A N A P P E A L.

Presented before the General Conference of Seventh Day Adventists at Takoma Park, Washington, D.C., May 27, 1909.

To the General Conference of the Seventh Day Adventists in session assembled:

Greeting: "Perfect peace and at such a time." I have appealed and do herein appeal from the procedure the process and the action of your Executive Committee in council assembled at Gland, Switzerland, May 10-24, 1907: and from that decision and action as worded in a communication to me dated June 17, 1907, and officially published in the REVIEW AND HERALD, June 27, 1907.

I do this because the form of organization of the Seventh Day Adventist denomination, of which this conference in session is the culmination, requires in justice that I should do it. As to form of organization, yours is a governmental system; as one Conference president defined it, "a politic system". You have a constitution and "by-laws". You have an "administration". You have "administration headquarters", etc. According to your form of organization the Executive Committee is appointed by you to conduct your affairs between your sessions. In form, therefore, as well as in principle, the Executive Committee is your creature, subordinate to you in every respect.

Therefore on principle no decision or action of this committee can be considered as absolute and final. On principle, and under your form of organization, every decision and every action of the committee is subject to examination, revision, or reversal, by this body. Therefore on principle every decision and every action of the committee is subject to appeal by any person who may choose to contest any decision or action of the committee; and especially when, as in this case, the very fundamental, and even elemental, principles of justice, of procedure, and of Christian order, are involved. That is why I have taken this appeal.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

It is proper that first of all I should state the case.

In 1902 I dissented from the action and proposed course of some members of the then Executive Committee of the General Conference. This I had full and perfect right to do.

In the spring of 1903, on the floor of the General Conference in session, I opposed the proposed change in General Conference order from that of 1901; and opposed the proposed new constitution by which would be established the changed order from that of 1901. This, I had full and perfect right to do.

In the fall of 1903 I went to the Battle Creek Sanitarium to teach the Bible, to preach the Gospel, and to engage in the general work of that institution. This, too, I had full and perfect right to do.

While I still dissented from the changed order from that of 1901, I simply dissented without making any opposition whatever to the new order of things. I had no wish to make any positive opposition to it. Besides, there was nothing connected with my position or work where I was that called for any positive course in this connection.

This, however, was not satisfactory to some who were of General Conference connection and standing. Therefore twice I was challenged by these, on behalf of "the people", that I should let "the people" know where I stand, because my "general attitude" had "~~perplexed~~ "greatly perplexed many of our people". It is due to you that I give the facts so that you can verify this if you wish.

The first of these challenges was not made direct to me. If it had been, then,in view of the source from which the challenge came,the people would have known where I stand a year or more before I did tell them. That challenge came from W.C.White,writing in a way that included his mother,in a communication in which the statement was made,and I was mentioned by name, to this effect: "We do not propose to do anything that will give to you and Elder A.T.Jones influence with the people,until the people know where you stand." I repeat,if that had been written direct to me,the people should have known just where I stand,a year or more before I told it. But I had no disposition to go out of my way to accept a challenge even by name,and so I said nothing.

The second call upon me in behalf of the people's knowing just where I stood because of the "perplexity" of the people regarding my "general attitude" came from the President of the General Conference. And I answered it in the leaflet,"Some History,Some Experience and Some Facts",March, 1906. This statement to the people of where I stand did not satisfy the members of the General Conference Committee; and that committee as such took it up and issued a "Statement"(latter part of May,1906) in which they called upon me for "proofs" of what I had written,and demanded to know "how" I knew what I had told. In the leaflet "Final Word and a Confession" (July, 1906) I gave the proof,and told just how I knew.

(In this connection there is another confession,which,till now,I have had no chance to make generally as is due. It comes thus: The last three pages of my leaflet "Final Word" are composed of a reprint of an article from the SOUTHERN WATCHMAN of May 1,1906,entitled "Religious Liberty,by Mrs.E.G.White". I now know that this article was never written by Mrs.E.G. White: not a word of it. That article was written by Elder George E.Fifield, in 1893; and was first printed with his name to it. Next it was printed with only his initials. Later it was printed without either his name or initials; and the somebody picked it up and put Mrs.E.G.White's name to it, and thus it was printed in the Religious Liberty number of the SOUTHERN WATCHMAN,May 1,1906. I did not know any of these facts when the article appeared in the WATCHMAN,as I had never before seen it; and so I accepted it as it was printed,- as "by Mrs.E.G.White". But now that I know that not a word of it was written by her,it is due to all who have read the article as printed in my leaflet,that I should make this correction. Any who want to know the full particulars as far as known,might write to the REVIEW AND HERALD,or A.G.Daniells,President S.D.A.General Conference,Takoma Park,Washington,D.C.,and ask that they publish in the REVIEW AND HERALD the statement of the case entitled "Another Confession,by Alonzo T.Jones",that was sent to them in the autumn of 1907: as soon as I found it out.)

The next step was this of the General Conference Committee in the council held at Gland,Switzerland,May 10-24,1907,in which without any notice or information of any kind to me that any question was to be raised or any action taken in reference to me; and wholly in my absence in every sense; and without my having any kind of a chance to be heard; your Executive Committee tried my case; found me guilty; condemned me; executed their judgment upon me; sent to me their official notice to that effect; and then, without waiting for any reply from me as to whether I would repent or not, further executed their judgment by publishing it to the denomination and to the world.

That is the case: and there and thereupon I took this appeal.

THE CHARACTER OF THAT ACTION

One brother to whom I stated this fact of the Committee's trying me, condemning me,and executing their judgment upon me,without notice or information to me,and wholly in my absence and without my knowledge,simply

could not believe it; and I suppose does not believe it to this day. Possibly all of you can not and do not believe it. Nevertheless it is the perfect truth before God and the world, and those men know it. And my appeal before God and the world is, Do you endorse that procedure, that process and that action?

(By official action May 31,1909, the General Conference in session did fully endorse the action, the process and the procedure of their committee and council at Gland, Switzerland, May, 1907; and did it on the same false basis and the same false principle as that of the course of the committee itself. The minutes of the General Conference action of endorsement present that this action was taken as the "necessary conclusion" of what had been done at Berrien Springs, Mich., May, 1906, where the question, it is said, was fully "considered". That this is not a true presentation at all is plain from the following facts:

1. There was not any possibility of a "full consideration" of the question at the Conference at Berrien Springs, because the material steps that make the case had not been taken. Here they are:

a. My leaflet, "History, Experience and Facts" was issued the latter part of March, 1906.

b. The "Statement" of the General Conference Committee refuting what I had said in my leaflet and calling for "proof" was not published until the latter part of May, 1906.

c. My "Final Word" giving the called-for proof was issued in July, 1906. Without these three, - all three - publications any such thing as a full consideration was impossible.

Now it is a fact that the Conference at Berrien Springs was held May 8-18, 1906; and so, before the "Statement" of the General Conference Committee was issued, and much more before my "Final Word" was issued giving the proofs called for in the "Statement". It is true that Elder Daniells had page-proofs of the "Statement" at the Berrien Springs meeting, and did read portions of it. But even so there was no possibility of any full consideration of the case then; because the evidence essential to the case was not all in; and at the utmost only two of the three steps essential to the making of the case had yet been taken.

2. There entered into the action of the council at Gland concerning me things that occurred only in March and April, 1907 - things that "somebody told" that another man did, and for which, even if it were true, I never was responsible at all. And this the whole General Conference Delegation knew when they took their action May 31, 1909, for the President of the General Conference had publicly told it to them all, the night of May 29; and upon it I had publicly said to them all, "Am I to be judged and condemned for what 'somebody told' him that another man did?" How those delegates could make out that "the action at Gland" May, 1907, was the "necessary conclusion" of what occurred at Berrien Springs in May, 1906, when they all knew that into the action at Gland there entered things that occurred only in March and April, 1907, possibly they can explain - on the same principle of justice by which they can justify the action at Gland in judging and condemning me for what "somebody told" the President that another person did, and with which I had nothing to do even if it had been true.

3. The action of the General Conference in session at Washington, D.C., May 31, 1909, justifying the action at Gland, Switzerland, May, 1907, as "the necessary conclusion" of what occurred (and what did not occur) at Berrien Springs, Mich., May, 1906, even upon their own statement, is all in utter oblivion of the simple principle of justice that a person judged (even upon a hearing) by one set of men at one place, can never by any possibility justify another set of men at another place in judging the same person in the same case without any hearing or any chance to be heard.

Therefore, even upon their own statement, in the action taken May 31, 1909, in this matter, the Seventh Day Adventist General Conference in session did in fact commit itself to the lawless principle, and did justify

the assumption of the lawless prerogative,of judging men without their having been heard,without any opportunity to be heard,and without any notification or information whatever.)

The wicked Jews when in general committee seeking to kill the Lord Jesus,even they could be checked with the word from one of their number, "Doth our law judge any man before it hear him,and know what he doeth?" In my case it seems that no such question was even asked. If it was asked,it is certain that it had no effect to check the proceedings.

The profession is that your denominational "organization" is practically the reproduction of that established by Moses. But nowhere in all the writings or the order of Moses is there any sanction given or implied to any such thing as this that was done by your committee in this case. In the Mosaic order it is specifically declared, "Justice,justice, that which is altogether just,shalt thou follow". And in order that justice might be followed and found,the Mosaic order ordained that in "all manner of trespass",and of "controversy between men" "the cause of both parties shall come before the judges". In this case of the procedure of your committee,only one party was present. The other party,the accused,was not present; he was not asked to be present; and he was neither notified nor informed that the matter was to be touched at all. In his absence in every possible sense,without his being heard and without his having any chance to be heard,he was tried and condemned at a place four thousand miles away. And the execution of their judgment upon him was the first intimation that he had of the matter in any way whatever.

