

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

CHAPTER 11

A CHAMPION STANDS ALONE

LINK TO COMPLETE DOCUMENT:

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

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	1
The Andreasen Protest	2
Virginia Steinweg’s Version Of Andreasen’s Protest.....	3
Froom’s Omission:	6
Froom’s Actual Quote:	6
Questions On Doctrine	10
The Attempt To Insert Footnotes In EGW Writings.....	11
Two facts are plainly evident from this document.....	13
Andreasen Called For A Hearing Before the General Conference	13
Is the General Conference the Voice of God?	15
Andreasen’s Books Removed From Adventist Book Centers	18
God’s true remnant people will be the Church triumphant.....	21
Four Andreasen Books Republished After His Death	21
Final Words Of M. L. Andreasen.....	22

INTRODUCTION

*To stand in the defense of truth and righteousness
when the majority forsake us, to fight the battles of the Lord
when champions are few—this will be our test.*
(5T, p. 136).

Sadly, only one faithful Adventist stood alone in protest against the betrayal of trust by the Seventh-day Adventist leadership in the Evangelical Conferences of 1955 and 1956. His name was Milian Lauritz Andreasen (An-dree-ah-sen). Andreasen, known to his friends as M. L., was at the time a retired Seventh-day Adventist minister. He had served the Church as an evangelist, teacher, college professor, academic dean, Conference President, *and was the first teacher at the Seventh-day Adventist seminary.* He was one of few writers whose

books were published in the *Christian Home Library Series*, known to Adventists as “the little red books.” Some titles published in this series were *The Sanctuary Service*, *The Sabbath, Prayer, A Faith to Live By*, and *Hebrews*. He also penned a wonderful Sabbath School Lesson series on the book of Isaiah, which was later published in book form.¹ The following brief description of Andreasen’s faithful service to the truth and the Church is found in the *Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia*:

ANDREASEN, MILIAN LAURITZ (1876–1962). Danish-born administrator, educator, author; A.B., University of Nebraska (1920); M.A., University of Nebraska (1922). Following his ordination in 1902 he held varied administrative positions: president of the Greater New York Conference (1909–1910), president of Hutchinson Theological Seminary (1910–1918), dean of Union College (1918–1922), dean of Washington Missionary (now Columbia Union) College (1922–1924), president of the Minnesota Conference (1924–1931), president of Union College (1931–1938), and field secretary of the General Conference (1941–1950). From 1938 to 1949 he taught at the SDA Theological Seminary in Washington, D.C. .He gave special study to the doctrine of the sanctuary and was considered an authority in that field. *Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia, Second Revised Edition, 1995, Art. Andreasen, Milian Lauritz.*

In view of the fact that the betrayal of doctrine in the Evangelical Conferences involved two major areas, (1) the human nature of Christ, (2) the final atonement in the heavenly sanctuary,

it must be noted here that Andreasen “gave special study to the doctrine of the sanctuary *and was considered an authority in that field.*” Also, “From 1938 to 1949 he taught at the SDA Theological Seminary in Washington, D.C.” (*ibid.*, *Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia*, emphasis supplied). Now in the book *Questions on Doctrine*, published in 1957, the Church leadership was presenting to Evangelicals and the world in opposing statements on these two most important foundation “pillars” of Seventh-day Adventism. Andreasen was well qualified to address this desertion of truth.

The Andreasen Protest

The following narrative of Andreasen and his courageous protest against the betrayal of trust by Adventist leadership in the Evangelical Conferences is taken from a chapter titled, “Clouds on the Evening Horizon,” in a book on Andreasen’s life entitled, *Without Fear or Favor*. This book was written by Virginia Steinweg, one of Andreasen’s Union College students. Bruno Steinweg, husband of Virginia, researched the material for the chapter, “Clouds on the Evening Horizon.” (This book may be purchased from, *Leaves-Of-Autumn-Books*, P. O. Box 440, Payson, Arizona 85541).

“The name M. L. Andreasen was on the lips of a great number of Seventh-day Adventists during the 1950’s and early 1960’s,” Steinweg, or the editors, wrote on the back cover. “Greatly disturbed by what he saw as false teachings in the book Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine, Elder Andreasen first protested to church leaders, then penned what were known as ‘Letters to the Churches,’ in which he strongly expressed his dissent.” (Virginia Steinweg, Without Fear Or Favor, Back Cover).

The statement on the back cover added, “The controversy resulted in his ministerial credentials being temporarily withdrawn.” The statement “temporarily withdrawn” is only a partial truth. Andreasen’s “temporarily withdrawn” ministerial credentials were restored after his death. No mention

is made of how leadership removed his book titles from the *Christian Home Library Series*, with some titles restored to the list after his death.

It must be noted here that Steinweg chose to follow the deceptive technique of contemporary Seventh-day Adventist leadership in dealing with “sensitive” portions of SDA history. This becomes obvious from her own comments that,

(1) “From the first, the final six years of Elder Andreasen’s life posed a problem.”

(2) “It seemed that the story could not be included. . .”.

(3) Bruno Steinweg researched the history of Andreasen’s protest, and “General Conference leaders visiting Lima read the result with interest.” (Steinweg, WFOF, p. 10).

In addition to this evidence, Steinweg listed the names of those who “so willingly contributed to the book.” Among the names listed were, R. R. Bietz, President, Southern California Conference, 1950-1960, President, Pacific Union Conference, 1959-1968, and R. R. Figuhr, President, General Conference, 1954-1966. The point is that both of these men, who “so willingly contributed to the book,” were high officers (Figuhr holding the highest office) in the Seventh-day Adventist Church) during the Evangelical Conferences of 1955-1956. The chapter in Steinweg’s book on Andreasen’s objection to leaderships deviation from pioneer Adventist teaching, “Clouds on the Evening Horizon,” had to be written from leaderships view of the story. The reader is encouraged to read Andreasen’s *Letters to the Churches* for Andreasen’s side of the story. (Andreasen’s *Letters to the Churches*, may be purchased from, Adventist Laymen’s Foundation, P. O. Box 69, Ozone, AR 72854).

Virginia Steinweg’s Version Of Andreasen’s Protest

“On a certain morning in the autumn of 1956, M. L. [Andreasen] as usual dedicated his life anew to the Saviour he had served for more than sixty years,” Virginia Steinweg begins. “As he did so, he had no inkling that four pages he would read that day, a reprint of Donald Barnhouse’s article in Eternity magazine, would set off a series of reactions on his part that would long outlive him.” (Virginina Steinweg, “The Life of M. L. Andreasen,” Without Fear Or Favor, Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1979, page 166).

“What did he read on those four pages? Barnhouse, an evangelical scholar, was giving his evaluation of present-day Seventh-day Adventism,” Steinweg continued. “M. L. took at face value this report from an outsider looking in, without waiting for confirmation.” (ibid., WFF, p. 166).

There was no reason why Andreasen should not take the word of Barnhouse “at face value.” The Adventist leadership had examined the articles by Dr. Barnhouse and Walter Martin in *Eternity* magazine and had given the articles their blessing.

