

HARVEST INSPIRATION DISCOVERIES

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

CHAPTER 7

A CHURCH CREED AND A CHURCH MANUAL

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	3
Ancient and Modern Israel’s Desire To Look To Man.....	3
Modern Israel and Leroy Froom	4
Pioneer Adventists Opposed A Creed Or Church Manual.....	5
James White Agrees With Loughborough	6
Timing Right For An Official SDA Creed and Church Manual	6
Froom Reveals Why Timing Was Right.....	7
Who were some of these “certain individuals” who had by 1930 passed to their rest.	7
A Suitable Statement Of Faith?.....	8
Who Wrote the Original Statement Of Fundamental Principles?.....	8
Seventh-day Adventists say it was Uriah Smith. Is this true?.....	8
In his 1971 book, <i>Movement of Destiny</i> , Froom tells an outright lie about who wrote the 1874 “Fundamental Principles” of Seventh-day Adventist Beliefs.	8
Leroy Froom Falsifies History	8
Documented Proof That Froom Altered An Historical Fact.....	8
Froom’s Unfounded Purpose For Altering History	9
Only Two Sentences Quoted.....	10
The Strange Case Of the Yearbooks	10
The statement, “our fundamental beliefs were undefined and unspecified,” is one of Froom’s greatest lies in all of his writings.	10
There are so many subtle contradictions, allusions, and implications in this one paragraph that it almost boggles the mind! Note the following four important points in Froom’s statement:	11
Committee Of Only Four	12
To Be Used At An Appropriate Time?	12
One Man Writes New Statements – Leadership Rubber-Stamps	13
Note carefully Froom’s conclusion, and justification for the formulation of the “new” 1931 Statement of Fundamental Beliefs:	14

Has the contemporary Seventh-day Adventist Church become Babylon? Who knows? Let Jesus be the judge.....	14
What was so offensive in the old “Fundamental Principles” published in the <i>Yearbooks</i> for 40 years? What was changed, if anything, in the “new” Fundamental Statement of Beliefs? And even more important, what was omitted by the new Statements?.....	14
“Original” Fundamental Principles verses “New” Statement Of Beliefs “Old Landmarks” verses “New Theology”	14
Statement On the Godhead Statement In the SDA Church <i>Yearbooks</i> , 1874-1914	15
Statement In the First SDA <i>Church Manual</i> (1931)	15
Statement On the Incarnation (Human Nature Of Christ).....	16
Statement In the SDA Church <i>Yearbooks</i> , 1874-1914.....	16
Statement In the First SDA <i>Church Manual</i> (1931)	16
Two Views On the Human Nature Of Christ.....	16
Statement In the SDA <i>Yearbooks</i> , 1874-1914	16
The New Contemporary Seventh-day Adventist View.....	16
Statements On the Final Atonement.....	16
Statement In the SDA Church <i>Yearbooks</i> , 1874-1914.....	17
Statement In the First SDA <i>Church Manual</i> (1931)	17
Two Views On the Final Atonement.....	17
Pioneer Seventh-day Adventist View	17
The New Contemporary Seventh-day Adventist View.....	18
Pioneer Seventh-day Adventist View	18
The New Contemporary Seventh-day Adventist View.....	18
Statement On Christ’s Ministry In the Heavenly Sanctuary.....	18
“The Blotting Out Of Sins” Statement In the SDA <i>Yearbooks</i> , 1874-1914	18
Statement In the First SDA <i>Church Manual</i> (1931)	19
The Place Of the Study Of Prophecy Statement In the SDA <i>Yearbooks</i> , 1874-1914.....	19
Statement In the First SDA <i>Church Manual</i> (1931)	19
Identification Of the Man Of Sin Statement In the SDA <i>Yearbooks</i> , 1874-1914.....	20
Statement In the First SDA <i>Church Manual</i> (1931)	20
Historical Events Cast Their Shadow.....	20
In this third “wrong step” toward ecumenism the Seventh-day Adventist leadership accepted and approved new doctrines;.....	21
Ecumenical Objective For Formulating New Statement Of Fundamental Beliefs.	21

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

John N. Loughborough

INTRODUCTION

Speaking of the attempt to remove the name Seventh-day Adventist from the *American Sentinel* in 1890, to make the magazine popular with other denominations, Ellen White stated,

“This policy is the first step in a succession of wrong steps.” (Counsels to Writers and Editors, page 96, emphasis supplied).

In the context of this testimony Ellen White was speaking of the “wrong steps” the leading brethren were taking down the road to ecumenical concessions. However, in 1890 a living prophet was present and this “first step” toward ecumenism was averted. In 1926 the first “wrong step” toward ecumenical concessions was actually taken by the General Conference voting that

“We recognize every agency that lifts up Christ before man as a part of the divine plan for the evangelization of the world, and we hold in high esteem the Christian men and women in other communions who are engaged in winning souls to Christ.” (“Relationship To Other Societies,” General Conference Executive Committee, 1926).

In 1928 a second “wrong step” toward ecumenism was taken by the acceptance of a new Bible, the *American Revised* version, above the *Authorized King James* version . (See, Art., Wilkinson, Benjamin George, *Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia*, Revised Edition, 1976, page 1609). At the 1930 General Conference session, the Committee took a third wrong step, “*in a succession of wrong steps,*” toward ecumenism by voting to publish a *Church Manual*, and an official “new” Statement of Fundamental Beliefs.(See below).

