Revised & Enlarged

1888 RE-EXAMINED

REVISED AND UPDATED BY THE ORIGINAL AUTHORS

ROBERT J. WIELAND AND DONALD K. SHORT

1888 – 1988
The story of a century of confrontation between God and His people

"All these things happened
unto them for ensamples:
and they are written for our admonition,
upon whom the ends of the world are come."
(1 Corinthians 10:11)

This unpretentious gathering of delegates to the 1888 General Conference Session in Minneapolis has become the focal point of intense interest in the world-wide Seventh-day Adventist Church. The General Conference are addressing serious 1888 questions as follows:

What really happened in 1888?
What were the doctrinal issues involved?
Who were the personalities involved?
What were the results that followed?

This book addresses these and other vital questions. It was written originally as a private document for the General Conference. It is now updated and released in response

to numerous requests world-wide. In many previously unpublished statements Ellen G. White is permitted at last to speak freely and frankly to 1888 issues of paramount interest. The bulk of these statements were unknown to most of her contemporaries. What she says will come as a surprise to many in this generation.

Donald K. Short and Robert J. Wieland are ordained ministers with an aggregate total of nearly 100 years of service to the Seventh-day Adventist Church, 62 as missionaries in Africa. Publication of this book has been initiated by The 1888 Message Study Committee composed of laymembers and ministers who wish to revive that "most precious message."

Copyright © 1987 by Robert J. Wieland and Donald K. Short
Compiled in 1950
First published, August 1987 - 9,000 copies Second printing, June 1988 - 10,000 copies Appendix E and Annotated Index added.

Contents

Preface 4
Chapter 1 – Why Re-Examine Our Adventist Past? 8
Chapter 2 – The Sin of Leaving Our First Love 14
Chapter 3 – The Loud Cry to Come in a Surprising Way 19
Chapter 4 – Acceptance or Rejection: in Search of a Sharper Focus 30
Additional Note to Chapter Four 49
Chapter 5 – The Fundamental Problem: How to Evaluate the 1888 Message 56
Chapter 6 – The 1888 Rejection of Ellen White 67
Chapter 7 – A Closer Look at the "Confessions" 82
Chapter 8 – Crisis at the 1893 General Conference Session 94
Chapter 9 – A False Righteousness by Faith: Sowing the Seed of Apostasy 103
Chapter 10 – Why Did Jones and Waggoner Lose Their Way? 118
Chapter 11 – The "Alpha" and "Omega" Crises 132
Chapter 12 – The Pantheism Apostasy 143
Chapter 13 – Ellen White's Predictions of Baal-Worship 150
Chapter 14 – From 1950 to 1971 164
Chapter 15 – From 1971 to 1987 and Beyond 175
Appendix A: Did A. T. Jones Teach the "Holy Flesh" Heresy? 189
Appendix B: The Righteousness by Faith Comparisons 192
Appendix C: One Source of the Acceptance Myth 198
Appendix D: What Is the Future of the Seventh-day Adventist Church? 202
Appendix E: A Brief Review of 1987-1988 Publications 210
Annotated Index 224

KEY TO ABBREVIATIONS USED

AA *Acts of the Apostles*
AH *The Adventist Home*
1BC *The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary,* Vol. 1, etc.
CD *Counsels on Diet and Foods*
CH *Counsels on Health*
COL *Christ's Object Lessons*
COR *Christ Our Righteousness*
CT *Counsels to Parents, Teachers, and Students*
CW *Counsels to Writers and Editors*
DA *The Desire of Ages*
Ed *Education*
Ev *Evangelism*
EW *Early Writings*
FE *Fundamentals of Christian Education*
GC *The Great Controversy*
GCB *General Conference Bulletin*
GW *Gospel Workers*
LS *Life Sketches*
MB *Thoughts From the Mount of Blessing*
MH *Ministry of Healing*
Ms Ellen White manuscript
NEB *New English Bible*
PK *Prophets and Kings*
PP *Patriarchs and Prophets*
RH *The Review and Herald*
SC *Steps to Christ*
1SM *Selected Messages,* Book One, etc.
1T *Testimonies for the Church,* Vol. *1,* etc.
TM *Testimonies to Ministers and Gospel Workers*

PREFACE

The authors hold the firm conviction that God has entrusted to Seventh-day Adventists His last message of more abounding grace for humanity. This message must supply a final cure for the problem of sin, demonstrate righteousness in believing humanity, and vindicate the sacrifice of Christ. Nothing can enter the kingdom of heaven "that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination or maketh a lie."

The authors also believe that the Saviour has an immeasurable longing for His people to prepare the way for His return. The message the Lord sent this people in 1888 was intended to complete His work of grace in human hearts so that the great controversy could be brought to an end. But something went wrong a century ago. The Lord's plan was frustrated and delayed. What happened? Why this long delay?

The beacon lights of a century ago have grown dim and in many cases have flickered and gone out. The hallmarks of Adventism have become tarnished. Our people have not verbally abandoned confidence in the second coming of Christ, but the expectation of His *near* return has faded. Many are bewildered and confused. The present world entices to fashion, amusements, and me-first luxury.

Even in enlightened Seventh-day Adventist communities with a rich historical heritage, divorce has become almost epidemic. Social drinking is a problem in our colleges and universities and in too many of our homes. Most Seventh-day Adventists in North America have no clear concept of a heavenly Day of Atonement or of our unique duty of temperance and self-control in relation to it. It is amazing that in a time of exploding human knowledge, we as a people generally still have only a vague concept of what Christ is doing as High Priest in this final Day of Atonement, and scant sympathy with His aims. And what we do not understand we cannot communicate to the world.

It is well known that a large proportion of our youth lack clear-cut convictions of Seventh-day Adventist identity. A series in the *Adventist Review* of June 1986 recognizes a new phenomenon: Adventist youth are joining Sunday-keeping churches (see chapter 13 of this book).

Off-shoots and independent ministries proliferate. Financial scandals and heresies supply grist for the mills of the critics. Serious questions are raised about whether the Seventh-day Adventist church is destined to become another segment of Babylon.

The "most precious message" the Lord "sent" this people nearly a century ago contains the "beginning" of the solution to all these problems. It was a message of much more abounding grace. Our increasing perplexities are the direct result, the certain harvest, of an unbelief, past and current, of that 1888 message. When truth is refused, error always rushes in to fill the vacuum. But no problem is too great to be rectified through repentance.

Without further delay the world church must know the full story of our century-old confrontation with Christ. Ellen White often likened our 1888 default to the Jews' rejection of Him two millennia ago. This book will re-examine her letters and manuscripts as well as published statements. She must be allowed to speak frankly without inhibition. When the full truth is comprehended, whether these authors can tell it clearly enough or whether other authors yet to come must succeed better, repentance and reformation will take place and a people will be prepared for the coming of the Lord. The Laodicean message will not fail, but will result in healing and restoration. Ellen White's confidence is neatly summed up

in a brief word written by her son shortly before her death: "I told Mrs. Lida Scott how Mother regarded the experience of the remnant church, and of her positive teaching that God would not permit this denomination to so fully apostatize that there would be the coming out of another church" (Letter, May 23, 1915). This statement implies that there would indeed be very serious apostasy—but the Lord would not permit it to become total. Until her death she cherished the conviction that denominational repentance would eventually come.

What Did the 1888 Message Say?

This book is not intended to reproduce the message itself. Several other works prepared by the authors attempt to do this.[1] But for those who do not have access to these publications or to original sources, we list in very brief form a resume of the unique, essential elements of that message. Readers will recognize that these concepts are in contrast to ideas generally (or officially) held by our people today (documentation is available in the books cited in the footnote):

(1) Christ's sacrifice is not merely *provisional* but *effective* for the whole world, so that the only reason anybody can be lost is that he has chosen to resist the saving grace of God. For those who are saved at last, it is God who has taken the initiative; in the case of those who are lost, it is they who took the initiative. Salvation is by faith; condemnation is by unbelief.

(2) Thus Christ's sacrifice has *legally* justified "every man," and has literally saved the world from premature destruction. All men owe even their physical life to Him, whether or not they believe. Every loaf of bread is stamped with His cross. When the sinner hears and believes the pure gospel, he is justified by *faith.* The lost deliberately negate the justification Christ has already effected for them.

(3) Justification *by faith* is therefore much more than a legal declaration of acquittal; it changes the heart. The sinner has now received the atonement, which is reconciliation with God. Since it is impossible to be truly reconciled to Him and not also be reconciled to His holy law, it follows that true justification by *faith* makes the believer to become obedient to all the commandments of God.

(4) This marvelous work is accomplished through the ministry of the new covenant wherein the Lord actually writes His law *in the heart* of the believer. Obedience is *loved,* and the new motivation transcends fear of being lost or hope of reward in being saved (either of those motivations is what Paul means by his phrase, "under the law"). The old and new covenants are not matters of time but of condition. Abraham's faith enabled him to live under the new covenant, while multitudes of Christians today live under the old covenant because self-centered concern is their motivation. The old covenant was the promise of the people to be faithful; under the new covenant salvation comes by *believing* God's promises to us, not by our *making* promises to Him.

---

[1] *The 1888 Message—An Introduction,* Review and Herald, 1980; *Gold Tried in the Fire,* Pacific Press, 1983; *The Good News is Better Than You Think,* Pacific Press 1985; *A Summary of the History and Content of the 1888 Message,* 1977, The 1888 Message Study Committee.

(5) God's love is active, not merely passive. As Good Shepherd, Christ is actively seeking the lost sheep. Our salvation does not depend on our seeking the Saviour but on our believing that He is seeking us. Those who are lost at last continue to resist and despise the drawing of His love. This is the essence of *unbelief.*

(6) Thus it is difficult to be lost and it is easy to be saved *if one understands and believes how good the good news is.* Sin is a constant resisting of His grace. Since Christ has already paid the penalty for every man's sin, the only reason anyone can be condemned at last is continued unbelief, a refusal to appreciate the redemption achieved by Christ on His cross and ministered by Him as High Priest. The true gospel unveils this unbelief and leads to an effective repentance that prepares the believer for the return of Christ. Human pride and praise and flattery of human beings is inconsistent with true faith in Christ but is a sure sign of prevailing unbelief, even within the church.

(7) In seeking lost mankind, Christ came all the way, taking upon Himself and assuming the fallen, sinful nature of man after the fall. This He did that He might be tempted in all points like as we are, yet demonstrate perfect righteousness "in the likeness of sinful flesh." The 1888 message accepts "likeness" to mean what it says, not *unlikeness.* Righteousness is a word never applied to Adam in his unfallen state, nor to sinless angels. It can only connote a holiness that has come into conflict with sin in *fallen human flesh,* and triumphed over it.

Thus "the message of Christ's righteousness" that Ellen White endorsed so enthusiastically in the 1888 era is rooted in this unique view of the nature of Christ. If He had taken the sinless nature of Adam before the fall, the term "Christ's righteousness" would be a meaningless abstraction. The 1888 messengers recognized the teaching that Christ took only the sinless nature of Adam before the fall to be a legacy of Romanism, the insignia of the mystery of iniquity which keeps Him "afar off" and not "nigh at hand."

(8) Thus our Saviour "condemned sin in the flesh" of fallen mankind. This means that He has outlawed sin; sin has become unnecessary in the light of His ministry. It is impossible to have true New Testament faith in Christ and continue in sin. We cannot excuse continued sinning by saying that we are "only human" or that "the devil made me do it." In the light of the cross, the devil cannot force anyone to sin. To be truly "human" is to be Christlike in character, for He was and is fully human as well as divine.

(9) It follows that the only element God's people need in order to prepare for Christ's return is that genuine New Testament *faith.* But that is precisely what the church lacks. She imagines herself to be doctrinally and experientially "rich and increased with goods" when in fact her root sin is a pathetic *unbelief.* Righteousness is by faith; it is impossible to have faith and not demonstrate righteousness in the life, because true faith *works* by love. Moral and spiritual failures are the fruit of perpetuating Israel's ancient sin of unbelief today through the confusion of a false righteousness by faith.

(10) Righteousness by faith since 1844 is "the third angel's message in verity." Thus it is greater than what the Reformers taught and the popular churches understand today. It is a message of abounding grace consistent with the unique Adventist truth of the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary, a work contingent on the full cleansing of the hearts of God's people on earth.

There are other aspects of the 1888 message such as reforms in health and educational methods, but our principal concern in this book is its heart, as recognized by Ellen White—

righteousness by faith. It is not true that the 1888 message was opposed to church organization (see chapter 10).

Significance of the Message Today

The 1888 history and message supply a key to reconciliation with the Lord Jesus. The great "final atonement" will become reality. "There shall be a fountain opened to the house of David [the church leadership] and lo the inhabitants of Jerusalem [the organized church] for sin and for uncleanness." Some, perhaps many, will despise and reject that fountain which Zechariah speaks of, but we believe that the inner heart of God's people is honest. When they know the full truth, they will respond. "Thy people shall be willing in the day of Thy power," says the Psalmist. The latent genius of Adventism will yet perceive and receive truths as now dimly perceived. In spite of opposition within the church structure, the Adventist conscience will yet recognize Ellen White's 1888 testimony to be a genuine manifestation of the gift of prophecy, "the testimony of Jesus." In its impact on honest hearts, truth is invincible.

The world and the universe await that other angel who comes down from heaven "having great power; and the earth was lightened with his glory." If it was the Lord's plan that the 1888 message be the "beginning" of that angel's work and the "beginning" of the latter rain, could anything be more important than seeking the full truth about it?

May this book be read with a prayer for discernment and a spirit of faith and repentance.

The Authors.

June 3, 1987

CHAPTER ONE

WHY RE-EXAMINE OUR ADVENTIST PAST?

The Advent Movement has not thus far made progress consistent with its prophetic destiny. There has been progress, but not that which Scripture says must come. The three angels of Revelation 14 have not yet stirred the world. Billions still know little or nothing about this life or death message.

We cannot deny that the fourth angel of Revelation 18 has not yet lightened the earth with the glory of his message. God's program of loving concern for this planet has somehow been thwarted. The long delay deepens perplexity in the church and assumes vexing proportions.

To say that we have failed to do our duty is merely to state the problem in different terms: Why haven't we done our duty, and when will we do it? And to say that God will soon arise and do something is to state it in still another form: Why hasn't He already done what He will eventually do?

We would not dare to charge God with negligence in fulfilling His word. We know that He so loves the world that He gave His Son for its redemption, and He has been ready to bring the plan of salvation to its ultimate triumph long ago. The cross demonstrates His total devotion to the human problem. Such love denies any possibility of divine indifference. Yet billions know almost nothing about His message of grace. Must they never know, never have a chance to appreciate the redemption price He paid and His on-going High Priestly ministry? The questions insist on answers: What is the reason for the delay, and how can the difficulty be rectified?

For the greater part of a century we have looked for answers in each succeeding program, evangelistic resolution, policy and strategy. If only some supernatural power would render the propagation of the message universally phenomenal so that world population could at least understand what it is, then the movement would be vindicated, and its long-awaited triumph would be realized. There would then be no need to re-examine our history.

But God cannot vindicate a lukewarm people. This would surrender His century-long insistence on their following right principles communicated through an inspired messenger. Such compromise would amount to His admission of defeat, virtually that of the entire plan of redemption, because its true success depends on its final hour.

The Reason Is Evident

The hope of God's people in all ages has been the first resurrection. For Biblical reasons, Seventh-day Adventists cannot agree with their brethren of other communions who believe that the saved go immediately to their reward at death. Scripture indicates that they "sleep in Jesus" until they come forth in the first resurrection. But this hope is vain unless Christ comes a second time, because His personal presence alone can make a resurrection possible. "This same Jesus" must return literally and personally. No ethereal spirit substitute can raise the dead.

But this Adventist belief immediately poses a serious problem which calls into question popular theories of righteousness by faith. If the human soul is by nature immortal and the saved go to heaven at death, no special character preparation for the second coming can be necessary. There is no further work that "the everlasting gospel" can accomplish other than what it has accomplished for thousands of years for those who have died. Thus popular concepts of righteousness by faith allow of no special preparation for a second coming.

This is the reason why most non-Adventist Protestants conceive of righteousness by faith as limited to a legal justification. In their view, perfect obedience to God's holy law is neither necessary nor possible. A special preparation for Christ's second coming is simply excluded from thought.

But the Bible truth of the nature of man requires that a community of living believers be ready for Christ's second coming, so that a resurrection of the dead can take place. He is a Farmer who cannot come for His harvest until it is ripe (Mark 4:26-29). But suppose God's people never do get ready either because they cannot, or because they will not?

Christ says of Himself, "I ... overcame" (Revelation 3:21), and He says that "the angel of the church of the Laodiceans" must overcome "even as" He overcame. Evidently a special preparation is necessary. But if that special preparation never takes place, must He admit at last that His people cannot or will not overcome, that His standard for them has been too high, that He has never seriously expected it could be attained? Have we misunderstood Him for over a century, assuming that He demands obedience to His law when obedience is impossible? Could it be that no special readiness of His people is necessary?

These are serious questions. A sizable segment of the church and its ministry lean toward popular concepts that it is not possible to overcome sin per se. These ideas have been adapted to Adventism, following the Calvinist view that as long as one possesses a sinful nature, continued sinning is unavoidable and therefore excusable. (This of course logically denies the significance of the unique Adventist idea of the antitypical Day of Atonement).

To lower God's expectation in order to vindicate an uncaring, lukewarm people would insult divine justice. It would mean establishing the Old Jerusalem in the new earth, continually backsliding, unrepentant and disobedient, in place of the spiritually triumphant and thoroughly repentant New Jerusalem. It would disappoint the hopes of Abraham who "looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God." This "city" would be a finally victorious community of his spiritual descendants, not merely a few scattered, uncoordinated individuals (cf. Hebrews 11:10). Abraham's faith dare not prove to be in vain! There must be a people who attain to that maturity of Christian experience and faith of which he was the true spiritual ancestor. This is the climax toward which history has been moving.

And not only did Abraham exercise such faith. We read that Christ Himself has exercised faith in His people, despite the fact that in the past they "did not believe." He gave His blood for human beings and for the complete redemption of the human race. That's an expensive investment if the returns prove unsatisfactory! In the end "the faith of God" must not prove to be "without effect" (Romans 3:3). Otherwise, the everlasting gospel will be called in question and He will be eternally embarrassed for having exercised a naive faith in mankind.

Failure: an Unthinkable Denouement to God's Program

Even though Christ died for us and paid the price of all our sins as our divine Substitute, there must be some response of faith on our part. Without a people truly ready for Christ's second coming, and without their world mission comprehended, the Lord cannot return. He cannot "thrust in" His mighty sickle until "the harvest of the earth is ripe" (Revelation 14:15, 16). Adventism is deeply rooted in this obvious truth. There is no way we can get away from it and remain Adventists.

Before the Lord can vindicate His remnant church, the present generation must somehow in principle rectify every failure of God's people to follow the light. This must be accomplished not by a program of works, but by their maturely developed faith. As Judge, God cannot clear the unrepentant, whether individuals or a movement.

The findings of this essay suggest there has been some grave official misunderstanding of vital Seventh-day Adventist history. There is evidence that truth concerning the latter rain of the Holy Spirit and the loud cry of Revelation 18 has been distorted and even covered up. There have been tragic world-wide consequences. Misunderstanding our past also throws our understanding of the present out of focus and weakens confidence in our unique mission. And that can leave us prey to disaster. It is impossible for any people anywhere to understand current events correctly if they have distorted the facts of their past.

Truth loses nothing by closer re-examining. Whether it is a theological doctrine or a tenet of vital church history, Ellen White indicates that it must be ferreted out:

> ***No true doctrine will lose anything by close investigation. We are living in perilous times, and it does not become us to accept everything claimed to be truth without examining it thoroughly, neither can we afford to reject anything that bears the fruits of the Spirit of God; but we should be teachable, meek and lowly of heart.... The Lord designs that our opinions be put to the test (RH December 20, 1892).***

If we ourselves do not "put to the test" our opinions concerning both doctrines and historical interpretations, keen minds among our opponents will eventually do the job for us:

> ***If God has ever spoken by me, the time will come when we shall be brought before councils and before thousands for His name's sake, and each one will have to give the reasons of his faith. Then will come the severest criticism upon every position that has been taken for the truth (RH December 18, 1888).***

When the above words were written, important denominational history was in the making. Today, certain interpretations of it among us have assumed almost the form and authority of "doctrine." Hence the need for thorough investigation, that true history may be distinguished from the "tradition of the elders." For reasons to be named later, we have enveloped the 1888 episode of our history in the mists of that tradition. Fact must be separated from fancy.

Repentance and the Day of Atonement

The cleansing of the sanctuary can never be complete until the 1888 incident of our history is fully understood and the underlying spiritual problem solved. That particular segment of our history is specially significant. This is implied in a statement Ellen White wrote to the General Conference president, O. A. Olsen, four years after the Minneapolis conference:

> ***The sin committed in what took place at Minneapolis remains on the record books of heaven, registered against the names of those who resisted light, and it will remain upon the record until full confession is made, and the transgressors stand in full humility before God (Letter, September 1, 1892, O19, 1892).***

Her later writings indicate that "full confession" was never made and the experience of "full humility before God" eluded most of them. Those brethren have all died, but that does not mean those "record books of heaven" are automatically cleansed. They record corporate sin as well as personal sin. The foundation truth that has made Seventh-day Adventists a unique people is that death does not cleanse the heavenly record books. The cleansing must occur in "the investigative judgment," a corporate and final Day of Atonement.

The present issue is not the salvation of the souls of those dear leaders of a century ago who resisted the message. They rest in the Lord, at peace, while they remain prisoners in their tombs. The issue now is the finishing of the work of God on earth, developing a long overdue empathy with the Lord so that we can truly "give glory to Him, for the hour of His judgment is come." We must recover in this generation the priceless blessing which our brethren of a century ago "kept away from the world" and "from our people, in a great measure" (1 SM 234, 235). We are "one body" in Christ, "a city" or a spiritual community corporately involved with those brethren of the past. Their sin is our sin, apart from specific, intelligent repentance.

The "body" is lukewarm, ill with spiritual disease that can be traced to 1888. A new generation must now correctly interpret what happened in a past generation because of its profound implications for our spiritual state today. Christ's message to His last-day church implicitly demands a re-examination of our history which underlies our "rich-and-increased-with-goods" complex (Revelation 3:14-21).

A failure to do so invokes upon ourselves the guilt of previous generations. We are being tested as truly as they were. Like Calvary, 1888 is more than a mere historical event. God's providence will not permit it to be covered with dust in the Adventist attic, forgotten by a new generation. It represents the outworking of principles that reapply in every generation until the final victory of truth.

In a certain real sense, we today are each one at Calvary; we are also "delegates" at the 1888 Conference. We shall be called upon to do what a past generation failed to do. An inspired prophecy tells us how 1888 must be re-examined:

> ***We should be the last people on earth to indulge in the slightest degree the spirit of persecution against those who are bearing the message of God to the***

world. This is the most terrible feature of unchristlikeness that has manifested itself among us since the Minneapolis meeting. Sometime it will be seen in its true bearing, with all the burden of woe that has resulted from it (GCB 1893, p. 184; emphasis added).

A former president of the General Conference also recognized that this issue of 1888 must remain a perennial test among us until at last we do fully overcome:

Some may feel tried over the idea that Minneapolis is referred to [in these meetings, 1893]. I know that some have felt grieved and tried over any allusion to that meeting, and to the situation there. But let it be borne in mind that the reason why anyone should feel so is an unyielding spirit on his part. Just as quickly as we fully surrender, and humble our hearts before God, the difficulty is all gone. The very idea that one is grieved, shows at once the seed of rebellion in the heart ...

If we fail at one time, the Lord will take us over the ground again; and if we fail a second time, He will take us over the ground again; and if we fail a third time, the Lord will take us over the same ground again.... Instead of being vexed over the idea that the Lord is taking us over the same ground, let us thank Him, and praise Him unceasingly, for this is God's mercy and compassion. Anything else than this is our ruin and destruction (O. A. Olsen, ibid., p. 188).

Today there may be some who also feel "grieved and tried" that an inquiry such as this should be made into our history. Why pay such attention to the tragic past? Why not forget it and go "forward" from where we are now?

According to this General Conference president of 1893, sensitive feelings of resentment about 1888 indicate an attitude of heart at war with God's Holy Spirit. Perhaps the Lord impressed him to say what he did. And Ellen White also reminds us that there is terrible danger in forgetting the past (LS 196). A prediction made by A. T. Jones at the same 1893 Session seems uncannily on target:

There will be things to come that will be more surprising than that was to those at Minneapolis,--more surprising than anything we have yet seen. And, brethren, we will be required to receive and preach that truth. But unless you and I have every fiber of that spirit rooted out of our hearts, we will treat that message and the messenger by whom it is sent, as God has declared we have treated this other [1888] message (ibid., p. 185).

Insight Needed Rather Than More Works

Facing the full truth is not being "critical." The truth about the past not only lights up the mysterious present; it imparts hope for the unknown future. The full truth is always good news. When we recognize it, our attempts to secure the promised latter rain and to effect the final harvest will succeed. The longest way around will prove to be the shortest way home. The experience of faith presupposes a full recognition of truth. But until we are

willing to face truth, all our catalog of works must fail because they will be necessarily devoid of that saving faith.

Under God's guidance, history must bring us to a confrontation with reality:

(1) God's love demands that His message of "everlasting good news" go to all the world, proclaimed with power. But He has declared that He cannot add His blessings to confusion in our midst.

(2) The false "Christ" of the modern world is powerless to fasten the remnant church permanently in his grasp. He cannot bestow a supernatural power on it as a whole, as he will eventually do with other religious bodies, because of the presence within her of many thousands who will insist on full acceptance of truth. They are conscientious Seventh-day Adventists because of deep convictions based on Scripture. They will not bow the knee to Baal. And they will not let Baal succeed in silencing them, because they know themselves to be members of Christ's body. They will stand firm as did that lone One in the temple who insisted, "How dare you turn my Father's house into a market!" (John 2:16, NIV).

(3) Thus the Seventh-day Adventist church will not fail in the final crisis because there is a residual strength of the honest in heart who still constitute a great proportion of its fellowship. That strength renders impotent Baal's final attempt to subjugate the Israel of God. Even Baal cannot add his counterfeit blessings to a divided people halting between two opinions! The decisive factor which ensures victory for truth is the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary, a High Priestly ministry of the world's Saviour which has never taken place in history previous to 1844.

The next step will be for those who claim to cherish "the blessed hope" to decide to follow, in the sense of utter devotion, one Lord or the other. The implications of such a decision are staggering to contemplate.

CHAPTER TWO

THE SIN OF LEAVING OUR FIRST LOVE

No one can question the genuineness of the spiritual experience of those who passed through the 1844 movement. Jesus was "precious" to the believers who looked for His soon coming, and their hearts were united in deep, sincere devotion. They recognized the Holy Spirit as unmistakably present in that movement.

It was this conviction, transcending mere reliance on theological correctness, that held the confidence of "the little flock" through the Great Disappointment. The Seventh-day Adventist Church was conceived in an experience of genuine love and was born in a travail of soul by those few who risked everything on their recognition of a genuine work of the Holy Spirit. Thus she was well born, conceived in true faith and not in legalism.

In her early years, she loved the Lord with a true heart, and appreciated the presence of the Holy Spirit. Her later difficulties stem from a tragic leaving of that "first love," and a consequent failure to recognize the true Holy Spirit.

As early as 1850, this warmth of devotion for Jesus began to be gradually replaced in the hearts of many by a "stupid and dormant," "half awake" condition, according to the young messenger of the Lord. An insidious love of self began to replace true love for the Saviour, producing lukewarmness. Pride and complacency in possessing a system of truth gradually crowded out much of the simple heart-felt faith in Jesus which led to its acceptance originally.

Thus, soon after the Great Disappointment of 1844 and the gathering of the "little flock" who held their faith, there developed a deficiency in their understanding of the import of the three angels' messages. The deficiency was not theological but spiritual. The church was like an adolescent who grows physically but remains a child otherwise.

The "truth" made phenomenal progress and was found invincible in debate, but "the servants of the Lord have trusted too much to the strength of argument," said Ellen White in 1855 (1T 113). This made it difficult for them to resist the unconscious but subtle temptation to indulge a spiritual pride--had they not seen and accepted truth, and sacrificed for it? There seemed to be merit in such sacrifice. Ministers and evangelists would pitch their tent in a new community, stir up the other ministers and the popular churches, win the arguments and debates, gather out their "best" members, baptize them, raise up a new church, and move on to more victories almost everywhere. There enjoyed a euphoria of success.

Opposition led them to cherish the hope of personal or corporate vindication at the second advent more than love's anticipation of meeting the Beloved, whether such a meeting included vindication or not. Their faith became to them more an act of belief in doctrinal truth and obedience to it, motivated by a self-oriented concern for reward rather than a heart-felt appreciation of the grace of Christ. Instead of walking humbly in utter dependence on the Lord, "we" began to walk proudly with our indisputable doctrinal evidence of "the truth."

The result was inevitably a form of legalism. The same experience has been repeated often in the individual lives of new Adventist converts. Rightly understood, the history of the Advent movement is the story of our own individual hearts. Each of us is a microcosm of the whole, as each drop of water embodies the essence of the rain. In all that we say about the experience of past years, we remember that we are no better than our forefathers. As Paul informed the believers at Rome, "we" do the same things (Romans 2:1). Only through an insight which recognizes corporate guilt can the failures of our denominational history be resolved with positive, encouraging value.

How Our Lukewarmness Took Root

Ellen White early recognized that our problem was a leaving of our "first love," a loss of intimacy with Christ through not appreciating His sacrifical love. She herself apparently never lost that first love, for she was always keen and quick to recognize manifestations of the true Holy Spirit. But "we" were not so readily perceptive.

We could sing joyfully with W. H. Hyde, "We have heard from the bright, the holy land, we have heard and our hearts are glad," yet there was a constant tension between recognizing or appreciating the living gift of prophecy, and our natural-born human resentment against its reproof or correction. While the power of the Spirit of God attending Ellen White's ministry often constrained church leadership to recognize the divine authority of her message, they were seldom as a whole in true heart-sympathy with its deep spiritual probing. Such inner resentment is not surprising for us humans. It was evident all through Israel's ancient history.

This almost continual neglect to heed Ellen White's earnest appeals to return to a contrite "first love" resulted in the darkest hours of our history. An increasing but unconscious self-love of ministers and believers crowded out real faith, and as a consequence the ability to discern the working of the Holy Spirit faded away. A development so horrendous as to be unimaginable to the pioneers (and nearly so to us today) finally took place. The time would come in 1888 when that mighty Third Person of the Godhead would actually be "insulted" by the responsible delegates at an official General Conference Session (cf. Ms. 24, 1892; Special Testimonies, Series A, No. 7, p. 54; see chapter six). How could Seventh-day Adventists do such a thing?

Had it not been for Ellen White's continued ministry, it is doubtful that the movement could have survived other than as a legalistic cult like the Jehovah's Witnesses or the Worldwide Church of God. This in itself--usually recognized as true--is a strikingly plain commentary on the nature of our deep seated unbelief. We were repeating in a few decades history which ancient Israel took centuries to traverse. No Seventh-day Adventist would deny that the church was "Jerusalem." But she was still the old city, not yet the New.

We failed to see the three angels' messages as "the everlasting gospel." The doctrines were true. But ministers and members were blinded to a proper discernment of the third angel's message in verity, as the blindness of the Jews prevented them from discerning the true message of the Old Testament. That verity which the Jews couldn't see was the place of the cross in their sanctuary services and in the ministry of their long-expected Messiah. Likewise, the place of the cross in the third angel's message eluded our late-nineteenth-century brethren.

As early as 1867, Ellen White spoke of the principle of the cross (rather than dress reform) as the fundamental motif inspiring all of our Seventh-day Adventist commitment and lifestyle:

> ***We have been so united with the world that we have lost sight of the cross, and do not suffer for Christ's sake....***
>
> ***In the acceptance of the cross we are distinguished from the world. (1T 525).***

And in 1879 she wrote:

> ***"There is too much bustle and stir about our religion, while Calvary and the cross are forgotten" (5T 133).***

Growth Vs. Progress

What made our spiritual state even more difficult to understand was the fact that the church did enjoy a prosperous growth numerically, financially, and in prestige. This was reflected in a steady increase of institutional, financial, and organizational strength. The fledgling movement, starting from less than nothing in the face of the world's post-1844 scorn, had assumed the form of a permanently established denomination, well respected. We had what was widely recognized as the finest health institution in the world, and one of the most advanced church printing plants in the "west."

Of course, there was nothing wrong with such material progress. Most of the advances made were at the insistence of the agent of the gift of prophecy. It was right and proper that institutions be established, that the work spread into new regions and churches everywhere be raised up. But ministers and laity alike mistook this growth for the true end and purpose of the Advent movement--a spiritual preparation for the return of Christ. Confusion resulted, and self-esteem and complacency began to surface in the weekly reports of "the advance of the cause" as published in the Review.

The spirit evident in those reports of "progress" contrasts with the fervent messages of counsel which Ellen White sent out at the same time. Many of the brethren expressed almost incessant optimism about the results of their work. True, God was leading, and the movement was His. But inspiration and history report that the most remarkable aspect of the "work" was not its material progress, but its lack of spiritual maturity.

The primary purpose of the Advent movement has always been to develop the Christlike character of a remnant which vindicates His sacrifice. No other community of saints in all history have welcomed such a maturity of experience, symbolized in Scripture as the Bride making "herself ready" (Revelation 19:7). This last remnant will become the population of a "New Jerusalem," having overcome the backslidings of all previous generations. In their character will be seen the practical results of the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary. The plan of salvation is to reach its culmination, and the doubts and objections of Satan and his hosts are to be forever answered. The unfallen universe itself is to be reassured by watching a grand demonstration of the complete success of the plan of salvation in its final hour. The gospel is to be demonstrated as "the power of God unto salvation" (Romans 1:16).

Bound up with the attainment of this primary objective is the realization of a secondary one: finishing the gospel program of world mission. The attainment of the secondary goal is represented in Scripture as virtually assured once the primary one is realized (Mark 4:26-29; Revelation 14:15; John 13:35).

Had "we" not been blinded by self-love, a true understanding of the verity of the three angels' messages would long ago have ensured genuine progress toward the attainment of that primary goal of Christlikeness of character. Instead, there has been an imagined progress in the fulfillment of the secondary goal.

But a serious problem immediately becomes evident. Other denominations are making the same kind of numerical and institutional "progress," even far better, which suggests that such growth means little so far as Heaven's real blessings on our work are concerned. In the process we have largely lost sight of the primary goal in this illusory fulfillment of the secondary one. Official reports reach ill-advised conclusions based on financial or statistical advancement. One example follows, the tip of an iceberg of pride and complacency:

> ***The financial success of this vast denominational undertaking cannot be stronger than the faith and zeal which animate God's chosen people. These combined resources, under the generalship of the Captain of the Lord's hosts, will lead to the early triumph of the great Second Advent Movement in all the world (Thirty-seventh Financial Report, General Conference, December 31, 1948, p. 9).***

In other words, the spiritual faith and zeal of God's chosen people are measured by their statistical records! It may be said that this is an extreme and outdated example. But it illustrates a mind-set predominant at the time, and recognizable almost everywhere today. The language of our hearts claims that we are "rich and increased with goods." The Author and Finisher of our faith says the opposite, however.

Such was the spiritual condition of the church in the decade preceding the 1888 General Conference Session. The messenger of the Lord had often decried the love of self that became so painfully evident in an all-pervasive lukewarmness. In desperate efforts to help, she sent burning messages of entreaty to "us" in the years preceding the 1888 Conference, messages to motivate ministers and people to recover the deep, heart-felt love for Jesus that had become nearly lost. She worked hard, but for some reason the appeals largely fell on deaf ears and were not successful.

God's Simple Remedy for a Serious Denominational Problem

Could some dynamic message, some simple "word," penetrate to Laodicea's heart and accomplish for the church in a short time what decades of Ellen White's earnest spiritual ministry had failed to do?

The answer is yes, according to the Lord's plan. He would send such a "word" through humble instruments in 1888, a message to be the "beginning" of the latter rain and the loud cry. The circumstances of its coming would be as lowly as the "worm" that caused Jonah's vine to wither, and as humble as the birth in Bethlehem's barn. God sent two young, obscure agents with a fresh presentation of pure truth. Ellen White was delighted with

their message. She saw how it provided the missing link of Adventism, the motivation that transformed the heavy "oughts" of legalism into the joyful imperatives of apostolic devotion.

But she was righteously indignant with leading brethren who could not see what was happening and who reacted to it negatively. She spoke about the two messengers thus:

> ***The priest took [the infant Jesus] in his arms, but he could see nothing there. God did not speak to him and say, "This is the consolation of Israel." But just as soon as Simeon came in, ... he sees there that little Infant in His mother's arms, ... God says to him, "This is the consolation of Israel." ... Here was one who recognized Him because he was where he could discern spiritual things....***
>
> ***We have not a doubt but that the Lord was with Elder Waggoner as he spoke yesterday....***
>
> ***The question is, Has God sent the truth? Has God raised up these men to proclaim the truth? I say, yes, God has sent men to bring us the truth that we should not have had unless God had sent somebody to bring it to us.... I accept it, and I no more dare to lift my hand against these persons [than] against Jesus Christ, who is to be recognized in His messengers....***
>
> ***We have been in perplexity, and we have been in doubt, and the churches are ready to die. But now here we read [quotes Revelation 18:1] (Ms. 2, 1890).***

Our Problem Today

A century later, with a more ponderous world-wide machinery of organization, the difficulty of rectifying the same lukewarm, "ready to die" condition appears even more perplexing than it was in 1890. Denominational pride and lukewarmness in many nations and cultures present a staggering problem. It can no longer be hoped that the mere passage of time will provide a remedy. Even God's patience may soon be at an end. The effects of our lukewarmness will not, cannot, be tolerated by the Lord Himself forever. It is He who says that we make Him so sick that He feels like throwing up (this is what the original language implies in Revelation 3:16, 17).

The key to understanding our present baffling position lies in a true appraisal of what happened at the 1888 Session and its aftermath. We must recognize the reality of its spiritual fall-out in our denominational character world-wide today. The latter rain and the loud cry began among us as a simple, unspectacular message of miraculous power, but these priceless blessings were shut off because the Holy Spirit was "insulted."

How this could happen we must consider in our next chapter.

CHAPTER THREE

THE LOUD CRY TO COME IN A SURPRISING WAY

For decades preceding 1888, the church and its leadership looked forward to the "times of refreshing" when the long-expected latter rain would come. This was a cherished expectation among us a century ago like the long-awaited coming of the Messiah was to the Jews in John the Baptist's time.

However, few seemed to recognize that the latter rain and the loud cry would be primarily a clearer understanding of the gospel. The loud cry was expected to be increased noise. It took us by surprise that it turned out to be increased light.

We expected a thunderous shaking of the earth with a message of "Get ready, or else!" and were not prepared for the still small voice of a revelation of grace as the true motivation of the third angel's message. The supernatural power we hoped for must be consequent on our accepting that greater gospel light. that must lighten the earth with glory.

There was a terrible danger that the Jewish leaders might reject their Messiah when He should come "suddenly." And there was an equal danger that the responsible leaders of our church might spurn the loud cry when it should begin. As far back as 1882 Ellen White had warned that they might someday be unable to recognize the true Holy Spirit:

> ***Many of you cannot discern the work and presence of God.... There are men among us in responsible positions who hold that ... such a faith as that of Paul, Peter, or John, is ... old fashioned, and insufferable at the present time. It is pronounced absurd, mystical, and unworthy of an intelligent mind (5T 74, 79).***

A false optimism prevailed ("I know that many think far too favorably of the present time"), and "in the mighty sifting soon to take place," these leading workers could be found unfit for crisis-era leadership:

> ***Those who have trusted to intellect, genius, or talent, will not then stand at the head of rank and file. They did not keep pace with the light. Those who have proved themselves unfaithful will not then be entrusted with the flock. In the last solemn work, few great men will be engaged (5T 80).***

Ellen White had looked forward to the time when the Lord would take leadership into His own hands and raise up human instruments whom He could trust:

> ***When we have men as devoted as Elijah, and possessing the faith which he possessed, we shall see that God will reveal Himself to us as He did to holy men of old. When we have men, who, while they acknowledge their deficiencies, will plead with God in earnest faith, as did Jacob, we shall see the same results (4T 402).***

Specifically, the General Conference president in 1885 was warned that unless he and some others are

> ***aroused to a sense of their duty, they will not recognize the work of God when the loud cry of the third angel shall be heard. When light goes forth to lighten the earth, instead of coming up to the help of the Lord, they will want to bind about His work to meet their narrow ideas. Let me tell you that the Lord will work in this last work in a manner very much out of the common order of things, and in a way that will be contrary to any human planning.... The workers will be surprised by the simple means that He will use to bring about and perfect His work of righteousness (October 1, 1885; TM 300).***

That letter was addressed to both G. I. Butler and S. N. Haskell. Haskell heeded the warning and was one of the few who had the discernment to recognize the mysterious thing that was happening before his eyes three years later. But not Butler and many others. The Lord would be forced in 1888 to pass by experienced ministers, to use younger or more obscure agents:

> ***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....***
>
> ***Many will reject the very messages God sends to His people, if these leading brethren do not accept them.... Even if all our leading men should refuse light and truth, that door will still remain open. The Lord will raise up men who will give the people the message for this time (GW old ed., 126).***

Again, in 1882 we were told:

> ***It may be under a rough and uninviting exterior the pure brightness of a genuine Christian character will be revealed....***
>
> ***Elijah took Elisha from the plough, and threw upon him the mantle of consecration. The call to this great and solemn work was presented to men of learning and position; had these men been little in their own eyes, and trusted fully in the Lord, He would have honored them with bearing His standard in triumph to the victory....***
>
> ***God will work a work in our day that but few anticipate. He will raise up and exalt among us those who are taught rather by the unction of His Spirit, than by the outward training of scientific institutions (5T 81, 82).***

Those 1882 testimonies exhibit an inspired foresight. It was as though that little lady wrote the 1888 history in advance!

The Divine Choice of Messengers

In that very year, 1882, E. J. Waggoner began a course of training that was evidently under the special guidance of the Holy Spirit. He was being prepared to be the agent of a special work. He later described his experience:

> ***I began my real study of the Bible, thirty-four years ago [1882]. At that time Christ was set forth before my eyes "evidently crucified" for me. I was sitting a little apart from the body of the congregation in the large tent at a camp meeting in Healdsburg [California], one gloomy Sabbath afternoon. I have no idea what was the subject of the discourse. Not a word nor a text have I ever known. All that has remained with me was what I saw. Suddenly a light shone round me, and the tent was for me far more brilliantly lighted than if the noon-day sun had been shining, and I saw Christ hanging on the cross, crucified for me. In that moment I had my first positive knowledge, which came like an overwhelming flood, that God loved me, and that Christ died for me. God and I were the only beings I was conscious of in the universe. I knew then, by actual sight, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself; I was the whole world with all its sin. I am sure that Paul's experience on the way to Damascus was no more real than mine....***
>
> ***I resolved at once that I would study the Bible in the light of that revelation, in order that I might help others to see the same truth. I have always believed that every part of the Bible must set forth, with more or less vividness, that glorious revelation [Christ crucified] (Letter, May 16, 1916, written just before his sudden death).***

In those same years preceding 1888 the Lord was preparing his colleague. The message of truth found A. T. Jones as a private in the U. S. Army. Although not a product of the schools, he studied night and day, amassing a great store of historical and Biblical knowledge. J. S. Washburn, who knew him personally, told us that he was a humble, earnest, and deep- feeling person whose effectual prayers gave evidence that he knew the Lord (interview, June 4, 1950).

Young Jones' keen intellect was balanced by warm, simple, child-like faith. In the days when he was used of God, he was powerful in preaching and in personal ministry. In the years immediately following 1888, there were significant demonstrations of the Spirit of God working through him, including special ministry in Washington at the U. S. Senate to defeat the Blair Sunday bill. In fact, this near-century of continuing religious liberty that Americans enjoy is a legacy of the effective efforts of the unrecognized and unhonored Jones and Waggoner in opposing religious intolerance of their day.

The Spirit of God was truly preparing these two young men to herald to the remnant church and to the world itself the "beginning" of the long-awaited loud cry:

> ***The Lord in His great mercy sent a most precious message to His people through Elders Jones and Waggoner. This message was to bring more prominently before the world the uplifted Saviour, the sacrifice for the sins of***

the whole world.... God gave His messengers just what the people needed (1895; TM 91, 95).

For eight years following 1888, Ellen White often spoke of these two young men as "the Lord's messengers," endorsing them in words never uttered of any others. There are between 200 and 300 such enthusiastic statements from her. In 1890 she said:

Suppose that you blot out the testimony that has been going during these last two years, proclaiming the righteousness of Christ, who can you point to as bringing out special light for the people? (RH, March 18, 1890).

In 1888 she had said:

God is presenting to the minds of men divinely appointed precious gems of truth, appropriate for our time (MS. 8a, 1888; A. V. Olson, Through Crisis to Victory, p. 279; hereafter, Olson).

The message given us by A. T. Jones and E. J. Waggoner is the message of God to the Laodicean church (Letter S24, 1892).

When she first heard the message of Waggoner, she immediately perceived its true significance. It was a special revelation for the church and for the world:

I have had the question asked, what do you think of this light which these men are presenting? Why, I have been presenting it to you for the last forty-five years,--the matchless charms of Christ. This is what I have been trying to present before your minds. When Brother Waggoner brought out these ideas at Minneapolis, it was the first clear teaching on this subject from any human lips I had heard, excepting the conversations between myself and my husband. I have said to myself, it is because God has presented it to me in vision that I see it so clearly, and they cannot see it because they have not had it presented to them as I have, and when another presented it, every fiber of my heart said amen (Ms. 5, 1889).

In our modern terminology, she perceived the message to be a transmission that would apply power from the engine to the drive wheels. For "forty-five years" she had been racing the engine, but the power to finish the gospel commission wasn't getting through. Now she perceived how the new message supplementing the old would actually prepare the people of that generation for the coming of the Lord. No wonder she was happy!

How the Loud Cry Was Not Recognized

As early as April 1, 1890, Ellen White, growing in understanding, applied the language of Revelation 18 to the 1888 message:

Several have written to me inquiring if the [1888] message of justification by faith is the third angel's message, and I have answered, "It is the third

angel's message in verity." The prophet declares, "And after these things I saw another angel come down from heaven, having great power; and the earth was lightened with his glory" [Rev. 18:1] (RH, April 1, 1890).

By 1892, she was ready to state unequivocally that the message was indeed the beginning of the long-awaited loud cry:

The loud cry of the third angel has already begun in the revelation of the righteousness of Christ, the sin-pardoning Redeemer. This is the beginning of the light of the angel whose glory shall fill the whole earth (RH November 22, 1892).

Note that the "beginning" of this angel's work was the message, not its assumed acceptance by the leadership or the people. We shall see later how this reality packs a powerful significance in a time of crisis.

Elder Butler, the most responsible officer of the church, was foremost in opposing that precious light of the loud cry. Few others were spiritually able to transcend his negative influence. In his blind opposition to the loud cry we may see the tragic fulfillment of the inspired warning sent him on October 1, 1885 (cf. TM 300):

There are some who have a desire to have a decision made at once as to what is the correct view in the point under discussion. As this would please Elder Butler, it is advised that this question should be settled at once. But are minds prepared for such a decision? I could not sanction this course.... They are not prepared to make safe decisions....

I see no reason for the wrought-up state of feeling that has been created at this meeting [Minneapolis, 1888].... The messages coming from your president at Battle Creek are calculated to stir you up to take a decided position; but I warn you against doing this.... Excited feelings will lead to rash moves (Ms. 15, 1888; Olson, p. 295).

I can never forget the experience which we had in Minneapolis, or the things which were then revealed to me in regard to the spirit that controlled men, the words spoken, the actions done in obedience to the powers of evil... They were moved at the meeting by another spirit, and they knew not that God had sent these young men to bear a special message to them which they treated with ridicule and contempt, not realizing that the heavenly intelligences were looking upon them.

I know that at that time the Spirit of God was insulted (MS. 24, 1892).

Thus did the leadership of this church, fondly expecting to be vindicated before the world in the long-expected loud cry, actually do despite to the Spirit of grace and despise the riches of His goodness.

Let us make clear that this sin of insulting the Holy Spirit did not bind the corporate body of the church in the unpardonable sin. The ancient Jews' sin against the Holy Spirit consisted of attributing His work to Satan (Mark 3:22-30). We do not read that our brethren in general in the 1888 era went that far, although some individuals may have

done so. (Insulting Him was bad enough!). Ellen White continued to minister to this church until her death in 1915, thus indicating her belief that forgiveness is possible, and that the solution to our problem is not denominational disintegration or abandonment, but denominational repentance and reconciliation with the Holy Spirit.

So-Called "Faults" of Messengers No Excuse to Reject Their Message

Rejection of light by God's appointed trustees is always inexcusable. It is not our place in this late day to find fault; we can only note facts. The brethren who opposed the light sincerely thought they were doing right because the agents whom the Lord employed seemed faulty. The Lord worked in a manner out of the ordinary and surprised the brethren. Ellen White described what was happening, using the future tense to depict events in the present:

> ***In the manifestation of the power that lightens the earth with its glory, they will see only something which in their blindness they think dangerous, something which will arouse their fears and they will brace themselves against it. Because the Lord does not work according to their expectations and ideas, they will oppose the work (RH Extra, December 23, 1890).***

Earlier, she had pinpointed the difficulty the brethren were having in their own souls. We can sympathize with them, for the trial was a very severe one:

> ***Now I want you to be careful, every one of you, what position you take, whether you enshroud yourselves in the clouds of unbelief because you see imperfections; you see a word or a little item, perhaps, that may take place, and judge them [Jones and Waggoner] from that.... You are to see whether God is working with them, and then you are to acknowledge the Spirit of God that is revealed in them. And if you choose to resist it you will be acting just as the Jews acted (Sermon, March 9, 1890; MS. 2, 1890).***

Older experienced brethren were piqued at the prospect of Ellen White so decidedly supporting two comparatively young and obscure men against practically the entire assembly of workers. Elder A. G. Daniells later said that she had to stand "almost alone" against nearly the entire General Conference (The Abiding Gift of Prophecy, p. 369). Robert W. Olson reported to the 1986 Annual Council in Rio de Janeiro that she was "publicly defied" at the 1888 session (Adventist Review, October 30, 1986). If she was right, it seemed that God had passed the leading brethren by, and this was disconcerting:

> ***Those whom God has sent with a message are only men, but what is the character of the message which they bear? Will you dare to turn from, or make light of, the warnings, because God did not consult you as to what would be preferred? (RH December 27, 1890).***
>
> ***God ... gave you opportunity to come up armed and equipped to the help of the Lord.... But did you make ready? ... You sat still, and did nothing. You left the word of the Lord to fall unheeded to the ground; and now the Lord has taken***

men who were boys when you were standing at the forefront of the battle, and has given to them the message and the work which you did not take upon you.... Will you criticize? Will you say, "They are getting out of their place?" Yet you did not fill the place they are now called to fill (TM 413).

Human nature being what it is, opposers would seek for some pegs on which to hang their doubts. The fact that the Lord's messengers were "only" men seemed to supply the need:

Those whom God has sent with a message are only men.... Some have turned from the message of the righteousness of Christ to criticize the men (RH December 27, 1890).

Speaking to "those in responsible positions," Ellen White asked: "How long will you hate and despise the messengers of God's righteousness?" (TM 96).

One of our esteemed denominational authors attempts to show that the 1888 opposition was justifiable. Note how he emphasizes the "faults" of Jones and Waggoner and blames them for causing the rejection of their message. Thus he in fact perpetuates the 1888 prejudice and sets our clock back a hundred years:

Not only was he [Jones] naturally abrupt, but he cultivated singularity of speech and manner, ... was at times obstreperous, and he gave just cause for resentment ....

[Jones and Waggoner] shouting, "Christ is all" ... gave evidence that they were not wholly sanctified.... [Incorrectly cites Mrs. White as supporting the idea that Jones and Waggoner contributed a contentious spirit to the "terrible experience at the Minneapolis Conference."]

They bore almost exclusively upon faith as the factor in salvation, ... [were] not disposed to consider the other side calmly.... Were not wholly without fault in conceit and arrogance....

Failed to show the humility and love which righteousness by faith imparts.... Extreme teaching of Jones and Waggoner is observable still in the mystical pronouncements of those who make faith all and works nothing.

... [They were] imperfect channels.... As we look back on the controversy we perceive that it was the rancors aroused by [Jones' and Waggoner's] personalities, much more than the differences in beliefs, which caused the difficulty (A. W. Spalding, Captains of the Host, pp. 591-602).

This is a negative analysis of the men whom inspiration designated as the "Lord's messengers." While they were indeed "only men," it is difficult to understand why the Lord should choose for such a special work men who were notably "imperfect channels", unsanctified (in comparison with others), justly arousing "resentment" and "rancors," crude and "mystical." The Lord abhors a self-righteous, contentious spirit. But Jones and Waggoner did not have such a spirit in the 1888 era.

While it is true that Ellen White rebuked A. T. Jones for being momentarily "too sharp" on Uriah Smith in the pre-session controversy on the ten horns, she nevertheless defended

the two brethren as "Christians" and "gentlemen." And she more than hinted that a goodly number of the opposing brethren did not evidence such "heavenly credentials."

We have modern writers who paint Jones and Waggoner in the same fault-finding terms as did their 1888 opponents. But the two "messengers" enjoyed Ellen White's unqualified endorsement. It is true that after the 1888 era finally ended, they faltered and lost their way. This is probably the reason why modern writers want to blame them for the 1888 tragedy. But they misjudge the facts.

Ellen White foretold that this tragic development would take place if opposition to their message continued. Nevertheless, she added, their later failure would in no way invalidate their message and ministry from 1888-1896, the period of her endorsements (see chapter 10). For us to criticize these "messengers" during that era of the "beginning" loud cry is to endorse the objections of their contemporary opponents. Logically, it justifies spurning the special blessing which came from heaven. It's amazing that after a hundred years we still feel compelled to blame the Lord's special messengers for the consequences of our own unbelief.

Ellen White notably regarded Jones and Waggoner as showing a genuine Christian spirit during and after the Minneapolis conference (contemporary eyewitness accounts substantiate her judgment):

> ***Doctor Waggoner has spoken to us in a straight-forward manner.... Of one thing I am certain, as Christians you have no right to entertain feelings of enmity, unkindness and prejudice toward Dr. Waggoner, who has presented his view in a plain, straight-forward manner, as a Christian should.... I believe him to be perfectly honest in his views, and I would respect his feelings and trust him as a Christian brother, so long as there is no evidence that he is unworthy. The fact that he honestly holds some views of Scripture differing from yours and mine, is no reason we should treat him as an offender, as a dangerous man, and make him the subject of unjust criticism (Ms. 15, 1888; Olson, p. 294).***

A young minister who came to the Minneapolis meeting with a prejudiced mind against him has left on record his impressions of the spirit which Waggoner showed:

> ***Being decidedly prejudiced in favor of Elder Butler, and against E. J. Waggoner, I went to that meeting with a prejudiced mind....***
>
> ***With pencil and notebook in hand I listened for heresy and was ready to see flaws and find fault with whatever was presented. As Elder Waggoner started in, it seemed very different from what I was looking for. By the close of his second lesson I was ready to concede that he was going to be fair and his manner did not show any spirit of controversy, nor did he mention any opposition that he was anticipating. Very soon his manner, and the pure gospel that he was setting forth materially changed my mind and attitude, and I was an earnest listener for Truth ... At the close of Elder Waggoner's fourth or fifth lesson I was a subdued, repenting sinner....***
>
> ***.... After Elder Waggoner had finished his eleven studies, the influence of which had in quite a measure taken out of a good many the debating spirit....***

(C. McReynolds, "Experiences While at the General Conference in Minneapolis, Minn., in 1888." E. G. White Estate, D File, 189).

Ellen White even defended the bold teaching and apparently iconoclastic spirit of the young messengers:

Men will go forth in the spirit and power of Elijah to prepare the way for the second advent of the Lord Jesus Christ. It is their work to make crooked things straight. Some things must be torn down; some things must be built up (Ms. 15, 1888; Olson, p. 300).

Let no soul complain of the servants of God who have come to them with a heaven-sent message. Do not any longer pick flaws in them, saying, "They are too positive; they talk too strongly." They may talk strongly; but is it not needed? God will make the ears of the hearers tingle if they will not heed His voice or His message....

Ministers, do not dishonor your God and grieve His Holy Spirit, by casting reflections on the ways and manners of the men He would choose. God knows the character. He sees the temperament of the men He has chosen. He knows that none but earnest, firm, determined, strong-feeling men will view this work in its vital importance, and will put such firmness and decision into their testimonies that they will make a break against the barriers of Satan (TM 410, 412, 413).

A modern historian describes the unpolished and supposedly unlettered A. T. Jones as "a towering, angular man, with a loping gait and uncouth posturings and gestures" (Spalding, op. cit., p. 591). Ellen White had a very different view of him:

There are Christian workers who have not received a collegiate education because it was impossible for them to secure this advantage; but God has given evidence that He has chosen them.... He has made them effectual co-workers with Himself. They have a teachable spirit; they feel their dependence upon God, and the Holy Spirit is with them to help their infirmities.... There is heard in his voice the echo of the voice of Christ.

It is evident that he walks with God, that he has been with Jesus and learned of Him. He has brought the truth into the inner sanctuary of the soul; it is to him a living reality, and he presents the truth in the demonstration of the Spirit and of power. The people hear the joyful sound. God speaks to their hearts through the man consecrated to His service.... He becomes really eloquent. He is earnest and sincere, and is beloved by those for whom he labors.... His defects will be forgiven and forgotten. His hearers will not become weary or disgusted, but will thank God for the message of grace sent them through His servant.

They [opponents] can hold the objectionable atom under the magnifying glasses of their imagination until the atom looks like a world, and shuts out from their view the precious light of heaven.... Why take so much account of that which may appear to you as objectionable in the messenger, and sweep

away all the evidences that God has given to balance the mind in regard to truth? ("Christian Education," 1893, quoted in FE 242, 243; RH April 18, 1893).

Ellen White herself, with all her respected experience and age, and conscious of her exalted position as a special messenger of the Lord, felt it an honor to support the work of Jones and Waggoner:

I have traveled from place to place, attending meetings where the message of the righteousness of Christ was preached. I considered it a privilege to stand by the side of my brethren, and give my testimony with the message for the time (RH, March 18, 1890).

The True Reason Why the Message Was Rejected

As we today re-read the inspired messages sent for years after 1888, urging the acceptance of the message, we cannot understand--reading on the surface--why there could be any failure to do so. We have therefore made the mistake of assuming that our brethren did indeed come to accept it wholeheartedly.

We must not overlook an important fact. How could anyone accept the message God sent and "hate and despise" the messengers whom He used? They were "only men," were very positive and bold, and unfortunately for the prestige and peace of the brethren, they were right. This made the Lord's chosen agencies of deliverance to become objects of stumbling and a stone of offence because of the prevailing unbelief. That which the Lord intended as a savor of life unto life became a savor of death unto death. That which He sent for the finishing of His work became the beginning of a long delay.

To accept the message was too much humiliation. The implications were that God was somehow displeased with the spiritual condition of those who were the "proper channels" for special light from heaven. Note Ellen White's analysis of the heart of the problem:

If the rays of light which shone at Minneapolis were permitted to exert their convincing power upon those who took their stand against light, if all had yielded their ways, and submitted their wills to the Spirit of God at that time, they would have received the richest blessings, disappointed the enemy, and stood as faithful men, true to their convictions. They would have had a rich experience; but self said, "No." Self was not willing to be bruised; self struggled for the mastery, and every one of those souls will be tested again on the points where they failed then.... Self and passion developed hateful characteristics (Letter 19, 1892).

Some have been cultivating hatred against the men whom God has commissioned to bear a special message to the world. They began this satanic work at Minneapolis. Afterward, when they saw and felt the demonstration of the Holy Spirit testifying that the message was of God, they hated it the more, because it was a testimony against them (TM 79, 80; 1895).

The Holy Spirit will, from time to time, reveal the truth through its own agencies; and no man, not even a priest or a ruler, has a right to say, You shall not give publicity to your opinions, because I do not believe them. That

wonderful "I" may attempt to put down the Holy Spirit's teaching (TM 70; 1896).

They [the opposers] heard not, neither would they understand. Why?--Lest they should be converted and have to acknowledge that all their ideas were not correct. This they were too proud to do, and therefore persisted in rejecting God's counsel and the light and evidence which had been given.... This is the ground which some of our leading brethren are travelling over now (Ms. 25, 1890).

As in all past ages, a prophet's analysis of the truth was unflattering and unwelcome. But for us today, there is good news in facing reality.

Who Were the "Some"?

Note the expression, "*some* of our leading brethren" rejected "God's counsel." Is it possible to know the truth of what proportion that "some" implies?

Six years later Ellen White identified those who rejected the message with a generic designation. The "some" were the bulk of our leading, most influential brethren: "The light that is to lighten the whole earth with its glory was resisted, and by the action of *our own brethren* has been in a great degree kept away from the world" (Letter 96, 1896; 1 SM 235; emphasis added). Without exception she consistently identifies those "of our own brethren" who rejected as "many" and those who accepted as "few" (see chapter 4).

The parable of 1888 throws light on our position today:

The Jews refused to receive Christ because He did not come in accordance with their expectations....

This is the danger to which the church is now exposed--that the inventions of men shall mark out the precise way for the Holy Spirit to come. Though they would not care to acknowledge it, some have already done this. And because the Spirit is to come, not to praise men or to build up their erroneous theories, but to reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment, many turn away from it (TM 64, 65; 1896).

Obviously, the 1888 message was far more than a mere re-emphasis of a neglected doctrine. The delegates to the Conference came unexpectedly face-to-face with Christ when they came face-to-face with His message. "What is justification by faith? It is the work of God in laying the glory of man in the dust" (COR 104). The confrontation involved the humbling of their souls into that dust, and for this they were not prepared. They resented contrition, and tears trickling down their faces.

In retrospect, we can see how the love of Christ that melts hearts and professional clergy pride was unwelcome. They were steeped in success, and lowliness of heart became a stumblingblock.

Could this still be our problem today?

CHAPTER FOUR

ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION: IN SEARCH OF A SHARPER FOCUS

Whether the 1888 message was accepted or rejected is more than a trivial academic controversy. As it is impossible to separate the gospel from the history of the cross, so it is impossible to appreciate the 1888 message apart from seeing the truth of its history. We cannot correctly understand our present corporate relationship to Christ unless we understand that reality. Confusion is dangerous, for it is well known that a people who do not know history are fated to repeat it, and may already be doing so.

Ellen White's account of the history is clear and impossible to misunderstand. Nevertheless, one author represents the historical evidence as being ambiguous:

> ***The question has often been discussed: What happened following the Minneapolis General Conference of 1888? Did the church accept or reject the new emphasis on the gospel of salvation? If a person studies the records of those years looking for evidence of acceptance, he can find such evidence. On the other hand, one who looks for evidence of rejection can also find what he seeks (N. F. Pease, The Faith That Saves, p. 43).***

However, the important issue is not whether the church accepted the message. Ellen White says that "Satan succeeded in shutting [it] away from our people, in a great measure" (cf. 1 SM 234, 235; 1896). The church never had a fair chance to consider it undistorted and unopposed. The issue is whether the leadership accepted it. Ellen White speaks frankly about this. Her testimony is present truth, relevant to our spiritual state today.

The world-wide Seventh-day Adventist Church has been taught through authoritative publications that the 1888 message was accepted in that generation by the predominant leadership, and has been the secure doctrinal possession of the church ever since. Here is a "rich and increased with goods" assumption. Briefly stated, the official view follows:

> ***The rank and file of Seventh-day Adventist workers and laity accepted the [1888] presentations at Minneapolis and were blessed. Certain leading men there resisted the teaching (A Further Appraisal of the Manuscript "1888 Re-examined," General Conference, September 1958, p. 11).***

An authoritative volume which at its initial publication bore the endorsement of two General Conference presidents "was read critically by some sixty of our ablest scholars.... Doubtless no volume in our history has ever had such magnificent prepublication support" (p. 8). This book informs us that opposition to the message was insignificant because eventually less than ten delegates to the 1888 session actually rejected the message or

were unfavorable to it. This astounding view deserves close attention, for if it is true, we must believe it:

> ***The charge ... that the teaching of Righteousness by Faith was rejected in 1888 by the denomination, or at least by its leadership, is ... refuted by the personal participants at the Conference, and is an unwarranted and unsupported assumption. It simply is not true historically.... "Some" leading brethren stood in the way of light and blessing. But the ... leaders as a group, never rejected the Bible doctrine of Righteousness by Faith (L. E. Froom, Movement of Destiny, p. 266; 1971).***
>
> ***Of the approximately ninety delegates registered at the Minneapolis General Conference of 1888, there were less than a score--and consequently not even a fourth of the total number of participants--who actually fought the message....***
>
> ***Most of those who first took issue made confessions ... and thenceforth ceased their opposition.... Only a small hard core of "die-hards" continued to reject it....***
>
> ***The "some" who rejected turns out to be less than twenty out of more than ninety--less than one quarter. And, according to Olson most of those twenty made confessions, hence ceased being "rejectors" and thus becoming accepters (ibid., pp. 367-369; emphasis original).***

This book further informs us that the message was initially accepted in 1888 by the leadership of the church:

> ***The denomination as a whole, and its leadership in particular, did not reject the message and provisions of Righteousness by Faith in and following 1888.... The new president ... wholeheartedly accepted and maintained the teaching of righteousness by faith.... The responsible leaders of the movement from 1888 to 1897, definitely did not reject [it] (ibid., pp. 370, 371; emphasis original).***

Both a General Conference vice-president and president in separate statements agree:

> ***During my fifty-five years in the Seventh-day Adventist ministry ... I have never heard a worker or a lay member .... express opposition to the message of righteousness by faith. Neither have I known of any such opposition having been expressed by Seventh-day Adventist publications (A. V. Olson, Through Crisis to Victory, p. 232; 1966).***
>
> ***It is correct to say that the [1888] message has been declared, both from the pulpit and through the press, and by the lives of thousands upon thousands of God's dedicated people.... Adventist pastors and evangelists have announced this vital truth from church pulpits and public platforms, with hearts aflame with love for Christ (ibid., pp. 233, 237).***
>
> ***It has ... been suggested by a few--entirely erroneously--that the Seventh-day Adventist Church has gone astray in failing to grasp this great***

fundamental Christian teaching [the 1888 message] (R. R. Figuhr, General Conference President, in Foreword to By Faith Alone, p. vii, by N. F. Pease; 1962).

