

AUTHORITY vs FREEDOM!

Should the SDA Church allow its members to question its doctrines?

NO WAY!!

But what about liberty and freedom? How will the church live up to its potential if it does not allow this!!

Dear Friends,

I had already made mention that the enemies of liberty, who are despots, hide their true colors by constantly telling us that every man has a right to his own opinions and should neither be denigrated nor ridiculed on account of his honest views. This was done to encourage debate and confusion. Yet these words are well familiar to you, and you know that the greatest defenders of liberty also use words that are similar to these. I had made a very brief mention that there was a difference between the way the despots use these words as compared to the defenders of liberty. I will now attempt to explain the difference.

As I have said before, I am a member of an internet email discussion forum that is dedicated to hosting issues pertaining to Adventism. Since the beginning when this forum first started, certain strange people began to make their presence known. In just a short time I knew who they were, but then a problem arose with that knowledge. I became upset with them and reproved them for what they were doing. They were militant infiltrationist Catholics who were posing as Adventists and members of other Christian groups.

After a while, it soon became rather hard for me to convince the rest of those on that forum that I am not merely upset with these people "just because they disagree with me." These strange people were doing all in their power to make the participants and spectators on that forum believe that I am upset with them just because they do not share my views. In response to their efforts, one particular person on that forum who was Jewish, made a post where she was trying to compare Hitler with me. She made an honest mistake and did not understand the issues at the time.

More than once I had to point out certain other people on that forum whom I did not have an issue with. There were others on that forum who disagreed with me on certain important issues. One person became my good friend, but she was a Shepherd's rod. I had no problem with her as far as discussion is concerned, even though we disagreed. There were also others that supported the Celebration worship style. I had no problem with them either even though I strongly disagreed. But there was a difference between these honest people who disagreed with me, and those whom I saw were members of the Militia of the Vatican.

The problem was that I had told those on the forum that I have no special love for diverse views. Contrasted with the others who stated that they loved diverse views, I did not look very good on that forum. It therefore appeared that I was stating that I didn't regard any other views but my own. How was I able to explain my position?

I told them that I do not tolerate diverse beliefs about Adventism from Adventists or, in other words, from within; I also told them that, in or out of Adventism, I don't believe that DIVERSITY is the secret of our strength. I respect opinions and the right to state them outside of the church, but I do not respect diverse opinions about the church foundations by those who are inside. I soon found myself in need for giving an explanation. How did I answer the Jewish lady who compared me with Hitler?

Enervation: The Great Divide

I tried to show her first that the Adventist Church, just like any other, is a sovereign body. It has a charter, a mission and a foundation which was established for a purpose. Once in there you are going to believe and honor that charter and mission. If everything is as it is supposed to be, you will find yourselves being bombarded with views like my own once in there. You are not supposed to be allowed to go to the left of it or to the right. Is that liberty? Is that freedom??

Some years ago, the leader of a certain Independent ministry (Countdown Ministries) began attacking the inspiration of Ellen White. This man (Charles Wheeler) was soon reproved by another official of that organization for doing so. Charles then published a letter entitled, if I can remember correctly, "You Either Have it or You Don't." What was he talking about? He was talking about LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE.

He was stating that a person within the Adventist Church can believe what he wants about anything relating to the church. He is not only to be treated with respect, but he is to have the right to freely share his views anywhere and at any time, he is to enjoy full membership, and he is to be acknowledged as a bonafide Adventist. The deepest issues therefore surfaced. Is it against the principles of liberty for the Adventist Church to demand loyalty to her teachings? He stated, if I could remember correctly, that if this were not done, basic human liberties would be challenged; to have it otherwise would be a threat to our free system. Is that true? If this is true, what would the Adventist Church benefit by pushing for her members to believe many different things or anything they felt like believing?

As we are speaking, the Adventist Church is on a campaign to sue ministries which move out from her communion and keep the name "Seventh-day Adventist" with them. These were people who freely spoke their minds while they were in the Seventh-day Adventist Church. They protested against the changes that were taking place, and the Adventist Church therefore disfellowshipped them in violation of the rules that were stated. The rules that were stated was that any man has the right to his own and honest views EVEN WITHIN THE ADVENTIST CHURCH. If you have been reading the Adventist Review, you would discover that this principle has been pushed for many years. Those demanding the organization to change have been saying that an Adventist can entertain a great spectrum of beliefs. He is free to voice them anywhere, and he is to be respected and regarded as a bonafide Adventist. From these principles, can the organization really have a concern about going after what is supposed to be the natural result of such Jesuit principles? Can she really sue independent ministries for carrying the name "Seventh-day Adventist" because she is concerned for the integrity of the name? Not ethically!

