

The Teachings of Jack Sequeira

Within the last few months, Jack Sequeira published a doctrinal book through Pacific Press. Entitled, *Beyond Belief*, this 192-page book details a sizable range of Sequeira's teachings. In addition to that book, earlier sermon tapes of his are available. Since Sequeira is becoming an important theological speaker, on behalf of leadership, it is important that we know what he teaches. In the present study we will survey nine of them:

He ridicules Ellen White's writings, and says we should not use them.

He rejects essential parts of our historic Sanctuary Message.

He teaches errors which Ballenger taught.

He refuses to use the Spirit of Prophecy in his sermons, papers, books, or replies to critics.

He labels those areas, in which he disagrees with the Spirit of Prophecy writings, as "non-essential" and "non-fundamental."

He declares that Christ's atonement was totally finished on the cross, and our salvation was assured and fully completed at that time.

He teaches that we now have unconditional salvation which, received by us just once, guarantees our being taken to heaven.

He says that cooperation with God in working out our salvation is "Galatian legalism."

He insists that the Final Crisis will be fought over acceptance of the finished atonement, instead of over obedience to the law of God.

There is a very real danger in attending meetings or reading books by one of our people who refuses to use the Spirit of Prophecy or accept its counsels. To do so is to lay oneself open to hypnotic influences. Beware of men who come to you with complicated theological reasoning and strange, new words and concepts. But especially so when they refuse to be corrected by the Spirit of Prophecy. Having voluntarily laid down the Spirit of Prophecy in order to hear them out, their deep, complex reasoning can weary the mind, and lead to an attitude of mental surrender to the man's views. This is dangerous. The mind becomes locked into error.

From January 1988 until a few months ago, E.H. (Jack) Sequeira was the senior pastor of the Walla Walla Seventh-day Adventist Church. In earlier publications, we have noted the dancing and similar activities which occur there. As the leading pastor of the Walla Walla Church, Elder Sequeira had an important responsibility to guide

the feet of young and old in the right paths. After reading his writings, we can understand why so much worldliness has crept into that college within the last few years.

For some reason, senior pastors of Adventist college churches in North America are generally quite liberal. We have seen this in Louis Venden (Loma Linda University Church), Morris Venden (Pacific Union College Church, Union College Church, and Southwestern Adventist College Church), and Gordon Bietz (Southern College Church). The new theology religion courses in our colleges have become so liberal that the administration and faculty of those schools seem to be concerned that, when they select a new pastor, they must be sure they get a liberal. Otherwise, squabbling and theological infighting could occur. The students must be presented with a united front.

Jack Sequeira has had an influence in our church far beyond his pastoral duties to the students, faculty, and village folk in College Place and Walla Walla, Washington. (More recently, Sequeira was transferred to the Potomac Conference.) In his sermons, he openly boasts that he is in so demand by conference presidents. He explains that he frequently receives calls from them to hold ministerial retreats in order to teach the ministers the importance of not using the Spirit of Prophecy in their work.

He has, in addition, the unusual distinction of being the only Adventist college pastor who regularly teaches groups of *historic* Adventists throughout the continent. This is due to the fact that he is frequently a speaker at 1888 Message Study Committee seminars.

After reading his book, several of his earlier papers, and listening to some of his sermon tapes, we can now understand why Sequeira has been so well accepted by the administration at Walla Walla College and at conference ministerial retreats.

First, let us consider Jack's attitude toward the Spirit of Prophecy:

1 - THE SPIRIT OF PROPHECY

The Spirit of Prophecy contains so much doctrinal detail, that it is difficult to teach false doctrine as long as those books are freely used by the audience, and, along with the Bible, frequently quoted by the speaker. The currently in-print Spirit of Prophecy books contain nine times as much information as is given in the Bible. The out-of-print and hard-to-get materials (such as the *Review Articles*) probably double that ratio. On any given concept, the Spirit of Prophecy will generally be far more detailed and explicit than the Bible. That is why we so much value both of them, rather than the Bible only.

There are two primary ways to set the Spirit of Prophecy aside:

A favorite method is to announce that there is "new

light” for the people, and the one speaking has it. Anything new must be accepted, simply because it is declared to be “new light.” All kinds of strange teachings can then be presented. Yet the Spirit of Prophecy declares that all new light will fully (fully) agree with the light already given in God’s Word. The truth is that, in almost every case, genuine “new light” is only found as we discover new insights directly from God’s Word itself. To the degree that you and I value and cling to Scripture, to that degree will we be guarded by the angels in the days ahead.

Another method, found to be very effective, is to downgrade the Spirit of Prophecy as of little importance. This can be done in a variety of ways. A person can declare that someone else wrote part or all of the Spirit of Prophecy books. Or it can be said that the Spirit of Prophecy should not be used for doctrinal purposes.

That is the method used by Desmond Ford and the new theology. That is the method used by Jack Sequeira also.

In a sermon delivered at the Walla Walla Church, entitled “*Issues: The Spirit of Prophecy*,” Jack used 1 Corinthians 14:1-5 as his expository text, and explained to students and faculty why it was important to set the Spirit of Prophecy back in the shade, so it would not interfere with effective doctrinal analysis. Here is a sample statement from that sermon:

Jack: “**How should we use the writings of Ellen G. White on [sic. in] the pulpit?** Well, I have some statements from her. Okay, let me read it to you. I have all these [sic.] quotations. I normally don’t take along all this stuff, but **I want you to get it from the horse’s mouth.**”

Sequeira appears to have a somewhat uncouth manner of presentation. We had hoped for better things from him. In addition, we note that he appears almost offended at having to bring a Spirit of Prophecy quotation into the pulpit. But that was the point of that entire “doctrinal sermon on the Spirit of Prophecy: to explain to the students why they must not use the Spirit of Prophecy whenever they speak to another. So, then should our ministers use the Spirit of Prophecy? A very important question. Let us see how Jack answers it:

Jack: “**We have misused her until the young people of this country are sick and tired of Ellen G. White.** We have used her as a hammer.”

That introduction to the subject is not likely to encourage the young people in attendance at the college to read very much in the precious Spirit of Prophecy writings.