The long-time Secretary of the Ellen G. White Estate assures us that the message was generally accepted:

The concept that the General Conference, and thus the denomination, rejected the message of righteousness by faith in 1888 is without foundation.... Contemporary records yield no suggestion of denominational rejection. There is no E. G. White statement anywhere that says this was so.... The historical record of the reception in the field following the session supports the concept that favorable attitudes were quite general.... It would seem that disproportionate emphasis has come to be given to the experience of the Minneapolis General Conference session (A. L. White, The Lonely Years, p. 396; 1984).

Following the lead of other scholars, another author remarks:

Does this mean that the church as a whole, or even its leadership, rejected the 1888 message? Not at all. Some rejected it--a vocal minority.... The new leadership wholeheartedly endorsed the new emphasis (Marjorie Lewis Lloyd, Too Slow Getting Off, pp. 19, 20).

If these official views are substantiated by history and by testimony from Ellen White, we are under moral obligation to believe them. But we have a problem, because she repeatedly likens the leadership reaction to the 1888 message to that of the Jews against Christ.[2] That was not acceptance!

If these statements are true, it is hard to understand why Ellen White should be so concerned for a decade and even longer about what she said was continued rejection of the message on the part of "our brethren" at headquarters when so few opposed it. Would the Lord withhold from the entire world church the blessings of the latter rain and the loud cry if less than ten ministers persisted in opposing it, and they not even leaders?

If so, can we ever hope for a better percentage of acceptance of any message Heaven might send us? If the Lord withholds from all of us the blessings of His Holy Spirit because of such miniscule opposition, what hope do we have that there ever can be a finishing of the gospel commission?

---

[2] Cf. MS. 9, 1888, Through Crisis to Victory, p. 292; MS. 15, 1888; ibid., pp. 297, 300; MS. 13, 1889; RH March 4, 11; August 26, 1890; April 11, 18, 1893; TM 64, 75-80; Special Testimonies, Series A, No. 6, p. 20; Special Testimonies to R&H Office, pp. 16, 17; FE 472.

The Jews Deny That They Rejected the Messiah

The Jews' denial takes two forms: (a) a case of mistaken identity: Jesus of Nazareth was not the Messiah, they say, therefore rejecting "him" was no serious mistake; (b) a case of mistaken blame: the Romans, not they, crucified "him" (cf. Max I. Dimont, Jews, God, and History, pp. 138-142).

It is evident in many of the above statements that we also have a problem: (a) There is mistaken identity. Almost all of these authors evade the fact that the 1888 message was the beginning of the latter rain and the loud cry. Practically without exception they identify the 1888 message as a mere "re-emphasis" of the 16th century, Protestant doctrine of justification by faith as the popular churches teach it.[3] (b) There is a problem of misplaced blame: it is uniformly insisted that only a few unimportant individuals resisted and rejected the message, most of the others repenting, so that in the end the message was quite well accepted by the responsible leadership of the church.

Dr. Froom tells us that A. W. Spalding's and L. H. Christian's accounts of the 1888 history are "in complete harmony" with the facts (op. cit., p. 268). And A. V. Olson likewise suggests that Spalding presents "the whole truth" of the matter (op. cit., p. 233). Their accounts differ markedly from Ellen White's, but since they enjoy such full modern endorsement, they deserve our close attention:

> ***The greatest event of the eighties in the experience of Seventh-day Adventists was the recovery, or the restatement and new consciousness, of their faith in the basic doctrine of Christianity... The last decade of the century saw the church developing, through this gospel, into a company prepared to fulfill the mission of God.... The church was aroused by the revival message of justification by faith (A. W. Spalding, Captains of the Host, pp. 583, 602; 1949).***
>
> ***1888 is a notable landmark in Seventh-day Adventist history. It was really like crossing a continental divide into a new country. Some smiters of the brethren calling themselves reformers have tried to make out that the session was a defeat; whereas, the truth is that it stands out as a glorious victory.... It introduced a new period in our work--a time of revival and soulsaving.... The Lord gave His people a marvelous victory. It was the beginning of a great spiritual awakening among Adventists.... the dawn of a glorious day for the Adventist church.... The after effect of the great Minneapolis revival ... beginning in 1888 ... was rich in both holiness and mission fruitage (L. H. Christian, The Fruitage of Spiritual Gifts, pp. 219, 223, 224, 237, 244, 245).***

---

[3] Pease makes one brief reference to Ellen White's November 22, 1892 statement identifying the message as the "beginning" of the loud cry (By Faith Alone, p. 156). But in general he identifies the message as a mere re-emphasis of the popular Protestant "doctrine." Froom often positively and firmly recognizes the message as the "beginning" of the latter rain and the loud cry, but illogically contradicts himself by maintaining just as firmly that it was the same message as the popular Evangelical revivalists of the time were preaching (Movement of Destiny, pp. 262, 318-325, 345, 561-570, 662-667). The other writers totally ignore Ellen White's identification of the message.

Note that one of our authors unwittingly fulfills Christ's prophecy concerning the leadership of the Laodicean church. He uses the very word that Christ puts into the lips of "the angel of the church" (Revelation 3:14, 17) who claims to be "rich and enriched" through an assumed acceptance of the message.

Was the Message Accepted or Rejected?

Surely our author would not want to label a former illustrious General Conference president as a "smiter of the brethren." But logically A. G. Daniells must fit into that category, for he clearly says that the 1888 history marked a "defeat" in the onward progress of the cause of God. His statements completely contradict our endorsed authors:

> ***This message of righteousness in Christ ... met with opposition on the part of earnest, well-meaning men in the cause of God! The [1888] message has never been received, nor proclaimed, nor given free course as it should have been in order to convey to the church the measureless blessings that were wrapped within it.... The division and conflict which arose among the leaders because of the opposition to the message of righteousness in Christ, produced a very unfavorable reaction. The rank and file of the people were confused, and did not know what to do...***
>
> ***Back of the opposition is revealed the shrewd plotting of that master mind of evil.... How terrible must be the results of any victory of his in defeating it! (A. G. Daniells, Christ Our Righteousness, pp. 47, 50, 53, 54; 1926).***

Throughout his book, Daniells insists that there was no denomination-wide revival and acceptance of this message and experience. In 1926 he considered the revival to be yet future:

> ***Through the intervening years [since 1888] there has been steadily developing the desire and hope--yes, the belief--that someday the message of righteousness by faith would shine forth in all its inherent glory, worth, and power, and receive full recognition (ibid., p. 43).***

The "mighty revival" that others say took place, Daniells placed in the category of a "what might have been:"

> ***What a mighty revival of true godliness, ...what a manifestation of divine power for the finishing of the work, ... might have come to the people of God if all our ministers had gone forth from that Conference as did this loyal, obedient servant of the Lord [Ellen White] (ibid., p. 47).***

Ellen White must also logically come under Christian's stricture of being a "smiter of the brethren," for she summed up the end of the 1888 era as a time of victory for our enemy when she said that "Satan succeeded .... in a great measure" in keeping the message away from both the church and the world (1 SM 234, 235; 1896).

A. T. Jones, when he was walking humbly with the Lord, must also come under the same stricture, and not only he, but the congregation assembled at the General Conference Session of 1893. Yet they were close to the real situation. Not one person dared to challenge the speaker, for all knew he was telling the truth:

> ***When did that message of the righteousness of Christ begin with us as a people? [One or two in the audience: "Three or four years ago."] Which was it, three? or four? [Congregation: "Four."] Yes, four. Where was it? [Congregation: "Minneapolis."] What then did the [leading] brethren reject at Minneapolis? [Some in the congregation: "The loud cry."] ... What did the brethren in that fearful position in which they stood, reject at Minneapolis? They rejected the latter rain--the loud cry--of the third angel's message (GCB, 1893, p. 183).***

In 1908 Jones tells of official opposition continuing during those "twenty-one years against God's message of righteousness by faith":

> ***Today in positions of Presidents of Union Conferences, and of officials of the General Conference, there are men who at the beginning ... opposed then and all the way since by every question ... that they could devise, the truth of righteousness by faith as that truth is in the plain word of the Scriptures. This I know because more than once have I been held up by the hour in that very way by these very men (A. T. Jones letter to R. S. Owen, February 20, 1908.)[4]***

If "the rank and file of Seventh-day Adventist workers and laity accepted the presentations at Minneapolis," would it not be reasonable to expect that years later Jones could remember at least one of them, besides Ellen White? Thirteen years after 1908 he recalls:

> ***I can't now name anyone who accepted the truth at that 1888 meeting openly [besides Ellen White, obviously]. But later many said they were greatly helped by it. One Battle Creek man said at that meeting after one of Dr. Waggoner's meetings: "Now we could say amen to all of that if that is all there were to it. But away down yonder there is still something to come. And this is to lead us to that.... And if we say amen to this we will have to say amen to that, and then we are caught."... There was no such thing, and so they robbed themselves of what their own hearts told them was the truth; and by fighting what they only imagined, they fastened themselves in opposition to what they knew that they should have said amen to (Letter to C. E. Holmes, May 12, 1921).***

---

[4] Objective evidence in support of his remarks can be seen in official publications regarding the "two covenants" controversy of 1906-1908. The prevailing view in the Sabbath School Quarterly on the two covenants and the Pacific Press and the Review and Herald defenses of it, was that of the opposition to the 1888 message. For example, see Signs of the Times, November 13, 1907; January 29, 1908.

In the same letter, Jones added that "the opposers were ... all who could be swung by General Conference influence."

Jones once said that "some" accepted the message at the Minneapolis Conference, "some" rejected, and "some" stood in between (GCB 1893, p. 185). Those who favor the acceptance theory have interpreted this to mean that the group was divided roughly into thirds; and since it is assumed that "many" who initially rejected or were neutral later repented, the great majority are assumed to have ended up accepting the message. Jones' 1921 statement continues with a different view:

> ***Others would favor it, but when the spirit of persecution was strong, instead of standing nobly in the fear of God, and declaring in the face of the attack, "It is the truth of God, and I believe it in my soul," they would begin to yield and in an apologetic way offer excuses for those who were preaching it.***

Such a wishy-washy attitude is anything but true acceptance of the message of Christ's righteousness! Those who follow Christ are prepared to die for His truth.

Jones has left on record his opinion of the extent of the "world-wide denominational revivals" which followed the 1888 Conference. The following from this 1921 letter is quoted in an officially approved book which supports the acceptance view:

> ***When camp-meeting time came [after 1888] we all three [Ellen White, Waggoner, and himself] visited the camp-meetings with the message of righteousness by faith .... sometimes all three of us at the same meeting. This turned the tide with the people, and apparently with most of the leading men (Pease, By Faith Alone, p. 149).***

The quotation in the book stops here. But Jones' next sentence refutes the acceptance thesis:

> ***But this latter was only apparent, it was never real, for all the time in the General Conference Committee and amongst others there was a secret antagonism always carried on, and which ... finally gained the day in the denomination, and gave to the Minneapolis spirit and contention and men the supremacy.***

This letter was written when Jones was not far from his death. It reveals a chastened spirit of loyalty to all Seventh-day Adventist doctrinal beliefs, and to the full inspiration of Ellen White's prophetic ministry.

Within five years, A. G. Daniells published his view that essentially agrees with that of Jones: "The message has never been received, nor proclaimed, nor given free course as it should have been in order to convey to the church the measureless blessings that were wrapped within it" (Christ Our Righteousness, p. 47; 1926).

But we do not need to depend on Jones' or Daniells' appraisal of what happened. We have other testimony.

Significant Inspired Evidence

Candidly investigated, Ellen White's writings are never ambiguous on this issue of the reception of the 1888 message. She can not support both sides of two contradictory views. Jones' remark about "the tide" being turned only "apparently" with the leading brethren is substantiated by Ellen White:

> ***For nearly two years [1890], we have been urging the people to come up and accept the light and the truth concerning the righteousness of Christ, and they do not know whether to come and take hold of this precious truth or not (RH, March 11, 1890).***

Why was this? Next week she told the reason why the lay members and younger ministers were hesitant:

> ***Our young men look to our older brethren, and as they see that they do not accept the message, but treat it as though it were of no consequence, it influences those who are ignorant of the Scriptures to reject the light. These men who refuse to receive truth, interpose themselves between the people and the light (March 18, 1890; emphasis added).***

She also agreed with Jones' statement that there was not one of the leading brethren at headquarters willing to take a firm stand for the message of Christ's righteousness:

> ***Again and again did I bear my testimony to those assembled [Minneapolis, 1888] in a clear and forcible manner, but that testimony was not received. When I came to Battle Creek, I repeated the same testimony in the presence of Elder Butler, but there was not one who had the courage to stand on my side and help Elder Butler to see that he, as well as others, had taken wrong positions.... The prejudice of Elder Butler was greater after hearing the various reports from our ministering brethren at that meeting in Minneapolis (January 25, 1889; Letter U3, 1889; emphasis added).***

The brethren who she said "interpose themselves" were leaders. Thank God, not all "refused to receive truth," but the term "our own brethren" is generic in sense. It must mean the bulk of the responsible leadership, with few if any influential exceptions. She uses the term repeatedly. And what is significant, she uses it in retrospect:

> ***At Minneapolis ... Satan succeeded in shutting away from our people, in a great measure, the special power of the Holy Spirit.... The enemy prevented them from obtaining that efficiency which might have been theirs in carrying the truth to the world.... The light that is to lighten the whole earth with its glory was resisted, and by the action of our own brethren has been in a great degree kept away from the world (1 SM 234, 235).***

No way could a few uninfluential "die-hard" opposers have such a determinative effect if many of the leading brethren wholeheartedly received the message. To believe that the tail could wag the dog thus would stretch credulity. She wrote the following to a relative, after most of the influential "confessions" had come in:

> ***Who of those that acted a part in the meeting at Minneapolis have come to the light and received the rich treasures of truth which the Lord sent them from heaven? Who have kept step with the Leader, Jesus Christ? Who have made full confession of their mistaken zeal, their blindness, their jealousies and evil surmisings, their defiance of truth? Not one ... (Letter, November 5, 1892; B2a 1892).***

Seven or eight long years after 1888 she is forced to confess concerning "some" in Battle Creek who "keep alive the spirit which ran riot at Minneapolis," and who are also identified as "many,"

> ***They began this satanic work at Minneapolis.... Yet these men have been holding positions of trust, and have been molding the work after their own similitude, as far as they possibly can (TM 80; May 1, 1895; May 30, 1896; emphasis added).***

A Plea for Simple Honesty

A. G. Daniells encourages us to be honest in facing reality: "It would be far more agreeable to eliminate some of the statements given by the Spirit of Prophecy regarding the attitude of some of the leaders toward the message and the messengers. But this cannot be done without giving only a partial presentation of the situation, ... leaving the question in more or less of mystery" (op. cit., p. 43).

The less "mystery" the better in this late perilous hour. Therefore the following citations, as brief as possible but verbatim, are taken from Testimonies to Ministers written in 1895. This is Ellen White's retrospective judgment, written pretty well toward the close of the 1888 era:

> ***Many ... treat it [the message] with disdain.***
> ***You have turned your back, and not your face, to the Lord.***
> ***That light which is to fill the whole earth with its glory has been despised.***
> ***Beware how you ... pour contempt upon the manifestations of the Holy Spirit.***
> ***I know not but some have even now gone too far to return and to repent.***
> ***These great and solemn realities are unappreciated and spoken against.***
> ***Men ... stand in the way of sinners, and sit in the seat of the scornful.***
> ***Many have entered dark, secret paths, and some will never return.***
> ***They have tempted God, they have rejected light.***
> ***They have chosen darkness rather than light, and have defiled their souls.***
> ***They have not only refused to accept the message, but they have hated the light.***

These men are parties to the ruin of souls. They have interposed themselves between the heaven-sent light and the people. They have trampled upon the word of God, and are doing despite to His Holy Spirit.

Have stood for years resisting light and cherishing the spirit of opposition.

How long will you hate and despise the messengers of God's righteousness?

They have taunted them [the messengers] with being fanatics, extremists, and enthusiasts.

You will, when it is too late, see that you have been fighting against God.

Your turning things upside down is known of the Lord.

Go on a little longer as you have done, in rejection of the light from heaven, and you are lost.

So long as false guideposts, pointing the wrong way.

If you reject Christ's delegated messengers, you reject Christ.

Despise this glorious offer of justification through the blood of Christ.

I entreat you ... cease your stubborn resistance of light and evidence (TM 89-98).

This was what our authors speak of as the "notable landmark in Seventh-day Adventist history," the crossing of a "continental divide into new country," the "glorious victory and the occasion and the beginnings of larger and better things for the advent church," the "time of revival and soul-saving," the "time of happy spiritual experience," the "beginning of a great spiritual awakening among Adventists," a "denomination-wide revival"! Ellen White wrote better than she knew in 1895: "Your turning things upside down is known of the Lord."

Seven or eight years after the Conference afforded ample opportunity for repentance, confessions, and a hearty participation in a "denomination-wide revival." The chronology of rejection can be catalogued year by year:

Instead of pressing your weight against the chariot of truth that is being pulled up an inclined road, you should work with all the energy you can to push it on.

Our older brethren ... do not accept the message, but treat it as though it were of no consequence (RH, March 18, 1890).

I cannot express to you my burden and distress of mind as the true condition of the cause has been presented before me ...

It was shown to me that on the part of the ministers in all our conferences, there is neglect to study the Scriptures, to search for the truth ... Faith and love, how destitute are the churches of these! ...

Bible religion is very scarce, even among our ministers ... The standard of the ministry had been greatly lowered....

Coldness, heartlessness, want of tender sympathy, are leavening the camp of Israel. If these evils are permitted to strengthen as they have done for some years in the past, our churches will be in a deplorable condition (TM 142-156; August 20, 1890).

There was not much revival by 1892:

The atmosphere of the church is so frigid, its spirit is of such an order, that men and women cannot sustain or endure the example of primitive and heaven-born piety. The warmth of their first love is frozen up, and unless they are watered over by the baptism of the Holy Spirit, their candlestick will be removed out of its place (TM 167, 168, 161; July 15, 1892).

It was the same in 1893:

O how few know the day of their visitation! ... We are convinced that among the people of God there is blindness of mind and hardness of heart, although God has manifested inexpressible mercy toward us....

Today there are few who are heartily serving God. The most of those who compose our congregations are spiritually dead in trespasses and sins.... The sweetest melodies that come from God through human lips--justification by faith, and the righteousness of Christ--do not bring forth from them a response of love and gratitude... They steel their hearts against [the Heavenly Merchantman] (RH April 4, 1893).

Conditions had not improved by 1895:

There are many who have outgrown their advent faith, ... while saying in their hearts, as they desire it shall be, "My Lord delayeth His coming." ...

Men who are entrusted with weighty responsibilities, but who have no living connection with God, have been and are doing despite to His Holy Spirit.... Warnings have come from God again and again for these men, but they have cast them aside and ventured on in the same course...

If God spares their lives, and they nourish the same spirit that marked their course of action both before and after the Minneapolis meeting, they will fill up to the full the deeds of those whom Christ condemned when He was upon earth (TM 77-79; May 1, 1895).

There had been apparently little change by 1896:

That men should keep alive the spirit which ran riot at Minneapolis is an offense to God. All heaven is indignant at the spirit that for years has been revealed in our publishing institution at Battle Creek ... A voice has been heard pointing out the errors and, in the name of the Lord, pleading for a decided change. But who have followed the instruction given? who have humbled their hearts to put from them every vestige of their wicked, oppressive spirit? (TM 76, 77; May 30, 1896).

It seems that the "revival" had not succeeded in capturing the hearts of the leaders by 1897:

God gives men counsel and reproof for their good. He has sent His message, telling them what was needed for the time--1897.... He gave you opportunity to come up armed and equipped to the help of the Lord. And having done all, He told you to stand. But did you make ready? Did you say, "Here am I; send me"? You sat still, and did nothing. You left the word of the Lord to fall unheeded to the ground....

O, why will men be hindrances, when they might be helps? Why will they block the wheels, when they might push with marked success? Why will they rob their own soul of good, and deprive others of blessing that might come through them? These rejecters of light will remain barren deserts (TM 413).

For sure, those rejectors remained "barren deserts" spiritually. A persual of their printed sermons and articles reveals that they are dry and boring, devoid of the essential motifs of the 1888 truths. Yet they evince supreme confidence that they understand and preach righteousness by faith.

The Story of the Post-1888 Revivals

From 1888-1890 Ellen White makes numerous references to the revival meetings which she held in company with Jones and Waggoner. The acceptance theory is based largely on these statements. We must give due weight to them. The following are samples of her glowing enthusiasm:

I have never seen a revival work go forward with such thoroughness, and yet remain so free from all undue excitement. There was no urging or inviting. The people were not called forward, but there was a solemn realization that Christ came not to call the righteous, but sinners, to repentance.... There were many who testified that as the searching truths had been presented, they had been convicted in the light of the law as transgressors (RH March 5, 1889).

The tidings that Christ is our righteousness has brought relief to many, many souls, and God says to his people, "Go forward."...

In every meeting since the General Conference [1888] souls have eagerly accepted the precious message of the righteousness of Christ....

On Sabbath [Ottawa, Kansas], truths were presented that were new to the majority of the congregation... But the labors of the Sabbath were not in vain. On Sunday morning there was decided evidence that the Spirit of God was working great changes in the moral and spiritual condition of those assembled (ibid., July 23, 1889).

We are having most excellent meetings. The spirit that was in the meeting at Minneapolis is not here. All moves off in harmony.... The universal testimony from those who have spoken has been that this message of light and truth which has come to our people is just the truth for this time, and wherever they go among the churches, light, and relief, and the blessing of God is sure to come in (Ms. 10, 1889).

These statements taken out of a ten-year context give the impression of a hearty leadership acceptance of the message. But further evidence in context must be considered. An impression of leadership acceptance must be balanced by reality.

Jones said that those meetings "turned the tide with the people." However, there never was an issue or tide to be turned with the people. The problem was entirely with the leaders and the ministry. The people were ready to accept the light gladly if the leaders should permit it to come to them undistorted and unopposed, or rather, if they should join heartily in presenting it. Many younger ministers were keenly interested. But the continually noncommittal attitude or outright opposition of responsible leaders in Battle Creek and elsewhere quenched the movement. Not only do Ellen White's remarks attest this fact, but the General Conference correspondence in the Archives is also clear.

In fact, it is not necessary even to summon her to the witness stand to testify to this official Battle Creek rejection of the message. The documentation in the recorded correspondence demonstrates an undercurrent of opposition, which Jones spoke of as "a secret antagonism always carried on" (see Additional Note at the end of this chapter).

The Counter-Revival Pressure

At Minneapolis, Ellen White quickly saw that the problem lay with the leadership. She earnestly appealed to the delegates not to look to the older, experienced men to see what they would do with the light. She said that they would even try to prevent it reaching the people:

> ***I entreat you to make God your trust; idolize no man, depend upon no man. Let not your love of men hold them in places of trust that they are unqualified to fill ....***
>
> ***You need greater light, you need a clearer understanding of the truth which you carry to the people. If you do not see light yourselves, you will close the door, if you can, you will prevent the rays of light from coming to the people. Let it not be said of this highly favored people, "They would not enter in themselves, and those who were entering in they hindered." All these lessons are given for the benefit of those upon whom the ends of the world are come....***
>
> ***At this meeting ... opposition, rather than investigation, is the order of the day....***
>
> ***No one must be permitted to close the avenue whereby the light of truth shall come to the people. As soon as this shall be attempted, God's Spirit will be quenched (Ms. 15, 1888; Olson, pp. 297, 301).***
>
> ***Now our meeting is drawing to a close and not one confession has been made, there has not been a single break so as to let the Spirit of God in. Now I was saying what was the use of our assembling here together and for our ministering brethren to come in if they are here only to shut out the Spirit of God from the people? (Ms. 9, 1888; Olson pp. 290, 291.)***

What was the actual mechanism of rejection? How did it operate? While it is true that Jones and Waggoner were permitted to speak in camp meetings and to publish articles, and while it is true that their message was welcomed by the laity, leadership rejection constantly counteracted their best efforts. We have Ellen White's analysis of what happened:

> ***The very men who ought to be on the alert to see what the people of God need that the way of the Lord may be prepared, are intercepting the light God would have come to His people and rejecting the message of His healing grace (Letter to Miller brothers, July 23, 1889).***
>
> ***Some of our leading brethren have frequently taken positions on the wrong side, and if God would send a message and wait for these older brethren to open the way for its advance, it would never reach the people....***
>
> ***The rebuke of the Lord will be upon those who would be guardians of the doctrine, who would bar the way that greater light shall not come to the people; and if there were no voice among men to give it, the very stones would cry out . . It is the coldness of heart, the unbelief, of those who ought to have faith, that keeps the churches in feebleness (RH July 26, 1892; emphasis added).***

At the time, both Jones and Waggoner were persona non grata with responsible brethren in Battle Creek (Olson, p. 115). As we shall see in a later chapter, the Review and Herald editor was the most influential opposer. And Ellen White said that the new General Conference president himself "acted as did Aaron in regard to these men who have been opposed to the work of God ever since the Minneapolis meeting" (Letter to A. O. Tait, August 27, 1896). "The President of the General Conference ... went directly contrary to the cautions and warnings given him" concerning the 1888 aftermath (Letter to I. H. Evans, November 21, 1897; E51, 1897).

Further, it was only natural that opposing brethren should expect and very likely hope that the unwelcome message should take no better with the common people than it did with the elders and authorities at Battle Creek. But when the reports came in of the wonderful results of the preaching of the inspired trio, they were chagrined. It is painful to report that Ellen White says that the Holy Spirit's approval of the work discomfited them. She was not concerned about an insignificant minority of obscure brethren, but about the total impact of responsible, influential leadership:

> ***Afterward when they saw and felt the demonstration of the Holy Spirit testifying that the message was of God, they hated it the more, because it was a testimony against them. They would not humble their hearts to repent, to give God the glory, and vindicate the right (May 1, 1895; TM 80).***

The revivals held at South Lancaster, Chicago, Ottawa, Kansas, and in the Battle Creek church itself, were a powerful witness that God had set His seal to the message being borne. The experiment testing the light was being made in the laboratory of the churches. It worked--never had such manifestations of heavenly glory attended any message or movement since the midnight cry of 1844:

Now although there has been a determined effort to make of no effect the message God has sent, its fruits have been proving that it was from the source of light and truth. Those who have ... stood to bar the way against all evidence, cannot be supposed to have clearer spiritual eyesight for having so long closed their eyes to the light God sent to the people.... There will be resistance from the very ones we expected to engage in such a work (Letter O19, 1892).

She continued to hope for a change of heart in the leaders once they recognized the incontrovertible proof. The following paragraph could be cited as evidence that the 1888 message was accepted by the leadership of the church:

I saw that the power of God attended the message wherever it was spoken. You could not make the people believe in South Lancaster that it was not a message of light that came to them ... God has set His hand to do this work. We labored in Chicago; it was a week before there was a break in the meetings. But like a wave of glory, the blessing of God swept over us as we pointed men to the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world. The Lord revealed His glory, and we felt the deep movings of His Spirit.

But the same article in the Review of March 18, 1890 indicates that the leading brethren still were not in sympathy with the work:

I have tried to present the message to you as I have understood it, but how long will those at the head of the work keep themselves aloof from the message of God?

A greater sin was added to the unbelief of 1888 at Minneapolis: the incontrovertible evidences of the Holy Spirit's approval of the message, demonstrated in the wonderful revivals, only confirmed the opposition of these brethren. "When they saw and felt the demonstration of the Holy Spirit testifying that the message was of God, they hated it the more" (TM 80; 1895). A few years before, Ellen White had pathetically appealed for unity with the messengers:

For nearly two years we have been urging the people to come up and accept the light and truth concerning the righteousness of Christ, and they do not know whether to come and take hold of this precious truth or not (ibid., March 11, 1890).

We entreat of you who oppose the light of truth, to stand out of the way of God's people (ibid., May 27, 1890).

The overwhelming weight of evidence indicates that they did stand in the way. This context of the glowing reports of the "revivals" must be borne in mind. Earlier statements expressing prophetic hope (1889-1890) must be balanced by the disappointment of the actual subsequent history which Ellen White was forced to record (1891-97). Every avenue

of solid evidence goes in the same direction: her testimony, Jones' testimony, the official archival files, and the obvious import of nearly a century of history.

"Just Like the Jews!"

Never since the rejection by Israel of her King of glory has the heavenly universe witnessed a more inexcusable and shameful failure on the part of the chosen people of God, led by their leaders. The Lord's messenger did not hesitate to apply to the leading brethren the famous "woes upon the Pharisees" (Luke 11:50-52), and emphasize their present (1896) application: "If God has ever spoken by me, these scriptures mean very much to those who shall hear them" (TM 76). "Ye entered not in yourselves, and them that were entering in ye hindered."

Such is the true picture of the "great revival" which followed the 1888 meeting. Many lay members and younger ministers began "to enter in" but the elders at Jerusalem verily "hindered" them. Thus the revival proved abortive, and the Holy Spirit was grieved, "insulted" and quenched. Frequently the Lord's messenger compared the anti-1888 spirit to the Jews' rejection of Christ. For example:

> ***Light has been shining upon the church of God, but many have said by their indifferent attitude, "We want not thy way, O God, but our own way." The Kingdom of heaven has come very near, ... but they have barred the door of the heart, and have not received the heavenly guests; for as yet they know not the love of God....***
>
> ***There is less excuse in our day for stubborness and unbelief than there was for the Jews in the days of Christ.... Our sin and its retribution will be the greater, if we refuse to walk in the light. Many say, "If I had only lived in the days of Christ, I would not have wrested His words, or falsely interpreted His instruction. I would not have rejected and crucified Him, as did the Jews"; but that will be proved by the way in which you deal with His message and His messengers to-day....***
>
> ***Those who live in this day are not accountable for the deeds of those who crucified the Son of God; but if with all the light that shone upon His ancient people delineated before us, we travel over the same ground, cherish the same spirit, refuse to receive reproof and warning, then our guilt will be greatly augmented (ibid., April 11, 1893).***

One week later the author added:

> ***Those who are filled with unbelief can discern the least thing that has an objectionable feature. They can lose sight of all the evidences that God has given ... in revealing precious gems of truth from the inexhaustible mine of His word. They can hold the objectionable atom under the magnifying glasses of their imagination until the atom looks like a world, and shuts out from their view the precious light of heaven .... Why take so much account of that which may appear to you as objectionable in the messenger [A. T. Jones or E. J.***

Waggoner] and sweep away all the evidences that God has given to balance the mind in regard to truth? (ibid., April 18, 1892).

Our imagination struggles to grasp the reality of the blessings that would have come to the Seventh-day Adventist Church if this precious message had been heartily accepted:

If through the grace of Christ His people will become new bottles, He will fill them with new wine. God will give additional light, and old truths will be recovered, and replaced in the framework of truth; and wherever the laborers go, they will triumph (RH, Extra, December 23, 1890).

Our Upside-Down History

What should have taken place, but what didn't, was made plain in a statement made at the 1901 General Conference session, when Ellen White referred back to the 1888-1891 crisis. What our historians have assumed was "revival" turns out to be only a verbal assent with no genuine reformation:

I feel a special interest in the movements and decisions that shall be made at this Conference regarding the things that should have been done years ago, and especially ten years ago, when we were assembled in Conference, and the Spirit and power of God came into our meeting, testifying that God was ready to work for this people if they would come into working order. The brethren assented to the light God had given, but there were those connected with our institutions, especially the Review and Herald office and the [General] Conference, who brought in elements of unbelief, so that the light given was not acted upon. It was assented to, but no special change was made to bring about such a condition of things that the power of God could be revealed among His people (GCB 1901, p. 23).

Some of the brethren recognized in 1893 that because reformation had been refused, revival had consequently failed. Jones said:

Brethren, the time has come to take up tonight what we there [Minneapolis four years before] rejected. Not a soul of us has ever been able to dream yet the wonderful blessings that God had for us at Minneapolis, and which we would have been enjoying these four years, if hearts had been ready to receive the message which God sent. We would have been four years ahead, we would have been in the midst of the wonders of the loud cry itself, tonight (GCB, 1893 p. 183).

The following letter from Ellen White, read at the same session, explains how the process worked by which the 1888 message was turned into defeat:

The opposition in our own ranks has imposed upon the Lord's messengers a laborious and soul trying task; for they have had to meet difficulties and

obstacles which need not have existed.... All the time and thought and labor required to counteract the influence of our brethren who oppose the message has been just so much taken from the world of the swift coming judgments of God. The Spirit of God has been present in power among His people, but it could not be bestowed upon them, because they did not open their hearts to receive it.

It is not the opposition of the world that we have to fear; but it is the elements that work among ourselves that have hindered the message.... Love and confidence constitute a moral force that would have united our churches and insured harmony of action; but coldness and distrust have brought disunion that has shorn us of our strength....

The influence that grew out of the resistance of light and truth at Minneapolis tended to make of no effect the light God had given to His people through the Testimonies ... because some of those who occupy responsible positions were leavened with the spirit that prevailed at Minneapolis, a spirit that beclouded the discernment of the people of God (ibid., p. 419).

An army that loses a battle will try afterwards to discover why the defeat took place. They will speak of victory only in the conditional, subjunctive mood of the verb, as what "might have been." It is significant that the oft-quoted passage published in 1909 in Testimonies, Vol. 9, page 29, which begins with a tragic "if," was written concerning the results of the 1888 history. It is the next sentence after the above quotation:

If every soldier of Christ had done his duty, if every watchman on the walls of Zion had given the trumpet a certain sound, the world might ere this have heard the message of warning. But the work is years behind. What account will be rendered to God for thus retarding the work?

There is Good News in the 1888 History!

This does not mean that the war has been lost. Far from it. Only a battle was lost. We have here, however, a most intriguing situation. A few paragraphs later in the same letter, Ellen White predicted that Satan would work up his advantage skillfully. "The deep plotting of Satan will reveal its working everywhere." He would be far too keen to make the blunder of assuming the livery of the devil; he would pretend to be the Christ. "The appearance of a false Christ will arouse delusive hopes in the minds of those who will allow themselves to be deceived."

Satan is too keen-minded to claim his victory before it is complete, even though the partial victory is true. Such boasting would drive the remnant church to her knees in the repentance of the ages, for she is honest in heart. Telling her the truth will never work--she must be kept in deception until the very last.

Therefore, Satan's desire is that we should be deceived about our 1888 history. He will slyly admit defeat and concede the victory, pretending to lie prostrate at our feet. But the deception, if cherished, can lead only to an infatuation with the false Christ. If we cannot read the past aright, how will we be able to interpret the future correctly as it unrolls before our eyes?

Do these obvious truths paint a dark or discouraging picture? Not if we love Him who says He is the Truth. Recognizing truth is the only way to come close to Him!

While it is true that our history is a clear call to repentance, we must remember that calls to repentance have always been up-beat, positive, hope-inspiring, and encouraging.

Conclusion

Those who portray our 1888 history as a glorious victory are very sincere. They desire to preserve the unity of the church. Critics have arisen claiming that the victory gained by Satan in 1888 and thereafter was complete, so that the church is now in a hopeless condition. This is not true, but such a false idea takes root and flourishes as a reaction against the pride and complacency which deny the truth of our history for generation after generation. Israel will never become Babylon, though she may have her periods of captivity. The Lord will bring her again to her own borders, chastened and repentant.

In seeking to counteract disloyal critics who condemn the church as hopeless, we must not deny truth. Let us ascribe honor to whom it is due. That, in the light of our past history, will require that we be greatly humbled:

> ***There will be great humbling of hearts before God on the part of every one who remains faithful and true to the end (Ms. 15, 1888; Olson, p. 297).***
>
> ***Unless the church, which is now being leavened with her own backsliding, shall repent and be converted, she will eat of the fruit of her own doing, until she shall abhor herself (8T 250).***

That experience is no evidence that God will have cast off His church. Peter, when he threw himself on the ground in Gethsemane and wished that he might die, was at last converted (Matthew 26:75; DA 713). When the above words are fulfilled, the remnant church will likewise be converted. Her Pentecost will be no further away at that time than Peter's was when he came to know himself, and in so doing, found His Lord's forgiveness.

A true understanding of the 1888 experience will figure largely in our coming to know ourselves: "Sometime it will be seen in its true bearing, with all the burden of woe that has resulted from it" (GCB 1893, p. 184).

A. T. Jones at the 1893 meeting also referred to that long-delayed "sometime" of reparation:

> ***There will be things to come that will be more surprising than that was to those at Minneapolis.... But unless you and I have every fiber of that spirit rooted out of our hearts, we will treat that message and the messengers by whom it is sent, as God has declared we have treated this other message (ibid. , p. 185).***

If none of the references presented in this chapter were available to us, logic and simple reason would dictate some conclusions:

(1) The loud cry was to have an effect on the closing of the work like fire that goes in the stubble (RH, December 15, 1885). "The final movements will be rapid ones." But instead of going like fire in the stubble, there has been a century of protracted smoldering

and smoking, inching along, while human souls are being born faster than we reach them with our message. The only reasonable conclusion is that the fire was put out--by human, not divine, instrumentality.

(2) When the loud cry comes, says John the Revelator, it is to be light which will lighten the earth with glory superseding all previous displays of heavenly power. The "kings of the earth" have not yet stood afar off, with the "merchants of the earth," bewailing the fall of great Babylon, brought to nought in one brief "hour" by the mighty preaching of the true loud cry. Yet the light of the fourth angel's mighty message began to shine in that strange and impressive way in 1888. The only reasonable conclusion is that the light was put out, by human instrumentalities.

(3) When the 1888 message of righteousness by faith, the true "beginning" of the latter rain, is accepted, there will be seen in the remnant church a revival of primitive godliness heretofore unknown. "The enemy of God and man is not willing that this truth should be clearly presented; for he knows that if the people receive it fully, his power will be broken." (GW 103, old edition). The only conclusion possible: the message of Christ's righteousness was not truly received.

(4) The message being of God in a special sense, the authoritative, responsible, and persistent opposition to it constituted a spiritual defeat for the Advent movement; but this defeat must be recognized as a battle in a larger war, and not the losing of the war itself.

Such a view of the matter will require that this generation recognize the facts of the case, and thoroughly rectify the tragic mistake. This can be done, and the living, righteous God will help us.

This has to be good news.

ADDITIONAL NOTE TO CHAPTER FOUR

The Testimony of the General Conference Archives

Official correspondence in the Battle Creek archival files corroborates Ellen White's and Jones' testimony regarding the negative attitude of the most responsible leaders in Battle Creek. A. T. Jones said that "there was a secret antagonism always carried on" (Letter to C. E. Holmes, May 12, 1921).

The letters of the General Conference Secretary, Dan T. Jones, illustrate how this attitude functioned. Although he was deeply prejudiced against the 1888 message and the messengers, a few weeks after Minneapolis the Holy Spirit impressed him with clear evidence that Jones was a true messenger of God. He writes to a friend:

> ***We have had good meetings here... Bro. A. T. Jones has been doing most of the preaching. I wish you could have heard some of his sermons. He seems altogether different from what he did [sic] at Minneapolis. Some of his sermons***

are as good, I think, as I ever heard. They are all new too. He is original in his preaching and in his practical preaching seems very tender and deeply feels all he says. My estimation of him has raised considerably since I have seen the other side of the man (Letter to J. W. Watt, January 1, 1889).[1]

But Dan Jones becomes a man convinced against his will. It is phenomenal how good leaders could harden their hearts against what they clearly saw to be "credentials" of the Holy Spirit. We need to understand how this happened, for we today are in grave danger of repeating their history. As Luther said, we are all made of the same dough.

A year later, for some strange reason, Dan Jones has let his heart become hardened against the 1888 messengers, while during this same period Ellen White's attitude toward them has become increasingly supportive. Here we see a mysterious ferment of the human spirit. As a responsible administrative officer, he writes to the leadership of the Missouri Conference, his home area. He must communicate his mistaken judgment. Here is an under-the-table kind of influence operating, the "secret antagonism" A. T. Jones spoke of:

I think an Institute in Missouri would be a splendid thing; but I believe an institute on a quiet plan will be just as valuable to you as to make a great parade of it and get in ... Elder A. T. Jones and E. J. Waggoner. To tell you the truth, I do not have very much confidence in some of their ways of presenting things. They try to drive everything before them, and will not admit that their positions can possibly be subject to the least criticism.... In fact, [they] do not dwell upon any other subjects scarcely than those upon which there is a difference of opinion among our leading brethren. I do not think you want to bring that spirit into the Missouri Conference (Letter to N. W. Alee, January 23, 1890; emphasis supplied).

The 1888 messengers probably never knew why their ministry was not welcome in Missouri.

Dan Jones' informative letters to G. I. Butler regarding developments at Battle Creek reveal the "antagonism" operating. He encourages Butler in his opposition to the message:

I am glad, indeed, that you are looking at matters from the standpoint that you do, and are not getting discouraged and bowing down under the load that seems to be thrown upon you.... I have often thought of what you said to me last winter that the California fellows [Jones and Waggoner] would be on the editorial staff of the Review in less than two years. I should not be at all surprised if an attempt in that direction was made inside of that many months. But I feel sure that it would meet with very strong opposition (Letter, August 28, 1889).

---

[1] Letters written by Dan T. Jones are found in General Conference Archives and Statistics, Record Group 25. Used with permission.

The "strong opposition" he anticipated erupted like a volcano within his own soul during the following winter of 1890. Waggoner one day announced in his Bible class that on the next Monday morning he would discuss the two covenants. He had been officially invited, even urged, to leave his work in California and teach in Battle Creek. He naturally assumed that he was free to present the gospel as he understood it.

But when Dan Jones heard the news about the two covenants, he could not contain himself. He immediately took steps to stop Waggoner, appealing to Uriah Smith and even to Ellen White for support. He was so deeply stirred by the incident that he wrote about it at considerable length in letters to G. I. Butler, O. A. Olsen, J. D. Pegg, C. H. Jones, R. C. Porter, J. H. Morrison, E. W. Farnsworth, and R. A. Underwood. His letters cannot disguise official antipathy for the message and the messengers, while, of course, professing acceptance of "the doctrine of justification by faith."

We can be grateful that he was a prolific letter-writer, for he gives valuable insights into the behind-the-scenes attitudes of leadership. He discloses his inner feelings with candor. His continuing heart opposition to the message was evidently a heavy burden to his conscience like Saul's kicking against the pricks. Concerning this confrontation with Waggoner he writes to Butler:

> ***There has never anything happened in my life that has taken me down like this. I have just felt so thoroughly upset by the whole affair that I have hardly known how to act or what to do.... When I saw what the lessons were [Sabbath School lessons on the covenants, written by Waggoner], I decided at once that I could not teach them; and after studying over the matter some, decided to resign as teacher in the sabbath-school....*** [2]
>
> ***I have been worrying and fretting over this thing until it has hurt me worse than a half year's work (Letter, February 13, 1890).***

What a spectacle--the General Conference Secretary "worrying and fretting" over what is in fact the leading of the Holy Spirit in the latter rain!

A Glimpse Behind the Scenes in Old Battle Creek

Dan Jones continues with a remarkable vignette of Battle Creek administration, frankly telling Butler of the official plan to hide the real facts from the students and to "let the matter in as easy as possible, without attracting any more of the attention of the students of

---

[2] Waggoner's position which Dan Jones, Uriah Smith and others opposed is presented in his The Glad Tidings (Pacific Press, revised ed., pp. 71-104). The view of his opponents is perpetuated in the Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary and Bible Dictionary . Ellen White says that she was shown that Waggoner's position is correct: "Night before last I was shown that evidences in regard to the covenants were clear and convincing. Yourself [Smith], Brother Dan Jones, Brother Porter and others are spending your investigative powers for naught to produce a position on the covenants to vary from the position that Brother Waggoner has presented" (Letter 59, 1890; see also Letter 30, 1890). Dan Jones reports that Waggoner "charged the leading men in the General Conference with having [implicitly] endorsed [D. M.] Canright's view on the covenants, Brother Smith among the rest," which of course they denied (Letter to Butler, February 13, 1890). Sad to say, Waggoner was correct; it is still more sad that after nearly a century, his beautiful good news truth on the two covenants has still not met with our acceptance.

the school to the change than was necessary." This would be politically astute. Waggoner spoiled his plans by telling the open truth, and "let the whole thing out; and all I could do was to say that we had thought best to ask Dr. Waggoner to postpone the covenant question for the present."

Ellen White, W. C. White, Waggoner and A. T. Jones labored to set matters right before the brethren in Battle Creek, with the result that the truth forced Dan Jones, Uriah Smith, and others unwillingly into a corner. Again, Dan Jones was candid in telling his friends of the discomfiture they had suffered:

> ***This left some of us in rather an embarrassing position. We had been laboring under a misapprehension, and the props were taken out from under us. No one could dispute Dr. Waggoner's word or Sister White's word (Letter to Butler, March 27, 1890).***

Dan Jones' humility and honesty are refreshing--almost naive, certainly so, in light of the real truth which he did not realize--that his antipathy was in fact directed toward heaven's gracious gift of the latter rain and the beginning light of the loud cry. He is dead set against this heaven-sent blessing and cannot avoid letting it be known. He is outstandingly a man convinced against his will and thus of the same opinion still.

Ellen White's famous March 16 sermon at Battle Creek (Ms. 2, 1890) contains the statement, "There was no reception" of the message, and some dozen references to the continuing unbelief and rejection among the Battle Creek leadership since Minneapolis. Writing one day later, Dan Jones laments his distress:

> ***It seems to me that her position is evidently the correct one, and the principle will apply to other matters with just as much force as it applies to the covenant question, or the law in Galatians.... I was just as certain as I could be that certain plans and purposes were being carried out by Dr. Waggoner and others and that certain motives were behind those plans and purposes; but it now appears that I was altogether mistaken in both. It seems strange how it could be so. Every circumstance seemed to add to the evidence to prove the things true; but, regardless of all this, they have been proven false (Letter to J. D. Pegg, March 17, 1890).***

Writing to Butler ten days later, his progress is reluctant, and he still is not clear. He is of the same opinion still regarding the message. As with Uriah Smith, he must blame Jones and Waggoner for creating the misunderstandings. He cannot see them in the light that Ellen White saw them, as the Lord's "delegated messengers":

> ***Perhaps we have been mistaken in some of our opinions that we have held.... I do not see now what can be done but to accept the explanations that have been made, and act upon them.... Sister White ... thinks reports that were brought to you from the Minneapolis meeting were greatly exaggerated, and that you have not got a correct idea in reference to what was going on there. While I hold the same position on the law in Galatians, and the covenant question that I have always held, I am glad to have my mind relieved in***

reference to the motive and plans of some of the brethren.... Let us hope that in the future our brethren will not act in such a way as to lay the foundation for unjust judgment on their plans and purposes (Letter, March 27, 1890).

Writing to R. C. Porter a few days later, he discloses how he and Uriah Smith are still not truly reconciled to the 1888 message nor to Ellen White:

Elder Smith ... can not understand why ... Sister White spoke at one time positively against a certain thing, as she did against the law in Galatians, to Elder [J. H.] Waggoner several years ago, then turn around and practically give her support to the same thing when it comes up in a little different way.... I am trying to think as little about it as possible (Letter, April 1, 1890).[3]

Two weeks later, Dan Jones is still not sure, and can now bring himself to speak with some derision of what was in fact the leading of the Lord in the beginning of the latter rain. He wants to see Jones and Waggoner whittled down to size, and assures Elder Butler that he and the brethren are still nobly carrying on the fight against them. What Ellen White and history have recognized as "a most precious message" he still considers in the category of "peculiar views" that he hopes never again will be tolerated:

I know it is a little difficult in the face of the circumstancial [sic] evidence that has surrounded this matter for a year and a half, for us to come to the conclusion now that those matters that transpired in Minneapolis were all done in lamb-like innocence. But if Dr. Waggoner says that he did not have any plan when he came there, and Brother Jones says the same, and Sister White sustains them, what can we do but accept it as a fact? ... You may think that we have kicked a little up here, and then have been roped in, and swallowed whole. Such is not the case by any means. I consider that we gained every point that we were holding for, and think the other side was glad enough to be let down a little easy; and I was willing that it should be, if they have learned the lessons that we designed they should learn. I feel confident now that Dr. Waggoner will be very cautious about throwing his peculiar views before the people until they have been carefully examined by the leading brethren; and I think the leading brethren will be much more careful in their examinations of these peculiar views than they have been in the past (Letter to Butler, April 14, 1890).

These archives abundantly confirm A. V. Olson's remark that Jones and Waggoner were persona non grata at the Battle Creek headquarters (op. cit., p. 115). The tension was so

---

[3] Uriah Smith and Ellen White's modern critics are mistaken in attributing to her a significant change in her position on the law in Galatians. She urged J. H. Waggoner not to make prominent his view that the law in Galatians is the moral law, but it appears there is no evidence that she said to him what Smith thought she did. Undoubtedly J. H. Waggoner did not grasp the larger heart-warming truths of Galatians as clearly as his son did later. She could not endorse the father's message as "most precious." Smith mistakenly relied on a partial fact to condemn the further light that the Lord sent through Waggoner's son in 1888.

sharp that it is easy to understand how Waggoner found himself sent to Britain in early 1892. His handwritten letter to the General Conference president of September 15, 1891, may have exacerbated the situation. He had been appointed a member of the book committee, but his normal participation in its work had somehow been circumvented. His letter is respectful; he makes no personal complaint; his concern is for the good of the cause:

> ***I wish to ask about Elder [G. I.] Butler's book. I see by the report of the Book Committee that it has been voted that the Review and Herald office publish it. From this I conclude that it must be about ready for publication. If so, as a member of the Book Committee, I would like to see the manuscript. Something over a year ago, I think, I saw a list of the chapters that were to compose the book; and from that, together with what I know of the condition of things in general, I am quite sure that there is good prospect that the book will be as much in need of examination as any other book. If it is put through without examination except by a committee of three, I am sure there will be dissatisfaction.... Certainly every member has the right to examine any manuscript that properly comes before the committee at all.***[4]

Uriah Smith Defends His Rejection of the Message

Uriah Smith's opposition to the 1888 message was logical, scholarly, and apparently reasonable. He writes Ellen White on February 17, 1890 explaining why he cannot receive it. He is utterly sincere. It is a humbling experience to read his six-page letter, for he is so convincing that one can exclaim, "There but for the grace of God am I." It may be as easy for us today to consider the larger gift of the Holy Spirit a disaster as it was for him to do so. He sees the leading of the Lord as a great "calamity." We can note his arguments only briefly:

> ***As it looks to me, next to the death of Brother White, the greatest calamity that ever befell our cause was when Dr. Waggoner put his articles on the book of Galatians through the Signs....***
>
> ***If I was on oath at a court of justice, I should be obliged to testify that to the best of my knowledge and belief, ... you said that Brother [J. H.] Waggoner was wrong [about the law in Galatians]. That has seemed to me ever since to be according to the Scriptures. And Brother White was so well satisfied on the subject, that, you remember, he withdrew Brother Waggoner's book from circulation.... The position that Brother [E. J.] Waggoner now takes is open to exactly the same objection.... It seems to me contrary to the Scriptures, and secondly, contrary to what you have previously seen....***
>
> ***The brethren in California [Jones and Waggoner] ... nearly ruined the [1888] Conference, as I feared they would. Had these disturbing questions not***

[4] General Conference Archives and Statistics, Record Group 11. Used by permission.

been introduced, I can see no reason why we could not have had as pleasant and blessed a Conference there as we have ever enjoyed....

[E. J. Waggoner] took his position on Galatians, the same which you had condemned in his father. And when you apparently endorsed his position as a whole, ... it was a great surprise to many. And when they asked me what that meant, and how I could account for it, really, Sister White, I did not know what to say, and I do not know what yet.

... When views and movements crop out ... which ... will utterly undermine your work, and shake faith in the message, I can but have some feeling in the matter; and you can imagine that it must seem like a strange situation to me, when, because I venture a word of caution on some of these points, I am held up in public as one who is shooting in the dark, and does not know what he is opposing. I think I do know to some degree what I am opposing. I probably do not know the full extent of this work of innovation and disintegration that is going on; but I see enough to cause me some anxiety. I believe I am willing to receive light at any time, from anybody. But what claims to be light must, for me, show itself to be according to the Scriptures and based on good solid reasons which convince the judgment, before it appears light to me. And when anyone presents something which I have long known and believed, it is impossible for me to call that new light (Letter of Uriah Smith, February 17, 1890).

Could it be that there are many "Uriah Smiths" in the church today, just as sincere and reasonable in their heart opposition to the light that in God's providence must yet lighten the earth with glory?

It is painful to .look over the shoulders of our Battle Creek brethren of a century ago and read their letters. But it may do us good to realize that some day others will read our letters. And angels will correctly discern our true heart attitude toward the work of God.

A deep heart enmity against the humbling message of Christ's righteousness made it possible for good brethren long ago to credit ill-founded rumors and distorted reports. Ellen White often compared the situation with the Jews opposing Christ. They too had good logic and well-reasoned arguments on their side. They thought they saw Scriptural evidence that made it impossible for Him to be the true Messiah. Had any prophet ever come out of Galilee? Did any of the leaders at Jerusalem believe on Him? (John 7:48-52). And His personality also rubbed them the wrong way.

It's too late now for our brethren of a century ago to dig deep enough into their souls to repent of rejecting the most significant outpouring of the Holy Spirit since Pentecost.

Thank God, it's not yet too late for us to do so, for we can easily see ourselves in them.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE FUNDAMENTAL PROBLEM: HOW TO EVALUATE THE 1888 MESSAGE

The error of assuming that "we" accepted the message of 1888 stems from a still deeper error of misunderstanding, that is, what the message really was.

The officially endorsed view that it was accepted also must assume that there was nothing uniquely Adventist about it. The message is evaluated as "the doctrine of righteousness by faith," that is, the same "doctrine" that Protestants have believed for hundreds of years. The following from one of our esteemed authors, a General Conference vice-president, is typical of this widely accepted view of the message:

> ***Some may ask, What was this teaching of righteousness by faith which became the mainspring of the great 1888 Adventist revival, as taught and emphasized by Mrs. White and others? It was the same doctrine that Luther, Wesley, and many other servants of God had been teaching (L. H. Christian, The Fruitage of Spiritual Gifts, p. 239).***

It would be grossly humiliating to confess that "we" rejected "the same doctrine that Luther, Wesley, and many other servants of God had been teaching." Hence we must say that we accepted "the doctrine" in and after 1888.

While another authoritative writer concedes that the 1888 message was "the third angel's message in verity" as Ellen White characterized it (RH, April 1, 1890), he confuses the issue by insisting that many non-Adventist Evangelical leaders also proclaimed "the same general ... emphasis," having obtained their message "from the same Source." Without exception, all these highly endorsed books of recent years logically imply that the "verity" of the third angel's message is nothing more than popular Protestant teaching. Not one takes a consistent position to evaluate the 1888 message as Ellen White did, nor recognizes any unique Adventist element in it. Froom's insistence is very clear:

> ***Men outside the Advent Movement--[had] the same general burden and emphasis, and arising at about the same time.... The impulse manifestly came from the same Source. And in timing, Righteousness by Faith centered in the year 1888.***
>
> ***For example, the renowned Keswick Conferences of Britain were founded to "promote practical holiness."... Some fifty men could easily be listed in the closing decades of the nineteenth and the opening decades of the twentieth centuries ... all giving this general emphasis (Froom, Movement of Destiny, pp. 319, 320; emphasis original).***

The conclusion is logical and inescapable: we should go to these sources to get the "doctrine" and to learn how to teach righteousness by faith. And we have done so, for

decades, in spite of the fact that the constant trend of this view of righteousness by faith is antinomian.

We can believe that these Evangelical leaders were good, sincere men, living up to all the light they had. But did they proclaim "the third angel's message in verity," as Ellen White described the 1888 message? Our author concedes that while they "did not understand our specific message," that is, the sabbath and the state of the dead and other "peculiar" doctrines, nevertheless they did proclaim "the same ... righteousness by faith" doctrine that the Lord gave us in 1888. Yet, in contrast, Ellen White insists that the 1888 message contains a unique spiritual nutriment that leads to "obedience to all the commandments of God" (TM 92).

This authoritative position logically supports our opponents' view that there is nothing special about the heart of the Seventh-day Adventist message. It encourages their view that aside from what valid gospel "doctrine" we may borrow from the Evangelicals, the essence of Seventh-day Adventism is legalism. Certainly therefore we have no mandate to call the Christian world to judgment and repentance.

What is the true evaluation of the 1888 message? Was it the "same doctrine" that the Protestant Reformers and 19th century Evangelicals taught, as our authors insist? Or was it a distinct, unique understanding of "the everlasting gospel" in relation to our special sanctuary message? Our officially endorsed authors all ignore any such special sanctuary relationship.

The truth of this is crucial to understanding our identity as a people.

If the message of 1888 was only the historic Protestant doctrine of justification by faith, we face some serious problems:

(1) Suppose we accept that Ellen White is correct in saying repeatedly that the 1888 message was resisted and rejected; it must follow logically that Seventh-day Adventist Church leadership rejected "the same doctrine" that Luther and Wesley taught concerning justification by faith.

In other words, for us to say that the message of 1888 was the "same doctrine that Luther, Wesley ... had been teaching" logically requires that our 1888 forefathers rejected the historic Protestant position. Such a rejection would be as disastrous as Rome's rejection of Luther, or the Church of England's rejection of Wesley. This would be tantamount to a spiritual fall as bad as the fall of Babylon.

But this cannot be, for it would destroy the foundations of the church. Thus our authors are forced to assume that "we" accepted the message of 1888, and had a "great ... revival."

(2) Again, if the view is true that the message of 1888 was "the same doctrine" of the Reformers, it would require that "Luther, Wesley, and many other servants of God" from the 16th to the 19th centuries preached "the third angel's message in verity." Thus Seventh-day Adventists cannot logically see their identity in the three angels' messages of Revelation 14.

Some years ago Louis R. Conradi, our leader in Europe, followed this official idea to its logical end and maintained that Luther preached the third angel's message in the 16th century. Conradi in time left the church. (He had also been an opposer of the message at the 1888 conference.) And we are today losing ministers, members and youth for the same basic reason--they see nothing unique and attractive in our gospel message. These officially endorsed views imply that there is nothing unique about it.

Have our trusted historians unwittingly short-circuited the Seventh-day Adventist movement of destiny? If so, great damage has been done, for authoritatively published ideas have a great impact on the world church.

The Re-emphasis View of 1888

Another highly endorsed view of the 1888 message is that it was a mere "re-emphasis" of what the Adventist pioneers had believed from our very beginning, a recovery of a homiletical balance in doctrine and preaching temporarily lost between 1844 and 1888. This view has come to be very widely believed. A few examples must suffice:

> ***This conference [1888] ... proved to be the beginning of a re-emphasis of this glorious truth, which resulted in a spiritual awakening among our people (M. E. Kern, RH, August 3, 1950).***
>
> ***The greatest event of the eighties in the experience of Seventh-day Adventists was the recovery, or the restatement and new consciousness, of their faith in the basic doctrine of Christianity, "Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ" (A. W. Spalding, Captains of the Host, p. 583).***
>
> ***There were those who accepted the [1888] emphasis on righteousness by faith; on the other extreme were those who thought this emphasis threatened the "old landmarks."...***
>
> ***The reaction of the church during the nineties to the new emphasis on justification ... was mixed (N. F. Pease, The Faith That Saves, pp. 40, 45; 1969).***

If this "re-emphasis" (or "emphasis") view is correct, some further questions arise:

(1) How could conscientious leaders resist, spurn, or even neglect a re-emphasis of what they themselves had always believed and had preached some twenty, thirty, or forty years before? Or if this session of 1888 included a new generation of Adventist preachers, how could they reject a "glorious truth" their immediate forebears had been preaching?

(2) Again, how could we defend ourselves against the charge that the Adventist church suffered a moral fall similar to that of Babylon if we accept the view that the 1888 brethren rejected a re-emphasis of truth that they believed at the beginning of the Advent movement? When one is climbing upwards, and suddenly goes backward, that is a "fall."

We deplore offshoots and uncharitable critics unjustly saying that the church has fallen as did Babylon. We don't believe it. But the official version of our 1888 history logically concedes this discouraging view. Many reasoning minds follow it to its ultimate conclusions, as did Conradi. The more we ferret out the truths of 1888, the more apparent it becomes that off-shoots, fanaticism, apostasies, and lukewarm complacency proliferate because of our long-standing failure to recognize those realities.

This chapter will present evidence that the message of 1888 was not a mere re-emphasis of the doctrines of Luther and Wesley, nor even of the Adventist pioneers. Neither was it a re-play of what the Keswick speakers and popular Protestant leaders of the day taught as "the doctrine of righteousness by faith." It was greater than these! It was the "beginning" of a more mature concept of the "everlasting gospel" than had been clearly

perceived by any previous generation. It was "the beginning" of the final outpouring of the Holy Spirit as the latter rain. It was the initial announcement of the message of the fourth angel of Revelation 18. It was to be a blessing unprecedented since Pentecost (cf. FCE 473; RH June 3, 1890).

This is not to say that the messengers of 1888 were greater than Paul, Luther, Wesley, or any one else, nor that they were keener, brighter students. The message they brought was simply the "third angel's message in verity," an understanding of righteousness by faith parallel to and consistent with the "time of the end" doctrine of the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary where the High Priest ministers in the antitypical Day of Atonement in the Most Holy Apartment (cf. EW 55, 56, 250-254, 260, 261). He entered upon that last phase of His work in 1844. From there He ministers true justification by faith to those who follow Him by faith. Hence there is something unique about justification by faith in the light of the Day of Atonement, and the 1888 message recognizes it.

If allowed free course for heart acceptance and theological development, the message would have prepared a people to meet the Lord "not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing," "without fault before the throne of God" (Ephesians 5:27; Revelation 14:5). It was intended by its Divine Author to ripen the "firstfruits unto God and to the Lamb." If this is not true, Ellen White's lifetime credibility must suffer, as well as our denominational self-respect.

Further, the obvious undeniable rejection of that message did not constitute a moral or spiritual fall of the remnant church involving a repudiation of Protestant theology. It was rather an arresting of her ordained spiritual development, a pitiful blindness and inability to recognize the eschatalogical consummation of the love and the call of the Lord.

The rejection of that message virtually eclipsed an ethical and practical understanding of the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary. It left only the outward shell of doctrinal structure, such as the chronological proofs of the 2300 years, and the mechanical concept of the "investigative judgment" as preached by us before 1888. Our own retarded growth in understanding has invited the scorn of Evangelical opponents who deride this unique Adventist truth as "flat, stale, and profitless." This is why so many of our own people, especially our youth, see the sanctuary "doctrine" as boring and irrelevant.

What Ellen White Saw in the Message of 1888

As soon as she had heard a little of Dr. Waggoner's message at Minneapolis (for the first time, incidentally), she recognized it to be "precious light" in harmony with what she had been "trying to present" during the previous 45 years. She knew no jealousy, but welcomed the messengers and their message. It was a further development in full harmony with past light, but never clearly preached before:

I see the beauty of truth in the presentation of the righteousness of Christ in relation to the law as the Doctor has placed it before us. You say, many of you, that it is light and truth. Yet you have not presented it in its light heretofore.... That which has been presented harmonizes perfectly with the light which God has been pleased to give me during all the years of my experience. If our ministering brethren would accept the doctrine which has been presented so clearly ... the people would be fed with their portion of the meat in due season (Ms. 15, 1888; Olson, op. cit., pp. 294, 295).

The brethren at Minneapolis themselves understood the message to be a revelation of new light, rather than a re-emphasis of what they had formerly preached. This is implied as follows:

> ***One brother asked me if I thought there was any new light that we should have, or any new truths? ... Well, shall we stop searching the Scriptures because we have the light on the law of God, and the testimony of His Spirit? No, brethren (Ms. 9, 1888; Olson, pp. 292, 293).***

Thus the message of 1888 was something which the brethren had not previously comprehended. There was a failure to appreciate the heart and verity of the third angel's message, the outward forms of which alone they understood:

> ***There are but few, even of those who claim to believe it, that comprehend the third angel's message; and yet this is the message for this time. It is present truth. But how few take up this message in its true bearing and present it to the people in its power. With many it has but little force. Said my guide, "There is much light yet to shine forth from the law of God and the gospel of righteousness. This message understood in its true character, and proclaimed in the Spirit will lighten the earth with its glory" (Ms. 15, 1888; Olson, p. 296).***
>
> ***The peculiar work of the third angel has not been seen in its importance. God meant that His people should be far in advance of the position which they occupy to-day.... It is not in the order of God that light has been kept from our people--the very present truth which they needed for this time. Not all our ministers who are giving the third angel's message, really understand what constitutes that message (5T 714, 715).***

Ellen White never at any time used the word "re-emphasis" or even "emphasis" in respect of the 1888 message. Clearly, it appeared to be new light which contradicted ideas held by the brethren, just as the Jews thought that Christ contradicted Moses when in fact His message fulfilled Moses. Her context is the message and its reception:

> ***We see that the God of heaven sometimes commissions men to teach that which is regarded as contrary to the established doctrines. Because those who were once the depositaries of truth became unfaithful to their sacred trust, the Lord chose others who would receive the bright beams of the Sun of righteousness, and would advocate truths that were not in accordance with the ideas of the religious leaders....***
>
> ***Even Seventh-day Adventists are in danger of closing their eyes to truth as it is in Jesus, because it contradicts something which they have taken for granted as truth but which the Holy Spirit teaches is not truth (May 30, 1896; TM pp. 69, 70).***

There was a principle which made an advance revelation of "new light" necessary in 1888. This is stated in one of Ellen White's sermons at Minneapolis:

The Lord has need of men who are ... worked by the Holy Spirit, who are certainly receiving manna fresh from heaven. Upon the minds of such, God's word flashes light...

