MEN WHO HAVE ARISEN

LESSONS FROM THE PAST

From time to time, men have arisen in our ranks with a message. But there were earmarks in their conduct and/or in their message that were as red flags which should have been a warning. Other men arose whose deportment and message were both beneficial.

Yet, as we view the past century, we find that, repeatedly, each new generation of our people who has come onto the scene of action has not learned from the mistakes of the preceding one.

Let history teach you. He who will not be taught by the past is condemned to repeat it. Learn the lessons that others before you have failed to learn.

The following study will only be a brief survey. Anything more than that would quickly become too lengthy and involved. However, several of these brief biographies may be found in expanded form in earlier studies by the present writer. —vf

From time to time, men have arisen in our ranks with a message. But there were earmarks in their conduct and/or in their message which were as red flags, and should have warned the people to have nothing to do with them. Other men arose whose deportment and message were both beneficial.

Let history teach you. He who will not be taught by the past is condemned to repeat it. Learn the lessons that others before you have failed to learn.

Dudley Mervin Canright (1840-1919) was at one time one of our outstanding evangelists. He had a way with words, and could both speak eloquently and place powerful metaphoric pictures in his written articles. Yet he was a weak man because he was vain and conceited. Ever concerned with what people thought of him, and how he could rise to a higher position in the estimation of the public, D.M. Canright was ripe for takeover by Satan,

On a number of occasions Ellen White pled with the man to change. You will find some of her counsel in the Testimonies (for example: 3T 304-329; 4T 277-278, 280-281, 297; 5T 516-520, 571-573, 621-628; 25M 162-170). But, each time, he only hardened his heart. Several times before his final separation from our people, he left the work.

On one occasion, he complained to a younger worker how he, Canright could have been a great orator in the world—if he did not have to represent the Adventists and their unpopular teachings. Startled, the young worker replied that Canright was only a mouthpiece for God, and if he ever left our Bible/Spirit of Prophecy messages—he would become a broken man.

Finally, in February 1887, Canright resigned for the last time. In his letter to Ellen White, 'he triumphantly told her he was taking his wife and children with him. The Baptists quickly ordained him as pastor of the Baptist Church in Otsego, Michigan, where he made his home. But he quit within a year after quarreling with the church members.

He spent the rest of his life writing attacks on Ellen White and our historic beliefs. One degree of misery after another came to him in the years to come, until he stumbled around lame, with a hole in one socket where an eye had formerly been.

John Harvey Kellogg (1852-1943) was an egotistical man who brooked no interference. Eventually he imagined himself to be smart enough to invent a great new religion. But when Elder William Spicer (later

General Conference president, and earlier our first leader in India) told Kellogg he had not invented anything new—that he was just teaching Hindu pantheism—Kellogg refused to listen.

John Kellogg thought he had devised a new religion. The problem is that when a man is proud, he is regularly letting devils talk to him. Satan had given Kellogg the same theories he had given to pagans in a number of other lands and times. Do not become a follower of a proud man. In the process of destroying himself, he will take his followers with him. The Kellogg pantheism crisis peaked around the years 1902-1903. The Ballenger crisis occurred not long afterward.

Albion Fox Ballenger (1861-1921) thought he could improve on the Spirit of Prophecy. While serving in England as a denominational pastor, he invented a different—and self—contradictory scheme of doctrinal beliefs. Bold enough to think he could come up with better religious views than any before his time, Ballenger was also arrogant enough to laugh when Ellen White tried repeatedly to counsel with him by mail.

The crisis came in 1905, but the denomination weathered the storm. After leaving the church, Ballenger preached and wrote publications, in an effort to separate people from the Spirit of Prophecy and our historic beliefs.

Then there was Alonzo T. Jones (1850-1923). Learning the sweet message of Christ our forgiving, enabling righteousness from E. J. Waggoner. Jones, always a powerful speaker. trumpeted it everywhere. But, although he had the right message, it was not firmly enough planted in his own heart. In the mid—1890s. his haughty traits of character began to reveal themselves. He became a man who was eager for high positions and overbearing with subordinates.

After resigning as president of the California Conference in 1903, Jones stopped by Elmshaven, at Ellen White's request, to see her. She pled with him not to unite with Kellogg, but the written transcription of that meeting (which the present writer has read) reveals Jones by that time to have been a sarcastic, self-confident man. Headstrong, determined to have his own way, Jones went to Battle Creek and became one of J.H. Kellogg's co-workers. Ellen White predicted Kellogg would take control of him, and exactly that occurred. Jones was ruined. later, he sided with Ballenger, and became one of his cowriters. When Ballenger died in August 1921, Jones wrote a stirring obituary to the greatness of the man who had defied Ellen White and those who supported her positions. (See above Kellogg and Ballenger biographical sources for additional information.)

Yet Jones' fall need not have occurred. Both Kellogg and Ballenger were openly arrogant. That should have provided Jones with a clear danger signal not to become one of their supporters.

Having by their strong conceit yoked up with Satan, arrogant men are able to exert a hypnotic control over minds willing to yield to them. Refusing to be warned by Ellen White, Jones was destroyed. Kellogg first, and then, Ballenger turned him fully against the Spirit of Prophecy. That sealed his doom.