I appeal from that action. I appeal from that process. I appeal from that procedure. Upon the scriptures I appeal. Upon the Mosaic order,according to which it is professed that you are "organized",I appeal. In the name of Christianity I appeal; for not a single step prescribed by Christ or in the New Testament was taken in this case. In the name of only human justice I appeal. I appeal even by that one single remaining decent trait of the wicked Jews against Jesus - that even they had yet enough remaining respect for common justice that they could be checked by the word,"Doth our law judge any man before it hear him,and know what he doeth?" Will you regard this appeal? Or do you indorse the action,the process,and the procedure of your committee in this case?

But that you committee went beyond the wicked Jews was not all. When the Jews,wanting to kill Paul,desired "To have judgment against him" in his absence,even a heathen Roman laid down the principle of justice that "It is not the manner of the Romans" to do thus "before that he which is accused have the accusers face to face,and have license to answer for himself." Therefore,not only upon the principle of Mosaic justice,but upon the plain principle of only heathen Roman justice,I appeal from the action,the process and the procedure of the General Conference Committee in this case.

Nor yet is this all: Wickliffe was three times tried by the Papacy; John Huss and Jerome were tried,condemned and executed,by the Papacy; Luther was tried and condemned by the Papacy; but never once nor one of them without a full and open hearing: or at the least a full and open notification and citation or summons. Wickliffe had full opportunity to answer,each of the three times. Huss three times,and Jerome twice,were heard for hours - Jerome twelve hours. Luther was heard as long as he chose to speak; first in his native German and afterward in Latin.

The writings of men were condemned,and even executed in the flames, by the Papacy,in the absence of the men. But never were the men themselves so dealt with by the Papacy in their absence,without full and open notice and summons to them to be present. And if the man were accessible,even though he were dead,he was brought to the place of trial so that he should be present. And when once the papacy,after having regularly summoned Luther,took action before he had full time in which to appear,history has set it down against her,thus:-

"Even the forms of a just and impartial inquest had not been observed. Luther had been declared heritic,not only without having been heard, but even before the expiry of the period named for his compearance. The passions (and nowhere do they show themselves stronger than in religious discussions) overleap all the forms of justice. Strange proceedings,in this respect,occur,not only in the ~~our~~ church of Rome,but in Protestant churches also which have turned aside from the Gospel; in other words, in all places where the truth is not,everything done against the Gospel is deemed lawful. We often see men who,in any other case,would scruple to commit the smallest injustice,not hesitating to trample under foot all forms and all rights when the matter in question is Christianity,and the testimony borne to it." - D'Aubigne Hist. Reformation,book IV,Chap.II.

And Luther said of it, "Is it the style and fashion of the court of Rome to cite,admonish,accuse,judge,and pronounce sentence of condemnation, all in one day,against a man who is at such a distance from Rome that he knows nothing at all of the proceedings? What answer would they give to this? Doubtless they forgot to purge themselves with helebore before proceeding to such falsehoods."

Therefore not only upon the principle of Mosaic justice; not only upon the plain principle of only heathen Roman justice; but also upon the principle of even papal justice,I appeal from the action,the process and the procedure of the General Conference Committee of Seventh Day Adventists in this case. That such a thing could be done by,or in the presence of not less than a hundred men,all professing not only to be Christians,but to be special representatives of Christ and His cause in the last message of mercy to men and the world,is difficult to believe,but that it is entirely true is most certain. And they know it.

I appeal from it. The Seventh Day Adventist name and profession; the sacred cause for which you stand; the very Christian name and profession; - all these are worthy of better representation than that. Will you regard the appeal? Or do you indorse the action,the process and the procedure of your committee in this case?

JUDGES IN THEIR OWN CASE

Nor yet is this all. I cited the requirement of the Mosaic order ,according to which it is professed that you are "organized", that in "all manner of trespass" or of "controversy between men" "the cause of both parties shall come before the judges". In this connection there appears in this case another egregious ~~feathu~~ feature; that is,that the accusing party,which alone was present,was itself the judge,and thus judge in their own case. See this in the plain facts. Who were the "both parties"in this matter? - None other than the General Conference Committee and myself. For,when upon the second call,I had told the people where I stand, the General Conference Committee as such,entered the case by an official "Statement" to refute what I had said. In this the General Conference Committee as such made itself one of the parties to the matter. To the demand of the committee for "proofs" and "how" I knew,etc.,I replied. If they desired that the controversy should go further,it was their turn to disprove my proof,etc. Instead of doing this by publishing another statement,of refutation,or explanation,the committee met four thousand away and took judicial cognizance of my "public utterances and published statements",and replied to them by this action,process,and procedure,of trying and condemning me without any hearing or any possible opportunity to be heard; but wholly in my absence in every respect.

Therefore it stands demonstrated that the General Conference Committee, as one of the parties in this controversy of their own seeking,did make themselves not only judges in their own case; but also made themselves accusers and prosecutors and judges - all three in one.

How such action,process and procedure as this of judging a man without his having a chance to be heard,and of men making their own case and of judging in it,would be looked at in a civil court and under a civil con-

stitution, is well shown in the words and decision of a United States Court not long ago. Here are the words:

"We live under a guaranty that reaches back to the beginnings of our law and is securely planted in every constitution of civilized government - that no one shall be punished until he has been heard; and above this fundamental gauranty there can be set no higher prerogative.

. . . .

"Can an American Judge without abuse of judicial discretion condemn any one who has not had his day in court?

"That to our minds is strange doctrine in Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence. Can it rightfully be done here on no other basis than the Judge's personal belief that the party marked by him for punishment deserves punishment? If so, it is because the man happens to be Judge and is above the law."

That says that the guaranty that "no one shall be punished until he has been heard" "is securely planted in every constitution of civilized government." That is the truth. Now, you have a "constitution", and, by this, professedly a General Conference and denominational government. Is that guaranty "securely planted" in the constitution of your General Conference and denominational government?

According to the action, the process and the procedure of your Executive Committee in this case, the guaranty that a man shall not be punished until he has been heard, that is "securely planted in the constitution of every civilized government" is not planted at all in the constitution of your denominational government. I say "denominational government", because this process and procedure of the general committee is extended clear through to the local churches; and even the unwilling local church is pressed into it in the name of the General Conference, men and by General Conference men.

(In the late General Conference the impression was conveyed, and it appeared in print as "authorized" by a committee, that what the General Conference had done or what the General Conference might do, would not affect my church membership, but only my relations to the General Conference: that "the General Conference leaves to the local churches entirely the matter of receiving and dropping the names of those who are not considered as in fellowship".

Now, all of that talk and impression conveyed amounts to just nothing at all, in the presence of the well-known fact that the president of a union conference, H.W.Cottrell; Haskell; and another man, W.C.White; - all three of them leading members of the General Conference Committee - by personal presence and pressure tried hard and did their best, in August and September, 1908, to get the "local church" , of which I am still a member in good standing, to put me under "the censure of the church". And they did it in the name of "the General Conference": they tried it in the same old way, too, - without any hearing, or any chance to be heard. They told the church that if they did not do it they would be "ignoring the General Conference". I have the records of it. But they failed.)

Since it is a guaranty that is "securely planted in every constitution of civilized government", that "no one shall be punished until he has been heard", and since, in this case, one was punished without his having been heard, and without any kind of a chance to be heard; then plainly, upon your course as to this matter now, there depends the decision by yourselves as to whether the Seventh Day Adventist denominational government is to be classed with the civilized or with the uncivilized, of the earth. As the denomination stands committed by your General Conference Committee (and now by the General Conference itself in session) in this case, you are clearly excluded from the ranks of the civilized. And however they may boast of the perfection of their "organization", it is certain that it

would not be easy to find any uncivilized tribe on earth so utterly beyond all law and every principle of justice, human or divine, as is manifested in the process, the procedure and the action of the committee in this case. Is it the special prerogative of religious "organization" or government to be uncivil or "above the law"?

But my appeal is not only from the action of your committee; it is from their action "as that action is worded" in the communication sent to me by the Secretary of the General Conference of the Seventh Day Adventists dated June 17, 1907, and published in the Review and Herald of June 27, 1907.

WHAT CONSTITUTES "GOOD STANDING"?

What, then, is this wording? The first sentence runs thus:

"In the matter of the ministerial credentials held by A.T. Jones, declaring him to be 'an ordained minister of good standing in the General Conference of Seventh Day Adventists,' etc."

While that sentence does not specifically say in words that I was not "of good standing", the clear implication is just that. What, then, constitutes a "minister of good standing in the General Conference"? Is it moral character? Then, while I do not state it to appear at all as in any wise good, but only as the fact is, it is the truth simply as a fact pertinent, that when that statement was written and that action taken I had been for thirty years an ordained minister of such standing morally that no charge or suggestion of any immoral conduct had ever been made against me. Since that action was taken there has been a lot of it by report and rumor, and it is probable that there may yet be a lot more; but when the action was taken, there was no such charge and never had been any; so that absolutely nothing of that kind entered into the case. Morally, then, I was at that time "of good standing".

Is it doctrinal integrity that constitutes a "minister of good standing in the General Conference of the Seventh Day Adventists"? It has always been the boast of the Seventh Day Adventists that they have no creed: but that "the Bible and the Bible only" as "the religion of Protestants" is the sole and sufficient standard of truth, of faith, and of teaching. When I became connected with the Seventh Day Adventists it was preached, and it was the only preaching that was offered, that Seventh Day Adventists claimed to have only the truth of the Bible; but that they did not claim to have yet all of the truth that is in the Bible: that while what they had was the truth of the Bible, there was yet much more truth to come forth from the Bible, and that they held themselves open and perfectly free to go on in the Bible, in the "path of the just that shines more and more unto the perfect day", unto this more and more truth, until all of the truth in the Bible in all of its fullness should be found in that perfect day. And I never expected anything else than that this people would allow themselves to be led into all of the truth of the Bible in the matter of organization, as in everything else.

That, I repeat, is the only preaching and the only basis, upon which I became of the Seventh Day Adventist connection. And just there I have always stood. There I stand now; and there I shall ever stand. According to the only proposition or principle upon which I entered the Seventh Day Adventist connection, the holding and preaching of the truth of the Bible, as it is in the Bible, whatever that truth may be, would be the only fair standard or test of doctrinal integrity. And nobody has attempted to show that anything that I preach or teach whether by voice or in writing is not the truth of the Bible as it is plainly in the Bible.