Again, in 1890 the first wrong step “in a succession of wrong steps” was avoided. Why were these second and third steps in 1926 and 1930 not avoided? Because there was no longer a living prophet. Ellen White passed from the scene in 1915, *eleven years prior to the second wrong step taken in 1926!* Interestingly, when SDA Church leadership decided to take these “succession of wrong steps” toward ecumenism, the three steps were taken quickly, only two years apart – 1926, 1928, 1930.

Ancient and Modern Israel’s Desire To Look To Man

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

Speaking of the parallels between ancient Israel and the Seventh-day Adventist Church, Ellen White stated,

“We are repeating the history of that people.” (Testimonies for the Church, Vol. 5, page 160).

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

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

Modern Israel and Leroy Froom

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

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

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

“Because of differences?” The only “differences” over Seventh-day Adventist doctrine was in the mind of Edson Rogers and Leroy Froom. Adventists in 1930 were united in the truth as it was so eloquently stated by James White in the Seventh-day Adventist *Yearbooks* prior to 1914.

In 1930, Edson Rogers was the General Conference statistician. He held that position for 38 years, from 1903 until he retired in 1941.

“He [Rogers] was responsible for the makeup and issuance of the annual Seventh-day Adventist Yearbook.” (ibid., Froom, MD, page 410, emphasis supplied).

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

“Other denominations had declarations of faith in their annuals.” Now there is an absurd reason to form a Statement of Beliefs – a creed! Since when should we care what the other denominations of Babylon do in their church policies? The second line: “So as far as other religious bodies could observe,” is another redundant statement. Are we supposed to care what other religious bodies think about our doctrine? We have a commission from God to call those people out of Babylon, out of their churches and creeds, and into the truth. Froom stated that the omission of a Statement of Beliefs “troubled Rogers.” Obviously it also troubled Froom as

he was writing in favor of Roger's position. As to the omission of a Statement of Beliefs from the annual SDA Church Yearbook, it will be clearly seen just who it was that omitted the Statements of Beliefs from the Yearbooks starting in 1914!

An "official" Statement of Fundamental Beliefs, published in an "official" Church Manual, filled with "official" Church policies. This was something that was carefully avoided by pioneer Seventh-day Adventists – from the great disappointment in 1844, until 1930 – a period of 86 years! Remember, Ellen White received visions and direct counsel from the Lord on such matters, and she was alive for 71 of those years. **We find nothing in the Spirit of Prophecy instructing or counseling that the Church should publish an "official" Church Manual, which would be filled with Church "policies." Neither is there counsel or instruction that the Church should formulate an "official" Statement of Fundamental Beliefs" that would be a test of faith to Church members.**

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

Notice the counsel is given that "in no respect" is God's work to be circumscribed, enclosed or encompassed, "by man-made restrictions." Indeed, many of the ambitious "policies" that are made "are not endorsed by Him." Ellen White was concerned about worldly policies coming into the Church. The following are some choice counsel on worldly policies:

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

Notice that, "The perversion of right principles has not been brought about suddenly," and this "perversion" was "leading our brethren to conform to worldly policies." Moreover, Ellen White stated, "The angel of the Lord presented this matter to me."

Pioneer Adventists Opposed A Creed Or Church Manual

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

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

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

James White Agrees With Loughborough

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

“Let us suppose a case: We get up a creed, stating just what we shall believe on this point and the other, and just what we shall do in reference to this thing and that, and say that we will believe the gifts too,” James White continued. “But suppose the Lord, through the gifts, should give us some new light that did not harmonize with our creed; then, if we remain true to the gifts, it knocks our creed all over at once.” James White added further that, “Making a creed is setting the stakes, and barring up the way to all future advancement. (ibid., Review and Herald, October 8, 1861).

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

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

Notice hat if we adapt a creed, or “official” statement of beliefs, we would be taking a step “toward becoming Babylon.” If we wish to be like the other denominations, we are taking a step “toward becoming Babylon” ourselves.

Timing Right For An Official SDA Creed and Church Manual

“Shortly after the death of Ellen G. White (1915), the leadership of the Seventh-day Adventist Church began to publish articles in the Signs of the Times and Ministry magazines promoting the American Revised Version of the Bible,” so states the Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia.

In 1928 the time was right for a new Bible. Two years later (1930) the time was right for a Creed and a Church Manual.

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

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

Froom Reveals Why Timing Was Right

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

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

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

- (1) The time element in these statements, “the spring of 1930.” Remember this date. Many important events were taking place at this time, not only in Adventism, but also in the world.
- (2) Arthur G. Daniells had told Froom that “time would be required for certain theological wounds to heal,” and time would be required for “attitudes to modify.” What did Daniells mean by these statements? Evidently, Daniells meant that with the passing of time, attitudes would “change” and “modify,” and become more liberal.
- (3) The most astounding statement Froom recalled was that, “Possibly it would be necessary to wait until certain individuals had dropped out of action.” To paraphrase Daniells, this could only mean that, “*it would be necessary to wait until all pioneer Adventists had died!*”
- (4)

Who were some of these “certain individuals” who had by 1930 passed to their rest.