The Adventist Church is God's church. She presents messages from the Scriptures. The Scriptures talk about a Commander named Jesus Christ who gave His servants writings to live by. Were these writings created to be debated upon? Were they subject to diverse interpretation or debate? Were you supposed to take those messages and create Letters to the Editor in the Adventist Review magazine encouraging a pro and con debate structure within it over the guidance found in the bible? If they were designed to be debated upon, how come the Scriptures liken God's people to be like an Army? Which army do you know of where the soldiers are encouraged to debate about their marching orders? When in war, would an army be specially blessed if their soldiers were encouraged to debate the orders of their commanders? Which army do you know of will win a single war under such principles?

Question: You join the army and you are presently in boot camp. While there, you notice that there are officials all around you who like to yell at you. These officials will wake you up in the mornings and put you through intense physical training. At any given moment these officials may request that you do pushups for them. If you don't do things exactly right you may experience at any time any one of those officials sticking the brim of his hat in your face while yelling at you. They may say it! They may spray it! You have to bear it! If you don't do as those officials say, you will be punished! Is the army therefore opposed to the American principles of freedom? THE ANSWER IS NO!

Enervation: The Great Divide

The answer is no because you, of your own free will enlisted. You went to a recruiter, made an oath and enlisted. You already had adequate knowledge of what to expect while in the army. After you agreed, you signed a contract so to speak, and you are therefore bound to the agreement. From then on, you should not experience anything that you had no foreknowledge of. You should consider that it may well be your responsibility to find out all the particulars before enlisting.

I therefore ask again. Is it true that if the Adventist Church demands compliance and loyalty to her doctrines and principles, she as an organization is opposed to freedom? No it is not true!

Many would say and have been taught to believe that members should have the right to disagree, question and to also influence change upon the church. Is that true? What is the name of people who are dissatisfied with the church? They are called "dissidents." What is the first thing therefore that dissidents would try to do with the church? It is obvious that the first thing dissidents would try to do with the church IS TO CHANGE IT! They don't like the way it is, so they will therefore determine to change it.

But what about Christ, you say? Didn't Christ disagree with the established order of the Jewish Church and then change it? Didn't Christ make RADICAL changes? Wasn't Christ a dissident? No. The Jews strayed away from the original design. Christ came and pointed this out, but He did not call for any convention or Sanhedrin Conference Session in order to change the church politically or administratively. He was not into politics. Christ merely showed His example. He did not meet with the leaders in order to change the Jewish Church.

The example of those wanting change today are mostly typical. They want to change the whole system, for their object is to silence the special distinctive doctrines and messages of Adventism, which, consequently, point out the Papacy. These therefore cannot follow the example of Christ to brush the dust off of their feet and to start their own church where their principles can be seen and shown for the church at large to decide whether they want it or not. No one really has to tell them that this will not work and that the Church at large will not favor them if viewed this way. These people are really intelligent.

When the Celebration Movement first attacked the church, leaders were telling us that we must "wait and see" and test it out. This plea to "wait and see," did not mean that they will start their own churches and show us what they are trying to tell us. The plea was for ministers to force-change the churches because the intent was to silence our special messages God commanded us to give. Jesus, after having His example rejected, started His own church. This is something the Celebrationists can never do, for that was never their mission. They never cared whether we liked their movement or not. They were determined that it overcome us. They are part of the papal agenda. The Gospel is NEVER forceful. That was one of the major arguments during the Protestant Reformation. The Protestants declared that Christ came as the Saviour knocking on the door of every heart and pleading for admittance. The Catholics mentality was for the Saviour to approach the doors of our hearts with a battering ram in order to control all totalitarian style. That is exactly how the Celebration conspiracy attacked our church to this day.

The problem was that the denominational establishment was and is determined to change the church into some unrecognizable shape during those turbulent years of the preceding and earlier decades-- even to this day, while the independent ministries protested and fought against the changes. The independent ministries were therefore labeled, "dissidents" even though they liked the established order of the church and were intent on defending it. Most people do not realize that these independent ministries are different from the history of others which broke with the church. Historically, those that broke with the church were dissidents. They didn't like the way the church was, so they tried to change

Enervation: The Great Divide

it. The church then had to address them. In the scenario of the present and past decade and to this day, the roles have been reversed, and few people know this. Ellen White forewarned about this in a special message. It is found in the book Omega, by Lewis R. Walton. We are in the Omega of apostasies right now. It is because many didn't understand this why the Adventist Church had been so heavily assaulted these past decades from the inside. I have yet to show what happened during those times. It will probably surprise you.

