

# HARVEST INSPIRATION DISCOVERIES

[HTTP://PRODISCOVERIES.COM](http://prodiscoveries.com)

## CHAPTER 10

### THE ULTIMATE BETRAYAL

LINK TO COMPLETE DOCUMENT:

[http://prodiscoveries.com/images/stories/SDA-ONLY/THE\\_GREAT\\_CONSPIRACY/THE-GREAT-CONSPIRACY-COMPLETE-REV-L.pdf](http://prodiscoveries.com/images/stories/SDA-ONLY/THE_GREAT_CONSPIRACY/THE-GREAT-CONSPIRACY-COMPLETE-REV-L.pdf)

#### Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION .....	2
The Fourth Wrong Step Toward Ecumenism .....	3
Leroy Froom’s Eyewitness Report Of the Evangelical Conferences.....	3
The Expunged Note In Bible Readings.....	4
The Alleged Erroneous Note.....	5
Pioneer Adventists and Christ’s Human Nature .....	5
Nine quotations form the pioneers on the human nature of Christ .....	6
Ellen White and Christ’s Human Nature .....	7
Leroy Froom’s Erroneous Conclusion On <i>Bible Readings</i> Note .....	8
Who Dared To Expunged the Note In <i>Bible Readings</i> ?.....	8
Froom’s Own Son Concurred With Pioneer Adventists .....	9
Standard Seventh-day Adventist Books Not To Be Revised .....	9
Daniel and Revelation by Uriah Smith Revised long after his deeth .....	9
The Jesus took the Nature Of Adam – Before the Fall, Or After the Fall?.....	10
Tobie E. Unruh’s First Contact With Evangelicals.....	11
Unruh’s Misconception Of Evangelical Trust .....	13
Tobie Unruh’s Eyewitness Report Of the Evangelical Conferences: .....	14
Unruh’s Short Sketch Of Walter Martin’s Credentials: .....	14
Leadership Defines Doctrine To Evangelicals.....	15
Donald Barnhouse’s Eyewitness Report Of the Evangelical Conferences: .....	17
The Big Historical Lie.....	17
Note carefully the following scenario. ....	18
What does inspiration say about this “new movement,” this “new theology?” .....	19
The Landmarks Defined.....	20
Please remember that the old landmarks listed above were not the only pillars of the church. ....	21
Was Ellen White a false prophet? Was the SDA Movement a false movement?.....	21
Leadership Expunges Sentence From Spirit of Prophecy .....	23

A new doctrinal phrase, never before known in Seventh-day Adventist theology was coined at that time,.....	25
Triumphal Adventist Objective Attained In the Evangelical Conferences .....	27
CONCLUSION OF ULTIMATE BETRAYAL .....	30

## INTRODUCTION

Remove not the ancient landmark, which thy fathers have set.  
Proverbs 22:28

This policy is the first step in a succession of wrong steps,” Ellen White warned.

*“The principles which have been advocated in the American Sentinel are the very sum and substance of the advocacy of the Sabbath, and when men begin to talk of changing these principles, they are doing a work which it does not belong to them to do. . . .” (Counsels to Writers and Editors, page 96, emphasis supplied).*

This statement by Ellen White was made in reference to an incident that took place in 1890 in which ministers who were in charge of the *American Sentinel* (Seventh-day Adventist Religious Liberty magazine of the day, forerunner of our contemporary *Liberty* magazine) met behind closed doors to contemplate dropping the name Seventh-day Adventist from the magazine. This was proposed to gain acceptance from the Sunday-keeping churches. Ellen White received a vision of what was taking place and gave the following testimony:

*In the night season I was present in several councils, and there I heard words repeated by influential men to the effect that if the American Sentinel would drop the words “Seventh-day Adventist” from its columns, and would say nothing about the Sabbath, the great men of the world would patronize it. It would become popular and do a larger work. This looked very pleasing. These men could not see why we could not affiliate with unbelievers and non-professors to make the American Sentinel a great success. I saw their countenances brighten, and they began to work on a policy to make the Sentinel a popular success. Ellen G. White, Manuscript Release, No 1033, pages 59, 60. (emphasis supplied).*

*“These men could not see why we could not affiliate with unbelievers and non-professors.” This is a definite statement against Ecumenism, against affiliating with unbelievers and non-professors. Unbelievers and non-professors of what? The third angel’s message, of course! “Can two walk together, except they be agreed?” the Bible states. (Amos 3:3). “These men could not see why we could not affiliate,” the Spirit of Prophecy agrees. Yet in 1926, eleven short years after the death of Ellen White, SDA leadership officially voted that, “We recognize every agency that lifts up Christ before man as a part of the divine plan for the evangelization of the world, and we hold in high esteem the Christian men and women in other communions who are engaged in winning souls to Christ.” (“Relationship To Other Societies,” General Conference Executive Committee, 1926, emphasis supplied).*

Then in 1955, again there were men at the head of the Seventh-day Adventist Church who “could not see why we could not affiliate with unbelievers and non-professors.” Oh, but now there was no living prophet

to stem the overwhelming tide of Ecumenism about to flood into the Church. There were only the writings of the prophet, which leadership had been ignoring for many years.

### **The Fourth Wrong Step Toward Ecumenism**

We now come to the fourth wrong step toward ecumenism – the Evangelical Conferences of 1955-56. Documentation of this historical event is taken from four reliable eyewitness participants, plus two other reliable sources:

1. Leroy Edwin Froom, *Movement of Destiny*. Froom made an early contact with the noted Evangelical, Dr. E. Schuyler English, editor of *Our Hope* magazine. Froom also played a major role in the Evangelical Conferences.
2. T. E. Unruh, the first Seventh-day Adventist contact with the noted Evangelical, Dr. Donald Grey Barnhouse, editor of *Eternity* magazine. “When the events described here took place, Unruh was President of the East Pennsylvania Conference.” (Editor’s Note, *Adventist Heritage*, Vol. 4, No. 2, 1977).
3. Dr. Donald Grey Barnhouse, “popular radio preacher, minister, of the Tenth Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, author of a number of Evangelical books, and founder and senior editor of the influential *Eternity* magazine.” (T. E. Unruh, *The Adventist Heritage*, Vol. 4, No. 2, 1977, page 35). Barnhouse was also the chairman of the conferences between the Evangelicals and the Seventh-day Adventists.
4. Walter R. Martin, *Eternity* magazine. Martin worked with Dr. Barnhouse and was a major Evangelical participant in the conferences. At that time he was preparing his Doctoral manuscript on titled, *The Truth About Seventh-day Adventists*.
5. Video tapes of the *John Ankerberg* television program, (1983), featuring as guests, Dr. Walter R. Martin (author of *The Truth About Seventh-day Adventists* and *The Kingdom of the Cults*), and Dr. William G. Johnsson, current Editor of the *Adventist Review*.
6. Virginia Steinweg, *Without Fear or Favor*, “The Life of M. L. Andreasen,” Review and Herald Publishing Association, Washington, D.C., 1979.

### **Leroy Froom’s Eyewitness Report Of the Evangelical Conferences**

*“The following chain of circumstances began before the contacts with Walter R. Martin and Donald Grey Barnhouse,” Leroy Froom stated. “However, this earlier exchange with Dr. English had a definite bearing upon – though it was separate from – the conferences with Martin and Barnhouse.” (Leroy Edwin Froom, Movement of Destiny, pages 468, 469).*

*“One of the later type [articles] appeared in 1955 in a brief editorial note in Our Hope, published in Philadelphia and edited by Dr. E. Schuyler English, also chairman of the Revision Committee of the Scofield Reference Bible,” Froom recalled. “A chain of unique circumstances grew out of this editorial item that should be told, for his journal led the way in corrective undertaking.” (ibid., MD, p. 468).*

**The footnotes in the “Scofield Reference Bible” are one of the most anti-Adventist compositions known to man. And now Froom discloses that Dr. E. Schuyler English was the chairman of the**

**Scofield Reference Bible “Revision Committee.” How could Dr. English be objective to “true” Seventh-day Adventist doctrine?**

*“In order to understand the . . . conferences with Evangelicals Martin and Barnhouse – and the resultant book Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine (1957) – it is necessary to go back to 1955, and certain pre-preliminary exchanges with Dr. English, of Our Hope [magazine],” Froom continues. “In an editorial note in his January, 1955, issue, English stated erroneously, that Seventh-day Adventists ‘deny Christ’s Deity’ (p. 409). And he added that we are a group that ‘disparages the Person and work of Christ’” (ibid., MD, p. 469).*

*“As to the latter expression, Dr. English based this misconception upon his understanding that we hold that Christ, during His incarnation, ‘partook of our sinful, fallen nature,’” Froom quoted English. “In this expression he was clearly alluding to the then off-cited note in the old edition of Bible Readings.” (E. Schuyler English, letter to L. E. F., Mar. 11, 1955, p. 1). (ibid., MD, p. 469).*

Notice that Froom says the reason Dr. English believed that Seventh-day Adventists ‘deny Christ’s Deity’ was because the book *Bible Readings* stated that “we hold that Christ, during His incarnation, partook of our sinful, fallen nature.” Was Dr. English right? No. Pioneer Seventh-day Adventists did believe in the “Deity of Jesus Christ.” Did pioneer Adventists believe that while on earth Christ “partook of our sinful, fallen nature?” Yes they did. Was the position on Christ’s human nature, published in *Bible Readings*, the correct position of pioneer Adventists? Yes, indeed it was.

*“We immediately wrote to Dr. English expressing concern over his mistaken understanding of our teachings on these and other points,” Froom stated. “And further, that the old Colcord minority-view note in Bible Readings – contending for an inherent, sinful, fallen nature for Christ – had years before been expunged because of its error.”*

Who were the “we” that wrote to Dr. English and dared to explain to him what Seventh-day Adventists believe? When was the statement in *Bible Readings* “expunged,” and who had the authority to delete Adventist doctrine from one of Adventism’s most treasured and influential missionary books?