Louis Richard Conradi (1856-1939) was one of our leading workers in Germany. Few men in our denomination have been more earnest and zealous in trying to build up the church in difficult places. He was often pursued by the police, and was arrested once. He was expelled from Romania, Turkey, and Hungary because of his missionary activities. Conradi had unusual strength of character, but, unfortunately. he was also proud.

When he learned that a German translation of certain denominational books were to be published on the continent, he had the audacity to try to change them to agree with his own ideas.

Filled with pride, he determined to resist the Spirit of Prophecy and said he was going to leave the denomination and, when he did, he boasted he would take all the Adventists of Germany with him. When, in 1932, he did leave, relatively few believers followed him out.

In this study, we are briefly surveying the lives of several leading men who have arisen in our ranks over the past century. Now we come to a man who was not proud, who was not attacking the Spirit of Prophecy or our historic beliefs, but was only trying to point the people back to them.

In the early 1930s, a young man named Everett Rogers was the lay pastor or local elder of a small congregation in western Washington State. He had just come across a little book by the name of Christ Our Righteousness. It had been written by A.G. Daniells. But first, we should turn our attention to that book:

After his retirement in May 1922, after having served as General Conference president for 21 years. Elder Arthur G. Daniells (1858-1935) had time to think about the past. He recalled how he had rejected Ellen White's call for him to circulate the anti—meat pledge among our people. He thought again about the 1888 crisis and how it had never been resolved. He thought back over the Kellogg crisis and the Ballenger crisis. He reminisced on the fires at Battle Creek and the move to Washington, D.C. And then, incredibly, after his retirement, Elder Daniells experienced something of a reconversion experience. The rush and hurry of worldwide presidency was past—and Daniells took time to make his peace with God and return to the Spirit of Prophecy. Then he wrote the books, Christ Our Righteousness and The Abiding Gift of Prophecy, both very good books.

Because a former General Conference president had prepared this Spirit of Prophecy compilation, it was kept in stock in our bookstores and, over the years, has helped many people.

When Everett Rogers began reading Daniell's book, Christ Our Righteousness, he was thunderstruck at what he found. The Spirit of Prophecy and Bible quotations were fabulous. Soon after, he began preaching the truths in that book in his local church at Enemclaw.

His message was simple, to the point, and powerful. I met Everett at his home in Boulder, Colorado, in the spring of 1965. He was a sincere, godly Christian man. To my knowledge, there was no error in Everett's basic message. It was just old-fashioned Righteousness by Faith, the kind so clearly explained in such books as Steps to Christ, Mount of Blessing, Christ's Object Lessons, and Desire of Ages. It is faith in Jesus Christ to forgave our past and enabled us to obey His Father in the present. He did not teach instantaneous removal of sin, nor did he downgrade obedience to God's law-and call that "righteousness."

But when the conference folk heard about it, they were disconcerted that laymen over at the Enemclaw Church were making such a big issue out of religion. Besides, all this had started without being authorized by the conference leaders. The situation reminds us of the religious leaders, when they were instructed by shepherds and wise men (Desire of Ages, pages 62-63). Setting their faces against the preaching at Enemclaw, the order was issued that the preaching stop. Yet there was nothing wrong with the Preaching; it was simply Righteousness by Forgiving, Enabling Faith.

For their part, over at Enemclaw, the church members could not understand what was wrong at the conference office. Why were they so upset? But, then, they were told to stop preaching about the love and grace of Jesus—or be shut out. After praying about the matter earnestly, they said they could not stop.

So the Enemclaw Church was cast out There had been no fanaticism, no error, just powerful preaching. I have been told it was the first time in our denomination that a special, new loyalty sentence was demanded of church members: "Are you willing to submit to duly constituted church authority?" Yet

such wording was necessary—because nothing could be found wrong with what was being preached at Enemclaw—except one thing: The Washington Conference did not want it done. Forbidding was its own justification.

Soon it became known as the "Roger Brothers Movement" You may have heard vague references to it. There was no fanaticism, no time setting, no strange new beliefs; it was just simple Christianity. Everett was not trying to separate from the church or start a new one. He was just trying to help people draw closer to Jesus.

Soon the Enemclaw Church was excommunicated. At about that time, Everett's brother, Merle, united in the preaching. This was unfortunate. Merle was an even more powerful preacher than Everett, and soon had nearly everyone on his side. But Everett was the one grounded in the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy. Merle was a proud man.

Because the denomination had cast them out, the people looked all the more strongly to Merle to lead them. This also was unfortunate. They should have leaned the more heavily on the Inspired Writings and looked to God for leadership. With the denomination giving the group as much opposition as it could, they gradually scattered here and there and eventually went to pieces under Merle's conceited leadership.

In the 1960s, I met several elderly friends of Everett Rogers, who had remained with him. All were retired or nearly so, and were humble Advent believers. Everett, an older man by that time, had long since stopped preaching.

Some of you may recall Spirit of Prophecy Research. It was an anonymous group, which mailed out small Spirit of Prophecy compilations in the 1950s and 1960s. That which you probably do not know is that it was Everett Rogers, in Boulder, and Nellie Brewer, in Walla Walla, who prepared and sent out those studies. I met Nellie at her home in the 1960s.

As mentioned earlier, Merle took nearly the entire group away from Everett, and the majority of the followers went with Merle. Those who were the most solidly founded in Scripture stayed with Everett.