One individual who lives in the Walla Walla area and has heard many of Sequeira’s sermons, made this comment:

“Jack takes statements from Mrs. E.G. White’s writings to prove that you are not to use the Testimonies as a reason or authority or explanation of your beliefs. He says, Do not quote Ellen G. White; the Bible and the Bible only; or read the greater light, not the lesser light. He says,

How do we interpret her visions? [and then replies] In the majority of cases, God revealed truth by symbolic languages. So what she says is not what you read—it is just symbolic of what I [Jack] believe she means.”

In that particular sermon, Sequeira went on to explain that Ellen White categorically taught that no one is ever to use or refer to her writings; they are only to use the Bible.

That makes it easier for Sequeira to carry on his work. Here are two Spirit of Prophecy sentences he quoted to support that:

“Do not quote my words again as long as you live . . . Do not repeat what I have said.”—*3 Selected Messages*, 33.

“Little heed is given to the Bible, and the Lord has given a lesser light to lead men and women to the greater light.”—*Colporteur Evangelist*, 37.

Repeatedly, the above two sentences have been used by false teachers to support their insistence that the Spirit of Prophecy not be used to check the correctness of their assertions.

The *3 Selected Messages* statement (*Manuscript 43, 1901*) was made by Ellen White in a board meeting with certain church leaders. She was indignant at their intransigent refusal to obey basic principles, but instead try to weasel nefarious policies into action. She never made that statement for print to our people. She said it to a hypocritical gathering of men. It should never have been published. Read the footnote on that page. Our church leaders were deeply upset that she had returned from Australia, and did not want to hear anything she had to say.

What does God do when men no longer want to hear His word? He takes an understanding of it from them! We are discussing steps on the way to the final sin against the Holy Spirit! God takes the Word from them. Yet Sequeira wants the students to take it from themselves.

Beware lest you send you children to such a school!

That same evening just after her return from Australia, as taken down in shorthand (*Manuscript 43, 1901*), Ellen White also told them this:

“God has told me that my testimony must be borne to this conference, and that I must not try to make men believe it. My work is to leave the truth with the people, and those who appreciate the light from Heaven will accept the truth.”—*Manuscript 43, 1901* (see *3SM 33, footnote*).

Although those men that night did not want to give proper regard to the Spirit of Prophecy, yet the God of heaven commissioned her to continue speaking to others. In her words and writings, God has constantly tested His people. Those who do not accept these vital counsels, or ignore them, are but pounding another nail in their own coffins.

Till the day of her death, Ellen White continued counseling and warning our people and our leaders. They could take it or leave it; that was their choice. Their destiny would hinge on their ongoing decision. Men near the brink of

the cliff when the Lord has to speak to them in such words.

“The church has turned back from following Christ her Leader and is steadily retreating toward Egypt. Yet few are alarmed or astonished at their want of spiritual power. Doubt, and even disbelief of the testimonies of the Spirit of God, is leavening our churches everywhere. Satan would have it thus. The testimonies are unread and unappreciated. God has spoken to you. Light has been shining from His word and from the testimonies, and both have been slighted and disregarded.”—*5 Testimonies, 217.*

“We have learned by painful experience, also, that when these testimonies are silent, or their warning lightly regarded, coldness, backsliding, worldly-mindedness, and spiritual darkness take possession of the church.”—*1 Testimonies, 610.*

“Why will not men see and live the truth? Many study the Scriptures for the purpose of proving their own ideas to be correct. They change the meaning of God's Word to suit their own opinions. And thus they do also with the Testimonies that He sends. They quote half a sentence, leaving out the other half . . . God has a controversy with those who wrest the Scriptures, making them conform to their preconceived ideas.”—*3 Selected Messages, 82.*

“Sister White is not the originator of these books. They contain the instruction that during her lifework God has been giving her. They contain the precious, comforting light that God has graciously given His servant to be given to the world.”—*Colporteur Ministry, 125.*

That is the kind of "new light" which we need! the wonderful truths in the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy. We receive that light as we study God's Word, instead of listening to the error around us.

In concluding this section, it should be noted Jack Sequeira condemns both types of communications regarding the Spirit of Prophecy writings: (1) We are not to quote or refer to them in lectures and sermons. (2) We are not to quote or refer to their principles in private conversations with others. For much more on this, see the tape transcript (elsewhere in this present study) of his “*Issues: The Spirit of Prophecy*” sermon, given at the Walla Walla Church.

2 - THE SANCTUARY MESSAGE

Next, we come to Jack Sequeira's position on the heavenly Sanctuary where Jesus is ministering on our behalf. An individual's view on this is always indicative of his relationship to the new theology. Historic Adventists believe there is a Sanctuary in heaven where Jesus is ministering in our behalf, that it has two rooms, and that Jesus did not enter the second one (the most holy place) until 1844. Liberals are firm in their position that there is no Sanctuary in heaven, it is “all heaven,” or, if one exists there at all, it only has one room which Jesus entered in A.D. 31. Ask any denominational worker, pastor, or other official whether there are two rooms in the Sanctuary in heaven—and see what kind of reply you receive. If he

says, “Two,” then ask when Jesus entered the second. Firm new theology advocates have a very definite position in regard to a “heavenly sanctuary.”

In his sermon tape, “*Issues: The Heavenly Sanctuary*,” delivered at the Walla Walla College Church to the students, administration, faculty, and village folk, Jack Sequeira said a lot. In his sermons, he had frequently mentioned certain doctrinal errors: (1) The “sanctuary” in heaven has only one room. (2) Jesus entered the most holy place in A.D. 31. (3) He has a “two-phase” ministry in that one room. (4) Actually, all heaven where Jesus is—is in the sanctuary. So, in this sermon, Jack came out boldly and reiterated these four errors and feebly tried to defend them with new theology logic.

After mentioning that “God did not send Jesus to help us to be good” (more on that later), Jack launched into his topic. First, he implied that the study of the rooms of the sanctuary in heaven was “non-essential and non-fundamental.” Then he added, “The rooms have nothing to do with our salvation,” “It does not matter,” and “Don't nitpick.”

