

A Personal Response
to

The “Majority Report”

of the

Primacy of the Gospel Committee

of the

General Conference (PGC)

February 8, 2000

By

Robert J. Wieland

A member of the 1888 Message Study Committee (1888MSC)

And

A member of the Primacy Gospel Committee (PGC)

March 5, 2001

On May 17, 1994 the PGC was formed by action of the then president of the General Conference and by its ADCOM members (the highest administrative committee). The main purpose of this *ad hoc* committee was to study into the actual message that A. T. Jones and E. J. Waggoner taught during the 1888-decade (which message was then endorsed by Ellen G. White over 300 times), to determine if their message finds clear support in the Bible. Is the Seventh-day Adventist Church proclaiming it clearly today?

A secondary purpose also emerged—to seek for Christ like unity in understanding and proclaiming God’s last-day message of justification by faith. The president of the General Conference had expressed the hope that “the apparent rift” between the General Conference and the 1888MSC could be bridged.¹

In view of counsels from the Bible and Ellen White’s writings, these two goals were praiseworthy, for in John 17 Jesus pleads that His followers allow themselves to be “one,” and in 7:24 He commands us, “Judge righteous judgment.” The “Majority” members of the PGC on February 8, 2000 wrote their “Report” as the result of the final meeting. Widely published on the web, it has aroused deep interest. Questions sent to me, and requests, have led me to write this personal “Response.”

One of the key issues discussed during these six years was the definition of the 1888 message. The 1888 message was declared by Ellen White to be something far in advance of the “gospel” understandings of the Sunday-keeping churches because in her view it was “the beginning” of the loud cry of Revelation 18 and of the long-awaited (and long-prayed-for!) latter rain. Thus she saw the 1888 view of justification and righteousness by faith as a unique truth parallel to and consistent with the special Adventist idea of the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary, which work began in 1844.²

She recognized that no other church grasps this truth embodied in Daniel 8:14, which is the “foundation of our faith.”³ She identified the 1888 message as “the third angel’s message in verity.” Yet the great majority of Seventh-day Adventist Church members are uninformed of the actual content of the message, and are perplexed by confusing views of its history.

The 1888MSC representatives rejoiced when the General Conference leadership appointed them to be voting members of the PGC, for it seemed that at last these serious issues were to be studied fairly and thoroughly, with the Bible as the ultimate source of authority.

The PGC was composed of 17 individuals, 11 from the General Conference and 6 from the 1888MSC. It met about twice a year for a total of 15 full days. Frequently the 6 from the 1888MSC were alternately disappointed by what seemed an unwillingness to receive the Good News understanding taught by those whom Ellen White described as “the Lord’s special messengers,” and on the other hand they were encouraged by what seemed evidence that some were beginning to perceive that message more positively. In general, the spirit that pervaded the sessions was one of cordial Christian fellowship

and mutual respect. We were hopeful that the Lord could bring our minds into true harmony.

The prevailing attitude was thus the most open, friendly, and reasonable of any of the previous committees that had investigated the issues for 50 years. We appreciated what seemed to be sincere efforts to reach consensus. Several of the General Conference members at times expressed appreciation for key 1888 concepts that had previously been misunderstood. Thus the 6 members from the 1888MSC cherished hopes that the PGC would result in a fulfillment of Jesus' John 17 prayer that His followers become "one."⁴

At the final brief meeting on February 8, 2000, this positive spirit was abruptly reversed. An animus had developed, mysteriously.⁵ The hoped-for unity of spirit and convictions had vanished, as is clearly evident in the "Majority Report" published by the Biblical Research Institute of the General Conference.

The General Conference members of the PGC maintain that they are "the brethren of experience" to whom Ellen White said all theological questions should be submitted and whose judgment thereof should be considered final.⁶ But other "brethren" of very extended "experience" support positions of the 1888MSC!⁷ In fact, at least one General Conference member of the PGC itself supports our basic gospel understandings and rejoices for the existence of the 1888MSC.

The "Majority Report" prepared by the General Conference personnel of the PGC in advance of that brief final meeting was not brought to the committee as a whole for a vote. However, the apparent minority were assured that if they disagreed, they were at liberty to prepare a "Minority Report" which would be submitted to the General Conference (and we understood) would be published alongside the Majority one.⁸ This is the normal procedure with responsible investigating committees (indeed, dissenting justices on the U. S. Supreme Court regularly publish their views). World-wide interest in the 1888 message in the SDA church suggests that confidence in church leadership would require that the minority members of the PGC be heard as widely as the majority.

