

HWAPP# 2540 504

3-1-28

BAD COPY
WROTE TO R.U.
FOR
REPLACE-
MENT

Dear Mrs. Clerke:

I was glad to have your letter of March 1st, and to know have your explanation for having felt we were "Adventists."

I surely hope there are no hard feelings as a result of our exchange of letters. I want you to know, Mrs. Clerke, that I respect your views, even tho we may not agree wholly upon certain points.

One thing, I am sure we are in complete accord in the one great first truth, of salvation. I believe, with you, that we are saved, or justified, not by the law, but by the atoning blood of Jesus Christ -- by grace. Really, it was largely* to explain that to you -- that I do believe that -- that I wrote you that letter.

My whole object and purpose was to explain to you our belief, so you would not misjudge us -- not to convince you of our views. I only wrote it after it had come to our attention from at least three or four different sources that others had heard from you that we were "Adventists," and were misjudging us -- and only after you had written me on the subject.

Whether deserved or not, Adventists are subject to much prejudice. Others regard them with scorn, ridicule, and to be regarded as one subjects one to some embarrassment.

I can understand and appreciate how you came to assume we must be Adventists. But don't you see, Mrs. Clerke, that because we happen to hold similar views on certain minor points, that fact no more makes us Adventists than it makes you a Roman Catholic to believe as they do on certain minor points of the same question? Some of the points in your letter we have seen similarly expressed in Roman Catholic literature. Yet you would not expect me to consider you a Roman Catholic. I am not judging Catholics, nor Adventists, nor you nor anyone. But none of us like to be known as Catholics or Adventists when we are not.

As I said, my purpose was not at all to convince you of our views on the Sabbath question, but to explain to you what we believe and why so that you would not confuse us with Adventists. If we agree with them on one or two minor points, certainly we disagree with them on many others. I do not expect you to agree with us. I respect your views on the subject, and I believe you are sincere and honest in believing as you do. We are sincere and honest in our belief, too. So, since our MOTIVES are right, we should not misjudge each other, should we -- or have hard feelings-- or anything but that love that Jesus told us to have for our neighbors? Let us not take disagreement on some of these

points to heart, or let it cause any feeling, or argument. If we could discuss some of these things, in the manner of an exchange of views -- not in a spirit of trying to force our views upon one another -- in writing in this way, I think perhaps we might benefit mutually.

Now I don't want to say this in a spirit of argument, and you won't think I say it to try to force you to agree, will you, if I simply explain briefly OUR view on a couple of points in your letter? The Bible says that in a multitude of counsel there is safety -- to search the scriptures -- and to PROVE ALL THINGS by them. To me, that means that we should be ready and willing to listen, to consider, to weigh carefully, cautiously, yet open-minded, and willing to accept what then appears to us to be truth, ready to reject our own views when proved erroneous, but determined to hold fast to that which is good.

In Acts 20: 6-8, I know it has been held by many that the "BREAKING OF BREAD" ~~has been accepted by many to~~ indicates that this was a meeting which could be held only upon the day of the week which was being observed as the Sabbath, or Sunday as it is today observed. But in PROVING this by searching the Scriptures, I was forced to decide otherwise, in view of Acts 2: 4-6 -- "And they, continuing DAILY with one accord in the temple, and BREAKING BREAD from house to house," which indicates that the "breaking of bread" was a DAILY occurrence or ceremony, if indeed it means anything further than eating a regular meal.

Yes, it is possible, tho to me not "more than probably," that an unbiased mind might get the meaning from I Cor. 16: 1-4 that it was the custom to "lay by in store" on the first day of the week because they were gathered together on that day. The language is somewhat vague, and frankly, seems capable of being interpreted just as readily one way as the other, to me. But my view is this: Since it does not POSITIVELY mean they met together on that day -- since "lay by in store" may just as logically mean at home as in church, we ASSUME if we dogmatically claim either interpretation. And I personally cannot find justification for scripturally keeping Sunday on that vague possible assumption. Further, there is no proof that, even if the meaning be that they gathered together, that it was for religious observance.

"Now when Jesus was risen early the first day of the week," might be assumed, at first glance, to say that Jesus actually did rise on the first day of the week. But in reading the WHOLE sentence, it appears to me to have a very different meaning. The sentence continues "he appeared first to Mary Magdalene. "Was risen" is past tense. Assuming that Jesus did rise the evening before, on the seventh day, he surely WAS RISEN the day after, or the first day. The subject matter here is the appearance of Jesus before Mary Magdalene, and "first day of the week," has the obvious meaning of telling