That which God gives His servants to speak to-day would not perhaps have been present truth twenty years ago, but it is God's message for this time (Ms. 8a, 1888; Olson, pp. 273, 274).

There was a distinct difference in her mind between the message of righteousness by faith as presented in 1888 and the "past message" the Lord sent prior to 1888. While there was to be no contradiction, there must be further development: "We want the past message and the fresh message" (RH, March 18, 1890). (But her appeals are not a license to fanaticism or novel ideas irresponsibly proclaimed).

In a series of Review articles in early 1890, Ellen White discussed the cleansing-of-the-sanctuary truth in connection with the controverted 1888 message of righteousness by faith. Each truth complemented the other. There was a desperate need for a more profound understanding of the everlasting gospel in relation to the Day of Atonement:

We are in the day of atonement, and we are to work in harmony with Christ's work of cleansing the sanctuary.... We must now set before the people the work which by faith we see our great High-priest accomplishing in the heavenly sanctuary (RH January 21, 1890).

The mediatorial work of Christ, the grand and holy mysteries of redemption, are not studied or comprehended by the people who claim to have light in advance of every other people on the face of the earth. Were Jesus personally upon earth, He would address a large number who claim to believe present truth with the words He addressed to the Pharisees: "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, or the power of God."...

There are old, yet new truths still to be added to the treasures of our knowledge. We do not understand or exercise faith as we should.... We are not called to worship and serve God by the use of the means employed in former years. God requires higher service now than ever before. He requires the improvement of the heavenly gifts. He has brought us into a position where we need higher and better things than have ever been needed before (ibid., February 25, 1890).

We have been hearing His voice more distinctly in the message that has been going for the last two years.... We have only just begun to get a little glimmering of what faith is (ibid., March 11, 1890).

Thus it is evident:

1. The message of 1888 was "light" which the brethren had not seen or presented "heretofore."

2. It was our "meat in due season"--food for today, not manna restored from yesterday.

3. Ellen White heard at Minneapolis for the first time a doctrinal unfolding of what she had been "trying to present" all along--the matchless charms of Christ in the light of His Day-of-Atonement ministry. No other human lips had preached it.

4. She recognized in E. J. Waggoner an agent used by the Lord for an advanced revelation of truth to His people and to the world.

5. The "verity" of the third angel's message had not been comprehended by our ministers because they had not advanced in understanding as they should have forty-four years after the beginning of the cleansing of the sanctuary. Instead, advanced light had been kept from the people.

6. The brethren at the time understood her support of Waggoner and Jones as a recommendation of the new light which they brought. It was not a call to their original understanding of the "established doctrines." It opposed a mere re-emphasis of old understandings. Had Brethren Butler, Smith and others so understood it, would they not have been strong to champion it instead of opposing it as they did?

7. Therefore, what the brethren rejected was the call for "most decided changes." They did not refuse to go back; they refused to go forward. Thus they tried to stand still--a difficult thing for any army on the march.

The Light of 1888 the Beginning of Greater Light

Ellen White often spoke of the certainty of the Lord sending new light, if and when His people were willing to receive it. The tragic "if and when" are necessary only because the new wine must have new bottles, and that means a crucifixion of self (cf. Matthew 9:16, 17):

> ***If through the grace of Christ His people will become new bottles, He will fill them with the new wine. God will give additional light, and old truths will be recovered, and replaced in the framework of truth; and wherever the laborers go, they will triumph. As God's ambassadors, they are to search the Scriptures, to seek for the truths that have been hidden beneath the rubbish of error (ibid., December 23, 1890).***
>
> ***A great work is to be done, and God sees that our leading men have need of greater light, that they might unite harmoniously with the messengers whom He will send to accomplish the work that He designs they should (ibid., July 26, 1892).***

Can there be any question that the message of 1888 was the beginning of that fourth angel's message, who joins his voice with the third angel? Neither The Fruitage of Spiritual Gifts (Christian), Captains of the Host (Spalding), Through Crisis to Victory (Olson), The Lonely Years (A. L. White), nor the recent White Estate "Statement" inserted in Selected Messages, Volume 3, (pp. 156-163), makes a single allusion to this fact. The same is true of the article on the 1888 conference in the Spring 1985 issue of Adventist Heritage. Our Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia discusses the 1888 message in several articles, but never recognizes it for what it was (pp. 634, 635, 1086, 1201, 1385).

This evasion of a vital truth is amazing. It's like the Jews' readiness to acknowledge Jesus of Nazareth as a great rabbi while they evade seeing Him as the Messiah. But logic and

consistency require this special maneuver by those who insist that the 1888 message was accepted. They must virtually ignore the fact that the message was the beginning of the latter rain and the loud cry, or else they must explain how a work which was to have gone "like fire in the stubble" has been dragging on for nearly a century, when it could have enlightened the world long ago if "our brethren" had truly accepted it (Letter B2a, 1892; GCB 1893, p. 419).

Note how clearly Ellen White saw the 1888 message in the light of Revelation 18:

> ***Several have written to me, inquiring if the [1888] message of justification by faith is the third angel's message, and I have answered, "It is the third angel's message in verity." The prophet declares, "And after these things I saw another angel come down from heaven, having great power; and the earth was lightened with his glory" [Revelation 18:1] (RH, April 1, 1890).***
>
> ***The loud cry of the third angel has already begun in the revelation of the righteousness of Christ.... This is the beginning of the light of the angel whose glory shall fill the whole earth (ibid., November 22, 1892).***

If that wondrous message is to be proclaimed by the popular Protestant revivalists, we have no reason to exist as a people.

The Light of the Loud Cry Turned Off

The Lord is merciful and long-suffering, and ready to forgive. He restores that which was lost on condition of repentance. But we must not allow confusion to neutralize the parable of 1888.

If those who opposed the light at Minneapolis later repented truly and were forgiven, why was not the original purpose of the 1888 message fulfilled? It is certain that there was no revival and reformation consistent in scope and effect with what would have come had the light been accepted. The Lord sent no more light beyond that fateful "beginning." We may ask, Why?[1]

At no time between 1888 and 1901 did the responsible leadership of the church manifest a firm purpose to rectify the tragic mistake of 1888. Doubt, suspicion, mistrust of the message and the messengers continued even for decades.

Although this tragedy occurred, there is no need to conclude that the Lord withdrew His blessings from His people. What was despised and rejected was the latter rain, but the former rain has continued to fall. Unnumbered souls have been led to the Lord during the

---

[1] There is no evidence that Ellen White took over Jones' and Waggoner's mission, thus making them redundant. Yet the common idea prevalent today is that their message is redundant because Ellen White wrote out after 1888 the light they were commissioned to bring to the church and to the world. She supported their message because it was what she had been "trying to present," that is, "the matchless charms of Christ." But she never claimed that the Lord had laid on her the burden of proclaiming the loud cry message. Most of Steps to Christ was written before 1888 and compiled later. To say that we do not need the 1888 message because we have her writings is to contradict her own message.

past century--including every reader of this book. Not one person is living today who took part in the 1888 history.

God has not forsaken His people. But our attitude tied His hands, making it impossible for Him to send any more showers of the latter rain. He could not, would not, cast His choicest pearls before those who would not reverence His more abounding grace. Therefore, those showers of the latter rain ceased after the initial outpouring was persistently repulsed. He is not beyond the capacity of being grieved.

In a thought-provoking, almost cryptic sermon at Minneapolis, Ellen White spoke of Elijah fed by a widow outside of Israel because those in Israel who had light had not lived up to it. "They were the most hardhearted people in the world, the hardest to impress with the truth," she said. The Syrian Naaman was cleansed from his leprosy while Israelite lepers remained defiled. When the inhabitants of Nazareth rose up against the Son of Mary, "some" were ready to accept Him as the Messiah, but an influence "pressed in" to counter their conviction. These were illustrations of our 1888 history:

> ***But here a state of unbelief arises, Is not this Joseph's son? ... What did they do in their madness? "They rose up and thrust Him out of the city." Here I want to tell you what a terrible thing it is if God gives light, and it is impressed on your heart and spirit.... Why, God will withdraw His Spirit unless His truth is accepted. But God was accepted at Nazareth by some; the witness was here that He was God; but a counter influence pressed in ... that would cause the hearts to disbelieve (Ms. 8, 1888; Olson, pp. 263, 264).***

That "counter influence" is a significant factor in our 1888 history. Two days before, she had warned that the steps of unbelief being taken would prove final for that generation so far as advanced light of the latter rain was concerned:

> ***We are losing a great deal of blessing we might have had at this meeting [Minneapolis], because we do not take advance steps in the Christian life, as our duty is presented before us; and this will be an eternal loss (ibid., Olson, p. 257).***
>
> ***That light which is to fill the whole earth with its glory has been despised by some who claim to believe the present truth.... I know not but some have even now gone too far to return and repent (TM 89, 90; 1896).***
>
> ***If you wait for light to come in a way that will please every one, you will wait in vain. If you wait for louder calls or better opportunities, the light will be withdrawn, and you will be left in darkness (5T 720).***

Speaking of a meeting of minister-leaders in 1890, Ellen White revealed the pathetic picture of Jesus Christ being turned away as the bride-to-be in the Song of Solomon 5:2 turned her lover away: "Christ knocked for entrance but no room was made for Him, the door was not opened and the light of His glory, so nigh, was withdrawn" (Letter 73, 1890).

The Source of Reformationist Misunderstanding

Earnest efforts for decades to disparage the 1888 message as "new light" tend to deflect favorable attention from the message itself toward popular non-Adventist, Protestant concepts. This has been the case for some sixty years, beginning around the 1920's. A. G. Daniells' Christ Our Righteousness of 1926 saw nothing unique in the 1888 message, but mistakenly interpreted it as being "in perfect harmony with the best [non-Adventist] evangelical teaching" (Pease, By Faith Alone, p. 189).

This long tradition has doubtless laid the foundation for the current success of concepts of righteousness by faith similar to those held by Calvinist "Reformationist" theologians. If non-Adventists possess the truth on righteousness by faith, we must of necessity import the doctrine from them. But in the process of doing so, the 1888 truths have been neglected, and even opposed.

The following is typical of this widely held view. It seriously confuses Reformationist views with the 1888 message. Here is an example of the venerable foundation on which rests the phenomenal confusion of recent decades:

> ***[The 1888] righteousness by faith was not new light. There are those who have entertained the mistaken idea that the message of the righteousness of Christ was an unknown truth to the advent movement up to the time of the Minneapolis meeting, but the fact is that our pioneers taught it from the very beginning of the advent church. As a young preacher, I often heard our veterans, such as J. G. Matteson and E. W. Farnsworth, declare that justification by faith was not a new teaching in our church (Christian, The Fruitage of Spiritual Gifts, pp. 225, 226).***

Sad to say, some of those "veterans" were not receptive to the increased 1888 light. This insistence that the 1888 message was not new light was the familiar insignia of the opposition of that time. Not long after the Minneapolis meeting, R. F. Cottrell wrote an article for the Review attacking the 1888 message, asking, "Where is the New Departure?" (RH April 22, 1890). W. H. Littlejohn likewise attacked the message with an article, January 16, 1894, entitled, "Justification by Faith Not a New Doctrine." Both failed to recognize what was happening in their day--the onset of the latter rain.

Some writers have cited isolated, wrested Ellen White statements in support of the same opposition thesis--that it was not new light. But she did not contradict herself on this important point. Let us examine the statements used in support of the "re-emphasis" view. We must give them a fair hearing:

> ***Elder E. J. Waggoner had the privilege [at Minneapolis] granted him of speaking plainly and presenting his views upon justification by faith and the righteousness of Christ in relation to the law. This was no new light, but it was old light placed where it should be in the third angel's message.... This was not new light to me, for it had come to me from higher authority for the last forty-four years (Ms. 24, 1888; 3 SM 168; Olson, p. 48).***

Laborers in the cause of truth should present the righteousness of Christ, not as new light, but as precious light that has for a time been lost sight of by the people (RH March 20, 1894; Olson, p. 49).

These statements do not say that the 1888 message in its fulness was not the new light of the latter rain and the loud cry. In context, the Ms. 24, 1888 statement was written to refute the prejudice of opposing brethren who disparaged the message as merely human novelty. All light is eternal; none is ever strictly "new." But it was certainly new to our brethren in 1888 and to our congregations. And it would have been new to the world if we had proclaimed it!

And whatever the 1888 light was, new or old, it is obvious that no one else had preached it among us during those "last forty-four years" (Ms. 5, 1889; MS. 15, 1888, Olson p. 295). Further on in the 1889 manuscript, Ellen White stated that the entire 1888 message would indeed prove to be "new light" if the gospel commission was to be finished in that generation:

Questions were asked at that time, "Sister White, do you think that the Lord has any new and increased light for us as a people?" I answered, "Most assuredly. I do not only think so, but can speak understandingly. I know that there is precious truth to be unfolded to us if we are the people that are to stand in the day of God's preparation (3 SM 174).

Seventh-day Adventists are not to cultivate the reputation of being inventors of new doctrines, but repairers of the breach, the restorers of paths to dwell in, the discoverers of the old ways. Such a presentation will disarm prejudice, whereas presenting truth as something newly invented will arouse opposition.

But this does not deny that the 1888 message was an advanced revelation to the church. While Ellen White's conviction gradually deepened that it was the fulfillment of the Revelation 18 prophecy, she saw how it harmonized with the unique concept of the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary. This was the genius of the message.

This is truth that sincere fellow Protestants have never comprehended. Could one reason be that we have never made it clear to them?

It is shocking to orthodox Jews who have been praying for the coming of their Messiah to realize that He came long ago but was rejected by their forefathers. It is no less shocking to Seventh-day Adventists who keep praying for the outpouring of the latter rain to realize that the blessing came a century ago, but was rejected by their forefathers.

CHAPTER SIX

THE 1888 REJECTION OF ELLEN WHITE

What Ellen White says about the reaction against the 1888 message sounds almost incredible. Could it be that a natural-born unbelief veils our eyes and heart? We humans seem to have difficulty believing "the testimony of Jesus." What was a defeat we like to call "a glorious victory." Where we lost our way we assume that we found it.

We must clarify hazy, indistinct impressions to as near pin-point accuracy as possible. Several avenues of heaven's blessing were blocked by the negative reaction toward the 1888 message. The inhabitants of heaven already realize what "we" did in that history, as follows:

(1) The Holy Spirit Was Insulted

This may sound impossible, for several reasons. It may be difficult for us readily to conceive of the Holy Spirit as a Person who can be insulted or who can feel it and be concerned about it. And it may be even more difficult to conceive how Seventh-day Adventists could do such a thing--certainly not ministers and General Conference leaders. But we must face what the Lord's messenger has to say. The testimony of Jesus does not gloss over reality:

> ***Now our meeting is drawing to a close and ... there has not been a single break so as to let the Spirit of God in. Now I was saying what was the use of our assembling here together and for our ministering brethren to come in if they are here only to shut out the Spirit of God from the people? (Ms. 9, 1888; Olson, pp. 290, 291).***
>
> ***There was, I knew, a remarkable blindness upon the minds of many [at Minneapolis], so that they did not discern where the Spirit of God was and what constituted true Christian experience. And to consider that these were the ones who had the guardianship of the flock of God was painful....***
>
> ***Our brethren who have occupied leading positions in the work and the cause of God should have been so closely connected with the Source of all light that they would not call light darkness and darkness light (Ms. 24, 1888; emphasis added).***

The details of this history are precise and clear-cut. There need be no confusion in our thinking regarding intangibles. The reception of the Holy Spirit was implicit in the reception of the message itself. It would be impossible to receive the latter rain gift of the Holy Spirit and not receive the message through which the gift was given. And the good news that we today need to grasp is the corollary of this truth: it is equally impossible to receive the message today and not receive the gift of the Holy Spirit implicit with it. If we have not received the Holy Spirit in the power of the latter rain and the loud cry, this is clear evidence that we have not received the message that the Lord sent to us.

What is important in understanding 1888 is not the negative attitude of a few individuals, a so-called die-hard minority, but the spirit which "controlled" or "prevailed" at the 1888 Conference and thereafter. This is what had a determinative effect on that generation, and has had on every generation since. Ellen White is clear about that "controlling" influence:

> ***I met with the brethren in the tabernacle and I felt it my duty to give a short history of the meeting and my experience at Minneapolis, the course I had pursued and why, and plainly state the spirit which prevailed at that meeting.... I told them of the hard position I was placed in, to stand, as it were, alone and be compelled to reprove the wrong spirit that was a controlling power at that meeting. The suspicion and jealousy, the evil surmising, the resistance of the Spirit of God that was appealing to them, were more after the order in which the reformers had been treated. It was the very order in which the [Methodist] church had treated my father's family and eight of us....***
>
> ***I stated that the course that had been pursued at Minneapolis was cruelty to the Spirit of God (Ms. 30, 1889; emphasis supplied).***
>
> ***[The opposing brethren] were moved at the meeting [Minneapolis] by another spirit, and they knew not that God had sent these young men to bear a special message to them, which they treated with ridicule and contempt, not realizing that the heavenly intelligences were looking upon them.... I know that at the time the Spirit of God was insulted (Letter S24, 1892).***
>
> ***Sins ... are lying at the door of many.... The Holy Spirit has been insulted, and light has been rejected (TM 393; 1896).***
>
> ***Some[1] have treated the Spirit as an unwelcome guest, refusing to receive the rich gift, refusing to acknowledge it, turning from it, and condemning it as fanaticism (TM 64; 1896).***

The idea of insulting the Holy Spirit is more than a passing hyperbole. This tragedy affects us today as surely as the Jews' mistake of long ago affects them today.

A sin that an individual committed long ago as an insult to another person remains as a burden on his or her conscience and affects the character and personality. This can continue even for decades, as long as both individuals live and until repentance and restitution take place.

Likewise, the consciousness of the corporate body of the church, our denominational character and personality, our standing before Heaven, the spirit that permeates our churches, are affected negatively by this vital episode of our history. Our environmental heritage is inescapable. Jeremiah says that "the sin of Judah is ... engraved on the tablet of their heart with a point of adamant" (17:1, NEB). And it extends from one generation to another (2:5, 9; 3:24, 25; 14:20). Until repentance takes place, we doom ourselves to repeat the sins of our fathers. Alienation from the Holy Spirit is deeply involved.

---

[1] Never does Ellen White say that the "some" who opposed were "few," nor does she say that those who accepted were "many." Without known exception, those who rejected the message were "many" and those who accepted were "few."

The Holy Spirit is a Person, not a mere influence or an ethereal "it." He can be grieved. This keen concept of the personality of God as the Holy Spirit pervades the Hebrew Scriptures. The prophets were constantly representing God as the disappointed, grieved lover of Israel's soul.[2] The idea is unique to Israel, for no pagan religion had any such concept of a "jealous" divine personality.

The same truth pervades the New Testament, and is also impressively emphasized in Ellen White's testimonies. However, the idea is generally lacking in modern Catholic and Protestant teaching. A full appreciation of this reality is unique to those who will welcome the Lord at His second coming, for they are corporately represented as a bride who has at last made herself ready for the intimate relationship of marriage (Revelation 19:7-9. The 1900's "alpha" heresy of pantheism attacked this truth of the personality of the Holy Spirit; the "omega" will doubtless renew that error).

Grieved and insulted, He has a right to retribution. And how can He seek it, consistent with His character of love? His retribution is more poignantly painful to endure than any other, for it will still be the voice of love that speaks:

> ***There will be messages borne; and those who have rejected the message God has sent will hear most startling declarations.... Injured and insulted Deity will speak, proclaiming the sins that have been hidden. As the priests and rulers, full of indignation and terror, sought refuge in flight at the last scene of the cleansing of the temple, so will it be in the work for these last days (Special Testimonies, Series A, No. 7, pp. 54, 55).***

The context of this statement is a discussion of the Seventh-day Adventist Church.

(2) Jesus Christ Was Spurned and Insulted

This also is difficult for us to see. Again, the personality of the Son of God is at issue. Does He have feelings as we humans do? Can He be grieved? What happened in our 1888 history seems so astonishing that the story would be incredible if it were not clearly told in the writings of Ellen White. Her discernment was inspired.

The meek and lowly Jesus still chooses messengers who are "only men," who are like "a root out of a dry ground." He condescended to identify Himself with the 1888 messengers and was grieved and insulted when the "heavenly credentials" He gave them were despised:

> ***Here was evidence, that all might discern whom the Lord recognized as His servants.... These men whom you have spoken against have been as signs in the world, as witnesses for God.... If you reject Christ's delegated messengers, you reject Christ (TM 97; 1896).***

---

[2] See for example, 1 Samuel 8:7; 12:6-12; Isaiah 50:1; 54:5-17; 61:10; 63:9-14; Jeremah 31:1-9; Ezekiel 16; Hosea, *passim* .

To accuse and criticize those whom God is using is to accuse and criticize the Lord who sent them....

With many the cry of the heart has been, "We will not have this man [Christ] to reign over us." ... The true religion, the only religion of the Bible, that teaches forgiveness only through the merits of a crucified and risen Saviour, that advocates righteousness by the faith of the Son of God, has been slighted, spoken against, ridiculed, and rejected (TM 466-468).

The present message ... is a message from God; it bears the divine credentials, for its fruit is unto holiness (RH September 3, 1889).

This message as it has been presented [by Jones and Waggoner] should go to every church that claims to believe the truth, and bring our people up to a higher standpoint.... We want to see who have presented to the world the heavenly credentials (ibid., March 18, 1890).

But even in modern times, our esteemed church historian casts contempt upon the messenger, if not upon the message itself:

As we look back on the controversy we perceive that it was the rancors aroused by personalities, much more than the differences in beliefs, which caused the difficulty. The party of Butler, Smith and Morrison believed in the theory of justification by faith.... The party of Waggoner and Jones believed in the performance of good works; but .... bore almost exclusively upon faith as the factor in salvation. Minds which could calmly reason could harmonize these views, but neither side was disposed to consider the other side calmly (Spalding, Captains of the Host, p. 599).

A more accurate assessment would be that the 1888 messengers "bore almost exclusively" on a "faith which works by love" precisely as Paul preached it (Galatians 5:6). That message with "divine credentials" was not a compromising mixture of legalism and gospel. They did most emphatically proclaim righteousness by faith alone--but it was New Testament faith which demonstrates its built-in motivating power for true obedience to all the commandments of God (TM 92).

Did those messengers who were declared to represent our Lord "arouse" the "rancors" that made Heaven turn from the scene with shame? Would the Lord grant "heavenly credentials" to messengers who were not disposed to "calmly reason"? Ellen White, for sure, could never recognize "precious light" in unsanctified "shouting" or the unreasonable "extreme teaching" that our author attributes to them (Spalding, op. cit., pp. 593, 601).

Back of the shameful scene at Minneapolis, and back of the confusing shadows caused by our unbelief today, stands the Figure who was the Rock of offence and the Stone of stumbling at that fateful meeting. We come face to face with reality:

Men professing godliness have despised Christ in the person of His messengers. Like the Jews, they reject God's message.... He was not the Christ that the Jews had looked for. So today the agencies that God sends are not what men have looked for (FCE 472; 1897).

Christ has registered all the hard, proud, sneering speeches spoken against His servants as against Himself (RH May 27, 1890).

The true Christ has always been misapprehended. As often expected, He has as often been rejected. But modern Israel must overcome at last all past failures of ancient Israel. This will take place, for we are living in the time of the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary. This is a special end-time work of overcoming that has never been completed in the past.

Flesh and blood can never reveal to us the true credentials of the "root out of a dry ground" that may stand before us. The story of 1888 teaches us that the ancient Jews will have to make room in history for us to kneel down beside them:

Many say, "If I had only lived in the days of Christ, I would not have wrested His words, or falsely interpreted His instruction. I would not have rejected and crucified Him, as did the Jews." But that will be proved by the way in which you deal with his message and His messengers today (RH April 11, 1893).

The issue of 1888 was not how much "emphasis" to place on the preaching of this "doctrine" in relation to our other "peculiar" doctrines. The real issue was, "What think ye of Christ?" It is futile for us today to talk of establishing a right "relationship with Christ" unless we face this reality of 1888.

In order to bolster our confidence that we do not need repentance, we have produced Seminary theses "to inquire what place the teaching of justification and righteousness by faith has been accorded alongside the distinctive tenets" of the church. Graphs have been made counting the number of times the words "righteousness," "justification," "faith," "salvation," "Saviour," and "law" have appeared in our Sabbath School Quarterlies, "to prove that Seventh-day Adventists have not slighted the emphasis on salvation through Christ." Can computers now measure our faithfulness and prove that the True Witness is wrong? If mere verbiage is the criterion, Roman Catholicism must be the most Christ-centered teaching in the world. While the Son of God continues to suffer, must we cast lots in various inquiries to see how to divide His vesture, this "doctrine or tenet of righteousness by faith alongside the distinctive tenets of the church"? The righteousness of Christ is vastly more than a mere verbal repetition.

The grandest eschatalogical opportunity of the ages was rejected in our 1888 era. What was despised was an intimate heart reconciliation with Christ such as a bride feels for her bridegroom. But verbiage and cold doctrine have been substituted for it.

Dry homilies that split hairs between imputed and imparted righteousness, justification and sanctification, expiation and propitiation, have made "righteousness by faith" become nauseating to many. The same trouble prevailed soon after 1888. Ellen White discusses the efforts of those whose hearts opposed the message:

Many commit the error of trying to define minutely the fine points of distinction between justification and sanctification. Into the definitions of these two terms they often bring their own ideas and speculations. Why try to be more minute than is Inspiration on the vital question of righteousness by faith? Why try to work out every minute point, as if the salvation of the soul depended

upon all having exactly your understanding of this matter? (Diary, February 27, 1891).

May we come to see how the living, loving Christ was insulted at Minneapolis, and not the cold doctrine that was misunderstood! We distrusted those swellings of the heart which were His drawings, and cast contempt upon Him who was drawing us by terming His tenderness "fanaticism." The tears that started to flow from the mysterious attraction of the uplifted cross drew from us zealous declaiming "against enthusiasm and fanaticism" (TM 80, 81).

Jesus knows our human nature, for He Himself partakes of it still. He is a Person. He too knows self-respect. He came very near to us in 1888. "Not a soul of us dreams of what might have been" in the sweet days that would have followed had we walked with Him in Heaven's glorious light. We often speak of 1844 as "the Great Disappointment." But 1888 was His disappointment, for we can read of how He loved us. That intimacy of love we would not have. Why should we marvel if He did not force it upon us?

We were told at Minneapolis itself:

No one must be permitted to close the avenue whereby the light of truth shall come to the people. As soon as this shall be attempted, God's Spirit will be quenched.... Let the love of Christ reign in hearts here.... When the Spirit of God comes in, love will take the place of variance, because Jesus is love; if His Spirit were cherished here, our meeting would be like a stream in the desert (Ms. 15, 1888; Olson, pp. 300, 301).

No more tender calls, no better opportunities could be given them in order that they might do that which they ought to have done at Minneapolis.... No one can tell how much may be at stake when neglecting to comply with the call of the Spirit of God. The time will come when they will be willing to do anything and everything possible in order to have a chance of hearing the call which they rejected at Minneapolis.... Better opportunities will never come, deeper feelings they will not have (Letter O19, 1892).

Again the testimony of Ellen White stretches our faith. But we must understand reality. Human hearts trifled with the tender love of One who gave His blood for us. Finally, on the part of "many" in leadership, the trifling changed to what Ellen White sadly was forced to call "hatred." Seven years after Minneapolis she said to those "many":

You have turned your back, and not your face, to the Lord.... The Spirit of God is departing from many among His people. Many have entered into dark, secret paths, and some will never return.... They have not only refused to accept the message, but they have hated the light.... They are doing despite to His Holy Spirit (TM 89-91; 1895).

Heaven was "indignant" (TM 76). There is an intimacy of divine personal grief involved here that is unique in modern religious history, perhaps in all time. We are reminded of the heart cries of Jeremiah and Hosea of old. Ellen White said at Minneapolis: "If you only knew how Christ has regarded your religious attitude at this meeting" (Ms. 8a, 1888; Olson, p.

281). Four years later, "There is sadness in heaven over the spiritual blindness of many of our brethren" (RH July 26, 1892). Speaking of "those who resisted the Spirit of God at Minneapolis," she said:

> ***All the universe of heaven witnessed the disgraceful treatment of Jesus Christ, represented by the Holy Spirit. Had Christ been before them, they would have treated Him in a manner similar to that in which the Jews treated Christ (Special Testimonies, Series A. No. 6, p. 20).***
>
> ***The scenes which took place at that meeting [Minneapolis] made the God of heaven ashamed to call those who took part in them His brethren. All this the heavenly Watcher noticed, and it was written in the book of God's remembrance (Special Testimony to the Review and Herald Office, 1896, pp. 16, 17).***

These are sad words to record, but we cannot be honest and refuse to face their full implications. What "the heavenly Watcher noticed" must also be "written in the book of [our] remembrance." We can see ourselves in those dear brethren of a century ago, for "there, but for the grace of God, am I."

(3) Ellen White's Ministry Was Disparaged

The attitude of leadership to Ellen White's support of the 1888 message was similar to that of ancient Israel and Judah to prophets such as Elijah and Jeremiah. Note her frank remarks shortly after the Minneapolis conference:

> ***I have not had a very easy time since I left the Pacific Coast. Our first meeting was not like any other General Conference I ever attended.... My testimony was ignored, and never in my life experience was I treated as at the [1888] conference (Letter 7, December 9, 1888).***
>
> ***Brethren, you are urging me to come to your camp meetings. I must tell you plainly that the course pursued toward me and my work since the Gen. Conf. at Minneapolis--your resistance of the light and warnings that God has given through me--has made my labor fifty times harder than it would otherwise have been....***
>
> ***It seems to me that you have cast aside the word of the Lord as unworthy of your notice.... My experience since the conference at Minneapolis has not been very assuring. I have asked the Lord for wisdom daily, and that I may not be utterly disheartened, and go down to the grave brokenhearted as did my husband (Letter 1, 1890).***

These were not the words of a woman who was overwrought emotionally. She had good reason for her feelings:

> ***I related in the Thursday morning meeting [at Ottawa, Kansas] some things in reference to the Minneapolis meeting....***

God gave me meat in due season for the people, but they refused it for it did not come in just the way and manner they wanted it to come. Elders Jones and Waggoner presented precious light to the people, but prejudice and unbelief, jealousy and evil-surmising barred the door of their hearts that nothing from this source should find entrance to their hearts....

Thus it was in the betrayal, trial, and crucifixion of Jesus, all this had passed before me point by point and the Satanic spirit took the control and moved with power upon the human hearts, that had been opened to doubts and to bitterness, wrath and hatred. All this was prevailing at that meeting [at Minneapolis]....

I was conducted to the house where our brethren made their homes, and there was much conversation and excitement of feelings and some smart, and as they supposed sharp, witty remarks. The servants whom the Lord sent were caricatured, ridiculed, and placed in a ridiculous light. The comment ... passed upon me and the work that God had given me to do was anything but flattering. Willie White's name was handled freely and he was ridiculed and denounced, also the names of Elders Jones and Waggoner (Letter 14, 1889; emphasis added).

Voices that I was surprised to hear were joining in this rebellion, ... hard, bold and decided in denouncing [Sister White]. And of all those so free and forward with their cruel words, not one had come to me and inquired if these reports and their suppositions were true.... After hearing what I did my heart sank within me. I had never pictured before my mind what dependence we might place in those who claim to be friends, when the spirit of Satan finds entrance to their hearts. I thought of the future crisis, and feelings that I can never put into words for a little time overcame me.... "The brother shall betray the brother to death" (idem).

It would not be fair to characterize Ellen White's heart reaction to this as "emotional," or that of Jones and Waggoner. But all three were human beings with hearts that could be wounded. All three felt pain and grief, as did the ancient prophets. Ellen White in particular sensed keenly the premonitions of the final persecution of the saints. She actually used the word "persecution" to describe the heart attitude of leading brethren toward the 1888 messengers (GCB 1893, p. 184).

On the other hand, it was a puzzle to the sincere brethren of that era how she could support two apparently faulty young men against the calm, stolid judgment of nearly all the established leaders and ministers. If "balance" was needed, why did she support the apparently unbalanced? Why did she liken the brethren's reaction against Jones' and Waggoner's message to the Jews' reaction against Christ?

The 1888 opposition was composed of good, sincere, self-sacrificing, hard-working ministers. Their concern for the progress of the church was genuine. It was their fear that this beautiful vision of Christ's righteousness would lead to fanaticism. But this fear calcified human hearts. There seems only one way to understand this mysterious reaction. A careful study of Ellen White's numerous statements indicates that it was the revelation of the breadth, and length, and depth, and height of Christ's love (agape) that our dear, hard-

working brethren were instinctively opposing. The love revealed at the cross "constraineth us" so that believers henceforth find it impossible to go on living for self (2 Corinthians 5:14, 15). The profound truth seems to be that this kind of devotion to Christ, this closer intimacy with Him, was unwelcome:

> ***Here was evidence, that all might discern whom the Lord recognized as His servants. But there are those who despised the men and the message they bore. They have taunted them with being fanatics, extremists, and enthusiasts (TM 97; 1896).***
>
> ***These men [the opposition] have been holding positions of trust, and have been moulding the work after their own similitude, as far as they possibly could ... They have been zealously declaiming against enthusiasm and fanaticism. Faith ... that God has enjoined upon His people to exercise, is called fanaticism. But if there is anything upon the earth that should inspire men with sanctified zeal, it is the truth as it is in Jesus, ... Christ, made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption.***
>
> ***... If there is anything in our world that should inspire enthusiasm, it is the cross of Calvary (ibid., pp 80, 81; 1895).***

Thus we are brought to the foot of Christ's cross. Here is the mysterious continental divide in Adventism where faith and unbelief go their separate ways. Of all human beings, the gospel minister or administrator faces the most subtle temptation to indulge a disguised love of self. Unless he surveys that wondrous cross and casts contempt on all his professional and personal pride, he will unconsciously resist the agape revealed there. John Bunyan in The Pilgrim's Progress saw hard by the very gate of heaven there is a path that leads to hell.

Ellen White did not consider Jones' or Waggoner's presentations to be either extreme or radical, but tried to reason with the brethren who thought they were. Widely published statements such as the following perpetuate a myth:

> ***Mrs. White [did not] endorse the ideas advanced by Elder Waggoner concerning Galatians.... She even seemed to have a feeling that the two men who were so prominent at that time might later on be carried away by their extreme views of certain points. (Christian, op. cit., p. 232.)***

Her remarks were not directed against any "extreme views" Waggoner had. Instead of charging him with being radical or extreme, she intimates that some of his views were immature--there was not "perfection." In God's plan, this immaturity was to be overcome by faithful, earnest "digging in the mines of God for the precious ore." The light that shone in 1888 was only the "beginning" of the light which was to lighten the earth with glory.[3] Such glorious light began to shine through imperfect but divinely chosen channels.

---

[3] Incidentally, although Ellen White took no firm stand on the "law in Galatians" in 1888, by 1896 she was ready to take a stand. Waggoner had been right all along! "The law in Galatians [is] . . . especially . . . . the moral law" (1 SM 234, 235).

A Glorious Treasure Hunt Despised

It was not God's plan that one or two young men should do all the digging. Other more mature minds should go on with it, willing to receive "every ray of light that God shall send ... though it should come through the humblest of His servants" (Ms. 15, 1888). Within their lifetime the everlasting gospel should unfold in a mature and complete whole, ready to lighten the earth with the glory of truth.

If this was God's purpose, it would be necessary that the views of both Waggoner and Jones should not be perfect or mature at this early stage of development. They were merely to challenge their brethren to the greatest treasure hunt of the ages. The very imperfections and immaturity of their views would rally the hearty cooperation of their brethren. Had the two young men seen all the light in its perfection, where would have been the joy of their brethren in the sheer delight of discovery? God, in His infinite mercy, would share it among them.

It was this gracious privilege that the brethren scorned, taunting the pioneer miners of hidden veins of truth with being "fanatics" and "extremists." To suggest that the messengers even at Minneapolis were unstable, in danger of being "carried away" with their "extreme views," casts an unjustified aspersion on Ellen White herself. Would she not be naive if she endorsed young messengers so untrustworthy?[4]

She almost recklessly risked her reputation on enthusiastic and persistent support of their message. Could the Lord choose messengers so unstable? Would He endow them with a message so potentially self-destructive? Is it dangerous to yield to be the Lord's messenger? Surely God's mercy is greater than to endow His servants with self-destruct messages!

We must note briefly how in several General Conference assemblies speakers have openly recognized that the anti-1888 spirit included virtual defiance of Ellen White's ministry:

> ***What did the brethren in that fearful position in which they stood, reject at Minneapolis? They rejected the latter rain--the loud cry of the third angel's message.***
>
> ***Brethren, isn't that too bad? Of course the brethren did not know they were doing this, but the Spirit of the Lord was there to tell them they were doing it, was it not? But when they were rejecting the loud cry, "the teaching of righteousness," and then the Spirit of the Lord, by his prophet, stood there and told us what they were doing,--what then? Oh, then they simply set this prophet aside with all the rest (A. T. Jones, GCB 1893, p. 183; emphasis supplied).***

[4] See Appendix for a discussion of the charge that Jones was teaching the error of "holy flesh" and perfectionism as early as a few months after the 1888 conference.

No one in the Session congregation challenged him, for all knew that what he said was true. At the 1986 Annual Council in Rio de Janeiro, Robert W. Olson of the White Estate also stated that in the 1888 session Ellen White was "publicly defied" (Adventist Review, October 30, 1986). In 1889, she said:

> ***Elder Butler presented the matter before me in a letter stating that my attitude at that Conference [1888] just about broke the hearts of some of our ministering brethren at that meeting....***
>
> ***Since some of my brethren hold me in the light they do, that my judgment is of no more value than that of any other, or of one who has not been called to this special work, and that I am subject to the influence of my son Willie, or of some others, why do you send for Sister White to attend your camp meetings or special meetings? I cannot come. I could not do you any good, and it would only be trifling with the sacred responsibilities the Lord has laid upon me....***
>
> ***To have these words distorted, misapprehended by unbelievers, I expect, and it is no surprise to me; but to have my brethren who are acquainted with my mission and my work, trifle with the message that God gives me to bear, grieves His Spirit and is discouraging to me....***
>
> ***My way is hedged up by my brethren (Letter U-3, 1889).***

Of course, not all the brethren opposed her so. But open support for her was inconspicuous. The Lord's humble messenger realized at Minneapolis what was happening. The larger blessings of the latter rain caused former friends to change their attitude from positive to negative:

> ***God did not raise me up to come across the plains to speak to you and you sit here to question His message and question whether Sister White is the same as she used to be in years gone by.... Then you acknowledged that Sister White was right. But somehow it has changed now, and Sister White is different. Just like the Jewish nation (Ms. 9, 1888; Olson, p. 292).***

In 1893 she said,

> ***"The office of a messenger whom God has chosen to send with reproofs and warnings is strangely misunderstood at the present time" (RH July 18, 1893).***

(4) Ellen White's Exile to Australia

So determined was the post-1888 opposition to Ellen White that the General Conference virtually exiled her to Australia. While it is true that the Lord overruled her sojourn there for the good of His cause in that continent, it was never His will that she go at that time. She says that the Lord wanted the inspired trio to stay together in America and to fight the battle through to victory. Her own writings indicate that the leading brethren wanted both Ellen White and Waggoner out of the way.

It is well known that Mrs. White went only because the General Conference appointed her to go (a laudable example of cooperation with the church leadership!). In 1896 she wrote very frankly to the General Conference president:

> ***The Lord was not in our leaving America. He did not reveal that it was His will that I should leave Battle Creek. The Lord did not plan this, but He let you all move after your own imaginings. The Lord would have had W. C. White, his mother, and her workers remain in America. We were needed at the heart of the work, and had your spiritual perception discerned the true situation, you would never have consented to the movement made. But the Lord reads the hearts of all. There was so great a willingness to have us leave, that the Lord permitted this thing to take place. Those who were weary of the testimonies borne were left without the persons who bore them. Our separation from Battle Creek was to let men have their own will and way, which they thought superior to the way of the Lord.***
>
> ***The result is before you Had you stood in the right position the move would not have been made at that time. The Lord would have worked for Australia by other means, and a strong influence would have been held at Battle Creek, the great heart of the work.***
>
> ***There we should have stood shoulder to shoulder, creating a healthful atmosphere to be felt in all our conferences. It was not the Lord who devised this matter. I could not get one ray of light to leave America. But when the Lord presented this matter to me as it really was, I opened my lips to no one, because I knew that no one would discern the matter in all its bearings. When we left, relief was felt by many, but not so much by yourself, and the Lord was displeased, for He had set us to stand at the wheels of the moving machinery at Battle Creek.***
>
> ***This is the reason I have written you. Elder Olsen had not the perception, the courage, the force, to carry the responsibilities; nor was there any other man prepared to do the work the Lord had purposed we should do. I write you, Elder Olsen, telling you that it was God's desire that we should stand side by side with you, to counsel you, to advise you, to move with you.... You were not discerning; you were willing to have the strong experience and knowledge that comes from no human source removed from you, and thus you revealed that the Lord's ways were miscalculated and overlooked.... This counsel was not considered a necessity.***
>
> ***That the people of Battle Creek should feel that they could have us leave at the time we did, was the result of man's devising, and not the Lord's.... The Lord designed that we should be near the publishing houses, that we should have easy access to these institutions that we might counsel together.... O how terrible it is to treat the Lord with dissimulation and neglect, to scorn His counsel with pride because man's wisdom seems so much superior (Letter to O. A. Olsen, 127, 1896).***

Those who say that the 1888 message was accepted by the leadership of the church may interpret Ellen White's years in Australia as General Conference cooperation with the

Holy Spirit. It is true that she was able to write good letters back home. But depriving North America of her personal ministry at this critical time ensured "in a great measure" the eventual defeat of the beginning loud cry message.

E. J. Waggoner suffered a similar exile in being sent to England in the spring of 1892. There is evidence also that it was not pure missionary zeal that sent him. Ellen White was now gone; the second member of the special trio must also leave. We note the following in Gilbert M. Valentine's doctoral thesis on W. W. Prescott:

> ***According to W. C. White, Mrs. White, who apparently still had memories of the injustices of the post-1888 period, stated that it had been shown to her "that whereas some of our people were well pleased to have him [E. J. Waggoner] removed from the work at Battle Creek by his appointment to work in England," he should be brought back "to assist as a teacher at the heart of our work" (W. C. White to A. G. Daniells, May 30, 1902; William Warren Prescott: Seventh-day Adventist Educator, Vol. 1, p. 289).***

A year before Ellen White went to Australia she poured out her heart in a letter to J. S. Washburn, a young minister. Here, like Jeremiah, she writes almost in despair. She vividly describes the prevailing climate at the headquarters in Battle Creek:

> ***I attend meetings in the small churches but feel that I have no strength to labor with the church who have had my testimony so abundantly, and yet those who have set themselves against my message, and have not been moved to change their position of resistance notwithstanding all the Lord has given me to say in demonstration of the Spirit and power, I have no hope could be helped by anything I should say further. They have resisted the appeals of the Spirit of God. I have no hope that the Lord has a reserve power to break down their resistance. I leave them in the hands of God, and unless the Lord places upon me a decided burden to speak words in the Tabernacle [at Battle Creek] I shall not attempt to say anything until those who have acted a part to hedge up my way shall clear my path.... I have not strength to contend with the spirit, and resistance, doubts and unbelief which have barricaded their souls, that they could not see when good cometh. I have far greater liberty in speaking to unbelievers. They are interested....***
>
> ***Oh, it is the hardest place in the world, to speak where great light has come, to men in responsible positions. They have been enlightened, but have chosen darkness rather than light....***
>
> ***You may depend I have great sorrow of heart.... What will be the end of this stubborn unbelief we have yet to learn (Letter W32, 1890).***

Do the 1890's Have a Message for the 1990's?

Ellen White's ministry to the Seventh-day Adventist Church frequently exhibits this Jeremiah-like quality. The ancient prophet's message is present truth. The 1888 episode is a parable, and God will test us again.

Because the facts of our 1888 history have been so widely garbled, our contemporary attitude is still unappreciative of Jones and Waggoner's work. We still are suspicious lest their message may lead to fanaticism. We still falsely assume that it carried the two messengers away into apostasy. As long as we think thus, should the Lord send any more pearls of truth to be cast before us, we would be obliged to react to such a message as did the opposition of the 1888 era.

We today inherit no genetic guilt of our forefathers who rejected the grandest opportunity of the ages, the beginning of the latter rain and the loud cry; but we are their spiritual descendants. Holy Scripture teaches no genetic transmission of sin, "original" or otherwise, from generation to generation. But there is a transmission of sin which is not genetic. "By one man sin entered into the world." "Sin abounded" and "hath reigned unto death." "All the world [has] become guilty before God" (Romans 5:12, 20, 21; 3:19). This mysterious transmission of sin is clarified for us in the following statement:

> ***At its very source human nature was corrupted. And ever since then sin has continued its hateful work, reaching from mind to mind. Every sin committed awakens the echoes of the original sin....***
>
> ***Mutual dependence is a wonderful thing. Reciprocal influence should be carefully studied....***
>
> ***Every generation takes up some phase of evil in advance of the one which preceded it, moving onward in the march of impenitence and rebellion. God is looking on, measuring the temple and the worshipers therein....***
>
> ***No man liveth to himself. Consciously or unconsciously he is influencing others, either for good or evil.... Is it not time that a people stood forth in moral independence, cherishing at the same time a sense of their dependence on God? ...***
>
> ***The Lord has sent to our world a message of warning, even the Third Angel's Message. All heaven is waiting to hear us vindicate God's law (RH, April 16, 1901).***

We have more light than had our forefathers, hence we have greater responsibilities. The heart alienation from Christ that caused the rejection of the 1888 message is today far more subtle, more sophisticated, more deeply buried beyond our consciousness. But it is no less real. Only the enlightenment of the Holy Spirit will make it manifest. The time must come at last for each of us when "the cross will be presented, and its real bearing will be seen by every mind that has been blinded by transgression. Before the vision of Calvary with its mysterious Victim, sinners will stand condemned" (DA 58). Would it not be a blessing if we could see that cross today before it is too late?

The Holy Spirit enables the sincere believer to see himself or herself reflected in Bible characters of long ago. He can likewise enable us to see ourselves in our forefathers of a century ago. We are innately no better than they. The Holy Spirit can heal us of the blindness that permits us to see evil if it is sufficiently farfetched and distant in the past while we fail to recognize it under our very nose. God's word has been true from the very beginning:

Without the enlightenment of the Spirit of God, we shall not be able to discern truth from error, and shall fall under the masterful temptations and deceptions that Satan will bring upon the world.

We are near the close of the controversy between the Prince of light and the prince of darkness, and soon the delusions of the enemy will try our faith, of what sort it is (RH November 29, 1892).

Conclusion

To realize the truth that our forefathers insulted the true Christ and the true Holy Spirit is not itself bad news. And to unveil the reality of deep-seated resistance of "the testimony of Jesus" is a blessing. In no other way than facing truth can we prepare for future tests. The truth is positive, upbeat, encouraging.

The good news is that Heaven has all along been more willing to grant the final outpouring of God's Spirit than we have thought. It's only our continued resistance, often unconscious, that has hindered the Gift now for nearly a century, despite our prayers for it.

To face the truth honestly has to be a source of joy. The stability and progress of the organized church can only be blessed by it.

CHAPTER SEVEN

A CLOSER LOOK AT THE "CONFESSIONS"

Mystery surrounds the post-1888 confessions of those who opposed the message. We came to the time of the latter rain and the loud cry and then backed away from our opportunity. Israel also came to the borders of their Promised Land, and then backed away.

Deep, true repentance is a rare virtue. It is by no means impossible, in the light of the sacrifice of Christ. But many confessions are as superficial as that of Esau and King Saul. Both acknowledged wrong, and both shed tears; neither found repentance that restored what was lost.

Israel's history at Kadesh-Barnea and afterwards illustrates the experience of this movement at and following the Minneapolis conference. Israel made a mistake and then "repented," but that generation never recovered what they had lost.

There is a principle involved in the kind of repentance and confession that does not comprehend the gravity of the sin:

> ***Now [Israel at Kadesh-Barnea] seemed sincerely to repent of their sinful conduct; but they sorrowed because of the result of their evil course, rather than from a sense of their ingratitude and disobedience.... God tested their apparent submission, and proved that it was not real.... They were only terrified to find that they had made a fearful mistake, the results of which would prove disastrous to themselves. Their hearts were unchanged....***
>
> ***Though their confession did not spring from true repentance, it served to vindicate the justice of God in His dealings with them.***
>
> ***The Lord still works in a similar manner to glorify His name by bringing men to acknowledge His justice.... And though the spirit which prompted the evil course is not radically changed, confessions are made that vindicate the honor of God, and justify His faithful reprovers, who have been opposed and misrepresented (PP 391, 393).***

Evidence from an inspired pen indicates that this was the nature of the post-1888 confessions of the most influential prominent leaders who had initially rejected the message.

But contemporary opinions widely published hold that most of the opposing brethren at Minneapolis rectified their mistake, made humble and deep confessions, repented thoroughly, and then preached the message of 1888 "with power."

What does the evidence say?

(1) The confessions were practically extorted by overwhelming, compelling evidence. "The present evidence of His working is revealed to you, and you are now under obligation to believe," said Ellen White in 1890 (TM 466). Faith had given away almost entirely to sight.

(2) There is evidence that the most prominent and influential confessors subsequently acted contrary to their confessions.

(3) There was very little frank, open reconciliation that led to brotherly union with A. T. Jones and E. J. Waggoner or acceptance of their message. (It was after the confessions that Ellen White was exiled to Australia and Waggoner to Britain). As late as 1903, Elders G. I. Butler and J. N. Loughborough at a General Conference session misrepresented their true positions over their verbal protests (see chapter 10).

(4) The issue at stake was the personal salvation of the opposing ministers' souls. But there is no evidence that they repented of quenching the Holy Spirit's outpouring in the latter rain, or of suppressing the light of the loud cry and keeping it away "in a great degree" from the church and from the world. Thus the consequence of the rebellion at Minneapolis, the indefinite postponing of the world-wide proclamation of the loud cry message, could not be averted.

(5) With the exception of W. W. Prescott, there is no evidence that any of the confessors recovered the essence of the 1888 message sufficiently to proclaim it well. (Saul of Tarsus repented so thoroughly that he ever after proclaimed the gospel with power). Pease discloses that when the nineteenth century became the twentieth, none of those who initially rejected the 1888 message were in evidence to proclaim it effectively:

> ***During the nineties the revival centering about this great doctrine was largely the work of the same three people, Mrs. White, E. J. Waggoner, and A. T. Jones. True, there were many harmonizing voices but no Elishas were in evidence by 1900 ready to assume the mantle in case something should happen to the three principal champions of the doctrine (By Faith Alone, p. 164).***

A perusal of the post-confession printed messages of these "confessors" confirms this statement. A true repentance would have resulted in a multitude of powerful evangel-laden messengers proclaiming the "most precious message" in a way that would have thoroughly revived the church and lightened the world with glory. But Ellen White had to say on November 5, 1892 that "not one" of the original rejectors had recovered what he had lost by his initial unbelief (Letter B2a, 1892). This statement was made after the most prominent confessions came in.

Contemporary Views of the Post-1888 Confessions

An oft-quoted statement from an older worker forms the basis for much of the present misunderstanding of what happened after Minneapolis:

> ***Early in the spring, 1889, word began to come of those who stood with the opposition at the conference beginning to see light and soon earnest confessions followed. Within two or three years most of the leading men who had refused the light at the conference had come out with clear confessions (C. McReynolds, "Experiences while at the G. C. in Minn. in 1888," D File, 189, E. G. White Estate. Cf. N. F. Pease, op. cit., pp. 142, 143).***

The confessions mentioned above were doubtless, in some cases, precipitated by sober reflection after the individuals concerned were far removed from the scene of controversy (Pease, op. cit., p. 144).

Another statement, from Captains of the Host, supports the idea that the confessions effectively reversed the 1888 opposition:

Gradually there came the turning and the gathering into the unity of the faith. There was both a cutting and healing power in the messages [Ellen White] sent, carrying the gospel of righteousness and of good will in Christ, which in general brought the erstwhile estranged brethren together (Spalding, op. cit., pp. 598, 599).

Our Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia presents the same view:

Misunderstanding, opposition, and division cloud the record of that meeting [1888]. However, many who were reluctant to accept this new emphasis in 1888 later changed their viewpoint. Some continued for a time to oppose it (p. 1086).

No mention is made in The Fruitage of Spiritual Gifts of the confessions, as the author assumed that in general the message of 1888 was initially well received at Minneapolis itself.

By far the predominant view held today is that we "have" the 1888 message as a sure possession, either because our forefathers' initially accepted it, or because of their subsequent confessions of repentance. And "we" have therefore been proclaiming it powerfully for many decades. We must inquire if this is a "rich and increased with goods" mindset.

There Are Problems With This View

If the confessions of the Minneapolis opposers changed their real attitude so they could proclaim the message effectively to our people and to the world, some questions need answers:

(1) Where is the evidence that the message and light of 1888 were recovered, and by the repentant brethren themselves proclaimed to our people in clear and powerful form? Where is the evidence that the opposition ceased instead of going underground?

(2) Why wasn't the "work" finished soon after the time of confession and repentance? The opposition at Minneapolis quenched the loud cry; a proper repentance would logically restore it.

(3) How can one explain the persistent and numerous statements from Ellen White as late as 1901 that the message was continually misrepresented and opposed by leadership? One such follows, indicating that the genuine reformation that follows repentance could not have taken place:

I feel a special interest in the movements and decisions that shall be made at this Conference [1901] regarding the things that should have been done years ago, and especially ten years ago, when we were assembled in Conference.... The brethren assented to the light given, but ... the light that was given was not acted upon. It was assented to but no special change was made to bring about such a condition of things that the power of God could be revealed among His people. Year after year the same acknowledgement was made.... It is a marvel to me that we stand in as much prosperity as we do today. It is because of the great mercy of God, not because of our righteousness, but that His name should not be dishonored in the world (GCB 1901, p. 23; emphasis added).

Her real convictions are disclosed in a statement she made a week later supporting the reorganization and a hoped-for reformation: "Many who have been more or less out of line since the Minneapolis meeting will be brought into line" (p. 205).

One of the most poignant of Ellen White's prophetic messages is her "What Might Have Been" testimony (January 5, 1903; 8T 104-106). The beautiful repentance that our historians say took place turns out to have been only a dream instead of "reality."

The Testimony of Our History

It is common knowledge that Uriah Smith was one of the most persistent opposers of the message. As editor of the Review and Herald and with his well-earned prestige as a prominent author, he could have exerted the most powerful influence for the message. His incisive, logical writing appealed to thoughtful minds. This able and lovable brother wielded the mightiest pen in Battle Creek and could have helped to lighten the earth with the glory of maturely developed truth. The Holy Spirit could have worked with the author of Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation if his heart and keen mind had joined in the happy task.

He chose not to. He considered the message to be merely an over-emphasized "doctrine," and maintained that we had always taught it. Immediately after Minneapolis, he and W. W. Prescott tried to silence A. T. Jones in Battle Creek. Ellen White mentions the incident:

Elder Uriah Smith thought [A. T. Jones] had better not be invited to speak, for he took rather strong positions. And the arrangements were made to shut him out of the [Battle Creek] school (Ms. 16, 1889).[1]

Efforts to help Smith only aggravated his stubborness. For a long time, no "sober reflections" brought him to any different view.

In March, 1890 Ellen White wrote in the Review:

---

[1] Only Ellen White's influence secured the pulpit and the classroom for him. W. W. Prescott joined Smith in seeking to bar Jones from the pulpit in Battle Creek.

I have tried to present the message to you as I have understood it, but how long will those at the head of the work keep themselves aloof? ...

For nearly two years we have been urging the people to come up and accept the light and the truth concerning the righteousness of Christ, and they do not know whether to come and take hold of this precious truth or not.... I can speak to the ear, but I cannot speak to the heart. Shall we not arise and get out of the position of unbelief? (RH March 18, 1890).

Finally, after being "under obligation to believe" (TM 466), Elder Smith was drifting helplessly, in danger of being lost:

Brother Smith is ensnared by the enemy and cannot in his present state give the trumpet a certain sound ... yet ... is placed in positions as teacher to mold and fashion the minds of students, when it is a well known fact he is not standing in the light. He is not working in God's order. He is sowing seeds of unbelief that spring up and bear fruit for some souls to harvest.... Elder Smith will not receive the light God has given to correct him, and he has not a spirit to correct by confession any wrong course he has pursued in the past.... I have been shown that as he now stands, Satan has prepared his temptations to close about his soul (Letter to O. A. Olsen, October 7, 1890).

I have great sorrow of heart. I know that Satan is seeking for the mastery over men.... Such men as Elder Smith will harden their hearts, lest they shall see and be converted. There are those who are looking to Elder Smith, thinking that a man who has been given such great light will be able to see when good cometh, and will acknowledge the truth. But I have been shown that in Elder Smith's character there is a pride and stubbornness that has never been fully brought into subjection to the Spirit of God. Again and again his religious experience has been marred by his determination not to confess his wrongs, but to pass along and forget them. Men may cherish this sin until there is no forgiveness for them (Diary, January 10, 1890, Battle Creek).

These solemn words bear evidence of the Christlike love that Ellen White had for his soul. In the light of eternity, truth is more precious than self-deception. In other communications from her we can see how serious the situation had become:

The men in responsible positions have disappointed Jesus. They have refused precious blessings, and refused to be channels of light.... The knowledge they should receive of God ... they refuse to accept, and thus become channels of darkness. The Spirit of God is grieved (Ms. 13, 1889).

Our young men look at the older men that stand still as a stick, and will not move to accept any new light that is brought in; they will laugh and ridicule what these men say and what they do as of no consequence. Who carries the burden [guilt] of that laugh, and of that contempt? ... [They] have interposed themselves between the light that God has given, that it shall not go to the people who should have it (Ms. 9, 1890).

The devil has been working for a year to obliterate these ideas [the 1888 message of Christ's righteousness]--the whole of them.... How long will the people at the heart of the work hold themselves against God? How long will men here sustain them in doing this work? Get out of the way, brethren. Take your hand off the ark of God, and let the Spirit of God come in and work in mighty power (idem).

The Review editor's negative influence went far and wide. Ellen White held him largely responsible:

You have strengthened the hands and minds of such men as Larson, Porter, Dan Jones, Eldridge and Morrison and Nicola and a vast number through them. All quote you, and the enemy of righteousness looks on pleased.... If you should recover your faith how can you remove the impressions of unbelief you have sown in other minds? Do not labor so hard to do the very work Satan is doing. This work was done in Minneapolis. Satan triumphed (Letter 59, 1890).

When Ellen White tried to help him, he responded "by writing me a letter accusing Elder Jones of tearing up the pillars of our faith" (Letter 73, 1890; see Additional Note, chapter four). Finally, after the turn of the new year 1891, he made confession to his brethren, and asked the pardon of Mrs. White for his erroneous course. This was good. He was an honest man. Our Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia admits his initial opposition to "the new emphasis on righteousness by faith," but credits his confession as restoring "complete harmony" (p. 1201). But it was not to be.

Elder Smith had formerly had experiences quite similar. His faith in the work of Ellen White was sometimes not very strong. And he propagated his unbelief. His letters could hardly do otherwise than encourage D. M. Canright to question Ellen White's inspiration.[2] The slightest push will send a drowning man down.

Was Elder Smith's repentance of early 1891 thorough and permanent? It could well have been. The Lord was willing. Speaking to the Review and Herald office, Ellen White said that "the Lord will blot out the transgressions of those who since that time have repented with a sincere repentance."

How Something Miscarried

The rejoicing at the confessions must be placed in the perspective of later history. As we have seen, Ellen White later declared that there had been an influence in the Review and Herald office that tended to say "I go, Sir," but went not. No one can question the sincerity and goodness of the brethren; we note only the reality of deeper layers of unbelief of which they were not aware. "The brethren assented to the light God had given, but there were those connected with our institutions, especially the Review and Herald office and the

[2] See for example Uriah Smith letters to Canright of March 22, April 6, July 31, August 7, and October 2, 1883.

[General] Conference, who brought in elements of unbelief, so that the light given was not acted upon" (GCB 1901, p. 23; emphasis added).

After his confession, she encouraged him to look upon things in the right light. She knew that he was not giving the trumpet a certain sound in the Review. More than a year after his confession, she wrote him in a tone of warning and counsel, plainly stating that he had returned to his former stance of opposition:

> ***Some of our brethren... are full of jealousy and evil surmising, and are ever ready to show in just what way they differ with Elder Jones or Waggoner. The same spirit that was manifested in the past manifests itself on every opportunity; but this is not from the impulse of the Spirit of God....***
>
> ***Should [Elder Jones or Waggoner] be overthrown by the temptations of the enemy, ... how many ... would enter into a fatal delusion because they are not under the control of the Spirit of God (Letter S24, 1892; emphasis added).***

Elder Smith seemed to have a mistaken sense of the spiritual condition of the church. As previously (1882), he continued to "think far too favorably of the present time" (cf. 5T 80). We cannot blame him for he did not have the discernment of the gift of prophecy. Nevertheless, his unrealistic optimism establishes him as Mr. Laodicea. His innocent readers then knew no better; we a century later do know better, now that history has upheld the Spirit of Prophecy, which so opposed his view. In an editorial of March 14, 1892, he spoke with undue optimism:

> ***The cause has been going forward with increasing rapidity, especially in these later years. The object here is to ... call attention to the wonderful momentum which the cause of present truth has now attained. It is going forward everywhere. It is increasing in velocity day by day. It is going with a power which cannot be arrested. At the rate of progress now developed, it must soon reach its goal. It is accelerating its footsteps to its final triumph (RH, March 14, 1892).***

The Lord's messenger was not so pleased, for she was conscious of a serious arresting of the work within our own ranks and the looming specter of a long delay. History has proven Elder Smith's editorial to be a superficial judgment. Ellen White said so then:

> ***The opposition in our own ranks has imposed upon the Lord's messengers a laborious and soul-trying task, for they have had to meet difficulties and obstacles which need not have existed.... It is the elements that work among ourselves that have hindered the message....***
>
> ***The influence that grew out of the resistance of light and truth at Minneapolis tended to make of no effect the light God had given....***
>
> ***The work is years behind. What account will be rendered to God for thus retarding the work? (GCB 1893, pp. 419).***

Repeatedly, the misguided editor followed a line of thought diametrically opposed to present truth--that of Christ's righteousness sounding forth in the beginning of the loud

cry. Dramatically enough, his opposition was often neatly met by articles from Ellen White or others which came as apparent coincidences. To his credit, he published them. Editorial control was more relaxed in those days than now. But his personal mindset was fixed.

As late as 1892, well after the editor's confession, she says: "The first position you took in regard to the message and the messenger has been a continual snare to you and a stumblingblock.... That loss is still your loss" (Letter S24, 1892).

We find him writing an editorial saying that the present message is not the beginning of the loud cry; that is something yet future. His view was divine sovereign determinism, virtually that of modern Reformationist Calvinism. We can neither hasten nor delay the Lord's coming:

> ***Would it be the proper course now for the people of God to fix their minds upon these future blessings and this future power, and dropping all else, make these things the direct end to be specially sought for? To fix the mind upon what is to be, and then to reason, Now the church must have such and such mighty works, they are to attain to such and such a condition, and then conclude that they must, to the neglect of duties nearer by, seek by special means to gain that power and those attainments now, --is that the way in which these blessings are to be secured? ...***
>
> ***All these other developments will come in the Lord's good time. God will in His own good time bestow upon His people the needed power.... He will bring the loud cry of the message.... Leave future blessings to be granted by Him whose the work is, when and how it shall please him (RH May 14, 1892).***

Elder Smith apparently had no idea that "the Lord's good time" has been and is always now since the seventh angel began to sound in 1844. "There should be delay no longer" (Revelation 10:5, NKJV). Only one week later appeared an article by Ellen White which countered the spirit of his muddled editorial. S. N. Haskell soon sent in a fervent article to counteract the editor's "peace and safety" words (July 26, 1892). Then President Olsen also took occasion to rebuke the editor through the columns of his paper:

> ***We have long been talking about the loud cry of the third angel's message.... Well, has the time come for that loud voice to be heard? ... It certainly has, brethren.... Then don't be looking forward to it any longer; don't be expecting it at some place way off; realize that it is here, and that it means something (RH, November 8, 1892).***

During this stirring time of grand eschatalogical opportunity, the editor of the Review continued his stale homilies on "Sunday Props" arguments examined and refuted. There is something pathetic about the situation. In the time of the loud cry itself, he re-hashes in a polemical, debating style the caviling opposition of unreasoning opponents to the sabbath truth, something more in place thirty years earlier. We can hear the angels pleading, "Mr. Laodicea, please wake up!"

Concerning such blindness to recognize the work of God Ellen White wrote:

Too often the leader has stood hesitating, seeming to say, "Let us not be in too great haste. There may be a mistake. We must be careful not to raise a false alarm." The very hesitancy and uncertainty on his part is crying "Peace and safety." "Do not get excited. Be not alarmed. There is a great deal more made of this Religious Amendment question than is demanded. This agitation will all die down." Thus he virtually denies the message sent from God; and the warning which was designed to stir the churches fails to do its work. The trumpet of the watchman gives no certain sound, and the people do not prepare for the battle (5T 715, 716).

Such an editorial policy and such a mindset forces an unwelcome conclusion. Uriah Smith returned to his former stance of opposition and non-committal blindness after the emotional effects of his confession wore off.

Finally, in December Ellen White spoke very plainly:

On the very eve of the crisis, is no time to be found with an evil heart of unbelief, departing from the living God....

Among those who are half-hearted are the class who pride themselves on their great caution in receiving "new light" as they term it. But their failure to receive the light is caused by their spiritual blindness....

There are men in our cause who might be of great use if they would but learn of Christ, and go on from light to greater light; but because they will not, they are positive hindrances (RH December 6, 1892).

