

Removing the Pillar



Artwork: Michael Vincent-Rori

“The Fatherhood of God is given to us in the gift of Jesus Christ; and as God was one with His only begotten Son, so He would have His earthly children one with Him.”

Review and Herald. Sep 30. 1909

First published 2013

Copyright © Margaretha Tierney 2013

Printed in Australia

All rights reserved

All Scripture from King James Bible

Permission is given for limited portions of this work to be copied for study or review purposes without written permission, provided the source is duly credited.

CONTENTS

Ch. 1	Conscience-Bound.....	1
Ch. 2	Spirit's Testimony.....	5
Ch. 3	Eisegesis.....	13
Ch. 4	Seed's Sown.....	19
Ch. 5	Historical Debate.....	27
Ch. 6	Displaced Horns.....	33
Ch. 7	Only Begotten.....	41
Ch. 8	Dew Drops.....	47
Ch. 9	God's Light.....	55
Ch. 10	Drastic Measures.....	63
Ch. 11	Secret Conference.....	73
Ch. 12	Planned Change.....	87
Ch. 13	Changes Continue.....	99
Ch. 14	Dangerous Connections.....	111
Ch. 15	Decision Ratified.....	119
Ch. 16	Too Late.....	129
	Epilogue.....	145
	Index.....	151
	Personal Message.....	165

Dedicated
to all who love Jesus
and long for His return

Chapter 1

CONSCIENCE-BOUND

"I am astonished..." said Dr John Eck to Martin Luther.

...that the reverend doctor undertakes single-handed to combat so many distinguished Fathers, and to know better than sovereign pontiffs, councils, doctors, universities...

It would, certainly, be astonishing that God should have concealed the truth from so many saints and martyrs... and not revealed it until the advent of the reverend father!" D'Aubigne's History of the Reformation Vol. 2. p36.

Could it be possible that God had given truth to a monk and not to His 'divinely-appointed' councils? Does God in fact pass by the learned, the theologians and those in authority to give His truth?

The question is not new.

When the wise men enquired where the King of the Jews would be born, the learned teachers of the day were furious. "It could not be, they said, that God had passed them by, to communicate with ignorant shepherds or uncircumcised Gentiles." Desire of Ages p62.

When the temple officers returned without arresting Jesus, the Pharisees asked, "Are ye also deceived? Have any of the rulers or of the Pharisees believed on him?" John 7:47.48.

It appeared to the 'wise' that God would never give His sacred truths to those who had not studied in their higher schools of learning.

But Martin Luther, though a monk, was well-educated. God does use educated men, for John Huss, Jerome, Calvin, Wycliffe, Knox, the Wesley brothers and Whitefield were all educated.

However, God often chooses those who have had little education to make their stand for the truth, as the millions of martyrs who died for their faith in God's Word testify.

What about our own history?

God chose William Miller, a farmer, who did not have any theological training. He later worked with Joshua Himes, Josiah Litch and Charles Fitch, who were trained ministers of the gospel.

It matters not to God.

The first light of the Advent Movement was given to a humble man who feared to go before the people, then others were called to assist.

And the prophet?

Ellen Harmon, a frail seventeen-year-old girl.

After the first disappointment, when Samuel S. Snow brought further light, it was the humble who received the midnight cry. "Angels were sent from heaven to arouse the discouraged saints and prepare them for the great work before them. The most talented men were not the first to receive this message. Angels were sent to the humble, devoted ones, and constrained them to raise the cry, 'Behold, the Bridegroom cometh...'" Early Writings p238.

Thus it will always be.

Secular governments will soon place God's people on the witness stand to testify against the most learned religious leaders in the land. Our only hope is in the promise that our words will be given, "For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you." Matthew 10:19,20.

The authorities will be surprised at the clarity of our answers, but ridicule and condemnation will be on their lips. Our arguments, even our texts of Scripture, will be said to be totally irrelevant, out of context, or twisted to suit our purpose.

Whether we are standing for the Sabbath, the true state of the dead, or any other Bible teaching that differs from our accusers,

there will always be opposition, and many will have arguments that appear far superior to our own. It is indeed daunting to face those who have the ability to make our beliefs seem utterly ridiculous.

We are to hold to the truth no matter what men may say contrary to our words.

Luther said at Worms, "If I am not convicted by the very passages which I have quoted, and so bound in conscience to submit to the Word of God, I neither can nor will retract anything, for it is not safe for a Christian to speak against his conscience." D'Aubigne's History of the Reformation Vol 2. p182.

Today, Seventh-day Adventists are facing a challenge that is causing church boards to ask brethren to answer for their faith. As in all church councils, the majority follow the church teaching, rather than sit down with the Word of God and study the subject.

Martin Luther, John Huss and other reformers anticipated that the papal council would study their writings, and hopefully see the truth of their words. They were bitterly disappointed.

During those early centuries, the subjects of debate were many, but today the Adventist debate is predominantly one -- the Trinity. Certainly there are other issues, such as prophetic interpretations and women's ordination, but the major concern is the identity of God.

Who is He?

Is He one? Or is He three in one?

Should we have nothing to do with it? Does it really matter?

Imagine you belonged to a denomination that kept Sunday, and a few of your brethren began advocating the seventh day of the week as the day of worship.

Would it matter?

Should the church board disfellowship these brethren for teaching heresy?

And what about you – Should you study the subject with them?

Of course you know the answer.

Today there are brethren in *our* church who are teaching that the Trinity is false. In the main, they are not church leaders, but men and women in the pews. However, some have been in leadership and others currently pastors.

Perhaps they should not be members? Should the church simply disfellowship them? After all, they have moved away from the 28 Fundamental Beliefs.

The decision is yours, but keep in mind that history has a tendency to repeat itself, and it may be that the few are right!

In the future, all Seventh-day Adventists who remain true to Jesus will be brought before the courts to answer for their faith. It will not be easy to be harassed for the truth, with every word challenged and ridiculed.

How we will wish our accusers would sit with us and study the subject. Then they would understand.

It is the same today.

Listen to what these brethren say and study the Word of God diligently. Ask God to reveal *His* truth about the Trinity doctrine. Do not be lukewarm to the challenge. You need to know for yourself what you believe.

When your studies are complete, you will be able to repeat the words of Luther, “Here I stand... my conscience is captive to the Word of God.” Luther at Worms.

Chapter 2

SPIRIT'S TESTIMONY

Those of us who joined the Seventh-day Adventist Church rejoiced that we had found the truth. Many had searched for years, praying and longing to find the true church. Finally, there was a sigh of relief – home at last.

Most did not know that a controversy had waged for years over the Trinity doctrine. Many church leaders knew our fundamental beliefs had been changed, but when joining the church in the 1960s and 1970s, we had no idea.

The subject was never mentioned, not even in our baptismal studies. We just assumed all Christendom believed in the same God.

Of course, by the 1980s, a new struggle arose over doctrine when Dr. Desmond Ford presented his accumulated errant findings. However, this fiasco did not affect the controversy that had begun years earlier. It still smouldered, biding its time until it was able to break forth into a hot and consuming fire.

It has yet to rage to its fullest, but even now, if you mention your aversion to the Trinity in certain circles, there is a very negative reaction. It can be rather heated, even nasty.

Speaking to non-Adventists on the subject brings the same reaction – *You aren't a Christian.*

Why is this so?

Why must every Christian believe in the Trinity?

Is it because of the creeds of Christendom?

Our pioneers rejected all the creeds, including Nicaea, Chalcedony, Constantinople and others, as these were Catholic councils and not the source of truth.

Ellen White wrote, "The Bible, and the Bible alone, is to be our creed, the sole bond of union; all who bow to this Holy Word will be in harmony." *Review & Herald*. Dec 15. 1885.

Many Seventh-day Adventists are aware that our pioneers had a different belief on the doctrine of God.

George Knight, Adventist historian stated, "Most of the founders of Seventh-day Adventism would not be able to join the church today if they had to subscribe to the denomination's Fundamental Beliefs. More specifically, most would not be able to agree to belief number 2, which deals with the doctrine of the trinity." *Ministry*. Oct 1993. p10.

Does this include the prophet?

William G. Johnsson confirmed the change in the 'Adventist Review', "Adventist beliefs changed over the years under the impact of 'present truth'. Most startling is the teaching regarding Jesus Christ, our Saviour and Lord. Many of the pioneers, including James White, J.N. Andrews, Uriah Smith, and J.H. Waggoner, held to an Arian or semi-Arian view... that is, the Son at some point in time before the Creation of our world was generated by the Father... the Trinitarian understanding of God, now part of our fundamental beliefs, was not generally held by the early Adventists. Even today a few do not subscribe to it." *Adventist Review*. Jan 6. 1994. p10.

The truth is that all our pioneers rejected the Trinity doctrine. James White called it the "old Trinitarian absurdity..." *Review & Herald*. Aug 5. 1852. (Uriah Smith had problems in the beginning, believing Jesus to be created, but came to realise this was false and changed his belief to be in harmony with his brethren)

Our pioneers rejected all versions of the Trinity doctrine because it was not revealed in the Bible.

In 1981, the following was stated in a special issue of the 'Adventist Review', "While no Scriptural passage states formally the doctrine of the Trinity, it is assumed as a fact by Bible writers and mentioned several times." Adventist Review. 1981. Vol. 158. No.31.

And again, "The concept of the Trinity, namely the idea that the three are one, is not explicitly stated, but only assumed." Handbook of Seventh-day Adventist Theology. Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopaedia Vol.12. p138. Doctrine of God. Fernando L Canale.

This is generally accepted in Christendom also, as is shown in the following quotations. "Neither the word Trinity nor the explicit doctrine appears in the New Testament..." The New Encyclopaedia Britannica. Vol. XI. p928. 2003.

"Christianity derived from Judaism and Judaism was strictly Unitarian [believing that God is one person]. The road which led from Jerusalem to Nicea was scarcely a straight one." The Encyclopaedia Americana. Vol. XXVII. p294L. 1956.

"In the New Testament we do not find the doctrine of the Trinity in anything like its developed form, not even in the Pauline and Johannine theology." Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics. Vol. XII. p458. 1951. J. Hastings.

"Because the Trinity is such an important part of later Christian doctrine, it is striking that the term does not appear in the New Testament. Likewise, the developed concept of three coequal partners in the Godhead found in later creedal formulations cannot be clearly detected within the confines of the canon..." Metzger. B.M & Coogan. M.D. The Oxford Companion to the Bible p782. 1993.

These statements and others show why our early pioneers rejected the Trinity – they did not find a Trinity in the Bible.

After the disappointment of October 22 1844, those who continued to believe God had led them began studying together that they might discover the truth.

Sister White wrote, "Many of our people do not realize how firmly the foundation of our faith has been laid. My husband, Elder Joseph Bates, father Pierce, Elder (Hiram) Edson, and others who were keen, noble, and true, were among those who, after the passing of the time in 1844, searched for the truth as for hidden treasure. I met with them, and we studied and prayed earnestly. Often we remained together until late at night, and sometimes through the entire night, praying for light and studying the Word..." 1 Selected Messages p206.

James White had been an ordained minister of the Christian Connection Church when he heard William Miller. This was a church that refused all creeds, determined to follow the Bible and not theology. As a result, they rejected an eternal-burning hell, the immortality of the soul, and the doctrine of the Trinity. Joseph Bates, Joshua V. Himes, Lorenzo Fleming and Timothy Cole were also members of that church. Ellen White was a Methodist; other pioneers were Baptists, Free Will Baptists, Dutch Reform, Lutheran, Episcopalian, Seventh-day Baptists, Congregationalists and more. Prophetic Faith of our Fathers. Vol 4. p954. 510. 633. 510.

When the members of this study group first met, they had many differences in doctrinal understanding, but were willing to put aside their own thoughts and rely on the Lord to lead them into all truth.

Sister White said of her own experience, "During this whole time I could not understand the reasoning of the brethren, My mind was locked... I was in this condition of mind until all the principal points of our faith were made clear to our minds, in harmony with the Word of God." 1 Selected Messages. p206.

God had a purpose in keeping her mind locked.

"When they came to a point in their study where they said, 'We can do nothing more', the Spirit of the Lord would come upon me, I would be taken off in vision, and a clear explanation of the passages we had been studying would be given me, with instruction as to how we were to labor and teach effectively.

Thus light was given that helped us to understand the Scriptures in regard to Christ, His mission, and His priesthood..." Ibid p206.

Did you grasp the full impact of these words?

The Holy Spirit explained to Ellen the true meaning of the Scriptures relating to Jesus Christ.

Did the Spirit reveal the truth?

What about Ellen White – did she accept the testimony of God's Spirit? After all, she was a Methodist Trinitarian.

We can safely assume that God would not have continued to guide her as the messenger of the Lord for the rest of her life if she refused the light given.

Some of our scholars say Ellen White remained a Trinitarian, a 'closet Trinitarian' if you will, for the next fifty years, and in 1898 made her first Trinitarian statement. They believe this marked the beginning of our non-Trinitarian pioneers maturity on the subject. Yet there was no public declaration and no correction of her brethren for believing error so many years!

A single line, "In Christ is life, original, unborrowed, underived" was written. The Desire of Ages. p530. (There are other sentences in this book that are now believed to be Trinitarian, but this is the main one)

Were these words the prophet's public introduction to revealing her belief in the Trinity?

These seven words are not original in 'The Desire of Ages', but quoted from another passage where Sister White is speaking about the type of life Christ possessed. "In him was life; and the life was the light of men; It is not physical life that is here specified, but immortality, the life which is exclusively the property of God.

The Word, who was with God, and who was God, had this life. Physical life is something which each individual receives. It is

not eternal or immortal; for God, the Lifegiver, takes it again. Man has no control over his life.

But the life of Christ was unborrowed. No one can take this life from Him. 'I lay it down of myself' (John 10:18), He said. In Him was life, original, unborrowed, underived. This life is not inherent in man. He can possess it only through Christ. He cannot earn it; it is given him as a free gift...." 1 Selected Messages p296.297.1897.

Is this passage about the Trinity?

Trinitarians believe the words in 'Desire of Ages' prove that Christ is eternal and without beginning, which in turn shows Him to be the second Person of a three-in-one Godhead.

But, is this true?

If you and I receive this life as a gift, does that prove we have lived for eternity? Of course not.

It has been said that our pioneers were "not endowed scholars" and we cannot expect them to have the maturity we possess today. Isn't this rather arrogant?

There is no question they would have matured in their understanding, but within the framework of the truths already received. It is the same for us – we continue to mature, but new light never contradicts old truth.

"Although new and important truths appropriate for succeeding generations have been opened to the understanding, the present revealings do not contradict those of the past. Every new truth understood only makes more significant the old." Review & Herald. Mar 2. 1886.

It took four years for the truths of God's Word to be made clear to all the Advent believers. Being scattered in different parts of Eastern United States, they could not meet at one time, so meetings took place in little groups, each studying different subjects.

In 1848, five meetings were held in large barns of various brethren, called today the Sabbath Conferences. Of those who attended, "hardly two agreed", and all wanted the opportunity to preach. Messenger to the Remnant p38.

In the confusion, Ellen fainted. The brethren prayed for her, and she was soon lost to earthly things. In her vision, she was instructed to tell the brethren that their ideas were not according to the Bible. These Sabbath Conferences united the brethren on the great truths connected with the message of the third angel.

Five months after the last Sabbath Conference the prophet wrote, "Our position looks very clear; we **know** we have the truth." Letter. March 1849. Record Book 1 p72.

Six years later she said, "The truth is now made so plain that all can see it and embrace it if they will, but it needed much labor to get it out clear as it is, and such hard labor will never have to be performed again to make the truth clear." Manuscript 2. Aug 25. 1855. Messenger to the Remnant p40.

Sadly, the Adventist Church has moved away from the revelation given by the Holy Spirit in those early days, and today we need to go through that hard study again. As we do not have a living prophet among us, we must compare our conclusions with the inspired Spirit of Prophecy writings for confirmation.

The counsel is, "When the power of God testifies as to what is truth, that truth is to stand forever as the truth. No after suppositions, contrary to the light God has given, are to be entertained." EGW Letter 329. 1905. Counsels to Writers and Editors p31.32.

Dear Reader, if nothing contrary is to be believed, what does that make the Trinity doctrine?

The prophet continues, "One will arise, and still another, with new light which contradicts the light that God has given under the demonstration of His Holy Spirit... if such application moves one pillar from the foundation that God has sustained

these fifty years, is a great mistake. He who makes such an application knows not the wonderful demonstrations of the Holy Spirit that gave power and force to the past messages that have come to the people of God." EGW Letter 329. 1905. Counsels to Writers and Editors p31.32.

As you and I did not see the power of God's Spirit in those early days, should we not quietly submit to the light revealed to the messenger of the Lord?

Chapter 3

EISEGESIS

Jim was a Baptist, and a student at the Wesleyan Theological College. On this day, the immortal soul was the point of discussion.

God had a problem, he said. *What would He do with those who did not repent?* The class was in full agreement and eager to hear his further comment. *He had to make a place for them, and this is why they will burn in hell for eternity.*

There was one in the class who disagreed, a Seventh-day Adventist. In the discussion that followed, it was very clear that to convince a man against his denominational background was almost impossible.

*But there **is** an eternal-burning hell*, said Jim. *It says so in Revelation 14, verse 10. "The same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God... and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb." And the next verse makes it clearer still. Look, "And the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever..." v11.*

We did not get very far that day – a man convinced against his will, is of the same opinion still. He could not see that other verses showed a different picture, indeed, no one in the class was *ready* to learn.

On December 19, 1513, Pope Leo X issued a Papal Bull declaring, "We do condemn and reprobate all who assert that the intelligent soul is mortal."

In his 1520 published defence of 41 Propositions, Luther cited the Pope's immortality declaration as among those "monstrous

opinions to be found in the Roman dunghill of decretals.” 27th Proposition. No. c & e.

Standing with him in those early centuries were John Frith, George Wishart, Johann L. von Mosheim, John Milton, William Tyndale, Dr Joseph Priestley and many more.

Bishop Timothy Kendrick stated in 1805, “The soul of man dies with the body, and is restored to life in the resurrection and the second advent.”

Canon Frederick W. Farrar denounced the “dogma of endless conscious suffering, and could not find a single verse in all Scripture that, when fairly interpreted, teaches the common view about endless torment.” Canon of Westminster Abbey and Dean of Canterbury. (1831-1903) www.specialtyinterests.net/champions_of_conditional_immortality.html

Dr R.F. Weymouth stated, “My mind fails to conceive a grosser misrepresentation than when five or six of the strongest words the Greek tongue possesses, signifying to *destroy* or *destruction*, are explained to mean ‘maintaining an everlasting but wretched existence’. To translate black as white is nothing to this.” Translator of New Testament in Modern Speech. R.F. Weymouth. Headmaster at Mill Hill School. (1922-1902) Ibid.

What was the difference between Jim’s class and these men of the early centuries?

One group followed exegesis; the other eisegesis.

These are theological words with a vast difference in their approach. Exegesis interprets a text based on a careful, objective analysis, being led to a conclusion by following the text itself. (Exegesis means ‘to lead out of’)

On the other hand, eisegesis is the interpretation of a text based on a subjective, non-analytical reading. If there is a theological bias, the text will say exactly what the reader wants it to say. (Eisegesis means ‘to lead into’)

True exegesis will “rightly divide the Word of truth”. 2 Timothy 2:15.

In the study of the Trinity, there is much eisegesis, forcing the Bible to agree with the reader. We need to interpret the text by what it says, not what we think it says.

When studying certain doctrines, our interpretation must wait until we have carefully analysed every verse on the subject; only then will the true meaning be seen.

When studying the doctrine of an eternal-burning hell, the words 'eternal, everlasting, for ever, evermore, ever and ever,' will come into play. A Greek mind will see those words to mean 'without end', but a Hebrew mind will understand them to mean 'as long as it lasts'.

There is no conflict between the Hebrew Old Testament and the Greek New Testament, but the Hebrew sets the standard for the rest of the Bible. The main word in the above subject is *olam*, which can be translated 'evermore, for ever, ever and ever, everlasting and eternal'. However, the texts have various meanings.

For instance, a slave's ear is pierced for him to serve his master "for ever". Deuteronomy 15:17. Clearly the length of time is the rest of his life. The Lord is King "for ever". Psalm 10:16. The time period in these two texts is vastly different, but both are *olam*.

Adam and Eve were forbidden to eat from the tree of life after they had sinned, lest they live "for ever". Genesis 3:22.

Jacob's blessing from Isaac was bounded by the "everlasting hills", one day to pass away. Genesis 49:26.

Zion would be made an "eternal excellency"; for the earthly Zion, this was fulfilled until Christ withdrew His presence. Isaiah 60:15.

Daniel tells us that many who sleep in the dust will wake to "everlasting life", and others to "everlasting shame". Daniel 12:2. The Hebrew word (*olam*) is the same for both periods of time.

Jim and his friends said -- *God is eternal, so both rewards must be eternal.*

Eisegesis looks at the text with a strongly-held belief. The only way to rightly conclude the meaning of “everlasting shame” is to study the whole subject.

Another verse that once told an important fact about the birth of Jesus, is today a proof text for the Trinity.

“But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting.” Micah 5:2. (The Hebrew word for ‘everlasting’ is *olam*)

What is this verse saying about the One to become Ruler in Israel? “His goings forth have been from old, from everlasting.”

How long is ‘everlasting’ in this verse?

With a Trinitarian mindset and an eisegesis method of study, it will be ‘for all eternity, without beginning’. But an exegesis approach will say – *I don’t know*.

We are told in the prophet’s writings that Christ’s pre-existence prior to His incarnation cannot be “measured by figures”. Signs of the Times May 3 1899.

Olam means ‘to veil from sight, to conceal from sight, vanishing point, time out of mind, so far back no one can remember, beyond the horizon, a very distant time.’

A common phrase, *l’olam va’ed*, is usually translated ‘forever and ever’. In Hebrew it does not mean ‘for eternity’, but ‘to the distant horizon and again’, meaning ‘a very distant time and even further’, either the ancient past or the distant future.

Another important Hebrew word that deals with time and distance is *qedem*. It has diverse meanings, yet all are in harmony to the Hebrew mind. *Qedem* is the word for ‘east’ or ‘the direction of the rising sun’. It also means ‘to project oneself, to precede, beginning, earliest time, from aforetime, ancient’, or ‘of old’. It has also been translated ‘eternal’, but must be understood as the Hebrew sees it.

The word *qedem* has been used for 'old' in the text -- "his goings forth have been from of old..." This parallels *olam*, confirming that Christ's pre-existence has been from ancient times, but it does not tell us how far back.

It could be eternity. It could be from a point in eternity.

As this is a controversial issue, our interpretation must wait until we have studied further.

“QUESTION: Have you any other way of providing that the Church has power to institute festivals of precept?

ANSWER: Had she not such power, she could not have done that in which all modern religionists agree with her... she could not have substituted the observance of Sunday... for the seventh... A change for which there is no Scriptural authority...

QUESTION: Do you observe other necessary truths as taught by the Church, not clearly laid down in Scripture?

ANSWER: The doctrine of the Trinity, a doctrine the knowledge of which is certain necessary to salvation, is not explicitly and evidently laid down in Scripture, in the Protestant sense of private interpretation.”

Convert’s Catechism of Catholic Doctrine’
Peter Geiermann.

Chapter 4

SEEDS SOWN

Sister White was in vision, and before her was an iceberg. She was told to, "Meet it firmly, and without delay." 1 Selected Messages p200.

"The engines were put on at full force, and the vessel crashed into the iceberg. There was a tremendous shock, and the ship quivered from stem to stern; but she rebounded from the shock unhurt, and went safely on her way. After seeing this representation, I knew what work I must do. I knew that I must meet the errors that were coming in among us." 1 Sermons and Talks p344.

The year was 1903, and a crisis was in full force.

Dr John H. Kellogg had begun to teach clients at the Battle Creek Sanitarium a view of God that was *not* in harmony with Adventist understanding. When Brother Palmer and his wife read an article of Kellogg's in the 'Good Health' magazine, Sister Palmer said, "That seems like another god." 1919 Bible Conference transcript. Jul 13.1919.

Lectures had been given at the 1899 and 1901 General Conference sessions by Kellogg and others, saying, "There is an intelligence that is present in the plants, in all vegetation... Wherever God's life is, God Himself is. You cannot separate God and His life. That is the reason why God is everywhere... God is in me, and everything I do is God's power; every single act is a creative act." General Conference Bulletin. Second quarter. 1901.

Ellen White also spoke at these two sessions, where she said, "Nature is not God, and never was God. The voice of nature

testifies of God... but nature is not God.” General Conference Bulletin. March 6. 1899.

But the major challenge came in 1903.

Kellogg had printed a book entitled ‘Living Temple’ in which he had placed his theories. Ellen White said they were “spiritualistic” and “akin to pantheism”. Special Testimonies B. No.6. p41. Not only that, but these teachings were the “alpha of deadly heresies.” 1 Selected Messages p200.

In vision Ellen saw “a platform, braced by solid timbers – the truths of the Word of God. Someone high in responsibility in the medical work was directing this man and that man to loosen the timbers supporting this platform...

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 to take decided action.” 1 Sel. Messages. p204.

In the first edition of ‘Living Temple’, Kellogg said, “There is present in the tree a power which creates and maintains it, a tree-maker in the tree, a flower-maker in the flower -- a divine architect who understands every law of proportion, an infinite artist who possesses a limitless power of expression in color and form; there is, in all the world about us, an infinite, divine, though invisible, Presence...” Living Temple p29.

Sister White had the book in her library, but did not read it until 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. He sat down beside me, and we read the paragraphs to which he referred.

When we had finished I turned to him and said, ‘These are the very sentiments against which I was bidden to speak in warning at the very beginning of my public work... ‘Living Temple’ contains the alpha of these theories. The omega would follow in a little while. I tremble for our people.

These beautiful representations are similar to the temptation that the enemy brought to Adam and Eve in Eden... In 'Living Temple' the assertion is made that God is in the flower, in the leaf, in the sinner.

But God does not live in the sinner. The Word declares that He abides only in the hearts of those who love Him and do righteousness. God does not abide in the heart of the sinner; it is the enemy who abides there." Sermons and Talks . Vol. 1. p341.343.

Kellogg believed his book to be in harmony with the prophet's writings, claiming his words could be sustained by statements from the testimonies. Sister White told him he had taken her statements away from their connection, and interpreted them according to his own mind.

It was a very stressful time for Ellen White. "The battle nearly killed me. I saw what was coming in, and I saw that our brethren were blind. They did not realize the danger." Ibid p344.

Dr Kellogg explained his thinking in a letter to W.W. Prescott. "When we say God is in the tree, the word 'God' is understood in its most comprehensive sense, and people understand the meaning to be 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 from Dr. Kellogg to W.W. Prescott. Oct 25. 1903.

Kellogg had stated that people understood the meaning of the Godhead as God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit, but this was only the understanding of those who had accepted the Trinity, not brethren with the pioneer belief.

Kellogg felt the problem had been solved and said, "The whole thing is now clear to my mind. I confess it was not quite clear before...." Ibid.

The prophet was grieved.

At the 1903 Autumn Council, Arthur G. Daniells was concerned that the supporters of 'Living Temple' would cause a confrontation, and he dared not call for a vote. The very understanding of the character and personality of God were under threat. Near the end of the council, a letter arrived from Ellen White.

"Be careful how you sustain the sentiments of this book regarding the personality 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." Keepers of the Flame. No.6. Dr Alan Lindsay.

Praising God for her letter, Daniells wrote back to Ellen White saying, "This communication, calling our brethren to take their stand, brought great relief to me, and the terrible load that had at times almost crushed me, has, in a measure, rolled off from me." A.G. Daniells to Ellen White. October 20. 1903.

After the council, Kellogg wrote a number of letters explaining his position. Daniells wrote to Willie C. White regarding the proposed changes the doctor had planned for his book.

"Ever since the council closed I have felt that I should write you confidentially regarding Dr Kellogg's plans for revising and republishing 'Living Temple'... He said he had been thinking the matter over, and began to see that he had made a slight mistake in expressing his views... 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..." A.G. Daniells to W.C. White. Oct 29. 1903. p1.2.

Sister White wrote to Dr Kellogg about the proposed changes, making it clear that he had not changed his beliefs, despite the corrections. "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. The Elmshaven Years. Vol 5. 1900-1905. Arthur L. White. 1941.

In 1904 another vision was given in which the doctor was speaking before his associate physicians, and ministers of the gospel.

"The subject upon which he was speaking was life, and the relation of God to all living things. In his presentations he cloaked the matter somewhat, but in reality he was presenting, as of the highest value, scientific theories which are akin to pantheism... I was astonished to see with what enthusiasm the sophistries and deceptive theories were received. The influence of this talk gave the speaker encouragement to call for a council of our brethren at Battle Creek, for a further examination of these seducing sentiments." Series B. No.6. p210.

Some of the brethren spoke to Sister White about investigating the doctor's beliefs, but the prophet said, "We have no such investigation to make..." 1 Selected Messages p200.

Why would she not look into the subject?

