

HARVEST INSPIRATION DISCOVERIES

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

CHAPTER 8

A WARNING AND ITS REJECTION-1888 MESSAGE

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	2
1950 – A Pivotal Period In SDA History	3
Dr. Denton E. Rebok was commissioned by the Review and Herald to revise <i>Bible Readings for the Home</i>	4
This statement that appeared for 35 years in <i>Bible Readings for the Home</i> was the express position on Christ’s human nature given by E. J. Waggoner and A. T. Jones in the 1888 message.	4
Truth Replaced With Error In 1949	5
The Actual 1888 Message That Was Rejected-A Most Precious Message	5
Notice the following six important points about the 1888 message and the messengers:	6
Some Questions and Answers About the 1888 Message	6
I am not promoting Jones and Waggoner’s books after the mid 1890’s	7
Three Major Divisions of the 1888 Message	8
Part #1 of the 1888 Message – Obedience By Faith	8
Pioneer Adventist Righteousness By Faith	8
The “righteousness by faith” portion of this “most precious message” consisted of three important points:	8
What about justification by faith? Is there justification for those who disobey God’s law?.....	9
Righteousness By Faith – Evangelical Or Adventist?.....	9
We will now consider this first portion of the 1888 message, this concept of “obedience by faith,” as it was presented by A. T. Jones.	9
A. T. Jones On Obedience By Faith	9
E. J. Waggoner On Obedience By Faith.....	10
Ellen White On Obedience By Faith	12
Part #2 of the 1888 Message – Christ’s Human Nature.....	13
A. T. Jones On the Human Nature Of Christ.....	13
“Christ As Man”	13
“He Took Part Of the Same”	14
“Made Under the Law”	14

“Made Of A Woman”	14
The Human Nature Of Mary	15
E. J. Waggoner On the Immaculate Conception Of Mary.....	15
E. J. Waggoner On the Human Nature Of Christ	16
“God Manifest In the Flesh”	16
Short summary on Original Sin.....	17
SDA’s Traditionally Preached Against Original Sin.....	17
Scriptural Truths About the Nature of Guilt:.....	18
What has been the Traditional SDA, EGW, View	19
We have lost much by accepting into our theology an artificial problem:	20
Part #3 of the 1888 Message – Undue Ecclesiastical Authority	20
A. T. Jones On “Undue Ecclesiastical Authority”	20
“Authority Of Church Leadership”	21
E. J. Waggoner On “Undue Ecclesiastical Authority”	22
Ellen White Confirmed the Third Portion Of the 1888 Message-“Undue Ecclesiastical Authority”	23
The Perfecting Of the Saints	24
A. T. Jones On the Perfecting Of the Saints--“Everlasting Righteousness”	24
E. J. Waggoner On the Perfecting Of the Saints	24
The Faith Of Jesus.....	25
Notice that the NIV renders the text “faithful TO Jesus” rather than “faith OF Jesus.”	26
In the second and third chapters of Revelation Jesus gives eight wonderful promises to those that overcome.	26
1888 Message Was the Beginning Of the Latter Rain	27
General Conference Official Reply To Charge.....	28
SDA Leadership Denial Of Rejecting the 1888 Message	28
Denial Of Presenting A False Christ	28
The Book, Through Crisis To Victory	29
Translation Faith – Bottom Line Of the 1888 Message	29
I need to repeat that I am not promoting Jones and Waggoner’s books after the mid 1890’s.....	30
WHAT HAPPENED TO JONES AND WAGGONER.....	31
What happened to <i>Alonzo Trever Jones</i> in later years?.....	31
What happened to Waggoner in later years?	31

*The message given us by A. T. Jones and E. J. Waggoner is a
message of God to the Laodicean Church
Letter S-24, 1892*

INTRODUCTION

Ellen White had stated that the 1888 message was the beginning of the “latter rain.” The “Loud Cry”

had begun in 1888, and the fact that the Church was still here in 1950 proved that we had, not only rejected the 1888 message, *but we had rejected the Loud Cry!*

“The time of test is just upon us, for the loud cry of the third angel has already begun in the revelation of the righteousness of Christ, the sin-pardoning Redeemer,” Ellen White wrote in 1892. “This is the beginning of the light of the angel whose glory shall fill the whole earth.” (Ellen G. White, Review and Herald, November 22, 1892, emphasis supplied). (See also, Selected Messages, Book 1, page 362).

Now brethren, when did that message of the righteousness of Christ, begin with us as a people? [One or two in the audience: “Three or four years ago.”] Which was it, three? or four? [Congregation: “Four.”] Yes, four. Where was it? [Congregation: “Minneapolis.”] What then did the brethren reject at Minneapolis? [Some in the Congregation: “The loud cry.”] What is that message of righteousness? The Testimony has told us what it is; the loud cry – the latter rain. Then what did the brethren in that fearful position in which they stood, reject at Minneapolis? They rejected the latter rain – the loud cry of the third angel’s message. Alonzo T. Jones, General Conference Bulletin, 1893 (page 183) (emphasis supplied).

Notice that the pioneer Adventist people attending the 1893 General Conference session acknowledged that the Church leadership in 1888 “*rejected the latter rain – the loud cry of the third angel’s message!*”

“We know by every evidence that now we are in the times of refreshing,” A. T. Jones wrote, “the time of the latter rain.” (The Consecrated Way To Christian Perfection, “The Times of Refreshing,” page 124, emphasis supplied).

“Now as never before we are to repent and be converted that our sins may be blotted out, that an utter end shall be made of them forever in our lives and everlasting righteousness brought in,” A. T. Jones concluded. “And this, in order that the fulness of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit shall be ours in this time of the refreshing of the latter rain.” (ibid., The Consecrated Way To Christian Perfection, page 125, emphasis supplied).

Again, the fact that the Church was still here on earth in the year 1950 indicated that the message of 1888 had been rejected. The leadership of the Seventh-day Adventist Church was “infatuated with a false Christ and are presenting a false Christ.” This charge was also categorically rejected by the leadership of the Church in 1950.

“The charge that we are infatuated with a false Christ and are presenting a false Christ is, we believe, unfounded,” the report stated. “We must record our inability to accept some of the things Brethren Wieland and Short say about the nature and work of Christ.” (ibid., Wieland and Short Manuscript Report, page 3, emphasis supplied).

1950 – A Pivotal Period In SDA History

In 1949,

Dr. Denton E. Rebok was commissioned by the Review and Herald to revise *Bible Readings for the Home*.

Leroy Froom recalls the details as follows:

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

Rebok then deleted the note and replaced it with a new note. The deleted note was in response to question number 6, “How fully did Christ share our common humanity?” The Scripture reference was Hebrews 2:17, “Wherefore in all things it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people.” The Note that leadership felt was false read as follows:

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

Bible Readings for the Home, Copyright Review and Herald Publishing Association, all editions 1914-1949, Pacific Press Publishing Association, page 173. (emphasis supplied).

This statement that appeared for 35 years in *Bible Readings for the Home* was the express position on Christ’s human nature given by E. J. Waggoner and A. T. Jones in the 1888 message.

It was also the express position of all pioneer Seventh-day Adventists, and it was the position of Ellen G. White. (See, Dr. Ralph Larson, *The Word Was Made Flesh*; See below, Chapter #12, “The Ultimate Betrayal”).

“The example He [Christ] has left must be followed,” Ellen White counseled. “He took upon His sinless nature our sinful nature, that He might know how to succor those that are tempted.” (Medical Ministry, page 181, emphasis supplied).

Think of Christ’s humiliation. He took upon Himself fallen, suffering human nature, degraded and defiled by sin. He took our sorrows, bearing our

grief and shame. He endured all the temptations wherewith man is beset. He united humanity with divinity: a divine spirit dwelt in a temple of flesh. . . . “The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us,” because by so doing He could associate with the sinful, sorrowing sons and daughters of Adam. Ellen G. White, Youth’s Instructor, December, 1900. (emphasis supplied).

Truth Replaced With Error In 1949

The note in Bible Readings was deleted and a new note inserted in its place. All editions since 1949 read as follows:

Jesus Christ is both Son of God and Son of man. As a member of the human family “it behoved Him to be made like unto His brethren” – “in the likeness of sinful flesh.” Just how far that “likeness” goes is a mystery of the incarnation which men have never been able to solve.

Bible Readings for the Home, Copyright Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1959 edition, Pacific Press Publishing Association, page 143. (emphasis supplied).

The leadership of the Seventh-day Adventist Church had rejected the 1888 message. Moreover, in 1949 the leadership of the Church had indeed become “infatuated with a false Christ” and were presenting a false Christ.

The Actual 1888 Message That Was Rejected-A Most Precious Message

“The Lord in His great mercy sent a most precious message to His people through Elders Waggoner and Jones,” Ellen White wrote in 1895, seven years after the 1888 General Conference session in Minneapolis, Minnesota. (Testimonies to Ministers, pages. 91, 92, written May 1, 1895 from Hobart, Tasmania, emphasis supplied).

“This message was to bring more prominently before the world the uplifted Saviour, the sacrifice for the sins of the whole world,” Ellen White wrote. “It presented justification through faith in the Surety; it invited the people to receive the righteousness of Christ, which is made manifest in obedience to all the commandments of God.” (ibid., Testimonies to Ministers, pages. 91, 92, emphasis supplied).

Contemporary articles and books authored by modern-day Adventists fail to emphasize the last line in this statement by Ellen White. Liberal “new theology” writers are inclined to emphasize the first portion of the statement, “it invited the people to receive the righteousness of Christ,” and omit the last part of the sentence, “which is made manifest in obedience to all the commandments of God.”

“But as the precious message of present truth was spoken to the people by Brn. Jones and Waggoner,” Ellen White recalled one year after the 1888 General Conference, “the people saw new beauty in the third angel’s message, and they were greatly encouraged.” (Review and Herald, August 13, 1889, emphasis supplied).

Three years later she recalled that, “The message given us by A. T. Jones and E. J. Waggoner is a message of

God to the Laodicean Church.” (Letter S-24, 1892, emphasis supplied). The same year Ellen White testified,

“I considered it a privilege to stand by the side of my brethren [Jones and Waggoner], and give my testimony with the message for the time; and I saw that the power of God attended the message wherever it was spoken.” (R&H, March 18, 1890, emphasis supplied).

Three years later, in a letter written May 1, 1895 from Hobart, Tasmania Ellen White stated further about Jones and Waggoner,

“If you reject Christ’s delegated messengers, you reject Christ.” (See, Testimonies to Ministers, pp. 91-97, emphasis supplied).