Again, taking “time and place” into consideration, note carefully the dates these pioneer Adventists “passed from the scene”:

- (1) Uriah Smith, “dropped out of action” when he died in 1903.
- (2) Daniel Bourdeau, “dropped out of action” at his death in 1905.
- (3) Ellen G. White, “dropped out of action” at her death in 1915.
- (4) E. J. Waggoner and Dr. David Paulson, “dropped out of action” when they died the following year in 1916.
- (5) Stephen Haskell, “dropped out of action” at his death in 1922.
- (6) A. T. Jones, “dropped out of action” at his death in 1923.
- (7) John Norton Loughborough, “dropped out of action” at his death in 1924, two years before SDA leadership adopted the policy that, “We recognize every agency that lifts up Christ before man as a part of the divine plan for the evangelization of the world, and we hold in high esteem the Christian men and women in other communions who are engaged in winning souls to Christ.” (“Relationship To Other Societies,” General Conference Executive Committee, 1926, emphasis supplied).

In 1930 the time was now right for change because these “certain individuals” had passed to their rest and would not be able to sound an alarm. Their voices were now silent. Their writings could still speak, but this

would not be as effectual as a live pioneer speaking in protest to the changes that began in 1926. For many years the writings of pioneer Adventists have been eliminated from the shelves of Adventist Book Centers. Indeed, the writings of E. J. Waggoner and A. T. Jones have been virtually impossible to find until recent years. *Leaves-Of-Autumn-Books*, and other independent ministries have been responsible for the restoration of pioneer Adventist writings being restored, not only to the people, but also to Adventist Book Centers.

A Suitable Statement Of Faith?

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

“A suitable Statement of Faith?” Why did Edson Rogers, Leroy Froom, and other Seventh-day Adventist Church leaders feel that the old “Fundamental Principles,” published in the *Yearbook* from 1874 through 1914, were no longer “suitable?” Was there error or heresy in the old “Fundamental Principles?”

Who Wrote the Original Statement Of Fundamental Principles?

At this point it must be established who wrote the 1874 “Fundamental Principles” that had stood for over 40 years without challenge. Contemporary

Seventh-day Adventists say it was Uriah Smith. Is this true?

In his 1971 book, *Movement of Destiny*, Froom tells an outright lie about who wrote the 1874 “Fundamental Principles” of Seventh-day Adventist Beliefs.

He states that Uriah Smith wrote the old “Fundamental Principles,” when the truth was that James White was the author of the “Fundamental Principles.”

Leroy Froom Falsifies History

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

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

Documented Proof That Froom Altered An Historical Fact

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

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

Notice that the editors of the book, Living Witness, disagree with Leroy Froom by stating that, “Though there is no assurance that James White was the only author, he no doubt had a large part in its composition.” It is the practice of contemporary Seventh-day Adventist historians to place all blame, for what they consider to be error, solely on Uriah Smith.

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

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

Notice that Froom emphasizes a portion of the second sentence, “We do not put forth this as having any authority with our people, nor is it designed to secure uniformity among them, as a system of faith,” while he omits the last part of the sentence which states, “but is a brief statement of what is, and has been, with great unanimity, held by them [Seventh-day Adventists].”

Froom’s Unfounded Purpose For Altering History

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

Again Froom was bending the truth. In response to Froom’s erroneous statement we must comment as follows:

It was James White who wrote the “Fundamental Principles,” not Uriah Smith.

Could Leroy Froom state that those Fundamental Principles, “clearly had less ‘unanimity’ than James White averred?” No. It would be impossible to convince Adventists that James White was in error. Therefore, Froom aspired to place the origin of the “Fundamental Principles” squarely on the shoulders of Uriah Smith. Froom knew that conferring Uriah Smith as the author of “Fundamental Principles” would provide less support and “unanimity” to the Fundamental Principles than if it was known that James White was the actual author. This devious tactic has been used many times by contemporary Seventh-day Adventist historians.

(See, Leroy Edwin Froom, *Movement of Destiny*, Review and Herald Publishing Association, pages 157-166).

Only Two Sentences Quoted

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

[In presenting to the public this synopsis of our faith, we wish to have it distinctly understood that we have no articles of faith, creed, or discipline aside from the Bible. We do not put forth this as having authority with our people, nor is designed to secure uniformity among them, as a system of faith, but is a brief statement of what is, and has been, with great unanimity, held by them.]
We often find it necessary to meet inquiries on this subject, and sometimes to correct false statements circulated against us, and to remove erroneous impressions which have obtained with those who have not had an opportunity to become acquainted with our faith and practice. Our only object is to meet this necessity. With these remarks, we ask the attention of the reader to the following propositions which aim to be a concise statement of the more prominent features of our faith. James White, Editorial, Signs of the Times, June 4, 1874, Vol. 1, Num. 1: The Living Witness, 1959, Pacific Press Publishing Association, pages 1, 2.

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

These “Fundamental Principles of Faith” were published in the official journals of the Seventh-day Adventist Church for 42 years, without challenge from a single pioneer Adventist!

Ellen White was alive during those 42 years, and there was no testimonies given against those “Fundamental Principles of Faith.” Ellen White must have known about the existence of the “Fundamental Principles” and read them many times herself. Indeed, her husband, James White, was the author of the “Fundamental Principles.”

The Strange Case Of the Yearbooks

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

The statement that, “So as far as other religious bodies could observe,” proves Froom’s ecumenical aspirations. Froom was always worried about what “other religious bodies” might think of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. (Leroy Edwin Froom, *Movement of Destiny*, pages 469, 470).

The statement, “our fundamental beliefs were undefined and unspecified,” is one of Froom’s greatest lies in all of his writings.

