


*"Watchman,  
what of the night?"*

*"The hour has come, the hour is striking, and striking at you,  
he hour and the end!"*

*Eze. 7:6 (Moffatt)*



## **THIS YEAR In Retrospect**

### *Editor's Preface*

Since in the November issue of *WMN* we insert the listing of the manuscripts and publications available through the Foundation, the actual size of the publication is reduced one page. During the years, we have at times brought together for the November issue, news from the ecumenical world. This year, we will note in review some of the high points which were discussed during the year and update some of the issues, such as the crisis which has rocked the Roman Church.

The question can be asked, "Anything new in publication and research?" The answer is negative. Until we come to know what has taken place in the Church during the last half century, we will remain children in respect of what our duty is. Some may already have these documents, such as *Steps to Rome*, (being led by the eulogized "Adventist Statesman"); *The Hour & the End*; and "The Sacred Trust Betrayed." If you do, may we suggest that you call a friend's attention to their availability. One book that speaks volumes is *So Much in Common*, a book co-authored by B. B. Beach, and Dr. Lukas Vischer, who at the time of writing was secretary of the Faith and Order Commission of the WCC.

For those interested in a detailed study of what has happened over the past half century, we suggest the following sequence:

- 1) M. L. Andreasen's *Letters to the Churches*.
- 2) *SDA-Evangelical Conferences*, taking special note of the recorded telephone conversation between A. L. Hudson and Donald G. Barnhouse.
- 3) *Key Doctrinal Comparisons*, from the first Statement in 1872 to the 1980 Dallas Statement.

In Retrospect:

## This Year

**In the December issue of WWN for the year 2001, we called attention to the counsel given by the Lord's messenger in the *Review & Herald*, July 26, 1892. It read:**

We have many lessons to learn, and many, many to unlearn. God and heaven alone are infallible. Those who think that they will never have to give up a cherished view, never have an occasion to change an opinion, will be disappointed. As long as we hold our own ideas and opinions with determined persistency, we cannot have the unity for which Christ prayed.

**As we concluded the article, we commented, "If in 1892, there were lessons to learn, and many, many to unlearn, the intervening years have not nullified this counsel, and because it has not been done, it makes it even more necessary that such an attempt be made now." (p. 7).**

**In the January issue of this year, we began with the key doctrine of Adventism – the teaching and understanding of the meaning of the sanctuary which God, in blueprint form, gave to Moses at Mt. Sinai. The interpretive tool for this teaching is given in the book of Hebrews: The priests of the earthly type served "unto the example and shadow of heavenly things" (8:5).**

**Throughout the history of Adventism, there have been questions and problems over this basic teaching. Many are unaware that E. J. Waggoner of the 1888 team stumbled over aspects of the "orthodox" teaching. Prior to his sudden death in 1916, Waggoner wrote a letter to a friend in which he stated:**

Sin is a condition, not an entity. It exists only in the individual, and can be removed only by a new life in the individual. ...

Twenty five years ago [1891], these truths (of Christ's saving grace) coupled with the self-evident truth that sin is not an entity but a condition that can exist only in a person, made it clear to me that it is impossible

that there could be any such thing as the transferring of sins to the sanctuary in heaven, thus defiling that place; and that there could, consequently, be no such thing, either in 1844, A.D., or at any other time, as the "cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary." (pp. 9, 14)

**It is also of interest that as Waggoner continues his "Confession of Faith" he sets forth arguments very similar to those used by Cottrell in his essay read before the San Diego Chapter of the Association of Adventist Forums, February 9<sup>th</sup> of this year. (See WWN XXX-7) Because Cottrell has borrowed from Waggoner, and because Waggoner drew the conclusion he did, doesn't make it right, nor does it nullify the sanctuary truth. But it does make more imperative, that the counsel that we have many things to learn, and many, many things to unlearn, be applied.**

**Waggoner concluded correctly that sin is not an entity, but a condition. Further, in the type, one did not transfer sin to the sanctuary via his sin offering. The defiling record of sin had been or was already being placed in the books of Heaven (Dan. 7:10; Rev. 20:12).**

**In 1890, the first volume of the Conflict of the Ages series was published – *Patriarch and Prophets*. In it would be found the following paragraph:**

The most important part of the daily ministration was the service performed in behalf of individuals. The repentant sinner brought his offering to the door of the tabernacle, and placing his hand upon the victim's head, confessed his sins, thus in figure transferring them from himself to the innocent sacrifice. By his own hand the animal was then slain, and the blood was carried by the priest into the holy place and sprinkled before the vail, behind which was the ark containing the law that the sinner had transgressed. By this ceremony the sin was, through the blood transferred in figure to the sanctuary. In some cases the blood was not taken into the holy place; but then the flesh was to be eaten by the priest, as Moses directed the sons of Aaron, saying, "God hath given it you to bear the iniquity of the congregation." Both ceremonies alike symbolized the transfer of the sin of the penitent to the sanctuary. (pp. 354-355).

