

Glacier View Reports

Ford Responds to Shea

To the Editors: I agree wholeheartedly with Dr. Shea's opening statement in his SPECTRUM article (Vol. 11, No. 2) that the real issue at Glacier View was "whether or not the past teaching of the SDA Church that an investigative judgment began in heaven in 1844 was soundly based in Scripture." Since writing that statement, Dr. Shea has been informed by fellow seminary professors at Andrews University, in their meeting of December 16, that their judgment is in the negative on this issue, and that they are not in sympathy with his position as reflected in the October *Ministry*.

Dr. Shea rebukes me for not directly addressing the issue of Old Testament parallels for the investigative judgment. But there are really no such parallels. His discursive analyses of certain Old Testament passages, such as in Ezekiel 1-10, and Psalms, are more homiletic than exegetical, for such instances are anthropomorphic and symbolic, rather than literal and didactic. Inasmuch as they are all found in the era before the atonement of the cross, they cannot be said to parallel God's dealings with His people since. The New Testament (Eph. 3: 9, 10; Rom. 16:25, 26; 2 Cor. 3:5-18; Gal. 4:22-31; Heb. 8:13; 9:1-15)

is clear that the divine dealings since the cross transcend everything in the Old Testament era. In the dispensation of the new covenant, the believer has been judged already at the moment of faith and eternal life given to him, so that condemnation in judgment is no longer possible, provided he abides in Christ (See John 5:24; Rom. 8:1, 11).

The Old Testament citations offered by Dr. Shea might have some value if the New Testament applied them as he does, or if the New Testament gave a clear didactic presentation of the doctrine of the investigative judgment. The question must be asked, "Why does Dr. Shea refrain from using the usual New Testament proof texts such as Acts 3:19; 1 Peter 4:17; and 1 Timothy 5:24?" Could it be that he suspects that the New Testament knows nothing whatever of an investigative judgment, and that therefore there is nothing in this regard for the Old Testament to parallel? For a discussion of this, see chapter five of my sanctuary manuscript.

Dr. Shea's next point concerns Antiochus Epiphanes. He says "many" modern scholars so apply the little horn of Daniel 8. He should have said "most" scholars, both past and present, have so applied it. Those scholars who limit the little horn to Rome have ever been a very insignificant number comparatively.

Dr. Shea's main argument in rebuttal of the Antiochus position is that Daniel 11:22 obviously applies to Christ, and therefore inasmuch as 11:31 parallels 8:11-13, the power in verse 22 must be identical with the prince of 9:26 — Rome. In answer, I would point out that verses 14-35 (at least) are closely knit and that, therefore, whatever chronological view is taken of verse 22 must fit in with the entire prophetic picture. I would challenge Dr. Shea or anyone else to make exegetical sense of the passage by using any other power than Antiochus Epiphanes as central to verses 21-35. Uriah Smith's interpretation has long seemed forced and invalid to many scholars. Dr. Shea puts much stress on the sequence of the verses, but even Smith recognized that it is impossible from the Rome viewpoint to contend for sequence. Thus Smith took verse 23 back to 160 years before Christ, and made the following verses to verse 28 apply to pre-Christian times.

There seems to me to be only one way to make exegetical sense of the Daniel passage:

Verse 22 should be specially noted. As Antiochus is "credited" with betraying princes to whom he professed friendship, and in his day, according to Jewish tradition, the deposed high priest Onias III was murdered, so Rome broke the "prince of the covenant" in AD 31. The latter term is reminiscent of "the Prince of the host" (8:11), "the Prince of princes" (8:25), and "an anointed one, a prince" (9:25). Just as in Matthew 24 and all Old Testament descriptions of "the day of the Lord," the perspective can abruptly change by the introduction of a feature that transcends the immediate historical occasion, so it is here."¹

Verses 29 and 30 speak of the same "he" as the previous 10 verses and distinguish him from the "Kittim" who come against him. "Kittim" (originally Cyprus) came to signify all those regions which, from a Palestinian viewpoint, lay directly to the west. Both the LXX and the Dead Sea Scrolls apply Kittim to Rome. Thus the primary meaning of the power opposed by Kittim cannot also be Rome, but rather fits Antiochus perfectly.

Dr. Shea declares that I have "specifically rejected the interpretation which applies 9:26, 27 to the second century B.C." (39:2). He has not noticed that I have applied the apotelesmatic principle here as well. I quote the lines Dr. Shea has apparently missed.