Why did this happen? Merle preached to the people and, because he was egotistical, there was a fascinating quality about him. But the faithful recognized that they did not dare follow an arrogant man. Drawing back, they remained with Everett. As a result, they did not depart from the Spirit of Prophecy, as did those who followed his brother.

Merle gradually revised his message of "righteousness by faith" into one even more advanced than that achieved by the present new theology in our church today. Merle taught that the righteousness of Christ saved those who smoked, drank, and did any other worldly thing, as long as they professed faith in His covering righteousness.

So, in this instance, a group arose in our ranks which (1) had a humble leader, and (2) which did not try to devise strange, new teachings. It was only when a proud, boastful man gained control of the movement that it crashed, taking nearly all with it.

There are several lessons here; the most important are these: First, stay with God's Word, no matter what it costs. Second, God's words are always more important than man's words. Third, it matters not whether the leadership is that of a conference officer or an independent ministry—there is still danger of being misled.

Throughout the twentieth century, our people have been plagued with arrogant men who have arisen and taken many of our people with them. The hallmark by which to identify them has always been the same: a proud spirit and a determination to gain a large following. It is always detectable in the man.

When you see that in your leader, run—the other direction! Never, never, get on the bandwagon of a proud, arrogant man! You will be lost if you do.

Victor T. Houtiff was another conceited man. In 1929, through false interpretations of the Spirit of Prophecy, he began his efforts to obtain a following. Calling his organization, the Shepherd's Rod, in 1941 he renamed it the Davidian Seventh-day Adventist Church.

The present writer recently prepared an in—depth history of that organization. It became apparent that, what Houtiff and his successors did, was to appeal to pride in the followers. By doing so, they could fill their followers with the captivating devils they themselves were possessed of. We have received a number of letters from believers who have told of interviews they have had with Davidians—who told them that they would soon reign as kings and priests over the earth, but first they must slay the unfaithful Adventists. The offer of eventual kingship and queenship came wrapped up in a package of conceit, which required murder to obtain. In order to gain the offer, the intention to murder must be accepted. By accepting it, the demon of conceit enters the heart.

A similar transaction occurs whenever a person binds himself to an arrogant leader.

Because he had predicted that he would not die before the Second Advent occurred, Houtiff's death in 1955 greatly shook his followers. The leaders, in a desperate effort to hold the group together, published a time prophecy, which failed. The Rod collapsed on March 11, 1962, but other conceited men arose who gathered the remnants of the Davidians to themselves. One was Benjamin F. Rodin. A later one was David Koresh.

Milian Lauritz Andreasen (1876-1962) was another man who arose among us with a message. But M.L. Andreasen was neither proud nor did he try to tear down our God—given Bible—Spirit of Prophecy beliefs. Instead, he sought to defend them, even though to do so meant opposing leaders in our denomination. Andreasen was not afraid to name names and call sin by its right name.

For decades, he had been a leading evangelist, and later dean or president of one or more of our colleges. Andreasen had a clear mind and never swerved from loyalty to the God of heaven and the Bible—Spirit of Prophecy writings. He wrote 13 books, and, by the 1940s and 1950s, was our leading authority on the sanctuary service.

But while the Evangelical Conferences met in the mid-1950s, efforts were made to keep a lid on the doctrinal sellout that our leaders in Washington were carrying out with representatives of the Evangelicals. When M. L. Andreasen learned what was happening, he was aghast.

It is an intriguing fact that there were hundreds of other men in our colleges, publishing houses, administrative offices, and local churches, who also gradually learned what was taking place. Word spreads fast among the work force. But, fearing to lose their job, nearly everyone kept quiet. But not M. L. Andreasen. He would not sell out for a mess of pottage. You will find the entire story of what occurred in our Evangelical Conferences, now in section two of our Doctrinal History Tractbook. Andreasen published the facts and named the names. He called sin by its right name. The only response was to castigate him as a "troublemaker." But he could rightly reply, as did Elijah to Ahab, "I have not troubled Israel; but thou, and thy father's house, in that ye have forsaken the commandments of the Lord, and thou hast followed Baalim" (read 1 Kings 18:17—18).

Not the burden of denouncing error, but the vicious response of rejection and abandonment hurled at the man from every direction, led to bleeding ulcers which killed Andreasen in 1962. He died a martyr for God's truth. And that is not a poetic sentiment, but an accurate statement.

Andreasen was a man who arose with a message—not of denunciation of the Spirit of Prophecy or our historic beliefs,—but rather a defense of both, combined with a strong reproof of the very men who were trying to new—model our beliefs into an image of modern Protestant error.

M. L Andreasen tried as hard as he could to stem the doctrinal apostasy that two men in Washington, D.C. (LE. Froom and RA. Anderson) were agreeing to, in order to keep peace with Walter Martin and Donald Barnhouse, so those Protestant leaders would print in their journal, Eternity; that we were a true-blue "Evangelical" church.

Most of Andreasen's efforts were made in the middle and late 1950s. Soon another voice was to be raised in our church.

Brinsmead

In the 1940s, there was a family living up in a mountain range in the northern part of Queensland, Australia. The father and mother in the home had been blessed with high caliber intelligence and a studious devotion to the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy. In the course of their earlier research, they had even checked out the German Reform Church (which calls itself the Seventh-day Adventist Reform Movement), and, after discovering its errors, they had returned to the Adventist Church and a deeper study of God's Word.