Simply because it contradicted the truth God had given at the beginning. "We are to hold to the sure pillars of our faith. The principles of truth that God revealed to us are our only true foundation. They have made us what we are. The lapse of time has not lessened their value." Ibid p201.

During these years (between 1900 and 1910), Sister White is attributed to having said such things as 'the three great powers of heaven', 'the three great personal dignitaries', 'the three highest powers in the universe', 'the holiest beings in heaven', 'the three worthies of heaven', 'the three living personalities', 'the heavenly trio', 'the three representatives of heavenly authority'.

These phrases have confused some brethren.

Taken alone, they appear to be Trinitarian. However, during these same years, the prophet wrote other statements that are certainly not Trinitarian.

Was she contradicting herself? No.

There are two important principles when reading the Spirit of Prophecy and the Bible -- * the weight of evidence, * time and place.

Sister White said, "Regarding the testimonies, nothing is ignored; nothing is cast aside; but time and place must be considered." 1 Selected Messages p57.

At the turn of the century, the issues were pantheistic, but blended with the personality of God in ways that brought Him down to the level of nature. Kellogg wrote in his book, "God is the explanation of nature,— not a God outside of nature, but in nature, manifesting himself through and in all the objects, movements, and varied phenomena of the universe." Living Temple p28.

It was necessary for the prophet to make clear statements of God's power and authority, to elevate the Father, His Son, and the Spirit above nature itself. Counteracting the work of the enemy required strong messages, and she needed to lift the people's minds from a low level.

"God's handiwork in nature is not God Himself in nature. The things of nature are an expression of God's character and power; but we are not to regard nature as God... the thing made is not the maker... it is the God of nature that is to be exalted." Ministry of Healing p333.

The pantheistic sentiments were a great concern, but as we have said, it was far more than pantheism, more subtle. Kellogg had combined truth with error, and as a result, men and women were actually worshipping a false god.

"Thousands have a false conception of God and His attributes. They are as verily serving a false god as were the servants of Baal.

Are we worshipping the true God as He is revealed in His Word, in Christ, in nature, or are we adoring some philosophical idol enshrined in His place?" The Faith I Live By p60.

Today most Adventists believe our pioneers had the wrong understanding of God. What about Kellogg? When he became a Trinitarian, was he then worshipping the true God, but mingled with error?

What about our pioneers? Do you think they would have seriously considered the subject of God, of Christ, and the Holy Spirit in their studies of 1844-1848?

Think about it in the light of the first commandment. "Thou shalt have no other gods beside me." Exodus 20:3.

If you were meeting with these brethren, and at least three of them were not Trinitarians, do you think you would be able to study other subjects and feel perfectly at ease?

What about today?

Someone is sure to say – *So long as we don't discuss the subject of God, His Son, or the Holy Spirit, it will be fine, but if anyone wants to debate the subject of the Trinity, we cannot continue.*

Would that person be you?

If our pioneers had refused to discuss the controversial subject of God, Christ and the Spirit, do you think they would have been blessed with truth?

Dr Kellogg's beliefs were not to be investigated because he was trying "to bring in theories that remove the pillars of our faith concerning the sanctuary or concerning the personality of God or of Christ..." Manuscript Release 760. p9.10.

When the second angel sounded and God's remnant came out of Babylon, it was a completely new beginning. We had been called out of confusion, and were to be a "peculiar people", separate from all other churches. 1 Peter 2:9.

Like Israel of old, we were to worship **יְהוָה**, a God who is distinctive and separate from the gods of the nations. The God we worship today must not only be different from the nations and their religions, but also different from the denomin**ations** that have moved away from Bible truth.

If you and I make a choice to return to the beliefs of the pioneers, we will be criticised, scorned, derided and labelled a sect, perhaps even a cult.

Are you willing to pay the price?

Chapter 5

HISTORICAL DEBATE

During the early fourth century, Arius was presbyter (elder, priest) in charge of a parish church in Alexandria, Egypt. When the bishop of the city attempted to explain 'the unity of the Holy Trinity', Arius dissented, sharing his views with others. Bishop Alexander called a small synod of presbyters to discuss the question. Both sides claimed victory and the controversy grew. Two Republics. A.T. Jones p332. (Bishop Alexander was the Catholic bishop of Alexandria)

Eventually many bishops and clergy agreed with Arius, and they in turn taught the people. Finally Alexander called a council of 100 bishops, most of whom supported his view.

At the council, Arius was commanded to abandon his views and adopt the beliefs of Alexander. He refused, and was excommunicated, with all who believed as he did.

The Arian bishops and clergy sent a statement of their views to other bishops, asking for support to be received back into communion. Bishop Alexander also sent circular letters to the bishops.

Arius began to write songs that set forth his views, putting them in a book entitled 'Thalia', meaning 'Songs of Joy'. This book became so popular, it was not long before hundreds were singing his songs.

Thus the controversy spread.

The main difference in belief was the relationship of the Son to the Father.

Bishop Alexander said: "We believe, as is taught by the Church, in an only unbegotten Father, Who of His being has no cause,

immutable and invariable... and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, begotten not out of that which is not, but of the Father...

And He is Father from the continual presence of the Son... for He did not beget His only Son in time, or in any interval of time, nor out of that which had no previous existence.” Ecclesiastical History, Theodoret. Bk 1. Ch iv. Written by Bishop Alexander.

Arius said: “But we say and believe... that the Son is not unbegotten... and that before He was begotten, or created, or purposed, or established, He was not. For He was not unbegotten. We are persecuted, because we say that the Son has a beginning, but that God is without beginning...” Ibid Bk 1. Ch 4. Written by Bishop of Nicomedia, an Arian.

The dispute became a debate as to whether the Son was of the *same substance* of the Father, or of *like substance* with the Father.

A council was called in AD325 at Nicaea, composing 318 bishops, of whom eighteen were Arian. After much noisy disputing and argument, the controversy was resolved by the addition of the Greek word *homoousion* to a creed. The word, meaning ‘same substance’ or ‘consubstantial’, expressed the Catholic belief in more than one person inhabiting the same substance without division or separation. This became the original Nicene Creed. (Another word that expressed the belief of Arius more clearly was *homoiousion*, ‘like substance’, although the difference was certainly not absolute)

The Arian bishops were asked to sign the corrected creed; seventeen refused, but when commanded under penalty of banishment, twelve succumbed. Eusebius of Caesarea, a favourite counsellor of Constantine, and also an Arian, consulted the emperor to explain the meaning of *homoousion*.

The emperor quietly told him that it could be understood as *homoiousion*. Those in the council who heard the reply, mockingly called Constantine a heretic, bringing laughter to the lips of many. Eusebius signed, believing the emperor’s explanation.

The number gradually dwindled down to four who refused to sign, but when banishment was clearly the alternative, two yielded. The other two absolutely refused, and were banished with Arius.

However, the Council of Nicaea did not solve the problem.

Those believing the teaching of Arius grew and multiplied. At the request of his dying Arian sister, Constantine restored Arius, and the two others banished with him.

Alexander died a few months after Nicaea and was replaced by Athanasius, zealous to carry the flag of his predecessor.

Eventually, the Arians split into a third faction, the Anomeans, meaning 'different' -- the Son was in everything *unlike* the Father. There were now the Arians, Semi-Arians, and these 'extreme' Arians, the Anomeans.

After the death of Constantine, his three sons – Constantius II, Constantine II and Constans -- took over the empire, each acquiring a region. In AD340, Constantine II and Constans clashed over the western provinces, leaving Constantine II dead. Ten years later, Constans was assassinated, leaving Constantius II to rule the empire. Wikipedia.

Constantius had been an Arian, but he changed his view to the Semi-Arian understanding that Jesus was like His Father in nature, in existence, essence, substance, and in every other way. The Arians had come to believe the Son was like His Father by grace rather than nature, and Constantius could not accept this. It appears that the Arians had changed their belief, as the Nicaean debate was not over the Son being like His Father by grace alone.

<http://stcletusparish.com/adultfaith/credo/epic/docs/6ARIUS.pdf>

Constantius planned to unite the empire according to his belief, and called a council in AD355 at Milan. He was able to give full expression to his Semi-Arian sympathies, and it was at this council he planned to condemn Athanasius, the champion of the Trinitarian debate.

It was reported by Athanasius that Constantius said, "Let, whatsoever I will, be that esteemed a canon." Coming from Athanasius, it may not be accurate, but certainly gives a picture of the attitude of Constantius. Cambridge Journals Online.

All who refused to sign the document of faith, were threatened with exile.

In AD359, he called another council at Rimini in the Summer, where more than 400 bishops assembled; of these 80 were Semi-Arians. Another 160 bishops assembled at Seleucia in the Autumn, of whom 105 were Semi-Arians and 40 were Arians; the remainder were Catholics.

The five Semi-Arian bishops at Emperor Constantius' residence drew up a creed which was sent to the council at Rimini; all the Semi-Arians readily agreed to sign. But the 320 Catholics proclaimed dissent with loud voices, declaring that any new formula was wholly unnecessary; that the Council of Nicaea had done all that was necessary in regard to the faith.

Taking everything into their own hands, they unanimously approved the Nicene Creed, especially the *homoousion*, declaring the emperor's creed heretical. They pronounced a curse upon each point of the Arian belief, finally pronouncing a curse upon all heresies in general and Arius in particular.

"The majority of bishops at Ariminum (Rimini) were orthodox and accepted the faith of Nicaea, but the Arian minority included skilled diplomats who successfully undid the orthodox decision of the majority when it reached the emperor. The orthodox bishops remaining at Ariminum were then forced to recant and subscribe to an Arian creed drawn up at Nice in Thracia." http://universalium.academic.ru/257279/Ariminum_Council_of

At Seleucia, there were three distinct parties, the Anomeans, the Semi-Arians, and the Catholics. Both the Catholics and the Semi-Arians opposed the Anomeans.

When the creed of Constantius was presented, there was “such utter confusion, tumult, bitterness, that after four days of angry debate, in which the prospect became worse and worse, the imperial officer declared that he would have nothing more to do with the council, and told them they could go to the church if they wanted to, and indulge in this vain babbling there as much as they pleased.” History of the Popes. Archibald Bower. par 28. The Two Republics. A.T. Jones p381.

They dispersed and the parties met separately, denouncing, condemning, and ex-communicating one another. The council sent their deputies to Constantius, who spent a whole day and most of the night securing their signatures.

“Many who till then had been thought invincible, were overcome, and complied with the times.” Ibid.

The document was published throughout the whole empire, and all bishops were commanded to sign, under penalty of exile if they refused.

Not one orthodox bishop was left --- Arianism was now entirely orthodox. Jerome said, “The whole world woke up astonished to find itself Arian.” www.newadvent.org (The statement does not distinguish between the different groups – all are seen as Arians)

The triumphs were however, transitory, for when Constantius died the following year, the Western part of the empire returned to the faith of Athanasius.

You are probably thinking – *I am glad I was not part of all that debate and argument.*

We would all agree.

Whether Arius was a Christian we cannot say, but there is no question the majority of the Catholics involved in the debate were not Christians; it is also clear the Arians were not either.

“It is difficult, in the second half of the 20th century, to offer a clear, objective, and straightforward account of the revelation, doctrinal evolution, and the theological elaboration of the mystery of the Trinity.

Trinitarian discussion, Roman Catholic as well as other, present a somewhat unsteady silhouette... when one does speak of unqualified Trinitarianism, one has moved from the period of Christian origins to the last quadrant of the fourth century.

It was only then that what might be called the definitive Trinitarian dogma 'one God in three persons' became thoroughly assimilated into Christian life and thought.”

The New Catholic Encyclopedia.
Vol. XIV. p295. Article Trinity.

Chapter 6

DISPLACED HORNS

While the Papacy worked on securing 'unity of the faith', hordes of barbarians were heading swiftly and in multitudes towards the empire. For one hundred years these nations had been encroaching upon the West and breaking occasionally upon the East.

At the close of the fourth century, the tempest burst in all its fury.

As early as AD377, a million Goths had crossed the Danube, and in the next thirty years had ravaged Thessalonica to the Adriatic Sea. In AD400, a host of them entered the borders of Italy.

In AD407, a band of Burgundians, Vandals, Suevi, and Alans from the north of Germany – 400,000 strong – overran Italy as far as Florence. After their retreat, the Goths arrived and spread over Italy, pillaging the country. Three years later, the Visigoths sacked the city of Rome, and again thirty years later by the Vandals. <http://www.fsmitha.com/h1/rome24.htm>

The Papacy adapted itself to these barbarian invasions, reaping power and influence. Some of the barbarian tribes were already professedly Arian Christians, and (apart from the Vandals) were not so ready to persecute. They were willing to settle and make themselves homes in the territories of the lost empire.

When Clovis the Frankish king was converted to Catholicism, for the "first time the diffusion of belief in the nature of the Godhead became the avowed pretext for the invasion of a neighbouring territory." Henry H. Milman. History of Christianity. Bk. 3.Ch 2. par 28. Two Republics p526. A.T. Jones.

In AD508, Clovis complained, "It grieves me to see that the Arians still possess the fairest portion of Gaul. Let us march against them with the aid of God; and having vanquished the heretics, we will possess and divide their fertile province." Edward Gibbon. *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* Ch. xxxviii. Par 11. Two Republics p527. (It was the Visigoths who occupied Gaul. The Goths were a Germanic tribe that split into the Visigoths, north of the Danube, and the Ostrogoths, on the far east)

War was declared and the "Visigoth kingdom was wasted and subdued by the remorseless sword of the Franks." Ibid Par 12. Ibid p258. They were not wiped out, but being in subjection, converted to Catholicism.

"Thus was the bloody course of Clovis glorified by the Catholic writers, as the triumph of the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity over Arianism." The Two Republics. A.T. Jones p528.

In AD476, the Heruli, another barbarian kingdom established itself in Italy. Their king Odoacer did not openly oppose Catholicism, but ruled the country impartially. He shielded his people from persecution inaugurated by the combined efforts of the pope and the emperor of the East. *Facts of Faith* p37.38.

"The barbarians who took possession of Italy were Arians, which in the sight of the bishop of Rome was worse than all other crimes put together." *History of the Popes*. Bower. Felix 11. Par 1. Ibid.

The Catholic ecclesiastics of Italy began to plot the overthrow of the Heruli, and they appealed to Theodoric, king of the Ostrogoths, to free Rome from the Heruli. This barbarian nation was in the service of the Eastern Empire and it was the emperor who happily gave permission.

"The march of Theodoric must be considered as the emigration of an entire people: the wives and children of the Goths, their aged parents, and most precious effects, were carefully transported... and he displayed his invincible banners on the confines of Italy." Gibbon. *Decline and Fall*. Ch. xxxix. Par 6.

Cardinal John Henry Newman said, "Odoacer was sinking before Theodoric, and the pope was changing one Arian master for another." An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine. Part 11. p320. 1878. Facts of Faith p39.

The Heruli were massacred in AD493, and they disappeared from history.

Yes, the Ostrogoths were Arians too. The Church of Rome, in destroying one opponent never hesitates, even if another rises in its place. It was one less, and sooner or later, the remaining one would also be destroyed.

Theodoric ruled Italy thirty three years, during which time the country enjoyed such peace and quietness and absolute security as had never been known there before. The population of the Ostrogoths was nearly one million, and their 200,000 troops, formerly wild and given to plunder, were restored to complete discipline in their new land.

Not only did civil peace reign, but there was perfect freedom of religion. The separation of Church and State was clear and distinct, not simply toleration, but a genuine recognition of the rights of conscience.

However, this peace and quietness applied to Italy itself, not to Rome. The dominions of Theodoric and his people were at peace, but in Rome there was no peace at all.

As king, Theodoric assumed some authority over the church, however, the bishops and people were free to worship according to their conscience. "The religious liberty, with its attendant blessings to the country which Theodoric had inaugurated, did not satisfy the Catholic bishops; for Rome does not want religious liberty for other churches, but sole domination for herself." Facts of Faith p46.

Persecution soon brought suffering to the Ostrogoths. Theodoric was urged to retaliate, but he steadfastly refused.

“Theodoric deserves the highest praise; for during the thirty eight years he reigned in Italy, he brought the country to such a state of greatness, that her previous sufferings were no longer recognizable.” Fall of Rome. John G Shepherd p301.302. 1861. Facts of Faith. p45. He died in AD 526.

Justinian became emperor of the Eastern Empire in AD527.

The emperor was no admirer of Catholicism, however, to achieve his plans, he needed to employ the pope’s support.

His aim was to gain dominion over the fallen Western Empire and to achieve this, he would ‘unite all men in one faith’, whether they were Jews, Gentiles, or Christians. Those who did not embrace the Catholic faith were declared to be “infamous”, and their estates “confiscated”. The Wise Shall Understand. Charles H. Clever. p184.

A great persecution arose. “In his zeal to gather all men into one Christian doctrine he (Justinian) recklessly killed all who dissented.” Secret History of the Court of Justinian p138.139. P. Covici. 1927. Facts of Faith p41.

In AD533, another Trinitarian debate arose as to whether one of the Trinity suffered on the cross, and whether it was divinity or humanity that suffered. Two Republics p548.

Justinian became involved in the dispute, and he sent a flattering letter to the bishop of Rome. “... We cannot suffer that anything which relates to the state of the church, however manifest and unquestionable, should be moved, without the knowledge of your Holiness, who are the *head of all the holy churches*; for in all things we have already declared, we are anxious to increase the honor and authority of your apostolic chair.” Code of Justinian. Bk 1. Title 1. Sec 4. (Grammar ‘are the head’ in the text. Italics added) Cited in: ‘The Enactments of Justinian’, translated from the original Latin, edited and compared with all accessible systems of jurisprudence ancient and modern by S. P. Scott AM, author of ‘History of the Moorish Empire in Europe’. www.constitution.org/sps/sps12.htm

Justinian employed a lawyer named Tribonian, who, with a committee of sixteen lawyers, codified the letter, and the following

year (AD534), an imperial rescript of it was issued, recognising the bishop of Rome as head of all the churches.

This made the Catholic faith official by law, “as the only orthodox religion of the empire”, uniting the two mighty forces of state and religion under the Papacy.

<http://dedication.www3.50megs.com/dan/1260.html> (There are some who say Justinian’s code is a fraud, having been written by the Catholic Church to substantiate the pope’s authority as the head of the churches, however, copies of Justinian’s code have been translated by reputable scholars and these stand today. The Code did not deal only with the pope, but with all Roman law, gathered together by the emperor’s lawyers and placed in fifty books. It was the first time Roman law had been written down, thus preserving it for succeeding generations)

Although the Code was official, the two remaining Arian horns must be overthrown before the pope could wield his sceptre.

In Africa, Catholics were being persecuted by the Arian Vandals, a reverse of what had taken place under Catholic rule. Justinian planned a crusade to deliver the Catholic people.

Hilderic, the Arian king of the Vandals, preferred peace rather than war, and he gave all the Catholic bishops freedom of worship. The Arian clergy accused him of falling from the faith and he was removed from the throne by Gelimer, who took his place.

Hilderic had won the favour and friendship of Justinian for his actions toward Catholics, and although the emperor was anxious to rid the world of the Arians, he declined to wage a war against the Vandals.

While he lingered, a fanatical bishop of the East claimed to have seen Justinian in vision delivering the African Church. “It is the will of Heaven, O emperor! that you should not abandon your holy enterprise for the deliverance of the African church. The God of battles will march before your standard, and disperse your enemies, who are the enemies of his Son.” Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. Edward Gibbon. Fall in the East. Chapter 41.

Belisarius was sent to Africa to vanquish the Vandals, and in AD534 they “disappeared from history.” Encyclopaedia Britannica. 1963 ed. Vol. 22. p973.

“The Arian heresy was proscribed, and the race of these remarkable conquerors was in a short time exterminated... There are few instances in history of a nation disappearing so rapidly and so completely as the Vandals of Africa.” A History of Greece under the Romans. George Finley p234 1856. Facts of Faith p44.

The armies of Justinian now turned their attention to Italy and the Arian Ostrogoths.

In AD538, under the generalship of Belisarius, Rome, Sicily and Rhegium were seized, and two years later, the Ostrogoth capital of Ravenna. Although Totila, the new Ostrogoth leader lay siege to Rome and succeeded in re-taking it twice, he was not able to set up the kingdom.

The power of the Ostrogoths had been broken in AD538, and their attempts to regain the kingdom were but a flicker of a failing lamp. It was “the annihilation and disappearance of a great and powerful people from the world’s history.” Fall of Rome. J.G. Sheppard p306. 1892. Facts of Faith p49.

The Ostrogoth kingdom “lost their king, their capital, their treasures, the provinces from Sicily to the Alps, and the military force of two hundred thousand barbarians, magnificently equipped with horses and arms.” Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. Ch22. Par.23.28. Chxliiii. Par.4. Edward Gibbon. (‘Mopping up’ took until AD552 [or AD555] for complete annihilation) Two Republics p552.

Prophecy had been fulfilled, and the last of the three horns were plucked up by the roots. The pope could now wield his sceptre with forcefulness, making emperors and the kings of Europe bow in reverence.

The prophet Daniel saw the final result of this long religious controversy in vision. “I considered the horns, and, behold, there came up among them another little horn, *before whom there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots*: and behold, in this horn were eyes like the eyes of a man, and a mouth speaking great things.” Daniel 7:8.

It is stated three times.

“... and the other which came up, and *before whom three fell...*”
Daniel 7:20.

“... and another shall arise... and *he shall subdue three kings.*”
Daniel 7:24.

History calls these three kingdoms ‘barbarians’, and our minds have generally thought of them as totally heathen, unruly and fierce. It is true the Vandals are known as a cruel nation, however, of its approximately five million people, only a small percentage were soldiers. The remainder were mothers, fathers, children, grandparents, brothers, sisters, aunts, uncles, friends who wanted to live in peace.

It is the same for the Heruli and the Ostrogoths. These kingdoms were heathen at one time, but eventually each accepted the Christian faith.

In their walk with God, the three barbarian nations gradually shared the view that the Papacy was wrong in its understanding of the Trinity, and made a stand against a religious power that was to become the universal Catholic Church. (In their zeal to rid them from the earth, the Roman Church did not distinguish between Arians and Semi-Arians)

Perhaps we need to rethink our attitude towards these people!

Their desire to conquer other nations is questioned, but we have not lived in their times. Perhaps they were driven from their homes. One historian said food was their urgent need.

Let us not forget that these people were destroyed because Rome regarded them as a cult, and was determined to eradicate all who did not believe in Roman dogmas, especially the Trinity.

What about today?

If the Catholic Church did an investigation into the beliefs of our pioneers, a modern Justinian would have wiped us out!

“The cause of the fall of Babylon is thus stated: ‘she made all nations drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication’...

This harlot, in consequence of her unlawful union with the powers of earth, has corrupted the pure truths of the Bible, and with the wine of her false doctrine, has intoxicated the nations. A few instances of her corruption of the truths of the Bible must suffice:

Point 2. The doctrine of the Trinity, which was established in the church by the council of Nice, AD325. This doctrine destroys the personality of God and his Son Jesus Christ our Lord.

The infamous measures by which it was forced upon the church, which appear upon the pages of ecclesiastical history, might well cause every believer in that doctrine to blush.”

J. N. Andrews.

Review and Herald. March 6th 1855.

‘The Fall of Babylon’

Chapter 7

ONLY BEGOTTEN

Ellen White has often been accused of denying the divinity of Christ in the beginning of her ministry. This is because statements in her writings speak of Jesus being begotten of the Father in eternity.

We do not know which statements have been referred to, but perhaps the following may be one of them. "The Eternal Father, the unchangeable one, gave His only-begotten Son, tore from His bosom Him who was made in the express image of His person, and sent Him down to earth to reveal how greatly He loved mankind." Review & Herald. Jul 9. 1895.

Did Ellen White deny Christ's divinity?

Of course not.

You see, it is a cardinal belief of Christendom that unless Christ is eternal and without beginning, He cannot be divine. The Roman Catholics do not have a problem as their Son is "eternally begotten", without beginning. Creed of Athanasius

The various branches of the Arians were called heretics because they believed Christ had an origin, although they differed in their understanding of His nature. This is when the accusation first came into being -- *not eternal, not divine*.

But think it through.

God created fish, birds and animals to reproduce "after their kind". Genesis 1:21.24.25. Like is designed to beget like. He created plants to produce their own kind – tomatoes produce tomatoes. Even in the area of the mind, "whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." Galatians 6:7.

What is true in nature is also true of human beings.

God created Adam and Eve as human beings, and being our parents, we received their nature. This is not strange to us. We are born with a human nature because our mother and father were human beings.

So it is with God. When He gave birth to a Son in eternity, His Son received the same nature as His Father -- a divine nature. It is not difficult to understand.

God's Son inherited divinity by birth, and was given the name Michael -- מִיכָאֵל . (mee-cha-ayl) He was not a co-equal and co-eternal God, but a begotten Son, "the brightness of His (Father's) glory, and the express image of His (Father's) person..." Hebrew 1:3.

Unfortunately, the false idea persists, bringing with it another thought – the Son of God was created.

Bishop Alexander said, "Arius, in direct opposition with the truth, affirmed that the Son of God is merely a creature or created being, adding the famous dictum – there once was a time when He was not..." Alexander 4th century.

We do not know for certain if Arius believed the Son was created, however, Catholic writers accuse him of it over and over. Two thoughts are combined -- * the Son is a created being and * there was a time when the Son was not -- the latter proving the former.

You may think the Catholic writers prove that Arius believed Jesus was created, however, there are historians who believe it was a false charge against Arius by the Catholic Church.

Adventist author, Benjamin G. Wilkinson stated, "An erroneous charge was circulated that all who were called Arians believed that Christ was a created being." Truth Triumphant p92. 1944.

The present writer agrees with this brother because the very same words are repeated in our day, not by Catholics, but Seventh-day Adventists.

No matter how many times brethren are told -- *I don't believe Jesus was created* – we continue to be misrepresented as saying He was created.

Why is this?

It is strange. Probably it is because they are unable to divest from their minds the thought that God's Son had an origin, therefore He cannot be divine and must be created. It may seem logical, but the premise is not correct.

The question was asked in 1883, and answered in the Review & Herald.

Question: Will you please favour me with those Scriptures which plainly say that Christ is a created being?

Answer: You are mistaken in supposing that S. D. Adventists teach that Christ was ever created. They believe, on the contrary, that he was 'begotten' of the Father, and that he can properly be called God and worshiped as such. They believe, also, that the worlds, and everything which is, was created by Christ in conjunction with the Father. They believe, however, that somewhere in the eternal ages of the past there was a point at which Christ came into existence. They think that it is necessary that God should have antedated Christ in his being, in order that Christ could have been begotten of him, and sustain to him the relation of son. They hold to the distinct personality of the Father and Son, rejecting as absurd that feature of Trinitarianism which insists that God, and Christ, and the Holy Spirit are three persons, and yet but one person. S. D. Adventists hold that God and Christ are one in the sense that Christ prayed that his disciples might be one; i.e., one in spirit, purpose, and labor. Review & Herald. Vol 60. No.16. p250. Apr 17. 1883.

www.adventistarchives.org/docs/RH/RH18830417-V60-16_B.pdf

Elder E.J. Waggoner had to deal with Jesus being created at Minneapolis. He said, "No one who holds this view can possibly have any just conception of the exalted position which Christ really occupies... The Scriptures declare that Christ is 'the only-

begotten Son of God'. He is begotten, not created. As to when He was begotten, it is not for us to inquire, nor could our minds grasp it if we were told... The point is that Christ is a begotten Son, and not a created subject. He has by inheritance a more excellent Name than the angels; He is 'a Son over His own house'. (Hebrews 1:4. 3:6)" Christ and His Righteousness p27.29.

The Word who "was with God... was made flesh, and dwelt among us (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father), full of grace and truth." John 1:1.14.

The Greek word for begotten in this text is *monogenes*, which means, (mono) 'single, sole, alone, only, by themselves', coupled with *gennao*, meaning 'to be'. Thus it means 'only born, only child, only begotten, single born child'.

Four verses speak of God's "only begotten Son" as *monogenes*. John 1:18. 3:16. 3:18. 1 John 4:9. Another verse says "only begotten of the Father." John 1:14. One other verse refers to Abraham's "only begotten son", Isaac. Hebrews 11:17.

The word *monogenes* is also translated 'only', but it still refers to an 'only begotten' child. The widow of Nain had a son who was "the only son of his mother." Luke 7:12. Jairus had "an only daughter" who was sick and died. Luke 8:42. The father with the epileptic son said "he is mine only child." Luke 9:38.

The translators of the King James Bible understood the true meaning of *monogenes* and translated it correctly. In 1611 they wrote, "For God so loued y world, that he gaue his only begotten *Sonne*, that whosoeuer belieueth in him should not perish, but haue euerlasting life." John 3:16. (The spelling is old English; the word for 'the' is a strange letter, a bit like a 'y')

It is important to understand what *monogenes* really means, as it is fast being eliminated in Christendom, including the Adventist Church.

Why is this so?

It is purported that the Greek really means 'unique'.