Quite an endorsement of Jones and Waggoner and the 1888 message, wouldn’t you say?

Notice the following six important points about the 1888 message and the messengers:

1. The Lord sent “a most precious message” to His people through Elders Waggoner and Jones.
2. This most precious message was “a message of present truth.”
3. Through this most precious message “the people saw new beauty in the third angel’s message.”
4. This most precious message “is a message of God to the Laodicean Church.”
5. Ellen White saw that the power of God attended the message.
6. If you rejected the messengers, Jones and Waggoner, you were rejecting Christ.

Some Questions and Answers About the 1888 Message

If “The Lord in His great mercy sent a most precious message to His people through Elders Waggoner and Jones,” wouldn’t it be to our advantage to find out what that message really was? Why is there so much confusion and disagreement by Seventh-day Adventist historians over the content of the 1888 message? Because of all the disagreement and mystery over the content of the 1888 message, wouldn’t it be prudent to seek the answer from the messengers themselves? Indeed, we should check the writings of Jones and Waggoner. Therefore, the remainder of his chapter will highlight the writings of A. T. Jones and E. J. Waggoner, *Christ’s delegated messengers*. We wish to discover,

- (1) the actual content of the 1888 message,
- (2) why the message was rejected in 1888 and 1950, and, even more importantly,
- (3) *why the 1888 message is rejected today.*

As we begin our research, we are astonished to discover that most of the writings of Jones and Waggoner have been discarded and concealed by the leadership of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. Only two books by E. J. Waggoner, *Christ and His Righteousness*, and, *The Glad Tidings* were published by Seventh-day Adventist publishing houses. Not one book by A. T. Jones was published by the Church. Why is this?

Why are most of the writings of Jones and Waggoner published outside of the denomination? Leadership would probably answer, “Because Jones and Waggoner left the Church, and we hesitated to republish their writings.”

“It is quite possible Elder Jones or Waggoner may be overthrown by the temptations of the enemy, but if they should be, this would not prove that they had no message from God, or that the work that they had done was all a

mistake,” Ellen White replies. “But should this happen, how many would take this position, and enter into a fatal delusion because they were not under the control of the Spirit of God.” (Letter S-24, 1892, emphasis supplied).

Notice that it was “quite possible Elder Jones or Waggoner may be overthrown by the temptations of the enemy.” However, “this would not prove that they had no message from God, or that the work that they had done was all a mistake.” Is it possible that the leadership of the SDA Church today are among those who “would take this position, and enter into a fatal delusion because they were not under the control of the Spirit of God?”

I am not promoting Jones and Waggoner’s books after the mid 1890’s.

The 1888 message was right on but they moved away from it and apostatized. I use Ellen White’s writings on the 1888 message in the Desire of Ages, Thoughts from the Mount of Blessings, Steps to Christ, Christ Object Lessons, and others. Ellen White had to eventually tell Jones that he had gone too far and was confusing the message of 1888. He eventually joined up with John Harvey Kellogg and left the church. Here is one of the references from Ellen White to A.T. Jones:

I was attending a meeting, and a large congregation were present. In my dream you were presenting the subject of faith and the imputed righteousness of Christ by faith. You repeated several times that works amounted to nothing, that there were no conditions. The matter was presented in that light that I knew minds would be confused, and would not receive the correct impression in reference to faith and works, and I decided to write to you. You state this matter too strongly. There are conditions to our receiving justification and sanctification, and the righteousness of Christ. I know your meaning, but you leave a wrong impression upon many minds. While good works will not save even one soul, yet it is impossible for even one soul to be saved without good works. God saves us under a law, that we must ask if we would receive, seek if we would find, and knock if we would have the door opened unto us.

378

{1SM 377.1}

Christ offers Himself as willing to save unto the uttermost all who come unto Him. He invites all to come to Him. "Him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out" (John 6:37). You look in reality upon these subjects as I do, yet you make these subjects, through your expressions, confusing to minds. And after you have expressed your mind radically in regard to works, when questions are asked you upon this very subject, it is not lying out in so very clear lines, in your own mind, and you cannot define the correct principles to other minds, and you are yourself unable to make your statements harmonize with your own principles and faith. {1SM 378.1}

The young man came to Jesus with the question, "Good Master, what shall I do, that I may inherit eternal life?" (Mark 10:17). And Christ saith unto him, "Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is, God: but if thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." He saith unto Him, "Which?" Jesus quoted several, and the young man said unto Him, "All these things have I kept from my youth up: what lack I yet?" Jesus said unto him, "If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come and follow me." Here are conditions, and the Bible is full of conditions. "But when the young man heard that saying, he went away sorrowful: for he had great possessions" (Matthew 19:17, 20, 21,

22). {ISM 378.2}

That whole section in 1 SM is worth reading.

Three Major Divisions of the 1888 Message

The 1888 message presented by E. J. Waggoner and A. T. Jones consisted of three separate, yet coinciding, portions of the message.

- (1) Righteousness by Faith,”
- (2) “the Human Nature of Christ,”
- (3) the “undue ecclesiastical authority” of Church leadership.

To reject any one of these three portions of the 1888 message is to reject the message. To reject the message is to reject Christ.

“If you reject Christ’s delegated messengers, you reject Christ.” Ellen White stated. (ibid., Testimonies to Ministers, page 91, emphasis supplied).

Although it is true that the leadership of the Seventh-day Adventist Church rejected all three phases of the 1888 message, it was this third portion, “undue ecclesiastical authority,” Church leadership has the greatest aversion to. We will now carefully examine the three major portions of the 1888 message from the writings of E. J. Waggoner and A. T. Jones.

Part #1 of the 1888 Message – Obedience By Faith

The first portion of the 1888 message was “righteousness by faith.” As we shall soon discover, by examining the writings of Jones and Waggoner, a better title would be “obedience by faith.” Not all in the corporate Church of 1888 rejected this first portion of the message. Today, however, SDA leadership, by-and-large, does reject the idea of “obedience by faith.” The new theology emphasis is on “free grace,” which is salvation without obedience to the law of God. Justification for your past sins, *and justification for the sins you are planning on committing in the future!* This is the erroneous “righteousness by faith” doctrine taught by the Sunday-keeping churches of Babylon.

Pioneer Adventist Righteousness By Faith

As Taught By Waggoner and Jones

The “righteousness by faith” portion of this “most precious message” consisted of three important points:

- (1) “Justification through faith in the Surety,”
- (2) the message “invited the people to receive the righteousness of Christ,”
- (3) this righteousness of Christ “*is made manifest in obedience to all the commandments of God.*”

Without “obedience” to all the commandments of God there can be no “righteousness by faith,” no “justification through faith in the Surety.” It is as simple as that.

“If ye love me, keep my commandments,” Jesus said. “If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as I have kept my Father’s commandments, and abide in his love.” (John 14:15; 15:10).

We can only obey the ten commandments “through faith” in the power of Christ. “Here are they who keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus.” (Revelation 14:12). This was the byword of pioneer

Adventism – “The commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus.” **Again, the doctrine of “free grace” is one of the “doctrines of devils” of the Evangelical Sunday-keeping Churches of modern Babylon, and also the “new theology” of modern Adventism. (1 Timothy 4:1, 2).**

What about justification by faith? Is there justification for those who disobey God’s law?

“There is no justification for those who, having the light, close their eyes and their ears to a plain `Thus saith the Lord,`” Ellen White replies to our question. “They have taken up the weapons of their warfare against God, and their guilt is made manifest.” (Signs of the Times, November 22, 1899, emphasis supplied).

*The apostle James saw that dangers would arise in presenting the subject of justification by faith, and he labored to show that genuine faith cannot exist without corresponding works. The experience of Abraham is presented. “Seest thou,” he says, “how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect?” James 2:22. Thus genuine faith does a genuine work in the believer. Faith and obedience bring a solid, valuable experience. Ellen G. White, “God’s Remedy For Sin,” *The Faith I Live By.* (page 115) (emphasis supplied).*

Righteousness By Faith – Evangelical Or Adventist?

Waggoner and Jones emphasized that the righteousness by faith they were presenting was not the concept taught by the popular churches of modern Babylon. It was not a new concept, but an old concept presented by the apostles during the time of the apostolic church. This true concept of righteousness by faith had been lost during the dark ages, along with all the cardinal doctrines of the apostolic church, and was now being restored by Waggoner and Jones as a true portion of the continuing Reformation of the Christian church. It was a concept of righteousness by faith that was “made manifest in obedience to all the commandments of God.”

We will now consider this first portion of the 1888 message, this concept of “obedience by faith,” as it was presented by A. T. Jones.

A. T. Jones On Obedience By Faith

*“There is obedience of Christ His whole lifetime in Sabbath observance, to make every soul righteous in that,” Jones wrote. “And so Sabbath-keeping can be, and it is, altogether of the works of God and of the righteousness of God which is by faith.” (A. T. Jones, *Lessons From the Reformation*, page 343, emphasis supplied).*

*“There is no obedience of Christ in Sunday observance, ever to make any soul righteous in that,” Jones continued. “And so Sunday observance has to be, and it is, altogether of man’s own works and never can be of faith.” (ibid., *LFR*, page 343, emphasis supplied).*

Thus we see A. T. Jones’ position on obedience by faith. The Sunday-keeping churches do not have true Righteousness by Faith because they reject obedience to the Sabbath, one of the ten commandments, and there is no righteousness in Sunday. But, according to A. T. Jones, there is righteousness by faith in obedience to the seventh day Sabbath, which is the fourth commandment of God’s holy law.

The word of God is truth. All His commandments are truth. Ps. 119:151.