The “Fundamental Principles” had appeared in the Seventh-day Adventist *Yearbook* between the years 1874 and 1914. After 1914 it was discontinued. Why? Who was the General Conference statistician in 1914, when the “Fundamental Principles” were discontinued?

“He [Rogers] was responsible for the makeup and issuance of the annual Seventh-day Adventist Yearbook,” Froom replies. Rogers was that statistician, and it was Rogers himself who “was responsible for the makeup and issuance of the annual Seventh-day Adventist Yearbook.” Rogers was responsible for the makeup and issuance of the annual Yearbook for “38 years, until he retired in 1941.” (ibid., MD, page 410, emphasis supplied). Edson Rogers, therefore, as General Conferences statistician, was also the one responsible for removing the “Fundamental Principles” from the Yearbook after the 1914 edition!

“Rogers was distressed over the fact that, because of differences, for a number of years there had been no statement of Seventh-day Adventist Beliefs, or Faith, in our annual *Yearbook*.” (ibid., MD, page 10). What differences? Who dared to challenge pioneer Adventist “Fundamental Principles” that had stood unchallenged from 1844 to 1930, a period of 86 years? These “Fundamental Principles” had appeared in the Seventh-day Adventist *Yearbook* from 1874 through 1914, a period of 40 years?

What “differences” over doctrinal truth had developed since 1914, and by whom? Obviously, Rogers did not agree with James White and the other pioneer Adventists who had endorsed the

“Fundamental Principles” that had appeared in the *Yearbook* for so many years. Moreover, it should be noted that Ellen White was alive during the 40 years these “Fundamental Principles” were published in the *Yearbook*. She must have been aware of their content. Surely Ellen White would have given counsel if the “Fundamental Principles” published in the *Yearbook* contained error or heresy. Yet Rogers and the Seventh-day Adventist Church leadership of 1930 had “differences” with those pioneer Fundamental Principles. Obviously, Froom also agreed with Rogers and the 1930 SDA Church leadership.

Another important point to note, taking time and place into consideration, is that the “Fundamental Principles” appeared through the year 1914. They were omitted the following year in 1915. *The year the “Fundamental Principles” were omitted, 1915, was the year Ellen White died!* Froom stated that the omission of a Statement of Beliefs from the *Yearbook*, “troubled Rogers, for he believed that this omission placed us at a decided disadvantage.” Edson Rogers was troubled because there was no Statement of Beliefs in the *Yearbook* – yet Rogers himself, as General Conference statistician, *was the one who had omitted the “Fundamental Principles” from the Yearbook after the 1914 edition!*

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

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

Rogers “agitated in high places.” He went to the top. As General Conference statistician he undoubtedly knew personally the leading brethren of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. Note that Rogers agitated at headquarters, “and even abroad.”

“His appeals were not without effect.” The brethren listened to Rogers and agreed. Undoubtedly, as Ministerial Secretary of the General Conference, and Editor of *The Ministry* magazine, Froom backed Rogers. In this paragraph, Froom himself stated that “it was a reasonable request.”

“Largely as a result of Rogers’ urging’s.” Rogers was responsible for getting the ball rolling, so to speak. Rogers was responsible for omitting the “Fundamental Principles” from the *Yearbook*. Why? So fifteen years later he could agitate for a “new” official Statement of Beliefs, and, as a result of his own “urging’s,” Rogers was successful in getting SDA Church leadership to approve a “new” official Statement of Fundamental Beliefs.”

“A small committee was named to frame such a statement.” A small committee? Evidently the leading brethren felt that “a small committee” would suffice in the framing of a “new” Statement of Fundamental Beliefs. Astounding! A small committee could speak for the entire denomination and tell the world what Seventh-day Adventists believe. Actually, the “new” Statement of Fundamental Beliefs was written by one man! (See below).

Committee Of Only Four

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

“Named: M. E. Kern, F. M. Wilcox, E. R. Palmer, C. H. Watson.”

General Conference Minutes, December 29, 1930, page 195. op. sit., Froom, MD, page 411. (emphasis supplied).

Notice that the General Conference President, C. H. Watson (one man at the head), was voted the authority to select the committee of four “*of which he shall be a member.*” Then three other men were named with Watson as members of the four-man committee. Who were the three other men that were chosen, and what position did they hold in the Seventh-day Adventist Church in 1930? What heavenly credentials did these men hold that would make them wise enough to define the doctrinal beliefs of the entire Seventh-day Adventist denomination? Again, Froom gives us the answer:

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

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

To Be Used At An Appropriate Time?

“Fortunately, they later made specific statements to this writer concerning this episode,” Froom added further, “for use at an appropriate time.” (ibid., MD, page 411, emphasis supplied).

What did Froom mean “for use at an appropriate time?” Would the Seventh-day Adventist Church leadership have to wait until even more orthodox Adventists had passed “out of action?” About the four man committee, Froom had stated in 1971, “all of whom are now deceased.”

*“Back in the spring of 1930 Arthur G. Daniells. . . told me he believed that, at a later time, I should undertake a thorough survey of the entire plan of Redemption – its principles, provisions, and divine Personalities,” Leroy Froom stated in the Author to Reader section of his book *Movement of Destiny*. (ibid., MD, page 17, emphasis supplied).*

Unfortunately, in his book Froom presented, not a “survey,” but a “revision” of Seventh-day Adventist doctrine. As will be shown later, the “principles” and “provisions” of Adventism were altered in the books, *Seventh-day Adventists Answer, Question on Doctrine, and, Movement of Destiny*. The “divine Personalities” – the pioneer Adventist position on the human nature of Christ – was changed, altered, mutilated, and omitted in Seventh-day Adventist publications. (See, L. E. Froom, *Movement of Destiny*; see also, “Evangelical Conferences of 1955-56, *Adventist Heritage*, Vol. 4, No. 2, 1977).

