

Chapter 7

A CREED AND A CHURCH MANUAL

1930-1932

The first step of apostasy is to get up a creed,
telling us what we shall believe.

John N. Loughborough,
(*Review and Herald*, October 8, 1861)

Speaking of the attempt to remove the name Seventh-day Adventist from the *American Sentinel* (Religious Liberty journal of the SDA Church) in 1890, to make the magazine popular with other denominations, Ellen White stated, “This policy is the first step in a succession of wrong steps.” (*Counsels to Writers and Editors*, page 96, emphasis supplied). In the context of this testimony Ellen White was speaking of the “wrong steps” the leading brethren were taking down the road to ecumenical concessions. In 1890 this “first step” toward ecumenism was averted because a living prophet was present to correct and prevent this erroneous and dangerous move on the part of SDA leadership toward ecumenism. However, in 1926, the first “wrong step” toward ecumenical concessions was actually taken by the General Conference voting that “We recognize every agency that lifts up Christ before man as a part of the divine plan for the evangelization of the world, and we hold in high esteem the Christian men and women in other communions who are engaged in winning souls to Christ.” (“Relationship To Other Societies,” General Conference Executive Committee, 1926). Why was this “wrong step” taken in 1926 and not in 1890? Could it be that this “*wrong step*” was taken in 1926 because the living messenger of the Lord had passed from the scene in 1915, *eleven years previous to 1926?*

In 1928, two years after this first “wrong step” was voted by the General Conference Executive Committee in 1926, the second “wrong step” toward ecumenism was taken by the acceptance of a new Bible translation (the *American Revised* version), above the *Authorized King James* version. (See, Art., Wilkinson, Benjamin George, *Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia*, Revised Edition, 1976, page 1609).

At the 1930 General Conference session, the Committee took a third wrong step, “*in a succession of wrong steps,*” toward ecumenism by voting to publish an official *Church Manual*, and an official “new” Statement of Fundamental Beliefs. (See below).

Again, it must be noted, that in 1890 the first wrong step “in a succession of wrong steps” was avoided. Why were these second and third steps in 1926 and 1930 not avoided? Because there was no longer a living prophet. Ellen White passed from the scene in 1915, *eleven years prior to the second wrong step taken in 1926!* Interestingly, when SDA Church leadership decided to take this “succession of wrong steps” toward ecumenism, the three steps were taken quickly, only two years apart -- 1926, 1928, 1930. While Seventh-day Adventist Church leadership were taking the three “wrong steps,” *at that very hour in history (1929) the deadly wound of the Papacy was healed!* (See, *San Francisco Chronicle*, Tuesday, February 12, 1929).

Ancient and Modern Israel’s Desire to Look to Man

The Bible records how “the elders of Israel gathered themselves together, and came to Samuel unto Ramah.” (I Samuel 8:4). And what did the General Conference Committee of ancient Israel say to Samuel? “Behold, thou art old, and thy sons walk not in thy ways: now make us a king to judge us like all the nations.” (I Samuel 8:5). “But the thing displeased Samuel, when they said, Give us a king to judge us.” (Verse 6a).

Speaking of the parallels between ancient Israel and modern Israel (the Seventh-day Adventist Church), Ellen White stated; “We are repeating the history of that people.” (*Testimonies for the Church*, Vol. 5, page 160).

“Now, it has been Satan’s determined purpose to eclipse the view of Jesus, and lead man to look to man, and trust to man, and be educated to expect help from man,” Ellen White wrote. “*For years the church has been looking to man and expecting much from man*, but not looking to Jesus, in whom our hopes of eternal life are centered.” (*Letter to O. A. Olsen*, dated at Hobart, Tasmania, May 1, 1895; *The Ellen G. White 1888 Materials*, page 1338, emphasis supplied).

What should the leadership of the Seventh-day Adventist Church have done when tempted to look to man for guidance? What did Samuel do when the people demanded a king or president to rule over them “like the nations?” The Bible says that, “Samuel prayed unto the Lord.” (I Samuel 8:6).

Modern Israel and Leroy Froom

“Leroy Edwin Froom. . . was called to the General Conference headquarters, where he was first associate secretary and then secretary of the Ministerial Association from 1926 to 1950,” the SDA *Encyclopedia* states. “During this time he founded *The Ministry* magazine and was its editor for 22 years.” (*ibid., Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia*, Second Revised Edition, 1995, Review and Herald Publishing Association, emphasis supplied).

Leroy Froom played a major role in the three wrong steps “in a succession of wrong steps,” toward ecumenism. Froom came to the General Conference to serve as “secretary of the Ministerial Association in 1926,” the very year the first “wrong step” was voted. (See above). Two years later (1928) in the second “wrong step” toward ecumenism, articles first appeared in *The Ministry* magazine, promoting a “new” Bible translation. (See above). The Ministry magazine was founded and edited by L. E. Froom in 1926! In the third “wrong step” toward ecumenism, Froom narrates in his own words the role he played in the formulation of a Creed and the first Seventh-day Adventist *Church Manual*. (See below). Because of this ecumenical background, Leroy Froom was the most prominent figure in the ecumenical, Evangelical Conferences of 1955-1956. (See, Leroy Edwin Froom, *Movement of Destiny*, Review and Herald Publishing Association (1971), pages 469, 470).

History of the Formation of An “Official” Creed and *Church Manual*

“[Edson] Rogers was distressed over the fact that, because of differences, for a number of years there had been no statement of Seventh-day Adventist Beliefs, or Faith, in our annual *Yearbook*,” Leroy Froom stated in his historical book of 1971. (*ibid., Movement of Destiny*, page 410, emphasis supplied).