*When God has spoken, that word must be accepted as the truth, and all there is then to do is to obey the word as He has spoken it. “It shall be our righteousness if we observe to do all these commandments before the Lord our God as he hath commanded us.” Deut. 6:25. Nothing is obedience but to do what the Lord says, as He says it. He says, “The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work.” To disregard the day which God has commanded to be kept, is disobedience. And the disobedience is not in the slightest relieved by the substitution of another day for the one which the Lord has fixed, even though that other day be styled “Christian.” The fact is that the seventh day is the Sabbath; and in the fast-hastening Judgment the question will be, Have you kept it? God is now calling out a people who will keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus. Nothing but that will answer. Neither commandment of God nor faith of Jesus ever enjoined the observance of Sunday, the first day of the week. Both commandment of God and faith of Jesus show the everlasting obligation to keep the seventh day, the Sabbath of the Lord thy God. Will you obey God? Will you keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus? Alonzo T. Jones, *The Abiding Sabbath and the Lord’s Day*, page 128. (emphasis supplied).*

*“It being, then, the one great purpose of Christianity to restore man to his original condition and relation to God, its purpose is to restore him to the condition in which he can love God with all the heart, with all the soul, with all the mind, and with all the strength, and his neighbor as himself,” A. T. Jones concluded. “It is to restore him to obedience to these first two of all the commandments. It is to restore him to perfect and supreme religion.” (A. T. Jones, *Christian Patriotism*, pages. 8, 9, emphasis supplied).*

Many more examples of the teaching of A. T. Jones could be presented. The reader is invited to study the books quoted. (These books can be obtained from *Laymen’s Ministry News, Publishing International, Inc.*, HC04, Box 94C, St. Maries, Idaho, 83861; – *Leaves-Of-Autumn-Books*, P. O. Box 440, Payson, Arizona, 85541).

E. J. Waggoner On Obedience By Faith

How about E. J. Waggoner? Did he also teach that righteousness by faith was made manifest in obedience to all the commandments of God? Yes, indeed. Waggoner’s teaching was in perfect harmony with Scripture and the teaching of Jones.

*“In 1 Cor. 1:30 we are told that Christ is made unto us righteousness as well as wisdom, and since Christ is the wisdom of God and in Him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily, it is evident that the righteousness which He is made to us is the righteousness of God,” Waggoner wrote. “Let us see what this righteousness is.” (E. J. Waggoner, *Christ and His Righteousness*, page 46).*

In Ps. 119:172 the Psalmist thus addresses the Lord, “My tongue shall speak of Thy word, for all Thy commandments are righteousness.” The commandments are righteousness, not simply in the abstract, but they are the righteousness of God. For proof read the following:- “Lift up your eyes to the heavens and look upon the earth beneath, for the heavens shall vanish away like smoke and the earth shall wax old like a garment, and they that dwell therein shall die in like manner; but my salvation shall be forever and my

*righteousness shall not be abolished. Hearken unto me, ye that know righteousness, the people in whose heart is my law; fear ye not the reproach of men, neither be ye afraid of their revilings.” Isa. 51:6, 7. *ibid.*, E. J. Waggoner, *Christ and His Righteousness*, pages 46, 47. (emphasis supplied).*

Notice that those who know righteousness are “the people in whose heart is my law.” Thus the apostle Paul wrote, “Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good.” (Romans 7:12). Moreover, the apostle John wrote,

“Little children, let no man deceive you: he that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as he is righteous.” (I John 3:7).

“What do we learn from this?” Waggoner continued. “That they who know the righteousness of God are those in whose heart is His law, and therefore that the law of God is the righteousness of God.” (ibid., CAHR, page 47, emphasis supplied).

*“Sin is the transgression of the law [I John 3:4], and it is also unrighteousness; therefore sin and unrighteousness are identical,” Waggoner reasoned. “But if unrighteousness is transgression of the law, righteousness must be obedience to the law.” (ibid., *Christ and His Righteousness* pages 47, 48, emphasis supplied).*

“Unrighteousness = transgression of the law. . .which is a negative equation,” Waggoner resolved. “The same thing, stated in positive terms, would be: Righteousness = obedience to the law.” (ibid., CAHR, page 48, emphasis supplied).

*“Now what law is it obedience to which is righteousness and disobedience to which is sin?” Waggoner asks. “It is that law which says, ‘Thou shalt not covet,’ for the apostle Paul tells us that this law convinced him of sin. Rom. 7:7.” (ibid., *Christ and His Righteousness*, page 48). “The law of ten commandments, then, is the measure of the righteousness of God,” Waggoner concluded. “Since it is the law of God and is righteousness, it must be the righteousness of God. There is, indeed, no other righteousness.” (ibid., *Christ and His Righteousness*, page 48, emphasis supplied).*

*“This little digression will help us to bear in mind that in the chapter before us there is no disparagement of the law,” Waggoner stated, “but the righteousness, which is the fruit of faith, is always obedience to the law of God.” (The Everlasting Covenant, page 296, emphasis supplied). “The Gospel is preached for the obedience of faith,” Waggoner concluded. “Obedience carries a blessing with it, for it is written, “Blessed are they that do His commandments.” (ibid., *The Everlasting Covenant*, page 296, emphasis supplied).*

This last Scripture quoted by Waggoner (Revelation 22:14) is omitted in the modern translations that the contemporary Seventh-day Adventist Church treasures so dearly. We can plainly see from these passages that E. J. Waggoner also taught that righteousness by faith consists of obedience to God’s holy law. Waggoner’s

writings are in perfect harmony with Scripture and the teachings of A. T. Jones.

Ellen White On Obedience By Faith

Did Ellen White agree with Waggoner and Jones on “obedience by faith,” the first portion of the 1888 message? Yes, indeed. Notice carefully the following five statements from the pen of inspiration on obedience by faith:

By living faith, by earnest prayer to God, and depending upon Jesus’ merits, we are clothed with His righteousness, and we are saved. “Oh, yes,” some say, “we are saved in doing nothing. In fact, I am saved. I need not keep the law of God. I am saved by the righteousness of Jesus Christ.” Ellen G. White, Faith and Works, page 71.

“Christ came to our world to bring all men back to allegiance to God,” Ellen White stated. “To take the position that you can break God’s law, for Christ has done it all, is a position of death, for you are as verily a transgressor as anyone.” (ibid., Faith and Works, page 71, emphasis supplied).

Those who are teaching this doctrine to-day have much to say in regard to faith and the righteousness of Christ; but they pervert the truth, and make it serve the cause of error. They declare that we have only to believe on Jesus Christ, and that faith is all-sufficient: that the righteousness of Christ is to be the sinner’s credentials; that this imputed righteousness fulfills the law for us, and that we are under no obligation to obey the law of God. This class claim that Christ came to save sinners, and that He has saved them. “I am saved,” they will repeat over and over again. But are they saved while transgressing the law of Jehovah?-- No; for the garments of Christ’s righteousness are not a cloak for iniquity. Such teaching is a gross deception, and Christ becomes to these persons a stumbling block as He did to the Jews,--to the Jews, because they would not receive Him as their personal Saviour, to these professed believers in Christ, because they separate Christ and the law, and regard faith as a substitute for obedience. They separate the Father and the Son, the Saviour of the world. Virtually they teach, both by precept and example, that Christ, by His death, saves men in their transgressions. Ellen G. White, “The Law and the Gospel,” Bible Echo and Signs of the Times, February 8, 1897. (emphasis supplied).

“Many will say, I am saved, I am saved, I am saved,” Ellen White stated in her 1888 messages. “Well, have they been cleansed from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit? and can they cleanse themselves by the righteousness of the law?” (1888 Materials, page 128).

Jesus Christ came to this world, and there is His righteousness to impart to the children of men who are obeying the law of God. The whole world can say, I am saved, as well as any transgressor today. They can say, I believe on Christ that He is my Saviour, but why do they disregard His law which is the transcript of His character? When they disregard the law of Jehovah they disregard the Lord Jesus Christ. ibid., The Ellen G. White 1888 Materials, “Sabbath Talk,” page 128. (emphasis supplied).

From these five statements it is clear that Ellen White was in total agreement with the teaching of Waggoner and Jones on obedience by faith to the law of God. The contemporary Seventh-day Adventist Church today rejects this first portion of the 1888 message by teaching the Evangelical concept of righteousness

by faith. The “new theology” so prevalent in contemporary Adventism teaches “free grace,” salvation without obedience to the law of God.

Part #2 of the 1888 Message – Christ’s Human Nature

The second portion of the 1888 message was the nature Christ assumed while in the flesh. Why is it so important that the Christian should understand the truth on this point? Because if the Christian believes the true doctrine of the 1888 message on the nature Christ assumed while in the flesh – that Christ took upon Himself our sinful, fallen nature like as we have – then Christ becomes the Christian’s example in obedience. If we believe the erroneous concept taught by modern Babylon and **the “new” theology of the contemporary Seventh-day Adventist Church – that Christ took upon Himself the nature of Adam before he fell in the Garden of Eden – then Christ becomes the Christian’s substitute only.**

Why is this “before the fall” position so desirous of the contemporary SDA Church leadership? Because this erroneous doctrine can be harmonized with the Evangelical doctrine of “free grace,” which brings Adventism into harmony with all modern Christendom. Thus in 1973 the book, *So Much In Common*, “Between the World Council of Churches and the Seventh-day Adventist Church,” was co-authored by Bert B. Beach, then President of the Northern Europe Division of Seventh-day Adventists, and Lukas Vischer, Secretary of the World Council of Churches.

By the acceptance of this erroneous doctrine of “free grace,” the Seventh-day Adventist Church can now be accepted into the vast Ecumenical movement sweeping the world, and be accepted into the Evangelical community as Christian brethren. *Seventh-day Adventism is no longer considered to be a cult.* **Remember, that in our research, we have discovered so far that the reason, the bottom line, for all apostasy has been ecumenical. SDA Church leaders have always resented being classed along with Mormons, Jehovah’s Witnesses, and other cultic groups.** (See, *Adventist Heritage*, Vol. 4, No. 2, 1977).

A. T. Jones On the Human Nature Of Christ

“The Lord Jesus took the same flesh and blood, the same human nature, that we have, flesh just like our sinful flesh,” A. T. Jones wrote in the Review and Herald, “and because of sin, and by the power of the Spirit of God through the divine mind that was in Him, ‘condemned sin in the flesh.’ Rom. 8:3.” (“Sinful Flesh,” Review and Herald, April 18, 1899). Jones added further in the article that “therein is our deliverance (Rom. 7:25); therein is our victory. ‘Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus.’ ‘A new heart will I give you, and a new Spirit will I put within you.’” (ibid., RH, 4/18/1899).

In his book, *The Consecrated Way to Christian Perfection*, A. T. Jones states clearly his teaching on the human nature Christ assumed while in the flesh. Indeed, in this work six chapter titles are dedicated to the human nature of Christ; Chapter 3, “Christ as Man,” page 17; Chapter 4, “He Took Part of the Same,” page 21; Chapter 5, “Made Under the Law,” page 27; Chapter 6, “Made of a Woman,” page 32; Chapter 7, “The Law of Heredity,” page 40; and Chapter 8, “In All Things Like,” page 45. Let us consider a few statements from this most wonderful work.