Yet, while Seventh Day Adventists proclaim that they have no creed, there has ~~been~~ for many years been in print an accepted statement of "fundamental principles" which "they hold to" as "certain well defined points of

faith". If it should be held that belief of these "fundamental principles" as "well defined points of faith" is the standard of doctrinal integrity that decides whether a man is a "minister of good standing", then I say that I hold fully and truly, without any interpretation or qualification every one of these "fundamental principles" and "well defined points of faith" exactly as I always did, and exactly as they stand printed in the Seventh Day Adventist Year Book of 1907 - the very year in which this action was taken by the General Conference Committee upon the implication that I was not a "minister in good standing".

Again: In that 1908 Thanksgiving-week campaign-number of the Review and Herald, that was especially a commendation of the Seventh Day Adventist denomination to the other people of the world, as a basis of those other people's making donations to this denomination - in that paper of which nearly 800,000 copies were printed and supposed to have been circulated, there was published a series of statements of what "We believe". And each and every one of these things I do believe.

Thus to this day I am not only in perfect harmony with the proposition, the preaching and the principles of doctrinal integrity upon which I entered the Seventh Day Adventist connection, but I am also in perfect harmony with every item that has been officially published as a statement of the "fundamental principles" or "the defined points of faith" of Seventh Day Adventists.

Therefore not upon any published or known denominational statement of "fundamental principles" or "defined points of faith" was there any possible ground for the implication, written and published by the General Conference Committee in this case, that I was not a "minister of good standing in the General Conference of the Seventh Day Adventists."

SOMETHING ELSE

It is plain, therefore, that their implication and their action upon the implication, that I was not a "minister of good standing", was based upon something else than any commonly known or recognized definition or embodiment, or fundamental principle or "well defined point of faith" of Seventh Day Adventists.

Where, then, did they get this something else? Where did they get this new and unknown thing which they of themselves erected into a standard of faith and practice, and a test of fellowship; and upon which they would proclaim against a man who is in full harmony with every principle of morals and with every stated or known or recognized "fundamental principle" or "defined point of faith" of Seventh Day Adventists, the implication that he is not a minister of good standing?

Where did they get this something else; this formerly unknown thing which they erected into such a test? Wherever they got it, or however they got it, it demands the question, What right have a few men, a mere committee, to set up new and formerly unknown tests of ministerial standing, and without any publication of it, or notification or information to anybody - not even to the one most concerned - apply those tests as far as in the power of the committee lies, to the total destruction of the ministerial and denominational standing of any man?

I appeal from it. Does this General Conference assembled in session propose to sanction a procedure that puts the ministerial and denominational ~~standard~~ standing of every Seventh Day Adventist minister in such subjection as that to the arbitrary will, the official caprice, or the personal resentment, of a few men of a mere committee sitting four thousand miles away or anywhere at all? Does this General Conference in session assembled sanction this self-erected, fountain of faith and tribunal of ministerial standing?

But, what is this new thing that so far as the General Conference Committee can go has thus been established as the one transcendent test of

ministerial standing in the Seventh Day Adventist denomination - a test in the presence of which thirty or even fifty years of consistent character and doctrinal integrity count for absolutely nothing? Here it is exactly as officially stated and adopted and published by themselves:

"That Alonzo T.Jones's work and influence have ceased to be helpful to the denomination from which he received his credentials,that his public utterances and published statements,which have been widely circulated, show his attitude to be antagonistic to the organized work of the denomination which granted him his credentials."

There it is. And when found,what is it? Oh! it is "the denomination", "the denomination",and the "organized work of the denomination!"

Now the profession is that "the denomination" is a Christian church; yes,even the very Christian church itself. If that be so,then the denomination is in the world to help men,and not be helped by men. That is the Christian order. But by this formerly unknown and transcendent standard, ,the Christian order is reversed; and lo! "the denomination" is here to be helped by men,instead of to help men. Men exist for the denomination, and not the denomination for men. Is the Sermon on the Mount good for anything any more? If so,then please read Matt.5:43-48; Luke 6:32-36.

Now as a matter of truth and fact Christ never sent me nor anybody else to preach a denomination,nor to build up a denomination; but to preach the Gospel,and to build up Christians. And that is all that I shall ever do. The religion of Christ is neither inter-national,nor national,nor denominational. It is individual and universal. And in every denomination and in no denomination,as well as "in every nation,he that feareth God and worketh righteousness,is accepted with Him".

2. "His public utterances and published statements,which have been widely circulated,show his attitude to be antagonistic to the organized work of the denomination."

That does not specify just what "public utterances and published statements" of mine are meant. But it is only fair to suppose that the reference is to the particular ones that are of record in this case. And the truth is that these utterances and statements were not published,nor written, nor even spoken,until I had been called upon the second time by those of General Conference standing and connection to let "the people" know where I stand. It is also the truth that unto this hour those utterances and statements would not have been made by me either publicly or privately if those men had not called upon me as they did to let "the people" know where I stand. If they did not want it,~~why did they call for it~~,why did they call for it? And when they did so much want it that they called the second time for it,then when they got it,why were they not content with it? But no; the committee as such must rush into print with a "refutation" that was more a confession,and a demand that I should give "proofs" and tell "how" I knew. In response I did give proof,and did tell just "how" I knew. And that this was to them sufficient proof,and sufficient information as to "how",is sufficiently indicated by the fact that their only answer ever offered was this one of force,this uncivilized action,taken at Gland,Switzerland. Is it for that that they wanted to know where I stand? If they wanted this for other reasons,then why didn't they make other use of it? It is the very spirit of the Inquisition to demand of a man and press him to tell where he stands,and then punish him for it.

IS IT ANTAGONISTIC?

But now,as to fact and denominational truth,is it true that my attitude is antagonistic to the denomination,or to the organized work of the denomination. Is this true according to your own standard publications - not any publications that I have written,but to those which you claim,and I admit,are written through the Spirit of prophecy? Should not the standard and authoritative writings of the denomination be a proper and sufficient standard by which to decide this? To test this,allow me to cite only a

few brief passages from "Desire of Ages". First, page 324:

"The soul that is yielded to Christ, becomes His own fortress, which He holds in a revolted world, and He intends that no authority shall be known in it but His own."

That plainly says all that I have ever claimed: that in the soul that is yielded to Christ He intends that no authority shall be known in it but his own. That is the everlasting truth. I know it, and I will everlastingly preach it everywhere and to every soul. And this, in order that, so far as ~~im~~ in me lies, the divine intent of the Lord Jesus shall be met.

Next is page 414:

"The head of every man is Christ. God, who put all things under the Saviour's feet, 'gave Him to be Head over all things to the church, which is His body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all'. The church is built upon Christ as its foundation; it is to obey Christ as its Head. It is not to depend upon man, or to be controlled by man."

That is the truth. There is where I stand, and that is just what I preach: that the church is not to depend upon man nor to be controlled by man.

Further I read, the very next sentence:

"Many claim that a position of trust in the church gives them authority to dictate what other men shall believe and what they shall do. This claim God does not sanction."

That is where I stand, and that is what I preach from the Bible: That a position of trust in the church never gives to any man or to any company of men, any authority to dictate what any man shall believe or what he shall do. And when men in position in a church do make the claim, or when they act as if they made the claim, that they have authority to dictate or to decide what other men shall believe or what they shall do, then I am ready to say to all people just as this book says, "This claim God does not sanction." It is eternally right; and I will hold it and preach it.

Further I read, the next sentence:

"The Saviour declares, 'All ye are brethren'. All are exposed to temptation and are liable to error. Upon no finite being can we depend for guidance. The Rock of faith is the living presence of Christ in the church."

It is the perfect truth of God that "upon no finite being can we depend for guidance". And I am not going to depend upon any finite being, but only upon the infinite Spirit of the infinite Being, for guidance. That is what I hold, and just what I preach. And I will do everything I possibly can by preaching the word, by prayer, and by instruction in every way, to have every soul to receive that infinite Spirit, and to depend, and how to depend, fully and only upon Him for guidance.

It is the truth of God that "the Rock of faith is the living presence of Christ in the church". And all that I am asking of any person, or of any denomination, is that the place that belongs to the living presence of the living Christ in the church shall be given to Him in His own living Person.

Again I read, on page 668:

"As Christ lived the law in humanity, so we may do if we will take hold of the Strong for strength. But we are not to place the responsibility of our duty upon others and wait for them to tell us what to do. We cannot depend for counsel upon humanity." ....

It is the truth of God that "we can not depend for counsel upon humanity". The Lord Jesus is the divine, the God-given, "Counsellor". By His divine Spirit He comes and dwells personally with each believer as ~~His~~ his Head, his "All in All". That is Christianity: and I will preach it and teach it everywhere. And why should that be antagonistic to any "organized work"?

Again I read, the next sentence:

"The Lord will teach us our duty just as willingly as He will teach somebody else. If we come to Him in faith, He will speak His mysteries to us personally."

That is the truth. That is Christianity. The Lord will teach you your duty just as willingly as He will teach any other one his duty. And He will teach you your duty far more willingly than He will teach somebody else your duty. Believe Him, believe in Him. Live with Him. Talk with Him. Trust Him. Believe that He will; expect that He will; and then let Him, "speak his mysteries to you personally". That is what I preach and that is what I teach, everywhere and to everybody. It is the truth of Christianity, and I will teach it.

