

EXCEPT AS WE FORGET



*"We have nothing to fear
for the future,
except as we shall forget the way
the Lord has led us,
and His teaching
in our past history."*

***Prepared by:
Remnant Messages
P. O. Box 378
Ararat, VIC 3377
Australia***

***Re-Printed by:
שְׁמָעָה (Shema') Publishers
P. O. Box 7137
Kariang, NSW 2250
Australia***

www.acts321.org

(for more titles, see inside back cover)

‘Therefore seeing we have this ministry, as we have received mercy, we faint not; But have renounced the hidden things of dishonesty, not walking in craftiness, nor handling the word of God deceitfully; but by manifestation of the truth commending ourselves to every man’s conscience in the sight of God. We having the same spirit of faith, according as it is written, I believed, and therefore have I spoken; we also believe, and therefore speak.’ 2 Corinthians 4:1, 2, 13

THE ALPHA OF DEADLY HERESY

In 1904 Sr White wrote, “It is the constant effort of the enemy to remove these truths (our foundation doctrines) from their setting, and to put in their place spurious theories. He will bring in everything that he possibly can to carry out his deceptive designs.” 1 Selected Messages p201. (Brackets added)

In a vision Sr White was “shown distinctly that these sentiments have been looked upon by some as the grand truths that are to be brought in and made prominent at the present time. I was shown a *platform*, braced by solid timbers – the truths of the Word of God. Some one high in responsibility in the medical work was directing this man and that man to loosen the timbers supporting this *platform*.

Then I heard a voice saying, “Where are the watchmen that ought to be standing on the walls of Zion? Are they asleep? This *foundation* was built by the Master Worker and will stand storm and tempest. Will they permit this man to present doctrines that deny the past experience of the people of God? The time has come for decided action.” Ibid p204.

The man in high responsibility was John Harvey Kellogg.

What doctrinal errors was he trying to bring in that would deny the past experience of God’s people -- the Godhead, who He is, and how He manifests Himself.

Dr Kellogg learned his false understanding in 1895 from Dr A.H. Lewis, a Seventh-day Baptist, when this gentleman visited Battle Creek and the Kellogg home. (Mrs Kellogg was a Seventh-day Baptist)

The doctor kept his views to himself until 1897, when he gave a series of talks at the Ministerial Institute, preceding the General Conference session, in the College View Church, Lincoln Nebraska. They were published in the General Conference Bulletin and distributed world-wide. Sister White said he was presenting “spiritualistic theories regarding the personality of God.” 1 Selected Messages p204.

In a short time, Battle Creek College and the Sanitarium were rampant with these pantheistic, philosophical teachings. ‘Keepers of the Flame’ No.6 ‘The Lesser Light’. Adventist Media Centre.

Many letters of warning were written by the prophet to Dr Kellogg and others, telling them that the ideas being put forward did not harmonise with light God had given her.

(There were warnings on various subjects, as well as the doctrine of God. One warning related to investing means to “add building to building”, which was “not after God’s order”. 8 Testimonies p146. The “arms of power at Battle Creek (were) being extended more and more widely, seeking to control the work far and near, and to crush that which they cannot control... The spirit that now controls is not the Spirit of the Lord.” Ibid p150. Instead of holding up the banner of truth to the world, physicians were “in danger of hiding the principles of our faith in order to obtain large patronage...” Ibid p155. Sanitariums were designed to educate the sick in regard to healthful living of body, mind, and soul. ‘Ye Shall Receive Power’ p201. It was to be “the right arm”, instead it was becoming “the body”, resulting in a separation of the medical work from the teaching ministry. It was the largest building of its kind in the world [in 1885], with almost one thousand on its staff, and it was “absorbing talent and means that belong to other lines of work, and the effort in lines more directly spiritual has been neglected.” 6T p290. “If the medical missionary work is carried on as a part of the gospel, worldings will see the good that is being done; they will be convicted of its genuineness and will give it their support.” Ibid p292. “Press together; press together”. Ibid p293)

In a letter on the Holy Spirit she wrote, “The nature of the Holy Spirit is a mystery not clearly revealed, and you will never be able to explain it to others because the Lord has not revealed it to you. You may gather together Scriptures and put your own construction on them, but the application is not correct. The expositions by which you sustain your position are not sound...

It is not essential for you to know and be able to define just what the Holy Spirit is... on some of these points, silence is golden... Now my brother, it is truth we want and must have, but do not introduce error as new truth.” Letter to Brother Chapman. Jun 11. 1891. MR #1107 p5-6.

(Please note, when Sr White recommends ‘silence’ on the subject of the Holy Spirit, she is speaking of the philosophical ideas of those who try to explain the Spirit beyond that revealed in the Scriptures and the Spirit of Prophecy writings. Many are doing this very thing today. (See Book 3) Those who quote this passage to men and women who are explaining the pioneer or Bible understanding of the subject, are using a Spirit of Prophecy statement totally out of context. Silence is not golden when anyone reveals the

teachings of the Bible. The statement in Acts of the Apostles [p51.52] must stand alongside the prophet's original quotation in 1891)

To Dr Kellogg she said, “You are not definitely clear on the personality of God, which is everything to us as a people. You have virtually destroyed the Lord God Himself.” Letter 300 1903. The Early Elmshaven Years. Vol. 5. 1900-1905 by Arthur L White 1941. (Sister White said “not definitely”, instead of ‘definitely not’)

Sadly, Brother Kellogg rejected the counsel of the Lord.

He was building Battle Creek up on a grand scale, and deeply involved in “searching for advanced scientific ideas”, not in the realm of physiology, but in theology. Special Testimonies B No7. p62.

Finally, in February 1902, the Battle Creek Sanitarium burned to the ground, as a judgment of God. 8 Testimonies p102.

Brother A G Daniells suggested Dr Kellogg write a simple book on physiology and health care to help defray costs for the rebuilding of the sanitarium, but he was warned not to include his teachings on the personality of God. ‘Keepers of the Flame’. No.6. ‘The Lesser Light’ video. Dr Alan Lindsay. Video by Adventist Media, Australia.

The doctor wrote a 568-page book called ‘The Living Temple’, which, instead of being a simple book on physiology and health care, was filled with the false theological ideas of the Godhead. Ibid. (Dr Kellogg had already written 50 books)

A General Conference committee was set up to review the book, but after seeing its philosophical teachings on the personality of God, refused to pass it. Dr Kellogg then placed a personal order with the Review & Herald to print it. They agreed, but in December, the Publishing House was destroyed by fire, and the plates were burned to cinders.

Dr Kellogg was warned not to continue with the book, but he took the manuscript to an outside commercial printer, and placed an order for 3000 copies. These were printed and the circulation began. (1903)

Sister White had asked that the book be revised, and prior to hearing Dr Kellogg's comment that the revision had been done, she stated, “It will be

said that 'Living Temple' has been revised, but the Lord has shown me that the writer has not changed...." 1 Selected Messages p199.

Sister White received a copy of 'The Living Temple', but knowing it did not bear the "endorsement of God", placed it on her bookshelf unread. Ibid p202.

Some were in favour of giving the book a wide circulation. "It contains the very sentiments that Sister White has been teaching", they said. Upon hearing this, the prophet was "struck right to the heart". She lamented, "I felt heartbroken; for I knew that this representation of the matter was not true." Ibid p203

It was then that her son said, "Mother, you ought to read at least some parts of the book that you may see whether they are in harmony with the light that God has given you".

Together they sat down and read the preface, most of the first chapter, and paragraphs from other chapters. Sister White said she saw "the very sentiments against which I had been bidden to speak in warning during the early days". Ibid. The same heresy had risen again.

'The Living Temple' began to circulate among Adventists, and many saw its sentiments as 'new light' on the personality of God and the Holy Spirit.

Again the prophet gave a warning. "Those who have been feeding their minds on the supposedly excellent, but spiritualistic theories of 'Living Temple', are in a very dangerous place. For the past fifty years I have been receiving intelligence regarding heavenly things. But the instruction given me has now been used by others to justify and endorse theories in 'Living Temple' that are of a character to mislead." Manuscript Release Vol 4. p248.

In 1903, the Autumn Council was held in Washington DC, and Elder Daniells hoped 'The Living Temple' and its teachings would not come up for discussion, but "when Dr Kellogg and his supporters arrived, it was evidence a confrontation was unavoidable." Keepers of the Flame. No.6. Dr Alan Lindsay.

"Elder Daniells dared not call for a vote because of the tension. The church was facing a crisis, but what to do?" Ibid.

Near the end of the council, a letter arrived from Ellen White that spoke directly about 'The Living Temple' and its philosophical teachings. She wrote, "Be careful how you sustain the sentiments of this book regarding the personality of God...it has been represented to me that these sentiments do not bear the endorsement of God... it has been represented to me that the writer of this book is on a false track. He has lost sight of the distinguishing truths for this time." Ibid.

Elder Daniells wrote to Sister White saying, "Never were messages from God more needed than at this very time... You can never know what a great blessing your communication regarding 'The Living Temple' has been to us. It came at just the right time exactly. The conflict was severe, but your message came and settled the controversy." Ibid.

"The Washington council was not just a threat to organisation or leadership. It involved much more, for the very understanding of the character and personality of God were under threat." Ibid.

Immediately after the council, Brother Kellogg wrote to W. W. Prescott defending his position. "You, Elder Daniells, and others have spoken about a fine line of distinction, but I could not quite see what it was, but this statement by Sister White makes it clear to me.

The difference is this: When we say God is in the tree, the word 'God' is understood in that the Godhead is in the tree, God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit, whereas the proper understanding in order that wholesome conceptions should be preserved in our minds, is that God the Father sits upon his throne in heaven where God the Son is also; while God's life, or Spirit or presence is the all-pervading power which is carrying out the will of God in all the universe." Letter: J H Kellogg to W W Prescott. Oct 25. 1903.

Three days later Dr Kellogg wrote a letter to George Butler, summing up his feelings. "As far as I can fathom, the difficulty which is found in 'The Living Temple', the whole thing may be simmered down to the question: Is the Holy Ghost a person? You say no. I had supposed the Bible said this for the reason that the personal pronoun 'he' is used in speaking of the Holy Ghost.

Sister White uses the pronoun 'he' and has said in so many words that the Holy Ghost is the third person of the Godhead. How the Holy Ghost can be the third person and not be a person at all is difficult for me to see.” Letter: J H Kellogg to G I Butler. Oct 28. 1903.

The following day, Brother Daniells wrote to W C White regarding changes to the book. “Ever since the council closed I have felt that I should write you confidentially regarding Dr Kellogg’s plans for revising and republishing ‘The Living Temple’.... He (Kellogg) said that some days before coming to the council, he had been thinking the matter over, and began to see that he had made a slight mistake in expressing his views. He said that all the way along he had been troubled to know how to state the character of God and his relation to his creation works...

He then stated that his former views regarding the trinity had stood in his way of making a clear and absolutely correct statement; but that within a short *time he had come to believe in the trinity* and could now see pretty clearly where all the difficulty was, and believed that he could clear the matter up satisfactorily.

He told me that he *now believed in God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost*; and his view was that it was God the Holy Ghost, and not God the Father, that filled all space, and every living thing. He said if he had believed this before writing the book, he could have expressed his views without giving the wrong impression the book now gives.

