



# "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*

## DANIELLS VERSUS FROOM

One of the sections of Elder D. K. Short's manuscript - The Mystery of 1888 - is entitled, "Daniells versus Froom."<sup>1</sup> It is this aspect of the historical review of 1888 which we wish to cover in this thought paper.

In the very first paragraph of Froom's foreword to his book, Movement of Destiny, Froom bases the first cause for writing the book on a mandate given him in 1930 by Elder A. G. Daniells. He states that he was urged by Daniells to present a "comprehensive portrayal - one that would honor God and exalt truth."<sup>2</sup> Froom writes he was further "admonished" by Daniells "to be fair and faithful to fact, comprehensive and impartial in treatment, and to present the full picture in balance." He finalizes Daniells mandate in these words:

He charged me to take due note of the impediments, as well as the incentives, involved in our advance. A true and trustworthy picture was imperative. Truth, he insisted, is never honored by shading or shielding. And only in candid portrayal can we really see the divine hand of God that has so clearly led us. So he urged me to plumb the depths, to record faithfully, and to evaluate the storms as well as the calms. He wanted the portrayal to be both comprehensive and trustworthy.<sup>3</sup>

Froom concluded his foreword with this words - "Above all, I must not be unfaithful to God and to the Church, and the burden that had been placed upon me." This was his New Year's resolution of 1970, for the statement was dated, January 1, 1970.<sup>4</sup>

In the previous thought paper, we noted what Froom had to say about the General Conference of 1888. By way of review note the following observations:

It [1888] definitely introduced a new epoch. After its initial conflict a period of revival and heart searching followed. . . 1888 therefore came to mark the beginning of a new note and new day, the significance of which was

not fully sensed at the time. . . 1888 was not a point of defeat, but a turn in the tide for ultimate victory.<sup>5</sup>

Froom in his foreword to Movement of Destiny also noted that Daniells had begun a "brief recital" of the events and reaction of 1888 in the book, Christ Our Righteousness.<sup>2</sup> But what does Daniells actually write in his book in regard to what Froom calls a "revival", "a new epoch", and "a new note and new day."? Observe carefully:

How sad, how deeply regrettable, it is that this message of righteousness in Christ should, at the time of its coming, have met with opposition on the part of earnest, well-meaning men in the cause of God! 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 measureless blessings that were wrapped within it.<sup>6</sup>

Daniells also wrote:

Who can tell what would have come to the church and the cause of God if that message of Righteousness by Faith had been fully and whole heartedly received by all at that time? And who can estimate the loss that has been sustained by the failure of many to receive that message?<sup>7</sup>

Now if Elder A. G. Daniells is giving a fair and accurate summation of the 1888 Conference and its aftermath in regard to the message of Righteousness by Faith, then Froom has betrayed his mandate and perpetrated a deception on the Church. His New Year's resolution of 1970 constitutes a Jesuitical fraud of the darkest hue.

Daniells plainly stated that the cause of the rejection of the message of 1888 was due to the action of the leaders of the Church. Here are his words:

The message was not received alike by all who attended the Conference; in fact, there was a serious difference of opinion concerning it among the leaders. . . This difference of views among the leaders led to serious results. It created controversy, and a degree of estrangement which was most unfortunate.<sup>8</sup>

This Froom denies. He writes:

There is one contention that, regrettably, had periodically been brought forward that needs to be considered frankly in our quest for historic truth. Ever since the 1888 tensions there has been recurrent harpers on the note that the Church, and primarily its *leaders*, actually rejected the Message of 1888 - at and following that fateful hour of trial.<sup>9</sup>

In the Appendixes to the book, Movement of Destiny, Froom vigorously states the

charge that the Message of 1888 was rejected by the leaders of the Church "*is an assumption without justification in historical truth or fact.*"<sup>10</sup> Then he concludes - "And it should be added that no defector or detractor, through the years, has ever produced any such E. G. White statements, or evidence, sufficient to convince unbiased scholars."<sup>11</sup>

Here again the deception of From surfaces, and his New Year's resolution takes the shape of a "cover-up" for the distortion of truth. The servant of the Lord has plainly placed the rejection of the message of 1888 on the "brethren" in leadership. Here are her words:

An unwillingness to yield up preconceived opinions, and to accept this truth, lay at the foundation of a large share of the opposition manifested at Minneapolis against the Lord's message through Brethren Waggoner and Jones. By exciting that opposition Satan succeeded in shutting away from our people, in a great measure, the special power of the Holy Spirit that God longed to impart to them. . . The light that is to lighten the whole earth with its glory was resisted, and by the action of our own brethren has been in a great degree kept from the world.<sup>12</sup>

