

FALSIFYING HISTORY

Current SDA Leadership Rejection of the 1888 Message

*The prophets prophesy lies in my name: I sent them not,
neither have I commanded them, neither spake unto them:
they prophesy unto you a false vision and divination,
and a thing of nought, and the deceit of their heart.*

Jeremiah 14:14

Neil C. Livingston

The following article appeared in the *Adventist Review*, May 6, 1994, and was authored by William G. Johnsson, the editor-in-chief. Point seven of this article is a most flagrant distortion of Seventh-day Adventist history. Even more disturbing, in his editorial, Johnsson endorses the most subtle and dangerous theological heresy ever urged upon the Seventh-day Adventist Church -- the Ecumenical, Evangelical theology of Desmond Ford. Point seven of the *Adventist Review* article is presented here in its entirety with Biblical, Spirit of Prophecy, and pioneer Adventist historical documentation after each paragraph.

Paragraph #1 of Johnsson's *Adventist Review* Article

Part 7 - Two Theological Streams

The watershed in Adventist theology isn't as some want to claim, 1956, when the church issued *Questions on Doctrines*. Not 1956 but 1888 saw the origin of two distinct theological streams.

William G. Johnsson, Editor in Chief, *Adventist Review*, May 6, 1994. (emphasis supplied).

These two statements are a flagrant distortion of Seventh-day Adventist history! Even the Evangelical participants in the Seventh-day Adventist --Evangelical conferences of 1955-56 observed that, "The position of the Adventists seems to some us in certain cases to be a new position." (Donald Grey Barnhouse, "Are Seventh-day Adventists Christian?" *Eternity*, September, 1956). No, indeed. This statement by William Johnsson is a historical falsehood. The "two streams of theology," on righteous by faith currently dividing the Seventh-day Adventist Church did indeed come from the Seventh-day Adventist--Evangelical conferences of 1955-56 and in the publication of the book, *Questions on Doctrine*. (See, Neil C. Livingston, *The Greatest Conspiracy*, Chapter 12, "The Ultimate Betrayal.").

Thought Question

How could there be "two steams of theology" coming down to us from 1888 when the Seventh-day Adventist Church leadership state unequivocally that they accepted totally the 1888 message? (See, Livingston, *The Greatest Conspiracy*, Chapter 10, "A Warning and It's Rejection.").

Paragraph #2 of Johnsson's *Adventist Review* article

Adventists tend to be strong individuals, and from our earliest days we have debated and argued among ourselves (and with others) over doctrine. We united on a common platform of "present truth," but many differences have continued beyond the foundation.

ibid., Johnson, *Adventist Review*, May 6, 1994. (emphasis supplied).

The first statement is true. In our past Seventh-day Adventists have debated over points of doctrine. After the great disappointment of 1844 pioneer Adventists were establishing truth that had been lost since apostolic times. They were the builders of the "old waste places:" and they were raising up the "foundations of many generations," and they were called, "The repairer of the breach, The restorer of paths to dwell in." (Isaiah 58:12). However, after the foundation of truth was laid, our pioneer Seventh-day Adventists were totally united on the vital points of truth. If early Seventh-day Adventists were not united on truth, the movement would have died one hundred and fifty years ago.

"In presenting to the public this synopsis of our faith, we wish to have it distinctly understood that we have no articles of faith, creed, or discipline aside from the Bible," James White wrote in 1874. "We do not put forth this as having authority with our people, nor is it designed to secure uniformity among them, as a system of faith, *but is a brief statement of what is, and has been, with great unanimity, held by them.*" (James White, *Signs of the Times*, June 4, 1874, Editorial, Volume 1, Number 1, emphasis supplied).

Johnson's statement that, "many differences have continued beyond the foundation," is totally false. James White stated in 1874 that there was "great unanimity" held by Seventh-day Adventists. (See, Livingston, *The Greatest Conspiracy*, Chapter 7, "A Creed and A Church Manual.").

"We have nothing to fear for the future," Ellen White warned, "except as we shall forget the way the Lord has led us, and His teaching in our past history." (*Life Sketches*, page 196, emphasis supplied).

