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Lessons from the First Advent

“Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God.”1 With these startling words our Saviour laid bare the poverty of Biblical understanding of the Sadducees, the most liberal element of God’s Church in His day.2 The contemporary conservatives, the Pharisees, fared no better. Christ prefaced His response to their question concerning the payment of tax with the words, “Why tempt me ye hypocrites?”3

Christ’s answer to this latter question left the Pharisees so embarrassed that “When they had heard these words, they marveled, and left him, and went their way.”4 The Sadducees were similarly humiliated before the listening church members who were “astonished at his doctrine.”5

Here were the leaders of God’s designated church on earth, the intelligentsia of that church, exposed as Scriptural ignoramuses, by a young man whose curriculum vitae lacked any College or University education and whose lone “elementary” education was supplied in a home-schooling environment. Yet at the age of twelve He was vastly superior in the knowledge of the Old Testament to the most eminent theologians of the day.6,7

God’s Church at the time of the First Advent was led by ecclesiastical leaders and doctrinally influenced by theologians, both of whom were teaching rank apostasy. To declare this plain fact concerning the Jewish Church in our Seventh-day Adventist Churches of the twenty-first century would arouse little, if any, opposition from the communicants present.8

As we examine the history of the factors surrounding the publication of the book, Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine9 (QOD), half-a-century past, this moment demands a period of introspection.

Fifty years have passed since the publication of Questions on Doctrine. There is widespread agreement that this book has played a defining role in the transformation of certain crucial Seventh-day Adventist doctrines. We can now reflect, with the benefit of hindsight, upon its impact upon our beloved Church and its members. We would be remiss if we did not consider at this Conference the great impact these alterations have had upon the entire body of our faith and upon our witness to the world and the cohesion of our Church members.

One passage of the Spirit of Prophecy challenges our thinking.

The same disobedience and failure which were seen in the Jewish church have characterized in a greater degree the people who have had this great light from heaven in the last messages of warning.10

---

1 All material in bold was read at the Conference.
I possess no doubt whatsoever that the Seventh-day Adventist Church is God’s Remnant Church\(^{11}\) that it is “the one object of His supreme regard;”\(^{12}\) that our Church will never become Babylon;\(^{13}\) that it is the Church which will ultimately triumph;\(^{14}\) that the name God’s Church bears was selected by God Himself.\(^{15}\)

With these firm convictions, I have often pondered whether we could possibly be more disobedient, and even greater failures, than the Jewish Church, God’s chosen Church, during His earthly sojourn. Would I have cried, “Crucify Him!?”;\(^{16}\) Would I have rejected my Saviour and spurned the Christian Church which replaced the Jewish Church in 34 AD as God’s designated earthly Church, had I lived in that era?

It is with these questions coursing through my mind that I present this paper.

*Salvation Is at Stake*

It is with these convictions within my heart that I wish to explore the history surrounding the publication of *Questions on Doctrine*.

The plan of salvation Biblically and historically rests upon the subject of righteousness by faith.\(^{18}\) This central doctrine of God’s infinite love for us lost sinners encapsulates all other doctrines presented in Scripture. A number of these doctrines especially pertain to our understanding of this transcendent doctrine. These include:

1. Justification by faith\(^{19}\)
2. Sanctification by faith\(^{20}\)
3. Glorification\(^{21}\)
4. The Sanctuary Message\(^{22}\)
5. The Atonement\(^{23}\)
6. Christ’s Human Nature\(^{24}\)
7. The Spirit of Prophecy\(^{25}\)
8. Obedience to God’s Holy Law including the holy Sabbath day and holy worship\(^{26}\)

For simplicity, I will refer to the destruction of this body of truth by the term “The New Theology.”\(^{27}\)

Elders Dudley Canright\(^{28}\) and Albion Ballenger\(^{29}\), and Pastors Louis Conradi\(^{30}\), William Fletcher\(^{31}\) and Robert Greive\(^{32}\) successively proposed the principles of the New Theology between the 1870’s and the 1950’s. Tragically, all of these men had been gifted, prominent pastors.

Canright\(^{33}\), Ballenger\(^{34}\), Conradi\(^{35}\), Fletcher\(^{36}\) and Greive\(^{37}\) all propounded numbers of the key components of our eight Seventh-day Adventist Bible-based doctrines, each of which is an immovable pillar of God’s doctrine of Righteousness by Faith.

It has been insightfully concluded that *Questions on Doctrine* “easily qualifies as the most divisive book in Seventh-day Adventist history. A book published to help bring peace between Adventism and conservative Protestantism, its release brought prolonged alienation and separation to the Adventist factions that grew up around it.”\(^{38}\)
The Initial Impact of *Questions on Doctrine*

In 1957 *Questions on Doctrine*, hot off the Review and Herald Publishing Association press, bearing the imprimatur of the General Conference President, Elder R. R. Figuhr, set forth certain tenets of the New Theology, proclaiming them to be faithful to our old established principles of faith, now expressed in new and clearer language. Colin and I, at twenty-four years of age, did not accept this evaluation. 