The question was asked of a Greek friend some time ago, *What does monogenes mean?* As a Trinitarian, he said, *To a Greek it means 'only begotten'.*

So why are people anxious to eliminate “begotten”?

Not being privy to the minds of the one who came up with the idea, it is not possible to say. Perhaps it was to counter truth!

If Jesus was not begotten of the Father, and does not have His origin from Him, He cannot be truly considered a Son.

You see, Mary did not just give birth to a child who was born of the Holy Spirit – a human mother and a divine Father. If this is all that took place, we could certainly say Jesus was a completely new person, begotten of a divine Father and a human mother.

However, this is not the truth of Scripture.

“In the councils of heaven, before the world was created, the Father and the Son covenanted together that if man proved disloyal to God, Christ, one with the Father, would take the place of the transgressor, and suffer the penalty of justice that must fall upon him.” MS 145. 1897. Ellen White. 6 Bible Commentary p1070.

When it came time for the incarnation, Michael, God’s only begotten Son, entered the human family. It was not a co-equal person called God the Holy Spirit simply providing seed for the child Jesus to be conceived.

The Bible says, “... that which was conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost.” Matthew 1:20. This text, if taken alone, can be seen with a Trinitarian understanding as God the Holy Spirit working the miracle of conception upon Mary. But how then did God the Father become the Father of Jesus?

If each person of a Trinitarian God is co-equal and co-eternal, and the Holy Spirit was the divine Agent involved in the conception, what part did ‘God the Son’ play in the whole process?

The relationship between the Father and the Son becomes confusion.

The truth is that God's divine Son clothed Himself with a body through the Spirit in the womb of Mary in a way we do not understand. The Psalmist says, "Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire..." Psalm 40:6. The apostle Paul, when speaking of Christ, added the words to his quotation of the psalm, "but a body hast thou prepared me." Hebrews 10:5.

Ellen White said, "Christ, at an infinite cost, by a painful process, mysterious to angels as well as to men, assumed humanity. Hiding His divinity, laying aside His glory, He was born a babe in Bethlehem." Upward Look p90.

The prophet also said that Christ "gained in a new sense the title of the Son of God" when He took on humanity. "While the Son of a human being, He became the Son of God in a new sense. Thus He stood in our world – the Son of God, yet allied by birth to the human race." 1 Selected Messages p226.227.

If Jesus became a Son in a 'new sense', He must have been a Son prior to coming to this earth. It is not possible to understand the words any other way.

The last sentence in the quotation makes clear the truth. "He stood in our world – the Son of God, yet allied by birth to the human race." The Son of God and the human race existed separately, **yet** they have been joined together (allied) 'by birth'. The little word 'yet' is the key that links together two realities.

God asks us to accept this truth and rejoice in it.

"Let us drink in this love, that we may know by experience what a real, tender, joyful, experience there is in a realization of the Fatherhood of God." Spalding and Magan p69.

Chapter 8

DEW DROPS

Sister White was asked a year after the 1888 General Conference session – *What do you think of the light these brethren are presenting?*

Her reply was given in a sermon, “Why, I have been presenting it to you for the last 45 years – the matchless charms of Christ... When Brother Waggoner brought out these ideas in Minneapolis, it was the first clear teaching on this subject from any human lips I had heard, except the conversation between myself and my husband.

I have said to myself, it is because God has presented it to me in vision that I see it so clearly, and they cannot see it because they have never had it presented to them as I have. And when another presented it, every fiber of my heart said, Amen.” 5 Manuscript Release p219. Ms 5, p10. Sermon – Rome. New York. June 19. 1889.

It was a “most precious message”. 9 Testimonies p91.

In the report of the Minneapolis session, the prophet stated, “I see the beauty of truth in the presentation of the righteousness of Christ in relation to the law as the doctor (E.J.Waggoner) has placed before us... That which has been presented harmonizes perfectly with the light which God has been pleased to give me during all the years of my experience.” The 1888 Materials. p164.

Notice her last words, “it harmonizes **perfectly** with the light which God has been pleased to give me during all the years of my experience.” (Bolding added)

Does this statement sound like Ellen White changed her beliefs?

Not at all.

In 1890, Ellet J. Waggoner printed a book entitled 'The Righteousness of Christ', setting forth his precise teaching and phraseology at Minneapolis. It was based on shorthand reports of Jessie F. Moser-Waggoner, taken at the General Conference session. (In the United States, it was 98 pages, printed by Pacific Press. In England it was called 'Christ our Righteousness', and in Australia, 'Christ and His Righteousness', printed in 1893)

After the session, Sister White, together with Brethren Jones and Waggoner, visited from place to place with the same message. "In every meeting since the General Conference, souls have eagerly accepted the precious message of the righteousness of Christ." Review and Herald. July 23. 1889.

In 1892, she wrote, "The time of test is just upon us, for the loud cry of the third angel has already begun in the revelation of the righteousness of Christ, the sin-pardoning Redeemer. This is the beginning of the light of the angel whose glory shall fill the whole earth." 1 Selected Messages p363.

Why did it not become the latter rain?

Only a few local churches received the message. A large majority of the denominational leadership at the General Conference session were unwilling to "yield up preconceived opinions... The light that is 'to lighten the whole earth with its glory' was resisted, and by the action of our own brethren has been in a great degree kept away from the world." 1 Selected Messages p234.235.

The message was clearly presented, but too many were not willing to accept the light.

The year before Minneapolis, Ellen White gave the warning, "The attention of the people must be gained; unless this can be done, all effort is useless; though an angel from heaven should come down to speak to them, his words would do no more good than if he were speaking into the cold ear of death." Review & Herald. Mar 22. 1887.

With the resistance of so many leading men at the Conference, the prophet said afterwards, "What power must we have from God that icy hearts, having only a legal religion, should see the better things provided for them -- Christ and His righteousness! A life-giving message was needed to give life to dry bones." 1888 Materials Vol 1. p229.

The life-giving power had been made available, but many 'bones' remained dry. In 1890, it was stated, "As a people, we have preached the law until we are as dry as the hills of Gilboa that had neither dew nor rain. We must preach Christ in the law, and there will be sap and nourishment in the preaching that will be as food to the famishing flock of God." Review & Herald. Mar 11, 1890.

In that same year, the prophet revealed a sad fact. "The prejudices and opinions that prevailed at Minneapolis are not dead by any means. The seeds there sown are ready to spring into life and bear a like harvest, because the roots are still left. The tops have been cut off, but the roots are not dead, and will bear their unholy fruit, to poison the perception and blind the understanding of those you connect with, in regard to the messengers and messages that God sends. When you destroy the root of bitterness by thorough confession, then you will see light in God's light." Manuscript 40. 1890. 1888 Materials Chapter 115.

As a result, the prophet knew problems would arise in the future.

You will remember that Dr Kellogg and others on his medical staff at Battle Creek were seen in vision dismantling the pillars supporting the platform of the Seventh-day Adventist Church.

At the time of the vision, Ellen gave the warning that if these men were successful, "Our religion would be changed. The fundamental principles that have sustained the work for the last fifty years would be accounted as error. A new organization would be established. Books of a new order would be written... Nothing would be allowed to stand in the way of the new movement... Their foundation would be built on the sand, and

storm and tempest would sweep away the structure.” 1 Selected Messages p204.

We might think all is well, and that *‘the church is going through’*, but should we not be asking if there has been a dismantling of the pillars that support the platform of truth given to Seventh-day Adventists?

The prophet warned that the devil would seek to bring about a “new organization”, not an organisation outside the church, but within. It has been called the “synagogue of Satan.” Experiences and Views p13. 1851. General Conference Bulletin Oct 22.1903. Revelation 3:9.

No matter what you think about the “new organization” or the “new books”, and whether they are now in the church, it is vital we all understand that the only way to make certain we are standing on the platform of eternal truth, is to compare what we believe with the truth given to our pioneers, Waggoner and Jones in 1888, and the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy.

At Minneapolis, it was a **“most precious message”** to Ellen White and the two young men God chose to share it at the 1888 General Conference session.

Ask yourself – *Is the 1888 message most precious to me?*

Imagine yourself sitting among the delegates. What would your reaction have been to Brother Waggoner’s presentation? Think about it as you listen to his words.

“The Word was ‘in the beginning’. The mind of man cannot grasp the ages that are spanned in this phrase. It is not given to men to know when or how the Son was begotten; but we know that He was the Divine Word, not simply before He came to this earth to die, but even before the world was created... We know that Christ ‘proceeded forth and came from God’ (John 8:42), but it was so far back in the ages of eternity as to be far beyond the grasp of the mind of man.” Christ and His Righteousness p16.

At the same time, the prophet said, "And although we may try to reason in regard to our Creator, how long He has had existence, where evil first entered into our world, and all these things, we may reason about them until we fall down faint and exhausted with the research when there is yet an infinity beyond." 7 Bible Commentary p919. 1888.

At Minneapolis, this part of the message was believed by the majority of those present.

Would it have been difficult for you to listen to it?

Waggoner continued, "It is true that there are many sons of God; but Christ is the 'only-begotten Son of God', and therefore the Son of God in a sense in which no other being ever was, or ever can be. The angels are sons of God, as was Adam by creation; Christians are the sons of God by adoption, but Christ is the Son of God by birth." Christ and His Righteousness p19. 1890. Job 38:7. Luke 3:38. Rom 8:14,15.

No doubt Sister White had heard Brother Waggoner say these words many times, and when she spoke of the same subject, the words came naturally.

"A complete offering has been made; for 'God so loved the world, that He gave his only-begotten Son' -- not a son by creation, as were the angels, nor a son by adoption, as is the forgiven sinner, but a Son begotten in the express image of the Father's person, and in all the brightness of His majesty and glory, one equal with God in authority, dignity, and divine perfection. In Him dwelt all the fullness of the Godhead bodily." Signs of the Times. May 30. 1895.

Listen as Elder Jones speaks. Christ, "who was born in the form of God, took the form of man." The General Conference Bulletin. 189. p449. 1895.

Later he said, "He came from heaven, God's first-born, to the earth, and was born again... He whose goings forth have been from the days of eternity, the first-born of God, was born again in

order that we might be born again.” Christian Perfection, Par 53. (At Bethlehem Christ was born a second time, ‘in a new sense’)

These statements were all given in the years following the 1888 General Conference when the churches were being visited. If Ellen White and the two brethren had not been in harmony, it would have been impossible for drops of the latter rain to fall.

Of course, the message covered more than the origins of the Saviour, but these details would strengthen the faith of his listeners in the ability of the Son to grant righteousness.

Christ was shown to be the *divine, omnipotent* Son, having full power as Creator, Mediator, Lawgiver, Redeemer, and Judge.

Sister White said, “The Lord in His great mercy sent a most precious message to His people through Elders Waggoner and Jones. This message was to bring more prominently before the world the uplifted Saviour, the sacrifice for the sins of the whole world.

It presented justification through faith in the Surety; it invited the people to receive the righteousness of Christ, which is made manifest in obedience to all the commandments of God... All power is given into His hands, that He may dispense rich gifts unto men, imparting the priceless gift of His own righteousness to the helpless human agent.” Testimonies for Ministers p91.

It is a message that bears the “divine credentials”. Review & Herald. Sep 3. 1889.

Five years later, in 1893, Elder Jones queried the delegates assembled at the General Conference session.

“Now brethren, when did that message of the righteousness of Christ begin with us as a people?” (One or two in the audience: *Three or four years ago*)

“Which was it, three or four?” (Congregation: *Four*)

“Yes four. Where was it?” (Congregation: *Minneapolis*)

"What then did the brethren reject at Minneapolis?" (Some in congregation: *The loud cry*)

"What is the message of righteousness? The Testimony has told us what it is: the loud cry – the latter rain. Then what did the brethren in that fearful position in which they stood, reject at Minneapolis? They rejected the latter rain – the loud cry of the third angel's message." General Conference Daily Bulletin. 1893. No.11. p68.

The dew drops of the latter rain began to fall in 1888, but the blessing was blocked. Years have come and gone. One hundred and twenty five years have passed!

How long before the Revelation 18 angel will return?

The prophet gives three essential ingredients for receiving the latter rain.

* The message.

The message of righteousness, according to God's understanding of righteousness, must be presented, as it was in 1888. "This is the message that God commanded to be given to the world. It is the third angel's message..." Testimonies to Ministers p91.

"Several have written to me, inquiring if the message of justification by faith is the third angel's message, and I have answered, 'It is the third angel's message in verity.'" Review & Herald. April 1. 1890.

* Personal readiness.

We must be purified from jealousy, evil surmising, self-indulgence and all that defiles. The character of Christ must be "perfectly reproduced" in God's people. Christ's Object Lessons p69.

"Today you are to have your vessel purified that it may be ready for the heavenly dew, ready for the showers of the latter rain; for the latter rain will come, and the blessing of God will fill every soul that is purified from every defilement. It is our work today to yield our souls to Christ, that we may be fitted for the time of

refreshing from the presence of the Lord--fitted for the baptism of the Holy Spirit." God's Amazing Grace p205.

* Working for souls.

"The great outpouring of the Spirit of God, which lightens the whole earth with His glory, will not come until we have an enlightened people, that know by experience what it means to be laborers together with God... but this will not be while the largest portion of the church are not laborers together with God." Review & Herald. July 21. 1896.

If these three areas are not a reality in our lives, the Holy Spirit "may be falling on hearts all around us, but we shall not discern or receive it." Testimonies to Ministers p507.

Chapter 9

GOD'S LIGHT

"In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." Genesis 1:1.2.

Look, says the Trinitarian, there is the Holy Spirit, the third Person of a triune God.

What makes you think so?

Well it says so. It is the first time the Holy Spirit is mentioned in the Bible, and it continues through the whole of Scripture.

But it doesn't say 'Holy Spirit'.

No, but that is what it means.

How do you know that is what it means?

What else can it mean?

So many fall into the eisegesis trap with Genesis 1:2. It is not only a false method of study, but gives a totally wrong picture, as you saw in a previous chapter when Jim jumped on the words "tormented for ever and ever."

The word for Spirit is *ruach*. This is the only word in the Hebrew for spirit -- any spirit -- man's spirit, holy spirit and evil spirit. The word *ruach* itself does not identify which spirit; it is the context.

The Hebrew is *ruach elohiym* - "spirit god" - moved upon the face of the waters. We know it is speaking about the true God, so we can give both words a capital letter "Spirit God", and to have it read well in English we can legitimately add 'of', making it Spirit of God.

When interpreting the text, what does the Bible say?

It says, "the spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters". Genesis 1:2.

Does it say this is the third person of a triune God? No.

Is it Trinitarian or non-Trinitarian?

It depends on whether our mode of study is exegesis or eisegesis. Based on this text alone we must say, *I don't know*. Only a study of all the Bible references for *ruach* will reveal the meaning of Spirit of God.

Throughout the Old Testament *ruach* is seen as – 'Spirit of God, Spirit of the Lord, My Spirit, my spirit, His Spirit, his spirit, the Spirit, the spirit, a spirit, every spirit, your spirit, their own spirit, of spirit, another spirit, in spirit, whose spirit, spirit, spirit of, spirit in'; and others with an adjective before 'spirit', such as 'familiar spirit'. (Those with a capital letter refer to God's Spirit, gained from the context; with lower case, either a man's spirit or an evil spirit)

Nowhere is there the title 'God the Holy Spirit' in the Hebrew.

In the New Testament, the Greek word is *pneuma*, and exactly the same terms are used. Some with an adjective before them are 'unclean spirit, dumb spirit, quickening Spirit, eternal Spirit'. Other verses are – 'by one Spirit are we all baptised', and 'he who is joined unto the Lord is one spirit'. (Similar terms use Holy Ghost instead of Spirit) Other New Testament terms are 'Spirit of Christ, Spirit of your Father, Spirit of His Son, Spirit of His mouth, Spirit of prophecy'.

Nowhere is the title 'God the Holy Ghost', or 'God the Holy Spirit' in the Greek, nor is it in the Hebrew. Neither is it in the Spirit of Prophecy.

A comprehensive study reveals that 'the Spirit' is God's own personal presence -- in Spirit. This does not mean it is non-personal. "The Holy Spirit is a person; for He beareth witness with our spirits that we are the children of God." 20 Manuscript Release 68.

A false charge against non-Trinitarians is – *You believe the Holy Spirit is only an influence or power.*

No, it is the Spirit of God Himself in His omnipresence that has the power.

Seated upon His throne in glory, God is able to speak to the holy beings in His presence, but He is also able to speak, hear, direct, guide, rebuke, convict, comfort and give power to His people in any place in the universe by His personal omnipresent and powerful Spirit.

Some have a hard time imagining the concept, but the devil has counterfeited it by supposedly giving men and women the ability to have out-of-body experiences.

One of these is called astral travel. The body remains in its local environment, while the 'spirit' roams distant lands. In a far-away-place, the 'spirit' takes hold of a definite item from the country, and when the trip is over, and the 'spirit' returns to the body, the evidence is in their clasped hand.

It should not be difficult to grasp. Our spirit-abilities are limited by our own minds, but God's abilities are not. We can say, *I am with you in spirit*, and we mean our thoughts and feelings are with you. Colossians 2:5. When God says it, He can be with us in reality by His omnipresent Spirit, not simply as an influence, but His very presence.

Listen to the Psalmist as he speaks of God's Spirit. "Whither shall I go from thy spirit? Or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there: if I make my bed in hell, behold, thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea; even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me." Psalm 139:7-10.

This is not an inanimate power -- in heaven, the grave, the sea -- but God's very presence.

"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.

Ellen White was not implying that God's Spirit was only a powerful influence. She was making it perfectly clear that God was everywhere, having an "intimate knowledge of" and "personal interest" in His creation, *by His Spirit*. (Psalm 139 is quoted with this passage)

If we ask God to be with us in our meetings, His presence is really with us, for He says, "... **there I am in the midst.**" Matthew 18:20. It is the same "Spirit of God" who moved upon the face of the waters in the beginning.

Another charge is made – *You don't believe in the Holy Spirit*.

For many the thought is frightening, because a denial of the Holy Spirit might be the unpardonable sin. But this too is incorrect.

When Jesus promised the Comforter, Judas (not Iscariot) received a glimmer of understanding, for he asked, "*How is it that thou wilt manifest thyself unto us, and not unto the world?*" John 14:22.

In reply, Jesus said, "*If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him...*" John 14:23.

Do not ignore Jesus' words -- "**We**", speaking of Himself and His Father, "**we will come unto him, and make *our* abode with him**". It is the Father and the Son who will make their abode with the believer. Jesus said, "... *the Spirit of truth... shall be in you.*" John 14:17. (Romans 8 makes this clear by an interchange of terms between the Spirit of the Father and the Spirit of Christ, not as two Spirits, but one. Romans 8:9-11)

Clearly there is only "...one Spirit..." Ephesians 4:4. Ephesians 2:18.

The relationship between the Father and the Son is intimate as they "both have the same Spirit." Christ and His Righteousness. E.J. Waggoner p30.

"Wherever God's children are, there is the Spirit - not an individual person, as we look upon persons, but having the power to make present the Father and the Son." Questions and Answers. M.C. Wilcox. Vol 11. 1919 Edition p38. 1938 Edition p34. "...both come by the Holy Spirit." Ibid.

Jesus prayed for His people, "that they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us... that they may be one, even as we are one... I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one..." John 17:21.23.

It is only as we have the Spirit of the Father and the Son that we can have unity and closeness to them. Another independent Spirit, such as the third co-eternal person of a Trinitarian God, cannot give intimacy on behalf of the Father and the Son. No one can provide intimacy for another person.

Before Jesus ascended to heaven, He promised He would not leave His disciples as orphans. "I will not leave you comfortless." John 14:18. "I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever." John 14:16.

What did Jesus mean by "*another* Comforter" whom He called the "Spirit of truth"? Jesus said of this Spirit, "he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you." John 14:17. (The Greek for 'another' in this verse is *allos*, which means 'another the same', showing the Comforter to be a familiar person, not a stranger)

Jesus spoke of the Holy Spirit in the *third person*, "... he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you." John 14:17. But He also spoke of the Spirit in the *first person*, for He said to His disciples – "I will come to you." John 14:18. (For readers not thoroughly acquainted with grammar, the first person is when we speak of ourselves as I, me, my; second person is when we speak to another as you or your; third person is when we speak of another as he, she, it, him or her)

In the above verses Jesus speaks in the *third person* and the *first person* when referring to the Holy Spirit?

Speaking in the *third person* when referring to Himself was not unusual for Jesus. He often called Himself the 'Son of man' and people asked, "Who is this Son of man?" John 12:34.

At times Sister White spoke in the *third person* of herself. One example, "*Sister White* is not the originator of these books. They contain the instruction that during *her* lifework God has been giving *her*." Review & Herald. Jan 20. 1903. (She could have said, 'I am

not the originator... God has been giving *me*.' This would have been *first* person)

When the prophet said "the Holy Spirit is the third person of the Godhead," she was speaking numerically. Desire of Ages p671. It is true, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are three living persons, but it is not easy to understand the Holy Spirit.

We are told by the prophet that the "nature of the Holy Spirit is a mystery. Men cannot explain it... (and regarding) such mysteries, which are too deep for human understanding, silence is golden." Acts of the Apostles p52.

Take special note, that it is the *nature* of the Spirit that is the mystery. It is the same for God Himself, as the prophet wrote, "No human mind can comprehend God. None are to indulge in speculation regarding His nature. Here silence is eloquence. The Omniscient One is above discussion." Ministry of Healing p429. This does not mean we must remain totally silent about God or the Spirit, for much has been revealed.

The word 'another' must be seen in the light of Christ's promise to not leave His children as orphans, and to return to them in Spirit, as their indwelling Comforter. Reflecting Christ p200.

Another difficult word is Ellen White's use of 'representative', as our minds immediately see *another* co-equal person (as in the Trinity) representing Christ, but this is not the message.

"The Holy Spirit is Christ's representative, but divested of the personality of humanity, and independent thereof. Cumbered with humanity, Christ could not be in every place personally. Therefore it was for their interest that He should go to the Father, and send the Spirit to be His successor on earth.... By the Spirit the Saviour would be accessible to all. In this sense He would be nearer to them than if He had not ascended on high." Desire of Ages p669.

If you have read the passage correctly, you would have seen that the Spirit was 'divested' of the 'personality of humanity'. This does not mean divested of *personality*, but of the hindrances [that is, the

cumbrances] of the human personality or flesh.

Some brethren think that by becoming human, Jesus gave up omnipresence, and therefore had to send 'another' as His representative. It is true, in His human flesh, Christ was limited to one place at a time, but after His glorious enthronement in heaven, He was able to return in Spirit. If Jesus had remained on earth, He could only be with those in His physical presence, but by coming in Spirit, He was able to be with all believers.

Another quotation, similar to the previous one, makes the subject even clearer. "Cumbered with humanity, Christ could not be in every place personally; therefore it was altogether for their advantage that He should leave them, go to His Father, and send the Holy Spirit to be His successor on earth. The *Holy Spirit is Himself* divested of the personality of humanity and independent thereof. He would represent Himself as present in all places by His Holy Spirit, as the Omnipresent." 14 Manuscript Release. p23. Italics added. No.1084.

Note the words, "The Holy Spirit is *Himself*..." In these words, the prophet has made it perfectly clear that Christ would "represent Himself..." on earth. As a man goes to court on his own behalf, so Christ returns in Spirit, *representing Himself*.

Do not be surprised if it is difficult.

"The disciples still failed to understand Christ's words in their spiritual sense, and again He explained His meaning. By the Spirit, He said, He would manifest Himself to them." Desire Ages p670.

On His first resurrection visit, Jesus "breathed on" His disciples, saying "Receive ye the Holy Ghost." John 20:22.

"Jesus is waiting to breathe upon all His disciples, and give them the inspiration of His sanctifying spirit, and transfuse the vital influence from Himself to His people... Christ is to live in His human agents, and work through their faculties, and act through their capabilities. Their will must be submitted to His will, they must act with His Spirit, that it may be no more they that live, but

Christ that liveth in them. Jesus is seeking to impress upon them the thought that in giving His Holy Spirit He is giving to them the glory which the Father has given Him, that He and His people may be one in God." Signs of the Times. Oct. 3. 1892. Ye Shall Receive Power p26.

While Christ is ministering in the heavenly sanctuary, He is still "by His Spirit the minister of the church on earth. He is withdrawn from the eye of sense, but His parting promise is fulfilled, 'Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.' While He delegates His power to inferior ministers, His energizing presence is still with His church." Desire of Ages p166.

The mystery relating to the in-dwelling Spirit has been revealed in the words, "Christ in you, the hope of glory." Colossians 1:27. Romans 16:25.

We were designed to be God's dwelling place, for the apostle Paul said, "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God..." 1 Corinthians 3:16. It has always been true, as it is "God's purpose that every created being, from the bright and holy seraph to man, should be a temple for the indwelling of the Creator." In Heavenly Places p191.

Adam and Eve were created with the indwelling Spirit that shone from their bodies as "garments of light". Story of Redemption p21. When they sinned, the Spirit departed and they were left naked. Genesis 3:10. Confrontation p59.

These beautiful garments of light are "such as the angels wear", and if we have Christ's Spirit in our hearts, the day will come when it will shine from us as a glorious light of heavenly clothing, evidence of our union with God the Father and His beloved Son. Sons and Daughters of God p124.

When Jesus returns, He will come with the glory of His own Spirit, the glory of the Father and of the holy angels, and "will come clad in the robe of light, which He has worn from the days of eternity." Lift Him Up. p373.

In the kingdom of heaven, the holy Spirit has no throne, except the sanctified hearts of all who make up God's great family.

Chapter 10

DRASTIC MEASURES

John H. Kellogg was a brilliant doctor in charge of the largest and most well-respected sanitarium in the world. Many of its patrons came from the upper classes of society, including royalty.

But Battle Creek had its problems.

For years Sister White had counselled that the gospel ministry and the medical work should go hand in hand. Pastors were to be medical missionaries. Some of the medical men wanted to use drugs, but the counsel was always to use natural remedies. Male doctors and nurses were not to act as midwives for the birth of a child; neither should male doctors give physical examinations to women patients. The reverse was also true. Large sanitariums and hospitals were not to be built; instead there were to be small facilities in different places. 13 Manuscript Release 113-118. Counsels Diet-Foods p303. Counsels on Health p212. Series B No.6 p192-194.

This counsel was largely rejected by the medical profession.

The publishing house had its problems too. Instead of giving priority to 'The Great Controversy' as the prophet had directed, they chose to print and promote 'Bible Readings for the Home Circle'. Clear instruction had been given to only print truth-filled literature, but with the demand to keep presses running, they accepted secular work for printing.

In 1901 Sister White wrote, "The presses in the Lord's institution have been printing the soul-destroying theories of Romanism and other mysteries of iniquity... I have been almost afraid to open the 'Review', fearing to see that God has cleansed the publishing house by fire." Letter 138. 1901. 8 Testimonies p91.

Finally, God Himself took drastic measures.

On February 18, 1902, the Battle Creek Sanitarium burned to the ground.

It was a great loss to the denomination, but Dr. Kellogg was determined to rebuild. The grandeur and monumental size of the five-story building, far bigger than voted by the committee, was found to cost much more than had been estimated. The Story of our Health Message. Doris E. Robinson p318.319.

Kellogg was commissioned to write a new book to help defray the costs. This book was 'Living Temple'. He was told not to include his new theories, but ignored the counsel. He tried to gain approval at the Autumn Council for his book to be published at church expense, but a letter from Sister White counselled Daniells to have nothing to do with the book; a vote was not taken. Kellogg took 'Living Temple' to the Review and Herald Publishing House as outside work, and they agreed to print it. <http://www.sdadefend.com/Ad-history/Alpha/alpha-3.htm>

On December 30 of the same year, the publishing house burned to the ground, and with it the galley proofs of Kellogg's book. He took the manuscript to a non-Adventist printer.

Financially, the loss of the publishing house was a huge disaster to the denomination, and Sister White felt that loss. But her greatest sorrow was the attitude of those in leadership.

At the General Conference the previous year, the prophet had told the delegates that a thorough reformation was necessary. The church is "working upon wrong principles", she said. Manuscript 37. p98. 1901.

"The people have lost confidence in those who have the management of the work. Yet we hear that the voice of the Conference is the voice of God. Every time I have heard this, I have thought it was almost blasphemy. The voice of the Conference ought to be the voice of God..." Manuscript 37. 1901. p8. Talk by Mrs. E. G. White in the Review Chapel regarding the Southern work.

The brethren were advised that “it is not wise to choose one man as president of the General Conference.” To Conference Presidents. Aug 1896. Battle Creek College Apr 1. 1901.

“The Great General of armies, the Captain of the Lord's host, is our leader... Now I want to say, God has not put any kingly power in our ranks to control this or that branch of the work.” General Conference Bulletin. Apr 3.1901. No.1 p26.

“Men of stubborn, ironlike will, both in and out of the office, were confederating together, determined to drive certain measures through in accordance with their own judgment.” Testimonies to Ministers p461.462. 1890.