"My brethren, the value of the evidences of truth that we have received during the past half century, is above estimate," Ellen White wrote. "These evidences are as treasure hidden in a field." (*Review and Herald*, April 19, 1906, emphasis supplied). Note the date, 1906. Ellen White stated further that we should, "Study the Bible truths that for fifty years have been calling us out from the world." (*ibid.*).

No, friend. There is too much documented history. It is a historical fact that real "division" over "doctrinal" points did not come into the Church until 1955-56. (See, Livingston, *The Greatest Conspiracy*, Chapter 12, "The Ultimate Betrayal," page 225).

Thought Question

Because contemporary Seventh-day Adventist Church leaders, scholars, and teachers believe that pioneer Adventist were divided over doctrinal truth in the past; Is it any wonder that the Church is divided over doctrinal truth today?

Paragraph #3 of Johnson's *Adventist Review* article:

The two streams that flow from 1888 concern weightier than the king of the north, the "daily," or Armageddon, however. They reach to our most basic message, the one we are called to sound in Revelation 14--the everlasting gospel.

What must I do to be saved?" That is still the question on which Adventists differ.

ibid., Johnson, *Adventist Review*, May 6, 1994. (emphasis supplied).

To Johnson and other contemporary leaders of the "Adventist" church, the "everlasting gospel" of Revelation 14 is not the first angel's message; (1) the sanctuary message; or the second angel, (2) the message to come out of Babylon; or even the third angel, (3) a warning against the beast and his mark. Oh, no! That would be "beast bashing." Their concept of the Everlasting Gospel of Revelation 14 is an Everlasting, Evangelical, Ecumenical message. The very same gospel, the very same concept of righteousness by faith, that the Presbyterian and other large Evangelical denominations preach. "What must I do to be saved? That is still the question on which Adventists differ." The new theology of William Johnson and the contemporary Seventh-day Adventist Church teaches that the Christian should "only believe," and that the Christian is already saved! "I am saved," they say along with all other Evangelical, Babylon denominations of the day. Notice what Ellen White says about this "new" theology that came into our church directly as a result of the Evangelical Conferences of 1955-56:

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 Savior, 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 Savior 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).

Ellen White wrote this statement in 1897, referring to the Sunday churches of the day. Oh, how sad, dear reader, the shoe now fits the theology of the contemporary Seventh-day Adventist Church!

Paragraph #4 of Johnson's *Adventist Review* article:

One stream tends to emphasize the divine side in salvation without negating the human side, the other the human side without negating the divine. For one the key word is grace, for the other it is victory.

ibid., Johnson, *Adventist Review*, May 6, 1994. (emphasis supplied).

Johnson ridicules Seventh-day Adventists who believe in obedience and victory over sin by implying that Adventists who believe in victory over sin do not believe in Grace. Astounding! I know no Seventh-day Adventist who believes that it is possible to

overcome sin without the Grace of God. This concept is totally contrary to the Bible and the Spirit of Prophecy. Notice the plain testimony from the servant of the Lord:

We are never to rest in a satisfied condition, and cease to make advancement, saying, "I am saved. . ." No sanctified tongue will be found uttering these words till Christ shall come, and we enter in through the gates into the city of God. Then, with the utmost propriety, we may give glory to God and to the Lamb for eternal deliverance. As long as man is full of weakness,--for of himself he cannot save his soul,--he should never dare to say, "I am saved." It is not he that putteth on the armor that can boast of the victory; for he has the battle to fight and the victory to win. It is he that endureth unto the end that shall be saved. The Lord says, "If any man draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him." If we do not go forward from victory to victory, the soul will draw back to perdition. We should raise no human standard whereby to measure character. We have seen enough of what men call perfection here below. God's holy law is the only thing by which we can determine whether we are keeping his way or not. If we are disobedient, our characters are out of harmony with God's moral rule of government, and it is stating a falsehood to say, "I am saved." *No one is saved who is a transgressor of the law of God*, which is the foundation of his government in heaven and in earth.

Ellen G. White, "The Truth as It Is in Jesus," *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald*, June 17, 1890 (emphasis supplied).