A point-by-point analysis of the "Disagreement" Items of the Majority Report

(The introductory 12 "Areas of Agreement" are largely platitudinous and could have been agreed on just as well on the first day of the sessions in 1994. All but the last would be endorsed by any orthodox Christian church. But that last one appears to cancel the later negative ones, for it says, "We agree that studying the 'most precious message' presented by Jones and Waggoner is important." That is just what the 1888MSC pleads for—study! Our very name has "*study*" built in. If Ellen White was right to say that the 1888 message was the "beginning" of the "light" of Revelation 18 and of the latter rain, it would follow logically that nothing could be more important to the Seventh-day Adventist Church—and to the world—than for us together to recover that message, be united in understanding it and in proclaiming it to the world).

1. The use or misuse of Ellen White's statements about the 1888 message and its history. We have asked only that a fair anthology of her actual bona fide comments

regarding the message and its history be made available to the church at large. If readers can see her testimony in context, it will settle all disputed points. The 1821-page photocopy collection (*The Ellen G. White 1888 Materials*) published by the White Estate is valuable for special scholars but difficult to read and expensive for the average church member. A more concise collection of her endorsements would clarify much confusion. We all agree that the spiritual condition of the church as a whole is as “lukewarm” now as it was in the 1888 era. What she said then regarding the value of the message of Jones and Waggoner is therefore applicable today.

2. Applying the primacy of the Bible. We are faulted for reading the Bible through the eyes of Jones and Waggoner. To this we reply: Yes, we want to read the Bible—just as it is, the naked text of Scripture, and present that Bible evidence so all can read and judge for themselves. Indeed, there are truths in the Bible to which Jones and Waggoner did call our attention, which otherwise we would not have seen.⁹ (They called some things to Ellen White's attention, too!). But what else should Jones and Waggoner do whom “the Lord in His great mercy sent”? If anybody calls our attention to *any* Bible truth, we must be grateful and receive it. Jones and Waggoner were never more than what Ellen White said they were—“the Lord’s special messengers” with “heavenly credentials.”

3. How much did Ellen White endorse the message of Jones and Waggoner? We want warm heart-felt unity with our General Conference brethren and sisters. But we must note that no evidence exists in her writings that says there are “*many* areas in which Ellen White differs with Jones and Waggoner.” This casts unjustified aspersion on the “most precious message” which the Lord gave Jones and Waggoner for His people. While the two were fallible mortals (as are we all), she would be guilty of gross ineptitude to write over 350 expressions of endorsement if she disagreed with them in “*many* areas”! In a very few instances during the years of her support, she cautioned or corrected them, but did not oppose their message. She wanted to help them express it more clearly to avoid misunderstanding. They accepted her counsels and profited from them.

But even if the Majority members were to reconsider and withdraw their word “many” and agree to substitute “some,” still no scholar has to date been able to document even one area of their mature message about righteousness by faith that she rejected or even faulted. The picture of wholehearted support shines clear and bright.¹⁰

4. Historical accuracy. Let’s have it. Ellen White’s inspired judgment renders her appraisal as more accurate than any non-inspired contemporaries. Time can never efface the history or change it. Common people can understand it. It could well be argued that our denominational post-1888 history is an exposition of Christ’s message to “the angel of the church of the Laodiceans” (Rev. 3:14-19). His word must supersede all of our opinions.

5. Corporate repentance. This indeed is the point of greatest objection.¹¹ The Majority Report says that “the impression should not be given that Ellen White called for corporate repentance” (in other words, it’s a wrong idea). But the issue is not did Ellen

White “call for corporate repentance,” but does the Lord Jesus *Himself* call for it?¹² The Majority Report assumes that a denominational repentance took place in the administration that followed the 1888 Session (O. A. Olsen’s leadership did not “take the same position in regard to Jones and Waggoner as the Butler/Smith administration”). Therefore, they say, no denominational repentance for rejecting the 1888 message is necessary today, and we are “wrong, wrong, wrong” for saying Christ calls for it, and we “have been wrong for 50 years.”¹³