“Support articles by Martin, to follow in Eternity, were also gone over,” T. E. Unruh reported. “We were given permission to quote or otherwise refer to these articles.” (Adventist Heritage, page 42, emphasis supplied).

Although over forty years have passed, the Seventh-day Adventist Church to this date has not repudiated the *Eternity* articles on Adventism written by Donald Grey Barnhouse and Walter R. Martin.

“A phrase caught Andreasen’s attention: ‘Immediately it was perceived that the Adventists were strenuously denying certain doctrinal positions which had been previously attributed to them,’” Steinweg continued. (Donald Grey

Barnhouse, editor, "Are Seventh-day Adventists Christians?" Eternity, September, 1956, emphasis supplied; op sit., Without Fear or Favor, page 166,).

The phrase, "Adventists were strenuously denying certain doctrinal positions which had been previously attributed to them" in a leading Evangelical magazine would disturb any true Seventh-day Adventist, would it not?

"Further along M. L. read, 'This idea is also totally repudiated.' What idea was this?" Steinweg described Andreasen's puzzled thought. "None other than what he considered the basic concept of the sanctuary and the atonement—the subject on which he had centered his thought all these years." (ibid., WFF, pages 166, 167, emphasis supplied).

Notice that Steinweg stated, "what he considered the basic concept of the sanctuary." Andreasen was a young man while Ellen White was still alive. Indeed, in the following paragraph Virginia Steinweg relates Andreasen's visits with Ellen White. He knew well what pioneer Seventh-day Adventists believed and taught on the sanctuary doctrine, the final atonement and the blotting out of sins. At the time, in 1957, Andreasen was considered the foremost living authority on the sanctuary doctrine as taught by Seventh-day Adventists. Yet historians still use the term, "as he saw it," or "what he considered the basic concept." **Andreasen was not merely voicing his own opinion, but what has been well documented and consistently taught with great unanimity by Seventh-day Adventists prior to the Evangelical Conferences of 1955-56.**

"When privileged to spend some time at the home of Ellen White, he had especially examined the subject of the atonement and had copied a great number of quotations he had later used in his teaching," Steinweg confirmed. "Of the fifteen books he had written, two were directly on this subject, as were several of the nine quarters of Sabbath school lessons he had been asked to prepare through the years." (ibid., WFF, p. 167, emphasis supplied).

"Now he read this sentence: 'They do not believe, as some of their earlier teachers taught, that Jesus' atoning work was not completed on Calvary but instead that He was still carrying on a second ministering work since 1844,'" Steinweg continued. "What do they believe? he asked. 'They believe that since His ascension Christ has been ministering the benefits of the atonement which He completed on Calvary.'" (ibid., Eternity, 9/56, op sit., WFF, p. 167, emphasis supplied).

Again, any true Seventh-day Adventist would have been alarmed at the statement, "They do not believe, as some of their earlier teachers taught." **This was stating that the Adventist leadership had told the Evangelicals that Adventists no longer believed pioneer Adventist doctrine on the main pillar of Adventism, the sanctuary truth!** Who would not be alarmed? Sadly, only one man was alarmed. Only one man stood alone. Apparently the rest of the Adventist community was deep asleep in Laodicean slumber, or worse yet, *did not have the Christian fortitude to stand with M. L. Andreasen!* Several Seventh-day Adventist ministers and evangelists have admitted regret for not standing with Andreasen at the time.

David Bauer, son of a General Conference vice-president, addressed the apostasy in the book Questions on Doctrines at his Church in Nevada. He was removed as the pastor. The church board voted him back in as a church elder. The Conference in retaliation disbanded the church and locked the doors, placing members on "the conference church rolls." This is a common practice when Conference officials wish to be rid of a person or church body. Remember, Ellen White had prophesied,

*“Nothing would be allowed to stand in the way of the new movement.”
(Selected Messages, Bk. 1, page 204).*

“What a discovery! By the simple device of using the phrase ‘benefits of the atonement’ describing Christ’s work in heaven, *it could be implied that the atonement had been completed on Calvary,*” Steinweg continued. “The only trouble was that Ellen White had written, ‘The great plan of redemption, which was dependent on the death of Christ, had been thus far carried out.’” (2T, p. 211). (*ibid.*, WFF, p. 167, emphasis supplied).

“Thus far carried out?” What was Virginia Steinweg trying to say? This does not prove that Ellen White believed the atonement was finished and completed on the cross. Indeed, Ellen White had written in many places that the final atonement is made in heaven.

“As the priest entered the most holy once a year to cleanse the earthly sanctuary,” Ellen White wrote, “so Jesus entered the most holy of the heavenly, at the end of the 2300 days of Daniel 8, in 1844, to make a final atonement for all who could be benefited by His mediation, and thus to cleanse the sanctuary.” (Early Writings, page 253, emphasis supplied).

Notice that Jesus entered the heavenly sanctuary to make a final atonement for all who could be “benefited by His mediation,” not as the Adventist conferees told the Evangelicals, “the benefits of the atonement which He completed on Calvary.” (See, EGW, Ms. 69, p. 13; SG, Vol. 1, pp. 161, 162; PP, p. 358; EW, p. 254; PP, p. 357; GC, p. 480; and PP, pp. 358).

“But why should the brethren be so anxious to rephrase the standard Adventist doctrine?” Steinweg continued. “M. L. found the answer on another page of the article.”

*The final major area of disagreement is over the doctrine of the “investigative judgment.”..a doctrine held exclusively by the Seventh-day Adventists. At the beginning of our contacts with the Adventists Mr. Martin and I thought that this would be the doctrine on which it would be impossible to come to any understanding which would permit our including them among those who could be counted as Christians believing in the finished work of Christ. Donald Grey Barnhouse, Eternity, October, 1956; *op sit.*, Without Fear or Favor, pages 167, 168. (emphasis supplied).*

“So that was the reason why there must be a rephrasing!” Steinweg continued, quoting the thoughts of Andreasen. “Investigative judgment has to do with the atoning work being done by Christ in the heavenly sanctuary. Early Adventist writers had been so impressed with the importance of this distinctive doctrine that they had not applied the word ‘atonement’ to Christ’s sacrifice on the cross.” (ibid., WFF, p. 168, emphasis supplied).

The last statement that, “Early Adventist writers had been so impressed with the importance of this distinctive doctrine that they had not applied the word ‘atonement’ to Christ’s sacrifice on the cross,” is just not true. Indeed, many books on the sanctuary and the atonement were written by pioneer Adventists recognizing the sacrificial atonement of Christ on the cross. (See, “Atonement,” *Adventist Pioneer Library*, CD-ROM, 1,170 times mentioned).

“M. L. could see that the present trend was to swing to the opposite extreme, limiting the atonement to the cross, while calling the heavenly work merely the `application of the benefits of the atonement,” Steinweg wrote. “In reality, as attested by Scripture and confirmed by Ellen White, both phases constitute the atonement.” (ibid., WFF, p. 168, emphasis supplied).

