

young people? If the moving picture invention were forgotten and entirely destroyed, annihilated, it would be a blessing to the world and no loss to the church. Dancing is graceful. It is good exercise. Why not have dancing classes in all our churches? Shall we lessen or widen the gulf that separates our young people from these subtle temptations that are coming in like a flood? Is this a part of the spiritual "revival" and reformation" of which we hear so much today? Are moving pictures and the Boy Scout movement an essential part of the "Victorious Life"? Is it not entirely logical that men who teach that "the daily in transgression" in other words, devil worship, is the "continual mediation of Jesus Christ" should seem to teach a spiritual revival and yet open the door to let in upon our young people, in fact introduce to them two of the most subtle influences for evil known in the world today? My dear brother, in conclusion I must ask you this solemn question, Which way are you leading our young people today?

Sincerely your brother in Christ
J. S. Washburn.

019063

THE FRUIT OF THE "NEW DAILY"

Pamphlets

920 Harding Drive, Toledo, Ohio
February 18, 1923

Elder Meade MacGuire, 1875-1967
General Conference Office,
Takoma Park, Washington, D. C.

Dear Brother:

The Young People's Society of our Toledo church, and some of the older members of the church also, are planning to take the Standard of Attainment examination. Several have secured the Senior Standard of Attainment Manual and are studying from it the doctrines of the Seventh-day Adventist church, in order to prepare for that examination. They have requested me to help them in this preparation. This I am very glad to do. Years ago I took the Standard of Attainment examination, and have been very glad to help many of our young people in this matter.

But there is one thing that troubles me greatly and I am coming to you for help. I met the same difficulty in 1918, in one of our churches in Virginia, which had purchased a number of copies of the "Standard of Attainment Manual" and several members were preparing to take the examination. I found at that time that the Manual was teaching a very serious error,—a doctrine entirely out of harmony with the teachings of the pioneers, and those earnest students of the Bible and history, who under the illumination and divine guidance of the Spirit of Prophecy, mined out the great truths of the third angel's message, in 1844 and the years immediately following. The fundamental principles of this message are clearly set forth in that great work, "Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation," by Uriah Smith. The Spirit of Prophecy has again and again endorsed this book, and placed it in the same class as "Great Controversy" and "Patriarchs and Prophets," and urged that these books be sold to all the people everywhere. I will quote one or two statements among the many that might be quoted.

1
ANDREWS UNIVERSITY
BERRIEN SPRINGS, MICHIGAN
HERITAGE ROOM

"'Patriarchs and Prophets,' 'Daniel and the Revelation,' and 'Great Controversy,' are needed now as never before. They should be widely circulated because the truths they emphasize will open many blind eyes. . . . Many of our people have been blind to the importance of the very books that were most needed. Had tact and skill been shown in the sale of these books, the Sunday-law movement would not be where it is today."—Review and Herald, Feb. 16, 1905.

"'Daniel and the Revelation,' 'Great Controversy,' and 'Patriarchs and Prophets' will make their way. They contain the very message the people must have, the special light God has given His people. The angels of God prepare the way for these books in the hearts of the people. . . . Of all the books that have come from the press, those mentioned have been of the greatest consequence in the past and at the present time. I know that 'Daniel and the Revelation' have done a great work in this country (Australia)."—Special Instruction Regarding Royalties, pp. 9, 12.

In 1918, I found that the Standard of Attainment Manual taught the new doctrine of the "Daily," that the "Daily" of Daniel 8:11-13, is not Paganism, as taught in the book "Daniel and the Revelation," and by the pioneers and builders of this message, who were guided by the Spirit of Prophecy, but that the "Daily" is the "continual mediation of Jesus Christ."

The same thing is taught in the present edition of the Standard of Attainment Manual, on page 28. On pages 20, 21, 27, much is said in regard to the "Mediatorial work of Jesus Christ," and the "Continual Mediatorial Service," and on page 28, under the heading "Christ's Ministry," and the subhead, "The Substitution of a False Mediatorial Service," are the following statements:

- "1. Substituting the false system for the true."
- "2. The one who assumes the place of God."
- "3. The true mediator and the false."
- "4. The true Priest and the false."

Then follow the proof texts. 1. Dan. 8:9-12.