In 1901, it was voted that a ‘chairman’ would head the General Conference for only one year. Arthur Daniells had been elected, but two years later, he was still in that position.

But in 1903, a new Constitution was proposed that specifically provided for the election of a General Conference ‘president’, who would be given a “mandate from the church.” This would give the president and “leading officers” authority to enact what they thought the people needed. <http://ims.truepath.com/gcsessions/1903gc.html>

This is worldly policy.

When the vote was taken, 85 out of 108 delegates voted for the new Constitution, making Daniells the president, an office he held for the next twenty years.

The new Constitution provided for the Executive Committee of 25 members, to have full administrative power between sessions for any *five members* (including the president or vice president) as a quorum to take steps that would involve the whole committee. 1903. Article 11, Section 1 and 2. Early Elmshaven Years p257. (The committee was increased in 1901 from 13 to 25 members. GCB p151)

Sister White spoke to the Conference saying, “These principles are so foreign to God’s principles that God cannot bless those who vote upon them.” 1903 GCB p152.

"God will not vindicate any device whereby men shall in the slightest degree rule or oppress his fellow man." 7 Testimonies p81.

Ellet .J. Waggoner spoke out against the Constitution, saying, "The first objection I have to the report is that it is fundamentally and diametrically opposed to the principles of organization as set forth in the Bible... This being so, I regard the (majority) report as revolutionary and inconsistent.... My second objection is to this constitution itself, which, in some of its particulars, I regard as the worst constitution ever devised among Seventh-day Adventists." Gen. Conf. Bulletin 1903.

Percy Magan reminded the delegates of the principles laid out in the previous council, saying, "the principles which are to be brought in through this proposed constitution, and in the way in which they are brought in, are the same principles, and introduced in precisely the same way, as they were hundreds of years ago when the Papacy was made." General Conference Bulletin. Day 3. No.10 p150.

Alonzo T. Jones said, "I believe with the minority report that this proposed constitution is subversive of the principles of organisation given to us at the General Conference of 1897, and that of 1901...

The constitution today simply carries us back to these wrong principles; for in the constitution proposed, is incorporated the principle that one man shall be president of the General Conference; and then it is so arranged that a few men shall have a voice in molding things, and acting for the whole people..." Ibid p152.153.

One week after the Conference had ended, the Lord spoke through His prophet regarding the decision made by church leaders, "How is the faithful city become an harlot!... Unless the church, which is now being leavened with her own backsliding, shall repent and be converted, she will eat of the fruit of her own doing, until she shall abhor herself." 8 Testimonies p247.250. April 21 1903.

Dear Reader, do not pass over this message of condemnation simply because it was written over one hundred years ago.

Instead, ask yourself – *Is the church repeating the same evil?*

Are we still working on wrong principles?

Ignoring past counsel places the church in a very dangerous position. God is patient and merciful, but there comes a time when it is no longer possible to change.

As a result of the decisions in 1903, Sister White stated one year later, “I have seen men who have been placed in positions of trust as watchmen, molding and fashioning the work in our conferences and institutions in accordance with worldly policy, which God condemns.” Series B No.2. p19.20. June 1904.

God may once again use drastic measures. He is watching to see if repentance and change actually takes place.

It is said by many -- *We are the Laodicean church, and it is going through to glory. There are only seven churches, not eight. Laodicea is the last church; the remnant.*

Unfortunately, this well-accepted position is making Laodicea a title, rather than a condition. As a result we have not seen ourselves as truly “wretched, miserable, poor, blind, and naked.” Revelation 3:14.

When Brother Jones spoke on the subject in 1893, he made it so clear that some of the brethren were offended. (All are quotations; the different styles are for variation)

“How can you say that? We are Christians. If I am in Christ, am I to acknowledge myself a helpless, undone sinner? I thought when I was in Christ I could thank the Lord that I was good, entirely perfect and sanctified?”

Jones replied, “Why no. He is. When you are in Christ, He is perfect, He is righteous, He is holy and never errs, and His holiness is imputed to you – is given to you. His faithfulness, His perfection is mine, but I am not *that*....

"O yes, but when I come to him for wisdom and ask for wisdom and He gives it to me, then can't I boast and say, I am wise?"

Why no... When I did not walk wisely, He gave me His wisdom; His wisdom guided me... He is my wisdom, and I have no wisdom at all, but His wisdom. Don't you see?... 'I will guide thee with mine eye.' When He says He guides me with His eye, I shall answer, it is His eye that guides you and me, and not our own eyes...

And now about that thought last night – some thought I was going entirely too far. They could say, it is enough when He says, 'You are wretched', I say I am wretched. When He says, 'You are poor', I say I am poor. When He says, 'You are blind', I say, I am blind.

And when He says, 'You don't know it', then I am to say 'I know it'?

No, no. When He says, 'You don't know it', I am to say I don't know it. Do not go to putting constructions upon His way... "If any man thinketh he knoweth anything, he knoweth nothing yet as he ought to know it." Gen. Conf. Bulletin 1893 p63.64.

Sister White said the Laodicean message is a "startling denunciation of their true condition of spiritual blindness, poverty, and wretchedness. The testimony, so cutting and severe, cannot be a mistake, for it is the True Witness who speaks, and His testimony must be correct." 3 Testimonies p252.253.

Did you realise the True Witness is speaking to you?

And to me.

God wants us to *believe* that we are "wretched, miserable, poor, blind and naked" -- all of us. We can't see it; we must believe the Lord's denunciation. Man's glory must be "laid in the dust." 20 Manuscript Release p117.

"The religious services, the prayers, the praise, the penitent confession of sin ascend from true believers as incense to the heavenly sanctuary, but passing through the corrupt channels of

humanity, they are so defiled that unless purified by blood, they can never be of value to God.” 1 Selected Messages p344.

“All must be laid upon the fire of Christ’s righteousness to cleanse it from its earthly odor before it rises in a cloud of fragrant incense.” Faith and Works p23.24.

Upon hearing these truths from Brother Jones in 1893, some of the brethren felt very discouraged.

They were told, “Brethren, if the Lord has brought up sins to us that we never thought of before, that only shows He is going down to the depths, and He will reach the bottom at last; and when He finds the last thing that is unclean or impure, that is out of harmony with His will, and brings that up, and shows that to us, and we say, ‘I would rather have the Lord than that’ -- then the work is complete, and the seal of the living God can be fixed upon that character. (Congregation: Amen)...

“Which would you rather, have the completeness, the perfect fullness of Jesus Christ, or have less than that, with some of your sins covered up that you never knew of? (Congregation: His fullness)...

He has got to dig down to the deep places we never dreamed of, because we cannot understand our hearts... He will cleanse the heart, and bring up the last vestige of wickedness... And when He does bring our sins before us, let the heart say, ‘Lord, Thou gavest Thyself for my sins; Oh, I take thee instead of them.’ They are gone, and I rejoice in the Lord... Which would you rather have, your sins or Christ?” (Congregation: Christ) Gen. Conf. Bulletin. p120. 1893.

Isn’t this a precious message?

Sadly, not all surrendered in those early days. Sister White said divisions would come in the church, and we will “witness the apostasy of men in whom we have had confidence, in whom we trusted, who we supposed, were as true as steel to principle.” 3 Selected Messages p411.

Even Brethren Jones and Waggoner went astray.

As early as 1893, while editor of the 'Signs of the Times', Jones was influenced by Dr Kellogg. In 1903 the doctor asked him to teach at the Battle Creek College, and by 1906 Ellen White said he was **"a man deluded and deceived"**. Letter 116 to Dr David Paulson. 1906. (Jones died in 1923)

In 1903, Waggoner moved to Battle Creek, placing him in great peril. Sister White wrote to him, saying, **"Satan is working stealthily, untiringly, to affect your downfall through his specious temptations... He hopes to lead you into the mazes of spiritualism."** Letter 231. 1903. (Waggoner died in 1916)

In vision, the prophet saw her counsellor addressing both young men, **"The sentiments that you have received in harmony with the special theories presented in the book 'Living Temple' are not pure truth. There is a co-mingling of truth and error... Separate entirely from the bewitching, misleading sentiments that run through 'Living Temple'."** Letter 279. 1904.

Both young men were lost to the denomination.

Kellogg continued to teach heresy, and many were seduced. Men were put under his spell, and followed an apostate position for the rest of their lives. (Kellogg died in 1943)

But apostasy did not die with Dr. Kellogg.

The prophet said it will **"develop into darkness deep as midnight, impenetrable as sackcloth of hair"**, and will increase in strength until the coming of Jesus. Special Testimonies Series B. No.7 p57. 7 Manuscript Releases p185.

"Rebellion and apostasy are in the very air we breathe." 2 Selected Messages p58.

The problem is not so much apostasy in the church. Individuals will go astray and leave the denomination. But when the church in session passes heretical doctrines and worldly policies, then it becomes a church in apostasy.

We have been warned.

In 1904. "For the past fifty years every phase of heresy has been brought to bear upon us...

Messages of every order and kind have been urged upon Seventh-day Adventists, to take the place of the truth which, point by point, has been sought out by prayerful study, and testified to by the miracle-working power of the Lord." Special Testimonies Series B #2 p59.

Over and over the prophet wrote of the wonderful way in which the truth came to us in the beginning. It was not a work of man, but of God.

In 1905 she said, "Every pillar that He has established is to be strengthened. We cannot now step off the foundation that God has established. We cannot now enter into any new organization; for this would mean apostasy from the truth." Manuscript 129, 1905. 2 Selected Messages p390.

In 1906. "The truth is the same as it ever has been, and not a pin or a pillar can be moved from the structure of truth. That which was sought for out of the Word in 1844, 1845, and 1846 remains the truth today *in every particular*." Letter 38, 1906.

Some brethren believe the Seventh-day Adventist Church is still standing on the platform of truth given to the pioneers, and anyone who denies this is maligning the church. Others think that speaking of the denomination being in apostasy is a conspiracy of the devil to destroy the church.

In 1907 the prophet wrote, "The time of this apostasy is here. Every conceivable effort will be made to throw doubt upon the positions we have occupied for over half a century." Letter 410, 1907. p2. (To J. E. White. Aug 26. 1907.) 7MR 195.

To talk of apostasy is not a conspiracy theory. We must remind ourselves that we are blind. Jesus called the Jewish leaders "blind leaders of the blind", as they refused to believe God's plainly-stated words. Matthew 15:14. 23:16.

Are we doing the same?

It is not so much thinking everything is evil. There are good men and women in our church who are honouring God to the best of their understanding.

Talented evangelists are sharing the truth of the third angel in a remarkable way. The Spirit of God is evident in their lives and the testimony of their witness. Countless brethren and sisters have ministries that reveal the love of Jesus to all who come in contact with them.

When A.T. Jones was speaking to the 1903 delegates about the evils prior to 1897, he said the same thing. "Now, please bear in mind, I am not in any sense calling attention to any fault, or trying to, or raising any reproach whatever against the brethren who have been at headquarters... because it is simply the principle that is wrong." General Conference Bulletin 1903 No.10. p153.

After A.G. Daniells was out of his presidential office, he realised Brother Jones was right about organisation, and tried to correct it. But by that time, no one would listen to him. 'Landmarks' Aug. 1999. Conversation between Meade MaGuire and A.G. Daniells, told to George Burnside by Meade MaGuire.

God's loving arms are still extended to His church -- *Obey My will and I will bless you.*

"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." Life Sketches p196.

Today we must ask --- is anyone listening?

Chapter 11

SECRET CONFERENCE

Look at these Brother Mansell.

Don Yost handed two packages of yellowed papers to his co-worker. As Don Mansell quickly scanned the sheets, he realised they had found the records of the 1919 Bible Conference.

Brother Yost, this is more than we would have hoped. What a find for our historians and researchers.

It was 1974.

Dr Don Yost (senior archivist at the General Conference) and Don Mansell (book editor at the Review and Herald) were doing an inventory of all the materials in the General Conference archives. The two packages were the size of an A4 (or legal) sheet and about 10 centimetres (4 inches) thick. Information from a number of sites, including: www.sdanet.org and www.swordofelijah.org/english/1919BibleConference.pdf

It was an amazing discovery after fifty five years of silence.

(Spectrum magazine printed two days of the conference - Jul 30 and Aug 1 - in 1979 relating to the Spirit of Prophecy. 'Adventist Today' magazine Vol 2 No.6 recorded a small portion of the transcript in 1994, relating to the Spirit of Prophecy. Today the transcript is available on the Internet. It has been suggested there were 2494, but after taking out duplicates, there are 1308 pages, 1,100 from the Bible Conference, the remainder from the council that followed. The address for the transcript is: www.adventistarchives.org/documents.asp?CatID=19&SortBy=1&ShowDateOrder=True)

The first report of the Conference was placed in the Review and Herald three weeks after it had convened in 1919. Daniells stated that the objective of the conference was "to unite in a definite, practical, spiritual study of the Word of God." Review & Herald. Aug. 21. 1919.

The Adventist Encyclopaedia or Bible Commentary quoted directly from the Review and Herald article, saying, "The Bible and history teachers, the editors, and members of the General Conference Committee, who came together from all parts of North America, rejoiced to find themselves in agreement on all the great fundamental truths of the Bible." Encyclopaedia & Bible Commentary Vol 10.1966 edition.

In 1919, Arthur G. Daniells was still the General Conference president, and in his opening address, he gave details of how the conference came to be.

"When the question first arose, it was in the form of a proposal to meet and study some mooted (difference of opinion) questions, and for a long time that was the uppermost thought in the proposal. But there were difficulties in the way." Transcript. Jul 1 1919.

One difficulty was simply getting the people together, but there was a real fear "that in meeting to study controverted questions we might get into a controversy that would not be helpful to any of us, nor to our people. And we hesitated."

Perhaps another reason for hesitating was because of a rebuke given by the prophet in 1910 to Daniells and Prescott over the publicity they made of the 'daily' at the General Conference session that year.

Sister White wrote, "The subject of 'the daily' should not call forth such movements as have been made. As a result of the way this subject has been handled by men on both sides of the question, controversy has arisen and confusion has resulted. . . . While the present condition of differences of opinion regarding this subject exists, let it not be made prominent. Let all contention cease. At such a time silence is eloquence." Notebook Leaflets, Number 2. p161.

She told Daniells and Prescott they "had no moral right to blaze out... upon the subject of the 'daily' and suppose your influence

would decide the question... Elders Daniells and Prescott both need reconversion.” 20 Manuscript Release p17-22.

The result was that the people were “becoming confused.” Ibid p22.

It was stated by the prophet that if the debate continued, “unbelief and scepticism would be sown in human minds, and strange crops of evil would take the place of truth.” Ibid.

Sister White passed to her rest five years later in 1915.

As time moved on, the idea began to take shape, Daniells said they would not so much magnify doctrinal differences, but “would give first of all careful study to the major questions, the great essentials, the fundamentals...” Transcript Jul 1. 1919.

Church members were afraid the conference would “fix up a creed for them to subscribe to.” Daniells said, “They are much disturbed about it. The secrecy alarms them. We have never had anything like this before, and they are very fearful.” Daniells introductory speech. Ibid.

When the people realised who was invited, they became even more concerned. Some of the organisers even felt the plan should be abandoned -- *Is it right to only invite select men?* But Daniells, Prescott and others were determined to continue, saying the brethren would realise their alarm was unnecessary.

Invitees consisted of members of the General Conference Committee, Bible and history teachers in colleges, junior colleges, seminaries, and a number of leading editors – 65 in all.

Daniells said these men would “exercise care and good judgment” and “be careful of the reports they send out, and would so deport themselves that unseemly discussion and differences would not come in.” They would be a “real help to those who are not here in the days that will come.” Ibid. (Obviously the plan was to make the material available to the church)

The Bible Conference began on July 1, 1919, with a devotional at 8.00am, then two studies.

In the afternoon, the *three* morning meetings were discussed, with Daniells as chairman. Topics covered the Person and Mediatorial work of Christ, the nature and work of the Holy Spirit, the two Covenants, the principles of prophetic interpretation, the Eastern question, the beast power in Revelation, the 1260 days, the United States in prophecy, the seven trumpets, Matthew 24 and the identification of the ten kingdoms.

The subject of the Spirit of Prophecy took place on the last two days, and many questions were raised. Another subject promoting much discussion was 'the Eastern question', or the king of the North and the king of the South. Uriah Smith's interpretation of Daniel 11 was at the time being questioned.

The main subject of the Conference was Christ, His person and ministry, and the Holy Spirit. These were presented by Professor Prescott each morning. He brought out many beautiful lessons, but the subject promoted much discussion that related to the Trinity.

The Trinitarian doctrine had been accepted by a number of brethren, but as there was still a large majority believing the non-trinitarian-pioneer view, caution was necessary. Those who now stood for the Trinity, were still not clear on every aspect. At times they presented the truths believed by the pioneers, which prompted questions. At other times no one made a comment.

We will now look at some of the main comments of the transcript on the above subject from July 2, the second day of the Conference. (All from the transcript; formatting for variation)

W.E. Howell had stated that he would like Prescott to enlarge on the point of 'beginning', and H.C. Lacey asked,

"Can we go one step further and say that the Word was without beginning?"

Prescott replies. "I was going to raise that question. Are we agreed in such a general statement as this, that the Son of God is co-eternal with the Father? Is that the view that is taught in our schools?"

"It is taught in the Bible." (C.M.Sorensen)

Prescott says, "Not to teach that is Arianism. 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-eval (same age) or co-eternal with the Father? That makes Him a finite being.

Any being whose beginning we can fix is a finite being. We have been circulating for years a standard book which says that the Son is not co-eternal with the Father. That is teaching Arianism. Do we want to go on teaching that?..." (The book is Daniel and Revelation by Uriah Smith)

"I would like to ask, Do you think it is necessary, or even helpful in the defining of Christian doctrine, to go outside of the New Testament for terms to use in the definition?..." (C.P.Bollman)

"Please illustrate what you mean." (Prescott)

"The Scripture says Christ is the only begotten of the Father. Why should we go farther than that and say He was co-eternal with the Father? And also say that to teach otherwise is Arianism?" (C.P. Bollman)

"I do not find in the New Testament expressions as 'co-eternal', but I find expressions that are equivalent to that, as I understand it." (Prescott)

"Give an example please." (Bollman)

Prescott replies. "I think the expression 'I am' is the equivalent of eternity. I think these expressions, while they do not use the term co-eternal, are equivalent in their meaning. That brings up the whole question of the relation of the Son to the Father. There is a proper sense, as I view it, according to which the Son is subordinate to the Father, but that subordination is not in the question of attributes or of His existence.

It is simply in the fact of the derived existence, as we read in John 5:26, 'For as the Father hath life...'

Using terms as we use them, the Son is co-eternal with the Father. That does not prevent His being the only-begotten with the Father. That does not prevent His being the only-begotten Son of God. We cannot go back into eternity and say where this eternity commenced, and where that eternity commenced.

There is no contradiction to say that the Son is co-eternal with the Father, and yet the Son is the only-begotten of the Father."

"I think we should hold to the Bible definitions." (Bollman)

"We take the expression co-eternal, and that is better." (Prescott)

Let us pause here to make a comment on Prescott's statement. He said, 'It is simply in the fact of the derived existence...' This is interesting because those who hold the pioneer belief have been labelled as having 'the derived view'. At this point, we do not know what Prescott means. His last comment is interesting, '*We take the expression...*' Who does this refer to? And why does he prefer a non-Biblical term?

Bollman says. "My conception of the matter is this; that at some point in eternity the Father separated a portion of Himself to be the Son. As far as the substance is concerned, He is just as eternal as the Father, but did not have an eternal separate existence. I do not think that approaches any nearer to Arianism than the other does to _____." The last word has been left out of the transcript.

"May I say something on that point?" asked H.C. Lacey. "Every year I am brought in touch with this from two points of view, one in the Greek class, and the other in Bible Doctrines. Twice a year, and sometimes more frequently, I am brought face to face with this. 'In the beginning was the Word....' The eternity of the Word is emphasized in that.

When you come to the study of the deity of Christ, the fundamental attribute is eternity of existence. If Jesus is divine, He must have that essential attribute, and so I have dared to say that Christ is absolutely co-eternal with the Father...

I am just stating what I teach. I want to know whether this is so. *That is what this council is for.* I say that God was always in existence. Just as the light is always with the sun; the light comes from the sun, and so Jesus was always with God, always reigning with him. I have explained the meaning of the son in this way. The son is always younger than his father.

But if we bring into this divine conception the thought of motherhood and fatherhood as humanly understood, I think we are astray. It does not mean that Jesus had a mother; God is a Father..." (Italics added)

Again there is an anomaly. How is the son, when speaking of the Son of God, always younger than his Father in the Trinitarian understanding?

Lacey continues. "I think we ought not to teach that there was a time when He produced another being who is called the son. I want to know. The son is called eternal with the Father, another person living with him, a second intelligence in that Deity..."

Prescott responds. I think it well for us instead of attempting to reason out or to explain these things, to read a scripture. I think that will be a better plan than to spend a long time discussing themes, only that we may get the meaning of the scripture. Brother Lacey said eternity is an attribute of Deity. It is proof of the Deity..."

"Did you state that he derived life from the Father?" (J. Anderson)

"No. Simply in the fact that equality with the Father is derived equality, but equality is the same." (Prescott)

"I thought you said that he derived life from the Father." (Anderson)

"No. I used the Scripture statement – John 5:26... But the two expressions referred to must apply equally both to the Father and the Son." (Prescott) (His meaning is still not clear for the Trinitarian view)

A voice says, *"Simply a difference in what respect – that of rank with the Father?"*

“He himself says that ‘the Father is greater than I’. He also said ‘I and my Father are one’. And both are true.” (Prescott)

“If he is inferior in any respect to the Father how can he be God?” (Anderson)

“I do not think that I used that term ‘inferior’.” (Prescott)

“But others may use that word in some instances – that the Son was inferior to the Father, and my inquiry arises that if it were true that Jesus the Son was inferior in any respect – in age, or in nature, or attributes; if that be so, how could he be God?” (Anderson)

“I would not say that he was. I do not think I used that expression.” (Prescott)

“Is it not that he is only inferior to the Father in rank – he is second in rank with the Father, and in all other respects is equal?...” (Lacey) (The discussion moved to other aspects not relevant to our subject) We will now go to the 6th July, showing the important points.

Lacey speaks. “It was this, as to whether there was ever a time when Jesus was not, or when Michael, as he was called, was not. I think the Bible teaches that we are to answer that question with an emphatic negative. There never was a time when the Son was not. If the word Son puzzles us, let us remember that that is God’s own sacred word to present His love for that second person of the deity. We are to know God as his father and our father.

Jesus is the revelation. He is the Son of God, not meaning that he proceeded forth and developed from him, nor is there another mother – I cannot help being precise. His existence spans eternity, and we cannot settle upon any point in eternity past when he began any more than we can settle upon any point in the future when he will not be... When we raise the question of the origin of the Son, we say there is no origin to Him. He is the second person of the Godhead.”

L.L. Caviness enters the discussion. “I missed a good deal of this discussion, and I do not know whether the idea is that we are to accept the so-called Trinitarian doctrine or not. Personally, I have not been able to accept the so-called Trinitarian doctrine, that is, as generally presented, that there are three persons in the Godhead, and that there always were three.

If that is the doctrine, I cannot quite agree with it, because I was reading in the Bible yesterday, in the book of John, which is the book which reveals to us the deity of Christ, and I read as far as I could everything that Christ said concerning himself.

Without contradicting what he said about himself, I cannot agree with the doctrine. As I understand it, his statement of the deity rests upon his Sonship, and I do not think there is any one thing through the book of John that is more constantly referred to than the Sonship. I cannot believe that the two persons of the Godhead are equal, the Father and the Son – that one is the Father and the other the Son, and that they might be just as well the other way around.

There is another statement he makes. He says that the Father, who has life in himself, gave the Son to have life in himself. When that took place, I do not know, but I believe it took place somewhere away back in eternity. I have to take Christ's word for it, that at some time that was true, that the Father had life in himself, and gave the Son to have life in himself.

There is also that other statement, that he had received glory from his Father. In praying he said it was his wish that the disciples might see the glory which he had with the Father, and which the Father had given him. It was not something he had all through eternity, but the Father had some time given to him the glory of God. He is divine, but he is the divine Son. I cannot explain further than that, but I cannot believe the so-called Trinitarian doctrine of the three persons always existing.”

At this point, Daniells requested there be no transcript, from which we assume he did not want his next words recorded.

Further on Wilcox asks, "We all believe the deity of Christ. It is not a question as to his deity or non-deity. In all this discussion there is no question regarding this." (M.C. Wilcox or F.M. Wilcox)

"Would you consider the denial of the co-eternity of the Father and Son was a denial of that deity?" (Wakeham)

"That is the point I was going to raise. Can we believe in the deity of Christ without believing in the eternity of Christ?" (Prescott)

"I have done it for years." (Bollman)

"That is my very point – that we have used terms in that accommodating sense that are not really in harmony with the Scriptural teaching. We believed a long time that Christ was a created being, in spite of what the Scripture says..." (Prescott)

Pause a moment. This last statement is not true at all. Prescott may have believed Christ was created, along with Uriah Smith for a short time, but no other pioneer believed it.

W.T. Knox speaks. "Now I cannot but believe as Brother Prescott has said, the Deity must be eternal. But the difficulty with me is that I cannot believe that the Deity of the Son as a separate existence is eternal. I believe in the trinity of God, and I believe that Jesus is God... And so Christ, with the Father, and of the Father – and the Father – from eternity; and there came a time – in a way we cannot comprehend nor the time that we cannot comprehend, when by God's mysterious operation the Son sprang from the bosom of his Father and had a separate existence..."

A.O. Tait says, "I feel we are discussing something we ought to wait sixty billion years before we start... Some of these Scriptures do not mean to me what the brethren say they mean to them..."

"Now we shall have to change the order", says Daniells. "We don't want to keep on and go too far in fine distinctions. But I don't

think I can altogether agree with Brother Tait. I have enjoyed these discussions..." (Daniells)

"Is it necessary, in order to have a heart apprehension of a Bible truth, that our minds should have a clear-cut apprehension of it?..." (Lacey)

"Perhaps we have discussed this as long as we need to. We are not going to take a vote on Trinitarianism or Arianism, but we can think. Let us go on with the study." (Daniells)

"Does the discussion, so far as it has gone, involve the question of Trinitarianism or Arianism? I can't see that it does..." (Knox)

Prescott then speaks of Christ as being "subordinate to the Father in this sense, that it was derived from the Father, but not that it was any less. The same glory, the same power that the Father had."

John Isaac asks, *"What are Bible teachers going to do?"* He told them that his students are taught one thing by one minister, and something different by another. "We ought to have something definite... Was Christ ever begotten, or not..." Daniells suggests they should study the word begotten.

In conclusion from 14th July by Prescott.

"The world deals with visible things. We have to learn to deal with invisible things... The advent of the Spirit is the advent of the Spirit of Jesus Christ – his personal presence. The impartation of the Spirit is the impartation of the life of Christ..."

Now the promise of the Spirit – the Comforter – in the 17th verse was that 'he shall be in you', which was to be fulfilled in that day when ye shall know that I am in you. That is the advent of the Comforter, the advent of this person of Christ in the Spirit – divested now of his humanity to dwell without humanity.

To get this clear we must take all the Scriptures: 'That Christ may dwell in your heart', 'Crucified with Christ', 'Christ living in me'. All these Scriptures that speak of the in-dwelling Christ are

fulfilled by the indwelling Comforter. But now he ministers that Comforter, he ministers that life himself..."

This study is again quite amazing, as it is clearly the pioneer view that the Spirit is without the limitations of humanity.

On July 16, Daniells asked for suggestions from the main party of delegates to advise the committee as to what to do with the transcript. (The statements are based on their replies, not in order)

"I think there should be rigid editing if they are printed." (Daniells)

"We can't afford to lose the historical facts on the Eastern question." (Underwood and Wilcox)

"I doubt the wisdom of letting immature minds get hold of this." (Professor Wirth)

"I think they will be used against us no matter what we say." (Underwood)

"But they should only be given to ordained ministers in this conference." (Wilcox)

"We have not reached a place where we would want everything all over the field for general discussion." (Tait)

"It seems to me the only way to help the brethren who are not here is to give them a clear statement of this whole situation in printed form." (Branson)

Thompson said, "I think that the publishing of this matter would sow seeds of division and discord, and as far as I am concerned, I am not in favour of sending out anything." (Stenographer, and field secretary for the General Conference)

Knox agreed, *"I believe it would be better not to print it at all, or else we ought to be willing to face criticism and send it out to them. The latter, I am sure you will all agree with me, would be a wrong step to take..."*

Daniells made a final statement, "As has been stated, these are *not the fundamental things...*

I sometimes think it would be just as well to lock this manuscript up in a vault, and have anyone who wishes to do so come there for personal study and research..." Transcript Jul 16.1919.

They are not fundamentals?

In his Review and Herald report of the Bible Conference, Daniells wrote that those who came to the Conference "rejoiced to find themselves in agreement on all the *great fundamental truths* of the Bible"? Review & Herald. Aug. 21. 1919.