**Inexcusable Silence**

Only recently has an explanation for the failure of this book to generate a worldwide outcry against the intrusion of rank apostasy into our beloved church been offered. To concerned lay people like my brother and me, as we then were, we assumed that most ministers feared leadership ire and even dismissal if they dared to speak out in warning. We even conjectured between ourselves whether an entire generation of ministers had departed from the faith. These fears were fuelled by the disgraceful treatment of the one man who did stand when other champions were few, indeed, initially non-existent. Almost alone, Milian Lauritz Andreasen, evinced sufficient courage to make a stand. Surely in the kingdom of heaven he will stand tall. Yet in his brief biography in *The Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopaedia*, this, the greatest moment of his ministerial career, is totally ignored.

We are indebted to Dr Herbert E. Douglass for his first-hand account of the reasons why Church leaders, fully alert to the alterations in faith, silenced their concerns. In summary the reasons for silence were:

1. That they totally underestimated the impact of *Questions on Doctrine* on our Church.
2. They washed their hands of the entire matter, a number even literally doing so.
3. They did not believe that *Questions on Doctrine* “would amount to much”.
4. “They chose to remain respectful”.
5. “We still felt that *Questions on Doctrine* would die a quick death and the less we all said about it the better.”
6. They “did not expect the crescendo of *Ministry* editorials and articles with a remarkably orchestrated PR programme in workers’ meetings”.
7. Elder R. R. Figuhr, saw *Questions on Doctrine* as “a magnificent achievement”.
8. Very few leaders read *Questions on Doctrine*.
9. Church leaders “were assured that any misunderstandings were semantic”.
10. Many “Denominational workers were lulled to sleep”.
11. Some Denomination leaders “went underground”.
12. Some “kept their peace not wanting to appear disloyal.”

Not one of these excuses for silence, or all combined, bore the least merit.

Indifference and neutrality in a religious crisis is regarded of God as a grievous crime and equal to the very worst type of hostility against God.
Elder Andreasen’s Noble Stand

Amidst this inexcusable silence, one man delivered his soul. Elder Andreasen, his Viking genes bristling with holy indignation, stood virtually alone. His book, *Letters to the Churches*, ranks with the noblest defences of precious truth in the past six thousand years.

I have judged Elder Andreasen to be our Church’s twentieth century Moses, exhorting God’s people to uphold the purity of the faith as the ancient prophet did before the Golden Calf. Just as Moses placed the eternal salvation of God’s heritage above all else, I believe Elder Andreasen did likewise in the mid-twentieth century. Many of my contemporaries judged Elder Andreasen’s motives otherwise. So, too, were Moses’ motives misjudged by many 3500 years ago. 54

One mystery is yet to be solved. Elder Andreasen’s ministerial credentials were suspended55, and he was stripped of his sustentation. He died of a haemorrhaging duodenal ulcer on 19 February, 1962. His ministerial credentials were restored posthumously on 1 March, 1962, ten days after his death. 56

That I have discovered no evidence that one of those silent concerned leaders wrote openly in support of the defense of truth by Elder Andreasen, may point to the fear of possible ecclesiastical penalties. Yet, no doubt many of these pastors in their evangelistic days had encouraged new converts to keep the Sabbath, despite the loss of their employment, trusting God to care for them. There appears to be a lesson for each of us in this.

Elder Andreasen was generally regarded as the most qualified and able exponent of the doctrine of the atonement in our Church at the beginning of the second half of the twentieth century.57 Yet he was not consulted in the preparation of *Questions on Doctrine*.58

Destruction of Scripture

That *Questions on Doctrine* altered the long-held doctrines of the human nature of Christ and the atonement is indisputable.59 A massive piece of research undertaken by Dr Ralph Larson in the 1980’s discovered that in the century 1852-1952 not a single author published in our English language denominational literature had ever promoted the error that Christ possessed an unfallen human nature. To the contrary, Sister White over four hundred times upheld Christ’s fallen nature and in about eight hundred articles in the English language other writers all over the English-speaking world upheld this doctrine clearly defined in Scripture and the Spirit of Prophecy.60

It is not my commission to deviate from history to theology. I leave that to others. Clearly, until the 1950’s, these doctrines, bearing divine mandates, were widely accepted in God’s Church.

Techniques of Subterfuge

A most concerning issue is that none of these alterations were ever brought before a General Conference Session for acceptance by the world body. History
attests that they were introduced by the “back door.” The leadership of the General Conference had exceeded their mandate. Unquestionably these leaders knew that a body of delegates would have rejected this debasing of our faith by a handsome majority.

