

# An Open Document Addressed to the General Conference of SDA: The Omega of Deadly Heresies

## **CONTENDING FOR THE FAITH: THE OMEGA HERESY IS AMONG US 1st QUARTER 2017 "THE HOLY SPIRIT AND SPIRITUALITY"**

Note: The following document was written expressly for the consideration of the General Conference of Seventh day Adventists. It was written as a reproof to them, and a warning to those who would yield their minds to following men without thorough and intelligent study of the Bible. This address was specifically to the elders of the churches in the New Brunswick conference; and also to Pastor Ricky Schwarz and Maritimes General Conference president Paul Llewelyn, who gave a clear ultimatum to: (1) Submit to the conference in respect to the Trinity doctrine (with no clear consensus as to what we are to submit to in regards to what constitutes a Biblical Trinity) or (2) Renounce the name Seventh-day Adventist under certain legal ramifications for us and this ministry. In this document however, we cannot submit to either. For to submit to the first would be to accept what is clearly defined in this document as the omega of deadly heresies, and to have no clear defineable position upon which to rest my faith- thus it would be a denial of Christ; to submit to the second would be amiss, seeing as this message was given expressly for Seventh-day Adventists, of which I am, and not another people; the warning given to Seventh-day Adventists regarding the Omega of deadly heresies must also be given to this people, even though it's an unsavory message to a people who have at times felt "in need of nothing", I give it from the Christ who I love to the people who I love who profess faith in the third angel's message. To such as would ask me to go elsewhere with the message I've been given as the conference president Paul Llewelyn has, the word of Amos to Amaziah the priest of Bethel is sufficient: "Also Amaziah said unto Amos, O thou seer, go, flee thee away

into the land of Judah, and there eat bread, and prophesy there: But prophesy not again any more at Bethel: for it is the king's chapel, and it is the king's court. Then answered Amos, and said to Amaziah, I was no prophet, neither was I a prophet's son; but I was an herdman, and a gatherer of sycomore fruit: And the LORD took me as I followed the flock, and the LORD said unto me, Go, prophesy unto my people Israel. Now therefore hear thou the word of the LORD: Thou sayest, Prophecy not against Israel, and drop not thy word against the house of Isaac. Therefore thus saith the LORD; Thy wife shall be an harlot in the city, and thy sons and thy daughters shall fall by the sword, and thy land shall be divided by line; and thou shalt die in a polluted land: and Israel shall surely go into captivity forth of his land." (Amos 7:12-17)

To put it plainly, there is nowhere else in the world that this message applies but to those who profess Seventh-day Adventism.

I've used conference-accepted material to weightily define this position and conclusion that the present Trinity doctrine within the conference is the very omega of deadly heresies prophesied by the prophetess who warned the conference that these things should come, and that the people should be aware. This is among the chiefest of the warnings to come from the True Witness to the Laodicean church. He says to the church "repent" or the warning of captivity is certain. "Defile not ye yourselves in any of these things: for in all these the nations are defiled which I cast out before you: And the land is defiled: therefore I do visit the iniquity thereof upon it, and the land itself vomiteth out her inhabitants...(For all these abominations have the men of the land done, which were before you, and the land is defiled;) That the land spue not you out also, when ye defile it, as it spued out the nations that were before you."(Lev. 18:24-28)

With several attempts to communicate to the leadership regarding this, and with only threatenings and mostly silence, not even so much as a word being answered, with confused and divided positions amongst those who profess to be leaders of the people, I have chosen to make this document visible and open for all, and desiring that if there is clear evidences regarding a difference of opinion regarding the omega, that it is other than what I've published, please come and reason together with me in honesty and transparency of heart. I am willing to be corrected, but only by the reasonable weight of evidences. The author gives permission for

this document to be printed freely and shared with the leaders of the various conferences throughout the world. May the true God hear and bless the readers of this piece.~ Administrator of the Loud Cry of the Third Angel

“The religion of Jesus is endangered. It is being mingled with worldliness. Worldly policy is taking the place of the true piety and wisdom that comes from above, and **God will remove His prospering hand from the conference.** Shall the Ark of the Covenant **be removed from this people?** Shall **idols be smuggled in?** Shall false principles and false precepts be **brought into the sanctuary?** Shall **antichrist** be respected? Shall **the true doctrines and principles given us by God**, which have made us what we are, **be ignored?** ...This is directly where the enemy, through blinded, unconsecrated men, **is leading us.”** (MANUSCRIPT RELEASES, VOL. 21 [NOS. 1501-1598], PAGE 448)

I want to be clear before beginning that I have been concerned about the state of our churches. For some time there has seemed to be a deepening worldly manner that has come about in amongst professed Adventists, and we ought to ask the question “Where is our God?” but instead, week unto week, we just continue to drift. We have no real burden for souls, nor for searching the Scriptures. We do not study out the Scripture for ourselves to know what we believe, and can't defend what we believe from them. We have relied on teachers so fully, that they have become our Scriptures. We've fed on the words of pastors and books of people who may have, to more or less degree, studied the Bible for themselves, yet the Scripture's hidden treasure lay uncovered because it takes effort, even deep digging, to seek it out. This is the general condition existing today amongst God's professed people.

I ask you all to study for yourselves what is Bible truth. Do not let the pastor or someone else do your studying for you, saying with the foolish virgins, “Give me of your oil” to those who are wise. Neither think that what I write here is true just because I say it and quote quotes. You must study with an honest heart for the truth yourself. Here is some counsel:

“Those who allow prejudice to bar the mind against the reception of truth cannot receive the divine enlightenment. Yet, when a view of Scripture is presented, many do not ask,

**Is it true—in harmony** with God's word? but, **By whom** is it advocated? and **unless it comes through the very channel that pleases them, they do not accept it.** So thoroughly satisfied are they with their own ideas that

they will not examine the Scripture evidence with a desire to learn, but refuse to be interested, merely **because of their prejudices.**

The Lord often works where we least expect Him; He surprises us by revealing His power through instruments of His own choice, while He passes by the men to whom we have looked as those through whom light should come. **God desires us to receive the truth upon its own merits—because it is truth.**

The Bible must not be interpreted to suit the ideas of men, however long they may have held these ideas to be true. **We are not to accept the opinion of commentators as the voice of God; they were erring mortals like ourselves.** God has given reasoning powers to us as well as to them. We should make the Bible its own expositor.

All should be careful about presenting new views of Scripture before they have given these points thorough study, and are fully prepared to sustain them from the Bible. Introduce nothing that will cause dissension, without clear evidence that in it God is giving a special message for this time. But beware of rejecting that which is truth. The great danger with our people has been that of depending upon men and making flesh their arm. **Those who have not been in the habit of searching the Bible for themselves, or weighing evidence, have confidence in the leading men and accept the decisions they make; and thus many will reject the very messages God sends to His people, if these leading brethren do not accept them.**" (Testimonies to Ministers and Gospel Workers, p. 105)

What I will present here, I fully believe, is a special message for this time. I pray all will be tolerant to investigate what is here said, and take the above counsel to heart instead of closing their minds off. Be willing to investigate the matter more deeply is my request to the reader of this article. Please, DO YOUR RESEARCH, even when you are convicted that a matter is true, and embrace the "weight of evidence" as sister White admonishes!