“Christ As Man”

“Just as certainly as we see Jesus lower than the angels, unto the suffering of death,” Jones wrote, “so certainly it is by this demonstrated that, as man, Jesus took the nature of man as he is since death entered and not the nature of man as he was before he became subject to death.” (The Consecrated Way To Christian Perfection, page 20, emphasis supplied).

“If He [Christ] were not of the same flesh as are those whom He came to

redeem,” Jones concluded, “then He never really came to the world which needs to be redeemed.” (*ibid.*, *The Consecrated Way*, page 35, emphasis supplied).

“He Took Part Of the Same”

“Man is subject to death,” Jones reasoned. “Therefore Jesus must become man, as man is since he is subject to death.” (*ibid.*, *The Consecrated Way*, page 22, emphasis supplied).

“Before man sinned he was not in any sense subject to sufferings,” Jones continued. “And for Jesus to have come in the nature of man as he was before sin entered, would have been only to come in a way and in a nature in which it would be impossible for Him to know the sufferings of man and therefore impossible to reach him to save him.” (*ibid.*, *The Consecrated Way*, page 22, emphasis supplied).

“But since it became Him, in bringing men unto glory, to be made perfect through sufferings,” Jones concluded, “it is certain that Jesus in becoming man partook of the nature of man as he is since he became subject to suffering, even the suffering of death, which is the wages of sin.” (*ibid.*, *The Consecrated Way*, page 22, emphasis supplied).

“Made Under the Law”

“1. ‘Christ Jesus. . . being in the form of God. . . emptied Himself, and took upon Him the form of a servant and was made in the likeness of men.’ Phil. 2:5-7, R.V.,” Jones wrote in chapter five. “*He was made in the likeness of men, as men are, just where they are.*” (*ibid.*, *The Consecrated Way*, page 27, emphasis supplied).

“2. ‘The Word was made flesh.’ *He ‘took part of the same’ flesh and blood as that of which the children of men are partakers, as they are since man has fallen into sin,*” Jones continued. “And so it is written: ‘When the fullness of the time was come, God sent forth His Son, made. . . under the law.’” (*ibid.*, *The Consecrated Way*, page 27, emphasis supplied).

“Made Of A Woman”

“By what means was Christ made flesh?” Jones asked. “Through what means was He partaker of human nature? Exactly the same means as are all of us partakers: all of the children of men. For it is written: ‘As the children [of the man] are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise took part of the same.’” (*ibid.*, *The Consecrated Way*, page 32).

Likewise signifies “in the like way,” “thus,” “in the same way.” So He partook of “the same” flesh and blood that men have in the same way that men partake of it. Men partake of it by birth. So “likewise” did He. Accordingly, it is written, “Unto us a Child is born.” *ibid.*, A. T. Jones, *The Consecrated Way To Christian Perfection*, page 32. (emphasis supplied).

“Accordingly, it is further written: ‘God sent forth His Son, made of a woman, Gal. 4:4,’” Jones continued. “He, being made of a woman in this world, in the nature of things He was made of the only kind of woman that this world knows.” (*ibid.*, *The Consecrated Way*, page 32, emphasis supplied).

“In order to do this, He must be made of a woman, because the woman, not the man, was first and originally in the transgression,” Jones wrote. “For ‘Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression.’ 1 Tim. 2:14.” (*ibid.*, *The Consecrated Way*, pages 32, 33, emphasis supplied).

*“It was ‘the Seed of the woman’ that was to bruise the serpent’s head,” Jones concluded, “and it was only as ‘the seed of the woman’ and ‘made of a woman’ that He could meet the serpent on his own ground, at the very point of the entrance of sin into this world.” (ibid., *The Consecrated Way*, page 33).*

The Human Nature Of Mary

If Jesus was not just like you and me, the fact that Christ was born of a woman raises the question of the human nature of Mary. What does the 1888 message teach about the human nature of Mary, the mother of Jesus?

*It is thoroughly understood that in His birth Christ did partake of the nature of Mary—the “woman” of whom He was “made.” But the carnal mind is not willing to allow that God in His perfection of holiness could endure to come to men where they are in their sinfulness. Therefore endeavor has been made to escape the consequences of this glorious truth, which is the emptying of self, by inventing a theory that the nature of the virgin Mary was different from the nature of the rest of mankind; that her flesh was not exactly such flesh as is that of all mankind. This invention sets up that by some special means Mary was made different from the rest of human beings, especially in order that Christ might be becomingly born of her. A. T. Jones, *The Consecrated Way To Christian Perfection*, pages 35, 36. (emphasis supplied).*

*“This invention has culminated in what is known as the Roman Catholic dogma of the Immaculate Conception,” Jones explained. “Many Protestants, if not the vast majority of them as well as other non-Catholics, think that the Immaculate Conception refers to the conception of Jesus by the virgin Mary. But this is altogether a mistake. It refers not at all to the conception of Christ by Mary but to the conception of Mary herself by her mother.” (ibid., *The Consecrated Way*, page 36, emphasis supplied).*

“The official and ‘infallible’ doctrine of the Immaculate Conception,” Jones stated, “as solemnly defined as an article of faith, by Pope Pius IX, speaking ex-cathedra on the 8th of December 1854 is as follows:—”

By the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ of the blessed apostles Peter and Paul, and by our own authority, we declare, pronounce, and define that the doctrine which holds that the most blessed Virgin Mary, in the first instant of her conception, by a special grace and privilege of Almighty God, in view of the merits of Jesus Christ, the Saviour of mankind, [Mary] was preserved free from all stain of original sin, has been revealed by God, and therefore is to be firmly and steadfastly believed by all the faithful.

*Wherefore, if any shall presume, which may God avert, to think in their heart otherwise than has been defined by us, let them know, and moreover understand, that they are condemned by their own judgment, that they have made shipwreck as regards the faith, and have fallen away from the unity of the Church. Catholic Belief, page 214, op. cit., A. T. Jones, *The Consecrated Way To Christian Perfection*, page 36.*

E. J. Waggoner On the Immaculate Conception Of Mary

“After speaking the last time I was here, there were two questions handed me, and I might read them now,” E. J. Waggoner stated. “One of them is this; ‘Was that Holy Thing that was born of the Virgin Mary born in sinful flesh, and did that flesh have the same evil tendencies to contend with that ours

does?” (General Conference Bulletin, 1901, page 403).

“Before we go on with this text, let me show you what there is in the idea that is in this question,” Waggoner continued. “You have it in mind, Was Christ that holy thing which was born of the virgin Mary, born in sinful flesh?” (ibid., GCB, 1901, page 403).

“Did you ever hear of the Roman Catholic doctrine of the immaculate conception?” Waggoner asked. “And do you know what it is? Some of you possibly have supposed in hearing of it, that it means that Jesus Christ was born sinless.” (ibid., GCB, 1901, page 403).

“This is not the Catholic dogma at all,” Waggoner explained. “The doctrine of the immaculate conception is that Mary, the mother of Jesus, was born sinless. Why? – Ostensibly to magnify Jesus, really the work of the devil to put a wide gulf between Jesus the Saviour of men, and the men He came to save, so that one could not pass over to the other. That is all.” (ibid., GCB, 1901, page 404, emphasis supplied).

“We need to settle, every one of us, whether we are out of the church of Rome or not,” Waggoner continued. “There are a great many that have got the marks yet, but I am persuaded of this, that every soul that is here tonight desires to know the way of truth and righteousness. . .and that there is no one here who is unconsciously clinging to the dogmas of the papacy, who does not desire to be freed from them.” (ibid., GCB, 1901, page 404, emphasis supplied).

“Do you not see that the idea that the flesh of Jesus was not like ours (Because we know that ours is sinful) necessarily involves the idea of the immaculate conception of the virgin Mary?” Waggoner asked. “Mind you, in Him was no sin, but the Mystery of God manifest in the flesh, the marvel of the ages, the wonder of the angels, that thing which even now they desire to understand, and which they can form no just idea of, only as they are taught it by the church, is the perfect manifestation of the life of God in its spotless purity in the midst of sinful flesh. O that is a marvel, is it not?” (ibid., GCB, 1901, page 405).

E. J. Waggoner On the Human Nature Of Christ

At the 1888 General Conference session in Minneapolis, Minnesota, there had been no General Conference Bulletin published. Neither had there been any written recording of what was presented at the conference. However, Jessie Mosier, Waggoner’s secretary did take shorthand notes. In 1890, two years after the infamous 1888 General Conference, E. J. Waggoner published his message in a book titled *Christ and His Righteousness*. This book is acknowledged by most Adventist historians as the actual message given at the 1888 General Conference session by E. J. Waggoner. The book has been published by Pacific Press Publishing Association. We will now consider a few excerpts from that most excellent work.

“God Manifest In the Flesh”

“A little thought will be sufficient to show anybody that if Christ took upon Himself the likeness of man in order that He might redeem man, it must have been sinful man that He was made like, for it is sinful man that He came to redeem,” Waggoner wrote. “Death could have no power over a sinless man, as Adam was in Eden, and it could not have had any power over Christ, if the Lord had not laid on Him the iniquity of us all.” (E. J. Waggoner, *Christ and His Righteousness*, page 26, emphasis supplied).

“Moreover, the fact that Christ took upon Himself the flesh, not of a

*sinless being, but of a sinful man, that is, that the flesh which He assumed had all the weaknesses and sinful tendencies to which fallen human nature is subject, is shown by the statement that He `was made of the seed of David according to the flesh,'” Waggoner concluded. “David had all the passions of human nature. He says of himself, `Behold I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me.’ Ps. 51:5.” (ibid., *Christ and His Righteousness*, page 27, emphasis supplied).*

Short summary on Original Sin

“There are many who in their hearts murmur against God. They say, "We inherit the fallen nature of Adam, and are not responsible for our natural imperfections." They find fault with God's requirements, and complain that He demands what they have no power to give. Satan made the same complaint in heaven, but such thoughts dishonor God.”²⁰ *Signs of the Times*, August 29, 1892.

One of the major emphases in Ellen White's writings is her understanding that the claim that God's law could not be obeyed by His creatures was Satan's first, greatest, and most persistent attack against the character of God.

You will find references to it in DA 29, DA 69, DA 117, DA 308-9, DA 311-13, DA 618, ST 1/16/96, and ST 7/23/02, to mention only a few. I have listed these in your handout.

Her own response to this claim is best given in her own words:

“Therefore he (Satan) is constantly seeking to deceive the followers of Christ with his FATAL SOPHISTRY that it is impossible for them to overcome.” (Emphasis mine) *The Great Controversy* p. 489.