“Because of differences?” The only “differences” over Seventh-day Adventist doctrine was in the mind of Edson Rogers and Leroy Froom. Adventists in 1930 were united in the truth as it was so

eloquently stated by James White in the Seventh-day Adventist *Yearbooks* prior to 1915 -- *the year Ellen White passed from the scene!*

In 1930, Edson Rogers was the General Conference statistician. He held that position for thirty eight years, from 1903 until he retired in 1941. "He [Rogers] *was responsible for the makeup and issuance of the annual Seventh-day Adventist Yearbook.*" (*ibid.*, Froom, MD, page 410, emphasis supplied).

Other denominations had declarations of faith in their annuals. So as far as other religious bodies could observe, our fundamental beliefs were undefined and unspecified. That troubled Rogers, for he believed that this omission placed us at a decided disadvantage--which was true. (*ibid.*, Leroy Edwin Froom, *Movement of Destiny*, page 410, emphasis supplied).

Notice the ecumenical rationale; "Other denominations had declarations of faith in their annuals." Now there is an absurd reason to form a Statement of Beliefs -- a creed! Since when should we care what the other denominations of Babylon do in their church policies? The second line: "So as far as other religious bodies could observe," is another redundant statement. Are we supposed to care what other religious bodies think about our doctrine? We have a commission from God to call those people out of Babylon, out of their false doctrine -- their fallen churches and erroneous creeds, and into the truth of the third angel's message.

Froom stated further that the omission of a Statement of Beliefs "troubled Rogers." Obviously it also troubled Froom as he was writing in favor of Roger's position. As to the omission of a Statement of Beliefs from the annual SDA Church *Yearbook*, it will be clearly seen just who was responsible for removing the original *Fundamental Principles* from the *Yearbooks*! Again, one very important fact to remember is that the following year (1915), the first year the *Fundamental Principles* failed to appear in the SDA *Yearbook*, was also the year that Ellen G. White, the living prophet and messenger of the Lord to the Seventh-day Adventist Church -- *was laid to rest!*

An "official" Statement of Fundamental Beliefs, published in an "official" *Church Manual*, filled with "official" Church policies that almost yearly required revision -- this idea was a proposal that was carefully avoided by pioneer Seventh-day Adventists. From the Great Disappointment in 1844 until 1930 (a period of 86 years), the proposal for an "official" Seventh-day Adventist *Church Manual* was soundly defeated every time the proposal was brought before the General Conference. Ellen White received visions and presented direct counsel from the Lord on such matters -- *and she was alive for 71 of those 86 years!* We find nothing in the Spirit of Prophecy instructing or counseling that the Church should publish an "official" *Church Manual*, which would be filled with Church "policies." Neither is there counsel or instruction that the Church should formulate an "official" Statement of Fundamental Beliefs that would be a test of faith to Church membership. However, there are many statements and counsel from the Spirit of Prophecy warning against Church policies!

Ambitious Church Policies

"In no respect is God's work to be circumscribed by man-made restrictions," Ellen White counseled. "*Many of the ambitious plans and policies that have been made are not endorsed by Him.*" (*Manuscript Releases*, Vol. 1, page 245, emphasis supplied).

Notice the counsel is given that “in no respect” is God’s work to be circumscribed, enclosed or encompassed, “by man-made restrictions.” Indeed, many of the ambitious “policies” that are made “are not endorsed by Him.” Ellen White was concerned about worldly policies implemented by the assumed ecclesiastical authority of Church leadership. The following are some choice counsel on worldly policies:

Sub-title, Worldly Policies Steal Away Identity -- It is conformity to the world that is causing our people to lose their bearings. *The perversion of right principles has not been brought about suddenly.* The angel of the Lord presented this matter to me in symbols. It seemed as if a thief were stealthily moving closer and still closer and gradually but surely stealing away the identity of God’s work by leading our brethren to conform to worldly policies. (Ellen G. White, *The Publishing Ministry*, page 169, emphasis supplied).

Notice that, “The perversion of right principles has not been brought about suddenly,” and this “perversion” was “leading our brethren to conform to worldly policies.” Moreover, Ellen White stated, “The angel of the Lord presented this matter to me.” It is interesting to note that there are 77 references to the word “policies” on the EGW CD-ROM disk, *and 773 references to the word “policy” in the writings of Ellen White.* None are favorable to Seventh-day Adventist Church leadership.

Five Erroneous Steps of Ecclesiastical Policy

[1] The first step of apostasy is to get up a creed, telling us what we shall believe. [2] The second is to make that creed a test of fellowship. [3] The third is to try members by that creed. [4] The fourth to denounce as heretics those who do not believe that creed. [5] And fifth, to commence persecution against such. (*Review and Herald*, Battle Creek, Mich. Third-Day, October 8, 1861, emphasis supplied).

“The purpose of the Lord can be clearly discerned in bringing out a distinct people under the proclamation of the second angel’s message--the second call to the `supper’-and the `midnight cry,’” Loughborough stated. “Precious truths for the last days were to be searched out and proclaimed--*a work which could not be done in `creed-bound’ churches* any more than the heralding of the gospel to the world could be accomplished by the apostolic church while retaining a connection with the Jewish sects.” (J. N. Loughborough, *The Second Angel’s Message*, page 178, emphasis supplied).

Loughborough added further that, “God called for separation there, and he also called for separation of the Advent believers *from those who would seek to hold them in the circle of their creeds.*” (*ibid.*, *The Second Angel’s Message*, page 178, emphasis supplied).

Creeds In Opposition To the Gifts

“On the subject of creeds, I agree with Bro. Loughborough,” James White stated. “*Now I take the ground that creeds stand in direct opposition to the gifts.*” (James White, *Review and Herald*, October 8, 1861, emphasis supplied).