Among other improprieties, quotations were wrested from their contexts in order to pervert their inspired meaning.\textsuperscript{61}

Truth is ever transparent. It stands the most rigorous, inspired scrutiny. Error skulks in dark recesses, it falls upon the sword of inspiration. Truth is ever logical, error fails the test of logical thought.\textsuperscript{62}

Robert Greive, President of the North New Zealand Conference, was the last Church leader to be disciplined for promoting the New Theology. His dismissal from ministry occurred just prior to the issuing of Questions on Doctrine. One of the two most prominent authors of that book, Australian Pastor Roy Allan Anderson (1895-1988) had alerted Pastor Greive that alterations to our doctrines, with which Pastor Greive would feel more at ease, were in the making, and counselled him to mute his New Theology convictions until this alteration was public.\textsuperscript{63} To his credit, Pastor Greive did not resort to this subterfuge and was properly discharged from ministry.

Despite the euphoria that was engendered by the request of the Evangelicals in 1955 to discuss our Bible-established doctrines with them, this proved to be a major turning point in the history of God’s last church on earth.

\textit{Euphoria in Pleasing Those Who Despised Our Faith}

Since we possess no knowledge of what Elder T E Unruh, the then President of the East Pennsylvania Conference wrote in appreciation of Dr Donald Barnhouse’s radio presentation earlier in 1949, we shall not speculate. But one matter is certain, both Donald Barnhouse and Walter Martin expressed opposition to every one of our distinctive doctrines. This was evident AFTER their dialogues in 1955, 1956 with our General Conference representatives, and even in the \textit{Eternity} issue of September, 1956 which incredibly delighted many Church leaders.\textsuperscript{64} It is astounding that the men who met with these two Evangelicals did not perceive that attempting to alter our doctrines in order to please such men was a design unfitting for pastors of their high calling.

It is difficult not to conclude that the negotiators on the side of our Church suffered from a strange denominational inferiority complex, which led the negotiators to value the plaudits of representatives of the more popular professing Christian Churches. Never is it prudent to seek “the praise of men more than the praise of God.”\textsuperscript{65}

For a period of eight decades Church leadership dealt effectively with those who attempted to introduce the tenets of New Theology into God’s Remnant Church in order that we would no longer be “a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people” showing forth “the praises of him who hath called” us “out of darkness into his marvelous light.”\textsuperscript{66}
Preparing for Questions on Doctrine

*Questions on Doctrine* did not alter the faith in a vacuum. Four most significant steps had been taken which smoothly paved the way for its publication and general acceptance. Once the first of these steps was taken under the leadership of Elder Arthur Daniells who had served as a pioneer worker in Australia, three other steps were taken under the leadership of Australia’s only General Conference President, Charles Watson. These were:

1. The 1919 Bible Conference
2. 1931 Permission granted for certain Colleges to seek accreditation
   The first to succeed was Pacific Union College.
3. 1932 Plans for a Seminary put in place.
4. 1932 Issuing of a Church Manual

*Questions on Doctrine* effectively removed the barriers previously erected by Church leadership against the acceptance of a number of the doctrines promulgated by the proponents of the New Theology. These had been considered earlier by Church leadership to be contrary to Biblical principles of faith. These leaders had judged that to accept these perceived errors would have disqualified us from being identified as a chosen generation and divert God’s church from the sole mission for which it was established – to bear God’s last and greatest message of love to every sinner – the Three Angels’ Messages.

The removal of those barriers soon bore dire fruits. Dr Desmond Ford was a fellow student with Colin and me at the Australasian Missionary College in 1950. He was a young man of unbounded potential, outshining each one of his fellow students and of whom we all expected great deeds for the Lord. He was well placed to succeed where Canright, Ballenger, Conradi, and his fellow Australians, Fletcher and Greive, had failed. *Questions on Doctrine* had effectively prepared his way.

The South Pacific Defends the Faith

By the mid-1960’s ministerial students were graduating from Avondale College proclaiming rank error. With the appointment of faithful Elder Robert Pierson (1911-1989) to the Presidency of the General Conference in 1966, the centre of the promotion and advance of the New Theology moved from North America to the South Pacific. In Dr Ford the New Theology had found its able successor to Dr LeRoy Froom and Pastor Roy Anderson.

Dr Ford was highly regarded by the Australasian Division President, New Zealander, Pastor Naden. When Pastor Burnside took his concerns related to Dr Ford’s teaching of the New Theology to Pastor Naden, the President was not of a mind to accept Pastor Burnside’s urgent warning.

The book *Questions on Doctrine* was now read by numbers of courageous and devout Australian and New Zealand pastors who had hitherto left it on their shelves. These men, calling themselves Concerned Brethren, arose in defense of the faith. Subsequent South Pacific Division Presidents were no more sympathetic to the faithful witness of these stalwarts for truth than was Pastor Naden. Even the
dismissal of Dr Ford from the ministry after the Glacier View Meetings of 1980, did not alter this situation.

