

April/70.



"Watchman, what of the night?"

The watchman said, The morning cometh, and also the night: if ye will enquire, enquire ye: return, come. Isaiah 21:11-12

"AFTER TEN YEARS"

Recently Robert D. Brinsmead wrote two enlightening letters. One dated, September 10, 1969, from Duranbah, N. S. W., was sent to "Brethren & Fellow Burden Bearers in the Awakening." Some who are not in this category, including this writer, also received a copy. The second letter was published in the IHI Bulletin of November 1, 1969. It would appear that the latter letter is a modified version of the first inasmuch as many of the same topics and individuals are discussed, however, in a less brusque manner. Both letters are a summary on the part of Brinsmead as to the results, and idiosyncrasies of "The Awakening" after ten years of activity. These letters seek to stimulate discussion on the question - "Whither bound?"

There is no doubt in the mind of Brinsmead as to the basis of his authority. While he writes, "I will speak guardedly here, lest someone erroneously says that Brinsmead claims to be a prophet, or inspired", he, nevertheless, states unequivocally that "in the type of calling which I have come preaching, my calling has not been the calling of a priest, but of a prophet. And, I say, again, that this calling does not demand full inspiration but a simple two-fold test."¹ The two-fold test is stated to be - "Is it the truth, and does the Spirit bear witness to the preaching."² This resolves itself into a single test - "Is it the truth?" The witness of the Spirit can only be judged as to whether it bears witness to truth. Many have the witness of a spirit; for example, Oral Roberts, and Billy Graham.

In this paper, we shall limit our discussion to one aspect of the teaching of the Brinsmead message. As a church, we need a revival of the message of 1888. Is the Brinsmead "Awakening" a revival of that message?

No one can truly present the message of 1888 unless he understands clearly the issues and what happened in 1888, and the decade that immediately followed. How does Brinsmead evaluate the experience of 1888? Note these words:

Let us take a look at past history - 1888. It is generally thought that those who opposed the message in 1888 were responsible for turning the church back into the wilderness for another long period of wandering. A true view of 1888 would show us that it was those who professedly accepted the message who frustrated the finishing of the work. God could have easily taken care of the opposition, but it was because the ones who professed acceptance did not allow the work of grace to go deep enough that the Lord could not bring His work on earth to a climax.³

This position is diametrically opposed to the plain statements of the Spirit of Prophecy. Observe this inspired evaluation:

An unwillingness to yield up preconceived opinions, and to accept this truth [Justification by Faith], lay at the foundation of a large share of the opposition manifested at Minneapolis against the Lord's message through Brethren Waggoner and Jones. By exciting that *opposition* Satan succeeded in shutting away from our people, in a great measure, the special power of the Holy Spirit that God longed to impart to them.⁴

Again note the basis for the failure of the church in 1888 as given in a letter to the Miller Brothers:

The very men who ought to be on the alert to see what the people of God need that the way of the Lord may be prepared, are intercepting the light that God would have come to His people and *rejecting* the message of healing grace.⁵

Not only is Brinsmead in factual error in regard to the failure that the church experienced at Minneapolis in 1888, but this is compounded by a failure to understand the relationship of Christ to His church. It is true that God could have taken care of the opposition to the message. He could have spewed them out of His mouth then and there, and formed a new church around Sister White, and Elders Jones and Waggoner. This He did not choose to do, but has

sought to carry the divinely inaugurated Movement of 1844 on into the Eternal Kingdom. God desires that there be a corporate continuity from 1844 to the close of time. How long the divine Patience will wait, and how many times more He will try to bring us again to 1888, before He will settle for a spiritual continuity, only the heart of Infinite Love knows. The experience of 1888 brought a crisis "in the government of God in which something great and decisive must be done. The delay will not be prolonged long."⁶ This crisis every church administrator, and everyone who is involved in the spiritual issues as it pertains to the church of God on earth, needs to understand. This is no time for fuzzy, ill-defined, and erroneous evaluations of 1888 to be projected upon the church of God. We need the truth about 1888, and the fulness of the message that was brought during the period - 1888 - 1893.

In another section of the letter appearing in the IHI Bulletin, Brinsmead seeks to set forth "the apostolic succession" of the "Awakening" from 1844.⁷ He notes that "God has especially visited His people with opportunity to move across the Jordon about every 40 years." The year 1888 was noted as the first time following the inception of the Advent Movement in 1844. Then "about 1928, at the end of another 40 years, Daniells and MacGuire tried to revive the message of 1888 in the church." Brinsmead places his awakening as the third appeal of God to the church at the close of another 40 year period.