It is at this point that the mystery in regard to 1888 deepens. Elder Daniells noted in his brief presentation in 1926 that while ---

no complete report of the presentation and discussion of the message of Righteousness by Faith at the Minneapolis Conference was published, . . . through subsequent writings of the spirit of prophecy, information is furnished regarding developments in connection with the giving of the message and its reception and also its rejection, and it is quite necessary to become familiar with this inspired information in order to understand better our present situation."<sup>13</sup>

Then he wrote these key sentences:

It would be far more agreeable to eliminate some of the statements given in the spirit of prophecy regarding the attitude of some of the leaders toward the message and messengers. But this cannot be done without giving only a partial presentation of the situation which developed at the Conference, thus leaving the question in more or less of mystery.<sup>14</sup>

As far as I have been able to ascertain in my reading of Daniell's book, Christ Our Righteousness, not one single statement to which he alludes in the above admission, appears in the book. The first published statement by the press of the Church,

following the agitation created over the original research by Weiland and Short, was the statement found in Selected Messages, bk i, pp. 234-235, quoted above. This was in 1958. Prior to this date, the books, Life Sketches, and Testimonies to Ministers contained some references to the leadership rejection of the 1888 Message. (What has been done to mitigate the force of the statements in the last named book will be noted in the next thought paper.)

But at this point the mysterious question arises. Did Daniells actually believe - by his omission of such statements - that the cause of God would be best served if these statements remained forever covered, even though it would mean "only a partial presentation of the situation"? Is this the basis of Froom's assertion in his foreword to Movement of Destiny that - - -

Elder Daniells recognized the serious problems involved, and sensed almost prophetically certain difficulties that would confront. He knew that time would be required for certain theological wounds to heal, and for attitudes to modify on the part of some. Possibly it would be necessary to wait till certain individuals had dropped out of action, before *the needed portrayal* could wisely be brought forth.<sup>2</sup>

Note that Froom does not use the words - although these words constitute the main thrust of his foreword - "honest", "truthful", nor "full" in describing the portrayal that could wisely be brought forth, but "the needed portrayal." Is this really what Daniells said to Froom, or is this Froom's deduction from what Daniells wrote? Did Daniells really believe that it would be best to hold back on these statements and by suggesting this belief to Froom, Froom went "overboard" to the point where he purposefully misrepresented the facts of our history? Both men are now dead, so we will never know, thus this phase of the 1888 presentation will forever remain a "mystery." It remains, Daniells versus Froom - and the only point where their polarity seems to verge is over what attitude was best to take in regard to what the servant of the Lord wrote. Even in this there is a gap - Daniells conceded "it would be far more agreeable" if such statements could be eliminated from consideration,

while Froom emphatically denies their existence.

He that eyes to read, let him read.

---

<sup>1</sup>D. K. Short, The Mystery of 1888, pp. 9-14

<sup>2</sup>L. E. Froom, Movement of Destiny, p. 17

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 18

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 23. Not only does Froom invoke Daniells' blessing, but he also calls to record three successive General Conference Presidents, Watson, McElhaney, and Branson stating that each urged him "to be faithful and forthright in my searchings and presentations." (p. 19) He also evoked the "shades of the dead. He wrote that A. V. Olson "charged [him] straitly not to falter, but to get to the bottom of the facts, to reveal the resultant findings, and to be candid and undeviating in my presentations." (p. 22).

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 187

<sup>6</sup>A. G. Daniells, Christ Our Righteousness, p. 63 (1926 edition)

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 55

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., pp. 56, 58

<sup>9</sup>Froom, op. cit., p. 357

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., p. 685, Emphasis his.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., p. 686

<sup>12</sup>Ellen G. White, Selected Messages, bk i, pp. 234-235

<sup>13</sup>Daniells, op. cit., pp. 58-59

<sup>14</sup>Ibid., p. 59

IX-2 (Feb. 1976)

+++++

#### A COMPARISON

One of the points which Froom seeks to make in regard to the acceptance of the message at the 1888 General Conference Session is the fact that the leadership of the Church was changed. Here are his words:

The elected leadership was changed at the '88 Conference by vote of the session, the absent president George I Butler, and secretary Uriah Smith, being replaced by O. A. Olsen as the new president and Dan T. Jones as secretary. . . So the elected head, the responsible leaders of the movement from 1888 to 1897 did not reject Righteousness by Faith. (Movement of Destiny, p. 370, emphasis his.)