"Those who **desire to doubt will have plenty of room.** God does not propose **to remove all occasion for unbelief.** He gives evidence, which must be carefully investigated with a humble mind and a teachable spirit, and all should decide **from the weight of evidence.** God **gives sufficient evidence** for the candid mind to believe; but he who turns from the weight of evidence because there are a few things which he cannot make plain to his finite understanding will be left in the cold, chilling atmosphere of unbelief and questioning doubts, and will make shipwreck of faith."

(5 Testimonies for the Church, p. 675, 676)

Do not accept it because this one says it, or that one says it, or the pastor says it, or whether it be Stephen Bohr, or Walter Veith, or Doug Batchelor. Know for yourself what is truth; and be personally acquainted with the God of the Scriptures. Prayerfully ask our heavenly Father what is truth. May He guide all of His honest children to see the light as it is in Jesus. Let no one say "I am of Paul" or "I am of Apollos", but rather, let us all be of Christ, and true sons of the pioneers in searching the Scriptures earnestly as they did. The only problems in the churches that have ever arisen is because the children of the reformation churches are seldom actuated by the same Spirit as their fathers, but settle on the light they have received; thus spiritual decline and backsliding inevitably results. If ever they are actuated by such a nobility of spirit, the churches that have settled will have a tendency to crucify the light they set forth from the Bible.

As you read this, I am going to address my very real concerns here. I do this to address those concerns, but NOT to replace your mind or your Bibles. I love this church, and I love Seventh-day Adventism. Most of my quotes here shall be Ellen White quotes, including warnings she gave to our church about the danger she foresaw coming into it. Furthermore, I humbly resign myself to these quotes as a basis for this study, and say that what has been written here was long enough already, and is by no means exhaustive. I ask that you will also give those quotes prayerful consideration, and analyze their context. It is the wholehearted conviction of the writer that the danger sister White spoke about **has come** to fruition already, and is alive in the churches today. While I hesitate to share this document with you all, knowing it may be cause for a strong antagonism against me, I must be true to duty, as we all are accountable to God for the light committed to us. I know if this be truth, then any antagonism that is manifested is not verily toward me, but toward Christ who strengthens me. I love you all and pray the mighty agency of the third person of the Godhead, the Spirit of Christ, to guide you into all truth by Christ's sustaining presence, in accordance with the will of the Almighty Father of lights. Amen.

**OUT ADVENTIST HERITAGE IS BEING DENIED IN THE MOST SUBTLE WAY:** The quarterly for beginning of 2017 is on the subject of the Holy Spirit. We are zealous for our history as Adventists, and believe that the truths God has committed to His church in the third angel's message are to be second to none. This prophetic platform of the first, second, and third angel's messages were messages that gave our people a divine directive to warn the world. What underhanded influences would come into our church since Ellen White's death which would do things to undermine those messages? There have been many that things that have gone unnoticed, but

not unwarned.

In the words of George Santayana, "Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it." As Adventists, we believe prophecy will be repeated again. What was before, comes again; for the principles of history, once repeated, result in the same consequences. The Papal beast that was in the dark ages is being resurrected, and her children are partaking of her intolerant spirit, and Donald Trump is giving them a voice in the nation, and promising the Protestants power under his presidency. These moments should cause us to solemnly reflect on history, and understand that those who forget the lessons of the past will go over the same ground again. Likewise it is in Adventism; we would do well to be informed fully regarding the past so that we can rightly contend for the faith that was once delivered to the saints. Here is our admonition and opportunity: "We have nothing to fear for the future, except as we shall forget the way the Lord has led us, and

**His teaching in our past history."** (Life Sketches, pg. 196)

In the days of early Adventism, John Harvey Kellogg wrote a book called "The Living Temple". Ellen White was very concerned with this book, as it expressed pantheistic ideas regarding God's person and His presence, which was denying our teachings regarding God:

"In the book ' Living Temple ' there is presented

**the alpha of deadly heresies....**Living Temple contains the alpha of these theories. I knew that the omega would follow in a little while; and I trembled for our people. I knew that I must warn our brethren and sisters not to enter into controversy **over the presence and personality of God.** The statements made in ' Living Temple' in regard to this point are incorrect. The Scripture used to substantiate the doctrine there set forth, is Scripture misapplied." (1 Selected Messages, pg. 200-203)

Notice what her concern was over. It was called a "deadly heresy" regarding "the presence and personality of God." She said regarding Kellogg's conclusions that Scripture was being "misapplied". Ellen White wrote over the fact that many could

not discern the dangers that Kellogg had come to believe regarding this heresy. Indeed, there were many believing it was the great light which was to unfold before the people of God; even believing (wrongly) sister White sustained the same ideas in her own writings:

“I am compelled to speak in denial of the claim that the teachings in ‘ Living Temple ‘ can be sustained by statements from my writings. There may be in this book expressions and sentiments that are in harmony with my writings. And there may be in my writings many statements which, taken from their connection, and interpreted according to the mind of the writer of ‘ Living Temple ‘, would seem to be in harmony with the teachings of this book. This may give apparent support to the assertion that the sentiments in ‘ Living Temple ‘ are in harmony with my writings. But God forbid that this sentiment should prevail.” (1 Selected Messages pg. 203)

She also warned that the omega of deadly heresies would follow; that it would be of the same nature, distorting the truth regarding the personality and presence of God. Saying:

“Be not deceived; many will depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils. We have now before us the alpha of this danger.” (Special Testimonies, Series B, no. 2, pg. 16) “The omega will follow, and will be received by those who are not willing to heed the warning God has given.” “I knew that the omega would follow in a little while; and I trembled for our people.” (Series B, no. 2, pp. 50, 53)

She clearly declared this would be a departure from the faith once delivered to the saints, “giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils”. She plainly stated this doctrinal heresy would be the voice of another spirit, rather than the Voice of God’s Spirit, while many would believe it was thus. If the controversy was thought of as being sustained by her writings in the Alpha, how much more would it be thought in

the omega that her writings sustained the same sentiments? Ellen White gave counsel of what would aid in keeping us grounded in the truth regarding this dangerous alpha heresy: "We need to study the words that Christ uttered in the prayer that He offered just before His trial and crucifixion. "...And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent." (Special Testimonies, Series B, No. 2, 12-17)

Ellen White spoke at her final address to the General Conference, giving one final message of warning to our people to know the testimonies she gave in this respect; that we might know that the same ground Kellogg went over WOULD BE REPEATED and nothing would stop it:

"I am charged to tell our people, that do not realize, that the devil has device after device, and he carries them out in ways that they do not expect. Satan's agencies will invent ways to make sinners out of saints. I tell you now, that when I am laid to rest

**GREAT CHANGES will take place.** I do not know when I shall be taken; and I desire to warn all against the devices of the devil. I want the people to know that **I warned them fully** before my death." Manuscript 1, February 24, 1915

Notice she said that the way the devil brings his devices to pass are SUBTLE; the people do not realize nor expect the devices to be brought about; we seldom think we could ever be in this class, which is what would make the deception all the greater. She said great changes would take place amongst the people, but that those changes could hardly be noticed seems inconceivable. Yet notice what she says would come: "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 reorganization. Were this reformation to take



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

Who has authority to begin such a movement? We have our Bibles, we have our experience, attested to by the miraculous working of the Holy Spirit. **We have a truth that admits of no compromise**. Shall we not repudiate everything that is not in harmony with this truth? (1 Selected Messages, 204, 205)

Notice very clearly what is being said here. Through internal reformation and reorganization, "a new organization would be established." This would result in God being removed, and that it would be fleshly strength, **apart from the divine presence**, which would be in operation. A startling visualization comes in of the Laodicean church that is depicted in **Revelation chapter 3**. Christ is **standing outside of the door of the church**, knocking and **calling to repentance a church that has shut Him out**, yet thinking she has done no such thing and in no need of repentance- thus in her blindness, she rejects the voice of her Master, unless she carefully takes heed.