I placed before him the objections I found in the teaching, and tried to show him that the teaching was so utterly contrary to the gospel that I did not see how it could be revised by changing a few expressions.

We argued the matter at some length in a friendly way; but I felt sure that when we parted, the doctor did not understand himself, nor the character of his teaching. And I could not see how it would be possible for him to flop over, and in the course of a few days fix the books up so that it would be all right.” Letter: A G Daniells to W C White. Oct 29. 1903 p1.2. (Emphasis added)

In another letter to Brother Butler four months later, Kellogg said, “I believe this Spirit of God to be a personality you don’t. But this is purely a question of definition. I believe the Spirit of God is a personality; you say, No, it is not a personality. Now the only reason why we differ is because we differ in our ideas as to what a personality is. Your idea of personality is perhaps that of semblance to a person or a human being.” Letter: J H Kellogg to G I Butler. Feb 21. 1904.

Obviously the words ‘person’ and ‘personality’ were difficult to define. Dr Kellogg had come to believe the Holy Spirit was a separate God-Being (as taught in the Trinitarian doctrine, although he uses the word ‘personality’), whereas the church believed it was the divine omnipresence of God and Christ. The difficulty lay in both calling the Spirit a person or personality, as both meant something different.

The pioneer teaching was that the Spirit is the person of God and Christ in their omnipresence. Sister White had written, “The greatness of God is to us incomprehensible. ‘The Lord’s throne is in heaven’ (Psalm 11:4); yet by His Spirit He is everywhere present. He has an intimate knowledge of, and a personal interest in, all the works of His hand.” Education p132. 1903.

Six weeks after Dr Kellogg wrote to Brother Butler, he received a response, “So far as Sister White and you being in perfect agreement, I shall have to leave that entirely between you and Sister White. *Sister White says there is not perfect agreement; you claim there is.*

I know some of her remarks seem to give you strong ground for claiming that she does. I am candid enough to say that, but *I must give her the credit until she disowns it of saying there is a difference too*, and I do not believe you can fully tell just what she means.

God dwells in us by His Holy Spirit, as a Comforter, as a Reprover, especially the former. When we come to Him we partake of Him in that sense, because the Spirit comes forth from Him; it comes forth from the Father and the Son. It is not a person walking around on foot, or flying as a literal being, in any such sense as Christ and the Father are – at least, if it is, it is utterly beyond my comprehension

of the meaning of language or words.” Letter: G I Butler to J H Kellogg. April 5. 1904. (Emphasis added)

It is clear that Dr Kellogg had changed his belief on the doctrine of God. He was now a Trinitarian. In an attempt to express his new ideas, he became philosophical, stating beautiful sentiments, but totally incorrect.

One statement was, “The Father is as the light invisible; the Son is as the light embodied; the Spirit is the light shed abroad.”

Another was, “the Father is like the dew, invisible vapor; the Son is like the dew gathered in beautiful form; the Spirit is like the dew fallen to the seat of life.”

And still another, “The Father is like the invisible vapor; the Son is like the leaden cloud; the Spirit is rain fallen and working in refreshing power”. Special Testimonies Series B No.7 p62.

In another representation Brother Kellogg described the power of God *in* creation like “a living boot, with little boots coming out of the seams.” His conclusion was that “there must be a Bootmaker in the boot. So there is present in the tree a power which creates and maintains it, a Treemaker in the tree.” The Living Temple p29.

Sister White called these philosophical concepts “spiritualistic representations” and “deadly heresy”, not only because they were pantheistic, but because they contradicted the divinely revealed understanding of the “presence and personality of God.” 1 Selected Messages p203.

Sister White gave the author of ‘The Living Temple’ warning after warning. In one letter she said, “Had God desired to be represented as dwelling personally in the things of nature – in the flower, the tree, the spear of grass – would not Christ have spoken of this to His disciples? To take the works of God, and represent them to be God, is a fearful misrepresentation....

I tell you, my brother, that the most spiritual-minded Christians are liable to be deceived by these beautiful, seducing, flattering theories. But in the place of honoring God, these theories, in the minds of those who receive them, bring Him down to a low level, where He is nothingness.” Manuscript Release Vol 21 p171.

To church members she wrote, “I must warn our brethren and sisters not to enter into controversy over the presence and personality of God. The statements made in ‘Living Temple’ in regard to this point are incorrect. The Scripture used to substantiate the doctrine there set forth, is Scripture misapplied.

I am compelled to speak in denial of the claim that the teachings in ‘Living Temple’ can be sustained by statements from my writings.

There may be in this book expressions and sentiments that are in harmony with my writings. And there may be in my writings many statements which, taken from their connection, and interpreted according to the mind of the writer of ‘Living Temple’, would seem to be in harmony with the teachings of this book.

This may give apparent support to the assertion that the sentiments in ‘Living Temple’ are in harmony with my writings. But God forbid that this sentiment should prevail.” 1 Selected Messages p203.

Sister White pled with church members during this time of the Kellogg crisis:

‘Come’, I call,
‘come ye out and be separate from him and his associates whom
he has leavened’.

She continued, “I am now giving the message God has given me, to give to all who claim to believe the truth. ‘Come out from among them, and be ye separate’, else their sin in justifying wrongs and framing deceits will continue to be the ruin of souls. We can not afford to be on the wrong side”. Series B No.7 p64.

The majority heeded the counsel of the prophet and “stepped back on the platform”, but some continued to follow the philosophical trinitarian, sentiments of the Godhead.

The doctrine of the trinity, modified by Rome at Nicaea and Constantinople, was an extension of ‘Platonic *philosophy*’, a Greek philosopher’s conception of a triune God.

In 1892, the prophet had warned those who refused to be converted and manifest love for their brethren that, “Unless there is a breaking away from the influence Satan has prepared, and a reviving of the

testimonies that God has given, souls will perish in their delusion. They *will accept fallacy after fallacy*, and will thus keep up a disunion that will always exist until those who have been deceived take their stand on the right platform. *All this higher education that is being planned will be extinguished; for it is spurious.*” 5 Testimonies 173.174. (Emphasis added)

In 1894, H Camden Lacey, a student at Battle Creek College, became a delegate from the college to the Second International Convention of the Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions.

While at the convention he heard such speakers as J Hudson Taylor, Robert Spear, J R Mott, A J Gordon, and others.

Geraldine Guinness, who was also a delegate from the College said, “Brother Lacey, these men are not Sabbath-keepers, as we understand it, but the Lord is certainly using them mightily. I have never felt the deep moving of the Spirit of God upon my heart, as I have here at this convention.” Brother Lacey wrote that he “could not help agreeing with her exactly.”

They both noticed that the speakers at the convention placed great emphasis on the Holy Ghost in the lives of God’s servants and missionaries. They had emphasised “a ministry as of a real, definite, divine person, always with us, and in us, the Comforter as taught by Jesus Christ in His last Pascal discourse, and as revealed in the book of Acts...” Information from a letter from H C Lacey to Leroy Froom August 30. 1945.

On his way back to Australia (a teacher of Bible and Greek at Avondale College, as well as Healdsburg, Union, Columbia Union in the USA, and Newbold College in England), Brother Lacey made the theme of the personality and work of the Holy Ghost, a special subject of personal Bible study. He stated in his letter “I became convinced for myself”, that the Protestant preachers were correct in their teaching of the Holy Spirit, as the Third Person of the Trinity.

In 1896, Brother Lacey was asked to conduct a series of Bible Studies at the 9.00 hour at a Bible Study Convention in Cooranbong. His theme was ‘The Personality and Work of the Holy Ghost’. Brother A G Daniells was in attendance, as was Marian Davis, Sister White’s literary assistant.

(According to Brother Lacey, Sister Davis took copious notes during the meetings, which of course does not mean she agreed with it) Ibid.

It is obvious from this background that the apostasy had already begun before Dr Kellogg wrote ‘The Living Temple’, but the prophet had been instructed by God to wait until the ‘alpha’ was fully ripe before she sent out testimonies directly against it.

In her vision of the platform of truth, it was made known that the enemy of souls “had sought to bring in the supposition that a great reformation (*re-form-ation*) was to take place among Seventh-day Adventists”.

Sister White said it would be a “*re-organization*” of the church, and would “consist in giving up the doctrines which stand as the pillars of our faith.” 1 Selected Messages p204. (Emphasis added)

After seeing this vision and the terrible consequences that would take place should the intentions of Satan be carried out, Sister White wrote out pointed testimonies, asking the men who were removing the timbers what authority they had “to begin such a movement?” Ibid p205.

Unfortunately, the seeds of spiritualistic philosophy *had already been sown* in the church.

And silently they would germinate...

THE OMEGA OF DEADLY HERESY

After the testimonies had been written out, Sister White hesitated in sending them, and for three nights she tossed in her bed, unable to sleep. On the third night she was given a dream, showing her she must act immediately. She saw a vessel sailing in heavy fog.

Suddenly the lookout called, “Iceberg just ahead!”

An authoritative voice cried out, “Meet it!”

Without a moment’s notice, the engineer put on full steam, and the man at the wheel steered the ship straight into the iceberg. With a crash the ship struck the ice, breaking the iceberg into many pieces. The vessel was injured, but not beyond repair. ¹ Selected Messages p205.

Sister White knew the meaning of the dream; the Captain had given His orders, and she again wrote a message of warning. In this testimony, she stated that the crisis must not be met by drawing workers from the field and having a Bible Conference, or a ‘new light’ committee.

The sentiments of Dr Kellogg were not to be settled by an investigation into doctrinal differences. “We have no such investigation to make”, she said. Ibid p200.

This is important. The alpha was heresy and no discussion as to the possibility of it being truth was to be considered.

To the physicians Ellen White wrote, “No longer consent to listen without protest to the perversion of truth. Unmask the pretentious sophistries which, if received, will lead ministers and physicians and medical missionary workers to ignore the truth...”

I have been instructed to warn our people; for many are in danger of receiving theories and sophistries that undermine the *foundation pillars* of the faith.... I call upon those who have been connected with these binding influences to break the yoke to which they have long submitted, and stand as free men in Christ. Nothing but a determined effort will break the spell that is upon them.

Be not deceived, many will depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils. We have now before us

the alpha of this danger. **The omega will be of a most startling nature.**” 1 Selected Messages p196.197.

It is impossible that the seeds of the deadly alpha of heresies would blossom into a different type of fruit, for the law of reproduction applies in every area. “Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap.” Galatians 6:7.

Although Dr Kellogg and others left the church, among those who remained were brethren who would yet promulgate the doctrines espoused by the doctor. “The sentiments of the enemy (had been) scattered everywhere. Seeds of discord, of unbelief, of infidelity (had been) sown broadcast.” 1 Selected Messages p195.

When would the “omega of deadly heresies” come forth?

The prophet said, “ ‘Living Temple’ contains the alpha of these theories. I knew that the omega would follow **in a little while...**” 1 Selected Messages p203.

Would it be received?

“In the book ‘Living Temple’ there is presented the alpha of deadly heresies. The **omega will follow**, and **will be received** by those who are not willing to heed the warning God has given.” 1 Selected Messages p200. Series B No.2 p49.50.