Yet God's Word tells us something quite different:

“The Sanctuary in heaven is the very center of Christ's work in behalf of man. It concerns every soul living upon the earth. It opens to view the plan of redemption, bringing us down to the very close of time and revealing the triumphant issue of the contest between righteousness and sin. It is of the utmost importance that all should thoroughly investigate these subjects and be able to give an answer to everyone that asketh them a reason of the hope that is in them.”—*Great Controversy, 488.*

“The correct understanding of the ministration in the heavenly Sanctuary is the foundation of our faith.”—*Evangelism, 221.*

Many more passages could be cited.

Regarding the Sanctuary, whether it exists, and has rooms, Jack asks, “**Literal or symbolic?**” Then he says, “**I have no problem. You can believe in two rooms if you want.**”

How would you like to be a student in one of his classes (our college pastors often teach Bible classes on campus), and have to face this kind of pressure to accept new theology positions?

Continuing on with his novel theories about the heavenly Sanctuary, Sequeira says:

Jack: “The veil of the [earthly] temple was torn from top to bottom; [therefore] the heavenly veil was also ripped apart to be consistent with our [historic Adventist] theology.”

How can that be called consistent? He is trying to reason us into a consistency in agreement with the new theology.

But *Early Writings, 253* and *Desire of Ages, 165* and *756-757* gives the correct meaning: The rending of the veil of the Jerusalem temple was a sign that it had been rejected by God and its ministry ended.

In sharp contrast, Jack maintains that the heavenly

curtain was also torn in A.D. 31—in order to make only one room in that building.

Jack: **“The renting of the veil represents the direct access to the most holy place [in heaven] where God is.”**

We have here the same errors which Ballenger taught. (More on this in a separate packet of materials you can obtain from us, mentioned later in this study.)

Sequeira applies *Desire of Ages*, 757:2 to Christ's having entered the most holy place in A.D. 31. But that passage is referring to the earthly temple at the time of Christ's death, and the fact that, henceforth, we can come in faith and prayer directly to Jesus in the Sanctuary above where He ministers on our behalf. We are to compare scripture with scripture. Carefully read *Great Controversy*, chapters 23, 24, and 28 (note pp. 414-421). Jesus went into the first apartment in A.D. 31 (*GC* 420:3), and not until eighteen centuries later did He and the Father pass into the second apartment (*GC* 421:3).

Then Jack twists *Christ's Object Lessons*, 386:1 into teaching the same error. But that passage is referring to breaking down the wall of partition between different cultures and races; it is not referring to the heavenly Sanctuary. He does not quote the first part of the paragraph.

Recognizing that he is teaching a new gospel, Sequeira defends his position with these words:

Jack: “*5BC*, page 1109: ‘A new and living way, **before which there hangs no veil**, is offered to all.’ Check your own records to see whether I am producing some cunning device or fables.”

Checking the record, we find that *5BC*, 1109/2:2 is referring, not to the nonexistence of a veil within the heavenly Sanctuary, but to rending of the earthly temple veil. (Also read the following paragraph, from a different manuscript: “Henceforth people might come to God without priest or ruler.”)

Sequeira is quite proud of the fact that he, and the other liberals in our denomination, got their ideas from outside universities:

Jack: **“Our church had been teaching the two rooms** in the heavenly sanctuary and had been quite comfortable with that theology. **But in [since] the 50's we have been sending our scholars to outside universities . . . Please, mix with other Christians!”**

The appeal to our young people is to please wake up, mingle with those out in the world, and imbibe their teachings.

“We are not to receive the words of those who come with a message that contradicts the special points of our faith. They gather together a mass of Scripture, and pile it as proof around their asserted theories. This has been done over and over again.”—1 Selected Messages, 161.

“I was shown the necessity of those who believe that we are having the last message of mercy, being separate from those who are daily imbibing new errors. I saw that neither young nor old should attend their meetings; for it is wrong to thus encourage them while they teach error that is a deadly poison to the

soul and teach for doctrines the commandments of men.”—Early Writings, 124.

And she adds that, at such meetings, “error is forced home to the people by the power of the will” (*EW*, 125).

In these men who try to infiltrate false teachings among us, we are confronting fallen angels, who are working through human agents.

“The enemy of truth, through the ministry of fallen angels, would be pleased to introduce uncertainty in the minds of many in regard to the doctrines that have been established by the sanction of the Holy Spirit. Disguised as one who has a deep understanding of truth, Satan will seek to point out supposed errors in that which needs no revision.”—10 Manuscript Releases, 337.

Then Sequeira says it as plainly as he can: He does not believe there have been two apartments in the heavenly Sanctuary since A.D. 31:

Jack: **“The argument of non-Adventist scholars:** If there are two rooms in the heavenly sanctuary, and if Christ began His intercession ministry, which we call the daily, in 31 A.D. until 1844,—**then we are teaching that the Father is in the most holy place** according to the earthly type and the Son represents our priest in the holy place, and **the Father and the Son have been separated by a curtain for 1,800 years.** When Christ ascended into heaven, He sat at the right hand of the Father. Show me in the type where the priest ever sat in the sanctuary? Show us in the type where God ever dwelt in the holy place.”

His point here is that the reasoning of the non-Adventists is correct. Sequeira is willing to accept their ideas on any subject, but he refuses to read or hear what the Spirit of Prophecy has to say on any subject. One Advent believer, who heard that sermon, later wrote this in reply:

“In the model, God met Aaron at the throne of intercession at the altar of incense in the holy place. Christ (*PP* 353) set on the altar of incense. God's glory, extending over the inner veil, met with the smoke and incense ascending. Both the Father and Jesus met in [the] type.” Then he quotes *Ex* 30:1, 6; *Heb* 9:24; and *PP* 353.

In regard to two thrones, we find them (plural) mentioned in Daniel 7:9, and we are told of the Father and Son sitting beside each other in Early Writings, 54.

Then, at the time when the investigative judgment began, the thrones were newly placed (*Dan* 7:10) and the Son of man draws near to it (7:13). *Early Writings*, 55 carefully explains the details of this transitional event (compare p. 32).

“It was then I had a view of Jesus rising from His mediatorial throne and going to the holiest as Bridegroom to receive His kingdom.”—Letter 3, 1847.