Although they lived in a rural area, several other Adventists came to study the books with them once each week. Gradually the study group grow larger, until many families were journeying weekly to their meetings—some from over a hundred miles away. The name of the family was Brinsmead.

In the early 1950s, their son, Robert, decided to go to Avondale College. He had inherited the brilliance of his parents and, upon arrival at our college in Australia, soon became the center of a student study group. Bob was filled with information which his parents had researched out, and he shared these concepts with others. Eventually, he became reader to one of the leading Bible teachers at the school. ("Reader" means he graded student papers for that teacher.) One day, that professor tossed a swath of papers over to Robert, with a remark that caught his attention. The packet had just arrived in the mail from Takoma Park in America. It was from the office of Leroy Edwin Froom in the General Conference. That Australian teacher had been selected as one of those in the world field to have the privilege of reviewing portions of the forthcoming book, Questions on Doctrine, before it was published. Young Bob sat down and read the papers, and found error.

(At the beginning of our lengthy study on the Martin-Barnhouse Conferences with our leaders in Washington, D.C., from 1954 to 1956 (Evangelical Conferences, now in our Doctrinal History Tractbook, the present writer tells of his own experience at that time. Having completed college, he was studying next door at the Adventist seminary, and janitoring nightly in the General Conference building.)

Bob mentioned the problems he found to his mentor, but the teacher shrugged it off. He agreed it was error, but he had no intention of sending any negative comments to world headquarters. Keeping his job was more important than keeping error out of the first official doctrinal book ever published by our denomination.

Back in Washington, D.C. the present writer was objecting in Heppenstall's classes and reading about the progress of the Evangelical Conferences in Protestant magazines and Ministry magazine. (See the abovementioned study for historical details and reprints of magazine articles.)

Time passed, and at some point along the way, the weekly Brinsmead family studies came to the attention of the Queensland Conference president. RA. Grieve. It was time for a repeat of Enemclaw.

Grieve called the family in to find out what was going on. He learned that simple Bible-Spirit of Prophecy studies were being given. The family reviewed them with him. Grieve had several associates with him in the office as the presentation was given, but all there knew that as conference president, he was the key man—and whatever he decided would be done. None would dare cross him. That was the way it was at Enemclaw, and the way it always shall be. The fatal flaw is that, within their jurisdiction, the conference, union, and (outside North America) the Division presidents have far too much power. As soon as the top man makes a decision, that is it. Then all the locksteps fall into place.

As Grieve sat there entranced, he was shown a preview of future events, as delineated in the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy. When it concluded, he was deep in thought. You see. RA. Grieve was no ordinary leader; he was also a thinker. Then he spoke: "I see that if you are right, there is a crisis ahead of the church." Then he dismissed the meeting and walked out.

Grieve was very much right! There IS a crisis ahead of the church! It is the crisis of the National Sunday Law, which will cause every person in the world to decide for or against Sundaykeeping. That decree will be given, we are told, accompanied by a threat of imprisonment and death. That crisis will begin well before the general close of probation. A crisis? Yes, an immense crisis for the world—and for the church!

Yet leadership folklore in the church would have it that there is no crisis ahead of the church! Instead, we will just keep getting bigger and more successful, till Jesus returns in the clouds and takes His people to heaven.

The Brinsmead family had invented nothing new in this respect. They were simply explaining to the conference president something clearly stated in Revelation and the Spirit of Prophecy. The problem regarding this truth is twofold: (1) Few are studying God's Word as they ought, and are not preparing for that coming crisis— (2) Leadership does not want to be told that the church will ever face any crisis.

R.A. Grieve went home and thought about it. He could not only execute, he could create. First, he executed. He sent out an order from the office of the Queensland Conference that the Brinsmeads were heretics and they and anyone favoring their ideas were to be eliminated from church membership. Then he created. Grieve invented a theology to substitute for the one he had heard that day. Just as Ballenger had done at the turn of the century. Grieve set aside the Spirit of Prophecy, and devised a new theory for the people.

R.A. Grieve's idea was simple enough (error sometimes is): instantaneous sanctification. That was essentially the error which Merle Rogers fell into: You don't need to obey; just accept Christ and sin all you want. As soon as you accept Christ, you are instantly sanctified and ready for heaven regardless of your ongoing conduct. (Sound familiar? We are facing it again today.)

Grieve immediately began teaching his new idea at worker's meetings. Without a word of protest, it was just as quickly accepted by the ministerial force of the Queensland Conference. They took it back to their local churches and began urging it upon their church members. R.A. Grieve was pleased, and his workers were pleased. No one had lost his job.

Grieve also sent word up the ladder to the Australasian (now called South Pacific) Division headquarters in Waroonga, that the Brinsmeads were teaching error and they and all favoring their ideas must be eradicated.

Waroonga passed the word along to world headquarters in Takoma Park. The wheels of progress began rolling.

Because Grieve had been doing such good work crushing out the Brinsmead faction, he was transferred to one of the two New Zealand conferences. But there was no word of reproof regarding his new

teachings. Apparently, no one cared. Upon arrival, he immediately began teaching instantaneous sanctification, and it was promptly accepted and taught by the ministerial force. All this is enough to make one quiver: how fast men can accept and champion error when their jobs depend on it. But, along with it,—why was there so little concern in leadership, higher-up—in this case, the division office—over the error he was teaching?