I, by the way, though knowing that the position of the independent ministries are basically correct over what the denominational structure has been doing, do not really subscribe to them. I do not tell people to leave the denominational structure to go join any. I have no quarrel with those who go there to worship. Many who go there have been ousted by Conference-sent ministers when they refused to have their churches changed. I was one of them. I have no quarrel with these.

We therefore come back to that internet forum. See those strange people on the forum, while attacking Adventism, were pushing ecumenism. They were telling us that all the churches should unite, and they naturally withheld the next crucial words which would have killed the whole proposition: UNDER ROME!.

They even today are trying to form a One World Church to complement the One World Global New World Order. These are essentially the same changes that had been pushed within the denominational structure through the introduction of "worship styles." They keep masking these intentions by creating movements and telling us that these things are "new." No one now seems to understand that Ecumenism was in existence far before my mother was born! We know the implications of that move as had the entire Protestant Reformation. Just some decades ago, anyone who suggested that would be instantly pointed out as a Papist. But things are different now. Here now is the problem:

You disagree with my views and the views of the Adventist Church, and the time comes when you want to be free of them. What would you do? It is simple: You would leave the church. When you leave the church, you would go and find another sovereign body--another church. Hopefully that other church will have your views. Unlike the Dark Ages, after you leave, something different will happen: you would not be hunted down like rats, your life would not be in danger, you would not lose the rights to your property, you would not be persecuted and your posterity would not be cursed. If those same church officials who sent you walking bumped into you, they will say hi and show no animosity. Is that not liberty?

But then a problem would develop under the other scenario. As I said, the strange people on the forum were pushing Ecumenism and were building a One World Global Church. If therefore you disagreed with their views, where would you go to be free of them? Would you move to the Baptist Church? People pushing Ecumenism are all over that body. Would you go to the Worldwide Church of God? The Worldwide Church of God was destroyed a while ago. Now they don't even preach about the importance of the Sabbath anymore. They have accepted the principles of this move for Ecumenism. What the Adventist Church is struggling with now is the same drive which destroyed the Worldwide Church of God, yet she is still being convinced that there is no Jesuit infiltration by the strange people infiltrated all among her. If you even bring up the subject, certain people MUST move in to do what they can to crush that view right then and there, willingly forgetting that we were told by them that we have the right to our honest views and we can state them anywhere.

It soon becomes obvious that you cannot escape the views of the strange people on that forum no matter where you go. You can't even escape the push for Ecumenism in the Adventist Church. The time will soon come when, if you want to be free of these views for a Global One World Church, you would

Enervation: The Great Divide

not even be unmolested if you chose to worship in a dumpster! If these capture the Adventist Church, they will capture more organizations.

What are they doing here therefore? They have the entire world at their feet agreeing with their views. We now see them on the Adventist forums going irate over freedom to have equal billing in our church when their views are already all over the earth through deception and infiltration. What are they doing over here therefore? If you give them so much as a foothold, you will lose your church, your establishment, AND FAR MORE IN ETERNITY!

When you are then forced to worship in solitary places, you will be silly to think that they will leave you alone! They will approach you to seek either your submission or your death! If you wait till that long to understand them, YOU DESERVE WHAT YOU ARE GOING TO GET!

After explaining it that way, the Jewish lady was then able to see what was going on, and she then understood that I was not the despot, but that the other strange people on the forum telling all that they have a right to question every sovereign entity even from within, were. These are the same strange people who pushed diversity. Can the Adventist Church therefore be defended in the policies she basically now maintains? If she continues to tell us that we can "question everything," why did she get upset when ministers began to question their authority? Let's see if we can understand the issues when examining the following scenario:

One day, you go to a popular gathering of the Boy Scouts. While in there, a strange person walks into the building you are in and demands to be enrolled. This is a strange kind of boy. He has long hair, he is soft, and he likes to play with dolls. In other words, THAT PERSON IS A GIRL. When she requests to join the Boy Scouts, the administrators tell her plainly that she cannot be admitted because she is a girl. She then gets upset, goes home and tells her parents what happened, and the Boy Scouts organization finds a discrimination lawsuit on their hands. They are charged with being discriminatory, bigoted and intolerant--opposed to liberty and freedom. Nothing the Administrators of that organization can do can convince the girl that she should not be admitted into their organization. They even gave her the directions to the Girl Scouts, but she remains adamant to join the Boy Scouts. Is the Boy Scouts establishment therefore contrary to the established American system of liberty?