**Crucial Conferences**

On 3, 4 February, 1976, eleven pastors and five laymen, of whom I was one, met with twenty chosen leaders and theologians\(^ {80}\) to discuss our concerns. Four issues were discussed after papers had been presented by various Concerned Brethren\(^ {81}\) –

1. Righteousness by Faith;
2. The Sanctuary Message;
3. The Age of the Earth; and
4. The Inerrancy of Scripture.

The discussion was emotional and passionate.\(^ {82}\) Despite Dr Ford’s brilliant mind the eternal truths of God presented by the old pastors comprehensively won the day. The New Theology is indefensible when confronted with inspired writings, no matter how brilliant its exponent.

Yet the Division Biblical Research Institute in its final judgment chose to support Dr Ford’s demonstrated errors.\(^ {83}\)

Pastor Pierson’s effort to resolve the escalation of the New Theology crisis in Australia failed at the subsequent Palmdale, California, Conference.\(^ {84}\) Nor did the Righteousness by Faith Consultation in 1979 to which Colin was an invitee\(^ {85}\) produce worthwhile results.

**Glacier View**

The much-touted Glacier View Meeting, convened 1-15 August, 1980, utterly failed to halt, much less reverse, the increasing raids of the New Theology upon God’s precious immoveable truths. It had long been forgotten that:

Error is never harmless. It never sanctifies, but always brings confusion and dissension. It is always dangerous. The enemy has great power over minds that are not thoroughly fortified by prayer and established in Bible truth.\(^ {86}\)

Theology had replaced the Bible, human desires and opinions replaced the Spirit of Prophecy.

Glacier View failed because many unbelievers were invited to participate.\(^ {87}\) It failed because human consensus rather than pure truth pervaded the conclusion published,\(^ {88}\) and Dr Ford’s erroneous view of justification by faith was sustained.\(^ {89}\) The New Theology had ultimately prevailed!\(^ {90}\)

**Techniques Devised to Silence Truth**

History answers a most perplexing question, “How did an entire generation of faithful pastors and laypeople permit our treasured Christ-inspired faith to be utterly destroyed?” The means employed were as simple as they were few. I summarise:

1. Those close to the development of Questions on Doctrine remained silent.\(^ {91}\)
2. The support of the General Conference President was accepted as evidence of \textit{Questions on Doctrines} veracity.\textsuperscript{92}
3. Men most qualified to evaluate truth, including Elder Andreasen, were provided no input into \textit{Questions on Doctrine}.\textsuperscript{93}
4. Punitive action was taken against men who dared to oppose the New Theology teachings. Many ministers and laypeople silenced their concerns rather than invoke ecclesiastical penalties.\textsuperscript{94}
5. Those refusing to accept the debasing of the faith were belittled and publicly denigrated, accused of disloyalty, changing doctrines and denounced as schismatics.\textsuperscript{95}
6. In 1980 in a most acrimonious session of a General Conference Quinquennial meeting,\textsuperscript{96} the Twenty-seven Fundamentals were voted, without full world-wide examination. Some of the Fundamentals were crafted with deliberately shaded meanings and omitted salient doctrines which were judged to be in opposition to the New Theology.\textsuperscript{97}
7. Our denominational publications have served as mediums for the promotion of the tenets of the New Theology.\textsuperscript{98}
8. The alterations in doctrine were never placed before a General Conference Session.

\textit{Consequences of Apostasy Endorsed by Questions on Doctrine}

This paper concludes with a necessarily abbreviated list of historical consequences arising directly out of \textit{Questions on Doctrine}:

1. Seventh-day Adventism is now extremely ecumenical.\textsuperscript{99}
2. Not only sins but crimes of many kinds are rampant in our midst.\textsuperscript{100}
3. In many congregations self-centred entertainment has replaced worship of our High and Holy Heavenly Father.\textsuperscript{101}
4. Sabbath desecration is the rule rather than an exception.\textsuperscript{102}
5. Our Adventist Book Centres abound in novels, books produced by the fallen churches of Babylon, perverted Bible translations and books teaching the New Theology.\textsuperscript{103}
6. Many of our scientists and theologians have rejected Genesis chapter one and Exodus 20:11, the latter written by the finger of God.\textsuperscript{104}
7. Immorality and divorce are commonplace.\textsuperscript{105}
8. Many now openly deny the Roman Catholic Church is the Antichrist.\textsuperscript{106}
9. Many deny that the Seventh-day Adventist Church is God’s Remnant Church of prophecy.\textsuperscript{107}
10. The numbers of members imbibing alcohol has greatly escalated.\textsuperscript{108}
11. Numerous church members now either pay a devalued tithe or none at all. They are also robbing God with their offerings.\textsuperscript{109}
12. Common observance of Palm Sunday and Easter pass unreproved.\textsuperscript{110}
13. Persecution of fellow Church members standing for Bible truth is widespread.\textsuperscript{111}
14. The Bible and Spirit of Prophecy are discounted by many since they are promoted as being in error.\textsuperscript{112}
15. The acceptance of State Aid for Seventh-day Adventist Education is widespread and Christian education principles eschewed.\textsuperscript{113}

16. *The Church Manual* has superseded Scripture.\textsuperscript{114}

17. The Three Angels’ Messages and Loud Cry Message are now an inaudible mumble.\textsuperscript{115}

*Our Sacred Church Today*

Our beloved Church is, in 2007, in dire straits. We are deep, deep in the Omega of Apostasy. “Deception of almost every kind [is] in the Church.”\textsuperscript{116}

This is a moment in history when we – the attendees at this conference – may covenant together to lead a movement which delivers God’s Church and His people from the devastating defeats of *Questions on Doctrine* to the glorious victory of the Latter Rain, and the glory of God’s heavenly Kingdom.