Thus our religion began to be changed, not in an obvious way, but subtly, slowly and imperceptively. Sister White said, “I **trembled** for our people.” 1 Selected Messages p203.

THE APOSTASY DEEPENS

In June, 1904, the prophet wrote, “There are some who in the past have had a correct experience, but who have changed leaders... Those leaders and teachers who refuse to follow Christ place themselves under the guidance of evil angels...

I have seen men who have been placed in positions of trust as watchmen, moulding and fashioning the work in our conferences

and institutions in accordance with worldly policy, which God condemns”. Series B #2. p19.20. June 1904. (Sr White wrote that Dr Kellogg controls the voice of Elder A T Jones, and will use him as his mouthpiece.” Thirteen Crisis Years p317. June 15. 1906)

In November the following year, Sr White wrote “The time is near when the deceptive powers of Satanic agencies will be fully developed.” Series B #7. p13-17. Nov 20.1905.

The next month she said, “One thing is certain is soon to be realised – the great apostasy, which is developing and increasing and waxing stronger, will continue to do so until the Lord shall descend from heaven with a shout...” Series B #7. p57. Dec 4. 1905.

During that same year, Ellen White wrote of King Jehoiakim, king of Judah, who, having received a message from the prophet, cut it up with a penknife and cast it into the fire. Then she said, “But this would not destroy the message; for the word of God will never return unto Him void.” Series B #7. P58.59.1905.

Some time after writing Series A and B, the General Conference condemned these testimonies because they spoke against apostasy at the heart of the work.

(The following is a copy of a letter printed in a magazine entitled ‘Liberator’. The experience was confirmed by Brother Washburn who gave the name of the man involved as Claude Holmes. Later Brother Washburn said he was able to meet Brother Holmes in Chicago, and was told by him that the following report was true)

“The man who was then (during those years when this special series was condemned), the tender of the incinerator, knew of the value of these pamphlets, and he, being sort of a reformer, thought that if he had a chance he would try to get hold of some of them. He prayed and planned his moves well, or God helped him. The pamphlets were to be destroyed on a certain day, under the supervision of a couple of trusted men.

He stoked up the fire to a hot blaze, but not much fuel in the fire. He let the coals burn down in the fire, but the stoking of the live coals gave out a hot blaze, and then when the men thought the fire heavy enough he threw in the pamphlets by the hundreds into the

fire; he then closed the door of the furnace, closed the dampers, and shut off the air.

The trusted men hung around for a while and when they looked at the fire in the furnace, the flames were all around the small books and pamphlets; they were satisfied and left.

But the material just smouldered, and in a short time the fire was smothered out, until there was only smoke in the furnace. Then it was possible for him to pull them out of the furnace, thus he rescued most of them". From a letter belonging to Willard Santee, from a bequeathed estate library.

The 'incinerator keeper' kept the pamphlets until he retired from his work, and so he would not lose his sustentation, put them in the care of a Dr Hayes. When Dr Hayes died, his library was sold at auction.

By this time, many had learned of the valuable pamphlets and a great number of people turned up at the auction, including some of the conference workers, who tried to outbid the church people. Some of the original pamphlets sold for \$10, some \$25, and others for \$50. Many still had burn marks on them. Ibid. Praise God for His protection. (Series B entitled 'The Alpha and the Omega', and 'The Foundation of our Faith', reprinted in 1 Selected Messages 193-208)

In October 1906 the prophet wrote in warning, "The evidence we have had for the past fifty years of the presence of the Spirit of God.... will stand the test of those who are now arraying themselves against the message of God". Letter 356. 2 Selected Messages p397. 1906.

That same month she said, "The time of this apostasy is here. Every conceivable effort will be made to throw doubt upon the positions that we have occupied for over half a century." Letter 410. 3 Selected Messages p408.409.1906.

In November 1908, the following was penned, "False doctrines will sap the foundations of many, because they have not learned to discern truth from error." Review & Herald. Nov 19. 1908.

In 1910, a reproof was given to A G Daniells and W W Prescott "because they were *trying to get up something new.*"

Sister White wrote, “When I gave my message and saw the way they treated it, I knew that the Lord would work against them... God is testing these men, and they are showing how they are standing the test, and how they stand with regard to the testimonies.

The time has come when his presidency (Elder Daniells) should come to an end. He has been in too long. This *whole thing they are doing is a scheme of the devil.*” This interview was given on June 8, 1910 at St Helena sanitarium to a highly respected older worker. (Emphasis added)

In 1915, Ellen G White passed to her rest.

“And Joshua, the son of Nun, the servant of the Lord died... and they **forsook the Lord God** of their fathers, which brought them out of the land of Egypt, and **followed other gods, of the gods of the people** that were round about them, and bowed themselves unto them, and provoked the Lord to anger.” Judges 2:8.12.

Sadly, some of the Adventist leaders also turned from the Lord and began to worship the gods of the denomi-*nations*.

Four years later, in 1919, a Bible Conference took place with the leading ministers and college teachers in attendance; Brother A G Daniells chaired the meeting. (The nineteenth year of his presidency. Thirty six delegates were initially seated, but others came in later, and some left as the meeting progressed. The conference was followed by a Bible and History Teachers Council)

At this conference, discussion covered many aspects of the Spirit of Prophecy, such as verbal inspiration, plagiarism, changes by copiers, differences between the testimonies and the ‘Conflict’ series. Which of the prophet’s writings were authoritative? Was Ellen White an authority on history? (Brother Prescott was urged to be part of a project to revise ‘The Great Controversy’) Summary of minutes 1919 Bible Conference.

Brother W W Prescott gave a series of studies entitled, ‘The Person of Christ’ at the Bible Conference. His main thrust was the Trinitarian belief that Christ was without beginning.

He asked, “Ought we to continue to circulate in a standard book a statement that the son is not co-eternal, that the Son is not co-equal or co-eternal with the Father?” (June 2, afternoon session. 1919)

Naturally this study promoted a lot of discussion, as there were men in attendance who believed the foundation teaching that Christ was begotten of the Father. Others held to the trinitarian position, and discussion became quite heated.

(Brethren W W Prescott, J N Anderson, H C Lacey, G B Thompson spoke in favour of the Trinitarian view. Brethren C P Bollman, T E Bowen, L L Caviness, W T Knox and C M Sorenson spoke against this view. Those giving a picture of uncertainty in their comments were Brethren A G Daniells, W E Howell, John Isaac, E R Palmer, A O Tait, Charles Thompson, W H Wakeham, and M C Wilcox, however, this does not necessarily give their true feelings. Note H C Lacey spoke in favour of the Trinity, and also W W Prescott, whose names will come up later)

At one point, Elder Daniells had to cool the discussions by emphatically stating, “We are not going to take a vote on trinitarianism or arianism, but we can think.” 1919 Minutes.

As one of the meetings came to a close, John Isaac said in frustration, “What are we Bible teachers going to do? We have heard ministers talk one way. Our students have had Bible teachers in one school spend days and days upon this question, then they come to another school, and the other teacher does not agree with that. We ought to have something definite so that we might give the answer. I think it can be done. We ought to have it clearly stated. Was Christ ever begotten or not?” Ibid. (Obviously there could not be a unanimous decision with two views held by the attendees)

During the years after the death of Ellen White, occasional articles came out speaking of the ‘Trinity’, however, it is interesting to note that most of them appear non-trinitarian in content. Perhaps it was a conditioning to hear the word ‘trinity’!

In 1926, young LeRoy E Froom was asked by church leaders to give a series of studies on the Holy Spirit covering the North American Union Ministerial Institutes of 1927 and 1928.

Forty years later, Brother Froom said of this research, “May I here make a frank personal confession? When, back between 1926 and 1928, I was asked by our leaders to give a series of studies on the Holy Spirit.... I found that, aside from priceless leads found in the Spirit of Prophecy, there was practically nothing in our literature

setting forth a sound Biblical exposition in this tremendous field of study....

I was compelled to search out a score of valuable books written by men outside of our faith – those previously noted – for initial clues and suggestions, and to open up beckoning vistas to intensive personal study.

Having these, I went on from there... And scores, if not hundreds, could confirm the same sobering conviction that some of these other men (non-SDA) frequently had a deeper insight into the spiritual things of God than many of our own men had on the Holy Spirit and the triumphant life.” Movement of Destiny p322. Leroy Froom. 1971.

Please note, Brother Froom could find “practically nothing” in the writings of the pioneers on the subject of the holy Spirit.

Why not? Was it because they taught something different?

As a result of his studies for the Ministerial Institutes, Brother Froom wrote a book entitled, ‘The Coming of the Comforter’, in which he revealed his belief in the Trinitarian position of the holy Spirit. (He, like Dr Kellogg, used Spirit of Prophecy statements to uphold his belief)

When the book came out, there was great opposition from the retired church leaders. Brother Froom stated, “You cannot imagine how I was pummelled by some of the old timers because I pressed on the personality of the Holy Spirit as the Third Person of the Godhead. Some men denied that – still deny it. But the book has come to be generally accepted as standard.” Letter from Leroy Froom to Dr Otto H Christenson. Oct 27. 1960.

Obviously Leroy Froom’s material impressed Brother Daniells, for in 1930 he suggested the young author “undertake a thorough survey of the entire plan of redemption – its principles, provision, and *divine Personalities* as they unfolded to our view as a Movement from 1844 onward, with special emphasis upon the developments of ‘1888’ and its sequel.” Movement of Destiny. Leroy Froom. ‘From Author to Reader’ – How this Portrayal came to be Written. Third printing of 1972.

Brother Froom stated that Elder Daniells urged him to “set forth the results in a comprehensive portrayal – one that would honor God

and exalt truth, that would enlighten and uplift the Church, and that by the very sweep of its presentation would constitute not only a survey but a summons to advance. He also expressed the earnest hope that it would be both complete and forthright, and documented for serious worldwide worker study... This had become a conviction with him, which he felt he must pass on to me.”

“His urge met with a definite response in my heart, for I was keenly interested in such a project. But I was awed by its magnitude and far-reaching character. I thought of it as for someone else, more mature and experienced, to undertake.

No, he said, he felt it was for me to do – for I had gotten a vision of it, and had a background and burden for it. And *I was a connecting link between past leaders and the present*. But, he said, *it is to be later – not yet.*” Ibid. (Emphasis added)

Why not yet?

Why should he not proceed immediately?

Brother Froom gives the reason. “Elder Daniells recognised 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 until certain individuals had dropped out of action* before the needed portrayal could wisely be brought forth...” Ibid. (Emphasis added)

In other words -- **wait until some people are dead** -- then you can begin.

Elder Daniells urged Brother Froom to “spare no effort in digging down to the very foundations of the Movement – to get beneath the familiar surface configurations, and to avoid any superficial type of treatment. I must find and set forth the determining factors and the underlying causes of our vicissitudes and advances in fully adopting these great provisions of redemption in Christ, the Eternal Verities of the Faith of Jesus, culminating in the great message of righteousness by Faith....

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.” Ibid.

Brother Froom accepted the challenge, and began his research for the project. He wrote to the pioneers who were still alive, as well as older members who had accepted the message under the pioneers, asking details about their belief on the Godhead.