That is enough on that phase: though there is much more: I take another. I read now from page 450. It is about Jesus and the church-leaders of His day:

"To avoid useless conflict with the leaders at Jerusalem, He had restricte His labors to Galilee. His apparent neglect of the great religious assemblies, and the enmity manifested toward Him by the priests and rabbis, were a cause of perplexity to the people about Him, and even to His own disciples and His kindred. In His teachings He had dwelt upon the blessings of obedience to the law of God and yet He Himself seemed to be indifferent to the service which had been divinely established. His mingling with publicans and others of ill-repute, His disregard of the rabbinical observances, and the freedom with which He set aside the traditional requirements concerning the Sabbath, all seeming to place Him in antagonism to the religious authorities, excited much questioning. His brothers thought it a mistake for Him to alienate the great and learned men of the nation. They felt that these men must be in the right, and that Jesus was at fault in placing Himself in antagonism to them."

Was it a mistake for Him to alienate the great and learned men of the nation? - It was not. Was Jesus "at fault in placing Himself in antagonism to them "? - He was not. But there were those who thought that He was. And why did they think so? - Oh, just because "they felt that these men must be in the right". And why did they feel that these men must be in the right? - Oh, just because they were "the religious authorities", "the leaders at Jerusalem". Just because these men occupied position and place, they "must be in the right"; and, of course, just because of this, Jesus must be "at fault" in placing Himself in antagonism to them. But in all this Jesus was not at fault in any sense whatever. He was eternally right all the time: and the real antagonism was not at all on His part.

Therefore disagreement with church-leaders, to dissent from "religious authorities", even to occupy an attitude of antagonism to them, is never, in itself, any evidence of error or fault. No man, no association or combination of men, ever has any authority because of any official position or place in the church of Christ, or in any church professing to be the church of Christ. And when any man or set of men ever does have it in any church it is because that church is of men only and not of Christ. "The princes of the Gentiles (the heathen) excercise dominion over them, and their great ones excercise authority upon them: but it shall not be so among you." Among Christians it is not so. And wherever it is so in any church, then just so far that is a heathen church; for it is only among "the Gentiles" that such things are done, and allowed to be done.

Again I read, page 550:

"In the kingdoms of the world, position meant self-aggrandizement. The people were supposed to exist for the benefit of the ruling classes. Influence, wealth, education, were so many means of gaining control of the masses for the use of the leaders. The higher classes were to think, decide, enjoy, and rule; the lower were to obey and serve. Religion, like all things else, was a matter of authority. The people were expected to believe and practice as their superiors dictated. The right of man as man, to think and act for himself, was wholly unrecognized.

"Christ was establishing a kingdom on different principles. He called men, not to authority, but to service, the strong to bear the infirmities of the weak. Power, position, talent, education, placed their possessor under

greater obligation to serve his fellows. To even the lowliest of Christ's disciples it is said,'All things are for your sakes' ...

"In matters of conscience,the soul must be left untrammeled No one is to control another's mind,to judge for another,or to prescribe his duty. God gives to every soul freedom to think,and to follow his own convictions. 'Every one of us shall give account of himself to God'. No one has a right to merge his own individuality in that of another. In all matters where principle is involved,'let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind'. In Christ's kingdom there is no lordly oppression: no compulsion of manner. The angels of heaven do not come to the earth to rule,and to exact homage,but as messengers of mercy,to co-operate with men in uplifting humanity."

That is precisely where I stand; and that is only what I preach from the Bible: the kingdom of God as it is in itself "righteousness,peace,and joy in the Holy Ghost": the kingdom of God as Christ brought it to the world: the kingdom of God as it is in the individual soul: the kingdom of God as it is in the church of God: the kingdom of God as it is presently to be,covering the earth as the waters cover the sea: the kingdom of God in which on the part of the Governor the only principle is Government with the consent of the governed; and in which,on the part of the governed the only principle is,Self-government in God and with God according to the will of God: that kingdom in which,accordingly,there being no place for any one to rule another,the only field of activity is loving service to one another: that kingdom in which the soul is left untrammeled; that kingdom in which no one seeks to control another's mind,to judge for another,or to prescribe his duty: that kingdom in which every soul enjoys his God-given freedom to think,and to follow his own convictions: that kingdom in which every one gives account of himself only to God: that kingdom where there is no lordly oppression,nor any ~~compas~~ compulsion even of manner. That is what I preach. Just that is what I have been preaching, and that is what I shall continue to preach; for it is the Kingdom of God, and the gospel of that kingdom which is to be preached in all the world as a witness to all nations; then the end will come.

The next passage is on page 826:

"In the commission to His disciples,Christ not only outlined their work, but gave them their message. Teach the people,He said,'to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you'. The disciples were to teach what Christ had taught. That which He had spoken,not only in person,but through all the prophets and teachers of the Old Testament,is here included. Human teaching is shut out. There is no place for tradition,for men's theories and conclusions,or for church legislation. No laws ordained by ecclesiastical authority are included in the commission. None of these are Christ's servants to teach. 'The law and the prophets',with the record of His own words and deeds,are the treasure committed to the disciples to be given to the world. Christ's name is their watchword,their badge of distinction,their bond of union,the authority for their course of action,and the source of their success. Nothing that does not bear His superscription is to be recognized in His kingdom."

In the teaching that Christ has commissioned me to teach there is no place for tradition,there is no place for men's theories and conclusions, no place for any church legislation,no place for any "laws ordained by ecclesiastical authority". "None of these are Christ's servants to teach." Then by what right do you require that I shall teach such things?

Now,all of this is the "Desire of Ages",without any explanation or qualification is precisely my attitude in all of my publications and published statements,and in all my preaching. Is that "antagonistic to the organized work"? If so,why? And even if it is,how can I help that? It is the truth,as the truth is in the Bible and in Jesus.

Yet even that is not all,from your own standard publications. Here is "Special Testimony Series B. No. 10": "Jehovah is our King." I have told the President of your General Conference,and others,and now I tell to you,

that I stand in full agreement with this in just what it says: and if you will stand there, then there can not possibly be any difference, much less antagonism, between us as to organization.

This message says these words:

"God declares, 'I will be glorified in my people'; but the self-confident management of men has resulted in putting God aside and accepting the devisings of men." - P. 16-17.

I never said anything as strong as that. I never said anything more "antagonistic to the organized work" than that. Is that Testimony antagonistic to the organized work? Or is it antagonistic to the organized work to teach from the Bible that which will effectually prevent that which this Testimony says "has resulted" - that is, "putting God aside, and accepting the devisings of men"? When God has been put aside by men in the church, and the devisings of men have been accepted, then I know what that means. Don't you? And I do not want it. Do you?

The Kingship of Jehovah, and that each one shall find God to be his King, in the Kingdom of God, instead of any kingdom of men in the place of God - this is only what I am preaching everywhere, and what I shall continue to preach.

This Testimony says in so many words:

"This message is spoken to our churches in every place, and that "these words:.... are needed in every place where a church is established." P.19, 33-34.

And yet it is the plain truth that hardly any churches in any place have ever had a chance to even know that it is in existence. Why? And though it has been in print a year and a half, the Tract Societies haven't it and never have had it for supply: and the only way to get it was to send directly to Pacific Press for it at five cents a copy. Why? Is it because that this Testimony, too, is held by these same ones to be "antagonistic to the organized work"?

Further this says:

"For years there has been a growing tendency for men placed in positions of responsibility to lord it over God's heritage, thus removing from church members their keen sense of the need of divine instruction and an appreciation of the privilege of counsel with God regarding their duty. This order of things must be changed. There must be a reform." P.13.

That this order of things shall be changed, and there be a reform, is all that I have ever asked for. And why is that antagonistic to the organized work?

Further I read:

"In my earlier experiences in the message, I was called to meet this evil. During my labors in Europe and Australia, and more recently at the San Jose Camp Meeting in 1905, I had to bear my Testimony of warning against it, because souls were being led to look to man for wisdom instead of looking to God, who is our wisdom, our sanctification, and our righteousness. And now (1907) the same message has again been given me, more definite and decisive, because there has been a deeper offense to the Spirit of God." - Id.

Again I read:

"I write thus fully because I have been shown that ministers and teachers are tempted more and more to trust in finite man for wisdom, and to make flesh their arm. To Conference Presidents and men in responsible places, I bear this message: Break the bands and fetters that have been placed upon God's people. To you the word is spoken, 'Break every yoke'. Unless you cease the work of making man amenable to man, unless you become humble in heart, and yourselves learn the way of the Lord as little children, the Lord will divorce you from His work." - P.16.

Is it true that "bands and fetters" have been placed upon God's people"? I didn't say that there had. But this Testimony says that there has, and that as late as October, 1907: and you profess to believe that this is instruction from God. Is that antagonistic to the organized work? Without

telling the people that bands and fetters had been placed upon them, I have been and shall continue to be, teaching the people how to be free from all such things as bands and fetters and yokes. Is that antagonistic to the organized work? If so, how can I help it?

After thus telling to Conference Presidents and men in responsible positions what they shall do; after telling to all the churches that the self-confident management of men has resulted in putting God aside and accepting the devisings of men; after telling to all that Christ "wants no power set over them that will restrict their freedom in His service"; that He "has never placed man as a ruler over His heritage"; and that "true Bible religion will lead to self-control, not to control of one another"; then it turns and tells to the individual what he shall do. Here is only one of these:

"Every church member should understand that God is the one to whom to look for an understanding of individual duty. It is right that brethren should counsel together; but when men arrange just what their brethren shall do, let them answer that they have chosen the Lord as their counsellor. Those who will humbly seek Him will find His grace sufficient. But when one man allows another to step in between him and the duty that God has pointed out to him, giving to man his confidence and accepting him as guide, then he steps from the true platform to a false and dangerous one. Such a man instead of growing and developing, will lose his spirituality. There is no power in any man to remedy the defective character. Individually our hope and trust must be in One ~~that is more than~~ who is more than human."

Now please bear in mind that I have not read this matter from "Desire of Ages" and "Jehovah is our King" as proof or evidence that what I hold and teach is the truth. I know it from the Bible, and I teach it from the Bible. What I have read these passages for from these two authoritative publications of the denomination, is solely to show that by your own authoritative publications there is ground for serious question as to whether my attitude is "antagonistic to the organized work" in any other way than that in which the attitude of Jesus was antagonistic to the "religious authorities" and the "leaders of Jerusalem" - "the organized work" of His day.