Footnote C in Steinweg’s book quotes Leroy Froom’s partial quote of the “Fundamental Principles” in the *Signs of the Times*, written by James White. Froom was trying to prove that pioneer Adventists did not believe in the Atoning sacrifice of Jesus Christ on the cross, and in so doing, purposely omitted the first portion of the statement. The portion omitted by Froom is here reproduced in brackets:

Froom’s Omission:

[That there is one Lord Jesus Christ, and Son of the Eternal Father, the One by whom God created all things, and by whom they do consist; that He took on Him the nature of the seed of Abraham for the redemption of our fallen race; that He dwelt among men, full of grace and truth, lived our example, died our sacrifice, was raised for our justification, ascended on high to be our only Mediator in the sanctuary in heaven, where with His own blood, He makes atonement for our sins;] Fundamental Principles, Signs of the Times, June 4, 1874

Froom’s Actual Quote:

. . . . which atonement, so far from being made on the cross which was but the offering of the sacrifice, is the very last portion of his [Christ’s] work as priest.

Fundamental Principles, Signs of the Times, June 4, 1874; quoted in Without Fear or Favor, page 168; op sit., L. E. Froom, Movement of Destiny, p. 514. (emphasis supplied).

Froom claimed Uriah Smith wrote this statement, but the statement was written by James White. (See, Signs of the Times, June 4, 1874). Also, it should be noted that this pioneer Adventist doctrinal position on a “duel” atonement, on the cross, and the final atonement in the heavenly sanctuary, stood until the new Statement of Fundamental Beliefs was voted in 1931, long after the death of Ellen White and all pioneer Seventh-day Adventists!

“In almost all of the fifteen books M. L. had written on theology,” Steinweg continued, “he had devoted the last chapters to describing, in varying ways, the final work of atonement.” (ibid., WFF, p. 169, emphasis supplied). Steinweg then quoted several examples from the writings of Andreasen.

“As if M. L. had not been sufficiently shaken,” Steinweg continued, “he read other statements in the Barnhouse article that disturbed him: `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 views divergent from that of the responsible leadership of the denomination.’” (ibid.,

Barnhouse, Eternity, 9/56; op sit., WFF, p. 170, emphasis supplied).

“‘Put the brakes on’ and ‘divergent views’ sounded, M. L. wrote later, like a return to the days of the Inquisition,” Steinweg observed. “He must not be reading correctly.” (ibid., WFF, p. 170).

Andreasen was a perceptive man. Indeed it was “a return to the Inquisition,” as Andreasen was about to find out.

“M. L. went back to the first page of the reprint and reread a statement concerning variant teachings in the church regarding the mark of the beast and the human nature of Christ,” Steinweg continued. “In regard to these teachings, the Adventist brethren were described as stating 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.’” (ibid., Barnhouse, Eternity, 9/56; op sit., WFF, p. 170).

“This last sentence Andreasen apparently considered a call to take up sentinel duty,” Steinweg observed. (ibid., WFF, p. 170).

Yes indeed! A call to duty. Our faithful brother determined to stand, even if he had to stand alone.

“If God abhors one sin above another, of which His people are guilty, it is doing nothing in case of an emergency,” Ellen White counseled. “Indifference and neutrality in a religious crisis is regarded of God as a grievous crime and equal to the very worst type of hostility against God.” (3T, p. 281, emphasis supplied).

“To stand in the defense of truth and righteousness when the majority forsake us,” Ellen White wrote, “to fight the battles of the Lord when champions are few—this will be our test.” (Testimonies for the Church, page 136, emphasis supplied).

“Soon The Ministry magazine announced that greatly enlarged answers to Mr. Martin’s questions were in the process of being prepared and would be published in book form,” Steinweg continued. (ibid., WFF, p. 170).

*This editor’s office in the General Conference building proved a hallowed spot where some six earnest men, sometimes more, sat around the table searching the precious Word of God. . . . It was soon realized that if these questions and answers could be published, it would aid greatly in making clear our position on the major phases of our belief. Roy Allen Anderson, “Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine,” *The Ministry*, June, 1957, page 24; op sit., *Without Fear or Favor*, pages 170, 171. (emphasis supplied).*

Another article, written by Ruben Figuhr, president of the General Conference, appeared in the *Ministry* magazine explaining “the process used in preparing the book.” (ibid., WFF, p. 171). This article stated in part:

Probably no other book published by this denomination has been so carefully read by so large a group of responsible men of the denomination before its publication as the one under consideration. Some 250 men in America and in other countries received copies of the manuscript before it was published. The preliminary manuscript work by a group of some fourteen individuals had been so carefully prepared that only a minimum of suggestions of improvement were made. There was, however, a remarkable chorus of approval.

*Ruben R. Figuhr, [General Conference President], "Questions on Doctrine," *The Ministry*, January, 1958, page 29; op sit., WFF, p. 171, emphasis supplied).*

*"Who were these 250 men who had received copies before publication? Andreasen wondered," Steinweg continued. "The answer was in *The Ministry*: (ibid., WFF, p. 171).*

*The manuscript, after being carefully studied by a large group here, was sent to our leadership in all the world divisions. In addition, it went to the Bible teachers in our senior colleges and the editors of our major journals. Copies were also sent to our union and local conference leaders in North America. *ibid.*, Roy Allen Anderson, *The Ministry*, June, 1957, page 24; op sit., WFF, page 171. (emphasis supplied).*

This document proves that the apostasy was complete throughout the leadership of the Church. The laymen, and most of the ministry, knew nothing of what was taking place among leadership in 1955-1957. Indeed, this author, as late as 1979, brought to the attention of a ministerial secretary of a major conference, the statement on page 383 in *Questions on Doctrine*,

"Although born in the flesh, He was nevertheless God, and was exempt from the inherited passions and pollutions that corrupt the natural descendants of Adam." (emphasis supplied).

The man was astonished, and made the remark, "I have read the book, but I did not see or comprehend this statement at the time! Now it is clear."

"According to M. L.'s friends, it greatly bothered him that anyone would think that sheer numbers could necessarily add up to expertise. . .," Steinweg continued. "It was not the task of men whose major work was administrative to be arbiters of truth. Such men were elected to see that the business of the church was carried on in an efficient manner. As for college teachers, M. L. had heard some admit that they had not studied the atonement." (ibid., WFF, pp. 171, 172, emphasis supplied).

Andreasen was right. It is not the duty of church leaders to define doctrine. This is a Roman Catholic concept. "The Holy See reserves to itself the right to pass finally on the origin of the present reading." (1 John 5:7, Saint Joseph, *New Catholic Edition*, 1962)

"In the very courts of the temple, scenes will be enacted that few realize. . .," Ellen White warned. "Vengeance will be executed against those who sit in the gates deciding what the people should have [believed]." (Ms. 15, 1886, emphasis supplied).

As stated above, some had returned the *Questions on Doctrine* manuscript without even reading it. Their reasoning was that they had “complete trust and confidence in the leading brethren.”