We have “played the harlot with many lovers.” Let us now heed our Saviour’s tender plea, “Yet return again to me, saith the Lord.”\textsuperscript{117}

Dear, dear Brethren and Sisters. This Church I have loved since my earliest recollections, the Church for which our pioneers suffered and sacrificed so much, for which my ancestors paid a heavy price to join, deserves much better. At this moment of anniversary, as a heart-broken member, I sincerely wish to examine my own heart as I pray each of us will do.

My Saviour deserves far better of us in this era of the Second Advent than His Church provided at the First Advent. With each of you I desire heaven more than all else. My sincere prayer is that each one of us, through Christ’s incomparable grace, will tread the Streets of Gold, and stand on the Sea of Glass.

May God bless you, each one!

*Notes*

For those desiring the full material quoted in each reference, see the book *A History of Questions on Doctrine – Fidelity or Compromise?* This book is authored by Russell R. Standish and Colin D. Standish and may be obtained from Hartland Publications, P.O. Box 1, Rapidan, Virginia. 22733. 540-6723566 or Highwood Books, 291 Maroondah Highway, Narbethong, Vic. 3778. 03-5963 7000. Copies will be found in Avondale College Library, Loma Linda University Heritage Library and Andrews University Library.

Ever contemporary leaders in God’s Church have plainly acknowledged the vile apostasy of earlier eras of God’s Church. The Jews of the First Advent were wide-awake to the great defects of the Jewish Church in earlier periods, but blind to their own vastly greater apostasies. Three or four days before they committed an evil so great that it transcended the horrors of all the vicious acts of their spiritual and biological ancestors combined and multiplied an infinite-fold, these leaders continued to declare proudly, “If we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets.” (Matthew 23:30).


We should remember that the church, enfeebled and defective though it be, is the only object on earth on which Christ bestows His supreme regard. (Ellen G. White, Selected Messages, Review and Herald Publishing Association, Washington D.C., 1958, Book 2, p. 396).

Ellen G. White, Testimonies to Ministers and Gospel Workers, Pacific Press Publishing Association, Mountain View, California, 1923, pp. 32-64; 41, 44.

Testimonies for the Church, op. cit., Vol. 5, pp. 475, 476.

We are Seventh-day Adventists. Are we ashamed of our name? We answer, "No, no! We are not. It is the name the Lord has given us. (Ellen G. White, Selected Messages, Review and Herald Publishing Association, Washington D.C., 1958, Book 2, p. 384).

See Endnote 10 above.

Daniel 9:24-27.


Romans 8:30; 2 Thessalonians 1:10.

Daniel 8:14. Turning again to the book of Hebrews, the seekers for truth found that the existence of a second, or new-covenant sanctuary, was implied in the words of Paul already quoted: "Then verily the first covenant had also ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary." And the use of the word "also" intimates that Paul has before made mention of this sanctuary. Turning back to the beginning of the previous chapter, they read (Hebrews 8:1, 2); Great Controversy, p. 413.

Daniel 8:14; Early Writings, p. 253).

Romans 1:3; Hebrews 2:14-18; 4:15.


John 14:15; 1 John 2:1; 3:6; Psalm 119:2, 3; 1 John 3:3-7; Revelation 12:17; 14:12.

See also Endnote 18.


30. Pastor Louis Richard Conradi (1856-1939), appointed President of the General European Conference (1901), Vice President of the General Conference (1903), President of the European Division until 1922, when he became a Field Secretary of the General Conference. (*Ibid*, Vol. 10, pp. 406, 407).

31. Pastor William Warde Fletcher (1879-1947) was influenced by Pastor Conradi when the latter visited India as Field Secretary in the General Conference in the early 1920’s. Pastor Fletcher at the time was President of the Southern Asia Division. Later he was Bible Teacher at Australasian Missionary College, where he influenced one student, Pastor Robert Greive.

32. Pastor Robert Greive was later President of the North Queensland and North New Zealand Conferences. He was dismissed from service just prior to the publication of the book *Questions on Doctrine*.

33. Canright made it plain where he stood: “…that he had come to a point where he no longer believed that the Ten Commandments were binding upon Christians and had given up the law, the Sabbath, the messages, the sanctuary, our position upon [the] United States in prophecy, the testimonies, health reform, the ordinances of humility. He also said that he did not believe the Papacy had changed the Sabbath. And though he did not directly state it, his language intimated that he would probably keep Sunday. He thinks that Seventh-day Adventists are too narrow in their ideas.—Church Clerk's Record, Feb. 17, 1887, Otsego, Michigan, in Johnson, *I Was Canright's Secretary*, p. 82. (Quoted in Arthur L. White, *Ellen G. White, “The Lonely Years,”* Review and Herald Publishing Association, Washington D.C., 1984, Vol. 3, p. 361).