019063

"Prophecy of the taking away of the true service and substitution of the false." Thus it is directly taught that the "daily sacrifice," which Daniel in this scripture states was taken away by the Papacy, was the Continual Mediation, the Mediatorial work of Christ. This is directly stated in the last sentence of the first paragraph of notes on page 28. The quotations from Catholic and other authorities emphasize the same teaching. But this is absolutely contrary to the teachings of the pioneers of this message, and "Daniel and the Revelation," where it is taught that the "Daily" is Paganism, Devil worship, in other words the "daily (continual) warfare of Satan against God and His people. This is the original teaching of Seventh-day Adventists. This new doctrine of the Daily changes Paganism, Satan's continual warfare against God, to mean the continual mediation of Jesus Christ. This is certainly an astounding transformation. And it is a startling fact that this new doctrine of the "Daily" changes nearly all the prophetic dates for the beginning and close of the prophetic periods of Daniel, the very framework of our message. The beginning and the close of the 1260, 1290, and 1335 days are all put back 5 years. This is all directly taught in the new edition of "Bible Readings." Doubt is thrown upon other prophetic dates by those who teach the new doctrine of the "Daily." And where this new doctrine of the "Daily" is taught, other theories develop which overthrow the Spirit of Prophecy and the entire message.

I knew this so called "new doctrine of the Daily," more than 25 years ago in England, before it was taught by any of our leaders in the United States. At one time I partially believed it myself, but when I saw that some of its strongest advocates apostatized from the truth, I gave it up and accepted again as truth, the original teaching of the message.

The Spirit of Prophecy found no fault with the book "Daniel and the Revelation" which always taught that the "daily" is Paganism. The

following will be of interest. "Many years ago, when the late Uriah Smith was writing 'Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation,' while Elder James White and Ellen G. White were at my house in Enosburg, Vermont, they received by mail a roll of printed proof-sheets on 'Thoughts on Revelation' that Brother Smith had sent to them. Brother White read portions of the same to the company, and expressed much pleasure and satisfaction because they were so concisely and clearly written. Then Sister White stated what she had been shown as follows: 'The Lord is inspiring Brother Smith—leading his mind by His Spirit, and an angel is guiding his hand in writing these "Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation."'" I was present when these words were spoken."

(Signed) "A. C. Bordeau."

But as soon as the "new doctrine of the daily" began to be pushed as an important doctrine, the Spirit of Prophecy appealed to those who were agitating this question to cease the controversy and stated that on this question "silence is eloquence." From a testimony dated Sanitarium, California, August 3, 1910, I will quote the following: Speaking of the "daily" of Daniel 8, the Testimony says:—"This is not to be made a test question, and the agitation that has resulted from its being treated as such, has been very unfortunate. Confusion has resulted. . . This has been pleasing to the great enemy of our work. The light given to me is that nothing should be done to increase the agitation upon this question. Let it not be brought into our discourses and dwelt upon as a matter of great importance. . . Let not 'the daily' or any other subject that will arouse controversy among brethren, be brought in at this time; for this will delay and hinder the work that the Lord would have the minds of our brethren centered upon just now. . . I was pained to hear that Elder ——— knowing there was a difference of opinion regarding this matter among our leading brethren, should urge this matter to the front, as was done in some places. Others of our brethren

have not been guided by wisdom, and have not reasoned clearly from cause to effect regarding the results of their efforts to uphold their views regarding the interpretation of the 'daily.' While the present condition of difference of opinion regarding this subject prevails, let it not be made prominent. Let all contention cease. At such a time silence is eloquence."

But in spite of all these plain statements, the Lord has sent us by the Spirit of Prophecy, the Manual of the Standard of Attainment, makes this matter the very heart of the gospel, and apparently seeks to leaven all our young people and all who take the Standard of Attainment examination, with this new doctrine of the "daily," as a vital part of the Christian standard to which all must attain. The Testimony of the Holy Spirit tells us that on this subject "silence is eloquence." But the Manual of the Standard of Attainment is not silent on this subject. Is the Standard of Attainment Manual, in harmony with, and obedient to the Testimony? There is no reason or call for the "continual" agitation of this subject. Those of us who believe the old original view of the "daily" are not agitating the subject or pushing it to the front. But when those who hold the new view of the "daily" are continually agitating it and pushing it to the front, and seeking to leaven our young people and the whole denomination with this new and foreign doctrine, in direct violation of the Testimony of the Holy Spirit, we must protest. This places me in a most difficult and painful position. I do not wish our people to know that there is a difference of opinion among our brethren on any subject. I wish them to regard all our people as being in perfect unity. But when those who have compiled this Manual, knowing full well this difference of opinion among our brethren force this matter to the front, you compel us to protest in the interest of what we believe and know to be the truth.