### **The Expunged Note In Bible Readings**

*“Cognizance must also be taken of the correction, in 1949, of a definite error appearing in a note on the nature of Christ during the incarnation,” Froom stated. “For years it had appeared, in the standard Bible Readings for the Home Circle. It was in the section on “A Sinless Life.”” (ibid., MD, pp. 427, 428, emphasis supplied).*

Observe that Froom admits that, “For years it [the note] had appeared, in the standard *Bible Readings* for the Home Circle.” Later Froom stated that the note had been inserted in *Bible Readings* in 1914 and continued until 1949, a period of 35 years. Remember, Froom stated in a previous chapter that the “new” Statement of Fundamental Beliefs in 1931 were accepted *because there was not one protest of objection against them!* If the note in *Bible Readings* was “a definite error,” as Froom states, *then why had not someone protested against it during those 35 years?*

## The Alleged Erroneous Note

The expunged note in *Bible Readings* was found on page 174 in the chapter “A Sinless Life.” The note was in response to question number 6, “How fully did Christ share our common humanity?” The Scripture reference was Hebrews 2:17, “Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people.” The expunged note that Dr. English, Leroy Froom, and Adventist leadership, then and now, have an aversion to reads as follows:

*In His humanity Christ partook of our sinful, fallen nature. If not, then He was not “made like unto His brethren,” was not “in all points tempted like as we are,” did not overcome as we have to overcome, and is not, therefore, the complete and perfect Saviour man needs and must have to be saved. The idea that Christ was born of an immaculate or sinless mother, inherited no tendencies to sin, and for this reason did not sin, removes Him from the realm of a fallen world, and from the very place where help is needed. On His human side, Christ inherited just what every child of Adam inherited—a sinful nature. On the divine side, from His very conception He was begotten and born of the Spirit. And all this was done to place mankind on vantage-ground, and to demonstrate that in the same way everyone who is “born of the Spirit” may gain like victories over sin in his own sinful flesh. Thus each one is to overcome as Christ overcame. Rev. 3:21. Without this birth there can be no victory over temptation, and no salvation from sin. John 3:3-7. Bible Readings for the Home, Copyright Review and Herald Publishing Association, all editions 1914-1949, Pacific Press Publishing Association, page 174. (emphasis supplied).*

This powerful pioneer Adventist statement on victory over sin is obviously a thorn in the side of contemporary “new theology” Seventh-day Adventists. The new note that was placed in *Bible Readings* in 1949 reads as follows:

*Jesus Christ is both Son of God and Son of man. As a member of the human family “it behoved Him to be made like unto His brethren” – “in the likeness of sinful flesh.” Just how far that “likeness” goes is a mystery of the incarnation which men have never been able to solve, Bible Readings for the Home, Copyright Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1959 edition, Pacific Press Publishing Association, page 143. (emphasis supplied).*

### Froom’s Explanation Of the Expunged Note In *Bible Readings*?

“Apparently it was first written by W. A. Colcord, in 1914,” Froom wrote. “It likewise involved one of those questions upon which there had been variance of view through the years.” (*ibid.*, MD, pp. 427, 428, emphasis supplied).

Froom was back to his devious method of insinuation without documentation. “Apparently it was first written by W. A. Colcord, in 1914.” Froom gives no historical references to the fact that Colcord might have written the note – just insinuation by the use of the word “apparently.” Froom then states that, “It likewise involved one of those questions upon which there had been variance of view through the years.” Again no documentation, just insinuation. Is this statement true? No. The truth is that James White and all pioneer Seventh-day Adventists, including Ellen White, believed the human nature of Christ to be as it was written in *Bible Readings*.

## Pioneer Adventists and Christ’s Human Nature

In his excellent research book, *The Word Was Made Flesh*, Dr. Ralph Larson found over 1,100 statements by Ellen White and other pioneer Adventists that Jesus came to earth in the nature of Adam after the fall in Eden. Larson did not find one statement that Christ took the nature of Adam before the fall. There is a document in the Ellen G. White Estate, however, which reveals that the apostate “Holy Flesh” movement in Indiana (1899-1900) taught the false doctrine that Christ took upon Himself the nature of Adam before the fall. This document was in the form of a letter to Ellen White from Stephen N. Haskell, mailed from Battle Creek, Michigan on September 25, 1900:

*When we stated that we believed that Christ was born in fallen humanity, they [the Holy Flesh leaders] would represent us as believing that Christ sinned, notwithstanding the fact that we would state our position so clearly that it would seem as though no one could misunderstand us.*

*Their point of theology in this particular respect seems to be this: They [the Holy Flesh leaders] believe that Christ took Adam’s nature before he fell; so He [Christ] took humanity as it was in the garden of Eden, and thus humanity was holy, and this is the humanity which Christ had; and now, they [the Holy Flesh leaders] say, the particular time has come for us to become holy in that sense, and then we will have “translation faith” and never die. Stephen N. Haskell, Letter #2, to Ellen G. White, dated at Battle Creek, Michigan, September 25, 1900. (emphasis supplied).*

Many quotations from pioneer Adventists on the human nature of Christ, that concur with the expunged note in *Bible Readings*, could be presented. However, only nine will be sufficient to demonstrate this point clearly.

#### **Nine quotations from the pioneers on the human nature of Christ**

*“He [Christ] was indeed a partaker of flesh and blood like unto us,” D. Lacy wrote, “and why? That He might know in His person and be touched with the feeling of our infirmities.” (Bible Echo, 4/01/90, p. 99, emphasis supplied).*

*“In coming down from the throne of glory which Christ had with the Father before the world was, to take upon Himself the likeness of sinful flesh,” S. McCullagh, first Secretary of Australasian conference, wrote, “it was that humanity might be met where they were in their low state. (ibid., Bible Echo, 1/15/1900, p. 43, emphasis supplied).*

*“Henceforth the church was to look backward to a Saviour who had come – who lived in sinful flesh,” Eugene William Farnsworth wrote. (1847-1935). (ibid., Bible Echo, 11/23/03, p. 568, emphasis supplied).*

*“(Jesus) took our nature upon Himself,” E. Hillard wrote, “and was subject to our temptations.” (ibid., Australia, Signs of the Times, 10/12/03, p. 492, emphasis supplied).*

*“Do not forget that the mystery of God is not God manifest in sinless flesh but God manifest in sinful flesh,” Alonzo T. Jones wrote. “There could never be any mystery about God’s manifesting Himself in sinless flesh, in one who had no connection whatsoever with sin. That would be plain enough. But*

*that He can manifest Himself in flesh laden with sin and with all the tendencies to sin, such as ours is – that is a mystery.” (ibid., Bible Echo, 11/30/96, p. 370, emphasis supplied). “By partaking of our nature, His human arm encircles the fallen race,” Stephen N. Haskell wrote.(ibid., Bible Echo, 2/15/92, p. 56, emphasis supplied).*

*“Christ, in order to reveal His father’s love,” W. H. Pascoe wrote, “took upon Himself our flesh, linked humanity with divinity, became subject to all our aches and pains. . . ‘Himself took our infirmities.’ ” (ibid., Australia, Signs of the Times, 7/04/04, p. 324, emphasis supplied).*

*“But who did keep the commandments?” William Warren Prescott asks. (1855-1944). “Jesus Christ. And who can do it over again, even in sinful flesh? Jesus Christ.” (ibid., Bible Echo, 12/09/95, p. 380, emphasis supplied).*

*“He [Christ] came, not where man was before he fell,” W. W. Prescott stated, “but where man was after he fell.” (ibid., Bible Echo, 1/6/96 and 1/13/96) (emphasis supplied).*

*“And notice, it was in sinful flesh that He [Christ] was tempted, not the flesh in which Adam fell,” Prescott concluded. “This is wondrous truth, but I am wondrous glad that it is so. It follows at once that by birth, by being born into the same family, Jesus Christ is my brother in the flesh.” (ibid., Bible Echo, 1/6/96 and 1/13/96, emphasis supplied).*

*“Because we are partakers of flesh and blood, and heirs of its weaknesses,” George Bert Starr wrote. (1854-1944), “He [Christ] became partaker of our nature. (ibid., Australia, Signs of the Times, 7/04/04, p. 323, emphasis supplied).*

### **Ellen White and Christ’s Human Nature**

Many statements by Ellen White can be produced that concur with the position of pioneer Adventists on Christ’s human nature. However, we will consider only three very plain statements to demonstrate this point.

- (1) Think of Christ’s humiliation. He took upon Himself fallen, suffering human nature, degraded and defiled by sin. He took our sorrows, bearing our grief and shame. He endured all the temptations wherewith man is beset. He united humanity with divinity: a divine spirit dwelt in a temple of flesh. . . . “The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us,” because by so doing He could associate with the sinful, sorrowing sons and daughters of Adam. Ellen G. White, *The Youth’s Instructor*, December 20, 1900. (emphasis supplied).
- (2) He who considered it not robbery to be equal with God, once trod the earth, bearing our suffering and sorrowing nature. Ellen G. White, *The Bible Echo*, August, 1887, page 114. (emphasis supplied).
- (3) The example He has left must be followed. He took upon His sinless nature our sinful nature, that He might know how to succor those that are tempted. Ellen G. White, *Medical Ministry*,

page 181. (emphasis supplied).

### Leroy Froom's Erroneous Conclusion On *Bible Readings* Note

*“Latitude had therefore been the accepted attitude on the question,” Froom concluded. “As a result, Adventists had long been censored by theologians not of our faith for tolerating this erroneous minority position, and this particular printed statement.” (ibid., Movement of Destiny, page 428, emphasis supplied).*

Ample evidence has already been shown that the teaching of pioneer Seventh-day Adventists and Ellen White, on the nature of Christ while in the flesh, was not an “erroneous minority position,” as Froom alludes. Further, it has been adequately demonstrated that the statements of pioneer Adventists and Ellen White harmonized perfectly with the statement in *Bible Readings for the Home*.

### Who Dared To Expunge the Note In *Bible Readings*?

*“In 1949, Professor D. E. Rebok, then president of our Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, when it was still in Washington, D. C., was requested by the Review and Herald to revise Bible Readings for the Home Circle,” Froom stated. “Coming upon this unfortunate note on page 174, in the study on the “Sinless Life,” he recognized that this was not true.” (ibid., Movement of Destiny, page 428, emphasis supplied).*

Who were the men at the Review and Herald Publishing Association that authorized Rebok to revise *Bible Readings for the Home*? Was it only Rebok's opinion that “this was not true,” or was it also the opinion of the Adventist leadership in 1949?

“But in eliminating the note he found that some still held with Colcord in his position,” Froom added further. (*ibid.*, MD, p. 428). Froom does not divulge who the “some” faithful Adventists were that still held with Colcord (if he indeed was the one who had inserted the note in *Bible Readings*), Ellen White, and other pioneer Adventists. However, in his splendid research book, *The Word Was Made Flesh*, Dr. Ralph Larson did document who the “some” were in 1949 that still believed the true human nature of Christ as taught by pioneer Seventh-day Adventists.