Jack: **“The presence of God makes any room or place ‘most holy.’ ”**

Continued on the next tract

More WAYMARKS - from —

PILGRIMS REST

HCR 77, BOX 38A - BEERSHEBA SPRINGS, TN 37305 USA

The Teachings of Jack Sequeira

Continued from the preceding tract in this series

The presence of God makes any place holy (cf. Ex 3:1-5), but it does not make it the Most Holy Place of the heavenly Sanctuary. Jack is quibbling in order to place error in the minds of the students at Walla Walla College. Should you let that continue, or should you write leadership at Walla Walla and the North Pacific Union about the matter?

Sequeira cannot help returning to the fact that he is close friends with Protestant teachers and theologians. He seems to gloat over the fact:

Jack: **"I mix with all these other people."**

"Now, I want to say right here, you may go to these infidel authors to get bright thoughts, but I don't want to go there . . . Why? Because mingled with all their writings is a serious malady. The cunning of Satan is there . . . Cannot he mingle some of his sophistry with truth so as to fascinate and captivate the human mind?"—9 Manuscript Releases, 66.

He may be well-meaning, but Sequeira's teachings about the Sanctuary probably have already destroyed confidence in both vital Scriptural truth and the writings of Ellen White—in the minds of hundreds, if not thousands, of our young people.

"It is a fact widely ignored, though never without danger, that error rarely appears for what it really is. It is by mingling with or attaching itself to truth that it gains acceptance."—Education, 230-231.

"The mind in which error has once taken possession can never expand freely to truth, even after investigation. The old theories will claim recognition. The understanding of things that are true and elevated and sanctifying will be confused. Superstitious ideas will enter the mind, to mingle with the true, and these ideas are always debasing in their influence."—Medical Ministry, 89.

This is why it is so dangerous to send our men to outside universities for years of advanced training. Those unacquainted with graduate studies should be made aware of the fact that university doctoral professors refuse to graduate doctoral students *until* they have been MOLDED into the views and theories espoused by that department. Doctoral graduation only follows years of intense coercive pressure.

New theology teachers will argue that there is only one room in the heavenly Sanctuary, but later will tell their real belief: There is no sanctuary there at all. Sequeira runs true to form:

Jack: "If we can't prove it from the Scriptures, don't teach it . . . **The sanctuary means dwelling place. God dwells in heaven. Heaven itself is the sanctuary . . . To us, heaven itself is the sanctuary.**"

"A minister of the Sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man."—Hebrews 8:2.

"The temple of God was opened in heaven."—Revelation 11:19.

One who heard Sequeira's sermon that day, said, in response, that there was a reason. *Early Writings*, 32, places the temple in the city at the present time, and outside the city later:

"The temple is now located in the holy city in heaven because it is integrally involved in the work of our salvation. When the sin problem is taken care of and we are in the new earth, the Sanctuary won't be needed anymore. It will not be in the city, but will be located on Mount Zion."

Seeking to again undermine confidence in the Spirit of Prophecy, Sequeira explains to the students that much of what she has to say is only symbolic, and it takes theologians like Jack to explain it to them.

Jack: **"How do we interpret her visions? In the majority of cases, God revealed truth by symbolic languages . . . When she saw two rooms, it was only symbolic."**

"Many interpret the visions to suit their own peculiar ideas, and God is grieved, His church weakened, and the cause dishonored."—5 Manuscript Releases, 378.

"My mind and perceptions are still clear. That which the Lord presents to me in figure, He enables me to understand."—3 Selected Messages, 42 (1907).

At this point, Sequeira uses John 14:1-3, in an attempt to negate the existence of a two-apartment Sanctuary in heaven!

Jack: "Whether the sanctuary has one room or two rooms? I don't know because **Jesus said, 'In My Father's house are many mansions—rooms. So is Jesus wrong too? Hey, Jesus! You made a mistake; there are supposed to be two rooms. No!'**"

This brazenness borders on sacrilege. Yet he is permitted to continue on as a teacher to the young and a minister to our people.

Thank God for the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy! Here is a statement from both:

We have His promise. We hold the title deeds to real estate in the kingdom of glory. Never were title deeds drawn up more strictly according to law, or signed more legibly, than those that give God's people a right to the heavenly mansions.

"'Let not your heart be troubled,' Christ says: 'Ye believe in God, believe also in Me. In My Father's house are many mansions. If it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto Myself; that where I am, there ye may be also.'"—This Day with God, 202, and quoting John 14:1-3.

Albion Ballenger taught deadly heresy back at the turn of the century (see our tract set, *Alpha of Apostasy* now in our *Doctrinal History Tractbook*, for a biography of him). It is crucial that we here note that Jack Sequeira teaches the same essential error which Ballenger taught!

Our denomination was brought into a crisis in 1905 over Ballenger. Most powerful Spirit of Prophecy warnings were given regarding Ballenger's teachings. Why then are we permitting men bearing similar falsehoods to remain as teachers and pastors in the work today?

Ballenger taught that the rending of the earthly veil at Christ's death also tore open the heavenly veil, and that Christ then entered a one-room sanctuary. An eyewitness at the time of the 1905 Ballenger crisis, wrote this:

"There was another feature of the meeting [with Ballenger] which was really sad to me. Brother Ballenger has got into a condition of mind which would seem to me to unfit him entirely to preach the message . . . He comes to the conclusion that the atonement was made when Christ was crucified and that when He ascended He went immediately into the most holy place and that His ministry has been carried on there ever since."—*E.W. Farnsworth, "Report on the Ballenger Position," to A.G. Daniells, quoted in A.G. Daniells' letter to W.C. White, March 16, 1905.*

Is Sequeira a Jesuit plant? What is this? Why are such men elevated to these high positions in our denomination? We know that the Jesuits initially penetrate organizations at lower employment levels, and then gradually work their way up into the ranks. But, in later years and holding key posts in administration, they are able to use their influence to hire agents directly into higher-level administrative and educational positions.

3 - CORPORATE GUILT

It is of interest that, after listening to the above sermon, and others by Jack Sequeira, one church member sent a Bible/Spirit of Prophecy reply to him. In the cover letter, the church member wrote this regarding Sequeira's teaching about "corporate sin" in sermons:

"It is quite evident that you have not entirely separated yourself from Catholic theology . . .