Before understanding what Kellogg came to believe, so we might understand how today Adventism has gone over the same ground again, **we must understand the condition of the church in the last days, when this "new organization" is fully formed**. We are told "Nothing would be allowed to stand in the way" of them removing the true pillars of our Adventist faith all in the name of Seventh-day Adventism. This is a terrible tragedy, but it must happen. We see Laodicea without the presence of God, because He is standing outside. Likewise, "God being

removed” because of this dangerous heresy that takes hold of the church, the leadership will largely prevent the message from being proclaimed and will disfellowship any who declare it. Christ’s voice is crucified in His servants the prophets, even as with Israel of old. We are given a startling warning from sister White of what happens because of Laodicean blindness that blinds the eyes of the people:

“The religion of Jesus is endangered. It is being mingled with worldliness. Worldly policy is taking the place of the true piety and wisdom that comes from above, and **God will remove His prospering hand from the conference**. Shall **the Ark of the Covenant be removed** from this people? Shall idols be **smuggled in**? Shall false principles and false precepts be brought into the sanctuary? **Shall antichrist be respected**? Shall the true doctrines and principles given us by God, which have made us what we are, be ignored? Shall God’s instrumentality, the publishing house, become a mere political, worldly institution? This is directly where the enemy, **through blinded**, unconsecrated men, is leading us.” (MANUSCRIPT RELEASES, VOL. 21 [NOS. 1501-1598], PAGE 448)

Likewise, in Ezekiel 8 and 9, we are told in symbolic vision of the temple, how the church will be in the last days. True doctrine and principles give by God are counted as error, and the Ark of the covenant is removed because idols are carefully brought into the church in a more subtle manner than J.H. Kellogg. The leaders are represented as being enjoined to those who have rejected the truth and as cherishing false concepts of God, even women weeping for Tammuz (part of the triad of Babylonian deities- Nimrod [the sun father], Tammuz [the reincarnated Nimrod- his son], and Semiramis [the queen of heaven who gives birth to the children of the sun father]. This is depicted in Ezekiel 8. God declares for those who have eyes to see and are not blindly being lead along into error: “Son of man, see you what they do? even the great abominations that the house of Israel commits here, that I **should go far**

**off from my sanctuary?"** "God being removed" from the sanctuary is the greatest heartache- and Laodicea is victim to this condition of things, and thinking that no such condition of things exists- thus showing she herself is victim to her own deceivings. Then in Ezekiel 9, there is a class of people revealing God's character for sin. They are mourning the terrible condition and blindness of the people, and crying out for their repentance. These are sealed on their foreheads, "And the LORD said unto him, Go through the midst of the city, through the midst of Jerusalem, and set a mark upon the foreheads of the men that sigh and that cry **for all the abominations that be done in the midst** thereof."

"Mark this point with care: Those who receive the pure mark of truth, wrought in them by the power of the Holy Ghost, represented by a mark by the man in linen, are those 'that sigh and that cry **for all the abominations that be done' in the church.** Their love for purity and the honor and glory of God is such, and they have so clear a view of the exceeding sinfulness of sin that they are represented as being in agony, even sighing and crying." (Testimonies, Vol. 3, p. 266-267)

Ellen White prophesies about this experience, and saying that the leaders will prevent the warning from being clearly given at this time:

"In the very courts of the temple, scenes will be enacted that few realize. God's people will be proved and tested, that He may discern 'between him that serveth God and him that serveth Him not.' Vengeance will be executed against those who sit in the gate, deciding what the people should have and what they should not have. **These take away the key of knowledge.** They refuse to enter in themselves, and those who would enter in they hinder. These bear not the seal of the living God. All who now occupy responsible positions should be solemnly and terribly afraid lest in this time they shall be found as unfaithful stewards." (Manuscript 15, 1886, Paulson Collection, p. 55)

These take away the key of knowledge. And what knowledge is it? It is knowledge that is key to God's presence being in our midst. It is this key that is taken away, so that the ark of the covenant is removed from the temple because of its abominations. Historically, the ark of the covenant was removed before the Babylonian captivity. In the apocryphal account, we are told that faithful priest and messenger Jeremiah took the ark before the Babylon took the city captive for its iniquities, because **they had set up the worship of the gods of Babylon in the temple**. Likewise, the priesthood duties that were given to the Levites was originally to be given to all of the tribes of Israel, but because of golden calf worship, all but the Levites, who would not bow to worship the gods of the land they came out from, that privilege was taken away from them, that they should be no priests. God would permit only the Levites to bear the ark of the covenant.

When this key of knowledge in the Scripture is taken away, the qualifications of the priesthood are renounced as these abominations begin to bear full sway in the churches: "Hear the word of the LORD, ye children of Israel: for the LORD hath a controversy with the inhabitants of the land, because there is no truth, nor mercy, nor **knowledge of God in the land**...My people are destroyed **for lack of knowledge**: because thou **hast rejected knowledge, I will also reject thee, that thou shalt be no priest to me**: seeing thou hast forgotten the law of thy God, I will also forget thy children." (Hosea 4:1,6)

We may see something of why Ellen White saw that nothing would be allowed to stand in the way of the omega, which would come in amongst our people after she died. We may even further understand why she said "I tremble for my people."

## **WHAT DID KELLOGG BELIEVE- THE ALPHA**

To understand the omega of deadly heresies, we must understand what Kellogg came to believe regarding the personality and

presence of God. In Ellen White's own words, we read: "I saw what was coming in, and **I saw that our brethren were blind. They did not realize the danger.** Our young people, especially, were in danger. They delighted in the beautiful representation—**God in the flower, God in the leaf, God in the tree. But if God be in these things, why not worship them?**" (1 Sermons and Talks, p. 344)

Ellen White warned that Kellogg was suggesting that the personal presence of the God we worship was in the objects our Creator upholds and sustains life in. In a letter directly to him, she declared: "You are not definitely clear on **the personality of God, which is everything to us as a people.** You have virtually destroyed the Lord God Himself." (Ellen G. White to John Harvey Kellogg, Letter 300, March 16th 1903)

Ellen White said that he was virtually destroying the Lord God Himself by his views, and was leading the blind brethren in a path to destruction. It was so bad, that many were believing Ellen White was sustaining the same views as Kellogg. This statement, for example, could be easily misconstrued to be teaching the very same thing as "God in the flower, God in the leaf, God in the tree" today in our churches because of the widespread confusion about the personality of God: "**The Lord puts His own Spirit into the seed,** causing it to spring into life. Under His care the germ breaks through the case enclosing it and springs up to develop and bear fruit." (8 Testimonies, p. 326)

Yet Ellen White said God forbid that such sentiments should prevail; she was not saying the same thing as Kellogg. There is a distinct difference between saying God is in the seed, and the Spirit of God is in the seed. God's person and presence was being distorted by Kellogg, who came to believe in a species of pantheism called panentheism, which teaches that while God is not everything, He is in everything. At a fundamental level, it came down to the belief of the God that we worship and where His presence was.