“Let us suppose a case: We get up a creed, stating just what we shall believe on this point and the other, and just what we shall do in reference to this thing and that [policies], *and say that we will believe the gifts too,*” James White continued. “But suppose the Lord, through the gifts, should give us some new light that did not harmonize with our creed; then, if we remain true to the gifts, it knocks our

creed all over at once.” James White added further that, “Making a creed is setting the stakes, and barring up the way to all future advancement.” (*ibid.*, James White, *Review and Herald*, October 8, 1861, emphasis supplied).

“They say virtually that the Lord must not do anything further than what has been marked out in the creed,” James White stated. “A *creed* [Official Statement of Beliefs] *and the gifts thus stand in direct opposition to each other.*” (*ibid.*, James White, *Review and Herald*, October 8, 1861, emphasis supplied).

Now what is our position as a people? The Bible is our creed. We reject everything in the form of a human creed. We take the Bible and the gifts of the Spirit; embracing the faith that thus the Lord will teach us from time to time. And in this we take a position against the formation of a creed. We are not taking one step, in what we are doing, toward becoming Babylon. (James White, “Doings of the Battle Creek Conference, October 5 & 6, 1861;” *Review and Herald*, Battle Creek, Mich. Third-Day, October 8, 1861, emphasis supplied).

Notice that if we adopt a creed, or an “official” Statement of Beliefs, we would be taking a step “toward becoming Babylon.” If we wish to be like the other denominations, we are taking that step “toward becoming Babylon” ourselves. Why? Because all of so-called Protestant Christendom (excluding the Remnant -- who keep the Commandments of God, and who have the faith of Jesus, Rev 14:12), *have become the harlot daughters of Babylon!*

1930 -- Timing Right For An Official SDA Creed and *Church Manual*

“Shortly after the death of Ellen G. White (1915), the leadership of the Seventh-day Adventist Church began to publish articles in the *Signs of the Times* and *Ministry* magazines promoting the American Revised Version of the Bible,” so states the *Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia*. In 1928 the time was right for a new Bible. Two years later (1930) the time was right for a Creed and a *Church Manual!*

“The time had come, he [Edson Rogers] felt, for a suitable Statement of Faith to appear in our *Yearbook*,” Froom recalled. “This, he thought, *now to be possible.*” (*ibid.*, Froom, *Movement of Destiny*, page 418, emphasis supplied).

Why was it “now possible” in 1930 to publish a *Church Manual*, which had previously been voted down by pioneer Adventists? Why was the time right in 1930 to write a new “suitable” Statement of Beliefs? Why was it “now possible” since 1928 to promote a new version of the Bible, inspired by the Jesuits of Rome, on a parity with the Authorized Bible of pioneer Seventh-day Adventists?

Froom Reveals Why Time Was Right to Insert Doctrine of a Trinity

“Back in the spring of 1930,” Leroy Froom recalled, “Arthur G. Daniells, for more than twenty years president of our General Conference, told me he believed that at a later time I should undertake a thorough survey of the plan of redemption, its principles, provisions, and divine Personalities.” (Leroy Edwin Froom, *Movement of Destiny*, page 17, emphasis supplied).

The phrase “divine Personalities” is a theological term for the word “Trinity.” Notice that the word “Personalities” is Capitalized -- *suggesting a plural number of Gods!* Evidently, (a word Froom

often utilized), Daniells was a Trinitarian and therefore urged Froom to write on the doctrine of the Trinity, i.e., “divine Personalities.”

“Elder Daniells recognized the serious problems involved,” Froom recalled. “He knew that time would be required for certain theological wounds to heal, *and for attitudes to modify on the part of some.*” Froom added further that, “Possibly it would be necessary to wait until certain individuals had dropped out of action.” (*ibid.*, Froom, *Movement of Destiny*, page 17, emphasis supplied).

These statements by Froom are quite revealing. Consider the following three important aspects of why “the timing was right” in 1930 according to Leroy Froom.

(1) The time element in these three statements, “the spring of 1930.” Remember this date. Many important events were taking place at this time, not only in Adventism, but also in the world.

(2) Arthur G. Daniells had told Froom that “time would be required for certain theological wounds to heal,” and time would be required for “attitudes to modify.” What did Daniells mean by these statements? Evidently, Daniells meant that with the passing of time, attitudes would “change” and “modify,” and become more liberal toward ecumenism and the doctrine of the Trinity! (See below, *Fundamental Statements of Belief*, #1).

(3) The most astounding statement Froom recalled was that, “Possibly it would be necessary to wait until certain individuals had dropped out of action.” To paraphrase Daniells, this could only mean that, “*it would be necessary to wait until all pioneer Seventh-day Adventists had died!*”

Pioneer Adventists Who “Dropped Out of Action”

Who were some of these “certain individuals” who had by 1930 passed to their rest. Again, taking “time and place” into consideration, note carefully the dates these pioneer Adventists “dropped out of action.”

(1) Uriah Smith “dropped out of action” when he died in 1903.

(2) Daniel Bourdeau “dropped out of action” at his death in 1905.

(3) Ellen G. White “dropped out of action” at her death in 1915.

(4) E. J. Waggoner and Dr. David Paulson “dropped out of action” when they died in 1916.

(5) Stephen Haskell “dropped out of action” at his death in 1922.

(6) A. T. Jones “dropped out of action” at his death in 1923.