So then -

Moral character is not the standard of good standing here: it is something else.

Doctrinal integrity is not the standard of good standing: it is something else.

Harmony with the standard and authoritative publications of the denomination is not the standard of good standing: it is still something else.

But when you are carried beyond all these, still to something else as the standard, then that something else can not be anything else than the arbitrary will and "authority" of men passing themselves off as the church. And one of the very first of Protestant principles is "opposition to the arbitrary authority of the church".

But now, and in view of this situation, I am disposed to waive all demurrer, and answer on the merits that charge that I am "antagonistic to the organized work".

~~2=05=8$=5=3=94=0+8(3%=204~~

WHAT IS THE ORGANIZED WORK?

What is that "organized work of the denomination" in just what is claimed for it and just what it is officially stated to be? In plain fact it is not only confessed, but it is officially written and officially published that the professed "organization" of Seventh Day Adventists is that of the Mosaic order. In the official statement and publication of this fact

the Mosaic order is fully outlined as such, in eight numbered points. Then, upon that outline of the exclusively Mosaic order, that official statement says:

"The general plan of the organization adopted by Seventh Day Adventists is very similar to that outlined above."

Then to show this "very similar" character, there is drawn and set down in six numbered points, a parallel with the outline of the Mosaic order. And then this official statement says:

"This comparison might be carried further, but what has been pointed out will prove sufficient to make it plain that there is a very close resemblance between that simple, complete, and efficient system of organization provided for the church established by Moses, and the organization worked out for the remnant church called out by the threefold message of Revelation 14:6-14." - The President of the General Conference, in Review and Herald. May 16, 1907, pp4-5.

There is, then, no possible room for question that the form of organization of the Seventh Day Adventist denomination is professedly that of the Mosaic order. And this to the exclusion of the Christian order: for in that whole statement Christ is neither mentioned nor referred to; nor is there any reference at all to any New Testament Scripture - except only the single one of Revelation 14. The New Testament itself is not even mentioned, except in the insinuation of the false suggestion that the Mosaic order was "for the direction and government of the church in both the Old and New Testament times".

The truth is that the Mosaic order of organization was no more for the direction and the government of the church in New Testament times, than that Moses himself is for the direction and government of the church in New Testament times. Moses himself was for the Mosaic or Old Testament times. And Christ Himself is for the Christian or New Testament times. The Mosaic order was for the direction and government of the church in the Mosaic or Old Testament times only: and has not, and can not possibly have, any place in the church of the Christian or New Testament times. The Christian order, and the Christian order alone, is for the direction and government of the church in the Christian or New Testament times.

To go back to Moses and to the Mosaic order for any such purpose as that which is set forth in that official statement as to the organization of the Seventh Day Adventists, is nothing else than to abandon Christ and the Christian order wholly. To ignore Christ and the Christian Church, as that official statement does, and to adopt Moses and the Mosaic order as that official statement does, is the direct abandonment of Christ and the Christian order for Moses and the Mosaic order.

THE "MOSAIC ORDER" IN THE SECOND CENTURY.

I will never agree to it. I know what it means; for it was tried once, and I know what it meant then. That is exactly the course that was taken in the second and third centuries after Christ, in the first steps of the papacy. This can be verified by any one who will only look through the pages of the church history of that time. And that I may not be counted too personal and pointed in this, I will say here what I have written in another place of that first attempt in adopting the Mosaic order for Christian times. Here is what I said of that attempt then:

"But again there came a falling away. Again God as king was abandoned. Christ as 'Leader and Commander to the people', and as only entitled to pre-eminence, was set aside. Men 'loving to have the pre-eminence' assumed His place. The Holy Spirit, as Sovereign and Guide in and of the Church, was supplanted with the devisings and machinery of men: again like 'all the nations'.

"Yet this was not done in open and confessed disregard of God. It was all done under cover of the scripture, and as the manifestation of the divine order itself. This deception was accomplished through the pretense of adopting the Mosaic order of organization. But to go back to the Mosaic order was, in itself and at one plunge, the total abandonment of the Christian order.

"This would havebbeen true, even if the Mosaic order had been truly and completely adopted. But the adoption of the Mosaic order was simply impossible. Under the Mosaic order the people were a compact mass, separate from all other people, and dwelling by tribes compactly within specific and narrow limitations: the area of the whole nation being one-sixth less, and the people being four to six or even eight times more, than that of Connecticut. To think, then, of applying that order in the case of a people who were scattered all over the known world, dwelling promiscuously among all the people of the world, one here, another yonder, two or three here, and four or five there, a small company in one city and no other within many miles - to think of applying in truth the Mosaic order and organization in such a situation as that, could not possibly be anything else than sheer wild humanisticalish nonsense.

"And, in fact, it never was either adopted or applied in truth. The scheme was never anything but a pretense, a contrivance to save appearances. But it served the ambitious clerics as a means of hoodwinking the people, and giving to themselves a show of divine sanction for their own assumed authority to reign against Christ and in the place of God. For how easy and natural it was under that "Mosaic order" to hold before the people the presumption and fate of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, and others, as the 'divine and awful warning' to all men who should 'dare anything against the bishop'; for 'we must look upon the bishop as upon the Lord Himself'.

"And this humanisticalish thing, which from the beginning was only a wicked invention of perverse minded men: this thing that was wholly the fruit of apostasy: this thing that sprang only from the abandonment of the Christian order and the adoption of a fraud on the Mosaic order: this thing that was only the fruit of the rejection of Christ for Moses, and thus the substitution of themselves for Christ: this utterly anti-christian thing, they who made it called 'the kingdom of God!' the one and only true church! But it was never anything else than only the kingdom of man in the place of God.

It is therefore the plain truth that in this openly professed adoption of the Mosaic and Old Testament order of organization there has been taken by the Seventh Day Adventist denomination this same open and definite step in the very course of the papacy. This simply cannot be denied: the parallel is perfect. In the Review and Herald on this subject, by General Conference officials, there has been set down in substance and almost in very words the arguments of Ignatius and Cyprian, and even of the full-fledged papacy. Even such a statement as that "In Peter, as in leading brethren now whom God is using, these companies of believers were united in the Holy Ghost." (R.and H. May 2,1907,p.10,first column,the Home Secretary.)

"In Peter!" "In Peter . . . believers were united in the Holy Ghost!" Think of that! That is precisely, in very thought, the claim of the papacy on behalf of Peter; and on behalf of the Bishop of Rome as the "successor of blessed Peter". And lo! just "as" in Peter", so "in leading brethren now" "believers are united in the Holy Ghost". It is not true. In Christ, the crucified One - in Christ, and in Christ alone, are believers ever united in the Holy Ghost. But I have not time to follow this utterly false lead. Do you hold that? Do you endorse that position?

The Seventh Day Adventist professed "organization" is not that of the Mosaic order in truth: it is only, as that before, a fallacious pretense of it. This is demonstrated in the fact that in this present case this professed "organized work" after the Mosaic order, absolutely disregarded the plain words of the very first principle of justice as in the Mosaic order. And who ever heard of the captains and elders of Israel making a

constitution and by-laws for themselves? Instead of this Seventh Day Adventist "organized work" being truly after the Mosaic order,it is exactly the repetition of that system of professed organization that resulted from abandoning the New Testament order,in the second and third centuries,and that was the first stage towards the fully developed and reigning Popedom. That you may have better words than mine upon this,I present the following from D'Aubigne,who makes the matter so plain that none can fail to see it:

" THREE GREAT SYSTEMS."

"Three great systems,in point of fact,held sway in the church previously to the epoch of the Reformation.

1st. The evangelical,which is the primitive system,but which extends only to the commencement of the second century. Then the Word of God reigned supreme,and a living faith in the grace which that Word proclaims was regarded as entirely sufficient for saving the sinner. But at the commencement of the second century,the void left in the church by the death of the ~~disciples~~ apostles,and the invasion of the house of God by the human element,brought about a general alteration in the spirit and organization of the Church; and the crisis ensued.

"2d. Then began the Catholic or Episcopal system. It was not until later,no doubt,that the episcopal came to be considered as the necessary divinely instituted form of Christian society; it was not until later that communion with an episcopate connected with the apostles by an unbroken succession,was required as a condition of salvation; but dating from the second century these ideas began to take shape,and the congregational episcopate of Ignatius prepared the way for the hierarchical episcopate of Cyprian. That system,with some shades of difference,prevailed in the Church down to about the eighth century.

"3d. It was about this epoch that the third system,that of the popedom,began.

"It had long been in progress,and the pride of the popes fondly dreamed of sovereignty. Then it was that the church of the West,feeling the need of a chief to govern it,that immense hierarchy,at once secular and religious,which had been founded in the course of the preceding period,admitted the pretensions of Rome. Catholicism passed into Romanism and the monarchical regimen took the place of the aristocratical that had preceded it.

"These three systems,which followed one on another before the Reformation,have divided Christendom ever since the great revolution of the sixteenth century; and all who bear the name of Christians are now grouped under one or other of these three forms.

"To leave the third of these systems for the second,amounts at most to a half reformation. And I need not say that the first of the three has all my sympathies.

"The internal and spiritual unity of the invisible Church,consisting in faith and love,was,at an early date,confounded with the external unity of the visible church which manifests itself in certain forms. This is what was done particularly by Cyprian in what he wrote on the unity of the church. An external representation of that unity was ever felt to be wanted,and it was sought for in a certain primacy over the other apostles, which was claimed on behalf of St.Peter - a primacy altogether opposed to the Word of God,and to the essence of the Christian economy expressed in these words: 'All ye are brethren'. ....

"The same distance that separates the popedom from episcopal catholicism,separates also episcopal catholicism itself from evangelical Christianity.

"I do not mean to say by this that there can not be in the last system ministers called bishops,and excercising certain special functions: what I reject is dogmatical episcopacy,not constitutional episcopacy.