“Let no one say, I cannot remedy my defects of character. If you come to this decision, you will certainly fail of obtaining everlasting life.” *Christ's Object Lessons*, p. 331.

SDA's Traditionally Preached Against Original Sin

Seventh-day Adventists have historically preached a doctrine of inherited weakness, but not a doctrine of inherited guilt. As we consider this subject, we need to remember that theological systems may be compared to a chain-mesh, that is, a net formed of metal chain links that connect with other links around them. Few doctrines exist in isolation with no connection with other doctrines. One's belief about original sin will affect one's belief about the nature of Christ, human nature, victory over sin, etc.

“The will is the *governing* power in the nature of man, *bringing all the other faculties under its sway*. . . It is the deciding power” 5T 513 (Emphasis mine.)

“. . . it is the *choice* . . . the *Kingly power*”-MH 318 (Emphasis mine.)

“But while Satan can solicit, he cannot compel to sin . . . the tempter can never compel us to do evil . . . *The will must consent*”. . . . DA 125 (Emphasis mine.)

Guilt cannot be transferred biologically from one person to another, from Adam to someone else. Guilt is a matter of the will. Until one wills to sin he is not guilty. The flesh of man, then, has never known guilt, has never carried guilt, and can never transmit guilt from flesh to flesh. The transmission of guilt has always been and must always be from will to will, and only by the consent to sin of the receiving will. Guilt is an assignment of responsibility by the will of a lawmaker to the will of a lawbreaker. This Definition avoids assigning responsibility to

God. This definition carefully avoids ascribing to guilt any mechanical, organic, or intrinsically legal qualities.

Those who would ascribe to guilt mechanical or organic qualities, which would make it possible for the guilt to reside in the flesh and be transmitted from flesh to flesh by biological inheritance, must struggle to answer the questions about the transmission of guilt to innocent infants, the transmission of guilt to the infant Jesus, etc., and the larger question lying behind them: If that is the way it is, who made it that way? Thus the responsibility inevitably goes back to God.

If our will is in control of all our faculties, and if Satan cannot compel that will to sin, it follows that sinning is always a free choice or decision of a free will, which may be expressed by either an inward attitude or by an outward act, or by both.

There can never, then, be anything unjust or cruel in holding the free will of man responsible for its choices and decisions, particularly if human inability to perform the good that is willed are matched or exceeded by the enabling grace of God.

Scriptural Truths About the Nature of Guilt:

As we reflect about the nature of guilt, let us keep in mind these basic scriptural truths:

Sin is the transgression of the law. - 1 John 3:4

Where there is no law, there is no sin. - Romans 4:15

The times of this ignorance God winked at. - Acts 17:31

Are There Extenuating Circumstances in Assigning Guilt?

Guilt is not *automatically* incurred by a violation of God's law. There can be wrong-doing without guilt, if the act is ignorant rather than *willful*. The deciding factor is the attitude of the *will* of the law breaker. Did he *will* to violate the law of his Creator God? Or did he violate an unknown or misunderstood precept of God's law while *willing* to serve and obey God? The Creator-God takes into account these extenuating circumstances in deciding whether or not to assign guilt.

And it is the will of the law-maker, the Creator God, that decides whether to hold the will of the lawbreaker responsible, i.e., guilty. Remove from this equation either the decision of the lawbreaker's will to sin or the decision of the lawmaker's will to assign responsibility for sinning, and guilt cannot exist. The action of both wills must be present.

With this definition of guilt there is no need for elaborate defenses of the character of God.

We need not struggle to explain how a God of love and justice can hold babies responsible for the sin of someone who died long before they were born, and punish them for the sin that they did not commit.

There is no need to explain God's condemnation and destruction of persons in heathen lands who followed all the moral light that shone upon their pathways.

And there is no need to construct elaborate schemes for the purpose of keeping the guilt of Adam from resting upon the infant Jesus.

There can be no sin without an act of the will of the law-breaker. There can be no guilt without an act of the will of the law-maker. When Ellen White makes reference to a reception of guilt, or an inheritance of guilt from Adam, she does not leave the will-factor out of the picture.

“It is inevitable that children should suffer from the consequences of

parental wrongdoing, but they are not punished for the parents' guilt, except as they participate in their sins. It is usually the case, however, that children walk in the steps of their parents. By inheritance and example the sons become partakers of the father's sin. Wrong tendencies, perverted appetites, and debased morals, as well as physical disease and degeneracy, are transmitted as a legacy from father to son, to the third and fourth generation. This fearful truth should have a solemn power to restrain men from following a course of sin."
PP 306 (Emphasis mine.)

“These dear children received from Adam an inheritance of *disobedience*, of guilt, and death.”
Baker Letter, p. 1 (Emphasis mine.)

Ellen White wrote in careful conformity to dictionary definitions, and according to the dictionaries an *inheritance* is something that can be retained, rejected, divided, bought, sold, or lost, according to the choices of the recipient's will.

Calvinistic concepts of inherited guilt as something that no human can avoid or escape would need to be described as a *biological*, or flesh to flesh, inheritance of guilt. In that case the inheritance could not be rejected or disposed of by any means since it would be in the flesh.

No such expression and no such thought can be found in the writings of Ellen White. She never describes guilt or its transmission in terms of flesh, nor in terms of an unavoidable state or condition.

What has been the Traditional SDA, EGW, View

According to the teaching of Ellen White, and of the Seventh-day Adventist church in general until recent years, all earth-born children, including Jesus, inherit the fallen nature of Adam **as weakness, not as guilt**. At the point in time when the will of the child chooses to sin, guilt enters the picture. (Ellen White attributes the death of infants to separation from the tree of life, not to inherited guilt.)

The will of the child Jesus never chose to sin, therefore never experienced guilt. According to Ellen White, this possibility is open to all:

“He has demonstrated that a *lifelong* obedience is possible.” Ms. 1, 1892 (Emphasis mine.)

“There is no excuse for sinning.” DA 311-312

“Let the children bear in mind that the child Jesus had upon Himself human nature, and was in the likeness of sinful flesh, and was tempted of Satan like all children are tempted.” YI 8/23/94

Just as firmly as Ellen White rejects the concept that we unavoidably inherit guilt from Adam, she also rejects the concept that we inherit such a severe weakness from Adam that sinning is unavoidable.

“Since the sin of Adam, men in every age have excused themselves from sinning, charging God with their sin, saying that they could not keep His commandments.” AST 9/14/03

“There are many who in their hearts murmur against God. They say, "We inherit the fallen nature of Adam, and are not responsible for our natural imperfections." They find fault with God's requirements, and complain that He demands what they have no power to give. Satan made the same complaint in heaven, but such thoughts dishonor God.” ST 8/29/92

Finally, let us consider this question:

Do you know of any *unavoidable* inheritance other than *biological* inheritance?

Describe guilt or define guilt however we may, I see no way that we can escape the conclusion that if it is *neither* a biological inheritance *nor* the applied will of God, it is *not unavoidable*.

There is no unavoidable non-biological inheritance. And if it is the applied will of God, the word *inheritance* is hardly applicable. *Judgment* would be the more appropriate term.

This is no problem for us Adventists, who do not visualize the Lord applying a judgment of guilt to tiny infants, including the infant Jesus. It is a problem to the Calvinist, and has required him to invent an altogether extra-Biblical theory that the Lord Jesus Christ came to this earth in the human nature of the unfallen Adam, in order to keep the guilt of Adam from resting upon the infant Jesus.

May I submit to you that this is the Calvinist's problem, and not ours? I believe we should reject it.

We have lost much by accepting into our theology an artificial problem:

The unavoidable transmission of guilt from Adam to all of his descendants, including Jesus; a problem that can only be remedied by an equally artificial solution:

The doctrine that Christ came to the earth in the human nature of the unfallen Adam.

Our position that all men inherit weakness from Adam but do not inherit guilt is, I am convinced, by far the best understanding of scripture, and is *the only possible* understanding of the inspired counsels that have come to us through Ellen White, such as this, one of her most simple and clear and yet most meaningful statements:

Just that which you may be, He was in human nature. - Letter 106, 1896

Part #3 of the 1888 Message – Undue Ecclesiastical Authority

The third portion of the 1888 message was condemnation of the Pontifical Ecclesiastical authority exercised by the leadership of the Seventh-day Adventist Church over the laity. The assumption of “undo authority” by SDA Church leadership makes it impossible for the Holy Spirit to do His work of perfecting the character of Christ in the individual Christian. Ecclesiastical authority stands between the Holy Spirit and the individual.

The first two portions of the 1888 message, (1) “Obedience by Faith,” and (2) “Christ’s Human Nature,” were presented to the leadership of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. However, the third portion of the 1888 message, “Undue Ecclesiastical Authority” was not presented. This third portion of the 1888 message was rejected by the corporate Seventh-day Adventist Church of 1888, and is rejected today by the contemporary Church.

A. T. Jones On “Undue Ecclesiastical Authority”

*“Some denominations extend the thought to the point of insisting that Religious Liberty is the freedom of every individual from any interference. . .by the State,” A. T. Jones wrote. “But not one of the denominations thinks, or will allow, that Religious Liberty is the perfect freedom of the individual believer from prohibition, or interference, or jurisdiction, in the matter of religion or faith, by the church.” (A. T. Jones, *Lessons From the Reformation*, “The Reformation Religious Liberty,” page 227, emphasis his).*

“And so the denominations all exercise as churches the very power and jurisdiction that they deny to the State,” Jones lamented. “They deny to the

individual as a member of the Church the very Religions Liberty which they advocate for him as a member of the State. (ibid., Lessons From the Reformation, page 227, emphasis his).

“Thus they [the Church] present the interesting situation that the Christian has more Religious Liberty as a member of the State than he can have as a member of the church,” Jones stated. “For the individual as only a member of the State they demand as a natural right, a Religious Liberty that they will not allow to him as a member of the church under the grace of God!” (ibid., Lessons From the Reformation, page 228, emphasis supplied).

“Does anybody but a confirmed denominationalist – a papist – need to be told that Reformation and Christian Religious Liberty is no such thing as that?” Jones asks, “that no Reformer was ever so blind and confused as that, in his thinking? (ibid., Lessons From the Reformation, page 228, emphasis supplied).