(7) John Norton Loughborough “dropped out of action” at his death in 1924, two years before SDA leadership adopted the policy that, “We recognize every agency that lifts up Christ before man as a part of the divine plan for the evangelization of the world, and we hold in high esteem the Christian men and women in other communions who are engaged in winning souls to Christ.” (“Relationship To Other Societies,” General Conference Executive Committee, 1926, emphasis supplied).

In 1930 the time was now right for change because these “certain individuals” had passed to their rest and would not be able to sound an alarm. Their voices were now silent. Their writings could still speak, but this would not be as effectual as a live pioneer speaking in protest to the changes that began in 1926. For many years the writings of pioneer Adventists have been eliminated from the shelves of Adventist Book Centers. Indeed, the writings of E. J. Waggoner and A. T. Jones have been virtually impossible to find until recent years. *Leaves-Of-Autumn-Books, Adventist Pioneer Library*, on Compact Disk, and other independent ministries have been responsible for the restoration of pioneer Adventist writings being restored, not only to the people, but also to Adventist Book Centers.

A Suitable Statement of Faith?

“The time had come, he [Edson Rogers] felt, for a suitable Statement of Faith to appear in our *Yearbook*,” Froom stated. (*ibid.*, Froom, *Movement of Destiny*, page 418, emphasis supplied).

“A suitable Statement of Faith?” In other words, Rogers, Froom and the leading Seventh-day Adventists of 1930 believed that the original pioneer *Fundamental Principles*, written by James White, and which had stood the test of fifty eight (58) years (1872-1930), was not “a suitable Statement of Faith.” Why would Rogers, Froom and other leading Adventists believe that the pioneer *Fundamental Principles* were no longer “suitable?” Was there error or heresy in the pioneer “Fundamental Principles?” If there was error, then which pioneer Seventh-day Adventists were responsible for that error?

Who Wrote the Original Statement of *Fundamental Principles*?

At this point it must be established who wrote the 1872 “Fundamental Principles” that had stood for over 58 years without challenge. Contemporary Seventh-day Adventists historians would love to place the blame on Uriah Smith. However, no contemporary SDA historian in his right mind would dare to place the blame on James White -- *the husband of the Lord’s messenger to the SDA Church!*

In his 1971 book, *Movement of Destiny*, Froom tells an outright lie about who wrote the 1872 *Fundamental Principles* of Seventh-day Adventist Beliefs. He states that Uriah Smith wrote the old “Fundamental Principles,” when the truth is that James White was the author.

Leroy Froom Falsifies History

1872 “DECLARATION” WITHOUT “AUTHORITY.”-- Apparently the first comprehensive “Declaration” of Seventh-day Adventist “Fundamental Principles” ever attempted appeared in 1872. It was in the form of a 14-page leaflet titled “A Declaration of the Fundamental Principles of the Seventh-day Adventists.” It was a somewhat formal statement. Though appearing anonymously, it was actually composed by Smith. (*ibid.*, Leroy Edwin Froom, *Movement of Destiny*, pages 159, 160, emphasis supplied).

Leroy Froom begins by using his favorite theological diversion word, “apparently.” The word suggests no real proof of anything. Froom then admits that the document “appeared anonymously,” but takes the liberty to state with biased, dogmatic certainty, and without any documented proof whatsoever, that “it was actually composed by [Uriah] Smith.”

Documented Proof That Froom Altered An Historical Fact

In 1959, the Pacific Press Publishing Association published a book titled, *The Living Witness*, “Significant Articles From the *Signs of the Times*.” The title of the first article in the book, the first article ever published in the *Signs of the Times*, was *Fundamental Principles*. The author of this first article was James White, not Uriah Smith as Leroy Froom would have us believe. The Introduction statement by the publishers to this first article stated:

The formulation of principle doctrines of the Seventh-day Adventist Church here presented was constructed earlier than the indicated publication date in the *Signs* [1874]. *Though there is no assurance that James White was the only author, he no doubt had a large part in its composition.* (*The Living Witness*, 1959, Pacific Press Publishing Association, pages 1, 2, emphasis supplied).

Notice that the editors of the book, *Living Witness*, disagree with Leroy Froom by stating that, “Though there is no assurance that James White was the only author, he no doubt had a large part in its composition.” The truth is that James White and Uriah Smith for many, many years worked together as editors of the *Adventist Review and “Sabbath” Herald*. Regardless of this fact, it has been (and still is) the practice of contemporary Seventh-day Adventist historians to place all blame, for what they consider to be error, solely upon Uriah Smith.

An “Unofficial” Statement of Faith

“In the Declaration,” Froom continued, “his [Uriah Smith’s] introductory paragraph reads: . . .” (*Ibid.*, Froom, *Movement of Destiny*, pages 159, 160). Froom then quoted only the first two sentences of the 1872 introductory statement as compared below:

In presenting to the public this synopsis of our faith, we wish to have it distinctly understood that we have no articles of faith, creed, or discipline, aside from the Bible. We do not put forth this as having any authority with our people, nor is it designed to secure uniformity among them, as a system of faith, but is a brief statement of what is, and has been, with great unanimity, held by them. (*A Declaration of Fundamental Principles*, 1872, page 3, emphasis supplied).

In presenting to the public this synopsis of our faith, we wish to have it distinctly understood that we have no articles of faith, creed, or discipline, aside from the Bible. *We do not put forth this as having any authority with our people. . . .* (Leroy Edwin Froom, *Movement of Destiny*, pages 159, 160, emphasis L. E. Froom’s).