It is obvious that the church was ripe for any error which might come along—as long as it was first presented by a high-placed church worker, and it appealed to sin in man. Within less than five years. Grieve resigned from the ministry and became a Protestant minister. Little more was heard about him. Several years later, Robert Brinsmead learned where he was living, and called and asked if he could stop by for a brief visit. It was unforgettable.

That evening. RA. Grieve, the man who started the pogrom against the Brinsmead family, told their son this: "You people were right—if you believe the Spirit of Prophecy. But I don't, and I didn't then. I decided I could give the people, a better message, and I did."

Then came the year 1960. The Brinsmeads combined brilliance of mind, a knowledge of the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy, and Australian push. Young Robert had inherited all that, but had he also inherited the solid grounding in the Word which his parents had, or did he merely receive an education in it? Many still wonder about that.

Robert had been traveling in Australia and preaching his parents' message. Meanwhile, a young man in eastern Oregon heard of him and the two corresponded.

Al Hudson had a little printing company in Baker, Oregon. He urged young Brinsmead (about 26 at the time) to come to America and present his message. He did just that. It was 1960 and a Catholic was running for president of the United States. Our people were upset, and wondered what was coming next.

Arriving at the Portland, Oregon, airport, Robert was met by a friend of mine who drove him to his home. That night, that friend tried to show Bob a key error in his teaching, but to no avail. Bob Brinsmead was never a man to back down. He had a bulldog pugnacity, which fascinated people and helped produce his large following. Humility was not part of it. Shortly thereafter, Brinsmead arrived at Walla Walla College. Leadership in America was totally unwarned and unprepared. They did not know be was in the country. Many people attended the meetings, and listened as he spoke several nights in a building off campus. By the time leadership awoke, it was too late. Key Spirit of Prophecy truths had been imparted.

Talk about a crisis: Walla Walla College had one right then.

Leadership was determined to stop this, no matter what the cost. As a result, a number of teachers and their families were kicked out. Many students were forced to leave. And those who remained entered the abyss.

The next school year at Walla Walla was a hades. Every type of frolic, sport, and sin was entered into. Why not? Rejecting God's Word was the price of readmission. It was as if those who remained had sinned away the day of grace. From Walla Walla, Brinsmead headed south. We learned that some young man was going to preach the next Sabbath afternoon up in the hills (Placerville or Camino, California; I do not recall which). So we went. The message was about the sanctuary service. What I heard agreed with the Spirit of Prophecy. Shortly afterward, Brinsmead held meetings in the city of the valley I was living near.

While holding that series, Brinsmead journeyed up into the hills to a natural healing health ranch and told a friend of mine that, as soon as this initial lecture tour of America was completed, he intended to come back, learn how to give natural remedies himself, and start his own health retreat.

But that resolution was never again to be uttered. Heading south, Brinsmead went to Loma Linda, and there met wealthy backers. As long as he stayed with theology, his future was assured.

While there, Bob eliminated the Mentone, California. German Reform Church (the official name is the Adventist Reform Movement). Their own denominational leaders had been taken unawares also, and young Brinsmead had the opportunity to speak with most of the Reform Movement members in that area at a series of meetings. Because of his parents' experience, young Brinsmead knew exactly how to pinpoint the German Reform errors, and reply to them from the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy. The entire Mentone church disbanded and rejoined the Adventist Church.

Brinsmead would not do that again. Throughout North America, German Reform leaders held emergency meetings with their followers and told them they must not attend Brinsmead's meetings, while refusing to say why they should not do so. The sheep obeyed the shepherds they had chosen. In the main body, our denominational leaders were doing the same thing. Upon inquiry, they would say, "Brinsmead teaching contains dangerous error." "What is it?" "It is so dangerous, I cannot tell you." Brinsmead teaching did indeed contain error —an error which was Quite obvious and easily shown from the Bible/Spirit of Prophecy to be false. If the workers knew what it was, they would gladly have revealed it.

(The present writer later heard the proceedings of the General Conference hearing of Robert Brinsmead. Officials at that hearing did not grasp his error either. The problem was that our people just were not studying the Bible/Spirit of Prophecy as they should have been doing.)

But the warning had been given. In the early 1940s, Elder Andreasen, after researching out errors in the Shepherd's Rod teaching, wrote a letter to the General Conference president. In it he stated that the problem was that our people were not studying the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy, and that, if the situation did not change, an error would come along which would endanger the whole church. (I have seen the letter, but do not have a copy of it here as I write.) That prediction is being fulfilled in the new theology, which Desmond Ford brought, first, to Australia, and, then, to the United States.

While at Loma Linda, Bob picked up a new error from an Adventist physician with Freudian leanings, an error foreign to the Spirit of Prophecy: the cleansing of the conscious, followed by a cleansing of the subconscious.

In later years, Brinsmead added yet another error: the idea that the European Common Market was predicted in the book of Revelation.

Each year, Brinsmead left the ranch (he inherited from his folks) in north Queensland, Australia, and came back to North America for another tour—he brought with him new concepts. As did the folk at Athens so long ago (Acts 17:21), the people continually hungered for something new.