The situation here is similar to that of chapter 8, the prophecies in each chapter covering the same ground. Both speak of an attack upon the sanctuary by a wicked leader. One speaks of a temporary taking away of the "daily" and the other of the permanent cessation of "sacrifice and offering." Most commentators who have given the prophecy study in depth affirm that God in His mercy intended the faithful before the Christian era to see even in this prophecy shades of Antiochus. See the commentaries of Zöckler, Auberlen, Bosanquet, Fausset, Hofmann, Delitzsch, and a host of others from very ancient times to the present.²

Auberlen writes, "It was therefore necessary that special prophetic announcement should prepare the people for Antiochus." Bosanquet and others have listed the parallels to their own day that the Maccabees would have recognized in Daniel 9:24-27. Here they are:

1. A command to restore and rebuild Jerusalem
2. The appearance of an anointed prince
3. His death
4. Damage to the city and the sanctuary
5. The ceasing of sacrifice
6. The overspreading of abominations in the temple, making it desolate
7. The anointing of a holy of holies at the end
8. Fulfillment in sabbatical cycles of years

Thus, "who could fail in Maccabean days, notwithstanding many obvious difficulties in the application, to couple vaguely these events of Antiochus Epiphanes with Daniel's words in chapter 9? They were so applied."³

Thus in chapters 8, 9 and 11, I have consistently applied each prophecy first to Antiochus, and then spoken of the larger later applications.

In this next section (pp. 40–41), Dr. Shea points out the differences between my denominational commentary on *Daniel* (written in 1973) and my later study manuscript for Glacier View written seven years later. (Shea speaks of a two-year gap by using the year of SPA publication, rather than the date when SPA received the manuscript). The chief difference, however, is that in general I have given most stress in the former volume to the meaning now seen as most pertinent after the delay of Christ's return for so many centuries. In my Glacier View manuscript, I have clearly affirmed "the validity of the year-day principle as a providential provision rather than a biblical datum and its application to the prophecies of Daniel, though without punctiliar precision. . . ." (See my discussion on this in chapter three of the Glacier View manuscript and particularly pp. 344ff.) Thus I have also stressed my confidence in 8:14 as eschatological and on no account to be limited to the second century B.C.

Even my *Daniel* commentary warns against punctiliar precision by precise dates. There, the decree of Cyrus is named as the starting point in the process of the rebuilding of the city (p. 230) and an earlier page quotes as follows: ". . . all sharp divisions in history are obviously artificial. Nothing ends and nothing begins absolutely. There is something absurd in setting hard and fast limits to a period by dates."⁴ The same volume denies the validity of A.D. 34 as a terminal date for the 70 weeks,⁵ and emphasizes that even the end of all things should have transpired within a few short years after the cross, had the church taken the gospel to the world.⁶ All the major interpretations of the Glacier View manuscript are either implicit or explicit in the *Daniel* commentary. The main difference between the two has to do with the literal or metaphorical meaning of *chathak*.

Dr. Shea's attempt to prove that the year-day principle is a biblical rather than a providential datum is based on the use of "years" in a chapter paralleling chapter 8. But the only three usages of this term are found in verses 6, 8, 13 — all within the days of the Greek divided empire and *all prior to the work of the desolating Antichrist who pollutes the*

sanctuary. The 2,300 "days" are specifically linked with the latter defilement — so much so that the numeral itself does not actually qualify "days" but "evening-mornings" — a reference to sanctuary *tamid* units.

This same section from Dr. Shea accuses me repeatedly of "shifting" "from one school of prophetic interpretation into another" (p. 41). This is not true. Both my *Daniel* commentary and the Glacier View manuscript insist on the validity of the apotelesmatic principle which means that the schools (and *not* the vagaries of each individual interpreter, as Dr. Shea insists I teach) of interpretation applying prophecy to the past, continuing history, and the future, may each be correct in what they affirm *in principle*.

Dr. Shea may well be right in affirming 457 B.C. as a settled date for the seventh year of Artaxerxes. I gave little space to that, only alluding to the more commonly used 458 B.C., inasmuch as my chief point was that the seventh year of Artaxerxes yielded a temple decree, not one to rebuild the city. See Ezra 6:14. There is absolutely no biblical evidence that the decree of Ezra 7 had to do with the rebuilding of the city mentioned in Daniel 9:25.

The last section of Dr. Shea's article suggests that "the ultimate irony in the controversy" is Ford's own refusal to employ his own principle" to Mark 14 and to Daniel 8:14 (in the sense of traditional Adventism). I would point out:

1) I do not refuse to apply the apotelesmatic principle to Mark 13. Both the *Daniel* commentary and my Glacier View sanctuary manuscript do so apply. (See pp. 49 and 293 of *Daniel*, and pp. 482ff. of the recent *Sanctuary* manuscript.) My Manchester thesis makes no references to the apotelesmatic principle at any point, for, as all know who have done exegetical work for non-Christian universities, examiners there are only interested in the initial meaning of a passage in biblical literature — what it meant for contemporaries. All other discussion is therefore out of place. My recent manuscript strongly links the apotelesmatic principle

with another principle — that of conditionality. The latter is clearly affirmed in the Manchester thesis, and repeatedly so.