"I have been instructed by the heavenly messenger that some of

the reasoning in the book Living Temple is unsound, and that this reasoning would lead astray the minds of those who are not thoroughly established on the foundation principles of present truth. It introduces that which is nought but speculation in regard to the personality of God and where His presence is. No one on this earth has a right to speculate on this question. The more fanciful theories are discussed, the less men will know of God and of the truth that sanctifies the soul...One and another come to me, asking me to explain the positions taken in Living Temple. I reply, 'They are unexplainable.' The sentiments expressed do not give a true knowledge of God. All through the book are passages of Scripture. These scriptures are brought in, in such a way that error is made to appear as truth. Erroneous theories are presented in so pleasing a way that unless care is taken, many will be misled...The track of truth lies close beside the track of error, and both tracks may seem to be one to minds which are not worked by the Holy Spirit, and which, therefore, are not quick to discern the difference between truth and error."

Notice Ellen White declares that what she was saying and what Kellogg advocated in his teaching might have seemed similar, but that they were dangerously far apart. Likewise, the things that will be mentioned addressing the problems in this quarter reveal that there is the very same denying of the pillars of our faith, the foundational principles of Adventism that made us what we were. Make no mistake. There is as much a difference as heaven and earth between the views of Adventism and what is advocated in the quarterly & Kellogg, and they will be contrasted. Not many have discerned the dangers coming in amongst us, and therefore, when these things have been presented by me to them, they do not see the dangers. Unless they have their eyes anointed with the eyesalve offered by our merciful High Priest, they might continue in darkness, believing Ellen White's statements to say one thing when in fact they are speaking something entirely different from what they have conceived in their minds.

A.G. Daniells admonished Kellogg regarding his views:

“Now look here, Doctor, that book must not contain a single argument of this new theory you are teaching, because there are a lot of people all over the States who do not accept it. I know from what they say, and if it has any of what they consider pantheism they will never touch it.” (‘The Early Elmshaven Years’ Vol. 5 chapter 21 page 288)

Pantheistic concepts, called panentheism (the God who is worshipped is in the things He created) was being taught by Kellogg. Daniells clearly said to not advocate this “new theory” regarding God’s personality and presence that he was teaching in his book. Nevertheless, he did. W.A. Spicer, secretary of the General Conference at this time had encouraged the writing of the book, since the Sanitarium had burned down just prior to it’s writing in order to gain means of rebuilding it.

Spicer had visited Kellogg after his disassociation with Adventism because of his views. It gave more clarity on his doctrine and how it denied our past teaching. Spicer begins his account by quoting a primitive vision of Ellen White that she had after the doctrine of the Trinity was renounced by our Seventh-day Adventist pioneers after a closer study of Christ and His priesthood in the sanctuary:

“I saw a throne, and on it **sat the Father and the Son**. I gazed on Jesus’ countenance and admired His lovely person. The Father’s person I could not behold, for a cloud of glorious light covered Him. I asked Jesus if His Father had a form like Himself. He said he had, but I could not behold it, for, said He, if you should once behold the glory of His person, you would cease to exist.” –Early Writings p. 45. (W. A. Spicer, How the Spirit of Prophecy Met a Crisis: Memories and Notes of the “Living Temple” Controversy’, 1938)

Note the above. In the vision the Father and the Son are seen upon the throne, **both having a form**. In the vision, she saw the people of God praying for the Father’s Spirit, and the Father gave the Spirit to Jesus, and Jesus placed it upon His people. In Revelation 22:1, we are given the

same view of things, and the Spirit is shown as proceeding forth as living waters from the throne, and going forth outside of the sanctuary.

However, there was another being in the sanctuary that she saw being worshipped who should not have been worshipped; a third who sat upon a throne. He was an intruder, sitting enthroned in the channel where the river was to flow interjecting himself between them and Christ. It was Satan. When another class who had lost view of Jesus prayed to God, asking for the Spirit, Satan "breathed upon them an unholy influence". Thus, the statement was fulfilled by Ellen White, demonstrating that "there are **two spirits** in the world,—**the Spirit of God** and **the spirit of Satan**." (Signs of the Times, November 24, 1887)

This is important to understand, because it has much to do with why Kellogg became deceived. Returning to Spicer's thought regarding God the Father having a form like Jesus. He stated: "This view is in harmony with Bible descriptions. Strike this view from us, and substitute the idea the all-pervasive personality called God by the pantheistic philosophy and we are at once involved in the mazes of the spiritualistic deception. Then Heaven and the throne are wherever God is, and He is everywhere, in tree and plant and creature."

Did you catch it? If God is everywhere, Spicer concluded that He is taken out of the Sanctuary, where His actual presence resides. The Sanctuary teaches that the courtyard is alienation from the throne of God; it is far from His presence. Jesus the high priest, became the sacrifice in the courtyard, and opens a fountain of living water from that throne, which brings the spiritual presence of God. It is that stream of the divine presence that leads us back to His throne at last, as the Great Source of the Spirit; hence the Spirit is called the Spirit **of** God. However, to make God the Father everywhere present He must necessarily be taken out of the Sanctuary. Ellen White said, "The spiritualistic theories regarding the personality of God, followed to their logical conclusion, sweep away the whole Christian economy." (1 Selected Messages, p. 204) This point is critical.



The idea of the God we worship being outside of the Sanctuary is foreign from the message of truth. If He was out of the Sanctuary, then reconciliation has already taken place; and thus there is no need for the atonement any longer. Ellen White said as much: "The foundation of our faith, which was established by so much prayer, such earnest searching of the Scriptures, was being taken down, pillar by pillar. Our faith was to have nothing to rest upon— the sanctuary was gone, the atonement was gone. Any idea that should add such sentiments which would misplace the worship of God and Christ in exchange for an everywhere present God would be as Satan interjecting his own throne between you, who stands in the courtyard, and the God whose dwellingplace is in the Holy of holies, where your faith ought to be fastened. We must understand that where the presence of the God we worship is will determine our belief regarding the Sanctuary, and the atonement (the reconciliation back into His actual presence)

Ellen White said that the omega, like the alpha, would overthrow the pillars of our faith, and account the past teaching of our people as error, all in supposed reformation that reorganizes Adventism from the inside-out. She spoke about the Laodicean blindness that was prevailing at this time. Those who seek to remove the old landmarks are not holding fast; they are not remembering how they have received and heard. Those who try to bring in theories that would remove **the pillars** of our faith **concerning the sanctuary or concerning the personality of God or of Christ, are working as blind men**. They are seeking to bring in uncertainties and to set the people of God adrift without an anchor." (Manuscript Release No.760, p. 9, 1905)

This is what Kellogg was doing, and Spicer recognized it very well. He recounts the initial pantheistic sentiments of Kellogg when the Living Temple was first brought forward: "In the first interview I had with the author [Kellogg] over the book prepared for us he illustrated his idea that it was idolatry to conceive of God as having form..." Explaining the truth in contrast with Kellogg's description, he said: "The

form was there on the throne, as real as the form of Jesus on the throne beside the Father. But a cloud of glory veiled the Father's person. The reverent mind does not seek to penetrate that veil between. Strike out [remove] this view of Bible truth and substitute for it the pantheistic conception that makes of Deity a personality present everywhere the same as He is anywhere, and there is **no place in the universe** for the sinner to come before God..."

It removed the place where God resides in the universe, specifically, in the Most Holy place. That was Kellogg's initial belief. A formless God the Father who was everywhere present. Kellogg did not take into account how this affected the question of pure worship of God, just as it is not being regarded by nearly all today.

