



*"Watchman,
what of the night?"*

The watchman said, The morning cometh, and also the night: if ye will enquire, enquire ye: return, come. Isaiah 21:11-12

A CONFIDENCE KEPT 25 YRS.

HUDSON REVEALS A PROMISE MADE

- + -

Confirms Data Given Us

- + -

In the aftermath of the Ankerberg Show (See WVN, XVIII-9) in which Johnsson, Editor of the Adventist Review, was completely routed, A. L. Hudson of Baker, Oregon, wrote a letter to six people: Elder Kenneth Wood, recent Editor of the Adventist Review, and now Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Ellen G. White Estate; Dr. Wm. G. Johnsson; Robert Gerow, Manager of the Ankerberg Show; John Ankerberg; Dr. Walter Martin, and Douglas Hackleman, Editor of Adventist Currents. In this letter, Hudson revealed a telephone conversation with Dr. Walter Martin back in 1958. In that conversation, Martin gave to Hudson the following facts in regard to the SDA-Evangelical Conferences and the release of the book, Questions on Doctrine:

1. Adventists in the book, Questions on Doctrine had made serious changes from the script you [Martin] saw from [L. E.] Froom and [R. Allan] Anderson and the beliefs of Adventists today as portrayed by these brethren in hours of personal conversations. It was upon this information you [Martin] and Barnhouse had publicly declared Adventists were not a cult but brethren in Christ.

2. You told me you were asking these men for explanations which at the time of our conversation you had not received.

3. You told me that I was the first Adventist to contact you and tell you the whole thing would not fly, and you asked me not to say anything to upset the apple cart and the delicate relationship then existing. (Letter dated, December 7, 1985)

Now the question will arise - Why after some 25 years has Hudson decided to reveal this conversation and what it means to Adventism? He explains:

I said that I wouldn't and for some 25 years I've kept that promise and said or done virtually nothing to upset the cart; but the present situation is getting out of hand and past being funny. It is dishonoring to my God and counter-productive to His kingdom on earth.

What Martin told Hudson was simply that the answers the Adventist conferees gave to him and Barnhouse to the questions they asked were not the same answers as given in the published book - Questions on Doctrine - for the laity to read.

My acquaintance and friendship with Hudson began over the issues raised by the SDA-Evangelical Conferences. Soon after the publication of the book - Questions on Doctrine - Hudson prepared a Supporting Brief to a "Proposed Resolution" to be submitted to the Delegates of the 48th General Conference Session "Pertaining to the Book Seventh-Day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine". This Supporting Brief was distributed widely to Bible teachers in the Church's schools and to high ranking leaders of the hierarchy. I was given a copy to read which had been sent to the Bible Instructor at Indiana

Academy.

In reading this Supporting Brief, I discovered that Hudson had a copy of the manuscript which Wieland and Short had written in 1950 - 1888 Re-Examined. I had been trying to obtain a copy to read ever since it was first written. Elder Henry F. Brown who at the time was connected with the General Conference had alerted me to its existence. I wrote to Hudson, and he sent me a copy to read.

From this contact there followed an exchange of correspondence which led to a meeting in Marion, Indiana, between Hudson, Wieland, Short and myself. Out of this meeting came the decision to publish - The Church Triumphant, by Hudson, which though irregular in its issues, is still being published. I wrote for this paper under the pen name, Ben Ezra II. But during all of these years, I was never aware of the conversation Hudson had had with Dr. Walter Martin nor its contents. Hudson kept his promise well.

However, I did learn of the fact that Questions on Doctrine as published for the laity of the Church was a revision of the script given to Dr. Walter Martin. On one occasion when both Wieland and I were in Takoma Park, we went to see Elder Don Neufeld, who at the time, as I recall, was a book editor for the Review & Herald. Wieland was desirous of getting Neufeld's opinion of the manuscript - 1888 Re-Examined. In the course of the conversation, the book, Questions on Doctrine, came into the discussion. Don Neufeld told us that he had in his desk at the time a copy of the original answers as given to Barnhouse and Martin. He commented that the published book was a revision of the original script. Naturally, I asked if we could see the copy of the original answers. He declined.

A number of years later, I wrote to him asking if he would please release this original copy for the sake of truth, and the clarification of the apostasy in the Church. To this request, Neufeld replied in a letter dated October 28, 1977:

Dear William:

Enclosed is my order form and a check.

I still feel it would be unethical to make available copies of those original answers sent to Martin and

Barnhouse. I received them in confidence and would have to have the permission of the people involved before I could make them available to others. I hope you don't mind.