*“It was the same flesh as we of the human family possess,” Berthold H. Swartakopf wrote. (ibid., Australia, Signs of the Times, March 21, 1949, page 7, emphasis his).*

*“The Son of God became the Son of Man. . .,” Robert Hare wrote. “Dressed in human flesh, united with the one fallen race in the universe.” (ibid., Australia, Signs of the Times, June 20, 1949, page 7, emphasis supplied).*

*“When we read His (Christ's) genealogy as given to Matthew and Luke,” Mary E. Walsh wrote (*Bible Instructor, Doctrinal Bible Studies for the Layman, Bible Studies for Catholics; author, The Wine of Roman Babylon*), “we know that His earthly forebears were men who were marked with human weakness.” (ibid., Australia, Signs of the Times, November 24, 1949, page 11, emphasis supplied).*

*“He is touched with our feelings and infirmities,” J. A. McMillan wrote, “because He shares our nature.” (The Bible and Our Times, England, December 11, 1952, page 13, emphasis supplied).*

*“The controversy of the ages was on,” Benjamin P. Hoffman wrote. (Missionary, College teacher, Seminary Professor).. “Its issue was to be determined in the person of Him who became the partaker of the same flesh and blood with fallen humanity.” (Review and Herald, April 9, 1953, page 4, emphasis supplied).*

*“Every day of His humiliation in sinful flesh was a day of suffering,” H. L. Rudy wrote. (Conference President, General Conference Vice-President). (ibid., Review and Herald, October 14, 1954, page 3, emphasized).*

*“Only as a man with the same handicaps and limitations as other men, could Jesus be a perfect example for other men,” G. Stevenson wrote (Editor, Signs of the Times, South Africa). “It was necessary that there should be no natural difference between Himself and the men He came to save.” (South Africa Signs of the Times, Vol. 20, No. 2, page 3, emphasis supplied).*

#### **Froom’s Own Son Concurred With Pioneer Adventists**

*“He was born as a babe in Bethlehem, subject to like passions as we are,” Fenton Edwin Froom wrote. “If Christ had been exempt from temptation, without the power and responsibility to choose, or without the sin-filled inclinations and tendencies of our sinful nature, He could not have lived our life without sin.” (Our Times, December, 1949, page 4, emphasis supplied).*

Curiously, this statement by Leroy Froom’s son, Fenton, is more clear than any pioneer statement on Christ’s Human Nature! The contradiction is that Leroy Froom’s own son, Fenton, was one of those who “still held with Colcord in his position.”

“So the inaccurate note was deleted, and has remained out in all subsequent printings [of Bible Readings], “ Leroy E. Froom concluded triumphantly.

*“Thus another error was removed through these revisions of the 1940's, as concerned some of our standard and otherwise helpful books.” (ibid., MD, p. 428).*

**Our standard books were “otherwise helpful,” except for the errors that Froom and other leaders alleged! Errors were “removed from some of our standard books?” We are not told which of our other “standard” books were “revised” during the 1940's.**

#### **Standard Seventh-day Adventist Books Not To Be Revised**

##### **Daniel and Revelation by Uriah Smith Revised long after his death**

We do know the details of the revision of one major Seventh-day Adventist book in the 1940's. Uriah Smith’s book, Daniel and the Revelation, was first published in 1881. By 1888 the book had gone through six

editions, but with no revisions! In 1941 the first “revised” edition was published, long after the death of Uriah Smith. The largest and last revision was done in 1944, again long after the death of Uriah Smith.

W. W. Prescott, former president of Battle Creek College, who had from 1903 to 1909 served as editor of the Review and Herald, and was in 1910 carrying leadership responsibilities, and A. G. Daniells, president of the General Conference, having espoused the so-called “new view” of the identity of the “daily” of Daniel 8:13 (See SDA Encyclopedia, article, “Daily”), were drawn into heated discussions with advocates of the “old view” expounded by Uriah Smith in his much-used and fruitful book Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation. .

*.. There was talk of the possible revision of books in which the old view was advocated, particularly the widely sold Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation. Publishers note, Ellen G. White Estate, Manuscript Releases, Vol. 18, page 49. (emphasis supplied).*

**Uriah Smith passed away in 1903, seven years before this proposal to revise his book was attempted. The revision of these standard Seventh-day Adventist books was done in total opposition to the counsel given by Ellen White.**

*“If we should now sow broadcast seeds of doubt as to the correctness of our printed books and tracts, and encourage the thought that there must needs be a general revision of our published books,” Ellen White counsels, “a work will have begun that the Lord has not appointed us to do.” (Letter 70, 1910, pages. 1, 3, August 11, 1910) (See also, Manuscript Releases, Vol. 10, “Counsels Concerning W. W. Prescott and A. G. Daniells,” pages 364- 366, emphasis supplied).*

*“Even a suggestion as to inaccuracies would, if made public, lead some to vindicate their course of action in spending much time in an effort to search for flaws and to find fault,” Ellen White counseled. “It is not safe to set some minds running in such channels of thought, as this would lead to a harvest of doubt and unbelief. I know whereof I speak, for the Lord has opened this matter before me.” (ibid., Letter 70, 1910, pages. 1, 3, August 11, 1910, emphasis supplied).*

*“In the night season I have seen men looking over our printed books in search of something to criticize, and the adversary was standing by their side, making suggestions to their minds,” Ellen White concluded. “The natural result of unwise criticism would be to bring infidelity into our ranks.” (ibid., Letter 70, 1910, pages. 1, 3, August 11, 1910, emphasis supplied).*

**The Jesus took the Nature Of Adam – Before the Fall, Or After the Fall?**

*In his letter to Froom, Dr. English stated that, “He [Christ] was perfect in His humanity, but He was none the less God, and His conception in His incarnation was overshadowed by the Holy Spirit so that He did not partake of the fallen sinful nature of other men.” (ibid., MD, p. 469, emphasis supplied).*

In his reply letter to Dr. English, Froom stated,

*“That, we in turn assured him, is precisely what we [Seventh-day Adventists] likewise believe.” (ibid., MD, p. 470, emphasis supplied). In his book*

*Movement of Destiny, Froom stated that, “He [Christ] was like Adam before his fall, who was similarly without any inherent sinful propensities.” (ibid., MD, p. 428, emphasis supplied).*

Is this the position of Ellen White and pioneer Seventh-day Adventists? No. It is not. Note carefully the following two statements from the pen of inspiration:

*He [Christ] took the nature of man, with all its possibilities. We have nothing to endure that He has not endured. . . . Adam had the advantage over Christ, in that when he was assailed by the tempter, none of the effects of sin were upon him. He [Adam] stood in the strength of perfect manhood, possessing the full vigor of mind and body. He [Adam] was surrounded with the glories of Eden, and was in daily communion with heavenly beings. It was not thus with Jesus when He entered the wilderness to cope with Satan. For four thousand years the race had been decreasing in physical strength, in mental power, in moral worth; and Christ took upon Him the infirmities of degenerate humanity. Only thus could He rescue man from the lowest depths of degradation. Ellen G. White, Manuscript. 113, 1902, pages. 1, 2. (See, Desire of Ages, page 117) (emphasis supplied).*

(2) *In Christ are united the divine and the human. The Creator and the creature, the nature of God, whose law had been transgressed, and nature of Adam, the transgressor, meet in Jesus,—the Son of God and the Son of man. Ellen G. White, Bible Training School, February 1, 1908. (emphasis supplied).*

It is obvious from these two statements that Leroy Froom is not in harmony with the Spirit of Prophecy on the nature that Christ assumed while in the flesh. What Froom told Dr. English that Seventh-day Adventists believe is just not true. This is not what Seventh-day Adventists historically believed and taught in their writings.

### **Tobie E. Unruh’s First Contact With Evangelicals**

“While some Adventist and non-Adventist dissidents have been vociferous in their denunciation

*of the Adventist definitions of the Evangelical evaluation,” T. E. Unruh began, “in retrospect the conferences improved the understanding and appreciation of the Seventh-day Adventist church on the part of many Evangelical leaders and likewise warmed many Adventist leaders toward the Evangelicals.” (T. E. Unruh, The Adventist Heritage, Vol. 4, No. 2, 1977, page 35, emphasis supplied).*

We might paraphrase Unruh’s statement “and likewise warmed many Adventist leaders toward Babylon.” In this first paragraph Unruh added, “It was a time when the gates between sheepfolds stood open.” (ibid., AH, p. 35, emphasis supplied). The time was right for Evangelical heresies to be introduced into the Seventh-day Adventist Church.

*“There was no thought of precipitating in anything of such historic consequence when I wrote a letter on November 28, 1949, commending Dr. Donald Grey Barnhouse for his radio sermons on righteousness by faith based*

*on the book of Romans,” Unruh disclosed. “At the time, Dr. Barnhouse was a popular radio preacher, minister, of the Tenth Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, author of a number of Evangelical books, and founder and senior editor of the influential Eternity magazine.”(ibid., AH, p. 35). Unruh added further that, “I was the president of the East Pennsylvania Conference, with headquarters in Reading.” (ibid., AH, p. 35, emphasis supplied).*

Tobie E. Unruh, president of the East Pennsylvania Conference, was the first Seventh-day Adventist (other than Leroy Froom) to reach out to the Evangelical leaders. Unruh must have had an obscure knowledge of the true teaching of Righteousness by Faith as it was taught by Ellen White and pioneer Adventists E. J. Waggoner and A. T. Jones.

*“The Lord in His great mercy sent a most precious message to His people through Elders Waggoner and Jones. . . ,” Ellen White wrote. “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.” (Testimonies to Ministers, pages 91-92, emphasis supplied).*

**What would Dr. Barnhouse, a Presbyterian minister, know about the true teaching of Righteousness by Faith? The Lord sent a special, “a most precious message,” to the Seventh-day Adventist Church on Righteousness by Faith. Why did not Jesus simply tell Adventists to “Study Righteousness by Faith as taught by the Presbyterian Church?”**

*“In his reply to my letter Barnhouse expressed astonishment that an Adventist clergyman would commend him for preaching righteousness by faith,” Unruh continued, “since in his opinion it was a well known fact that Seventh-day Adventists believed in righteousness by works.” (ibid., AH, p. 35, emphasis supplied).*

Notice that Barnhouse was astonished that an Adventist would believe in the “free grace” concept of Righteousness by Faith as taught by a Presbyterian. Indeed, Barnhouse stated that “*it was a well known fact that Seventh-day Adventist believed in righteousness by works.*”

Dr. Barnhouse also knew that Adventists believed in a different Christ than Evangelicals. The Christ of the Seventh-day Adventist is “the Lord of the Sabbath,”(Matt. 12:8), and the Christ that Adventists believed in, came to earth in the human nature of “the seed of Abraham.” (Heb. 2:16).