But Ellen White says the new president elected in 1888 supported the men who *opposed* the 1888 message. Our conscience is bound to the inspired record. “Elder Olsen . . . acted as did Aaron in regard to these men who have been opposed to the work of God ever since the Minneapolis meeting.” He could talk well, but his deeds didn’t match: “I feel very sorry for Brother Olsen. . . . He has not acted upon the light given. The case is a mysterious one. . . . He has ventured on, directly contrary to the light which the Lord has been giving him. All this confuses his spiritual discernment, and places him in a relation to the general interest, and wholesome, healthy advancement of the work, as an unfaithful watchman. . . . He has given unmistakable evidence that he does not regard the testimonies which the Lord has seen fit to give His people as worthy of respect, or as of sufficient weight to influence his course of action.”¹⁴

When she was “exiled” to Australia with his approval she left manuscripts with him for our leaders in America, rebuking them for heart-opposition to this “most precious message.” To illustrate the “Aaron” comparison, she had to say, “The President of the General Conference . . . went directly contrary to the cautions and warnings given him.” Regarding her “exile,” she says “you were willing to have the strong experience and knowledge that comes from no human source removed from you.”¹⁵ She wrote to I. H. Evans that the new president had “rejected” the trust placed with him in regard to the 1888 message.¹⁶

Will not thoughtful people worldwide understand that the call of the Lord Jesus Christ for such denominational repentance is valid today? *This seems to be the underlying issue of opposition.*

6. Universal Legal Justification. During the PGC’s sessions, serious attention was given to what the Son of God accomplished by His sacrifice. We know that not all on the “majority” side agree with this apparent disregard of what Paul teaches in Romans chapters 3 to 6. Our focal point of study was expressly commanded to be *the Bible*. To cite Ellen White as in *apparent* conflict—impossible! According to Scripture teaching, there are two consequences of Christ’s sacrifice: (a) As “the Saviour of all men” and as (“the Saviour of the world,”) He gives a *gift* to “all men . . . justification of life.” This present life is for “all men,” believers or unbelievers, *the gift* of His grace.¹⁷ (b) And to those who “believe” He also gives something more—eternal life. The “Majority” quotation from Ellen White says the same, as do all her writings. Where can there be any conflict?

7. The “in Christ” Motif. When the Father put His arms around Christ at His baptism in Jordan, did He not also embrace the human race?¹⁸ He adopted them “*in Him*,” made

“all men” “accepted *in the Beloved*,” unworthy as we are. *In this sense*, the entire human race is “adopted” “*in Him*.” Christ by His sacrifice has died the second death of “all men” and so redeemed them. We understand that the sinner must know how God has totally taken the initiative in his salvation.

Is it not true that the third angel’s Good News is not to arouse an egocentric-motivated, fear response, but one of gratitude for what Christ has *already* accomplished and has already given as a gift as surely as Esau was given his birthright.¹⁹ It is unfair to attribute to the “in Christ” idea the charge of antinomianism. The sinner’s “acceptance” is not what initiates the process of salvation; it was *already* accomplished by Christ’s sacrifice, but can be rejected as Esau “sold” his birthright. Do we have to defend this before the General Conference? Contrary to the misreading of Romans 5 in the “Adventist Bible” (*The Clear Word*), what Christ accomplished on the cross is not a mere “offer,” but in the actual words of Paul repeated five times, it is a *gift given* to “all men” (vss. 15-18).²⁰ We simply appeal to what every responsible translation of Paul’s words makes clear. The truth vitally affects the spiritual health of the church and its soul-winning success.

The “in Christ” truth flows from understanding the work of Christ in the Most Holy Apartment. We see this as the essence of the “most precious message” the Lord “sent” to us. This is not an invention of the 1888MSC—the message itself is in the original sources. We seek only to defend a glorious Bible truth. The Sunday-keeping churches are *not* proclaiming it. Surely the General Conference cannot oppose light which “the Lord in His great mercy sent” us! Surely they will eventually let the people see that light as He sent it.