The transcripts reveal a different picture.

Many differences of opinion were discussed, not only on the subject of the Trinity, but other fundamentals as well, including the Spirit of Prophecy.

There is no question the 1919 Bible Conference was controversial, so much so that those in attendance became concerned about making the transcript available to the church.

In 1920, Judson W. Washburn wrote to F.M. Wilcox saying, "You were in that 'secret Bible Council' which I believe was the most unfortunate thing our people ever did, and it seemed to me you were losing the simplicity of your faith." Letter Jul 3. 1921. Website Terry Hill. www.theprophetstillspeaks.co.uk

Washburn also wrote an open letter to A.G. Daniells saying, "Under the authority, and sanction or permission at least of this so called Bible Institute, teachers were undermining the confidence of our sons and daughters in the very fundamentals of our truth, while the parents were not allowed to inquire into the sacred secrets of this private council. . . . One of our most faithful workers said the holding of this Bible Institute was the most terrible thing that had ever happened in the history of this denomination." J. S. Washburn. An Open Letter to Elder A. G. Daniells and an Appeal to the General Conference. 1922. pp. 28-29. www.theprophetstillspeaks.co.uk

Another letter written by Washburn to Claude Holmes was published as a 36-page tract called "The Startling Omega and its

True Genealogy'. It was distributed at the General Conference of 1922.

In this tract he mentions that the college in Washington had become "a nest of Higher Criticism". He blamed Daniells and Prescott for all the theological problems. Omega Tract. Washburn. p1.6. (A letter by Claude Holmes was also distributed at the session. 'Open Letter'. Holmes to Daniels. May 1. 1922)

Today, the climate is very different than it was 90 years ago. It is a 'free-for-all', with private magazines and books circulated around the globe, especially through the internet. Everything is brought before *any eye* at the touch of a finger.

Where are we to stand?

How can we know the truth?

"To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." Isaiah 8:20.

Chapter 12

PLANNED CHANGE

You will remember Daniells' relief when he received Ellen White's letter at the 1903 Autumn Council warning him against the sentiments in 'Living Temple'. As General Conference president, he praised God that the church had been saved from disaster.

Not long after being elected president in 1901, Daniells called Dr John Edwin Froom to be secretary of the newly formed Medical Department of the General Conference. Movement of Destiny p396.

At the time of their move to Washington D.C., Leroy Froom was in his early teens. As a neighbour, Daniells built a good rapport with young Leroy.

After being relieved of his 20-year presidency in 1922, Daniells began to work through Ministerial Institutes, and in 1923, 1924, and 1925, moved across the country taking workers' meetings.

His emphasis was on true godliness and Righteousness by Faith in Christ in "all the fullness of the Godhead". Many were greatly moved by the messages. Movement of Destiny p395.

As you will remember, the early Adventist Church believed Christ to be divine even though He was begotten at some point in eternity. His Father could say of Him, "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever..." Psalm 45:6. Hebrews 1:8. This did not make the Son co-eternal, but it showed Him to have the same divine attributes and power as His Father.

Gradually the meaning of the word 'divine' changed, until it meant ***not fully divine***. We do not know how it changed, but Trinitarians

were using the term 'deity', instead of 'divine'. (Once divine and deity meant the same)

When Froom used the words, "*all the fullness of the Godhead*", he was making two statements -- * an Arian or Semi-Arian belief is not true Christianity, and * the Trinity has a Saviour with full deity.

During the years of 1923-1925, Daniells had a profound influence on thirty three-year-old Leroy Froom, who said of his ministry, "The unfolding theme in Daniells' quest was Righteousness by Faith, centred in and radiating out from Christ, in all the 'fullness' of His transcendent Deity." Movement of Destiny p399.

At the Nashville Institute, Froom listened to the older man with great interest, coming to the realisation personally that he had trusted in a *message* rather than a *Person*.

Seeing the young man deeply moved, Daniells invited him to be his junior associate at the General Conference. He was anxious to have literature produced that could be spread abroad, and Leroy would be the one to do it.

In 1926, Froom began personal studies on the Holy Spirit, and Daniells asked him to give a presentation at the Milwaukee General Conference session. This led to an invitation to present a series of studies on the same theme at the North American Union Ministerial Institutes of 1928.

In preparing for these meetings, Froom consulted the Spirit of Prophecy and pioneers writings.

He was rather shocked, he said. "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. There were no previous pathfinding books on the question in our literature." Ibid p322.

Determined to have sufficient materials for the Institute meetings, he turned to non-Adventist sources, saying, "I was compelled to search out a score of valuable books written by men outside our faith...

... for initial clues and suggestions, and to open up beckoning vistas to intensive personal study. Having these, I went on from there." Ibid.

He listed many of the men from whom he drew information for his studies, saying he could have easily listed fifty; Dwight L. Moody, founder of Moody Bible College and Joseph A. Seiss, a Lutheran, were just two of them.

Why was there nothing in our literature?

Simply because the Holy Spirit believed by the pioneers was different to that which Froom believed.

After the Institute meetings he said, "You cannot imagine how I was pummeled by some of the old timers because I pressed on the personality of the Holy Spirit as the third person of the Godhead." Letter from Leroy Froom to Dr Otto H. Christenson. Oct 27. 1960. (Ellen White also used the term 'third person of the Godhead', but with very different connotations)

Following on from the Institute, Froom put his studies in a book called 'The Coming of the Comforter', printed that same year. He said this was "an urgent request of hundreds of ministers" who had heard him at the meetings. Coming of the Comforter p9.

In the book he emphasised very strongly the personality of the Holy Spirit as a separate being from the Father and Son. It was clearly a Trinitarian understanding.

He wrote, "We are under the direct, personal guidance of the third person of the Godhead, as truly as the disciples were under the direct leadership of the second person of the Godhead." The Coming of the Comforter. p23.

The book contains many quotations from the Spirit of Prophecy, but the interpretation placed upon them was totally different from the teaching of the pioneer church.

Knowing others did not believe the Holy Spirit as he did, Froom wrote, "No, the Holy Spirit is not a thin, shadowy effluence

emanating from the Father. He is not an impersonal something to be vaguely recognized, just an invisible principle of life.

The Holy Spirit has in the minds of multitudes been separated from personality, made intangible, unreal, hidden in mists and shrouded with unreality.

But the greatest unseen reality in the world today is the Holy Spirit. He is a holy personality... to supply His (Jesus) place. No one but a person could take the place of that wondrous Person. No mere influence would ever suffice." Ibid p37.

The words "shadowy effluence", an "impersonal something", "hidden in mists shrouded with unreality" are grossly exaggerated. There is no question the nature of the Spirit is a mystery, but these descriptions are designed to influence the reader against what was gradually becoming 'the old view' of the Spirit of God.

Two years after 'The Coming of the Comforter' was published, Froom had a proposition put to him. "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, 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 p17.

Now forty years of age, Froom saw the enormity of the project. He was awed by its magnitude and far-reaching character.

He suggested that someone else should do it, but Daniells 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." Ibid.

Daniells told Froom he "was a connecting link between past leaders and the present. But, he said, it is to be later – not yet, not yet." Ibid. Both men understood the serious problems involved in printing a book on this subject, for it would contain sentiments not acceptable to those who had been close to the early beginnings of the church.

Daniells “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.

Dear Reader -- Are you listening to these words?

You cannot afford to skip over them.

The book was not to be printed until our early brothers and sisters had either passed to their rest, or drifted away from doctrines given to the pioneers.

Something was very wrong!

Froom accepted the assignment, and although he worked on many other very big projects over the years, this was to be his most important work.

Then came 1931, which according to Froom “stands out as a really momentous yet little-heralded transition point, essential to the destined final advance, when Christ in all His ‘fullness’... is to forge to the front in the great consummation phase of the Movement.” Movement of Destiny p409.

What happened that was so important?

In 1872, a “synopsis of our faith” had been printed in the denominational Yearbook. It was revised and expanded for the 1889 Yearbook, to be inserted again in 1905, where it continued until 1914. In 1931, church leaders in Africa requested a ‘statement’ that would “assist in a better understanding of our work.” 27 Fundamentals Introduction.

In answer to the request, a suitable Statement of Faith would be placed in the 1931 annual Yearbook.

“It was a delicate assignment – after 87 years of differing views on the intrinsic nature of Christ, the Holy Spirit, and the Trinity.... The divergent views as to whether Christ was eternal, or had a beginning.

And whether His life was ‘original, unborrowed, underived’ -- or derived, conferred, and dependent.” Movement of Destiny p411.

There had been many articles and books printed during the 1860s and 1870s on the pioneer, non-trinitarian view, of which Froom said had denied the eternal pre-existence and complete Deity of Christ, making the Holy Spirit merely an impersonal power or influence.

“Hence no Trinity”, said Froom. Ibid p412.

He also said that by 1931, periodicals, tracts and books had been published “on the ‘Three Persons’ of the Godhead, the eternal pre-existence and complete Deity of Christ, and the personality of the Holy Spirit”. Ibid p418.

There is no record of a *vast* amount of such material, unless it was that written by Froom himself under Daniells’ authority.

During these early years, a few articles using the word Trinity were printed in the ‘Review’ and ‘Signs’, but the messages were non-Trinitarian. In 1889, Samuel Spear, a Presbyterian minister had written an article entitled ‘The Subordination of Christ’, printed in a non-Adventist magazine ‘The New York Independent’. Two years later it was printed by our church leaders in two issues of the ‘Signs of the Times’. The following year it was published as a tract for the Bible Students’ Library with its name changed to ‘The Bible Doctrine of the Trinity’, and fourteen words omitted. The tract uses terms not generally used by Adventists, but it is generally non-Trinitarian in content. [http:// theprophetstillspeaks.co.uk](http://theprophetstillspeaks.co.uk)

Subtle changes were taking place.

Froom stated that by this time, “most conspicuous champions of the ‘derived’ view of Christ had gone to their rest”, and it was felt there would be little opposition. Movement of Destiny p411.418.

Russel Holt wrote later, “This period saw the death of most of those pioneers who had championed and held the anti-trinitarian position. Their places were being taken by men who were

changing their thinking, or had never opposed the doctrine. The trinity began to be published, until by 1931 it had triumphed and become the standard denominational position. Isolated stalwarts remained who refused to yield, but the outcome had been decided.” The doctrine of the Trinity in the Seventh-day Adventist denominational: Its rejection and acceptance”. 1969. Russell Holt.

A committee was selected in 1931 to prepare a Statement of Beliefs for the Yearbook. Those chosen were, M.E. Kern, F.M. Wilcox, E.R. Palmer and C.H. Watson. Only Wilcox, Editor of the Review and Herald, was willing to formulate a statement.

Point No. 2 read: “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.” Church Manual. 1963 edition. p29.

Wilcox placed the statement in the hands of F.D. Nichol to read. He expressed appreciation and approval of its scope and balance, saying it was “doubtless framed that way in the hope that it might be acceptable to those who had held divergent views, especially over the Godhead.” Movement of Destiny p414.

He was correct.

Wilcox suggested that the feeling of the small committee was that “no formal or official approval should be sought for the unofficial statement.” Ibid p419.

Thus the Statement of Beliefs was handed to Edson Rogers who was responsible for publishing the Yearbook. It was added in 1931, not by approval of the General Conference, but “by common consent”, and was “accepted without challenge.” Ibid p414.

According to Froom, a unified statement had become an actuality, and this was the “first public presentation of a united...faith.” Ibid p414.

He also said, “After 85 years of conflicting viewpoints over the Deity of Christ, the Trinity, and the Personality of the Holy Spirit, a unified position that honoured Bible truth – and was in accord with the Spirit of Prophecy – came to be accepted by both sides.” Movement of Destiny p409. (It was Froom’s view that it was in accord with the Spirit of Prophecy. There were still those who would have disputed it, not to mention the prophet if she had been alive)

In 1933, the Statement of Beliefs appeared in the official Church Manual, also without formal adoption.

It continued to appear in both the Yearbook and the Church Manual unchallenged, although William White was concerned.

He wrote, “The statements 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.” Letter Willie White. April 30. 1935.

The 1936 Sabbath School lesson for the 4th quarter was an interesting mixture of Trinitarian language and non-Trinitarian belief, showing the struggle that was going on in the minds of many during this period. <http://theprophetstillspeaks.co.uk/SBDH.htm> Section 42.

That same year, Benjamin Wilkinson, who wrote his book ‘Truth Triumphant’, answered a letter from Dr. T.S. Teters saying, “Replying to your letter of October 13 regarding the doctrine of the Trinity. I will say that Seventh Day Adventists do not, and never have accepted the dark, mysterious, Catholic doctrine of the Trinity.” <http://omega77.tripod.com/bivensholyspirit.htm>

Also in 1936, Prescott preached a sermon at the Takoma Park Church, where he said that Scripture “clearly implied the doctrine of the Trinity... there are three persons in the Godhead, but they are so mysteriously and indissolubly related to each other, that

the presence of one is equivalent to the presence of the other.”

Book: W.W. Prescott. p324.

The sermon was published as a pamphlet, bringing forth a very strong response by Judson S Washburn. He wrote a letter to the General Conference president, J.L. McElhany in protest. This letter also became a pamphlet. (One pastor immediately had 39 copies printed to distribute among his fellow pastors)

Washburn wrote, “The doctrine of the Trinity is a cruel heathen monstrosity, removing Jesus from his true position of Divine Savior and Mediator... It is wholly foreign to all the Bible and teachings of the Spirit of Prophecy...

This monstrous doctrine transplanted from heathenism into the Roman Papal Church is seeking to intrude its evil presence into the teachings of the Third Angel's Message...

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?” Judson S. Washburn. The Trinity. Letter to General Conference president in 1940.

No doubt his letter brought a reaction, but nothing changed the onward march of the Trinity doctrine.

In 1941, the General Conference Committee voted the Statement of Beliefs be made available in leaflet form and officially released as our accepted Statement of Faith. The committee also approved a uniform ‘Baptismal Covenant’ or ‘Vow’ in certificate form, based on the now generally accepted ‘Fundamental Beliefs’ declaration of 1931. General Conference session. 1941. San Francisco.

Froom said this baptismal certificate “completed and implemented the ‘Fundamental Beliefs’ profession of faith, making their

declarations obligatory upon all candidates for admission to the church through baptism. Before long this would, of course, automatically embrace all members aside from the old-timers.” Movement of Destiny p415.

Another brother speaking out during these years was Charles Longacre. In 1947, he wrote a paper called ‘The Deity of Christ’, submitting it to the Bible Research Fellowship for discussion.

He wrote, “The Son of God was not created like other creatures are brought into existence. He is not a created, but a begotten Being, enjoying all the attributes of His Father... God ‘only hath immortality.’ He alone is the only self-existent God. But He gave His Son when He was begotten the same life he had in Himself...

If there is one truth that the Bible teaches, it is that there is only one absolute God and none beside Him who is an absolute God. In the 15th chapter of 1 Corinthians, Paul teaches this doctrine, so there can be no doubt as to Christ's subordination and submission to the Father. 1 Corinthians 15:24-28 quoted...

Here Paul clearly teaches that God is not subject to Christ, but that Christ is subject to the Father, who gave all authority to Him. Whatever Christ is, whatever authority He has, whatever attributes He possesses, all have been imparted and bestowed upon Him by the Father, that the Father may be all in all and above all.” The Deity of Christ. p4.5. Charles Longacre. (34 page booklet)

Ray Cottrell said that “when C.S.Longacre died, its (Arianism’s) primary exponent died also.” Robert Olson. Interview with Merlin Burt. Loma Linda University. Oct 4. 1996.

In 1950, the General Conference Session voted that no change could be made to the ‘Fundamental Beliefs’ statement, except by action of the General Conference in session. Autumn Council Actions 1948 p19 to be presented at the General Conference session, 1950. Gen. Conf. Bulletin 1950. p230.

Once the Statement of Faith and Baptismal Certificate were printed,

Froom said, "We were now ready... to go to all the world with the Everlasting Gospel message in a clearer and more compelling way... The culminating events of the decade 1931 and 1941 consequently marked the end of an old epoch, and the beginning of a new day in unification and auspicious witness for us as a Movement. It was definitely another major turning point in denominational history." Movement of Destiny p421.422.

God moves in mysterious ways.

The book Leroy Froom was asked to write at the request of Arthur G. Daniells is the very book from which we learn the details of the change in our denomination's teachings on the doctrine of God. Little did he realise that God would use his own material to trace the change from truth to error.

Did Daniells and Froom deliberately foist something they knew to be evil upon the church?

Probably not.

Both men had come to believe in the Trinity, and this affected everything they did. Froom believed he had eradicated from the church the Arian heresy, which he did not believe was Christian.

But how did God see it?

When Dr Kellogg was instructing his co-workers to remove the pillars that supported the platform upon which our church stood, Ellen White was asked in vision -- "Where are the watchmen that ought to be standing on the walls of Zion? Are they asleep?..." 1 Selected Messages p204.

The counsel given in the days of Kellogg applies to Froom as well.

"What influence is it that would lead men at this stage of our history to work in an underhand, powerful way to tear down the foundation of our faith – the foundation that was laid at the beginning of our work by prayerful study of the Word and by revelation? Upon this foundation we have been building for the past fifty years.

Do you wonder that when I see the beginning of a work that would remove some of the pillars of our faith, I have something to say?" 1 Selected Messages p207.208.

The work of the two men parallel each other in many ways.

Leroy Froom continued the work of Dr Kellogg in loosening the pillars upholding the platform of our faith. In fact, his plan was to completely remove the central pillar, the capstone of the structure.

If he was successful, the foundation would be resting upon sand, and in time "storm and tempest would sweep away the structure." 1 Selected Messages p205.

Chapter 13

CHANGES CONTINUE

Many years were to pass before Froom was able to begin 'Movement of Destiny'. He became Emeritus Professor of Historical Theology at Andrews University, taking classes one quarter of each year. Movement of Destiny p19.

He wrote his monumental works 'Prophetic Faith of our Fathers' and 'The Conditionalist Faith of our Fathers', but was all the while researching and planning the book he had been asked to write.

Froom said he "toiled away" in his "never-ending search", saying little for many years; until he had "something vital to report." Ibid p22.23.

Unexpected calls came from workers' institutes, local and union ministerial retreats, theological workshops, and presentations to special groups, and he was happy to oblige. Ibid p19.

Invitations also came from other denominations, such as Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist, Reformed, Congregationalist, Unitarian, as well as an organisation of converted Roman Catholic priests. He took meetings for them all.

Other invitations came from universities, such as Marburg in Germany, and a number of universities in the United States. Extended exchanges were made between the Catholic priest Petrus Nober of the Pontifical Biblical Institute of Rome, who arranged for Froom's articles to be translated and printed in 'Revista Biblica'. Ibid 466.467.

Another project was to correct various Protestant encyclopaedias and religious reference works regarding Seventh-day Adventists.

He said it was “most gratifying” to see the readiness with which their critics were willing to correct “our basic position”. Much went on behind the scenes, quietly accomplishing their objectives. Ibid p468.

Once the Statement of Beliefs was in the Yearbook and Church Manual, 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.” Movement of Destiny p422. It was now our books, encyclopaedias and commentaries that needed correcting.

The most conspicuous book that needed changing was ‘Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation’ by Uriah Smith. He had passed to his rest in 1903, and could not object.

However, such an undertaking meant treading on delicate ground, as there were still those who were, according to Froom, Semi-Arian. “It was a highly sensitive matter”, even to edit the book at all, let alone remove what Froom regarded as Arianism. Ibid p424.

In 1944, the revision of this book was undertaken, the main task being to eliminate every portion that said Christ was begotten of the Father. Sentence construction was improved, but no prophetic interpretations were altered. (This is disputed by some today)

For example, the following was omitted from page 400 of the original book. “Christ is the agent through whom God created all things, but the Son came into existence in a different manner, as he is called ‘the only begotten’ of the Father.”

Two large portions have been omitted from page 429 and 430, part of which is shown below. * that the Lamb sits on the throne with the Father.

“Commentators, with great unanimity, have seized upon this * as proof that Christ must be coeval (same age) with the Father; for otherwise, say they, there would be worship paid to the creature which belongs only to the Creator.

But this does not seem to be a necessary conclusion. 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...

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." p430. 1918 edition.

The reaction came as Froom expected, and he said it was "rather vehement". However, the council proceeded to approve the report of the committee, and the 'Arian' statements were eliminated.

"Thus the volume was brought into theological harmony with our 'Fundamental Beliefs' statement in the Yearbook and Church Manual, the Baptismal Covenant and Vow." p424.425. (Changes were also made to Spirit of Prophecy books, such as lower case changed to capital letters for Third Person)

There were more to come – later.

In 1946, small portions of Ellen White articles were placed in a compilation called 'Evangelism'. This would be a very important volume in the process of change. Those on the committee were A.L. White, W.H. Branson, R.A. Anderson, Miss Louise Kleuser and J.L. Shuler.

Under the heading 'Misrepresentations of the Godhead', critical portions of the prophet's articles were placed together, many not even complete sentences. When reading the statements under such a heading, a subtle message is given.

The book 'Evangelism' achieved its purpose, and Froom was elated. Years later, he wrote to Anderson saying, "You know what it did with men in the Columbia Union... 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.

In fact, it has worked so well, that even today ‘Evangelism’ is one of the first books used in a Trinitarian discussion. And it is true, to deny the portrayed message of the chapter *appears* to be a denial of the Spirit of Prophecy. Herein lies the power of sub-headings connected with incomplete sentences and small portions of paragraphs.

In 1952, a book was copyrighted called ‘Principles of Life’, and printed in 1956. It has been used by school children as their Bible Doctrines study book. One paragraph says, “While God the Father, God the Son, and the Holy Spirit are three separate and distinct beings, yet they are ‘one in nature, in character, in purpose’. (PP34:1), working in such close relationship as to be one.” Principles of Life p28. The wording ‘beings’ would probably be unacceptable to Trinitarians today.

Time has now moved on to 1955, and Walter R. Martin, an Evangelical, working in harmony with Donald G. Barnhouse, Editor of ‘Eternity’ magazine, has approached church leaders to meet and discuss the beliefs of Seventh-day Adventists. He was working on a book about cults and wanted to know what we believed. Martin was acquainted with T. Edgar Unruh through correspondence, and he knew of Froom through his volumes on history.

The meeting was arranged between R. Allan Anderson, Walter E. Read, and LeRoy E. Froom, with the full approval of the General Conference president Reuben R. Figuhr. T. Edgar Unruh acted as chairman.

Were Adventists a cult? That was the question of the Evangelicals.

Martin had furnished the group with a long list of questions, and it was Leroy Froom’s task to write out the answers. He had stayed up until 2.00am, and in the morning was able to hand over twenty pages of notes.

It was a momentous day.

After the discussion was over, Martin announced that he had been mistaken about several of our teachings, and had come to the conclusion that Adventists were not a cult.

Extending the hand of fellowship he said, *No, you are definitely not a cult. Seventh-day Adventists can be accepted as fellow Evangelicals by the mainline Protestant churches of America!*

He then asked that our denominational leaders be sent a series of questions on our major beliefs, the answers to be acceptable to Ecumenicals. These would be placed in articles for 'Eternity' magazine. He also asked the denomination to write a book for all church members on the beliefs given in the meetings, and have it sent to Protestant public libraries throughout the world. Martin himself would publish his book exonerating Seventh-day Adventists.

There is no doubt Martin was seeking to cement the answers given by our leaders, as his reputation, and that of the Evangelical leaders, were at stake.

In September 1956, an article appeared in 'Eternity' that Barnhouse called "a bombshell article." Few would be in a position to read it, but word spread by word of mouth.

Two months later, an article appeared in 'Ministry' magazine under the title 'Changing Attitudes of Adventism'. An article by Froom accompanied the heading entitled, 'The Atonement the Heart of our Message'. www.sdadefend.com

The meetings with Martin covered important doctrinal areas, such as the investigative judgment, the nature of Christ, the atonement, sinless perfection.

Some years later R. Allan Anderson said he had been asked before the meetings began - "*What do you folks believe about the Trinity?*" Adventist Review Sep 8. 1983 p3.

This aspect is not often highlighted. One can study the 'Eternity' magazine articles and not realise this subject was even part of the discussions.

Anderson's comments continued, "The answers to their earnest questions lengthened into days of prayerful discussions. Our answer concerning the Godhead and the Trinity was crucial, for in some of the books they had read Adventists were classed as Arians." Adventist Review. September 8. 1983 p3.

At Campus Hill Church in 1989, Loma Linda, Walter Martin said the following words, "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.'

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." Walter Martin - taped conference at Campus Hill Church in Loma Linda. January 1989.

He said the committee was in "mortal shock", and Martin went on to say that Ellen White had denied the eternal deity of Christ in the beginning, relegating Him to the place of a second deity, but that she later changed her belief and taught the Trinity, being influenced by Uriah Smith.

The suggestion that Uriah Smith influenced the prophet is ridiculous. Smith wrote a book called 'Looking unto Jesus' the same year Ellen White printed 'Desire of Ages', and it was clearly non-trinitarian. Both were advertised in the same church papers.

It took some days for the committee to peruse the material. When they met again, it was stated, "Well, a great deal of these things...

are there, and we agree with you, and we don't agree with the statements. They do not reflect orthodox Adventist theology, and we reject it." Ibid.

Donald Barnhouse wrote in his 'Eternity' magazine, "Immediately it was perceived that the Adventists were strenuously denying certain doctrinal positions which had been previously attributed to them.... 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. September, 1956.

Obviously historian George Knight and William Johnson were correct in saying our doctrines have been changed, however, the change began much earlier than the Martin and Barnhouse episode, as has been shown in this book.

Concluding these meetings a book was published entitled, 'Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions of Doctrine', "prepared by a representative group of Seventh-day Adventist Leaders, Bible Teachers, and Editors." Questions on Doctrine. Front page 1957.

Section 4 on the 'Deity and Eternal Pre-existence of Christ' states, "It is frequently charged that Seventh-day Adventists deny the actual deity and eternal pre-existence of Christ, the Eternal Word." The question is then asked, "Do you believe in the Trinity?" Questions on Doctrine p35.

The answer is very subtle.

"Our belief in the deity and eternal pre-existence of Christ, the second person of the Godhead, is on record in our 'Fundamental Beliefs of Seventh-day Adventists', appearing annually in our official Yearbook and in our authoritative Church Manual... Moreover, those who are baptized into the Adventist Church subscribe to the 'Summary of Doctrinal Beliefs' appearing on our standard Baptismal Certificate..." Ibid p35.

The way had been prepared many years earlier.

After the printing of this book, Donald Barnhouse stated, "The Adventists fortunately deny the logical conclusions to which their doctrines must lead them; i.e. a negation of the full validity of the atonement of Christ." www.sdadefend.com

It was suggested that the denomination go on public record denying certain erroneous statements.

Our response was, "No... those early statements were the declarations of individuals or groups, not of the Church as a whole, and had never committed the denomination. Our later formal declarations were clear, Biblical, sound and 'orthodox'." Movement of Destiny p483.

But the Evangelicals insisted.

Finally, a statement was prepared, which read: "The belief of Seventh-day Adventists on these great truths 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." Questions on Doctrine. Question No.3. p31.32. Quoted in Movement of Destiny. p484.

'Questions on Doctrine' further states, "But with the passage of years the earlier diversity of views 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." Ibid p30.31.

It had been agreed upon that 'Questions on Doctrine' would be placed in Martin's bookshop, as well as his book 'The Truth about Seventh-day Adventists', and that both books would be available

through the Adventist Book Center. According to Ralph Weitz, a non-Adventist who has studied Adventists for many years, the ABC did not carry Martin's book. www.lifeassuranceministries.com

Leroy Froom said he was indebted to the Spirit of Prophecy and Ellen White's "contribution" to 'Questions on Doctrine'. He wrote, "We here unfold the Ellen White coverage on the Deity of Christ and its involvements. It is sublime in scope. Here is penetration, comprehensiveness, balance, dependability. No other writer in our ranks has ever approached it in coverage. Our greatest theologians have not come anywhere near to matching its impressive outline or content..."

We have nothing to be ashamed of – and everything to be proud of – in Ellen White's contribution to the full truth of the Deity of Christ in this day of widespread challenge and repudiation of His eternal pre-existence and complete Deity, His atoning death, literal resurrection, actual ascension, and imminent personal return. Here is an anchor, a guideline, a blueprint to have and to use. Here is set forth the solid faith of Seventh-day Adventists." Movement of Destiny p494.5.

We wonder what Ellen White would have said about her 'contribution' to 'Questions on Doctrine', the most controversial book in our recent history.

Sometime after the Evangelical visitors had met with our four church leaders in 1955 and 1956, two* men made a decision to commit a criminal act. Were it not for the quick-thinking of a brother, the outcome would have been very different. We do not know the identity of these two men, but their evil deed is written in the books of heaven. *assumed to be two or three men.

Claude Holmes was employed by the Conference as a lino type operator. He was a very strong believer in the Spirit of Prophecy, believing it to be equal with the Bible. In a letter to Willie White in 1926, he wrote, "I love your mother's writings. They are all scripture to me." Letter to W.C. White. Oct 31. 1926. 'Ministry' magazine. Dec 2000.