" 'Guilt' is defined as the act or state of one who has sinned, or who is liable to penalty for a crime. We did not sin corporately in Adam. Each person is accountable for his own sin, not Adam's (*Ezek 18:20*). The "guilt" we get from Adam is the depraved nature we inherited from Adam, which was the result of his disobedience (*PP 61*). This depraved nature made us prone to sin, but not sinners. We are not sinners until we choose to sin (*Deut 30:19*). The corporate death sentence was passed on all (*1 Cor 15:22*) as the result of Adam's disobedience, not for his disobedience. The first death, which is the curse of sin, should not be confused with the second death, which is the wages of sin (*GC 544*).

"If we sinned corporately in Adam, how do you account for the statement that little infants are taken to heaven, some without mothers to meet them (*2SM 260*). Surely, they could not enter heaven if they were sinners! The doctrine of corporate sin has led some churches to baptize infants, to insure their entrance to heaven.

"This doctrine of corporate sin, logically leads to Christ being included in it. If this were so, He could not be our

Saviour. Then it is logical to believe in the Immaculate Conception of Mary. Being born to a specially prepared mother, His flesh could not be the same as ours. This is the doctrine of antichrist (*1 Jn 4:2*) and contradicts Hebrews 2:14, which says He took part of the same (*DA 117*)."

Eventually, a number of the church members in and in the College Place and Walla Walla area became aroused by the errors being taught by Jack Sequeira at the Walla Walla Church. The situation became so tense that, on December 15, 1989, Sequeira issued an open letter challenging anyone who wished to participate to an open debate on the subject. (It is reprinted elsewhere in this study.)

But Sequeira reserved the right to set the ground rules, and his critics did not come forward to debate him, seeing that the ground rules were stacked against them. You will find those rules very interesting, especially these: (1) The Spirit of Prophecy cannot be used in any manner as a basis for arriving at truth. (2) The new doctrinal book must be used as the basis for determining who is teaching error. (This indicts the new doctrinal book [*Seventh-day Adventists Believe*] as having been written purposely to accommodate the new theology.) In the first quoted paragraph, below, Jack himself tells which of his teachings seem to be the most unorthodox:

Jack: "**The special areas of concern** as I understand are: 1. **Original sin**; 2. **Righteousness by Faith**; 3. **Sanctification**; and 4. **The Sanctuary**.

". . . But in order to resolve theological differences in a way that will bring harmony and unity in the church, it is of utmost importance that we comply with **certain ground rules**. I suggest the following:

1. **That the moderator of this discussion meeting will be chosen by the church board**, the governing body of this church.

"While E.G. White may certainly be used, **the Bible and Bible** alone will be the ultimate measuring stick of all truth . . .

"3. **All points of discussion must be first categorized as either fundamental or non-fundamental. By fundamental is meant the 27 beliefs** of the Seventh-day Adventist Church as outlined in the *Church Manual* and **which is spelled out in the book, *Seventh-day Adventists Believe*. All other matters will be considered as non-fundamental. Any disagreement in this area must be resolved by the higher authorities of this denomination.**

"4. While unity must exist in our understanding of the 27 fundamental beliefs of the church, **it may not be possible for us to agree fully in non-fundamental matters**. Therefore, in these areas of disagreement there must be unity in diversity; and all who are involved in the discussion must be willing to respect each other's views, in Christian love, regarding these non-fundamental matters.

"5. To avoid confusion and misunderstanding, **all theological terms** used, such as "*Original Sin*," "*Once Saved Always Saved*," "*Perfection*," "*Propensity*," etc.,

must first be defined clearly before entering into a discussion so that the issues presented are clear and not foggy . .

"We may not see eye to eye in every non-fundamental issue, but it is hoped at the end of the meeting a spirit of understanding and respect will be generated."—E.H. (Jack) Sequeira, *Pastor, Walla Walla SDA Church, letter dated December 15, 1989, to "Certain Brethren."*

Several points in the above letter stand out: (1) The Spirit of Prophecy must have no weight in deciding doctrinal matters. (2) Instead, statements in the doctrinal book will be the pivotal factor. (3) Fundamental beliefs are only those mentioned in the Dallas Statement of Beliefs. (4) Disagreements regarding orthodoxy of fundamental beliefs are to be decided by church leaders, rather than a gathering of leaders and members (and, obviously, not by the Bible/Spirit of Prophecy). (5) Non-fundamental beliefs do not matter. (6) Terms will be defined by the liberals in their favor before being discussed. (6) Church boards are the arbitors, and church leaders are the final authority—when it should be the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy.

As noted in our earlier studies, the *Dallas Statement of 27 Beliefs* is a fuzzy collection of points, which does not, for example, even mention the two-apartment ministry of Christ in the heavenly Sanctuary.

When he encounters opposition, Sequeira is quick to fall back on this matter of "*fundamental beliefs.*" He declares that all the controverted points are "non-fundamen-

tal."

Last, but not least, Jack is concerned about defining terminology in advance. In this way, topics such as original sin and righteousness by faith can be defined so as to favor his view of them.

It is of interest to note that, in his concluding paragraph (quoted above), Sequeira makes a revealing statement: With the rules stacked in his favor, he could confidently predict that, when the discussion ended, every contested point would be shown to have been a "*non-fundamental issue.*"

4 - RIGHTEOUSNESS BY FAITH

Jack Sequeira published a chart in the Walla Walla Church bulletin for March 5, 1988. He intended it to succinctly summarize his position on the means of salvation (reprinted on this page).

Looking at it, you will note that he lists three methods of receiving salvation. Only three. On the left, man attempts to be saved solely by his own works. Jack calls that "*Legalism*" and, for some reason, "*Eros,*" which, in Greek, means "sensual love."

In the center, man cooperates with God's efforts to save him (which the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy repeatedly tell us is the correct way), and Sequeira calls that "*Galatianism*" and "*Caritas*" (which Jack says means "charity" in Latin).

In the right column is Sequeira's choice. According to the arrows, man literally does nothing and is saved in

total passivity. That is termed by Jack, a featured speaker at Righteousness by Faith seminars, as standing for “**Righ-teousness by faith**” and “*Agape*,” which, in the Greek, means “deep, principled love.”