### **THE REVISION**

The Living Temple being published, a series of testimonies which Ellen White gave warning about it at a council in 1903 commenced:

"When the messages were read at the Council in Washington, Dr. Kellogg responded favorably, saying that he accepted the testimony and that he would modify the wording in the Living Temple dealing with theological matters. But his statements were rather erratic and changeable. His attitude alternated, and it finally turned out that **the doctor never really changed.**" (A. L. White, 'The Early Elmshaven Years' chapter 22, page 302 'Meet it')

Notice that Kellogg now wanted to now "modify the wording in the Living Temple dealing with theological matters". Regarding this revision, much was spoken of. Ellen White personally addressed Kellogg, informing him that he was still in danger:

"The book Living Temple is not to be patched up, a few changes made in it, and then advertised and praised as a valuable production. [...] When you wrote that book you were not under the inspiration of God. There was by your side the one who

inspired Adam to look at God in a false light. [...] My brother, I must tell you that you have little realization of whither your feet have been tending. The facts have been opened to me. You have been binding yourself up with those who belong to the army of the great apostate. Your mind has been as dark as Egypt." (Letter 253, p. 1, 12-14. To J. H. Kellogg, Nov. 20, 1903)

She compared the mind of Kellogg as being as dark as Egypt, the land where the Israelites had come out from- much like the Israelites who worshipped the golden calf, the god of Egypt. She also said he was binding himself up with those who belong to the army of Satan- Babylon. It is interesting to note that Kellogg was married to a dedicated Seventh-day Baptist, and his concepts of God were reportedly influenced by the minister of her faith that did not subscribe to the pillars of our faith as Adventists. He began going to churches outside of the first, second, and third angel's messages for light- going to Babylon for doctrine.

How did Kellogg come to this point where he believed in a venerated God who was everywhere present? It began with his views beginning to change into what he conceived was "great light" with his first encounter with a Seventh-day Baptist minister.

"This subject has been kept before me for the past twenty years, yea, for more than twenty years. **Before my husband's death (1881)**, Dr. Kellogg came to my room to tell me that he had great light...He sat down and told me what it was. It was similar to some of the views that he has presented in Living Temple. I said, "Those theories are wrong. I have met them before. I had to meet them when I first began to travel."...Ministers and people were deceived by these sophistries. They lead to making God a nonentity and Christ a nonentity. We are to rebuke these theories in the name of the Lord."

This time when James White died was in 1881. Before this time, Kellogg had contact with Rev. N. Wardner of the Seventh-day Baptists. John Harvey Kellogg on behalf of Seventh-day

Adventists was in dialogue setting forth their fundamental differences between the two classes. One fundamental and crucial issue that came up was the Trinity doctrine. Kellogg wrote for regarding Adventists position: "The only grounds upon which our reviewer could be justified in making such a statement would be the supposition on his part that we **believe in the doctrine of the trinity**; but he very well knows, from positions taken and arguments used in previous articles, **that we do not agree with him on this subject any better than on that of the nature of the soul**. We believe in but one Deity, God, who is a unity [one], not a compound being [three-in-one]...We repel the charge of "trinitarianism" without the slightest hesitation. We do not believe in a triune God, as before remarked. And we will not, as did our reviewer in a, former article, leave the reader in doubt as to our position on this point. We are utterly at a loss to comprehend how our reviewer could have blundered so strangely as to suppose us to share in **so gross an error as we believe** the orthodox doctrine of the trinity to be." (J. H. Kellogg, Review and Herald, November 25th 1880, 'Reply to Eld. Wardner's rejoinder')

It was at this time, that Kellogg's mind became unsettled, and he came to sister White claiming he had great light from God—thus influenced by the Trinitarian understanding of God, while not wholly yielding himself to that belief. Ellen White had to set him straight, but he would again be thus influenced again by a prominent Seventh-day Baptist, A.H. Lewis.

"Fifteen years later (1895) a Dr. A. H. Lewis, editor of the *Sabbath Recorder*, prominent among Seventh Day Baptists, and steeped in pantheism, visited Battle Creek and was entertained in the Kellogg home (Mrs. Kellogg was a Seventh Day Baptist). Lewis talked his pantheistic views, which did not fall on deaf ears. Kellogg first introduced pantheism publicly in 1897 in a series of talks at the ministerial institute that preceded the General Conference session held in the College View church at Lincoln, Nebraska." (Arthur White; *The Early Elmshaven Years 1900-1905*, p. 282)

In this introduction at the General Conference session, Kellogg spoke of this universal presence as "nothing else than

God Himself": "We have here the evidence of a universal presence, an intelligent presence, an all-wise presence, an all-powerful presence, a presence by the aid of which every atom of the universe is kept in touch with every other atom. This force that holds all things together, that is everywhere present, that thrills throughout the whole universe, that acts instantaneously through boundless space, can be nothing else than God Himself. What a wonderful thought that this same God is in us and in everything."

The attributing of the Holy Spirit's work of upholding life is the mighty power of the God of heaven to hold things together throughout the uttermost regions of the universe. However, it was the Seventh-day Baptist view that the Holy Spirit was God Himself, and to be worshipped as such; howbeit a little different from Kellogg's view, who upheld a mystical, unexplainably everywhere present God the Father, the Seventh-day Baptists were, and still are, Trinitarian.

It is important to note that the founders of Adventism studied out the Trinity, and rejected it, as confirmed by the Ellen White vision brought out by Spicer, which lead Ellen White to exclaim, "“Let the brightest example the world has yet seen be your example, rather than the greatest and most learned men of the age, who know not God, nor Jesus Christ whom he has sent. **The Father and the Son alone are to be exalted.**" (The Youth's Instructor, July 7, 1898)

Adventist Historian George Knight wrote: "Most of the founders of Seventh-day Adventism would not be able to join the church today if they had to subscribe to the denomination's Fundamental Beliefs. More specifically, most would not be able to agree to belief number 2, which deals with the doctrine of the trinity." (Ministry, Oct., 1993, p. 10)

William G. Johnson, assistant to the President of Interfaith Relations department in the General Conference, gave second witness, saying "the Trinitarian understanding of God, now part of our fundamental beliefs, was not generally held by the

early Adventists. Even today a few do not subscribe to it.” (William G. Johnsson in the Adventist Review, Jan. 6, 1994 p.10)

Kellogg, in dialogue with the Seventh-day Baptist minister had at first defended the true position of Adventism, but came to some unusual conclusions regarding where God’s presence was. These revived after the meeting with Abram H. Lewish. However, he claimed that his views of pantheistic magnitude had changed after the testimonies given in Washington, but Ellen White said no.

“It will be said that Living Temple has been revised. **But the Lord has shown me that the writer has not changed**, and that there can be no unity between him and the ministers of the gospel while he continues to cherish his present sentiments. I am bidden to lift my voice in warning to our people, saying, “Be not deceived; God is not mocked” (Gal.6:7).” (Selected Messages Book 1, p. 199, 1904)

What was it that Kellogg thought he had changed regarding his views that seemed to change but had “not changed”? A.G. Daniells, who warned Kellogg of not expressing his “new theory” regarding God in the book he was writing, now wrote to W.C. White, Ellen White’s son, regarding “the change” he was making:

““Ever since the council closed I have felt that I should write you confidentially regarding Dr Kellogg’s plans for revising and republishing ‘The Living Temple’... He (Kellogg) said that some days before coming to the council, he had been thinking the matter over, and began to see that he had made a slight mistake in expressing his views. He said that all the way along he had been troubled to know how to state the character of God and his relation to his creation works... He then stated that his former views regarding the trinity had stood in his way of making a clear and absolutely correct statement; but that within a short time he had come to believe

in the trinity and could now see pretty clearly where all the difficulty was, and believed that he could clear the matter up satisfactorily.”