2) When I do apply the apotelesmatic principle, I endeavor to do so with consistency. That is to say, a prophecy by means of the apotelesmatic principle is not to be applied to anything and everything, but to events of similar shape and context in separate ages. See Ellen G. White, *Patriarchs and Prophets*, p. 373. I do not see an attenuated investigative judgment as intended by *any* legitimate application of 8:14. The latter verse fortells *restoration* and must always be applied accordingly. Its meaning is certainly eschatological applying both to inaugurated and consummated eschatology as set forth in the *Daniel* commentary (see pp. 176-77).

Contrary to the allegation in Dr. Shea's last lines, I have never taught that all individual interpreters were "right in what they affirm and wrong in what they deny."

Desmond Ford

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. *Daniel*, p. 267.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 200.
3. *Ibid.*
4. *Ibid.*, p. 158.
5. *Ibid.*, pp. 212, 213.
6. See pp. 211, 212, 219.

Shea Replies to Ford

To the Editors: In reply to Desmond Ford's response to my critique of his Glacier View manuscript, I would submit the following observations:

1) I find it curious how inaccurately Ford reports on a meeting which I attended and he did not. My recollection of the meeting of the graduate and undergraduate religion faculties of Andrews University with Neal Wilson is that since Wilson's remarks were rather lengthy, there was only opportunity for half a dozen or so of the faculty to make remarks or raise questions. Of these, only one voiced anything that I would consider lending some support to Ford's views. If this is the kind of support he expects to find in the academic community, it is meager indeed.

2) That some of the judgments in the Old Testament were investigative in nature is quite clear from the cases I have cited from Numbers, in which the matter was presented before Yahweh at the door of the tabernacle to which he had come down in the pillar of cloud in the sight of all Israel. How one can call the visions of Ezekiel "homiletic" escapes me. For details the reader is referred to my study on this subject in *Studies in the Sanctuary and Atonement, Vol. 1*, available from the Biblical Research Institute at the General Conference.

3) Ford's remarks on the Old Testament era versus the New Testament era sound surprisingly like Scofield-style Dispensationalism. I personally believe that there is no difference between the way in which those who lived before the cross were saved and the way in which those who have lived after the cross are saved. All are saved by the atoning death of Christ on the cross. There naturally has been a difference in the way that atonement has been perceived by those before and after the cross, and the vehicle through which God has communicated His word to the world has differed, Israel being employed for that purpose before the cross and the church after it. These distinctions do not provide adequate reason for God not to judge through the era of the church when he did judge through the era of Israel, as the seals, trumpets, and plagues of Revelation indicate. Regardless how one applies these historically, their common denominator is that of judgment. To completely exclude the Christian world from these judgments is to skew the book of Revelation out of focus from a prominent center of its attention.

4) Implicit in Ford's appeal to the New Testament only here is a denigration of the Old Testament on its own merits. That the greatest revelation of God's love is found in the person and work of Jesus Christ is unquestioned. The debate over creation and evolution, however, has largely to do with Genesis 1-11. The greatest body of literature on the praise of God is found in the Old Testament Psalms. By far the largest body of predictive prophecy is found in the Old Testament. The greatest biblical statement on theodicy is found in the Old Testament book

of Job. The ten commandments and the Sabbath rest, by and large, on the authority of the Old Testament. If the Old Testament is of so little importance in Ford's scheme of things, then he appears to have wasted his time in writing a commentary on the Old Testament book of Daniel.

5) Since the pre-Advent judgment is found in the major apocalyptic book of the Old Testament, it is appropriate to look for it especially in the major apocalyptic book of the New Testament rather than in its letters and historical books. I find the same pattern of judgment in Revelation 14 that I find in Daniel 7, as the box on this page indicates.

Daniel 7:14 proceeds directly to its explanation in verse 27. Revelation 14:1-5 is not really out of order, it is just another case of the common Old Testament type of description which proceeds from result back to cause. Note that dead die in the Lord while the next two messages after that which announces the judgment are being given. Given these two parallel patterns through salvation history, and given the various other themes, terms and prophetic images that are common to Daniel and Revelation, it is reasonable to interpret Revelation 14:6-7 as announcing the judgment described in Daniel 7:9-14 and take both as resulting in the same outcome, the establishment of the final kingdom of God. Note also in this connection the parallels between Daniel 7:9-10 and Revelation 4 and between Daniel 7:13, 14 and Revelation 5.