Frankly, the chart is astounding. You cannot open to a page in the Bible or Spirit of Prophecy, where man is not called upon to cooperate with God by seeking Him, accepting His forgiveness and other provisions, worshipping Him, praising Him, and obeying His precepts.

That 1988 church bulletin chart is not out-of-date, as far as Jack is concerned, for most of it is reprinted on page 33 of his new book, *Beyond Belief*.

Jack: “Both the *eros* gospel and the *caritas* gospel can be described as **only conditional good news** [which Jack rejects as false]. Each depends on our fulfilling certain conditions before God extends His grace to us. Only the *agape* gospel is **unconditional good news** . . . This is the same gospel that the world so desperately needs to hear today. This is the gospel that will lighten the earth with God’s glory before the end comes.”—*Beyond Belief*, 25-26 [italics his].

Sequeira says, “Each depends on our fulfilling certain conditions before.” That little word, “before” makes a lot of difference. Sequeira incorrectly classifies all religious faith and practice into just two categories: (1) unconditional: “faith alone” and (2) conditional: doing certain works before God will accept us. He totally omits (3) faith that works, which is work by faith—cooperatively doing it all with Christ and in His strength. That third category is true religion.

5 - THE SABBATH AND FINAL CRISIS

A series of meetings were held at the Walla Walla SDA Church in April 1991 by Roland J. Hegstad. In preparation for it, Jack Sequeira wrote a two-page handout, which was distributed to all the Bible study interests, and everyone else, who attended (available separately from us; see announcement on nearby page). Later, it was handed out in his classrooms.

On that two-page outline, Sequeira provided a brief overview of his position on the Sabbath, the finished atonement, righteousness by faith, and the final crisis. He tells us a lot in two pages.

His key point in this two-page handout is that the atonement was finished at the cross. (Nearly the same coverage is provided in his book, *Beyond Belief*.) But that is exactly the error found in *Questions on Doctrine*, the book which Donald Grey Barnhouse and Walter R. Martin got our leaders to put into print, under threat of denouncing us to the Protestant churches as “non-Christian” if our denomination refused to do so.

Obviously, this error is closely linked to a non-belief in the heavenly Sanctuary and the ministry of Christ within it.

If the atonement is FINISHED at Calvary, then there is no need for a heavenly Sanctuary, no need for Christ’s ministry within it, no need for man to accept Christ, no need to resist temptation or obey God, and no need for a

final judgment of any kind. Everything has been settled at the cross.

Jack: “Both creation as well as **redemption** were accomplished through Christ. Further, both were **finished on the sixth day** . . . Adam and Eve . . . [began by] . . . resting in God’s perfect and finished work . . . **When Christ . . . [died] mankind’s redemption was fully realized.**”

Then, in the third section, Sequeira explains his theory of the final crisis. It is quite novel, to say the least: He says that, in our day, Sundaykeepers are resting in the finished atonement, and are therefore in the Sabbath rest. Whereas, Seventh-day Adventists are keeping the Sabbath day, and are out of the Sabbath rest—because they are trying to obey God, instead of resting in His finished work.

But, he reasons, in the future the situation will be reversed. He teaches that men will receive the mark or seal—not because of anyone’s effort to keep or not keep the Sabbath day (!)—but solely because they did or did not believe that the atonement was finished on the cross, and are “resting” in that fact.

Jack: “The issue then, in the final conflict, will not be between two groups of Christians, but **two opposing methods of salvation** represented by two rest days. The Sabbath signifying **salvation by faith alone** versus Sunday signifying **salvation by works or human effort.**”

Amid the confusion of his logic, keep in mind that the key points in this two-page study are (1) that the atonement was finished at the cross; (2) those who accept that fact will be sealed—while everyone else will be marked; and (3) the Final Crisis will not be over obedience to the law of God—but, instead, salvation by effortless faith alone vs. either legalistic works programs or cooperatively obeying God’s law by His enabling grace.

What is the pattern which we have encountered so far?

(1) By Jack’s own repeated statements, no Advent believer is to quote, mention, or comment on any Spirit of Prophecy passage in either a sermon or in private conversation with another. We know that, in our day, tolerance of sin and animosity toward obedience to the law of God is widespread. It is the Spirit of Prophecy that enables the people of God to withstand the flood of error, and strengthens them to reply to it with clear Bible insights.

(2) Sequeira places Calvary as the finish line in the Christian race. According to him, we came on the scene of action too late. It is all over with; the victory is won, and we are already saved.

(3) Jack downgrades the ministry of Christ in the heavenly Sanctuary. Like the Protestants, he provides our Saviour with little to do in heaven. Why need He do anything,

Continued on the next tract

More WAYMARKS - from —

PILGRIMS REST

HCR 77, BOX 38A - BEERSHEBA SPRINGS, TN 37305 USA

The Teachings of Jack Sequeira

Continued from the preceding tract in this series

if we are already saved? In strong contrast, the Bible-Spirit of Prophecy view is that Christ is mediating on our behalf, pleading His blood to strengthen us individually, and apply the atonement to us daily.

Carefully consider the above three points. They all lead to the same thing: downgrading the importance of our individual obedience to the law of God, and putting away sin from our lives.

What doctrinal point remains? A philosophy of Christian experience which will belittle the importance of obeying that law.

Now we come to Jack Sequeira's new book, *Beyond Belief*, published by Pacific Press. So far, we have found a consistent pattern in his lectures and papers. Will it continue on into this new book of his?

6 - HOW ARE WE SAVED?

How are we saved? What is righteousness by faith? These are vital questions. We should consider them before turning to Sequeira's new volume.

How are we saved? In reality, we are totally saved by Jesus Christ. He does it all—but with one exception: our willing cooperation. First, He will not save us unless we let Him begin the process; Second, He will not do it without our cooperation at every step. Christ died to save His people from their sins, not in their sins. And they must cooperate in order to get the job done.

Yet all the power, all the provision, comes from Him. In one Spirit of Prophecy passage, we are told, "Christ's part is infinitely great, and our part is infinitely small; yet without our part, Christ will not do His." That is a magnificent, clarifying concept. Our individual part is so very small, yet without it we will individually be lost.