In the same issue occurs a half-hearted editorial admission that we might have delayed the work, but not at all seriously. We quote his statement because his Calvinist laissez faire attitude is immensely popular among many Adventists in these last years of the 20th century who say that God's people can neither hasten nor delay the return of Christ:

How the situation might have been changed if all had worked more earnestly and rapidly in the cause, we may not say....

But however much it has been in our power to delay the work, it is not in our power to arrest its progress nor prevent its final completion. Within the limits of that time when the work of the Lord must be done, it will be done (ibid., December 6, 1892).

In an editorial in the May 10, 1892 Review, Smith took open issue with E. J. Waggoner. In the same year he again blundered into open dispute with A. T. Jones over "the image of the beast." Our people noted these conflicts. Brother Foster of the Prahran church in Australia came in his perplexity to Ellen White . She tells of the incident:

[Foster] saw in the Review the article of Brother A. T. Jones in regard to the image of the beast, and then the one from Elder Smith presenting the opposite view. He was perplexed and troubled. He had received much light and comfort in reading articles from Brethren Jones and Waggoner; but here was one of the old laborers, one who had written many of our standard books, and whom we

had believed to be taught of God, who seemed to be in conflict with Brother Jones. What could all this mean? Was Brother Jones in the wrong? Was Brother Smith in error? Which was right? He became confused....

If before publishing Elder Jones' article .... Elder Smith had conferred with him, plainly stating that his own views differed from that of Bro. Jones, and that if the article appeared in the Review, he himself must present the opposite position, then the matter would appear in a different light from what it now does. But the course pursued in this case was the same as that taken at Minneapolis. Those who opposed Brethren Jones and Waggoner manifested no disposition to meet them like brethren.... Yet this blind warfare is continued.... We know that Bro. Jones has been giving the message for this time, meat in due season to the starving flock of God....

The conference at Minneapolis was the golden opportunity for all present to humble the heart before God, and to welcome Jesus as the great Instructor; but the stand taken by some at that meeting has proved their ruin. They have never seen clearly since, and they never will; for they persistently cherish the spirit that prevailed there, a wicked, criticizing, denunciatory spirit.... They will be asked in the judgment, "Who required this at your hand, to rise up against the message and the messengers I sent to My people? ... Why did you block the way with your own perverse spirit? And afterward when the evidence was piled upon evidence, why did you not humble your hearts before God, and repent of your rejection of the message of mercy He has sent you?" (Letter January 9, 1893; emphasis added).

In the same letter, Ellen White cites the former General Conference president as sharing Elder Smith's loss. The issue is not the salvation of their souls--that we leave with God. The issue is the proclamation of the loud cry message:

If such men as Elder Smith, Elder Van Horn, and Elder Butler shall stand aloof, not blending with the elements God sees essential to carry forward the work in these perilous times, they will be left behind.... These brethren have had every opportunity to stand in the ranks that are pressing on to victory; but if they refuse, the work will advance without them.... If they refuse the message, ... these brethren ... will meet with eternal loss; for if they should repent and be saved at last, they can never regain that which they have lost through their wrong course of action (emphasis added).

Conclusion

This in no way means that these dear brethren's life work was a failure. The point is that they used their influence to reject the beginning of the latter rain and thus helped delay the finishing of God's work for a long time.

Their cases were difficult. They were sincere, and good, and lovable. But they were falsely encouraged by every wave of superficial revival that occasionally swept through Battle Creek.

Even after the turn of the century as he neared his end, Elder Smith made a point of demonstrating that he never changed his mind about the issues of 1888. He was the notable prototype of ultra-conservative yet unbelieving Adventists of today.

His understanding of the prophecies of Daniel and Revelation and of other doctrines was in harmony with those of the pioneers. World conditions in his day were a clear fulfillment of prophecy. God's work could have been speedily finished then. His books have won thousands of people to the church and helped to establish Adventism around the world. If only he could have accepted the "beginning" of the latter rain, he could have had the joy of helping to proclaim the glorious loud cry to the world.

Confident that he understood justification and righteousness by faith and that he had always believed it, he made his contribution after 1888 in his major work on the subject, Looking Unto Jesus. Doubtless hailed by many 1888 opponents then as a masterpiece, it is obvious that it lacks "the most precious" elements of the 1888 message.

There was one confession that A. T. Jones mentioned near the end of his life:

> ***In justice to Brother J. H. Morrison, it must be said that he cleared himself of all connection with that opposition, and put himself body, soul, and spirit, into the truth and blessing of righteousness by faith, in one of the finest and noblest confessions that I have ever heard (Letter to C. E. Holmes, May 12, 1921).***

Jones later in the same letter said of the others that their change of heart "was only apparent, it was never real, for all the time in the General Conference Committee and amongst others there was a secret antagonism always carried on."

No opposition is more difficult to deal with than that which goes underground. The confessions after Minneapolis drove the spirit of unbelief beneath the visible surface.

Hence it is that we can sincerely assume that we are rich as a people with the "contribution" to Adventism made in 1888, and that we are increased with goods in understanding righteousness by faith, so that all we need is more money and technological resources for propagating our present understanding of our beliefs.

The symptoms of our denominational neurosis are apparent; the causes lie buried in a deep antipathy to the light that shone on our pathway in 1888, which reflected the true Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world. A final atonement, an ultimate reconciliation with Christ, is our only solution.

The primary purpose of this chapter was to show how the confessions that followed Minneapolis cut the "tops" down but left the "roots" of unbelief intact (cf. TM 467). As the investigation developed, a secondary purpose emerged. It is a logical consequence of the first, but is of far greater significance.

(1) In some serious instances, our present official views of righteousness by faith are identical to the opposition to the 1888 message. The real teaching of the latter is only slightly evident in our current presentations.

(2) Parallel with misconceptions of the message is the highly optimistic view of the "velocity" and "rapidity" with which the work supposedly advances today, when in reality it is being retarded by our deep heart unbelief. Statistical reports beguile us.

(3) Confusion regarding righteousness by faith spawns a sort of "continual" transgression of principles God has entrusted to the remnant church for the administration

of our medical, educational, publishing, and evangelistic work. "There has been a departure from God's plan in many ways ... and we have been steadily progressing in the ways of the Gentiles, and not after the example of Jesus Christ" (cf. GCB 1893, p. 459 and FE 221-230). Our hope rests in God's mercy and love, and His hope rests in the honesty of the souls of His professed people.

(4) The true cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary requires a complementary work in our hearts. There must be a cleansing of hidden, buried, "underground" roots of alienation from Christ. Light which will lay bare this reality and a means of spiritual therapy adequate for dealing with it, is more needful than any amount of technological resources for the propagation of our present "faith."

In other words, the power needed is light, and the finishing of the gospel commission will be a natural consequence. A true understanding of the 1888 history supplies a diagnosis; a true understanding of the gospel of the cross is the therapy.

CHAPTER EIGHT

A MOVEMENT IN CRISIS: THE 1893 GENERAL CONFERENCE SESSION

The 1893 General Conference session ranks next in importance to that of 1888 in determining how the message was received. The acceptance theory requires this view of the 1893 meeting: "It was really at the General Conference session in 1893 that light on justification by faith seemed to gain its greatest victory" (Christian, op. cit., p. 241).

We must examine the printed reports of that session in order to understand the nature of that "victory." According to Ellen White's later perceptive testimony, the "victory" gained in the end was Satan's (cf. 1SM 234, 235). The session clearly marked the withdrawal of Heaven's gift of the latter rain. Developments at that conference are of profound significance to those of us living today.

From the beginning of the institute and session, the message of 1888 was the overwhelming issue of importance. A few months before, the now- famous statement had appeared in the Review of November 22, 1892 that it was the actual "beginning" of the loud cry. That statement was like a bombshell. Several of the speakers could talk of little except that all-important issue. Even some in far-off Australia knew what was happening. A. T. Jones reported:

> ***I received a letter a little while ago from Brother Starr in Australia. I will read two or three sentences because they come in well just at this place in our lessons:***
>
> ***"Sister White says that we have been in the time of the latter rain since the Minneapolis meeting" (GCB 1893, p. 377).***

Can we imagine the excitement that prevailed? It was natural that back of the issue of the reception of the 1888 message should loom the blessed thought of the soon coming of Christ. Not since the Midnight Cry of 1844 had such a solemn joy thrilled believing hearts:

> ***Let us thank the Lord that he is dealing with us still, to save us from our errors, to save us from our dangers, to keep us back from wrong courses, and to pour upon us the latter rain, that we may be translated. That is what the message means--translation--to you and me (ibid., p. 185).***

They knew the Lord in His mercy would not withdraw the latter rain until giving them a reasonable opportunity to respond. That would require at least a few years after 1888. The following words quoted at the conference express the principle of God's fairness and patience:

> ***God will prove His people. Jesus bears patiently with them, and does not spew them out of His mouth in a moment. Said the angel, "God is weighing His***

people." If the message had been of as short duration as many of us supposed, there would have been no time for them to develop character. Many moved from feeling, not from principle and faith, and this solemn fearful message stirred them.... He gives them time for the excitement to wear off, and then proves them to see if they will obey the counsel of the True Witness (1T 186, 187; GCB 1893, p. 179).

Forebodings of Great Danger

Different speakers sensed that the light would be withdrawn if not acted upon soon. Thus, to trifle with the heavenly offer would mean losing it. A few months before the 1893 Session, Ellen White wrote:

The sin committed in what took place at Minneapolis remains on the record books of heaven, registered against the names of those who resisted light, and it will remain upon the record until full confession is made, and the transgressors stand in full humility before God.... And when these persons are tried, and brought over the ground again, the same spirit will be revealed. When the Lord has sufficiently tried them, if they do not yield to Him, He will withdraw His Holy Spirit (Letter O19, 1892).

At Minneapolis, she had warned that neglect of the light then shining would be tragedy. The problem was not merely the personal salvation of individuals who had rejected the message. The eschatological issue of the latter rain and the loud cry hung over the corporate church body:

Here I want to tell you what a terrible thing it is, if God gives light, and it is impressed on your heart and spirit, ... why God will withdraw His Spirit unless His truth is accepted (Ms. 8, 1888, Olson, p. 264).

The brethren assembled at the 1893 meeting were in an atmosphere of expectancy. The meeting seemed charged with solemnity, a realization that a fearful decision was to be forced upon them. Upon their choice would dawn the glad morning, or the return of night. If Satan could "get them to commit themselves on the wrong side, he has laid his plans to lead them on a long journey," said Ellen White to president Olsen (Letter O19, 1892). Imagine the tension that dominated that meeting:

Now the solemn thought to my mind is that [God] is getting impatient, and will not wait very much longer for you and me.... I cannot get away from the idea that now is a most critical time with us personally.... It seems to me that right now we are making choices that will determine whether we shall go on with this work through the loud cry and be translated, or whether we shall be deceived by the devices of Satan and be left out in darkness.... I have felt that way all through this conference (W. W. Prescott, GCB 1893, p. 386).

A. T. Jones recognized the unprecedented seriousness of the issue at that meeting. Note how his understanding transcended the Calvinist determinism idea of God's irresistible sovereign will:

> ***He has been trying these four years to have us receive the latter rain, how much longer is He going to wait before we receive it? ....***
>
> ***And the fact of the matter is, something is going to be done.... That is the fearfulness of the situation at this meeting; that is what lends to this meeting its fearful character. The danger is that there will be some here who have resisted this for four years, or perhaps who have not resisted it that long, who will now ... fail to receive it as the Lord gives it, and will be passed by. A decision will be made by the Lord, by ourselves in fact, at this meeting (ibid., p. 377, emphasis added).***

The president of the General Conference, O. A. Olsen, also sensed that a fateful issue confronted the delegates:

> ***This place is becoming more and more solemn on account of the presence of God. I presume that none of us have ever before been in quite such a meeting as we are having at this time. The Lord is certainly coming very near, and is revealing things more and more, things which we have not heretofore so fully appreciated nor understood....***
>
> ***I felt very solemn last evening. To me the place was terrible on account of God's nearness, on account of the solemn testimony that was borne to us here.... Some may feel tried over the idea that Minneapolis is referred to. I know that some have felt grieved and tried over any allusion to that meeting, and to the situation there. But let it be borne in mind that the reason why anyone should feel so is an unyielding spirit on his part.... The very idea that one is grieved, shows at once the seed of rebellion in the heart (ibid., p. 188).***

There were other statements made between 1888 and 1893 warning that if the light were not received, a specious departure into counterfeit light and apostate ideas would result. The delegates heard the following message from Ellen White:

> ***Unless you watch and keep your garments unspotted from the world, Satan will stand as your captain.... By many the words which the Lord sent will be rejected, and the words that men may speak will be received as light and truth. Human wisdom will lead away from self-denial, from consecration, and will devise many things to tend to make of no effect God's messages. We cannot with any safety rely on men who are not in close connection with God. They accept the opinions of men, but cannot discern the voice of the True Shepherd (ibid., p. 237).***

Less than a year after the Minneapolis Conference had come this word:

Unless divine power is brought into the experience of the people of God, false theories and erroneous ideas will take minds captive, Christ and His righteousness will be dropped out of the experience of many, and their faith will be without power or life (RH September 3, 1889).

Failure to accept the light brought by God's messengers at Minneapolis would result in the acceptance of false light brought by false messengers. She said:

False ideas that were largely developed at Minneapolis have not been entirely uprooted from some minds. Those who have not made thorough work of repentance under the light God has been pleased to give to His people since that time, will not see things clearly, and will be ready to call the messages God sends, a delusion (GCB 1893, p. 184).

What next? These very ones will accept messages that God has not sent, and thus will become dangerous to the cause of God because they set up false standards. ("To Brethren in Responsible Positions," ibid., p. 182).

Lessons From Israel "Written for Our Admonition"

Without doubt, the 1888 message was heavenly manna. We can learn something from the ancient symbolism. If God sets a plate of food before us, we had better eat it right away, because vitally nutritious food spoils more quickly than does devitalized food. There was danger in leaving the 1888 manna "until the morning," for it would spoil:

I will rain bread from heaven for you; and the people shall go out and gather the portion of a day in its day, that I may prove them, whether they will walk in my law or no....

And Moses said, Let no man leave of it till the morning. Notwithstanding they hearkened not unto Moses; but some of them left of it until the morning, and it bred worms, and stank (Exodus 16:4, 19, 20).

We are living in times full of importance to each one, light is shining in clear steady rays around us. If this light is rightly received and appreciated, it will be a blessing to us and to others; but if we trust in our own wisdom and strength, or in the wisdom and strength of our fellow men, it will be turned into a poison (TM 385, emphasis added).

Even at Minneapolis itself, the prophet saw this frightful danger. Here is a hint of the eventual tragic failure of the message and the messengers:

Those who have not been sinking the shaft deeper and still deeper into the mine of truth will see no beauty in the precious things presented at this Conference. When the will is once set in stubborn opposition to the light given, it is difficult to yield, even under the convincing evidence which has been in this [1888] conference....

If we neglect to walk in the light given, it becomes darkness to us; and the darkness is proportionate to the light and privileges which we have not improved (Ms. 8a, 1888; Olson, pp. 279, 280, emphasis added).

Still speaking of the 1888 message and of "God's messengers," she said that the enemy of God's work would employ unsanctified ministers and leaders. She sensed the reality of mortal spiritual conflict:

Unsanctified ministers are arraying themselves against God.... While professedly they receive Christ, they embrace Barabbas, and by their actions say, "Not this Man, but Barabbas." ... Satan has made his boast of what he can do.... He says, "I will go forth and be a lying spirit to deceive those that I can."... Let the son of deceit and false witness be entertained by a church that has had great light, great evidence, and that church will discard the message the Lord has sent, and receive the most unreasonable assertions and false suppositions and false theories....

Many will stand in our pulpits with the torch of false prophecy in their hands, kindled from the hellish torch of Satan. If doubts and unbelief are cherished, the faithful ministers will be removed from the people who think they know so much (TM 409, 410).

Only a few months before the 1893 Session came this unmistakable word:

The early church was deceived by the enemy of God and man, and apostasy was brought into the ranks of those who professed to love God; and today, unless the people of God awake out of sleep, they will be taken unawares by the devices of Satan....

The days in which we live are eventful and full of peril....

Without the enlightenment of the Spirit of God, we shall not be able to discern truth from error, and shall fall under the masterful temptations and deceptions that Satan will bring upon the world (RH November 22, 1892).

The enemy would use his skill to "try every device possible," presenting error in the guise of present truth, so that we would "not be able to discern truth from error." The delegates would cross a fateful hidden line at the 1893 Session. A few months before it convened, the Lord's messenger wrote to the General Conference president from her Australian exile:

I wish to plead with our brethren who shall assemble at the General Conference to heed the message given to the Laodiceans. What a condition of blindness is theirs; this subject [the 1888 message] has been brought to your notice again and again; but your dissatisfaction with your spiritual condition has not been deep and painful enough to work a reform.... The guilt of self-deception is upon our churches. The religious life of many is a lie....

I have deep sorrow of heart because I have seen how readily a word or action of Elder Jones or Elder Waggoner is criticized.... Cease watching your

brethren with suspicion.... There are many in the ministry who have no love for God or for their fellow men. They are asleep, and while they sleep, Satan is sowing his tares (Letter O19, 1892).

Various writers have compared the experience of ancient Israel at Kadesh-Barnea to our 1888 history. But it has not been recognized that the 1893 Session is a modern counterpart of Israel's attempt after Kadesh-Barnea to go up and capture the "promised land." Israel were under the false excitement and enthusiasm of a superficial repentance, and the modern reenactment is transparently documented in the 1893 Bulletin itself.

Caleb and Joshua brought this message to Israel:

If the Lord delight in us, then He will bring us into this land, and give it us; a land which floweth with milk and honey. Only rebel not ye against the Lord, neither fear ye the people of the land.... The Lord is with us.... But all the congregation bade stone them with stones (Numbers 14:7-10; compare 5T 383).

Later, after it was evident that the people had truly rebelled, the Lord was forced to decree a return to the wilderness: "And ye shall know the altering of My purpose" (vs. 34, margin). But Israel supposed that their superficial confession ("we have sinned"), and their superficial repentance ("the people mourned greatly"), had secured a reversal of the divine sentence, and that they could now readily conquer their enemies.

In their enthusiasm, they interpreted out of context the previous message of the two faithful spies, "The Lord is with us, fear them not." The people assumed that this would still be true after a skin-deep repentance left their stubborn rebellion unaffected. Thinking that the Lord was still "with" them, and without contrition, they presumptuously set forth into what they confidently thought would be their "loud cry" experience to conquer Canaan.

Moses tried to dissuade them, telling them that the message Caleb and Joshua gave them before their rebellion was no longer present truth. "Go not up, for the Lord is not among you," he cried (verse 42).

Israel's effort was a disaster. Indeed, the Lord was not with them in conquering Canaan. But He would not forsake them. He would still be with them in a program of weary, protracted wilderness wanderings until the entire generation of unbelief had perished. So at last they turned back.

The enthusiasm aroused at the close of the 1893 General Conference session was not the "greatest victory" of the message of Christ's righteousness that we have supposed. Rather, it was clearly a false excitement without true contrition and repentance. Our history has shown it to have been a failure, for the loud cry did not go forth after that meeting.

The Seventh-day Adventist Church is indeed the true modern Israel and the Lord has been with us. He has not forsaken us any more than He forsook His people at Kadesh-Barnea. But He has been with us as a pillar of cloud by day and a pillar of fire by night in decades of weary wilderness wanderings, not in a program of conquering "Canaan" in "loud cry" power. That experience is yet future for the remnant church, rendered so by our own unbelief in the past. God's purpose has had to be altered.

We must consider the recorded evidence.

A. T. Jones' Studies

A. T. Jones' twenty-four studies on the "Third Angel's Message" present no hint that he was bitter, argumentative, censorious, or un-Christian. His style was simplicity itself, and his approach was the essence of brotherly kindness. He never lifted himself above the people as one separate from them. Always he spoke of "our" failures, "our" unbelief, "our" need of the Lord, and often specifically included himself as being the most needy and the most helpless.

We read his sermons seeking in vain for evidence to support our historians' charges that he was "obstreperous," "gave just cause for resentment," was an "argumentative .... protagonist," "critical," aroused personality "rancors," was conceited or arrogant, or made "extreme statements" or "mystical pronouncements." These writers have invented these ideas, or at best have distorted truth. False judgment has been officially published about a humble servant whom the Lord identified as "His messenger."

His 1893 sermons are reported in the Bulletin verbatim without apparent editing or deletions. A proper reprint issued by the General Conference and the Seminary of a selection of these twenty-four sermons would convince many of our people today that here is the clearest, most simple, heart-warming teaching of "the third angel's message in verity" that we have heard for a century. The inditing of the Holy Spirit is evident.

In speaking of Minneapolis, he showed a humble mind. He recognized the necessity of speaking of it plainly, but it is difficult to see how anyone could have brought it in more tactfully, more kindly, more lovingly, than he did.

The General Conference secretary, Dan T. Jones, wrote to a friend about him: "His practical preaching seems very tender and [he] deeply feels all he says" (Letter to J. W. Watt, January 1, 1889). In 1890, Ellen White also said that she was pleased with his humble spirit: "Brother Jones talked very plainly, yet tenderly" regarding the 1888 affair (Letter 84, 1890).

Now she has been exiled to Australia and Waggoner to Britain; Jones is left standing virtually alone:

> ***And now we have come ... to the study of that part of it that comes right down to you and me as individuals.... To me this lesson and the next one are the most fearful of all that I have been brought to yet. I have not chosen them, and I dread them ... but ... it is no use for us to ... view these things lightly ... with our eyes shut, and not knowing what our situation is....***
>
> ***I ask you now to start with, do not place me up here as one who is separated from you, and above you, and as talking down to you, and excluding myself from the things that may be presented. I am with you in all these things. I, with you, just as certainly, and just as much, need to be prepared to receive what God has to give us, as anybody else on earth. So I beg of you not to separate me from you in this matter. And if you see faults that you have committed, I shall see faults that I have committed, and please do not blame me as though I were judging you, or finding fault with you.... What I want, brethren, is simply to seek God with you, with all the heart (Congregation--***

"amen") and to have everything out of the way, that God may give us what He has for us (GCB 1893, pp. 164, 165).

His teachings were clear, with no mystical or extreme slant. If they should seem to be unusual to us today, it is because we have so long been using blunted swords that the naked sword of the Word and of the Spirit may seem especially keen.

His statements regarding works were balanced. It was not until after this session (April 9) that Ellen White found it necessary to caution him against a potential for extreme statements on the subject of faith and works. (And it is after that letter that we find her most enthusiastic endorsements of his messages on faith and works). Note his clarity and balance in 1893:

I say again, that in all cases he who believes in Jesus Christ most fully will work most fully for Him.

Now let us have this word, and that will be the best close I could make to the whole thing tonight. "Steps to Christ," page 79 [original edition of 1892]: "The heart that rests most fully upon Christ will be the most earnest and active in labor for Him." Amen. (Congregation: "Amen.") ... Do not think that the man who says that he rests wholly upon Jesus Christ is either a physical or a spiritual loafer. If he shows this loafing in his life, he is not resting in Christ at all, but on his own self.... That is faith that will bring to you the outpouring of the latter rain (GCB 1893, p. 302; emphasis original).

He was also clear on the relationship of the law to the gospel. That meant he understood true repentance, in refreshing contrast to fatal concepts that are popular today. It is a tragic mistake to assume that superficial confessions result in all our sins being washed away automatically, and that convictions from the Holy Spirit of deeper sin are from the devil and must therefore be repulsed. Note this clear truth:

When sin is pointed out to you, say, "I would rather have Christ than that." And let it go. (Congregation: "Amen.") ... Then ... where is the opportunity for any of us to get discouraged over our sins? Now some of the brethren here have done that very thing. They came here free; but the Spirit of God brought up something they never saw before. The Spirit of God went deeper than it ever went before, and revealed things they never saw before; and then, instead of thanking the Lord that that was so, and letting the whole wicked business go, and thanking the Lord that they had ever so much more of Him than they ever had before, they began to get discouraged.... And they got no good out of the meetings day after day.

If the Lord has brought up sins to us that we never thought of before, that only shows that He is going down to the depths, and He will reach the bottom at last; and when He finds the last thing that is unclean or impure, that is out of harmony with His will, and brings that up, and shows that to us, and we say, "I would rather have the Lord than that"-- then the work is complete, and the seal of the living God can be fixed upon that character....

Which would you rather have, the completeness, the perfect fulness of Jesus Christ, or have less than that, with some of your sins covered up that you never knew of? ... So He has got to dig down to the deep places we never dreamed of, because we cannot understand our hearts.... Let Him go on, brethren; let Him keep on His searching work (ibid., p. 404).

Note the speaker's clear concept that Satan controls the natural mind unless there is a daily crucifixion of self with Christ. "The offence of the cross" was present. One brief illustration of his pointed applications must suffice to show that here was a genuine message, a call to a union with Christ through self being crucified with Him on the cross:

We have the word here that those things are amongst us; ambition for place, jealousy of position, and envy of situation; those things are amongst us. Now the time has come to put them away, ... for each one to find how low he can get at the feet of Christ, and not how high in the Conference, or in the estimation of men, or how high in the Conference Committee, or General Conference Committee.... No difference what it costs; that has nothing to do with it (ibid., p. 166).

Bound up with this solemn call to repentance was the repeated assurance of a deep, solid gladness in the Lord. There was no extreme of emotionalism evident, but tears of contrition were shed. It was a solid and genuine work of the Holy Spirit that A. T. Jones presented at that 1893 meeting.

Probably there has never been in our 100 years a more beautiful message presented at a General Conference session, so deeply indited by the Holy Spirit under a hovering pillar of fire and cloud that beckoned onward to eschatalogical fulfillment.

But fanaticism crept in near the close of the session, introduced by someone other than A. T. Jones.

CHAPTER NINE

A FALSE RIGHTEOUSNESS BY FAITH: SOWING THE SEED OF APOSTASY
(The 1893 General Conference Session, Part II)

The rejection of the 1888 light opened the way for false ideas to enter under the guise of righteousness by faith. Indeed, if we turn from the genuine, nothing can prevent our grasping the counterfeit.

Before presenting the evidence of such misconceptions, Jones reminded the 1893 session congregation of the rejection of light at Minneapolis and thereafter for four years. Then he showed how the mind devoted to self becomes the mind of Satan. He traced its development through paganism to the subtleties of Romanism. There are two kinds of justification by faith--a true and a counterfeit:

> ***We have found ... that when Christianity came into the world this same carnal mind got up a counterfeit of that and covered itself--the same carnal mind--with a form of Christianity, and called it justification by faith when it was all justification by works,--the same carnal mind. That is the papacy, the mystery of iniquity (GCB, 1893, p. 342).***

Next he traced the development of the mind of self in modern spiritualism, showing how this delusion would exalt the same love of self. He even seemed to have the embryo of a concept of spiritualism as a false Holy Spirit, an idea advanced for his day but obvious in our charismatic day:

> ***The nearer we come to the second coming of the Saviour the more fully Spiritualism will be professing Christ.... Satan himself ... comes as Christ; he is received as Christ. So then the people of God must be so well acquainted with the Saviour that no profession of the name of Christ will be received or accepted where it is not the actual, genuine thing (loc. cit.).***

Only through letting the mind of self be crucified with Christ, making possible an indwelling of the mind of Christ, could the remnant church recognize such a deception:

> ***Then although these folks quote the words of Christ, it is all counterfeit. You know that [Great Controversy] tells us that when Satan himself comes with the gracious words that the Saviour uttered, he will talk them with much the same tone, and will pass it off on those who have not the mind of Christ. Brethren, there is no salvation for us, there is no safety for us, there is no remedy for us at all, but to have the mind of Christ (ibid., p. 343).***

The mind of self being crucified "with Christ" in no way lessens true self-respect, but enhances it through union with Christ. There was a misconception of righteousness by faith already apparent by 1893, after the "in-a-great-measure" rejection of the genuine (1 SM 234, 235). Indeed, it is a principle that "those who have been in any measure blinded by the enemy ... will be inclined to accept a falsehood" (Special Testimonies, Series A, pp. 41, 42). Jones unmasked the falsehood:

> ***Some of these brethren, since the Minneapolis meeting, I have heard, myself, say "amen" to preaching, to statements that were utterly heathen, and did not know but that it was the righteousness of Christ. Some of those who stood so openly against that at that time, and voted with uplifted hand against it,[1] ... since that time I have heard say "amen" to statements that were as openly and decidedly papal as the papal church itself can state them. That I shall bring in here in one of these lessons, and call your attention to the Catholic church's statement and her doctrine of justification by faith.... Says one, "I thought they believed in justification by works." They do and they do not believe in anything else; but they pass it off under the head of justification by faith. And they are not the only people in the world that are doing it (GCB 1893, p. 244).***
>
> ***I have here a book entitled "Catholic Belief."...***
>
> ***That you may have the two things--the truth of justification by faith, and the falsity of it--side by side, I will read what this says, and then ... Steps to Christ..... I want you to see what the Roman Catholic idea of justification by faith is, because I have had to meet it among professed Seventh-day Adventists the past four years.... These ... very expressions that are in this Catholic book, as to what justification by faith is and how to obtain it, are just such expressions as professed Seventh-day Adventists have made to me as to what justification by faith is....***
>
> ***This is justification by faith. That other thing is justification by works. This is of Christ; that is of the devil. One is Christ's doctrine of justification by faith; the other is the devil's doctrine of justification by faith (ibid., pp. 261, 262).***

Jones saw that the essence of Romanism is self-worship in whatever form it may assume. Any specious teaching of righteousness by faith, even ostensibly by a Seventh-day Adventist agent, which exalts the sinful mind of self, is in reality a branch growing out of the root of Romanism and spiritualism:

> ***That is righteousness by faith; that is a faith that works, thank the Lord,--not a faith that believes something away off, that keeps the truth of God in the***

[1] For evidence concerning a vote taken at the 1888 General Conference Session to reject the message brought by Jones and Waggoner, see chapter 14.

outer court, and then seeks by his own efforts to make up the lack. No, but faith that ... itself is working; it has a divine power in it.... [2]

This is enough to show that the papal doctrine of justification by faith is Satan's doctrine; it is simply the natural mind depending upon itself, working through itself, exalting itself; and then covering it all up with a profession of belief ... but having no power of God (ibid., pp. 265, 266).

An even more subtle counterfeit was exposed. The Christian's Secret of a Happy Life by Hannah Whitall Smith was immensely popular. It presented a virtually cross-less and therefore powerless concept of righteousness by faith which knew nothing of repentance or contrition, nor any clear concept of the atonement on the cross, nor of a personal Saviour who is "nigh at hand" as He is presented in the 1888 message. Her righteousness by faith is a philosophy.

This Quaker author says that she lit her lamp from the teachings of Fenelon, a Roman Catholic mystic at the court of Louis XIV of France, who spent his life energies seeking to convert Protestants back to Rome.[3] The residue of author Smith's devitalized faith was termed "trust in Christ." Once the "surrender" is made, the soul must assume itself to be "saved," and any conviction of the true Holy Spirit warning to the contrary must be instantly repulsed by a repeated psychological affirmation that all is well.

Jones sensed the fatal danger. Some of our people had been reading Smith's book and mistakenly assumed that it was the essence of the 1888 message, and that Jones and Waggoner got their light from it. Jones set the record straight:

I have seen this same thing working another way. There is that book that a great many make a great deal of, "The Christian's Secret of a Happy Life." ... I want everyone of you to understand that there is more of the Christian's secret of a happy life in the Bible than in ten thousand volumes of that book....

I did hear once ... that I got my light out of that book. There is the Book where I got my Christian's secret of a happy life [holding up the Bible] and that is the only place. And I had it before I ever saw the other book, or knew it was in existence (GCB 1893, pp. 358, 359).

W. W. Prescott's Studies

Prescott gave a series of sermons on "The Promise of the Holy Spirit." He recognized that a serious mistake had been made at Minneapolis four years earlier. He had attended that conference prejudiced in favor of Uriah Smith and Butler and against A. T. Jones and

---

[2] This is evidence that his theology regarding the relationship of faith and works was correct. He never uttered any idea denigrating works, so far as the printed record of his sermons is concerned.

[3] See Encyclopedia Britannica, 1968, Vol. 9, pp. 169, 170; The Christian's Secret of a Happy Life, copyright 1888 by Fleming H. Revell, pp. 80, 81, 87. Much of our current popular presentations of righteousness by faith derive from Smith's concept and her book has been frequently recommended to our youth as helpful and sound. Widely published to this day, it is in effect a counterfeit of Steps to Christ., and of the 1888 message.

his message. After the Minneapolis conference he had even tried to bar Jones from speaking in the Battle Creek Tabernacle. He had later privately confessed taking a wrong position in company with most of the brethren.[4] However, in his lengthy studies at the 1893 meeting he gave no indication that he had been on the wrong side, or that such a confession had been necessary.

Whereas Jones expressed the principle of corporate guilt, speaking of "what we there rejected" (pp. 165, 183) although he was one of the messengers, Prescott set himself up as one who had always been on the right side. An honest, humble confession on his part would have done wonders to open the way for the Spirit of God to work in the session, but such was never expressed.

Instead, he proceeded to identify himself prominently with Jones as one who shared his special divine commission. Perhaps Jones naively invited him to help, for he no doubt felt lonely defending the 1888 message with Ellen White and Waggoner both in exile overseas.

Prescott's sermons preceded Jones' nightly. When Jones was speaking he was forward enough to interrupt him and to interject ideas or quotations or even exhortation to the audience. With a less mild and less appealing spirit, he vehemently demanded that the brethren get right.

It is painful to note a certain imperiousness of manner and impatience of appeal. The subtle difference of temperament would hardly be effective in binding up wounds and healing sores. His spirit was in stark contrast to that of Jones' whose sense of corporate repentance[5] enabled him to share the guilt of the rejectors of the message. Prescott's sermons give evidence of no such humility. Note how a hierarchical spirit, foreign to the 1888 message, crept in:

> ***Now the solemn thought to my mind is that [God] is getting impatient, and will not wait very much longer for you and me. I want you to see that plainly.... I say again, I am extremely anxious over this situation.... I do not dictate to anyone, but something must be done, something different must come to us than has come in this Conference yet, that is sure....***
>
> ***That is why we [!] are urging you to accept the righteousness, because the Spirit will be there. Do you not see? (GCB 1893, pp. 386, 387).***

---

[4] See William Warren Prescott: Seventh-day Adventist Educator, doctoral dissertation by Gilbert Murray Valentine, Andrews University, 1982, pp. 81, 82, 143: "It seems his natural reaction to the theological discussions [1888] was to try to maintain a neutral stance although he felt a strong pull to the side of Uriah Smith and G. I. Butler, to both of whom he felt a sense of loyalty and obligation. He was also rather disturbed by and prejudiced against Jones' provocative and somewhat uncouth style. . . .[and had been] a party to actions designed to prevent A. T. Jones from preaching at the Tabernacle altogether and to restrict his teaching at the college to that which had previously been taught by the denomination."

[5] Note that Waggoner also from the beginning of his interest in righteousness by faith clearly understood the concept of corporate guilt and repentance. Cf. his letter to M. C. Wilcox, May 16, 1916, where he refers to his 1882 experience of insight.

The fact that Prescott so outspokenly made himself Jones' special colleague would naturally confuse the minds of delegates and congregation to think that this was the spirit of the 1888 revival movement, when it was not:

> ***There is nothing that my soul longs for more than that the baptism of the Spirit shall rest upon the services of God at this time.... We must have experiences like removing right eyes and cutting off right hands. Everyone who wants that experience wants to be ready to give everything, even life itself, to God. (Murmers of Amen). And we should remember that it is easier to say Amen than it is to do what God says.***
>
> ***... What then, is our duty at this time? It is to go out and give the LOUD cry of the message to the world....***
>
> ***The Lord has long been waiting to give us His Spirit. He is even now impatiently waiting that He may bestow it upon us....***
>
> ***Now a work that will be greater than Pentecost has begun, and there are those here who will see it. It is here, it is now that we are to be fitted for the work (ibid., pp. 38, 39; emphasis in original).***

Prescott did not sense the sublime 1888 concept of motivation--that true New Testament faith itself "works by love." The impact of his 1893 messages reverts to the egocentric motivation of works.

In reading Jones' sermons, one finds no instance of severity or harshness. But Prescott gives a different impression:

> ***I say that if ever there was a needy company, it is this company....***
>
> ***Now I am perfectly aware that I am speaking with great plainness.... If we don't make this a matter of earnest prayer, I say it simply means death to you and to me....***
>
> ***It is no use to go this way any longer, and my advice is most solemnly to every one who cannot go out now imbued with power from on high and bear this light from heaven, and to do the work that God has to be done now, stay at home....***
>
> ***Now I know that this is very severe. But I tell you, brethren, something must come to us, something must take hold of us....***
>
> ***The question is, What are we to do about it? What are you and I going to do about it right here, now, at this Conference? ... Again I say, What are we going to do about it? (ibid., p. 67).***
>
> ***The servants of God under this message will go out with faces lighted up with a holy joy and holy consecration. I want to see these brethren go out in that way; I want to see their faces lighted up as did that of Stephen when he was in the council (ibid., p. 389).***
>
> ***Now I say in all sincerity that we might as well make up our minds here and now, before we go a step further, to face death and down it.... Unless we stand right there at this moment, and say that we will give up friends, homes,***

and that nothing shall separate us from the love of God that is in Christ Jesus our Lord, we might as well stop now (ibid., p. 241).

This sad recital of extreme statements reveals how an imperious, fanatical spirit began to creep in which was foreign to the 1888 message. But his "we" gave the wrong impression.

Prescott later humbled his heart in repentance for the fanaticism that followed the close of this conference, and he gave good messages in Australia in 1895. But these 1893 presentations brought confusion and hindered any possibility of a contrite acceptance of the message. Opponents such as Smith and Butler would naturally be ready to cite this fanaticism as an "I-told-you-so" example. (Even to this day, fanatics and self-appointed reformers cause many sincere church members to be prejudiced against the 1888 message). Three days before this meeting began, Ellen White had warned through the Review and Herald :

Satan is now working with all his insinuating, deceiving power.... When the enemy sees that the Lord is blessing His people, and preparing them to discern his delusions, he will work with his masterly power to bring in fanaticism on the one hand and cold formalism on the other.... Watch unceasingly ... for the first step of advance that Satan may make among us....

There are dangers to be guarded on the right hand and on the left.... Some will not make a right use of the doctrine of justification ... [to lead] into false paths (RH, January 24, 1893).

In his sermons on the Holy Spirit, Prescott preached a strange doctrine without the principle of the cross, without clear ideas of what repentance is, and in a confused, even self-contradictory manner. His vehemence had the appearance of earnestness. He himself was supporting projects at the same time which were unequivocally opposed by the Spirit of Prophecy, though he was doubtless unconscious of such a marked disparity.[6]

He likewise would be unconscious of the disparity between his doctrine of receiving the Holy Spirit and the truth. A few examples of this confusion must suffice. Fortunately, the 1893 Bulletin has been republished so that interested readers can more easily see for themselves the evidence therein:

What is the thing for us to do? ... It is to begin to confess our sinfulness to God with humility of soul, with deep contrition before God to be zealous and repent. Now that is the only message that I can bring tonight. It is just that....

This sounds fine, right on target. But the problem becomes apparent when we continue:

[6] Compare GCB 1893 pp. 279, 459 with FE 220-230.

Suppose we say we do not see anything to confess at all. That does not touch the matter in any way. When God sends us word that we are sinful, it is for us to say we are so, whether we can see it or not. That should be our experience (GCB 1893, p. 65).

Scripture nowhere tells us that God desires a lip confession of words that the heart does not feel. This is closer to Islam than to genuine Christianity. "The lips may express a poverty of soul that the heart does not acknowledge" (COL 159). Jones recognized that there was danger in such ideas. With the apparent purpose of answering Prescott, he later said:

If the Lord should take away our sins without our knowing it, what good would it do us? That would simply be making machines of us. He does not propose to do that; consequently, He wants you and me to know when our sins go, that we may know when his righteousness comes....

We are always intelligent instruments... We will be used by the Lord at our own living choice (ibid., p. 405).

An Effort to Resolve the Stalemate

Prescott expressed no open opposition to Jones, and it is certain there was no conscious intention of such. But did he truly overcome his initial opposition to Jones' message? The evidence in his voluminous messages hardly indicates that he did.

But for sure, the "offence of the cross" had not ceased. The Spirit of God was bringing conviction of sin to many hearts, and Prescott tried to find some way to receive the Holy Spirit that would be acceptable to disturbed hearts and yet avoid a painful conviction of sin.

The people knew very well that responsibility for rejecting the beginning of the latter rain hung over the conference like a cloud. The net result of Prescott's studies was confusion, a jamming of the spiritual ether waves which unsettled even Jones.

Prescott was unmistakably against sin, but he seemed to have no clear sense of what was the root of the sin which troubled the congregation. The present truth of accepting the latter rain and proclaiming the loud cry was his heart burden; but how to deal with the present hindrance, a true comprehension of the guilt which hung over them for the past four years, seemed to elude his understanding.

Some of his perplexity may have been the result of understanding the real issue but being afraid to say so clearly because of the imposing presence of the leading prejudiced brethren. Even the prophet Jeremiah would have been "confounded" if he had allowed the leaders of Judah to intimidate him (1:17). When a speaker feels forced to beat around the bush, he inevitably communicates confusion.

Finally, about ten days before the close of the session, Prescott began to develop a novel method of receiving the Holy Spirit. It bears a close resemblance to the ideas expressed in The Christian's Secret of a Happy Life.

What was necessary was simply an "act of faith" in assuming that you have the gift of the final outpouring of the Holy Spirit, specific repentance for the sin of 1888 being by-passed. There seemed to be a feeling of desperation:

I am free to say that I begin to feel seriously anxious over our work now.... Now for nearly four weeks ... we [have] considered what hindered our receiving an outpouring of the Spirit of God.... I have since felt there is almost a reaction from that, and that this work seems to move along rather easy with us now. I want to say for myself, I shall not at all be satisfied if this Conference passes without a greater outpouring of the Spirit of God than we have experienced yet....

I am extremely anxious over this situation; because the time is passing, and the days go easily one after the other....

Something different must come to us than has come in this Conference yet, that is sure....

We have only about ten days left in the Conference (ibid., pp. 384, 386, 389).

Now began a devious, nebulous argument that led the audience to believe they could receive the latter rain gift of the Holy Spirit by simply assuming and claiming they had it. We must not feel we have the power of the Holy Spirit, we must know we have it. Such a conscious assumption will not include true self-knowledge nor an awareness of the depth of our sin, for that could be dangerous and discourage us:

I notice that many here have from time to time asked the Lord to show them themselves just as He saw them; and I suppose that is one petition that the Lord saw best not to grant us. And I don't believe we ought to ask Him to do it. Now you can see what the effect is apt to be when He begins to show us ourselves; we begin to question right off whether the Lord loves us or not, and whether the Lord can save us or not.... I had no idea of my character.

Well, the Lord probably has not begun to show us ourselves as He sees us; I do not suppose we have any idea, or any conception at all, of the way we look in God's sight (ibid., p. 445).

Thus was ignored the true function of the law, and the congregation was led into confusion. Ellen White's frequent appeals for honesty in facing inward reality were circumvented.

The speaker paraphrased or repeated some ideas that Jones had presented, but gave them a subtle twist to aid his argument that instead of bringing the healing conviction of sin, the Comforter removes it. The cloud over the Conference must be lifted somehow, by any means possible. We must now assume that without a need for repentance, God has forgiven the sin that has caused the trouble. Now we must just claim that our sins are gone. Here appears his indebtedness to Hannah Whitall Smith:

Keep saying over what He says. You cannot go wrong then. If you do not understand it, and cannot see light in it, you keep right on saying what He says (ibid., p. 447).

Perhaps the best way to review this argument is to quote from him the following:

Now [the Spirit] convinces us of the righteousness of God in Christ--the righteousness of Christ. And He convinces us that that is a wonderfully desirable thing to have, and then He goes on and says that we can have it, and from that He convinces us that we have it, if we follow Him....

The purpose is not, I will convince you that you are a sinner, and then convince you that you are condemned. No, the work of the Spirit is to convince us that that condemnation has been taken away (ibid., pp. 448, 449; emphasis original).

The fundamental problem as he saw it was not personal deliverance from guilt, but the lifting of the cloud that hung over the corporate body in a General Conference session because of rejecting the latter rain. Here was a band-aid and an aspirin for our deep wound.

His theory could only confuse. The trumpet was not given a certain sound, and the sin of Minneapolis was never squarely faced and dealt with. It was assumed that the sense of guilt must be of Satanic origin and vigorously repulsed.

Thus was fulfilled the 1890 testimony that the 1888 tops were cut down and the roots left intact (TM 467). If any truthful conviction should intrude into the heart that the roots were still there, the conviction was to be considered a work of the devil.

Such would of course be the logical result of a doctrine which taught (1) that a blanket lip-confession of unconscious, unrealized sin was sufficient without the sins being brought to consciousness; (2) that it was wrong to pray for true self-knowledge; and (3) that the real work of the Holy Spirit is not to bring a conviction of sin but to take away all such conviction--directly contrary to Christ's teaching in John 16:8, 9.

A fourth point would follow logically in any reasoning mind: any doubt that you now have the Holy Spirit in latter rain power would be a lack of faith in God. You must therefore assume that you have received it. This is the idea that was now developed:

I want to feel in my experience that the Saviour is with me just as He was with His disciples.... I do not want to think of Him as simply there, I want to think of Him as being here.... Not simply, I want Him, but I have Him (ibid., p. 385).

Jones later disparaged such assumptions:

So then, the man who claims to believe in Jesus, and claims the righteousness of God which comes to the believer in Jesus, is his claiming it enough ... ? (Congregation: "No.") ... Well, how do you know it? "Why, I feel it in my heart; I feel it in my heart, and have for several years." Well, that is no evidence at all; for "the heart is deceitful above all things" (ibid., p. 414).

But Prescott, in speaking of the reception of the latter rain, pressed the point he had developed:

What I want to get at is, What hinders it [the latter rain] now? What we are to get after is the righteousness of Christ... I have been thinking about it

somewhat this way: If we were just to stop all questioning about one another, ... and sit right down here in the simplicity of it just as a child, ... we could take it....

Brethren, what is to hinder us from accepting it now in that way? Nothing. Then let us praise the Lord and say, I have it now (ibid., pp. 388, 389; emphasis original).

Thus was the popular doctrine developed which has been preached in every generation of Adventists since 1893: we receive the outpouring of the latter rain by simply assuming and claiming that we have it, without knowledge of, or repentance for, having rejected it. But it has not been so received.

Jones Confused

Jones sensed the lethargy that was benumbing hearts, and did not know what to do. He stood practically alone except for his self-appointed colleague, whose efforts only created confusion and possibly ill will. We read of his apprehension:

Brethren, we are in a fearful position here at this Conference. It is just awful. I said that once before, but I realize it tonight more than I did then. I can't help it, brethren.... Not a soul of us ever dreams what fearful destinies hang on the days that pass by here (ibid., p. 346).

During his last two or three studies, we find him becoming unsettled, quoting from Prescott. Weary and perplexed, he seemed to turn to him and to echo his confused thoughts.

Both failed to realize a fundamental reality: the latter rain must be withdrawn and modern Israel must turn back to wander in the wilderness. They both assumed that nothing could hinder the finishing of God's work in their generation. Therefore they assumed it must go forth in spite of opposition and rejection. Prescott's idea was essentially that of our popular Calvinism--God's time-clock had struck the hour for the latter rain, and it is impossible for His sovereign will to be thwarted by human unbelief. Now we find Jones repeating Prescott's extreme demands:

I say again that the message there given to us is the message for you and me to carry from this meeting. And anyone who cannot carry that message with him from this meeting had better not go.... That minister had better not leave this place as a minister (ibid., pp. 494, 495).

Soon he was making unwise propositions and asking questions that had been better left alone:

Has He given you the light of the knowledge of His glory? (Congregation: "Yes.") Has He? (Congregation: "Yes.") ...

Then that Spirit has come to those who can look into the face of Jesus Christ.

A few minutes later, "by permission of the speaker, Prof. Prescott read the following: 'Look up by faith, and the light of the glory of God will shine upon you.'" Jones continued:

> ***Now, with the accumulated force of four years' exercise, God puts it forth to His people. The proposition is again: "Arise, shine, for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee." Who will? Who will? (Numerous voices: "I will.") Good! How long will you? (Voices: "Always.") How constantly will you? How often will you? (Voices: "Always.")....***
>
> ***Then, "Arise, and shine, because the light has come, and the glory of the Lord hath risen upon thee" (ibid., pp. 496, 497).***

If the loud cry was indeed to go forth with power, it would follow that great changes must take place in the church. Now we find Jones, supported by Prescott, making unfortunate prophecies that have never yet been fulfilled. Someday his words must be fulfilled, but they were not fulfilled in that generation:

> ***Here is the most blessed promise it seems to me, that ever came to the Seventh-day Adventist church. "For henceforth there shall no more come into thee, the uncircumcised and the unclean." Thank the Lord, He has delivered us henceforth from unconverted people; from people brought into the church to work out their own unrighteousness, and to create division in the church. Church trials are all gone, thank the Lord; all mischievous talebearers and tattlers are gone....***
>
> ***"No more shall come into thee the uncircumcised and the unclean." ...***
>
> ***There is no place in the Seventh-day Adventist church for hypocrites. If the heart is not sincere, it is the most dangerous place that that man ever was in ....***
>
> ***Brethren, that is the message now ... and he who cannot carry it should not go. Oh, do not go.... Let no one go without the consciousness of that abiding presence--the power of the Spirit of God (ibid., pp. 498, 499).***

Prescott enthusiastically predicted the manifestation of the gifts of the Spirit, obviously extending the gift of prophecy to others besides the authentic agent:

> ***But now in the closing work of God, ... the gifts will reappear in the church. And God does not intend, as it seems to me, that these gifts are to be confined to just one here, or perhaps one there, and that it shall be a rare thing that any special gift shall be manifested in any church.... Gifts of healing; working of miracles; prophesyings; interpretation of tongues;--all these things will be manifested again in the church (ibid., p. 461).***

Did these wonderful gifts come? There were prophesyings of a sort after this session, and both Jones and Prescott were deceived by the unfortunate claims of one Anna Rice Phillips. Fanaticism was inevitable, for the loud cry of the third angel's message did not go forth after the 1893 session.

So enthusiastic was Prescott that he predicted that some would go forth now to raise the dead literally:

I want to tell you that there are persons right in this house that will go through these very experiences; they will be taken out of prison by the angel of the Lord to go and proclaim the message; they will heal the sick, and raise the dead, too. Now that will happen right in this message.... We must believe these things as simply as a little child believes them (ibid., p. 386).

Time and history have shown these predictions to be false, certainly so far as the church body was concerned. Was the assumption that they had now appropriated the latter rain of the Holy Spirit any more true?

Prescott's Predictions of Apostasy

Prescott was not too sure of his doctrine at that meeting, and made a series of strange but significant references to the possibility of becoming deceived by a false Christ:

Now, I say to those who have been in the ministry, and who have been teaching Christ to the people and tonight can't tell the difference between the voice of Christ and the voice of the devil, it is time for us to stop and learn the voice of God.... But you still ask: "How will they know his voice?" I can't tell you....

We will just as surely, you and I, in spite of all the light we have had under this work, be led astray. The fact is, we will change leaders and not know it, unless we have the Spirit of God with us....We will array ourselves against this work, against the power of God (ibid., p. 108).

He seemed to know no clear way of telling truth from error except by what he termed "the Spirit." What he did not make plain was how to distinguish "the Spirit of truth" from "the spirit of error:"

The promise was that the spirit of truth would come,--the Spirit of truth,--THE SPIRIT OF TRUTH....

There will be every wind of doctrine blowing, every effort made to bring in--not in an open way, but in an underhanded way, in a way that we shall not recognize of our own wisdom--principles ... to deceive if possible.... The effort will be made to bring it in as the truth, and to cloak it under the garment of truth ... and bring us to compromise with error without our knowing it (ibid., pp. 459, 460, emphasis original).

Speaking once of those with "blind eyes among us," he said: "Who knows whether that means me or not?" (p. 237). Finally he told the conference that the issue before them was either to be translated or to be deceived by the devices of Satan:

I cannot get away from the idea that now is a most critical time with us personally.... It seems to me that right now we are making choices that will determine whether we shall go on with this work through the loud cry and be

translated, or whether we shall be deceived by the devices of Satan and be left out in darkness (ibid., p. 386).

They were not translated; we are sure of that. Were they then "deceived by the devices of Satan"?

The decade that followed this conference was a dark one. Fire destroyed the church headquarters in Battle Creek as a divine judgment. Pantheism ravaged prominent leaders. And nearly ten further decades have rolled by without our receiving the gracious blessing Heaven tried to give us in 1888.

Conclusion

The 1893 General Conference session marked the near end of the 1888 era. The Lord withdrew any more of the latter rain as well as the loud cry. The brethren of the time so recognized it, and history has proved it true. A false enthusiasm infatuated the close of the 1893 Conference. And Jones was misled.

One month after the close of the session (April 9) Ellen White wrote him from Australia, cautioning him against extreme statements regarding faith and works. They were not made during the session nor recorded in the Bulletin. She had not read them, but heard them "in my dream." By exiling Ellen White and Waggoner, the opposition virtually assured the conclusive failure of the 1888 message, because the dragon's methods proved too clever and determined for the isolated Jones to handle alone.[7]

He had done the best he could. Earnestly and in humility he had urged the brethren to accept the light, assured that God would grant the loud cry experience for His glory. But it was not to be, or rather it could not be, unless they found a genuine repentance for 1888, which they did not find.

We read that Caleb and Joshua were also over-enthusiastic about conquering the Canaanites, telling Israel, "The Lord is with us: fear them not," after Israel's rebellion made it impossible for the Lord to be with them in that program (Numbers 14:9).

Just before the 1893 session convened, Ellen White had cautioned the General Conference president concerning the Minneapolis issue:

If Satan can impress the mind and stir up the passions of those who claim to believe the truth, ... to commit themselves to the wrong side, he has laid his plans to lead them on a long journey (Letter O19, 1892; emphasis added).

She later recognized that the "long journey" had begun because the purposes of God had to be altered:

---

[7] Cf. Ellen White's remarks to the effect that Butler's and Smith's continuing opposition laid a burden on Jones that the Lord never intended him to carry. Letter H-27, 1894.

We may have to remain here in this world because of insubordination many more years, as did the children of Israel.... But if all now would only see and confess and repent of their own course of action in departing from the truth of God, and following human devisings, then the Lord would pardon (Ms. 184, 1901; Ev 696).

Those who confidently assume that the 1893 session marked the "greatest victory" of the message of Christ's righteousness cannot account for the devious trail of those "many more years" which have now stretched out into a near century. It is a strange way for the loud cry to be proceeding, when it should have gone as fire in the stubble.

The leader of the 1893 confusion later followed a mysterious course. G. B. Starr wrote thus to A. G. Daniells:

You certainly know that Professor Prescott for some unaccountable reason has never been a safe leader. In England he was astray with Waggoner on many points, in the Annie Phillips false prophesying he showed lack of judgment ... He wrote and taught pantheism before and quite as decidedly as Doctor Kellogg. These are not the footprints of a safe leader. He does not err so often and constantly (Letter, August 29, 1919).

In the 1950 General Conference session, the newly elected president employed the same doctrine that Prescott taught in 1893. He convinced the vast congregation at San Francisco that they could receive the final outpouring of the Holy Spirit in the latter rain by simply assuming and claiming that they had it. No repentance for rejecting the "beginning" of the latter rain was needed, no lessons from our history were to be learned, no understanding of that "most precious message" the Lord sent us was needed (cf. GCB 1950, RH July 17, 1950, pp. 113-117, sermon of sabbath, July 15).

With very few exceptions, the entire congregation were as sheep blindly following a shepherd who reiterated the same doctrine that prevailed in 1893. Again, there was no reception of the latter rain. That was 37 years ago, as of this writing.

Most of the 1950 leaders have now gone to their rest, as was the case with our 1893 leaders. We are forced to inquire if 1950 marked significant progress over 1893. It would be charitable to note that very likely few if any of our 1950 leaders knew about what happened at the 1893 session. We have everything to fear for the future if we forget the way the Lord has led us in the past!

After the 1893 session, Ellen White was aroused as never before, saying, "We will change leaders and not know it." Her burden seemed to be that the enemy would now work within the church. The new Canrights would henceforth do an "inside" job:

Fanaticism will appear in the very midst of us. Deceptions will come, and of such a character that if it were possible they would mislead the very elect. If marked inconsistencies and untruthful utterances were apparent in these manifestations, the words from the lips of the Great Teacher would not be needed....

The Holy Spirit of God alone can create a healthy enthusiasm (2 SM 16, 17; 1894).

The course of the 1893 session reveals the possibility of preaching about the Holy Spirit without understanding Him or recognizing Him, and even while resisting Him.

It would be well for us all to pray, "Lord, is it I?"

CHAPTER TEN

WHY DID JONES AND WAGGONER LOSE THEIR WAY?

One of the great mysteries in Seventh-day Adventist history is A. T. Jones' and E. J. Waggoner's later failure. The usual understanding of such failure is that the basic tendencies toward it existed in character from the beginning of one's church connection. Such is the thought expressed by the apostle John:

> ***They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us: but they went out, that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us (1 John 2:19).***

This principle seems to have applied in the case of D. M. Canright. Long before he left us, he was, spiritually speaking, "not of us." He repressed his buried doubts from time to time with abject confessions, but the doubts were never eradicated. The graphic story is told in the *Testimonies* (Vol. 5, pp. 516-20, 571-3, 621-28).

A serious question prevails to-day concerning Jones and Waggoner. Were they genuine Christians even at Minneapolis? How could they have been true at that time and afterward lose their way? *The Fruitage of Spiritual Gifts* expresses the popular view that they were radical, extreme, in error even at Minneapolis, waiting only for a chance to jump the track:

> [At the time of the Minneapolis session] some were strongly inclined to take radical positions, as though it were a sign of strength to be extreme. Mrs. White … even seemed to have a feeling that the two men who were so prominent at that time might later on be carried away by their extreme views (p. 232).

However, an inspired judgment declares they were straight and true at the time of the Minneapolis meeting:

> ***The Lord in His great mercy sent a most precious message to His people through Elders Waggoner and Jones. … God gave to His messengers just what the people needed (TM 91, 95).***
>
> ***God is presenting to the minds of men divinely appointed precious gems of truth, appropriate for our time (Ms. 8a, 1888; Olson, p. 279).***
>
> ***God had sent these young men to bear a special message (Ms. S24, 1892).***

How could such words be written about men who were "radical" or "extreme"?

The fact that Jones and Waggoner eventually faltered does not mean "they were not of us." But their later failures are unwisely interpreted to cast a subtle, implied aspersion on the message which they brought in 1888, as though the message carried them away.

This is the main reason why some say they are afraid to study that message. Thus to this day the opposition at Minneapolis is subtly justified, and the Heaven-sent message and messengers are subtly disparaged. Such was the dangerous idea Ellen White said would develop among us if they should later lose their way.

A Mysterious Providence

We are faced here with a unique problem. Two phenomena are evident: (a) A master mind of evil rejoices in this apparently conclusive rejection of the message. (b) The Lord Himself mysteriously permits this tragedy to be a stumblingblock to all who *want* some reason for rejecting the reality of the latter rain message.

The especially difficult question is why should God choose as special messengers those who would later become unsound in the faith? Why should He permit the bearers of His sharply contested message to go astray when their apostasy would only confirm the opposition to that message? Something profoundly significant is involved in this perplexing history. God's footsteps may be mysterious, but that is no reason why we should carelessly misunderstand this strange providence.

To suppose that the Lord made a strategic mistake in choosing Jones and Waggoner is unthinkable, for He never errs in counsel. To suppose that He made the wrath of men to praise Him against their own will is also unthinkable, for it is evident that both were sincere, earnest, humbleminded Christians when they were used by the Lord. They neither "ran greedily after the error of Balaam for reward," loving "the wages of unrighteousness" (Jude 11; 2 Peter 2:15), nor was there a trace of dishonesty evident in their ministry.

Inspired evidence suggests an answer to our questions, and indicates that:

(1) Jones and Waggoner were not "carried away" by any "extreme views" regarding the righteousness of Christ, but they were *driven away* by the persistent and unreasoning opposition of the brethren whom God sent them to enlighten.

(2) Ellen White recognized the seriousness of the opposition to them personally and to their message, and fixed the ultimate blame for their later failure "*to a great degree*" upon the opposing brethren.

(3) The Lord permitted the sad event to take place as a test to the opposing brethren; and the failures of the 1888 messengers have had the effect of confirming "us" in a state of virtual unbelief. It was an example of what Paul calls a "working of error" which God "sent" (permitted), "that they all might be condemned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness" (2 Thessalonians 2:11, 12, mg).

It seems that the Lord is such a Gentleman that He apparently goes out of His way to provide hooks for us to hang our doubts on if we want them. He does not want any of us to receive the latter rain unless we are fully heart-committed to Him and to His truth. Somehow His character of jealousy is involved here. Anyone who will back away from the blessing for the slightest excuse is given ample opportunity to do so. But, oh, how that can be a severe kindness!

(4) The practical results of the investigative judgment will require that the remnant church, before the time of final victory, come to see the truth of the message and its history and recognize Jones' and Waggoner's work from 1888-96 for its true value, the "beginning" of the latter rain and the loud cry.

The Deep-Seated Nature of the Opposition

Criticizing the messengers imposed on them a burden that was heavier to carry than normal opposition:

> ***Whatever course the messenger may pursue, it will be objectionable to the opposers of truth; and they will make capital of every defect in the manners, customs, or character of its advocate (RH, Oct. 18, 1892).***
>
> ***Some of our brethren ... full of jealousy and evil surmising, ... are ever ready to show in just what way they differ with Elder Jones or Waggoner (Letter S24, 1892).***

The two men spoke positively and strongly. Keen perceptions of truth often lead those who are "only men" to speak that way. But that was offensive to human nature which was looking for an excuse to reject the message :

> ***Let no soul complain of the servants of God who have come to them with a heaven-sent message. Do not any longer pick flaws in them, saying, "They are too positive; they talk too strongly." They may talk strongly; but is it not needed? ...***
>
> ***Ministers, do not dishonor your God and grieve His Holy Spirit, by casting reflections on the ways and manners of the men He would choose ... He sees the temperament of the men He has chosen. He knows that none but earnest, firm, determined, strong-feeling men will view this work in its vital importance, and will put such firmness and decision into their testimonies that they will make a break against the barriers of Satan (TM 410-413).***

The Lord Himself had clothed His personal messengers with evidences of authority, "heavenly credentials." They had lost sight of self in their love for Christ and His special message. The still-uncrucified self in others was piqued:

> ***If the rays of light which shone at Minneapolis were permitted to excert their convincing power upon those who took their stand against light, ... they would have received the richest blessings, disappointed the enemy, and stood as faithful men, true to their convictions. They would have had a rich experience; but self said, No. Self was not to be refused; self struggled for the mastery (Letter O 19, 1892).***

Thus the principle underlying this rejection of truth is that which the Jew's demonstrated in their rejection of Christ. Caiaphas regarded Christ as his rival; he felt *personal* jealousy of Him (DA 704). Interwoven with that jealousy of Him who appeared to be a mere man, Caiaphas was expressing the enmity of the natural heart against God and His righteousness. Likewise, at Minneapolis, the personality of Jones and Waggoner became the visible, conscious stumblingblock for the invisible, unconscious rejection of Christ the Word. This is evident, as follows:

Men professing godliness have despised Christ in the person of His messengers. Like the Jews, they reject God's message. The Jews asked regarding Christ, "Who is this? Is not this Joseph's son?" He was not the Christ that the Jews had looked for. So to-day the agencies that God sends are not what men have looked for (FE 472).

The Personal Burden Which Jones and Waggoner Bore

Few have appreciated the effect which the opposition inevitably had on the young messengers. They knew that the message of Christ's righteousness was of God. They knew that they had been reined up by the Spirit of God to speak boldly in its defence. And they could not be blind to the obvious fact that a most determined resistance to that message was the reaction of the leadership of the one true remnant church which must eventually triumph.

They knew that the message was the beginning of the loud cry, which was to go as "fire in the stubble." They knew the time had come for the finishing of the work, when heavenly intelligences were watching with deep interest the unfolding of the drama. They further knew they were living in the time of the cleansing of the sanctuary when, of all times, the past unbelief and failures of old Jerusalem must not be repeated. Never had there been a like crisis; never had heaven granted greater evidences in vindication of a special message.

But, to their astonishment, never had history recorded a more shameful human failure to improve heaven-sent opportunity. It seemed to the young messengers to be the final, complete failure of God's people to believe and to enter into His rest. What could possibly lie beyond?

Luther had it easy compared to them. When persecuted by Rome, all he had to do was read the prophecies of Daniel and Revelation and recognize the papacy as the little horn and the beast. That made him feel good, even to the point of providing courage to burn the Pope's bull. But Jones and Waggoner could find no such heart comfort. Prophecy indicated no eighth church to succeed Laodicea. The possibility of God's people delaying His program for a century or longer seemed beyond their comprehension.

It must be said to their credit that Jones and Waggoner did not renounce faith in the God of Israel. They never became infidels or agnostics or atheists. They never gave up the Sabbath or their lifelong devotion to Christ. In today's climate of church fellowship they would still be members in good and regular standing. *Their sin was that they lost faith in the corporate body of the church and its leadership.* They were not confident of denominational repentance. They came to doubt human nature; hence Jones' bitterness and the failings of their own human nature. The enemy will press us sorely to repeat their failure. But we need not give in!

The little shrubs in the valley, bending beneath the zephyr winds that occasionally stir their quiet calm, would do well to refrain from critical comment when the mighty oaks on the mountain top go down in the crushing fury of the tempest. Let God speak when He says truly there was no excuse for Jones' and Waggoner's faltering; let us be slow to speak, when we realize that "*we*" were largely the cause of it.