6) My understanding of the enterprise of biblical scholarship today is that theology starts with exegesis and exegesis starts with linguistics. The very first place to start with the interpretation of Daniel 11:22 and 31 is, therefore, intra-Danielic linguistics. Before proposing historical interpretations for these passages, therefore, one must make a value judgment upon the significance of the lin-

guistic relationship of the *naḡîd* of the *be'rit* in Daniel 9:26-27 and the *naḡîd* of the *be'rit* in Daniel 11:22. As far as I can see, they should be the same person. Ford holds that they are not. He has not yet addressed himself to the problem posed by these relations.

In this connection I would point out that Jesus Himself reinforces the relationship that I have proposed here. He, as the fulfillment of the Messianic prophecy of Daniel 9:24-27, locates the fulfillment of Daniel 11:31 future to his own time according to Mark 13:14. This poses a major problem for Ford's 1972 thesis. His answer to this problem is to assume that Jesus accepted Antiochus Epiphanes as a fulfillment of Daniel 11:31, for which there is no biblical evidence whatsoever, because Ford thinks that it was fulfilled by Antiochus Epiphanes. For Ford's circular reasoning here, see *The Abomination of Desolation*, pp. 163-165.

7) Ford says that he accepts the second century B.C. application of Daniel 9:24-27 apotelesmatically, which simply contradicts what he has written on p. 297 of *Daniel*:

The evidence is overwhelming that the New Testament teaches that 9:24-27 was *not* [italics Ford's] accomplished in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes. Christ saw in the prophecy an allusion to the fate of the city (Jerusalem) and the world which would reject Him. He applied the "abomination of desolation" in 9:27 *first* [my italics] to pagan Rome's attack on Jerusalem in A.D. 70 and second to antichrist's attack on the church just before the end of time. *Christian expositors can do no other than follow their Master's exegesis* [my italics].

8) If one does not think that there has been a major shift in Ford's presentation of prophecy between his commentary and the Glacier View manuscript, then I simply invite the interested reader to lay the two texts side by side and compare them carefully. The Glacier View conference would never have been convened to examine his commentary

Present world history	Commencement of judgment	Temporal interval for judgment	Conclusion of judgment	God's future kingdom
Dan. 7:1-8 Rev. 13:1-18	Dan. 7:9-10 Rev. 14:6, 7	Dan. 7:11, 12 Rev. 14:8-13	Dan. 7:13, 14 Rev. 14:14-20	Dan. 7:27 Rev. 14:1-5

on Daniel and he would be teaching at PUC or Avondale today if that was all he had ever written on this subject.

9) Since the purpose of written communication is to clarify, I do not see why Ford bothers to maintain a pretense of appearing to adhere to some kind of quasi year-day principle when it is obvious from his Glacier View manuscript and his SPECTRUM article (pp. 32, 34 and 36) that he rejects any legitimate use of it in valid biblical exegesis. I would simply have said, "The year-day principle which I advocated in my *Ministry* articles of 1964 and in Appendix F of my commentary *Daniel* I now reject for the following reasons. . . ." There is not one place in the entire Glacier View manuscript where Ford ever applies the year-day principle to any time prophecy in Daniel or Revelation. In this, he was out of harmony with the reports of seven out of seven of the small groups at Glacier View.

10) Ford states that the 2,300 days (=6 yrs. + 4 mos. literal time) should be linked specifically with the defiling of the temple, but Antiochus Epiphanes' defilement of the temple lasted but three years to the day (1 Macc. 1:59, 4:52).

11) Ford continues to refuse to acknowledge that the question of dating the seventh year of Artaxerxes I is just a difference between the Persian-Babylonian spring-to-spring year and the Jewish fall-to-fall year (cf. Neh. 1:1, 2:1).

12) That Ezra began, for one reason or another, to build the city of Jerusalem as a consequence of the decree given to him by Artaxerxes is indicated historically by Ezra 4:11-16.

13) The issue of applying the apotelesmatic principle to Mark 13 is far greater than just deleting mention of it in his thesis because it was written for a non-Adventist professor at Manchester University. The point is that any application of the apotelesmatic principle to Mark 13 would have destroyed the very heart of his thesis. This can be seen from an examination of the alternate interpretations of this passage and the one he finally selected on page 62 of the *Abomination of Desolation*:

3. Application to both events (though understood in the gospel as distant in ful-

fillment from each other) on the basis that either Christ or the Evangelist blended the themes.