Neal C. Wilson, at the time Vice-President of the General Conference and President of the North American Division, was the Chairman of the Guidance Committee for Leroy Froom’s book, *Movement of Destiny*. (ibid., MD, page 15). Wilson stated that, “The preparation of this volume began about forty years ago.” (ibid., MD, page 15). The book was published in 1971 which would have placed the beginning of its preparation in the year 1931. Considering time and place in history, What was taking place in the year 1931? *The first Seventh-day Adventist Church Manual, with its “new” Statement of Fundamental Beliefs, was published in 1931!*

One Man Writes New Statements – Leadership Rubber-Stamps

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

In a sub-title, Froom stated further that,

“Approval By Committee Not Required.”

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

“It has appeared there annually ever since,” Froom concluded. “The authorizing did not call for submission to any other committee for approval.” (ibid., MD, page 414, emphasis supplied).

These statements were written in 1971 when the book *Movement of Destiny* was published.

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

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

Observe that this new Statement of Beliefs was "without any formal denominational adoption," and it was by common consent, "accepted without challenge" by the General Conference Committee, or any other denominational leaders. **One man wrote a "new" doctrinal statement, and by common consent, it was "accepted without challenge!"**

The 1874 "Principles," written by James White and printed in the *Yearbooks* for 40 years, were also accepted "without any formal denominational adoption," and were also "accepted without challenge," yet using this same reasoning, Froom, Rogers and the 1930 SDA Church leadership were unwilling to accept the 1874 Statement of Principles on those terms. Froom then added triumphantly that "it was on this basis that the new Statement of Beliefs was the first public presentation of a *united-harmonized-faith*." (emphasis his). However, as noted above by pioneer Adventists, James White and John Loughborough, the formation of a Creed is not a sign of "a united-harmonized-faith," but only an image of modern Babylon.

Has the contemporary Seventh-day Adventist Church become Babylon? Who knows? Let Jesus be the judge.

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

The Seventh-day Adventist Church was not united on the "new" 1931 Statement of Fundamental Beliefs. The community of believers is the Church, not the General Conference. The Advent people, who are asleep in Laodicean slumber, knew nothing about the "new" Statement of Fundamental Beliefs until they appeared in the first Seventh-day Adventist Church Manual. They had no voice in the matter, or a chance to accept or reject the new Statements "without challenge." "It was by common consent" of the leadership that the "new" Statement of Fundamental Beliefs were adopted. Seventh-day Adventist laymen have always had complete confidence in the leading brethren. But this is not the way of the Bereans, for they "searched the scriptures daily, whether those things were so." (Acts 17:11).

What was so offensive in the old "Fundamental Principles" published in the *Yearbooks* for 40 years? What was changed, if anything, in the "new" Fundamental Statement of Beliefs? And even more important, what was omitted by the new Statements?

"Original" Fundamental Principles verses "New" Statement Of Beliefs "Old Landmarks" verses "New Theology"

Let us now compare the Fundamental Principles, written by James White and published in the *Yearbooks* for 40 years, with the "new" Statement of Fundamental Beliefs, written by F. M. Wilcox and published in the "first" Seventh-day Adventist *Church Manual* in 1931. A simple examination of the two documents will reveal what was changed and what was omitted.

Statement On the Godhead Statement In the SDA Church Yearbooks, 1874-1914

THE TRINITY – No statement on the Trinity.

THE FATHER – That there is one God, a personal, spiritual Being, the Creator of all things, omnipotent, omniscient, and eternal, infinite in wisdom, holiness, justice, goodness truth, and mercy; unchangeable, and everywhere present by His representative, the Holy Spirit.

THE SON – That there is one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the Eternal Father, the One by whom He created all things, and by whom they do consist. . . .

THE HOLY SPIRIT – No statement on the Holy Spirit.

Statement on the Holy Spirit was included in the statement on the FATHER, Who is “everywhere present by His representative, the Holy Spirit.”

Statement In the First SDA Church Manual (1931)

THE TRINITY

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

Pioneer Seventh-day Adventists did not believe in the “Trinity” as stated in this contemporary Statement of Fundamental Beliefs. The word “Trinity” cannot be found in the Bible, or in the Spirit of Prophecy.

“The Church had to wait for more than three hundred years for a final synthesis, for not until the council of Constantinople (381) was the formula of one God existing in three co-equal Persons formally ratified.” (J. N. D. Kelly, Dean of St. Edmond Hall, Oxford, “The Pre-Nicene Theology,” Early Christian Doctrines, pages 87, 88, emphasis supplied).

Chapter VI, DOCTRINE OF A TRINITY SUBVERSIVE OF THE ATONEMENT. Trinitarians do not believe that the divine nature died. . . . They. . . take every expression referring to the pre-existence of Christ as evidence of a trinity. The Scriptures abundantly teach the pre-existence of Christ and his divinity; but they are entirely silent in regard to a trinity. The declaration, that the divine Son of God could not die, is as far from the teachings of the Bible as darkness is from light. And we would ask the Trinitarian, to which of the two natures are we indebted for redemption? The answer must, of course, be, To that one which died or shed his blood for us; for “we have redemption through his blood.” Then it is evident that if only the human nature died, our Redeemer is only human, and that the divine Son of God took no part in the work of redemption, for he could neither suffer nor die. Surely, we say right, that the doctrine of a trinity degrades the Atonement, by bringing the sacrifice, the blood of our purchase, down to the standard of Socinianism. Joseph Harvey Waggoner, The Atonement, pages 174, 175.(emphasis supplied).