“One thing M. L. knew: he who probably could have detected serious pitfalls in the presentation of the atonement and of the nature of Christ had not been given the opportunity,” Steinweg observed. “Even one unwisely chosen word in a written exposition of truth could cause embarrassment.” (ibid., WFF, p. 172).

Not only could “cause embarrassment” but indeed did cause embarrassment. One only has to view a video recording of the 1984 John Ankerberg television program, featuring Dr. Walter Martin and William Johnsson of the *Adventist Review* to see the embarrassment of Johnsson. Johnsson had great difficulty trying to explain to Martin the continuing doctrinal division in the contemporary Seventh-day Adventist Church over “the final atonement completed in heaven, and the human nature of Christ.”

Johnsson seemed confused as he tried to explain why the doctrines of “the atonement and the nature of Christ” as stated in the 27 Statement of Fundamental Beliefs, that he held in his hand, (the same doctrinal position told to Martin and the other Evangelicals in 1955 and 1956), were in opposition to the writings of Ellen G. White! Why was this so difficult? Because Ellen White’s statements on those important doctrines, “the final atonement and the human nature of Christ” differed drastically from that which Johnsson and the contemporary Seventh-day Adventist Church now teach.

Dr. Walter Martin stated, on the John Ankerberg television program, that Ellen White was a false prophet “because she approved the false position of Crosier on the final atonement.” that Ellen White was a false prophet because she endorsed the “final atonement in heaven” as written by O. R. L. Crosier. Martin tried to get William Johnsson, of the Adventist Review, to admit that Ellen White was a false prophet because of this point.

He knew that Johnsson did not believe in the final atonement in heaven as taught by Crosier and Ellen White. Martin and Ankerberg tried to get Johnsson to state that he was saved – that his sins would not be blotted out by our High Priest in the heavenly sanctuary – but that he was saved now. When Johnsson appeared to be cornered, in defense he would wave the 27 Statement of Fundamental Beliefs and state that this is what Seventh-day Adventists believe. John Ankerberg, the moderator, at one point referred to that document in Johnsson’s hand as the “Adventist creed.” Ankerberg was right! The 27 Statement of Fundamental Beliefs is a contemporary Adventist creed. It was a very feeble defense of these two crucial pioneer Adventist doctrines, to say the least.

“Some have thought that another possible reason for M. L.’s not having been among the 250 readers [of Questions on Doctrine] went back to when he had first moved to the Seminary in Washington in 1938,” Steinweg observed. “He had been invited to hold evening classes on the sanctuary service, which employees of the Review and Herald and the General Conference had enjoyed attending. Could it have been that other scholars who were not invited to give evening classes on their specialties had felt a bit envious of his popularity as a teacher?” (ibid., WFF, p. 173).

Andreasen had been a man well respected by the leadership of the Church. Why would they not now listen to one of the elder statesman of Adventism, “an expert on the sanctuary doctrine?” (Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia, Second Revised Edition, 1995, Art. Andreasen”).

*More recently, in connection with his preparing Sabbath school lessons for the first two quarters of 1957, M. L. had been asked to update his commentary, Isaiah, the Gospel Prophet. When the manuscript was ready, M. L. had been told it was not going to be published. The department head who had made the contract had retired, and the Book and Bible House managers had taken the opportunity to vote to have no more lesson helps for a while, possibly because those of recent years had not sold out. Had M. L. not felt it a matter of principle to insist that the publishing house reimburse him the \$3,000 he had asked for the expense of his time, secretarial help, and so on, the brethren might have been more kindly disposed toward him. *ibid.*, Virginia Steinweg, *Without Fear or Favor*, page 173. (emphasis supplied).*

Questions On Doctrine

“When Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine came off the press, M. L. read the 720 page volume with care,” Steinweg wrote. “He was pleased that an adjective he had objected to in a Ministry article, ‘final atonement applied to the atonement on the cross, had been omitted [from the book]. That is the tremendous scope of the sacrificial act of the cross—a complete, perfect, and final atonement for man’s sin.”—L. E. Froom, “The Priestly Application of the Atoning Act,” The Ministry, February, 1957., Italics supplied., op sit., Without Fear or Favor, pages 173, 174, emphasis supplied.

Once again we see an attempt by Leroy Froom to push his erroneous belief in “a complete, perfect, and final atonement [on the cross] for man’s sin” into the pages of latter-day Adventist history. However, the true pioneer Adventist history stands. We now have the writings of the pioneers on CD-ROM. (See, *Adventist Pioneer Library*, P. O Box 1844, Loma Linda, California).

“But he [Andreasen] could not find any reassuring statement, such as had appeared in the article, to the effect that Christ’s present ministry in heaven forms an integral part of the atonement,” Steinweg observed. “Instead of a clear cut presentation, he found this: ‘When, therefore, one hears an Adventist say, or reads in Adventist literature—even in the writings of Ellen G. White— that Christ is making atonement now, it should be understood that we mean simply that Christ is now making application of the benefits of the sacrificial atonement He made on the cross.’ (Questions on Doctrine, pp. 354, 355, emphasis theirs, op sit., WFF, pp. 173, 174).

In the last paragraph to this chapter, “Clouds On the Evening Horizon” in her book, *Without Fear or Favor*, Virginia Steinweg states that,

“While denominational literature has adopted the phrase ‘the benefits of His atonement,’ every effort is put forth to make clear to the world that Seventh-day Adventists believe that an important part of the atonement is taking place in the heavenly sanctuary.” (ibid., WFF, p. 183).

This statement is just not true! Consider the following doctrinal statement number 23,

“Christ’s Ministry In the Heavenly Sanctuary” from the current doctrinal statement of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, Seventh-day Adventists Believe, “27 Fundamental Doctrines.” This is stated exactly as it appeared in the book Questions on Doctrine:

*There is a sanctuary in heaven, the true tabernacle which the Lord set up and not man. In it Christ ministers on our behalf, making available to believers the benefits of His atoning sacrifice offered once for all on the cross. . . . “27 Fundamental Doctrines,” *Seventh-day Adventists Believe*, Copyright, 1988, The Ministerial Association, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, page 312. (emphasis supplied).*

“This sentence loomed so large in M. L.’s evaluation that he seemed completely unimpressed by the high scholarship evidenced elsewhere in the book,” Steinweg continued, “including such special features as forty-two pages on ‘Champions of Conditional Immortality,’ thirty-eight pages on ‘Basic Principles of Prophetic Interpretation,’ and two chapters on the scapegoat.” (ibid., WFF, p. 174).

The apostate book written by Dr. William Harvey Kellogg, *The Living Temple*, also contained many excellent statements on health and other truths. However, woven in were subtle statements of gross heresy. Like the book *Living Temple, Questions on Doctrine* also contains subtle heresy and is a dangerous document of truth mixed with error. Truth mixed with error is one of Satan’s most clever deceptions. What counsel would Ellen White give on this new doctrinal book *Questions on Doctrine* if she were alive today? We can only go by what she has written about books that contained truth mixed with error.