**In this paragraph is to be found a subscript asking the reader to turn to Appendix, Note 9. This note reads:**

When a sin-offering was presented for a priest or for the whole congregation, the blood was carried into the holy place, and sprinkled before the vail, and placed upon the horns of the golden altar. The fat was consumed upon the altar of burnt offering in the court, but the body of the victim was burned without the camp. See Lev. 4:1-21.

When, however, the offering was for a ruler or for one of the people, the blood was not taken into the holy place, but the flesh was to be eaten by the priest, as the Lord directed Moses: "The priest that offereth it for sin shall eat it: in a holy place shall it be eaten, in the court of the tent of meeting." Lev. 6:26, RV. See also Lev. 4:22-35. (p. 761).

**This note was in the original 1890 edition. Simply, it is saying that what was written in the text of the book does not accord with the Scriptures. This causes some questions to arise, and some observations on the data which has surfaced. First the data: 1) *Patriarchs & Prophets* was published in 1890 with the above quoted appendix note; 2) Waggoner indicates that it was in 1891 he confronted some cardinal points in the sanctuary message and found them wanting; and 3) in 1892, Ellen White called for the getting together in Bible study as was done at the beginning of the movement. Why? "We have many lessons to learn, and many, many to unlearn." Because of the date, 1892, one could conclude that the whole question still involved the issue of 1888, but a careful reading of the article in the *Review & Herald*, July 26, indicates a broader range of subjects.**

**Secondly, the questions: Instead of placing an appendix note, why did not the publishers go to Ellen White, and kindly, but pointedly indicate to her that she was not in line with Scripture on this point and make the corrections then and there? Why has there been no explanation of this variance with Scripture all these years while the attacks on the sanctuary truth have continued to mount?**

**In the type, the sin was a sin of ignorance, which when known was to be confessed. The penitent was to bring the specified offering and having placed his hand upon its head, was to slay it. (Lev. 4:22-24; 27-29). The common priest was to take some of the blood of the victim and put it on the horns of the altar of burnt offering, and pour the balance of the blood at the base of the same altar. The result to the confessor is clearly stated – "the priest shall make an atonement for him as concerning his sin, and it shall be forgiven him" (vs. 26, 31, 35). At no time was the blood taken into the sanctuary. The record on the horns of the Altar in the court was confessional. The steps were orderly: recognize the sin, confess the sin, accept a substitute, and the common priest secured forgiveness. This is also New Testament theology. "if we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, ..." (I John 1:9).**

**The important factor is that this transaction was done in the court, not in the sanctuary. Thus when the time of cleansing would come typically once a year, the High Priest would complete the "cleansing" ritual at that Altar. (Lev. 16:18-19). If sin were an entity, and the position valid that the sin offering transferred sin to the sanctuary, then the ceremony could have ended in the Most Holy Place; but being a condition, it must end in the person. Typically on the Day of Atonement, Israel gathered before the Court for just such a cleansing. In the February issue of WVN we discussed those illustrations from the Old Testament in Ezekiel and Zechariah which confirmed this point of view. The "Tau" involved persons not records. The records were not made the basis of wonderment, but men who had received a "change of raiment."**

**Another point dare not be overlooked. If the sacrifice of the sin-offering, and the finger printing of the blood of that sacrifice transferred sin as an entity to the sanctuary, then the easiest way to escape the condemnation of sin is not to confess. No confession, no registry in blood, thus no**

record of sin. One is home "scot-free." Except, that one would still be an unforgiven sinner facing the wrath of God against sin. Instead of accepting Him who was made to be sin for us, we would remain what we really are – sinners.

-+-

## Ὁ Ἀνομιος

Earlier in the year, the scandal within the Roman Church broke into the secular press, but we were unable to cover the subject until the June issue of WWN. We chose the title, as above, using the Greek word from II Thess. 2:8, translated in the KJV as "that Wicked (One)." Thayer, in his Lexicon translates this word, "He in whom all iniquity has fixed its abode." This is most accurate and very defining!

Several things have occurred since then. The American hierarchy of the Roman Church was summoned to Rome to hear the Pope's counsel. Upon their return, they met in session and formulated a policy which appeared to favor the molesting priest over the molested children. Then the Pope came to Toronto for the World Youth Day. Many lay Catholics were watching and listening to what he said and did. In *The Washington Post*, (August 4) a feature article by Mary McGrory summarized the reaction under the title – "Awaiting a Change Within the Church." In part, it read:

On his recent visit to Toronto, Pope John Paul II delivered two messages, one verbal and the other visual.

In his remarks at the World Youth Day Mass, the supreme pontiff lamented the "sadness and shame" of the pedophile scandal rocking the church. As before – in a Palm Sunday letter to the Roman clergy and an address to a Vatican meeting of U.S. bishops – he spoke glancingly of victims and urged sympathy for blameless priests who have been besmirched in the crisis.