Arthur White responded to the request, “Mrs Soper calls to our attention the fact that you are seeking information as to the positions held by our early workers concerning the Trinity, the personality of the Holy Spirit, and the pre-existence of Christ as this may be revealed in their writings. I think we will have to concede that our early workers were not Trinitarians.” Letter from Arthur L White to LeRoy Froom. Dec 7 1955.

Brother Cottrell replied, “From my personal knowledge the doctrine of the ‘Trinity-Godhead’, was not taught by Seventh-day Adventists during the early days of my ministry.” Letter from H Cottrell to LeRoy Froom. Sep 16. 1931.

Thus it was that information was gathered, not only in preparation for the book ‘Movement of Destiny’, but it gave a picture of *who still stood* for the pioneer beliefs, and who was on the side of change.

Brother Froom’s research also took him to Andrew’s University where he taught for one quarter of each year. He stated that this “afforded opportunity not only for continuing research, but for releasing my findings in the classroom.” Pilgrim’s Rest DH105, quoting from LeRoy Froom’s ‘Movement of Destiny’

His material was appreciated, and he spent many hours presenting his findings to Bible teachers, professionals, university and college staff, colporteurs and others.

Not only did he receive invitations from within the Adventist Church, but also from various quarters in the religious world, including Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist, Reformed, Congregationalist, and Unitarian faiths, as well as an organisation of converted Roman Catholic priests. Invitations also came from universities such as Marburg (Germany),

Rutgers (USA), Pittsburgh (USA). The results were “gratifying”, he said. Dialogues with Roman Catholic student priests were “very fruitful”. Ibid.

Extended exchanges were made between the Catholic priest Petrus Nober of the Pontifical Biblical Institute of Rome, editor of *Verbum Domine*, as well as other priests, including Luis Rivera of Rome and Argentina who Froom stated, “translated and printed articles of mine in his *Revista Biblica*.” Ibid.

Another work performed by Brother Froom during his research was to correct various encyclopedias and religious reference works within the denomination. It was “most gratifying”, he said, “to see the readiness with which the critics were willing to correct our basic position.”

“Many of these corrections went on behind the scenes, quietly accomplishing their objectives.” Pilgrim’s Rest. DH 105.

An article in the ‘Record’ confirms this very specific editing, for when speaking of anti-Trinitarian publications it stated, “Some reprints of older books and articles still contained such views, but these were eventually discontinued or edited to reflect the new understanding (of the Trinity).” ‘Record’ June 19, 1999 p8. (Brackets added)

Encouragement came from Brother A. V. Olson, of whom Froom stated, “He knew precisely what I was doing and much that I had found, and rejoiced over the results. He sensed their value to the church, for he had made a paralleling search into this particular area. He too charged me 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, correcting misconceptions and false impressions where needed – and providing a sound setting for the final advances.” Movement of Destiny p22.

It is obvious we have been reading the actual fulfilment of Sister White’s vision of the men who believed a great re-form-ation was to take place among Seventh-day Adventists that would consist in *giving up the doctrines* which stand as the pillars of our faith.

In the light of this, we should have *expected* that the Seventh-day Adventist religion would be changed....

We would have expected it.....*if we had remembered* how the Lord had led us and His teachings in our past history.

SUBTLE ADVANCES

Over the years the Trinity doctrine has been brought into the Seventh-day Adventist Church step by step, until it is now officially a part of our '27 Fundamentals'.

1931

The General Conference Statistical Secretary, Edson Rogers, along with requests from the field, urged for a new, clarified statement of beliefs. The four men appointed were brethren F M Wilcox, M E Kern, E R Palmer and C H Watson. Brother Wilcox was elected to prepare the draft for a new Statement of 22 Fundamental Beliefs. Approved without modification by the other three men, it was submitted by Brother Rogers to the General Conference, and published for the first time in the 1931 Yearbook.

Item No.2 read, “the Godhead, or Trinity, consists of the Eternal Father... the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the Eternal Father.... the Holy Spirit, the third person of the Godhead.” Issues p444. 1931 Statement of Belief.

1933

Two years later, this new Statement of 22 Fundamental Beliefs was placed in the first Church Manual. This gave the doctrine of the Trinity *an appearance* of being official, even though it was never brought before a General Conference Session to be voted upon. It was done simply “by common consent”, and not by vote of the world church. Gradually it came into greater acceptance. ‘Movement of Destiny’ p419. Issues p39. SDA Encyclopedia. Revised Edition. p935. 936. (The statement appears in the succeeding Manual revisions from 1934 – 1976)

Of course this insertion was noticed by those who did not believe in the Trinity, and they began to speak out.

However, there were others who had not received the same grounding, and this caused confusion. One person confused was Brother H W Carr. In **1935** he wrote to Sister White's son Willie on the subject of the personality of God.

“Dear Elder White,It is urged by some of our leaders now that the Holy Spirit is a third person of the same nature of the Father and Son, a member of the heavenly trio, co-operative in creation and personally active with the Father and Son. For many years I have used these statements of Sister White in combating false teachings relative to defining the Holy Spirit.

Will you kindly tell me what you understand was your mother's position in reference to the personality of the Holy Spirit... (other questions asked also)

I know Brother White you would not depart from your mother's teachings, and that you have as perfect an understanding of them as any one. I shall appreciate your opinion very much. Assuring you of the high esteem and respect I have had from my childhood in your father, mother and family. I am very truly yours in this blessed faith.” Letter to W C White from H W Carr. Jan 24. 1935.

Brother White replied saying, “Dear Brother Carr, I hold in my hand your letter of January 24... In your letter you request me to tell you what I understand to be my mother's position in reference to the personality of the Holy Spirit.

This I cannot do because I never clearly understood her teachings on the matter. There always was in my mind some perplexity regarding the meaning of her utterances which to my superficial manner of thinking seemed to be somewhat confusing.

I have often regretted that I did not possess that keenness of mind that could solve this and similar perplexities, and then remembering what Sister White wrote in Acts of the Apostles pages 51 and 52, regarding such mysteries which are too deep for human understanding, “silence is golden”, I have thought best to refrain

from discussion and have endeavoured to direct my mind to matters easy to be understood.

As I read the Bible, I find that the risen Saviour breathed on the disciples (John 20:22) "and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost". The conception received from this Scripture, seems to be in harmony with the statement in 'Desire of Ages' page 669, also Genesis 1:2; with Luke 1:4; with Acts 2:4 and also 8:15 and 10:44. Many other texts might be referred to which seem to be in harmony with this statement in 'Desire of Ages'.

"The statement and the arguments of some of our ministers in their effort to prove that the Holy Spirit was an individual as are God the Father and Christ, the eternal Son, have perplexed me and sometimes they have made me sad. One popular teacher said, 'We may regard Him (the Holy Spirit) as the fellow who is down here running things'.

My perplexities were lessened a little when I learned from the dictionary that one of the meanings of personality was 'characteristics'. It is stated in such a way that I concluded that there might be personality without bodily form which is possessed by the Father and the Son.

There are many Scriptures which speak of the Father and the Son and the absence of Scripture making similar reference to the united work of the Father and the Holy Spirit or of Christ and the Holy Spirit, has led me to believe that the Spirit without individuality was the representative of the Father and the Son throughout the universe, and it was through the Holy Spirit that they dwell in our hearts and make us one with the Father and with the Son....(other questions answered). With kind regards, I remain sincerely your brother." Letter from W C White to H W Carr. April 30 1935.

Although Brother White said he could not fully understand his mother's teaching on the Holy Spirit, his explanation to Brother Carr was in harmony with the pioneer beliefs and not with those advocating the Trinity. Brother White may not have had a deep understanding, but he did know the basic truth of his mother's teaching on the subject. That is clear from his response.

By this time, all the original pioneers had passed from the scene, however, there were still some older men who had been taught the truth by the pioneers, and they were very concerned about what was taking place. One of these men was Elder J S Washburn.

On October 14, **1939**, Brother W W Prescott had preached a sermon entitled, 'The Coming One'. In dealing with his subject, Brother Prescott included the doctrine of the Trinity, and it was this to which Elder Washburn opposed. Immediately he wrote a paper of protest. One Conference President was so impressed with Brother Washburn's letter that he distributed 32 copies to his ministers. A portion of the letter is below.

"The doctrine of the Trinity is regarded as the supreme test of orthodoxy by the Roman Catholic Church. Many of the councils of that church during its development were almost entirely given over to the discussion of the Trinity, the Arian and Trinitarian controversy...

The doctrine of the Trinity is a cruel heathen monstrosity, removing Jesus from his true position of Divine Savior and Mediator. It is true we can not measure or define divinity. It is beyond our finite understanding, yet on this subject of the personality of God, the Bible is very simple and plain – the Father, the Ancient of Days, is from eternity. Jesus was begotten of the Father....

The so-called Christian Church, the Papacy, that originated the doctrine of the Trinity, does not recognize Him (Christ) as the only mediator, but substitutes a multitude of ghosts of dead men and women as mediators. If you hold the Trinity doctrine, in reality, Christ is no longer your mediator...

The whole Trinity doctrine is utterly foreign to all the Bible and the teachings of the Spirit of Prophecy. Revelation gives not the slightest hint of it...

No one living can deny that where the Trinity was the supreme doctrine there has come horrible bondage, destruction, ruin, liberty utterly lost. Look at Italy, Spain, Russia, Hitler an Austrian Catholic, Stalin studied for the priesthood, Franco in Spain, Mussolini in Italy.

(Explanation added: all were Catholics) The world is in torment from action and reaction of the blasphemous doctrine of the Trinity...

The Catholic heathen doctrine of the Sunday Sabbath is just as sacred as the Catholic pagan doctrine of the Trinity and no more so....

Seventh-day Adventists claim to take the Word of God as supreme authority and to have 'come out of Babylon', to have renounced forever the vain traditions of Rome. If we should go back to the immortality of the soul, purgatory, eternal torment and the Sunday Sabbath, would that be anything less than apostasy?

If however, we leap over all these minor, secondary doctrines and accept and teach the very central root doctrine of Romanism, the Trinity, and teach that the son of God did not die, even though our words seem to be spiritual, is this anything else or anything less than apostasy? and the very Omega of apostasy?...

The apostasy in the days of Dr Kellogg was in regard to the personality of God. Then He was regarded as an ESSENCE pervading all nature. Being checked by the powerful Testimony of the Prophet of God, it is bound to come back later in a modified form. The Spirit of Prophecy plainly indicated this, 'THE RESULTS OF THIS INSIDIOUS DEVISING WILL BREAK OUT AGAIN AND AGAIN', and it HAS BROKEN OUT AGAIN, and *is still on the personality of God.*" Protest paper by J S Washburn. 1939. (Questions about Brother Washburn's arguments will be answered in other material. No reference for the Spirit of Prophecy quote in article)

1941

During this year, a uniform baptismal covenant or vow was recommended for adoption. It included an affirmative statement of the candidates belief in the trinity, although the word 'trinity' was not used.

Number 1, 2, and 3, of the 'Summary of Fundamental Beliefs' speaks of the Father being the first person of the Godhead; Jesus Christ, the second person of the Godhead; and the Holy Spirit, the third person of the Godhead; the latter being Christ's representative on earth, (who) "leads sinners to repentance and to obedience to all God's requirements."