Notice that his former views of the Trinity (his rejection of the doctrine) had now developed into a full-fledged belief in the Trinity- which was said to be the exact same doctrinal implications he had formerly espoused. Daniells continued:

“He told me that he now believed in God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost; and his view was that it was God the Holy Ghost, and not God the Father, that filled all space, and every living thing. He said if he had believed this before writing the book, he could have expressed his views without giving the wrong impression the book now gives. I placed before him the objections I found in the teaching, and tried to show him that the teaching was so utterly contrary to the gospel that I did not see how it could be revised by changing a few expressions. We argued the matter at some length in a friendly way; but I felt sure that when we parted, the doctor did not understand himself, nor the character of his teaching.” (Letter: A. G. Daniells to W. C. White. October 29, 1903. p. 1, 2)

Kellogg now came to the full fruition of the alpha of deadly heresies. It was the doctrine of the Trinity. Kellogg plainly confessed in a meeting with the leading brethren after he left Adventism visited him that the issue was, indeed, regarding the Trinity doctrine: “Now, I thought I had cut out entirely the theological side of questions of the trinity and all that sort of things. I didn’t mean to put it in at all, and I took pains to state in the preface that I did not. I never dreamed of such a thing as any theological question being brought into it. I only wanted to show that the heart does not beat of its own motion but that it is the power of God that keeps it going” (Interview, J. H. Kellogg, G. W. Amadon and A. C. Bourdeau October 7th 1907 held at Kellogg’s residence)

Now, based on this, let us read the statements side-by-side:

Ellen White's testimony on Kellogg's deception that had not changed (the Trinity): "**I saw that our brethren were blind. They did not realize the danger.** Our young people, especially, were in danger. They delighted in the beautiful representation—**God in the flower, God in the leaf, God in the tree. But if God be in these things, why not worship them?**" (1 Sermons and Talks, p. 344)

Ellen White's testimony: "**The Lord puts His own Spirit into the seed,** causing it to spring into life. Under His care the germ breaks through the case enclosing it and springs up to develop and bear fruit." (8 Testimonies, p. 326)

Many today are saying that it is God in the seed, and God in the man because they ignorantly blend these two concepts as Kellogg did with the Holy Spirit. Kellogg summed the matter up himself in a letter to G.I. Butler, president of the Southern Union Conference:

"As far as I can fathom, the difficulty which is found in the Living Temple, the whole thing may be simmered down to this question: is the Holy Ghost a person? You say no." "I had supposed the Bible said this for the reason that the personal pronoun he is used in speaking of the Holy Ghost. Sister White uses the pronoun he and has said in as many words that the Holy Ghost is the **third person of the Godhead.**" "How the Holy Ghost can be the third person and not be a person at all is difficult for me to see." (Letter, Kellogg to G. I. Butler, October 28, 1903)

Kellogg's new view had not changed. From God the Father to the Trinitarian God the Holy Spirit, it was still an everywhere present God that you worship. The implications were entirely the same. He even addressed his confusion regarding sister White's writings with the very same interpretation many are interpreting her writings to say today: that the Holy Ghost is a person in the sense of being truly a separate



divine being to be honored and worshipped. But Butler's position was revealed by Kellogg's question and answer: "is the Holy Ghost a person? You say no." Many are having a difficult time seeing how the Holy Ghost can be the third person, and not a person in the sense of being today. Yet Ellen White explains herself clearly regarding who the Spirit is clear when harmonized:

There is no comforter like Christ, so tender and so true. He is touched with the feeling of our infirmities. His Spirit speaks to the heart... The influence of the Holy Spirit is the life of Christ in the soul. (Review & Herald, October 26, 1897)

It could be resisted and overcome only through **the mighty agency** of the Third Person of the Godhead, who would come with no modified energy, but in the fullness **of divine power**... Christ has given His Spirit **as a divine power to overcome** all hereditary and cultivated tendencies to evil, and to impress His own character upon His church. (Desire of Ages, p. 671)

There is **no power in you apart from Christ**, but it is your privilege to have Christ abiding in your heart by faith, and **He can overcome sin in you**, when you cooperate with His efforts. (Our High Calling, p. 76)

The Holy Spirit is a free, working, independent **agency**. The God of heaven **uses His Spirit** as it pleases Him... (Signs of the Times, March 10<sup>th</sup>, 191

Cumbered with humanity, Christ could not be in every place personally; therefore it was altogether for their advantage that He should leave them, go to His father, and send the Holy Spirit to be His successor on earth. *The Holy Spirit is Himself divested of the personality of humanity and independent thereof. He would represent Himself as present in all places by HIS HOLY SPIRIT, as the Omnipresent.* (Manuscript Releases, vol. 14, pages 23, 24; written February 18 and 19, 1895)

It is the spiritual life of Christ in the soul; the spiritual presence of God and Christ in the third person; their omnipresence that comes forth from the Sanctuary; the person of the Spirit is the spiritual manifestation of God and Christ that proceeds forth from their throne.

It was six months later that Butler would reply to Kellogg's letter, explaining in the best language he could gather: "God dwells in us by His Holy Spirit, as a Comforter, as a Reprover, especially the former. When we come to Him, we partake of Him in that sense, because the Spirit comes forth from him; it comes forth from the Father and the Son" "It is not a person walking around on foot, or flying, as a literal being, in any such sense as Christ and the Father are—at least, if it is, it is utterly beyond my comprehension or the meaning of language or words." (G. I Butler, letter to J. H. Kellogg April 5th 1904)

Apart from sister White's writings and warnings, we have the threefold warning of A.G. Daniells, W.A. Spicer, recounting Kellogg's own testimony recollected on the matter, and G.I. Butler, with Kellogg's summary of the controversy itself.

If the God you worship is the everywhere present Holy Spirit, herein lies the subtlety: you've been taken into the controversy. Hence, why we are addressing this quarterly, because the conclusions and arguments are in defense of that very concept that our people once rejected.

Ellen White said after she was laid to rest, great changes would take place. And indeed they would. The last of the pioneers died in the mid-1920's, and in 1932, an unofficial General Conference publication, a church manual, came out stating the following:

"2. That the Godhead, or Trinity, consists of the Eternal Father, a personal, spiritual Being, omnipotent, omnipresent [everywhere present]..."

Above shows that it was God the Father who was everywhere present. This was the same concept that Kellogg was teaching, yet nowhere quite as advanced as the philosophy Kellogg was advocating. Furthermore, we ought to contend for unity as much as possible, even striving for it as the apostle Paul says. For this cause, we may honestly read the above statement in

another interpretation, which could suggest that the Father is everywhere present by His Spirit, but not that the God we worship Himself is everywhere present. However, even this, in the 1980 statement becomes difficult to contend for:

“2. Trinity: There is **one God**:

Father, Son, and **Holy Spirit**, a unity of three co-eternal Persons. God is immortal, all-powerful, all-knowing, above all, and ever present. He is infinite and beyond human comprehension, yet known through His self-revelation. **He is forever worthy of worship**, adoration, and service by the whole creation.”

The Holy Spirit is among the three “forever worthy of worship...by the whole creation”; thus the cherubim would worship three upon the throne, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, when in fact it is the Father and Son alone that are to be exalted according to sister White; and are the only two seated upon the throne.