Both Holmes and Washburn believed the 1919 Bible Conference discussions on the prophetic gift discredited the prophet, and both believed they needed to defend the integrity of the Spirit of Prophecy. Ibid. (Holmes had a brilliant memory and was often called upon for Spirit of Prophecy references. In 1914, he borrowed and copied 300 pages of unpublished testimonies. Later his name came into disrepute for issuing a protest against two teachers at Washington Missionary College for their teachings and 'light esteem' of prophet's writings. He encouraged two others to do the same. All three were disfellowshipped. www.adventistarchives.org/docs/AST/Sligo_Series.pdf)

With this background, we can understand the concern of Holmes when he learned of the plan to burn a large number of Ellen White's letters. Thankfully, one of his duties was to tend the incinerator.

When the time came, he stoked the fire to a hot blaze without much fuel. He let the coals burn down, but as he stoked them, they gave out a hot blaze. The men thought the fire was hot enough to throw in the Spirit of Prophecy letters and small books.

And they did – hundreds of precious pages.

Holmes closed the door of the furnace, closed the damper, then shut off the air. The men stayed a while, and seeing the flames around the papers, were satisfied and they left.

The materials smouldered, but in a short time the fire was smothered out. It was now possible to rescue most of the precious materials.

Claude Holmes kept the singed letters and books until he retired, knowing he would lose his sustentation if it became known what he had done. When he retired, he gave them all to a Dr. Hayes.

When the doctor died, his estate was deeded to the Conference, except for his library and personal belongings, which were to be auctioned. Many had heard about the fire and were at the auction.

The letters and books sold for \$10, \$25, and \$50. Many still had burn marks on them.

(When this experience was told many years ago by Willard Santee, he had a number of the pamphlets in his possession. He also had a letter from the bequeathed estate library that tells the story. [The letter may have been written by Claude Holmes, although his name is not on it] The letter is dated 1957.

It was printed in a magazine entitled 'Liberator', after which a brother from Colorado contacted Pastor Santee to confirm the event. This brother had been told by Elder J.S. Washburn what had taken place, as well as the name of the faithful custodian who salvaged the pamphlets. Later the brother met Claude Holmes and heard the story firsthand) Audio tape 'Circle of Apostasy' by Willard Santee.

Today the letters are known as Special Testimonies Series A and B, written from 1890 to 1913. All are short, but contain much counsel to physicians, educators and ministers, self-supporting schools and the health work.

Praise God for the Spirit of Prophecy writings. They are so precious, and such a blessing to us.

“Many theologians really think that the Atonement, in respect to its dignity and efficacy, rests upon the doctrine of a trinity. But we fail to see any connection between the two.

To the contrary, the advocates of that doctrine really fall into the difficulty which they seem anxious to avoid.

Their difficulty consists in this: They take the denial of a trinity to be equivalent to a denial of the divinity of Christ. Were that the case, we should cling to the doctrine of a trinity as tenaciously as any can; but it is not the case.

They who have read our remarks on the death of the Son of God know that we firmly believe in the divinity of Christ; but we cannot accept the idea of a trinity, as it is held by Trinitarians, without giving up our claim on the dignity of the sacrifice made for our redemption.”

The Atonement in the Light of Nature
and Revelation p164.165.
J.H. Waggoner. 1884.

Chapter 14

Dangerous Connections


Among the rescued fire-singed letters was the vision of Dr Kellogg addressing his colleagues, and the prophet's amazement at how enthusiastically his hearers accepted the doctor's theories.

Her letter concluded, "Let the world go into spiritualism, into theosophy, into pantheism, if they choose. We are to have nothing to do with this deceptive branch of Satan's work." Series B No.6. p211. 1904.

What of Kellogg's theories -- were they pantheistic?

Sister White used the words "akin to pantheism", and according to the 1828 dictionary, pantheism is "the doctrine that the universe is God... or the supreme God." In this sense, Kellogg did not believe in strict pantheism, because he still believed, for a time, that the Father and Son were in heaven. The word used today for Kellogg's understanding is panentheism, 'God in all', rather than 'God is all'.

However, Sister White said of Kellogg's theories, "If God is an essence pervading all nature, then He dwells in all men; and in order to attain holiness, man has only to develop the power within him." Ministry of Healing p428.

What about the mega?

In 1985, Loma Linda University hosted meetings by Louis Tice entitled, 'New Age Thinking for Achieving your Potential'. Those attending were informed that "alignment with the 'right spirit' can make people 'constructive wizards' who are helpful to others... You know I have the power invested in me, by me. You know I have it. I've been on TV. You know they wouldn't have me here if I didn't have this power.

I declare you associate wizards. Go act Like it.” ‘The Omega Identified at Loma Linda’ by Deone Hanson. <http://www.temcat.com/013-Spiritualism/Omega%20at%20LLU.pdf>

Is this the “omega” of deadly heresies?

Sister White said in 1904, “‘Living Temple’ contains the alpha of these theories. I knew that the omega would follow in a little while.” 1 Selected Messages p203. (1904+1985 = 80-81 years)

We must ask ourselves – *Is eighty years ‘a little while’?*

You would agree, it is too long to be relevant.

In the alpha, Kellogg had God in the tree, the flower, and in man himself. His belief was certainly **not** the teaching of the church; in fact, the prophet said he had “virtually destroyed the Lord God”. Letter 300. 1903. His religion also became man-centred. He ended up believing the new birth was simply a change of attitude toward God. J.N. Anderson. 1919 Bible Conference. July 13. As far back as 1899, it was said publicly that “every breath (of man) draws in a direct breathing of God into his nostrils.” Gen. Conf. Daily Bulletin. Feb 23. 1899. Eventually Kellogg refused to be governed by any man, “...(not) by Sister White, nor the General Conference...” Quoted in A.G. Daniells by John J Robertson p95. (In relation to the sanitarium in Sth Africa)

By 1907, John Harvey Kellogg had moved so far from truth that he was disfellowshipped.

As we view our history, we need to ask ourselves if pantheism (or panentheism) developed ‘in a little while’ as was prophesied.

The answer is No.

It may have arisen on occasion, but we have no record of an ever-growing pantheistic teaching in our church. However, the growth and establishment of the Trinity doctrine can be followed throughout our denominational history.

When Kellogg moved away from the pioneer teaching of God and His Son, the devil was able to put thoughts into his mind about God dwelling *in* nature.

Warnings were given by the prophet that the seeds of the alpha were being sown in men's hearts and that in a short while, they would sprout and become the poisonous plant of the **Ω**mega.

Sad to say, there is evidence that the noxious omega plant is at this moment maturing in the Seventh-day Adventist Church. Once more it is a combination of the two beliefs – the Trinity and pantheism, or more accurately for us today, panentheism. The Trinity itself has well and truly matured, but its union with pantheistic-type teachings is being formed through 'spiritual formation'.

Dr Jon Dybdahl, once president of Walla Walla College, wrote, "Spiritual formation is a topic being raised by many pastors and church leaders in a growing number of Christian denominations. It's no longer enough to just know doctrine and facts – in today's hectic society people are searching for something deeper and more meaningful, something that makes sense in their whirlwind lives. Spiritual formation is not a new idea or concept, and a lot of Protestants are in the same boat – we are rediscovering it." Adventist News Network.

According to teachers of spiritual formation, a person is told to read a verse and think about it. Gradually "a more simplified and powerful way is (shown) to keep repeating a single word in that verse and eventually just sit there in a blank-minded silence, which is called 'contemplation'... this is the deeper stage into which everyone seriously devoted to mental prayer should arrive. This is said to be true prayer and meditation." The Truth about Spiritual Formation. Vance Ferrell. p55.

This procedure is no different to Yoga and the repeating of a mantra to induce transcendental meditation. The Christian mantra may be a Bible verse, phrase or word. It may be a Bible scene, called visualisation in NLP, a modern form of hypnotism. (Neuro Linguistic Programming)

When the 'alpha state' is induced, demons can implant ideas into the mind. These thoughts will be deceptive, yet they may be very appealing.

A former Hindu (now Adventist), said the sensation is euphoric, like being high on a drug. The Omega Rebellion. Rick Howard.

Spiritual formation originated with the Buddhists and Hindus, and was modernized by the Roman Catholic Jesuit priest, Ignatius Loyola, as part of his Spiritual Exercises. It is now being taught in many Adventist facilities. The Truth about Spiritual Formation. Vance Ferrell p149-260.

“Centering Prayer is a method of silent prayer that prepares us to receive the gift of contemplative prayer, prayer in which we experience God’s presence within us, closer than breathing, closer than thinking, closer than consciousness itself. This method of prayer is both a relationship with God and a discipline to foster that relationship...”

The source of Centering Prayer, as in all methods leading to contemplative prayer, is the Indwelling Trinity: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. The focus of Centering Prayer is the deepening of our relationship with the living Christ.” From a Catholic website.
www.contemplativeoutreach.org/category/category/centering-prayer

An article ran in the ‘Signs of the Times’ promoting ‘centering prayer’ in 2004, called ‘Stillness is Golden’. “Contemplation is essentially wordless, but its core cry is ‘I consent to Your presence and Your action within.’ (See Psalm 139:1-4; Romans 8:26, 27.) Feel your hunger for connection with the Divine and express your adoration. God is waiting to connect with you (Revelation 3:20.21), but it may take some time for you to focus. If you are distracted by thoughts, let them float past you without following.

One method, called ‘centering’ prayer, encourages you to refocus on God by internally saying one of the names of God that you relate to. This can help you to be present with God again.” Signs of the Times. Australia-NZ. November 2004.

This is not a Christian concept, but an occult practise.

The room is often in semi-darkness, with quiet music, candles, incense, prayer stations.

There are also labyrinths, which is a “spiritual experience that invites you to be still and silent as you participate in progressive experiences integral to the spiritual journey.” Signs of the Times. Australia-NZ. November 2004.

If men and women involve themselves in ‘silencing the mind’, there is no question the devil will quickly and quietly take up residence.

The words of 14th century Christian mystic Meister Eckhart are now believed by many to be truth -- “Nothing in all creation is so like God as silence.” This type of thinking is plentiful in mystic circles.

Note the words of Ramana Maharshi, an Indian mystic, “What exists in truth is the Self alone. The self is that where there is absolutely no ‘I’ thought. That is called Silence. The Self itself is the world; the Self itself is ‘I’; the Self itself is God.”

It is from these sentiments that contemplative prayer is drawn.

It is true the Bible says, “Be still, and know that I am God” (Psalm 46:10), but notice what the prophet says of this verse, “Through study of the Scriptures, through earnest prayer, they may hear His message to them, ‘Be still and know that I am God.’ When every other voice is hushed, when every earthly interest is turned aside, the silence of the soul makes more distinct the voice of God. Here rest is found in Him. The peace, the joy, the life of the soul, is God.” Fundamentals of Christian Education p440.

In 2011, the following took place at Newbold College during a Week of Prayer. “In candlelight and against a background of tranquil music, the path led individual seekers on a spiritual journey where they encountered music, meditation, art, media and symbolic activities at interactive stations. Audio prompting challenged participants to rethink their relationship with themselves, other people, the planet, and God.”

One student said, “It was beautiful. I cried three times. When I dropped the stone into the water, it felt like Jesus was beside me lifting the burdens from my shoulders. It was so real.”
<http://adventistnews.org.uk/news607.htm>

A non-Adventist website said, “Definition of Contemplative Spirituality: a belief system that uses ancient mystical practices to induce altered states of consciousness (the silence) and is often wrapped in Christian terminology; the premise of contemplative spirituality is pantheistic (God is all) and panentheistic (God is in all).” www.lighthouse trailsresearch.com/cp.htm

The above author asks, “Does pantheism have a legitimate place in orthodox Christianity? This is a vital question because pantheism is the foundational worldview among those who engage in mystical prayer.

Ken Kaisch, an Episcopal priest and a teacher of mystical prayer... noted: ‘Meditation is a process through which we quiet the mind and the emotions, and enter directly into the experience of the Divine.... there is a deep connection between us ... God is in each of us.’ Ray Yungen. Ibid.

The practice of spiritual formation may not have reached full maturity in the Adventist Church, but practicing the art of mystical-type meditation is a big step towards it. Not only will it reach maturity in the days ahead, but it will be a means of uniting Christendom with the false spirit.

Praise God there are Adventists who are speaking out against spiritual formation, such as Walter Veith, Howard Peth, Rick Howard, John Bradshaw, Doug Batchelor, and others. Some media ministries and colleges are deeply involved, others will have nothing to do with it. Mark Finley wrote an excellent article in ‘Ministry’ magazine (August 2012) on the subject, and in the same issue, Derek Morris, Editor of ‘Ministry’, spoke of his experience with spiritual formation twenty five years ago, and how he had embraced the false concept, but now regrets any confusion that may have been caused.

The truth is that spiritual formation, coming from Eastern Mysticism, fulfils the deceptions Ellen White warned against so many years ago -- spiritualism, pantheism, and theosophy.

But *do not miss the connection* --- a false god results in a false experience.

It is easy to concentrate on the phenomenon of spiritual formation taking place today, and forget that the **Ω**mega *begins* with an understanding of God that is not Biblical --- the Trinitarian root is still a problem.

- * The alpha was a combination of the Trinity with pantheistic-like theories, which formed the alpha of deadly heresies.
- * The omega is also a belief in the Trinity, but joined together with a far more dangerous form of pantheistic beliefs and occult practices.

One can visit a theosophical bookshop and see shelf after shelf of books teaching the same soul-destroying theories.

In her book 'The Secret Doctrine', Helena Blavatsky, the founder of theosophy, includes among her many pagan trinities, the Trinity believed by the churches, saying, "The process of manifestation can be explained through this Trinity, where we understand 'the Father' as the creating Spirit, 'the Son' as Logos, or Christ Consciousness (see Isis Unveiled, v.2, p.41), and 'the Holy Ghost', or 'the Mother', as the divine energy (love) flow (Shakti)." The Secret Doctrine. Helena Blavatsky. (Brackets in quote) Quoted in Trinity and Triunity: the Main Mechanism of Creation by Rosa and Margarita Riaikkenen. Theosophy Downunder Home Library of Theosophical Lectures. Dec 6. 2011.

Theosophy was founded in 1875, and well-developed by the time Ellen White warned of the dangers of spiritualism, pantheism and theosophy. The blending with Christian beliefs is often subtle, but to one well-versed in Bible truth, it is overt and appalling.

It must be remembered that Satan was determined to "be like the Most High", and in deceiving our church leaders into accepting the Trinity doctrine, the denomination has fallen at the feet of another deity. Isaiah 14:13,14.

Even if it is hard to believe, it cannot be quickly cast aside. Satan knows he has “**but a short time**” and will do *anything* to keep us deceived. Revelation 12:12.

It is a serious matter, the most serious we will face before the time of trouble.

The counsel of the prophet remains the same. “We are to hold the beginning of our confidence firm unto the end. Let no one attempt to tear down the foundation of our faith, or to spoil the pattern by bringing into the web threads of human devising.” Letter 249. 1903. Medical Ministry p97.

Sadly, the original pattern given to our pioneers has been spoiled, and the foundation of our faith torn down. We cannot afford to remain deceived.

Please do not ignore the facts.

When Kellogg was directing men to tear down the pillars, God asked, “Where are the watchmen that ought to be standing on the walls of Zion? Are they asleep?” 1 Selected Messages p204.

Many were asleep back then, and the work of apostasy progressed with little opposition. A new organisation was established, and books of a new order were written. We have been deceived, and without our knowledge or consent, *have been placed upon another foundation*.

But God’s truth is eternal; it is immovable. And the pillars of truth that support the foundation stand secure.

“As a people, we are to stand firm on the platform of eternal truth that has withstood test and trial. We are to hold to the sure pillars of our faith. The principles of truth that God has revealed to us are our only foundation.” Ibid p201.

Are you willing to step back on the platform of truth?

Chapter 15

DECISION RATIFIED

Leroy Froom published his assigned 700-page book 'Movement of Destiny' in 1971. In this volume, He outlined a history of the Seventh-day Adventist Church as few could ever imagine.

His historical account says we began as Semi-Arians, but steadily rose to become a strong Movement, able to take our place among mainline Protestant denominations. Together with them we wholeheartedly profess Christendom's doctrine of the Trinity and the full deity of Christ.

Froom believed that by 1888 Waggoner had left all traces of Arianism and become a Trinitarian. He was said to be fully in harmony with Ellen White's supposed belief that Christ is the eternal, second person of the Trinity.

According to Froom, Waggoner's introductory remarks at Minneapolis were to combat the false beliefs of Arianism. "He felt impelled to take note of certain false concepts, as well as to present the positive truth of Christ's complete deity and eternal place in the Godhead, or Trinity..." Movement of Destiny p192.

This is absolutely incredible. Not once does Waggoner say his words are to combat anything; his message is presented as pure truth.

The following year, Waggoner showed clearly where he stood, saying that "... both the Father and the Son were of the same nature, the Father was first in point of time. He is also greater in that He had no beginning, while Christ's personality had a beginning." Signs of the Times. Apr. 8. 1889. Clearly Waggoner was not a Trinitarian at this time of his life.

No wonder Froom's book was not to be published for many years!

Froom said Waggoner's primary purpose in his opening section, was "to present the majesty and glory, the transcendence and completeness of the eternal Godhood of Christ. It was to press home the immutable truth that Christ is not a created Being, with a beginning... At the very outset Waggoner had to firmly meet the persisting, neutralizing Arian view still maintained by some..." Movement of Destiny p200.

He said Waggoner presented Christ as "the coeternal, coequal, consubstantial Second Person of the Godhead." Ibid. (Note the word 'consubstantial', or the Nicaean *homoousion*)

Leroy Froom said Minneapolis, "was a definite turn in the denominational tide... It was the great division point. It began the re-establishment of the supreme provision of Righteousness by Faith in Christ as 'all the fullness of the Godhead'. That is ever to be remembered, irrespective of denials by some." Ibid p257.

He said further, "It was the beginning of a new awakening – a period of growing 'revival and reformation'... It aroused the Movement from the complacency of Laodiceanism... 1888 marked a new perception of the basic doctrine of the complete Deity of Christ, joined with Righteousness by Faith as the foundation truth of the Gospel and salvation..." Ibid p267.

Contrary to Froom's report, Ellen White was so upset with the spirit of debate, argument, criticism and ridicule in 1888, she said, "it was the saddest experience of my life..." 1888 Materials. p179.

An editorial in the Adventist Review stated the truth. "In reviewing the history of the 1888 era, we are led to the conclusion that it was a time of unparalleled opportunity for the Seventh-day Adventist church. The Lord actually gave His people the 'beginning' of the latter rain and loud cry... The attitudes and spirit of too many at that time made it necessary for God to withdraw this special blessing..."

It is clear that the fullness of the marvelous blessing God wanted to bestow upon the church was not received at that time nor subsequently.” Editorial in the Adventist Review. May 27. 1976.

However, the tenor of Froom’s book has largely been accepted by the denomination in a belief that we have the truth and are prospering.

In 1974, Leroy Edwin Froom was laid to rest, his life-work closed.

The final step would now be the work of others.

In 1980, the doctrine of the Trinity was to be discussed at the General Conference session, with a plan to make it an official doctrine of our faith.

Once again, caution was needed, as there were still non-Trinitarians among us.

Only five years earlier, a paper by Edward Edstrom was printed at the request of the Board of Walla Walla Valley Academy in book form called ‘Human Spirit – Divine Spirit’. (1975)

Edstrom’s belief in the Trinity had been challenged in 1954 when fellow pastors and workers in Central Africa were confronted by Moslems “who claimed ONE God Allah, while Christianity appeared to have THREE separate, distinct Gods that were *called* ONE.” Human Spirit – Divine Spirit. Introd. iv. Edward Edstrom.

It was obvious church leaders needed to be well-prepared when the subject came up for discussion. Clearly Arian-type questions would not be tolerated.

The Trinity to be discussed was (as printed eight years later in ‘Seventh-day Adventists Believe’), “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.” Belief No. in 27 Fundamentals.

This wording states that God is singular -- He 'is immortal' -- and yet there are three co-eternal Persons, a unity of three co-equals in one God. It does not say there is one God who is Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, but a group of three Persons who make up God.

A number of brethren saw the confusion.

Charles Upshaw asked, "I have a question on Article 2, 'The Trinity'. I believe when we first studied the document the term was 'Godhead'. My objection to the use of the word Trinity is the fact that in many Christian congregations it refers to one God and also means one person.

Yet in our explanation we refer to three co-eternal persons, and in Article 3 we refer to a triune God. I would like to suggest that we either change the title to 'The Godhead' or 'The Triune Godhead'." Adventist Review. May 1st 1980. 'Fifteenth business meeting. Fifty-third General Conference session. April 25. 1980. 1:30 P.M. Session proceedings'.

W. Duncan Eva responded, "We discussed this back and forth. We had both, and we did not like that. Now we have used one of them and this isn't popular. We had 'Godhead' in the old Manual and we didn't like that. I think it would be better just to ask the folk to express what they would prefer. Trinity to me seems to be a perfectly good word, even though we don't like some of its connotations. Many other words have connotations we are not happy with either." Ibid. (All statements are from the session, not necessarily in order; the font changes for variety)

Another brother commented. *"I do recognize and accept the Trinity as a collective unity, but I would have a little difficulty in applying the pronoun He to the Trinity or the Godhead. For me this has deep theological implications."* (J.H. Bennett)

"It seems to me we have a conflict or a contradiction in this statement, 'There is one God: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, a unity of Three co-eternal Persons.' Would not it be more clear if we were to say, 'There is one God consisting of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit'?

We begin with 'one God', then, without any explanation, we use 'Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.' Later, we go to 'a unity of Three.'" (H.J. Harris)

"I think we ought to be very careful in using terms that the Bible does not use of Him. When we framed this statement we tried to use Biblical phrases as much as we could." (Richard Hammil)

"I would suggest that when this goes back to the committee, Sister White's writings be studied to see what term she used to describe God the Father and the Holy Spirit. Let us use a lot of her terminology to define this. Whatever decisions are made and expressions found, let us be content with them." (Paul Chima)

Brother Leshner brought out an important point.

"I am concerned about words and phrases that would seem to limit God or to change the view of God that is given to us in Scripture... I presume that the speaker was referring to the use of 'They' in paragraph 2."

("The Godhead is infinite and beyond human comprehension, yet known to the extent that They have chosen to reveal Themselves. The members of the Godhead have revealed Themselves through the works of Their hands in nature...")

Leshner continues. "And, of course, the statement of Scripture is that 'The Lord our God is One Lord.' And to speak of 'They' or some other pronoun than 'He' would make us tritheist, instead of believing in one God... The idea of three Beings that are One is a mystery, and it seems to me that we should not try to remove all of that mystery from the statement." (W. R. Leshner)

Although these brethren had problems with wording, their questions did not threaten the overall plan to adopt the Trinity.

In discussion it was stated that Seventh-day Adventists do not believe in a creedal Trinity like the Catholic Church and the Protestant churches, who believe God does not have body parts. (See Anglican Thirty-nine Articles)

Instead it was stated that we have a Biblical teaching of the Trinity, just like we have the Biblical Sabbath. Sister White's writings were quoted, showing her to agree with the teaching of the Biblical Trinity, and that James White had objected to the creedal teaching.

Brother G.N. Banks asked the following question.

"Is our position as fundamentalists-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?"

The General Conference president, Pastor Neil Wilson, responded, "Well, you are getting into an area that could lead us into certain Arian complications."

Duncan Eva quelled further discussion, "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. Apr 24. 1980. p18.

It was a deliberate sidestep.

It had taken many years of subtle and deceptive moves, but the Trinity doctrine was officially voted into the Seventh-day Adventist Church at the Dallas session, 1980.

"Like the great ecclesiastical powers of ages past, the Advent Movement has solidified its beliefs in rigid dictum, proclaiming to all its adherents the final results of its own erudite investigation." <http://www.hullquist.com/Bible/bib-onegod-12c.htm>

The Statement of Belief now reads:

2. Trinity. 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. (Deut. 6:4; Matt. 28:19; 2 Cor. 13:14; Eph. 4:4-6; 1 Peter 1:2; 1 Tim. 1:17; Rev. 14:7.) www.adventist.org

Is the Adventist Trinity the same as the Roman Catholic Trinity?

Many would say - *No*.

The Creed of Athanasius says in part, "We worship One God in Trinity and Trinity in Unity, neither confounding the Persons nor dividing the substance. For there is one Person of the Father, another of the Son, another of the Holy Spirit. But the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, is One, the Glory equal, the Majesty coeternal." Catholic Creeds.

From a Catholic Encyclopaedia. "The Trinity is the term employed to signify the central doctrine of the Christian religion — the truth that in the unity of the Godhead there are Three Persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, these Three Persons being truly distinct one from another." www.newadvent.org Catholic Encyclopaedia

Semantics? The same doctrine, but different words?

Bert B. Beach wrote in his book 'So Much in Common' regarding our beliefs. "The member churches of the World Council of Churches and Seventh-Day Adventists are in agreement on the fundamental articles of the Christian faith as set forth in the three ancient symbols (Apostolicum, Nicaeno-Constantinopolitum, Athanasium). This agreement finds expression in unqualified acceptance of the doctrines of the Trinity and the Two Natures." So Much in Common p.40. (Brackets in statement refer to the creeds)

One thing is certain, the Seventh-day Adventist Church has moved away from the pioneer belief on the Godhead, as was stated by George Knight. "Most of the founders of Seventh-day Adventism would not be able to join the church today if they had to subscribe to the denomination's Fundamental Beliefs..."

especially the one which “deals with the doctrine of the Trinity.” Ministry. Oct 1993. p10.

Imagine denying membership to James and Ellen White, Joseph Bates, John Loughborough and others!

Once the Trinity had been made official, it was necessary for our new books to reflect the Trinitarian doctrine. Leroy Froom had fulfilled this work, now it was the responsibility of others.

In 1996, a devotional book entitled ‘Ye Shall Receive Power’ was printed, in which the prophet’s words were changed.

In 1899, Ellen White wrote, “Why should we not prostrate ourselves at the throne of divine grace, praying that God's Spirit may be poured out upon us as *it* was upon the disciples? *Its* presence will soften our hard hearts, and fill us with joy and rejoicing, transforming us into channels of blessing.

The Lord would have every one of His children rich in faith, and this faith is the fruit of the working of the Holy Spirit upon the mind. *It* dwells with each soul who will receive *it*, speaking to the impenitent in words of warning, and pointing them to Jesus, the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world. *It* causes light to shine into the minds of those who are seeking to co-operate with God, giving them efficiency and wisdom to do His work.” Signs of the Times. Sep 27. 1899.

If you look carefully, you will see that Ellen White has used the word ‘it’ four times, and one ‘its’ when speaking of the Holy Spirit. In the devotional ‘Ye Shall Receive Power’ p59, ‘it’ has been changed to ‘He’ or ‘His’ and ‘Him’. See also ‘Ye Shall Receive Power’ p93, 151, 164, 183, 303, 318, 319, 321, 323, 325, 344 for other changes.

(The word ‘spirit’ is a neutral word, as is the word ‘soul’, and when referring to either of these in a sentence, we can say ‘it’. Even a baby can be called *it*, if you are unaware of *its* sex. In fact, doesn’t a nurse announce the birth of a baby with the words ‘*It’s* a boy’ or ‘*It’s* a girl’? A woman might say of her crying baby, ‘Give *it* to me’. There is no disrespect in using ‘it’ in any of these cases)

In 2005, the baptismal vow was revised to read: “Do you accept the teachings of the Bible as expressed in the Statement of Fundamental Beliefs of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, and do you pledge to live your life by God’s grace in harmony with these teachings?”

For the first time in Adventist history, the church has based membership on a creed. The prophet had told us ninety five years earlier, “The Bible, and the Bible alone, is to be our creed.” Review & Herald. Dec 15. 1885.

As a response to Ted Wilson’s inspiring sermon at the 2010 General Conference, the church at large has begun to pray for revival and reformation. It is good to pray for the latter rain; we all long for “global rain”, the refreshing from the Lord. Hope Channel.

However, we must consider an important vision given to Ellen White in 1846 of two companies, both praying to the Father for the Holy Spirit. The issue at the time was whether the presence of Jesus was in the holy place or in the most holy place of the sanctuary.

Those whose faith remained in the holy place, prayed to the Father for the Holy Spirit. It was Satan who answered their prayers, sending light and power. The people thought the Father had sent the Holy Spirit.

The other group followed Jesus by faith into the most holy place and prayed to the Father for the Holy Spirit. Their prayers were answered by God, who sent light, power, love, joy and peace. Early Writings p55.56.

Today the issue still relates to where Jesus is. We do not question that He is in the most holy place of the heavenly sanctuary, but what about His Spirit?

Again there are two companies.

One group is praying to the Father for the Spirit He shares with His Son. They know it is the omnipresent Spirit that unites them with their God, Christ, and all believers, and they long to be one. John 17:21-23.