"What I combat is the idea that in order to a man's being a member of Christ's body,it is not enough for him to be united to the Saviour by a

real living faith.

"What I point to as a heresy, is the strange opinion that in order to belong to Christ one must be connected with an external organization which goes back, or rather pretends to go back, to the apostles.

"The evangelical system is the preeminence of the spirit above form: the Catholic system is the preeminence of form above spirit. According to the former, it is in the connection of a soul with Christ, that that soul's connection with the church is involved: according to the latter, it is ~~the~~in the connection of the soul with the church that there is involved that which it bears with Jesus Christ.

"The same difference presents itself when we have to do with God's ministers. According to the evangelical system it is grace, spiritual capacity, that legitimates the charge of the ministry, and that procures it: whereas, according to the Catholic system, it is, on the contrary, the charge, the ordination to the holy ministry, that communicates grace - spiritual capacity.

"Further, it is the same if we have to do with the commencement of the church: according either to the popedom or catholicism the external church comes first - Christ first of all founds a certain ecclesiastical organism which ought then, in virtue of certain privileges, to act upon the internal, or the spiritual. According to the evangelical Christianity, on the contrary, the internal church comes first - Christ by His Spirit first of all saves, converts souls: and these converted souls ~~unt~~ unite themselves into a community, forming the external visible church.

"Spiritual life is the real tie of the members of the Christian community, according to the evangelical system; adhesion to the hierarchical ~~unt~~ unity represented by the episcopacy, forms this tie, according to the popish and catholic doctors.

"Religious equality subsists in the evangelical system, notwithstanding the aristocracy of its office-bearers; for the charges with which they are invested are less a dignity than a service, and their authority proceeds not from their persons, but from the Word of God and the action of the Spirit. But in the Catholic as well as in the papal system, religious equality disappears, the authority of the office takes the place of the authority of the Word, the bishop becomes the exclusive channel of the divine favors, and thus stands as mediator between God and the Christian people.

"To say the truth, Catholicism is in its principles further removed from evangelical Christianity than it is from the papal system itself."

"Introductory Essay" to Ranke's "History of the Popes."

In view of that truthful and clearly drawn distinction between evangelical Christianity on the one side, and Catholicism and Popedom on the other side, it is high time that the Seventh Day Adventists should with deep solicitude be asking themselves whether they are really evangelical Christians, or whether they are Catholics tending towards papists; and whether the system of professed "organization" with which you are identified and in "unity", is the evangelical order, or whether it is the pseudo-Mosaic Catholic system tending towards the papal.

THE EVANGELICAL ORDER.

The evangelical order, the Christian and New Testament order, is Christ: the living present Christ, "all ~~in all~~ and in all".

The Christian and New Testament order is God in Christ the Builder of His church: - not Moses, nor some men in the place and name of Moses.

The Christian and New Testament order is Christ Himself in Person through and by the Holy Spirit the Head of every man personally and individually: - not collectively through a centralized hierarchy.

It stands written in the New Testament as the statement of the New Testament order -

1. That by the "One Spirit" it is "the same God which worketh all in all".
2. That "the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man": and given to "every man to profit withal".

3. That "all these" gifts, manifestations and administrations - "All these worketh that one and self-same Spirit dividing to every man severally (individually, personally, separately) as He will". - As He will: not as some president or committee will.

4. That, as the Builder of His own church which is the body of Christ "God hath set the members every one of them in the body (the church) as it hath pleased Him." As it hath pleased Him - not as it may please some committee or "organized work".

The Christian and New Testament order is the order of the Kingdom of God, where God in Christ by the Holy Spirit is the one King, the one Lord, and the one Sovereign, in and over each individual - "the kingdom of God is within you": and in and over the church of Christ which is built together by God "for an habitation of God through the Spirit". "The kingdom of Heaven is as a man taking a far journey, who called his own servants and delivered unto them his goods ... to every man according to his several (individual, personal, separate) ability."

This church of Christ is organized from Him and by Him, through the Holy Spirit alone. Eph.4:16-17; Col.2:19; 1 Cor.12:18.

According to this Christian and New Testament order, whosoever belongs to Christ by personal faith, in that very thing belongs to the Church of Christ "which is His body", the "Church of the First-born which are written in heaven".

The unity of this church and of the members thereof is the divine "unity of the Spirit" in the fellowship of the Father and the Son: - not an "organization" unity nor a unity of association, even. John 17:21-23; Eph.1:9-10. 1 John 1:3,6.

What is needed by Christians and churches everywhere is not human machinery but the Holy Spirit in all that He is, and in all that He is intended to be, to the individual and to the Church. And all that I am asking or preaching anywhere is that the place of the Holy Spirit shall be recognized in the individual and in the church: and that this place shall be given to Him wholly and absolutely.

That is the Christian and New Testament order. And that it is in truth antagonistic to the "organized work" of the Seventh Day Adventist denomination can not be denied so long as the "organized work" is confessedly and officially stated to be the Mosaic and Old Testament order. But so long as I believe in Christ instead of Moses, and in the Christian order instead of the Mosaic order; and so long as the Seventh Day Adventist denomination holds to Moses and the Mosaic order, this antagonism can not be prevented. Christ and the Christian order must stand. Christ and the Christian order must be preached. And Christ and the Christian order will prevail.

Which will you have? That is now the question to this General Conference, and to every Seventh Day Adventist.

THE NEW TESTAMENT ORDER REFUSED.

In 1901 the denomination was brought to the very threshold of the Christian and New Testament order. But instead of going on through the opened door fully into Evangelical Christianity, in 1902 the whole order was reversed. And that it was reversed, here is the sure evidence:

In the report presented to this Conference by your president, in the section on "Organization" the impression is conveyed that what you have now and here in the way of "organization" is the direct and consistent continuation of that which was begun in and by the General Conference of 1901. But by his own words, spoken in May, 1902, in explanation of what had been begun in 1901, anybody can see and know that such impression is not correct.

It will not be necessary to enter into this extendedly. All that is needed is to cite just eight lines. For in these eight lines he stated a principle that is the pivot of this whole matter, and that itself tells the whole story of then and now.

As printed in the Bulletin of the European Union Conference held in London, England, in May, 1902, he who is now your president said on "Organization" these words:

"As to representation, nobody can represent anybody except himself. All should be the Lord's representatives; but nobody can represent some other person, or a church. A church is fully represented in a conference when all its members are present; but nobody can delegate his mind or his conscience to another. If a person is present at any meeting, he does not require somebody to speak for him." ... Page 2.

That is the truth. It is a splendid statement of a fundamental Christian principle. And in May, 1902, that was stated by him in council as the principle of organization of 1901, and then. And that is the truth. It is the principle of 1901. And in the presence of that principle the present system of 1903 can not stand for a moment. Are you three hundred and twenty-eight delegates, now assembled and sitting here on the principle that "nobody can represent anybody except himself"? Are you here and sitting and acting in this conference, on the principle that "nobody can represent some other person or a church"? This great assembly of the people present at every session of the Conference - are these all proceeding on the principle that "if a person is present at any meeting, he does not require somebody else to speak for him"? Is this Conference, or is any other conference of Seventh Day Adventists, conducted in any sense on that principle? On the open face of things the present system is the direct reverse of that principle of 1901.

Now your president, equally with all other men, has full and perfect right to change his mind and reverse his principles whenever he chooses. But when he has changed his mind and reversed his principles, then he has no right to insist that the reversal of principle is the direct and consistent continuance of the original principle. Such a course is the utter confusion of all principle. And for any person to insist on its correctness is only the demonstration that he has lost all use of the faculty of direction.

Also in that Report the impression is conveyed that the chief fault which made necessary the reorganization that was begun in 1901, was the particular size of "the circle of administration" - "the circle was too small". This is also incorrect. The size of the circle was not at all the chief feature: it was what was in the circle. The word that was given is that in that circle "a king is enthroned". Where "a king is enthroned", whether the circle contain five hundred or only five, the principle is the same.

The word then given is, "The Lord wants the Holy Ghost to be King". That is what He wants now, and always, and forever. Will you let the Lord have what He wants? Will you let the Holy Ghost be King? On the principle of 1901, as stated by him who is now your president, the Holy Ghost could easily be King. But the system of 1903 and now, of representation and delegation, carries in itself the whole principle of papal infallibility. And on that principle there is never any place nor any chance for "the Holy Ghost to be King".

That is all that I ask anywhere - simply that the Holy Ghost shall be allowed to be King. And that is now the one great issue of the Third Angel's Message. For here stands the great and mighty movement of Federation of churches and religion of and for all the world, passing itself off as ~~the~~ "the Kingdom of God". And the only way that it can be truly met is with the true Kingdom of God. That movement of Church Federation is only the kingdom of man in the place of God. And Sunday observance is the sign and badge of it: while the Sabbath of the Lord is the sign and badge of the Kingdom of God, with God in His own place as God.

The true Kingdom of God, is God in His own place as God, all in all. The false Kingdom of God of Federation of Churches and religion is man in the place of God showing himself that he is God.

The Sabbath of the Lord is the sign of the Kingdom of God, and of God as true King in that true Kingdom of God. Sunday observance is the sign of the false Kingdom ~~of~~ of God, and of man as false king in the place of God. And everybody who does not know and have, God to be his King in the true kingdom of God, will compromise and will observe Sunday to satisfy the law and authority of man. In other words, everybody who recognizes man in the place of God anywhere, will receive the sign of man in the place of God; and will wear that sign either in his forehead or in his hand.

That is now the great central issue, and the fast-hastening final issue, of the Third Angel's Message and the whole world. Who shall be King - God, or man in the place of God? Which kingdom and which sign will you have? You can't have both.

I know that, with an air of horror, it is exclaimed: "Why, according to what you advocate, the whole thing would be only a rope of sand." I answer, No. In all that I have advocated the Holy Spirit is sole Sovereign, King, Guide, and all in all. And when that is allowed to be so, then by the mighty energy of that divine Spirit the sand is molten into a sea of glass reflecting the image and glory of God, and upon which stand the ransomed of the Lord singing in triumph the song of redemption.