Again, note the date. In the year 1890 Ellen White was traveling and speaking with E. J. Waggoner and A. T. Jones, *the authors of the 1888 message!*. Johnson wishes the reader to believe that contemporary Adventists (who are in good standing with the Conference, of course) are the only ones who believe in Grace, and that "historic" Adventists believe in salvation by works. Contemporary Adventist scholars incessantly imply that pioneer Adventists somehow did not preach a "Christ-centered" message. Notice Johnson's comments in the very next paragraph of his *Adventist Review* article:

Paragraph #5 of Johnson's *Adventist Review* article

Some of those in the "victory" stream see the issue in terms of a theological scheme that links Jesus' human nature with end-time perfection and the "delay" in the Second Coming. Christ *had* to be exactly like us, they argue, in order that we might overcome as He overcame, thus attaining sinless perfection, and until we reach that state, Jesus cannot come back.

ibid., Johnson, *Adventist Review*, May 6, 1994. (emphasis his).

Notice that Johnson emphasized the word "victory" and the word "*had*." "Some of those in the victory stream," he says.

Thoughtful Question: What does the Bible and the Spirit of Prophecy say about victory over sin in this life? First note a few Bible texts on victory over sin:

Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law: for sin is the transgression of the law. And ye know that he was manifested to take away our sins; and in him is no sin. Whosoever abideth in him sinneth not: whosoever sinneth hath not seen him, neither known him. (I John 3:4-6) (emphasis supplied).

For whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world: and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith. (I John 5:4) (emphasis supplied).

But thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ. (I Corinthians 15:57) (emphasis supplied).

And when Abram was ninety years old and nine, the Lord appeared to Abram, and said unto him, I am the Almighty God; walk before me, and be thou perfect. (Genesis 17:1) (emphasis supplied).

Thoughtful Questions: Did God demand something of Abraham that was impossible? I think not. What about Enoch and Elijah, who overcame sin and were translated? Did God translate sin into heaven? Do not Enoch and Elijah represent the last generation living on earth just before the second coming of Christ and are also translated?

By faith Enoch "was translated that he should not see death; . . . for before his translation he had this testimony, that he pleased God." Hebrews 11:15. In the midst of a world by its iniquity doomed to destruction, Enoch lived a life of such close communion with God that he was not permitted to fall under the power of death. The godly character of this prophet represents the state of holiness which must be attained by those who shall be "redeemed from the earth" (Revelation 14:3) at the time of Christ's second advent. . . . But like Enoch, God's people will seek for purity of heart and conformity to His will, until they shall reflect the likeness of Christ. Like Enoch, they will warn the world of the Lord's second coming and of the judgments to be visited upon transgression, and by their holy conversation and example they will condemn the sins of the ungodly. . . .

Ellen G. White, *Patriarchs and Prophets* (page 88,89) (emphasis supplied).

"And I saw as it were a sea of glass mingled with fire," the apostle John wrote, "and them that had gotten the victory over the beast, and over his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name, stand on the sea of glass, having the harps of God." (Revelation 15:2, emphasis supplied).

Johnsson also stated in this paragraph that those in the "victory" camp believed that "Christ *had* to be exactly like us." But, this is indeed truth, and was seen clearly by pioneer Seventh-day Adventists. Jesus was indeed exactly like us. What does Scripture say about the human nature of Jesus?

Thou madest him [man] a little lower than the angels; thou crownedst him with glory and honour, and didst set him over the works of thy hands. But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour; that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man. For both he that sanctifieth [Jesus] and they who are sanctified [human beings] are all of one: for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren. Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he [Jesus] also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil. For verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham. (Hebrews 2:7,9,11,13,14,16) (emphasis supplied).

Notice that "the seed of Abraham" is fallen human nature. Jesus was indeed just like you and me. Now notice carefully what Ellen White says about the nature Christ took upon himself while on earth:

"Think of Christ's humiliation," Ellen White stated. "He took upon Himself fallen, suffering human nature, *degraded and defiled by sin.*" (4BC:1147, emphasis supplied)

"In Christ were united the divine and the human - the Creator and the creature," Ellen White wrote. "The nature of God, whose law had been transgressed, and the nature of Adam, the transgressor, meet in Jesus - the Son of God and the Son of man." (7BC:926, emphasis supplied).