“Authority Of Church Leadership”

“The failure of James and the church in Jerusalem to recognize Christ’s gift of Paul and in Paul to the Church, put Paul in Roman prisons to the day of his death (except a very short interval near the end),” Jones wrote, “robbed the churches of Christ’s wonderful revelations in the Mystery of God, and hastened the rise of the mystery of iniquity. Gal. 2:13; Acts 21:18; 2 Tim. 1: 15; 4: 16; Gal. 1: 15, 16; Eph. 3: 2-5; Col. 1: 26-29; 2 Thess. 2: 3-10.” (ibid., Lessons From the Reformation, page 170, emphasis supplied).

“And the failure of professed Christians to recognize Christ’s spiritual gifts, is always of the mystery of iniquity,” Jones continued. “For it is but the manifestation of the natural against the spiritual, of the will of man against the will of Christ, and of man instead of Christ – of man in the place of God – in The Church.” (ibid., Lessons From the Reformation, page 171, emphasis supplied).

In the Scriptures there is no such thing as appointment or election by men in the Church, nor in the churches. There is ordination, but not election. And the ordination is the act of response of the members of the Body to the will of their Head [Jesus], not the endorsement nor the legalizing of it. Elections came in from Greece, by those Greeks who in the “falling away,” had not the Spirit, and so had lost their Head. Appointments came in from Rome, when the Greek political system in church affairs was imperialized and the bishop of Rome became the head. The Reformation threw off the Greco-Roman heathen political naturalism, and restored the spiritual principle of the divine order. Alonzo T. Jones, Lessons From the Reformation, “The Reformation Guidance,” pages 170, 171. (emphasis supplied).

“But there has been another falling away,” Jones lamented. “Again the spiritual principle has been lost.” (ibid., Lessons From the Reformation, page 171, emphasis supplied).

“In every denomination of professed Protestants the Greco-Roman naturalistic principle of human election and appointment prevails,” Jones stated. “Yet they are not consistent even in this inconsistency. Only some of the responsibilities that rightly pertain to the Church are allowed to be subject to election or appointment: as deacons, elders, and others of ‘helps’ or ‘governments.’” (ibid., Lessons From the Reformation, page 171, emphasis supplied).

“Out of all the Babylonish confusion of the two great fallings away combined [Roman Catholic and Protestant], Christ calls all of His own unto Himself, in His own Church which He is now sanctifying and cleansing with the washing of water by the Word, preparatory to her Glorious Presentation. Rev. 17: 5; 18: 4,” Jones concluded. “All the Religious Liberty known today either by individuals, or by States, or yet by the churches, is due to The Reformation.” (ibid., Lessons From the Reformation, page 173, emphasis supplied).

E. J. Waggoner On “Undue Ecclesiastical Authority”

“So we learn from the words of the Saviour, that there is to be no such thing in the church of Christ as the exercise of authority such as is known in civil government,” E. J. Waggoner stated. “The church is on an entirely different plane from the State. There is no likeness whatever between them.” (E. J. Waggoner, The Present Truth England, vol. 9, no. 22, August 31, 1893, emphasis supplied).

“The kingdom of Christ is a thing entirely different from human ideas of government,” Waggoner continued. “He said, ‘My kingdom is not of this world.’ John 18:36.” (ibid., Present Truth, 8/31/1893, emphasis supplied).

“They who think to understand the working of Christ’s kingdom by studying earthly models,” Waggoner concluded, “are proceeding in the wrong way, and are working in the dark.” (ibid., Present Truth, 8/31/1893, emphasis supplied).

“Recall again the words of 1 Peter 5:3,” Waggoner stated. “The elders or bishops he exhorts not to be ‘lords over God’s heritage, but being ensamples to the flock.’” (ibid., Present Truth, 8/31/1893).

“There can therefore be in the true church of Christ no such thing as a ‘Lord Bishop,’” Waggoner concludes. “That is one of the fruits of the unlawful connection of the church with the world.” (ibid., Present Truth, 8/31/1893, emphasis supplied).

“The church of Christ, as directed by the Lord Himself, is the only place on earth where ‘liberty, equality, and fraternity’ can be fully realized,” Waggoner continued. “The trouble with earthly associations formed for the

purpose of promoting liberty and equality on earth, is that they are only human organizations, directed only by human wisdom and human power, and among men self is bound to predominate.” (ibid., *Present Truth*, 8/31/1893, emphasis supplied).

“*Rank, ’ as known among men, is unknown to the church of Christ,*” Waggoner continued. “*There is no such thing as one setting himself up above another, or allowing himself to be so placed or considered. That pertains to the princes of this world, but the words of Christ are, ‘It shall not be so among you.’*” (ibid., *Present Truth*, 8/31/1893).

“*Christ ‘emptied Himself,’ and therefore self has no place in His body, the church,*” Waggoner concluded. “*To the Jews He said, ‘How can ye believe, which receive honor one of another, and seek not the honor that cometh from God?’ John 5:44.*” (ibid., *Present Truth*, 8/31/1893, emphasis supplied).

Notice the date on these statements by E. J. Wagoner, 1893. This was just five years after the 1888 message was presented by Waggoner and Jones at Minneapolis.

Ellen White Confirmed the Third Portion Of the 1888 Message-“Undue Ecclesiastical Authority”

On May 1, 1895, writing a testimonial *Letter* to O. A. Olsen, Ellen White confirmed the third portion of the 1888 message on “Undue Ecclesiastical Authority.” Indeed, this testimonial *Letter* is included in *The Ellen G. White 1888 Materials*, which certifies the affinity of this *Letter* to the 1888 message. **The four volume set *The Ellen G. White 1888 Materials* is a trustworthy source on the 1888 message without the worry of error.** In this testimonial *letter* Ellen White stated in part:

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. 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. Therefore [for that reason] God gave to His servants [Waggoner and Jones] a testimony that presented the truth as it is in Jesus, which is the third angel’s message in clear, distinct lines. Ellen G. White, Letter to O. A. Olsen, dated at Hobart, Tasmania, May 1, 1895; The Ellen G. White 1888 Materials, page 1338. (emphasis supplied).

Notice that because “for years the church has been looking to man, and expecting much from man,” and because the Church was “not looking to Jesus,” therefore, for that reason, “God gave to His servants a testimony that presented the truth as it is in Jesus.”

(1) God gave to Waggoner and Jones a testimony.

(2) The reason God gave this special message was because the Church was looking to man, instead of looking to Christ.

(3) This truth Ellen White stated “is the third angel’s message, in clear, distinct lines.”

The third portion of this truth was a rebuke of “Undue ecclesiastical Authority.” The reason why this third portion of the message was rejected then and now should be obvious to the reader.

The Perfecting Of the Saints

The work of the Holy Spirit is to make the Christian ready to receive the seal of God and the outpouring of the latter rain. This last generation perfecting of character would prepare the Lord's remnant people to stand during the seven last plagues without a mediator between them and their heavenly Father. Jones and Waggoner also taught that the bottom line of the 1888 message was that this work of perfecting the character of the remnant would fit them for translation.

A. T. Jones On the Perfecting Of the Saints--"Everlasting Righteousness"

*"Everlasting righteousness, remember," Jones wrote. "Not a righteousness for today and sin tomorrow and righteousness again and sin again. That is not everlasting righteousness." (ibid., *The Consecrated Way To Christian Perfection*, page 123, emphasis supplied).*

*"Everlasting righteousness is righteousness that is brought in and stays everlastingly in the life of him who has believed and confessed and who still further believes and receives this everlasting righteousness in the place of all sin and all sinning," Jones added further. "This alone is everlasting righteousness; this alone is eternal redemption from sin. And this unspeakable blessing is the gracious gift of God by the heavenly ministry which He has established in our behalf in the priesthood and ministry of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary." (ibid., *The Consecrated Way*, page 123, emphasis supplied).*

*"Accordingly, today, just now, 'while it is called today,' as never before," Jones concluded, "the word of God to all people is 'Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come [that there may come seasons of refreshing, 'R.V.] from the presence of the Lord; and He shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you: whom the heaven must receive until the time of restitution of all things.' Acts 3:19-21." (ibid., *The Consecrated Way*, page 123).*

E. J. Waggoner On the Perfecting Of the Saints

"We need to be on our guard against the idea that the blotting out of sin is merely as the passing of a sponge over a slate, or an entry in a ledger, to balance the account," E. J. Waggoner wrote. "This is not the blotting out of sin." (Review and Herald, September 30, 1902, emphasis supplied). "The tearing of a leaf out of a book, or even the burning of the book containing the record, does not blot out the sin," Waggoner continued. "The sin is not blotted out by blotting out the account of it, any more than throwing my Bible into the fire abolishes the Word of God." (ibid., R&H, 9/30/1902, emphasis supplied).

"The blotting out of sin is the erasing of it from the nature," Waggoner concluded, "the being of man." (ibid., R&H, 9/30/1902, emphasis supplied).

Waggoner was not teaching "holy flesh" here. He was referring to the character, "the nature" of man, and not the flesh of man. Man's flesh will be changed when Jesus comes, not his character. The character must be changed now.

"The blood of Jesus Christ cleanses from all sin," Waggoner continued.

“Our bodies are but the channel, the border, the sand upon the shore, of the river of life. Impressions have been made upon us by sin.” (ibid., R&H, 9/30/1902).

“At the seashore when you see a smooth piece of sand, your first impulse is to make some mark on it, to write some characters upon it,” Waggoner explained. “Then the sea comes up, and each wave that passes over it helps to obliterate the impression until it is entirely blotted out.” (ibid., R&H, 9/30/1902).

“Even so the stream of life from the throne of God will wash away and blot out the impressions of sin upon us,” Waggoner concluded. (ibid., R&H, 9/30/1902, emphasis supplied).

“The erasing of sin is the blotting of it from our natures, so that we shall know it no more,” Waggoner wrote. “The worshipers once purged—actually purged by the blood of Christ—have ‘no more conscience of sin,’ because the way of sin is gone from them.” (ibid., R&H, 9/30/1902, emphasis supplied).

“Their iniquity may be sought for, but it will not be found,” Waggoner stated. “It is for ever gone from them,—it is foreign to their new natures, and even though they may be able to recall the fact that they have committed certain sins, they have forgotten the sin itself—they do not think of doing it any more.” (ibid., R&H, 9/30/1902, emphasis supplied).

“This is the work of Christ in the true sanctuary which the Lord pitched, and not man,” Waggoner concluded, “the sanctuary not made with hands, but brought into existence by the thought of God.” (ibid., R&H, 9/30/1902, emphasis supplied).