8. *The Nature of Christ.* Yes, we *must* indeed be “careful, exceedingly careful as to how [we] dwell upon the human nature of Christ.” Does careful attention to our published writings on the subject demonstrate this “exceeding carefulness.” We think so.²¹ For example, we never say carelessly that Christ “had” a sinful nature; we insist on the exact inspired language, “He took on His sinless nature *our* sinful nature.”²² Interestingly, certain thoughtful non-Adventist writers and theologians have been forging ahead of the General Conference in coming to embrace this Bible truth quite as Jones and Waggoner understood it.²³

9. *Jones and Waggoner and the Reformers.* The idea that Jones and Waggoner saw no truth on justification by faith beyond what Luther and Calvin saw—how can this be substantiated?²⁴ We earnestly prayed that the Lord might help us demonstrate to the General Conference that the righteousness by faith in “the [1888] third angel’s message in verity” is truth beyond what Luther, Calvin, and the Reformers could see, and greatly beyond what the contemporary Sunday-keeping churches teach today. But this Majority Report would seem to indicate that we did not succeed.²⁵

10. *The Old Covenant.* We are asked to believe “that the old covenant . . . is equated with the Torah [Ten Commandments] of Sinai.” Is this not the position taken by former Adventist minister Dale Ratzlaff and other contemporary anti-Adventist writers? Ratzlaff is Adventism’s new “Canright,” the most assiduous opponent of our denomination. The issue of the two covenants was one of the most hotly contested truths of the 1888

message; must it remain so today? Despite Ellen White's unequivocal endorsement (through vision) of the truth of Waggoner's position,²⁶ it is here again classified as an area of General Conference "disagreement," just as it was a century ago.²⁷

11. Attitude of criticism. Is there need for extended comment? Ever since the Holy Spirit has been working in our sinful world, the possibility has existed of "loyal criticism." Our record demonstrates more than half a century of unequivocal loyalty to the organization of the Seventh-day Adventist church and to its doctrines (may the Lord never let go of us)²⁸:

- We have never held a camp meeting anywhere in the world.
- We have never held a "conference" in a non-Adventist venue.
- We have spoken in hundreds of Seventh-day Adventist churches in many lands, but never without official invitation or approval.
- We teach and practice loyal tithing to the organized church.
- We teach the support of the organized church with offerings.
- For years we have requested the General Conference to appoint someone as a member of our board of directors.
- We welcome General Conference counsel.
- The fact that we have a legal organization is what other loyal para-church ministries have within the denomination.
- We have always invited General Conference criticism or refutation of anything we have ever published, and seek to dialogue.
- In no way are we in competition with the organized church.
- "Conflict within congregations" occurs only when pastors or individuals are influenced by purported "official" propaganda creating contentious opposition to essential Good News elements obvious in the 1888 message itself.
- We "support no activity across the world" that is in the least detrimental to the objectives of the organized Seventh-day Adventist Church.

In Summary:

We appeal to leaders and members of the Seventh-day Adventist Church to study a message which Ellen White declared to be "most precious," the "beginning" of the Revelation 18 loud cry proclamation and initial "showers from heaven of the latter rain."

The Majority Report compares us to John Wesley. His history is said to be "extremely informative here" with respect to the 1888MSC. Anyone who has read history knows

that the reason why John Wesley preached in the streets and in the open fields is because the Anglican hierarchy closed the doors of their churches against him. He saved England from the horrors of the French Revolution, in spite of his church leadership's opposition to him. He died loyal to the Church of England. We pray that the Lord may give us grace to emulate his loyalty to Christ. Our built-in convictions of half a century regarding corporate guilt and repentance make impossible the PGC's implied prediction that we will eventually start a new church. We must protest this virtual slander.

12. *The church and justification by faith.* We would ask with deep respect, in what way can it be truthfully said that we "differ" with the official statements cited? It would seem reasonable that the General Conference should wish us well for emphasizing in an effective heart-warming way what those statements say.

Regarding the "Observations." Never have we said that the Church is "proclaiming a false gospel." What we have said is quite different. There are elements of the gospel that the Lord "sent" to us in 1888 that have been "kept away" from our people and from the world.²⁹ What was rejected by leadership and "kept away" from the church and the world was the message God intended would prepare *that generation* to meet the final issues and to be ready for the coming of Christ in that era. *The church is not preaching a false gospel*; it desperately needs the enrichment that "the Lord sent" in the 1888 truths.

What we say or think is of no moment. It is He who says that the "angel" of the church feels "rich and increased with goods, in need of nothing," to whom He says (not we!), "Be zealous, therefore, and repent."

Re the "Appeal." Evidence is clear that we are not in any way working "outside the organized Church." We are very much (thank God!) a part of the Church. Like John Wesley, we choose to minister within the organization; it is others who try to force us "outside" by publishing a misleading judgment about us. But we remain loyal, trusting in God.