34. Ballenger denied:
   a. The Sanctuary Message: “I am bidden to say in the name of the Lord that Elder Ballenger is following a false light. The Lord has not given him the message that he is bearing regarding the sanctuary service” (Ellen G. White, Manuscript 62, 1905, quoted in Arthur L. White, *op. cit.*, “The Early Elmshaven Years,” Vol. 5, p. 412).
   b. The Final Atonement in the Most Holy Place of the Sanctuary in heaven: “He has been studying the subject of the sanctuary a good deal lately, and he comes to the conclusion that the atonement was made when Christ was crucified and that when He ascended He went immediately into the Most Holy Place and that His ministry has been carried on there ever since” (Letter written by Eugene William Farnsworth, 1847-1935 to Arthur Grosvenor Daniells, 1858-1935, quoted in a letter from A. G. Daniells to William Clarence White, 1854-1937, dated 16 March, 1905, quoted in A. L. White, *op. cit.*, Vol. 5, p. 407).
c. Christ entered the Holy Place at His ascension. He claimed that Christ entered the Most Holy Place and had been ministering in that apartment ever since. *(Ibid).*

d. The public proclamation of the Sabbath to unbelievers: “She [Sister White] told Elder Ballenger that he was the minister that the Lord had presented before her in vision in Salamanca, New York, in 1890, as standing with a party who was ‘urging that if the Sabbath truth were left out of the [American] Sentinel, the circulation of that paper would be largely increased’” (Manuscript 59, 1905, quoted in A. L. White, *op. cit.*, Vol. 5, p. 408).

e. The testimonies of the Spirit of Prophecy were reliable: “Now again our Brother Ballenger is presenting theories that cannot be substantiated by the Word of God. It will be one of the great evils that will come to our people to have the Scriptures taken out of their true place and so interpreted as to substantiate error that contradicts the light and the Testimonies that God has been giving us for the past half century” (Manuscript 59, 1905, quoted in A. L. White, *op. cit.*, Vol. 5, p. 409).


37. But one student, later to hold high office, was influenced. Pastor Robert Greive, Conference President both in Queensland, Australia and North New Zealand, openly expressed the views of his former Bible teacher. Two young pastors serving in the North New Zealand Conference in the 1950’s, both young men of above average potential, left the faith with their Conference President. Brethren Darryl Wyborn and Stanley Bellette had been fellow Students at the Australasian Missionary College with us. Darryl graduated in 1950 and Stanley in 1952, the latter as class President. Darryl had been an Assistant (Student) Dean in 1950. Their talents were a sore loss to God’s work. We graduated in education in 1951. (Standish and Standish, *Ibid.*, p. 483).


39. In October, 1956, I was only approaching my twenty-third birthday. I was then a student, along with my twin brother Colin, studying for our B.A. degrees at the University of Sydney with a minor in English, a major in Modern History and honours in Psychology.

One Sabbath afternoon in October 1956 the Australasian Division Secretary, Laurence Christopher Naden (1906-1979) announced in the old Wahroonga Church, the Division headquarter’s Church, the “A most wonderful event for our church occurred last month in the United States. The highly respected Evangelical periodical, *Eternity*, has just declared that Seventh-day Adventists are part of the body of Christ.
I held Pastor Naden in high respect. I had never heard of *Eternity*. Yet, while unaware of the discussions that had generated this declaration and the doctrinal concessions our negotiators had made, I did not share Pastor Naden’s exuberance. In my immature mind two matters arose immediately; one a sense of affront and the other a question. “Who do these Evangelicals think they are that they believe they possess the authority to judge whether we are part of the body of Christ?!” was my initial reaction, “Of course we are! We have been since 1844.” The question which surfaced in my mind was, “What did we tell these Evangelicals about the mark of the beast?” As I recall, the names Barnhouse and Martin were not mentioned that day.

The following Monday at University I shared the matter with Colin. He empathised with my concerns.

When *Questions on Doctrine* was published we both, despite our impecunious circumstances, quickly purchased the volume. We had no idea that the questions posed were those raised by Walter Martin. We imagined that the questions were created by the anonymous authors in order to present validation of the Seventh-day Adventist faith upon salient doctrines for the benefit of members and non-members alike.

Our shock cannot be expressed in words when we discovered that salient truths including the atonement and the human nature were destroyed and Sister White’s role in our Church diminished with the proverbial “faint praise.” It was only later that the Barnhouse-Martin fiasco unravelled. (See our book, *The Gathering Storm and the Storm Burst*, Hartland Publications, Rapidan, Virginia, 2000, for a comprehensive account of the impact of *Questions on Doctrine* upon our Church in the era 1956-1985. See also our book, *Half a Century of Apostasy – the New Theology’s Grim Harvest*, Highwood Books, Narbethong, Victoria, Australia, published 2006.