This Manual must be revised or we cannot use it. I am not speaking for myself alone. I am a member of the Ohio Conference Committee, and I

know that all our committee and all our workers, with possibly one exception, do not believe the new doctrine of the "daily" as taught by the Manual. And I may say the same for almost the entire body of workers in the Columbia Union Conference. My father and mother were Seventh-day Adventists before I was born. My grandparents, on both my father's and mother's side were Adventists with William Miller, and Seventh-day Adventists with James White and Joseph Bates. My mother, the only living sister of Elder George I. Butler, knows the history and spirit and teaching of this people from the very beginning. She was personally acquainted with Sister White and has seen her in vision, and we know that this new doctrine of the "daily" is contrary and foreign to the whole spirit of the third angel's message. Our lay members as a body believe the original Adventist view. I have been in this work for nearly thirty-nine years, and I know something of the belief of our people in this country and in England where I labored ten years, and in behalf of the pioneers and the larger part of our workers, and almost the entire body of our "lay members," I appeal to you to revise this Manual so that we can all use it without violating our conscientious convictions of truth. We do not ask you to teach our view of the "daily." Leave out the subject entirely. God grant we may soon see eye to eye.

On page 258 in "Early Writings" is the following statement: "I saw a company who stood well guarded and firm, giving no countenance to those who would unsettle the established faith of the body. God looked upon them with approbation. I was shown three steps,—the first, second, and third angel's messages. Said my accompanying angel, 'Woe to him who shall move a block or stir a pin of these messages.' . . . God had led them along step by step, until He had placed them upon a solid, immovable platform. I saw individuals approach the platform and examine the foundation. Some with rejoicing immediately stepped upon it. Others commenced to find fault with the

foundation. They wished improvements made, and then the platform would be more perfect, and the people much happier. Some stepped off the platform to examine it and declared it to be laid wrong. But I saw that nearly all stood firm upon the platform, and exhorted those who had stepped off to cease their complaints for God was the Master-Builder, and they were fighting against God." (Bold face, mine.) The new doctrine of the "daily," which moves nearly all our prophetic dates, certainly moves more than one block and pin of this message and thus violates this Testimony.

On page 75 in "Early Writings" I find the following statement: "Then I saw in relation to the 'daily,' Dan. 8:12, that the word 'sacrifice' was supplied by man's wisdom, and does not belong to the text; and that the Lord gave the correct view of it to those who gave the judgment hour cry. When union existed, before 1844, nearly all were united on the correct view of the 'daily'; but in the confusion since 1844, other views have been embraced, and darkness and confusion have followed." The view held at that time was that the "daily" was Paganism, and that was the correct view. And darkness and confusion have always followed and always will follow the teaching of any other view. A testimony written Dec. 4, 1905, found on page 58, Series B, No. 7 states: "The past fifty years have not dimmed one jot or principle of our faith as we received the great and wonderful evidences that were made certain to us in 1844, after the passing of the time. . . . Not a word is changed or denied. That which the Holy Spirit testified to as truth after the passing of the time, in our great disappointment, is the solid foundation of truth. Pillars of truth were revealed, and accepted, the foundation principles that have made us what we are—Seventh-day Adventists, keeping the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus." In a letter written to Elder Burden, Dec. 14, 1905, Sister White says: "When the power of God testifies to what is truth, that truth is to stand forever

as the truth. No after suppositions, contrary to the light God has given are to be entertained. Men will arise, with interpretations of Scripture which are to them truth, but which are not the truth. . . . We had the truth; we were directed by the angels of God. . . . Another and still another will rise and bring in supposedly great light, and make their assertions. But we stand by the old land-marks. . . . It is eloquent for every one to keep silence in regard to the features of our faith in which they acted no part."