4. Application to both events, regarding such as promised by Christ to the generation contemporary with Him. This view makes the fall of Jerusalem a part of the predicted end of the age.

The third interpretation of Mark 13 is the one to which Adventists have traditionally held, and the fourth is the one that Ford came down in favor of in his thesis. If one looks carefully at these two alternatives, one can see that the third is the apotelesmatic solution, which he rejected, and the fourth is the non-apotelesmatic solution, upon which the rest of Ford's entire thesis is based.

14) Ford says that he applies the apotelesmatic principle with consistency, whereas I say that he has applied it with inconsistency and arbitrariness. I will point out but one example here. As Ford and I both agreed when we met at the small committee on the Andrews campus in May, he did not apply the apotelesmatic principle to Daniel 2 or Daniel 7 in his commentary. He did apply it to Daniel 8, 9 and 11. He has still not applied it to Daniel 2 or 7 in the Glacier View manuscript. Since Daniel 2, 7, 8 and 11 are all outline prophecies that extend through history from the sixth century B.C. to the time of God's final kingdom, the apotelesmatic principle should either be applied to all of them or to none of them. By applying it to only half of them, Ford has not done "so with consistency."

15) Finally, Ford states that "I have never taught that all individual interpreters were 'right in what they affirm and wrong in what they deny.'" Maybe not, if he is hedging about his use of the phrase "all interpreters," but he certainly has applied this phrase, his philosophical justification for the apotelesmatic principle, to all the major schools of interpretation of apocalyptic prophecy. To document this, I would note that on *Daniel*, page 68, Ford wrote:

Having now viewed the respective systems as wholes (preterism, historicism,

and futurism), what counsel can be given to one who comes to the task of exegesis with the sole intent of discovering truth regardless of whether it supports or wrecks systems?

It must be said that each of the systems is right in what it affirms and wrong in what it denies [italics Ford's].

In order to avoid an apotelesmatic acceptance of Daniel 8:14 as applying to an investigative judgment that began in heaven in 1844, Ford is forced here to delete all previous Adventist interpreters of Daniel from the ranks of the historicist school of interpretation. Consistency, thou art a jewel!

William H. Shea
Andrews University
Berrien Springs, Michigan

Inaccurate Report?

To the Editors: I have read your Glacier View issue of SPECTRUM with mixed emotions. Though I wish to express appreciation for your effort to provide a balanced portrayal as evidenced by your inclusion of both Desmond Ford's and Bill Shea's materials on Daniel, I must also take strong exception to certain things "reported" in this issue — in particular, the account of the Monday morning discussion session of Study Group 2.

It is somewhat painful for me to do this, inasmuch as the author of your SPECTRUM article is a long-time friend whose scholarship and concern for accuracy I have greatly admired. However, as secretary of Study Group 2, I cannot agree that his "considerably condensed report" is also a "virtually complete" one (p. 5). In fact, the gaps he has left and his oversimplified summaries leave the reader with a grossly distorted — if not completely baffling and confused — description of what this discussion session was really like.

For illustration, I will comment on the four remarks attributed to me in this section of the article. None of these gives the reader an accurate portrayal.

1) Except for the incorrect Hebrew trans-

literation, perhaps the most accurate summary of something I said is the statement, "I am with Jim Cox on *shabu'ah*" (the author goes on to explain the Hebrew term as "'weeks' or 'sevens' of years"). The term is *shabua*^c (sing.) or *shabu'im* (pl.). Irrespective of this, however, the author's statement (given on p. 7) is meaningless, since what Jim Cox said about *shabua*^c has been omitted, as has also the discussion leading up to Jim's comment. In fact, the reader is given *no background whatever* regarding *shabua*^c.

2) Another rather straightforward statement attributed to me concerns our consensus on the year-day principle: "Our consensus, then, is 'yes,' but that we need to base it on better reasons than we have in the past" (p. 7). The reader gets the impression that I made a declaration, when in fact, as secretary for the group, I was raising a question to ascertain whether this was what the group wished me to put into the minutes.