Without the Holy Spirit human nature and all combinations of human nature in the church, OUGHT TO BE only a rope of sand. God forbid that it should ever be a rope of hemp or of American steel to bind God's people in bands and fetters and yokes.

I repeat: In 1901 the denomination was brought ~~to~~ to the very threshold of the Christian and New Testament order. But instead of going on through the open door, fully into evangelical Christianity, in 1902 that whole order was reversed. In 1903 this reversal was confirmed in General Conference. And now, as officially written and published, the denomination is openly and positively committed professedly to the Mosaic order but in fact to the first steps of the papal order.

(In this same general Conference of 1909 at Takoma Park, Washington, D.C., on May 26, in the Twenty-second meeting of the Conference, the proceedings as officially published confirm all that I have here said as to this papistical tendency. The subject before the Conference was Resolutions 10 and 11, providing that "a book editor be appointed by the General Conference Committee"; and warning the people against reading any literature that has not on it the S.D.A. denominational imprint. The minutes contain the following:

"E.W.Farnsworth: How extensive would be the power of the book editor? Would he simply attend to the grammatical errors and the style, or would he make practically a new book of it?

"W.C.White: I understand that a servant is to do that which he is instructed and employed to do; and if he does not do it satisfactorily, his employer gives him proper instruction. This man, who would be employed by the General Conference, would work under the direction of the General Conference Committee, principally through the Publishing Department. He would naturally do those things which he was asked to do; and his work would be submitted to the members who direct his labor, for approval. It would be impossible for this congregation to instruct a book editor as to how far he should go in literary criticism or in criticism of theology, but the ~~members who stand close to him would~~ need to ~~give~~ ~~him instruction~~, and his work would be, I understand, advisory, and would be directed by the General Conference Committee."

* * * * * * * * *

"W.C.White: Isn't it time that we say to our people that the imprint of one of our houses means something? The imprint of one of our school printing houses means something. The imprint of one of our conferences

means something. In our 'Year Book' there are twenty-two publishing houses recognized. Should not our people take time to look to the 'Year Book' and see what that imprint is? Otherwise how are we to carry into this publishing work the same principles that we stand for in the doctrine of the laying on of hands, as it applies to church officers, to conference officers, to teachers in our schools? It is that sort of work that this resolution is aimed at, and I am sure that your sympathies are with it . . .

It is intended to instruct our people to watch the imprint of the literature which they receive, and to have some test as to whether itis Seventh Day Adventist literature or not, before they eat it or begin to pass it out for other people to eat."

I could myself characterize the foregoing and show just what it is like; but this has been so well done by the Review and Herald itself that I will only quote what that paper says just one week following the day when the foregoing statements were made in General Conference. In the Review and Herald of June 3, 1909, on the first editorial page there is the following editorial article entitled,

"SUBJUGATING THE MIND."

"The conquest of the human mind has been one of the prime objects of man's enemy during the entire campaign of unrighteousness. There have been many methods employed in bringing it about; but one object runs through them all. To subjugate the mind is to conquer the individual who possesses it. Lucifer has had that in view in the inauguration of every system of false worship, as well as in some other movements not rated as religious.

"In hypnotism, or mesmerism, the operator can do nothing until the subject yields his intellect to the control of another. In Spiritualism the 'spirits' can do nothing until the medium is in a 'receptive'mood. In Christian Science.. . . . In the Emmanual Movement this same campaign against the conscious self is waged, while the subliminal self, or some other being's self, is set over the thoughts and actions of the individual.

"In the same category stands the Roman Church, anathematizing private opinion and liberty of conscience, and seeking to compel men to think and speak only as the church dictates. Dr. O.R.Brownson, in the preface to his great defense of the Catholic Church (Essays and Reviews, preface, page VI), says:

"The articles (which comprise the book) before being printed in the Quarterly Review were submitted to the revision of a competent theologian, and I have no reason to suppose that they contain anything not in accordance with Catholic faith and morals; but they are as a matter of course republished with submission to the proper authority, and I shall be most happy to correct any error of any sort they may contain the moment it is brought authoritatively to my notice. It is not my province to teach; all that I am free to do is to reproduce with scrupulous fidelity what I am taught."

"This is the position that must be taken by every loyal Catholic writer. Otherwise his book is placed upon the Index Expurgatorius, and he is anathematized if he persists in holding his opinion. Every book that bears the "Imprimature" of an archbishop stands for an individual whose mind is subjected to the dominance of some authority outside himself; and every time such dominance is permitted, God is robbed of the allegiance that is His due. When the whole world bows down to one earthly ruler, although he is arrayed in the insignia of the viceregent of Christ, it will have declared its intellectual and religious capitulation to the powers of darkness, and the time for theSun of Righteousness to shine forth in the glory of the Father will have come."

I do not know that this editorial in the Review and Herald of June 3 was aimed at that papalistic procedure of the General Conference one week before. I hope that it was. But whether it was or not it certainly could

not have hit straighter that procedure in General Conference, if it had been positively aimed at it.

For what can be the difference in principle or in practice between the "Imprimatur" of a Catholic archbishop and the "Imprint" of a Seventh-day Adventist Publishing House or Conference, when this "Imprint" can come only from the General Conference through its editor, who, as a "servant", is to do only that which he is instructed and employed to do by the General Conference Committee or "the members who stand close to him" "to give him instruction".

What can be the difference in principle, in practice, or in consequences, between the people of the Catholic Church being instructed to watch the "Imprimatur" of literature which they receive, and have this test as to whether it is Catholic literature or not, before they eat it or begin to pass it out for other people to eat - what can be the difference between that and this instruction to Seventh-day Adventists to "watch the Imprint of literature which they receive, and have this test as to whether it is Seventh-day Adventist literature or not, before they eat it or begin to pass it out for other people to eat"?

What is the difference between the position, and the condition, too, of that Catholic writer whose province is only to reproduce what he is taught by his ecclesiastical superiors - what is the difference between that man and this proposed General Conference editor who is expected to be "a servant to do that which he is instructed" by the General Conference Committee to do, and whose "work should be submitted to the members who direct his labor, for approval"?

And note: "It would be impossible for this congregation to instruct a book editor as to how far he should go in literary criticism or in criticism of theology, but the members who stand close to him would need to give him instruction! Yes, of course! It would be impossible for you to do anything of that kind. But we, lo! we, the superior few "who stand close to him" - WE can do all this in perfection!

I shall not follow analysis further. I will only say that never in all the Middle Ages was there a more papalistic thing proposed than this that was put through by the Seventh-day Adventist General Conference May 26, 1909. Read the full proceedings on pages 173-175, General Conference Bulletin, and then read many times again the editorial here quoted from the Review and Herald, June 3, 1909.

And will the Seventhaday Adventist people submit to this subjugating and enslaving thing as the Catholic people do? Will they? Will you? The ~~Son~~ Seventh-day Adventist officialdom will, of course, just as the Catholic officialdom does; for it was they who put this thing through. And indeed they have already submitted to it: for of all the three hundred and twenty-eight delegates, in the whole discussion covering large pages there was not a single dissenting voice. They have done it: now will the people submit to it?

"A servant is to do that which he is instructed and employed to do." Yes, he is. But whose servant is he? Every Christian is to be the servant of Christ, to do that which he is instructed and employed by Christ to do. And Christ has spoken it, "Be not ye the servants of men". Whose servant are you?

By this action of the General Conference in session every Seventh-day Adventist is definitely put upon the issue, to decide it himself, for himself, Whose servant is he? Is he the servant of Christ to do what he is instructed and employed by Christ to do? Or is he the servant of men to do what he is instructed and employed to do by some committee, or some specially superior few, "who stand close to him to give him instruction"?

Also by this General Conference action every Seventh-day Adventist is definitely put upon the issue, What is thought to be the truth submitted to the Spirit of truth" himself given to "guide you

into all truth?" or is it a certain "Imprint" fixed by men?

And in view of this double issue let there be rung out everywhere clear and distinct the divine word, "Ye are bought with a price: be not ye the servants of men."

In the General Conference of 1903, I said in this connection that though Israel several times started back to Egypt, they never got there. But now it must be said that if this professedly Mosaic but truly papal system shall be confirmed by this General Conference, then you will have got there: you will be back in Egypt: and the bands and fetters and yokes "that have been put upon God's people" will be confirmed instead of broken. And as certainly as this shall be, then there will go forth again from God the mighty word, "Let my people go, that they may serve ME."

Is this General Conference now going to confirm that? Nay: will not this General Conference and every Seventh Day Adventist in the world espouse Christ and the Christian order only and forever?

IT IS NOT PROTESTANT IN TRUTH.

This professed "organized work" is not only not Mosaic in truth; it is not Protestant in truth. The first of all Protestant principles is "the right of private judgment" in religion: and thus perfect individuality in religion. But this first of all Protestant principles is neither recognized nor allowed in the Seventh Day Adventist "organized work". The principle is recognized, as relates to the State: but it is not allowed at all as relates to the church, nor is it allowed in the S.D.A. denomination.

"The organized work" will spend much time and effort and money, and will travel long distances to many places, to maintain and defend the full and perfect right of every individual to believe for himself, without any dictation or interference by the State. And all of this is perfectly right. But this is not Protestant, in truth.

This Protestant principle as such applies first of all to the church. It must never be forgotten that this principle as originally espoused, primarily had no reference whatever to the state, but only to the church and its "organized work". Secondarily it related to the State, because the State was only the tool of the church. And when by the Constitution of the United States, church and State became separated, the principle applies, of course, equally to the State as to the church.

But primarily and through all ~~Pres~~ Protestant history the principle applies to the church. And now for Seventh Day Adventists, or anybody else, to confine it exclusively or even primarily to the State, and deny it as to the church, is a total perversion of it; and exactly repeats the same perverse course of every denomination before.