Very sincerely yours,
(Signed - Don)

Don F. Neufeld
Associate Editor

Hudson also had some contact with Neufeld. In his letter to the six men, after telling of his contact with Neufeld addressed a paragraph directly to Elder Kenneth Wood. Hudson wrote:

Adventist leaders did alter, probably considerably, the original script of Froom and Anderson. We cannot get a copy of it. Don Neufeld, associate editor of the Adventist Review told me personally in Washington a few years later, "We (presumably the Review staff) knew what was going on but ethically we could not do anything."

Therefore, Kenneth, you know what I am saying is the truth, and you can fill in details that are not known to me. You served with Don as your letter to Gerow indicates. My letter is not intended to be minutely detailed but rather true in dealing with what actually happened in principle and is written by one whose God is being dishonored by both "sides" in the controversy through partial historical truth. (Hudson, op. cit. Emphasis his)

In 1980, Neufeld died suddenly. All Adventist contact for us to obtain a copy of the original answers ended. We knew that Martin must have a copy of these same answers but he would not release them. We were able to document a few changes by comparing page 30 in Questions on Doctrine with the article in Eternity, November, 1956, where Martin quoted from the original draft copy. (See our manuscript - The Seventh-day Adventist Evangelical Conferences of 1955-1956) Hudson also knows that Martin has such a copy, and in his letter appeals to Martin to release the same. He wrote:

Brother Martin, I am appealing to you further to come out with a copy of the original script of your book and the original script of the Adventist book and say, "This was our honest attempt to reconcile Adventism and Evangelical Christianity." I believe it was an honest, if misguided attempt. (Ibid., p. 5)

To page 7, col 1 →

Transcript of a Recorded

CONVERSATION

between

A. L. HUDSON

and

DR. DONALD BARNHOUSE

May 16, 1958

Regarding the book

QUESTIONS ON DOCTRINE

(H) Good morning.

(B) Good morning.

(H) This is Al Hudson, Baker, Oregon.

(B) Bob Hudson?

(H) Al Hudson

(B) Al Hudson

(H) Yes

(B) Yes?

(H) On the 28th of last month I wrote you and Mr Martin and Mr. Bryant a letter relative to some articles which have appeared in your magazine on Seventh-day Adventists, etc.

(B) (To Secretary) Have we a letter from a Mr. Al Hudson, Baker, Oregon, concerning articles on the subject Adventists? All right, go ahead.

(H) The reason I mentioned that was to try to identify myself.

(B) Yes.

(H) Now, I'm in this letter ---

(B) What church are you connected with?

(H) I'm a Seventh-day Adventists.

(B) Yes.

(H) In my letter I stated what I'm calling you about. That's the reason I mentioned the letter. I thought if you might have caught it, why then you would know what-

(B) Well we get so many thousands of letters that it takes generally a long time to filter up to me.

(H) Sure, I appreciate that. Well, then I can give you just a brief resume of the situation. I'm writing a paper dealing with certain phases of developments in the Adventist church, particularly in the last decade. Of course this matter of our relationship to the Evangelicals has come along as part of the picture. And I've read your articles in Eternity, also Mr. Martin's articles, and articles that other Evangelicals have written. Now some time ago, I talked to Mr. Martin, oh, I guess it's been about a month ago. I was interested in when his book was coming out, and so on. I had talked to Mr. Bryant of Zondervan publishing, and Mr. Martin. Then I wrote up the result of our conversation as I understood it, and sent it to Mr. Martin, asking him to confirm it, or correct it as he might see fit, and I haven't heard from him. In fact, he seems unwilling to either confirm or deny the facts that we discussed in our conversation.

(B) Well, I tell you, I know this, that I know that his book has been cleared by our office, and it is on the way. I think that Zondervan doesn't want to publish it before September.

(H) I see.

(B) That's the situation. The book proposition. They don't want to break it out at this time of the year.

(H) I see. It's a matter of financial ---

(B) I don't know. It's a matter of hitting the trade at a certain time.

(H) I see.

(B) But what can I do for you?

(H) Well, now the question: there's quite a bit of controversy over this matter in the Evangelical press, and of course it is also appearing in our press. Now there seems to be one angle of the thing that I would like to get cleared up. Have, to your knowledge, either to you or to Mr. Martin, or anyone else, have Seventh-day Adventist leaders indicated formally or informally that they desire fellowship in the National Association of Evangelicals?

(B) I don't know anything about these things. My staff keeps me protected from all controversy so that I can sit here at my desk

and write, etc.

(H) I see.