Unruh verified this pioneer position of Seventh-day Adventists on the human nature of Christ by relating that Barnhouse

*“went on to state that since boyhood he had been familiar with Adventists and their teachings, and that in his opinion about their views about the nature and work of Christ were Satanic and dangerous.” (ibid. AH, p. 35, emphasis supplied).*

Barnhouse then concluded his letter “by inviting this strange Adventist to have lunch with him.” (*ibid.*, AH, p. 35). Notice that Dr. Barnhouse considered Unruh to be a “strange Adventist” because of his “Presbyterian” concepts of Righteousness by Faith.

*“We did not then get together for lunch, but we did correspond for a time,” Unruh recalled. “I returned a soft answer to the first letter from Barnhouse and sent him a copy of Steps to Christ, at the same time affirming the evangelical character of Adventist doctrine.” (ibid., AH, p. 35, emphasis supplied).*

**T. E. Unruh obviously did not have a clear concept of what Seventh-day Adventists really believe, because true Adventist doctrine does not have an “evangelical character.” Adventists are not a part of Evangelical Babylon. The Advent message calls people out of the erroneous Sunday-keeping churches of Babylon.**

### **Unruh’s Misconception Of Evangelical Trust**

*“I thought we had an agreement that Barnhouse would publish no further criticism of Adventist before there was further contact and clarification,” Unruh lamented. “However, in Eternity for June 1949, he sharply criticized Steps to Christ and its author [E. G. White]. After that, I saw no point in continuing the correspondence.” (ibid., AU, pp. 35, 36, emphasis supplied).*

**Where was Unruh’s head? Evangelicals have always “sharply criticized” Adventist literature and Ellen White. Our faith cannot be compromised with that of the Evangelical Sunday-keeping churches of Babylon.**

*“There is as great a difference in our faith and that of nominal professors, as the heavens are higher than the earth,” Ellen Whites reminds us. (Spiritual Gifts, Vol. 2, page 300).*

*“Here a man of great spiritual stature, a bold crusader for truth, revealed his prejudice against Adventism and Ellen White,” Unruh recalled of Barnhouse.*

**Unruh’s perception of Adventism is totally devoid of understanding! That a Seventh-day Adventist Conference President regarded a Presbyterian to be “a bold crusader for truth” is beyond the comprehension of any thinking Adventist.**

*About the Ellen White book Steps to Christ, Unruh stated that Barnhouse “quoted a number of statements which he called half truths introducing Satanic errors, like a worm on a hook, `the first bite is all worm, the second bite is all hook. That is the way the Devil works.’” (ibid., AH, p. 36, emphasis supplied).*

Unruh should have known that Dr. Barnhouse and all Evangelicals believe in,  
(1) the sacredness of Sunday, the child of the Papacy,  
(2) that man goes to heaven or hell when he dies,  
(3) the rapture of the living saints, and all the rest of the false doctrines of Babylon.

How could Unruh continue to believe in a man who accused the messenger of the Lord of teaching “Satanic errors,” and “that is how the devil works?” After reading the wonderful inspired work, *Steps to Christ*, Dr. Barnhouse could glean nothing from the book, only condemnation! Unruh then added that, Barnhouse came to the place where he “acknowledge that Seventh-day Adventists were his brethren in Christ.” Preposterous! (*ibid.*, AH, p. 36).

*“In the spring of 1955, almost six years after my correspondence with Dr. Barnhouse began,” Unruh continued, “I heard from Walter R. Martin, who had seen our correspondence and who asked for face to face contact with representative Seventh-day Adventists. Martin had written a chapter critical of Adventism in his Rise of the Cults and now wanted to talk with Adventists before doing further writing on the subject of our doctrines.” (ibid., AH, p. 36).*

### **Tobie Unruh’s Eyewitness Report Of the Evangelical Conferences:**

Considering time and place in history we now come to the infamous Evangelical Conferences of 1955-1956. Why were Adventist leadership so anxious to meet “face to face” with those who were “critical of Adventism?”

### **Unruh’s Short Sketch Of Walter Martin’s Credentials:**

*Walter Martin had come to the attention of Dr. Barnhouse when the former was in his early twenties, a graduate student in the history of American religion at New York University. By 1955 Martin had to his credit several books about American Cults which were recognized as standard works in that field. He was a consulting editor on Eternity staff, a Southern Baptist clergyman, and a member of the Evangelical Foundation, known to the faithful as “How Firm a Foundation,” an organization started by Christian businessmen who managed the financial aspects of the Barnhouse Enterprises. T. E. Unruh, Adventist Heritage, Vol. 4, No. 2, 1977, pages 36, 37.*

Unruh is now stating that the Evangelical Foundation is “known to the faithful” as “How Firm a Foundation.” This statement is so foreign to pioneer Seventh-day Adventist thinking that it boggles the mind! It is organizations like the “Evangelical Foundation,” the “Lord’s Day Alliance,” and the contemporary “Christian Coalition,” that will be successful in establishing a national Sunday Law in America. Are these people “the faithful?” No. The real faithful are those who recognize “How Firm Is Our Seventh-day Adventist Foundation,” not “How Firm Our Evangelical Foundation.” Indeed the faithful few are Seventh-day Adventists who are watching prudently the waymarks, the sign-posts, of political developments in the contemporary Evangelical Sunday-keeping Churches of America. Watching as these churches of Babylon are moving slowly but surely toward a national Sunday Law. The faithful few are Adventists who recognize pioneer Adventist doctrine as “How Firm Our Foundation.” The faithful few are those who “keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus.” (Rev. 14:12).

*“It was understood at the onset that Martin, a research polemicist, had been commissioned to write against Seventh-day Adventism,” Unruh recalled. “Nevertheless, he declared that he wanted direct access so he could treat Adventists fairly.” (ibid., AH, p. 37, emphasis supplied).*

Again, Adventist leadership was content to confer with an influential Evangelical who “had been commissioned to write against Seventh-day Adventism.” Why should Adventist leadership trust leaders of Babylon who had already shown their hatred of Seventh-day Adventist truth?

*“When I explained to a friend at Adventist headquarters in Washington, D.C., they agreed that Martin should be treated fairly, and provided with the contacts he sought,” Unruh continued. “Martin expressly asked to meet Leroy E. Froom, with whose Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers he was already familiar with. Froom suggested the inclusion of W. E. Read, then a field secretary of the General Conference.” (ibid., AH, p. 37, emphasis supplied).*

In our study of apostasy in the history of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, the name of Leroy Froom looms once again as a major participant. Not only that, but Froom was allowed to choose another to serve on the conferences. Unruh then disclosed that, “I served as moderator or chairman throughout the conferences.” (*ibid.*, AH, p. 37). This would make Unruh’s documentation, as chairman of the Evangelical Conferences, a valuable one indeed.

*“In March 1955, Martin came to Washington for his first meeting with the Adventists,” Unruh continued. “With him was George E. Cannon, a professor of theology on the faculty of the Nyack, New York, missionary college. Martin, for his part, seemed to expect a degree of resistance and cover-up, such as he may have met in some of his other investigation. . . .” (ibid., AH, p. 37). Unruh added further that, “This first meeting can best be described as a confrontation.”*

Walter Martin stated in 1984 on the John Ankerberg television program that,

*“George Cannon took out his Greek New Testament and proved from the Greek that, at the ascension, Christ went into the most holy place in the heavenly sanctuary, not in 1844, as Mrs. White says – and all the Adventists present, Froom, Anderson, Read, Figuhr, Heppinstall, and others, agreed with Cannon that this was a true exegesis of Hebrews 9.”*

*“Martin began going through a list of questions which reflected his reading, “Unruh recalled. “We Adventists, rather than launching into a defense, began with a positive presentation in which we emphasized those doctrines held by our church in common with Evangelical Christians of all faith in all ages.” (ibid., AH, pp. 37, 38, emphasis supplied).*

Doctrines held in common with Evangelicals? What does the pen of inspiration say about such a position?

*“Here is to be found an image of the papacy,” Ellen White replies to our question. “When the churches of our land, uniting upon such points of faith as are held by them in common. . . .” (Spirit of Prophecy. p. 278).*

### **Leadership Defines Doctrine To Evangelicals**

“We stated our conviction that the Bible is the Inspired Word of God and the only rule of Adventist faith and practice.” This first statement is true. The Bible is our *only* rule of doctrine.

“We affirmed our belief in the eternal and complete deity of Christ, in His sinless life in the incarnation.” This second statement is also true. Adventists have always taught that Christ *lived a sinless life*. However, it must be remembered that the Evangelical concept of the doctrine of the “deity” of Christ is a different concept than that which was held by pioneer Seventh-day Adventists. Pioneer Adventists believed that “Christ lived a sinless life *in sinful flesh*.” Documentation for this has already been presented above. (For further study see, Dr. Ralph Larson, *The Word Was Made Flesh*).

What Unruh and the contemporary Adventist conferees told the Evangelicals was the same thing Leroy Froom told Dr. E. Schuyler English. In his letter to Froom, Dr. English had stated that, “He [Christ] was perfect in His humanity, but He was none the less God, and His conception in His incarnation was overshadowed by the Holy Spirit so that He did not partake of the fallen sinful nature of other men.” In his reply letter to Dr. English, Froom had stated, “That, we in turn assured him, *is precisely what we [Seventh-day Adventists] likewise believe.*” (*ibid.*, *Movement of Destiny*, page 470, emphasis supplied). Remember Froom had also stated that, “Dr. English based this misconception [of our belief in the deity of Christ] upon his understanding that we hold that Christ, during His incarnation, *partook of our sinful, fallen nature.*” In this expression he was clearly alluding to the then off-cited note in the old edition of *Bible Readings*.” (E. Schuyler English, *letter to L.E.F.*, Mar. 11, 1955, p. 1, emphasis his). (See also, MD, p. 469).

(3) Unruh related how they told the Evangelical conferees that we also believe, “In His atoning death on the cross, once for all and all-sufficient.” (emphasis supplied). This again was a partial truth. Pioneer Seventh-day Adventists did believe in the atoning death of Christ on the cross. But the wording implies a completed atonement on the cross, which pioneer Adventists did not believe. (Ample documentation for the “final atonement in heaven” was presented above in Chapter #12, “The Final Atonement”).

