The Changed Organization of GENERAL CONFERENCE and It's Authority According to Ellen White

Goran Šušljić

The changed organization of GENERAL CONFERENCE and its authority according to EGW

- "In following a course of this kind, men are pursuing a similar course to that of the Roman Catholics who center in the pope every power of the church, and ascribe to him authority to act as God, so that those below him in station lay every plan at his feet that he may prescribe the rules for men and women in every minutiae of life. In following a course of this kind, there is danger that no chance will be left for God to answer the prayers of His delegated servants according to His promise in giving them wisdom in pursuing their work. God does not purpose to have one man prescribe how his fellow workmen shall perform His work. When this manner of action comes in among our people, there is need of a protest." {Ellen White: 9MR, p. 179.3}
- "Apostasy has come in to our ranks as it came in to Heaven, and all who unite with satan
 in this kind of work will act on the same principles satan has worked. Not open, not frank, but
 in secrecy." {Ellen White: 7MR, p 178 and Letter 156, 1897}
- "The fact that a man has been selected to be the **president of conference** does **not mean** that **he shall have authority to rule over** his fellow workmen. This is after the **practice of Rome**, and it **cannot be tolerated**, for it restricts religious liberty, and the man is led to place himself where God alone should be." {Ellen White: 9MR, p. 178.2}
- "They (General Conference) are **following in the track of Romanism**." {Ellen White: TM, p. 362.2}

According to Ellen White, the role of president of the General Conference is directly against the will of God. It is completely unimportant which arguments are used, such as the justification that someone should speak out on behalf of the church organisation. Then it would have been necessary at the time of Ellen White, or with the Israelites at the time of King Saul, when they also wanted someone to represent them before all other nations. Apart from that, there is practically no more direct decision of the church corpus in the church. Although it still looks like democracy, the church is called to vote for already prepared decisions in the General Conference.

Why is it necessary to make some "urgent" changes to ancient doctrines that the Church is asked about after these has become accustomed to them? There is no rush to change our decades-old symbols. It also shows how far our Apostasy is. Has anyone been asked whether the Jesuit professors are allowed to appear as guest lecturers at our theological universities? Revelation clearly states that those who wants to get eternal life must leave Babylon. And what happens is exactly the opposite direction, and the return to Babylon and to the Pope, the 'beast'.

General Conference has risen above the Church in the same way as the politicians of this world, where the elections are only used to blind and calm us so that we can feel like we are influencing a decision. Has the church ever been asked whether it agrees to participate in ecumenical associations or the World Council of Churches? Or is it rather slowly becoming accustomed to many preliminary decisions slowly leading to the 'break even point' as a critical mass of believers who vote for every presented point.

Our members get presented, that Omega Apostasy is going to come in the future, under small part of Adventists. But a change in the organisation affects the majority, and not some small splinter groups who themselves reject any organisation. Members are presented with arguments that if one believes that the majority has fallen away, they will reject the last God established church. But just as in the Old Testament the clear majority fell away. At the time of the prophet Elijah, only 7,000 people remained in truth and had not aposted from God.

That was a small number compared to the millions of Israel at the time. Today's defence of Apostasy is based on the argument that, according to Ellen White's quotes, General Conference in the full assembly has always been the voice of God, and that we are not keeping God's commandments when we speak against the decisions of the General Conference. Of course, the prophetess of God wrote this, but we should only bow to it if the decision does not remove any foundation of biblical truth:

- "At times, when a small group of men entrusted with the general management of the work have, in the name of the General Conference, sought to carry out unwise plans and to restrict God's work, I have said that I could no longer regard the voice of the General Conference, represented by these few men, as the voice of God. But this is not saying that the decisions of a General Conference composed of an assembly of duly appointed, representative men from all parts of the field should not be respected. God has ordained that the representatives of His church from all parts of the earth, when assembled in a General Conference, shall have authority. The error that some are in danger of committing is in giving to the mind and judgment of one man, or of a small group of men, the full measure of authority and influence that God has vested in His church in the judgment and voice of the General Conference assembled to plan for the prosperity and advancement of His work." {Ellen White: 9T 260.2}
- "God has invested His church with special authority and power which no one can be justified in disregarding and despising, for he who does this despises the voice of God." {Ellen White: AA p. 163.2, 1911}
- "But when, in a General Conference, the judgment of the brethren assembled from all parts of the field is exercised, private independence and private judgment must not be stubbornly maintained, but surrendered. Never should a laborer regard as a virtue the persistent maintenance of his position of independence, contrary to the decision of the general body." {Ellen White: 9T, p. 260, 1909}

Do we really believe that today, as we have fallen away from so many parts of the truth, a decision by the General Conference is a guarantee that that decision would be correct? According to Ellen White and the Bible, certainly not! If the absolute majority in the Omega Apostasy has accepted the heresies, this majority will certainly not only agree to the truth as in the old days.

The other kind of interpretation would mean that even the rabbis with their majority in the then official but fallen Church of God would have made a "right decision as the voice of God" when they decided to crucify Jesus and to reject the truth that He is our messiah. So Ellen White wrote that she hopes we won't have to leave Babylon again

In Galatians 1:8 it says:

- "But though we, or an Angel from heauen, **preach any other Gospel** vnto you, then that which wee haue preached vnto you, let him be accursed." {Galatians 1:8}

The apostle Paul writes that even a heavenly angel is cursed if he preaches something other than the already known truth, the gospel. But according to today's theologians, the GC is obvious, analogous to Rome, "infallible" and assigned a higher dignity and truth than the heavenly angels who are directly around God! Why did Ellen White write that the GC will become like Rome?

Probably because our Church also claims to be the "infallible voice of God" and at the same time persecutes all "heretics", those who call for a return to the old biblical truth before the apostasy, which we kept until 1931! Some believe that General Conference is the New Testament manifestation of the voice of God, as in the Old Testament the gem on the priests' chests through which God sent the light to confirm correct decisions.

This is of course correct, but only if the Old Testament priests and the General Conference have made a decision compatible with the truth. Was the voice of the old priest always the voice of God because he carried these stones on his chest?

Certainly not, since we know that the fall of the Jews was complete, even before Jesus' death on the cross. Did Ellen White confirm that the voice of the general conference assembly is always the voice of God even when one rejects a truth?

- "And the **General Conference** is itself **becoming corrupted with wrong** sentiments and principles." {Ellen White: TM, p. 359.1}
- "...It has been some years since I have considered the General Conference as the voice of God, {Ellen White: 17MR 216, 1898}
- "That these men should stand in a sacred place, to be as the **voice of God** to the people, as we once believed the **General Conference to be,—that is PAST**." {Ellen White: General Conference Bulletin **1901**, page 25, PC422}
- "Yet we hear that the voice of the Conference is the voice of God. Every time I have heard this, I have thought that it was almost blasphemy. The voice of the Conference ought to be the voice of God, but it is NOT…" {Ellen White, 16LtMs, Ms 37, 1901, par.18}

And even these clear statements are then twisted again, with the argument that Ellen White later attended a meeting of the GC after all. But this also shows the opposite, namely that a General Conference is only worthy as the voice of God if the truth is carried out on it, which is definitely no longer the case today due to the apostate majority and apostate leadership.

That is why Jesus said that when the Son of Man comes again, He will find almost no believer on earth at all! Ellen White's statement about the organisation with the accepted Apostasy and trampled truth has been fully fulfilled.

Why is not a single word said in our church against immorality and ecumenism while liberal views are being preached from the pulpit, but at the same time someone is immediately there to defend them when they speak against the doctrine of the Trinity, even though it contradicts the Bible? At the same time, leaders from the GK circles travel around the world full of "worry" in order to "save" the church and Trinity.

www.first-commandment-or-trinity.com

May God give us His truth, love in our heart and eternal life!

Praise God and His Son Jesus Christ!