And therein lay the problem: Instead of studying God's Word, and going out and sharing it with others including the lost out in the world,—the people wanted the excitement of hearing something new for themselves.

After Brinsmead's 1964 visit, it was obvious that there had to be a breaking point eventually. Every year, Brinsmead had to come back with a new message; surely, eventually such a pattern would lead him off into deep error. And it did.

But before discussing that, it should be noted that there were two kinds of people interested in what Brinsmead had to offer.

The first category, were those who were interested in all the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy quotations he presented. Wherever he went, friends showered him with quotations they had found. These he shared in lectures, which were faithfully typeset by still other friends and printed.

But there was also another group. There were those who were fascinated with the man himself. Whatever Bob Brinsmead said; that was the last word on the subject. In contrast, the first group respected the man, but their first loyalty was ever to the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy itself

And that would make all the difference in the years to come.

In 1965, I met one of Brinsmead's top financial supporters. He told me he would do anything Brinsmead told him to do; give any amount of money, go to any distant country, anything. .

Folk with that type of mentality went with Brinsmead all the way; first, into his 1970 heresy, and, later, into his 1980 heresy. Those in the other category remained with the Spirit of Prophecy and grieved as they saw their friends led away from God's Word.

Well, Robert Brinsmead had error; we have noted some of it (and will mention the key error shortly). Did he have anything right? Yes, he did. He forcefully brought to the attention of the church the fact that there was a message for them in the Sanctuary service, as given in the Bible and explained in the Spirit of Prophecy. What is that message? The answer to that is simple enough, and you cannot be deceived when I tell you. It is this: Read chapters 23. 24, and 28 of the book, Great Controversy, and there you will find it. —With no error included.,"

And if you want still more quotations from Inspiration on the subject, order a copy of our The Sanctuary Message, now included as Part Two of our Sanctuary Tractbook. The message is presented there as clearly as possible,—yet entirely from inspired quotations.

Beware, my friend, of doctrinal discussions with a few quotations and a lot of man's talk. Error is very likely to be there.

Instead, leave the broken cisterns of man's theories and speculations, and go to the living springs of God's Written Word—the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy—and drink deeply. There was another error, which Brinsmead had from the very beginning of his ministry: He believed in original sin. This was the error which a friend tried to lead him out of but without success—while at the airport in Portland, Oregon, in the spring of 1980.

Because of that error, Bob Brinsmead taught it is our present work to "pray for repentance," and, later, when the judgment passes to the living, we will receive a cleansing of heart and mind, which will miraculously remove our sins from us.

It is a fascinating idea, but it is incorrect. The truth is that it is NOW, in the strength of Christ, that we are to put sin from us. That is the only teaching you will find in the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy. Then, when the judgment passes to our cases, we will be sealed into the character already in place—and go out and give the loud cry to the world.

I mentioned that Brinsmead always had to come up with something new. By the late 1960s, he was beginning to flag. Just about everything had been presented which could be presented, and he dared not discuss natural remedies, and he did not care to tell the people to go out and work for the lost souls in the world. That might place their money somewhere else. So, instead, he kept instructing them to pray for repentance and keep listening to what he had to say.

In the early 1980s, I met a family whom I will not name (many of you know their name), who had a conceptual study, which was invaluable. They showed it to Brinsmead in the mid-1960s. He was very willing to take and run with it, but only on the proviso that they let him have it as HIS. Not granting that permission, he would have nothing to do with it. That was Brinsmead.

One day, one of Brinsmead's primary financial backers stepped into the Porter Adventist Hospital cafeteria for a quick lunch—and spotted a Signs of the Times magazine on a rack. The feature article was "Is Perfection Possible?" by Edward Heppenstall, a teacher at our seminary. It taught that we cannot obey God until the Second Advent. This Colorado backer immediately conceived the idea of getting Brinsmead to write a reply to it, call it "Perfection is Possible," to show that, in Christ's strength, we can obey God. He and place both articles in parallel columns in an 8 ½ x11-inch publication (the cost of which he would underwrite) and send it all over Adventism.

When the project was completed, it was given widespread circulation. Bible /Spirit of Prophecy statements, interspersed with sound reasoning, was presented to show that we can obey the law of God, just as Advent believers and Inspiration has always taught.

Think not that this was a new concept. Our spiritual forefathers have always believed, taught, and practiced it: In the strength of Christ we can obey the law of God. Indeed, if we could not do so, why bother to tell other people to "keep the Sabbath"? Why tell them that the Ten Commandments are to be obeyed?

As the decade of the 1960s neared its dose, Brinsmead conceived the idea of touring major cities in North America. Australia and New Zealand, and holding meetings for Protestant ministers. At these meetings, he would be able to share deep thoughts. He was getting tantalizingly close to what Canright dreamed of doing. Brinsmead's backers were only too glad to subsidize the expensive meetings. Some Protestant ministers attended and were duly impressed with the man for, by this time, Brinsmead was becoming ponderous in his vocabulary and weighty in his theological descriptions.

In order to deepen the interest and increase the attendance. Brinsmead would appear on stage with one or two ministers of other denominations in a forum discussion. Bob was becoming sophisticated and a man of theological affairs. He was also even more conceited over his mental powers then before.

Then he met Geoffrey Paxton.