(B) Now, I don't think there is any doubt of the fact that Seventh-day Adventists, that is the top leaders, understand that it is a very important thing for Seventh-day Adventists to be recognized as evangelical. But you see, the difficulty lies in the fact, that -- the one thing that I stated about Seventh-day Adventists, namely that they are believers, has been overlooked by Talbot, and King's Business, and these people. The fact that I've said to thousands of people already, I said, "All I'm saying is that the Adventists are Christians." I still think that their doctrines are about the screwiest of any group of Christians in the world. I believe this beyond any question.

In fact, the doctrine of the investigative judgment is the most blatant, face-saving proposition that ever existed to cover up the debacle of the failure of Christ to come in 1844 as they said. When the two men walked through the cornfield, and suddenly one of them struck his head and said, "Why, Christ DID come." Why this is ridiculous, asinine nonsense. The whole of the investigative judgment is a face-saving thing, and now that a hundred years have gone by, if the Adventists had the courage-- because now the Adventists are becoming educated. A hundred years ago, the Adventists were practically all illiterate. And now they are becoming educated, and they know their doctrines will not hold the light of exegesis. Just simply cannot stand. There is no Greek, no Greek scholar in the world, that will fail to accept the fact that Christ died once and for all. And that He didn't go in and out, and that He hasn't been wandering around in the tabernacle. He has been seated, and that He has never gotten up to walk anywhere in 1844, or any other place else. Now failure to understand this is intellectual, ah, laziness or fear.

Now, you see, Seventh-day Adventist group was formed by three groups that came together, each holding a pet doctrine that was false. One group held Sabbatarianism, the others didn't at all. The second group held the investigative judgment, the other groups did not hold it at all. And the third group held the doctrine of conditional

immortality, and the other groups didn't hold it at all. They were all united on the great truth of the second coming of Christ. And so, in order to come together in one union, they effected what is a compromise. Each accepted the folly of the other to get their own folly accepted. Because -- Now, if you'll drop a post card to my office, they'll send you my new booklet, "The Christian and the Sabbath," which has just been published about a week ago. You can get it free.

(H) The Christian and the Sabbath?

(B) Yes, Box 2000, Philadelphia. I have just made an exhaustive study of the folly of Sabbatarians preaching on "one man esteemeth one day above another, another man esteems every day alike." And I have just published this, and it's on -- in fact if you listen next Sunday morning on National Broadcasting System, I'm on this subject, the Christian and the Sabbath, right now. I'm preaching six sermons on the Sabbath coast to coast on NBC, pointing out that the Adventists are wrong in keeping Saturday, the Protestant are wrong in keeping Sunday, and that the only thing to keep is, to have the attitude that every day is alike and that God not only is not entering into this day, but He HATES the Sabbath day. You see.

(H) Well, now, in your contact with Adventist leaders, which you mention in your magazine, and also Mr. Martin, do you feel that our top ranking leaders, who have as you say, become educated, are tending away from this concept of the investigative judgment as you have just mentioned it?

(B) You see, what we know is this. I cannot speak for any of these men, Roy Anderson and Froom, etc. - these are intelligent men. They'll speak for themselves. They'll tell you what they're believing and what they are doing. You wouldn't want anybody to call you up, or call somebody else up, and ask what the inside of your thinking was.

(H) No, except that you have had association with them, have talked with them.

(B) We have had great association; in fact I have a letter on my desk this minute. When I asked my secretary she just handed me a letter from L. E. Froom, and we are in correspondence right along, with the leaders of the Seventh-day Adventist Movement.

(H) Well then, that was the basis of my question. Now you have mentioned in your articles in Eternity that it seems to you that there is sort of a transition period, or a ---

(B) There has to be.

(H) Or a metamorphosis as it were out of the--

(B) I mean there HAS to be. Take for example, we have discovered a book by Ellen G. White that nobody knows exists. The Seventh-day Adventists know that it exists, and they have a copy locked in their safe in Takoma Park, Washington. And it is a book that does not exist any place else. There are only about three copies in the United States, that we know anything about. Well, they lock it up, to keep anybody from getting at it.

(H) Have you read it?

(B) Walter Martin has read it.

(H) Has he?

(B) Sure.

(H) Well, ah ---

(B) I mean the Seventh-day Adventists themselves lock it up to keep people from getting at it because they realize that if anybody read that stuff, they would raise their hands in holy horror and say, "Now wait a minute. She was just a human being in the first place." Now, I recognize clearly that Mrs White very frequently wrote some very spiritual things, but God Almighty NEVER spoke through a woman. Let's face it. You can't justify a woman preaching and usurping authority over a man. It can't be done. Now, this is the position, psychologically we can understand the Seventh-day Adventist very well, and the fact that I took the lead in clearing them, in fact, I picked the Seventh-day Adventists out of the association of Christian Scientists and Jehovah's Witnesses, and have said, "These people are Christians." Seventh-day Adventists are immature Christians. I don't think there is any doubt of the fact that Seventh-day Adventists have a tremendous immaturity. And this immaturity rises from the psychological complex of their background. Because, I mean, have you read Fromm's history?

