews' "rejection" of Christ, "His own received Him not". That is the retroactive, summary view of the inspired apostle in the latest book written of the NT. Yet, "some" of the Jews did receive Christ, including a "great company" of the priests. If the 1888 leadership accepted the beginning of the Loud Cry and the Latter Rain, then it is just as reasonable to say that the Jews accepted Christ, or at least to deny John's statement that "His own received Him not."

If you think my over-all position is error, would you kindly present the inspired evidence?

With kind regards,

Sincerely yours,

Robert J Wieland