Yet, there are also two other methods which mankind tries to use in order to achieve salvation:

The first method is used by all those who want to be saved in their sins, while doing nothing to eliminate those sins. This is a very large number in our world, and includes most of the religious groups—Christian and non-Christian—throughout the world. Mankind wants a way to be saved, without giving up sin.

Every pagan religion in the world provides a way to do that. Judaism, Catholicism, and most Protestant churches are also on this pathway. In addition, the new theology in our own ranks also opens a way for this to be done.

The second method is used by those who want to save themselves by their rituals and activities, while they continue sinning. They want to reach heaven by their own works. There are many such people. They are trusting to themselves, and not trusting in Christ to enable them to do it.

But neither method solves the sin problem. The sinning continues. Indeed, most of the religions figure out a

way to excuse the commission of sin.

Most people actually combine a little of both methods: They observe certain rituals, while hoping that divine grace will cause their sins to be overlooked.

Modern Protestant theology (its offshoot into Adventism is termed the "new theology") is somewhat unique, in that it so vigorously condemns attempts to obey the laws of God. Not even Hindus so fear obedience to the laws of divinity as much as Protestant theologians do. They tell us that all such concerns or efforts on our part—make those who do them "legalists" and result in perdition.

Yet, all through the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy, we find that it is not wrong to obey God. It is not wrong to want to do it, to try to do it, or to actually do it. Turn to any page in the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy, and see for yourself. However, Scripture is very clear on the point that such obedience can only be rendered in Christ's strength, not in our own.

7 - OUR COOPERATION VITAL TO SALVATION

Remember again the key point: God's part in our salvation is infinitely large, and our part is infinitely small; yet He will not do His part without our cooperation.

Jack approaches the matter by assuming that, in regard to salvation, God does it all, and we do nothing. As he views it, we are totally saved by Christ's finished work of atonement on the cross, 2,000 years ago.

Now, there is a partial truth here, but there is also serious error.

(1) It is true that Christ provided the sacrifice on Calvary, and the saving grace to us individually by His ministry in the Sanctuary above. He also prompts us to repent and come to Him so we can receive that empowering grace to resist temptation and overcome sin.

(2) It is also true that, when we are having a deep experience in Christ and everything is sailing smoothly, it is heaven on earth right now. Everything is working out just fine, and our walk with Jesus is calm and untroubled. At such times, the beautiful pictures drawn for us of Christian experience by Jack Sequeira so nicely correspond to reality.

But there is more to life than that.

Everyday life is full of turmoil and problems of every kind. Weariness, subtle temptations, perplexities, crises, opposition, persecution, and more—confront us constantly. Sickness, infirmities, mind-shaking sorrows come suddenly. Accidents and senseless tragedies. Our minds reel with it all. And what are we to do?

No smooth sailing here. Real life instead. The roaring lion is about, trying to distract, tempt, separate us from Christ, and work our destruction.

At such times a vital fact comes into play:

Trusting God in the darkness, we must move steadily

forward by faith—and press closer to Christ, resist temptation to doubt, push back discouragement, strive to cling to Jesus, push back temptations to self-satisfaction and pride. WE have a part to play! Oh, yes, every good thing is all done in His strength. But it is crisis living, nonetheless. We are on enemy ground. Ellen White repeatedly calls it “enchanted ground.” Satan wants to hypnotize and destroy us, as the snake hypnotizes and swallows the hapless mouse.

That is what real life is like: a constant crying to Jesus and resisting the continual efforts of Satan to drag us down through self-satisfaction, self-pleasing, fear, doubt, or anxiety. We are repeatedly told that every fiber of our being must be exercised in the fight of faith to cling to Christ and, in His strength, war against sin.

But, in strong contrast, Jack Sequeira teaches the new theology view that “*there are no conditions.*” This is a key aspect in his teaching; he calls it “righteousness by faith.” But, unmasked, we find it to be ‘unconditional salvation.’ ”

But that is not the message given all through the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy. The truth is that man must bend every spiritual muscle to cooperate with God in His effort to save him. Yes, God provides all the guidance, strength, and help—but man must cooperate to the fullest.

It is not wrong to cry to Jesus, to run to His side, to seek to be more like Him, to love praise and adore Him. My friend, it is not wrong, it is not bad—in spite of what these intellectuals tell you!

It is not wrong to pray for souls, and cooperate with God for their rescue. Right doing is not wrong doing, as the new theology contends.

8 - CORPORATE SALVATION

According to Jack Sequeira, we are corporately lost in Adam, we are corporately saved by Christ, we were corporately saved at the cross, and we are corporately saved because we are in the church.

As Jack explains it, we are not saved as individuals, but in groups. If you are not in the group, you will not be saved.

His teaching about “corporate salvation” leads directly into his teaching on “salvation only within the church.”

He teaches that, just as mankind has corporate sin in Adam and corporate forgiveness and salvation at the cross, so we only have corporate oneness in Christ. It is a corporate relationship, not an individual one. Later, at Christ’s return, we will receive corporate removal of our sinful living patterns. Corporate justification is termed the “in-Christ motif.”

9 - SAVED IN THE CHURCH

Sequeira speaks of “subjective” and “objective” gospels (pp. 31-33, 36, 64, 89, 99, 101, 137, 175). The gospel is “good news, not good advice” (104).

He strongly emphasizes the corporate nature of salvation—it is made available to a large group and that which the individual does bears little relationship to whether or

not he will be taken to heaven.

But where in the Bible do you find that your connection with the church is vital, but your connection with Christ is merely automatic?

Outside the church there is no salvation, is the teaching of Rome. It is also taught by some today who want to curry favor with leadership, while they carry forward their work of infiltrating modernist teachings among God’s people.

The truth is that one’s moment-by-moment connection with Christ is the crucial issue of vital consequence. One’s connection with an organized church body (“*visible church*”) is simply not on the same plane. A person may not live near a church, or even know of a church that believes as he does. He may have been disfellowshipped from his church for reasons he is not responsible for.

But there is also the “*invisible church.*” Every true believer, regardless of his nominal organizational connections, is a member of that one church. There is a branch on earth, and the inhabitants of heaven are also in it. Thank the Lord for that church!