The original “Principles,” written by James White, stated that God the Father was “everywhere present by His representative, the Holy Spirit.” The new 1931 “Statement,” written by F. M. Wilcox, states that the Holy Spirit is “the third Person of the Godhead.”

Statement On the Incarnation (Human Nature Of Christ)

Statement In the SDA Church Yearbooks, 1874-1914

That there is one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the Eternal Father. . . 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.

Statement In the First SDA Church Manual (1931)

That Jesus Christ is very God, being of the same nature and essence as the Eternal Father. While retaining His divine nature, He took upon Himself the nature of the human family, lived on earth as a man, exemplified in His life as our example the principles of righteousness, . . .

The 1874-1914 “Principles” statement that Christ took on him “the nature of the seed of Abraham” is omitted in the new 1931 “Statements,” de-emphasizing the pioneer Adventist belief in the fallen human nature of Christ. The new 1931 “Statements” adds that Christ retained His divine nature while in human flesh. The original “Principles,” written by James White, stated that Christ “lived our example.” The new 1931 “Statement of Beliefs” state that Christ exemplified “the principles of righteousness.”

Two Views On the Human Nature Of Christ

Today, most Seventh-day Adventist ministers, teachers, and leadership will tell you that there are currently two views on the human nature of Christ in the contemporary SDA Church. Of course, there is always two views of a doctrinal position – the true and the false. First, we will consider the pioneer Adventist view on the human nature of Christ, then the current position held by the contemporary Seventh-day Adventist Church.

Statement In the SDA Yearbooks, 1874-1914

(1) He [Christ] took on him the nature of the seed of Abraham.

James White, 1874 Fundamental Principles, op. sit. The Living Witness, “Significant Articles From the Signs of the Times,” 1874-1959, Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1959, page 2.

The New Contemporary Seventh-day Adventist View

(2) He [Christ] was like Adam before his fall.

Leroy Edwin Froom, Movement of Destiny, 1971, page 428.

Statements On the Final Atonement

Pioneer Adventists believed that the Atonement was not finished on the cross, but is finalized in the Heavenly Sanctuary during the anti-typical Day of Atonement -- 1844 to the close of probation..(See, O. R. L. Crossier, *Day-Star, Extra*, February 7, 1846; James White, *1874 Fundamental Principles, op. sit. The Living Witness*, “Significant Articles From the Signs of the Times,” 1874-1959, Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1959, page 2; James N. Andrews, *The Sanctuary and Twenty-Three Hundred Days*, Steam Press of the Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association, Battle Creek, Mich. 1872; Joseph Bates, *Eighth Way Mark*; Stephen N.

Haskell, "Preparation For Reception Of the Holy Spirit," 1909 *General Conference Daily Bulletin*, May 20, 1909; A. T. Jones, *The Consecrated Way To Christian Perfection*; J. N. Loughborough, *Great Second Advent Movement*; E. J. Waggoner, *Review and Herald*, September 30, 1902; James White, "The Sanctuary," *Bible Adventism*).

[Note:- While doing research for this manuscript, the author placed a call to the James White Memorial Library at Andrews University to purchase a photo-copy of Crosier's original article as it appeared in the *Day-Star, Extra*, February 7, 1846. The photo-copy of the article arrived, minus the "atonement" portion of the article! Another letter was mailed, with the required funds, requesting that the full article be sent, including the "atonement" portion of Crosier's *Day-Star, Extra* article. As of this writing (more than ten years), no further correspondence has been received. What is the corporate Seventh-day Adventist Church trying to hide? Thanks to the faithful work of Adventist laymen the complete article was published on the *Adventist Pioneer Library* CD-ROM disk. (*Adventist Pioneer Library*, P. O. Box 1844, Loma Linda, CA 92354-0380, USA/]

Statement In the SDA Church Yearbooks, 1874-1914

That there is one Lord Jesus Christ. . . that He. . . 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 the atonement for our sins; 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 work as priest, according to the example of the Levitical priesthood, which foreshadowed and prefigured the ministry of our Lord in heaven.

Statement In the First SDA Church Manual (1931)

That Jesus Christ. . . died on the cross for our sins, was raised from the dead, and ascended to the Father, where He ever lives to make intercession for us.

Notice that the 1874 "Principles" states that "the sanctuary in heaven, [is] where, with His own blood, He makes the atonement for our sins." The new 1931 "Statement of Beliefs" states simply that in the heavenly sanctuary Christ "ever lives to make intercession for us." The reason for the change is to imply that the final atonement was finished and completed on the cross. This position places the Seventh-day Adventist Church in harmony with the Sunday-keeping churches of Babylon.

Also observe that a large portion of the original 1874 statement on the "Final Atonement" was omitted from the "new" 1931 Statement of Fundamental Beliefs. The portion omitted stated,

"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 work as priest, according to the example of the Levitical priesthood, which foreshadowed and prefigured the ministry of our Lord in heaven."