(4) The Adventist conferees told the Evangelicals that we believe “in His literal resurrection, and in His priestly ministry before the Father, *applying the benefits of the atonement completed on the cross.*” (*Questions on Doctrine*, pages 354, 355, emphasis theirs). Again a partial truth. Pioneer Adventists did believe in Christ’s literal resurrection, they did not believe that as our High Priest, Christ is “*applying the benefits of the atonement completed on the cross.*” They did not believe that the atonement was finished and completed on the cross. They believed that the “final atonement” was begun in 1844 in the heavenly sanctuary and will be final and complete at the close of probation when Michael, Jesus Christ, our High Priest stands up. Dan. 12:1. (See, Owen R. L. Crosier, *Day-Star, Extra*, February 7, 1846; James N. Andrews, *The Sanctuary and Twenty-Three Hundred Days*, Steam Press of the Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association, Battle Creek, Mich. 1872, page 90; Joseph Bates, *Eighth Way Mark*, “Bridegroom Come,” page 101; Stephen N. Haskell, “Preparation For Reception Of the Holy Spirit,” 1909 *General Conference Daily Bulletin*, May 20, 1909, page 106; A. T. Jones, “The Times of Refreshing,” *The Consecrated Way To Christian Perfection*, page 124; J. N. Loughborough, *Great Second Advent Movement*, page 334; E. J. Waggoner, *Review and Herald*, September 30, 1902; James White, “The Sanctuary,” *Bible Adventism*, pages 185, 186).

**The four Adventist conferees “rephrased” our doctrines so they would be accepted by the Evangelicals and they would then consider us brethren and would no longer think of Adventism as a cult. Notice how the thread of ecumenism runs strongly throughout the history of the Seventh-day Adventist Church after the death of Ellen White and the other pioneer Adventists.**

*“It quickly became clear to the Adventist conferees that both questions and answers would have to be stated formally in writing,” Unruh continued, “that the answers would have to be made crystal clear to the Evangelical conferees and to those they represented, and that a way would have to be found to demonstrate the consensus we were sure we had. Martin was given books and periodicals to substantiate the claims we had made in our opening statement.”* (*ibid.*, AH, p. 38).

*“The immediate concern of the Adventists was the list of questions with which Martin had begun his interrogation,” Unruh stated. “Froom, who had a facile pen, took the responsibility of composing the initial answers, in a document running into twenty pages, whipped into shape by his secretary after hours until two o’clock in the morning.” (ibid., AH, p. 38, emphasis supplied).*

**Again Leroy Froom is heavily involved in stating what Seventh-day Adventists believe to contemporary Evangelical leaders. One man was telling the leaders of Babylon what Adventists really believe!**

#### **Donald Barnhouse’s Eyewitness Report Of the Evangelical Conferences:**

*“Immediately it was perceived that the Adventists were strenuously denying certain doctrinal positions which had been previously attributed to them,” Dr. Barnhouse observed. “As Mr. Martin read their answers he came, for example, upon a statement that they repudiated absolutely the thought that seventh day Sabbath keeping was a basis for salvation and a denial of any teaching that the keeping of the first day of the week is as yet considered to be the receiving of the antichristian ‘mark of the beast.’” (Eternity, October, 1956, emphasis supplied).*

Notice that even the Evangelicals could see that “the Adventists were strenuously denying certain doctrinal positions which had been previously attributed to them.” However, by “strenuously denying certain doctrinal positions” an embarrassing problem emerged for the Adventist leadership.

*“Martin pointed out to them that in their book store adjoining the building in which these meetings were taking place a certain volume published by them and written by one of their ministers categorically stated the contrary to what they were now asserting,” Dr. Barnhouse reported. (ibid., Eternity, 10/56, emphasis supplied).*

**If those allegations were true, what could the Adventist leadership do at that point to abate the concern of the Evangelicals? The solution came swiftly – alter the books that disagree with what they were stating to the Evangelicals!**

*“The leaders sent for the book, discovered that Mr. Martin was correct, and immediately brought this fact to the attention of the General Conference officers,” Dr. Barnhouse recalled, “that this situation might be remedied and such publications be corrected.” (ibid., Eternity, 10/56, emphasis supplied).*

Again we have a historical document stating that Seventh-day Adventist books were altered.

**Statements that did not agree with what the Adventist leadership was telling the Evangelicals, was simply expunged from the books. This is precisely how the statement on the human nature of Christ was expunged from Bible Readings for the Home in 1949.**

#### **The Big Historical Lie**

*“This same procedure was repeated regarding the nature of Christ while in the flesh,” Dr. Barnhouse reported further, “which the majority of the denomination has always held to be sinless, holy, and perfect, despite the fact that certain of their writers have occasionally gotten into print with contrary views completely repugnant to the Church at large.” (ibid., Eternity, 10/56, emphasis supplied).*

Who were some of these writers who had “occasionally gotten into print with contrary views” that were “completely repugnant to the [contemporary Seventh-day Adventist] Church at large?” *Ellen White for one!* Her books are filled with statements on the human nature of Christ. (See Dr. Ralph Larson, *The Word Was Made Flesh*). Uriah Smith, Waggoner and Jones, W. W. Prescott, Stephen Haskell, E. W. Farnsworth, G. B. Starr, and many others had “gotten into print with contrary views” that were “completely repugnant to the [contemporary Seventh-day Adventist] Church at large?”

*The enemy of souls has sought to bring in the supposition that a great reformation was to take place among Seventh-day Adventists, and that this reformation would consist in giving up the doctrines which stand as the pillars of our faith. Were this reformation to take place, what would result? The principles of truth that God in His wisdom has given to the remnant church, would be discarded. 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. A system of intellectual philosophy would be introduced. The founders of this system would go into the cities, and do a wonderful work. The Sabbath, of course, would be lightly regarded, as also the God who created it. Nothing would be allowed to stand in the way of the new movement. The leaders would teach that virtue is better than vice, but God being removed, they would place their dependence on human power, which, without God, is worthless. Their foundation would be built on the sand, and storm and tempest would sweep away the structure. Ellen G. White, *Selected Messages, Book 1, pages 204, 205.* (emphasis supplied).*

#### **Note carefully the following scenario.**

(1) Ellen White predicted that, “The fundamental principles that have sustained the work for the last fifty years *would be accounted as error.*” (ibid., SM, Bk. 1, p. 204, emphasis supplied). Remember, Ellen White penned this statement at the turn of the century. The fundamental principles were taught by pioneer Seventh-day Adventists from 1844 to the turn of the century. That is what is meant by the statement “the past fifty years.”

(2) The Evangelical conferees stated that, “Immediately it was perceived that the Adventists *were strenuously denying certain doctrinal positions which had been previously attributed to them.*” (ibid., Eternity, 10/56, emphasis supplied). Ellen White predicted that “this reformation would consist in giving up the doctrines which stand as the pillars of our faith.” (ibid., SM, Bk. 1, p. 204). (3) The Evangelicals stated that, “The leaders sent for the book, discovered that Mr. Martin was correct, and immediately brought this fact to the attention of the General Conference officers, *that this situation might be remedied and such publications be corrected.*” (ibid., Eternity, 10/56, emphasis supplied).

*To this Ellen White replies, “Who has authority to begin such a movement? We have our Bibles. We have our experience, attested to by the*

*miraculous working of the Holy Spirit.” (ibid., SM, Bk. 2, p. 205, emphasis supplied).*

*“We have a truth that admits of no compromise,” Ellen White concluded. “Shall we not repudiate everything that is not in harmony with this truth?” (ibid., SM, Bk. 1, p. 205, emphasis supplied). “They [the Adventist leadership] further explained to Mr. Martin that they had among their number certain members of their ‘lunatic fringe’ even as there are similar wild-eyed irresponsibles in every field of fundamental Christianity,” Dr. Barnhouse reported. “This action of the Seventh-day Adventists was indicative of similar steps that were taken subsequently.” (ibid., Eternity, 10/56).*

**This report of what the Adventist leadership told Barnhouse and Martin is beyond betrayal and deception! To think that contemporary Seventh-day Adventist leadership had the audacity to call faithful pioneer Adventists such names as “lunatic fringe” and “wild-eyed irresponsibles” is beyond the realm of Christian demeanor.**

*“There are men among us in responsible positions who hold that the opinions of a few conceited philosophers, so called, are more to be trusted than the truth of the Bible, or the testimonies of the Holy Spirit,” Ellen Whites replies. “Such a faith as that of Paul, Peter, or John is considered old-fashioned and insufferable at the present day. It is pronounced absurd, mystical, and unworthy of an intelligent mind.” (Testimonies for the Church, Vol. 5, page 79, emphasis supplied).*

*“The position of the Adventists seems to some of us in certain cases to be a new position,” Barnhouse continued, “to them it may be merely the position of the majority group of sane leadership which is determined to put the brakes on any members who seek to hold views divergent from that of the responsible leadership of the denomination.” (ibid., Eternity, 10/56, emphasis supplied).*

Notice that the “sane [insane] leadership is determined to put the brakes on any members who seek to hold views divergent from that of the responsible [irresponsible] leadership of the denomination.” First the Seventh-day Adventist leadership demean faithful Adventists by labeling them “lunatic fringe” and “wild-eyed irresponsibles.” Then the leadership portrays themselves as “sane leadership” and “responsible leadership” Then this so-called “sane leadership promised the Evangelical conferees that they “are determined to put the brakes on” any members who seek to hold views divergent from that of the responsible leadership of the denomination.”

**What does inspiration say about this “new movement,” this “new theology?”**

*“Nothing would be allowed to stand in the way of the new movement,” Ellen White replies. “The leaders would teach that virtue is better than vice, but God being removed, they would place their dependence on human power, which, without God, is worthless.” (ibid., Selected Messages, Bk. 1, p. 205, emphasis supplied).*

Historical documentation of “putting the brakes on” does not here need to be produced. Any contemporary Seventh-day Adventist layman who has studied at all in the past forty years knows that more people have been disfellowshipped for “views held divergent to so-called ‘sane’ leadership” since 1955 *than in the entire history of the Church!*

The truth is that a majority of those excommunicated from the Church in the past forty years were disfellowshipped, not for immoral purposes, but simply because their doctrinal concepts were not in harmony

with the “sane leadership” of the Church, and because they did not recognize the so-called “duly authorized authority” of the leadership of the Church. Indeed, “the brakes have been put on.”