WHEN Jesus appeared to her, not when the resurrection took place. The subject here -- the object of this passage -- is obviously not to tell the time of resurrection, but to tell of Jesus' appearing to Mary Magdalene. The Bible has been punctuated only in comparatively recent years by uninspired human beings. Put a comma after the word risen. "Early the first day of the week he appeared first to Mary Magdalene." The sense of the passage is, to me: "when Jesus was risen, or had risen, He appeared on the first day of the week to Mary Magdalene." And here again, since this interpretation is surely just as logical to any unbiased mind as the other, I cannot ASSUME an interpretation which makes Jesus Christ out a liar when He said, definitely and specifically, that He would be IN THE TOMB three days and three nights, or 72 hours. If I have mis-interpreted THREE DAYS AND THREE NIGHTS into 72 hours, then I have never seen it interpreted in any other way. I know full well that more than nine-tenths of the ministers of the Gospel would not agree with me, so I must surely grant you the privilege to disagree. But how can I believe otherwise, for myself? To me it is simply so plain that it seems hard to realize that anyone could see it otherwise. If you still think I am wrong on the point of the Resurrection, I will appreciate your comment -- because what I want is not MY OPINION, but the whole truth as God would have me see it. Whenever my opinion is wrong or false, I want to find it out and change it. The day of the Resurrection may not be of any special importance, except, to me, it robs Sunday of its last excuse and justification. Frankly, I should like to be able to see that it was God's will for me to keep Sunday. It certainly would be much easier. But because I would rather keep Sunday, or rather because it would be easier, I cannot do it if I feel some other day is more pleasing to God. If I have changed my views somewhat on the question, it is because I have seen, and been willing to accept, new and additional light, regardless of personal desires. I will change my views just as often as I become convinced the Lord would have me change them.

I cannot help but feel that all the truth has not yet come to light on the Sabbath question. I do not believe the Adventists have all the light, or all the true light, on it, by any means. So you won't condemn me, will you Mrs. Clerke, because I am honestly seeking the light, -- because I truly AM doing just what you suggested -- "prayerfully and humbly reading God's Word, trusting the Holy Spirit to guide us 'into ALL truth'", -- trying to PROVE ALL THINGS by the Scriptures themselves? -- If I were imbibing other people's ideas on these subjects, then you would expect me to agree with the majority of other people, would you not? -- at least with the Adventists, if not with the majority? But when I find other people's opinions going one way, and the meaning the Holy Spirit leads me to receive from the Scriptures going another way, and I take the path of the Scriptures as the Holy Spirit has lead me to see it -- a path practically NONE of the other people agree with -- than am I imbibing

-4
other peoples' ideas of Sabbath? And regarding the converted heathen, I have heard the Adventists use as one of their strongest arguments the assertion that these converted heathen, left for years without "Christianity" teachings from differing sects, but with only the Bible, invariably keep the seventh-day Sabbath.

I started keeping it about a year before my husband did. He says the thing that finally brought him to it, after much study -- after reading every argument he could get AGAINST it, to try to bring me back to Sunday -- was simply this: He got to thinking, "What if he were off on some island, where he had none of these arguments written by other people -- nothing but just the Bible itself -- would he keep Sunday, or the seventh-day sabbath? If he had never kept ANY day -- had never known of such a thing -- and had nothing but the Bible to go on -- what day would he keep? He could not escape the conviction that he would keep the seventh-day Sabbath -- the only day ever mentioned anywhere in the Bible AS a Sabbath, or weekly holy day of rest. He then came to the conclusion that he was keeping Sunday purely because he was born by tradition, habit, and the opinions, views, and habits of other people. Considered in this light, Sunday came to him to be a man-made doctrine. Sabbath became the only day ever set apart by God. He read that in Jesus' day the most pious, professing scribes and pharisees were rebuked by Jesus for worshipping Him in vain, because they taught for doctrines the commandments of men. Those religious teachers -- the preachers of that day -- would not believe Jesus when He told them in person, face to face. So perhaps it is not to be wondered at that most of them will not believe Him now, when they read these things in the Bible.

Well, Mrs. Clerke, when all is said and done, that is not the most important question. We spend very little time on this question any more. Our Bible study is mostly along the lines of what we consider more important subjects.

I want to thank you for your references regarding the "millennium," and the "day of the Lord." It seems to me the question here is mostly a question of the ORDER OF SEQUENCE of events. There seem to be three popular theories: the Post-Millennial theory, which denies any literal second coming, the Adventist theory, and the theory that the "bride of Christ" is caught up, taken out of the world until after the tribulation, a period of seven years, then returning to this earth and spending the thousand years here. X We have made no real study on this question, but have always taken for granted the view you hold, because we have always been taught it that way by other people. We will look up the references you gave us on this. I don't know as this subject need cause any great agitation, however, for the main thing is to be READY for these events, regardless of how they come. I do think we won't have many years to wait.

I did not know, off
had started any dis
the girls. We have
tion the subject as
had already heard
about Helen being a
her, and made her ap

I was glad to hear

Any time you have an
Bible lines, I shall
I don't hesitate to
of bringing us new
-- divine healing. T
minded, the PROVING
it possible for us
do not, and, as you
Prejudice excludes
common prejudice. B
we have studied quit
to say on healing, a
much there we had ne
is proved to be truth
present ideas that

Beverly of Dorothy-Jane
a Sabbath question between
dict orders never to men
irls they play with. We
one making the remark
Mr. Armstrong had correcte
ten.

better.

nk I ought to have, along
aving you give it to me.
you have been the means
important point of truth
we are trying to be open
Core accepting it, made
The churches at large
LL not. They are prejudiced.
mind. We shared that
healed so miraculously,
what the scriptures have
y been surprised to find
ne. We want anything that
to reject any of our
e.

ly,