Two Views On the Final Atonement

Pioneer Seventh-day Adventist View

Of those who charge us with teaching strange doctrines because we believe that Christ's work of atonement for sin was begun rather than completed on Calvary, we ask these questions: If complete and final atonement

*was made on the cross for all sins, then will not all be saved? for Paul says that He “died for all.” Are we to understand you as being Universalists? “No,” you say, “not all men will be saved.” Well, then, are we to understand that you hold that Christ made complete atonement on the cross for only a limited few, and that His sacrifice was not world embracing, but only partial? That would be predestination in its worst form. Francis D. Nichol, *Answers to Objections, Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1952 edition, page 408. (emphasis supplied).**

The New Contemporary Seventh-day Adventist View

*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, Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1957, pages 354, 355. (emphasis theirs).**

Pioneer Seventh-day Adventist View

*[Christ] ascended on high to be our only Mediator in the sanctuary in heaven, where, with His own blood, He makes atonement for our sins; 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 work as priest. James White, 1874 *Statement of Beliefs, op. cit. The Living Witness, “Significant Articles From the Signs of the Times, 1874-1959, Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1959, page 3. (emphasis supplied).**

The New Contemporary Seventh-day Adventist View

*Jesus our surety entered the “holy places,” and appeared in the presence of God for us. But it was not with the hope of obtaining something for us at that time, or at some future time. No! He had already obtained it for us on the cross. And now as our High Priest He ministers the virtues of His atoning sacrifice to us. *Questions on Doctrine, Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1957, page 381. (emphasis theirs).**

Notice that pioneer Adventists believed and taught that it was in the heavenly sanctuary “where, with His own blood, He makes atonement for our sins.” Contemporary Adventism concedes that Jesus went into the most holy place in the heavenly sanctuary, “But it was not with the hope of obtaining something for us at that time, or at some future time.” Pioneer Adventists state that the heavenly sanctuary is “where” Jesus “makes atonement for our sins.” Contemporary Adventism says, “No! *He had already obtained it for us on the cross.*”

Statement On Christ’s Ministry In the Heavenly Sanctuary

“The Blotting Out Of Sins” Statement In the SDA *Yearbooks, 1874-1914*

That the sanctuary of the new covenant is the tabernacle of God in heaven, of which Paul speaks in Hebrews 8 and onward, and of which our Lord, as great High Priest, is minister; that this sanctuary is the anti-type of the Mosaic tabernacle, and that the priestly work of our Lord, connected therewith, is the anti-type of the work of the Jewish priests of the former dispensation; that this is the sanctuary to be cleansed at the end of the 2300 days; what is termed

its cleansing being in this case, as in the type, simply the entrance of the high priest into the most holy place, to finish the round of service connected therewith, by blotting out and removing from the sanctuary the sins which have been transferred to it by means of the ministration in the first apartment; and that this work, in the anti-type, commencing in 1844, occupies a brief but indefinite space, at the conclusion of which the work of mercy for the world is finished.

Statement In the First SDA Church Manual (1931)

That the true sanctuary, of which the tabernacle on earth was a type, in the temple of God in heaven, of which Paul speaks in Hebrews 8 and onward, and of which the Lord Jesus, as our great High Priest, is minister; and that the priestly work of our Lord is the antitype of the work of the Jewish priests of the former dispensation; that this heavenly sanctuary is the one to be cleansed at the end of the 2300 days of Daniel 8:14; its cleansing being, as in the type, a work of judgment, beginning with the entrance of Christ as High Priest upon the judgment phase of His ministry in the heavenly sanctuary, foreshadowed in the earthly sanctuary service of cleansing the sanctuary on the day of atonement. This work of judgment, in the heavenly sanctuary, began in 1844. The completion will close human probation.

The 1874 “Principles” state that Christ’s work in the most holy place of the heavenly sanctuary is “blotting out and removing from the sanctuary the sins which have been transferred to it by means of the ministration in the first apartment.” The new 1931 “Statement of Beliefs” state that the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary is “a work of judgment.” The “blotting out of sins,” or final atonement, is omitted. “The judgment phase of His ministry,” is emphasized, and again it is stated that Christ’s work in the heavenly sanctuary is confined to, “This work of judgment.” Notice that the 1931 “Statement” suggests that the atonement was completed and finished on the cross, and that Christ has now entered “the judgment phase of His ministry.” The contemporary Seventh-day Adventist Church (1999) now teaches that this last phase of Christ’s ministry in heaven is judgmental only, and not the “blotting out of sins,” which is the final atonement.

In contrast to this erroneous 1931 statement, the pioneer 1874 “Fundamental Principles” states that Christ’s ministry in the most holy place is “to finish the round of service connected therewith, by blotting out and removing from the sanctuary the sins which have been transferred to it by means of the ministration in the first apartment.”

The Place Of the Study Of Prophecy Statement In the SDA Yearbooks, 1874-1914

That prophecy is a part of God’s revelation to man; that it is included in that Scripture which is profitable for instruction; that it is designed for us and our children; that so far from being enshrouded in impenetrable mystery, it is that which especially constitutes the word of God a lamp to our feet and a light to our path; that a blessing is pronounced upon those who study it; and that, consequently, it is to be understood by the people of God sufficiently to show them their position in the world’s history and the special duties required at their hands.

Statement In the First SDA Church Manual (1931)

NONE! No statement on prophecy since 1914.