In this system of liberty there are different sovereign entities that were designed to have a purpose. To have its components within such entities questioning its mission is the same as having a kidney rejection in a human being. Under the present system we all have the right to go to those churches or institutions that agree with our beliefs or goals. Believe it or not, this preserves VARIETY--the very thing that those changing our system have told us all that they like and encourage. If you don't like or believe in one church, you go to another.

The strange thing is that those who are pushing diversity and variety, are forcing their views into all churches AND MAKING THEM LOSE THEIR VARIETY. The services and doctrines of all the churches are merging and becoming as one. In order for this to be accomplished, strange people are telling them to forget and ignore their special doctrines, ignore most of Scripture and only concentrate upon Christ. Those who disagree with the motion are then opposed, called before church board meetings, marked, slandered, persecuted and expelled. Once expelled, they begin to wonder how focusing and concentrating upon Christ only was able to cause them to be banished from the churches that they loved. Where did those folk all only focused on Christ get such savy political skill at board meetings to always defeat them and have them cast out?

Is it therefore true that if you find yourselves within an institution that places restrictions upon you, that institution is against liberty and freedom? So many of those reading this are married. Now that you are married, can you go out and play the field? Can you pick up men or women now at singles clubs? Is

Enervation: The Great Divide

the institution of marriage contrary to liberty and freedom? Did you or did you not understand what you were going into?

We therefore conclude that before you entered the Adventist Church, you linked up with a bible worker and were shown all the particulars. You then signed on the dotted line when you made your baptismal vows. Those vows did not say that you entered to question or debate.

Now that you are an Adventist, you are not to entertain what you feel like nor think that God sent you on a parachute to this earth to question and debate. I tell you another thing. If you ever visited a Baptist Church as an Adventist, you are not to present the principles of Adventism while you are there on their property or environs. If you want to show a Baptist person the principles of Adventism, you had better do it at your home, his home or anywhere else. You are not to do it on property owned by the Baptist Church or any other sovereign entity. This does preserve variety, not that variety is necessary desired by us, but it also deters the movements of the Antichrist. It preserves the Protestant mission where we understand that there will be variety, but, if we do what we're supposed to, the truth will bring all ultimately and willingly under unity without any external force (such as crisis) to sway that decision.

The defenders of freedom therefore say that every man has a right to his opinions in a similar way the despots do. When he is outside of sovereign organizations, he respects that right. When and if he sees people on American soil pushing Socialism or Communism however, he confronts and exposes such people. When he sees people within sovereign institutions--even churches--claiming the right to question the foundations of those institutions, he understands that his system of liberty is being attacked by "friends" from the inside. We have a right to our opinions, but for the purposes of ultimately finding truth. The variety of sovereign institutions must be preserved from everything except willing consent to the truth without any external coercive force or condition. If you see Seventh-day Adventists attending the Baptist Church to spread and preach Adventism, you should be just as alarmed as if you see Baptists in Adventist environs doing the same.

Therefore, Question: Should the Adventist Church allow her members to disagree with the inspiration of Ellen White?

Answer: No!

The Adventist Church does show examples during the early days of the church where members did disagree, and were accepted. At that time the evidence was not fully seen. Now, with the unfolding of events, there is really no excuse. Everyone who questions the prophetic role of Ellen White always then move on to question other things, and then exalt and push their own opinions upon everyone.

PLEASE SAVE JUST ONE MAJOR SPOT ON EARTH FOR TRUE RELIGION!! GET UP! STAND UP! BE COUNTED!!

END

GOD HAS IN HIS WORD ESTABLISHED THE REGULATIONS GOVERNING HIS WORSHIP, AND THAT MEN ARE NOT AT LIBERTY TO ADD TO THESE OR TO DETRACT FROM THEM.

THE VERY BEGINNING OF THE GREAT APOSTASY WAS IN SEEKING TO SUPPLEMENT THE AUTHORITY OF GOD BY THAT OF THE CHURCH.

Rome began by enjoining what God had not forbidden, and she ended by forbidding what He had explicitly enjoined. -- GC pgs. 289, 290.