Although this can be read as an affirmation of truth, it still differs greatly from that written by the pioneers in 1889. Viewed alone, each step may seem insignificant, but when seen as a whole, the progression becomes clear.

Step by step, the apostasy advanced.

In 1966, Brother Froom wrote to eight men (who were the only living members of the original committee of thirteen, appointed in 1941 to frame this Baptismal Vow), reminding them of this task, and also that it was “**to point up a *bit more sharply* the First, Second, and Third Persons of the Godhead.**” Letter from L E Froom to R A Anderson, J L Shuler, D E Rebok, A W Peterson, W G Turner, J E Weaver. Nov 22. 1966) (Emphasis added)

In **1941**, a new hymnal was prepared, and ‘Christ in Song’ phased out. ‘Christ in Song’ was prepared by F E Belden, and printed in 1908.

In the current edition it states in the Contents, ‘Praise to the Trinity’, but knowing the opposition of the pioneers to the Trinity, we know this would not have been included when it was first printed. On the first page of the current edition it states, ‘Revised and Enlarged’, and in the light of the revisions being done by Brother Froom, we can safely assume this was one of them.

In the Church Hymnal printed in 1941, the term ‘Trinity’ is not used, but there is a section for God the Father, one for Jesus Christ, and another for The Holy Spirit, implying they are all equal. There are two hymns that are obviously Trinitarian in this hymnal, although there may be others not noticed.

‘Praise ye the Spirit, Comforter of Israel, Sent of the Father and the Son to bless us; Praise ye the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, *Praise the Eternal Three!*’ No. 9.

‘All that dedicated city, Dearly loved of God on high, In exultant jubilation, Pours perpetual melody; *God the One in Three* adoring, In glad hymns eternally.’ No. 487.

Another faithful brother who stood for the truth on the Godhead was Elder C S Longacre. He was an evangelist, author, editor, minister and

administrator who personally knew Ellen White. He is best remembered for his work in Religious Liberty, receiving a citation from Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State “in appreciation of his decades of distinguished service in behalf of religious freedom.” Biography of Charles S Longacre, ‘Champion of Religious Liberty’ by Nathaniel Krum. R & H Publishing Assoc. Washington DC.

Elder Longacre wrote a manuscript entitled, ‘The Deity of Christ’, in which he wrote of his belief in Jesus Christ as the only begotten Son of God. He wrote, “Not everything has a beginning nor does everything have an ending. God Himself never had a beginning and He will not have an ending. He is the self-existent One, who never had a beginning...”

Of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, it is said in the Scriptures, “He is the only Begotten of the Father”. The Son of God was not created like other creatures are brought into existence. He is not created, but a Begotten Being, enjoying all the attributes of His Father.... If He had been God in His own right, the Father could not have delegated to Christ authority in the execution of judgment, but it was delegated to Him ‘because He is the Son of man’....” (‘The Deity of Christ’ available on request)

Elder Longacre’s article also includes how the Trinity arose in the Papal councils. He states, “The argument that Athanasius and the Catholic Church Councils since the days of the Nicean Council in 325AD sets forth is that pure reason cannot conceive of the three Persons in the Godhead lacking the two essential properties of the divine nature, namely, eternity and immutability. But the Old and the New Testaments both teach that “there is but one God”, and beside God there is no other God....

Pure reason tells me, and the Bible tells me there can be but one absolute God who must possess the two essential properties of eternity and immutability. If pure reason can conceive of three Persons being co-existent, co-eternal, co-immutable, co-immortal, co-powerful, co-omnipotent, and co-equal, then why does pure reason stop with three Gods?... If we have three absolute Gods, three first causes and three last effects, three Alphas and three Omegas, all of equal status, why can we not have any number?....

Eternity and immutability can only be applied to God the Father – the one absolute God, and not to ‘God the Son’, or ‘God the Holy Spirit’. If eternity and immutability were applied to the Son of God, then the Son of God never took any chances so far as His existence was concerned when He came into this world to meet all the temptations to sin.... We read in the Spirit of Prophecy... “God permitted His Son to come.... at the risk of failure and eternal loss...” (Desire of Ages p49)

God’s Son placed Himself in a position where He could have failed. In His humanity, He was tested on “all points such as we are”, and if He had sinned, it would have been the loss of everything -- for Himself, as well as for us.

It was possible for one of the Godhead to be lost and eternally lost – and if that had happened, and it was possible to happen, God the Father would still have remained as the One and only absolute and living God, reigning supreme over all the unfallen worlds, but with all the human race blotted out of existence on this earth....” The Deity of Christ’ Charles S Longacre.

LeRoy Froom was bold enough to admit that the “next logical and inevitable step in the implementing of our unified ‘Fundamental Beliefs’ involved revision of certain standard works so as to eliminate statements that taught, and thus perpetuated, erroneous views on the Godhead.

Such sentiments were now sharply at variance with the accepted ‘Fundamental Beliefs’ set forth in the Church Manual, and with the uniform “Baptismal Covenant’ and ‘Vow’ based thereon, which, in certificate form, was now used for all candidates seeking admission to membership in the church.” Movement of Destiny p422.

The words of the prophet are appropriate at this point, “Some searched their Bibles to build up a faith of their own, independent of the body. Satan exulted in this, for he knew that those who broke loose from the anchor would be affected by different errors and false doctrines.” 1 Selected Messages p257.

1942-1944

By the beginning of the 1940s, most of the obstacles had been removed making it possible for the new theology to fully engulf the movement. One thorn in the flesh was Uriah Smith's book 'Daniel and Revelation'. It was a book that carried the endorsement of Ellen G White. (In its originally-published two portions)

Many charge Uriah Smith with believing Christ was a 'created' being, and it appears that in the first edition of his book 'Thoughts on the Revelation', he used the reference, "The beginning of the creation of God" (Revelation 3:14), as referring to Christ as the 'beginning' of creation, rather than the 'beginner'. In the next printing this was deleted so as not to cause confusion. He may have had a misunderstanding in his early days, however, on this occasion, he is still judged for a word.

He wrote in 1882, "The Scriptures nowhere speak of Christ as a created being, but on the contrary plainly state that he was begotten of the Father. But while as the Son he does not possess a co-eternity of past existence with the Father, the beginning of His existence, as the begotten of the Father, antedates the entire work of creation, in relation to which he stands as joint Creator with God. John 1:3. Hebrews 1:2.

Could not the Father ordain that to such a being worship should be rendered equally with Himself, without its being idolatry on the part of the worshiper?... The Father Himself has 'highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name.' Philippians 2:9. These testimonies show that Christ is now an object of worship equally with the Father; but they do not prove that with him he holds an eternity of past existence." Thoughts on the Book of Daniel and the Revelation p430. 1882.

(He also wrote, "God alone is without beginning. At the earliest epoch when a beginning could be – a period so remote that to finite minds it is essentially eternity – appeared the Word.... This uncreated Word was the Being, who, in the fullness of time, was made not like that of any other being in the universe... It appears that by some divine impulse or process, not creation, known only to Omniscience, and possible only to Omnipotence, the Son of God appeared." 'Looking Unto Jesus' Uriah Smith. p10. 1898)

Brother Smith's book 'Daniel & Revelation' had been "the longest running Adventist publication in print outside the Spirit of Prophecy books", but it contained many anti-Trinitarian statements. At the 1919 Bible Conference, Brother Prescott suggested it be removed from circulation because of its anti-Trinitarian views, but as it was considered an otherwise good book, this suggestion was rejected. The Foundation of our Faith by Allen Stump p197.

Instead, it was suggested it *needed revising* "to bring it up to date with historical events that had occurred since it had last been revised by Elder Smith." Movement of Destiny p160. (Brethren F. M. Wilcox and W E Read were two others on the committee who assisted in the revisional changes)

However, when it was revised, not only was it up-dated historically, but every anti-Trinitarian statement was removed. Morally, this is highly objectionable, if not a legally wrong, for at least eighteen anti-Trinitarian statements were removed, but the book printed as if from the pen of Uriah Smith.

As a result of this revision, many Adventists questioned "as to whether this decision did not constitute the settling of a doctrine for the church by a small group of men."

This concern was answered in a later 'Ministry' magazine stating that, "Our committee had not thought of making a pronouncement on the doctrine for the denomination. But knowing there are some differences of view among us, it was our judgment that it would be better to omit the subject altogether from the book, without comment, and leave the matter open for all to study without let or hindrance." The Ministry. May 1945 p4.

1945

During this year, Brother Froom published a compilation of Ellen White quotations in the 'Ministry' magazine, declaring the absolute "eternity of Christ". As he was the Editor, this was not a difficult task.

This compilation, the first of its kind, was said to have "guided and confirmed the work of the committee" when they deleted the non-

Trinitarian statements from ‘Daniel and the Revelation’ by Uriah Smith. Movement of Destiny p427.

1946

The following year, the book ‘Evangelism’ was published. It was another means of assisting the progress of Trinitarianism within the Adventist Church.

Brother Froom was on the Editorial committee, and was thus able to compile Ellen White statements in such a manner as to distort her true position. He did this by taking statements out of context, and using a number of ellipses. Sub-titles were included to introduce thoughts to the reader’s mind, which gave a false understanding of the quotation.

In a letter to another brother who worked on the project, Brother Froom wrote, “I am sure that we are agreed in evaluating the book ‘Evangelism’ as one of the great contributions in which the Ministerial Association had a part back in those days. You know what it did with men in the Columbia Union who came face to face with the clear, unequivocal statements of the Spirit of Prophecy on the Deity of Christ, personality of the Holy Spirit, the Trinity, and the like. They either had to lay down their arms and accept those statements, or else they had to reject the Spirit of Prophecy...”
Letter from Leroy Froom to Roy Allen Anderson. Jan 18. 1966.

Remember that this apostasy predicted by the prophet and that it would “wax worse and worse until the coming of the Lord.”

In **1946**, the General Conference session made an important step regarding the new baptismal vow. It had been changed without official vote of the world church, but now the delegates at the session were asked to vote that “changes to the baptismal vow could only be made by the General Conference delegates in official session”. Movement of Destiny p420-422.

This was a very strategic move.

Brother Arthur W Spalding, was also seeking information on the history of the Trinity among us, however, it appears he was not a part of the

conspiracy. It is obvious he had been taught the Trinity, but did not understand that apostasy had brought it into the church.

In a letter to Brother H Camden Lacey he wrote, “Dear Brother Lacey, Will you extend your helping hand to me once more? I am in Washington making the last revision of my manuscript for the first volume of ‘An Episodic History of Seventh-day Adventists’. Two or three large questions confront me.

One of these is the history of the Trinitarian and anti-Trinitarian doctrines among us.... I understand that some of our leading men in the beginning were opposed to the doctrine of the Trinity, at least as expressed by certain Trinitarians...”.

I should be grateful for any light you have to throw upon the subject. D E Robinson says that you are the first one he knows of to teach the straight doctrine of the Trinity in Australia...

There is to me a twilight zone in this history which I wish to have lighted. Did all the father’s sin? And if so, did they repent? How prove the unity of the faith in our succession if our pioneers were Arians and we are Athanasians?...