C. S. Lewis knew nothing of our 1888 episode, but he made an insightful comment in his *Reflections on the Psalms:*

Just as the natural result of throwing a lighted match into a pile of shavings is to produce a fire, ... so the natural result of cheating a man, or "keeping him down" or neglecting him, is to arouse resentment; that is, to impose upon him the temptation of becoming what the Psalmists were when they wrote the vindictive passages. He may succeed in resisting the temptation; or he may not. ... If that sin utterly corrupts him, I have in a sense debauched or seduced him. I was the tempter (p. 24).

Ellen White keenly felt the burden they carried. In 1892 she wrote to the General Conference president concerning them:

I wish that all would see that the very same spirit which refused to accept Christ, the light that would dispel the moral darkness, is far from being extinct in this age. ...

Some may say, "I do not hate my brother; I am not so bad as that." But how little they understand their own hearts. They may think they have a zeal for God in their feelings against their brother if his ideas seem in any way to conflict with theirs; feelings are brought to the surface that have no kinship with love. ... They would as leave be at swords point with their brother as not, and yet he may be bearing a message from God to the people. ...

They ... [believe] they are right in their bitterness of feeling against their brethren. Will the Lord's messenger bear the pressure brought against him? If so, it is because God bids him stand in His strength, and vindicate the truth that he is sent of God. ...

Should the Lord's messengers, after standing manfully for the truth for a time, fall under temptation, and dishonor Him who has given them their work, will that be proof that the message is not true? No. ... Sin on the part of the messenger of God would cause Satan to rejoice, and those who have rejected the message and the messenger would triumph; but it would not at all clear the men who are guilty of rejecting the message of God. ...

I have deep sorrow of heart because I have seen how readily a word or action of Elder Jones or Elder Waggoner is criticized. How readily many minds overlook all the good that has been done by them in the few years past, and see no evidence that God is working through these instrumentalities. They hunt for something to condemn, and their attitude toward these brethren who are zealously engaged in doing a good work, shows that feelings of enmity and bitterness are in the heart (Letter 019, 1892).

At about the same time she wrote to Uriah Smith intimating that they might not be strong enough to bear the strain and pressure brought against them:

It is quite possible that Elder Jones or Waggoner may be overthrown by the temptations of the enemy; but if they should be, this would not prove that they had had no message from God, or that the work that they had done was all a mistake. But should this happen, how many would take this position and enter into a fatal delusion because they are not under the control of the Spirit of God.

… This is the very position many would take if either of these men were to fall, and I pray that these men upon whom God has laid the burden of a solemn work, may be able to give the trumpet a certain sound, and honor God at every step, and that their path at every step may grow brighter and brighter until the close of time (Letter S24, 1892; emphasis added).

This information throws much light on the Jones and Waggoner tragedy:

(1) They suffered definite brotherly hatred. Brethren were eagerly criticizing "a word or action, " hunting for things to condemn. There was a subjective attitude of enmity, bitterness and suspicion as late as 1892, after the confessions had been made.

(2) The opposing brethren naively thought this attitude was a zeal for God, yet it was "the very same spirit which refused to accept Christ."

(3) The opposition became a very difficult and overmastering temptation to the young messengers.

(4) The tragic result confirmed the opposing brethren in disparaging the message .

(5) For the messengers to lose their way was a "triumph" for the opposing brethren, and, sad to say, for Satan. This development therefore became conclusive evidence that the opposing brethren had not truly repented of the Minneapolis sin. *Their "triumph " would constitute their "fatal delusion."*

Thus the failure of the messengers would tend to confirm the on-going Seventh-day Adventist Church leadership, pastoral, administrative, and academic, in impenitence. To this day the messengers' eventual failure is frequently cited as evidence that the 1888 message must be somehow dangerous. This was precisely Satan's purpose, and it fulfills Ellen White's prediction to the letter.

(6) The success of Ellen White's prayers that the two brethren would endure the test would be dependent on the attitude the opposing brethren would take from late 1892 on.

A few months later, she wrote to the General Conference delegates in session about the true cause of the messengers' possible failure:

It is not the inspiration from heaven that leads one to be suspicious, watching for a chance and greedily seizing upon it to prove that those brethren who differ from us in some interpretations of Scripture are not sound in the faith. There is danger that this course of action will produce the very result assumed; and to a great degree the guilt will rest upon those who are watching for evil. …

The opposition in our own ranks has imposed upon the Lord's messengers a laborious and soul trying task; for they have had to meet difficulties and obstacles which need not have existed. … Love and confidence constitute a moral force that would have united our churches, and insured harmony of action; but coldness and distrust have brought disunion that has shorn us of our strength (Letter, Jan. 6, 1893; GCB 1893, pp. 419-421).

It was that "laborious and soul trying task," "suspicion," "hunting for something to condemn," "dullness of some and opposition of others," seizing upon atoms to prove that they were "unsound in the faith, " which produced the "very result" anticipated—their failure. The proper, honest, inspired word for the opposition was "persecution:"

We should be the last people on the earth to indulge in the slightest degree the spirit of persecution against those who are bearing the message of God to the world. This is the most terrible feature of unchristlikeness that has manifested itself among us since the Minneapolis meeting (GCB 1893, p. 184).

However, suffering persecution was no excuse for Jones and Waggoner to lose their way.

What Was A. T. Jones' Problem?

One lone letter from Ellen White to Jones in 1893 is often cited as evidence that his message was extreme. Taken out of its context, this letter leaves on some minds the impression that his righteousness-by-faith message was unbalanced. But the letter must be read in context.

Ellen White never published the letter during her lifetime. If she had believed that Jones' message was extreme or unbalanced, she would not have hesitated to publish it in her *Testimonies*.

Writing from far-away Australia, she tells Jones that she heard something in her "dream." She had not read it in any publication. Jones had a tendency when bearing up under persistent opposition to overstate his case, and her letter nipped the tendency in the bud. He profited by her advice, which he accepted in humility. The letter states that his views of righteousness by faith were correct, for "you look in reality upon these subjects as I do," and she cited his views as "*our* position:"

In my dream you were presenting the subject of faith and the imputed righteousness of Christ by faith. You repeated several times that works amounted to nothing, that there were no conditions. The matter was presented in that light that I knew minds would be confused. ... You state this matter too strongly. ... I know your meaning, but you leave a wrong impression upon many minds. ...

You look in reality upon these subjects as I do, yet you make these subjects, through your expressions, confusing to minds. ... These strong assertions in regard to works never make our position any stronger. The expressions weaken our position, for there are many who will consider you an extremist, and will lose the rich lessons you have for them upon the very subjects they need to know. ... Do not lay one pebble for a soul that is weak in the faith to stumble over, in overwrought presentations or expressions. ... Remember that there are some whose eyes are intently fixed upon you, expecting that you will overreach the mark, and stumble, and fall (Letter 44, 1893, April 9; 1 SM 377-79).

Careful search of Jones' voluminous writings and sermons fails to yield even one example of his saying that "works amount to nothing," or anything of a similar extreme nature on the subject. We would expect to find some instance of an unwise statement on faith and works in his twenty-four sermons at the 1893 session which closed just before

she wrote this letter; but we find just the opposite—strong expressions giving a proper balance of faith and works, upholding works was not only necessary but as the fruit of genuine faith in Christ.

At the close of the 1893 session Jones was led astray by Prescott's influence into the fanatical assumption that the loud cry could not be hindered. This prepared the way for the Anna Rice Phillips fanaticism.

Ellen White's letter came in time to encourage him to be careful, and he was careful. Her most enthusiastic endorsements of his ministry are written *after* this April 9, 1893 letter, because he humbly repented of his temporary slip.[1]

No Sin is Ever Excusable

It was a sin of impatience of mind or ill temper of heart which finally ended Waggoner's and Jones' ministry. But Moses' experience on the borders of Canaan illustrates what happened to them. His sin was likewise inexcusable and he had to die for it, a sin of impatience with Israel. Passionately and impatiently he called them "rebels," which fact was true while his spirit was not:

> ***Thus the people were given occasion to question whether his past course of action had been under the direction of God, and to excuse their own sins. Moses, as well as they, had offended God. His course, they said, had from the first been open to criticism and censure. They had now found the pretext which they desired for rejecting all the reproofs that God had sent them through His servant (PP 417).***

Had Jones and Waggoner not covered their names with disgrace, we of a later generation would likely accord them almost idolatrous respect. "Many who had been unwilling to heed the counsels of Moses while he was with them, would have been in danger of committing idolatry over his dead body, had they known the place of his burial" (*ibid*., pp. 477, 478). The truth and logic of Jones' and Waggoner's position were so overwhelming that not long after 1888 many began to realize it. But the latter rain had to be postponed until a future generation. Now the messengers must be "buried" secretly—that is, all occasion for idolatry must be removed on the part of those unborn generations that must yet come. What better method of "burial" than to allow the messengers to lose their way in disgrace?

---

[1] In a letter to S. N. Haskell one year later she declares that she has more confidence in Jones now than she had before he erred in endorsing Anna Phillips. The letter says that Jones is the Lord's chosen messenger, beloved of God, His ambassador. This mistake would not have happened if Uriah Smith and G. I. Butler had united with Jones and Waggoner as they should have; Jones and Waggoner hear the voice of the Lord and the people recognize in their interpretations of the word of God marvelous things from the living oracles and their hearts bum within them as they listen; they have fed the people with bread from heaven; the Lord has the very men He wanted; they have carried forward the work with faithfulness, and have been the mouthpiece for God; they know the voice of counsel and obeyed it; they have drawn draughts from the well of Bethlehem; these chosen agents of God would have rejoiced to link up with Smith and others, including Butler; if union had existed, mistakes would not have been (Letter H-27, 1894).

It is frequently said that their numerous speaking appointments after 1888 indicate official acceptance of their message. But this is an erroneous deduction. Several factors must be noted: (1) lay members and local elders (who welcomed the message) had more voice in arranging speakers' appointments than they do now; (2) Ellen White's influence virtually demanded for them the hearing they received at General Conference sessions; (3) their speaking appointments when their message was unwelcome to many leaders imposed on them a heavy emotional burden. An example of this is the prevailing attitude at the 1893 session as evidenced in the *Bulletin*.

Nevertheless, many who had spurned their message when they were right eagerly followed them when they were unsettled in the faith. This made matters worse. In 1912 a former General Conference president wrote about them:

> ***When the message of justification by faith began to be preached in this denomination,[2] the enemy was deeply stirred, and made a strong effort to stop its spread. Failing in this, he changed his plan of opposition to a method that promised greater success. This plan was so to fasten the minds of the people upon the instruments that the Lord had called to promulgate the message, that these men would come to be regarded as the oracles of God, and the people's faith would become centered in them rather than upon Jesus Christ, the author of the message. It was reckoned by the enemy that the praise and flattery of the people would so inflate these men that they would come to feel that their opinions and judgment must prevail in all matters pertaining both to the Scriptures and to the management of the Lord's work on the earth (G. A. Irwin, RH July 4, 1912).***

Ellen White insisted that the unchristlike persecution they suffered was the *primary* cause of their failure. It separated them from the love and confidence of their brethren, which they needed. The havoc wrought by unwise adulation became *secondary*.

Considering the nature of the message they bore, this two-fold cause could only derange their spiritual faculties. If they could have received greater light so as to endure until victory came, they would have faced the world in the strength that those must possess who finally finish God's work on earth. But further light and power had to be shut off after the rejection of the message. Waggoner had been exiled to England, and both had to labor without Ellen White's help. They knew only the "beginning" of the loud cry light, and that was not sufficient to perfect sanctification, even in honest hearts. (Neither is it sufficient for us today!)

How Good Men Can Lose Their Way

Our history gives further evidence of how "those who … rejected the message and the messenger would triumph" (Letter O19, 1892). The 1888 General Conference president, G. I. Butler, was one of the principal initial rejectors. He was a good man with a strong macho

[2] Note the failure to recognize the message as the "beginning" of the latter rain and the loud cry.

gift of executive leadership, but the problem he had to handle was unprecedented. No former president had been confronted by the beginning of the latter rain and the loud cry! Ellen White tried to help him:

> ***You refer to your office as President of the General Conference, as if this justified your course of action. ... You have no right to wound the feelings of your brethren. You speak of them in a manner which I cannot sanction. ... You call brethren Jones and Waggoner fledglings (Letter 21, 1888).***

Due to his wife's illness, Elder Butler retired for some years after 1888 to a lonely farm in Florida. Eventually he confessed his wrong attitudes and returned to positions of high responsibility. The Lord accepted his further labors, as was the case with Uriah Smith. But the golden opportunity of proclaiming the latter rain and loud cry message was conclusively lost to both of them.

A pathetic example of how Butler's opposition finally "gained the supremacy" (A. T. Jones' phrase) is found in the 1903 General Conference *Bulletin*. At that session Jones and Waggoner stood with a minority who felt constrained by their conscience to oppose the revision of the 1901 constitution. In their view the 1903 revision was a step backwards from the reformation principles of 1901. Whether they were right or wrong in that conviction is beyond us to settle at this point, but they were undoubtedly sincere in holding their convictions. As the debate dragged on, "voices" called for "Elder Butler" to speak.

Seven times he went out of his way to say how he "dearly" loved "dear brethren" Jones and Waggoner; but the *Bulletin* reveals that he proceeded to misrepresent their true position over their interjected verbal protests. Then he held them up to public ridicule (pp. 145-164).

They had said in the session that "God's people are to be under Him, and Him alone. There is one Shepherd, and He has one flock," and that primarily "the committee must belong to Jesus Christ, and serve Christ, and let the other man alone, and let him preach the gospel which Christ gives.'' Elder Butler misconstrued this as favoring the abolition of all organization, and unjustly compared their position to the fanatical anarchists against whom the pioneers had to contend:

> ***These dear brethren do not know the difficulties that we had before organization...***
>
> ***Now, it does seem to me that if some of these things are carried out the way some of the good brethren have spoken, it would finally bring about, if carried out fully, just about the same state of disorganization that we started in on in the first place. ... I do not want to say anything now to hurt Brother Jones feelings, for I love Brother Jones dearly (GCB 1903, pp. 146-163).***

In the 1901 session Ellen White had emphatically warned against "kingly power in our ranks to control this or that branch of the work" (GCB 1901, pp. 25, 26). This was the main reason why for years she had been calling for reorganization and reformation. The tendency to restrict laborers had been a notable feature of Elder Butler's former presidency (cf. TM 297-300). It was especially prominent in his 1886-1888 era. Her rebukes to him are now well known. In 1903 she said, "The kingly power formerly revealed in the General

Conference at Battle Creek is not to be perpetuated" (8T 233). Yet Elder Butler publicly contradicts those statements, denying that it was even *possible* for any "kingly power" to occur in the General Conference presidency:

> ***You will pardon one of the old hands, who has been in the work for so many years, and who has had the presidency of the General Conference for thirteen terms, for saying that he fails to see that anything of a kingly nature can be brought into it. I do not believe there can. ... I held it thirteen terms. ... I should be very sorry to believe there was any kingly power in it. ... Though I held the office for thirteen terms, I was never reproved for any such thing, as I can remember (GCB 1903, p. 163).***

We humans do have a tendency to forget!

Caught up in the spirit of the discussion, Elder J. N. Loughborough made a speech seconding that of Elder Butler. He also spoke contemptuously of Jones' and Waggoner's minority convictions.

They had not in fact opposed the true principles of organization in their position in 1903, although they may have had some inkling of the state to which we have come in our late twentieth century when it is so difficult for men and women on committees to stand alone for Christ against strong peer pressure and fear of demotion.

But the thought of committees first of all submitting to Christ and earnestly seeking the Lord's guidance, and remembering that we are all brethren, seemed for some strange reason to frighten both Butler and Loughborough. Loughborough added:

> ***These brethren say they do not propose to tear down organization. Well, I do not think they mean to, but it seems to me that, after all, you get to where you don't have any constitution or order at all. "After all," they said in the early days, "we are all brethren. If we will seek the Lord, He will guide us" (p. 164).***

Was this a knife plunged in their back? Jones and Waggoner could be pardoned for feeling that it was. Rather pathetically, Jones arose at this point to make a plea to the delegates. It may mark a wound that never healed:

> ***I would like to make a request now to all the delegation and all the people who read the "Bulletin." When these speeches come out, please look at Brother Waggoner's and Brother [P.T.] Magan's, and then mine; read them over carefully, and if you can find anything in any one of them that strikes at organization in any sense whatever, I hope you will mark it, and send it to us, so that we can repent of it (idem.).***

Jones' challenge stood then and it stands even today. He and Waggoner had made a plea for a submission to Christ and the Holy Spirit, which they thought was in harmony with the 1888 message, a submission that would make possible the leading of the Lord in the finishing of His work in all the world. They did not oppose organization; what they wanted to see was organization submissive to Christ for finishing the gospel commission.

They wanted Christ to be recognized as the true Head of the church, in control of its organization.

They were misunderstood and misrepresented. Butler had the last word; he "triumphed," to use Ellen White's word. Something drove him and Loughborough to ignore their protests and to ride over their pleas for fairness. What can explain this except a smoldering 15-year resentment?

Jones' and Waggoner's humiliating defeat in 1903 was probably the beginning of their eventual human bitterness. "Dear brethren Jones and Waggoner" would be more than human if they did not feel they had suffered the crowning insult after fifteen years of opposition. Could they not feel pain?

Their plea for primary submission to Christ above subservience to human control was in harmony with Ellen White's frequent appeals and with Scripture, *but of course it could be done safely only if the Holy Spirit found a unified welcome among us*.

Elder Butler's continuing heart attitude is revealed in a letter to Dr. Kellogg a year later. He makes it clear that he has never repented of his 1888 blindness. He must still blame Waggoner for ills that beset the cause, and considers his downfall a blessing:

> ***I hold precisely the same opinions that I always have held since I came to be a Bible student. ... The later crop that came on to run things after I went out of office [as General Conference president] have remodeled things somewhat. Elder Waggoner was a leading spirit in these changes. He seems to have remodeled himself from a preacher into a doctor. Perhaps it is just as well for him and all concerned. I wish him well in every way (Letter, September 9, 1904).***

Coming at just this time, one wonders how such a letter could have helped Dr. Kellogg!

There are those who accuse Jones of coveting the office of General Conference president. That may or may not be true. The books of heaven can record heart motives better than we can with our limited vision of the murky shadows of the past. Doubtless his better judgment convinced him that he was not fitted for administration, or for editing the *Review and Herald*. His "heavenly credentials" had been for a different work—to herald the gospel of the loud cry to the church and to the world. That was enough for any one man to do. When that mission failed, he lost his hold on the patience of the saints.

The 1888 Spirit and the Kellogg Tragedy

Ellen White tells us that Dr. Kellogg was truly converted at the Minneapolis meeting (GCB 1903, p. 86). Her endorsements of his character and sincere devotion are multitudinous. Here is one of the last ones:

> ***God has given Dr. Kellogg the success that he has had. ... God does not endorse the efforts put forth by different ones to make the work of Dr. Kellogg as hard as possible. ... Those who rejected [the light on health reform] rejected God. One and another who knew better said that it all came from Dr. Kellogg, and they made war upon him. This had a bad influence on the doctor. He put on the coat of irritation and retaliation (GCB 1903, p. 86).***

A letter to Elder Butler, the 1888 General Conference president, indicates that Kellogg's eventual apostasy was "in a large measure" *our* responsibility. For sure, it was not God's will:

> ***It will be seen sometime that our brethren and sisters have not been inspired by the spirit of Christ in their manner of dealing with Dr. Kellogg. I know that your views of the doctor are not correct. Your attitude toward him will not bear the approval of God. ... You can pursue a course that will so weaken his confidence in his brethren that they cannot help him when and where he needs to be helped. ...***
>
> ***Dr. Kellogg has done a work that no man I know of among us has had qualifications to do. He has needed the sympathy and confidence of his brethren. ... They should have pursued a course that would have gained and retained his confidence. ... But there has been instead, a spirit of suspicion and criticism.***
>
> ***If the doctor fails in doing his duty and being an overcomer at last, those brethren who have failed in their want of wisdom and discernment to help the man when and where he needed their help, will be in a large measure responsible. ... His brethren do at times really feel that God is using the doctor to do a work that no other one is fitted to do. But then they meet so strong a current of reports to his detriment, they are perplexed. They partially accept them, and decide that Dr. Kellogg must really be hypocritical and dishonest. ... How must the doctor feel to be ever regarded with suspicion? ... Must it ever be thus? ... Christ paid the redemption price for his soul and the devil will do his utmost to ruin his soul. Let none of us help him in his work (Letter B21, 1888).***
>
> ***Those at the very heart of the work indulged their own wishes in a way that dishonored God. ... Dr. Kellogg was not sustained in the health reform work. ... [He] took up the work they did not do. The spirit of criticism shown to his work from the first has been very unjust, and had made his work hard. ... It is a fact that our ministers are very slow to become health reformers. ... This has caused Dr. Kellogg to lose confidence in them (Ms. 13, 1901, Diary, January 1898).***

The "manna" of 1888 had been rejected, and now it began to do what the ancient manna in Israel did when it was not eaten fresh. It spoiled. Highly nutritious food spoils more quickly than devitalized food. "We" lost three outstanding, gifted men who at one time gave evidence of being truly heaven-ordained. The spoiled manna became unpleasant to deal with, and the story is sad.

Conclusion

The last words which Waggoner wrote before his sudden death on May 28, 1916 are these closing sentences of a letter to M. C. Wilcox: "I do not question, but freely acknowledge, the superior goodness of the brethren in the denomination. I should be recreant to God if I did not recognize the light that He has given me; I could never

understand why it was given to me, except on the ground that His gifts are bestowed, not according to deserts, but according to need."

Whether he will be saved or lost at last is not for us to speculate. But if those were his last thoughts, and God in His infinite wisdom and mercy finds some way to save him, certain it is that Waggoner will plead himself unworthy. Will any of us who are saved plead otherwise?

One of the last letters we have from Jones before his death reveals a humble spirit of complete confidence in the Seventh-day Adventist message and in the ministry of Ellen White (May 12, 1921). The nurse who took care of him at Battle Creek in his last illness told us personally that he is certain that Jones died a genuine Christian.

A proper, authoritative reprint of their messages during the time of their faithfulness, issued with wholehearted endorsement, would provide for this generation a refreshing view of the pure gospel. And after we have gathered up the fragments that remain that nothing be lost, then could we with confidence press our petition to the throne of grace to give us this day bread convenient for us, meat in due season.

As surely as there is a living God, the prayer would not be unanswered.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

THE "ALPHA" AND THE "OMEGA" CRISES

A terrible crisis known as the pantheism heresy nearly overwhelmed the Seventh-day Adventist Church in the early 1900's. Ellen White described it as the "alpha" of "seducing spirits and doctrines of devils." Could it be that this "alpha" deception was related to the rejection of the 1888 light?

In direct proportion as genuine light is undiscerned and misunderstood does counterfeit light take its place, undiscerned and misunderstood for its true nature. We were told after 1888 that apostasy within would be unconscious and subtle and likely become widespread before it could be discerned.

This principle of deception following rejection of light is an unalterable law of history. Jesus said to the Jewish leaders, "I am come in My Father's name, and ye receive Me not: if another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive" (John 5:43). A true understanding of the post-1888 era is necessary in order to recognize the "sparks of kindling" which took the place of the true light.

The ministry in the 1888 era were good men, consecrated, working long hours, enduring privations. Sincerely professing the truth, they managed somehow to ignore or reject its reality. What happened is one of the most amazing developments in the history of God's work.

The brethren were sincerely unaware of a heart attitude which prompted an unholy reaction against the most glorious light which had ever shone upon this church. But they were no worse than we are by nature. We are one body with them.

It follows that the sin of rejecting that light of the loud cry can never be truly overcome until those unseen motives equally present in all our hearts are laid bare to our consciousness. This work certainly must be included in the cleansing of the sanctuary. What we failed to *believe* a century ago we must *learn* through traversing a devious detour of our own devising. Our history is an outworking of principles divinely ordained to lead us to reconciliation with Christ.

The Alpha History of the Early 1900's Illustrates This Principle

The Lord cannot, will not, force nor conquer by fear what He would win only by love. Hence His long patience during our detour. What else can He do but await our disillusionment? But His patient wisdom will win at last, because it is the wisdom of love, a truly divine strategy. Understanding the 1888 history is powerful good news!

Whether in 1844 or in 1888, a rejection of light made inevitable a submission to deception. Here is how the principle worked when some early Adventists rejected the increased light of the sanctuary truth:

I saw an exceeding bright light come from the Father to the Son, and from the Son it waved over the people before the throne. But few would receive this

great light. Many came out from under it and immediately resisted it; others were careless and did not cherish the light, and it moved off from them....

Those who rose up with Jesus would send up their faith to Him in the holiest, and pray, "My Father, give us Thy Spirit." ...

I turned to look at the company who were still bowed before the throne; they did not know that Jesus had left it. Satan appeared to be by the throne, trying to carry on the work of God. I saw them look up to the throne and pray, "Father, give us thy Spirit." Satan would then breathe upon them an unholy influence.... [His] object was to keep them deceived, and to draw back and deceive God's children (EW 55, 56).

This same principle of deception following rejection of heaven-sent light operated after 1888. Speaking of the crisis, Ellen White wrote in 1889: "We need never expect that when the Lord has light for His people, Satan will stand calmly by and make no effort to prevent them from receiving it" (5T 728).

There will be many now, as in ancient times, who will hold to tradition, and worship they know not what....

Certain it is that there has been among us a departure from the living God, and a turning to men, putting human in place of divine wisdom.

God will arouse His people; if other means fail, heresies will come in among them, which will sift them, separating the chaff from the wheat (ibid., p. 707).

At the Minneapolis session, we were told that failure to advance under the generalship of Christ would expose us without our realizing it to the generalship of Satan:

God will withdraw His Spirit unless His truth is accepted....

I wish you could see and feel that if you are not advancing you are retrograding and Satan understood about it; he knew how to take advantage of the human mind.... Here the battle is before us (Ms. 8, 1888, Olson pp. 264, 265).

Again, speaking of Minneapolis, Ellen White described the course of the fall-out:

Now at the present time God designs that a new and fresh impetus shall be given to His work. Satan sees this, and he is determined it shall be hindered.... That which is food to the churches is regarded as dangerous, and should not be given them. And this slight difference of ideas is allowed to unsettle the faith, to cause apostasy, to break up unity, to sow discord, all because they do not know what they are striving about themselves (Ms. 13,1889, emphasis added).

An enemy recognized that in the reaction of many against the 1888 light he could seize his best chance of winning a victory:

The enemy of God and man is not willing that this truth should be clearly presented, for he knows that if the people receive it fully, his power will be

broken.... [Christ] has warned us to be on our guard against false doctrines.... Many false doctrines will be presented to us as the teaching of the Bible.... God would have us intelligent ... and recognize the warnings He has given us that one may not be found on the side of the great deceiver in the crisis that is just before us (RH September 3, 1889).

Those who have had great light and who have not walked in it will have darkness corresponding to the light they have despised (TM 163).

Since the light which came in 1888 was the verity of the third angel's message, it makes sense for the enemy to seize the chance to confuse our understanding of that truth:

Satan is now working with all his insinuating, deceiving power to lead men away from the work of the third angel's message, which is to be proclaimed with mighty power.... He will work with masterly power to bring in fanaticism on the one hand and cold formalism on the other, that he may gather in a harvest of souls. Now is our time to watch unceasingly. Watch, bar the way against the least step of advance that Satan may make among us. ...

Some will not make a right use of the doctrine of justification by faith (Special Testimonies, Series A, No. 1, pp. 63, 64; 1890).

Unless divine power is brought into the experience of the people of God, false theories and erroneous ideas will take minds captive (RH September 3, 1889).

A. G. Daniells recognized in 1926 that the warning was justified, that this prophecy *had been fulfilled:*

To a lamentable degree, God's people failed to bring the divine power into their experience, and the result predicted has been seen: ... False theories and erroneous ideas have taken minds captive (COR 89).

Ellen White was concerned. The time of the loud cry is an exciting time, but also a time of peril. In her words, the post-1888 crisis marked a new era:

Henceforth we shall have a constant contest.... These words of Holy Writ were presented to me: "Of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them." This will surely be seen among the people of God....

There will be those who ... will mistake light for error, and specious error they will pronounce light, mistaking phantoms for realities, and realities for phantoms.... They will fall into deceptions and delusions that Satan has prepared as concealed nets to entangle the feet of those who think they can walk in their human wisdom without the special grace of Christ.... Men will accept one delusion after another until their senses are perverted (Ms. 16, 1890; Ev 593, 594).

While it is true that the enemy tried to deceive us before 1888, his most assiduous assaults were made afterward. The "alpha" deceptions were effective only because of a previous rejection of light:

> ***At the time of the loud cry of the third angel those who have been in any measure blinded by the enemy, who have not fully recovered themselves from the snare of Satan, will be in peril, because it will be difficult to discern the light from heaven, and they will be inclined to accept falsehood. Their erroneous experience will color their thoughts, their decisions, their propositions, their counsels. The evidences that God has given will be no evidence to those who have blinded their eyes by choosing darkness rather than light. After rejecting the light, they will originate theories which they will call "light," but which the Lord calls sparks of their own kindling, by which they will direct their steps.***
>
> ***By many the words which the Lord sent will be rejected, and the words that man may speak will be received as light and truth. Jesus says, "I am come in My Father's name, and ye receive Me not: if another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive." Human wisdom will lead away from self-denial, from consecration, and will devise many things that tend to make of no effect God's messages. We cannot with any safety rely on men who are not in close connection with God. They will accept the opinions of men, but cannot discern the voice of the True Shepherd, and their influence will lead many astray (RH, December 13, 1892).***

After the 1893 session, Ellen White saw before us impending evils of deception that were unprecedented: "Discernment seems to have departed, and [many] have no power to discriminate between the light which God sends them and the darkness that comes from the enemy of their souls" (RH August 7, 1894).

The Danger of Impatience

Some in the 1888 era wanted to advance with Christ into the larger spiritual joy of finishing the gospel commission. But the general body (of leaders especially) were not ready. Contrary to Calvinist predeterminism, the Lord had to alter His purpose and remain with His people. If they would not keep step with Him, He must at least keep step with them.

This was an irksome trial to the few who were of more ardent temperament than the most. They had to be urged "not to rush on before the Master, but to follow where He leads the way" (TM 228; 1894).[1] Until her death, Ellen White stayed with the church even though it had not followed the Lord's leading, just as Moses stayed with Israel after Kadesh-Barnea.

---

[1] It seems a strange quirk of fate that the foremost teacher of "alpha" heresy was Dr. J. H. Kellogg, who was truly converted at the Minneapolis conference according to Ellen White (GCB 1903, p. 86). W. W. Prescott, who for a time taught some aspects of the message, also taught pantheism in the early stages of the crisis. Even Waggoner erred in some of his expressions, giving his opponents occasion to accuse him of being a pantheist, although Ellen White did not fault him on that point. Some today mistakenly conclude that the evil of pantheism is implicit in the 1888 message.

She gave good counsel and a good example even for today. Human critics are not as patient as the Lord is. The long delay is an experiment, not for the Lord's sake, but for the sake of the church. Why does God permit apostasy to come within His church? Israel's history casts an alpenglow on ours:

> ***Even in the church God has allowed men to test their own wisdom in this matter.... When unfaithful teachers came among the people, weakness followed, and the faith of God's people seemed to wane; but God arose and purged His floor, and the tried and true were lifted up.***
>
> ***There are times when apostasy comes into the ranks, when piety is left out of the heart by those who should have kept step with their divine Leader.... But God sends the Comforter as a reprover of sin, that His people may be warned of their apostasy and rebuked for their backsliding (RH Dec. 15, 1891).***

The end of the detour is good news. It will bring the church to a true sense of her condition and a genuine repentance, an experience which will be the greatest of its kind in all ages of history:

> ***In the balances of the sanctuary, the Seventh-day Adventist church is to be weighed. ... If the blessings conferred have not qualified her to do the work entrusted to her, on her will be pronounced the sentence, "Found wanting." ...***
>
> ***Unless the church, which is now being leavened with her own backsliding, shall repent and be converted, she will eat of the fruit of her own doing, until she shall abhor herself. When she resists the evil and chooses the good, when she seeks God with all humility, ... she will be healed. She will appear in her God-given simplicity and purity, separate from earthly entanglements, showing that the truth has made her free indeed. Then her members will indeed be the chosen of God, His representatives.***
>
> ***When this reformation begins, the spirit of prayer will actuate every believer, and will banish from the church the spirit of discord and strife. ... All will be in harmony with the mind of Christ. (8T 250, 251; emphasis added.)***

Off-shoot enthusiasts quote excerpts from this passage in an effort to prove that the church has been rejected by the Lord. In proper context, Ellen White is here predicting an experience of denominational repentance.

"The Whole Church" Versus "the Whole Church"

Absolute accuracy is essential in expressing vital truth, for the track of error lies close to it. This was especially true of the message that was the beginning of the latter rain and the loud cry. The 1888 concepts emphasize how near to us the Saviour has come in His incarnation and in His ministry through the Holy Spirit. Determined and persistent opposition unsettled the messengers, creating an alienation of fellowship. Unnecessarily put on the defensive and deprived of wholesome brotherly correction, Waggoner strayed away from the fine line dividing precious truth from error.

Some inspired statements apparently say "the whole church" will never repent and cooperate with Christ. Off-shoot promoters use these. But other statements say the opposite. Does Ellen White contradict herself?

The context resolves the apparent contradiction. *Before* the "shaking" takes place, "the whole church" will not be revived; *after* the shaking "the whole church" will come into line. Let us look at both sets of statements:

> ***Are we hoping to see the whole church revived? That time will never come. There are persons in the church who are not converted, and who will not unite in earnest, prevailing prayer. We must enter upon the work individually (ISM 122;1887).***

Shortly after she said this, the 1888 message brought a new vision and hope. Now she speaks more positively. Ellen White was encouraged by the new message:

> ***When the latter rain is poured out, the church will be clothed with power for its work; but the church as a whole will never receive this until its members shall put away from them envy, evil surmisings, and evil speaking (RH October 6, 1896; emphasis added).***
>
> ***When the church awakes, ... the members will have travail of soul for those who know not God.... God will work through a consecrated, self-denying church, and He will reveal his Spirit in a visible and glorious manner....***
>
> ***When God's people receive this Spirit, power will go forth from them. (ISM 116, 117; 1898; emphasis added).***
>
> ***When the reproach of indolence and slothfulness shall have been wiped away from the church, the Spirit of the Lord will be graciously manifested.... The earth will be lighted with the glory of the Lord.***
>
> ***Heavenly angels have long been waiting for human agents—the members of the church—to cooperate with them in the great work to be done (9T 46, 47; emphasis added).***
>
> ***In visions of the night representations passed before me of a great reformatory movement among God's people. ... A spirit of genuine conversion was manifest.... The world seemed to be lightened with the heavenly influence....***
>
> ***Yet some refused to be converted ... These covetous ones became separated from the company of believers (9T 126, emphasis added).***
>
> ***The Holy Spirit is to animate and pervade the whole church, purifying and cementing hearts....***
>
> ***It is the purpose of God to glorify Himself in His people before the world (9T 20, 21).***

Speaking of the time of repentance and reformation when the latter rain is received, the Lord's servant predicts:

> ***The fear of God, the sense of His goodness, His holiness, will circulate through every institution. An atmosphere of love and peace will pervade every***

department. Every word spoken, every work performed, will have an influence that corresponds to the influence of heaven.... Then the work will move forward with solidity and double strength.... The earth will be lightened with the glory of God, and it will be ours to witness the soon coming, in power and glory, of our Lord and Saviour (MM 184, 185; 1902).

An understanding of our own history will be necessary for attaining that goal. "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" (LS 196). The honest in heart will see it, and be glad:

We must keep close to our great Leader, or we shall become bewildered, and lose sight of the Providence which presides over the church and the world, and over each individual. There will be profound mysteries in the divine dealings. We may lose the footsteps of God and follow our own bewilderment and say, "Thy judgments are not known;" but if the heart is loyal to God everything will be made plain.

There is a day about to burst upon us when God's mysteries will be seen, and all His ways vindicated (TM 432, 433).

The Foundation of the Pantheism Heresy

The melting, contrite heart that appreciates the cross of Christ was the focus of the 1888 message. Righteousness was by that kind of faith. But for many the arrogance of the proud human heart resisted this humility. Note how this self-sufficient pride is the soil in which later deception could take root. Without that non-faith pride, Satan's most clever temptations would have been powerless. There was no earthly reason why the church had to be plagued by the "alpha" deceptions, except for this post-1888 pride:

We are amid the perils of the last days, when voices will be heard on every side, saying, "Here is Christ," "Here is the truth;" while the burden of many is to unsettle the foundation of our faith which has led us from the churches and from the world....

The truth for this time is precious, but those whose hearts have not been broken, by falling on the rock Christ Jesus, will not see and understand what is truth. They will accept that which pleases their ideas, and will begin to manufacture another foundation than that is laid. They will flatter their own vanity and esteem, thinking that they are capable of removing the pillars of our faith, and replacing them with pillars they have devised (Elmshaven Leaflets, The Church, No. 4; Ms. 28, 1890).

The opposition at Minneapolis wanted to "stand by the old landmarks." Nothing would have pleased the enemy more than to see this people leave those landmarks.

But he has an army of termites who will take over a job when the dynamite crew have failed. Specious ideas long held, originating with the father of apostasy, could subtly undermine our understanding of truth. These termites cannot affect the pillars of truth, but they can eat their way into our faith and leave us with only an outward shell of the third

angel's message. It was not beyond Satan's intelligence to try such a work after 1888, as the pantheism history demonstrates:

> ***Those who are self-sufficient ... will be found professedly working for God, but in reality giving their service to the prince of darkness. Because their eyes are not anointed with the heavenly eye-salve, their understanding will be blinded, and they will be ignorant of the wonderfully specious devices of the enemy. Their vision will be perverted through their dependence on human wisdom, which is foolishness in the sight of God ("Danger of Adopting Worldly Policy," p. 4; 1890).***

Developments were taking place underground, where those roots of 1888 prejudice had "never been eradicated, and ... still bear their unholy fruit to poison the judgment, pervert the perceptions, and blind the understanding.... When, by thorough confession, you destroy the root of bitterness, you will see light in God's light" (TM 467). But the "thorough confession" never came for most of the brethren. Cutting off the tops and leaving the roots intact was just the situation the enemy wanted:

> ***Worldly policy is taking the place of 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 (Ms. 29, 1890).***

In 1894 came a crescendo of warning, again exposing Satan's astute cleverness:

> ***Satan's angels ... will create that which some will claim to be advanced light, ... new and wonderful things, and yet while in some respects the message is truth, it will be mingled with men's inventions, and will teach for doctrines the commandments of men.... There may be supposable things that appear as good things, and yet they need to be carefully considered with much prayer, for they are specious devices of the enemy to lead souls in a path which lies so close to the path of truth that it will be scarcely distinguishable from the path which leads to holiness and heaven. But the eye of faith may discern that it is diverging from the right path, though almost imperceptibly. At first it may be thought positively right, but after a while it is seen to be widely divergent from the path of safety, from the path which leads to holiness and heaven (TM 229; 1894).***

Even more pointed was the following:

> ***Fanaticism will appear in the very midst of us. Deceptions will come, and of such a character that if it were possible they would mislead the very elect. If***

marked inconsistencies and untruthful utterances were apparent in these manifestations, the words from the lips of the Great Teacher would not be needed....

The reason why I hang out the danger signal is, that through the enlightenment of the Holy Spirit of God I can see that which my brethren do not discern (Letter 68, 1894).

The path of presumption lies close beside the path of faith. ... If there is not careful, earnest, sensible work, solid as a rock in the advancement of every idea and principle, ... souls will be ruined (Letter 6a, 1894).

In the same year, she wrote about the possibility of our schools becoming entangled in the meshes of Satan's allurements. But again she expressed hope:

Our institutions of learning may swing into worldly conformity. Step by step they may advance to the world; but they are prisoners of hope, and God will correct and enlighten them, and bring them back to their upright position of distinction from the world (RH Jan. 9, 1894; FE 290).

The science-Christian synthesis popular in New England as early as 1895 may have swayed some of our educators and sown the particular seed of our pantheism heresy of the early 1900's. For sure, pantheism is not implicit in the third angel's message or in the beginning of the fourth angel's message—it is something foreign that had to be imported:

Association with learned men is esteemed by some more highly than communion with the God of heaven. The statements of learned men are thought of more value than the highest wisdom revealed in the word of God...

The men who parade before the world as wonderful specimens of greatness ... robe man with honor, and talk of the perfection of nature. They paint a very fine picture, but it is an illusion.... Those who present a doctrine contrary to that of the Bible, are led by the great Apostate.... With such a leader—an angel expelled from heaven—the supposedly great men of earth may fabricate bewitching theories with which to infatuate the minds of men (YI Feb. 7, 1895; HE 331, 332).

The Dark Decade of Our History

On the eve of the pantheism crisis, Ellen White sensed that portentious events were looming over us:

The right hand of fellowship is given to the very men who are bringing in false theories and false sentiments, confusing the minds of the people of God, deadening their sensibilities as to what constitutes right principles.... The light given, calling to repentance, has been extinguished in the clouds of unbelief and opposition brought in by human plans and human inventions (B-19 1/2, 1897).

Speaking to the General Conference session in 1899, Mrs. S. M. I. Henry also sensed some danger: "As the sweetest things, when they turn sour, become the most offensive, so to turn against the greatest light and truth is to fall into the greatest darkness, and evil" (GCB, 1899, p. 174).

The same 1899 session beheld first-hand a tragic example of deception. One of our honored leaders on his way from Europe to attend the session in South Lancaster made friends on shipboard with a man who claimed to be a wealthy ship captain. A cunning entrepreneur, he professed to accept "the third angel's message." Our elder sincerely invited him to attend the forthcoming session at South Lancaster. "Captain Norman" proceeded to make a great hit with the delegates and local Adventists, including a young lady to whom he proposed marriage and who accepted.

An earnest appeal was made in the session for our people to pledge donations for the work of God. The record in the 1899 *Bulletin* lists $100 as the highest donation anyone had been able to pledge, with most pledges much lower, until "Captain Norman" "pledged" $5000—in those days an astronomical sum. Quickly the pledges stopped coming. Why should our poor people sacrifice so when our wonderful new convert promised *fifty times* more than the best that the most able of our people had been able to pledge? How pleased the Lord must be with His people to bless them so wonderfully with a wealthy new convert like Captain Norman!

The man turned out to be an agent of the devil, said Ellen White.[2] (He disappeared with his fiancée's life savings). But those who were thus deceived by an agent of the devil were also to be confused soon after by what Ellen White termed *"doctrines* of devils" in the "alpha" history.

The last decade of the nineteenth century was a time of darkness and confusion at the headquarters of our work. There was much outward progress which masked a spiritual destitution. Mervyn Maxwell describes the stark contrast between the 1888 message and the spiritual state of the church:

> ***Leadership, laity, institutions, conferences, mission fields, and the church as a whole, were desperately in need of reformation.... [Ellen White said] there has been an "astonishing backsliding" with God's people. The church is "frigid," its first love frozen up. Leaders in Battle Creek have turned their backs to the Lord; many church members also have rejected His lordship and chosen Baal's instead. Conference presidents are behaving like medieval bishops. ... A "strange blindness" has come upon the General Conference president so that even he is acting contrary to the light.... "All heaven is indignant" (Tell It to the World, pp. 246, 247).***

---

[2] This incident was related to us by Elder S. A. Wellman in the winter of 1949-50. It can be confirmed by "Captain Norman's" entry in the 1899 *Bulletin.* The lady who accepted his proposal lost her life savings. Fifty years after "Captain Norman" a similar incident occurred at Takoma Park headquarters when "Dr. Legge," a cunning criminal, deceived some General Conference leaders with his pretended conversion, who likewise interpreted the "conversion" as the marvelous blessing of the Lord.

What was the real source of the spiritual difficulty? They had rejected the beginning of the latter rain and the loud cry. They had turned down the grandest eschatological opportunity any people had ever been offered.

CHAPTER TWELVE

THE PANTHEISM APOSTASY

Instead of refreshing showers of the latter rain preparing a people for the return of Christ, the turn of the century ushered in one of the gravest near-tragedies the church has met. Only the personal intervention of the humble messenger of the Lord saved the good ship from foundering as did the *Titanic* a few years later.

The "iceberg" was the subtle pantheism heresy promoted by some of the most highly respected leaders of Adventism who were as deaf to warnings of impending danger as was the captain of the ill-fated Cunard liner.

When it seemed to Ellen White that no one would do anything to resolve the crisis brought by Dr. Kellogg's heretical teachings, she was given an inspired dream:

> ***A vessel was upon the waters, in a heavy fog. Suddenly the lookout cried, "Iceberg just ahead!" There, towering high above the ship, was a gigantic iceberg. An authoritative voice cried out, "Meet it!" There was not a moment's hesitation. It was a time for instant action. The engineer put on full steam, and the man at the wheel steered the ship straight into the iceberg. With a crash she struck the ice. There was a fearful shock, and the iceberg broke into many pieces, falling with a noise like thunder to the deck. The passengers were violently shaken by the force of the collision, but no lives were lost. The vessel was injured, but not beyond repair. She rebounded from the contact, trembling from stem to stem, like a living creature. Then she moved forward on her way (Special Testimonies, Series B, No. 2, pp. 55, 56).***

The ship was the Seventh-day Adventist church. The authoritative "voice" was the testimony of Jesus. The ship *was* injured, but not beyond repair. In the aftermath of the collision three precious workers in the cause of God who were specially beloved of Ellen White made their exit—Jones, Waggoner, and Dr. Kellogg. Had the iceberg been seen sooner and the vessel steered around it, the church could have avoided this loss.

Several factors of this story deserve special attention:

(1) Many of our ministers and physicians could not discern the nature of the pantheistic crisis when it burst upon them. They were in a fog. Pantheistic sentiments were the "in" thing, the chic symbol of progressive theology. There was a bewitching beauty about them. The heady ideas enjoyed wide promotion, virtually without protest. "That those whom we have thought sound in the faith should have failed to discern the specious, deadly influence of this science of evil, should alarm us as nothing else has alarmed us" (*ibid*., Series B, No. 7, p. 37).

(2) Ellen White herself might not have recognized the subtle error without unusual discernment. Nevertheless, she hoped that her brethren and sisters would also be in close touch with the Holy Spirit so as to be able to discern it:

This is a time when Satan's deceptive power is exercised, not only upon the minds of those who are young and inexperienced, but upon the minds of men and women of mature years and of broad experience. Men in positions of responsibility are in danger of changing leaders (ibid., Series B, No. 2, p. 48; 1904).

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 [Kellogg] to present doctrines that deny the past experience of the people of God? The time has come to take decided action" (ibid., p. 54).

Actually, to be fair, history places more blame on the blindness of responsible watchmen on the walls of Zion who failed to discern the danger, than upon the misguided medical doctor who taught the heresy.[1] We are forward in condemning him and we rejoice in the deliverance wrought by the gift of prophecy. But the lesson is disturbing: the repeated warnings given since 1888 had failed to arouse most of our people.

Thus the pantheism crisis reveals the entrenched nature of the post-Minneapolis unbelief in the readiness with which many fell for delusions about a decade later. Those who maintain there was repentance for the 1888 blindness find it difficult to explain the subsequent pantheism blindness.

(3) Unfortunately, the pantheism test could not be the final one. The repeated warnings concerning the 1888 reception should have enabled our brethren on their own to steer the good ship safely through the perilous pantheism waters. But a personal, emergency intervention of Ellen White became necessary, or the ship would have foundered.

Satan must therefore be allowed to try us again, this time when the living agent is no longer present. It must be a supreme test as to whether we have come to maturity or whether as children we still need the personal guidance of a governess. Thus we find that the pantheism crisis was only an "alpha, " and an "omega" trial must follow. It may be closer now than we think:

---

[1] Ellen White wanted to help Kellogg and believed it possible to do so. He was "the Lord's physician," and had been soundly converted at the Minneapolis meeting, she said (GCB, 1903, p. 86). Kellogg said: "I would have been glad to have had some good friendly criticism given in a way that I could understand it before the book [*The Living Temple*] was out" (Letter to W. C. White, Dec. 24, 1903). Ministerial opposition both to the 1888 message and to the health message had discouraged him (cf. EGW Letter K-18, 1892; K-86a, 1893). Kellogg said of his youth: "When I saw the health principles, they looked so beautiful and consistent to me that I at once accepted them. Then I had such a struggle in contending for these principles that I did not love any one who did not love the principles. Some of the worst conflicts the health work has received have been from the ministers at our General Conferences. It was a great trial to our helpers at the sanitarium to have the ministers of the General Conference come to our tables, and ask the helpers, who had not tasted meat for a long time, to bring them in some stewed chicken or beefsteak. We got so that we dreaded to have a General Conference come there. … Finally I got so I dreaded to see the ministers. I was suspicious of them; for I did not know whether I could trust them or not. … I feel now that I can trust you, and have full confidence in you" (GCB 1903, p. 83). He later lost much of that confidence. The twin evils of continued ministerial indifference both to health reform and the 1888 message had much to do with Kellogg losing his way. The spiritual ferment in Battle Creek caused by heart opposition to the message could not provide nurture for Kellogg's soul.

Our people need to understand the reasons of our faith and our past experiences. How sad it is that so many of them apparently place unlimited confidence in men who present theories tending to uproot our past experiences and to remove the old landmarks! Those who can so easily be led by a false spirit show that they have been following the wrong captain for some time, so long that they do not discern that they are departing from the faith, or that they are not building upon the true foundation. ...

Some of the sentiments now expressed are the alpha of some of the most fanatical ideas that could be presented. Teachings similar to those we had to meet soon after 1844 are being taught by some who occupy important positions in the work of God (Southern Watchman, April 5, 1904).

"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 (Special Testimonies, Series B, No. 2, p. 53).

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. The omega will be of a most startling nature (1SM 197; 1904).

The omega will follow, and will be received by those who are not willing to heed the warning God has given (ibid., p. 200; Special Testimonies, Series B, No. 2, p. 50; 1904).

It is interesting that we do not find Ellen White expressing any warnings against *The Glad Tidings* by E. J. Waggoner. On April 11, 1901, he expressly denied that his ideas were pantheistic (GCB 1901, p. 223). Finehoned theology may uphold him in that claim. His sermons at the 1901 session were earnest and powerful. It was after this that Ellen White recommended that he be invited to teach at Berrien Springs, for his own as well as the good of the students. He needed closer fellowship with capable brethren than he had known when virtually alone in Britain.

In the January 29, 1982 issue of *The Criterion* (LLU), Dr. Jack Provonsha says of Kellogg, whose pantheism was far more pronounced than Waggoner's: "In terms of the technical meaning of pantheism, [Kellogg] was not a pantheist." But Kellogg was wrong in his concept of the nature of God. Ellen White apparently sympathized with Waggoner's gospel motivation, and for that reason may have refrained from criticizing him. She discerned that Kellogg's direction was to destroy the church's spiritual foundation.

This crisis was permitted as a test and trial to our faith and an object lesson to a future generation:

God has permitted the presentation of the combination of good and evil in "Living Temple" to be made to reveal the danger threatening us. The working that has been so ingeniously carried on He has permitted in order that certain developments might be made, and that it might be seen what a man can do. ... God has permitted the present crisis to open the eyes of those who desire to know the truth. He would have His people understand to what lengths the sophistry and devising of the enemy would lead (ibid., No. 7, p. 36).

Thus the "Living Temple" crisis could not mark the end of Satan's efforts to mislead, captivate, confuse, and bewilder the Advent people. The danger from subtle, inward apostasy in our midst is still present, more so than ever before: "One thing is soon to be realized—the great apostasy, which is developing and increasing and waxing stronger and will continue to do so until the Lord shall descend from heaven with a shout" (*ibid*., pp. 56, 57).

(4) The popular presentations of post-1888 history as a grand victory cancel the object lesson inherent in the Kellogg apostasy. That which God allowed to "reveal the danger threatening us" that we might understand "to what lengths the sophistry and devising of the enemy would lead" is portrayed as a victory for the wisdom of men and evidence of God's indulgent, approving care. The point of the experience is buried by saying that the "omega" was an event past and gone long ago:

> ***There were two phases to the struggle—first, the pantheistic errors, second, the question of ownership and control. The Spirit of Prophecy called them the Alpha and Omega of the issues. Pantheism, the "doctrines of devils," is called the Alpha, and Omega was said to be events [sic] "of a most startling nature."***
>
> ***Some have claimed that the term Omega refers to some great future difficulty or apostasy and have at times made a mistaken application of it to this or that branch of denominational work. ... In past years the understanding of those terms was that Alpha was the errors mentioned above and Omega the breakaway and rebellion that robbed our church of its oldest health institution. That was indeed a startling thing that few expected. In the long run, however, only a few of our members left us (L. H. Christian, The Fruitage of Spiritual Gifts, p. 292).***

If it is true that the loss of the Battle Creek Sanitarium was the *omega*, we may rest assured that the greatest trials and dangers to the Advent movement took place eighty years ago. With the alphabet of Satan's gamut of specious temptations already exhausted in the dim past, we have nothing to prepare for in the future.[2]

Where Lies the Truth About the "Omega"?

In a recent *Spectrum*, Vol. 12, No. 2, Dr. Robert Johnston revives Christian's idea, citing D. E. Robinson as support. However he gives no Ellen White evidence for this view She never at any time in the near decade afterward intimated that the loss of the Battle Creek institution was the *omega*. Never does she say that it is "events." Johnston weakens his case by conceding that *alpha* and *omega* are "parts of a simple and direct continuum." If so, the

[2] Ever since the 1920's attempts have been made to label this or that new or false doctrine the "omega." Some in our day have seen it in the Reformationist "new theology" movement. Each generation has had to face a more sophisticated delusion. No one can say with certainty whether we have as yet seen the end, the Z, of Satan's alphabet of deceptions. However, we may be in the X or the Y stage.

latter must be of the same nature as the former—not "events" but "doctrines of devils" cleverly masquerading as supposed truth.

The idea of the *omega* being an "event" of the past seems contrary to Ellen White's declarations:

(1) She said "many will depart from the faith" in that experience. But Christian says "only a few of our members left us" when we lost the Battle Creek Sanitarium.

(2) She said that the *omega* would be a "danger, " the end of an alphabet of deadly heresies and doctrines of devils. Being of the same alphabet, it must therefore be heresies and evil doctrines, only more acute, more subtle, and more specious as omega ultimately follows alpha. How could the physical loss of an institution fulfill the prophecy?

(3) When the *omega* should come, she said, "I trembled for our people." But the large Sanitarium was rebuilt at the express disapproval of Ellen White; why would she "tremble for our people" at the prospect of losing that which had become only a snare to them and should never have been rebuilt on such a large scale?

(4) The alphabet symbolism requires a development of apostasy and confusion within the church. The *alpha* is represented as follows in her writings; the omega must necessarily be of the same nature:

> ***Apostasy, wrong principles, brilliant sparkling ideas, theories and sophistries that undermine the foundation principles of the faith, perversion of truth, fanciful and spiritualistic interpretations of the Scriptures, deceivableness of unrighteousness, seeds of discord, of unbelief, of infidelity ... sown broadcast, insidious fallacies, sentiments of the enemy, falsehood and pleasing fables, infidelity and skepticism, a multitude of deceptions, a yoke of human manufacture, cunningly devised fables, a lie (these are verbatim expressions taken from Special Testimonies, Series B., Nos. 2 and 7, concerning the alpha).***

The great controversy between Christ and Satan still goes on. We have now come to "the future" that is spoken of here:

> ***In the future, truth will be counterfeited by the precepts of men. Deceptive theories will be presented as safe doctrines. False science is one of the agencies that Satan used in the heavenly courts. ...***
>
> ***Do not present theories or tests that have no foundation in the Bible. ... "It is written" is the test that must be brought home to everyone (RH January 21, 1904; Ev 600, 601).***

By now, our enemy must have acquired consummate skill. It is disturbing to note Dr. Kellogg's sincerity when he said he thought he was teaching the same things Ellen White taught. This is why many of our brethren were caught unawares:

> ***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. ...***

Those in favor of giving [The Living Temple] a wide circulation declared: "It contains the very sentiments that Sister White has been teaching." This assertion struck right to my heart. I felt heartbroken. ...

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 (Special Testimonies, Series B, No. 2, pp. 7, 52, 53; cf. Ellen White's statements that appear to come close to pantheism in 8T 255-261. There is no pantheism there, but an undiscerning reader might think it is there).

Whenever the *omega* does appear, it will very likely claim the support of the Spirit of Prophecy, and "many" undiscerning minds will agree. And it is also possible that some prominent, influential leaders will foster the deception. True Christlikeness of character will lead those in union with Christ to protest. When self is crucified with Christ a holy boldness is possible:

When men standing in the position of leaders and teachers work under the power of spiritualistic ideas and sophistries, shall we keep silent, for fear of injuring their influence, while souls are being beguiled? ...

Will the men in our institutions keep silent, allowing insidious fallacies to be promulgated, to the ruin of souls? (ibid., pp. 9, 13, 14).

Ellen White at last regarded the *omega* trials as an experience to come after her death:

I am charged to tell our people that some do not realize that the devil has device after device and he carries these 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, but I desire to warn all against the devices of the devil. ... They should watch every conceivable sin that Satan will try to immortalize (Letter, Elmshaven, February 24, 1915).

Conclusion

Genuine truth is always good news. Ellen White would pray, according to those who sometimes heard her, "Lord, show me the worst of my case." It's also a healthy prayer for us to pray, "Lord, show us the truth of our history, the truth of our present spiritual state." The truth of our past history gives incalculable hope and confidence for the future, if we will but recognize it for what it is.

The remnant church, enfeebled and defective as she is, is still the supreme object of the Lord's regard. Recognizing our sinfulness, our hope is in God's mercy and unchanging love. The long detour of wandering which we brought upon ourselves must lead in the fulness of the time to the Christ whom we spurned in our 1888 era. In self-abhorrence and repentance, we shall find Him. There will be no self-vindication in the process.

On the other hand, God's hope lies in our honesty of heart. He is Himself on trial in us, before the universe. He has staked His throne on the honesty of His people. We find this refreshing Christ-centered appeal in the 1893 General Conference *Bulletin*:

> ***"Something great and decisive is to take place, and that right early. If any delay, the character of God and His throne will be compromised."***
>
> ***Is it possible that we are about to risk the honor of God's throne? Brethren, for the Lord's sake, and for His throne's sake, let us get out of the way. (A. T. Jones, quoting Ellen White, p. 73; Ellen White in turn borrowed this thought from The Great Teacher by John Harris, 1836).***

Could any other kind of loud cry than that which would follow our repentance lighten the earth with glory?

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

ELLEN WHITE'S PREDICTIONS OF BAAL WORSHIP

A four-part series in the Adventist Review of June, 1986, deals frankly with a serious problem. Too many youth reared in Seventh-day Adventist homes and schools are leaving the church for a new reason: they are now joining other churches.

The series ("To Catch a Star") deplores the obvious fact that most Adventist youth lack the vision that motivated the "missionary volunteer" youth of previous generations. "Not exciting, not positive, not big enough, and not related to life"—these are "the specific inadequacies" our youth see in today's Adventism.

If the Seventh-day Adventist mission is that of the three angels of Revelation 14, can it possibly be true that it is "not exciting, not positive, not big …, and not related to life"? Not unless we have misunderstood reality! But for some strange reason, it has appeared so to many youth.

The true leader of the Seventh-day Adventist Church is not the General Conference or a hierarchical clergy. It is Christ Himself, the same Christ whom the pioneers in the 1840's saw as commencing His ministry in the Most Holy Apartment of the heavenly sanctuary. Is He not sufficiently exciting, positive, big, and related to life to capture the whole-hearted devotion of today's youth? Or is that vision of our pioneer youth as irretrievably lost to them as John and Charles Wesley's vision is lost to modern Methodist youth?

If the Seventh-day Adventist Church has become as dull as most of our youth think, the reason can not be that its Leader is "dull." According to the prophetic insight of Ellen White, the problem is that a false christ has usurped the place of the true One. She says that Baal-worship has captivated many of us as surely as it deceived God's ancient people in the days of Elijah and Jeremiah. The proportionate number may even be similar.

This does not mean that the church has fallen as has "Babylon" or that it has ceased to be the supreme object of the Lord's loving concern. Dissidents and off-shoots who write off the church as fallen do not understand the Baal-worship reality. The full truth is good news, for repentance, reformation, and reconciliation with Christ become possible when reality is recognized, just as they were in Elijah's day.

Israel in his day was still the Lord's chosen nation, and Judah likewise in Jeremiah's time. According to Bible prophecy, the Seventh-day Adventist Church is still today entrusted with the message of Revelation 14. The truth means simply that genuine repentance and reformation are necessary if this church is to proclaim "the everlasting gospel" to the world in a way that lightens the earth with Lord. And such a spiritual experience is possible.

If this is not true, we must simply squeeze ourselves into another denominational niche beside the "Baptists, Presbyterians, Lutherans, Episcopalians, and Catholics," who with other churches, says the Review, are welcoming increasing numbers of Adventist youth who forsake Adventism. These formerly Adventist youth see "denominational distinctiveness … as of lesser importance than a general belief in a Supreme Being." This mind set would cancel our history and put us back to square one in a world that had never heard of the Seventh-day Adventist message.

However, the prophetic scenario of Revelation does not call for the extinction of that unique people defined in chapter 14, nor for the suppression of their special message.

Rejection of the 1888 Message Leads to Baal-Worship

A few months after Minneapolis Ellen White saw one of the most graphic and chilling of all her visions: "I was impressed that great danger was before us at the heart of the work" (TM 460-471).

It seems that no one else shared her burden of soul, but the Lord encouraged her to believe that He would not forsake His church. "There were laid out before me some things which I could not comprehend; but the assurance was given me that the Lord would not allow His people to be enshrouded in the fogs of worldly skepticism and infidelity, bound up in bundles with the world" (p. 460).

Could she perhaps have sensed how many of our present-day youth would become enshrouded in those fogs, bound up in bundles with the world, satisfied with a mere "belief in a Supreme Being," devoid of a clear concept of the High Priest's work on the cosmic Day of Atonement?

Many of our youth find this vacuous shell of Adventism dull because it has lost the sanctuary vision of the pioneers and the 1888 message of hopeful Good News. Ellen White's Salamanca vision related this emptiness to the 1888 failure. She predicted that in consequence of that unbelief ancient Israel's apostasy would afflict us:

> ***The prejudices and opinions that prevailed at Minneapolis are not dead by any means; the seeds sown there in some hearts are ready to spring into life and bear a like harvest. The tops have been cut down, but the roots have never been eradicated, and they still bear their unholy fruit to poison the judgment, pervert the perceptions, and blind the understanding of those with whom you connect, in regard to the message and the messengers....***
>
> ***Infidelity has been making its inroads into our ranks; for it is the fashion to depart from Christ, and give place to skepticism. With many the cry of the heart has been, "We will not have this man to reign over us." Baal, Baal, is the choice. The religion of many among us will be the religion of apostate Israel, because they love their own way, and forsake the way of the Lord. The true religion, the only religion of the Bible, that teaches forgiveness only through the merits of a crucified and risen Saviour, that advocates righteousness by the faith of the Son of God, has been slighted, spoken against, ridiculed, and rejected. ... What kind of future is before us if we shall fail to come into the unity of the [1888] faith? (TM 467, 468; 1890).***

We can answer her question very simply: the kind of future we have now come to.

The post-1888 experience traumatized Ellen White for she saw almost with horror how powerfully Satan would try to destroy the uniqueness of this people's mission. Several years later she said:

> ***Everything may move forward amid apparent prosperity; but Satan is wide awake, and is studying and counseling with his evil angels another mode of***

attack where he can be successful. … The great controversy will wax stronger and stronger, and will become more and more determined. Mind will be arrayed against mind, plans against plans, principles of heavenly origin against principles of Satan. Truth in its varied phases will be in conflict with error in its ever-varying, increasing forms, and which, if possible, will deceive the very elect ….

Unsanctified ministers are arraying themselves against God. They are praising Christ and the god of this world in the same breath. While professedly they receive Christ, they embrace Barabbas, and by their actions say, "Not this man, but Barabbas" … Let the son of deceit and false witness be entertained by a church that has had great light, great evidence, and that church will discard the message the Lord has sent, and receive the most unreasonable assertions and false suppositions and false theories. … Many will stand in our pulpits with the torch of false prophecy in their hands, kindled from the hellish torch of Satan ….

The conflict is to wax fiercer and fiercer. Satan will take the field and personate Christ. He will misrepresent, misapply, and pervert everything he possibly can, to deceive (TM 407-11; 1897; emphasis added).

What Is Baal-Worship?

Are these predictions of Baal-worship of serious concern to us today, or was the problem only temporary, confined to Battle Creek in the nineteenth century? Our natural reaction to this inspired prediction is to say, "Impossible! Incredible! We may be 'wretched' and all that, but we're not that 'poor' spiritually!" On the other hand, our conscience quietly tells us that something is wrong. Maybe this makes sense after all. Who is Baal?

In the language of ancient Israel, Baal was the simple word for lord or husband:

It is significant that in patriarchal times … the husband is the master, the ba'al, of the wife, who is dependent on him for her whole livelihood, and over whom he has an authority not shared by others (B. G. Sanders, Christianity After Freud, Geoffrey Bles Ltd., London, 1949, p. 88; cf. Hosea 2:16).

Baal, the god of the Canaanites, means "the lord," often the ordinary way of speaking of Israel's true God, the LORD, Yahweh. The Babylonian Adon, Hellenized as Adonis, has the same meaning. It is a cognate word to the Hebrew Adonai or "the Lord." Thus when the prophets of Baal prayed at Mount Carmel, they cried, "O Lord, Lord, hear us," while Elijah preserved a distinct difference in his conception of God (1 Kings 18:26).

It is commonly assumed that there was a vast apparent difference between the true religion of Israel and the contemporary religions of paganism. But scholars say that there were striking similarities—a morning and evening sacrifice conducted daily, a tithe paid to the priests, animals offered without blemish, sacred books and penitential psalms, many concepts and ideas that were copies of the true.