Now, I want to be clear. The fundamental beliefs are framed with much truth, but the details are such as will perpetuate the understanding of an everywhere present God who is worshipped in the seed, worshipped in the tree, worshipped in man, etc.

Ellen White said it would, if received, that it would effect the receiver's belief regarding God and Christ: “The book Living Temple is an illustration of this work, the writer of which declared in its support that its teachings were the same as those found in the writings of Mrs. White. Again and again we shall be called to meet the influence of men who are studying sciences of satanic origin, through which Satan is working to **make a nonentity of God and of Christ.**”

Our pioneers said the Trinity did this very thing. J.N. Andrews, who established Andrews University, said it destroys the personality of God, just as Ellen White said Kellogg had practically destroyed the Lord God Himself:

“The doctrine of the Trinity which was established in the church by the council of Nice, A. D. 325. **This doctrine destroys the personality of God, and his Son Jesus Christ our Lord.** The infamous, measures by which it was forced upon the church which appear upon the pages of ecclesiastical history might well cause every believer in that doctrine to blush.” (J. N. Andrews, March 6, 1855, Review & Herald, vol. 6, no. 24, page 185)

James White also spoke very plainly regarding the Trinity doctrine making a nonentity of God and Christ: “...“for there are certain men,” or a certain class who deny the only Lord God and our Lord Jesus Christ.... The way **spiritualizers have disposed of or denied the only Lord God and our Lord Jesus Christ** is first using the old unscriptural Trinitarian creed...” (James White, The Day Star, January 24, 1846)

We cite James White last, because Ellen White gave special mention of her husband's mind and writings: ““He(Jame White) received a commendation that few others have attained. God has permitted the precious light of truth to shine upon His word and illuminate the mind of my husband. He may reflect the rays of light from the presence of Jesus upon others by his preaching and writing.” (Testimonies for the Church Volume 3, p. 502)

He said spiritualizers denied the only Lord God, and the Lord Jesus Christ through the Trinity. Ellen White said the very same would be the danger found in the church in the last days.

“Modern spiritualism, resting upon the same foundation, is but a revival in a new form of the witchcraft and demon worship that God condemned and prohibited of old.... Peter, describing the **dangers to which the church was to be exposed in the last days**, says that as there were false prophets who led Israel into sin, so there will be false teachers, “who privily shallbring **in damnable heresies**, even denying the Lord that bought them.... And many shall follow their pernicious ways.” 2

Peter 2:1, 2. Here the apostle has pointed out one of the marked characteristics of spiritualist teachers. **They refuse to acknowledge Christ as the Son of God.** Concerning such teachers the beloved John declares: "Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? He is antichrist that **denieth the Father and the Son.** Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father." 1 John 2:22, 23. Spiritualism, by denying Christ, denies **both** the Father and the Son, and the Bible pronounces it the manifestation of antichrist." (Ellen White, Patriarchs and Prophets, p. 686)

Notice that the church would be exposed to damnable heresies, even the alpha and omega of deadly heresies. The doctrine of antichrist is a denial of the Father and Son, which the pioneers saw in the Trinity doctrine- which also Kellogg believed and bound himself to the doctrine of the god of Babylon [Roman Catholicism], even as Israel who came out of Egypt began to worship it's gods in the golden calf controversy. But nothing is allowed to stop the omega from bearing full sway to test and try the honest children of God at this time to see who is on the Lord's side. God is removed by this doctrine, and those who contend for the faith are silenced; and who will lift up their voice in protest?

"Here we might mention **the Trinity, which does away the personality of God, and of his Son Jesus Christ,** and of sprinkling or pouring instead of being "buried with Christ in baptism," ...but we pass from these fables to notice one that is held sacred by nearly all professed Christians, both Catholic and Protestant. It is, The change of the Sabbath of the fourth commandment from the seventh to the first day of the week." (James White, December 11, 1855, Review & Herald, vol. 7, no. 11, page 85, par. 16)

James White said very clearly that Ellen White (though there seem to be statements people think are Trinitarian much like many who were blind to Kellogg's concepts of God), is by no means a Trinitarian:

“We invite all to compare the testimonies of the Holy Spirit through Mrs. W., with the word of God. And in this we do not invite you to compare them with your creed. That is quite another thing. **The trinitarian may compare them with his creed, and because they do not agree with it, condemn them.** The observer of Sunday, or the man who holds eternal torment an important truth, and the minister that sprinkles infants, **may each condemn the testimonies’** of Mrs. W. because **they do not agree with their peculiar views.** And a hundred more, each holding different views, may come to the same conclusion. But their genuineness can never be tested in this way.” { James White, Review & Herald, June 13, 1871}

Ellen White saw it coming. The present day Adventist movement declares it is “rich and increased with goods, and in need of nothing”, and “knows not that you are poor, blind, miserable, wretched, and naked”. It claims to have advanced into more light than our pioneers had, and thus, have come to embrace the Trinity doctrine again, although the entering of it into the church was not without resistance from zealous leaders of the church.

“In a vision of the night I was shown distinctly that these sentiments have been looked upon by some as the grand truths that are to be brought in and made prominent at the present time. I was shown a platform, braced by solid timbers the truths of the Word of God. Some one high in responsibility in the medical work was directing this man and that man to loosen the timbers supporting this platform. Then I heard a voice saying, ‘Where are the watchmen that ought to be standing on the walls of Zion? Are they asleep? This foundation was built by the Master Worker, and will stand storm and tempest. **Will they permit this man to present doctrines that deny the past experience of the people of God?** The time has come to take decided action...Many of our **people do not realize how firmly the foundation of our faith has been laid.** My husband, Elder Joseph Bates, Father Pierce, Elder [Hiram] Edson, and others

who were keen, noble, and true, were among those who, after the passing of time in 1844, searched for the truth as for hidden treasure.” (Special Testimonies, Series B, No 2, p. 51-59)

In Conclusion, a textbook of Andrews University that speaks of worship and prayer to the Holy Spirit by Jerry Moon, Woodrow Whidden, and John Reeve. The very first council of Constantine, the council of Nice, that J.N. Andrews condemned in the statement above as destroying the personality of God and Christ His Son, was the council they quoted, and show how from this Roman Catholic saints began to implement the worship of the Holy Spirit as one of the Christian justifications for it. “The Cappadocians **extended the shared nature of the Father and the Son to include the Holy Spirit**, clarifying the vagueness of the Nicene Creed [from the council of Nice which began the acceptance of the Trinity]. In his work On the Holy Spirit, Basil argued for a recognition of the relationship between Father, Son, and Holy Spirit as of one substance and of equal rank, **and therefore as worthy of worship**. It was in the context of worship that Basil made his most effective arguments...” (The Trinity: Understanding God’s Love, His Plan of Salvation, and Christian relationships, p. 148)

“To whom should we direct our petitions and adoration in personal devotions and corporate worship?...But what about direct prayer to the Holy Spirit? While we have **no clear example of or direct command to pray to the Spirit in Scripture**, doing so does have, in principle, some implicit biblical support. If the Spirit is indeed divine and personal and He interacts in all sorts of direct personal ways...it only seems logical that God’s **people can pray directly to and worship the Holy Spirit.**” (p. 272-273)

There is no clear example or command in Scripture (although there is a command to pray to the Father in the Son’s name), but let’s do it anyway. Direct prayer to the Holy Spirit, thus the incense of the priesthood does not rise to the Holy of

holies to reach the throne of God, but remains in the courtyard, where the sacrifice of Christ was slain- the earth.