Notice that Froom emphasizes a portion of the second sentence, “*We do not put forth this as having any authority with our people, nor is it designed to secure uniformity among them, as a system of faith. . . .*” Thus he omits the last part of the sentence which states, “but is a brief statement of what is, and has been, with great unanimity, held by them [Seventh-day Adventists].” The last part of omitted sentence declares that there was “great unanimity” among pioneer Seventh-day Adventists. Contemporary SDA leadership believe that an “official” Creed is necessary to establish unity in the Church -- while the fact is that there was already unity among Seventh-day Adventists. A “Creed” was only necessary to change pioneer SDA doctrines -- *and to force laity to adhere to that changed doctrine!*

Froom’s Unfounded Purpose For Altering History

“It is to be particularly noted that by the author’s [Uriah Smith’s] own statement it was not put forth as having any ‘authority,’ nor to secure ‘uniformity’ of belief,” Froom stated triumphantly. “But it clearly had less ‘unanimity’ than he [Uriah Smith] averred.” (*Ibid.*, Froom, *Movement of Destiny*,, pages 159, 160).

Again, Froom was bending the truth by omitting the last part of the sentence, which stated that there was “great unanimity” among pioneer Seventh-day Adventists. In response to Froom’s erroneous statement above we must comment as follows:

- (1) It was James White who wrote the “Fundamental Principles,” not Uriah Smith.
- (2) Could Leroy Froom state that those *Fundamental Principles*, “clearly had less ‘unanimity’ than James White averred?” No. It would be impossible to convince Adventist laity that James White was in error. Therefore, Froom aspired to place the origin of the “Fundamental Principles” squarely on the shoulders of Uriah Smith. Froom knew that conferring Uriah Smith as the author of “Fundamental Principles” would provide less support and “unanimity” to the Fundamental Principles than if it was known that James White was the actual author. This devious tactic has been used many times by contemporary Seventh-day Adventist historians.

“In 1872 Adventists published an anonymous, non-binding statement of beliefs. In the introduction, the unnamed author (Uriah Smith) took great pains to emphasize the unofficial and noncreedal nature of the document:” (*Issues*, “The Seventh-day Adventist Church and Certain Private Ministries,” page 39 (Copyright © by the North American Division, 1992, emphasis supplied).

(NOTE:-- Inside the front cover it is stated that the book *Issues* was “Authorized by the North American Division Officers and Union Presidents.” The Copyright was by the “North American Division of Seventh-day Adventists,” 1992.)

Only Two Sentences Quoted By Froom

Leroy Froom, in his attempt to prove Uriah Smith as the sole author of the *Fundamental Principles* quotes only the first two sentences from James White’s introductory statement in the *Signs of the Times* article. White’s introductory statement is here quoted in full context. The first two sentences quoted by Leroy Froom are enclosed by brackets. Note the wonderful message by James White in the balance of the statement that was omitted by Froom:

[In presenting to the public this synopsis of our faith, we wish to have it distinctly understood that we have no articles of faith, creed, or discipline aside from the Bible. We do not put forth this as having authority with our people, nor is designed to secure uniformity among them,] as a system of faith, but is a brief statement of what is, and has been, with great unanimity, held by them. We often find it necessary to meet inquiries on this subject, and sometimes to correct false statements circulated against us, and to remove erroneous impressions which have obtained with those who have not had an opportunity to become acquainted with our faith and practice. Our only object is to meet this necessity.

With these remarks, we ask the attention of the reader to the following propositions which aim to be a concise statement of the more prominent features of our faith. (James White, Editorial, *Signs of the Times*, June 4, 1874, Vol. 1, Num. 1: *The Living Witness*, 1959, Pacific Press Publishing Association, pages 1, 2, emphasis supplied).

As stated above, those Seventh-day Adventist “Fundamental Principles” first appeared in a pamphlet in 1872, and appeared unaltered two years later in the first edition of the *Signs of the Times*, and was written by James White. It appeared again, in the exact wording, in the Seventh-day Adventist *Yearbooks* beginning in 1889 through the year 1914. Note carefully the following three important facts:

- (1) These “Fundamental Principles” were published in the official journals of the Seventh-day Adventist Church for 42 years, *without challenge from a single pioneer Adventist!*
- (2) Ellen White was alive during those 42 years, and there was no testimonies given against those “Fundamental Principles” of Faith. Ellen White must have known about the existence of the “Fundamental Principles” and read them many times herself. Indeed, her husband, James White, was the author of the “Fundamental Principles.”
- (3) Publication of these “Fundamental Principles” ended in 1914, *one year before the death of Ellen White in 1915!*

An Unofficial Statement of Faith

Many, many times contemporary Seventh-day Adventist historians have stated emphatically, if not triumphantly, that the original “Fundamental Principles” (written by James White), was an “unofficial -- non-binding” declaration of faith. Yet they emphatically deny that the current 27 *Statements of Fundamental Belief* (published in the official SDA Church *Manual*), is a Creed. However, about the “original” *Fundamental Principles* they declare, “The nonbinding, noncreedal status of the statement is of special interest. . .” (*ibid.*, *Issues*, page 39, 1992, emphasis supplied). The fact is this; If the original *Fundamental Principles* were “nonbinding,” indeed, “noncreedal,” then it stands to reason that the current “binding” official 27 *Statements of Fundamental Belief* is indeed creedal!

“The first step of apostasy is to get up a creed, telling us what we shall believe,” John N. Loughborough wrote. “The fourth to denounce as heretics those who do not believe that creed. . .” (John N. Loughborough, *Review and Herald*, Battle Creek, Mich. Third-Day, October 8, 1861, emphasis supplied).

The Strange Case of the Seventh-day Adventist *Yearbooks*

“So as far as other religious bodies could observe,” Leroy Froom stated, “*our fundamental beliefs were undefined and unspecified.*” (*ibid.*, L. E. Froom, *Movement of Destiny*, page 410, emphasis supplied).