Notice that in the first statement Ellen White says that Christ took upon himself "fallen" human nature, and in the second statement Christ took upon himself the nature of Adam, "the transgressor." Adam after he had fallen was the transgressor. Ellen White taught that Christ took the nature of Adam "after" the fall. Contemporary Adventist "new" theology, the theology of William G. Johnsson, teaches that Christ took the nature of Adam before the fall. Notice the following contemporary Adventist statements that agree totally with the Roman Catholic view on the nature that Christ took upon himself while on earth:

Disbelief in the immaculate conception of the blessed virgin Mary would imply belief in the following revolting consequences; namely, that He who is holiness itself, and has an infinite horror of sin, took human nature from a corrupt human source.

Catholic Belief, (page 217), Quoted in Senior Sabbath School Lesson Quarterly, May 17, 1913, page 26. (emphasis supplied).

"Jesus was not like you and me when He was here upon earth," Donald Reynolds, former president of the Upper Columbia Conference wrote in harmony with the Catholic statement, "for He was never a sinner. He came to this earth as Adam before Adam fell. . ." (Donald G. Reynolds, "Adam and Evil," *Review and Herald*, July 1, 1965, emphasis supplied).

"He [Christ] was like Adam before his fall," Leroy Edwin Froom agrees. (*Movement of Destiny*, page 428).

"When the incarnate God broke into human history and became one with the race," Roy Allen Anderson, then president of the General Conference Ministerial, and Editor of *Ministry* magazine also agrees, "it is our understanding that He possessed the sinlessness of the nature with which Adam was created in Eden." (Roy Allen Anderson, "God With Us," *Ministry*, April, 1957, page 34, (emphasis supplied).

"Unlike the rest of the children of Adam, the soul of Mary was never subject to sin, even in the first moment of its infusion into the body," James Cardinal Gibbons wrote. "She alone was exempt from the original taint." (*The Faith of Our Fathers*, 88th Edition, page 171, emphasis supplied).

"Although born in the flesh, He [Christ] was nevertheless God," Seventh-day Adventist leadership agreed with the heresy of Cardinal Gibbons, "and was exempt from the inherited passions and pollutions that corrupt the natural descendants of Adam." (*Seventh-day Adventists Answer, Questions on Doctrine*, page 383, emphasis supplied).

Notice that in the two Roman Catholic statements both Mary and Jesus were "exempt" from what other human beings must pass through. Notice also the contemporary Seventh-day Adventist scholars agree in the statement from *Questions on Doctrine*!

In his book, *Movement of Destiny* (which was endorsed by then General Conference president, Robert Pierson, and vice-president, Neal Wilson) Leroy Edwin Froom quoted

the Evangelical scholar, Dr. E. Schuyler English on his understanding of Christ's human nature:

"He [Christ] was perfect in His humanity, but He was none the less God," Dr. Schuyler English, editor *Our Hope* stated, "and His conception in His incarnation was overshadowed by the Holy Spirit so that He did not partake of the fallen sinful nature of other men." (Quoted in *Movement of Destiny*, page 469, emphasis supplied).

Froom then stated, "That, we in turn assured him [Dr. Schuyler English], is precisely what we [Seventh-day Adventists] likewise believe." (See, Leroy Edwin Froom, *Movement of Destiny*, page 470, emphasis supplied).

Thought Question

Why did the contemporary Seventh-day Adventist Church change its view on the human nature of Christ in the mid-1950's? Francis D. Nichol, former editor in chief of the *Review and Herald*, gives us the answer to our question.

Critics, especially those who see the Scriptures through Calvinistic eyes, read into the term, "sinful flesh" something that Adventist theology does not require. Thus if we use the term, "sinful flesh" in regard to Christ's human nature, as some of our writers have done, we lay ourselves open to misunderstanding. True, we mean by the term simply that Christ "took on him the seed of Abraham," and was made "in the likeness of sinful flesh," but critics are not willing to believe this.