The Spirit of Prophecy has always indorsed and recommended the book. "Daniel and the Revelation" which has always taught and still teaches the old view of the "daily," that it is Paganism. The Spirit of Prophecy has never indorsed or recommended any publications that teach the new view of the "daily." The Spirit of Prophecy did not say that on the subject of the "daily" "silence is eloquence." until the new view of the "daily" was agitated. We do not ask that the Standard of Attainment Manual be revised to teach in harmony with "Daniel and the Revelation" and the great majority of our people, the old original view of the "daily" but we do ask, that it be revised to be in harmony with the Testimony that says on the subject of the "daily" "silence is eloquence." Otherwise thousands of our people can not use the book. A condition and not a theory confronts us. The present teaching of the Manual forces me to make this appeal which we trust will have immediate consideration.

Your brother in the Blessed Hope,
J. S. Washburn.

General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists
Missionary Volunteer Department
Takoma Park, Washington, D. C.
March 21, 1923.

Dear Brother:

I received your letter of February 18 some time ago. It had been forwarded to California and

back to Berrien Springs where I was holding meetings.

I am exceedingly sorry that you feel as you do concerning the "Standard of Attainment Manual." I heard some years ago of your feelings about it, as expressed in the church in Virginia. Of course, you understand, Elder Washburn, that I do not publish the "Standard of Attainment Manual." It is published by the denomination. It seems singular that if as you say, so very few of our workers believe in the doctrines as presented in the book, the denomination should continue publishing it.—this book and the new "Bible Readings," etc. It is really my opinion, Brother Washburn, that the use you make of the statements by Sister White regarding this matter is similar to that made by many regarding health reform. You must agree that some get very different conclusions from others after reading the same statements. It seems very unfortunate to me that any worker should take a strong position, urging our people in a church to repudiate or turn against standard books which are issued by the denomination. I hope some way can be found to adjust this matter.

Yours Sincerely,
(Signed) Meade MacGuire.

Elder J. S. Washburn
920 Harding Drive
Toledo, Ohio.

348 Eastern Avenue
Takoma Park, D. C.
July 18, 1923

Elder Meade MacGuire
General Conference Office,
Takoma Park, Washington, D. C.
Dear Brother:

Your letter of March 21, written in answer to my letter of February 18, in regard to the teaching of the new doctrine of the "daily" in the "Standard of Attainment Manual" was received just before I left Toledo for Washington.

You state that the "Standard of Attainment Manual" and the revised edition of "Bible Readings" are standard denominational books. But standard denominational books must teach standard denominational doctrines, or they are not standard denominational books. If the Review and Herald or the Pacific Press should issue a publication teaching that Sunday is the Sabbath or that the soul is immortal, you could not truthfully say that it was a standard denominational publication. Any publication that moves the prophetic dates in the great prophetic framework of our faith is not a true denominational publication. The denominational teaching is now and always has been that the 1260 years of Daniel 7th chapter began in 538 and ended in 1798; that the 1290 years of Daniel 12, began in 508 and ended in 1798; that the 1335 years of Daniel 12, began in 508 and ended in 1843. The new edition of "Bible Readings" teaches that the 1260 days began in 533 or 534 or 535 or 536 or 537 or 538, and ended in 1793 or 1794 or 1795 or 1796 or 1797 or 1798. This book also teaches that the 1290 days began in 503 or 504 or 505 or 506 or 507 or 508, and ended in the same indefinite, hazy way as the 1260 days. "Bible Readings" teaches that the 1335 days began in the same indefinite, uncertain manner as the 1260 days, and ended in 1838 or 1839 or 1840 or 1841 or 1842 or 1843. All these fundamental foundation prophetic periods began in mist and ended in moonshine. Further the book "Bible Readings" teaches that the 2300 days ended with or at the same time as the 1335 days, and it is true that the 1335 days bring us to the time when Daniel was to "stand in his lot," that is, the investigative judgment, as also the 2300 days. They reach to the same event. Then this great foundation prophecy also must have ended in the fog of a five-year sliding scale, in 1838 or 1839 or 1840 or 1841 or 1842 or 1843. Then it must have begun in the same dim, uncertain way in this sliding scale anywhere you please from B. C. 452 to 457 and then Christ was crucified in the midst of a prophetic week which