The statement that, “So as far as other religious bodies could observe,” proves Froom’s ecumenical aspirations. Froom often worried about what “other religious bodies” might think of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. (See, *Movement of Destiny*, pages 469, 470). That is why Froom would later become a major participant in the Evangelical Conferences of 1955-56. (See below, Chapter 13, “The Ultimate Betrayal”). The statement, “our fundamental beliefs were undefined and unspecified,” is one of Froom’s greatest lies in all of his writings! The “Fundamental Principles” had appeared in print in 1872, and in the first issue of the *Signs of the Times* in 1874, and in the Seventh-day Adventist *Yearbooks* between the years 1889 and 1914 -- *a period spanning 42 total years!* After 1914 it was discontinued.

Why? Who was the General Conference statistician in 1914, when the “*Fundamental Principles*” were discontinued in the yearly *Seventh-day Adventist Yearbooks*?

“He [Edson Rogers] was responsible for the makeup and issuance of the annual Seventh-day Adventist *Yearbook*,” Froom replies. Edson Rogers was that statistician, and was responsible for the makeup and issuance of the annual *Yearbook*, from 1903 when he took office, until he retired in 1941.” (*ibid.*, L. E. Froom, *Movement of Destiny*, page 410, emphasis supplied). Rogers, therefore, as General Conferences statistician, was also the one responsible for removing the original “*Fundamental Principles*” from the *Yearbook* after the 1914 edition! Again, it must be noted that the original “*Fundamental Principles*” statement was removed after the 1914 SDA *Yearbook* -- at the time of Ellen White’s death in 1915! Now, in 1930, it was Edson Rogers, the one who removed the original “*Fundamental Principles*” -- who was suggesting the need of a “new” Statement of Beliefs.

“Rogers was distressed over the fact that, because of differences, for a number of years there had been no statement of Seventh-day Adventist Beliefs, or Faith, in our annual *Yearbook*.” (*ibid.*, L. E. Froom, *Movement of Destiny*, page 410, emphasis supplied).

“Rogers was distressed” because there was no statement “for a number of years.” Rogers was the one who removed the original *Fundamental Principles* from the *Yearbooks*! Who was Edson Rogers that he should challenge the pioneer Adventist “*Fundamental Principles*” that had stood unchallenged (by either pioneer Adventists or the Spirit of Prophecy) from 1844 to 1930 -- *an even greater period of 86 years*?

Note that Rogers was also stressed because of “differences.” What differences was Rogers distressed about? What “differences” over doctrinal issues had developed in the 16 years following 1914 when the original *Fundamental Principles* were dropped from the *Yearbooks*? Obviously, Rogers did not agree with James White and the other pioneer Adventists who had endorsed the “*Fundamental Principles*.” If this is not the case, then why would Rogers have removed them from the *Yearbooks*? Apparently (again using one of Froom’s favorite phrases), there were “differences” in 1930. However, James White had stated in 1872-1874 that there was “great unanimity” among Seventh-day Adventists on doctrinal issues. Moreover, it should be noted that Ellen White was alive during the 40 years the “*Fundamental Principles*” were published in the Seventh-day Adventist *Yearbooks*. She must have been aware of their content. Indeed, her husband, James, was the author and had published the *Fundamental Principles* in the first edition of the *Signs of the Times*. Surely Ellen White would have addressed the error or heresy if the “*Fundamental Principles* had contained error or heresy. Yet Rogers and the Seventh-day Adventist Church leadership of 1930 had “differences” with those original *Fundamental Principles*. Obviously, Froom also agreed with Rogers and the 1930 Seventh-day Adventist Church leadership.

Again, it should be reviewed, taking time and place into consideration, that the original “*Fundamental Principles*” appeared through the year 1914. They were omitted the following year in 1915. That very year that the “*Fundamental Principles*” were omitted (1915), was the year Ellen White passed “*out of action!*”

Froom stated further that the omission of a “suitable” Statement of Beliefs from the *Yearbook*, “troubled Rogers, for he believed that this omission placed us at a decided disadvantage.” Edson Rogers was troubled because there was no Statement of Beliefs in the *Yearbook* -- yet Rogers himself, as General

Conference statistician, *was the one who had omitted the “Fundamental Principles” from the Yearbook after the 1914 edition!*

To this end he [Rogers] agitated in high places, both at home and even abroad. And his appeals were not without effect, for it was a reasonable request. Moreover, apostates were constantly misrepresenting us and projecting distorted caricatures of the Adventist Faith. That provided an added reason. So, largely as a result of Rogers’ urgings., *a small committee of well-qualified leaders was named to frame such a statement.* (*ibid.*, Leroy Edwin Froom, *Movement of Destiny*, page 410, emphasis supplied).

There are so many subtle contradictions, devious allusions, and false implications in this one paragraph that it almost boggles the mind! Note the following four important points in Froom’s statement:

- (1) Rogers “agitated in high places.” He went to the top. As General Conference statistician he undoubtedly knew personally the leading brethren of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. Note that Rogers not only agitated at headquarters, but “even abroad.”
- (2) “His appeals were not without effect.” The leading brethren listened to Rogers and agreed. Undoubtedly, as Ministerial Secretary of the General Conference, and Editor and founder of *The Ministry* magazine, Froom backed Rogers to the leadership. Indeed, in this one paragraph, Froom himself stated that “it was a reasonable request.”
- (3) “Largely as a result of Rogers’ urgings.” Rogers was responsible for getting the ball rolling, so to speak. Rogers was responsible for omitting the original “Fundamental Principles” from the SDA *Yearbook*. Why? So fifteen years later he could agitate for a “new” official Statement of Beliefs, and, as a result of his own “urgings,” Rogers was successful in getting Seventh-day Adventist Church leadership to approve a “new” official *Statement of Fundamental Beliefs*.
- (4) “A small committee [four] was named to frame such a statement.” A small committee? Evidently the leading brethren felt that “a small committee” of four men would suffice in the framing of a “new” *Statement of Fundamental Beliefs*. Astounding! A small committee of four men could speak for the entire denomination and tell the world what Seventh-day Adventists believe! *Actually, the “new” Statement of Fundamental Beliefs was written by one man!* (See the clear factual evidence below).