The temples of Babylonia and Assyria had much in common with Solomon's temple. The people of Israel often stumbled over these similarities and were deceived into various forms of apostate worship. It was difficult for Israel to sense that they were worshiping a

false god when the name was the one commonly used for the true God. The language and terminology were similar, but only an inspired prophet and those who believed him could discern how the motifs and concepts were different. Ellen White's prediction raises the frightful possibility that an apostasy as serious has quietly permeated the modern church while we have slept. If true, the situation is frightful, but not hopeless. Repentance was possible in Elijah's day, and it is possible in ours.

The apostasy in Elijah's day is often misunderstood as a departure from truth so obvious and striking as to make the Israelites seem unusually dull and inexcusable. The facts are that Israel's apostasy was gradual and unconscious, requiring about a century to assume the proportions Elijah recognized in his day. He must have had a very keen mind to discern it (cf. 3T 273; PK 109, 133, 137). We must remember that Elijah still lives, having been translated. Would he feel at home among us, recognizing Jezebel and her prophets?

Baal being a false christ, it is obvious that *all worship of self which is disguised as worship of Christ and which evades the principle of the cross is in reality Baal-worship.* The roots go deep, often beneath our consciousness.

The verbal use of the name of Christ and other Christian terminology means nothing so far as identifying truth is concerned. Christ's enemy is to "*impersonate Christ*," that is, assume the appearance of and usurp His identity through exceedingly clever deception. But long before the *impersonation* will come his *misrepresentation*. The non-Adventist Frederick A. Voigt recognized an aspect of this superb deception: "The 'Christian Ethic' is the Anti-Christ of the Western world. It is the most insidious and formidable corruption that ever afflicted that world."

One small example is the cult of self-love. Through a clever manipulation of Scripture, the sinful love of self has been transformed into a virtue. During the last fifteen years it has been strenuously taught to our youth as a supposed Christian duty. The divine command to love our neighbor as we love ourselves is twisted into a command to love self, when in fact the Lord taught that the motivation of our natural-born sinful love of self is now redirected through genuine faith to a Christlike love of our neighbor.

Genuine self-respect is indeed a virtue, but it becomes authentic through an appreciation of Christ's self-emptying love revealed at the cross. True self-esteem is thus rooted in His atonement. But the me-first love of self is antithetical to devotion to Christ and His work. It is understandable that an enemy would promote the cult of selfism as though it were Christ's teaching. What is difficult to understand is why Seventh-day Adventists should promote it.

Undoubtedly it is ignorance or disregard of Ellen White's statements about Baal-worship that has made it possible also for the New Age philosophy to be tolerated in our midst as much as it has been. But fundamental to all of our modern confusion is the mistaking of a false christ for the true in consequence of our 1888 tragedy. The roots go back for nearly a century.

We are all familiar with the description of the final stage of Satan's impersonation when he will counterfeit the second advent:

> ***As the crowning act in the great drama of deception, Satan himself will personate Christ … as a majestic being of dazzling brightness … unsurpassed by anything that mortal eyes have yet beheld. The shout of triumph rings out upon the air: "Christ has come! Christ has come!" The people prostrate***

themselves in adoration before him, while he lifts up his hands and pronounces a blessing upon them. … His voice is soft and subdued, yet full of melody. … This is the strong, almost overmastering delusion (GC 624).

The 1890 Salamanca vision unveils a mystery. In consequence of our 1888 misconception of the true Christ, this false Christ will find a way to worm himself in through *misrepresentation* by false doctrines and concepts long before he takes the final step of physical *impersonation*. This is how Ellen White's words can be fulfilled, "The religion of many among us will be the religion of apostate Israel" —Baal-worship. W*herever self becomes the true object of devotion while we profess to serve Christ, there is Baal-worship*. Wherever ladder-climbing, promotion, prestige, and power are the true motivations of ministry, *there we have the prophets of Baal*.

But this cannot happen where the true message of righteousness by faith is understood and believed. Baal-worship is the fruit of a species of corrupted teachings that encourage a profession of faith in Christ while self is not crucified with Him:

The present age is one of idolatry, as verily as was that in which Elijah lived. No outward shrine may be visible; there may be no image for the eye to rest upon; … Multitudes have a wrong conception of God and His attributes, and are as truly serving a false god as were the worshipers of Baal (PK 177).

In this age antichrist will appear as the true Christ … But the true leader of all this rebellion is Satan clothed as an angel of light. Men will be deceived and will exalt him to the place of God, and deify him (TM 62; 1893).

Christ will be personified, but on one point there will be a marked distinction. Satan will turn the people from the law of God (FE 471, 472; 1897).

Those who are not wholly consecrated to God may be led to do the work of Satan, while yet they flatter themselves that they are in the service of Christ (5T 103).

A counterfeit righteousness by faith is inevitable when faith itself is not defined in New Testament terms. The popular self-centered motivation of fear or hope of reward is not that of the "faith which works by love (agape)." Thus Baal-worship finds a way to intrude through popular but inadequate theories of righteousness by faith.

How Jeremiah Confronted Baal-worship

In Jeremiah's day Judah drifted into Baal-worship as imperceptibly to the priests and people as had Israel in Elijah's day. The Book of Jeremiah is a text-book on confronting Baal-worship.

(1) Because it was an unconscious apostasy, the leaders and people tried to deny its existence:

"How can you say, 'I am not polluted,
I have not gone after the Baals'?
See your way in the valley;
Know what you have done …

Yet you say, 'Because I am innocent. …'
You say, 'I have not sinned' " (Jeremiah 2:23, 35).

"They say to you, 'Why has the LORD pronounced all this great disaster against us? Or what is our iniquity?

Or what is our sin that we have committed against the LORD our God?' then you shall say to them, 'Because your fathers have forsaken Me,' says the LORD, 'they have walked after other gods' " (16:10, 11).

"According to the number of your cities were your gods, O Judah; … you have set up altars to that shameful thing, altars to burn incense to Baal. … Now the LORD gave me knowledge of it, and I know it; for You showed me their doings" (11:13, 18).

(2) This apostate worship was combined with the true worship of the Lord in His temple at Jerusalem:

"Will you steal, murder, commit adultery, swear falsely, burn incense to Baal, and walk after other gods whom you do not know, and then come and stand before Me in this house which is called by My name, and say, 'We are delivered to do all these abominations'? … The children of Judah … have set their abominations in the house which is called by My name, to pollute it" (7:9, 10, 30).

(3) The religious leaders at the headquarters of the nation aided and propagated this apostasy:

"'Both prophet and priest are profane;
Yes, in My house I have found their wickedness,' says the LORD ….

The prophets of Samaria. prophesied by Baal
And caused My people Israel to err. …

'From the prophets of Jerusalem
Profaneness has gone out into all the land.' …

Prophets … try to make My people forget My name by their dreams which everyone tells his neighbor, as their fathers forgot My name for Baal" (23:11, 13, 15, 26, 27).

Thank God He has promised to "send … Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord" (Mat. 4:5). We desperately need him! (Ellen White intimates that "Elijah" is the message that began in 1888; see RH February 18, 1890). At the same time we must understand how the enemy longs to counterfeit even Elijah's coming, and will encourage any self-appointed "reformer" who is lifted up in his own vanity to rush in where angels fear to tread. "The word of the Lord came to Elijah; he did not seek to be the Lord's messenger" (5T 299).

Has Babylon Continued to Fall?

Without understanding the 1888 message and its history in relation to the heavenly Day of Atonement, our youth find it difficult to see how the Seventh-day Adventist Church fits into God's plan for the world today. The temptation is almost irresistible to see Adventism as just another religious option, a lifestyle not necessarily more valid than any other respectable religious group who recognize a "Supreme Being."

There are countless good, sincere people and ministers in the popular Sunday-keeping churches. They are happy, loving, zealous, as devoted to their families as we are to ours, in some cases more missionary-minded than we have become. Their success in church growth fabulously outstrips ours in many cases, and their moral standards seem to be as high. The Lord's question, "What do ye more than others?" is one they have a right to ask us (Matthew 5:47, KJV). And that is the embarrassing question many of our youth are asking.

The full light of the third angel's message in verity "has been in a great degree kept away from the world" ever since the 1888 era (cf. 1SM 234, 235). As a result, the world has stood in a different relationship to God than His plan anticipated. While "Elijah" has had to go into exile, some "Obadiahs" have had to nourish the sincere prophets of the Lord "in a cave" as it were. The fall of Babylon has been checked. Not yet has it become what it will be when the loud cry is proclaimed. Not yet has that voice of Revelation 18:4 sounded clearly and powerfully, "Come out of her, My people"

Our Lord tells us plainly what the trouble is: He cannot yet work for His remnant church as powerfully as He would like to (cf. 6T 371). The Greek expression our Lord uses means that we make Him so nauseated that He feels like throwing up (Revelation 3:16, 17).[1] Is it too much to say that sincere people who are close to Jesus also feel nauseated, as He does, by the self-centered Baal-worship that finds its way into the modern equivalent of the Lord's temple? The vanity of spirit, the emptiness of sermons, the praise and flattery of men and women, the screaming and shouting into the microphones, the joking and jesting, the pathetic egocentric legalism—how does Christ feel? And how do those whom He describes in Revelation 18:4 as "My people" feel?

It is terrible to think that Baal-worship has infiltrated modern Israel as it did ancient Israel, but the Lord's servant insists it is true. Human nature being the same in all ages, our tendency has been the same as that of the Lord's ancient people—to assimilate the thinking of the people around us. The rejection of the 1888 message set the pattern for nearly a century of such assimilation, beginning with the exposure of counterfeit ideas at the 1893 session that purported to be the same as genuine righteousness by faith.[2]

---

[1] The original language is not a firm promise that the Lord will spue out His church of Laodicea. The Greek is *mello se emesai*, an expression that means literally, "I am about to vomit you out." The same word *mello* is used in Revelation 10:4 where the action anticipated does not take place. The Laodicean message declares that we can heal Christ's sickness of nausea by our repentance (verse 19). The word Laodicea is not a dirty word; it means "judging, or vindicating, the people." The problem with Laodicea is her lukewarmness, not her identity as the seventh or last of the churches.

[2] See GCB 1893, pp. 358, 359; Hannah Whitall Smith got her basic ideas for her *Christian's Secret of a Happy Life* from Fenelon, the Roman Catholic mystic at the court of Louis XIV who spent his life energies seeking to convert Protestants to Rome. His "righteousness by faith" is a close counterfeit, as was that of the Roman Catholic TV evangelist, Fulton Sheen, and modern Catholic TV evangelists. The resemblance to the genuine is often very subtle.

That was only the beginning. We have turned again and again to the popular churches and their leadership for ideas and inspiration which we have assumed was the same message, not discerning the fundamental distinctions. Already in the 1890's there were tendencies to confuse Roman Catholic justification by faith for the genuine (GCB 1893, pp. 244, 261, 262, 265, 266).

Just after World War I we borrowed "the victorious life" enthusiasm from *The Sunday School Times*. Froom's *Movement of Destiny* even boasts that the 1888 message was essentially the same as a vast array of Evangelical preachers were teaching (pp. 255-258, 319-321; 1971 ed.).

This is not to say that all such ideas have been bad, but the unique concept of the cleansing of the sanctuary has been absent from them all. This vacuum has invited Baal-worship to rush in.

The 1888 Message and the Day of Atonement

Although the fall of Babylon is not yet complete, the initial stages have taken place. Something essential is decidedly lacking in the doctrines and experience of churches that do not understand the Scripture teaching of the antitypical Day of Atonement. Far removed by several generations from their forefathers of the 1844 era, they cannot be held responsible for truth they do not know unless they have also rejected it. Nevertheless, they are tragically the poorer for not knowing it.

In one of her earliest communications Ellen White describes the beginning of this process of deprivation. She received prophetic insight into the root cause of modern Christianity's spiritual alienation from the "everlasting gospel" of Revelation 14. In her vision she saw the transition from the heavenly High Priest's ministry in the first apartment to that of the second. The knowledge of this change of ministry was rejected by multitudes of Christians. What makes this account important is not the issue of guilt or lack of it for rejecting the 1844 light. The reality is the terrible deception entering in for lack of a vital truth regarding Christ and His present-day work in the final Day of Atonement. This statement has profound implications:

> ***I did not see one ray of light pass from Jesus to the careless multitude after He arose, and they were left in perfect darkness. ... Those who rose up with Jesus would send up their faith to Him in the holiest [apartment], and pray, "My Father, give us Thy Spirit." Then Jesus would breathe upon them the Holy Ghost. In that breath was light, power, and much love, joy, and peace.***
>
> ***I turned to look at the company who were still bowed before the throne [of the first apartment]; they did not know that Jesus had left it. Satan appeared to be by the throne, trying to carry on the work of God. I saw them look up to the throne, and pray, "Father, give us Thy Spirit." Satan would then breathe upon them an unholy influence; in it there was light and much power, but no sweet love, joy, and peace (EW 55, 56).***
>
> ***By rejecting the two former messages, they [the rejectors] have so darkened their understanding that they can see no light in the third angel's message, which shows the way into the most holy place. I saw that as the Jews crucified Jesus, so the nominal churches had crucified these messages, and***

therefore they have no knowledge of the way into the most holy, and they can not be benefitted by the intercession of Jesus there. Like the Jews, who offered their useless sacrifices, they offer up their useless prayers to the apartment which Jesus has left; and Satan, pleased with the deception, assumes a religious character, and leads the minds of these professed Christians to himself, working with his power, his signs and lying wonders. ... He also comes as an angel of light, and spreads his influence over the land by means of false reformations. The churches are elated, and consider that God is working marvelously for them, when it is the work of another spirit (ibid., pp. 260, 261).

Is this prophetic insight valid? If so, it has far-reaching implications. It explains the mystery of the confusion we see in the modern Christian world. Although an apparent spiritual prosperity pervades many of the churches that "have no knowledge of the way into the most holy [place]" and which "can not be benefited by the intercession of Jesus there," the final issues of the mark of the beast will test everyone's devotion to Christ.

Members leave the Adventist church because they say that they find "love" and "warmth" and spiritual "power" in other churches, not discerning the true nature of Christ's love as agape. Thus they are easily deceived by a superficial sentimentality. Is it possible to understand this confusing situation apart from the inspired prophetic insight of the final Day of Atonement?

And can our own spiritual impotence be traced to losing touch with that special, unique High Priest who entered the second apartment ministry at the end of the 2300-year prophecy? His final work is exciting, positive, big, related to life! Have we also lost a practical understanding of His work, so that our mission appears "dull" in consequence? Let us analyze these *Early Writings* statements:

(1) A specific generation of Christians in the 1844 era had rejected the Spirit-endorsed proclamation of the first and second angels' messages, and many Millerites rejected the third angel's message. (The overwhelming majority of Christians and their ministers today understand nothing of this).

(2) God is eminently fair. He cannot hold guilty these modern descendants of the rejecting 1844 generation if they have not comprehended the message sufficiently to reject it intelligently. There is no reason to suppose that many of these people are not sincerely living up to all the light they have and thus are individually accepted by the Lord.

(3) However, the real issue is not mere personal salvation in preparation for death. Since Bible prophecy indicates that the coming of the Lord is near, the true issue is a preparation for His coming and the attendant final trials. And we must not forget the transcendent motivation of concern for the honor and vindication of the Saviour so that the great controversy can be ended in victory for Him.

For this to take place in any community of human hearts and lives, the full truth of righteousness by faith must be clearly understood. And the popular churches cannot understand this truth, however sincere they may be, for they "have no knowledge of the way into the most holy [place], and they can not be benefited by the intercession of Jesus there."

Genuine righteousness by faith is not only a truth but an experience that accompanies it which the heavenly High Priest ministers in His closing work of atonement. Continued centuries of ignorance of this truth cannot resolve the problem. The third angel's message

in verity is vitally needed. *In the absence of that truth, no body of people anywhere can be prepared for the second coming of Christ, regardless of their religious affiliation.*

(4) Ellen White is on target in depicting Satan as a sly counterfeiter. He succeeds only when "he leads the minds of these professed Christians" away from the special, unique work of Christ in the Most Holy Apartment. According to the Early Writings statement, his method is to appear to perpetuate the same ministry of Christ that continued in the first Apartment from His ascension to 1844. His intent is to eclipse a knowledge of the change in that ministry.

The High Priest's ministry must change, because He cannot forever minister His blood in substitution to cover the perpetual sinning of His people. He must accomplish something on the Day of Atonement that was never accomplished previously. He must have a people who overcome "even as" He overcame, a people who "condemn sin in the flesh" through His faith. Satan must zero in on this truth and eclipse it if possible. Thus the counterfeiter leads minds "to himself" by deflecting their interest from the unique work the true High Priest must accomplish.

If Third World entrepreneurs can counterfeit Swiss Omega watches so as to fool sophisticated buyers, is it hard to believe that Satan has by now polished a highly successful imitation of Christ and the true gospel message? It includes "light and much power, but no sweet love [*agape*], joy and peace." He has diligently studied the work of the true Holy Spirit and has invented a superb imitation that will deceive, if possible, the very elect. He has his counterfeit righteousness by faith nearly perfected for deception. Of course, it lacks an understanding of Christ's work in the Most Holy Apartment, that vital ingredient of agape that alone can cleanse human hearts of all fear and self-centered motivation which perpetuates sin.

(5) If Ellen White is correct, multitudes of "sincere," "loving" Christians will succumb to terrific pressure to restore the religious intolerance of the Dark Ages and will enforce the mark of the beast. Various forms of terrorism can easily accomplish this for a nation, a world, and churches given to materialism, sensuality and "spiritual" spiritualism. Ellen White unmasks the horrible specter of a false Christ spreading "his influence over the land by means of false reformations, … the work of another spirit" (*ibid*., p. 261).

(6) There are wheat and tares growing together in "Babylon" as there are within the church that professes to bear the third angel's message. But the stalemate of a near-century must be resolved. The human race is in a process of disintegrating morally and spiritually. We face problems of potential global suicide through drug abuse, drunkenness, infidelity, break-up of homes, violence, polarization of the rich and the poor, terrorism, and the always looming shadow of nuclear disaster.

The great controversy between Christ and Satan will likely appear to resolve itself into a contest to see which can preserve life on this planet. "The beast" will make it appear that he is the world's savior. Thus his mark will at last be urged as the only way to prevent the destruction of the human race. The "false reformations" brought by the counterfeit "high priest" who has pretended to take over the ministry of the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary will be the means to effect this vast deception.

(7) Thus there are truths inherent in the 1888 message of Christ's righteousness that are not comprehended by any segment of Christians who do not understand the two-apartment ministry of the heavenly High Priest. The "gospel" proclaimed by the "little horn" power virtually justifies sin and therefore logically upholds Satan's rebellion. This is

the secret of the lawlessness that pervades the modern world on all levels. All churches everywhere desperately need to have the gospel of the three angels' messages in verity effectively communicated to them.

Why the Third Angel's Message in Verity Is Needed

The third angel's message in verity proclaims a Saviour who "condemned sin in the flesh," offering the only valid rebuttal of Satan's charges against God. It effectively "condemns sin," that is, demonstrates that sin in human nature is unnecessary and is actually doomed to extinction. Ralph Larson explains the close relationship between "the Nature of Christ and the Saving Work of Christ" who cannot heal that which He has not assumed (*The Word Was Made Flesh*, pp. 277-283). The third angel's message thus presents a Saviour who was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin, and who therefore can save to the uttermost those who come to God by Him. The message will prepare a people for the Lord's return.

Those who follow Christ by faith in the change of His High Priestly mission appreciate three distinct and unique truths:

(a) *The perpetuity of the law of God, including the holy sabbath*. The true "fulfillment of the law" is *agape* (Romans 13:10) because it produces heart-obedience through the atonement. This is the unique aspect of righteousness by faith that is ministered only in the Most Holy Apartment ministry .

(b) *The non-immortality of the soul.* Apart from clearly comprehending the truth of the nature of man it becomes impossible to appreciate what happened on the cross of Calvary. Thus true motivation to holy living is weakened, and righteousness by faith is nullified.

(c) *The cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary is the final Day of Atonement ministry*. This ensures the ultimate demonstration of righteousness by faith in the hearts and lives of those who believe the truth.

These three "pillars" of truth support the Seventh-day Adventist Church (CWE pp. 30, 31). They embrace a complete message that can prepare a people for the return of Christ. But apart from understanding the 1888 message, the verity of truth therein necessarily eludes us. As surely as night follows day, the pioneers' confidence in the imminent return of Christ consequently fades away; we lose their vision and their star disappears.

How Baal-Worship Robs Us of Our Distinctive Message

There is no truth that Satan has sought more earnestly to counterfeit than New Testament love. Human hearts everywhere hunger for it; but "because lawlessness will abound, the love [*agape*] of many will grow cold" (Matthew 24:12). It is this genuine love that Ellen White saw is ministered only by Christ in His closing work of atonement.[3] A

[3] There are outstanding books on agape by Evangelical scholars, such as *Agape and Eros* by Anders Nygren, *Testaments of Love* by Leon Morris, and *The Love Affair* by Michael Harper. But there is something lacking in all of them: they do not comprehend how the love that led Christ to His cross is a love that endured the equivalent of the second death, as we find set forth so clearly in *The Desire of Ages* p. 753. Thus these sincere authors of necessity come short of appreciating the true "width and length and depth and height" of that agape "of Christ which passes knowledge." No community of Christians who hold the doctrine of natural immortality of the soul can see it, regardless of their sincerity. In proportion

counterfeit love is ministered by a counterfeit holy spirit, who is the essence of spiritualism. Here is what is happening before our eyes:

> ***I saw the rapidity with which this delusion [spiritualism] was spreading. A train of cars was shown me, going with the speed of lightning. The angel bade me look carefully. I fixed my eyes upon the train. It seemed that the whole world was on board; that there could not be one left. Said the angel, "They are binding in bundles ready to burn." Then he showed me the conductor, who appeared like a stately, fair person, whom all the passengers looked up to and reverenced. I was perplexed, and asked my attending angel who it was. [Why would Ellen White have to ask that question if it is so easy to recognize him?] He said, "It is Satan. He is the conductor in the form of an angel of light" (EW 88).***
>
> ***In this age antichrist will appear as the true Christ (TM 62).***
>
> ***He will assume to personate the angels of light, to personate Jesus Christ (Letter 102, 1894).***

The enemy would have had no power to weaken the Seventh-day Adventist Church unless "we" had somehow opened the door for him to squeeze in. "When the Lord has a genuine channel of light, there are always plenty of counterfeits. Satan will surely enter any door thrown open for him" (Letter 102, 1894).

It was a miracle that a unique people came into existence during the last century holding to those three distinctive "pillars" of truth embodied in the message of the three angels. No way should their work have been delayed or hindered, according to God's plan. But because of the 1888 unbelief, the Lord's messenger in 1889 predicted a terrible falling away from truth and purity:

> ***Unless divine power is brought into the experience of the people of God, false theories and erroneous ideas will take minds captive, Christ and His righteousness will be dropped out of the experience of many, and their faith will be without power or life (RH September 3, 1889).***

In order to appreciate this disclosure, we must note:

(1) Christ and His righteousness would not, could not, be "dropped out of the experience of many" *verbally*. For any of us to repudiate Him in words would arouse a dramatic thrill of horror. "The result predicted" had to take place while those "many" maintained a profession of Christ and His righteousness.

(2) Christ and His righteousness would not be "dropped out of the experience of many" *consciously*. That would be to awaken us to our need, a sense of extreme coldness. It would drive honest-hearted souls to the fire and put an end to lukewarmness. But Satan is pleased to keep us in a state of "balance," so long as it is thermostatic. Words or their lack may

---

as their concept of agape is thus weakened, so is their concept of faith weakened. Inevitably, their idea of righteousness by faith is compromised.

deceive us. "The lips may express a poverty of soul that the heart does not acknowledge" (COL 159).

(3) Christ and His righteousness would therefore be "dropped out of the experience of many" *unconsciously* through the mysterious process of our unknown hearts. There is a natural enmity against God working beneath the surface. "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked; who can know it?" Jeremiah 17:9). Any obsessional neurosis can develop with the causes buried beyond knowledge. Ellen White wrote of the possibility of our changing leaders after 1888 and not knowing it:

> ***For the last twenty years a subtle, unconsecrated influence has been leading men … to neglect their heavenly Companion. Many have turned away from Christ (RH February 18, 1904).***
>
> ***Those who can so easily be led by a false spirit show that they have been following the wrong captain for some time,—so long that they do not discern that they are departing from the faith (Southern Watchman, April 5, 1904).***

Conclusion

A heart-appreciation of Christ's cross always leads to self being "crucified with Him." But "human wisdom will lead away from self-denial, from consecration, and will devise many things to make of no effect God's messages" (RH December 13, 1892).

Multitudes of our own people, especially youth, are confused and bewildered by the dullness and spiritual impotence they see in the Seventh-day Adventist Church today. And the problems raised by fanatics, disloyal dissidents, and off-shoot leaders within the church can also be understood and solved only in the light of this reality.

The Seventh-day Adventist Church is not Babylon, and God has never planned that it become Babylon any more than ancient Israel in the days of Elijah or Jeremiah was to become Babylon. Baal-worship was and is a disease of the body that is foreign to it and makes it sick. But healing is possible through repentance and reformation. The solution to the problem is not the destruction of the church, but its spiritual recovery. Note this encouragement:

> ***God is leading out a people. … He would reprove and correct them. The message to the Laodiceans is applicable to Seventh-day Adventists who have had great light and have not walked in the light.… The message to pronounce the Seventh-day Adventist Church Babylon, and call the people of God out of her, does not come from any heavenly messenger, or any human agent inspired by the Spirit of God ….***
>
> ***God … has a work for His church to do. They are not to be pronounced Babylon, but to be as the salt of the earth, the light of the world … to proclaim a living message in these last days ….***
>
> ***How Satan would exult to have a message go broadcast that the only people whom God has made the repositories of His law are the ones to whom this message [the fall of Babylon] applies ….***
>
> ***Evidence which makes the message to the Laodicean church applicable … will not blot out the church that it will not exist (2 SM 66-69; 1893).***

When pride and self-seeking masquerade as devotion to Christ, there we have Baal-worship. And it has penetrated all levels of the church body. "Those who are more desirous of securing promotion and a good name in the world than of maintaining right principles, will betray sacred trusts" (RH January 31, 1892).

> ***Honesty and policy will not work together in the same mind. In time, either policy will be expelled, and truth and honesty reign supreme, or, if policy is cherished, honesty will be forgotten. They are never in agreement; they have nothing in common. One is the prophet of Baal, the other is the true prophet of God (5T 96).***

O that we might glimpse the face of our true Lord! If we will look in His face, we will not see the perpetual smile of indulgence with His unfaithful people that Baal assumes. He is an idol with a frozen smile. The face of the true Christ registers the pain of acute nausea, a divine sickness of heart with our terrible lukewarmness, our self-love, our professions of a devotion that we do not truly feel. Genuine Christian experience contrasts with the counterfeit as follows:

> ***A true sense of the sacrifice and intercession of the dear Saviour will break the heart that has become hardened in sin; and love, thankfulness, and humility will come into the soul. The surrender of the heart to Jesus subdues the rebel into a penitent ... This is the true religion of the Bible; everything short of this is a deception (4T 625).***
>
> ***A new order of things has come into the ministry. There is a desire to pattern after other churches, and simplicity and humility are almost unknown. ... Some open revival meetings, and by this means call large numbers into the church. But when the excitement is over, where are the converted ones? Repentance and confession of sin are not seen. The sinner is entreated to believe in Christ and accept Him without regard to his past life of sin and rebellion. The heart is not broken. There is no contrition of soul. The supposed converted ones have not fallen upon the Rock, Christ Jesus (Undated MS, 111).***

Where is that Rock, that we may fall upon it and be "broken"? The good news is better than Baal wants us to believe. Falling upon that "Rock" does not destroy self-esteem or in any way harm one's true personality. One's personality experiences a resurrection with Christ when the sinful love of self is crucified with Him. Christ never destroys anyone; but this experience of taking up our cross is the only way the heavenly High Priest can put us together right, both for time and for eternity.

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

FROM 1950 TO 1971

This manuscript in its original form was prepared in 1950 for the attention of the General Conference Committee. It was an appeal to "feed the flock of God" with the nutritive elements of the 1888 message. Since then, the Adventist conscience has wrestled with the conviction that there is widespread spiritual famine. The gospel commission is not yet finished, notwithstanding greater programs, activities, and promotions each passing year.

Only a few days after the 1888 session closed, on November 23 Ellen White spoke at the Potterville, Michigan, state meeting (A. L. White, *The Lonely Years*, p. 418). Her three sermons are recorded in the *Review and Herald*. In her sermon of November 24 she makes reference six times to the Jews, drawing comparisons with us:

> ***What would the Saviour do if he should come to us as he did to the Jews? He would have to do a similar work in clearing away the rubbish of tradition and ceremony. The Jews were greatly disturbed when he did this work.... The blindness of the Pharisees is an illustration of how people who claim great light and knowledge can so misunderstand and misrepresent the work of God. Glorious truths have been buried out of sight, and have been made lusterless and unattractive by error and superstition (RH, June 4, 1889).***

The next week's article, June 11, again five times compared us to the Jews, and referred over twenty times to the contemporary unbelief of the "ministering brethren":

> ***There are many who place themselves in a similar position to that of the Jews in the time of Christ, and they will not hear the word of truth, because their minds are filled with prejudice; but those who refuse heaven's light will be rejected of God just as his ancient people were.... Why should ministers make the truth powerless before the people because they themselves lack spiritual life and devotion, because they are not connected with God? ... You have gone so far away from him, that you can scarcely hear the sound of his voice.***

Again speaking in an 1888 context, she said:

> ***The trials of the children of Israel, and their attitude just before the first coming of Christ, have been presented before me again and again to illustrate the position of the people of God in their experience before the second coming of Christ—how the enemy sought every occasion to blind the minds of God's servants, that they may not be able to discern the precious truth (ibid., February 18, 1890).***
>
> ***Every line I trace about the condition of the people in the time of Christ, about their attitude toward the Light of the world, in [this] I see danger that we***

shall take the same position.... We shall have to meet unbelief in every form in the world, but it is when we meet unbelief in those who should be leaders of [God's] people, that our souls are wounded (ibid., March 4, 1890).

A prophet's deep discernment, unshared by almost all of her contemporaries, perceived how the end result of 1888 was equivalent to a recrucifixion of Christ. The Jews maintain that they never crucified the Messiah, and we find it hard to realize the extent of what we did:

Those who resisted the Spirit of God at Minneapolis were waiting for a chance to travel over the same ground again, because the spirit was the same.... All the universe of heaven witnessed the disgraceful treatment of Jesus Christ, represented by the Holy Spirit. Had Christ been before them, they would have treated Him in a manner similar to that in which the Jews treated Christ (Series A, No. 6, p. 20; January 16, 1896).

Confusion and perplexity arise in a recently published statement, "In 1888, the direction of the Adventist Church took an upward turn at the Minneapolis ministerial presession" (*Ministry*, November 1984). The Lord's messenger, speaking 14 years after 1888, said the opposite: "I have been instructed that the terrible experience at the Minneapolis Conference is one of the saddest chapters in the history of the believers in present truth" (Letter 179, 1902). Her inspired appraisal is: "cruelty to the Holy Spirit," "disgraceful treatment of Jesus Christ," which "sometime... will be seen in its true bearing with all the burden of woe that has resulted from it" (GCB 1893, p. 184). Perhaps that "sometime" is near.

Ellen White's comparison with the Jews is not casual. It penetrates to the very heart of the plan of salvation. The denial of John 3:16 is implicit in our "insubordination" because resisting Christ is involved in it. When this is seen, there will come a repentance commensurate with the transgression. The difficulty is that the transgression has not yet been appreciated for its true nature. We have not yet seen ourselves as Heaven sees us.

There is a new generation on the scene now, and no living church member can testify from experience in attending the 1888 session. Everything we can learn about it now must come from inspired written records.

Since 1950 a concerted effort has been made to publish books that convey the idea that 1888 was a victory for the church. Thus several authoritative books totaling nearly 1500 pages attempt to establish that "we" accepted the 1888 message. Two were endorsed by General Conference presidents; a third was written by a vice-president. Their publication attests the deep interest that 1888 holds for the Seventh-day Adventist conscience.

The Holy Spirit has led through all these years, and truth will emerge triumphant over all confusion. The solution to our problems lies not in criticizing church leadership or weakening church organization; it lies in repentance and reconciliation with Christ within the church organization. We dare not deny or suppress truth; fully disclosed and understood by honest hearts, truth overcomes fanaticism, legalism, and a holier-than-thou spirit of criticism. It can lead only to a humble, Christlike repentance that will bring effective healing.

We turn now to a brief overview of these developments.

1950

1888 Re-examined (204 mimeographed pages) bore no authors' names, had no title page and no date. Its intent was simple-to present evidence from inspired sources (600 Ellen White exhibits) that "we" took the wrong road in 1888, that the cause of God suffered a serious set-back, that the true progress of the cause requires that we accept that message and proclaim it to the world, and that denominational repentance is appropriate in view of our history and in response to Christ's appeal to Laodicea.

The appeal was firmly, officially rejected: "We do not believe that [a denominational repentance] is according to God's plan and purpose." "You will not wish to press your rather critical views nor circulate them any further" (General Conference, Defense Literature Committee letter, December 4, 1951). The General Conference position was that a denominational repentance is unnecessary and inappropriate in view of our large baptisms in the "double our membership" program in the 1950's, and our widespread denominational and institutional prosperity.

The authors would not rebel against General Conference direction. They have always firmly supported the principle of church organization and order. But they could not conscientiously retract their basic convictions which they believed were based upon the inspired testimony of Ellen White. Therefore they appealed the matter to the next higher authority—the Lord Himself in the investigative judgment and to "the disposition of His providence." They went on with their missionary duties in Africa (Letter to General Conference officers, February 5, 1952).

However, a copy of the manuscript somehow found its way outside the headquarters offices. While the authors were working as missionaries in Africa, various lay members and ministers in North America laboriously copied and reduplicated it. Without the concurrence of the authors, it was widely distributed on several continents.

1952

An epochal Bible Conference was held in the Sligo (Maryland) church September 1-13,1952. The studies "represent the best thinking on the part of sincere, honest, earnest, devoted, loyal men," the leaders of the church, according to D. E. Rebok in the Introduction to the two-volume report, *Our Firm Foundation* (Review and Herald, 1953, Vol. One, p. 13).

Near the conclusion of the conference, the General Conference president acknowledged the truth of the 1888 setback, and then made an astounding claim:

> ***To a large degree the church failed to build on the foundation laid at the 1888 General Conference. Much has been lost as a result. We are years behind where we should have been in spiritual growth. Long ere this we should have been in the Promised Land.***
>
> ***But the message of righteousness by faith given in the 1888 Conference has been repeated here. Practically every speaker from the first day onward has laid great stress upon this all-important doctrine, and there was no prearranged plan that he should do so. It was spontaneous on the part of the***

speakers. No doubt they were impelled by the Spirit of God to do so. Truly this one subject has, in this conference, "swallowed up every other."

And this great truth has been given here in this 1952 Bible Conference with far greater power than it was given in the 1888 Conference because those who have spoken here have had the advantage of much added light shining forth from hundreds of pronouncements on this subject in the writings of the Spirit of prophecy which those who spoke back there did not have....

No longer will the question be, "What was the attitude of our workers and people toward the message of righteousness by faith that was given in 1888? What did they do about it?" From now on the great question must be, "What did we do with the light on righteousness by faith as proclaimed in the 1952 Bible Conference?" (W. H. Branson, Vol. Two, pp. 616, 617).

He again emphasized this same claim in his closing remarks: "Brethren, let us stress in all our meetings with our workers the great importance of the message that came to the Minneapolis Conference in 1888—the message that has been repeated here in these meetings by all the speakers at this conference" (pp. 737, 738).

This Bible Conference was held nearly forty years ago. All the speakers were said to be in full harmony on "the doctrine of righteousness by faith," and it was claimed that they preached the message more clearly and more powerfully than did the 1888 messengers in the beginning of the latter rain and the loud cry.

If this is true, it follows logically that the 1952 messages were a "far greater" manifestation of the latter rain and the loud cry of Revelation 18 than was the 1888 message. Further, the 1952 messages were filly accepted without opposition, either officially in the General Conference or in the world field.

If what was tragically lacking in 1888 was so abundantly supplied in 1952, should not the earth have been lightened in that generation with the glory of the loud cry message? A similar acceptance of the 1888 message sixty years earlier would have prepared a people in that generation to finish the gospel commission. Did the blessing come in the 1952 generation?

A careful study of the two-volume report discloses a problem. None of the speakers reproduced the unique motifs or essentials of the 1888 message. Edward Heppenstall's messages on the two covenants were refreshingly in harmony with the 1888 position, and several other speakers said nothing contradictory to it. And there is no question that they were all "sincere, honest, earnest, devoted, loyal men," and each gave thoughtful presentations.

But the problem is that most, if not all, gave evidence that they were sincerely uninformed of the actual content of the 1888 message. No one gave evidence that he had as yet given careful study to the original sources of that "most precious message," which of course were all out of print. No one apparently saw any clear difference between the 1888 message and the popular Protestant doctrine of "righteousness by faith."

It is painfully evident that the 1888 messengers whom Ellen White endorsed were *persona nun grata* at this conference (see for example, Vol. One, p. 256). It was as though some "pre-arranged plan" had forbidden any recognition of them or of the content of their unique message. The essential nutriments being largely absent from the 1952 messages, they could not exert the spiritual power of the 1888 message for revival and reformation.

No doubt much good came from the conference. But the latter rain and the loud cry did not have another "beginning" 35 years ago.

Meanwhile, a widespread spontaneous distribution of *1888 Re-examined* continued. By 1958 relevant inquiries to the General Conference from church members in the field had stirred up another response.

1958

Thus a new reply was prepared by the General Conference and made available to the church in September, 1958. Entitled *A Further Appraisal of the Manuscript* "*1888 Re-examined*," it strongly opposed the document. We will note its conclusion:

> ***It is evident that the authors have revealed considerable amateurishness in both research and use of facts.***[1] ***There is a consistent pattern throughout the manuscript of using quotations out of their true setting.... The thesis of "1888 Re-examined" is a serious reflection upon the literary ethics of its authors.... Having proved themselves guilty of distortion of facts and misapplication of statements from the Spirit of Prophecy, the authors of "1888 Re-examined" have produced a manuscript that is detrimental to the church, derogatory to the leaders of the church, and to uninformed individuals who may happen to read it (pp. 47-49).***

When the authors read *A Further Appraisal*, they were of course deeply concerned. Were they guilty of "using quotations out of their true setting," "distortion of facts," producing a "manuscript that is detrimental to the church"? This called for earnest prayer, for heart-searching, and for further study of the Ellen White sources they had used and a search for others.

Accordingly in September 1958, while they were again on furlough in America, they prepared a 70-page reply, *An Answer to* "*Further Appraisal*," which dealt with each point raised. Unable to do research in the Ellen White Vault, they had gained access to private collections of many hitherto unpublished Ellen White documents in the libraries of retired ministers who had known Ellen White personally. This newly discovered documentation in support of their thesis was included in their *Answer*. *Appraisal* was withdrawn and no longer became available to the field.[2]

---

[1] The original report of the Defense Literature Committee had said rather the opposite: "The Manuscript gives every evidence of earnest, diligent, and painstaking effort."

[2] One example of how *Appraisal* supported the acceptance theory is its use of a single sentence excerpt from Letter 40, 1893: "We stood on the field of battle for nearly three years, but at that time decided changes took place among our people, and through the grace of God we gained decided victories" (*Appraisal*, p. 44). In 1983 the entire letter was released by the Ellen White Truetees so that the context could be seen (Release #966). The one-sentence excerpt occurs in a discussion of the use of cheese, how Dr. Kellogg bought an entire stock of cheese offered for sale at a camp meeting grocery, and how principles of health reform gained acceptance among our people. The context contains nothing relevant to the 1888 message or its reception.

1962

During another four years, church members continued to ask serious questions. *Appraisal* had said in 1958 that "it was thought that the [1951] report of [the Defense Literature Committee] seven years ago had closed the matter" (p. 3). But it would seem that providence was not willing to close off the 1888 interest. The Holy Spirit must keep it alive until repentance comes.

In 1962 a book about 1888 was published by N. F. Pease, *By Faith Alone*. The foreword by the General Conference president stated:

> ***The 1888 General Conference session, and the discussion of justification by faith at that meeting, have been variously commented upon by a number of persons, especially in recent months. It has even been suggested by a few—entirely erroneously—that the Seventh-day Adventist Church has gone astray in failing to grasp this great fundamental Christian teaching. This book sets the record straight (p . vii) .***

Dr. Pease is a very competent and careful scholar, and the General Conference appreciated his work. But there are problems with his book due to a failure to view the entire 1888 era in balance:

(a) The book almost completely fails to recognize the 1888 message for what it was in fact—the "beginning" of the latter rain and loud cry, a message sent to prepare a people for translation.

(b) Repeatedly the 1888 message is referred to as merely "the doctrine of justification by faith" or "the doctrine of righteousness by faith," equated with popular Protestant teaching. It even asserts that the 1888 messengers obtained it from the popular Protestant churches of that day (pp. 338, 139). But they said they obtained it from the Bible alone (cf. GCB 1893, p. 359). We look in vain in the contemporary writings of popular Protestant theologians for the unique elements that constitute the 1888 message.

(c) This raises the question, If the Protestant churches of the 1800's possessed the essence of our 1888 message, how could it be "the third angel's message in verity"? Where is the uniqueness of a Seventh-day Adventist evangel?

(d) The Seventh-day Adventist Church is represented as becoming "more evangelical with the passing years," enjoying a "crescendo of emphasis on justification by faith during the past forty years" (Pease, pp. 227, 239, 240). The question remains—what kind of "justification by faith" is this? Is it popular Protestantism, or is it the 1888 message?

(e) The book raises an anomaly. It is stated that "we" have "preserved for the denomination the spiritual emphasis of the revival movement of that [1890's] decade," and yet, strangely, "the revival of the nineties died away" (pp. 164, 177). Here is a discouraging implication. Logically this view implicitly denies the prophecy of Revelation 18:1-4. When the loud cry message is truly accepted by the leadership of the church, *it can never* "*die away*," but is prophetically destined to "lighten the earth with glory." This is the grandest scene of the world's prophetic future. The fact that the "revival" of the 1890's "died away" is itself the clearest evidence that the loud cry message was not truly accepted by the church leadership. This must be clarified, or we face the terrible prospect that all genuine

revival likewise is doomed to "die away" even if the message is accepted. Can Revelation 18:1-4 never be fulfilled?

Questions from church members continued to come.

1966

Another book about 1888 appeared, by A. V. Olson, General Conference vice-president. His sudden death on April 5, 1963 left his "virtually completed" manuscript in the hands of the White Estate board, who published his 320-page book in 1966 under the title, *Through Crisis to Victory*, *1888-1901*.

Sincere and deeply earnest, the author again intended to combat "misleading conclusions" regarding 1888. The foreword tells the reader that "the thirteen years between Minneapolis, 1888, and the General Conference session of 1901 were ... a period over which Providence could spell out the word *victory*" (p. 7). But again, there are serious problems:

(a) Those thirteen years were not marked by victory but by outstanding unfaithfulness in administration at the church headquarters. There were prophetic demands for reformation and reorganization, and eventual judgments from the Lord in disastrous fires at the Battle Creek Sanitarium and the Review and Herald Publishing Association. This came after the "victory" date of 1901. Ellen White's multitudinous letters from Australia during that period indicate anything but "progressive years" if spirituality and fidelity are important and if the 1888 message and experience are the criterion.

(b) The book tries to establish a legal basis for proving that the 1888 message was not "officially rejected" because "no action whatever was taken by vote of the delegates to accept it or to reject it" (p. 36). While it is true that there is no "official" *record* of a negative vote at Minneapolis, the fact is that a vote was taken and the official *Bulletin* of 1893 speaks of it. Ellen White also confirms it.

Several definite references to a vote of rejection occur thus:

> ***What did the brethren in the fearful position in which they stood, reject at Minneapolis? They rejected the latter rain-the loud cry of the third angel's message (p. 183).***
>
> ***Some of those ... stood so openly against that at that time ["the Minneapolis meeting"], and voted with uplifted hand against it (p. 244).***
>
> ***Whether the creed is drawn up in actual writing, or whether it is somebody's idea that they want to pass off by a vote in a General Conference, it makes no difference.... And there are people here who remember a time-four years ago; and a place—Minneapolis—when three direct efforts were made to get such a thing as that fastened upon the third angel's message, by a vote in a General Conference. What somebody believed—set that up as the landmarks, and then vote to stand by the landmarks, whether you know what the landmarks are or not; and then go ahead and agree to keep the commandments of God, and a lot of other things that you are going to do, and that was to be passed off as justification by faith (p. 265).***

As we have seen, Ellen White herself mentions a vote of rejection, but her reference to it is deleted in the recent publication of Ms. 24, 1888 in Book Three of *Selected Messages* (p. 176). Her Ms. 15, 1888 (Olson, pp. 294-302) is largely concerned with the wrongness of the brethren's trying to ram through such a vote.

In defiance of history, there are at least six modem published denials of a vote being taken: *Testimonies to Ministers*, preface by the White Estate, p. xxiv; *Through Crisis to Victory*, p. 36; *Movement of Destiny*, pp. 233, 370; *The Lonely Years*, pp. 395, 396; *The Faith That Saves*, p. 41.

It is reasonable to ask why, after "three direct efforts" to get a rejection vote recorded, the attempt failed. Why was nothing recorded? The answer is clear from the same 1893 Bulletin. All alone, Ellen White refused to let the vote go into the minutes:

> ***Were we not told at that time that the angel of God said, "Do not take that step; you do not know what is in that"? "I can't take time to tell you what is in that, but the angel has said, Do not do it." The papacy was in it. That was what the Lord was trying to tell us, to get us to understand.... Is there anybody in this house who was there at that time that cannot see now what that was back there? (p. 265).***

Thus the only reason the vote was not recorded is that Ellen White wisely forbade it. Clearly, the delegates intended to pass such a vote of rejection. It would have passed overwhelmingly because she declared at Minneapolis that "the spirit and influence of the ministers generally who have come to this meeting is to discard light" (Letter B21, 1888); "our ministering brethren ... are here only to shut out the Spirit of God from the people" (Ms. 9,1888, Olson, p. 291); and "at this meeting, ... opposition, rather than investigation, is the order of the day" (Ms. 15, 1888, Olson, p. 301). Such a recorded vote would have been virtual denominational suicide. Thank God she saved us from ourselves!

Pease acknowledges the force of the nearly total opposition: "It is probably safe to say that Waggoner and Jones would not have stood a chance without her support" (*The Faith That Saves*, p. 41). Without her direct support for them, the 1888 General Conference session would have officially voted to condemn their message.

(c) Olson minimizes the impact of the 1888 opposition by referring to a mere "twenty-three workers ... involved in it one way or another.... To suggest that there was wholesale collusion and organized opposition is not correct" (p. 84). Again we have a conflict with what the inspired messenger said in many statements. This also contradicts the eyewitness reports of C. C. McReynolds and R. T. Nash (see chapter 15).

(d) The book concludes with a painful, discouraging dilemma. The leadership and the ministry are faithful, the laity are not: "Adventist pastors and evangelists have announced this vital truth from church pulpits and public platforms, with hearts aflame with love for Christ." But "to many church members the message of righteousness by faith has become a dry theory.... They have neglected the light.... They have failed.... Their poor souls are naked and destitute.... They will soon be rejected by their Lord" (pp. 238, 239; emphasis added). The logical end of this thesis is the Roman Catholic concept of a faithful hierarchy and an unfaithful laity.

When "the angel of the church," its leadership, responds to Christ's last-day call, God's "people shall be willing in the day of [His] power" (Psalm 110:3). A faithful ministry and an

unfaithful laity is an indictment not only of God's people today, but of all sacred history, and offers no hope for the future other than an unfaithful people always resisting a faithful hierarchy. This cannot be and will not be.

1969

Soon Norval F. Pease published a sequel to *By Faith Alone*, entitled *The Faith That Saves* (1969). Its principal concern again is 1888. There are more problems:

(a) Again we find an evasion of any recognition of the eschatalogical significance of the 1888 message as the beginning of the loud cry of Revelation 18. Instead, the author represents it as "the common heritage of the Protestant groups," "old light in its proper context," a mere "new emphasis on justification," "the same everlasting gospel by which Christians have been saved in all ages" (pp. 25, 39, 45, 54). There seems no recognition of a unique truth constituting the "third angel's message in verity," no concept of its special relation to the cleansing of the sanctuary.

(b) Again we are told that "the [1888] delegation was divided three ways," implying that opposition was not serious. Rebutting those who say "that the 'denomination' rejected righteousness by faith in 1888,"[3] the author relies on the assumption that no vote recorded means that "no official action was taken on the subject," and that "most of those who failed to see the light in 1888 repented of their blindness and gave enthusiastic support" (p. 41). Evidence for that "enthusiastic support" is lacking.

Again we are reminded of Ellen White's plaintive letter to her nephew on November 5, 1892, well after the principal leaders' confessions had come in, saying that "not one" of the initial rejectors had "come to the light" and discerned the message (Letter B2a, 1892). Pease elsewhere recognizes that at the end of the decade no "Elisha" was preaching the message effectively except Jones, Waggoner, and Ellen White (*By Faith Alone*, p. 164). Where was their supposed support?

(c) Seeking to rebut the present authors' suggestion that the church "republish the writings of Waggoner and Jones so we might have the benefit of their teaching," Pease declares "that there was nothing said by Waggoner and Jones" that Ellen White did not say "better.... Ellen White was able to present this same everlasting gospel with a beauty and clarity that none of her contemporaries were able to equal" (p. 53).

This raises a serious question: Why did the Lord send the 1888 messengers if they could not present the message properly? Would He not have been wiser to appoint Ellen White as the agent of the latter rain and the herald of the loud cry message? Sacred history demonstrates that the Lord always chooses messengers for a reason.

Ellen White never regarded Jones' and Waggoner's message as superfluous; she endorsed it nearly 300 times in language unsurpassed for enthusiasm, and clearly

[3] Who these are is not clear. The authors of *1888 Re-examined* have never declared that "the denomination" rejected the beginning of the latter rain. They have only cited Ellen White evidence that the leadership rejected it, and "in a great degree" kept it away from the church at large so that "the denomination" never had a proper chance to accept it (cf. 1 SM 234, 235).

supported them as especially "appointed," "delegated," "credentialed" by the Lord to do a work that she was not called to do.[4]

The 1888 messengers' books are based on the Bible alone (e.g., *Christ and His Righteousness*, *The Gospel in Creation*, *The Glad Tidings*, *The Consecrated Way to Christian Perfection*, which use no Ellen White statements). Their message was a beautiful demonstration of the power inherent in a pure Scripture message of righteousness by faith. To denigrate it thus implies logically a disregard of Ellen White's endorsements.

(d) Our author concludes with an endorsement of the 1926 Milwaukee General Conference messages as more important that those of 1888. They are strong evidence that the 1888 message had been accepted, he says:

> ***It is my firm conviction that it would be well to give less emphasis to 1888 and more emphasis to 1926. In fact, the General Conference of 1926 was what 1888 might have been, had there been greater unanimity on the meaning of the gospel. Some have suggested that the denomination should go on record in some specific way, acknowledging the mistakes of 1888. No more positive evidence of spiritual growth and maturity could be presented than the sermons of 1926 (p. 59).***

But in fact, this view would logically plunge the church into confusion. Note what it entails: (1) The 1926 messages were greater and more important than those of 1888; yet (2) unlike 1888, the "greater unanimity on the meaning of the gospel" in 1926 meant that there was no opposition as there was in 1888; (3) over 60 years have dragged by since 1926, when Ellen White declares that had the 1888 message been accepted, the gospel commission could have been completed within a few years (GCB 1893, p. 419). (4) This understanding of 1926 would tell us therefore that "greater unanimity" and *acceptance* of the message bring no successful completion of the gospel commission. Could anything be more discouraging?

The fact is that the righteousness by faith taught in the 1926 messages as recorded in the *General Conference Bulletin* of that year is not the essential truths of the 1888 message.

---

[4] Some who say they accept "righteousness by faith" maintain that we do not need the "most precious message" that "the Lord . . . sent . . .through Elders Waggoner and Jones," because we possess Ellen White's writings. But there are problems with this position: (a) The church in 1888 also possessed her writings, and even more than we have today—they enjoyed her personal presence. (b) She says her writings are "the lesser light" to lead us to "the greater light," the Bible. Therefore she says nothing about righteousness by faith that is not better said in the Bible. (c) Further, it would follow logically that we do not need the New Testament, because both Jesus and Paul derived their understandings of righteousness by faith only from the Old Testament; and no one can deny that they understood it. (d) It would also follow that we do not need even the Major or Minor Prophets, because Abraham was "justified by faith" and became "the father of the faithful" when he knew nothing beyond Genesis 1-11.

This of course is absurd. The only logical conclusion we can come to is that *we need all the light that the Lord sees fit to send us*. Ellen White never claimed that she was sent to proclaim the latter rain or loud cry message, but she recognized it in the Jones and Waggoner presentations. It is impossible to accept Ellen White genuinely and not accept her endorsements of the 1888 message as proclaimed by Jones and Waggoner during the time of her endorsements.

The same thing happened as later in 1952. Those messages were inspired by "the victorious life" enthusiasm of the *Sunday School Times* and other prominent Protestant leaders' theological doctrines of the day. This is why no lasting revival and reformation could follow either the 1926 session or the 1952 conference.

We turn now to the most significant developments of an entire century in the growing concern about 1888.

CHAPTER FIFTEEN

FROM 1971 TO 1987 AND BEYOND

Some 700 pages had by now been published in attempts to deny the need of denominational repentance for 1888. Another 700 pages came in 1971, *Movement of Destiny*, by L. E. Froom. According to the author, "no volume in our history has ever had such magnificent pre-publication support" (p. 8). When first published, 1500 copies were sent out as gifts to church leaders around the world. The acclaim accorded it make it obviously the most authoritative word on 1888:

> ***Initiated and commissioned by former General Conference president A. G. Daniells back in 1930, as the search went on it was approved by five General Conference presidents in succession, and many consultants.... It was read critically by some sixty of our ablest scholars-specialists in denominational history and Adventist theology. By experts in the Spirit of prophecy. By key Bible teachers, editors, mass communication men, scientists, physicians (p. 8).***

Thus it is evident that *Movement of Destiny* represents the *summum bonum* pronouncement of the General Conference and responsible church leadership on the issue of 1888. The author assures his readers of his utmost fidelity in response to A. G. Daniells' charge,

> ***with special emphasis upon the developments of "1888" and its sequel. He urged that I set forth the results in a comprehensive portrayal—one that would honor God and exalt truth, ... both complete and forthright, and documented for serious worldwide worker study.... Daniells admonished me to be fair and faithful to fact, comprehensive and impartial in treatment, and to present the full picture in balance ... [and] avoid any superficial type of treatment.... A true and trustworthy picture was imperative. Truth, he insisted, is never honored by shading or shielding.... Plumb the depths, ... record faithfully (p. 17, 18).***

Other "veteran leaders" urged him

> ***to answer certain puzzling questions ... And above all to be faithful to fact and unswerving in fidelity to the full truth, ... to get to the bottom of the fads, to reveal the resultant findings, and to be candid and undeviating in my presentations (p. 22).***

Movement of Destiny represents a vast amount of labor, written by the most prestigious historical scholar in the church. He was blessed by God with many rich talents. His monumental volumes on the history of prophetic interpretation and conditionalism are awesome contributions to the literature of the Adventist movement. However, according to

at least one reviewer, his last book is not "dependable history" (*Seminary Studies*, Andrews University, January 1972, p. 121).

There are serious problems:

(a) It takes the opposite view of the 1888 history from that of Daniells' book, *Christ Our Righteousness*, and yet it was Daniells who commissioned it. The contrast is readily seen in the two following excerpts:

> ***The epochal Minneapolis Session stands out like a mountain peak, towering above all other sessions in uniqueness and importance. It was a distinct turning point.... It introduced a new epoch.... 1888 therefore came to mark the beginning of a new note and new day.... 1888 was not a point of defeat but a turn in the tide for ultimate victory.... The 1888 ... battle [was] hard fought and the victory dearly won (Froom, pp. 187, 191).***
>
> ***The message has never been received, nor proclaimed, nor given free course as it should have been in order to convey to the church the measureless blessings that were wrapped within it.... Back of the opposition is revealed the shrewd plotting of that master mind of evil, the enemy of all righteousness, ... to neutralize the message.... How terrible must be the results of any victory of his in defeating it (Daniells, pp. 47, 53, 54).***

(b) No one has been able to see any of Froom's collected "affidavits" supposedly attesting leadership acceptance of the message, for to date they are still unavailable for study. Our author tells us that they were provided by the "actual participants in the 1888 Minneapolis Conference," "recitals [that] have been held in trust since 1930," "signed declarations, written out in the spring of 1930" (pp. 8, 237, 238).

But in the two chapters featuring these "affirmations" (pp. 237-268), not once is the reader permitted to see even one of them. And three "eyewitness" reports that are in existence are not quoted. They contradict his thesis. Thus we are told on the authority of *invisible* witnesses that the 1888 message was accepted by the church leadership, while three *visible* eyewitnesses say the opposite. (We, will cite them in a moment.)

The "affirmations" were provided by "some twenty-six able and representative men and women who were actual participants, observers, or recorders at the crucial Minneapolis Session of '88" (p. 239). Of the total number provided, only 13 were by persons actually in attendance, so that there could only be 13 "eyewitnesses." Careful count indicates that 64 references are made to these 26 persons and their letters or interviews. One is mentioned 14 times.

But the inscrutable mystery is why the author, after making such impressive claims, does not allow them to speak. With one exception, *not a single sentence is quoted from any of the entire 64 references, eyewitnesses or otherwise*.

Reason demands that testimonies said to prove so much be made visible in support of the claim. Froom states categorically in his italics, "*There was no denomination-wide, or leadership-wide rejection*, these witnesses insisted" (p. 256). And then we are left without a single sentence from any one of them that supports that statement.

There is not a court or jury in the free world that would accept this kind of inference without evidence. And when supposed evidence so obviously contradicts the testimony of

Ellen White, Seventh-day Adventist church members should very earnestly demand that they be permitted to see such evidence.[1]

One of the 26 letters referred to (p. 248) had always existed in the White Estate files. The five- page letter written by C. C. McReynolds (1853-1937) entitled "Experiences While at the General Conference in Minneapolis, Minn. in 1888" is indexed as "D File 189." The letter closes with these two sentences:

> ***I am sorry for anyone at the Conference in Minneapolis in 1888 who does not recognize that there was opposition and rejection of the message that the Lord sent to His people at that time. It is not too late yet to repent and receive a great blessing.***

R. T. Nash's "Eyewitness Report of the 1888 General Conference" is also available. Likewise, it presents evidence in rather straight-forward language:

> ***The writer of this tract, then a young man, was present at that conference meeting [1888], and saw and heard many of the various things that were done and said in opposition to the message then presented.... When Christ was lifted up as the only hope of the church, and of all men, the speakers met a united opposition from nearly all the senior ministers. They tried to put a stop to this***

---

[1] Dr. Froom wrote to the present authors on December 4, 1964, before the publication of his *Movement of Destiny*, demanding a retraction of the positions they had taken in *1888 Re-examined*. We were required to "make a public and published disavowal . . . of certain conclusions advanced by you [that is, that the 1888 leadership rejected the beginning of the latter rain and the loud cry]. . . . Ere long the full, documented story of the 1888 episode will doubtless be put into print. And unless you have modified your presentation, you may find yourself in a most unenviable position. The contrast will be marked." On April 16, 1965 he wrote to us further: "In my view, you had better act first, and without much delay. . . . Your contention . . . stands out like a sore thumb, conspicuously alone, and in conflict with the virtually unanimous verdict of our scholars. . . . You have a lot of temerity to contradict the findings of this whole group of men. . . . I . . . feel . . . no obligation to share any further evidence with you. . . . Your unhappy plight makes me think of Elijah's situation. . . . He sharply disagreed with the historians and the experts in Israel about the situation. He was right, he felt, and they were all wrong. He only was loyally left, and was maligned and persecuted because of his claims and conclusions. . . . Elijah thus actually defamed and vilified Israel, and gave a misleading and blackening report. He bore an untrue witness, casting aspersion upon Israel and its leadership [Ahab and Jezebel?]. . . . You should cease, retreat, and retract." He claimed that he spoke with the authority of the General Conference behind him, as indeed their unprecedented endorsement of his book soon demonstrated.

One of us replied on May 10, 1965: "To retract on the basis of fear without inspired evidence would hardly . . . be the right thing . . . to do. . . . The Lord has never asked a man to do such a thing. In fact, a man can very well ruin his soul by yielding to a pressure of fear and anxiety, and cravenly retracting, without evidence, what he has held in good conscience." On November 10, 1965, the same author wrote to Dr. Froom: "I have repeated my willingness to retract if you will let me see clear evidence from the Spirit of Prophecy. You have categorically refused to let me see such evidence . . . . It seems strange to me and to others that you should demand I 'retract' while at the same time you deny me evidence which you say you have in unpublished Ellen G. White material that would require of an honest conscience such a retraction. . . . My prayer is that in the final outcome of this matter [God's] name be honored."

When *Movement of Destiny* appeared in print, the documentary "evidence" was completely absent.

teaching by Elders Waggoner and Jones. They wanted the discussion of this subject to cease.

A third "eyewitness" report is also in the Ellen White Vault, written by A. T. Jones: "All the time in the General Conference Committee and amongst others there was a secret antagonism always carried on, and which ... finally gained the day in the denomination, and gave to the Minneapolis spirit and contention and men the supremacy" (Letter to Claude Holmes, May 12, 1921).

None of these eyewitness statements found its way into *Movement of Destiny*. Instead, the reader is constantly assured that *invisible* "affidavits" say the opposite.

The "Peerless Witness"

(c) Froom devotes two chapters to the idea that Ellen White stands supreme in assessing 1888 (pp. 443-464). Her writings "*particularly since 1888*" should settle "for every reasonable mind" questions concerning this history (p. 444, emphasis original). This is eminently true. But in eleven pages devoted to her witness (443-453) there is not one quotation from her pen to support his premise.

(d) In the next chapter (pp. 454-464) is a list of over 200 items taken from her writings of 1888- 1901, which he says "forms the undergirding for the over-all presentation of this volume" (p. 456). But careful reading of the "titles" year by year yields a surprise. They have no specific connection with captions of published articles, but are solely the comments of the author to suit his thesis.

(e) Beginning on page 221 and continuing for 12 pages, there is an array of isolated words and phrases from Ellen White, again with no source given. Over 100 fragmentary words or phrases and half-sentences leave out vital meaningful portions, omitting contextual information which would give quite a different meaning and would nullify the "victory" theory. Words and phrases from her Minneapolis sermons are surrounded and smothered with the author's interjections, leaving Ellen White's real message indiscernible.

(f) Of the "hundreds of priceless source documents" said to have been obtained from an array of sterling contributors, not one is used to support the thesis. And yet the book contains 700 pages.

(g) Even if the "affidavits" were available (which they are not), to cite the opinions of sincere brethren who say they thought that the 1888 message was accepted does not prove that it was. A century of history indicates that the latter rain was not accepted, in spite of these supposed claims that it was. But Froom and the other authors cited would pit uninspired observers against the inspired testimony of one who exercised the gift of prophecy. Even a thousand uninspired "acceptance" testimonials can not successfully negate one inspired testimony from the Lord's messenger.

(h) As with Olson's book, Froom exonerates the ministers and the post-1888 leadership and blames the laity for delaying the finishing of the gospel commission: "The Holy Spirit—ready, willing, and able—could not do His allotted work because of the unpreparedness of the membership" (p. 582). "What now remains is entrance of His people into full provision of God for the finishing of the Great Commission" (p. 613).

In fact, what now remains is a leadership acceptance of the message, for it was leadership rejection of the message of the loud cry, says Ellen White, that was the initial cause of the long delay (cf. 1 SM 234, 235).

(i) The reader is told that she "rejoiced in the growing acceptance" of the 1888 message (p. 605), and that "the nineties were marked by a succession of powerful revivals," and "tremendous gains" (p. 264). We must look at an interesting example of the contrast between what she actually said and Froom's portrayal of the post-1888 General Conference leadership.

He rightly says that "the leading post-1888 mold on the Movement was, of course, largely given by the incoming General Conference president. We must consequently look chiefly to him for determinative evidence." In other words, the attitude of Elder O. A. Olsen as General Conference president will "chiefly" determine the truth of the message being accepted or rejected by the church leadership. *This is true*. We continue with Froom:

> ***Now, the record of [O. A.] Olsen's spiritual leadership is clear and loyal.... Olsen seemed to sense the spiritual bearings of the question at issue, and gave quiet but effective leadership to their solution....***
>
> ***The years of Olsen's administration saw a real revival and reformation, ... a time of awakening from Laodicean self-satisfaction ... through the growing acceptance of the message of Righteousness by Faith....***
>
> ***So it cannot, with any show of right, be said that Olsen personally rejected or subdued the message of Righteousness by Faith, or led or aided or abetted in such a direction....***
>
> ***Clearly, Olsen did not reject the message (pp. 354-358).***

Froom offers no Ellen White evidence to support these statements. The reader merely assumes that such emphatic statements are backed up somewhere by inspired evidence. Such is totally lacking in his book, the reason being that such does not exist in her writings. This is something that the "sixty of our ablest scholars" who endorsed the book did not notice.

Ellen White's View of the Post-1888 Leadership

We must now consider in contrast what Ellen White said in retrospect, eight years after president Olsen took office:

> ***I feel very sorry for Brother Olsen.... He has not acted upon the light given. The case is a mysterious one.... Notwithstanding the light which has been placed before him for years in regard to this matter, he has ventured on, directly contrary to the light which the Lord has been giving him. All this confuses his spiritual discernment, and places him in a relation to the general interest, and wholesome, healthy advancement of the work, as an unfaithful watchman. He is pursuing a course which is detrimental to his spiritual discernment, and he is leading other minds to view matters in a perverted light. He has given unmistakable evidence that he does not regard the testimonies which the Lord has seen fit to give His people, as worthy of respect,***

or as of sufficient weight to influence his course of action (Letter, August 27, 1896, to A. O. Tait).