Therefore, when the Seventh Day Adventist denomination and "organized work" apply this first of all Protestant principles to the State as they do, and then refuse it as to the church, as they do, it is absolutely inconsistent in itself, and unprotestant as to the principle. It is not fairly Protestant to protest against Rome, and the follow Rome's very course. It is not fairly Protestant to protest even against false Protestantism only in some things, while repeating other things that are just as falsely Protestant and more Romish. For who ever heard of any other professed Protestants teaching that "In Peter ..... believers were united in the Holy Ghost?"

Further: You maintain that when the State holds strictly to this principle of perfect freedom of conscience and individuality in ~~relig~~ religion, that is according to Christian principle. But you will not allow that your own church shall hold this attitude, which you insist that the State must hold. In this, then, you require that the State shall be more Christian than your own church. Any abridgement or interference whatever with this full and perfect right of the individual by the State, the Seventh Day Adventist "organized work" will vigorously deny over yonder on Capitol Hill. But you positively affirm it for your own church over here on Takoma Park hill.

You insist that your church shall hold and excercise this very power that you deny to the State. Then it is certain that,as the Seventh Day Adventist "organized work" stands,all of the people are better off only as citizens of the United States,than they would be as members of the Seventh Day Adventist Church. For so long as they are only citizens of the United States,your "organized work" will spend time and money and energy strongly and continuously to maintain their perfect right in the excercise of private judgment and their own individuality,in religion. But the moment they become members of the Seventh Day Adventist denomination,that right is absolutely denied: and if they attempt to excercise it,then the "organized work" will spend time and money and energy in vigorously denying the right, and denouncing them,and casting them out,even without any notice or hearing.

And all of this as to this Protestant principle is witnessed by your own acknowledged authoritative writings. In "Great Controversy",pages 292-3, there is mentioned "that grand principle,the outgrowth of the New Testament, which acknowledges God as the sole Judge of human faith;" and then there follow these weighty and most pertinent words:

"The doctrine that God has committed to the church the right to control the conscience,and to define and punish heresy,is one of the most deeply rooted of papal errors."

Is that papal error so deeply rooted in the Seventh Day Adventist denomination and "organized work" that it can not be rooted up? Is it so deeply rooted there that it must remain and grow into another great papal tree of religious despotism in the church? Even if this be so,there must not be forgotten the divine word that "Every plant that my heavenly Father hath not planted,shall be rooted up". My brethren,far better will it be to allow that papal error to be rooted up now by the gentle grace of the Holy Spirit, than to refuse this now,and then have it rooted up by the awful hand of the mighty God in that great and hastening day. O! choose now,to have it rooted up now.

CHURCH FEDERATION.

The "organized work" of Seventh Day Adventists as it now stands can never oppose on principle nor by the Scripture,the now great and sweeping movement of Church Federation: for the Seventh Day Adventist "organization" is more of a federation and confederation now than that other will be five years from now. No Seventh Day Adventist of the "organized work" can ever oppose Church Federation on principle,and as it now is without exposing the same thing in your own federation.

This is confirmed by the report of the proceedings of the "Religious Liberty Department", "Tenth Meeting,May 25, 8:00 A.M." This report says that "Prof.W.W.Prescott occupied the first half hour of the meeting with an address on the subject of 'The Inter-Church Federation Movement and Our Relation to It'. Then the report says: "The Catholic church,he said,needed no such movement; for they were already federated."

Now,the Catholic church is a single church with only a single organization of its own self and its own work alone,separate from all other churches. Therefore,as certainly as the Catholic church is a federation,then just so certainly the Seventh Day Adventist church,being only a single church, itself,and its own work organized as a single organization separate from all other churches,is likewise a federation. It is simply impossible to count the Catholic church a federation and logically escape counting the Seventh Day Adventist church equally a federation.

It is the truth. The Catholic church is a federation. And so is every other church that is "organized" on the plan or on the principle of the Catholic church.

If any of you do not believe that to oppose Church Federation on principle will only expose your own federation,then just try it: and see how soon you will find out that your "attitude is antagonistic to the organized work". And in this you need not mention,nor even refer to,the Seventh Day

Adventists or their "organized work". Yet to oppose and expose on principle and by the Scriptures that great movement of Church Federation is the very Third Angel's Message as that message is now due in warning against the Beast and his Image. As for me,I will preach this Message.

THE TESTIMONIES.

Do you say that I disregard the Testimonies? I answer,first: There is Testimony for everything that I hold and for everything that I preach. Secondly: from the only information that I have,the Testimonies that I am held to be most disregarding are Testimonies that I never saw nor heard, nor received in any way. And I know that God will never hold me responsible for disregarding any Testimony that I never either saw nor heard,and that never came to me in any way.

But do you say: "You say that 'Not everything is Testimony that is sent out as Testimony'". That "Some things that Sister White has written are not true". Yes,but that is not "antagonistic to the organized work"- except it be in publicly telling it. Let me read a few lines:

"THE TESTIMONIES"

"I believe I can sincerely say,also,that I agree with you in what you state concerning the testimonies. I have had many personal experiences similar to those you state in your letter. I do not think we can in any way connect the Spirit of prophecy as one of the helps of the Spirit in the last days,with infallibility. I do not believe that the testimonies are on a par with the Bible,but rather every testimony should be tested by the Scriptures and by the Spirit,to know whether it is so. Any one who is at all acquainted with Sister White's work knows that there have been more or less mistakes of a monor nature in what she has spoken and written; but to my mind this does not weaken the value of her work as a messanger of God. No prophet has ever been infallible.

"The Lord has sent his messages to his people through fallible instruments and has always held his people responsible for trying the spirits before accepting the messages. I might say this,however,that I have never yet known Sister White to make a mistake when she wrote what she was shown by vision concerning things. I believe that everything of that kind that has ever been written has stood the test. On the other hand,she has many times made statements and written statements that did not prove to be absolutely correct,because of some wrong information or lack of judgment.

"Now,I think I have stated the case quite as strongly as you have,and it appears to me that our statements agree very well. I will not refer to instances,but I know that what I have stated is true. However,I think there is a great danger to you and to me on this point. Many of us in years past made a mistake in unintentionally accepting the idea that everything spoken or written by Sister White was infallible,and when we decided that this was not so we were likely to swing too far the wrong way. In saying "we"I do not mean to say that you or I have actually done so,but there is danger in doing so. I know of many others who have actually believed in the infallibility of Sister White,or at least of her writings,and who have stood very stiffly for that idea yet who have thrown over the testimonies on discovering that they were mistaken on that point.

"I am confident today,as I have ever been,that the testimonies have been given to the church as one of the helps of the Spirit. It is one means by which we know that this is the closing work. In all our past experiences, the testimonies have had a strong tendency to bring us to the Word and to unite us as a people,and I trust that the Lord will so help us to relate ourselves to the testimonies that we may receive the benefit which He desires. At the same time we must be prepared to test every testimony by the Word and the Spirit,so that if at any time any testimony should be wrong we would set ourselves right by the infallible standard which God himself

has set up."

There, isn't that right? Do you say "No"? Well, then, in fact and in truth, those are really not my words at all. Those are the words of a brother who is now at the head of one of the principal General Conference Departments right here at headquarters in Takoma Park. I do not tell which department; because I do not want to subject him to the unpleasant consequences of its being known that he has told the truth; and also because I honestly believe that he can be found at the head of each General Conference Department in Takoma Park or anywhere else. This brother has stated that matter more strongly than I ever did. Yet in substance it is my position. He says that he knows that what he has stated is true; that Sister White "has many times made statements and written statements that did not prove to be absolutely correct". I know the same thing. Other people know it just as well as he and I do. Is that "antagonistic to the organized work"? It is the truth. And there is an occurrence strictly up-to-date that makes this perfectly plain. And it is only right to a lot of people as well as my, right, to present it here.

Here it is: There was a communication written February 4, 1907, in which I am twice mentioned by name. September 7, 1907, this communication was copied with the usual filing marks, "Sept.7,1907,8 ...H. 38,'07". It is only fair to suppose that at least seven of these indicated "8" copies were sent to as many different persons and places, and that they have been diligently used to publish and emphasize what is said in the communication concerning me. Yet no copy of it was ever received by me from the one who wrote it, nor in any way from any one acting for the one who wrote it. I never saw it till February 20, 1909: more than two years after it was written. I saw it then only because a brother told me that the brother to whom it was addressed had a copy, and that others had a copy and were using it. Then when I met the brother to whom it was originally addressed, I said to him that I heard that he had a copy of a testimony in which I was personally mentioned, but that I had never seen it nor known that it was in existence, and I thought it only fair that I should have a chance to see it. He thought so too, and let me take it. The passages that mention me are the following:

"I must act in accordance with the light the Lord has given me; and I say to you that Elder A.T.Jones and Dr.Kellogg will make every effort possible to get possession of the Tabernacle, in order that in it they may present their doctrines. We must not allow that house to be used for the promulgation of error. The Tabernacle was built ~~for~~ by the Seventh Day Adventist people. It is their property; and their loyal representatives should control it. On this question I will stand firm, and if you and others will take a decided stand with us, you will be doing that which God requires of you at this time. We must make sure the control of the Tabernacle; for powerful testimonies are to be borne in it in favor of the truth. This is the word of the Lord to you and to others. Elder Jones will work in every possible way to get possession of this house, and if he can do so, he will present in it theories that should never be heard. I know whereof I speak in this matter, and if you had believed the warnings that have been given, you would have moved understandingly."

Now, in all kindness, with no feeling of resentment whatever, but with perfect good humor, I say to her, to you, and to everybody; and I say it solemnly before God to be met in the Judgment, and to be endorsed by the Judgment as the truth, that these statements concerning me are not true. They were not true when they were written, they have never been true at any moment since they were written, and they never will be true in any sense whatever. I not only never did "all" that I possibly could, ~~to get possession of the Tabernacle~~ I never did even a single thing that I possibly could, to get possession of the Tabernacle. I never even thought on it, nor thought of it. This I know in the same way that I know that I am alive, or that I am here at this moment.

It cannot be said that the communication prevented me from doing what is