Committee of Only Four Chosen to Prepare the New Statement

Voted: That the chair [C. H. Watson, General Conference president] appoint a committee of which he shall be a member to prepare such a statement for publication in the *Year Book*.

“Named: M. E. Kern, F. M. Wilcox, E. R. Palmer, C. H. Watson.” (General Conference *Minutes*, December 29, 1930, page 195; *op. cit.*, Froom, *Movement of Destiny*, page 411, emphasis supplied).

Notice that the General Conference President, C. H. Watson (one man at the head), was voted the authority to select the committee of four “*of which he shall be a member.*” Then he (Watson) selected three other men to serve along with himself on the four member committee. Who were the three men that were chosen by Watson, and what position did the three hold in the Seventh-day Adventist Church in 1930? What heavenly credentials did these men hold that would make them wise enough to define the

doctrinal beliefs of the entire Seventh-day Adventist denomination? Again, Froom gives us a clear answer:

DISTINGUISHED COMMITTEE: WILCOX FORMULATES -- On December 29, 1930 -- thus between the GC sessions of 1930 and 1936 -- this highly representative committee of four was appointed to draw up a suggestive statement of our beliefs. As noted, the committee was comprised of M. E. Kern, F. M. Wilcox, E. R. Palmer, and C. H. Watson, all of whom are now deceased [1971]. (*ibid.*, Leroy Edwin Froom, *Movement Of Destiny*, page 411, emphasis supplied).

According to Froom, in 1930, “Kern was associate secretary of the General Conference, Wilcox was editor of the *Review*, Palmer manager of the Review and Herald Publishing Association, and Watson, president of the General Conference.” (*ibid.*, *Movement of Destiny*, page 411).

To Be Used At An Appropriate Time?

“Fortunately, they later made specific statements to this writer concerning this episode,” Froom added further, “*for use at an appropriate time* [1971].” (*ibid.*, L. E. Froom, *Movement Of Destiny*, page 411 (1971), emphasis supplied).

What did Froom mean “for use at an appropriate time?” Would the Seventh-day Adventist Church leadership have to wait until even more historic Adventists had passed “out of action?” About the four man committee, Froom had stated in 1971, “all of whom are now deceased.” Without doubt, by 1971 all original historic Adventists had long “passed out of action.”

1930 -- A Key Date In the Altering of SDA Doctrines

“Back in the spring of 1930 Arthur G. Daniells. . .told me he believed that, at a later time, *I should undertake a thorough survey of the entire plan of Redemption* -- its principles, provisions, and divine Personalities,” Leroy Froom stated in the “Author to Reader” section of his book *Movement of Destiny*, page 17, emphasis supplied). Unfortunately, in his book Froom presented, not a “survey,” but a revision of Seventh-day Adventist doctrine. As will be shown later, the “principles” and “provisions” of Adventism were altered in the books, “Seventh-day Adventists Answer,” *Question on Doctrine* [1958]; also in *Movement of Destiny* [1971]. In Froom’s statement of “divine Personalities” -- the doctrine of the Trinity is suggested; and the pioneer Adventist position on the human nature of Jesus Christ was changed, altered, mutilated, and omitted in Seventh-day Adventist publications.

“*Bible Readings for the Home* revised in 1949 to remove the erroneous [Froom’s opinion] statement, that Christ `partook of our sinful, fallen, nature.’” (Froom’s statement taken from the index, *Movement of Destiny*, page 692). (Compare chapter, “A Sinless Life,” *Bible Readings for the Home*, all editions prior to 1959 with current editions; See also, “Evangelical Conferences of 1955-56, *Adventist Heritage*, Vol. 4, No. 2, 1977; See also below, Chapter 13, “The Ultimate Betrayal”).

Neal C. Wilson, Chairman of the Guidance Committee for Leroy Froom’s book, *Movement of Destiny*, was at that time [1971], Vice-President of the General Conference and President of the North American Division. (*ibid.*, *Movement of Destiny*, page 15). Wilson stated that, “The preparation of this volume began about forty years ago.” (*ibid.*, MD, page 15, emphasis supplied). The book was published in 1971 which would have placed the beginning of its preparation in the year 1931. Considering time

and place in history, What was taking place in the year 1931? The “new” Statement of Beliefs was published in the 1931 SDA *Yearbook*, and the first Seventh-day Adventist *Church Manual*, which was published the following year in 1932!

One Man Writes New Statements -- Leadership Rubber-Stamps

“As no one else seemed willing to take the lead in formulating a statement, Wilcox--as a writer and editor--wrote up for consideration of the committee a suggested summary of ‘Fundamental Beliefs’ of Seventh-day Adventists,” Froom wrote. (*ibid.*, *Movement of Destiny*, pages 377-380, emphasis supplied).

Notice that one man, Francis M. Wilcox, wrote the “Fundamental Statements of Beliefs.” *One man stated to the world what Seventh-day Adventists believe!* In a following sub-title, Froom stated:

“Approval By Committee Not Required”

“Elder Wilcox felt he had drawn up a balanced summarizing statement,” Froom stated. “With full knowledge and approval of the committee of four, he [Wilcox] passed it over to Rogers, who placed it in the 1931 Yearbook.” (*ibid.*, *Movement of Destiny*, page 414, emphasis supplied).