We appeal to the General Conference: please take the initiative to "promote harmony in both doctrine and relationships" with sincere, honest people in the church who sense a hunger and thirst for a clearer understanding of righteousness by faith. The Holy Spirit will never cease to plead with the General Conference (and with ourselves) to come into genuine heart-unity and to "be of one mind" (Phil. 2:2).³⁰ Such unity is not only possible (contrary to some pessimistic opinions), but it will become certain in the providence of God as time goes on.

Even though there is some temporary, partial General Conference opposition, we urge all who read this to remain in fellowship with the organized church. Pray for church leadership. The Holy Spirit *is* working. Pray for church leadership. Support the Church in loyalty to Christ. There is a Bride who must "make herself ready" for a wedding. According to God's word, Heaven will give the gift of repentance and heart-unity "in Christ."³¹

Endnotes:

¹ Letter, April 18, 1994. The “rift” was always one-sided; we have been loyal to the General Conference throughout the 50 years of these discussions.

² See her series of weekly articles in the Review and Herald from January 21 through April 8, 1890. She repeatedly and emphatically links the specific message of Jones and Waggoner at that time with the unique Adventist idea of the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary. Her endorsements continued through 1896, and even into 1897.

³ *Evangelism*, 221.

⁴ Ellen White declares that those who will give the last message to the world *will* become one, united in their understandings of theology (*Historical Sketches*, 124).

⁵ The reason may have been that the 1888MSC had printed a little booklet containing the ten Bible studies we had presented to the PGC (entitled *What Is the 1888 Message?*). This the Majority members interpreted as a breach of trust. The booklet was intended as seeking counsel from our own constituency. It divulged nothing regarding confidential attitudes or discussions within the PGC itself. Another possible cause of resentment could have been a letter from this writer to the PGC members linking what a January 10, 2000 *Newsweek* article said about “sexual promiscuity” in largely “Christian” Africa as the leading cause of the AIDS plague there—as related to our nature of Christ issues. Any suggestion that the “sinless nature theory” could be related to Roman Catholicism and sexual sin is deeply opposed.

⁶ *Testimonies*, Vol. 5, 293 (1882). The original context concerns a “Brother Raymond” whose innovative teachings on Daniel and Revelation were destructive of the very foundation of the church. His opposition was to basic church teachings. EGW did not use that statement to try to silence discussion six years later, although so-called “brethren of experience” wanted to do so.

⁷ One of them was Dr. Arnold Wallenkampf, at one time a member of the Biblical Research Institute whose books *What Every Christian Should Know About Being Justified* and *What Every Adventist Should Know About 1888* largely support the 1888MSC views (R&H, 1988).

⁸ The reader is referred to the “official” Response of the 1888MSC dated March 25, 2000, available on request from their office (8784 Valley View Drive, Berrien Springs, MI 49103; 616-473-1888; fax 616-473-5851; glad 1888@parrett.net).

⁹ The reader may see the actual Bible studies we presented to the PGC as published in the spiral-bound book, *What Is the 1888 Message?* The studies are totally Bible based.

¹⁰ George Knight cites what he sees is evidence of the alleged “many areas” of Ellen White’s disagreement with them—her *one remark when she first heard Waggoner at Minneapolis*: “Some interpretations of Scripture given by Dr Waggoner I do not regard as correct.” “Some things presented [by Waggoner] . . . do not harmonize with the understanding I have had of this subject” (MS. 15, 1888), but Knight always omits her immediate qualifying phrase, “if I fully understand his position” (cf. *From 1888 to Apostasy*, 99; *Angry Saints*, 43-45; *A Search for Identity*, 100, 101; her qualifying expression is consistently deleted). Later she did understand. “Every fiber of my heart said amen” (Ms. 5, 1889) is typical of hundreds of similar warm endorsements.

¹¹ A brief definition: corporate repentance is realizing that none of us is innately better than anyone else, apart from the grace of Christ. We see that the sins of someone else would be our sins but for that grace. Just as “we” were the ones who crucified Christ, so “we” were the ones

who “in a great degree” rejected the beginning of the loud cry and of the latter rain. The corporate sin is in our corporate humanity. Corporate repentance is therefore appropriate.

¹² See the author’s book presented to the PGC members: *Corporate Repentance—Plea of the True Witness*.