Froom's contradiction of her is alarming, especially in light of the official support that his book enjoys. Ellen White's context is crystal clear:

> ***I am distressed beyond any words my pen can trace. Unmistakably Elder Olsen has acted as did Aaron, in regard to these men who have been opposed to the work of God ever since the Minneapolis meeting. They have not repented of their course of action in resisting light and evidence....***
>
> ***The disease at the heart of the work poisons the blood, and thus the disease is communicated to the bodies they [General Conference leadership] visit (ibid.).***

Ellen White did not go behind Elder Olsen's back; she had earlier written him the same things on November 26, 1894. Again she wrote him on May 31, 1896:

> ***I have communications which have been written for one and two years, but I have felt that for your sake they ought to be withheld until some one could stand by your side who could clearly distinguish Bible principles from principles of human manufacture, and who, with sharp discernment could separate the strangely perverted, human imaginations, which have been working for years, from things of divine origin....***
>
> ***Brother Olsen, you speak of my return to America. For three years I stood in Battle Geek as a witness for the truth [1888-1891]. Those who then refused to receive the testimony given me by God for them, and rejected the evidences attending these testimonies, would not be benefited should I return....***
>
> ***To a large degree the General Conference Association has lost its sacred character, because some connected with it have not changed their sentiments in any particular since the Conference held at Minneapolis....***
>
> ***I have been shown that the people at large do not know that the heart of the work is being diseased and corrupted at Battle Creek.***[2]

Ellen White later wrote to I. H. Evans saying that her only regret was that she had entrusted vital communications to president Olsen instead of sending out testimonies to the field that the people themselves might know what was going on in Battle Creek. Elder Olsen had "rejected" the trust placed with him, according to the autographed copy of the letter in the White Estate file (Letter E51, 1897). In another autographed carbon copy in a private collection, she crossed out the word "rejected" and wrote in her own handwriting,

---

[2] These documents were placed in Dr. Froom's hands on February 21, 1965, before he published his book and receipt acknowledged. They were also placed in the hands of General Conference leadership in 1973 before they republished it. One General Conference president has withdrawn his endorsement from the revised edition.

"neglected." What was the mysterious reason that motivated this continued official resistance/neglect of the Holy Spirit?

It will be recalled that Froom sets forth the high ethical standard he was to follow, mandated by Daniells. His book was to be "one that would honor God and exalt truth" (p. 17):

> ***Regrettable Ploy of Reconstructed History.—History has sometimes been reconstructed by attempted selectivity—that is, by using out of context or intent such citations as suit an objective— in an attempt to sustain a particular assumption or theory. But such a practice is neither ethical nor honest.... As men of integrity, we must have no part in such manipulation of historical episodes. Servants of the God of truth must ever use quotations, evidence, and lines of argument in such a way as to honor Truth and its Author (pp. 364, 365).***

This of course is beyond dispute. Nothing is gained by expressing criticism of Dr. Froom's work. But we can all learn a lesson in contrition. Multitudes of Christians in popular churches place undue reliance on preconceived judgments that cannot endure the test of truth. How can we Seventh-day Adventists help them unless we ourselves are loyal to truth, even at the cost of personal sacrifice or reputation?

1972

Dr. Froom had charged the authors of this manuscript to retract publicly their insistence that the leadership rejected the 1888 message. His demand was openly recognized as directed specifically to these present authors (*Seminary Studies*, Andrews University, January, 1972, p. 121). It reads as follows:

> ***An explicit confession is due the Church today by promulgators of a misleading charge, first of all against the names of the post-1888 leadership, now all sleeping. Moreover, it is likewise due those in the Church today who have been confused and misled by such an allegation. In the ultimate, then, it actually constitutes an impeachment of the dead. That is a gravely serious matter (p. 358).***

The authors were duty-bound to respond to such an official demand from Adventism's most noted scholar, especially when endorsed by the General Conference officers. In late 1972 they prepared their essay entitled, "*An Explicit Confession ... Due the Church*. " They reiterated their conviction that the facts of our history constitute a clarion call to corporate and denominational repentance. Copies were personally delivered to General Conference officers, who urged that it not be published, and called a series of special committee hearings in Takoma Park to consider the evidence, which meetings took place over a period of several years. The officers and the committees considered the Ellen White evidence and were impressed by it, but again urged that *Explicit Confession* not be published. Then after suppressing *Explicit Confession* they republished *Movement of Destiny* with no change in its basic thesis.

Two significant developments in particular grew out of this aroused interest in the 1888 history.

1973-1974

For two years following these special committees, the Annual Councils issued very serious appeals to the world church, calling for revival, reformation, and repentance. There was an unusual earnestness and solemnity evident in them. However, candor requires us to recognize that the results have been disappointing.

Committee appeals have seldom been effective in producing revival or reformation among either the ministry or the laity, because administrative policy can never effect reconciliation with Christ. However, in these Annual Council appeals there was a serious misreading of the fads of our denominational history, which logically defeated the objectives of the appeals. The problem appears on the surface to be minor, but it is significant. We quote from the 1973 Appeal:

> ***In the four years following the historic Minneapolis General Conference, the fresh, compelling emphasis on "righteousness by faith" had aroused the Adventist Church in such a way that Ellen White could say that the "loud cry" had begun! (emphasis added).***

The error here is not one of semantics. Ellen White never said that the 1888 message "aroused the Adventist Church." She said the opposite: "Satan succeeded in *shutting away from our people*, in a great measure, the special power of the Holy Spirit" (1 SM 234, 235). The message was never allowed to arouse the church.

But that is not the most serious problem of logic in this Appeal. There is a failure to identify correctly what was the "loud cry." We mention this, not to find fault with sincere and earnest endeavors, but because the hour is too late to afford the same error again.

The "beginning" of the latter rain and the loud cry was not a subjective revival that supposedly "aroused the Adventist Church;" it was the objective message itself. This is evident even in the Ellen White statement quoted in the Appeal:

> ***The loud cry of the third angel has already begun in the revelation of the righteousness of Christ, the sin-pardoning Redeemer. This is the beginning of the light of the angel whose glory shall fill the whole earth. (RH November 22, 1892; emphasis added).***

Why this is so important can be readily seen:

(a) If the beginning of the loud cry was the "arousal" of the church, its dying out so soon becomes very bad news. It implies that a genuine revival is more elusive than a cure for cancer, and that when the Holy Spirit is allowed to work (as is supposed in the 1890's), He Himself gets tired and abandons the revival. Why should an "aroused church fail to give the loud cry and finish the Lord's commission?

(b) But if the "beginning" of the loud cry is faithfully recognized for what it was in fact, *the 1888 message itself*, immediately we have hope, *for we can recover and proclaim the*

objective message as it is recorded in the existent sources. The power of the Holy Spirit is manifested in "the truth of the gospel" (Galatians 2: 14; Romans 1:16).

However, the Annual Councils of 1973 and 1974 did nothing practical and effective to recover and promulgate the 1888 message itself. Rather, they inadvertently ensured that the vacuum would be filled with an infusion of Calvinist "Reformationism." The 1888 message has never been freely and clearly proclaimed to the world church with full General Conference support.

The second outgrowth of this 1973-74 interest in 1888 was in consequence of the misunderstanding evident above. Recognizing that the church needs "righteousness by faith," the General Conference convened the Palmdale Conference in 1976 where certain theologians dominated the discussions and demanded support for their "Reformationist," Calvinist views of "justification by faith."

They claimed that their views were a true revival of the 1888 message content, when in fact they were a denial of every basic essential of that "most precious message." But their prominence in Australia and North America gave them wide influence throughout the world field. The general ignorance of the 1888 essentials plus an antipathy for "legalism" created the vacuum into which these "Reformationist" ideas rushed.

Time soon demonstrated how these views are incompatible with the Adventist truth of the cleansing of the sanctuary. If the General Conference and our publishing houses had appreciated the unique content of the 1888 message itself and faithfully published and upheld it, these views could never have taken deep root in North America, Europe, Africa, the Far East, and the South Pacific. Misreading the history of the 1890's resulted in repeating that history, with even more tragic consequences. We can document the loss of hundreds of ministers, and no one knows how many laity and youth.

There is a root from which these Calvinist views of righteousness by faith can be traced: the General Conference and White Estate insistence for decades that the 1888 message was only a re- emphasis of popular Protestant views. Our theologians in the 1970's were only building on a foundation laid for them beginning in the 1920's.

1984

Yet another publication was to deal with 1888, the biography of Ellen White, *The Lonely Years*, *1876-1891*, by Arthur L. White. Elder White's contribution to the Seventh-day Adventist Church is beyond an adequate estimate. During a long and distinguished career he has been an agent of the Lord in building confidence in the world-wide church in the Spirit of Prophecy. As the grandson of Ellen White he enjoys a unique distinction as the foremost authority on her writings. He is respected world-wide.

In three chapters of this volume he discusses the 1888 history. But first "certain points of background and developments should be considered" (p. 394). Then follow 14 points, some of which probe to the foundation of our denominational mission (pp. 394-397). We will note briefly a few miscellaneous points from this section of the book:

"(1) The subject of righteousness by faith ... was but one of many pressing matters that called for attention of the delegates." Point (10) continues: "It would seem that disproportionate emphasis has come to be given to the experience of the Minneapolis General Conference session. "We would inquire: What is the true eschatalogical significance

of the 1888 message? Is not the beginning of the latter rain and the loud cry the one matter of paramount importance?

"(4) While the business of the conference ... was broad and significant, the feelings and attitudes of those present were molded by the theological discussions." Need we point out that in this lies the significance of the session then, and its abiding importance for the church now? Unless our "theological discussions" are sound, our business administration cannot accomplish the gospel commission and cannot be blessed.

"(6) Information concerning just what took place at Minneapolis ... has come largely from the E. G. White documents and the memory statements of a few who were present." Our present dilemma as a people stems from a failure to give due weight to that inspired perspective communicated through her ministry, and a disproportionate reliance on the uninspired opinions of others.

"(7) No official action was taken in regard to the theological questions discussed." Thus the oft- repeated statement implies that no actual responsible rejection took place. As we have previously noted, such votes were taken "with uplifted hand" (GCB 1893, pp. 244,265)—but not recorded solely due to Ellen White's veto.

We note the next statement in full:

> ***(8) The concept that the General Conference, and thus the denomination, rejected the message of righteousness by faith in 1888 is without foundation and was not projected until forty years after the Minneapolis meeting, and thirteen years after Ellen White's death. Contemporary records yield no suggestion of denominational rejection. There is no E. G. White statement anywhere that says this was so. The concept of such rejection has been put forward by individuals, none of whom where present at Minneapolis, and in the face of the witness of responsible men who were there (p. 396).***

Objective evidence indicates that:

(a) The real issue is the acceptance or rejection of the latter rain and the loud cry, not the Protestant "doctrine" that the 1888 rejectors professed to believe.

(b) Ellen White herself at Minneapolis said the message was being rejected by "the ministers generally who have come to this meeting;" they "have come to this meeting to discard light;" "opposition ... is the order of the day" (Letter B21, 1888; Mss. 9, 15, 1888).

(c) The 1893 Bulletin contains a number of statements of "contemporaries" who confessed that the message had been rejected and was being resisted still by the responsible leadership of the church—this was a mere four years later. No one raised his voice at the 1893 session to protest that the message had been accepted or was being accepted. The 1901 *Bulletin* contains similar statements.

But this is not all. The latest edition of *Testimonies to Ministers* has an addition that previous editions lacked—an "Historical Foreword" and "Appendix Notes" designed to help the reader avoid the clear conviction that reading Ellen White's text brings: "These notes will aid the reader in ascertaining correctly the intent of the author in the messages here presented."

How this works will be seen by an example. On page 468 occurs this clear 1890 statement: "It is the fashion to depart from Christ.... With many the cry of the heart has been, 'We will not have this man to reign over us.' ... Righteousness by the faith of the Son of

God, has been slighted, spoken against, ridiculed, and rejected." The Appendix note cautions the reader to be careful. Apparently he should not too readily believe what the text says: "While some took the attitude here referred to there were many who received the message and gained a great blessing in their own personal experience" (p. 533). This directly counters many statements in the text.

This can only breed dismay among thoughtful church members who have a right to expect literary integrity, for they can read the contradicting evidence for themselves in the full context of Ellen White's words.

There is another denial of a straightforward Ellen White statement about the 1888 history. On March 16,1890 she said, "Christ ... has a blessing for us. He had it at Minneapolis, and He had it for us at the time of the General Conference here [1889]. *But there was no reception*" (emphasis added). This statement is made available in Release No. 253, but a footnote counters it: "The wording of this sentence is clearly faulty for, isolated, it is out of harmony with what follows and other of her statements relating to the General Conference of 1889."

However, the entire document in context clearly supports this statement as it reads. The context indicates that its wording cannot be faulty. Always the "some" who accepted were a few of lesser influence, while those who rejected were the "many" of influence.

But the matter does not end here. In 1980, *Selected Messages*, Book Three, was published with a 33-page chapter on "The Minneapolis Conference." Seven pages are again taken up with additional inserted "Historical Backgrounds." Although there was a "tragic setback," a "gradual change for the better ... ensued in the five or six years after Minneapolis" (p. 162). Yet Ellen White's strongest testimonies of reproof for post-1888 unbelief are dated seven or eight years after Minneapolis. (Ellen White's clear reference to a negative "vote" taken at Minneapolis is deleted from her Ms. 24,1888 document that forms the bulk of the chapter; cf. p. 176).

Again we are reminded that we must all seek the Lord's guidance in our search for vital truth. It would seem that 1888 presents a problem unique in the long history of God's confrontations with His people. There is a precious truth involved therein that seems more elusive than any in the history of past ages. How else could it be possible that scholars and leaders who possess the most outstanding opportunities for knowledge in all time should fail to recognize the obvious evidence? Repentance is incumbent on all of us; we should all inquire, "Lord, is it I?"

Incidentally, those who are confused about reports of Ellen White's occasional literary borrowing would find the true 1888 history helpful in resolving their doubts. Her integrity and qualifications as an agent of the gift of prophecy are uniquely demonstrated in her role in that history. Without any human help whatever, she threaded her way unerringly through the theological pitfalls inherent in that difficult controversy. Her courage in standing alone against "nearly all the senior ministers" in a General Conference session is fantastic.

Her extemporaneous sermons were taken down in shorthand and transcribed for us today. Who else could preach ten sermons without notes in the emotional heat of theological battle with every word recorded, plus writing scores of extant letters and diary entries, and stand clear of the slightest embarrassment a hundred years later? There is not an unfortunate word in any of them. Her enthusiastic endorsement of the message, against

great odds, is miraculously in harmony with the keenest, most competent theology of today. Never does that little lady stand so tall as in this 1888 history.

1888 An End-Time Test

How can we explain the almost superhuman official efforts since 1950 to contradict the inspired Ellen White evidence about 1888? Could it be that the enemy of the plan of salvation has a vested interest in covering up this significant truth? Could it be that knowing the real truth has a definite bearing on our personal and corporate relationship to Jesus Christ, and Satan knows this?

Our mishandling of the evidence is more serious than financial fiascoes. Were our enemies to research this history, we would be embarrassed. Our poor relation to truth keeps us in an unrepentant, lukewarm Laodicean state. The simple solution is an honest faith that includes a belief of truth and an open, contrite recognition of it. The hour is late, but thank God it is not too late for a new spirit of fidelity.

We have been told that the unfallen universe is watching. The honor of the Lord Himself is at stake. We know that someday there must be a people in whose "mouth [is] found no guile" (Revelation 14:5).

To consider "righteousness by faith" as merely the Protestant doctrine is to miss the point. Yet this has been the constant official approach to 1888. An example of far-reaching spiritual blindness is a quotation from A. W. Spalding (*Origin and History*, Vol. 2, p. 281). Note how this position contradicts the heart of the 1888 message itself:

> ***Justification by faith, the foundation truth of salvation through Christ, is the most difficult of all truths to keep in the experience of the Christian. It is easy of profession, but elusive in application (quoted in The Lonely Years, p. 415).***

No one who understands the 1888 message could possibly express such a thought, for it contradicts our Lord's words that His "yoke is easy, and [His] burden is light" (Matthew 11:30). If Spalding's statement is in any way true, we face a terrible problem. The message of "justification by faith ... is the third angel's message in verity" (RH April 1, 1890). So we have the awesome task of proclaiming to the world "the most difficult of all truths," the most "elusive in application"—bad news! Yet the third angel's message is first of all "the everlasting gospel," *good* news which is "the power of God unto salvation" (Romans 1:16).

It is this distorted understanding of the 1888 message which makes us "modern ancient Israel."

"For Our Admonition"

Our history is as much a part of the great sacred record of the battle between truth and error as is the crossing of the Red Sea by Israel, and their descendants' stoning of Stephen many centuries later. The root fads of our last century's history are now beginning to filter through to the world-wide church. The question now is, Will we accept our history, or will we also "stone Stephen"?

After a century of delay, it is time to see how the cause of God is imperiled. We have already witnessed the first-fruit of the 1888 rejection in the "alpha" pantheistic crisis of the early 1900's. Now we are in the time when the "omega" is due. The "alpha" was "received even by men who ... had long experience in the truth, ... those whom we thought sound in the faith" (*Special Testimonies*, Series B, No. 7, p. 37). "The omega will follow, and will be received by those who are not willing to heed the warning God has given" (No. 2, p. 50). The great controversy continues and the dragon is wroth with the "woman" and will spare no efforts to win.

We were told in the "alpha" days that the truth would be discarded; books of a new order would be written; a system of intellectual philosophy would be introduced; the Sabbath would be lightly regarded; the leaders would concede that virtue is better than vice, but they would place their dependence on human power (cf. Series B, No. 2, pp. 54, 55).

We see these words fulfilled today.

"Except the Lord build the house, they labour in vain that build it" (Psalm 127:1). He has told us, "My thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord" (Isaiah 55:8). The beginning of the latter rain and the loud cry was not Madison Avenue strategy and demographics; it was a clear understanding of good news, an *actual message itself*, something which every believer however humble could employ efficiently.

Inherent in that beautiful, heart-appealing "good news" message is the experience of the final atonement. The blood of Christ is to purge the conscience from dead works. The message is not merely to prepare a people for death, but for translation, and the power is in the objective message itself. Billions of dollars spent on the latest electronic and graphics communications will never lighten the earth with glory until "the *light* of the angel whose glory shall fill the whole earth" is wholeheartedly, humbly received and appreciated.

The Lord's method of true and lasting church growth is simplicity itself. Note how a true message of righteousness by faith will be the "light" that will do the work:

> ***We shall all come together to that oneness in our faith and in our knowledge of the Son of God; we shall become mature people, reaching to the very height of Christ's full stature. Then we shall no longer be children, carried by the waves and blown about by every shifting wind of the teaching of deceitful men, who lead others into error by the tricks they invent. Instead, by speaking the truth in a spirit of love [agape], we must grow up in every way to Christ, who is the head. Under his control all the different parts of the body fit together, and the whole body is held together by every joint with which it is provided. So when each separate part works as it should, the whole body grows and builds itself up through love [agape] (Ephesians 4:14-16, TEV).***

Meanwhile, good angels are commissioned to restrain the terrible winds of strife that will someday soon break loose. They are straining their powers to hold back the impending ruin that comes with drug abuse, alcoholism, sexual immorality and infidelity, crime, idolatrous materialism, corruption, and fearful pestilences. The most important work in the world is the work of that angel who seals the servants of God preparatory to the coming of Christ (Revelation 7:14). What little time of peace and prosperity we still have left is

borrowed time, ours only for finishing His work. And world stability depends on the fidelity of God's people to the truth, to their message and their mission.

Something must happen in the end-time that has never happened before. Millenniums of defeat must be reversed. This is the only way the cleansing of the sanctuary can be completed. Daniel's prophecy declares that it "*shall*" be done (8:14). The Lord will purify His church so that it may give the last message to lighten the earth.

God's work can be finished in an incredibly short time. But it will require the repentance of the ages, an understanding of truth for which, in our imagined prosperity and success, we have not felt a hunger and thirst. It will require the correction of theological confusion and a humbling of hearts. It will require the abandonment of worldly policies and their man-made strategies. It will produce a true and lasting unity and harmony among believers. Discordant "pluralism" will vanish. Every species of legalism will die. Fanaticism will discredit itself and die away.

Finally, the ultimate experience awaiting the church is like that which Jesus went through at Gethsemane. Only His very own will be willing to accept it, but He has staked the honor of His throne on His confidence that they will.

Facing the cross is what Peter would not accept, until he was converted. He denied his Lord; only a similar modern denial of Christ can account for the supreme self-centered motivation that continually expresses the concern that "I get to heaven." It was heaven that Christ forsook with no assurance that He would ever return—so that sin and death might be eradicated from the universe. True faith in Him is not centered on our receiving a reward.

Now the last, the seventh church, is on the scene, and we are surely in the last moments that can be allotted to her. There is no eighth.

When His people gladly accept all the truth that He has for them, they will fulfill the same role that Christ filled when He was on earth. That "short period of three years was as long as the world could endure the presence of the Redeemer" (DA 541).

When the power of Satan is broken among the Lord's people, the unbelieving world will not be able longer to endure their presence. They will have demonstrated true righteousness by faith, that closer intimacy with the world's Saviour that He still offers as He continues knocking at our door.

How much longer will He knock?

APPENDIX A

DID A. T. JONES TEACH THE "HOLY FLESH" HERESY?

Attempts are being made to represent A. T. Jones' message of righteousness by faith as leading into the "holy flesh" heresy. It is said that he taught this false doctrine as early as a few months following the 1888 conference. One example, doubtless based on research at the General Conference, follows:

> ***There appear to be some striking parallels between the experience of God's people around 1888 and our own times. For example, Waggoner and Jones were used by the Lord in 1888; but even as early as 1889 Jones's sermons began to show some drift in the direction of the "holy flesh" error (*****Adventist Review*****, *August 6, 1981).***

This charge must be examined carefully. If it is true, several consequences will immediately follow in many reasoning and logical minds:

(1) If true, it will discredit the 1888 message. If either Jones or Waggoner can be blacklisted as teaching heresy or fanaticism during the 1888 era, the church would be foolish to give serious attention to their message.

David P. McMahon and Desmond Ford have made the attempt to discredit Waggoner for this purpose notwithstanding the repeated endorsements of Ellen White. In his *Documents* No. 32 Ford has said that by 1892 Waggoner was no longer a Seventh-day Adventist. McMahon, in his *Ellet Joseph Waggoner The Myth and the Man* (Verdict Publications, Fallbrook, CA, 1979), argues that Waggoner departed from the Protestant view of justification by faith a few weeks after the 1888 conference and thereafter taught the Roman Catholic view. The falseness of these charges has been exposed by Dr. Leroy Moore in Appendix B of his *Theology in Crisis* (1979). Anyone who reads the Jones-Waggoner writings can readily see this for himself.

(2) If Jones was drifting "as early as 1889 ... in the direction of the 'holy flesh' error," Ellen White must also be discredited as naive and fanatical. During her long and distinguished career, she never at any time uttered endorsements of anyone as repeatedly and as enthusiastically as she did of Jones' message and labors from 1888 through 1896.

While it is true that Jones was a human being as prone to weaknesses as any of us, she would never have endorsed him so highly if she had entertained the slightest suspicion that his teaching was "drifting" to a fanaticism as horrendous as that which afflicted the Indiana Conference at the turn of the century. It will not help to excuse Ellen White for endorsing him on the grounds that she was honestly deceived by him. She exercised the prophetic gift and claimed heavenly inspiration. There is no way that we can respect her if she was mistaken about Jones.

(3) The only message that Ellen White ever identified as a genuine beginning of the Holy Spirit's gift of the latter rain and the loud cry is that of the 1888 messengers. If it

almost immediately "drifted" toward the "holy flesh" fanaticism, how can we trust any similar message that the Holy Spirit may in future inspire? We can be sure that Satan would like to dissuade the church from ever again receiving any true spiritual blessing sent from heaven.

Evidence Concerning the Charge Against Jones

The supposed evidence for the charge is found in remarks attributed to A. T. Jones in sermons preached at the Ottawa, Kansas, tent meeting in the spring of 1889. News of the meeting and notes on the sermons were printed in the *Topeka Daily Capital* newspaper. Sermons were not reported verbatim. They were greatly condensed and typographical errors are found to be numerous. The incomplete reporting creates occasional gobbledygook. We turn to a non-Adventist newspaper that gives evidence of poor journalism in order to find something to discredit the man who Ellen White said had "heavenly credentials" in a unique sense and brought us "a most precious message." And this we do a century later; yet even Jones' determined opponents of that generation did not do it.

The supposedly heretical remarks in fact reveal no trace of "holy flesh" fanaticism, but simply assert the possibility of overcoming sin in character perfection attained through faith. His statements are reported as follows in the Topeka newspaper:

> ***It is Christ's obedience that avails and not ours that brings righteousness to us. Well then let us stop trying to do the will of God in our own strength. Stop it all. Put it away from you forever. Let Christ's obedience do it all for you and gain the strength to pull the bow so that you can hit the mark....***
>
> ***In the fact that the law demands perfection lies the hope of mankind, because if it could overlook a sin to a single degree, no one could ever be free from sin, as the law would never make that sin known, and it could never be forgiven, by which alone man can be saved. The day is coming when the law will have revealed the last sin and we will stand perfect before Him and be saved with an eternal salvation ... It is a token of His love for us, therefore, whenever a sin is made known to you, it is a token of God's love for you, because the Saviour stands ready to take it away (May 14,1889).***
>
> ***It is only by faith in Christ that we can say we are Christians. It is only through being one with him that we can be Christians, and only through Christ within us that we keep the commandments—it being all by faith in Christ that we do and say these things. When the day comes that we actually keep the commandments of God, we will never die, because keeping the commandments is righteousness, and righteousness and life are inseparable—so, "Here are they that keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus," and what is the result? These people are translated. Life, then, and keeping the commandments go together. If we die now, Christ's righteousness will be imputed to us and we will be raised, but those who live to the end are made sinless before He comes, having so much of Christ's being in them that they "hit the mark" every time, and stand blameless without an intercessor, because Christ leaves the sanctuary sometime before He comes to earth (May 18, 1889; the newspaper attributes this sermon to W. C. White).***

We note the following:

(a) A careful study of all the Jones sermons reported in this newspaper fails to disclose any "holy flesh" motif. The statements that some interpret as showing such a "drift" are concerned only with *character* development by faith in preparation for the second coming of Christ.

(b) At no time in the years following 1889 is there any record that Jones uttered statements that can be construed as favoring this heresy. If he taught it in 1889, it would almost certainly appear again. To proclaim that Christ has "condemned sin in the flesh" as Paul says is not teaching "holy flesh."

(c) The May 18 statement above is the one that has primarily been regarded as evidence of this fatal "drift." But the newspaper report attributes the sermon to W. C. White. Nevertheless, whoever said it, the teaching is true, and is in harmony with the Adventist concept of the cleansing of the sanctuary.

(d) Both Jones and Waggoner strongly refuted the "holy flesh" fanaticism at the turn of the century. In the *Review and Herald* of April 18, 1899 Jones published an article which discloses the fallacy of that teaching.

From December 11, 1900, through January 29, 1901, he published a series of articles which further opposed it. The leader of the Indiana fanaticism, R. S. Donnell, published an article in the *Indiana Reporter* opposing Jones, indicating that he understood the articles to be a refutation of his teaching. Waggoner also opposed the "holy flesh" doctrine in sermons delivered at the 1901 General Conference session (cf. GCB 1901, pp. 403-422; we acknowledge assistance from Jeff Reich in researching this material).

Thus we have another example of a century of continued opposition to the "most precious message" that Heaven intended should be welcomed as the "beginning" of the latter rain and the loud cry. It is a mysterious subterranean river of unbelief, perhaps the strangest and most persistent that has flowed through all the millenia of God's attempts to help His people. Ellen White said plaintively, "I have deep sorrow of heart, because I have seen how readily a word or action of Elder Jones or Elder Waggoner is criticized" (Letter 019,1892). This time it wasn't a "word or action." It was only an imagined one.

APPENDIX B

THE RIGHTEOUSNESS BY FAITH COMPARISONS

The Popular View
The 1888 View

1. Begins with man's need for eternal security. Thus the appeal is self-centered. Never gets beyond this radius of human insecurity.

1. Begins with the revelation of the love of God at the cross. Appeal is to a higher motivation—faith, appreciation, and gratitude. Thus it is not egocentric.

2. Faith is defined as mere "trust" in the sense of grasping for personal security from being lost. Faith is conceived of as satisfying personal insecurity.

2. Faith is a heart-appreciation of God's sacrificial love, irrespective of hope of reward or fear of being lost. It overcomes egocentricity and lukewarmness.

3. Jesus taught that the love of self is a virtue, a necessary precondition to loving others. Love of self and proper self-respect confused.

3. Jesus taught that the converted person will love his neighbor as before conversion he found it natural to love self. When self is crucified with Christ we find true self-respect in Him. Faith expels self-love, an invention of Satan.

4. The sacrifice of Christ on the cross is only a contingent provision, and does nothing for the sinner unless and until he takes the initiative to "accept Christ." Thus the idea prevails that if one is saved, it is due to his taking this initiative; if one is lost, it is God who has taken the initiative in punishing him.

4. The sacrifice of Christ is more than a contingent "provision." It has done something for "every man." The physical life of "every man" is the purchase of Christ's blood. Every loaf of bread is stamped with His cross. Thus His sacrifice has legally justified "all men." It is He who takes the loving initiative.

5. The gospel is "good news" of what God will do for you if you do your part first. He waits until you take that first step in initiative. The heavenly machinery of salvation stands idle until the sinner presses the button to activate it.

5. The gospel is "good news" of what God has done and is doing for you now. He has "drawn" you all your life (Jer. 31:3; Jn. 12:32). Do not resist Him, and you will be saved. The pure gospel motivates to a lasting heart response of faith.

The Popular View
The 1888 View

6. God counts you outside the "family of God" until you "accept Christ." Thus His acceptance of you depends upon your taking the first step. Misconstrued Scripture gives this impression.

6. God has already accepted you in Christ. To Him, the soul who has never understood the gospel is a lost sheep, not a wolf; a lost coin, not junk; a wandering prodigal son, not a stranger.

7. God will torture and destroy the lost in hell-fire. Emphasis is on His vindictive initiative in punishment.

7. Sin pays its wages—death. The second death mercifully ends the misery of the lost. God's love is manifested in their fate.

8. Forgiveness is God's pardon or excusing of sin, His accepting it as inevitable and unavoidable ("we're only human"). Many have no clear concept of a difference between the forgiveness of sin and the blotting out of sin.

8. His forgiveness actually takes away the sin, which He still hates and can never excuse. The forgiven one now hates the sin. The "final atonement" brings the "blotting out of sin" in the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary.

9. It is hard to be saved and easy to be lost. Since few will make it to heaven, it must be very hard to follow Christ. Emphasis is on the difficulties in the way.

9. If one understands and appreciates the pure, true gospel as good news, it is easy to be saved, and hard to be lost. Christ's yoke is easy, His burden light.

10. The sinner must be pressured into accepting Christ, usually by employing egocentric motivation such as hope of reward or fear of punishment. "Sales appeal" is typical: "what's in it for me"?

10. Any use of pressure, gimmicks, or fear as motivation betrays a lack of gospel content in the message. Once the truth is revealed in love, nothing can stop the truth-seeker from responding.

11. Not until the sinner "accepts Christ" and is obedient is he legally justified. Ellen White's writings misconstrued.

11. All men were legally justified when Christ died for "all." When the sinner believes, he is justified by faith.

12. Justification by faith is the judicial act of accounting wherein God legally declares a still unconverted man righteous because he "accepts Christ." This forensic act has no effect on the heart.

12. When God "declares" one to be righteous, He cannot lie. Justification by faith goes further than a mere legal declaration. It makes the believer obedient to all the commandments of God.

The Popular View
The 1888 View

13. People can be justified by faith and still be lukewarm professors of Christ.
13. True mature faith ends lukewarmness and prepares for translation.

14. The supreme goal in life is to save our own souls, to do what is "essential for our salvation."
14. The supreme goal in life is the honor and vindication of Christ. He must receive His reward, more than we.

15. Sin is defined as the transgression of the law, but is superficially understood as the breaking of a moral taboo. Much emphasis on "known" acts of sin; no concept of deeper sin still unknown.
15. Sin is more than the mere breaking of a taboo; it is a refusal to appreciate God's true character of love revealed at the cross. In this Day of Atonement, the Holy Spirit will reveal all unknown sin.

16. "Made under the law" in Gal. 4:4 means that Christ was made under the Jewish ceremonial law (cf. *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*, Vol. 6, p. 966).
16. "Made under the law" means under the moral law. Christ was not "exempt" from our genetic inheritance; yet He did not sin. To do His Father's will, He had to deny His own will; He denied self.

17. Christ's flesh and nature in the incarnation were different from ours. He was "exempt" from our genetic inheritance, and took only the sinless nature of Adam as it was before the fall (cf. *Questions on Doctrine*, p. 383, and heading, p. 650).
17. Christ "took" fallen, sinful nature of man after the fall, was sent "in the likeness of sinful flesh," not in its unlikeness. He was "exempt" from nothing. The reason He did not sin was He chose not to. He was Love incarnate. He is both our Substitute and Exemplar.

18. Christ bore our guilt only vicariously.
18. Christ bore our guilt actually. He truly identified with us, and condemned sin "in the flesh," that is, in our flesh.

19. It was "impossible," "useless," and "unnecessary" for Christ to be truly tempted in all points like as we are (*Ministry Magazine*, January, 1961).
19. To deny Christ's full temptation is to deny His true incarnation. Unlike the sinless Adam, He was also tempted from within as we are, yet without sin. There is no sinner whom He cannot succour.

The Popular View
The 1888 View

20. Thus cut off from our genetic inheritance, Christ was "naturally" good. His own will was identical to His Father's will. No inner struggle. Thus His righteousness could not be by faith.

20. Christ's righteousness was by faith. He said, "I seek not Mine own will." He bore the cross all His lifetime, something the sinless Adam did not need to do. Christ constantly denied self.

21. Since He did not take our fallen, sinful nature, Christ could not truly meet and conquer sexual temptations.

21. Scripture gives us no right to exempt Christ from any human temptation. Heb. 4:15 is too clear.

22. Continued sinning is inevitable so long as man has a sinful nature. God's people will continue sinning up to the moment of translation. This logically requires that Christ never cease His High Priestly ministry as Substitute. Keep your "insurance" paid up by "relationship," and you are "covered."

22. Continued sinning is "condemned in the flesh" through Christ. Sin has become unnecessary in light of His gospel. Righteousness is by faith because faith works by love. Our difficulty is either ignorance of the gospel or unbelief. The second coming is impossible unless Christ ceases to be our Substitute.

23. Many of our people have no clear concept of the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary in its unique relation to righteousness by faith.

23. The 1888 message is a breakthrough that Luther, Calvin, and the Wesleys never found. It related the gospel to the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary.

24. Presentations of Christ's present work in the cleansing of the sanctuary in relation to personal Christian experience are almost nonexistent.

24. True justification by faith is now related to the work of Christ in the Most Holy Apartment (EW 254). This is a unique truth entrusted to this church.

25. "Cheap grace" is the only possible result of confusion regarding the nature of Christ, the prejudice against perfection of Christian character, the eclipse of the cross, and neglect of the cleansing-of-the-sanctuary truth.

25. Righteousness by faith imposes an extremely high standard—that of Christ Himself. He is the Exemplar who ministers that grace fully to believers. He will return when He sees His character perfectly reflected in His people. This is realized by faith, not by works.

The Popular View
The 1888 View

26. 1 John 2:1 tells us not to sin, as our insurance company tells us not to have an accident. But you will sin sooner or later, so make sure you are "covered" by the Advocate who will persuade the Father to excuse you. We cannot expect more than victory over "known sin." Participation in unknown sin is implied to be inevitable until Christ returns.

26. 1 John 2:1 says that for His people to stop sinning is the purpose of His sacrifice on the cross. It is not to excuse the perpetuation of sin. This becomes effective when they grasp the principle of corporate guilt—their relationship to "the sins of the whole world." Heaven will aid the believers in overcoming "even as" Christ overcame.

27. Prevailing egocentric concern makes it difficult to conceive of a repentance for any but one's own sins. Overriding motivation is concern for one's own personal salvation. No real sympathy with Christ is possible so long as hope of reward or fear of hell remains the dominant heart motivation.

27. The repentance and baptism of Christ introduce a larger concern: we see ourselves potentially guilty of "the sins of the whole world," but for His grace. Faith makes possible an empathy with Christ in His closing work like that of a bride for her husband. Corporate repentance like His makes it possible.

28. Maintaining a "relationship" with Christ is a difficult, arduous process. Everything depends on your holding on to God's hand. "Keep up your speed" or "gravity" will cause you to come "crashing down." It's a do-it-yourself program.

28. Everything depends on your believing that God is holding on to your hand. What makes the Christian life appear so difficult is an eclipse of the gospel of Christ's righteousness. "The love of Christ constraineth us."

29. Doctrinal differences within church fellowship are inevitable until Christ comes. True and full unity impossible.

29. Perfect unity is the norm for a church that has true faith. No need of conflicting, confusing prophetic ideas, for example.

30. We can believe, exemplify, and teach true righteousness by faith for many decades, and God's work not be finished. (We have done this for a century).

30. To believe and teach righteousness by faith clearly in relation to the cleansing of the sanctuary is to catalyze the church and the world in a single generation and finish the gospel task. (This has not yet truly been done).

31. The time for Christ's second coming is irrevocably predetermined by the sovereign will of God, and His people can neither hasten nor delay it.

31. Christ is eager to return as a bridegroom eager for a wedding. He will come whenever His Bride makes herself ready. The delay is her responsibility.

The Popular View
The 1888 View

32. The second coming of Christ is desired mostly by old, sick, poor, or suffering people. Our need is our supreme concern. May He come "so we can all go home to glory."

32. Sympathy for Christ, a desire that He receive His reward and vindication, and a yearning to see the world's agony ended, these are the real reasons for wishing to hasten His return. This new motivation is produced by true faith.

33. Consensus is more important than truth. If your convictions differ from the majority, stifle them.

33. True faith imparts a courage that fears no majority or power they may wield. It leads to bearing the cross.

34. The view of the two covenants as presented in the *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* and *Bible Dictionary* is similar to that of those who initially opposed the 1888 message.

34. The old covenant was Israel's faithless promise to obey; and it "genders to bondage" through "the knowledge of [our] broken promises." The new covenant is faith in God 's promise to us.

35. The 1888 message had its origin in "the creeds of the Protestant churches of the day" (Pease, *By Faith Alone*, pp. 138, 139). We have no distinct gospel.

35. The message is distinctly different from that of the popular churches. The "third angel's message in verity" is biblical, "Christ and Him crucified."

36. As a people, and particularly as ministers, we understand righteousness by faith correctly. What we need is more works. "Let's forget 1888 and work harder."

36. Especially in this respect we are "wretched, miserable, poor, blind, and naked." No works program can finish God's work. "This is the work of God, that ye believe on Him whom He hath sent." We need the 1888 message He sent us!

APPENDIX C

ONE SOURCE OF THE ACCEPTANCE MYTH

The widely popular view that the 1888 message was accepted a century ago derives from earnest, sincere, well-meaning people. Their loyalty to the church and its past leadership is commendable, and gives evidence of an enthusiastic team spirit.

Nevertheless, this view is in direct conflict with history, with numerous Ellen White statements, and, what is even more serious, with the testimony of the True Witness who gave His blood for this church. The acceptance myth insists, after even a century of delay, that we are "rich and increased with goods" in this matter of accepting and understanding righteousness by faith. Our Lord says that we are "poor." The conflict in view is serious, for the spiritual condition of the world church is affected, as well as His honor.

In view of the fact that Ellen White's testimony is so clear that the beginning of the latter rain and the loud cry was "in a great degree" rejected, how is it possible that the vast majority of our ministers, educators, and members world-wide believe that it was accepted by the leadership of that generation?

Part of the problem is a persistent confusion of thought that appears almost to be willful. As a people we *do accept* the popular Protestant "doctrine" of righteousness by faith just as Protestants profess to believe it. Therefore our apologists insist that this "doctrine" was not rejected in 1888 or thereafter. But this is not the full truth of our history. Our brethren "in a great degree" *did reject* the message which was the beginning of the latter rain and the loud cry. This obvious fact explains the long delay, and nothing else can explain it.

What is the source of this persistent and widespread confusion and misconception? Doubtless it is the human judgment of good men whose basic mindset is understandably Laodicean. We all partake of that same mindset, by nature. It is painful for any of us to believe what the True Witness says, that the truth of our history reveals us as "wretched and miserable," our 1888 history in particular being a replay of the Jews' history at Calvary. That history pinpoints our great need: denominational repentance.

This unwelcome conviction must at any cost be repressed with assurances of being "rich and increased with goods." Hence the acceptance myth. One prime source of that myth enjoys such unique credibility that it has seemed impossible for anyone to question it.

In his *The Lonely Years 1876-1891*, Arthur L. White informs us that "the concept that the General Conference, and thus the denomination, rejected the message of righteousness by faith in 1888 is without foundation and was not projected until forty years after the Minneapolis meeting and thirteen years after Ellen White's death" (p. 396). The author is a grandson of Ellen White.

We have already noted how rejection of the 1888 message was clearly recognized by Ellen White and her contemporaries from 1893 through 1901 (see chapter four of this book).

"Forty years after the Minneapolis meeting" would bring us to around 1928. It was in that era that Taylor G. Bunch at Pacific Union College publicly likened our 1888 history to that of Israel at Kadesh-Barnea rejecting the report of Caleb and Joshua. W. C. White, Ellen

White's son, remonstrated with Bunch, assuring him that such a rejection in 1888 did not take place. He was present at that conference, he said, and he knew. It is only natural that he would convey the same acceptance view to his son, Arthur L. White, who has served for so many years as secretary of the Ellen G. White Estate, and under whose supervision and endorsement some 1500 pages of books regarding 1888 have been published since 1950.

Both Ellen White's son and grandson have rightly enjoyed great esteem in the Seventh-day Adventist Church. They have been utterly sincere in their efforts to educate several generations of our people to believe that the 1888 message was not rejected. We accord to both of them the utmost respect which their unique place in our history warrants. At the same time, we must recognize that Ellen White exercised a still more unique ministry, that of an inspired messenger of the Lord whose ministry is an expression of the testimony of Jesus, the Spirit of Prophecy. Her prophetic gift endowed her with discernment that penetrated beneath the surface. Even if a thousand eyewitnesses with uninspired judgment contradict the word of an inspired prophet, we must trust that inspired word, for a "thus saith the Lord" is implicit in it. Ellen White's testimony is so clear and straight-forward that the common man can readily understand it. The future of this church depends upon this issue of prophetic guidance being settled rightly.

An indication of how the acceptance view gained official credence is found in a statement made by W. C. White in a sermon at Lincoln, Nebraska, November 25, 1905. He is describing an incident in Avondale, Australia, a decade earlier when W. W. Prescott was visiting. The mail had come in from America, and he and Prescott were reading to Ellen White letters from the leading brethren of the General Conference in faraway Battle Creek. The letters told of alleged great progress in the cause in America and of wonderful spiritual victories in respect of the 1888 issues. W. C. White recalls the incident thus:

> ***For years I have felt that it was my privilege to do all I could to draw Mother's attention to the most cheerful features of our work .... I reasoned that as the Lord has chosen Mother to be His messenger for the correcting of wrongs in the church,...and as these revelations burden her heart almost to death, therefore it can not be wrong for me to gather up all the words of cheer, and all the good news that will comfort her heart, and every incident that will show the power of Christ working in the church, and that will make manifest the best side of the workings of men who are bearing heavy burdens in the work of the Lord; therefore I will endeavor to bring to her attention to the bright side of things....***
>
> ***Well, one day while we were living at Cooranbong, New South Wales, we received letters from the President of the General Conference, filled with cheering reports, telling us about the good camp meetings, and how that some of these businessmen who had been reproved by the Testimonies[1] were going out to various states and speaking in the camp meetings, and that they were getting a new spiritual experience, and were a real help in the meetings....***

[1] Harmon Lindsay and A. R. Henry, "opposed to the work of God ever since the Minneapolis meeting," EGW Letter August 27,1896.

We [he and Prescott] were made very happy by the reading of these letters. We were fairly overjoyed about it, and we united in praising the Lord for the good report. Imagine my surprise when in the afternoon of the next day Mother told me that she had been writing to these men of whom we had received the good report, and she then read me the most far-reaching criticism, the most searching reproof for bringing in wrong plans and principles in their work, that were ever written to that group of men.[2] This was a great lesson to me (Spalding-Magan Collection, p. 470).

Ellen White records her heart sorrow that throws further light on this incident. It is in no way disrespectful of their memory to note that neither W. C. White nor W. W. Prescott enjoyed the larger discernment that is divinely imparted by the gift of prophecy. The gift is not hereditary. It would be only natural for them, as it would be for us, to believe at face value letters from the General Conference president containing such good news. The spirit pervading the church was always up-beat, rejoicing in progress and victories.

But the heart attitude of all human beings is naturally in conflict with "the testimony of Jesus," unless specifically enlightened by the Holy Spirit. Writing to the General Conference president, Ellen White describes how she felt when her son and Prescott tried to assure her that glowing reports from Battle Creek were true:

Dear Brother Olsen:

Last October I wrote you a long letter ... The burden upon me was very great, in regard to yourself and the work in Battle Creek. I felt that you were being bound hand and foot, and were tamely submitting to it. I was so troubled, that in conversation with Brother Prescott, I told him of my feelings. Both he and W. C. W. tried to dissipate my fears; they presented everything in as favorable a light as possible. But instead of encouraging me, their words alarmed me. If these men cannot see the outcome of affairs, I thought, how hopeless the task of making them see at Battle Creek. The thought struck to my heart like a knife. I said, I will not send the communication written to Eld. Olsen.

... For about two weeks I remained in utter feebleness. I was like a broken reed. I could not leave my room, could not converse with Brother and Sister Prescott. I did not expect to recover.... But ... my strength gradually returned to me. (Letter, May 25, 1896).

Because the issue of the latter rain and the loud cry is so important, it is imperative that the church and its leadership now place unqualified reliance on the inspired testimony of the Spirit of Prophecy. When human judgment conflicts with that inspired testimony, no matter how honored the human agents, the Spirit of Prophecy must take the clear precedence.

---

[2] Examples of such communications can be found in *Testimonies to Ministers*, pp. 63-77, 89-98.

For the better part of a century, we as a people have been prone to revel in this easily prevalent false optimism. The tragic consequence is a complementary widespread distrust of the counsel of the True Witness. Would not great spiritual blessings result from a full recognition of the truth? Rightly understood, our denominational history is one continual commentary on Christ's words in Revelation 3:14-21, and a call to appropriate repentance.

He who controls the past controls the future. Lukewarmness and spiritual weakness are a consequence of misinterpreting history.

APPENDIX D

WHAT IS THE FUTURE OF THE SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST CHURCH?

It is true that the Seventh-day Adventist Church has delayed the proclamation to the world of the everlasting gospel in its purity.[1] We all share in the responsibility for this failure. There is a corporate involvement. Ellen White often likened our failures to those of Israel of old when each generation shared in the guilt of their fathers because they not only shared the same fallen human nature but exercised the same unbelief.[2] There are many tragic evidences of our backsliding, disobedience to the Spirit of Prophecy, and even apostasy. Our history for the past century since 1888 is clear.

Does this mean that the Lord has rejected this church or its leadership? Or if He has not already done so, will He do so in future? Is the denominated Seventh-day Adventist Church doomed to failure?

When those who choose to follow Christ protest against what they believe is apostasy or wrong- doing in the church and find themselves opposed, should they conclude that the situation is hopeless? Should they withdraw their support and their church membership?

We are told in *Acts of the Apostles*, page 11, that "faithful souls" have always constituted the true church. Will there be a new group or loose federation formed of "faithful souls" who will complete the gospel commission and leave the organized Seventh-day Adventist Church behind to dissipate its existence in terminal apostasy?

If we liken the church to a ship, is it doomed to sink like the Titanic? Or will it be taken over by a mutinous crew? Should "faithful souls" abandon the ship and jump into the cold water on their own? Will there be no "ship" in the last days, every former passenger individually swimming or clinging to bits of wreckage? Or will every passenger become a crew member and under the leadership of Christ as Captain sail a tight ship into port?

Ellen White likened the Seventh-day Adventist Church to a "noble ship which bears the people of God," and declared that it would sail "safely into port."[3] What is the true church? Is the organized church still the fulfillment of the Revelation 12 prophecy of "the remnant of [the woman's] seed, which keep the commandments of God, and the testimony of Jesus Christ" (vs. 17)? Or is the true "remnant" merely a non-cohesive, unorganized, nongroup scattering of "faithful souls"? These questions probe into the reasons for our existence as a people for nearly 150 years.

No intelligent person would dare say that a nominal connection with the organized church can guarantee an individual's personal salvation. Of course not. That's not the issue.

---

[1] Ev 694-697

[2] See chapter 4 of this book.

[3] 2SM 390; 1892.

The important question is whether church membership and supporting the church are valid duties which the Lord requires of "faithful souls." What is "the mind of Christ" toward the Seventh-day Adventist Church? If we can determine the answer to that question, we can know what our "mind" toward it should be.

There are guidelines in Scripture that are helpful, as well as numerous Ellen White statements:

(1) God's intention has always been that His people on earth be an organized, denominated, visible "family." The reason is that they might be His witnesses, His soul-winning agents in the world. Abraham's "seed was the ancient equivalent of the church. The Lord said to him, "In thee shall all families of the earth be blessed ... Unto thy seed will I give this land." "I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations ... and to thy seed after thee. My covenant will I establish with Isaac" (Gen. 12:3, 7; 17:7, 21).

(2) God has never changed that covenant and He *cannot* change it. Through all the centuries of ancient Israel's and Judah's apostasies, the Lord remained faithful to His promise. In the days of Elijah and the apostate king Ahab and his wicked queen Jezebel, Israel was still Israel. At the nadir of Judah's history in Jeremiah's day when the Lord gave them up to be taken captive to Babylon, they were still the Lord's denominated people. They never *became* Babylon, although they were in captivity *in* Babylon. Only those who refused to come back at the end of the Captivity lost their place in history. The covenant still extended to those who retained their denominated identity, and through them the Messiah finally came.

(3) This is not to say that fleshly descent from Abraham made any individual to be an heir of the covenant. Always it was "*in Isaac* [that] thy seed shall be called." "They which are *of faith*, the same are the children of Abraham" (Rom. 9:7; Gal. 3:7). The true Israel were always those who had the faith of Abraham. But they were always to be a denominated, identifiable people, according to God's plan, so they could function efficiently to evangelize the world. Even Naaman's wife's servant girl preserved that loyal relationship in her slavery and won souls.[4]

(4) The early Christian church of the apostles was not an appendage or an offshoot from Israel. *It was the true Israel*. This was because its members cherished the faith of Abraham[5] From its very beginning when Jesus called the first disciples, His church was an organized, denominated body.[6] Through the years of His earthly ministry it was tightly organized with Him as its Head.

The New Testament indicates that in apostolic times the church was also highly organized and denominated, with apostles, elders, evangelists, teachers, deacons, deaconesses and others with various gifts all functioning in disciplined inter-relationship under the guidance of the Holy Spirit.[7] When Saul of Tarsus was converted, the Lord

---

[4] See 2 Kings 5.

[5] Galatians 3: 7-9, 29.

[6] AA 18: DA 29.

[7] 1 Cor. 12: 1-28; Eph 4: 8-16; 1 Tim 3: 1-15; Titus 1: 5-11.

brought him into immediate fellowship with His organized church.[8] "Faithful souls" indeed constituted the early church, but that church was by no means disorganized. There are numerous examples of its tight discipline. When used to imply that the organized church cannot be the true one, the AA 11 statement about "faithful souls" has been wrested from its context.

(5) The records of God's care over "the woman [who] fled into the wilderness ... a thousand two hundred and threescore days" indicate that again this persecuted church during medieval times followed New Testament patterns of organization and discipline.[9] True believers always functioned as a body, although the precise details of the methods of organization varied.

(6) In the early days of Seventh-day Adventists, battles were fought over organization, with fanatical anarchists rebelling against proper discipline within the body.[10] The Holy Spirit set His unmistakable seal of approval on the need for order. Our pioneers saw the denominated Seventh-day Adventist Church in its organized state as the fulfillment of Revelation 12:17 and 14:12. They saw it as divinely appointed to function efficiently to proclaim the message to the world and prepare a people for the coming of the Lord.[11]

Any movement that the Holy Spirit leads must be organized and disciplined, because "God is not the author of confusion."[12] The century-long establishment of the world Seventh-day Adventist Church among so many diverse cultures is clearly the work of the Holy Spirit. There is no other worldwide movement or body of believers that can even remotely be identified as the fulfillment of Revelation 14:6-12. Ellen White never doubted our historical identification.[13]

Here is a body already in existence superbly crafted by the Lord to accomplish the task of proclaiming "the everlasting gospel." No offshoot or independent movement can possibly grow within anyone's lifetime to become such a potentially efficient soul-winning instrument. True Seventh-day Adventists are more concerned for the honor and vindication of Christ than for their own personal reward. They think primarily in terms of accomplishing His gospel commission for the world rather than their own security. For them, self-love has given way to an experience of being crucified with Christ. They are "under grace," a new motivation imposed by an appreciation of His sacrifice, rather than "under law," their former motivation of spiritual self- concern.

They endure the same test that Moses endured. When God proposed to abandon His organized people Israel and prosper Moses as the leader of their off-shoot successors,

---

[8] Acts 9:10-19; AA 122, 163.

[9] Cf. GC 62, 63, 67-69.

[10] TM 26-29.

[11] FE 254: 1T 271,413; 3T 501.

[12] 1 Cor. 14:33.

[13] See for example 9T 19; 1 T 186187; 1 SM 91-93; 7BC 959-61.

Moses chose to have his name blotted out of the book of life rather than see God's honor thus compromised.[14] The "shaking" in the last days will separate from God's people all whose deep heart-motivation is mere concern for their own security.

(7) An "under law" motivation of self-concern comes from a failure to appreciate righteousness by faith. It has poisoned the application of our principles of church organization. James and Ellen White pleaded for recognizing Christ as the true Leader of the church:

> ***At no time during His public ministry does Christ intimate that any one of His disciples should be designated as their leader ... And there is no intimation that the apostles of Christ designated one of their number above another as their leader ... Christ, then, is the leader of His people in all the ages ... Christ will lead His people, if they will be led (James White, RH December 1, 1874).***
>
> ***It was not the design of God that any system of organization should exist in the Christian Church that would take the leadership from Christ.***
>
> ***The minister who throws himself on any Conference Committee for direction, takes himself out of the hands of Christ. May God preserve to us our organization and form of church discipline in its original form (ibid., January 4, 1881).***

But recognizing Christ as the Head of the church, directing its organization, requires heart-submission to Him; this becomes impossible when the gospel of righteousness by faith is not clearly understood. The "under law" motivation supplants the "under grace" motivation, and leaders and people suffer. "Kingly power" is exercised, and ministers and people learn to look to fallible human beings for leadership, following their dictates and praising them. A subtle Baal- worship caters to the love of self while professing devotion to Christ. (The common practice of conference employees designating their president "the chief" is an example of a direct violation of Christ's counsel in Matthew 20:25-28). The "under law" motivation may so deeply permeate the church that sincere people think it almost impossible to conceive of any other kind of effective leadership.[15]

(8) An important truth that will help us understand the mind of Christ toward the Seventh-day Adventist Church is our 1888 history. In spite of decades of lukewarmness within it, the Lord sent the "beginning" of the final latter rain through delegates to a General Conference session. He honored this people with the "revelation of the righteousness of Christ" in this "most precious message" destined to lighten the earth with glory.

(9) The 1901 re-organization was intended to bring revival and reformation and a return to the leadership of Christ working through those who believe His word, "All ye are

---

[14] Exodus 32.

[15] See TM 359-364.

brethren." But the spiritual renewal did not take place. It was only a dream, a "what might have been." The 1888 pattern of unbelief was not reversed.[16]

The 1903 General Conference session was seen by some as a backward step. Jones' and Waggoner's attitude toward the revised constitution was considered in chapter 10 of this book. A few others joined them in their convictions:

> ***Any man who has ever read those histories [Neander, Mosheim] can come to no other conclusion but that the principles which are to be brought in through this proposed constitution [1903] ... are the same principles, and introduced in precisely the same way, as they were hundreds of years ago when the Papacy was made.... The moment you vote it you vote yourselves right back where we were two years ago and before it (P. T. Magan, GCB 1903, p. 150).***
>
> ***Brethren, the thing to do is to go back where we were two years ago in the matter of reorganization, and take it up, and carry it out, and give it a fair trial, because those who have been in responsible places have admitted that they did not carry out the letter of that, because they did not believe that it was possible. I believe that it is possible (E. A. Sutherland, ibid., pp. 168, 169).***

(10) If she believed that the 1903 revision was a mistake, Ellen White did not publicly oppose it, although some of her later remarks may be construed as disapproval. But the important fact to note is that she did not withdraw her support from the organized church following 1903, but remained true and loyal until her death in 1915. This was despite the fact that she was deeply disappointed with the spiritual *results* of the 1901 session.[17] The Lord continued through all those years to honor this church with the ministry of His messenger.

The solution to our problem does not consist in destroying or changing the mechanical system of our constitutional organization, but in finding repentance and reconciliation with Christ within it. All is futile unless the axe is laid to the root of the tree. Weaknesses or errors in organization will be rectified almost overnight when the Holy Spirit succeeds in leading us to repentance.

(11) Literally millions of people can testify that the only agency which led them to a knowledge of the everlasting gospel of Revelation 14 is the Seventh-day Adventist Church, despite its failures. The best hope for an ultimately successful proclamation of the last message to the world is a repentant Seventh-day Adventist Church that not only proclaims the message with crystal clarity but demonstrates without question that it works. This was Ellen White's conviction; in the midst of the 1888-era unbelief, she had hope for reformation:

---

[16] 8T 104-106; EGW Letter to Judge Jesse Arthur, January 15, 1903.

[17] 8T 104-106; Letter to Judge Jesse Arthur, January 15, 1903.

God is at the head of the work, and He will set everything in order. If matters need adjusting at the head of the work, God will attend to that, and work to right every wrong … God is going to carry the noble ship which bears the people of God safely into port (2SM 390; 1892).

Although - there are evils existing in the church and will be until the end of the world, the church in these last days is to be the light of the world that is polluted and demoralized by sin. The church, enfeebled and defective, needing to be reproved, warned, and counseled, is the only object upon earth upon which Christ bestows His supreme regard…. Let all be careful not to make an outcry against the only people who are fulfilling the description given of the remnant people who keep the commandments of God and have faith in Jesus, who are exalting the standard of righteousness in these last days. God has a distinct people, a church on earth, second to none, but superior to all in their facilities to teach the truth, to vindicate the laws of God…. Let all unite with these chosen agents (TM 49,57,58; 1893).

When anyone is drawing apart from the organized body of God's commandment-keeping people, when he begins to weigh the church in his human scales and begins to pronounce judgment against them, then you may know that God is not leading him (3 SM 18; 1893).

Victory will attend the third angel's message. As the Captain of the Lord's host tore down the walls of Jericho, so will the Lord's commandment-keeping people triumph, and all opposing elements be defeated (TM 410; 1898).

I was never more astonished in my life than at the turn things have taken at this meeting [the 1901 session]. This is not our work. God has brought it about…. I want every one of you to remember this, and I want you to remember also that God has said that He will heal the wounds of His people (GCB 1901, pp. 463,464).

Whether or not those "wounds" were healed in 1901 and thereafter, we can be heartened by the assurance that "He *will* heal" them. After 1901 and 1903 Ellen White made some of the strongest statements of her lifetime identifying this organized church as the true one, and giving assurance of its ultimate success in ministry *when repentance permeates the body:*

We cannot now step off the foundation that God has established. We cannot now enter into any new organization; for this would mean apostasy from the truth (Ms. 129,1905).

I am instructed to say to Seventh-day Adventists the world over, God has called us as a people to be a peculiar treasure unto Himself. He has appointed that His church on earth shall stand perfectly united in the Spirit and counsel of the Lord of hosts to the end of time (2 SM 397; 1908).

The fear of God, the sense of His goodness, will circulate through every [Seventh-day Adventist] institution. An atmosphere of peace will pervade every department. Every word spoken, every work performed, will have an influence that corresponds to the influence of heaven … Then the work will move forward with solidity and double strength. A new efficiency will be imparted to the

workers in every line … The earth will be lightened with the glory of God, and it will be ours to witness the soon coming, in power and glory, of our Lord and Saviour (MM 184,185; 1902).

I am encouraged and blessed as I realize that the God of Israel is still guiding His people and that He will continue to be with them, even to the end (remarks to 1913 General Conference session; LS 437, 438).

She clearly defined "God's people" as "this denomination." W. C. White wrote as follows a few weeks before her death:

I told [Mrs. Lida Scott] how Mother regarded the experience of the remnant church, and of her positive teaching that God would not permit this denomination to so fully apostatize that there would be the coming out of another church (Letter, May 23,1915).

A hospital is a place where sick people can be given medical care in order to restore them to health. The patient's life is of supreme importance. The church which is to become the Bride of Christ is sick; she needs healing. Loyalty to Christ will require loyalty to His Bride-to-be, an all-out cooperation to secure her healing.

We who have served as missionaries in Africa have seen how loyalty to Christ (or lack of it) operates in human hearts. "Rice-Christian" employees unconsciously demonstrate their true spirit by speaking of the church as "you" or "they." They couldn't care less for its honor or prosperity. But true believers in Christ manifest a corporate oneness with the church, speaking of it instinctively as "we." They are more concerned for its honor as representing Christ than for their own personal reward.

(12) What is the significance of God's promises being conditional? Should we take a wait-and-see attitude and withhold our loyalty and support until we have evidence that the church has fulfilled the conditions? The following statement emphasizes the conditions:

We are far from where we should have been had our Christian experience been in harmony with the light and the opportunities given us … Had we walked in the light that has been given us, … our path would have grown brighter and brighter ….

In the balances of the sanctuary the Seventh-day Adventist church is to be weighed. She will be judged by the privileges and advantages that she has had…. If the blessings conferred have not qualified her to do the work entrusted to her, on her will be pronounced the sentence, "Found wanting." (8T 247).

All of God's promises to ancient Israel were no less conditional. Generation after generation was "found wanting" and died as failures. The history of Kadesh-Barnea was repeated many times, when an entire generation except two individuals had to perish in the wilderness. Nevertheless, the covenant-keeping God remained loyal to Israel when she was disloyal to Him. He always tried again with a new generation. Never did He ordain another people to take the place of "Abraham's seed."

Because ancient Israel failed repeatedly as has the church in modern times does not mean necessarily that the of backsliding and apostasy will continue forever. The failures of

God's corporate people have always involved the heavenly sanctuary in defilement; Satan has had occasion to taunt God with responsibility for the failure of His people.

The foundation of the Seventh-day Adventist Church is a belief in the good news of Daniel 8:14, "Then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." Then shall this constant cloud of failure which has hovered over God's Israel be lifted; then shall God's name be cleared as His people demonstrate His plan of salvation to be a success; then shall the sacrifice of Christ be vindicated. A cynical attitude which says, "Suppose the church fails and the conditions are not met" is the same as saying, "Suppose the sanctuary will not be cleansed." The honor of God requires that it *shall* be cleansed!

This is the ultimate issue in the great controversy. We have the privilege of standing in absolute loyalty to Christ and to His Bride-to-be.

The testimony quoted above is entitled "Shall We Be Found Wanting?" Ellen White answered her own question as she closed the chapter:

> ***When purification shall take place in our ranks, we shall no longer rest at ease … Unless the church, which is now being leavened with her own backsliding, shall repent and be converted, she will eat of the fruit of her own doing, until she shall abhor herself. When she resists the evil and chooses the good, when she seeks God with all humility, and reaches her high calling in Christ, standing on the platform of eternal truth, … she will be healed. She will appear in her God-given simplicity and purity, separate from earthly entanglements, showing that the truth has made her free indeed. Then her members will indeed be the chosen of God, His representatives.***
>
> ***The time has come for a thorough reformation to take place. When this reformation begins, the spirit of prayer will actuate every believer, and will banish from the church the spirit of discord and strife … There will be no confusion, because all will be in harmony with the mind of the Spirit … All will pray understandingly the prayer that Christ taught His servants: "Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done on earth, as it is in heaven" (ibid., pp. 250, 251).***

Our duty now is to remove the hindrances within the church that have prevented that "thorough reformation to take place," and to learn to pray the Lord's prayer.

Appendix E

A Brief Overview of 1987-1988 Publications

In the providence of God, the year 1988 was set aside as the Centennial of the Minneapolis General Conference Session. What was once either a virtually unknown subject or a no-no has now become a familiar topic of conversation worldwide. Thank God for this aroused interest. Large numbers of our people will not rest satisfied now until they ferret out the full truth.

Since the first printing of this book in August 1987, several significant publications were issued as part of the 1988 Centennial "Celebration":

(1) *The Ellen G. White 1888 Materials* (Ellen G. White Estate, 1987). In releasing this vast collection of 1,812 pages in full context, the Ellen G. White Trustees are to be commended. They obviously have no intention of withholding anything significant. Ellen White is at last permitted to speak unhampered on these issues. Had this been published decades ago, much of the present confusion regarding 1888 would by now be resolved. Since the Holy Spirit has always confirmed the "testimony" of Ellen White, this publication must prove in His providence to be a giant step toward ultimate revival and reformation.

Reading these documents gives one a feeling of satisfaction like that of enjoying a square meal. One has no lingering doubts or unsatisfied questions about what might be lurking unseen within the withheld confines of this or that ellipsis, for there are no ellipses.