(H) I have it here. I use it as a reference

book. I haven't read it through, no.

(B) All right, well, if you go to the last volume of it and let him describe for you the whole Millerite proposition, he puts in capital letters, THE GREAT DISAPPOINTMENT, capital G, capital R, capital E, all capitals, THE GREAT DISAPPOINTMENT! Well, the great disappointment was that Jesus didn't come back on that day. Well, all of the people that were in that movement, were Presbyterians, Methodists, Episcopalianians, - it was an evangelical movement in all the great churches, looking for the second coming of Christ. Miller was a Baptist, Miller wasn't a Seventh-day Adventist. He didn't believe in Saturday the Sabbath; he didn't believe in the investigative judgment; he didn't believe in conditional immortality.

Now you see, these men, as I say, I forget the name of the man that went by the back way through the cornfield, you know who I mean. Well, let's face it. What happened to him that day was a great and terrible sin for what he was doing instead of getting down on his knees and saying, "Lord God, I've been a fool, and the Bible says that if any man makes a prophecy and it does not come to pass, you will know that I have not sent him." And there, I don't believe the Seventh-day Adventists are ever going to be any real witness unless the Seventh-day Adventist gets down on his knees and says, "Lord God, in the beginning we were founded on a lie," because your were founded on a lie.

(H) Well, of course those are moot points that ---

(B) Why, they're not even moot. I mean, if you take anybody that is not a Seventh-day Adventist, the five most honest men in the world, in fact if you take a Jew who is not a Christian, even, or a Roman Catholic, and put the thing up to them and say, "Now historically, judge!" why they're all going to say, "This is a face-saving proposition, at most; certainly it has nothing to do with the Bible."

(H) Well, I can see your line of reasoning.

(B) Now, I love all Christians. I love, and I have found - why, when these men came here to my home - I happen to have a nice place in the country - and these men came

to my home for days. And we were down on our knees together; we prayed together; we walked in the garden together. And let me tell you, Roy Anderson is one of the finest men I have ever met in my life and Unruh. We've prayed together. I know these men are brothers in Christ, you see, all that Talbot and the rest of them say -- I mean, you take the last copy of the magazine Evangelical Action, the organ of the National Association of Evangelicals. Brother, they came out in a big blast of Talbot and DeHaan against me and the Seventh-day Adventists, on the basis of the SDA book, but anybody who reads, have you read the big SDA book? [Questions on Doctrine]

(H) Yes, I have a copy here.

(B) Well, let's face it, in a very nice way, the leaders who have written this book, have moved from the traditional position of the SDA movement. They've come back toward the Bible.

(H) But they insist that they haven't. Now, that's the controversy, you see.

(B) What you fellows ought to do, now I don't know what your position is, but if you want to strike a blow for truth, write an article and come right out and say something like this, "Let's face the fact that we have error in our fundamental position. Let's abandon them and go forward with truth."

(H) Now you feel that Anderson and Froom are more or less of that disposition?

(B) Now I don't say that at all.

(H) You don't think so.

(B) No, I don't say that at all. They should be, but I think there are a lot of fellows that are holding sticks over them, and they don't dare to advance as much as they should.

(H) You think they would advance more if they weren't being held back?

(B) Look, I think you would advance more if you weren't being held back. If you follow the Holy Spirit, you would abandon the investigative judgment in one minute.

(H) Well, on the, of course there is a lot of doctrinal controversy there, but on the practical end, as I said before, it seems to me this matter of fellowship -- Now,

if Adventist leaders made overtures to the Association for recongition--

(B) I don't think they have.

(H) You don't think they have. Well, then the controversy in the Evangelical press to the effect that we are asking for fellowship has no foundation.

(B) I don't think it has any foundation. You see, in a large measure - let's face it, Mr. Hudson, in a large measure -- You see, most of the Fundamental Evangelicals in the United States are partially ignorant, and many, many of them are very jealous of me because I have had - I was a University professor, and have had a great education, and they know that if I say something that I have background for it. And they know what I've done in coming out in saying that Seventh-day Adventists are Christians. You see, Louie Talbot earned half of his living giving lectures against the cults, Christian Science, etc., and Walter Martin's rise has made Louie Talbot a has-been. Now this is the reason why he's attacking, and he's attacking me as much as he's attacking Seventh-day Adventists. You see, this we know.

