

Email Correspondence Regarding W. R. Jones & A. D. 70 Doctrine

From: Mark Mayberry **To:** Stan Adams **Sent:** Friday, July 10, 2009 6:56 AM
Subject: W. R. Jones & A. D. 70 Doctrine

Dear Stan,

I hope all is well with you and your family. It was good to see you recently. As you will recall, we discussed the difficulties that you faced at Lake Jackson regarding the A. D. 70 doctrine. You mentioned that brother W. R. Jones came to Lake Jackson during this controversy, and preached on the subject of Realized Eschatology, holding up your hands in the conflict, and opposing the A. D. 70 doctrine.

Can you please provide a short, written statement to that effect, confirming in your own words, brother Jones' position on the subject? This doctrine is now troubling the Woodland Hills congregation in Conroe, Texas and it seems there is some question regarding W. R.'s attitude toward this issue. In my past dealings with bro. Jones, I am confident that he would never endorse or tolerate such heresy. Can you offer a statement of clarification, that I might freely share with the brethren in Conroe?

Yours, Mark Mayberry

From: Stan Adams **To:** Mark Mayberry **Sent:** Friday, July 10, 2009 10:57 AM
Subject: Re: W. R. Jones & A. D. 70 Doctrine

No problem. In my discussions with W. R. He told me to "hold the line." he also told me that things were very ugly in the congregation at Lake Jackson.

He came in an effort to heal things. He was supportive of me in what he said to me and he definitely did not support the A. D. 70 doctrine at that time. Whether he changed in the ensuing years I cannot speak to. I am sure that Pat Jones, his son, can clear this up for sure. I think he is still in Lufkin.

W. R. Jones, had he held to this doctrine, would have held up by many as a champion of it by those who would have sought a champion. In my experience, a lot of people who hold the 70 A. D. position are willing to seize on any aspect of the doctrine that one may hold. For instance, if one holds to an early date of the book of Revelation or to the position that Matthew 24 was all referring to the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A. D., some would use those views to say that they are sympathetic to the doctrine. Of course, we all know that one can hold these positions on the passages and not be anywhere near the 70 A. D. doctrine. Desperate men seek any straw they can find.

I am alarmed that some would accuse W. R. of this, after he is gone. Again, in my experience with W. R. at Lake Jackson, he was nothing but supportive of me personally regarding what I, Ron, Harry and others taught regarding the 70 A. D. doctrine.

I am not sure if I have a tape of what he said or not, but I will check through what I have on this and see. Hope this is helpful, Mark.

Interesting the number of congregations in that area of Texas who have battled with this divisive doctrine. It may be of interest to ask them if they know of the name, Tom Olienik. He was the one who taught this in Lake Jackson (and later repented of it). I have heard from three churches in the last 15 years who have had trouble over the 70 A. D. doctrine and they say that Tom is still teaching it or is teaching it again.

In Him, Stan Adams

From: Pat Jones **To:** Mark Mayberry **Sent:** Friday, July 10, 2009 6:32 PM

I have been informed that someone has suggested that my father, W. R. Jones, may have believed in or been sympathetic to what is known as the 70 A. D. doctrine. I want everyone to know with absolute certainty that he did not believe that doctrine nor was he ever sympathetic to those who taught it. He and I discussed this doctrine several times and he was very much against it. I also know that he sent materials against the 70 A. D. doctrine to brother Earl Pickle (when he was alive) at Huntsville. He believed that passages like the latter part of Matthew 24:36-51 and Matthew 25, I Corinthians 15:23-26,51-55; I Thessalonians 4:13-5:4; II Thess. 1:6-10; II Peter 3:7-14, and Revelation 20:10-22:5 were all about what would take place at the second coming of Christ on the last day at the end of time. I never heard him make one comment or preach one sermon that ever lent support to the 70 A. D. doctrine.