His other message was conveyed in the presence of Boston's Cardinal Bernard Law, who is at the eye of

the hurricane, and whose handling of pedophilic priests in his diocese has led to the fury among the faithful and to calls for his resignation and even for his indictment. But readers of the Boston Globe, the paper that uncovered the scandal, were shocked to see a picture of the prelate dancing and singing with young pilgrims from Massachusetts.

The pope did not make any mention of the hierarchy's responsibility in the tragedy. Catholics are left to wonder if his attitude toward Cardinal Law is an implicit endorsement of Law's policy of coverup, payoff and fast shuffle of notorious pedophiles from parish to parish – with no warning to their new parish. Or is it simply an expression of hierarchical solidarity and a suggestion to the people in the pews that this is entirely a matter for the supreme pontiff to decide?

Ms. McGrory in her feature article indicated that there is a "fast-growing lay group" in the Roman church, called the "Voice of the Faithful." Founded in Boston, it has now over 22,000 members nationwide. The president of the group, Jim Post, a professor at Boston University, was "disappointed" at the pope's Toronto statement. He had hoped to have heard that the laity would be included in a solution, but instead he heard, "Go sit in the pews and be quiet."

Cardinal Law discouraged the formation of this group and has locked horns with it over "the all-important matter of money." When church contributions started declining because the laity objected having their funds used as hush money, the Voice of the Faithful offered direct contributions to needy agencies. Law balked insisting that all funds go through him.

Victims' Advocate David Clohessy, executive director of the Survivors' Network of those Abused by Priests, had trouble with the pope's formulation of an equation between child victims and priests unfairly tainted by the scandal. He calls it "ludicrous" to compare the embarrassment of priests to the devastation of children.

The founder and first president of Voice of the Faithful was Dr. James Muller, a professor at the Harvard School of Medicine and a Nobel Peace Prize winner. "As a devout Catholic, he instantly attracted

attention and support when, in a personal crisis of faith, he invited the laity to make known their anger and pain inside the church. Four thousand people attended a recent convention in Boston to endorse an idea that is anathema to the Vatican – the idea of divided power.”

Muller did not encourage nor agitate the removal of Cardinal Law. He explained:

It isn't just Cardinal Law. Sexual abuse is not just in the United States, it's all over the world. The underlying cause is the same as it was in the Crusades, the inquisition and other atrocities – it's absolute power.

While Dr. Muller perceives of the problem as “absolute power,” The Catholic World Report documents it as “The Gay Priest Problem.” In its November, 2000 issue, it published an essay by a Marine Corps and Navy Chaplain. One of his observations is relevant:

When more of your priests die by sodomy than by martyrdom, you know you've got a problem; when the man you bring for the fix comes down with AIDS; you know that you have got a crisis; and when the Pope first gets the facts thanks to *60 Minutes*, you know you're corrupt. (p. 57).

We first noted this Essay in the 2001 February issue of WWN. However, in the June issue of this year we detailed some of the data from *The Catholic World Report* including the foul language used by the South African auxiliary bishop, Reggie Cawcutt, who was exposed by Roman Catholic Faithful for his participation in a homosexual internet “chat room.” The report of this “chat room” participation has been given with all of its vulgarity in the August/September issue of *The Catholic World Report*, page 64. Along with this report is the release from the Vatican press office that the Pope has accepted the resignation of Bishop Reginald Michael Cawcutt, auxiliary of the archdiocese of Cape Town. Canon Law 401, par. 2, cited as the basis for the resignation reads, “A diocesan bishop who, because of illness or some other grave reason, has become unsuited for the

fulfilment of his office is earnestly requested to offer his resignation.”

Cawcutt is a self admitted “gay,” and he is quoted as saying on the internet, “I suppose the issue is really celibacy and not gay sex.” In all of this scandal that is rocking the Roman Church, and the various reasons being projected as to why, the problem; one senses that there is a relationship between the conduct of the pedophile priests, and the life style of their superiors all the way up into the Vatican curia.

- + -

2003

In another month, we face a new year. The subject matter for WWN must be selected. Do you have a suggestion? What type of research articles would be most helpful for you? Or what subject matter would best meet your spiritual needs? Send us either a card, or a brief note letting us know your thinking and convictions.

- + -

“We have nothing to fear for the future, except as we shall forget the way the Lord has led us, and His teaching in our past history.”

Life Sketches, p. 196

- + -

“Watchman, What of the Night?” is published monthly by the Adventist Laymen's Foundation of Mississippi, Inc., P. O. Box 69, Ozone, AR 72854, USA.

Editor, Publications & Research

Elder Wm. H. Grotheer

Regional Contacts:

Australia - P. O. Box 5023, Wodonga Plaza, VIC 3690

Canada - P. O. Box 117, Thorne, ON POH 2J0

Any portion of the Thought Paper may be reproduced without further permission by adding the credit line - “Reprinted from WWN, Ozone, Arkansas, USA.”

Current copy free upon request. Previous and duplicate copies - 50c.

800-4-LAYMEN (800-452-9636)

FAX - (479) 292-3745; Regular Calls - (479) 292-3721