(H) Well what is the basis of Mr. Martin's statement that there is no question, I think I have it here. "There is no doubt that Seventh-day Adventists desire to receive and to extend the hand of fellowship to all truly within the body of Christ," meaning, at least in part, the members of the National Association of Evangelicals.

To Be Continued

Comment - No doubt as you have read this conversation thus far, you have wondered - How could men who professed to be guardians of the spiritual interests of the people continue in dialogue, pray and find fellowship with one who believed as Barnhouse revealed himself in this telephone conversation with Brother A. L. Hudson. These Adventist leaders had to know early on how Barnhouse felt about the Sabbath and the priestly ministry of Christ in the Most Holy Place of the Heavenly Sanctuary. Was their "appetite" for human approbation so great that they would surrender truth to have it satiated? What a price to pay for such a "bowl of pottage"!

From page 2 - "A Confidence Kept 25 Years"

Now we know that the Adventist conferees - - T. E. Unruh, then president of the East Pennsylvania Conference; W. E. Reed, a Field Secretary of the General Conference; L. E. Froom, former Editor of Ministry; and R. Allan Anderson, then head of the Ministerial Association of the General Conference compromised the faith, denying the sanctuary truth, and the historic position of the Church on the Doctrine of the Incarnation as given in the 1888 Message. This is self evident as one reads Unruh's summary on the Conferences which he chaired. To what extent, no one can know until the original answers to the questions on doctrine as asked by Barnhouse and Martin are released. It is time that these answers be released. There is no doubt that somewhere in the Adventist secret "storage bins" copies are still extant. The Archives in Takoma Park may have such a copy. What ever the case, the Adventist laity should raise such a hue and cry that the hierarchy will have to release the document for all to read and see what was really said.

#

MORE FROM HUDSON'S LETTER

When Froom, Anderson and company presented their script for publication responsible Adventist leadership could no longer stand by for "ethical" reasons. Machinery was set in operation to modify the "answers" of Froom, Anderson and company so that Adventism would not throw them out.

At the same time Barnhouse, Martin and company had stuck out their necks in calling us "brethren in Christ" and answers must be prepared that would enable them to save face also. So Questions on Doctrine was made sufficiently ambiguous as to serve the purpose of saving face for both Adventists and Evangelicals involved.

It appears both Questions on Doctrine and The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism [by Martin] were to hit the public simultaneously with Adventists selling Martin's book in our book stores.

But Martin had the same trouble as Froom and company.

"Watchman, What of the Night?" is published monthly by the Adventist Laymen's Foundation of Mississippi, Inc., P. O. Box 789, Lamar, AR 72846, USA. It is sent free upon request. For Canada, write - The Adventist Laymen's Foundation of Ontario, P. O. Box 117, Thorne, Ont., POH 2J0. Any portion of this Thought Paper may be reprinted without further permission by adding the following credit line - "Reprinted from "Watchman, What of the Night?", Lamar, Arkansas.

Zondervan would not print Martin's book as the script was submitted. Bryant told me it "was too favorable to the Adventists." Apparently it took three years for Martin to work the script over so Zondervan would publish it. Questions on Doctrine bears a 1957 date and The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism bears a 1960 date.

As I see it from the information available to me what happened is quite simple and understandable. All parties concerned entered the project in good faith. Martin was the youngest of the men involved and had honest stars in his eyes. He was not experienced in the ways of organized religion. The rest of the men were. He was honestly taken in by Adventist leaders, and he sold Barnhouse.

Read my conversation with Barnhouse.¹ Froom did tell me what I alleged to Barnhouse. By saying Martin was honest I am not implying the other men were really dishonest - they were experienced clergymen in organized religion and professional clergymen and professional lawyers have ways somewhat mysterious to us laymen

Froom, Anderson and company backed by General Conference president Figuhr honestly thought they drew enough water to swing Adventism their way. They honestly thought² their way was the right way and a service to Adventism. I believe Martin honestly thought he was doing the cause of Christ a service by "making peace with the Adventists," and it would be were it possible.

Everybody really acted in good faith - except in the cover-up. Everybody involved knew they were covering up to save face. (Barnhouse obtained permission from Figuhr to sue me for recording our conversation but when I said I would be glad to discuss the whole thing in open court as neither side would talk in private, I heard no more from him.) [pp. 2-3]

¹In this issue of the Thought Paper (p. 3) we will begin the publication of the conversation between Barnhouse and Hudson verbatim. In the July issue we will conclude the transcription of the conversation.

²When other possible factors are considered, this conclusion is open to question.

#