As a side-light to this issue, Charles Ferguson, Pastor of a prominent Seventh-day Adventist Church in the North Pacific Union, in a sermon given Saturday, February 28, 1995, stated that,

*“If the Church board voted to keep Sunday, you should go along with the board’s decision for the sake of the unity of the Church.” (From a tape recording).*

*“The second [meeting] will never be forgotten by those who participated in the conferences,” T. E. Unruh stated. “As the morning session began Martin announced that, as the result of the first round of discussion and the reading matter he had been given, he was admitting that he had been wrong about Seventh-day Adventism on several important points and had become persuaded that Adventists who believed as the conferees were truly born again Christians and his brethren in Christ.” (ibid., *Adventist Heritage*, Vol. 4, No. 2, 1977, page 38, emphasis supplied).*

*“In a dramatic gesture he [Martin] extended his hand in fellowship,” Unruh added triumphantly. (ibid., AH, p. 38).*

*“Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers,” my Bible says, “for what fellowship. . .hath light with darkness?” (2 Cor. 6:14).*

*“What can there be in common between these parties?” Ellen White asks. “There can be no fellowship, no communion. The word fellowship means participation, partnership.” (Fundamentals of Christian Education, page 476, emphasis supplied).*

“What communion can there be between light and darkness, truth and unrighteousness?” Ellen White asks again. “None whatever. Light represents righteousness; darkness, error, sin, unrighteousness.” (ibid. *Fundamentals of Christian Education*, page 476, emphasis supplied). The Evangelical churches the Adventists were conferring with in 1955 and 1956 were, and still are, in “darkness.” They reject totally the three foundation pillars of Adventism;

- (1) The final atonement and the blotting out of sins in the heavenly sanctuary truth of 1844,
- (2) the seventh day Sabbath,
- (3) the soul-sleep of man in death.

### **The Landmarks Defined**

“[1] One of the landmarks under this message was the temple of God, seen by His truth-loving people in heaven, and the ark containing the law of God,” Ellen White wrote.

“[2] The light of the Sabbath of the fourth commandment flashed it’s strong rays in the pathway of the transgressors of God’s law.

[3] The nonimmortality of the wicked is an old landmark.” (Councils to Writers and Educators, pages 30, 31). Then in this same statement Ellen White concluded, “*I can call to mind nothing more that can come under the head of the old landmarks.*” (ibid., *Counsels to Writers and Educators*, pages 30, 31, emphasis supplied).

**Again, it cannot be over-stressed that the Evangelical Sunday-keeping churches of Babylon unequivocally reject all three of these most important Bible truths of which Ellen White states are “the old landmarks.”**

**Please remember that the old landmarks listed above were not the only pillars of the church.**

*“Those who seek to remove the old landmarks are not holding fast; they are not remembering how they have received and heard. Those who try to bring in theories that would remove the pillars of our faith concerning the sanctuary or concerning the personality of God or of Christ are working as blind men. They are seeking to bring in uncertainties and to set the people of God adrift without an anchor.”*

**It is said that the doctrine of God was not a foundational doctrine , or a “pillar” or “landmark”, and as such was open to revision. But I would ask that the sincere truth seeker ask him or herself, “Is it possible that God could say through Ellen White that every doctrine of the historic Adventist church was established by Himself and yet the church be completely wrong about the very identity of God, holding a deadly heresy that undermines the very gospel of Christ?”**

**Was Ellen White a false prophet? Was the SDA Movement a false movement?**

**Dr. Jerry Moon 2002**

*“More recently, a further question has arisen with increasing urgency: was the pioneers’ belief about the Godhead right or wrong? “As one line of reasoning goes, **either the pioneers were wrong and the present church is right, or the pioneers were right and the present Seventh-day Adventist Church has apostatized from biblical truth.**” — Jerry Moon, ‘The Trinity’, chapter, ‘Trinity and anti-trinitarianism in Seventh-day Adventist history, page 190*

We will stick with the Spirit of Prophecy and our pioneers. What about you?

Going on--

Please remember, Adventist friend, *even after the agreements made in the conferences of 1955-56, and until this very day, the Evangelicals still rejected these three “old landmarks” of Seventh-day Adventism!*

*“He [Martin] was not convinced that Adventists were right on doctrines we described as ‘present truth,’” Unruh continued, “nor was he ever convinced of these.” (ibid., AH, p. 38, emphasis supplied).*

True Seventh-day Adventists will never convince most of the Evangelicals of the “present truth” of the great Advent message. A good case in point – Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi’s book, *From Sabbath to Sunday*, published by the Pontifical Gregorian University Press, in Rome, Italy, with the IMPRIMATUR of, R. P. Herve Carrier, S.I., the head Jesuit theologian of the Jesuit University, was endorsed on the back pages by some of the highest ranking Roman Catholic and Evangelical scholars – *yet to this day not one has accepted the Bible truth on the seventh day Sabbath!*

*“We Adventists also faced problems,” Unruh recalled. “The Evangelical conferees were satisfied that we were presenting contemporary Adventist doctrines, because we were supported by the 1931 Statement of Fundamental Beliefs, which appeared regularly in official yearbooks and manuals of the church, and by the amplified statement in the baptismal covenant.” (ibid., AH, p. 38, emphasis supplied).*

Again we come back in history to the heretical “1931 Statement of Fundamental Beliefs” which was written by one man. “As no one else seemed willing to take the lead in formulating a statement, [M. C.] Wilcox—as a writer and editor—wrote up for consideration of the committee a suggested summary of ‘Fundamental Beliefs of Seventh-day Adventists,’” Leroy Edwin Froom stated about the 1931 document. (*Movement of Destiny*, pages. 377-380). Froom stated further that, “Approval by [the] Committee [was] not required. The authorizing did not call for submission to any other committee for approval.” (*ibid.*, MD, 414). Here again, the 1931 “Statement of Fundamental Beliefs” were sustained in the contemporary Seventh-day Adventist Church because there was no protest or opposition to the statements first published in the new Church Manual in 1931. The Adventist conferees should have convinced the Evangelicals of true Adventist doctrine from Scripture, rather than from a Church Manual and an official Statement of Beliefs. However, the stratagem the leadership used by falling back on the 1931 “Statement of Fundamental Beliefs” did not convince the Evangelicals.

*“But, they [the Evangelicals] asked, ‘if the Adventist church had reached a firm consensus, why did they find contrary or misleading statements in Adventist publications, for sale in Adventist book and Bible houses?’” Unruh continued. “We explained that this was the results of efforts by the church to avoid an officially adopted creedal statement, and the denomination’s preference for an open-end theology which permitted new light to penetrate in depth.” (ibid., AH, p. 38).*

The Adventist conferees told the Evangelicals that “the church [wished] to avoid an officially adopted creedal statement.” But instead of proving our cardinal doctrines from Scripture they fell back on the 1931 “creedal” Statement of Fundamental Beliefs. What was the response of the Evangelicals to this ploy?

*“This explanation did not impress them,” Unruh lamented. “They asked if we did not think that we ourselves were to some extent to blame if these erroneous statements were used against us.” Then Unruh made this astounding admission, “We could only reply that correction had begun.” (ibid., Adventist Heritage, page 38, emphasis supplied).*

Was the Adventist leadership accepting New light from the Evangelicals in 1955, *or were they presenting a new Adventist theology to the Evangelicals?* Indeed, Dr. Barnhouse in his *Eternity* article had stated earlier that, “Immediately it was perceived that the Adventists were strenuously denying certain doctrinal positions which had been previously attributed to them.” (*Eternity*, 10/56). Again, the Evangelicals did not believe the Adventist leaders in their attempt to fall back on the 1931 Statement of Fundamental Beliefs to prove unity of the Church in the “new” doctrine being presented.

*“While church leaders had known of the conferences from the start, a point was reached where we thought it was wise to make a formal report to the church,” Unruh continued. “In a long letter to Froom and Read, dated July 18, 1955, I reviewed the progress in understanding achieved so far in the conferences.” (ibid., AH, p. 38).*

**Notice that, “Church leaders had known of the conferences from the start.” Finally the four Adventist conferees decided that they should make a formal report to the Church.**

*“A copy of this letter was sent to R. R. Figuhr, president of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists,” Unruh continued. “Thereafter Figuhr*

*gave the support of his office to the conferences and the publication of the definitive statement of Adventist belief which resulted.” (ibid., AH, p. 38).*

*“In anticipation of the extension of Evangelical participation in the conferences Froom early in August urged the enlargement of the Adventist conferee group,” Unruh revealed. “He recommended the inclusion of R. Allen Anderson (secretary of the Ministerial Association, GC, and editor of Ministry magazine) as a regular member because of the latter’s background as evangelist, college teacher of religion, author, and especially because of his gift for diplomatic dialogue with leaders of other communions.” (ibid., AH, p. 39, emphasis supplied).*

Again, we see Leroy Froom manipulating, dominating, not only the agenda, but also who was to be added to the conferee team. **It should be noted here that Roy Allen Anderson was converted to the Seventh-day Adventist Church from the Presbyterian Church. This is significant because the Adventist and Evangelical conferees were debating “Presbyterian” concepts of Righteousness by Faith, the doctrine of “free grace,” and the atonement completed and final upon the cross.**

From editorial statements published in *Ministry* magazine, while Anderson was editor, it is obvious that Anderson still held to Presbyterian theology on righteousness by faith. (See below). “Since April he [Anderson] had been participating in the conferences,” Unruh added. “Thereafter he was a member of the team.” (*ibid.*, AH, p. 39).

*“We four Adventists [Unruh, Froom, Read and Anderson] were authorized by the General Conference to plan with Martin and Cannon for the meeting with Barnhouse at his home in Doylestown,” Unruh disclosed. “The planning was held in Anderson’s Washington office on August 22.” [1955] (ibid., AH, p. 39).*

Remember that George Cannon was the man who later in the conferences took out his Greek New Testament and, according to Walter Martin, proved that at His ascension, not in 1844, Christ entered the most holy place of the heavenly sanctuary, and also according to Martin, “all the Adventists present agreed with Cannon – Leroy Froom, Roy Allen Anderson, Rubin Figuhr, W. E. Read, Tobie Unruh, Heppinstall – I believed these were all honest men.” (Dr. Walter Martin, (syndicated) John Ankerberg television program, 1984).

*“So it came about then on August 25 and 26, 1955, we four Adventists [Unruh, Froom, Anderson, Read], with Walter Martin and George Cannon, sat down with Donald Grey Barnhouse, one of the most influential men among American Protestants and internationally famous as a representative Evangelical,” Unruh concluded, “to discuss what Seventh-day Adventists really believe.” (ibid., AH, p. 39, emphasis supplied).*

**Notice that only Four men sat down with the leading Evangelicals and told them what the rest of us Adventist people “really believe.” Astounding! Absolutely amazing!**

### **Leadership Expunges Sentence From Spirit of Prophecy**

**In the book *Evangelism*, pages 592, 593, Ellen White makes an amazing statement about the leadership of the Seventh-day Adventist Church near the close of probation.** The original source for this statement is found in *Manuscript* 15, 1886. However, the last sentence in the original statement in *Manuscript*.