---

40. See *Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia*, op. cit., Vol. 10, p. 68.
42. Ibid, p. 7.
43. Ibid, p. 9.
44. Ibid.
45. Ibid, pp. 10, 11.
46. Ibid, p. 11.
47. Ibid.
48. Ibid.
49. Ibid, pp. 11, 12.
51. Ibid.
52. Ibid.


56. As a Consultant Physician (Internist), I can only speculate concerning the part played in Elder Andreasen’s death by the stress he endured. (Ibid, p. 181, 182).

57. Annotated edition of Seventh-day Adventists Answer Objections on Doctrine, op. cit., p. xviii.

58. Ibid.

59. Dr. Donald Barnhouse, “Are Seventh-day Adventists Christians?”, Eternity, September, 1956; Dr Herbert Douglass, op. cit., p. 13.


62. Hebrews 2:14-18; Romans 1:3; Galatians 4:4,5; Hebrews 2:9; Manuscript Releases, Vol. 5, p. 112 and Vol. 6, p. 334; Letter K.303, 1903;


65. John 12:43

66. 1 Peter 2:9

67. Elder Arthur Grosvenor Daniells (1858-1935), General Conference President (1901-1922).
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74. Now Avondale College

75. Desmond Ford traveled to our Seminary then in Washington DC in the late 1950’s to study for his Masters degree. He was greatly influenced by Dr Edward Heppenstall (1901-1994). After completing a Ph.D. in Rhetoric at the State University of Michigan, Dr Ford returned to Avondale College to teach in the Theology Department.
Australian layman, Robert Brinsmead, caused a great division in the Church by strongly upholding many of the principles destroyed or shaded by Questions on Doctrine. Dr Ford as the Division President’s defender against Brinsmead was thus highly valued. Robert Brinsmead later did a complete turnabout, accepted the New Theology, later departing from the faith and even Christianity.


Those in attendance at this meeting listed.

Pastor Frank Basham and Dr John Clifford – Righteousness by Faith
Pastor George Burnside – The Sanctuary Message
Dr Russell Standish – The Age of the Earth
Pastor Frank Breaden – The Inerrancy of Scripture
In addition, Pastor Elwyn Martin presented a short paper in which he set forth problems he had discovered in the beliefs of young Avondale College ministerial graduates.

Personal recollections as an attendee.

The Division’s findings presented in full (The Gathering Storm and the Storm Burst, op. cit., pp. 113, 114).

The Palmdale Conference was held 23-30 April, 1976. The General Conference delegates and Australasian Division delegates listed. Review and Herald, 27 May, 1976; Dr D. Ford, a chapel talk at Avondale College entitled Sanctification, presented 8 May, 1976, as a preview to the college students of the Palmdale Statement; Dr D. Ford letter to Dr R. Standish dated 7 June, 1976; Dr D. Ford, letter published in the Review and Herald, 23 Dec., 1976; Standish and Standish, The Gathering Storm and the Storm Burst, op. cit., pp. 122-125;

Recollections of Colin Standish.

Ellen G. White, Testimonies for the Church, Vol. 5, p. 292.


The Great Controversy, op. cit., p 595.


Dr Herbert Douglass, Opportunity of the Century, op. cit., pp. 6-12.

Ibid.

Virginia Steinweg, op. cit., p. 172, 173. See Endnotes 57 & 58 above

See Endnotes 55 and 56 above.

Dr. George Knight, op. cit., p. xvi.


Dr H. Douglas, op. cit., p. 11.
Popular Seventh-day Adventist youth preacher, Pastor “Litch” Litchfield from the United States conducted an evangelistic series for youth in the Mildura Church, Victorian Conference, Australia. At the conclusion the youth were passed a commitment sheet which stated:

- I would like to make a once in a lifetime decision and accept the offer of eternal life.
- I would like to be involved in a Bible Study Group.
- I would like to join a Youth Fellowship Group
- The Fellowship Group I would like to contact me is:
  - Anglican
  - Living Waters
  - Red Cliffs Christian Fellowship
  - Seventh-day Adventist
  - Other

(This commitment Form is on file on our Remnant Herald Office).

Even a General Conference President wrote,


This material was funded by Adventist Health Services and distributed by Ministry.

Naturally our hearts were heavy when we read of evidences that the Florida [Adventist] Hospital, our Church’s largest hospital in the world, had turned its back on Sabbath keeping by providing their “Hospital Video Theater” for patients on the holy Sabbath day. On one Sabbath day the films available on Sabbath were as follows:

- 7.45am  The Naked Gun; The Smell of Fear;
- 10.00am  Beaches;
- 12.15pm  Indiana Jones and the Last Crusade;
- 2.30pm  Always;
- 5.00pm  Field of Dreams;
- 8.00pm  Dances with Wolves.
Confessions of a Nomad, p. 86, 118, 120; Adventist Review, December 1994; Adult Sabbath School Quarterly, Fourth Quarter 2001; Steve Daily, Chaplain La Sierra [Adventist] University, Adventism for a New Generation, pp. 134, 296, 298;
South Pacific Record, 11 March, 1995; Spectrum, March 1996; From the G.C. President, 4 April, 1994; http://answersingenesis.org/3906.asp; Romans 5:12, 14, 21.