The Faith Of Jesus

It is the “work of Christ” in the true sanctuary in heaven to blot out sins from the “character” of the believer. This is what is meant by those who have “the faith of Jesus.” The by-word of pioneer Adventists was “the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus.” (Revelation 14:12).

“As the fourth commandment and those who observe it are ignored and despised,” Ellen White stated, “the faithful feel that it is the time not to hide their faith but to exalt the law of Jehovah by unfurling the banner on which is inscribed the message of the third angel, the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus.” (General Conference Daily Bulletin, April 13, 1891, emphasis supplied).

*God is now calling out a people who will keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus. Nothing but that will answer. Neither commandment of God nor faith of Jesus ever enjoined the observance of Sunday, the first day of the week. Both commandment of God and faith of Jesus show the everlasting obligation to keep the seventh day, the Sabbath of the Lord thy God. Will you obey God? Will you keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus? A. T. Jones, *The Abiding Sabbath and the Lord’s Day*, page 128. (emphasis supplied).*

Notice that four times in this statement A. T. Jones used the pioneer Seventh-day Adventist by-word, “the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus.” This is taken from the description of the three angel’s messages recorded in Revelation 14:1-11. After describing the three angel’s messages the Scripture then states

in verse 12, “Here is the patience of the saints: here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus.” (Revelation 14:12).

It must be here noted that the New International Version of the Bible, honored by the contemporary Seventh-day Adventist Church, and read freely from the pulpits of the Church states,

“This calls for patient endurance on the part of the saints who obey God’s commandments and remain faithful to Jesus.” (Revelation 14:12, NIV, emphasis supplied).

Notice that the NIV renders the text “faithful TO Jesus” rather than “faith OF Jesus.”

It is not just a matter of semantics. It is a matter of theology. The New International Version rendering can be harmonized with the erroneous Evangelical theological concept of “free grace” – salvation without obedience to the law of God. This is the “new” theology of contemporary Seventh-day Adventism. The King James Version rendering unfurls the banner of pioneer Adventism upon which is inscribed “the commandments of God, and the faith OF Jesus.”

The 1888 message of righteousness by faith presented by Waggoner and Jones was a concept contrary to this erroneous theology of “free grace.” The 1888 message

“invited the people to receive the righteousness of Christ, which is made manifest in obedience to all the commandments of God.” (Ellen G. White, Testimonies to Ministers, pages 91-97, emphasis supplied).

Obedience to God’s law we understand, but what exactly is “the faith OF Jesus?” It is the bottom line of the 1888 message. When we have the faith of Jesus we will walk as He walked, obey as He Obeyed. “He that saith he abideth in him ought himself also so to walk, *even as he walked.*” (I John 2:6, emphasis supplied). Eight times in the book of Revelation Jesus admonishes His followers to be overcomers. (Revelation 2:7, 11, 17, 26; 3:5, 12, 21; 21:7).

In the second and third chapters of Revelation Jesus gives eight wonderful promises to those that overcome.

- (1) To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the paradise of God. (Revelation 2:7, emphasis supplied).
- (2) He that overcometh shall not be hurt of the second death. (Revelation 2:11, emphasis supplied).
- (3) To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the hidden manna, and will give him a white stone, and in the stone a new name written, which no man knoweth saving he that receiveth it. (Revelation 2:17, emphasis supplied).
- (4) And he that overcometh, and keepeth my works unto the end, to him will I give power over the nations: (Revelation 2:26, emphasis supplied).
- (5) He that overcometh, the same shall be clothed in white raiment; and I will not blot out his name out of the book of life, but I will confess his name before my Father, and before his angels. (Revelation 3:5, emphasis supplied).
- (6) Him that overcometh will I make a pillar in the temple of my God, and he shall go no more out: and I will write upon him the name of my God, and the name of the city of my God, which is new Jerusalem, which cometh down out of heaven from my God: and I will write upon him my new name. (Revelation 3:12, emphasis supplied).
- (7) To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne. (Revelation 3:21, emphasis supplied).
- (8) The eighth and final reference promises that, “*He that overcometh shall inherit all things; and I will be his God, and he shall be my son.*” (Revelation 21:7, emphasis supplied).

If we walk as Jesus walked, if we have “the faith of Jesus,” we will then receive the “seal of God” and the “latter rain” of the holy spirit – *and the world will be lightened with His glory!*

1888 Message Was the Beginning Of the Latter Rain

“The time of test is just upon us, for the loud cry of the third angel has already begun in the revelation of the righteousness of Christ, the sin-pardoning Redeemer,” Ellen White wrote in 1892. “This is the beginning of the light of the angel whose glory shall fill the whole earth.” (Review and Herald, November 22, 1892, emphasis supplied).

Notice that this 1892 testimony states that the “loud cry” had already begun four years prior in the 1888 message given at Minneapolis, Minnesota by A. T. Jones and E. J. Waggoner. If the 1888 message was the beginning of the latter rain, the fact that the Church was still here in 2015 is proof that the Church had rejected, not only the 1888 message, *but that the Church had rejected the latter rain!* The fact that the Church in 2015 is still here confirms this point.

In a sermon preached at the 1893 General Conference session, A. T. Jones referred to this testimony given by Ellen White the previous year. He commented further on Ellen White’s statement that the giving of the 1888 message was the beginning of the “Latter Rain” and the “Loud Cry” of the third angel’s message.

“You remember the other evening when I was reading that second chapter of Joel, that one of the brethren, when I had read that 23rd verse—Brother Corliss—called attention to the margin. Do you remember that?” A. T. Jones asked the congregation. “And I said we would have use for the margin at another time.” (General Conference Bulletin, 1893, page 183).

“Now all of you turn and read that margin,” Jones continued. “The 23d verse says, ‘Be glad, then, ye children of Zion, and rejoice in the Lord your God: for he hath given you the former rain, moderately.’” (ibid., GCB, page 183).

What is the margin? “A teacher of righteousness.” He hath given you “a teacher of righteousness.” How? “According to righteousness.” “And he will cause to come down for you the rain”; then what will that be? When He gave the former rain, what was it? “A teacher of righteousness.” And when He gives the latter rain, what will it be? “A teacher of righteousness.” How? “According to righteousness.” Then is not that just what the testimony has told us in that article that has been read to you several times? “The loud cry of the third angel,” the latter rain has already begun, “in the message of the righteousness of Christ.” [R&H, 11/22/1892.] Is not that what Joel told us long ago? Has not our eye been held that we did not see? Did not we need the anointing? Brethren, what in the world do we need so much as that? How glad we ought to be that God sent His own Spirit in the prophets to show us, when we did not see! How infinitely glad we ought to be for that! ibid., Alonzo T. Jones, General Conference Bulletin, 1893, page 183.

“Well then the latter rain—the loud cry—according to the testimony and according to the Scripture, is ‘the teaching of righteousness,’ and ‘according to righteousness,’ too,” Jones concluded. (ibid., GCB, page 183).

Now brethren, when did that message of the righteousness of Christ, begin with us as a people? [One or two in the audience: “Three or four years ago.”] Which was it, three? or four? [Congregation: “Four.”] Yes, four. Where

*was it? [Congregation: “Minneapolis.”] What then did the brethren reject at Minneapolis? [Some in the Congregation: “The loud cry.”] What is that message of righteousness? The Testimony has told us what it is; the loud cry – the latter rain. Then what did the brethren in that fearful position in which they stood, reject at Minneapolis? They rejected the latter rain – the loud cry of the third angel’s message. *ibid.*, Alonzo T. Jones, *General Conference Bulletin*, 1893, page 183. (emphasis supplied).*

Will the leadership of the corporate Seventh-day Adventist Church ever repent? No, the Church leadership will never admit the need of repentance. They will go on in blindness until it is too late for repentance. They will forever consider themselves “the voice of God on earth to Seventh-day Adventists.” (William Johnsson, Editor in Chief, *Adventist Review*, in a television interview, *The John Ankerberg Show*).

General Conference Official Reply To Charge

In 1958 the leadership of the Seventh-day Adventist Church officially rejected the charges. The leadership also rejected the warning that if there was no corporate repentance the Church would ultimately reach out to Babylon and join in the world-wide Ecumenical movement that would soon embrace the religious world.

1. **First:** That at the General Conference session held in Minneapolis, Minnesota, in the year 1888, “we” – our church or denomination – rejected the light sent to us by the Lord through Brethren A. T. Jones and E. J. Waggoner on the subject of righteousness by faith; that since then we have been on a detour, presenting hazy ideas regarding righteousness by faith; and that we have been infatuated with a false Christ.
2. **Second:** That we can never get back on the track, and experience the full blessing of God in the outpouring of the latter rain, until the General Conference confesses that we rejected the light in Minneapolis. Our Answer: Certainly Brethren Wieland and Short have failed to prove that our church rejected the light in Minneapolis. Neither Brethren Wieland or Short nor anyone else can prove that this light was rejected. *The facts are that there was no action taken to reject it.*
3. The charge that we are infatuated with a false Christ and are presenting a false Christ is, we believe, unfounded. *We must record our inability to accept some of the things Brethren Wieland and Short say about the nature and work of Christ.*

Wieland and Short Manuscript Report, As Received By the Officers, page 3. (emphasis supplied).

Notice the arrogant and brazen admission of aversion to, and rejection of, the message presented by Waggoner and Jones in 1888, and the message-presented in 1950. Note SDA leadership’s bold rejection of the “human nature of Christ” as it was taught by Wagoner and Jones in their “most precious message.” Even more important than rejecting true doctrine, is the refusal of SDA leadership to repent.

SDA Leadership Denial Of Rejecting the 1888 Message

Denial Of Presenting A False Christ

“The charge that we are infatuated with a false Christ and are presenting a false Christ is, we believe, unfounded,” Committee statement. “We must record our inability to accept some of the things Brethren Wieland and Short say about the nature and work of Christ.” (ibid.)

The leadership of the Seventh-day Adventist Church in recent years has urged upon the people the idea that the messages of righteous by faith given in 1888 was totally accepted by the Church. Indeed, a book was

recently published by the *Review and Herald* in which the title of the book implied this very concept.

The Book, Through Crisis To Victory

The Seventh-day Adventist Church published a book on the history of the 1888 message entitled, *“Through Crisis to Victory.”* (*Review and Herald Publishing Association*, 1966). The author, A. V. Olson, was then chairman of the Ellen G. White Estate. When the second edition of this book was published the name was changed to *“13 Crisis Years.”* Arthur L. White, chairman of the White Estate at the time of the revision (1981), commented that the reason for the change in the title was that the former title, *“Through Crisis To Victory,”* implied total “victory” by the Church of the message of righteous by faith as given at the 1888 General Conference session. (See Arthur L. White, “Forward to the Second Edition,” A. V. Olson, *13 Crisis Years*, Revised Edition, 1981, pages 9-11). This statement by Arthur White was a left-handed admission of a “partial” rejection of the 1888 message.