*I am compelled to speak in denial of the claim that the teachings of *Living Temple* can be sustained by statements from my writings. There may be in this book expressions and sentiments that are in harmony with my writings. And there may be in my writings many statements which, taken from their connection, and interpreted according to the mind of the writer of *Living Temple*, would seem to be in harmony with the teachings of this book. This may give apparent support to the assertion that the sentiments in *Living Temple* are in harmony with my writings. But God forbid that this sentiment should prevail. Ellen G. White, “*The Foundation of Our Faith*,” *Selected Messages, Book I*, page 203. (emphasis supplied).*

“Other matters disturbed M. L., such as the omission from a Sabbath school quarterly on Revelation of the study on the mark of the beast,” Steinweg continued. “He connected this with Mr. Martin’s contacts with the brethren.” (ibid., WFF, p. 174, emphasis supplied).

History has proven that Andreasen was right in his perception of the reason for the omission of the study on the mark of the beast. One has only to observe current trends in Adventist literature with such phrases as “beast bashing,” and omissions on the study of the Pope as the “man of sin,” the reluctance to openly name the Papacy as the Antichrist. See below, Chapter #18, “The Invaders”).

The Attempt To Insert Footnotes In EGW Writings

“Then one day, while he was visiting a former chairman of the E. G. White Board of Trustees, a courtesy copy of the latest minutes arrived,” Steinweg wrote. “His host passed them over for M. L. to read without having read them himself, just as a matter of interest. M. L.’s eye caught a phrase about appending a few notes to certain Ellen G. White writings, explaining ‘our understanding of the various phases of the atoning work of Christ.’” (ibid.,

WFF, p. 174).

“As the slightest tremor can startle an earthquake survivor, M. L. feared what might happen next,” Steinweg observed. “Could not such notes undermine the authority of the Ellen White writings? he asked.” (ibid. WFF, p. 175, emphasis supplied).

“In actuality, the men working with the evangelicals had discovered that the phrase in Early Writings regarding ‘the benefits of His atonement’ had been of great help to those scholars in understanding the sanctuary ministration,” Steinweg concluded. “The brethren had therefore suggested that this passage might be used as an appendix note or a footnote in a place or two in The Great Controversy.” (ibid., WFF, p. 175, emphasis supplied).

This statement by Steinweg is just not true! In May, 1957, two men, Roy Allen Anderson and W. E. Read, members of the committee which had been appointed to write the book *Questions on Doctrine*, had been invited by the Board of the Ellen G. White Estate to discuss “a question that had received some consideration at a meeting the previous January [1957].” (Andreasen, *Letters to the Churches*, Series A, No. 2, p. 1).

The identity of the two men was revealed by M. L. Andreasen, in his *Letters to the Churches*, Series A, #5, page 9. “#2: **“The vault visits of Elders Anderson and Read [sic] in regard to having insertions made in the writings of Mrs. White.”** The question concerned statements by Ellen White in her writings on the “final atonement” in the heavenly sanctuary. These two men, Anderson and Read, wanted footnotes added to the Ellen G. White books explaining that,

“When, therefore, one hears an Adventist say, or reads. ..even in the writings of Ellen G. White—that Christ is making atonement now, it should be understood that we mean simply that Christ is now making application of the benefits of the sacrificial atonement He made on the cross.” (QOD, p. 354, emphasis theirs).

Now, if the reader will consider the exact wording of the Ellen G. White Board Minutes the truth about this incident will be readily discerned:

The meeting of the Trustees held May 1 closed with no action taken on the question which was discussed at length – suitable footnotes or explanations regarding the E. G. White statements on the atoning work of Christ, which indicate a continuing work at the present time in heaven. Inasmuch as the chairman of our board will be away from Washington for the next four months, and the involvements in this question are such that it must have the most careful consideration and counsel, it was:

VOTED: That we defer consideration until a later time of the matters that were brought to our attention by Elders “x” [Roy Allen Anderson] and “y” [Walter E. Read] involving the E. G. White statements concerning the continuing atoning work of Christ.

Ellen G. White Estate Board, Minutes, May 2, 1957, page 1488 (emphasis supplied).

Two facts are plainly evident from this document.

(1) The Ellen G. White Estate Board admits that in her writings Ellen White's statements on the atoning work of Christ "indicate a continuing work at the present time in heaven."

(2) The Board admitted that the purpose of Anderson and Read's visit to the vault involved "the E. G. White statements concerning the continuing atoning work of Christ."

The two men, Anderson and Read, urged the Ellen G. White Estate Board to take immediate action on their request:

"This is a matter which will come prominently to the front in the near future, and we would do well to move forward with the preparation and inclusion of such notes in future printings of the E. G. White books." (E. G. White Estate, Minutes, May 2, 1957, p. 1483).

M. L. Andreasen, who objected to the attempt to insert footnotes and explanations in the Ellen G. White books, received a letter from a high official in the General Conference. In this letter it was stated:

"You cannot, Brother Andreasen, take away from us this precious teaching that Jesus made a complete and all-sufficient atoning sacrifice on the cross. . . ." (Letter to M. L. Andreasen, from A Chief Officer of the General Conference; Andreasen, Letters to the Churches, Series A, #2, p. 5).

"The board chairman was leaving in a few hours for an overseas trip," Steinweg continued, "hence more than a quarter of a year passed before the board decided not to append the notes." (ibid., WFF, p. 175, emphasis supplied).

Andreasen Called For A Hearing Before the General Conference

"M. L. [had] offered to go to Washington for a hearing, on the condition that he could have a copy of the proceedings," Steinweg observed. "A tape recording was suggested, and he understood that he would receive one. However, further correspondence revealed that it would not be prudent to give him a tape." (ibid. WFF, pp. 176, 177).

This statement is also not true. In a letter Andreasen was assured that he could have a copy of the tape. (See, Andreasen, *Letters to the Churches*). Then he was told that he could not have a copy of the tape. (*ibid.*, *Letters to the Churches*). Further correspondence revealed that instead of a tape recording, minutes of the meeting would be written out by a stenographer. Andreasen was then told that he could have a copy of the written minutes.

The final correspondence to Andreasen was an official statement from the leadership that, instead of the minutes being written, an overall view of the proceedings would be recorded, but Andreasen would not receive a copy. The written overview "would remain in the office." "M. L. thereupon decided that a hearing was impossible," Steinweg wrote. (ibid. WFF, p. 177).

Indeed, why would Andreasen wish to appear before a board of men behind closed doors without a record of what was said and done? He could not have complete trust in the brethren. **They had lied three times**

about his obtaining a tape recording of the proceedings. Forces were at work in the leadership of the Seventh-day Adventist Church that were so strong that Andreassen knew that he would be lynched without a record of what was said at this meeting. And yet the leading brethren called this a “fair hearing.”