3) I am quoted as saying, "There are two types of prophetic literature — classical and apocalyptic — and this makes a difference. It is not proper to attribute multiple fulfillment to apocalyptic prophecies, as Dr. Ford does" (p. 6). The last sentence contains distortion, for my publications going back over a decade will reveal that I have never denied the possibility of "multiple fulfillment" in apocalyptic prophecy. In fact, in the first edition of my *Open Gates of Heaven* (1970), I call attention to this sort of fulfillment as portrayed in Ellen White's *Acts of the Apostles*, pp. 585-589. I believe Desmond Ford recognizes this sort of application too. What I do reject is Ford's approach as represented in his particular use of the "apotelesmatic principle." Along hermeneutical lines, I very seriously question the propriety of utilizing the dual-fulfillment modality of general or classical prophecy as an interpretational schema for apocalyptic when apocalyptic itself gives no warrant for such. (What is this sort of transposition but a heightened form of "proof-textism" that ignores context?) I also deny the legitimacy of breaking an apocalyptic historical-continuum sequence by giving multiple fulfillment to one item of it, such as the Little Horn of Daniel 8. Why should *it* have multiple fulfillment when the four horns of the

goat, the goat itself, and the ram should not have such multiple fulfillment?

4) Regarding the year-day principle, I am quoted as saying, “The crucial issue is how Ellen White used these texts (Numbers 14:34 and Ezekiel 4:6). God always communicates with His people in terms of their own time” (p. 7). Once again, my comment is very poorly represented — especially inasmuch as it follows immediately after Elder Duffy’s statement that “We should not use negative expressions in our report” (a statement to which my comment was not at all related). Moreover, the question I raised was not “how” but *why* Ellen White used these texts — because earlier discussion had made reference both to her use of the texts and to present-day inadequacy of these texts as “proof texts.” A full transcript of my comments would show that I referred to Matthew’s “typological” (or special kind of “Old Testament-proof-text”) hermeneutic as useful for his day, even though we do not tend to use it today. Such a transcript would also reveal my mention of the fact that if time should last, later generations would undoubtedly look back at our 20th-century approaches as being outmoded and very inadequate. Does all this mean that God has been unable to communicate truth at these various times — including our own time? Obviously not. Rather it means that He has indeed communicated truth — through the avenues of understanding that are appropriate to the various times. If I gathered the consensus of our group aright, we did concur that Numbers 14:34 and Ezekiel 4:6 were not genuinely appropriate from the standpoint of “proof-text” use *today*, but we did so without denying the legitimacy of this sort of use of them in the past. However, we also concluded that the texts do *illustrate* the year-day principle, and therefore as such they can be used as *supporting* evidence for the validity of that principle.

Though inadequacies in the reporting of other speeches may in some instances be even more drastic than with regard to mine, it is not my intent to elaborate further, except

that I feel obliged to mention that one of the most crucial and significant items in Dr. Zurcher’s reference to the year-day principle has been omitted. Reference is made (p. 7) to his believing that “the year-day principle is based on the sabbatical year and the jubilee system.” What is not said is that that pertains to Daniel 9. Dr. Zurcher then proceeded to give support that the 1,260 days of Daniel 7 and the 2,300 days of Daniel 8 should be considered year-days on the basis of ancient numerological concepts related to lunar and solar astronomical principles, respectively — concepts existing at the very time when the book of Daniel was written.

I have mentioned the foregoing simply to illustrate how inadequate is the sort of reporting represented in your article. It may be useful in jogging the memories of those of us who were there in Study Group 2, but it can hardly do anything but confuse the situation for general readers. I would admit that in our Study Group we did jump around a bit in our discussion at times as we dealt with various facets of the different questions, but our discussion was by no means so disjointed and incoherent as this report would indicate. I can assure you that our dialogue in Study Group 2 was strikingly more intelligent, coherent, stimulating, and enlightening than what this truncated version in SPECTRUM portrays.

Kenneth A. Strand
Secretary

Glacier View Study Group 2

Cottrell Responds

To the Editors: The section of the Glacier View report in SPECTRUM (Vol 11, pp. 2-26, November 1980) to which my esteemed friend Dr. Kenneth Strand takes exception — the Monday morning discussion in Study Group 2 — and the following section covering the Monday afternoon proceedings of the full assembly, were specifically requested by the editors after they read my original draft of the article, which was already several pages longer than the space assigned it. Abbreviation was inevitable;

hence the “considerably condensed report” he describes as “oversimplified,” “grossly distorted,” “baffling,” “confused” and “meaningless.” So be it. These heated adjectives reflect two qualities that might more calmly and accurately be described as brevity and a lack of coherence. I, too, was troubled by these defects as I sought to comply with the editors’ request. In Strand’s lament, he acknowledges that “we did jump around a bit in our discussion at times as we dealt with various facets of the different questions.” How could the abbreviated report requested by the editors avoid seeming even more “disjointed and incoherent”? He laments, also, a lack of “background” — the addition of which would have lengthened the report still further, rather than abbreviate it. I would like to invite him to try his hand at an equally brief report of the Monday morning proceedings, in the same format, that would be more coherent and that would more adequately capture the essence of the discussion.