began, or did not begin anywhere from A. D. 22, 23, 24, 25, 26 or 27 to 34, 35, 36, 37, 38 or 39. Thus the very cross of Christ is moved out of place, and every "block" and "pin" of our whole prophetic framework is moved, shifted and twisted by this absurd, slippery, slimy, sliding scale. "Woe to him who shall move a block or stir a pin of these messages." "Early Writings," page 258. The Spirit of Prophecy in "Great Controversy," teaches the clear, definite dates 538, 1798, 1844, etc., also "Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation," endorsed as shown in my letter of February 18, by the Spirit of Prophecy. The Spirit of Prophecy has sealed all the fundamental teachings of this denomination, and woe to any man or company of men who shall venture to alter or change that which the Holy Spirit has forever settled.

The Declaration of Independence was signed in 1776. Why not apply the "daily" sliding scale and say, "The Declaration of Independence was signed in 1771-1776"? It took a long time to sign it. According to this new prophetic device for mystification, Columbus discovered America 1487 to 1492, the headquarters of Seventh-day Adventists were moved to Washington 1898-1903, Elder O. A. Olsen was born 1840-1845. The action of the eyesight of Columbus must have been painfully slow; five years is a long time to make the journey from Battle Creek to Washington; and surely five years is a long time to be born. Everyone knows that the five year sliding scale is an absurd impossibility, a most unreasonable untruth, a mystical monstrosity. A new sacred number has appeared, the sacred number five. One year in five and no year in particular, a perfect parallel with Gamble's sliding Sabbath, "One day in seven and no day in particular." One is no more reasonable nor true than the other.

"The daily sacrifice by reason of transgression," Daniel 8:12, is literally in the Hebrew, "the daily in transgression," see any Hebrew lexicon. This could be no other than Satan and the worship of Satan, devil worship, paganism, etc.

This was the position of the pioneers of this message, the founders of this denomination, and the Spirit of Prophecy affirms that they had the "correct view of the daily." "Early Writings," page 75. But according to the new view of the "daily," this "daily in transgression," devil worship, has become the "Continual mediation of Jesus Christ." In other words Satan is Christ!! Surely the most astonishing transformation of all the ages. If I ascribe the work of Satan to Christ or the work of Christ to Satan is there no danger that I may thus sin against the Holy Ghost?

Your letter implies that as some men may differ in their interpretation of the Testimonies, that one interpretation may be as good as another. If that position is correct, the Testimonies mean nothing and can prove nothing to us. In the same way the Bible can all be interpreted away to mean nothing, and if that principle is correct, then there is no absolute truth, there is no "full assurance of faith," we can never "know the truth," and the truth can never make us free. This is the doctrine of the agnostic, the infidel. The truth is that no man has wisdom to interpret the Word of God, whether in the Bible or the Testimonies. My interpretation or yours has nothing to do with the truth. The Bible and the Testimonies mean just what they say. The Word of God is its own interpreter. It needs no fallible, human interpreter. As you well know, the divinely appointed method is the comparison of one passage with another. 1 Cor. 2:13.

The new teaching of the "daily" was held by none of the pioneers. It began to be taught a little more than 25 years ago by Dr. E. J. Waggoner and Prof. W. W. Prescott in England. Prof. Prescott told me in England that if he could get our people in the U. S. to believe and teach the new doctrine of the "daily," it would put a new face and a new mould on all our work. He has certainly made a very diligent effort to do this, and we are beginning to reap the strange fruit. Dr. Waggoner, A. T. Jones, and nearly all who