Francis D. Nichol, *Answers to Objections*, (page 397) (emphasis supplied).

Notice that Nichol was concerned about what "critics" thought about Seventh-day Adventists -- "especially those who see the Scriptures through Calvinistic eyes." Then Nichol states, "Thus if we use the term, 'sinful flesh' in regard to Christ's human nature, as some of our writers have done, we lay ourselves open to misunderstanding." Ellen White was one of those writers!

Thought Question

What did E. J. Waggoner and A. T. Jones, and other pioneer Seventh-day Adventists teach about the human nature of Christ?

Note first the following statement by a noted Roman Catholic and then the teaching of E. J. Waggoner on the nature of Christ:

"We define that the Blessed Virgin Mary in the first moment of her conception, by the singular grace and privilege of Almighty God, in virtue of the merits of Jesus Christ, the Savior of the human race, was preserved free from every stain of original sin." (pii Papae IX, *Bulla Dogmat.*, quoted in *The Faith of Our Fathers*, 88th Edition, page 171. (emphasis supplied).

E. J. Waggoner's Reply to the Above Roman Catholic Statement

Was that holy thing which 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?

Are we truly out of the church of Rome? There are a great many that have got the marks yet, but I am persuaded of this, that every soul who is here to-night 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.

Do you not see that the idea that the flesh of Jesus was not like ours (because we know ours is sinful) necessarily involves the idea of the immaculate conception of the virgin Mary? 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?

Elliot J. Waggoner, *General Conference Bulletin* (1901), pages 404-406 (emphasis supplied).

Contrary to contemporary Seventh-day Adventist history teachers, the main thrust of the 1888 message was on the fallen human nature Jesus assumed while on earth. Notice that the teaching of A. T. Jones, the other messenger sent by the Lord to Seventh-day Adventists in 1888, was in perfect harmony with that of E. J. Waggoner:

A. T. Jones Statement On Christ's Human Nature

By what means was Christ made flesh? 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." 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."

Accordingly, it is further written; "God sent forth His Son, *made of a woman*." Gal. 4:4. He, being made of a woman in *this world*, in the nature of things He was made of the only *kind* of woman this world knows.

But why must He be made of a woman? why not of a man?--For the simple reason that to be made of a man would not bring Him close enough to mankind as mankind is, under sin. He was made of a woman in order that He might come, *in the very uttermost*, to where human nature is in its sinning.

Alonzo T. Jones, *The Consecrated Way to Human Perfection* (page 26) (emphasis supplied).

Indeed, the title of A. T. Jones' book, "The Consecrated Way to Human Perfection" states clearly his teaching on the subject. The reader can judge for himself by some of the chapter titles -- "Christ as Man" "He Took Part of the Same" "Made Under the Law" "Made of a Woman" "The Law of Heredity" "In All Things Like" and "Perfection." It seems that the *Adventist Review* editor, William Johnsson, and the contemporary Seventh-day Adventist leadership do not even know what the 1888 message was all about -- else why would they have a contrary view to our pioneers on the very nature of our Lord?

Paragraph #6 of Johnsson's *Adventist Review* article

You can find several theological variants on the above scheme, but the radical dissidents among us -- those who are becoming offshoots -- all share it. They charge the official church with apostasy because it does not endorse the scheme. Strongly antiauthoritarian, they employ print and video to propagate their views, accept tithing funds, and run parallel meetings and camp meetings. Some have gone so far as to ordain their own clergy.

ibid., Johnson, *Adventist Review*, May 6, 1994. (emphasis supplied).

Here Johnsson resorts to name-calling; "radical dissidents" "offshoots" "strongly antiauthoritarian" "accept tithe funds" "run parallel meetings and camp meetings" and "ordain their own clergy." He seems to take a pun from the Seventh-day Adventist-Evangelical conferences of 1955-56. Then it was stated that anyone disagreeing from the Conferees and the leadership of the Church were a "lunatic fringe" and "wild-eyed irresponsibles." (See, Donald G. Barnhouse, *Eternity*, September, 1956).