Dr. Strand’s own consensus report of our Monday morning session to the full assembly that afternoon also omitted relevant material that several of us would like to have seen included. His report was, to be sure, more coherent and logical than mine. He had the privilege of editing the comments and was not under constraint as to its length. As a matter of fact, his report was eminently logical and coherent, in contrast with the blow-by-blow account the SPECTRUM editors requested of me. His report, however, very inadequately reflected comments by one-third or so of the members of Group 2 Monday morning, to the effect that all Old Testament prophecy, including that of Daniel, is conditional, that it is an expression of God’s *purpose* for His people and not of His *foreknowledge*, that it had meaning for the originally applied to people of the time in which it was given, and would have been fulfilled to ancient Israel under the covenant, that the Old Testament does not present two advents separated by 2,000 years, and that Christ, the disciples and the New Testament writers all envision His return and the fulfillment of the prophecies within their lifetime. Dr. Strand’s report very inadequately reflected this minority point of view, yet none of us

thought of faulting him inasmuch as it did reflect the opinion of the majority.

I suppose every speaker could wish that more of his remarks had been included. To have included everything each speaker said might well have filled that entire issue of SPECTRUM. Another point not to be forgotten is that no two writers would be likely to select precisely the same parts of the various speeches, or to agree completely on what was most important. However imperfect my report of the Monday morning session of Group 2 was — and I could point to a number of inadequacies he does not mention — it was an honest attempt to be equally fair to all and to give the gist of each speaker’s remarks *in his own words* as recorded in my somewhat voluminous shorthand notes. Where I may have failed in this attempt I accept full responsibility.

Perhaps an author under fire may be permitted a moment of solace with the kudos that tend to balance the brickbats. A seminary colleague whom Dr. Strand esteems highly wrote the editors of SPECTRUM: “From my point of view as a member of the Sanctuary Review Committee, I would say that Cottrell’s account of what happened at Glacier View is by far the most authoritative report that has yet appeared in print. Not only was it accurate and fair, but his analysis of the event and its aftermath was perceptive and constructive.”

Regarding the substance of Dr. Strand’s comments:

1) He is, of course, correct as to the transliteration of *shabua*^c. I, too, noticed the error once the article was in print. My shorthand notes have it spelled correctly (in Hebrew). Veteran editor Francis Nichol used to comment that doctors are fortunate; they can bury their mistakes. But authors and editors publish theirs for the whole world to see. Alas and alack! I regret also the careless omission of what Jim Cox said about *shabua*^c.

2) Having already introduced Dr. Strand as secretary of Group 2, I assumed — perhaps naively — it would be obvious that his comment about a consensus on the year-day principle was spoken in his role as secretary for the group. Was it necessary to state the obvious?

3) I am puzzled as to the point Dr. Strand attempts to make here, because his Glacier View remark as I reproduced it is precisely what he now affirms in the remainder of the paragraph as his own position on the subject. SPECTRUM has him saying that he does not consider it correct to attribute multiple (apotelesmatic) fulfillment to apocalyptic prophecies, as Dr. Ford does; he now protests that he rejects Ford's particular use of the apotelesmatic principle. To my dull mind, these are simply two different ways of saying the same thing. I concur with Dr. Strand's evaluation of the apotelesmatic principle.

4) Dr. Strand laments that his comment about Ellen White's use of Numbers 14:34 and Ezekiel 4:6 is "very poorly represented" inasmuch as, in my report, it follows an entirely unrelated statement by Elder Duffy. Yet in the same sentence, Dr. Strand goes on to explain that his own Group 2 remark was "not at all related" to Duffy's comment. SPECTRUM reports the two statements as they occurred, in the order in which they occurred. Strand also notes that his Group 2 remark refers back to earlier discussion of the subject, which SPECTRUM likewise reports — also as it occurred. Strand's further observation that Group 2 saw these two passages of Scripture as illustrating the year-day principle and as supporting evidence for its validity is true as a majority consensus, though a third of the group saw matters otherwise. Strand regrets that Dr. Zurcher's comments were not reported at more length — which regret I share with respect to his remarks and to those of a number of the other participants as well.

I accept Dr. Strand's criticisms as those of a friend and trust that he will accept my comments in the same spirit. All said and done, I deeply regret that what I wrote embarrassed or hurt Dr. Strand, or perhaps others. It was certainly not intended to do so.