It was the year 1970, and it marked the fall of Brinsmead. He has been a hollow shell ever since. Because it was then that he turned away from the Spirit of Prophecy. It came about this way:

Brinsmead was busily making friends with Protestant pastors and leaders in Australia, so he could hold public forums with them. In Brisbane one day, he stopped off at a theological school, intending to do some research in its library. But he also wanted to meet the headmaster, Geoffrey Paxton, who was influential among the ministers in that city.

Paxton was a highly-educated Anglican minister, with as much self-confidence and assertiveness as Brinsmead. An hour of intended discussion turned into days, and Paxton gradually converted Brinsmead to Anglicanism!

The entire changeover did not occur all at once, but the foundation was laid that year. Shortly afterward, Brinsmead issued his famous written statement, which went something like this: "I was wrong and Heppenstall was right."

Brinsmead had capitulated. No longer did he believe that, prior to the Second Advent of Christ. temptation could be resisted and sin overcome. Yet that great truth—which he had now set aside remained the basis, both of Biblical Christianity and the Advent Movement: We MUST obey the law of

God, and we CAN do it through the empowering grace of Jesus Christ. Yes, we agree, all the saving is of Jesus; He does it all—except one thing: our ongoing cooperative choices to work with Him in doing it. He gives all the desire and power to obey, but we must determinedly set our face to cooperate. If we do not, we fall.

Immediately, Brinsmead set to work to defend his new position. With Paxton's help, he tried to imaginatively expand on definitions of justification, and he devised theories to downplay the importance of sanctification. By the time of his 1971 meeting tour of North America. he was proclaiming that we are saved solely by justification. Period.

To state the truth again: Although we are totally saved by Jesus. He does it through cooperation with our will and efforts. If we do not, in His strength, do our part, He will not do His. Salvation is a cooperative work, but all the strength and enabling comes from Him. But the power of choice is ours, and at each step, we choose whom we will serve. And that ongoing choice—and the resultant cooperative thoughts, words, and actions—makes all the difference between redemption and perdition. No one will be saved in sin, on the basis of profession alone. As Ellen White says it somewhere: "His part is infinitely great, and our part is infinitely small; but without our part, He will not do His part. "That is a deep truth.

Later, Brinsmead began proclaiming another modern Protestant error: that it is wrong to try to obey God, because that would be legalism. Instead, we must not try, but simply wait placidly for Him to do it for us someday when He decides to. That teaching is also found in books by Helmut Ott and Morris Venden.

In reality, it is NOT wrong to try to obey God. If perchance, a person makes some mistakes (tending toward legalism) in the process, if he keeps studying God's Word and pleading with Jesus for help, soon all will be proceeding well. The one seeking to obey God quickly learns that he can only do the right in full dependence upon Christ for help. Taking hold of that strength, he perseveringly does so. He is cooperating with God, and God approves.

Brinsmead also decided to make his monthly journal even more weighty with deep thoughts, and mail it free to Protestant ministers. As usual, his backers stepped forward with all the money he would need for the project. Those who had ever revered Brinsmead more than his message, steadfastly followed him. Those who appreciated the Bible/Spirit of Prophecy quotations he printed, had, by 1971, drawn back.

Meanwhile, that which we today call the new theology urged so strongly by Desmond Ford in Australia and New Zealand since the mid-1960s—was making fabulous headway. This was actually the same apostate Protestant position which Brinsmead accepted from Paxton. By the late 1970s, it was being welcomed with open arms by liberal Adventists in America. Desmond Ford had been a key promoter of these modern Protestant errors.

Desmond Ford has reason to be proud of the fact that he is the only man to arise with a message—who has been wholeheartedly accepted by a majority of church members. Why? Because his message appeals to the carnal nature. He tells his hearers it is all right to sin and still be saved. That is a message, which is always very much appreciated. We know we are very near the end of time—for the church, which was supposed to give the final message to the world, is in the process of repudiating it! Moreover, most of the smaller groups that remain true, are either not giving the message to the world or are being led off after one man after another.

Few are really ready for the end. Few believe we have a hell to shun and a heaven to win. Few believe that the law of God is really important or worth keeping in this life. Few believe they need to go out and warn their neighbors. Few are doing it.

We are almost to the Sunday Law Crisis, and soon it will be upon us. And, as in the days of the apostles, it appears that there will be few to initially give that final message.

But we see not as God sees. He has in reserve His faithful ones, and when the threat of imprisonment and death are suddenly thrust upon them, the faithful who remain will arise under the direct command of heaven (TM. 300), and will go out and give the loud cry. (For much, much more on this, see our series of booklets on final events, entitled The End of Time Series. It is the most complete Spirit of Prophecy compilation on last-day events.)

By the end of the 1970s, so much progress had been made in introducing the new theology into North America, that it was felt that more rapid advance moves could now be made in our denomination. Unknown to most of us, a majority of the Bible teachers in our colleges and universities were, by that time, solidly new theology. The future was assured, for every year more ministerial students indoctrinated in the new view—graduated and went out to the local churches. It was thought that the hour had come to take the wraps off the teaching and give it fuller display.

First came Ford's lecture. Always very self-assured. Desmond Ford was determined to lead the way. In October 1979, he gave a powerful Adventist Forum lecture at Pacific Union College, in which he praised Ballenger and ridiculed a variety of historic Adventist concepts. When A.L. White, living in retirement at Deer Park a few miles down the hill (working on the six-volume E.G. White biography) heard about it, he immediately notified the General Conference. Ford was put on suspension until the Glacier View hearing the next summer.