And so, Jerry Moon, the author of the Andrews University textbook, and the one leading the march for Trinitarianism from Andrews University to every pulpit in the conference, has rightly concluded this final thing, and we should all take careful heed to it:

“That most of the leading SDA pioneers were non-Trinitarian in their theology has become accepted Adventist history, ... More recently, a further question has arisen with increasing urgency: was the pioneers’ belief about the Godhead right or wrong? As one line of reasoning goes, **either the pioneers were wrong and the present church is right, or the pioneers were right and the present Seventh-day Adventist Church has apostatized from biblical truth.**” (Jerry Moon, The Trinity, Chapter, Trinity and antitrinitarianism in Seventh-day Adventist history, p. 190)

“The spiritualistic theories regarding the personality of God, followed to their logical conclusion, sweep away the whole Christian economy... They make of no effect the truth of heavenly origin, and rob the people of God of their past experience, giving them instead a false science...

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 reorganization. Were this reformation to take place, what would result? The principles of truth that God in His wisdom has given to the remnant church, would be discarded. Our religion would be changed. The fundamental principles that have sustained the work for the last fifty years would be accounted as error. A new organization would be established. Books of a new order would be written. A system of intellectual philosophy would be introduced. The founders of this system would go into the cities, and do a wonderful



work. The Sabbath of course, would be lightly regarded, as also the God who created it. Nothing would be allowed to stand in the way of the new movement. The leaders would teach that virtue is better than vice, but God being removed, they would place their dependence on human power, which, without God, is worthless. Their foundation would be built on the sand, and storm and tempest would sweep away the structure.

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

I hesitated and delayed about the sending out of that which the Spirit of the Lord impelled me to write. I did not want to be compelled to present the misleading influence of these sophistries. But in the providence of God, the errors that have been coming in must be met." (Selected Messages 1, p. 204-205)

---

## [What Seventh-Day Adventists Once Believed About A Church Manual](#)

"The first serious attempt at a church manual was made in 1882, when a committee consisting of W. H. Littlejohn, J. O. Corliss, and H. A. St. John was appointed by the General Conference to prepare a church manual, to be printed first serially for discussion and criticism (13 articles came out in the *Review and Herald* from June 5 to Aug. 28, 1883). It covered such matters as the organizing of churches; the duties

of church officers; the admission, transferring, and dropping of members; church trials; and the conducting of quarterly business meetings and the ordinances. However, the next General Conference, in November, 1883, decided against publishing a church manual because it was deemed to be undesirable to take any step that could be construed as leading to a creed or discipline other than the Bible, or toward formalism, G. I. Butler, president of the General Conference, explained the action taken, in an article in the *Review and Herald* (60:745, Nov. 27, 1883).” (*Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia*, page 264-265, ‘Church manual’)

The concept of a church manual was rejected by the General Conference for a number of reasons. The matter while at Rome was urged for reconsideration, and a committee was setup to put a proposed manual together. It was rejected however, because there was a



tendency from the previous churches of the reformation to begin a church manual, which developed into a creed. The original objective of forming the Conference was to avoid patterning after other churches, but to present a united people in the third angel’s message, who could have the declaration, “Here are they that keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus.” (Rev. 14:12).

The decision to reject the church manual was published in the *Review and Herald*. For all to understand the reasons for rejecting the church manual, here is the reasons.

## **NO CHURCH MANUAL**

**By George I. Butler**

**(Review and Herald, 27<sup>th</sup> November 1883)**

THE writer was requested by the recent General Conference to make a brief statement through the REVIEW of the action taken in reference to the proposed Church Manual. For four or five years past, there has been with some of our brethren a desire to have some manual of directions for the use of young ministers and church officers, etc. It was thought that this would lead to uniformity in all parts of the field, and afford means of instruction to those who were inexperienced, and be very convenient in many respects. Steps were taken several years ago to prepare a manual, but for a time it was left unfinished. Last year, at the Rome Conference, the matter came up for consideration, and three brethren were appointed a committee to prepare a manual, and submit it to the Conference this year for its approval or rejection. During the past summer the matter they have prepared has appeared in the REVIEW, and has doubtless been well considered by its readers.

At the recent Conference a committee of thirteen leading brethren were appointed to consider the whole subject, and report. They did so, and unanimously recommended to the Conference that it was not advisable to have a church manual. Their reasons were briefly given in the report of Conference proceedings given in last week's REVIEW. The Conference acted upon this recommendation, and quite unanimously decided against having any manual. In doing so, they did not intend any disrespect to the worthy brethren who had labored diligently to prepare such a work. They had presented much excellent matter, and given many valuable directions concerning church ordinances, holding business meetings, and many other important questions, and had done as well, no doubt, as any others would have done in their place. The reasons underlying this action of the Conference were of a broader character. They relate to the desirability of any manual whatever.

**The Bible contains our creed and discipline.** It thoroughly furnishes the man of God unto all good works. What it has not

revealed relative to church organization and management, the duties of officers and ministers, and kindred subjects, should not be strictly defined and drawn out into minute specifications for the sake of uniformity, but rather be left to individual judgment under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. Had it been best to have a book of directions of this sort, the Spirit would doubtless have gone further, and left one on record with the stamp of inspiration upon it. Man cannot safely supplement this matter with his weak judgment. **All attempts to do it in the past have proved lamentable failures.** A variation of circumstances requires variation in action. God requires us to study important principles which he reveals in his word, but the minutiae in carrying them out he leaves to individual judgment, promising heavenly wisdom in times of need. His ministers are constantly placed where they must feel their helplessness, and their need of seeking God for light, rather than to go to any church manual for specific directions, placed therein by other uninspired men. Minute, specific directions tend to weakness, rather than power. They lead to dependence rather than self-reliance. Better make some mistakes and learn profitable lessons thereby, than to have our way all marked out for us by others, and the judgment have but a small field in which to reason and consider.

While brethren who have favored a manual have ever contended that such a work was not to be anything like a creed or a discipline, or to have authority to settle disputed points, but was only to be considered as a book containing hints for the help of those of little experience, yet it must be evident that such a work, issued under the auspices of the General Conference, would at once carry with it much weight of authority, and would be consulted by most of our younger ministers. **It would gradually shape and mold the whole body; and those who did not follow it would be considered out of harmony with established principles of church order.** And, really, is this not the object of the manual? And what would be the use of one if not to accomplish such a result? But

would this result, on the whole, be a benefit? Would our ministers be broader, more original, more self-reliant men? Could they be better depended on in great emergencies? Would their spiritual experiences likely be deeper and their judgment more reliable? We think the tendency all the other way.

The religious movement in which we are engaged has the same influences to meet which all genuine reformations have had to cope with. After, reaching a certain magnitude, they have seen the need of uniformity, and to attain to it they have tried to prepare directions to guide the inexperienced. These have **grown in number and authority till, accepted by all, they really become authoritative.** There seems to be no logical stopping-place, when once started upon this road, till this result is reached. Their history is before us; **we have no desire to follow it.** Hence we stop without a church manual before we get started. Our brethren who have favored such a work, we presume never anticipated such a conclusion as we have indicated. Very likely those in other denominations did not at first. **The Conference thought best not to give even the appearance of such a thing.**

Thus far we have got along well with our simple organization without a manual. Union prevails throughout the body. The difficulties before us, so far as organization is concerned, are far less than those we have had in the past. We have preserved simplicity, and have prospered in so doing. It is best to let well enough alone. For these and other reasons, **the church manual was rejected.** It is probable it will never be brought forward again. GEO. I. BUTLER.