¹³ See the list of Ellen White appeals for corporate and denominational repentance listed in Dr Fred Bischoff’s personal “Response” to the Primacy Report, available from the 1888MSC office. The Majority were insistent that the denomination is proclaiming the message clearly and powerfully.

¹⁴ Letter to A. O. Tait, Aug. 27, 1896; *1888 Materials*, pp. 1607, 1608. This is not quoted to disparage the memory of this dear man of God; it is simply honest truth that he unwittingly used his influence to delay finishing the gospel commission (“thou knowest not,” Rev. 3:17).

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 1620-1622; the *Adventist Review* once recently described her going to Australia as an “exile.”

¹⁶ Letter E51, 1897, copy in White Estate vault.

¹⁷ See DA 660; Rom. 3:23, 24; 5:16-18.

¹⁸ See DA 113, He made the human race “accepted in the Beloved” (Eph. 1:6).

¹⁹ Esau “sold” something that had not merely been “offered” him but which had already been *given* him and which he *had*. So those who are lost at last will be lost not because they rejected something Christ merely “offered” them, but they “sold” something He had already *given* them. Paul’s truth seems to stretch our current comprehensions. The power of the soul-winning appeal implicit in the 1888 message goes beyond our usual presentations. The position generally endorsed by the General Conference is that Christ gave nothing to “all men” except the physical life also given to the animals, and that “a judicial . . . verdict of acquittal” (Rom. 5:16, NEB) was merely *offered* to “all men,” not actually a gift *given* to “all men” through Christ’s sacrifice. As was the case over a century ago, good sincere people fear the 1888 view as leading to antinomianism.

²⁰ While it is also “offered” as a “gift” it is infinitely more: Christ gave it.

²¹ Compare the lack of that “exceeding carefulness” in some books by PGC Majority authors.

²² *Medical Ministry*, 181, emphasis added.

²³ For example: D. M. Baillie; Anders Nygren; Karl Barth; J. A. T. Robinson; T. E. Torrance; C. E. B. Cranfield; Nels F. S. Ferre; Leslie Newbigin; Harry Johnson; Clark H. Pinnock. Of course they have known nothing of “1888,” only the Bible!

²⁴ Knight cites an apologetic remark Waggoner made at the 1891 General Conference Session in which he sought to allay the brethren’s suspicions by saying he was simply trying to recover the message of Luther and the Reformers. Knight relies on that remark as Waggoner disclaiming that further light was now needed. Yet at the same Session Waggoner said he believed that the latter rain was then beginning in a clearer understanding of Romans and Galatians—concepts that Luther and Calvin could not see clearly in their day.

²⁵ Louis R. Conradi taught that the 16th century Reformers preached the third angel’s message; according to Ellen White the essence of that message is justification by faith in the light of the cleansing of the sanctuary; so if Jones and Waggoner were merely preaching the 16th century Reformers’ message (the Majority PGC position), logically there is no need for the SDA church to exist. This is where their Report seems unwittingly to be leaning.

²⁶ Letters 30, 59, 82, 1890. See our “Lightened With His Glory,” 109-114.

²⁷ Dale Ratzlaff’s propaganda is a serious threat to many of our uninformed church members. He boasts that his education was Seventh-day Adventist from the cradle roll through our theological Seminary. If he had been exposed to the 1888 view of the two covenants he could not build his propaganda on the view of the two covenants opposite that of Jones and Waggoner! Again, the reader is referred to the appendix of *What is the 1888 Message?* for a study of the 1888 view of the two covenants.

²⁸ We have interacted and dialogued with seven General Conference presidents and/or their administrations, with the correspondence on file (Spicer, McElhany, Branson, Figuhr, Pierson, Wilson, Folkenberg).

²⁹ 1SM 234, 235. “In a great degree” the church and the world are deprived of further light that was the beginning of the loud cry.

³⁰ The interested reader is again referred to this spiral-bound booklet that was presented to the Primacy of the Gospel Committee before the last meeting when the Majority Report was drawn up. The booklet is available from: The 1888 Message Study Committee, 8784 Valley View Drive, Berrien Springs, MI 49103; 616-473-1888; fax 616-473-5851; e-mail: glad1888@parrett.net

³¹ Cf. Zech 10:12-13:1; EGW, *Historical Sketches*, 124.