The truth is here disclosed that the leadership of this church did in fact "in a great degree" reject the beginning of the latter rain and the loud cry while stoutly professing to accept "righteousness by faith." Further, the post-Minneapolis "confessions" are seen as in no way reversing that tragedy. And Ellen White's unqualified endorsements of the doctrinal content of the message turn out to be far more numerous and emphatic than anyone appears previously to have realized. Such multiple endorsements in these 1,812 pages may perhaps approach the better part of a thousand.

It is a solemn experience to read these unedited documents, often photographed from awkwardly typed originals with her emendations in her handwriting. How could that little woman stand almost alone against almost the entire leadership of this church, writing that vast amount of correspondence without saying at least something in the heat of controversy that would prove embarrassing a century later? She emerges from this 1888 saga vindicated both in her positions and in the spirit which she demonstrated. Nothing ever published by the White Estate does such credit to her as this ingenuous outpouring of her heartfelt zeal.

She never expresses any criticism of the righteousness by faith theology of Jones and Waggoner from 1888 on through 1895 and 1896. Those who in our Centennial denigrate the 1888 message rely exclusively on one sentence that appears to be critical, but it is possible that they wrest it from its context and may even misquote it as well. In that one lone sentence stenographically reported in 1888 she says, "Some interpretations of Scripture given by Dr. Waggoner I do not regard as correct" (Ms. 15, 1888).

The stenographer could not record the emphasis Ellen White might have given to that "I", but it is clear in her immediate context that she finds no fault with his doctrinal

message. Rather, she is willing to surrender her personal opinions for greater light to be received through Waggoner: "I would have humility of mind, and be willing to be instructed as a child. The Lord has been pleased to give me great light, yet I know that He leads other minds, and opens to them the mysteries of His Word, and I want to receive every ray of light that God shall send me, though it should come through the humblest of His servants [an obvious reference to Waggoner].... Some interpretations of Scripture given by Dr. Waggoner *I* do not regard as correct. But ... I see the beauty of truth in the presentation of the righteousness of Christ in relation to the law as the doctor has placed it before us.... *That which has been presented harmonizes perfectly with the light which God has been pleased to give me during all the years of my experience.* If our ministering brethren would accept the *doctrine* which has been presented so clearly, ... their prejudices would not have a controlling power.... Let us pray as did David, 'Open thou mine eyes'" (Ms. 15, 1888, emphasis added).

For a decade Ellen White expresses only consistent, often joyous, recognition that the Holy Spirit was endorsing Waggoner's and Jones's doctrinal message, while the unreasonable opposition they suffered isolated them and at times drove them to unwise expressions, as ancient Israel drove Moses to a rash word and act. Her famous April 9, 1893 letter to Jones unequivocally commends his theology while cautioning him against being pressured into extreme expressions to defend it.

Although the 1888 messengers were human, as are we all, there is here no Ellen White hint that they showed a lack of Christian spirit toward their brethren during these early years, no evidence that harshness or an abrasive spirit on their part gave just cause for their brethren to oppose them so. These four volumes seem to make clear that our published Centennial criticism of Jones and Waggoner perpetuates the 1888 unbelief. This is phenomenal—after a century of our history, like the Jews' continued rejection of Christ and His apostles after nearly 2000 years of their history.

But "the entrance" of truth "giveth light." With the publication of these four volumes we have at last turned on to the right runway, and we can expect the Lord to begin to work henceforth. Any scholar will now hesitate to publish misrepresentations of Ellen White's 1888 testimony, for the humblest layman can check the sources for himself.

(2) *Manuscripts and Memories of Minneapolis 1888* (Pacific Press, 1988). This further 591 page collection includes documents from other contemporaries of Jones and Waggoner. They reveal that many of "the brethren" leave a record of spiritual blindness and resistance to the Holy Spirit in a time of unprecedented eschatological opportunity. All were hardworking men consecrated to the cause of the church, professing to believe the gospel, while with few exceptions they reveal an insensitivity to the actual leading and teaching of the Holy Spirit in "the truth of the gospel." And the most prominent among them were absorbed in heart-opposition to Ellen White.

Further, in these documents none of those who confess rejection of the 1888 message cite as an excuse that Jones's or Waggoner's personality provoked them to reject it. Self-justifying human nature would exploit significant failure on their part if it had been prominent.

Two brethren who do express criticism of Jones's 1888 personality wait until 42 years later to do so, but one (W. C. White) in 1889 strangely contradicts his disparaging 1930 testimony with an opposite view of warm commendation. In 1931 A. T. Robinson recalls Jones's sharp Minneapolis remark to Uriah Smith concerning the "ten horns," but at the

time it apparently did not impress Ellen White enough to mention it in her diaries or extensive reports of the Minneapolis story, nor do any of the others in this collection do so.

This isolated incident apparently made little impression in 1888 against the backdrop of a steady, unequivocal Holy Spirit endorsement. Either the lapse of time superimposed the image of the post-1903 Jones onto Robinson's earlier memories, or Jones's spirit in that remark was not as severe as he assumed.[1]

There is something pathetic in reading this vast correspondence of leaders of the church who conduct business as usual in a time which we now know was one of unprecedented eschatological opportunity.

(3) *From 1888 to Apostasy --The Case of A. T. Jones,* by George R. Knight (Review and Herald, 1987). This special "1888 Centennial Series" volume appears to be a transparent effort to discredit both Jones and the message which the Lord gave him for this church. The book gives clear recognition that the message was rejected at Minneapolis and thereafter, a step toward reality; but it confuses the picture by presenting a bungling God who made a poor choice of a messenger and His naive prophet who was over-enthusiastic about the message and messenger.

Capitalizing on every possible defect in Jones's personality and ministry, real or imagined, and often imputing evil motives gratuitously, the author pictures him as a man of "careless mouth and harsh speech," using "sensational language" with "pompous attitudes," "self-confident," "egotistic," a man who "never mastered the art of ... Christian kindness," who had an "abrasive and cocksure personality." Even as he arose from the baptismal waters in Walla Walla the youthful Jones is saddled with this "perennial problem of extremism." Why would the Lord specially choose such a man?

Jones's gospel message is dismissed as having "error mixed" in it; thus it is clearly implied that it is dangerous to accept it. Specifically, he is charged with heavy responsibility for fathering both the "holy flesh" and pantheism heresies of the turn of the century.

Many readers who are unable to check the original sources will conclude that nothing such a quixotic figure as Jones says is worth serious attention today. This appears to be the thesis of the book.

But if one pursues Ellen White's contemporary accounts of Jones's character and message, a problem comes into focus. She describes him as one who "bears the word of the Lord," "Christ's delegated messenger," a "man whom God has commissioned ... [with] the demonstration of the Holy Spirit," a "chosen servant ... whom God is using." He is one of only two Seventh-day Adventist ministers in history who she said had "heavenly credentials. "[2] Is it not strange that such a villification of Jones is published and endorsed in our Centennial Celebration? Do nations or churches normally villify the principals whom they celebrate in centennials?

---

[1] J. S. Washburn told these authors of the incident in 1950, but his context also is highly supportive of Jones as demonstrating his "heavenly credentials" at that time. See transcript of June 4, 1950 interview as published in the *1888 Message Study Committee Newsletter,* 2934 Sherbrook Drive, Uniontown, Ohio 44685.

[2] Sources for quotations from Knight and Ellen White are found in *A. T. Jones: The Man and the Message* (1888 Message Study Committee, 2934 Sherbrook Drive, Uniontown, Ohio, 1988).

Our author endorses the popular misconception that the 1888 message itself is lost. But Ellen White's enthusiastic endorsements of both Jones's message and manner of presenting it continue for nearly a decade following 1888, indicating that the "message" was more than the supposedly lost presentations at Minneapolis. Years later she says in the present tense, "The message given us by A. T. Jones ... is a message of God to the Laodicean church." "God has upheld [him], ... given [him] precious light." (Letter S24, 1892; Letter 51a, 1895).

During this decade she even speaks with enthusiasm of Jones's personality and method of speaking, directly contradicting the impression of gauche abrasiveness: he "set forth [the message] with beauty and loveliness," "with light, with grace, and power." Listening to him, the people "saw the truth, goodness, mercy, and love of God as they never before had seen it." She considers "it a privilege to stand by the side of [Jones] and give my testimony with the message for this time" *{Review and Herald,* May 27, 1890; February 12, 1889; March 18, 1890; Letter, January 9, 1893). It is difficult to relate these words to the "cocksure," "harsh" personality which our Centennial writers attribute to him. Would she not consider it embarrassing to "stand by" such a man?

But this book does not create its disparaging view of Jones from modern imagination. There are indeed historical sources critical of him. He had enemies in his day who taunted him "with being a fanatic, extremist, and enthusiast," who "criticized and depreciated, and even stooped to ridicule the messenger through whom the Lord has wrought in power" (cf. *Testimonies to Ministers,* p. 97). *But these were unbelieving opponents fighting the Holy Spirit's leading.* Why is their judgment superior to that of Ellen White?

The Lord's endorsements of Jones are pretty serious, for she says that those who "accuse and criticize [Jones] ... accuse and criticize the Lord who has sent" him. Opposers "will be asked in the judgment, 'Who required this at your hand, to rise up against the message and the messenger I sent to My people with light, with grace, and power?'" *(Ibid.,* p. 466; Letter, January 9, 1893).

The charge that Jones virtually fathered the "holy flesh" fanaticism rests literally on one word that he used in an 1898 editorial, which turns out to be a direct quotation from the apostle Paul. The context of the November 22 editorial is health reform, having nothing to do with "holy flesh." Likewise, the charge that Jones taught or believed pantheism rests on the assumptions or prejudices of others. Not one sentence is quoted from him as objective evidence that he believed or taught pantheism.

This may seem like an unimportant detail, but the integrity of the "most precious message" the Lord sent this people is the issue at stake. If that message led its believers into pantheism, Ellen White must be seriously wrong because the message was most dangerous, not "most precious." But in Jones's case it did not lead him into pantheism, proving thus that it could not have been a factor to lead Waggoner into pantheism. What led to the pantheism (or pan-entheism) problem was the climate of rejection of their 1888 message, not its acceptance.

But Knight justifies his charge by suggesting a novel definition of pantheism. Its true definition is an *impersonal* "God" dwelling in grass and trees. For Knight, the dangerous source of pantheism is the 1888 concept of a *personal* God in close fellowship with us, linking the experience of righteousness by faith *in the believer's heart* with "the doctrine of the heavenly sanctuary and its cleansing." "The concept of the indwelling power of Christ ...

inherent in the 1888 message ... when pushed too far ... easily crosses the border into pantheism."

But this contrived definition creates insurmountable problems, for it logically suggests that the author of Hebrews was also a pantheist, as was Ellen White. And Jesus also pushes the concept very far, assuring His followers that the Holy Spirit, His Vicar, will not only "abide with you forever," but "shall be *in you."* That which proves too much proves nothing.

There is indeed evidence that at one period of his life Jones became harsh and abrasive. He lost his hold on the grace of meekness and became a bitter critic of his former brethren. *But this was more than a full decade after Minneapolis.* There are "two" Jones's: (a) the 1888-1903 "servant of God" who in general honored his commission and justified his "heavenly credentials," albeit at times exhibiting human weaknesses; and (b) the post-1903 Jones who lost his way tragically. Modern opponents of Jones confuse the two. And the really critical years were 1888-1893, for the opposition had so hardened by that time that our long wandering became inevitable after 1893. Jones's record during those early years seems clear.

The Centennial literature about Jones fails to give attention to a missing ingredient in the fascinating story. During those early years of his faithfulness, he suffered severe "unchristlike" "persecution," to borrow Ellen White's phrases *{General Conference Bulletin* 1893, p. 184). Its cumulative impact unsettled and deranged his spiritual faculties. The Lord could not have made a mistake in selecting him for his unique role—heralding "the beginning" of the loud cry message. Neither did Ellen White err in supporting him. "To a great degree" his later failure is the consequence of "our" uncharitable rejection of his message, which Ellen White often likened to the spirit of the ancient Jews in rejecting Christ.

Jones's failure thus had something to do with the consequence of what she said was our brethren insulting the Holy Spirit. When He comes in the form of the latter rain blessing and is "insulted," in that unique sense He has to leave. The latter rain blessing has to be withdrawn in the very time when it is desperately needed. Yet the ferment of time can not be halted; history must go on, and then all kinds of bad things develop. This is our denominational story.

Knight insists that Ellen White was not concerned about the doctrinal or theological aspects of Jones's and Waggoner's message. But her own writings demonstrate a keen concern for the same. He urges the church to *"start living the caring Christian life now,"* but without benefit of the "most precious message" that the Lord sent which alone can make such a reformation a reality. Thus his position logically sets the clock of reformation back and vitiates a hundred years of history.

In pre-Minneapolis times Ellen White often urged the church to start living "the caring Christian life now." But she complained that her exhortations were largely ineffective. When the message of Jones and Waggoner came, she rejoiced because she saw how it could transform Adventist imperatives into joyous enablings. Knight's position logically reiterates the 1888 opposition, holding to the popular legalistic imperatives while denigrating the God-given gospel enablings implicit in the actual 1888 message itself.

(4) The *Adventist Review* of January 7, 1988, the "Centennial Edition," honors the 1888 message while in fact disparaging it, saying that "Jones and Waggoner had error mixed in their message." In other words, be afraid of their message! Significantly, the entire issue does not permit them to say a word, rendering them virtually *persona non grata* even more

effectively than did the *Review* editor of a century ago. The unique essentials of their message find no place in this issue. Yet Luther, Paul Tournier, and even Uriah Smith, the foremost opponent of their message, are allowed to speak.

(5) *Ministry, International Journal for Clergy,* February 1988, the "righteousness by Faith—Special Edition." The main points as set forth by the various writers can be briefly summarized in italics. Our comments which follow in indentation are not intended to be critical or fault-finding. It is a blessing that this magazine was published for it has directed many thoughtful minds to study into the issues. These comments are offered in view of the shortness of time while the Lord still commissions the four angels to hold the four winds a little longer:

(a) *The 1888 Session was marked by open rebellion against Ellen White on the part of a large number of our ministers. She even wondered at one point whether God might have to call out another movement, but her confidence in God's leading of the church was restored. Most of the delegates, "the ministers generally," "nearly all," were opposed to the beginning of the glorious loud cry message* (cf. pp. 4, 6).

> ***This first article is a radical departure from decades of leadership insistence on an opposite view—that nearly all the 1888 delegates accepted the message. It is cause for rejoicing that the truth of the 1888 history is now being acknowledged, and in the fulness of the time the Lord can add His blessings to that. We heartily agree with the hopeful assurance of this article that in the end truth will be triumphant and that the church will yet respond to the leading of the Lord. Knowing the truth of our history must prepare the church for repentance and reconciliation with the Holy Spirit.***

(b) *We don't really know what was the 1888 message because Jones's and Waggoner's Minneapolis presentations were not taken down in shorthand. We have to rely on Ellen White's sermons and writings and what modern expositors assume is the message* (cf. pp. 15, 16, 23-33).

> ***The message of Jones and Waggoner was not confined to the supposedly unrecorded presentations at Minneapolis. Ellen White's endorsements relate to their on-going presentations through 1896, and even beyond. For example, her famous statement that the message is "most precious" does not mention either Minneapolis or 1888, but is dated 1896. (L. E. Froom says that Waggoner's widow told him that she did record her husband's 1888 presentations in shorthand, and that he adapted and expanded the material for his 1889 Signs editorials, his 1890 Christ and His Righteousness, and The Glad Tidings.)***

> ***Ellen White's books such as Steps to Christ and Desire of Ages are wonderful. Yet she never claimed that her writings made the 1888 message of Jones and Waggoner passé. Neither did she ever claim that her books presented the message of the latter rain or the loud cry, yet she did make that claim regarding the 1888 message. Millions of copies of Steps have been widely circulated, yet the latter rain has not come. Why? Another millenium of receiving the early rain will not bring the***

grain to harvest because the latter rain is essential. Is it wise to disparage the message that Ellen White said marked its beginning?

(c) *The message of righteousness by faith as presented by Jones and Waggoner contained error. It led to "holy flesh" and pantheism heresies. Ellen White criticized their message and found fault with it* (cf. p. 13, 61).

Every writer who portrays the message as erroneous relies on that one lone exceptional Ellen White sentence--"Some interpretations of Scripture given by Dr. Waggoner I do not regard as correct" (Ms. 15, 1888). To wrest this from its context denies literally hundreds of other statements that express unqualified endorsement. Only a flawed methodology can interpret it as a criticism of Waggoner's theology when she says on the same page, "That which has been presented harmonizes perfectly with the light which God has been pleased to give me." A few days later she adds, "When I ... had heard for the first time the views of Elder E. J. Waggoner, ... I stated that I had heard precious truths uttered that I could respond to with all my heart." "Every fiber of my heart said amen" (Ms. 24, 1888; Ms. 5, 1889). If we italicize her "I" as she may well have emphasized it in that Ms. 15, 1888 sentence, all contradiction is removed. She says that she is ready to exchange personal preconceived opinions for greater light.

The ultimate test of Jones's and Waggoner's unique message is the witness of Scripture. Here the evidence is also solid.

(d) *A significant share of the blame for the church leadership rejecting the message between 1888 and 1896 lies with Jones and Waggoner, who were basically unconverted men at that time, "proud, opinionated." They showed an unsanctified spirit in presenting their righteousness by faith message* (cf. pp. 11, 13, 61).

No evidence from Ellen White supports these dark allegations. Neither do we find it in the newly published correspondence of contemporaries from 1888 to 1896. It is difficult to understood how the Lord would select two messengers for a special work in 1888 if they were at that time unconverted, harsh, obnoxious, arrogant, proud, opinionated, cantankerous, or abrasive.[3]

(e) *Several writers suggest that personal experience and winsomeness are more important than truth. Another counters this by saying that true experience cannot take place without comprehending true doctrine. But the emphasis of this* Ministry *is that we do not*

---

[3] In a letter to Jones long after he had "apostatized" Ellen White said he had "never yet been thoroughly converted" (November 19, 1911). If the "never yet" goes back to the time when the Lord sustained him in his labors, we have a serious problem with Ellen White's endorsements and with Jones's obviously contrite experience at that time. The phrase "never yet" more likely has reference to the timing of her appeals to him in the post-1900 period when he was a man who had "lost his bearings," and thus lost his conversion.

need the doctrine or theological teachings of the 1888 message itself and that it is wrongheaded to give serious credence to them (cf. pp. 16, 61).

> ***Biblical righteousness by faith says the "gospel is the power of God unto salvation." There is in it a doctrinal "truth of the gospel" which contradicts the falsehood of "another gospel." "The truth shall make you free." Doctrinal error corrupts and paralyzes the gospel, even when presented in small amounts. A correct "experience" in the time of the final issues is impossible without the full truth of the gospel which communicates a saving knowledge as its built-in feature.***

(f) *There is no difference between "translation faith" and "resurrection faith." Those who stand in the final time of trouble will not overcome or reflect Christ's character more significantly than those who have lived in past ages* (cf. p. 42)

> ***This seems to be a contradiction of the following: "Those who are living upon the earth when the intercession of Christ shall cease in the sanctuary above are to stand in the sight of a holy God without a mediator.... There is to be a special work of purification, of putting away of sin, among God's people on earth" {The Great Controversy, p. 425; see also p. 623). Since the beginnings of the Advent Movement our people have recognized the unique nature of the mature faith of those who are ready to welcome Christ at His return; if this were not clearly supported by many Bible and Spirit of Prophecy statements, it should be discarded as Ministry recommends. But the inspired support is voluminous.***

(g) *What we say is less important than how we say it In other words, true doctrine seems less important than a pleasant personality* (cf. p. 61).

> ***Carried to its logical conclusion, this position could give credence to the mark of the beast instead of to the seal of God provided the proponent shows what appears to be a more pleasant, winsome spirit. "Many a man of cultured intellect and pleasant manners ... is but a polished instrument in the hands of Satan" [Great Controversy, p. 509). The New Testament teaches that while the truth as it is in Jesus will always make the believer Christlike in spirit, it will also make one aggressive for truth in a sanctified sense; and the 1888 messengers notably demonstrated this.***

(h) *The apostasy of Jones and Waggoner is a warning not to trust their message. In other words, it cannot be "most precious" if it led to their downfall* (cf. pp. 13, 61).

> ***This does not harmonize with Ellen White's several statements that the messengers' failure or apostasy will in no way invalidate their message, but that those who think so will be under "a fatal delusion" (Letter S24, 1892).***

(i) *Being a reformer is a bad idea because it is dangerous. Reformers are generally held in low esteem* (cf. p. 62).

Being a self-appointed, fanatical "reformer" is indeed dangerous; but cooperating with the Holy Spirit in reformation cannot be dangerous. The church desperately needs genuine revival and reformation, and it may not be safe to wait for another generation to effect it.

(j) *Adventist theology and preaching are more Christ-centered today than before 1888. This indicates commendable spiritual progress since 1888* (cf. p. 62).

This may be quite true, but whether or not it is depends more on the judgment of Christ than upon our own. Is not His message in Revelation 3:14-17 still applicable? For sure, the essential elements of the 1888 message are still opposed and even silenced a hundred years later, and worldliness and lukewarmness abound. This would not be true if the pure gospel were clearly proclaimed, for it is "the power of God unto salvation." Careful motif analysis may reveal that there is far more legalism still implicit in our current teaching than we care to recognize.

(k) *The 1888 message was well accepted in the decade following Minneapolis, and the new General Conference president, O. A. Olsen* (not A. V. Olson) *supported it "enthusiastically"* (cf. p. 62).

This is refuted by Ellen White's 1896 testimonies which represent Olsen acting "as did Aaron" in weakly submitting to the driving influence of determined opponents of the message. See her clear statements cited in this book, pp. 178, 179.

(l) *Daniel's prayer in chapter 9 does not express corporate repentance, but intercession, nor does it support the idea that one generation can repent for the sins of a previous one. The idea of corporate repentance is also confused in this magazine, assuming that it means a formal action of the General Conference in session acknowledging the wrong of a century ago, and voting "official" regret for it* (cf. pp. 34-36; 7,8).

Something further needs study—the reality of the guilt the whole world shares for the murder of the Son of God [Testimonies to Ministers, p. 38; Desire of Ages, p. 745; Romans 3:19). Should only the ancient Jews and Romans repent for that sin? Calvary sums up the world's corporate guilt—guilt for sins that we may not have personally committed but would commit except for the grace of God because of our natural human enmity against Him (Romans 8:7). This guilt is shared by every human being, apart from specific repentance. Ministry must also recognize Christ's experience of corporate repentance in behalf of the world, as His baptism demonstrates {In Heavenly Places, p. 252; Review and Herald, January 21, 1873; General Conference Bulletin, 1901, p. 36). Biblical corporate repentance is personal, individual repentance for the sins of others as though they were our own, which they would be but for the grace of Christ. We all need Christ's righteousness imputed 100%. Confusion in realizing the true depths of corporate repentance frustrates the message of Christ's righteousness, implying that we do not need its complete imputation.

No responsible minister or scholar, to our knowledge, has ever been so naive as to recommend a formal vote by a General Conference in session, or even by a

committee, as a method of righting the wrong of 1888. "Corporate confession" has always been a misnomer. "Corporate repentance" is the proper term, and thank God it has now been recognized as worthy of serious study.

(m) *God has predetermined the time for Christ's second coming. Therefore to avoid "a skewed picture" we must discount inspired statements which say that we have delayed it by our unbelief or that we can hasten it by repentance and true faith. It is assumed that Christ has delayed His coming, but it would follow logically that it is "wicked" to suggest that we have delayed it* (cf. pp. 41-45).

This is the opposite of what Christ says in His parable. This thesis hangs on two isolated Ellen White statements, both misapplied and one actually misquoted. While it is true that Christ's return has been delayed, it is not He who has delayed it, but we:

(i) "Like the stars in the vast circuit of their appointed path, God's purposes know no haste and no delay" (Desire of Ages, p. 32). Here Ellen White discusses the first coming of Christ, not His second. Note the context: "The hour for Christ's coming had been determined. When the great clock of time pointed to that hour, Jesus was born in Bethlehem." The author assumes that because there was a predetermined time for the first coming of our Lord, there must be the same for the second. The first was set by Daniel's time prophecies; the second is in a different category: "In the days of the voice of the seventh angel, when he shall begin to sound" there shall be kronos no longer (Revelation 10:7, 6). In other words, since 1844 there are no more predestined, predetermined times.

(ii) "The apparent tarrying is not so in reality, for at the appointed time our Lord will come" (Letter 38, 1888). Our author later misquotes this as "His 'appointed time,'" when our Lord Himself explains what is "the appointed time"—not predeterminism but "when the grain ripens, [when] immediately He puts in the sickle." "The time has come for You to reap, for the harvest of the earth is ripe" (Mark 4:39; Revelation 14:15). Our author makes no reference to these two key Bible passages, but causes Ellen White virtually to contradict both. He further remarks that "Ellen White did say that Christ has delayed His coming," but causes her to use the language of the unfaithful servant in the parable. In reality it is we who have delayed it.

This thesis introduces an element of Calvinism into Adventist thinking, disparaging the reality of the 1888 event in relation to the timing of the second advent. The Father's infinite foreknowledge allows not a thread of Calvinistic predeterminism.

(n) *"The Dynamics of Salvation" is recommended as a statement on righteousness by faith so complete and effective that it virtually renders unnecessary the publication of the 1888 message itself. Here is evidence that leadership understands, believes, and preaches the message. The preface deplores the fact that some charge the leadership of the church today*

with holding the righteousness by faith views of those who opposed the 1888 message a century ago (cf. pp. 22-28).

(i) It is obvious that this has become a sensitive and emotionally charged issue. It is true that the present authors have indeed taken the position for years that our popular "righteousness by faith" today is largely a combination of that of the Sunday-keeping churches and of what those taught who opposed the 1888 message a century ago.

(ii) The present authors must confess that they believe the evidence indicates that our long wilderness wandering for a century and the world-wide lukewarmness of the church are indeed evidence of rejecting the 1888 message and starving our people for it. We do not wish to antagonize our brethren; we wish only to be honest in stating our convictions as conscience requires, and to state them in a spirit of Christlike love and loyalty.

(iii) This issue is so vitally important that the world church must consider it candidly. If our position is wrong, the world church must reject it decidedly. If we are right, nothing could be more important to settle on the side of truth. We must honestly analyze the 1888 message in the extant writings, and compare with it our contemporary presentations of the gospel. The predominant views of the church can be motif-analyzed in our denominational publications. We shall find that the 1888 messengers achieved a breakthrough in doctrinal and practical understanding that bridged Calvinism and Arminianism and went far beyond both. This was the reason for Ellen White's decade of enthusiasm for their message. A message that more clearly recovers the full truths of the gospel than did the 16th century Reformers or our own exegetes today must lighten the earth with glory.

(iv) The claims made for this document are like those of the 1952 General Conference president at the Sligo Bible Conference. He claimed that the message presented there surpassed the 1888 message. It is futile for Ministry to claim that our scholars do the same today, and it is equally futile for these present authors to maintain that they do not. Let the world church consider the objective evidence by comparing the two.

(v) The following are some of the 1888 concepts that are unique: legal justification and the effectiveness of that which is by faith; the glorious good news of the two covenants; the mighty power of Christ to save from continuing sin; His nearness in taking our fallen sinful nature; the initiative of the Holy Spirit in saving the lost; the Good Shepherd's initiative in seeking His lost sheep; the possibility of overcoming all sin even as Christ overcame in our behalf; the certainty of a final generation reflecting the perfection of Christ's character; the practical relation of the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary to the cleansing of human hearts; the motivation of concern for Christ's honor that transcends self-centered seeking of reward or avoiding punishment; the reality of the lost taking the initiative to be lost; and the truth that the sacrifice of Christ accomplished far more than making a

mere provision that does nothing unless we do something— He gave His blood for the world, therefore the world owes its present life to Him. The 1888 message probed the depths of the atonement in a way that must yet capture the attention of the world.

With the exception of a few brief excerpts one writer cites from Waggoner, neither of the 1888 messengers endorsed by Ellen White is allowed to speak in *Ministry.* The 64-page magazine is devoted to 1888, yet the reader catches no glimpse of the authentic message itself as "the Lord in His great mercy" sent it. Undoubtedly the reason is that the editors know that every unique element of that message is controverted today, so that the 1888 message itself has now become the stone of stumbling and the rock of offense to the Seventh-day Adventist Church, as Christ became such to the ancient Jews.

(6) *Perfect in Christ* by Helmut Ott (Review and Herald, 1987) is recommended in the *Adventist Review,* January 7, 1988, p. 21. It "focuses upon two themes of the 1888 session: Christ's work today in securing salvation of those who accept Him, and the all-sufficient righteousness of Christ imputed to mankind through faith."

In fact, the basic thesis of this book is a direct contradiction of the 1888 message of Christ's righteousness. But the author has so skilfully manipulated Scripture and Ellen White statements that the Review editors assumed that the manuscript taught a valid righteousness by faith.

The basic idea is that our mighty Saviour is so weak that He never enables "believers to develop perfect righteousness or attain spiritual wholeness" or demonstrate His righteousness "in their personal historical lives." Their continued sinning and practical unrighteousness is conveniently covered by the legal substitution of Christ's perfect righteousness. The author creates a straw man that he can ridicule by the derogatory use of his own verb: "Believers" do not "actually *achieve"* "perfect righteousness ... in their personal historical lives."

But the true, issue is not whether believers will *achieve* a Christlike character but whether through faith in Him they will *demonstrate* such a character "in their personal historical lives." Scripture overwhelmingly says they will.

The volume misses the point of the 1888 concept of justification by faith. The *legal* declaration of justification that results from Christ's sacrifice applies to the "whole world," to "all men" (Romans 3:23, 24; 5:18; 2 Corinthians 5:19; 1 John 2:2; John 1:29, etc.). But those who respond to the Good News, who *believe,* experience justification *by faith,* and are thus made truly obedient to all the commandments of God. The instrumentality which accomplishes this miracle is "faith which worketh by love." Thus God's people will *demonstrate* "in their personal historical lives" a true obedience.

The White Estate Staff in early 1988 released an "Analysis" of Ott's book which concludes that it is incomprehensible that it could have been published by a Seventh-day Adventist press. The analysis demonstrates that it makes "of none effect the testimony of the Spirit of God" as presented in the writings of Ellen White, and that the arguments used are supported by the same misuse and misinterpretation of Ellen White statements that were characteristic of Desmond Ford. (January 20, 1988).

(7) *Grace on Trial* by Robert J. Wieland is a book manuscript that was requested in 1987 by the editors at the Pacific Press who planned to market the volume for the 1988

camp meeting season. It was duly submitted to the editors according to normal denominational procedure. After examining the manuscript, the editors voted to publish it and proceeded to edit it. When it was in the early production process, the General Conference intervened and forced them to reject it.

If it had been published by Pacific Press, it would have been the first book of the Centennial Series that allowed the 1888 messengers to present their message in their own words.

(8) *What Every Adventist Should Know about 1888* by Arnold V. Wallenkampf (Review and Herald, 1988) is a milestone in our denominational history. An expanded version of four unpublished articles Dr. Wallenkampf wrote in 1979, this book thoroughly contradicts the rich-and-increased-with-goods thesis of the major works about 1888 that have been authoritatively published for the past forty years.

The author makes abundantly clear that the gracious message was resisted and rejected by "the majority of the ministers at the [1888] conference," and that the resistance continued "with the passing of the years." He says that we have been in a "state of rebellion against God." Seventh-day Adventist leaders "cruelly treated" the Holy Spirit with "hard words ... aimed at Christ Himself." Our true history is a "groupthink" "betrayal and crucifixion of Jesus" which "staggers one's imagination." We must learn "not to follow leaders blindly." "If the majority of the delegates to the Minneapolis conference had not followed their leaders in rejecting the 1888 message, Ellen White would not have implied that Christ was figuratively crucified at the conference."

Further, he notes that the repentance of the most influential of the opponents of the message "was not wholehearted and complete." "A largely imperceptible ground swell of opposition was rising against it" in the decade following Minneapolis. "By 1899 the church's righteousness had become nauseating to our Saviour." Ellen White's exile to Australia was related to the 1888 unbelief: "It was largely discomfort among certain influential leaders with her and her messages that had spawned the plan that took her to Australia in 1891." Little improvement followed 1901: "Apparently, by 1902 to 1904 the church was in danger of sliding back to the same state that had existed prior to the Minneapolis conference." Ellen White did not believe "that the majority of Seventh-day Adventists had accepted the 1888 message as a personal experience before her death in 1915." In 1926, A. G. Daniells "believed that the Adventist Church was still waiting for the experience that God had hoped to introduce at Minneapolis."

According to Wallenkampf, we have created tragic unbelief today by "pretending" that initial rejection turned into later "enthusiastic acceptance." "If we do not forthrightly present the history of the 1888 General Conference session and its aftermath, we as a denomination perpetuate the sin committed at Minneapolis in 1888. By doing so, we join our spiritual forefathers and virtually crucify Christ anew in the person of the Holy Spirit."

A General Conference leader is speaking forthrightly at last: "It is incumbent on us as a people to confess that for a long time we have largely glossed over the virtual rejection of the 1888 message.... God wants all His followers to be truthful and honest." "Our present responsibility is to tell the truth about the Minneapolis conference of 1888 and its aftermath. There is no virtue in saying that all has been well when this is not so." These are his words, not ours.

Amen!

May the Holy Spirit in great mercy enable us all to be honest in this Centennial year! He can grant revival, reformation, and repentance if we will simply tell the full truth and stop repressing or denying it. This will bring reconciliation with Christ and heal our internecine alienations. Surely 100 years is time enough to face the reality of Christ's call to "the *angel* of the church of the Laodiceans" to repent. (Wallenkampf recognizes that this "angel" is the leadership of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, and that our decades of denial have produced world-wide lukewarmness and lethargy in the church). The evidence is now clear that Christ has had enough. He cannot forever endure His nausea.

There is definitely progress in the 1988 Centennial. Focusing denominational attention on 1888, its history and its message, even by misinformation, can be blessed of the Lord to the awakening of many minds. Especially youth who are confused by contemporary Adventism will be intrigued by the new candor. And the Holy Spirit permits even the publication of falsehood to be overruled by sharper delineations of truth. (Wallenkampf attacks the idea of corporate repentance but gives clear evidence he sincerely does not understand it. The widespread 1988 ridicule of corporate and denominational repentance will be overruled by the Holy Spirit to stir up many serious minds to ponder more deeply Christ's call in Revelation 3:19. It is abhorrent for Adventist leaders to heap-scorn on *His call). .*

Hopefully, this generation will come to realize our true spiritual need as a people, and experience a hunger and thirst for the righteousness (by faith) that the Lord in His great mercy tried to give us. Repentance cannot be worked up by ourselves or forced even by the publication of overwhelming documentary evidence. It remains a precious gift from God.

We hope and we pray that He will graciously give it to this generation.

ANNOTATED INDEX

PREFACE
Authors hold conviction message is final cure for sin
SDA's lack clear concept of heavenly Day of Atonement
Off-shoots and independent ministeries proliferate
Full truth requires repentance and reformation
God will not permit denomination to fully apostatize
What Did the 1888 Message Say?
Ten points
Significance of the Message Today

CHAPTER ONE

WHY RE-EXAMINE OUR ADVENTIST PAST?
Adventist Movement has not progressed as destined
God cannot vindicate lukewarm people
Plan of redemption depends on final hour
The Reason Is Evident
Special preparation for second coming
Abraham's faith not in vain
Failure: An Unthinkable Denouement of God's Program
Must be response of faith on our part
God's people must rectify every failure
Official misunderstanding of history
Need for thorough investigation
Repentance and Day of Atonement
Cleansing of sanctuary depends on understanding history
Lukewarm disease traced to 1888
Like Calvary 1888 more than historical event
Resentment indicates war with Holy Spirit
Insight Needed Rather Than More Works
Facing truth is not being critical
History must bring us to a confrontation
Church must decide one Lord or other—Baal

CHAPTER TWO

THE SIN OF LEAVING OUR FIRST LOVE
Jesus was precious to 1844 believers
SDA Church conceived in love and work of Holy Spirit
Devotion for Jesus replaced by love of self
System of truth crowded out faith in Jesus
Corporate vindication became hope rather than meeting Beloved
Legalism was the result

How Our Lukewarmness Took Root

"First love" lost, not appreciating His sacrificial love
Resentment against ministry of EGW
Ability to discern work of Holy Spirit faded away
Preview of insult to Holy Spirit in 1888
Movement's survival depended on ministry of EGW
Place of cross eluded us

Growth Vs. Progress

Prosperous growth covered true spiritual state
Self-esteem and complacency took over in reports
EGW messages in sharp contrast
Lack of spiritual maturity most remarkable
Character development primary purpose
Secondary purpose world missions
Second purpose assured when primary attained
Self-love blinds to true understanding
Statistical records usurp faith and zeal

God's Simple Remedy for a Serious Denominational Problem

God sent two young agents
EGW delighted with their message
Affirmed God sent truth, Christ in messages

Our Problem Today

Lukewarmness, denominational pride is staggering problem
Key to understanding lies in true appraisal of 1888
Priceless blessings shut off, Holy Spirit insulted

CHAPTER THREE

THE LOUD CRY TO COME IN A SURPRISING WAY

Latter rain, loud cry to be increased light
False optimism prevailed
Work of God not recognized
Experienced ministers to be passed by

The Divine Choice of Messengers

Spirit preparing two young men
Jones and Waggoner termed "Lord's messengers"
EGW approved the message
EGW perceived message would prepare for second coming

How the Loud Cry Was Not Recognized

Message given was third angel's message
The "message" was the beginning, not the assumed acceptance
Church's responsible officer foremost in opposing
Insulting Holy Spirit did not commit unpardonable sin
EGW continued to minister indicating her belief

So-Called "Faults" of Messengers No Excuse to Reject Their Message

Rejection of light is always inexcusable

The agents seemed faulty
Experienced brethren piqued at EGW support
EGW appraises situation, "hate and dispise the messengers"
Jones and Waggoner "faults" perpetuated by current writers
To criticize "messengers" is to endorse their contemporary opponents
EGW condemned flaw picking
EGW considered it privilege to stand with messengers

The True Reason Why the Message Was Rejected

Mistakenly assumed brethren accepted message wholeheartedly
Message for finishing work became beginning of long delay

Who Were the "Some"?

The "some" were the bulk of leading influential brethren
Jews refused Christ, did not come in accordance with expectations
1888 message far more than re-emphasis of neglected doctrine
Love of Christ that melts hearts unwelcome

CHAPTER FOUR

ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION: IN SEARCH OF A SHARPER FOCUS

Impossible to appreciate 1888 message apart from truth of its history
The issue is whether the leadership accepted it
Rejection of message by leadership denied by Froom
President and vice-president agree no rejection
Secretary EGW Estate assures message accepted
EGW repeatedly likens leadership rejection to that of Jews against Christ

The Jews Deny That They Rejected the Messiah

Evasion of fact that message was beginning latter rain and loud cry
Claimed that only few unimportant persons resisted
Froom, Spalding, Christian, Olson, agree no rejection
Their accounts differ markedly from EGW

Was the Message Accepted or Rejected?

GC President Daniells says 1888 history marked a "defeat"
Daniells insists no denomination-wide revival
EGW says era was victory for Satan
1893 GC session confirms rejection

Significant Inspired Evidence

EGW affirms not one of leading brethren willing to stand for message
Years later, 1896, referred to "satanic work at Minneapolis"

A Plea for Simple Honesty

Daniells recognizes EGW statements regarding leaders
Twenty-two EGW statements showing leadership disdain and resistance
Chronology of rejection, 1892, 1893, 1895, 1896, 1897

The Story of the Post-1888 Revivals

Undercurrent of antagonism persisted

The Counter-Revival Pressure

EGW saw leadership problem, appealed for trust in God

Leadership saw demonstration of Holy Spirit, but "hated" the message

"Just Like the Jews"

"Woes upon the Pharisees" applied to leadership

Our Upside-Dawn History

Historians assumed "revival" but history says otherwise

Warning the world depended on acceptance

There Is Good News in the 1888 History!

A battle was lost but not the war

Satan desires we should be deceived about our 1888 history

Conclusion

Historians sincere in proclaiming 1888 glorious victory

Critics say church now in hopeless condition

This is not true; Israel will never become Babylon

Sometime history will be seen in its true bearing

Fire was quenched, light put out by human instrumentalities

Message of Christ's righteousness not received, battle lost but not war

This generation must recognize facts and rectify tragic mistake

ADDITIONAL NOTE TO CHAPTER FOUR

The Testimony of the General Conference Archives

Achival files corroborates EGW testimony regarding negative attitude

Letters of GC secretary reveal "antagonism"

A Glimpse Behind the Scenes in Old Battle Creek

Plan to hide facts spoiled by Waggoner

GC secretary cannot see "messengers" in the light EGW saw them

Archives confirm Jones and Waggoner were opposed at Battle Creek

Uriah Smith Defends His Rejection of the Message

Uriah Smith's opposition logical, scholarly, apparently reasonable

There may be "Uriah Smiths" in church today

Heart enmity prevented good brethren from recognizing Holy Spirit

CHAPTER FIVE

THE FUNDAMENTAL PROBLEM: HOW TO EVALUATE THE 1888 MESSAGE

Error of rejection based on error of misunderstanding

Confusion over "doctrine" and "third angel's message in verity"

Froom insists men outside Advent Movement gave "same...emphasis"

Was message same as Protestant Reformers taught?

(1) Cannot be else we deny historic Protestant position

(2) If same then Reformers preached "third angel's message in verity"

Officially endorsed views cancel uniqueness of message

The Re-Emphasis View of 1888

1888 message was not a mere re-emphasis of Luther or pioneers

"Beginning" of mature concept of "everlasting gospel"

Intended by Divine Author to ripen firstfruits unto God and Lamb

Rejection eclipsed practical understanding of sanctuary cleansing

What Ellen White Saw in the Message of 1888

EGW recognized message as "precious" never clearly preached before
Message was not previously comprehended by brethren
EGW discussed sanctuary truth in connection with 1888 message
Brethren rejected call for "most decided changes," refused to advance

The Light of 1888 the Beginning of Greater Light

1888 message was beginning of fourth angel's message
This fact ignored by our historians

The Light of the Loud Cry Turned Off

Latter rain despised and rejected, thus impossible send further showers
EGW says Christ knocked for entrance but turned away

The Source of Reformationist Misunderstanding

For decades 1888 message disparaged as "new light"
Message was an advanced revelation to the church
Jews pray for Messiah; SDA pray for latter rain; both reject history

CHAPTER SIX

THE 1888 REJECTION OF ELLEN WHITE

Heaven's blessing blocked by negative reaction to message

(1) The Holy Spirit Was Insulted

Reception of Holy Spirit implicit in reception of message
EGW emphatic, Holy Spirit insulted
SDA corporate character negatively affected by our history

(2) Jesus Christ Was Spurned and Insulted

"Reject Christ's delegated messengers, you reject Christ"
Esteemed church historian casts contempt on messenger
Issue not "doctrine," but "What think ye of Christ?"
"Universe ... witnessed the disgraceful treatment of Jesus"

(3) Ellen White's Ministry Was Disparaged

"My testimony was ignored"
"Rebellion ... hard, bold and decided in denouncing"
Brethren were instinctively opposing Christ's love
"There are those who despised the men and the message"

A Glorious Treasure Hunt Despised

Charges of "extreme views" casts unjustified aspersion on EGW
1893 session acknowledges "set this prophet aside with all the rest"
"You acknowledged [EGW]... now different. Just like the Jewish nation"

(4) Ellen White's Exile to Australia

"The Lord was not in our leaving America"
"I could not get one ray of light to leave America"
Waggoner suffered similar exile to England

Do the 1890's Have a Message for the 1990's?

1888 history so garbled contemporary attitude still unappreciative
Today heart alienation more subtle, sophisticated, deeply buried

Without Holy Spirit, not able to discern truth from error

Conclusion

In no other way than facing truth can we prepare for future tests
Continued resistance for century hindered the Gift, despite our prayers

CHAPTER SEVEN

A CLOSER LOOK AT THE "CONFESSIONS"

Confessions practically extorted by compelling evidence
Confessors subsequently acted contrary to their confessions
Very little frank open reconciliation that led to brotherly union
No evidence quenching of Holy Spirit was reversed
Confessors did not recover essence of message to proclaim it well

Contemporary Views of the Post-1888 Confessions

Predominant view is that we "have" the message, therefore proclaiming

There Are Problems With This View

Where is evidence the message and light were recovered?
Why wasn't "work" finished after time of confession and repentance?
Why does EGW persist with statements as late as 1901, leaders oppose

The Testimony of Our History

Uriah Smith able editor, author, persistant opposer
EGW held him responsible for negative influence far and wide
His faith in work of EGW not strong, and so cast influence

How Something Miscarried

Assented to light but failed to act upon it
We know today editor's optimism was unfounded
Repeatedly followed line diametrically opposed to present truth
Editor took open issue with Waggoner and Jones in Review
The issue is the proclamation of the loud cry message
"They can never regain that which they have lost"

Conclusion

Sincere, good, lovable brethren misread actual situation in Battle Creek
Uriah Smith prototype conservative unbelieving SDA's never changed
"Tops" of unbelief cut down, "roots" left intact
In some instances official views today identical to opposition in 1888
Parallel misconceptions cause statistical reports to beguile us
Confusion regarding message spawns transgression in all departments
Cleansing of heavenly sanctuary requires complementary work in hearts
Power needed is light, gospel completion natural consequence

CHAPTER EIGHT

A MOVEMENT IN CRISIS: THE 1893 GENERAL CONFERENCE SESSION

1893 GC session ranks next in importance to that of 1888
The message of 1888 was overwhelming issue of importance

Forebodings of Great Danger

"God will withdraw His Spirit unless His truth is accepted"
Speakers recognized unprecedented seriousness
Failure to accept would result in acceptance of false light

Lessons From Israel "Written for Our Admonition"

Light received a blessing, but own wisdom turns it into "a poison"
Writers have compared Israel at Kadesh-Barnea to our 1888 history
1893 is counterpart of later attempt to capture "promised land"
Israel's effort a failure; so 1893 enthusiasm false excitement, failure

A. T. Jones Studies

Jones presented twenty-four studies, "Third Angel's Message"
Spoke humbly of "our" failures, "our" unbelief and need of the Lord
Jones presented a solid genuine work of the Holy Spirit

CHAPTER NINE

A FALSE RIGHTEOUSNESS BY FAITH: SOWING THE SEED OF APOSTASY

(The 1893 General Conference Session, Part II)

Rejection of 1888 light opened way for false ideas
Jones reminded session mind devoted to self becomes mind of Satan
Traced development through paganism, Romanism, spiritualism
Catholic view contrasted with Steps to Christ
Essence of Romanism is self-worship
Counterfeit exposed, The Christians Secret of a Happy Life
Teachings from Fenelon, Catholic mystic

W. W. Prescott's Studies

Series of sermons on "The Promise of the Holy Spirit"
Prescott severly demanded that the brethren get right
Messages revert to the egocentric motivation of works
Confused presentations hindered acceptance of true message

An Effort to Resolve the Stalemate

Prescott studies brought confusion which unsettled even Jones
Audience lead to believe, receive Holy Spirit by assuming and claiming
Doctrine developed we receive H. S. without knowledge or repentance

Jones Confused

Both failed to realize: latter rain withdrawn, Israel return to wander
Unfortunate prophecies made that have never yet been fulfilled
Prescott predicted manifestation of gifts of the Spirit
Prescott and Jones deceived by unfortunate claims

Prescott's Predictions of Apostasy

Seemed to know no sure way to tell truth from error
Following decade dark with fires and pantheism

Conclusion

1893 session marked end of the 1888 era
Assumed "greatest victory" cannot account for further delay of century
1950 session followed 1893 assumption, receive Spirit by claiming

EGW had warned, "Change leaders and not know it"

CHAPTER TEN

WHY DID JONES AND WAGGONER LOSE THEIR WAY?

Great mystery in SDA history why Jones and Waggoner later failed
Popular view is they were radical, extreme, in error at Minneapolis
Such a view cannot be reconciled with appraisal of EGW
Message and messengers subtly disparaged and opposed to this day

A Mysterious Providence

To suppose the Lord made strategic mistake is unthinkable
Jones and Waggoner driven away by persistent unreasoning opposition
EGW fixed ultimate blame "to a great degree" upon brethren
Lord permitted sad event as test to confirm "us" in unbelief
Investigative judgment requires church to see truth of message

The Deep-Seated Nature of the Opposition

Brethren "ever ready to show ... they differ with" J & W
Two men spoke positively and strongly which piqued uncrucified self
Personality of Jones and Waggoner became stumblingblock

The Personal Burden Which Jones and Waggoner Bore

J & W knew message from God, beginning loud cry, to finish work
Their sin, lost faith in corporate body of church and leadership
EGW sensed pressure might be more than they could bear
Failure tended to confirm leadership impenitence
Failure cited today as evidence 1888 message dangerous

What Was A. T. Jones' Problem?

One letter of EGW out of context cited against Jones
EGW "dream" letter accepted, humble repentance followed
Letter stated his views correct, as "our position"
Jones writings do not say "works amount to nothing"
Jones led astray by Prescott's influence

No Sin is Ever Excusable

J & W failure has kept later generations from idolatrous respect
EGW insisted unchristlike persecution primary cause of failure
They knew "beginning" of loud cry, not sufficient for sanctification

How Good Men Can Lose their Way

Office of GC president not justify wounding brethren
J & W promotion of 1901 constitution misconstrued by president
President denied charge of "kingly power" by EGW
Jones challenged delegation to show he was against organization
J & W defeat in 1903 probably beginning eventual human bitterness
Jones' "heavenly credentials" to herald "loud cry" not administer

The 1888 Spirit and the Kellogg Tragedy

EGW states Dr. Kellogg was truly converted at Minneapolis
Kellogg's eventual apostasy largely our responsibility says EGW

The "manna" of 1888 had been rejected, it spoiled, sad story

Conclusion

Waggoner acknowledged "superior goodness of the brethren"
Could not understand why God had given him light
Jones died with confidence in SDA message
Their messages reprinted would provide grand view of pure gospel

CHAPTER ELEVEN

THE "ALPHA" AND THE "OMEGA" CRISIS

Terrible pantheism crisis nearly overwhelmed SDA church, early 1900's
Deception follows rejection of light, unalterable law of history
What we failed to believe, must learn by detour we devised

The Alpha History of the Early 1900's Illustrates This Principle

Lord cannot force by fear, must await our disillusionment, win by love
Warned at Minneapolis, follow Christ or fall under Satan's generalship
Enemy seized chance to confuse our understanding
Daniells recognized in 1926 warning justified, enemy won
"Alpha" deceptions effective because of previous rejection of light

The Danger of Impatience

Lord had to alter His purpose, keep in step with His people
Human critics impatient, delay for sake of church
End of detour good, church will sense true repentance

"The Whole Church" Versus "the Whole Church"

Whole church revived after the "shaking," not before
Understanding of our history necessary to attain that goal

The Foundation of the Pantheism Heresy

Arrogance of human heart became soil for deception to take root
"Eyes not anointed with heavenly eyesalve ... understanding blinded"
"Fanaticism will appear in the very midst of us. Deceptions will come"
Pantheism is foreign to third and fourth angel's messages

The Dark Decade of Our History

Light calling for repentance extinguished in clouds of unbelief
"Captain Norman" deception, agent of the devil
"Astonishing backsliding" with God's people, church "frigid"
Source of spiritual difficulty, rejection of latter rain and loud cry

CHAPTER TWELVE

THE PANTHEISM APOSTASY

Intervention of EGW saved church from foundering on pantheism
Respected leaders deaf to pending fate of church
Pantheistic sentiments bewitched ministers, physicians
"Watchman ... on the walls of Zion? Are they asleep?"
Pantheism test not final, Satan must bring supreme "omega"
Presenting post-1888 history as "victory" cancels Kellogg lesson

Loss of Battle Creek Sanitarium not the "omega"

Where Lies the Truth About the "Omega"?

"Omega" being an event is contrary to EGW declarations
She said, "many will depart from the faith".
She said omega will be a "danger," end of alphabet of deadly heresies
When omega should come she said, "I trembled for our people"
Alphabet symbolism requires development of apostasy within the church
EGW regarded the omega trials as experience following her death

Conclusion

Truth of our past history gives hope and confidence for the future
Long detour of wandering must lead in time to Christ
He has staked His throne on the honesty of His people

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

ELLEN WHITE'S PREDICTIONS OF BAAL-WORSHIP

Our youth see "specific inadequacies" in today's Adventism
True leader of SDA church not General Conference but Christ Himself
If church is dull, because false Christ has usurped place of true one
Adventist "distinctiveness" must prevail or we have no reason to exist

Rejection of the 1888 Message Leads to Baal-Worship

Following 1888 EGW saw "great danger" at heart of work
Mere belief in "Supreme Being" not sufficient in Day of Atonement
Because of 1888 failure, unbelief of ancient Israel would afflict us
Baal would be our choice
Satan tries to destroy uniqueness of this people's mission
Many stand in our pulpits with torch of "false prophecy" in their hands

What Is Baal-Worship?

Are EGW predictions of Baal-worship of serious concern today?
Baal the god of the Canaanites means "the lord"
Striking similarities between Israel's religion and contemporary paganism
Apostasy in Elijah's day gradual, unconscious over a century
Worship of self disguised as worship of Christ is Baal-worship
Current cult of self-love is antithetical to devotion to Christ
Ladder-climbing, promotion, prestige, power motivates prophets of Baal
Baal-worship intrudes where self-centered motivation prevails

How Jeremiah Confronted Baal-Worship

Baal-worship unconscious apostasy, leaders and people tried to deny
Apostate worship was combined with true worship of the Lord
Religious leaders of the nation aided and propagated apostasy
Word of the Lord came to Elijah, he did not seek to be messenger

Has Babylon Continued to Fall?

Ignorance tempts youth to think SDA church merely religious option
Full light of third angel's message has been kept away from the world
Fall of Babylon checked, pending when loud cry proclaimed
Lord's servant insists Baal-worship has infilterated modern Israel

We turn to popular churches for inspiration not discerning distinctions

The 1888 Message and the Day of Atonement

Fall of Babylon not yet complete, only initial stages
Christianity's alienation, ignorance of High Priest's ministry
Result, "Satan... trying to carry on work of God"
(1) Christians in 1844 rejected messages of three different angels
(2) God cannot hold guilty modern descendants of 1844 rejectors
(3) Preparation for 2nd coming demands knowledge of three angels
(4) Substitution must change, people must overcome as He overcame
(5) False christ spread influence by false reformations
(6) "Beast" will appear as saviour, urges mark to prevent destruction
(7) Understanding 1888 message and two-apartment ministry go together

Why the Third Angel's Message in Verity Is Needed

Third angel's message presents Saviour tempted in all points as we are
Those who follow High Priest's ministry appreciate three unique truths
(a) The perpetuity of the law of God, including holy sabbath
(b) The non-immortality of the soul
(c) Cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary is final Day of Atonement
These three truths support SDA Church, the verity being in 1888 message

How Baal-Worship Robs Us of Our Distinctive Message

Satan has sought earnestly to counterfeit New Testament love
Counterfeit love ministered by counterfeit holy spirit
"Satan will enter any door thrown open for him"
EGW predicted in 1889 a terrible falling away from truth and purity
Christ and His righteousness not dropped out of experience verbally
Christ and His righteousness not dropped out consciously
Christ and His righteousness would be dropped out <u>unconsciously</u>
"Lead by a false spirit ... following the wrong captain"

Conclusion

Appreciation of Christ's cross leads to self being crucified with Him
Spiritual impotence bewilders SDA members, promotes dissidents
SDA Church not Babylon. Baal-worship foreign disease, can be healed
"Honesty and policy will not work together in the same mind"
There is resurrection with Christ when sinful love of self is crucified

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

FROM 1950 TO 1971

This manuscript prepared in 1950 for General Conference Committee
Since then conviction grows there is widespread spiritual famine
Only days after 1888 session EGW repeatedly compared "us" to Jews
Prophet's discernment perceived result of 1888, equaled re-crucifixion
Comparison with Jews penetrates to heart of plan of salvation
Since 1950 concerted effort to publish idea 1888 was a victory
Solution not in criticizing church leadership but in repentance

1950

1888 Re-examined presented evidence "we" took wrong road in 1888
The appeal was firmly, officially rejected
Manuscript somehow duplicated and distributed on several continents

1952

Bible Conference held in Sligo church Sept. 1-13, 1952
GC president claimed 1888 truth presented with more power in 1952
If true, what happened to the blessings that should have come?
Presentations did not contain the 1888 message
Messages and messengers endorsed by EGW not considered in 1952
Conference good but latter rain and loud cry not evident in 1952
Widespread spontaneous distribution 1888 Re-examined continued

1958

GC reply: A Further Appraisal of the Manuscript "1888 Re-examined"
Authors charged: "distortion of facts," "manuscript ... detrimental"
70-page reply prepared: An Answer to "Further Appraisal"
Appraisal withdrawn, no longer available

1962

Serious questions continued during another four years
By Faith Alone published 1962; said book would set "record straight"
(a) Book fails recognize 1888 message "beginning" latter rain
(b) 1888 message referred to as merely "doctrine" of justification
(c) Question: Did Protestant churches have three angels' messages?
(d) SDA church becoming more evangelical: what message?
(e) "Revival of the nineties died" evidence message not truly accepted

1966

Questions from church members continue
EGW Estate publishes Olson's book: Through Crisis to Victory, 1888-1901
Purpose of book: combat "misleading conclusions"
(a) EGW letters indicate not "victory" or "progressive years"
(b) Book tries to establish message not "officially rejected," no vote
GC Bulletin 1893 definitely speaks of vote taken
EGW herself mentions vote of rejection
Vote of rejection not recorded because EGW forbade it
(c) Olson minimizes opposition; conflicts with EGW and eyewitnesses
(d) Painful conclusion: pastors aflame, church members "have neglected"

1969

Pease published sequel: The Faith That Saves, concerns 1888
(a) Again evasion of unique truth of three angels
(b) Opposition not serious, no vote, repented, supported message
(c) Nothing said by J & W not said better by EGW
If true, why did Lord send J & W as His messengers?
(d) 1926 Milwaukee GC endorsed as more important than 1888
This view logically plunges church into confusion, no lasting revival

CHAPTER FIFTEEN

FROM 1971 TO 1987 AND BEYOND

700 pages had by now been published denying need of repentance
Additional 700 pages in Movement of Destiny, by L. E. Froom
Author assures readers of utmost fidelity in response to Daniells' charge
Written by most prestigious historical scholar in the church
Book reviewed as not "dependable history"
(a) Takes opposite view from Daniells on 1888 history
(b) No one has been able to see Froom's "affidavits"
On authority of invisible witnesses acceptance assured
States categorically no rejection, but not one statement to support
Eyewitness written reports contradict Froom's assertions

The "Peerless Witness"

(c) Froom says EGW stands supreme in assessing 1888
11 pages devoted to EGW, not one quotation to support his premise
(d) Lists over 200 items from EGW but actually are comments of author
(e) 12 pages phrases of EGW but smothered with author's ideas
(f) Hundreds of "source documents" but not one is quoted
(g) Century of history indicates latter rain not accepted as EGW said
(h) Like Olson, Froom exonerates ministry and leadership, blames laity
(i) Affirms EGW "rejoiced" in acceptance but offers no confirmation
GC president's attitude "determinative evidence"
EGW evidence totally lacking in his book

Ellen White's View of the Post-1888 Leadership

EGW said Olsen "has ventured on directly contrary to the light"
"As unfaithful watchman .... does not regard the testimonies"
Froom's contradiction of EGW and official support of book is alarming
How can SDA help others unless we are loyal to truth?

1972

Dr. Froom charged authors of this manuscript to retract publicly
In 1972 they prepared: An Explicit Confession ... Due the Church
Reiterated their conviction, our history calls to corporate repentance
Officers urged Confession not be published; two developments followed

1973-1974

Annual Council 1973 made earnest appeal but misread history
Loud cry not subjective revival but it was the objective message itself
(a) If revival dies out has the Holy Spirit become tired?
(b) Loud cry is message itself and Holy Spirit's power manifested
1888 message has never been clearly proclaimed to world church
Outgrowth of 1973-74 interest was Palmdale Conference in 1976
"Reformationist," Calvinist views presented, denial of 1888 message
Tragic results, loss of hundreds of ministers and laity

1984

Further publication dealing with 1888, The Lonely Years, 1876-1891
Author Arthur L. White says "disproportionate emphasis " given 1888

Says EGW documents and memory statements supply data
Dilemma is, disproportionate reliance placed on uninspired opinions
Repeats "no official action was taken" but GCB says there was vote
Paragraph 8, p. 396, emphatically denies truth of 1888 history
Thoughtful church members dismayed at such literary tactics
How is it possible scholars and leaders overlook obvious evidence
EGW unerring endorsement of message stands clear after century

1888 An End-Time Test

How can we explain official efforts since 1950 to contradict EGW?
Were our enemies to research this history, we would be embarrassed
Spiritual blindness says justification by faith most difficult of all truths
This distorted understanding makes us "modern ancient Israel"

"For Our Admonition"

Our history as important as crossing Red Sea and stoning of Stephen
Question is, will we accept our history or "stone Stephen"?
After century of delay, cause imperiled, "omega" pending
Inherent in "good news" message is experience of final atonement
Angels restraining winds, world stability depends on fidelity God's people
God's work can be finished in an incredibly short time
Will require repentance of the ages, understanding, correction of confusion
Ultimate experience awaiting church like that of Jesus in Gethsemane
Christ forsook heaven, true faith not centered on our reward
Seventh church on scene in last moments, no eighth church
Power of Satan broken when true righteousness by faith demonstrated

APPENDIX A

DID A. T. JONES TEACH THE "HOLY FLESH" HERESY?

Attempts being made charge ATJ's message leads to "holy flesh" heresy
(1) If true, it will discredit the 1888 message
If J & W blacklisted, church foolish to give attention to their message
Falseness of charge exposed by Dr. Leroy Moore, Theology in Crisis
(2) If Jones drifting in 1889, EGW must be discredited as fanatical
Endorsed Jones 1888-1896, if mistaken no way to respect her
(3) Satan would like to dissuade church from receiving spiritual blessing

Evidence Concerning the Charge Against Jones

Supposed evidence taken from condensed sermons in newspaper
(a) Study of Jones newspaper sermons disclose no "holy flesh" heresy
(b) At no time following 1889 is there any record favoring this heresy
(c) Primary statement actually by W. C. White but agrees SDA concept
(d) J & W both refuted "holy flesh" fanaticism at turn of century
Another example of continued opposition to "most precious message"

APPENDIX B

THE RIGHTEOUSNESS BY FAITH COMPARISONS

Thirty-six comparisons: The Popular View and The 1888 View

APPENDIX C

ONE SOURCE OF THE ACCEPTANCE MYTH

Popular view of earnest sincere people, message accepted century ago
This view in direct conflict with history and EGW statements
EGW testimony clear, latter rain, loud cry "in great degree" rejected
Our history a replay of Jews', need denominational repentance
EGW's son and grandson rightly enjoy great esteem in SDA church
EGW's ministry unique, inspired, beyond a thousand eyewitnesses
Future of SDA church depends on issue being settled rightly
Human attitude naturally conflicts with "testimony of Jesus" without HS
Imperative church now place unqualified reliance on Spirit of Prophecy
Lukewarmness, spiritual weakness consequence of misinterpreting history

APPENDIX D

WHAT IS THE FUTURE OF THE SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST CHURCH?

Church has delayed proclamation to world of everlasting gospel
Corporate involvement EGW compared to failures of Israel
Has the Lord already or will He in future reject this church?
Because faithful protest apostasy and are opposed is situation hopeless?
Will "faithful souls" complete gospel, leave SDA Church to apostasy?
Is the organized church still "the remnant" of Rev. 12?
Is church membership a valid duty for "faithful souls"?
There are guidelines in Scripture and EGW statements
(1) God's intention His people be denominated, family, Abraham's "seed"
(2) Through Israel's, Judah's deepest apostasies, Lord remained faithful
(3) True Israel was always identifiable, "in Isaac" had faith of Abraham
(4) Early Christian church organized, true Israel, Christ the Head
(5) God's care over "the woman" in wilderness indicates organization
(6) Early SDA Church battled organization, HS set seal of approval
Any movement Holy Spirit leads must be organized, disciplined
No other world-wide body of believers remotely fulfills Rev. 14:6-12
Body crafted by the Lord to proclaim gospel, no offshoot can replace
True SDA's concerned for honor, vindication of Lord, not reward
They are "under grace," a new motivation, rather than "under law"
"Shaking" separates from God's people all merely concerned for safety
(7) "Under law" self-concern fails to appreciate righteousness by faith
Recognizing Christ as church Head, requires heart-submission
Otherwise "kingly power" exercised, ministers, people look to humans
(8) 1888 history shows Lord sent "beginning" through delegates to GC

(9) 1901 re-organization intended to return leadership to Christ
Only a dream, "what might have been," 1888 unbelief not reversed
1903 session seen as backward step by others besides J & W
(10) 1903 revision did not cause EGW to withdraw her church support
Solution not in destroying church but in repentance within it
(11) Millions testify SDA Church despite failures, brought gospel Rev. 14
Best hope for success, church that not only proclaims but demonstrates
EGW reminds: "God has said that He will heal the wounds of His people"
"God would not permit... fully apostatize ... be ... another church"
Bride of Christ is sick, needs healing, all-out cooperation required
(12) Should members withhold loyalty, support, pending evidence
Promises to Israel conditional but God remained loyal, always tried again
Foundation church Dan. 8:14, honor of God requires "shall be cleansed"
This is the ultimate issue in the great controversy
"When.... When ... when she seeks God ... she will be healed"
Duty now to remove hinderences within church preventing reformation

APPENDIX E

A BRIEF REVIEW OF 1987-1988 PUBLICATIONS

The Ellen G. White 1888 Materials;
Manuscripts and Memories of Minneapolis 1888;
From 1888 to Apostasy — The Case of A. T. Jones;
Adventist Review, January 7, 1988;
Ministry, International Journal for Clergy, February 1988;
Perfect in Christ;
Grace on Trial;
What Every Seventh-day Adventist Should Know About 1888.