Translation Faith – Bottom Line Of the 1888 Message

“And this true faith in Christ the Son of God as that true priest, in that true ministry, of that true sanctuary, at the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens,” A. T. Jones concluded, “that His priesthood and ministry finishes transgression and makes an end of sins and makes reconciliation for iniquity and brings in everlasting righteousness—this true faith will make every comer thereunto perfect. It will prepare him for the seal of God and for the final anointing of the Most Holy.” (*The Consecrated Way To Christian Perfection*, page 127, emphasis supplied).

The present time being the time when the coming of Jesus and the restitution of all things is at the very doors and this final perfecting of the saints having necessarily to precede the coming of the Lord and the restitution of all things, we know by every evidence that now we are in the times of refreshing—the time of the latter rain. And as certainly as that is so, we are also in the time of the utter blotting out of all sins that have ever been against us. And the blotting out of sins is exactly this thing of the cleansing of the sanctuary; it is the finishing of all transgression in our lives; it is the making an end of all sins in our character; it is the bringing in of the very righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ, to abide alone everlastingly. *ibid.*, A. T. Jones, *The Consecrated Way To Christian Perfection*, page 124. (emphasis supplied).

“Brethren, that is where we are,” Jones stated to the leadership of the Church in 1893. “Let us act like it. Let us thank the Lord that He is dealing with us still, to save us from our errors, to save us from our dangers, to keep us back from wrong courses, and to pour upon us the latter rain, that we may be translated.” (*Sermon, General Conference Daily Bulletin, 1893, page 185, emphasis supplied*).

“That is what the message means—translation—to you and me,” Jones implored. “Brethren, let us receive it with all the heart, and thank God for it.” (*ibid.*, GCB, 1893, page 185, emphasis supplied).

“And then in the righteousness, the peace, and the power of this true faith, let every soul who knows it spread abroad to all people and to the end of the world the glorious news of the priesthood of Christ,” Jones concluded, “of the cleansing of the sanctuary, of the finishing of the mystery of God, of the times of refreshing come, and of the soon coming of the Lord to be glorified in His saints and to be admired in all them that believe. . .in that day’ and to present to Himself a glorious church not having spot or wrinkle or any such

thing' but 'holy and without blemish.'” (ibid., The Consecrated Way To Christian Perfection, pages 128, 129, emphasis supplied).

Oh dear Lord, what have we done with this “most precious message?” If the latter rain began with the 1888 message, why are we still here in this wicked old world in 2015? In our earnest quest for truth we must find the answers to this most important question. One hundred and twenty six years have passed since the latter rain began to fall, and then was evidently withdrawn from an unbelieving Church. Oh Lord, is it too late? Is there yet time for our salvation? Let not the pronouncement be placed on us.

I need to repeat that I am not promoting Jones and Waggoner’s books after the mid 1890’s.

The 1888 message was right on but they moved away from it and apostatized. **I use Ellen White’s writings on the 1888 message in the Desire of Ages, Thoughts from the Mount of Blessings, Steps to Christ, Christ Object Lessons, and others.** Also, the four volume set **The Ellen G. White 1888 Materials is a trustworthy source on the 1888 message without the worry of error.**

Ellen White had to eventually tell Jones that he had gone to far and was confusing the message of 1888. He eventually joined up with John Harvey Kellogg and left the church. Here is one of the references from Ellen White to A.T. Jones:

I was attending a meeting, and a large congregation were present. In my dream you were presenting the subject of faith and the imputed righteousness of Christ by faith. You repeated several times that works amounted to nothing, that there were no conditions. The matter was presented in that light that I knew minds would be confused, and would not receive the correct impression in reference to faith and works, and I decided to write to you. You state this matter too strongly. There are conditions to our receiving justification and sanctification, and the righteousness of Christ. I know your meaning, but you leave a wrong impression upon many minds. While good works will not save even one soul, yet it is impossible for even one soul to be saved without good works. God saves us under a law, that we must ask if we would receive, seek if we would find, and knock if we would have the door opened unto us.

378

{ISM 377.1}

Christ offers Himself as willing to save unto the uttermost all who come unto Him. He invites all to come to Him. "Him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out" (John 6:37). You look in reality upon these subjects as I do, yet you make these subjects, through your expressions, confusing to minds. And after you have expressed your mind radically in regard to works, when questions are asked you upon this very subject, it is not lying out in so very clear lines, in your own mind, and you cannot define the correct principles to other minds, and you are yourself unable to make your statements harmonize with your own principles and faith. {ISM 378.1}

The young man came to Jesus with the question, "Good Master, what shall I do, that I may inherit eternal life?" (Mark 10:17). And Christ saith unto him, "Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is, God: but if thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." He saith unto Him, "Which?" Jesus quoted several, and the young man said unto Him, "All these things have I kept from my youth up: what lack I yet?" Jesus said unto him, "If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come and follow me." Here are conditions,

and the Bible is full of conditions. "But when the young man heard that saying, he went away sorrowful: for he had great possessions" (Matthew 19:17, 20, 21, 22). {ISM 378.2}

That whole section in 1 SM is worth reading.

WHAT HAPPENED TO JONES AND WAGGONER

Yet Satan was at work. He wanted to destroy the messengers who, with Ellen White, brought such great light to our people at Minneapolis. Already, by 1893, some of A.T. Jones' statements were becoming extravagant. **Ellen White had to write him that he should not teach that *there are no conditions to salvation*.** Carefully read *1 Selected Messages, 377-382*. As for E.J. Waggoner, both he and his father had been confused on whether Christ was a created being. Although God used erring men to help bring a message to His people, **we can only trust with fullest confidence the statements of the Spirit of Prophecy, not the fallible helpers raised up for a brief time to come to her aid.**

What happened to *Alonzo Trever Jones* in later years?

After writing against church leadership as a hierarchical power to be avoided, he quickly accepted the presidency of the California Conference when it was offered him in 1901. After serving for two years, he was invited by Dr. J.H. Kellogg to work with him. Ellen White had a way of learning things, and she immediately warned Jones not to unite with Kellogg. But, ignoring her warning, Jones resigned and, before heading east, stopped by to see Ellen White at Elmshaven. The present writer has read a transcript of that visit. It is a shocking presentation. Throughout the conversation, it is clear that A.T. Jones thought she was just an old woman who did not know any better than to try to give guidance to a man of Jones' brilliant stature.

Jones rejected the warning and joined Kellogg. And the Spirit of Prophecy warning was exactly fulfilled: Jones came under Kellogg's hypnotic influence. Keep in mind that John Harvey Kellogg, from the late-1890s onward, was rapidly developing his pantheism heresy. Jones was caught up in that. (Between July 23, 1904 and November 10, 1911, she wrote eleven letters to Jones, appealing for him to return to historic Adventism.)

Because he had essentially rejected the Spirit of Prophecy, A.T. Jones was ready for the next deception which came along: Albion Fox Ballenger (1861-1921). After Ellen White urged the leaders to meet that crisis head on in 1905, Jones, knowing full well that Ellen White declared it to be error, united with A.F. Ballenger. In Ballenger's periodical, *Gathering Call*, which announced his death (August 1921). Jones wrote profusely in that issue, praising Ballenger. Jones died only two years later (1923).

Do not consider Alonzo T. Jones a brother in the faith; after the mid-1890s, he was rapidly veering off, first into self-glorification, and later into outright heresy.

What happened to Waggoner in later years?

Five years younger than Jones, *Ellet J. Waggoner* remained editor of the *Signs of the Times* until 1891. Shortly after the Minneapolis Conference ended, early the next year he went to England where, from 1892-1897, he was editor of the British *Present Truth*. He became the first president of the South England Conference. After a visit to Battle Creek and J.H. Kellogg in 1897, he returned to London and began developing a theory, which he called *spiritual affinities*. In 1903, he returned to America for the General Conference Session and enthusiastically spoke of his precious new light, but Ellen White wrote him on October 2 of that year, warning him that it was Satan who was making Waggoner's theories appear beautiful and attractive, when in reality they were hideous (*Letter 230, 1903*). She warned him that he was in great peril, akin to being in the mazes of spiritualism (*Letter 231, 1903*). He ignored her warnings.

Three years later, she commented that Dr. Waggoner was then departing from the faith in the doctrine he held regarding spiritual affinities. In another letter, she said he was giving heed to seducing spirits and dangerous doctrines of devils (*Letter 121, 1906*). Two years later, she declared his theories to be dangerous misleading fables (*Letter 224, 1908*).

From 1903 onward, Waggoner remained in America. After a short period at Berrien Springs, he went to Battle Creek and also joined Kellogg! Jones probably encouraged him to come. Ellen White warned him to leave Battle Creek, but he foolishly disregarded her counsel. When we reach that point where we can go it alone without Gods Word we are headed for trouble and, erelong, we shall be deeply mired in sin and captivity to Satan.

A.T. Jones left God because he thought himself competent to plan and devise new theories for himself. He was an intellectual, and went off into doctrinal error and opposition to the Spirit of Prophecy.

E.J. Waggoner left God because he, too, imagined he could invent new religious theories. Beware of people who come to you with new theories! If their ideas sound strange and novel, it is generally because they are foreign to Bible/Spirit of Prophecy concepts. Dally with them but for a brief time, and you will become enmeshed in Satan's captivating power. Throwing an aura of exciting loveliness over them, he will enfold you in his coils.

Because Waggoner was the emotional type, and strong on feelings. his *spiritual affinities* theory was nothing more than an excuse for wickedness: He thought he could leave his wife and marry a different one, since he needed to select in advance the one he would be married to in heaven. So, while still on the staff of Battle Creek Sanitarium, he left his wife in 1906 and remarried. The last six years of his life he taught at Kellogg's Battle Creek College (1910-1916).

So, in a sense, we have come full circle. At Minneapolis, a mature understanding of righteousness by faith was presented, and the opponents wanted works alone. Today when that mature view is presented, the opponents want faith alone. All the while, the correct view of forgiveness and enabling obedience by faith in Christ (the message of the Third Angel: Revelation 14:12) is set aside, ridiculed, ignored, or repudiated.

LINK TO COMPLETE DOCUMENT:

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