In defense of the so-called "dissidents" and "offshoots" it must be stated that most of the leaders of these independent ministries were former employees of the Seventh-day Adventist church. Indeed, Ron Spear, of "Our Firm Foundation" ministries was formerly a field secretary of the Review and Herald. Colen Standish, "Heartland Institute" ministries was formerly the Dean of Columbia Union College. His brother, Russell Standish, was for many years the head of the Bangkok Seventh-day Adventist Hospital. Ralph Larson, well known independent speaker, was formerly the pastor of Loma Linda Campus Hills church, and professor of theology at Philippians Union College. Incidentally, his book, *The Word Was Made Flesh*, "One Hundred Years of Seventh-day Adventist Christology, 1852-1952," is a masterpiece of research on the human nature of Christ. Many others were faithful ministers and laymen of the Seventh-day Adventist church. All of the above named men believed strongly that the Seventh-day Adventist Church would someday reform. All were disfellowshipped, excommunicated, from the Church. Not because of their personal theology, but because they would not obey the authority of the Church above Scripture and the Spirit of Prophecy. They meet together, worship and pray together. They hold meetings, preach reform, teach laymen how to witness in door-to-door ministry. They conduct Bible training schools--witness through videos and cassette tapes. When the pope visits America and other countries, they use the opportune moment to hand out *The Great Controversy* and other literature to warn the people of the "Beast and his Mark," which, of course, is the Third Angel's Message. The official Church accuses them of "beast bashing."

The Independent ministries are ministries of action. They do -- that is the key word. They work, they witness, they do, all the things the official Seventh-day Adventist Church should be doing and is not. As Alden Thompson, professor of theology at Walla Walla College, stated in a snide remark about these faithful Adventists, "they make homes in the country and work the large cities, carrying with them cheap newsprint copies of the Great Controversy."

Thought Questions

Does that statement by Thompson sound familiar? Was not this the work of the Waldenses during the great apostasy of the dark ages?

Paragraph #7 of Johnsson's *Adventist Review* article

None so far has registered as a separate denomination, although in function that is what they are. Here Ellen White, who they otherwise seek to quote to support their position, denies, categorically their logical course.

Will these dissident groups unite in a major schism? Can we find unity on what the everlasting gospel really is?

William G. Johnsson, "Seven Factors Fragmenting the Church," *Adventist Review*, May 6, 1994, pages 12-14.

The so-called "dissident" Adventist are really faithful Seventh-day Adventists. They do not believe in making a new denomination. They were cast out, or they would still be with the Church, trying to bring reform to the many "Laodicean" brethren who are sleeping so soundly in Zion. Indeed, it is the contemporary Seventh-day Adventist Church leadership who have fabricated a new Church, a "new theology," and "books of a new order."

The Seventh-day Adventist Church Now the Omega of Deadly Heresy

"In the book 'Living Temple' there is presented the alpha of deadly heresies," Ellen White warned. "The Omega will follow, and will be received by those who are not willing to heed the warning God has given." (*Testimonies for the Church Containing Letters to Physicians and Ministers Instruction to Seventh-day Adventists*, page 50, emphasis supplied).

"Living Temple" contains the alpha of these theories," Ellen White wrote. "I knew that the Omega would follow in a little while; and I trembled for our people." (*Testimonies for the Church Containing Letters to Physicians and Ministers Instruction to Seventh-day Adventists*, page 53, emphasis supplied).

Under the Omega There Will Be "Books of A New Order"

The enemy of souls has sought to bring in the supposition that a great reformation was to take place among Seventh-day Adventists, and that this reformation would consist in giving up the doctrines which stand as the pillars of our faith, and engaging in a process of re-organization."

Ellen G. White, *Special Testimonies for the Church*, Series B., page 54. (emphasis supplied).

"Were this reformation to take place, what would result?" Ellen White asked, then answered her own question: (*ibid.*).