Second, Ford's close friend in the new theology (see Australasian Controversy for details about that friendship), Robert Brinsmead, published a special issue of his journal in 1980, in which he repeated the jaded jargon of the antinomians who hate the law of God and the Bible Sabbath. He concluded by fully repudiating God's holy Sabbath.

Third, in October 1981, Frank Knittle, the president of Southern College, delivered his two-part address to the students of the college, in which he ridiculed the idea that our denomination had any kind of inspired "blueprint" to guide us, downgraded the Spirit of Prophecy, and exalted the values of masturbation (Knittle's "Blueprint" Lecture). We published major parts of that lecture, released a tape of it, and Knittle went to La Sierra as an English teacher.

By repudiating the Seventh-day Sabbath, Brinsmead broke his last connection with many of our people. But that special group, which had always venerated the man more than God's Word, clung doggedly to him and went all the way out with him.

Hundreds of people will be lost because of Robert Brinsmead.

During the 1980s, much of his time was spent on his banana and avocado plantation in the hills of northern Queensland. Yet the money kept pouring in. His supporters were thrilled that he had delivered them from obedience to the law of God and the divinely-given Sabbath. They were anxious to pay him back for their forthcoming destruction.

Well, it is time to end this brief survey of men who have arisen in our church with a message. (We could actually continue for many pages, for there are now many men arising with messages.)

But, before concluding, whatever happened to those men after that?

All the earlier-mentioned ones are now dead. Desmond Ford, after separating from the denomination in 1980, was determined to take his message to the world via books, magazines, and radio broadcasts. He aroused his followers to a white heat, and set to work.

And it all fizzled. Ford's message—that it is not necessary to keep the law of God—is exactly what they already believe. Few in the other churches were impressed with the man. He offered a special thrill to our people: freedom from obedience. But the other churches already had it, and they surely did not need to hear Ford tell it to them again.

Those in important positions in our denomination who opposed the new theology in the early 1980s were all sent overseas or retired. Since then, no denominationally-salaried worker dares openly oppose it. As for the few Fordite workers who became too obnoxious in their defense of Ford, they have been quietly sent off to high-paying jobs in Adventist Health Systems.

But what about Brinsmead? Whatever happened to Robert Brinsmead after he rejected the Bible Sabbath in the spring of 1980?

A friend from Australia stopped by to visit us recently. I asked him if he knew what Robert Brinsmead was doing today. He told me he took the trouble to find out.

About the year 1989, he drove up to Brinsmead's ranch in north Queensland (which is well over a hundred acres in size)—and discovered it was a gigantic fruit and nut farm, intermingled with a large theme park, complete with a small railroad engine and cars. Brinsmead had built himself a Disney World! Where did he get the money to do it? Thousands of people come yearly to enjoy the fun on the rides and other amusements. With many employees and hundreds of revelers our friend hardly knew what to do. Finally he managed to find his way to the main office, and there inquired if he could speak to Robert Brinsmead, the owner of this expensive playland.

His name was taken and he was seated. Eventually, a man in his mid-fifties walked in (Brinsmead was born about the year 1934). The two spoke together for about half an hour. Our friend unabashedly declared himself to believe in the Bible, the Spirit of Prophecy, and historic Adventism. Brinsmead told him Adventism was an idle tale—and he told him why: Brinsmead said that people should hold no beliefs that separate them from other people. He said the Sabbath does this, and so does other Adventist beliefs. He concluded that all such beliefs should be abandoned. (But, according to that, we should all smoke, drink, and engage in free love, for then we will not, be separated from most anyone. It is morality which separates.)

When asked why he was running an amusement palace for Australians and overseas tourists, he said that making people happy was God's will for mankind, and he was doing that. Then he excused himself and hurriedly left. It was impressed on our friend's mind that Brinsmead appeared to be a man filled with anxieties.

Robert Brinsmead was blessed with a powerful mind and keen analytical powers. Yet when he switched to false premises, all his conclusions built on the new, erroneous foundation were erroneous. When a man accepts false premises, he can no longer think right. Even a child, with only part of the mental powers of an adult, can know the truth, make right choices, and be saved—if he will base those decisions on the Word of God and relying on Jesus as a little child, he will be true to them.

And where do we stand today? When will we learn our lesson? Are the Advent people condemned to forever wander off after weak, erring men who want their own way? There is so little time left. We no longer have time for mistakes. We are too near the end for that.

I appeal to you, my friend: Trust only the Word of God, and you will be safe in the crisis ahead. Put your trust in man, and your future will be more shadowed. The problem is that there have been few men in the past who have arisen to defend the Word of God in humility of spirit. Most have desired to gain a following. But such men will do whatever is necessary to keep that following—compromise and error results. The humble and meek are the ones closest to Jesus. But they will also be the ones to defend

God's truth in a time of crisis, when so many about them are compromising. And that is the situation in the world today. "Many have tried neutrality in a crisis, but they have failed in their purpose." We cannot be half-way on either side in the final controversy over God's special truths. To be "half and half, whatever may be their intentions," will ultimately find them "enlisted on the enemy's side." (TD. 240). Remain true to God, dear friend!