Working on this point, Froom presents Elder Olsen as a leader who adhered strictly to the Testimonies received by the servant of the Lord. The comparison between what Froom states concerning O. A. Olsen. and what the Spirit of Prophecy indicates are

two different pictures. From Elder D. K. Short's manuscript, Mystery of 1888, (pp. 21-22) we chart the following comparisons:

From - Movement of Destiny

1. ". . . the record of Olsen's spiritual leadership is clear and loyal." p. 359
2. "He joined wholeheartedly with Ellen White. . ." p. 361
3. "Olsen. . . helped to bind the church together." p. 362
4. "Olsen. . . fostered the study of the Spirit of Prophecy." p. 363
5. "Olsen's tenure of office was a time of. . . growing acceptance of the message of Righteousness by Faith." p. 363.
6. "His was a healing, unifying, and helpful influence. . ." p. 362

Ellen G. White

1. ". . . he has not acted upon the light given." (Letter to O. A. Tait 8/27/96)  
". . . you have not regarded the warnings and instructions which have been given you." (Letter to O. A. Olsen 5/31/96)
2. ". . . he ventured on, directly contrary to the light which the Lord has been giving him." (Tait, op. cit.)
3. "He is leading other minds to view matters in a perverted light." (ibid.)
4. "He does not regard the testimonies." (ibid.)  
"Your practice has been contrary to these warnings, and this has weakened them in the eyes of men who needed correction." (Olsen, op. cit.)
5. "Unmistakably Elder O. has acted as did Aaron, in regard to these men who have been opposed to the work of God since the Minneapolis meeting. They have not repented of their course of action in resisting light and evidence." (Tait, op. cit.)
6. "The disease at the heart of the work poisons the blood. . . The spiritual blindness which rests upon human minds seems to be deepening." "The whole body is sick." (ibid.)  
  
"I have been shown that the people at large do not know that the heart of the work is being diseased and corrupted at Battle Creek." (Olsen, op. cit.)

This sickening portrayal of the rewrite of our Church history could go on. But the tragedy is compounded today. The laity are lulled into the acceptance of this distortion by the "disease at the heart of the work" in this our day. On this book has been placed the imprimatur of the President of the General Conference, Elder R.

H. Pierson, who wrote concerning it - "Movement of Destiny is a must for every worker, every theological student, and every church officer - in fact, for every church member who loves this message and longs to see it triumph in the near, very near, future." (Movement of Destiny, p. 13) How can distortion of truth cause the Movement to triumph?

But this is not all. Froom wrote in his acknowledgement these two paragraphs:

When finally in manuscript form, it was read critically by some sixty of our ablest scholars - specialists in denominational history and Adventist theology. By experts in the Spirit of Prophecy. By key Bible teachers, editors, mass communications men, scientists, physicians. And by veteran leaders with vivid memories and extensive backgrounds.

Next, magnificent constant help from special consultants concerning key chapters, sensitive sections, and problems - particularly Administrator Neal C. Wilson, Seminary Dean W. G. C. Murdoch, Ministerial Secretary R. A. Anderson, Radio Veteran H. M. S. Richards, Sr., Denominational Researcher H. W. Lowe, Educator T. S. Garaty, White Publications Secretary A. L. White, Review Editor, K. H. Wood - and a dozen other experts. And protected by verifiers and copy editors. (p. 8)

THINK - open your eyes, consider! Have any of these men - princes and ancient men of the house of Israel - publically confessed that they were dupes - whether willingly or not so willingly - when they placed their approval on this vast distortion of truth? Have they confessed to the laity, and to God regarding their acquiescence to this rewrite of our history? To this date, to my knowledge not one - yea not a single one has placed in writing in the same media which advertized the book, Movement of Destiny, his rejection of this fraudulent deception. Well did Jeremiah write:

The prophets prophesy falsely, and the priests bear rule with their means; and my people love to have it so: [BUT] what will ye do in the end thereof? (Jer. 5:31)

++++++

TAPES AVAILABLE:

A-01 - Egypt, Where Our Lord Was Crucified + Christ Or Barabbas

A-02 - Three Crosses + The Revelation of the Cross

A-03 - Δοξα and Δοξαζω in the Gospel of John + Jesus Christ as Revealed in the Gospel of John.

All tapes - \$2.00. Order by number. Ask about the Tape Lending Library.