I am slow to censure any of the fathers, but I am ready to make situations as clear as they appear to me. In the beginning of my writing I did not realize that the question of the Trinity among us was of so serious a nature, and my reference to it in an early chapter was quite inadequate. I may have to expand it elsewhere, yet I do not want to make it more of a major question than it was....” Letter from A W Spalding to H C Lacey. Jun 2 1947.

Brother Lacey replied, “Most assuredly our people were anti-Trinitarians, when we (the Lacey family) accepted the ‘truth’ in 1888... Well ‘sin’ is perhaps too strong a word. But they certainly ‘all’ held inadequate views on both the ‘eternity of the Son’ (and therefore His essential Deity) and the ‘personality of the Holy Ghost’.... ‘And if so, did they repent?’ Not so as you could notice it, I fear...

How prove the unity of the faith in our succession if our pioneers were Arians and we are Athanasians? Well, now, the answer is

obvious – to you, as well as to the rest of us, so let us leave it there!” Letter from H C Lacey to A W Spalding. Jun 5 1947. (Bracket in quote)

It is absolutely vital to understand that the progress of apostasy was almost complete by this time. Few of the older men remained who had taught the truth on the Godhead, and all the younger generation had been taught the Trinity from the beginning of their experience.

1949

During the year 1949, Professor D E Rebok was asked by the Review & Herald to revise ‘Bible Readings for the Home Circle’. This was another move to eliminate pioneer teachings that had become an embarrassment to the New Theological doctrines being put forward, such as the teaching that Jesus accepted the sinful nature of man. This was taken out by the committee. Bible Readings for the Home Circle p174.

Brother Froom stated, “So the inaccurate note was deleted, and has remained out in all subsequent printings. Thus another error was removed through these revisions of the 1940s, as concerned some of our standard and otherwise helpful books.” Movement of Destiny p428.

1950

It was in this year that two young men by the name of Robert Wieland and Donald Short expressed concern to the brethren that the church had veered off course from the message given at Minneapolis in 1888.

Having been brought up under Trinitarians, they did not see the progress of this particular apostasy, but they understood that the church was continuing to reject the message of righteousness by faith, including the point deleted from ‘Bible Readings for the Home Circle’, that Christ took upon Himself ‘the likeness of sinful flesh’, and “not mere appearance, but reality.” 1888 Re-Examined p156. 1950 edition.

A recent South Pacific ‘Record’ article suggested that “Christ’s deity did not die, but suffered something far worse – the rending of the Trinity”.. ‘Record’ Jun 19.1999. p8. However, the Spirit of Prophecy clearly

states this aspect of His suffering, “Christ felt *His unity with the Father broken up.*” The Desire of Ages p686. (Emphasis added)

The death of Christ rent with anguish the heart of the Father, and literally tore Christ’s heart in two. “It was the burden of sin, the sense of its terrible enormity, of its separation of the soul from God – it was this that broken the heart of the Son of God.” Steps to Christ p13.

Brother Wieland and Brother Short were attempting to show how a ‘false Christ’ could appear among Seventh-day Adventists. “They believed, accurately, that misrepresentation would precede impersonation.” The Foundation of our Faith Allen Stump p199.

“The death of a false Christ would have no power to draw all men, such as a clear understanding of the death of the true Christ. It would rather be an inexplicable transaction that took place between the Father and the Son....” 1888 Re-Examined. 1950 edition p158.

They also stated, “It is now abundantly evident that ‘we’ have travelled the road of disillusionment since the Minneapolis meetings of 1888. Infatuation with false teachings has taken the place of clear, cogent, heaven-inspired truth, as regards “righteousness by faith”. By the hard, humiliating way of actual experience with counterfeits, Israel has brought herself to the time when she is ripe for disillusionment.” Ibid p202.

Although much of the message of 1888 was understood by Brother Wieland and Short, the 1952 Bible Conference did not see the root of the problem, and the Trinitarian view was never challenged.

Thus the apostasy marched on apace....

THE FINAL STEPS

Satan has always wanted to be worshipped, and now he attains worship through a clever doctrinal deception. He “desired to usurp the throne of God. Failing in this, he has worked in darkness, in crookedness, in deception, to usurp his place in the hearts of men. He has set up his throne between God and man, to appropriate the adoration that belongs to God alone.” 6 Bible Commentary p1119.

1951

An article was published in a Protestant newspaper entitled ‘Mrs E. G. White’s Confusion on the Trinity’. Obviously other denominational leaders saw Ellen White as writing both *for and against* the Trinity, and no doubt the article attempted to make her *appear* inconsistent, which would be an embarrassment the Seventh-day Adventist Church. The larger churches of Christendom already believed Adventists were a sect, and this publicity confirmed that belief.

One man who was very interested in the subject of ‘sects’ was Walter R Martin, for he had written a book entitled ‘Rise of the Cults’. In its first printing he included a chapter on Seventh-day Adventists. Naturally, this disturbed church leaders, for they were doing their ‘best’ to bring the church into the mainline teachings of Christendom.

1955

Arrangements were made to conduct a series of conferences between the Evangelicals and Seventh-day Adventists, to thoroughly discuss the issue.

The meetings were not widely publicised and only four men were chosen to meet with the Evangelicals – LeRoy E. Froom, Walter E. Read, T. Edgar Unruh, Roy Allen Anderson. The Evangelicals who met with these men were Walter Martin, consulting editor on the staff of ‘Eternity’ magazine, and George E Cannon, a professor of theology on the faculty of the Nyack, New York, Missionary College. (Dr Donald Barnhouse, Editor of ‘Eternity’ magazine also met with them on occasions)

Brother Unruh explained in an article that the meetings resulted from Walter Martin requesting face-to-face contact with representative Seventh-day Adventists, as he was doing further writing on the cults, and wanted to “treat Adventists fairly”. (He also “expressly asked to meet LeRoy Froom”, with whose ‘Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers’ he was already familiar)

The first meeting convened in March 1955, at which Mr Martin launched into a list of questions that reflected his reading of such men as D. M. Canright and E. S. Ballenger, men who had apostatised from the faith.

Brother Unruh stated, “We began with a positive presentation in which we emphasized those doctrines held by our church in common with Evangelical Christians of all faiths in all ages.... It quickly became clear... that both questions and answers would have to be formally stated in writing, that the answers would have to be made crystal clear to the Evangelical conferees and to those they represented, and that a way would have to be found to demonstrate the consensus we were sure we had....”

Martin was given books and periodicals to substantiate the claims we had made in our opening statement.... Froom, who had a facile pen, took the responsibility of composing the initial answers...” The Seventh-day Adventist Evangelical Conferences of 1955-1956. by T. E. Unruh.

The next morning, Walter Martin announced that he had been wrong about Seventh-day Adventism on several important points, and had been persuaded that Adventists who believed as did the conferees, were truly born-again Christians and his brethren in Christ. “In a dramatic gesture”, wrote Brother Unruh, “he extended his hand in fellowship.” Ibid.

Twenty eight years later, Brother Anderson stated in the ‘Adventist Review’, “What do you folk believe about the Trinity was a question put to me some years ago (1955) by two gracious Christian gentlemen (Walter Martin and George Cannon) who came unannounced (?) to the General Conference headquarters in Washington DC...

Our answer concerning the Godhead and the Trinity was crucial, for in some of the books they had read that Adventists were classed as Arians... We reassured the visitors when we turned first to the Scriptures, then to the Fundamental Beliefs of Adventism. They

discovered that we were in harmony with sound Biblical scholarship, not only on the Trinity, but on every other cardinal doctrine of Christianity.” Adventist Review. Sep 8. 1983 p4. (? Added – ‘unannounced?’)

Walter Martin spoke at a conference held at the Campus Hill Church, Loma Linda of his experience in meeting Brother Froom in 1955, thirty four years earlier. He said, “When I first met with L.E.Froom, he took me to task for about fifteen minutes on how I could ever possibly think that Adventism was a cult, “Adventism rings as true as steel”, he said.

I said, “Do you think Arius was a Christian?”

He was an excellent church historian and he said, “Of course he wasn’t a Christian, he denied the deity of Jesus Christ.”

I said, “So did Ellen White.” Dr Froom replied, “What!”

I said, “Yes”, and opened up a suitcase and produced at least twelve feet of Adventist publications stacked up and marked for Dr Froom’s perusal, and for the perusal of the committee to check the sources in there.

And they were in mortal shock I might add, to think that it was as pervasive as it was. Mrs White reversed herself later on very quickly, and affirmed the doctrine of the Trinity very strongly and taught it. But she was influenced by Uriah Smith. She did deny the eternal deity of Christ at one time and relegated Him to the place of a second deity. That’s why you were classified with the Jehovah’s Witnesses early on, because of the Arian emphasis in Adventism. And because of the fact that you affirmed Michael the Archangel to be Christ.” Walter Martin – tape of conference at Loma Linda. Jan 1989.

(Remember, these are the charges of a non-Adventist man who does not believe in the Spirit of Prophecy. If Ellen White ‘reversed’ her belief in later years, after having received divine illumination from God, she would be a false prophet, which of course is what Evangelicals believe)

Of course the Adventist conferees hastily perused the material, and at the next meeting stated that what Mr Martin had said was true, but that they

did not agree with the statements. “They do not reflect orthodox Adventist theology”, they said, “and we reject it”.

1956

After the on-going discussions had concluded, Dr Barnhouse, printed a three-part series of articles written by Walter Martin on Seventh-day Adventists in his magazine ‘Eternity’, stating that at the conference “it was perceived that the Adventists were strenuously denying certain doctrinal positions which had been previously attributed to them... (and that the) Adventists specifically repudiate any teachings by ministers or members of their faith who have believed, proclaimed, and written any matter which would classify them among Arians.” Eternity. Sep 1956.

1957

In this year, the book ‘Questions on Doctrine’ was prepared. At the front it states, “Prepared by a Representative Group of Seventh-day Adventist Leaders, Bible Teachers, and Editors”. We do not know their names, but we can assume they included the four men who were at the Evangelical Conference. Possibly it was LeRoy Froom’s pen, as he was a ready writer.

Quoting from the book ‘Questions on Doctrine’. “Question 1. What doctrines do Seventh-day Adventists hold in common with Christians in general, and in what aspects of Christian thought do they differ?”

Answer. In common with Conservative Christians and the Historic Protestant Creeds, We Believe... That the Godhead, the Trinity, comprises God the Father, Christ the Son and the Holy Spirit.

Question 3. Have Seventh-day Adventists changed from some of the positions advocated by certain adherents of earlier years, from whom citations are still currently circulated? Do such citations misrepresent the present teachings of Adventist leadership?

Answer. The founding fathers of the Seventh-day Adventist Church over a century ago came out of various denominational

backgrounds. While all were pre-millennialists, some were Trinitarian; others were Arian... Nor did they, at first, seek to define the nature of the Godhead, or the problems of Christology, involving the deity of Christ and His nature during the incarnation; the personality and deity of the Holy Spirit...

But with the passage of years the earlier diversity of view on certain doctrines gradually gave way to unity of view. Clear and sound positions were then taken by the great majority on such doctrines as the Godhead, the deity and eternal pre-existence of Christ, and the personality of the Holy Spirit...

A few however, held to some of their former views, and at times these ideas got into print. However, for decades now the church has been practically at one on the basic truths of the Christian faith.”