Raymond F. Cottrell
Calimesa, California

Ford Dismissal

To the Editors: I would like to commend the editors for the recent issue of SPECTRUM in which the events and issues of the Glacier View Conference were presented with such welcome clarity and forthrightness. It is an issue which is certain to stand as a landmark of integrity and a signpost of emerging credibility in Adventist literature. I sincerely hope, however, that the progress towards clarification and insight into the issues leading to and addressed at the Glacier View Conference will not end with this issue. Nor, I hope, will it end with the recent defensive expulsion of the individual on whom the issues were focused. I see many parallels between the collective response to the Adventist Church administration in these events and the typical response of individuals and social systems suffering from an acute sense of insecurity and a confusion of identity.

Insecure individuals, when faced with a problem which highlights their insecurity, instinctively respond by attempting to destroy that which addresses their insecurity or to banish it to the recesses of the mind (or, sociologically, to the mountains). Psychologically, this is done in the presumed interest of "defending the ego" or self. In actuality, however, such behavior is maladaptive and only confounds the initial insecurity and confusion of identity. At each attempt at banishment, additional energy is needed to continually justify and maintain the banished idea (or individual) from again emerging into the mainstream of consciousness. This depletes energy available for normal and creative problem solving and daily pursuits. The only way in which such diverted energy can again be reclaimed and made available for constructive pursuits is to openly and honestly examine, experience and discuss the source of the insecurity and thereby "work through" and come to terms with it. To accomplish this of necessity entails more than a little emotional turmoil and anguish. And in the process it is incumbent upon the individual to utilize all the resources and faculties

at his disposal, even and especially those that might most aggravate and provoke his sense of insecurity. To banish, expel or neglect even one of these subjects the individual or social system to a life of mental anguish and darkness. Finally, and most importantly, the process of self discovery must take place in a milieu of complete trust, acceptance and honesty.

In examining the events surrounding the Glacier View Conference and subsequent actions of PREXAD which led to the expulsion of Dr. Ford, I am left with the inevitable impression that had the administrators involved in these actions been entirely secure in their theological positions and beliefs, they surely would not have responded in such an obviously defensive manner. Such action will invariably lead to a siphoning of energy within the church from creative and essential pursuits and divert it toward a divisive conflict over the specific action of the church administrators. The real peril in this process is that the key issues will be decided, not on careful and systematic examination and thought, but upon defensive emotional reactions. And there will be little energy for a unified approach to the real issues and problems.

When dealing with an individual in mental anguish, it is incumbent upon the therapist to skillfully direct and assist that individual in understanding the source of his anguish and to ensure that he does not neglect or banish any resources available to him in dealing with it. And if he does, it is incumbent upon the therapist to tactfully, but directly, make him aware of his errancy. Likewise, I submit that, as earnest and dedicated students of truth, it is incumbent upon all scholars and concerned individuals within the church skillfully, but without ambiguity, to inform the church and its administrators of the errancy in their actions and of the theological and doctrinal insecurities and ambiguities and to ensure that these are openly and vigorously pursued and clarified. Not to do so and to allow the defensive pathology of a few transiently powerful individuals to destroy the work of

so many who have traversed this path before us in building our faith would entail awesome responsibility many times greater than the actual deed of destruction itself.

The intellectual pursuit, study and discussion of theological and doctrinal matters is not a "pardonable activity" as Neal Wilson contends in his letter published in SPECTRUM (Vol. 11, No. 2). Rather, I submit that it is a sacred responsibility of all those who enter into the endeavor and search for truth. I disagree with the attitude implicit in the church administrators' admonition against public discussion of controversial issues on the grounds that the church laity is not sufficiently capable of dealing with theological or doctrinal disputes or ambiguities. I have much more faith and trust in the general intellectual capacity and faith of Adventist church members. On the contrary, the overriding problem is one of a lack of faith and trust in the church administrators' ability accurately and openly to present information to the church at large and likewise to deal with emerging problems and conflicts. It is this lack of administrative credibility, not doctrinal controversy, that is the gravest threat to the church unity. And this can only be resolved by vigorous, open and forthright discussion and study of doctrinal insecurities that lead to such drastic and divisive action as the expulsion from the ministry of men of obvious integrity and dedication who attempt to fulfill their inherent responsibility of ensuring truth and validity in theological doctrine.

If the Adventist Church is to continue to carry out its sacredly mandated responsibility, it must openly search and study the issues, not simply to verify preexisting concepts, but to discover new accommodations to existing knowledge. And if this is done with intellectual honesty and integrity, I suggest that the perceived threats to our institutional integrity will, in the end, not loom as darkly as our current state of institutional insecurity and instinctive emotional responsibility may lead us to fear.

H. Dale Baumbach, Ph.D.
Lewiston, Idaho