To have a valid succession, there must be a continuity of basic doctrinal concepts. Two major doctrinal concepts marked the message of 1888: 1) God sent His Son in the likeness of sinful flesh in which He condemned sin *in the flesh*; and 2) We being made free from sin, become *now* the servants of righteousness.⁸ These two basic concepts were carried forward in the Daniells-MacGuire revival. Elder Meade MacGuire wrote:

The Bible makes a distinction between sin and sins. Sins are acts of

transgression, sin is an inherited tendency or law of our being. . .

There is only one means of deliverance from this inherent law of sin. That is Christ. He took humanity upon Him. He conquered sin while in a body which had come under the hereditary law of sin. He *now* proposes to live that same sinless life in my members. His presence completely counteracts the power of the law of sin. ⁹

While Brinsmead originally taught the doctrine of the incarnation as was believed by Jones, Waggoner, and MacGuire, he now teaches a concept that varies little from the ideas expressed by some of those who helped author the book, Questions on Doctrine.¹⁰ In the area of perfection, instead of victory *now* over the law of sin in our members, Brinsmead projects that experience to a time when original sin will be removed from the individual at a "final atonement". Thus doctrinally there is no "apostolic succession" between 1888 and the Brinsmead "Awakening". In this area many sincere followers of Brinsmead are being deceived. They are accepting a counterfeit in place of the genuine revival of 1888 for which their souls long.

To the knowledge of this writer, not a single person who has studied carefully into the experience of 1888, is presently involved in "The Awakening". The two men in our church today, who are the most knowledgeable on the subject of 1888 - Elders R. J. Wieland and D. K. Short - have not united with Brinsmead and his activities. The only theologian of note that has expoused the "awakening" is Peter Jarnes. But his understanding of 1888 is placed in serious question when he seeks to relegate a clear statement of the Spirit of Prophecy to the realm of mere rhetoric and prophetic projection.¹¹

There are those who minister in high places of the church who would like to believe that Brinsmeadism is the fruitage of the research made by Elders Wieland and Short in 1950. But if these men who make such charges would take a good look at our immediate past history - the last two decades - they would soon discover that Brinsmeadism, and all the other agitation, has come as a result of

the illicit fraternization with the Evangelicals which produced the book - Questions on Doctrine. Those who have refused to go along with this prostitution of our fundamental truth have been kept from the ultra-holiness of Brinsmeadism, only because they obtained a clear understanding of the 1888 Revival and its aftermath. Now after ten years of turmoil and strife, discord and disunity, is it not time that we seek a genuine repentance before our God, and acknowledge our harlotry with the Evangelicals? Only as we are willing to return to the firm platform of truth cast up for the ransomed of the Lord, high above the earth, can we once again unitedly press toward the Kingdom of heaven.

¹Robert D. Brinsmead, Letter dated 10th September 1969, pp. 1, 2

²Ibid.

³Robert D. Brinsmead, IHI Bulletin, Nov. 1, 1969, p. 2

⁴Ellen G. White, Selected Messages, bk i, pp. 234-235

⁵Ellen G. White, Letter to the Miller Brothers, July 23, 1889

⁶Ellen G. White, Ms. 10, 1889

⁷Robert D. Brinsmead, IHI Bulletin, Nov. 1, 1969, p. 5

⁸See Thought Paper, March 1970 - "What Did Elder E. J. Waggoner Teach?"

⁹Meade MacGuire, The Life of Victory, pp. 17-18

¹⁰See Thought Paper, February 1969 - "The Human Nature of Christ"

¹¹Peter Jarnes, The Sanctuary Restored, (Pictorial Edition) p. 77

+++++

From the Field - "Your last thought paper [Feb, 1970] was impressive. It was the best one so far. It was real spiritual meat, pointing out the need for personal growth. I thought it was great.

"The articles Norval Pease had in the Review a few months ago differed somewhat. He reminded one of a person driving down the road, approaching a RR crossing. With lights flashing, he says, in effect, 'Look at the children along the road picking flowers, that's a prettier view than the flashing lights.'" A Local Elder (Emphasis his)

+++++

Elder Wm. H. Grotheer
P. O. Box 237
Florence, Miss., 39073

April 1970 (III-4)