have given up the faith in recent years, have held the new view of the "daily." I quote from an autograph letter written by Dr. Waggoner from Battle Creek Sanitarium, Nov. 22, 1909. "I was intensely interested in that intra-denominational war over the 'daily.' I knew the view that Prescott held in London, . . . and do not see how anybody who has any regard for the Scriptures can hold any other view. I mean any one who regards the Scriptures as above all other books and sufficient in themselves. . . 'Early Writings' most clearly and decidedly declares for the old view. O. A. Johnson shows most clearly that the 'Testimonies' uphold the view taught by Smith. Of course he quotes no Scripture, and does not consider it necessary. . . But the leaders of the denomination must profess to believe that everything that Sister White has written is equal to or above the Bible, in order to save their faces. . . But when they dare not stand on a Bible foundation without having it buttressed by the 'Testimonies' and get their support only by showing that the 'Testimonies' do not mean what they say, what have they got? It seems to me that the superstructure will be very shaky." Thus Dr. Waggoner sets the Testimonies squarely against the Bible, and with a covered sneer at the Testimonies declares for the new view of the "daily." The Testimonies nowhere teach the new view of the "daily," and he who accepts the Waggoner view logically must do just what Dr. Waggoner did in this letter, that is he must set the Spirit of Prophecy squarely against the Bible. Is that "standard denominational" teaching?

For some time Prof. Prescott was the only man in this country among our people who held the new view of the "daily." Is he the denomination? Were his views then standard denominational teaching? If not, just when did his views become so? How many men must accept his new theology before it becomes "standard denominational teaching"? Did Elders Butler and Haskell who did not believe Prof. Prescott's new

view of the "daily" die in the denomination or out of it? Because a small body of men in Washington receive the new theory from him and publish it, is it therefore "standard denominational teaching"?

A few years ago "Bible Readings" was revised by W. A. Colcord, the last work he did for the denomination before he apostatized. He has told me personally that he did not believe the Spirit of Prophecy at the time he was writing and revising the book. He states that D. M. Canright helped him in the work of revision. Will you permit W. A. Colcord and D. M. Canright to stigmatize such men as the late Uriah Smith and the faithful and aged pioneer Elder J. N. Loughborough as unorthodox? And is the new book "Bible Readings" with such an origin a "standard denominational book"? And is the "Standard of Attainment Manual" which copies "Bible Readings" in this matter of the new doctrine of the "daily" therefore a "standard denominational publication"? This question answers itself. Because I can not see this Waggoner and Colcord theology thrust into the innocent minds of the young people through the "Standard of Attainment Manual" without a protest, am I therefore opposing "standard denominational publications," and "standard denominational doctrines"?

"Ye shall know them by their fruits." The recent determined efforts to bring the Boy Scout movement and its plans and methods and the moving pictures into the young people's department of our church work, by those who hold the new theology, is the logical result and legitimate fruit of this teaching. I was in England when Baden Powell, one of England's famous generals in the Boer War started the Boy Scout movement, in order to develop the military idea among the young people. It was the farthest thing from my thoughts then, and I am astounded now, that Seventh-day Adventists who do not believe in war and who teach that the Lord calls us to come out from the world and be separate, would ever copy the plans and principles of this worldly military organization. The whole idea of

making the swimming so many yards, the tying of so many knots, the trekking ("trekking is a Baden Powell, South African expression) so many miles as one of the tests of a religious organization is absurd and contrary to every principle of real spiritual Christian faith. One brother said if this plan was not adopted his boy would join the real Boy Scouts. Another brother said if this plan was not continued in his conference there would be a "riot." This is the spirit that is in it and back of it.

Mr. Flemming, of Chicago, a member of the Motion Picture Commission of that city, says: "When the devil realized that the saloon's days were over, he dug down into Hades and found the motion picture, and the devil is using it to destroy the morals of the people. The motion picture is doing more damage today than the saloon ever dared to do." After giving many illustrations showing that the moving picture is a school of crime, he says: "The motion picture screen is the biggest school that the lower regions ever turned loose." "The motion picture is the greatest force of this land toward lawlessness, the breaking down of our laws and trampling them under foot." Prof. M. E. Kern in the Instructor of July 26, 1921 says, "This wonderful invention, sad to say, is used almost exclusively for theatrical purposes." In the same number of the Youth's Instructor Prof. C. A. Russell says: "The only safe course for our young people to pursue is to shun the movies as one would shun the leprosy." And yet in the face of this recognized terrible danger it was seriously proposed to have an "educational" moving picture show at the recent Colorado Springs Missionary Volunteer Convention, and to formally adopt this deadly serpent into the M. V. family as an educational method!!! One of the Young People's leaders told of the great value of the lesson learned from seeing the moving picture of a filthy fly. Would the value of this lesson learned from this loathsome movie counterbalance the risk of the spiritual and eternal loss and ruin of millions of