Spectrum, Vol. 12, No. 3, pp. 33, 35, 36; Walla Walla College Collegian, students’ paper, 30 November, 1995; Flyer, La Sierra University Bookstore, June, 1994; Andrews University, Student Movement, 26 February, 1997; Ibid, 2 April, 1997; Fresh Bread, 1 April, 1995 the official “publication of the W.A. (Western Australia) SDA Conference;
Spectrum, Vol. 27, Issue 3, Summer 1999; Letter written by Elder David vanDenburgh, Senior Pastor of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, Kettering, Ohio, published in the Dayton Daily News, 10 September, 1996; Adventist News Network, written by Pastor Ray Dabrowski, himself Polish, Communications Director of the General Conference; The General Conference Adult Sabbath School Quarterly for the Second Quarter, 2002; “Maxwell, Signs of the Times.” [USA] (pp. 7, 8, 13); The Adventist News Network (ANN) of the Church World Headquarters, dated 11 May, 2002; South Pacific Division Record, 16 April, 2005, p. 2; Lincoln Journal Star, 21 October, 1995;
South Pacific Record, 21 October, 2000; Exodus 31:13, 17; Ezekiel 20:12, 20). The four “conversations” between Pastor Bruce Manners, editor of the South Pacific Record, and Dr. Arthur Patrick, former Director of the Ellen G. White Research Centre, Avondale College, (Record, 7, 14, 21 and 28 February, 2004; Transcript of audiotape, Elders’ Summit, Melbourne, 19 June, 2004;
In the late 1980’s or very early 1990’s Ministry wrote an article on Alcoholism in the Seventh-day Adventist Church.
In the 1970’s, 70-80 per cent of [Seventh-day Adventist Church] members attended church regularly and 65 per cent tithed. Now 45-50 per cent of members regularly attend and 30 per cent tithe, according to Pr Maxson. (South Pacific Record, 22 November, 2003); South Pacific Record, 13 December, 2003
Launceston Examiner, 2 April, 1993; Avondale Memorial Seventh-day Adventist Church Bulletin, 11 February, 2006; Lake Macquarie News; South Pacific Record, 6 May, 2006, p. 1; Walla Walla Union Bulletin, Easter 1993; Church Bulletin Walla Walla Village S.D.A. Church, 10 April, 1993;
South Pacific Record, 7 April, 1990; Fiji Times, 6 May, 1994; Orange Church Bulletin, 6 March, 1993; Winter 1993 issue of Adventist View, a publication of the North American Division designed for young people; Letter from Church pastor, Warren Ruf of 1 February, 1996 to Pastor Kang.
In 1996, Brother Howard Price, a Church elder for many years, and his wife, Joan, were notified in writing that they had been disfellowshipped from the Cannington Church in the Western Australian Conference.
Their daughter, Chellie Jayne, a lawyer then assisting a Judge of the Supreme Court of Western Australia, was incensed and, unknown to her parents, took out a Supreme Court Writ against the Church. The
sincerity of the Church membership in the decision they had made against two of the most sincere members of their Church, was thus tested. The Church pastor, Pastor F. Miraslav Stilinovic, upon receipt of the writ, rapidly visited the Price home and informed the couple that there had been a “mistake” and they had been returned to Church membership.

If Brother and Sister Price had breached a divine command meriting Biblical disfellowship, no act of a secular court would alter that decision, for our Church must obey the divine dictum, “We ought to obey God rather than men.” (Acts 5:29). Peter and John were staring death in the face, yet they did not alter their course. But the Cannington Church held no such fidelity, for they well knew that they possessed no just grounds for their action. (SDA Press Release, Collegedale, Tennessee)

112. See Endnote 107.

113. In 1997 the North Pacific Union Conference (NPUC) took steps to investigate the Theology Department of Walla Walla College (WWC), well known for its liberal agenda.

A commission was appointed to investigate.

We document a few of the Commission’s findings:

The older view of doctrine and the pursuit of theology as deduction from Scripture has to make way for views that claim to be in tune with modern ways of study that are more in harmony with the scientific spirit. The Bible is then viewed as the inspired words of men about God, rather than words inspired by God concerning God and His relationship to man.

The subtly undermining influence of this model, if naively courted, or intentionally deployed in the Adventist theological education process will have far-reaching, paralyzing effects on the message and mission of Adventism.

Graduates lack of ability to articulate basics of Adventism in an easy and winning way.

...some ministerial students coming out of their WWC experience testify that they are unsure of the basics of Christian and Adventist faith.

See Endnote 105.