“Meanwhile, M. L. had been exchanging letters with headquarters,” Steinweg continued. “He was not satisfied with the answers which included, ‘I have discussed this with the brethren concerned and would like to leave the matter there.’ Again, ‘I have considered the matter to which you have referred as closed.’” (ibid., WFF, p. 175). This deaf ear turned to Andreassen’s pleading was from none other than General Conference president, Ruben R. Figuhr.

“From this M. L. concluded that he had worn out the welcome for his letters to the leaders in Washington,” Steinweg continued her version of the story. “Under the strong conviction that something must be done, he began mimeographing a series of letters on the atonement, which he mailed to former students, and possibly to others who sent him postage.” (ibid., WFF, p. 175). “For M. L. the scholar, the great focal point of the church was sound doctrine, emanating from Christ, the Way, the Truth, and the Life,” Steinweg wrote. “From the administrative point of view, the great focal point of the church was expressed by the president of the General Conference in his opening talk at the 1957 Spring Council, in which he stated principles that needed emphasis at this time: (ibid., WFF, p. 176).

What holds our denomination together? We cannot by force hold a single individual in the church. It is all voluntary. Our people are united because they believe in God’s church and in the leadership, be it president or church pastor. We must retain this confidence by our example, by the life we live, the way we live, the way we act, by what we say, and the way we say it. . . . We must be earnest, but never extreme, neither fanatical nor over liberal.

*Ruben R. Figuhr, “A Sound From Heaven,” *The Ministry*, June, 1957, page 26. (emphasis supplied). (ibid., WFF, p. 176).*

The Seventh-day Adventist Church leadership could not “by force hold a single individual,” but they were trying to do just that by bringing ecclesiastical force against M. L. Andreassen. His credentials were removed and he was not allowed to preach in the churches that he had loved for over sixty years. Even his retirement funds were rescinded! Andreassen’s retirement funds were restored only at the demand of the California State Welfare Department.

The statement by president Figuhr, “Our people are united because they believe in God’s church and in the leadership, be it president or church pastor,” must be challenged. One of the biggest problems with contemporary Seventh-day Adventists is that the people do believe in the arm of flesh more than in earnest study of the Bible, the Spirit of Prophecy, and Seventh-day Adventist history. *God’s people are united on the truth*, not the ecclesiastical authority of the Church. That is a Roman Catholic concept! Again, it is the truth that unites the people, not the Church. The Church is the community of believers. To believe that the Church is the voice of God is Romanism. Ecclesiastical authority never brought unity, only persecution. The pages of this world’s history during the dark ages are strewn with the bodies of some fifty to ninety million faithful Christian martyrs.

Is the General Conference the Voice of God?

Ellen G. White, the messenger to the remanant church, had much to say in regard to the church and its authority over God's people. The following quotations were taken from the published writings of E. G. White. The reader is advised to look up these references and read the complete statements in context.

The people have lost confidence in those who have the management of the work. Yet we hear that the voice of the Conference is the voice of God. Every time I have heard this, I have thought it was almost blasphemy.

Ellen G. White, Manuscript 37, 1901; Manuscript Release 365. (emphasis supplied).

We are not to turn from One Mighty in counsel to ask guidance of men. Let those who are inclined to do this read and receive the Bible as the word of God to them. The Bible is the voice of God to His people.

Ellen G. White, Review and Herald, Vol. 5, page . 224. (emphasis supplied).

“Thus, for the chief administrator [the General Conference president],” Steinweg continued, “any words directed against the leadership constituted a threat to the very unity of the church.” (ibid. WFF, p. 176, emphasis supplied).

“The Jews worshiped the temple [Church] and were filled with greater indignation at anything spoken against that building than if it had been spoken against God. (Early Writings, page 198, emphasis supplied).

“We cannot then take a position that the unity of the church consists in viewing every text of Scripture in the very same light,” Ellen White counseled. “The church may pass resolution upon resolution to put down all disagreement of opinions, but we cannot force the mind and will, and thus root out disagreement. These resolutions may conceal the discord, but they cannot quench it and establish perfect agreement.” (Ms. 24, 1892, emphasis supplied).

“I have been shown that it is a mistake to suppose that the men in positions of special responsibility at Battle Creek [or Washington] have wisdom which is far superior to that of ordinary men,” Ellen White stated. “Those who think that they have, supposing them to have divine enlightenment, rely upon the human judgment of these men, taking their counsel as the voice of God. But this is not safe; for unless men are wholly consecrated to God, Satan will work through them to impart that knowledge which will not be for the present and eternal good of those who hear.” (Series A, No. 9, p. 37, emphasis supplied).

“An administrator is not expected to be an expert on all subjects,” Steinweg observed. “He is surrounded by specialists to whom he refers some matters, confident that all will be well taken care of.” (ibid., WFF, p. 176).

But who are these “specialists” that the president of the General Conference is “surrounded”

with? Leroy Froom, for one. Anderson and Read, the two men who tried to get footnotes in the writings of Ellen White making her say the opposite of what she had written.

“Therefore, when the chief administrator had received several letters from M. L.,” Steinweg concluded, “he discussed their contents with the specialists then wrote to him stating that he considered the matter closed, and earnestly entreating him to cease his agitation.” (ibid., WFF, p. 176).

Notice that after Figuhr had discussed the contents of Andreasen’s letters “with the specialists,” (Froom, Anderson, Read, and other betrayers of truth on the Evangelical Conference committee), “he considered the matter closed.”

The Pope of the Adventists had spoken.

“Other persons besides M. L. were concerned about Questions on Doctrine,” Steinweg observed. “One of these affirms that he was authorized by M. L. to print and circulate ‘Letters to the Churches,’ rewritten from the atonement messages. This naturally increased the number of readers.” (ibid., WFF, p. 177).

Steinweg gives no documented reference to this statement. However, many copies of Andreasen’s “Letters to the Churches” were published around the world. Andreasen first took his grievances to the leaders of the Church. They would not hear him. They were determined to bring into the Church the “new theology.” They “considered the matter closed.” Then, only after he had exhausted all avenues to the leading brethren, Andreasen published his “Letters to the Churches.” After all, the Bible plan for protest against heresy is plain enough.

“Moreover if thy brother [brethren] shall trespass against thee, go and tell him [them] his [their] fault between thee and him [them] alone.” (Matthew 18:15a). Andreasen wrote letters but was unable to secure a fair hearing.

“But if he [they] will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established.” (Matthew 18:16). Or to paraphrase the passage, “that in the tape recording of the meeting *every word may be established.*” Andreasen could not take two or three witnesses with him because he was standing alone. Many ministers and evangelists have lamented the fact that they let Andreasen stand alone. However, Andreasen did write more letters, pleading for the ear of the leading brethren. But he was told, “I [we] consider the matter closed.”

“And if he [they] shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the church.” (Matthew 18:17a). Indeed, the Spirit of Prophecy is filled with such counsel.

“If God abhors one sin above another, of which His people are guilty, it is doing nothing in case of an emergency,” Ellen White warned. “Indifference and neutrality in a religious crisis is regarded of God as a grievous crime and equal to the very worst type of hostility against God.” (Testimonies for the Church, Vol. 3, page 381, emphasis supplied).