The statement on prophecy was omitted in the 1931 statement of beliefs. The time of the new 1931 statement of beliefs is significant. At this time, 1931, when the Seventh-day Adventist Church was dropping the statement on prophecy, just two years prior, in 1929, the deadly wound of the Papacy was healed at the signing of the Lateran Treaty between the nation of Italy and the Papacy.

Identification Of the Man Of Sin Statement In the SDA Yearbooks, 1874-1914

That as the man of sin, the papacy has thought to change times and laws (the law of God, Daniel 7:25), and has misled almost all Christendom in regard to the fourth commandment; we find a prophecy of a reform in this respect to be wrought among believers just before the second coming of Christ.

Statement In the First SDA Church Manual (1931)

NONE! No statement on the man of sin (the papacy) since 1914.

The statement identifying the “Man of Sin” is omitted from the “new” 1931 Statement of Fundamental Beliefs.

Historical Events Cast Their Shadow

When studying history one must consider time and place – events that had recently taken place, that were taking place – events that were casting their shadow in the near future. For example, What was taking place in the world between the years in question, 1928-1931?

The year 1929 would see the crash of the Stock Market and the beginning of the greatest depression the world had ever known.

1929 was the year the “deadly wound” of the Papacy was healed. “The Lateran Treaty, signed on Feb. 11, 1929, by Benito Mussolini for the Italian government and Cardinal Pietro Gasparri for the papacy, settled the vexatious question of the relationship between the Holy See and Italy.” (Robin Buss, “The Lateran Treaty,” *The New Growler’s Multimedia Encyclopedia*, Release 6). Reporting on the signing of this document, the *San Francisco Chronicle*, Tuesday, February 12, 1929, carried the story on the front page with a photograph of Cardinal Pietro Gasparri and Benito Mussolini signing the document with the caption, “Heal Wound Of Many Years.”

*The Roman Church now presents a fair front to the world, covering with apologies her record of horrible cruelties. She has clothed herself in Christlike garments; but she is unchanged. Every principle of the papacy that existed in past ages exist today. The doctrines devised in the darkest ages are still held. Let none deceive themselves. The papacy that Protestants are now so ready to honor is the same that ruled the world in the days of the Reformation, when men of God stood up, at the peril of their lives, to expose her iniquity. She possesses the same pride and arrogant assumption that lorded it over kings and princes, and claimed the prerogatives of God. Her spirit is no less cruel and despotic now than when she crushed out human liberty and slew the saints of the Most High. Ellen G. White, *The Great Controversy*, page 571. (emphasis supplied).*

What has been the response of the contemporary Seventh-day Adventist Church leadership to the “healing of the wound,” and to this inspired counsel of the Spirit of Prophecy?

Although it is true that there was a period in the life of the Seventh-day Adventist Church when the denomination took a distinctly anti-Roman Catholic viewpoint, and the term, “hierarchy” was used in a pejorative sense to refer to the papal form of church governance, that attitude on the Church’s part was nothing more than a manifestation of widespread anti-popery among conservative Protestant denominations in the early part of this century and the latter part of the last, and which has been consigned to the historical trash heap so far as the Seventh-day Adventist Church is concerned. Court Brief, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission vs. Pacific Press Publishing Association, footnote #2, page 41. (emphasis supplied). (Note:- This document, Excerpts Legal Documents, may be obtained from the Adventist Laymen’s Foundation, P.O. Box, 69, Ozone, AR 72854).

In this third “wrong step” toward ecumenism the Seventh-day Adventist leadership accepted and approved new doctrines;

- a new Bible, the American Revised Version (now approved by the Papacy), instead of the authorized King James Version;
- a new Christ, with a divine human nature, instead of a Christ with a fallen human nature, “Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren” (Heb. 2:17);
- and a new “final atonement,” completed and finished on the cross, rather than a final atonement finished in the most holy place of the heavenly sanctuary.

Then all of this was placed in the “First” *Church Manual*, the first creed for Seventh-day Adventists.

Did this apostasy from the truth on the atonement and the human nature of Christ progress in the years following 1931? Yes. This apostasy did advance and was culminated in the ultimate betrayal of trust in the 1955-1956 Evangelical Conferences by the leadership of the Seventh-day Adventist Church.

Ecumenical Objective For Formulating New Statement Of Fundamental Beliefs.

What was the reason given for a new Statement of Faith? “So the world might know,” Froom stated. Why not restore the original “Fundamental Principles” back into the *Yearbook*, and also into the proposed “new” *Church Manual*? Because, Rogers and Froom believed that, before the world should see what Seventh-day Adventists believe, “a suitable Statement of Faith” needed to be formulated “to appear in our *Yearbook*.” To accomplish this objective, Edson Rogers, the General Conference statistician, had omitted the original “Fundamental Principles” from the *Yearbooks* since 1914. Now, sixteen years later, in 1930, Edson had “agitated” in high places, and even abroad, and was successful in getting a “new” Statement of Fundamental Beliefs voted in 1931. Once again the leadership of the Seventh-day Adventist Church were seeking recognition from the world in their first *Church Manual* and “official” Creed.

The stage was now set. With an erroneous Bible in hand, and an official Ecumenical “Statement of Beliefs,” and an official *Church Manual* in place, Seventh-day Adventist leadership was now ready and willing to lead the ship into strange ports.

“But in the sanctuaries of worship in our day,” Ellen White wrote “with the songs of praise, the prayers, and the teaching from the pulpit, there is not merely strange fire, but positive defilement.” (Temperance, p. 45).

LINK TO COMPLETE DOCUMENT:

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