Questions on Doctrine – An Explanation of certain major aspects of Seventh-day Adventist Belief p29-31. Review & Herald Publishing Association. 1957. (Denominational history and the Spirit of Prophecy show this statement to be inaccurate)

“Question 4: Do you believe in the Trinity?

Answer: To answer this question, the “official” Yearbook and “authoritative” Church Manual (1951 edition) are cited, as well as the “standard” Baptismal Certificate. “Seventh-day Adventists base their belief in the Trinity on the statements of Holy Scripture rather than on a historic Creed. Article 2 of the statement of Fundamental Beliefs is explicit:

That the Godhead, or Trinity, consists of the Eternal Father, a personal, spiritual Being, omnipotent, omnipresent, omniscient, infinite in wisdom and love; the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the Eternal Father, through whom all things were created and through whom the salvation of the redeemed hosts will be accomplished; the Holy Spirit, the third person of the Godhead, the great regenerating power in the work of redemption.” Ibid. p35.36.

“Question 5: If a Unitarian or an Arian (rejecting the trinity of the Godhead, and denying the deity of Christ) should seek admission into your church, would a Seventh-day Adventist minister baptise and receive such into membership? Is it possible for an individual to remain in good and regular standing if he consistently refuses to submit to church authority regarding the historic doctrine of the death of Jesus Christ?

Answer: It “is hypothetical – for the simple reason that an avowed Unitarian or Arian does not seek membership in an avowedly Trinitarian church while still holding his old views on the Godhead.... and no minister has ever been faced with such a request”. Ibid. p 42.43. (Bracket in quote)

The answer also states that Seventh-day Adventist ministers are required to thoroughly instruct all candidates for membership preparatory to baptism. “If a candidate persists in holding erroneous views concerning our Lord and Saviour... then only one course could be followed, the applicant would have to be told frankly that he is totally unprepared for baptism....

“Furthermore, the Seventh-day Adventist Church uses a uniform four-page Certificate of Baptism, which is given to the candidate at the time of his baptism... on page 4 is found the candidate’s ‘Baptismal Vow’, with thirteen terse declarations to be made in the affirmative before baptism is administered, following which the certificate is signed and dated....

That this Baptismal Certificate is authoritative, and in constant use in the church, is seen from its inclusion in our official Church Manual.... On page 224 (in the Church Manual), under the heading “Reasons for Which Members Shall be Disciplined”, there are listed seven definite departures, any one of which could be grounds for disfellowshipping a member.

The first reads: ‘Denial of faith in the fundamentals of the gospel and in the cardinal doctrines of the church or teaching doctrines contrary to the same’.” Ibid p42-49.

Further on in the answer it states, “Our people have always believed in the deity and pre-existence of Christ, most of them quite likely unaware of any dispute as to the exact relationships of the Godhead... Quite possibly our toleration of a few variant theories has not been too high a price to pay for freedom from creedal dogmatism and controversy, and for unity of spirit and effort in our world task.” Ibid. p42-49.

Remember, the question relates to an Arian or Semi-Arian wanting to join the Church.

The answer to this question certainly makes the beliefs of the pioneers appear totally false, and if those very pioneers were alive today, including Ellen White, it is obvious they would not be permitted to remain members of the Seventh-day Adventist Church! In fact, 'Ministry' magazine stated, "Most of the founders of the Seventh-day Adventism would not be able to join the church today if they had to subscribe to the denomination's Fundamental Beliefs." Ministry Oct 1993 p10.

When the manuscript for 'Questions on Doctrine' was being prepared, a draft was sent out to many of the brethren around the world. One brother who returned his questionnaire wrote alongside Question 5, 'Would we disfellowship Elder Longacre?' (Brother Longacre was still well known for his anti-Trinitarian beliefs in 1957. He died the following year)

A further statement in answer to Question 3 is as follows: "The belief of Seventh-day Adventists on these great truths (the Godhead, Christology, pre-existence and deity of Christ, deity of the Holy Spirit) is clear and emphatic. And we feel that we should not be identified with, or stigmatized for, certain limited and faulty concepts held by some, particularly in our formative years.

This statement should therefore nullify the stock 'quotations' that have been circulated against us. We are one with our fellow Christians of denominational groups in the great fundamentals of the faith once delivered to the saints." Questions on Doctrine p31.32. (Bracket not in quote, but subject matter in answer)

Brother Froom stated that the above was added as a public disavowal, denying all "erroneous" statements by the early pioneers that are not in harmony with the current 'Fundamental Statement of Beliefs' or 'New Theology'. This was to be a "token of goodwill, and a gesture of friendship toward all the Protestant Evangelical world." Movement of Destiny p483.484.

During 1957, Brother M. L. Andreasen became very concerned about what was taking place, and began to write letters to church leaders regarding his concerns. He stated, "I have sent out letters from time to time concerning what I consider a serious departure from the faith on the

part of the leaders... for a number of months, even for years, our leaders had been studying with some evangelical ministers with a view to eventual recognition of the Adventists as an evangelical Christian body...

The evangelical ministers appear to have made a pronounced impression upon the Adventist leaders, so much so that Dr Barnhouse, one of the participating evangelical ministers, reports that the Adventist leaders “totally repudiated” some of their most important doctrines.” Letters to the Churches M. L. Andreasen p35.

Brother Andreasen became an Adventist in 1894 at the age of 18. (He entered the ministry in 1902) Having been brought up in the church at the end of the 1800s, he learned the pioneer belief on the Godhead. He knew Christ was the ‘begotten’ Son of God, and that the holy Spirit was the omnipresent Spirit of the Father and Christ, and not as understood by Trinitarians.

However, in 1898, when ‘The Desire of Ages’ came out, he said he received quite a shock when he read some of Ellen White’s statements. (Particularly p19, 530, 671) He did not believe the prophet had written these sentences, and took a special trip to view the handwriting for himself. However, he found the statements to be in the originals.

Many today believe that Sister White differed “sharply with most of the pioneers” on the subject of the Godhead, however, this is totally false. To Elder Andreasen, the statements in question looked contrary to what he believed about Christ and the Holy Spirit, and also what he knew Sister White believed and taught, otherwise it would not have been such a shock. The Trinity: Heresy or Hopeful Sign? South Pacific ‘Record’ Jun 19.1999.

Yes, the statements in question looked unusual, they looked Trinitarian.

But were they?

If Sister White changed her belief in the Godhead, then everything she wrote at the time of the Kellogg crisis is without significance. Those who charge the prophet with believing and teaching error a short time prior to the printing of ‘The Desire of Ages’ do not understand the gravity of the charge. It means, while denouncing the doctor for his Trinitarian beliefs, she herself was standing *for the Trinity!*

And if she had a belief in the Trinity from the beginning, she was negligent in not dealing with the conflicting teachings of the pioneers *publicly years earlier*, as she did with Dr Kellogg later.

The fact is – the prophet did deal with the problem in the early days, but it had nothing to do with the pioneer leaders of the work. They all spoke vehemently against the doctrine of the Trinity, including Sister White’s own husband James. He called it “the old unscriptural trinitarian **creed**”. Day Star Jan 24.1846.

Previous to becoming an Adventist, James White had belonged to the Christian Connection, a denomination that repudiated the doctrine of the Trinity. In 1852, he called it “the old trinitarian absurdity”. Review & Herald Aug 5. 1852.

Russell Holt wrote, “The evidence from his pen seems to indicate that from his first spiritual affiliations with the Christian Connection, until his death at the age of 60, James White opposed the Trinity, both on the basis of logic and Scripture...” Quoted in The Foundation of our Faith Allen Stump p63.

There is no record of censure by Ellen White to her husband for his anti-Trinitarian beliefs, nor to any of the pioneers. (The statements of Sister White that *appear* to be Trinitarian are dealt with in the book ‘Nothing to Fear’ Book 3 in this series)

A very legitimate area of which Brother Andreasen became aware (during 1955-57), was that the Testimonies were being tampered with by the White Board of Trustees. Words, sentences and letters were being changed, footnotes and headings were being inserted, that would make it appear Sister White was in harmony with the ‘new’ theology that was appearing in the ‘Ministry’ magazine and ‘Questions on Doctrines’ Ibid p46.

(This information came to Brother Andreasen from an official minutes of a meeting of the White Board of Trustees. Someone handed him a confidential copy of the minutes, from which he gained this information. Tampering with the books is also dealt with in ‘Nothing to Fear’ Book 3 in this series)

Although he was very concerned, Elder Andreasen’s “real concern was the realization that this had been approved by the administration,

and was henceforth to be accepted policy”, and so his letters continued to expose the sins of the leaders. Ibid.

(Eventually, Brother Andraesen was asked if he would continue his ‘activities’, to which he replied, ‘Yes’. After much fruitless communication regarding a hearing, Brother Andraesen stated, “I have exhausted all means of corresponding with the men I should address. I can now speak to the church, as Christ said might be done if other means fail. This I shall do, but I still hold myself ready to come to a hearing or trial, properly conducted and properly recorded. Let the light in.” Ibid p52.53. As a result his letters were printed in a book called ‘Letters to the Churches’, and these were circulated among other concerned church members)

1960

In August of this year, Brother Froom wrote to Walter Martin stating, “One of these days I want to write a history of the development of doctrine in the Seventh-day Adventist Church from the very beginning of the little Sabbath conferences in 1848, on up through the formative period of some forty years to the place where the matter of the Godhead, the Deity, the nature of the incarnation, and the nature of the atonement came to the point of issue over clarification and correction in 1888. That marked a turning point.

There was still reverberations on the part of some of the earlier misconceptions, the minority opinion of a little group of individuals who were rather vocal, but did not represent any majority view.

When I study the history of the emergence of other religious bodies, and their formative period, their divergencies, and their conflicts, and their ultimate clarification – I do not know that our background problem was too much different except that a few Arians did obtain a prominence all out of proportion to their number. The majority were of the quiet order who simply went on believing in the Deity and the Atonement much as most of the larger Protestant bodies have held.

I think that the book ‘Questions on Doctrine’, with its definite repudiation of those two points held by some, has done much to clarify this matter and dispel a misconception, and a misrepresentation of a distinctly minority, but vocal view.” Letter to Walter R Martin from L E Froom. Aug 18. 1960

1971

LeRoy Froom did write a book on the history of the Seventh-day Adventist Church from 1848 to 1888 -- forty one years after Elder A G Daniells suggested he write a volume on the progress of the Advent Movement throughout history. In 1971 'Movement of Destiny' was printed.

But although the book is a detailed account of Adventist history, it is a clear attempt to rewrite that history. Again the anti-Trinitarian view of the pioneers is called the "minority view", a completely false statement, as a view of the writings of the pioneers will prove. Movement of Destiny p149

Not only that, but he also called it "an encapsulated cancer, gross but confined". The Sanctuary and the Atonement p530. L E Froom.

Although 'Movement of Destiny' is a very biased book, fully supporting the Trinity, it gives a wealth of material revealing the way the apostasy has entered the church. **The truth of the apostasy is open to all.** Letters, conversations, research, alterations to books are all documented.

1980

This year was a landmark in the history of apostasy in the Seventh-day Adventist Church, a year when delegates met for the quinquennial General Conference Session of the World Church in Dallas, Texas.