The other group also prays to the Father.

They believe the Spirit is *another* Person, God the Holy Spirit, separate from the Father and the Son, a divine Person in His own right. Their faith is in Jesus who is in the most holy place, but as He is unable to be with His people in the flesh, He sends the Holy Spirit as His representative.

Brothers and sisters, it is a fearful thing to say, but one group will receive the wrong spirit.

Oh Lord, have mercy upon us all!

There is only one answer. There must be careful, prayerful and diligent study of God's Word, and a willingness to put aside pre-conceived ideas to hear God's voice saying – *This is the truth*. If we do not love truth, God will “send” or allow “strong delusion that (we) should believe a lie.” 2 Thessalonians 2:10-12.

And remember, the counterfeit latter rain will fall before the genuine.

Do you think it will only fall on Babylon?

Ask yourself the question -- *Who is the devil determined to deceive right until the end – the remnant or Babylon?*

We have been warned.

The Adventist Church is now being prepared for Satan to work his lying wonders among us, and “those who have not stood firmly for the truth will unite with the unbelieving, who love and make a lie. When these wonders are performed, when the sick are healed and other marvels are wrought, they will be deceived.” 3 Selected Messages p407.408.

“He that hath an ear, let him hear...” Revelation 3:22.

Chapter 16

TOO LATE

Jaban, look at the size of those grapes. Two men are carrying one bunch. They are huge.

Yes, and pomegranates too.

And figs.

I told you it would be a good land Hazor.

Israel had waited forty days for the spies to return from searching the land. The young people could not contain their excitement as they listened to the men give their report.

Moses, the land flows with milk and honey; and we brought back this fruit. “Nevertheless, the people be strong that dwell in the land, and the cities are walled, and very great: and moreover we saw the children of Anak there...” Numbers 13:27-29.

Murmurs rise from the congregation. Caleb calls for the people to be quiet. “Let us go up at once, and possess it; for we are well able to overcome it.” Numbers 13:30.

But no one is listening.

Tears flow, and angry voices cry out. “Would God that we had died in the land of Egypt! Or would God we had died in this wilderness! ... Let us make a captain, and let us return into Egypt.” Numbers 14:2-4.

Moses and Aaron fall on their faces. Joshua and Caleb tear their clothes and cry out, *People, people, listen*, “The land... is an exceeding good land. If the Lord delight in us, then he will bring us into this land, and give it us... only rebel not ye against the Lord... the Lord is with us: fear them not.” Numbers 14:7-10.

It is no use.

The congregation is angry and they pick up stones to cast at Caleb and Joshua.

Suddenly, the glory of the Lord appears in the tabernacle, and God's voice fills the air. *Moses*, "how long will this people provoke me?... I will smite them with the pestilence, and disinherit them, and will make of thee a greater nation and mightier than they." Numbers 14:11.12.

No Lord, "the Egyptians will hear of it... then the nations which heard the fame of thee will speak, saying, because the Lord was not able to bring this people into the land which he sware unto them, therefore he hath slain them in the wilderness.... Pardon, I beseech thee, the iniquity of this people according unto the greatness of thy mercy..." Numbers 14:13-19.

The congregation waits in silence.

Moses, "I have pardoned according to thy word... (But) all those men which have seen my glory, and my miracles, which I did in Egypt and in the wilderness, and have tempted me these ten times, and have not hearkened to my voice; Surely they shall not see the land which I sware unto their fathers, neither shall any of them that provoked me see it...

Tomorrow turn you, and get you into the wilderness by the way of the Red Sea... your carcasses shall fall in this wilderness... from twenty years old and upward, which have murmured against me... and your children shall wander in the wilderness forty years, and bear your whoredoms, until your carcasses be wasted in the wilderness." Numbers 14:21-23.25.28.29.32.33.

"... and the people wept that night." Numbers 14:1.

Next morning, the men of the congregation rise early and prepare themselves for battle. "Lo, we be here, and will go up unto the place which the Lord hath promised: for we have sinned." Numbers 14:40.

Immediately Moses cries out in a loud voice, *No, you cannot go into the land now.* “Go not up, for the Lord is not among you; that ye be not smitten before your enemies.” Numbers 14:42.

But they will not listen.

Israel, it is too late. You wanted to die in the wilderness – your wish is granted. Do not go up and fight. You will lose the battle.

And it was so.

The attitude of the people affected the whole nation, for not only did the rebellious wander forty years in the wilderness, but Moses, Joshua and Caleb were obliged to suffer with them.

Israel had been delivered from Egypt that they might make known the only true God to the nations. They were to teach men and women to worship Him alone, and to keep His holy Law. If Israel had been faithful, the nations of the world would have made pilgrimages to the capital city seeking salvation.

“And many nations shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.” Isaiah 2:3.

But the Jewish nation did not become the light of the world.

Before Moses died, the Lord told him, “Behold, thou shalt sleep with thy fathers; and this people will rise up, and go a-whoring after the gods of the strangers of the land... and will forsake me, and break my covenant which I have made with them...” Deuteronomy 31:16.

After their settlement in the promised land, and the death of Joshua, with his elders and all the people, the new generation “...forsook the Lord God of their fathers... and followed other gods.” Judges 2:10.

Instead of fully destroying the nations in the land, they "... mingled among the heathen..." learning their works.

"Yea, they sacrificed their sons and their daughters unto devils, and shed innocent blood, even the blood of their sons and of their daughters, whom they sacrificed unto the idols of Canaan: and the land was polluted with blood." Psalm 106:34-38.

During the four-hundred-and-fifty-year period of the judges, every man did that which was right in his own eyes." Judges 21:25. Acts 13:20. They worshipped Ashteroth, goddess of the Zidonians, Molech, fire god of the Ammonites, Chemosh, god of the Moabites, the gods of the Philistines, the gods of Syria, and Baal. Judges 10:6.

God sent warning after warning, but every reformation was followed by deep apostasy. It is a story of "backsliding and chastisement, of confession and deliverance", repeated again and again. Patriarchs and Prophets p545.

God had set forth the result of unfaithfulness through his servant Moses many years earlier --- curses in every area of life, until finally they would be driven from the land.

"The Lord shall bring a nation against thee from afar... as swift as the eagle flieth; a nation whose tongue thou shalt not understand; a nation of fierce countenance... he shall besiege thee in all thy gates, until thy high and fenced walls come down...

If thou wilt not observe to do all the words of this law that are written in this book... and the Lord shall scatter thee among all people, from the one end of the earth even unto the other; and there thou shalt serve other gods... And thy life shall hang in doubt before thee..." Deuteronomy 28:49.50.52.58.64.66.

Despite the warnings, apostasy continued. "At times these warnings were heeded and rich blessings were bestowed upon the Jewish nation and through them upon surrounding peoples." Prophets and Kings p20.

But Satanic agencies worked to confuse the minds of the people in regard to true and false worship, and they became an easy prey.

After the death of Solomon, ten of the tribes revolted and headed north, leaving Judah with the remnant of Benjamin in Jerusalem. Under the leadership of Jeroboam, two altars were set up in Dan and Bethel, upon which were placed golden calves.

In defiance, Jeroboam proclaimed, "Behold, thy gods O Israel which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt." 1 Kings 12:28. It was a repeat of the apostasy at Sinai -- golden calves, with exactly the same words. At this blasphemous act, and the choosing of priests from any tribe, the Levites returned to Jerusalem.

The sins of the northern kingdom continued to increase.

They left all the commandments of God, and "walked in the statutes of the heathen... (they) did secretly those things that were not right against the Lord their God, and they built them high places in all their cities... and they set them up images and groves in every high hill, and under every green tree: And there they burnt incense in all the high places, as did the heathen... for they served idols...

And they caused their sons and their daughters to pass through the fire, and used divination and enchantments, and sold themselves to do evil in the sight of the Lord, to provoke him to anger." 2 Kings 17:8-12.

God suffered long with His people.

"Patiently He set their sins before them and in forbearance waited for their acknowledgment. Prophets and messengers were sent to urge His claim upon (them), but instead of being welcomed, these men of discernment and spiritual power were treated as enemies....(they) persecuted and killed them." Prophets and Kings p21.

The closing years of the northern kingdom were marked with violence and bloodshed, "such as never had been witnessed even

in the worst periods of strife and unrest under the house of Ahab.” Prophets and Kings p279. Finally, the Assyrians attacked Samaria, and in the siege, multitudes perished miserably.

“The city and nation fell and the broken remnant of the ten tribes were carried away captive and scattered in the provinces of the Assyrian realm.” Prophets and Kings p291.

What about Judah in the south? Did they remain faithful?

No, for the prophet said, “And Judah kept not the commandments of the Lord their God...” 2 Kings 17:19.

Judah also built high places and burned their sons and daughters in the fire. Jeremiah 7:31. “Yea, they sacrificed their sons and their daughters unto devils, and shed innocent blood, even the blood of their sons and of their daughters, whom they sacrificed unto the idols of Canaan...” Psalm 106:37.38.

Not only did Judah worship idols, but they “set their abominations” in the temple. Jeremiah 7:30.

The prophet Ezekiel saw greater and still greater abominations in vision. “I lifted up mine eyes the way toward the north, and behold northward at the gate of the altar this image of jealousy in the entry... Then he brought me to the door of the gate of the Lord’s house which was toward the north; and, behold, there sat women weeping for Tammuz...”

And he brought me into the inner court of the Lord’s house, and, behold, at the door of the temple of the Lord, between the porch and the altar, were about five and twenty men, with their backs toward the temple of the Lord, and their faces toward the east; and they worshipped the sun toward the east.” Ezekiel 8:5.14.16.

During the time of Hezekiah, a remnant of the scattered northern kingdom returned in repentance. Twelve sacrifices were offered, one for each tribe. It was a wonderful Passover.

Sadly, the king’s son Manasseh caused much corruption and idolatry.

The temple became defiled, and so full of rubbish that the sacred Book of the Law was lost. No one knew where it was until young King Josiah ordered the cleansing of the temple.

While cleaning out the sacred rooms, Hilkiah the priest found the lost scroll. He gave it to Shaphan the scribe, who took it to the king.

“And it came to pass, when the king had heard the words of the law, that he rent his clothes... for great is the wrath of the Lord that is poured out upon us, because our fathers have not kept the word of the Lord, to do after all that is written in the book.” 2 Chronicles 34:19,21.

Go and enquire of the Lord for me, said Josiah.

The prophetess Huldah gave counsel. “Because they have forsaken me, and have burned incense unto other gods... therefore my wrath shall be poured out upon this place, and shall not be quenched.” 2 Chronicles 34:25.

Tell the king of Judah that because he humbled himself before God, he will go to his grave in peace. 2 Chronicles 34:28.

Destruction was certain; nothing could change it.

Finally, the Babylonians attacked, taking captives and treasures from the temple. Daniel and other nobles were taken in the first assault. In the fourth siege, the magnificent temple was burnt to the ground.

Now a captive in Babylon, Daniel is given a vision for his people and Jerusalem. (From now on Judah will be referred to as ‘the Jews’, the ‘Jewish nation’, or ‘Israel’)

“Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness...” Daniel 9:24.

Not only was the vision a prophecy of the coming Messiah, but it was a warning that unless the Jews put an end to rebellion and

apostasy, their probation would close -- four hundred and ninety years to repent and amend their ways. If they truly repented, the Messianic age would begin, bringing with it reconciliation and righteousness.

But when John the Baptist arrived to prepare the way for the Messiah, the Jewish nation was not ready.

Although Babylon had taught the uselessness of gods made of wood and stone, a more subtle form of idolatry arose – pride in being the chosen people. The temple and its rituals were almost worshipped. The Jews “looked upon Jerusalem as their heaven, and they were actually jealous lest the Lord should show mercy to the Gentiles.” Desire of Ages p29.30.

Certainly Israel was a privileged people, having received “the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises.” Romans 9:4. Ahead was a glorious future, **if** they were willing to repent and obey God’s holy Law.

As the seventy-week prophecy neared its climax, the priests and leaders began to expect the Messiah to arrive. Desire of Ages p133. His coming would be with power, as they believed it was the “day of vengeance” against Rome. Isaiah 61:2.

They “looked for the Messiah to come as a conqueror, to break the oppressor’s power, and exalt Israel to universal dominion.” Desire of Ages p30.

When Jesus began His Messianic ministry, the leaders refused to accept Him as the promised One. Pride, self-worship, and a misinterpretation of the Scriptures, paved the way for rejection.

How could this Nazarene be the Son of God? Psalm 2:7. The Messiah was to “break (the heathen) with a rod of iron... and dash them to pieces like a potter’s vessel.” Psalm 2:8.9.

“Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled...” Psalm 2:12. No way would the

Pharisees, Sadducees, scribes, rulers and lawyers submit to such a One as Yeshua of Nazareth, who claimed to be the Son of God.

One day Jesus asked the rulers, *Tell me, "What think ye of Christ? Whose son is he?"*

"The Son of David", they reply.

Quoting Psalm 110:1 Jesus responds, "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool."

He asks the question, *"How then doth David in spirit call him Lord? If David then call him Lord, how is he his son?"* Matthew 22:42-45.

The Jewish leaders clearly understood and interpreted the passage of Scripture as Messianic, but Jesus' question baffled them. Matthew 22:46.

One day Jesus asked His disciples, "Whom do men say that I the Son of man am?" After various answers, Jesus asked, "But whom say ye that I am?" Matthew 16:13.15.16.

Peter replied, *"Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God."*

Many in Israel recognise Yeshua as the Messiah and rejoice in His powerful teachings. Church leaders refuse to believe. They will not accept this young preacher from Nazareth as the Messiah.

Hatred grows until they begin to plot His death.

It is the final week of the 70-week prophecy and Jesus walks through the temple doors for the last time. Sorrowfully He declares to the priests, "Your house is left unto you desolate". Matthew 23:38. God's presence has been withdrawn, and its symbolic rites are now meaningless. "The whole system must be swept away." Desire of Ages p36. 620.

Less than forty eight hours later church officials arrest Jesus and put Him through the mockery of a trial. During the proceedings, the high priest defiantly puts the question to Jesus, "I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God." Matthew 26:57.63.

Jesus must answer under oath, and He says, "Thou hast said: nevertheless, I say unto you, Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven." Matthew 26:64.

The high priest is furious.

Jesus has once again identified Himself as the Messiah with Psalm 110:1 and also Daniel 7:13. Immediately Caiaphas asks, "What think ye?" and they all cry out, "He is guilty of death." Matthew 26:66.

With an agreement to put Christ to death, the Sanhedrin, the Jewish supreme court of justice, can now take Jesus to the place of stoning to be put to death. But this is not their plan. They have a better one – God Himself will curse Jesus, "... for he that is hanged (on a tree) is accursed of God." Deuteronomy 21:22,23. (Crucifixion "was an improper execution of rabbinic law." Talmud. San 43a)

When Jesus is taken to Pilate in the early hours of Passover, the governor turns to the robed dignitaries and asks, "*What will I do with Jesus which is called Christ?*"

The priests and religious leaders answer, "*Let him be crucified.*"

"*Why, what evil has he done?*"

The answer comes back, "*Let him be crucified.*"

When Pilate saw he could not prevail against them, he asked for water and bowl, and washed his hands before them all, saying, "*I am innocent of the blood of this just person; see ye to it.*"

The priests and people cry out, "*His blood be on us, and on our children.*" Matthew 27:22-25.

"The awful cry ascended to the throne of God. That sentence, pronounced upon themselves, was written in heaven. That prayer was heard. The blood of the Son of God was upon their children and their children's children, a perpetual curse. Terribly was it realized in the destruction of Jerusalem." Desire of Ages p739.

Thirty nine years after the death of the Messiah, Titus besieged Jerusalem.

Christians had already fled, but once the Roman army surrounded the city, no one could escape. Those remaining suffered for weeks without food or water. Yet, Jewish leaders continued to cry, *Jerusalem will never be destroyed. God will spare the city. We are His people; the temple of the Lord is holy. Jerusalem will not be destroyed.*

False prophets quoted the Scriptures, "Thus saith the Lord, which giveth the sun for a light by day, and the ordinances of the moon and of the stars for a light by night... If those ordinances depart from before me, saith the Lord, then the seed of Israel also shall cease from being a nation before me for ever." Jeremiah 31:35.36.

A man's voice continued to wail in the streets -- *Woe upon Jerusalem. Woe upon the people. Woe. Woe. Woe.* After sounding forth a message of doom for seven years, he died with thousands in the siege.

Men and women shut themselves up in their inmost rooms and ate corn without grinding it. Others baked bread, but snatched it out of the fire half-baked. Parents refused to give bread to their children, and still others killed and roasted their infants for food. The warnings of Moses were being fulfilled. Deuteronomy 28:53-57.

Those who did not die in the siege were taken captive as slaves, and finally scattered around the world.

Through disobedience, Israel had lost the land, the temple, and all their privileges. "Terribly has it been manifested in the condition of the Jewish nation for eighteen hundred years – a branch severed from the vine, a dead, fruitless branch, to be gathered up and burned. From land to land throughout the world, from century to century, dead, dead in trespasses and sins!" Desire of Ages p739.

Think about it -- Is Israel still a dead branch?

Do the Jewish people appear lifeless and ready to be burned?

Although threatened and attacked by the Moslem world, the Jewish nation still praises God that the land of Israel was declared a Jewish State in the Balfour Declaration of 1917.

This is believed to be a fulfilment of prophecy for the dispersed to return to the land from all over the world. "And it shall come to pass in that day, that the Lord shall set his hand again the second time to recover the remnant of his people, which shall be left, from Assyria, and from Egypt... and from the islands of the sea... and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth..." Isaiah 11:11.12.

Jewish praises sounded loudly in Jerusalem after their victory in the Six-day War -- Israeli soldiers had captured the Temple Mount. It was the first time in almost two thousand years that the sacred Mount was again in their hands. (Six-day War in 1967 to the Destruction Jerusalem in AD70 = 1897 years)

But once again, the Jews have misinterpreted Scripture.

Sadly, millions of Evangelical Christians have fallen for the same false understanding, and in their enthusiasm proclaim Israel's divine right to the land. Old Testament prophecies are seen with literal fulfilments – "the desert shall rejoice, and blossom as the rose". Isaiah 35:1. Carefully planned irrigation is responsible for transforming the desert.

In reality, the prophecies have not been fulfilled.

If Moses was permitted to visit the Jewish people today, he would cry out to them, **No, Israel.** *No. Repent. You lost the land two thousand years ago. It is no longer yours.*

Stop preparing furniture for the third temple. The only temple is the heavenly Jerusalem which will come down from heaven as a bride adorned for her husband. Your menorah, table, altar of sacrifice, vessels, red heifer, are now useless symbols. Your cohenim will never serve in God's temple. (menorah – candlestick; cohen – priest, cohenim -- priests)

Israel, look to Yeshua, He really is the Son of God.

He is seated on the throne of His Father in heaven. Soon He will come back. Oh my people, accept Yeshua, He really is the Meshiach. He loves you so much and wants you to be ready to meet Him when He comes in the clouds of glory.

Today the Wailing Wall represents the Jewish prayer for the city and its people. "Pray for the peace of Jerusalem: they shall prosper that love thee. Peace be within thy walls, and prosperity within thy palaces." Psalm 122:6.7.

God has made it clear through the prophets that prosperity always depends on obedience to the commandments. If Israel had obeyed, they would have been blessed. "But if thou wilt not hearken unto the voice of the Lord God, to observe to do all his commandments... *ye shall be plucked from off the land...* and the Lord shall scatter thee among all people, from the one end of the earth even unto the other..." Deuteronomy 28:15.63.64.

In AD34, at the end of the 70-week prophecy, probation of the Jewish nation closed completely. Every promise in the Word of God has been transferred to spiritual Israel, those who accept Yeshua-Jesus as the Messiah and surrender to Him, whether they be Jews or Gentiles. Galatians 3:28.29.

Reader, do not miss the point.

The Jewish nation has totally rejected the judgments and warnings of God. It is as if He said nothing.

And yet, presumptuously, they are still claiming the promises. Enthusiasm never changes reality.

The disobedient in Israel were severed from the spiritual olive tree two thousand years ago and only faith in Yeshua will graft them back, one by one.

The Bible says Israel is a type, and "all these things happened unto them for ensamples: they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come." 1 Corinthians 10:11.

We must ask ourselves – *Are we claiming the promises in disobedience, like Israel?*

The Jewish nation strongly upholds the Torah and the Law of God, and we can admire their zeal. But to the Jew, the glory is always Israel. (Torah is the first five books of Moses)

Seventh-day Adventists have a great responsibility to instruct the precepts of the same Law of God to the nations. Where Israel of old failed, you and I have been destined to succeed.

However, Laodicea cannot finish the work – *We are rich and increased with goods, and have need of nothing.* Revelation 3:17. The spirit of pride, like the Jews, bars the way.

Praise God there will be 144,000 repentant and submissive believers who have the loving Philadelphian character. To this remnant, **Jesus is the glory** of their self-sacrificing love.

- * Laodicea can *expect* to be rejected if we continue to deny Christ's true Sonship to the Father.
- * Laodicea can *expect* the curses to apply if we refuse to obey God's Word.
- * Laodicea can *expect* the counterfeit latter rain to fall upon us while practising mystical meditation without our walls.

The warning stands, "Jerusalem is a representation of what the church will be if it refuses to walk in the light that God has given." 8 Testimonies p67.

If-- the conditions always apply.

“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, then the Lord will grievously afflict and humble them, and, unless they repent, will remove them from their place and make them a reproach...”

The Upward Look p131.

EPILOGUE

A number of metaphors are used to depict the solid rock upon which Christ's church is built – the *foundation*, the *platform*, the *pillar* supporting the platform. All speak the same truth. The book in your hand is based on Ellen White's metaphor that the central pillar supports the foundation in a similar way that a cornerstone supports the building -- Jesus Christ, "the chief corner stone." Ephesians 2:20.

Metaphors are figures of speech where a descriptive term is given to an object or person that is not literally applicable. Some believe Ellen White's references to Jesus as the 'Son of God' prior to the incarnation is hindsight, and the name 'Son' and 'Father' are used as metaphors. Is this so?

For instance, the prophet wrote, "The Son of God declares concerning Himself...The Lord possessed Me in the beginning of His way, before His works of old...When He appointed the foundations of the earth: I was by him, as one brought up with him: I was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him." Patriarchs and Prophets p34.

The text quoted in Proverbs 8 begins with wisdom. Some brethren think the whole chapter is about wisdom, however a careful reading shows that wisdom becomes a metaphor for God's Son "in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." Colossians 2:3. The prophet makes this clear.

When Lucifer learned that the Father and His Son would create man upon the earth, without consulting him, envy filled his heart. Through pride and jealousy, this highly honoured angel began to covet the position of the Son. Patriarchs and Prophets p15.18.

"To dispute the supremacy of the Son of God, thus impeaching the wisdom and love of the Creator, had become the purpose of this prince of angels. To this object he was about to bend his

energies of that master mind, which, next to Christ's, was first among the hosts of God." Ibid p35. (DA 129)

It was then necessary for God to make His Son's position, as the Prince of heaven, absolutely clear to the angels. "Before the assembled inhabitants of heaven the King declared that none but Christ, the Only Begotten of God, could fully enter into His purposes, and to Him it was committed to execute the mighty counsels of His will.

The Son of God had wrought the Father's will in the creation of all the hosts of heaven; and to Him, as well as to God, their homage and allegiance were due." Patriarchs and Prophets p36.

Think about it. If the Son is a metaphor, Lucifer's jealousy must also be a metaphor. Even the council called by the Father to make clear His Son's authority must be metaphoric. The whole chapter becomes meaningless. Dare we do this?

Finally, Lucifer is cast from heaven. "The Son of God, the Prince of heaven, and His loyal angels engaged in conflict with the archrebel and those who united with him." Lift Him Up p19. The prophet tells us that the death of Christ would "justify God and His Son in their dealing with the rebellion of Satan." Patriarchs and Prophets p69.

Although the plan of redemption had been laid before the creation of the earth, it became a struggle for the Father, whether to let man suffer the penalty for sin or to allow His Son to pay the price Himself. A vivid picture reveals the Father's trial in allowing His Son to fulfill the covenant of peace. Zechariah 6:12,13.

"Soon I saw Him (the Son) approach the exceeding bright light which enshrouded the Father... Three times He was shut in by the glorious light about the Father, and the third time He came from the Father we could see His Person... He then made known to the angelic choir that a way of escape had been made for lost man; that He had obtained permission to give His own life as a ransom for the race..." Early Writings p126.

“Said the angel, ‘Think ye that the Father yielded up His dearly beloved Son without a struggle? No, No.’ It was even a struggle with the God of heaven, whether to let guilty man perish, or to give His darling Son to die for them.” Ibid p127.

The death of Christ would “answer the question as to whether the Father and the Son had sufficient love for man to exercise self-denial and a spirit of sacrifice.” Patriarchs and Prophets p70.

In the Garden of Eden, it was “the Son of God who gave our first parents the promise of redemption. It was He who revealed Himself to the patriarchs” – Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Moses. Ibid p366. “These holy men of old held communion with the Saviour who was to come to our world in human flesh; and some of them talked with Christ and heavenly angels face to face.” Ibid p366.

When Abraham met three heavenly beings at his tent, after the two angels departed for Sodom, he was left “alone with Him whom he now knew to be the Son of God.” Ibid p139.

The great test of faith for Abraham and Isaac on Mount Moriah was not only a lesson for them regarding the plan of salvation, but the angels also began to understand.

“It had been difficult even for the angels to grasp the mystery of redemption – to comprehend that the Commander of heaven, the Son of God, must die for guilty man. When the command was given to Abraham to offer up his son, the interest of all heavenly beings was enlisted.

With intense earnestness they watched each step in the fulfillment of this command... and when the father’s hand was stayed as he was about to slay his son, and the ram which God had provided was offered in the place of Isaac – then light was shed upon the mystery of redemption, and even the angels understood more clearly the wonderful provision that God had made for man’s salvation.” Ibid p155.

Epilogue

Consider the analogy – Isaac was Abraham’s real son. Was God’s Son a metaphor?

It was “the Son of God, enshrined in the cloudy pillar (who) led the way” to the promised land. Ibid p437. When Moses stood high on the hill before the people he was told, “Behold, I will stand before thee there upon the rock in Horeb; and thou shalt smite the rock...” Exodus 17:6.

The prophet said, “Moses smote the rock, but it was the Son of God who, veiled in the cloudy pillar, stood beside Moses, and caused the life-giving water to flow.” Patriarchs & Prophets p298.

When Nebuchadnezzar threw the three Hebrew worthies into the fiery furnace, they walked with a divine Being. Was it the Son of God? Or are these words metaphoric?

Sister White asked, “How did that heathen king know what the Son of God was like? The Hebrew captives... had told of Christ, the Redeemer to come; and in the form of the fourth in the midst of the fire the king recognized the Son of God.” Prophets and Kings p509.

Over and over the term ‘Son of God’ is used by the prophet, not as a metaphor, but as reality. Metaphors are valuable tools of language, but used incorrectly they teach a false message.

Believe the truth.

“God *sent* his Son from the heavenly courts... But the world hated the Son of the infinite God.” Review & Herald. Sep 20. 1881.

This is our challenge today -- to believe that God really did *send His Son*. To deny Christ His heavenly origin, makes God “a liar.” 1 John 5:10.

It is such a blessing to know that “God should consent to let His only begotten Son come to a world all seared and marred with the curse, to walk a man among men, and to suffer death by crucifixion -- does not this bear eloquent witness to the power of God’s love?” Youth’s Instructor. August 21, 1902.

"Human love is weak and changeable, but God's love is full and deep and unchangeable.

Why then are not our souls aglow as we contemplate this love?

Why do we close our eyes to it?

God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, will shine into the hearts of all who believe, to give the light of the knowledge of his glory in the face of Jesus Christ.

"Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins."

O what amazing love.

Language cannot measure it. It is without a parallel.

"He that spared not his own Son, but delivered Him up for us all, how shall He not with Him also freely give us all things."

Gospel Herald. Ellen G White.
March 1 1900.