The principles of truth that God in His wisdom has given to the remnant church, would be discarded. *Our religion would be changed.* The fundamental principles that have sustained the work for the last fifty years would be accounted as error. A new organization [theology] would be established. Books of a new order would be written. A system of intellectual philosophy [Self-Esteem] would be introduced. *The founders of this system would go into the cities, and do a wonderful work.* The Sabbath, of course, would be lightly regarded, as also the God who created it. *Nothing would be allowed to stand in the way of the new movement* [the new theology]. The leaders would teach that virtue is better than vice, *but God being removed,* they would place their dependence on human power, which, without God, is worthless. Their foundation would be built on the sand, *and storm and tempest would sweep away the structure.*

ibid., Ellen G. White, *Special Testimonies for the Church*, Series B., page 54. (emphasis supplied).

"Who has authority to begin such a movement?" Ellen White asked. (*ibid.*). Then she answers her own question:

We have our Bibles. We have our experience, attested to by the miraculous working of the Holy Spirit. We have a truth that admits of no compromise. Shall we not repudiate everything that is not in harmony with this truth?

ibid., Ellen G. White, *Special Testimonies for the Church*, Series B., page 54. (emphasis supplied).

"It may be that the destroyers are already training under the hand of Satan," Ellen White concluded. (*ibid.*).

As to William Johnsson's last statement, "Can we find unity on what the everlasting gospel really is?" The problem is that the contemporary Seventh-day Adventist Church, since 1950, is teaching Evangelical gospel, the gospel of the Sunday churches of Babylon. (See, *Questions on Doctrine*, also, *Movement of Destiny*). Sadly, even the Evangelical leaders see that the Seventh-day Adventist Church has changed. Note their observations:

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

William Johnsson's Conclusion in His *Adventist Review* Article

The Days Ahead: As I consider the factors tending to fragment the Seventh-day Adventist church - and there are more than the seven I have listed I would be pessimistic except for one factor - Jesus.

Jesus Christ is head of the church, not any individual (Col. 1:15-20). He gave Himself for the church; the church is His bride. He wants to present the church pure and spotless to His Father (Eph. 5:26, 27).

And John saw the church in vision. He saw a vast numberless multitude redeemed from every nation, kindred, tongue and people (Rev. 7:9,10). He saw them - saw those who came through the end-time crisis (Rev. 14:1-5).

"The church may appear as about to fall, but it does not fall," wrote Ellen White (*Selected Messages*, Book 2, p. 380). How true that has been in the past! And it will continue to be true in the days ahead.

I believe the miracle will continue. I believe, not merely because I am an inveterate optimist, but because I believe in Jesus. I believe that His cross has won the victory over evil for all time and guarantees the future of the church.

William G. Johnson, Editor in Chief, *Adventist Review*, May 6, 1994. (emphasis supplied).

William Johnsson, like the rest of the Seventh-day Adventist leadership, believe that the corporate Church will go through to the end. He stated that he believes the cross "guarantees the future of the church," which is true. However, Johnsson believes the corporate Seventh-day Adventist Church to be "the Church." that will go through to the end. With this erroneous conclusion it is obviously that contemporary Adventist leadership no longer believe in "the time of trouble," when the true people of God cannot buy or sell, and therefore cannot pay tithe and offerings to support the Church. They no

longer believe in the close of probation or the seven last plagues to be poured out before the return of Jesus. The conclusion must be that when Jesus returns the leading brethren will simply walk out of the conference offices and step onto the waiting cloud that will take them all to heaven.

Further, Johnsson states that millions of people will be translated to heaven without seeing death. "And John saw the church. . . a vast numberless multitude. . . *those who came through the end-time crisis* " (*ibid.*, emphasis supplied). This is the absurd conclusion Seventh-day Adventist Church leadership has propagated since Church membership surpassed 144,000.

God's true people have always been a small group. Not because the Lord planned it that way, but because man almost always chooses the broad road, rather than the straight and narrow.

"Because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life," Jesus said sadly, "and few there be that find it." (Matthew 7:14).

At the time of the flood, there were only eight souls saved. From the many who came out of Egypt, only two entered the Promised Land. Will there be millions translated? Oh, it would be wonderful, dear reader, if it was only true!

Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom. (Luke 12:32).

§ § § § §