The main focus of the session was the development of a new Statement of Beliefs to replace the 1931 statement which had only undergone minor revisions. It was the final opportunity for the laity to 'meet' the omega of apostasy.

How would they treat it?

Sadly, the majority did not understand the issue; they had forgotten how the Lord had led in our past history.

However, "the discussion, contention, and disagreements about the 'trinity' section in the statement of beliefs caused no little confusion among many of the delegates". General Conference Bulletin 1980, discussion on No.2 Statement.

Brother G N Banks asked the question: “Is our position as fundamentalist-believers that the Godhead is a unit of three equal members, pre-existent to all things, and that there was a period when there was no Sonship involved – just three members of the Godhead? Is that our position? Did the term Father come into play only in relationship to the Sonship experience as a result of sin and the need of the atonement?”

Brother Neil Wilson responded: “Well, you are getting into an area that could lead us into certain Arian complications.”

Brother Duncan Eva stated: “Mr Chairman, we did not want to get into those areas that Elder Banks has talked about, but we felt confident in using the word Father because that is the word Jesus gave us to use: ‘Our Father which art in heaven’.” *Adventist Review* April 24. 1980 p18.

Unfortunately, the question of Brother Banks was turned aside, and discussion that could have brought understanding of the apostasy before the delegates was missed

The twenty seven fundamentals were voted through as official doctrinal statements of belief. Statement No.2 is now a dogma of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. It reads:

“There is one God: Father, Son and Holy Spirit, a unity of three co-eternal Persons. God is immortal, all-powerful, all-knowing, above all, and ever present. He is infinite and beyond human comprehension, yet known through His self-revelation. He is forever worthy of worship, adoration, and service by the whole creation....

There is no distance between the persons of the triune God. All three are divine, yet they share their divine powers and qualities. In human organization final authority rests in one person – a president, king, or prime minister. ***In the Godhead, final authority resides in all three members.***

While the Godhead is not one in person, God is one in purpose, mind, and character. This oneness does not obliterate the distinct

personalities of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Nor does the separateness of personalities within the Deity destroy the monotheistic thrust of Scripture, that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are one God.” Fundamental Beliefs No.2. Seventh-day Adventists Believe p16. (Emphasis added)

Dear Seventh-day Adventist, this is what you are required to believe as a member of the denomination. On the surface, it appears to be in harmony with all the mainline churches of Christendom – Roman Catholic, Anglican, Uniting, Baptist, Church of Christ, Lutheran – however, it is more Trinitheism, as the three Persons are not consubstantial as stated in the Creed of Nicaea.

A special issue of the ‘Adventist Review’ stated, “Although other religions include a ‘trinity’ in their pantheon, only Christianity is marked by a general belief in one triune God – one true and living God”. Adventist Review Special Issue.

1984

A new baptismal vow was printed, bringing it into harmony with the official 27 Fundamental Beliefs.

1985

During this year, the new Seventh-day Adventist Hymnal was released. This time there was a section entitled, ‘Trinity’, with seven hymns listed, and a responsive reading of portions of Ephesians 1, 2 and 4. (The seven hymns listed are 70,71,72,73,116, 234,235. Remember, it is not a sin to mention the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, but it can be written in a Biblical way, or in a Trinitarian way. There are many other Trinitarian hymns, when the words are carefully read. Hymn No.148 is another one)

Some of the lines that are obviously Trinitarian are:

‘All glory to our Lord and God, For love, so deep, so high, so broad;
The Trinity whom we adore, Forever and forever more.’ No.148.

‘To Thee, great *One in Three*, Eternal praises be’ No.71.

‘To God the Father, God the Son, and God the Spirit, *Three in one.*’

No.72. (This is a Latin hymn of the 9th century)

‘*God in three persons, blessed Trinity!*’ No. 73.

Interestingly, the above hymn ‘Holy, Holy, Holy’ has a meter called ‘Nicaea 11.12.12.10’. According to the song writer Reginald Heber, it was written to give glory to the Trinity. The musician John B Dykes, honoured Heber’s purpose and wrote the music to fit his theme.

In the previous hymnals this hymn had three verses, but in the current one, the first verse has been changed from ‘God over all who rules eternity’, and an extra verse added from the original rendering. The last line (of verse 1 and 4) says, ‘*God in three persons, blessed Trinity*’. Clearly this is a deliberate attempt to move the Seventh-day Adventist Church into harmony with the doctrine of the Trinity. The fourth verse is exactly the same as in the Anglican Book of Common Prayer, hymn No.160.

When this new hymnal was first published, there was an outrage over the inclusion of Catholic and Anglican terminology, Latin hymns, false doctrine, especially the blatant wording, “When I fall on my knees, With my face to the rising sun...” No.403.

1988

Thirty one years after the printing of ‘Questions on Doctrine’, the book ‘Seventh-day Adventists Believe’ was published, a ‘Biblical Exposition of 27 Fundamental Doctrines’. Rumours had been circulating that ‘Questions on Doctrine’ needed updating, and this book became its sequel.

1993

During this year, the North American Division commissioned the printing of a book called ‘Issues: The Seventh-day Adventist Church and Certain Private Ministries’. It was specifically designed “To help clarify the church’s relationship to certain private organizations.” (This book was sent to every minister in the United States, as well as other countries, including Australia. In some places head elders received it also)

Although ‘certain private ministries’ are mentioned in the book, it is clear that *any church member* who speaks out against apostasy will be placed in the same category.

“The heart of the problem”, according to the writers of ‘Issues’, “is their insistence that leaders, members, and ministers must agree with them or be charged with heresy and that view-points differing from theirs are an evidence of apostasy in the church.” From an abbreviated and adapted version of the book ‘Issues’. Authorized by the Officers and Union Presidents of the North American Division of the General Conference p8.

One point made very clear is that it confirms that the pioneers of the Seventh-day Adventist Church did not believe in the Trinity. (As has already been stated, when one reads the writings of the pioneers, it is perfectly clear that they were *all* anti-Trinitarian, but the modern line is that only a ‘minority’ believed this view)

The book ‘Issues’ stated, “After the 1952 Bible Conference, for example, Nichol wrote in the ‘Review’ of the “impressive fact that we have not changed our theology”. To be sure, the qualifiers that Nichol adds to that statement tend to temper its intensity. He seems to be speaking of Adventism’s major doctrines. But even then it would seem that the shift to a Trinitarian theology is a significant ‘change’ in Adventist thinking....

In addition to the missing preamble, the 1931 statement differs most dramatically from the 1872 statement in that *it is fully Trinitarian*. The 1980 statement is like the 1931 statement in that *it is fully Trinitarian*.” Issues p46.

An important question is asked by the compilers of the book ‘Issues’, and it is one that the reader of this book needs to ponder, especially if there is a desire to stand with the faith once delivered to the saints in the early days of our history.

“Are modern defenders of so-called historic Adventism really prepared to return to a non-Trinitarian position?” Issues p39.

Denominational leaders today know that most Independent Ministries are not willing to return to the anti-Trinitarian position of the pioneers because of the cultic stigma attached to the belief. Not to mention the loss of financial support.

Reader, what about you? Are you prepared to stand with the truth and be considered a cult?

The Seventh-day Adventist Church leaders have worked very hard to place the denomination in a position of favour with the mainline churches of Christendom, even being willing to deny the teachings that made the solid platform of truth in our past history. But today the original platform has gone...

Remember the Bible verse, “If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?” Psalm 11:3.

What is the answer?

NOTHING.

1995

On July 8, as a climax to the 1995 General Conference Session, a packed audience of 40,000 gave enthusiastic applause to Catholic representatives as they paraded across the stage, bearing the **triple-mitred flag of the Vatican**. This ‘Parade of Nations’ was like no other, for it ‘planted’ the Vatican ‘Trinity standard’ in the midst of the Seventh-day Adventist Church in its official World Session in Utrecht, Holland. (Was this the forerunner to the final step? Matthew 24:15. Mar 13:14)

It is too late to do anything now for the Seventh-day Adventist Church. It is drifting out to sea, without chart or compass, because ‘somebody’ has “cut the cable that anchored it to the Eternal Rock”. Advent Review Jul 24 1888. ‘In Heavenly Places’ p201. (This article deals with the gospel and the relationship between faith and works, another subject that has been altered to suit liberal theology)

The only thing left for you, as an individual Christian accountable to God, is to **REPENT** and make your stand for the truth.

What will your decision be?

THE LAST STEP

There is always a final step to apostasy, and from it there is no return. The servant of the Lord wrote a warning to every church and person called to do a work for Him.

“The Lord Jesus will always have a chosen people to serve Him. When the Jewish people rejected Christ the Prince of life, He took from them the kingdom of God and gave it to the Gentiles. God will continue to work on this principle with every branch of His work.

When a church proves unfaithful to the work of the Lord, whatever their position may be, however high and sacred their calling, the Lord can no longer work with them. Others are chosen to bear important responsibilities.

But, if these in turn do not purify their lives from every wrong action, if they do not establish pure and holy principles in all their borders (including true principles of faith), then the Lord will grievously afflict and humble them from their place and make them a reproach...” The Upward Look p131. (Bracket added)

In the Year 2000, the Papacy had its “phase of celebration”, the aim of which was, according to Pope John Paul II, “**to give glory to the Trinity**, from whom everything in the world and in history comes and to whom everything returns.

This mystery is the focus of the three years of immediate preparation: from Christ and through Christ, in the Holy Spirit, to the Father. In this sense the Jubilee celebration will make present in an anticipatory way **the goal and fulfilment of the life of each Christian and of the whole Church in the Triune God...**” The Third Millennium. John Paul 11 p78.79.

And the Pope of Rome, together with the world’s religious and secular leaders, will soon cause all, “both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand, or in their foreheads, and that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name... And

as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed”. Revelation 13:15.16.17

What about Seventh-day Adventists?

Will they bow before the Pope of Rome and keep his ‘holy’ day, thus acknowledging his god as supreme?

“The Lord has a controversy with his professed people in these last days...”, wrote Ellen White in 1884. Reader, this is a testimony you must take seriously.

“In this controversy men in responsible positions will take a course directly opposite to that pursued by Nehemiah. They will not only ignore and despise the Sabbath themselves, but they will try to keep it from others by burying it beneath the rubbish of custom and tradition.

In churches and in large gatherings in the open air, ministers will ***urge upon the people the necessity of keeping the first day of the week...*** The church of today has followed in the steps of the Jews of old, who set aside the commandments of God for their own traditions. She has changed the ordinance, broken the everlasting covenant, and now, as then, pride, unbelief and infidelity are the result....” Advent Review’ Mar 18. 1884.

When the beast and his image command obedience to the Sunday Law, those who have built their religious experience upon sand, will bow before the Man of Sin, and will worship his Triune god, the one they have already acknowledged as their own.

And in the shadows, Satan will be laughing....

"In reviewing our past history, having traveled over every step of advance to our present standing, I can say, Praise God! As I see what the Lord has wrought, I am filled with astonishment, and with confidence in Christ as leader. We have nothing to fear for the future, except as we shall forget the way the Lord has led us, and His teaching in our past history. We are debtors to God to use every advantage He has entrusted to us to beautify the truth by holiness of character, and to send the messages of warning, and of comfort, of hope and love, to those who are in the darkness of error and sin."

{Life Sketches, 196}