In support of Andreasen’s position “the Review had carried an associate editor’s article, ‘Can Truth Be Popular?’” Steinweg stated. (ibid. WFF, p. 178):

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, "Can Truth Be Popular?" Review and Herald, May 15, 1958. (emphasis supplied).

Nine months later, Francis D. Nichol, the editor in chief of the *Review and Herald* also wrote in support of Andreasen's position:

There is a subtle temptation facing Adventists today—this day of our increasing popularity—to feel that if we rephrase 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, "Warning Lesson From Bogus Books," Review and Herald, February 26, 1959. (emphasis supplied).

Notice that the Review editor admits that the Evangelical conferences were approved by Satan himself. The Adventist leadership did "feel that if we rephrase our beliefs a little, setting them forth in less disturbing form, we can have good fellowship on all sides." But Nichol stated that in so doing, "Greatly would the evil one like to persuade us to fall into that trap." History discloses that the leadership of the contemporary Seventh-day Adventist Church did fall into that trap, and, "The Advent message [that] is poles removed from the modern religious thinking" was compromised.

"On January 5, 1960, at the age of 83," Steinweg continued, "M. L. wrote in a personal letter, 'I can still see a little, hear a little, think a little. I go swimming practically every day. I thank God for my health. Also I preach quite regularly, but mostly I write.'" (ibid., WFF, pp. 178, 179).

"I knew it was time to sound the alarm. . . . I have received my orders from God, MEET IT, MEET IT," Andreasen stated. "And I must be true to my Lord." (Andreasen, "Suspension Story," page 1; op. cit., WFF, p. 179).

"His faithful wife of more than fifty-two years was no longer by his side to remind him that the Bible prophets were to deliver their message, 'whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear,'" Steinweg observed. "Once they had delivered it, they were to go home." (ibid., WFF, p. 179, emphasis supplied).

They were to go home? My Bible says that many times the prophets were stoned, just like Andreasen was castigated. Did Elijah go home? No, he stood on Mount Carmal and faced the false teachers of Baal.

"'Annie would have straightened him out in two minutes,' it has been observed," Steinweg quotes, but does not give the source, "but he refused to go home. Instead, he stood up and shouted all the louder." (ibid., WFF, p. 179).

Would that there had been more champions who “stood up and shouted all the louder.” Possibly, the Church would not be in apostasy today.

Andreasen’s Books Removed From Adventist Book Centers

“During the years of controversy, five of Andreasen’s books were regularly listed in the Christian Home Library Series, of which the announcement read: ‘Each book going into this series was good yesterday, is good today, and will be equally good tomorrow,’” Steinweg continued. “Each is worthy of a permanent place on your library shelves.” (ibid., WFF, pp. 179, 180).

“After November 17, 1960, this announcement continued to appear in the Review, but without Andreasen’s titles being included in the list.” Steinweg wrote. “The book Prayer rejoined the list during the fourth quarter of 1966.” (ibid., WFF, pp. 179, 180).

Unfortunately, 1966 was four years after Andreasen’s death. Although the “new” theology often speaks of “love and forgiveness,” what kind of so-called Christians were leading the Seventh-day Adventist Church, leaders that would deal so deviously with a faithful Adventist worker?

“In spite of his difficulties, the veteran had not lost his spirit of fight nor his sense of humor,” Steinweg observed. (ibid., WFF, p. 180).

It is a wonderful thing to live in such a time and under such circumstances as these. I am enjoying life as never before. ‘To be living is sublime.’ So I will keep on doing what I have done: write a little, rest a little until my good friends think I have given up, am sick, or passed on. Then I come to life again, and continue my work.

M. L. Andreasen, The Living Witness, page 5; op. sit., WFF, p. 180. (emphasis supplied).

“But the denomination could not condone M. L.’s activities,” Steinweg wrote. “Therefore, on April 6, 1961, the members of the General Conference committee assembled in Spring Council reluctantly voted to suspend his ministerial credentials.” (ibid., WFF, p. 180, emphasis supplied).

“This was done for (1) bringing discord and confusion into the ranks by voice and pen,” Steinweg quoted the GC Committee, “and for (2) refusing to respond favorably to the appeals to make a statement of his differences to the General Conference except on his own particular terms.” (Minutes of the Spring Council filed in General Conference archives; op. sit., WFF, p. 180).

“It was a sad, sad meeting,” Arthur White observed. “We all honored Elder Andreasen. We loved him.” (Arthur White, letter to Thomas A. Davis, Oct. 23, 1978; op. sit., WFF, p. 180).

Today we would remark, “Yea, right, they loved him. They removed his credentials, took his books off the shelves, and took away his retirement pay.” **The record of these harsh actions of apostate leadership against a faithful brother is recorded in heaven.**

“As you may know, I have had my credentials suspended,” Andreasen wrote in a personal letter to a friend. “I didn’t know about it till later. But I am an SDA. . . . I am of good courage. ‘Stay by the ship’ is somewhat hard when they throw you out.” (op. cit., WFF, p. 180).

“That summer, two former students came to visit him, resolved not to mention his troubles,” Steinweg related. “The first thing he said was, ‘Well, they’ve suspended my credentials.’ With tears in his eyes he added, ‘I’ve not left the church. I have no intention of leaving the church.’” (ibid., WFF, pp. 180, 181).

“But in spite of his second wife’s devotion in giving him the best possible physical care, M. L.’s body could not withstand the grief that assailed him, especially during the long nights,” Steinweg observed. “He even wrote letters to God.” (ibid., WFF, p. 181).

“No longer was he permitted to preach even one sermon on Sabbath,” Steinweg continued. “That his zeal for what he understood to be the Lord’s cause should have gotten him into this predicament was more than he could take.” (ibid., WFF, p. 181).

Notice that Steinweg uses the now weary phrase “what he understood to be the Lord’s cause.” Sadly, there were not more faithful Adventists to stand with Andreasen in “his zeal for what he understood to be the Lord’s cause.”

“He developed a duodenal ulcer that eventually began to hemorrhage,” Steinweg wrote. “Less than a week before his death, which occurred on February 19, 1962, he was taken to the hospital. His heart was not strong enough for surgery.” (ibid., WFF, p. 181).

“He spent his last night at home praying and weeping over his sad situation relative to the ministry of which he had formed a part for almost sixty years,” Steinweg continued. “His wife sent word to the General Conference president [R. R. Figuhr], who was in the vicinity at the time, explaining that M. L. wanted to see him. He went, accompanied by the president of the Pacific Union Conference [R. R. Bietz].” (ibid., WFF, p. 181, emphasis supplied).

The three had met together on previous occasions, when the results had been unsatisfactory. Now they talked together frankly about past experiences and actions. M. L. made it plain that although he differed regarding some of the procedures followed in handling his case, he wanted to be at peace with his brethren and with God. He wanted no animosities. The president responded in

kind. Then each prayed. The bitterness was eliminated. At last the old warrior was ready to leave the whole matter in the Lord's care. There were tears of gratitude in his eyes as the visitors left. "Now I can die in peace," he told his wife.

ibid., Virginia Steinweg, Without Fear Or Favor, page 181.