15, 1886, is expunged from the *Evangelism* statement. First we will note the statement as it appears in *Evangelism*:

*Under the cloak of Christianity and sanctification, far- spreading and manifest ungodliness will prevail to a terrible degree and will continue until Christ comes to be glorified in all them that believe. In the very courts of the temple, scenes will be enacted that few realize. God's people will, be proved and tested, that He may discern "between him that serveth God and him that serveth Him not." Ellen G. White, Evangelism, pages 592, 593.*

Note that there were no ellipses . . . . at the end of this statement, although there was one more sentence to follow. Now we will note the statement as it first appeared in *Manuscript*. 15, 1886. The expunged last sentence of the statement will be underscored:

*Under the cloak of Christianity and sanctification, far- spreading and manifest ungodliness will prevail to a terrible degree and will continue until Christ comes to be glorified in all them that believe. In the very courts of the temple [Church], scenes will be enacted that few realize. God's people will, be proved and tested, that He may discern "between him that serveth God and him that serveth Him not." Vengeance will be executed against those who sit in the gates deciding what the people should have. Ellen G. White, Manuscript 15, 1886. (emphasis supplied).*

Notice that it is not God's intention that Church leaders should define doctrine to the members of the Church. "Vengeance will be executed against those who sit in the gates deciding what the people should have." William Grotheer, writing to the White Estate for an explanation of the expunged sentence, received this reply:

*"Unreleased because it could be misused."*

**It was not in God's plan that Church leaders should define our doctrines to the leaders of the modern churches of Babylon. Neither was it God's plan that the leadership of the Church should expunge portions from the writings of the Spirit of Prophecy.**

*"In the first Doylestown conference there was much discussion of Froom's Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers, as providing an historical background for Adventism," Unruh continued. "It was clear that the Evangelicals had respect for Froom's scholarly attainments." (ibid., AH, p, 40, emphasis supplied).*

Again, Leroy Froom is portrayed as the leading figure in the big lie that was told to the Evangelicals in 1955. The lie about what Seventh-day Adventists really believe.

*"Our friends [the Evangelicals] helped us to express our beliefs in terms more easily understood by theologians of other communions," Unruh revealed. (ibid., AH, p, 40, emphasis supplied). An excellent comment to this statement can best be given by the then editor in chief of the Review and Herald, Francis D. Nichol:*

*There is a subtle temptation facing Adventists today—this day of our increasing popularity—to feel that if we re-phrase our beliefs a little, setting them forth in less disturbing form, we can have good fellowship on all sides.*

*. . . Greatly would the evil one like to persuade us to fall into that trap. . . . The Advent message is poles removed from the modern religious thinking that would give us a foggy, inspirational kind of emotion as a substitute for rugged doctrines, and those sharply etched concepts of God and His requirements, that are vital to true religion. Francis D. Nichol, Editor in Chief, Review and Herald, “Warning Lesson From Bogus Books,” February 26, 1959. (emphasis supplied).*

*“That same evening, in our motel, Martin and Cannon came to express their amazement over the change they had witnessed in Dr. Barnhouse,” Unruh continued. “To them it seemed a miracle. To Martin it meant that he would not have resistance from Barnhouse in writing the truth about Seventh-day Adventism, as he had come to see it. (ibid., AH, p. 40, emphasis supplied).*

**Martin had come to see Adventist doctrine through the eyes of Leroy Froom and the other three Adventist conferees. But this was not the true belief of most Seventh-day Adventists! The Adventist people did not know anything about what was taking place until the apostate book *Questions on Doctrine* was published two years later in 1957.**

*“We [four] Adventists had come to see that we could state our doctrinal positions with clarity, in language understood by the theologians of other churches. . . .,” Unruh stated, because, “Our friends helped us to express our beliefs in terms more easily understood by theologians of other communions.” (ibid., AH, p, 40, emphasis supplied).*

Unruh added that in restating the doctrines they were “never bending for the sake of clarity or harmony alone.” (ibid., AH, p. 40).

But indeed the Adventist conferees did “bend for the sake of clarity or harmony” with the Evangelicals.

**A new doctrinal phrase, never before known in Seventh-day Adventist theology was coined at that time,**

*“Christ is now making application of the benefits of the sacrificial atonement He made on the cross.” (Questions on Doctrine, pages 354, 355, emphasis theirs).*

*Leroy Froom was probably the first Adventist to use the phrase, “the benefits of His atonement.” This phrase is now prominent in the book, Seventh-day Adventists Believe – 27. “There is a sanctuary in heaven, the true tabernacle which the Lord set up and not man,” contemporary SDA Church leadership states. “In it Christ ministers on our behalf, making available to believers the benefits of His atoning sacrifice offered once for all on the cross.” (Seventh-day Adventist Believe. . . 27 Fundamental Doctrines, 1988, page 312, emphasis supplied).*

*“We say that, while there had been doctrinal deviation, and this was still a possibility, it was essential for us to demonstrate the existence of a majority*

*position,” Unruh continued, “a preponderant view that a consensus actually existed, and that we were correctly reflecting that consensus.” (ibid., AH, p. 41, emphasis supplied).*

Unruh is here stating that it was important that they convince the Evangelicals that Adventist leadership was not telling them a lie about what Seventh-day Adventists believed. It was imperative that the four Adventist conferees convince the Evangelicals that their position was the majority position of, not only the “contemporary” Seventh-day Adventist Church at large, but also the position of pioneer Seventh-day Adventists. However, Barnhouse had observed that,

*“The position of the Adventist seems to some of us in certain cases to be a new position: to them it may be merely the position of the majority group of sane leadership which is determined to put the brakes on any members who seek to hold view divergent from that of the responsible leadership of the denomination.” (Eternity, 10/56, emphasis supplied).*

We repeat here Donald Grey Barnhouse’s observation of the Adventist approach to this problem:

*The leaders sent for the book, discovered that Mr. Martin was correct, and immediately brought this fact to the attention of the General Conference officers, that this situation might be remedied and such publications be corrected. This same procedure was repeated regarding the nature of Christ while in the flesh which the majority of the denomination has always held to be sinless, holy, and perfect, despite the fact that certain of their writers have occasionally gotten into print with contrary views completely repugnant to the Church at large. They further explained to Mr. Martin that they had among their number certain members of their “lunatic fringe” even as there are similar wild-eyed irresponsibles in every field of fundamental Christianity. This action of the Seventh-day Adventists was indicative of similar steps that were taken subsequently. Donald Grey Barnhouse, Eternity, October, 1956.*

Note carefully the phrases used by the Adventist conferees to convince the Evangelicals that the entire Seventh-day Adventist Church, leaders and laymen, were united on the false doctrines they were now espousing.

The nature of Christ while in the flesh “which the majority of the denomination has always held to be sinless.”

Certain Adventist writers had “occasionally gotten into print with contrary views completely repugnant to the Church at large.” This again was a lie. The Seventh-day Adventist Church was united before 1952 on the nature of Christ while in the flesh. (See, Ralph Larson, *The Word Was Made Flesh*, “One Hundred Years of Seventh-day Adventist Christology,” The Cherrystone Press, P. O. Box 3180, Cherry Valley, California, 92223).

The Adventist conferees told the Evangelicals that among their members were those of a “lunatic fringe” who were “wild-eyed irresponsibles.” The Adventist conferees were telling the Evangelicals that anyone who believed the pioneer Seventh-day Adventist position on the nature of Christ while in the flesh was a “wild-eyed irresponsible” from a “lunatic fringe” of the Church.

The Evangelicals observed that, “This action of the Seventh-day Adventists was indicative of similar steps that were taken subsequently.”

*“In another dimension, it was planned to demonstrate consensus by submitting the questions and answers to Adventist leaders in North America, and then around the world, using a mailing list of more than 250 names,” Unruh continued. “The document by this time had grown to some sixty questions and answers, and was beginning to be thought of as having book possibilities—a definitive statement of contemporary Adventist theology, in convenient reference book form.” (ibid., AH, p. 41, emphasis supplied).*

“In another dimension,” the manuscript of the forthcoming book, *Questions on Doctrine* would be sent to leading Adventists around the World proving to the Evangelicals that there was a “consensus” among the contemporary Seventh-day Adventist Church. Notice also that the forthcoming book *Questions on Doctrine* would be “a definitive statement of contemporary Adventist theology.”

**Adventists who are awake and studying recognize this “contemporary Adventist theology” to be the “new” theology.**

*“A committee of fourteen members with General Conference approval, was to prepare the document for distribution to church leaders, and to analyze and evaluate the feedback,” Unruh stated. “Figuhr, president of the General Conference, was chairman of this committee.” (ibid., AH, p. 41). Unruh then disclosed the names of the others who were on this committee, “Also on the committee were, A. V. Olson [secretary, White Estate]; W. B. Ochs; L. K. Dickson; H. L. Rudy; A. L. Ham; J. I. Robison; W. R. Beach [father of B. B. Beach, who gave the gold medallion to the pope, [See below, Chapter #18, “The Invaders”]; C. L. Torrey; F. D. Nichol [editor, Review and Herald]; T. E. Unruh, chairman of conferees, President, East Pennsylvania Conference]; R. A. Anderson [Ministerial Secretary, General Conference, editor, Ministry]; L. E. Froom, [History Department, Andrews University]; W. E. Read [Field Secretary General Conference].” (ibid., AH, p. 41, emphasis supplied).*

*“Correspondence relating to the project was entrusted to J. L. Robison, the president’s secretary,” Unruh related. (ibid., AH, p. 41).*

David Bauer recalled how his father, Clifford L. Bauer, at that time president of the Pacific Union, received one of these 250 copies to evaluate. As his father was preparing to return the “sixty question” document by mail, David scolded his father because he had not read the document. Clifford Bauer replied that he had complete faith and confidence in the brethren and did not need to evaluate the document. How many times this scenario was repeated around the world will only be revealed when the Master of the vineyard returns for the final accounting. “The response was good, the consensus was demonstrated, and the decision to publish was made,” Unruh concluded. “Thus *Questions on Doctrine* came into being.” (ibid., AH, p. 41).