Again note that one man, “Elder Wilcox felt he had drawn up a balanced summarizing statement.” Here Froom boldly admits that Wilcox was the only one who drew up the “new” Statement of Beliefs. And thus, “With full knowledge and approval of the committee of four,” Wilcox then “passed it over to [Edson] Rogers, who placed it in the 1931 *Yearbook*.” After all his agitating “in high places, both at home and even abroad” (MD, p. 410), Rogers finally had achieved his objective, and Adventism got a new, this time, “official” and erroneous *Statement of Beliefs*.

The following year, 1932, a second apostate move was made by Seventh-day Adventist Church leadership. For the first time in the history of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, an “official” *Church Manual*, filled with worldly policies, which needed almost yearly revisions was published. The “new” SDA *Church Manual*, of course, contained the very same “official” *Fundamental Statement of Beliefs*, to which all must adhere. For the first time in history the Seventh-day Adventist Church now had an “official” Creed!

The first step of apostasy is to get up a creed, telling us what we shall believe. [2] The second is to make that creed a test of fellowship. [3] The third is to try members by that creed. [4] The fourth to denounce as heretics those who do not believe that creed. [5] And fifth, to commence persecution against such. (*Review and Herald*, Battle Creek, Mich. Third-Day, October 8, 1861, emphasis supplied).

“It [the new creed] has appeared there annually ever since,” Froom stated. “*The authorizing did not call for submission to any other committee for approval.*” (*ibid.*, *Movement of Destiny*, page 414, emphasis supplied).

Again note that, “The authorizing did not call for submission to any other committee for approval.” The new official *Creed*, written by one man, Wilcox, *was put into edict by the committee of only four!* These statements by Froom were written in 1971 when the book *Movement of Destiny* was

published. Note carefully Froom's conclusion, and justification for the formulation of the "new" 1931 *Fundamental Statement of Beliefs*:

"It was therefore without any formal denominational adoption that this [1931] statement of Fundamental Beliefs first appeared in the *Yearbook*, and was, by common consent, *accepted without challenge*," Froom concluded triumphantly. "And it was on this basis that it was the first public presentation of a united--harmonized -- faith." (*ibid.*, *Movement of Destiny*, page 414, emphasis supplied).

Observe that this "new" Statement of Beliefs was adopted by Seventh-day Adventist Church leadership "without any formal denominational adoption," and it was by common consent "accepted without challenge" by the General Conference Committee, or any other denominational leader. The "new" creed appeared "without challenge" from laity because laity knew nothing about the "new" creed until it first appeared in the *Yearbook* and *Church Manual*. How was it possible for laity to object to something that was already written by one man and officially approved by a committee of only four?

Again, one man wrote a "new" doctrinal statement, and by common consent of leadership it was "accepted without challenge!" The 1874 "Fundamental Principles," written by James White and published in the first issue of the *Signs of the Times*, and published in the *Yearbooks* for 25 years, were also accepted "without any formal denominational adoption," and were also "accepted without challenge," yet using this same reasoning, Froom, Rogers and the 1930 Seventh-day Adventist Church leadership were unwilling to accept the original 1874 Statement of Beliefs on those very same terms.

Froom had concluded triumphantly that "it was on this basis that the new Statement of Beliefs was the first public presentation of a *united--harmonized -- faith*." (emphasis his). However, as noted above by pioneer Adventists, James White and John Loughborough, the formation of a Creed is not a sign of "a united -- harmonized -- faith," but only an image of modern Babylon.

Has the contemporary Seventh-day Adventist Church become "a sister to fallen Babylon?" (*Manuscript Releases*, Vol. 21, page 380). Let Jesus be the Judge.

"In the balances of the sanctuary the Seventh-day Adventist church is to be weighed," Ellen White warned. "She will be judged by the privileges and advantages that she has had. . . ." (*Testimonies for the Church*, vol. 8, page 247, April 21, 1903, emphasis supplied).

Ellen White added further that, "By the light bestowed, the opportunities given, will she be judged." (*ibid.*, *Testimonies for the Church*, Vol. 8, page 247, emphasis supplied).

The Seventh-day Adventist Church was not united on the "new" 1931 Statement of Beliefs. The community of believers is the true Church, not the General Conference. The Advent people, who are asleep in Laodicean slumber, knew nothing about the "new" Statement of Beliefs until they appeared in the first Seventh-day Adventist *Yearbook* and *Church Manual*. They had no voice in the matter, or a chance to accept or reject the new Statements. "It was by common consent" of the leadership that the "new" Statement of Beliefs were adopted. Seventh-day Adventist laity have always had complete confidence in the leading brethren, which, of course, is directly contrary to Scripture: "Thus saith the Lord; Cursed be the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm . . ." (Jeremiah 17:5). But this is not the way of the Bereans, for they "searched the scriptures daily, whether those things were so." (Acts 17:11), or the Ephesians, about whom Jesus said: "I know thy works, and thy labour, and thy

patience. . .and thou hast tried them which say they are apostles, and are not, *and hast found them liars:*” (Revelation 2:2, emphasis supplied).

What was it that was so offensive to Seventh-day Adventist leadership in the “original” “Fundamental Principles” published in the *Yearbooks* for 25 years? What was changed in the “new” Statement of Beliefs? And even more important, What was omitted by the new Statements? In the following Chapter 8, “Fundamental Principles vs Statements of Belief,” we will carefully compare the two *Fundamental Statements of Belief*.