INDEX

Abominations in Israel p132
Adventists' beliefs have changed p6
Adventists not a cult, Martin p103
Adventists rose to be part of mainline churches p119
'After their kind' p39.40
Alexander, bishop p25.27
Alpha of deadly heresies p20.111.112
Andrews.J.N. says Trinity destroys personality of God and Christ p18
Angel from heaven not wake dead p48
Anomeans p29
Another Comforter p59
Apostasy in air we breathe p70
Apostasy in men we trusted p67
Apostasy will develop into the darkness of midnight p70
Apostasy is here p71
Arian complication, Neil Wilson p124
Arian statements removed from our books p100
Arian, whole world became p31
Arians – three Arian factions p29
Arians worse than crimes says Bishop of Rome p35
Arius p27.28.29.31.42
Arius accused of Christ being created p42
Astral travel p57
Athanasius p29
Attention of the people must be gained p48
Autumn Council p22

Balfour Declaration p140
Banks asks question about the Trinity p123
Baptismal vow updated to Trinity belief p126
Barbarians p33.39
Barnhouse. Donald p105
Battle Creek sanitarium destroyed by fire p64
Begotten p44.45
Begotten by a painful process p46
Benjamin Wilkinson p42.94
Bert B Beach on Trinity p125
Bible our creed p6.126
Bible Conference 1919, not to release report p84.84
Bible Conference 1919, report released 60 years later p73
Bible Conference 1919, 2494 typed pages p73

Index

Bible Conference subjects p76
Book of the Law found in the temple p135
Books changed p100.101.125.126
Books of a new order p49.50
Burning Spirit of Prophecy p108.109
Cardinal John Newman p35
Catholic Catechism on Trinity p40
Catholicism - Trinity not Christian thought until the fourth century p38
Caviness presents his puzzlement over the Trinity p81
Centering and visualisation p114.115
Changes to Spirit of Prophecy p126
Charles Longacre p96
Child inherits father's nature p42
Christ's pre-existence p16
Christ cursed p138
Christ in you p61
'Christ and His Righteousness' book in Australia p48
Christ became Son of God in a 'new sense' p46
Christ divested of human form p60
Christ inherited Father's nature p42
Christ minister of church on earth p68
Christ son of God by birth p45.46
Christ was not created p42.43.44
Christ's life prior to the incarnation p9.10
Christ's pre-incarnation name, Michael p42
Christ's righteousness as incense p68
Christ a begotten Son p45.46
Christ promises to not leave disciples alone p59
Christian Connection p8
Church a harlot p66
Church is going through p50
Claude Holmes objects to Bible Conf. p85
Claude Holmes job to tend incinerator p108.109
Clovis complains that Arians have all the good land p34
Clovis makes the Godhead a pretext to invade p33
'Coming of the Comforter' L Froom p90
Conceived by Holy Ghost p45
Constantine p28
Constantius p29.30
Consubstantial p28
Contemplative prayer p114
Cottrell R.F. quote p149
Council of heaven p45

Index

Council of Milan p29
Council of Nicaea p5.28
Council of Chalcedony p6
Council of Constantinople p6
Council of peace p144.145.
Counterfeit latter rain p128
Covenant of Father and Son p45
Created being, charge p42
Creed of Athanasius p41
Creed, Bible p6.126
Creeds of Christendom p5
Created for the Spirit to indwell p61
Cults will be scorned and derided p26

Dallas Gen Conf. leaders warding off Trinity debate p124
Daniel and Revelation changed p100.101
Daniel's prophecy – seventy weeks p135
Daniells and Prescott rebuked in 1910 on 'daily' p74.75
Daniells and Froom neighbours p87
Daniells asks Froom to write an important book p90.91
Daniells dares not take a vote p22
Daniells emphasises 'all the fullness of the Godhead' p87.88
Daniells realised Jones right on organisation p72
Daniells' relief in receiving Ellen White's letter p22
Daniells says Bible Conf. not fundamentals truths p84
Daniells says to locks transcript in a vault p85
Daniells stops stenographer at 1919 Bible Conference p81
Daniells tells Froom he is the connecting link p90
Daniells to be careful about Living Temple p22
Daniells writes to Willie White regarding Living Temple p22
Dead branch, Jewish nation p139.141
Deity not means 'fully divine' p87
Demonstrations of the Spirit p11
Desert blossom as a rose p140
Desire of Ages p9.10
Destruction of Jerusalem p138.139
Destruction of Jerusalem predicted p135
Die in wilderness p130
Divested of humanity p59.60
Divine credentials, message Waggoner and Jones p47
Divine changes its meaning to 'not fully divine' p87
Doctrines changes p6.105
Dry as the hills of Gilboa p49
Early Bible studies p7.8.

Index

Edstrom wrote non-Trinity book p121
Eisegesis p14.55
Eliminating Arian statements p100.101
Ellen Harmon p2
Ellen White with Waggoner and Jones visited churches p48
Ellen's mind locked p8
Ellen White accused of being a closet Trinitarian p9
Ellen White, Bible to be our creed p6
Ellen White denied Kellogg was in harmony with her writings p20.21
Ellen White refuses to study with Kellogg p21
Ellen White reads portions of Living Temple p22
Ellen White said Kellogg destroyed the Lord God p112
Ellen White said 1888 was the saddest experience of her life p120
Ellen White sees Kellogg in vision speaking his theories p23.111
Ellen White's 'three' statements p23
End of an old epoch and beginning of a new day, Froome p97
Ensamples for us p141
Eternal p15.16
Eva. Duncan, sidesteps Arian discussion p124
Evangelism prepared p101.102
Everlasting p15
Exegesis p14
Extreme Arians p29
Faithful city become a harlot p66
False conception of God is idolatry p24.25.117
False charge, do not believe in the Holy Spirit p58
Fatherhood of God p46
Firstborn of every creature p51.52
For ever and ever p15
Foundation built by Master Worker p20
Foundation firmly laid p8
Founders could not join church p125
Four years of study for truth p10
Froome and R.A. Anderson reminisce about Evangelism p101
Froome begins to study the Holy Spirit p88
Froome believed eradicated Arianism p97
Froome charges Holy Spirit as a 'shadowy effluence' p89.90
Froome charmed with Daniells' message p88
Froome family moves to Washington D.C. neighbours p87
Froome goes to non-SDA sources p88.89
Froome on Minneapolis p119.120
Froome pummeled by old timers about his understanding p89
Froome received invitations from non-SDAs p99

Index

Froom says indebted to Spirit of Prophecy p107.108
Froom shocked to find little on Holy Spirit in SDA writings p88
Froom studies the Holy Spirit p88
Froom's never-ending search p99
Future glory for Israel is obey p131
Garments of light p61
George Knight p6.105.125
Global rain p127
God and Christ have one Spirit p58
Godhead pretext for invasion p33
God in nature – Kellogg p20.21
God is not nature. He is outside nature p25.26
God of Adventists – not the God of the denominations p25.26
Golden calves p133
'Good Health' magazine p19
Greek *homooousion* p28.29
Greek mind on eternal p15
Greek *monogenes* p44.45
Greek *pneuma* p56
Hard labour of study, no more p11
Heavenly trio statements p23
Hebrew *l'olam va'ed* p16
Hebrew mind on eternal p15
Hebrew *olam* p16
Hebrew *qedem* p16
Hebrew *ruach* p56
Heruli p34
Hilderich, king Vandals p37
Hills of Gilboa p49
Holmes, Claude p85.108.109
Holy Spirit don't believe, charge p58
Holy Spirit explained Scripture to Ellen White p8.9
Holy Spirit is Himself p60
Holy Spirit only influence or power, charge p56.57
Holy Spirit overshadowed Mary p45
Holy Spirit 'shadowy effluence', charge p89.90
Humble receive truth p2
Iceberg vision p19
Interpretations will arise, not truth p11.12
Israel a dead branch p139.140
Israel lost the land p140.141
'It' changed to 'he' in devotional p126

Index

James White quote p62
Jerome p31
Jerusalem destroyed – AD70 p138.139
Jerusalem a representation of SDA Church p142
Jesus cursed on a tree p138
Jesus said – I will come to you p59
Jesus still omnipresent p60
Jesus takes humanity by painful process p46
Jesus – Son of the living God p137.138
Jesus under oath – I am Son of God p137/138
Jewish nation failed role p141
Jews saw Jerusalem as their heaven p136
Jim a Baptist believes in eternal burning p13
Jones and Waggoner accompany Ellen White p48
Jones and Waggoner fall into a trap p69.70.
Jones objects to the new Constitution p66
Jones says men not evil in leadership, principles p71
Jones speaks on Laodicea p67.68.69
Joseph Bates p8
Judah's idolatry p134.135
Justinian p37.38
Kellogg destroyed the Lord God p23.112
Kellogg explains that Godhead means Trinity p21
Kellogg not clear on personality of God p22.23
Kellogg on a false track, be careful p22
Kellogg says it was the Holy Ghost in the tree p22
Kellogg trying to bring in theories to remove pillars p20
Kellogg writes Living Temple to get funds rebuild sanitarium p64

Laodicean church p67.68
Latter rain missed in 1888 p52.53
Latter rain may be falling, not discern p54
Latter rain, counterfeit p128
Legal religion p49
'Living Temple' contains the alpha p20
'Living Temple' contains truth and error p70
'Living Temple' not in harmony with the Spirit of Prophecy p21
Longacre writes on deity of Christ. Submits to B.R.F. p96
Louis Tice at Loma Linda p112

Magan. Percy said principles are papal p66
Man's glory to be laid in dust p69
Mantra p114
Martin. Walter p102.103.104.105

Index

Men go into apostasy we trusted p69
Mind locked, Ellen Harmon p8
Minneapolis p47.48.119.120
Minneapolis, saddest experience of her life p120
Most precious message, by Waggoner p47.48.50
Movement of Destiny finished p119
Nature of Holy Spirit a mystery p61
Neuro Linguistic Programming p114
New organisation and new books p49.50
New truth not contradict old p10
Nicol. F.D. reads Statement of Faith p93
No contrary belief once Spirit testifies truth p11
No Trinity, not Christian p5
Non-immortality of the soul p13.14
Northern kingdom's idolatry and destruction p134
Not measured by figures, Christ's pre-existence p16
Nothing to fear for the future p72
Nothing to be ignored in testimonies p24
Nothing stand in the way of new movement p50
Omega will follow in a little while p20.112
Omnipresence of God by Spirit p57
One God in three persons quote p32
One Spirit p58
Opposition to truth in court p2.4
Original, unborrowed, underived p9.
Original statement p9
Origin of Trinity, 4th century p32
Ostrogoths p35.36.38.39
Our religion will be changed p50
Painful process, birth of Christ into humanity p46
Pantheism p20.24.111.112.113.116
Peculiar people, we are to be p25.26
Percy Magan says decisions of 1903 Gen Conf were papal p64
Pioneers begin Bible studies p7.8
Pioneers charged as not scholars p10
Platform braced by solid timbers p20
Pope Leo X's Bull p13
Position of truth clear p11
Precious message, by Waggoner p47
Predominant debate – Trinity p3
Pride of Jewish nation p136
Prophetess, Huldah p135

Index

Questions on Doctrine p105.106.107
Religion changed p49.50
Representative p59.60
Review and Herald problems p63.64
Review and Herald destroyed by fire p64
Review and Herald agreed to print Living Temple p64
Revival and Reformation p127
Road to Nicaea not straight p7
Rome not want liberty for others p35
Roman dunghill of decretals p14
Sabbath Conferences united brethren p10.11
Same Spirit, Father and Son p58
Samuel S. Snow p2
Samuel Spear article 'The Subordinate Son' p92
SDAs do not believe Christ created p43
Seeds of bitterness not uprooted from Minneapolis p49
Semi-Arians p29.30
Silencing the mind p115
Son has all the divine attributes p39.40
Son of God in a 'new sense' p46
Soul sleep p13.14
Spirit, God's omnipresent power p57
Spirit of God-Christ present in our midst p57.58
Spirit of Prophecy changes p126
Spirit sees, hears, guides, convicts p57
Spiritual formation p113-116
State of the dead believers p13.14
Statement of Faith 1931, no vote of approval p93
Statement of Belief 1980. No.2 on Trinity p124
Stenographer says to print nothing of 1919 Bible Conf. p84
Synagogue of Satan p50
Testimonies, time and place must be considered p24
Testimony of Spirit p8.11
Theodoric, king Goths p34.35.36
Third person grammatically p60
Three horns plucked up p38.39
Three statements of Ellen White p23
Time and Place must be considered p24
Trinitarianism not 1st century, but late 4th century p38
Trinity assumed p6
Trinity confuses rather than clarifies p24
Trinity, Creed Athanasius p124.125
Trinity, Catholic Encyclopaedia p125

Index

Truth needs no investigation or error p2
Trinity assumed p7
Trinity destroys personality of God and Christ p 18.112
Trinity, difficult to offer clear, objective revelation p38
Trinity implied p12
Trinity not developed NT p7
Trinity not detected in Bible p7
Trinity not explicit p7.40
Trinity triumphed, Russel Holt p92
Trinity voted in at 1980 General Conference p124
Truth given point by point p71
Truth, not a pin or pillar to be moved p71
Truth so plain p11
Turning point in the denomination, Froom p120
Twenty five men Executive Committee p65
Two companies praying for Holy Spirit, vision p127.128

Uriah Smith p100.101
Unfaithful punished p1268Unique p42
Unique p44.45

Vandals p37.38
Visigoths convert to Catholicism p24
Vision of two companies praying for Spirit p127.128
Visualisation p114

Waggoner and Jones lost to denomination p69.70
Waggoner continues to preach non-Trinity after 1888 p119
Waggoner left behind Arianism by 1888 says Froom p119.120
Waggoner objects to new Constitution in 1903 p66
Waggoner's book a transcript of his message of 1888 p48
Waggoner's book 'The Righteousness of Christ' p48
Waggoner's message to combat Arianism, says Froom p119.120
Waggoner. J.H. on atonement p110
Walter Martin opens his suitcase p104.105
Walter Martin said SDAs not a cult p103
Walter Martin said EGW denied deity of Christ p104
Warning against sentiments of Living Temple p22
Washburn condemns 1919 Bible Council as 'secret' p85
Washburn says Trinity a cruel heathen monstrosity p95
Washburn says Trinity is clearly apostasy p95
Weymouth statement on destruction p14
Where are the watchmen? p19
William Miller p2.8
Wilson. Neil, president concerned about Arian complications p124

Index

Wilson. Ted, president inspiring sermon Gen Conf. 2010 p127

Worship false gods, Israel p1312.132.133

Wrong principles, God cannot bless p65.66

'Ye shall Receive Power' p126

AD34 -- Close probation Jewish nation p141

AD325 -- Council of Nicaea p28

AD355 -- Council of Milan p29

AD359 -- Council of Rimini p30

AD377 -- Goths cross the Danube p33

AD400 -- Goths enter borders of Italy p33

AD407 -- Burgundians, Vandals, Suevi overrun Italy p33

AD476 -- Heruli establish themselves in Italy p34

AD493 -- Heruli destroyed p35

AD500 -- Visigoths sack Rome p33

AD530 -- Vandals sack Rome p33

AD508 -- Clovis grieved to see Arians with best land p34

AD526 -- Theodoric dies p36

AD527 -- Justinian becomes emperor of the East p36

AD532 -- Justinian issues edict to unite world p36

AD533 -- Trinitarian debate p36

AD534 -- Vandals destroyed p37

AD538 -- Ostrogoths destroyed p38

1513 -- Dec 19. Papal Bull condemning non-immortal soul p13

1520 -- Luther's 41 propositions p13

1611 -- King James Bible published p44

1844 -- Pioneers began studies together p7.8

1844 -- October 22, 2nd disappointment p7

1844-1848 -- Sabbath Conferences p11

1846 -- Ellen White's vision of two companies praying p127.128

1848 -- Precious message p48

1848 -- Hardly two agreed at Sabbath conferences p11

1849 -- We know we have the truth p11

1855 -- Truth so plain, no more hard labour p11

1883 -- Question and Answer on Christ being created p43

1888 -- Minneapolis p47.48.49

1888 -- Loud cry and latter rain resisted p52.53

1888 -- Latter rain rejected p52.53

1890 -- Waggoner's book 'The Righteousness of Christ' printed USA p48

1892 -- Loud cry begun p48

1893 -- Waggoner's 'Christ and His Righteousness' printed Australia p48

1893 -- A.T. Jones queries delegates on 1888 and what was rejected p52.53

Index

- 1897 -- Recommendations for essential change at Gen Conf. session p64.65
- 1901 -- Recommendations for change repeated and voted, one chairman p65
- 1901 -- Gen Conf. Committee increased from 13 to 25 p65
- 1901 -- Battle Creek sanitarium burns to the ground. Feb 18. p64
- 1903 -- Crisis begins with 'Living Temple' and 'alpha' p20
- 1903 -- Autumn Council p22
- 1903 -- Kellogg has supporters for Living Temple p22
- 1903 -- Uriah Smith dies p100
- 1903 -- Kellogg asks Jones to teach Battle Creek p69
- 1903 -- Gen. Conf. session rejects 1897 and 1901 recommendations p65
- 1903 -- Waggoner moves to Battle Creek p70
- 1904 -- Ellen has another vision of Kellogg p23
- 1905 -- Every pillar of truth is to be strengthened p71
- 1906 -- Not a pin or pillar can be moved p71
- 1906 -- Jones deluded and deceived p69.70
- 1907 -- Kellogg disfellowshipped p112
- 1907 -- Apostasy is here p71
- 1915 -- Ellen White dies p75
- 1916 -- Waggoner died p70
- 1919 -- Bible Conference p70 +
- 1921 -- Washburn calls 1919 Bible Conf. a 'secret Bible Council' p85
- 1922 -- Washburn says 1919 B.C. 'most terrible in our history' p85
- 1922 -- Claude Holmes letter also circulated at G.C. p85
- 1923, 1924, 1925 -- Daniells takes workers' meetings p87.88
- 1926 -- Leroy Froom invited to present at Milwaukee G.Conf p88
- 1928 -- The Coming of the Comforter published p89
- 1930 -- Daniells asked Froom to do a special book p90.91
- 1931 -- Statement of Faith put in 1931 Yearbook p94
- 1933 -- Statement of Faith appears in Church Manual p94
- 1936 -- Sabbath School lessons a mixture of truth and error p94.95
- 1939 -- Washburn responds in protest, 39 printed to circulate p94
- 1941 -- Gen Conference approved change to Baptismal Vow p95
- 1944 -- Corrections to Daniel and Revelation began p100
- 1946 -- Compilation of Evangelism p101
- 1947 -- Longacre writes on deity of Christ, non-Trinitarian position p96
- 1950 -- Gen. Conf. votes no change to Statement only is session p96
- 1952 -- Book 'Principles of Life' doctrines p102
- 1954 -- Edstrom challenged in Africa about the Trinity p121
- 1955, 1956 -- SDA leaders anxious not to be a cult p103
- 1956 -- Walter Martin meets to committee p102.103
- 1971 -- Movement of Destiny published (700 pages) p119
- 1974 -- Froom dies p120
- 1974 -- 1919 Bible Conference transcript discovered p73
- 1975 -- Edward Edstrom writes non-Trinitarian book p121

Index

1980 -- Trinity becomes official at Dallas Gen Conf. p124
1989 -- Walter Martin tells of case of books at Loma Linda p104.105
1996 -- Devotional 'Ye Shall Receive Power' p126
2005 -- Baptismal revised to Trinity belief p126

Genesis 1:1.2. p56
Genesis 1:21.24.25 p41
Genesis 3:10 p61
Genesis 3:22 p15
Genesis 49:26 p15
Exodus 17:6 p146
Exodus 20:3 p25
Numbers 13:27-29 p129
Numbers 13:30 p129
Numbers 14:1 p130
Numbers 14:2-4 p129
Numbers 14:7-10 p129
Numbers 14:11.12 p130
Numbers 14:13-19 p130
Numbers 14:21-23. 25.28.29.32.33 p130
Numbers 14:40 p130
Numbers 14:42 p131
Exodus 20:3 p25
Deuteronomy 15:17 p15
Deuteronomy 21:22.23 p138
Deuteronomy 28:49.50.52.58.64.66 p132
Deuteronomy 28:53-57 p139
Deuteronomy 28:15.63.64 p141
Deuteronomy 31:16 p131
Judges 2:10 p132
Judges 10:6 p132
Judges 21:25 p132
1 Kings 12:28 p133
2 Kings 17:8-12 p133
2 Kings 17:19 p132
2 Chronicles 34:19.2 p135
2 Chronicles 34:25 p135
2 Chronicles 34:28 p135
Job 38:7 p51
Psalm 2:7 p136
Psalm 2:8.9 p134
Psalm 2:12 p136
Psalm 10:16 p15
Psalm 11:4 p57

Index

Psalm 40:6 p46
Psalm 45:6 p87
Psalm 106:34-38 p132
Psalm 106:37.38 p134
Psalm 110:1 p137.139
Psalm 122: 6.7 p144
Psalm 139:1-4 p114
Psalm 139:7-10 p55
Proverbs 8 p145
Isaiah 2:3 p131
Isaiah 8:20 p86
Isaiah 11:11.12 p140
Isaiah 14:13.140 p117
Isaiah 35:1 p140
Isaiah 60:15 p15
Isaiah 61:2 p136
Jeremiah 7:31 p132
Jeremiah 31:35.36 p139
Ezekiel 8:5.14.16 p134
Daniel 12:2. p15
Daniel 7:8 p38
Daniel 7:13 p135
Daniel 7:20 p39
Daniel 7:24 p39
Daniel 9:24 p135
Daniel 12:2 p15
Micah 5:2 p16
Zechariah 6:12.13 p144

Matthew 1:20 p45
Matthew 10:19.20 p2
Matthew 16:13.15.16. p137
Matthew 18:20 p58.75
Matthew 22:42-45 p137
Matthew 22:46 p137
Matthew 23:38 p137
Matthew 26:63.64 p137.138
Matthew 26:66 p138
Matthew 27:22-25 8132
Luke 7:12. 8:42. 9:38 p44
Luke 3:38 p45
1John 1:14 p44
John 1:14.18. 3:16. 3:18. p44
John 3:16 p44

Index

John 5:26 p77.79
John 7:47.48. p1
John 8:42 p50
John 10:18 p10
John 12:34 p59
John 14:17 p58
John 14:16 p59
John 14:18 p59
John 14:22.23. p58
John 17:21-23 p59/127
John 20:22 p60
Romans 8:14.15 p51
Romans 8:9-11 p58
Romans 8:26.27 p114
Romans 9:4 p136
Romans 16:25 p61
1 Corinthians 3:16 p61
1 Corinthians 10:11 p141
1 Corinthians 15:24-28 p96
2 Corinthians 6:16 p59.102
Galatians 3:28.29 p141
Galatians 6:7 p41
Ephesians 2:18 p58
Ephesians 2:20 p143
Ephesians 4:4 p58
Colossians 2:3 p143
Colossians 2:5 p57
Colossians 1:27 p61
2 Thessalonians 2:10-12 p128
2 Timothy 2:15 p14
Hebrews 1:3 p42
Hebrews 1:8 p87
Hebrews 1:4. 3:6 p44
Hebrews 11:17 p44
Hebrews 10:5 p46
1 Peter 2:9 p25
1 John 5:10 p146
Revelation 3:9 p50
Revelation 3:20.21 p114
Revelation 3:22 p128
Revelation 3:14 p67
Revelation 12:12 p117
Revelation 14:10.11 p13

Dear Brothers and Sisters,

I was once a Trinitarian, and it pained my heart in recent years to hear of those who had 'left the faith once delivered to the saints', as I thought. In 1995, a friend gave me a book and two audio tapes. Out of politeness, I took them. But when I opened the book, it was unintelligible to me. The tapes seemed to be in 'Chinese', and so I only heard a few moments.

This ended my encounter with the subject. I did not study it, nor even think about it. It completely went out of my mind; just disappeared.

*Three years later, a magazine arrived on the subject. I had dismissed a previous issue, but this time I glanced through it. Suddenly a Spirit of Prophecy statement caught my attention, and I immediately thought, 'Uh oh, I think I need to study this'. Taking 'Patriarchs and Prophets' from the shelf, I read the first chapter. There was no doubt in my mind now – *This is the truth.**

Then began an in-depth study, from November 1998 until this day, and the subject is clearer and more beautiful now than when I first believed it.

Dear Reader, if you have found the subject difficult, I can appreciate your feelings. If you have not seen it as truth, I understand. I know through my own experience that when something is new, it can be hard to understand. My mind could not even begin to consider the subject. And yet, as I later looked at the book and listened to the tapes, I found them to be so simple and plainly stated.

One thing I did know – I loved the truth.

I became a Christian in 1959, and an Adventist in 1961. As a 21-year-old, who had disliked school and study, I became very analytical, loving to study God's Word.

When the subject of God and His Son was presented in 1995, I should have studied it, but for some reason, it was beyond me. Three years later, when I saw the light, study of the subject became easy. I went

through every text in the Bible on the subject; I wanted to be absolutely certain.

I am so grateful to God for bringing me to Jesus at an Anglican camp meeting in 1959. I knew absolutely nothing about the Bible, except that Jesus was a good man who healed people. I attended Sunday School and Youth Fellowship, but was unable to understand anything else. However, when the gospel was clearly presented to a few of us in a little after-meeting at the Anglican camp, God opened my mind and a light came on.

The next twelve months was only Jesus, and Sundays were filled with church services. At 8.00am Communion in my local church, 9.00 taught Sunday School, 10.00 Youth Fellowship, 11.00 Divine Service, 2.00 a Chinese Church, 4.00 Chinese Youth Service, and at 7.00pm Evensong at St. Paul's cathedral.

In 1960, my father, a very active Anglican churchman, took me to a meeting in the State Theatre, where Geoff Ratcliffe was to speak on the second coming of Christ. Little did either of us know it was an Adventist mission (crusade), in fact, I had never heard of Seventh-day Adventists.

What a revelation the subject was for me – Jesus is coming back!

My dear Daddy later told me he had believed this for forty years, having read a book while at school called 'The Midnight Cry'. (I found out later it was printed by the Signs Publishing Company)

Oh Daddy, why didn't you tell me? But I held my peace.

You see, I remembered the death of my grandmother and how my heart had been broken. I cried every night for months. Mimi was gone; I would never see her again. I remembered her funeral as a 16-year-old, and recall watching the Lutheran pastor comfort my auntie. He did not say a word of comfort to me, yet I had lost the light of my life.

But now, joy filled my heart -- I would see Mimi again.

As the mission progressed, my mind was filled with wonder, excitement and many questions. Was all this true?

The big question was the Sabbath – if that was true, the rest must be. The next twelve months were filled with personal Bible study. After work, I would go to the public library to study history. Did the Ten Commandments go through the cross? Surely history would reveal it.

My answer came during our weekly Bible study with Roy Naden, Pastor Ratcliffe's singing evangelist, and I was baptised the following Sabbath. My mother came to the baptism, but I was alone in the truth. I still praise God for His mercy upon me. I determined never to allow a friend to lose a loved one without giving them hope.

My Anglican father and Lutheran mother remained members of their churches, but my dear Daddy, who died March 10, 2012, aged 100 years, rejoiced in Jesus. He believed the truth that he would go to sleep until the resurrection. In the hospital, two days before he died, he asked, 'Margaretha, I am going to sleep, but Jesus will wake me up, won't He?' 'Yes Daddy', and I quoted 1 Thessalonians 4:16,17. We prayed together. It was the last time I saw him, but I will see him in 'the morning'.

I will always remember how a Catholic work-friend of my husband shared thoughtful words with me at my grandfather's funeral. He simply said, 'This is a sad day.' He had never met my grandfather, but came out of respect for us. It is the only comment I remember, but it has lived with me since 1972.

My prayer has been that I might be thoughtful, kind and gentle too, but it has not been easy. I had to learn it for writing too. A friend, after reading one of my books said, 'Don't make sharp thrusts.' It was counsel I needed and began to implement it in my writing. Today I try to remember, and am grateful for proofers who say, 'That word is too hard', as it can be changed.

I want Jesus to shine through me. Jesus is not a doctrine; He is a living Person. I know many readers understand this, and Jesus does shine from your countenance, whether His name is spoken or not. My husband's friend did not mention Jesus, but through His kind words,

God's love blessed my heart as I have remembered them these forty-one years.

However, doctrine is also essential, and as Adventists we understand this very well. The book you hold in your hand is about a very powerful doctrine, and many pages of history. To me history is exciting, especially denominational history, so study is a delight. But it is not easy for everyone and I have tried to vary it so as not to become tedious. My hope is that everything is simple to understand and interesting. I have also tried to be respectful, not only of the brethren about whom I write, but of the reader.

There is no question I want you to understand the doctrine -- the Fatherhood of God, and the Sonship of Jesus -- but it is my prayer you will continue to grow more and more like the Saviour every day, no matter whether you see light in these pages or not.

If you have received this book in the mail from me, but do not wish to communicate, you will receive nothing more. If you have been approached by many on this subject, and feel 'Oh no, not another one', I apologise. Your right to reject the book is understandable.

If you would like further materials, do write to me. A follow-up book will be sent to all who request it called 'Immanuel -- God with Us', a 96-page devotional about Jesus in His incarnation. Other books are available if you are interested. All free upon your request.

I am praying that 'Removing the Pillar' will be a blessing to all who read it, and will continue to pray that God will use it to His glory, and that you will pass it on to others.

Jesus is coming back soon and my prayer is that you will be ready to meet Him in peace with your loved ones.

Margaretha Tierney

Notes

“Then cometh the end, when He (Christ) shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when He shall have put down all rule and all authority and power.

For He (Christ) must reign, till He (God) hath put all enemies under His feet.

The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. For He hath put all things under His feet.

But when He said all things are put under Him, it is manifest that He is excepted which did put all things under Him.

And when all things shall be subdued unto Him, then shall the Son also Himself be subject unto Him that put all things under Him, that God may be all in all.”

1 Corinthians 15:24-28.