### **Triumphal Adventist Objective Attained In the Evangelical Conferences**

*“Martin, in November 1955, reported talks with Pat Zondervan who was to publish *The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism* and who was interested in the new direction the book was taking,” Unruh stated. “A month later, Martin reported going over the questions and answers in their entirety in a five-hour session with Dr. Barnhouse, and stated that Barnhouse was satisfied that Adventists were fundamentally Evangelical in matters concerning salvation.” (ibid., AH, p. 41, emphasis supplied).*

**Ecumenism! This, obviously, was the bottom-line objective of the Seventh-day Adventist Church leadership of 1955. Indeed, ecumenism has ever been the motive of all historical Seventh-day Adventist apostasy since the death of the pioneers and Ellen White.**

*“Martin also reported that Frank E. Gaebelein had written to James DeForest Murch, stating his opinion that the Seventh-day Adventist Church would qualify for membership in the Evangelical group, if they so desired,” Unruh stated. (ibid., AH, p. 42, emphasis supplied).*

**Notice that with their “new” Statement of Fundamental Beliefs the Seventh-day Adventist Church could qualify for membership in the National Association of Evangelicals “if they so desired.” The Adventist leadership did so desire in 1955. That was the initial objective of the dialog with the Evangelicals. If the blind Adventist leadership could have seen into the future, they would see the time when the contemporary Seventh-day Adventist Church could now also qualify for membership in the World Council of Churches!**

*“Dr. Gaebelein was the founder and director of the famed Stony Brook School (of which Martin was a graduate), a member of the Reformed Episcopal church, and an official in the National Association of Evangelicals,” Unruh added further. “Dr. Murch, prolific author of religious works, publications director and later president of the National Association of Evangelicals and the editor of United Evangelical Action, was a member of the Disciples of Christ.” (ibid., AH, p. 42).*

The nauseating adulation of man, position and education, by contemporary Adventist leadership cannot be overlooked. Indeed, strict warnings have come from the pen of inspiration about this new system of Church leadership.

*“A system of intellectual philosophy would be introduced. . . ,” Ellen White prophesied, “they would place their dependence on human power, which, without God, is worthless. . . .” (Selected Messages, Bk. 1, pp. 204, 205, emphasis supplied).*

*“It is unsafe for any church to lean upon some favorite minister, to trust in an arm of flesh,” Ellen White warned. “God’s arm alone is able to uphold all who lean upon it.” (Testimonies for the Church, Vol. 4, page 594, emphasis supplied).*

*“Meanwhile, correspondence between Froom and E. Schuyler English, editor of Our Hope and chairman of the revision committee of the Scofield Reference Bible, resulted in an editorial statement by Dr. English in February 1956,” Unruh continued, “correcting misconceptions about Adventist doctrine as to the nature of Christ in the incarnation, the Trinity, and the completed atonement on the cross, followed by an article by Walter Martin in November 1956, the earliest affirmation of the essential Christianity of the theology of Adventism on matters relating to salvation to appear in a non-Adventist journal of note.” (ibid., AH, p. 42, emphasis supplied).*

The earliest affirmation of the “new theology” of Adventism to appear “in a non-Adventist journal of note.” This erroneous “new theology” is stated in three points according to Froom,

(1) the sinless human nature of Christ in the incarnation,

- (2) the Trinity,
- (3) and the completed atonement on the cross.

**As documented above in Chapters #11 and #12, these three doctrines were not taught or believed by pioneer Seventh-day Adventists, neither were they taught in the Spirit of Prophecy. These three erroneous Evangelical doctrines had to be compromised into Adventist doctrine for the contemporary Seventh-day Adventist Church to qualify for membership in the National Association of Evangelicals, and later as official “observers” in the World Council of Churches.**

*The distinctive truths proclaimed by Seventh-day Adventists for more than a century have never been popular in theological circles, and it is futile to expect that they ever will be. . . . Were Seventh-day Adventists to yield their distinctive teachings in order to win and wear the robe of theological respectability, they would doubtless be accepted by other Christian bodies. But in so doing they would be traitor to the truths that have made them a people. . . . They would no longer be Seventh-day Adventists. Raymond F. Cottrell, Associate Editor, Review and Herald, “Can Truth Be Popular?” May 15, 1958. (emphasis supplied).*

**This observation by Raymond Cottrell has come to pass. The leadership of the Church has “yielded their distinctive teachings in order to win and wear the robe of theological respectability.” The leadership was successful in their quest to “be accepted by other Christian bodies.” “But in so doing” the leadership has become a “traitor to the truths that have made them a people.” Because the leadership has betrayed their trust, they are no longer Seventh-day Adventists! The organization of the SDA movement has been shaken out.**

*“In August 1956, Russell Hitt, the managing editor of Eternity, came to Washington to go over with us the long-awaited Barnhouse articles repudiating his former position on Adventism,” Unruh recalled. “Support articles by Martin, to follow in Eternity, were also gone over. We were given permission to quote or otherwise refer to these articles.” (ibid., AH, p. 42, emphasis supplied).*

This document by T. E. Unruh discloses that the Adventist leadership approved of the statements written by Donald Grey Barnhouse, “Are Seventh-day Adventists Christians?” and Walter Martin’s series of articles in *Eternity* magazine titled, “The Truth About Seventh-day Adventists.” The following are a few choice excerpts from those *Eternity* articles.

*The position of the Adventists seems to some of us in certain cases to be a new position: to them it may be merely the position of the majority group of sane leadership which is determined to put the brakes on any members who seek to hold view divergent from that of the responsible leadership of the denomination. Donald Grey Barnhouse, “Are Seventh-day Adventists Christians?” *Eternity*, October, 1956 (emphasis supplied).*

Inside Editorial Box Of the Barnhouse Article:

*Have the Seventh-day Adventists been proselytizers? During the course of our dealings with Adventist leaders we brought up the complaints, common to the mission field, that Adventist missionaries and workers have been proselytizers. The leaders affirmed vehemently that they have been doing everything possible to prevent such proselytizing, and, while there may have*

*been such cases in the past, they hold that such methods are not now in use. In cooperation with them we will gladly receive from any missionaries in the world fully documented instances of such proselytization that have taken place during the past two years. Such documentation, if any, sent to the Rev. Mr. Walter R. Martin, in care of Eternity, will be forwarded to Adventist leaders, who have promised a thorough investigation. *ibid.*, Donald Grey Barnhouse, "Are Seventh-day Adventists Christians?" *Eternity*, October, 1956 (emphasis supplied).*

**The word "proselytize" means to make an Adventist out of Baptist, Lutheran or other Christians. With this kind of a policy on "proselytizing" how is it possible for Seventh-day Adventist missionaries or evangelists to call God's people out of Babylon and into the present truth of the Advent movement? It is not possible. The new position is that we should simply be Christian brethren with the Evangelical Sunday-keeping churches of Babylon. We should not "proselytize" their members and make Seventh-day Adventists out of them. After all, one current Adventist leader goes so far as to state that the Pope of Rome is his Christian brother. (Mitchell A. Tyner, *The Columbian Union Visitor*, June 1, 1995, p. 6).**

Again, this policy which was told to the Evangelicals is in perfect harmony with the policy adopted at the 1926 General Conference which stated that,

*"In the desire to avoid occasion for misunderstanding or friction in the matter of relationship to the work of other societies, the following statement of principles are set forth as a guidance to our workers in mission fields in their contacts with other religious organizations":*

*#1. We recognize every agency that lifts up Christ before man as a part of the divine plan for the evangelization of the world, and we hold in high esteem the Christian men and women in other communions who are engaged in winning souls to Christ.*

*"Relationship To Other Societies," General Conference Executive Committee, 1926. (emphasis supplied).*

It must be remembered that this policy was voted sixteen years after the death of Ellen White. Testimony would have been given immediately against this betrayal of the three angel's messages.

*"There is as great a difference in our faith and that of nominal professors, as the heavens are higher than the earth," Ellen White stated. "True brotherhood can never be maintained by compromising principle." (Spiritual Gifts, Vol. 2, p. 300; Manuscript 23b, 7/25/96, emphasis supplied).*

*"God has committed to us," Ellen White wrote, "the special truths for this time to make known to the world." (Testimonies for the Church, Vol, 5, p. 236).*

## **CONCLUSION OF ULTIMATE BETRAYAL**

We have discovered that the leadership of the Seventh-day Adventist Church accepted a new Christ and changed the time of the final Atonement in the first angel's message from the heavenly sanctuary to the cross.

In the Evangelical conferences of 1955-56 the leadership admitted those changes to the Evangelical church leaders of Babylon. In 1957 the Church leadership published those changes to the world in the "official" book, *Seventh-day Adventists Answer, Questions on Doctrine*.

In Chapter #1, "The Invaders," we learned that the Seventh-day Adventist Church leadership rejected the third angel's message when they stated to the world in a Supreme Court Brief that

*“it is not good Seventh-day Adventism to express, as Mrs. Tobler has done, an aversion to Roman Catholicism as such.” (United States District Court, Northern District of California. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission vs. Pacific Press Publishing Association, Civ. No. 74-2025 CBR. Reply Brief for Defendants in Support of Their Motion for Summary Judgment. (emphasis supplied).*

Now we have learned in the past three Chapters that the Church leadership has rejected the first and second angel’s messages as taught by pioneer Adventists. Again we ask, has the Seventh-day Adventist Church been faithful to the message of trust given to her? Can the Church give up the three angel’s messages and still be considered faithful? To these two most important questions we must sadly answer, no, no. Has the contemporary Seventh-day Adventist Church joined hands with the enemy? Oh, how sadly we must answer, yes!

*“How is the faithful city [Church] become an harlot!” an angel said to Ellen White in vision. “My Father’s house is made a house of merchandise, a place whence the divine presence and glory have departed! For this cause there is weakness, and strength is lacking.” (Testimonies for the Church, Vol. 8, p. 250, emphasis supplied).*

*In the balances of the sanctuary the Seventh-day Adventist church is to be weighed. She will be judged by the privileges and advantages that she has had. If her spiritual experience does not correspond to the advantages that Christ, at infinite cost, has bestowed on her, if the blessings conferred have not qualified her to do the work entrusted to her, on her will be pronounced the sentence: “Found wanting.” By the light bestowed, the opportunities given, will she be judged. Ellen G. White, Testimonies for the Church, vol. 8, page 247 (April 21, 1903). (emphasis supplied).*

*“Let the sin of deceit and false witness be entertained by a church that has had great light, great evidence,” Ellen White counsels, “and that church will discard the message the Lord has sent, and receive the most unreasonable assertions and false suppositions and false theories. Satan laughs at their folly, for he knows what truth is.” (Testimonies to Ministers, page 409, emphasis supplied).*

Oh, may the Lord of the Sabbath, our High Priest in the Heavenly Sanctuary, have mercy on His people – and may we not be found wanting!

**LINK TO COMPLETE DOCUMENT:**

<http://prodiscoveries.com/images/stories/SDA-ONLY/THE GREAT CONSPIRACY/THE-GREAT-CONSPIRACY-COMPLETE-REV-L.pdf>