“At last the old warrior was ready to leave the whole matter in the Lord's care.” All the persons involved in the Evangelical Conferences are now resting in their graves, “to leave the whole matter in the Lord's care,” awaiting the coming of the Judge of us all.

Andreasen not only “differed regarding some of the procedures followed in handling his case,” but he differed on doctrinal viewpoints. This point cannot be over-emphasized; Andreasen stood alone on doctrinal points that were being altered.

“On March 1, 1962, the General Conference Committee voted to restore M. L.'s ministerial credentials and to list his name in the Yearbook along with the other sustentees,” Steinweg continued. “But M. L. never learned of this action; he had already gone to his rest [February 19, 1962, ten days prior]. (ibid., WFF, pp. 181, 182, emphasis supplied).

“Eight months after M. L.'s death, the following “Letter From Our President” appeared in the Review,” Steinweg stated. (ibid., WFF, p. 182):

True faith in God will lead us to believe that when we have brought to the attention of responsible bodies our personal convictions, then God can be depended upon to overrule any errors men or committees might have committed. It is unfortunate for anyone to take the position that if his view is not accepted, the brethren are therefore wrong; and it is doubly wrong for a person to begin to broadcast his view in an endeavor to compel acceptance of it. How much better it is to rely on God to work things out after we have made our proper approaches. . . . Ruben R. Figuhr, “A Letter From Our President,” Review and Herald, October 4, 1962, page 5; op. cit., WFF, p. 182. (emphasis supplied).

“God can be depended upon to overrule any errors men or committees might have committed.” If Luther and others had taken this position there never would have been a Protestant Reformation. As has been amply shown in the three previous chapters, the protest Andreasen was bringing against the leading brethren was not “his own personal view,” but the view of Ellen White and pioneer Adventists. The doctrines that were being altered were searched out by our pioneer Seventh-day Adventists and endorsed by the Spirit of God. These were the foundation doctrines that Ellen White said “had sustained us the past fifty years.”

“It would be folly for any leader to maintain that he is above erring or for any board to assume that it is infallible,” Figuhr stated further. (op. cit., WFF, p. 182).

The history of the Evangelical Conferences of 1955 and 1956, and the way the leadership handled Andraesen's protest of those conferences contradict this statement by President Figuhr. **But then, the "new" theology is permeated with contradictions.**

"The many earnest prayers of God's people in behalf of His work and church leaders we confidently believe are heard in heaven," Figuhr continued. "He answers in His own divine way, at times even leading His church in what may appear to be the wrong direction. But we can trust Him to bring His people triumphantly through at last into the Promised Land." (op. cit., WFF, pp. 182, 183).

God's true remnant people will be the Church triumphant.

The Lord does not hear the prayers for leaders who are compromising the true doctrine of pioneer Seventh-day Adventists. The Lord will "bring His people triumphantly through at last into the Promised Land." But we have no assurance that God will lead the corporate Church into the promised land, because since 1955 the corporate Church is in apostasy. God's true remnant people will be the Church triumphant.

"A 'Thus saith the Lord' is not to be set aside for a 'Thus saith the church' or a 'Thus saith the state.'" Ellen White stated. (Acts of the Apostles, page 69, emphasis supplied).

"Many will stand in our pulpits with the torch of false prophecy in their hands, kindled from the hellish torch of Satan," Ellen White warned. "If doubts and unbelief are cherished, the faithful ministers will be removed from the people who think they know so much." (Testimonies to Ministers, page 410, emphasis supplied).

Four Andraesen Books Republished After His Death

"In 1969, seven years after his death, four of Andraesen's books were republished to begin a new library named the Shield Series," Steinweg wrote. "These titles read: The Sanctuary Service, The Faith of Jesus, The Sabbath, and A Faith to Live By. (ibid. WFF, p. 183).

"People who attended M. L. Andraesen's funeral on February 23, 1962," Steinweg recalled, "heard not only what they might expect but also some things they never could have expected. (ibid., WFF, p. 184):

In my many conversations with Elder Andraesen through the months and years, he always recognized the goodness of the Lord. Just a few days before his death some of us were visiting him at the hospital. His hope in Christ was evident by the manner in which he talked about death. He knew that he might die any moment. Even with thoughts of death upon his mind, he was a cheerful man. Even his sense of humor broke through during that hour. Elder R. R. Bietz, President, Pacific Union Conference; op. cit., Without Fear Or Favor, page 185.

“Few, very few, have made the impact on the thinking and the faith of Seventh-day Adventists that Elder Andreasen’s teaching and writing have made,” said T. J. Michael, who read the obituary. “Yet this man of God, who achieved so much in his lifetime, wrote of himself a few hours before his death that his was an ordinary life, that he came from nowhere in particular, accomplished no feats of strength or wisdom, but was a mere man who lived a quiet life without ostentation. . . who left no footprints on the sands of time.” (op. sit., WFF, p. 185).

“As he stated, he was not a Columbus, an Einstein, or an Edison,” T. J. Michael stated further. “But to the hundreds who knew and loved him, he was more than these, he was a trusted friend, a wise counselor, and a spiritual strength. He had an intimate acquaintance with God, and to the best of his ability he endeavored to share this friendship with all whose lives he touched.” (op. sit., WFF, p. 185).

Final Words Of M. L. Andreasen

“It seems fitting that on this occasion I should leave a word to my friends here assembled,” Andreasen wrote. (op. sit., WFF, p. 185).

“God has been good to me these many years; life has been good to me; my friends have been good to me; my family has been good to me,” Andreasen continued. “As I believe that life here is given us that we may demonstrate how we will use it, I leave my testimony that I love life, that I appreciate the privilege of having been permitted to live these many years, and associate with my dear friends.” (op. sit., WFF, pp. 185, 186).

“Life and love are wonderful, and I have had my full share of them,” Andreasen continued. “I have had a taste of life and love, and I am looking forward to another life, unending, with my friends and loved ones, where there will be no parting, no sad farewells.” (op. sit., WFF, p. 186). “So, dear ones, be faithful and true, even to the end,” Andreasen wrote. “I shall rest in hope, looking forward to the day of glad reunion. I love my God. I shall soon see Him. I love you that are here today; I love music; I love flowers; and I appreciate your love.” (op. sit., WFF, p. 186). “Farewell, then, till we meet again.” The document was signed, M. L. Andreasen. (op. sit., WFF, pp. 185, 186).

Farewell, then, to you, Elder Andreasen. A champion who stood alone in the frail senior years of your life. The Lord of the Sabbath and of the true pioneer Seventh-day Adventist message will say to you on that day,

“Well done, M. L., thou good and faithful servant: thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things:
enter thou into the joy of thy lord.” Matthew 25:21

LINK TO COMPLETE DOCUMENT:

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