Jack: “**In order to save us, the cross must deliver us from the world and place us in the church, the body of Christ. Every other aspect of salvation is based upon this fact . . . Christ will never take us to heaven as individuals, but only as members of His church.**”—*Beyond Belief*, 115.

That last sentence is one of the few in the entire book which he places entirely in italics. Thumb through the book and see if you can find many others.

According to Sequeira, every aspect of salvation is based on church membership. Without membership in the church we cannot be saved. This is Jack’s teaching. Just which of the two “churches” is Jack Sequeira talking about, when he says “without membership in the church, it is impossible for us to be saved”? According to his thinking, every other aspect of daily living is covered by the cross, except our initial acceptance of Christ as our Saviour. So, according to him, the only present, twentieth-century factors, determining whether or not you will be saved, is (1) whether you ever accepted Christ one time, and (2) whether you hold membership in the church. Everything else was finished two millenniums earlier at the cross. That is Sequeiran theology.

What church is this? He cannot be referring to the invisible church of all believers, because we are automatically in that church. Jack gives several pages of his book to a discussion of the necessity of being sure we are in the church. It is quite clear, as we read those pages, that he is talking about the visible church, i.e., the Seventh-day Adventist denomination. We can know this for a certainty because the invisible church only contains faithful souls, and no worldlings. The following lines, for example, clearly reveal that, when Jack says we must belong to the church in order to be saved, he is referring to the Seventh-day Adventist denomination:

Jack: “Tragically, **we see much of the world creeping into the church today.** In contradiction to the gos-

pel of Christ, **the church is copying the world's fashions, accepting its philosophy**, and depending on its resources. All this is happening because the church has lost sight of the true meaning of the doctrine of salvation. No wonder **the church is so weak and so indistinguishable from the world!**"—*Beyond Belief*, 116. (For Sequeira's complete study on the church, see pp. 112-120, 137.)

Jack: "The world has not had an opportunity to see, in the church, what God is like."—*Beyond Belief*, 152.

Jack: "The Church has neither grown into the fullness of Christ."—*Beyond Belief*, 153.

Jack: "**The church is spiritually bankrupt.**"—*Beyond Belief*, 91.

It is clear from the above statements that, by "church," Sequeira means the literal organization; in our time, the Seventh-day Adventist denomination--and not the invisible church of all true believers. Therefore, since he says that a person can only be saved if he holds membership in the church, if your church board kicks you out for holding to Bible-Spirit of Prophecy principles, you will be lost. You will not be able to go to heaven.

We are dealing here with a complete package. Jack Sequeira rejects—and openly condemns—truths presented privately or publicly from the Spirit of Prophecy. That is clear. He teaches definite error about the Sanctuary Message. Thus, anyone who sits at the feet of Jack Sequeira, to listen to his theories, is on dangerous ground.

And now we find that he emphasizes as strongly as possible that, *outside the church, there is no salvation*. Yet you and I know that many faithful souls are being disfellowshipped because they cannot accept modernist errors in our church, and therefore openly resist them with Bible-Spirit of Prophecy truths. But none of this bothers Jack Sequeira. He himself is a modernist, teaching modernist theories which he learned from his "mix" friends in the universities, and he himself condemns the sharing of Spirit of Prophecy truths with others.

10 - UNCONDITIONAL SALVATION

Jack also places great emphasis on "unconditional" (*BB*, 8, 25, 29, etc.). Accept Christ and be yourself, and you are bound for heaven.

Jack: "**God actually and unconditionally saved all humanity at the cross.**"—*Beyond Belief*, 8.

Jack: "**All that is necessary for our salvation from sin is already an accomplished fact in Christ.**"—*Beyond Belief*, 118.

Where in the Inspired Word do you find that the event of our salvation is past? Where are we told that salvation is unconditional?

11 - JUSTIFICATION

Sequeira teaches that salvation is by justification alone, and sanctification is meaningless in relation to whether or not we will be taken to heaven. I wonder if they will have disputes over gun control in heaven? Jack's reply would be that our indulged sins will be removed in a twinkling of an eye when Jesus returns.

According to Sequeira, there may be some sanctification after justification, but it is merely incidental. As he puts it, the objective gospel is justification and it has nothing to do with our behavior. The subjective gospel is righteousness by faith.

Jack: "We describe the second aspect of salvation—**the subjective gospel—as the imparted righteousness of Christ**. This is what gives evidence of the reality of the imputed righteousness of Christ in the life. **It does not contribute in the slightest way to our qualification for heaven**; it witnesses, or demonstrates, **what is already true of us** in Christ. Imparted righteousness does not qualify us for heaven."—*Beyond Belief*, 32.

Both justification and sanctification are needed for salvation; that is clear in the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy. But Jacks says that all that is needed is justification, and that was finished for everyone 2,000 years ago:

Jack: "**Justification** means all of Christ's righteousness that He provided for us so that **nothing more is required of us to qualify for heaven.**"—*Beyond Belief*, 103.

Evil activity in the Christian life cannot bar you from heaven, according to Sequeira. But the evil activity of rejecting Christ's offer of unconditional salvation can.

Jack: "**Righteousness 'in Christ' [justification] is the only means of our salvation**, and unless we resist and reject it, **it fully qualifies us for heaven both now and in the judgment.**"—*Beyond Belief*, 33.

So now we know Jack's view of "righteousness by faith." It is unrighteousness in sin, covered by the merits of Christ.

Jack: "The righteousness God, obtained for all humanity in Christ, is full of merit. It is this **alone** that qualifies us for heaven, now and in the judgment. **The righteousness God produced in us, on the other hand, has no saving value.**"—*Beyond Belief*, 170.

But, identical with the new theology in several other ways, Sequeira mirrors it in this claim also:

Jack: "**The gospel of faith plus works, or justification plus sanctification, is at the heart of Roman Catholic theology. It is a subtle form of 'legalism.'**"—*Beyond Belief*, 25.

12 - THE FIGHT AGAINST SIN

So Jack makes a frontal attack against genuine Christian living in two ways: First, he discounts as of no value any good thing you might be prompted to do by the Holy Spirit. Second, he declares that, in doing it, you are returning to the slavery of papal rule.

He has you coming and going. As far as he is concerned, you might as well indulge sin and be on the safe side. You are going to heaven anyway. We surely do not want to engage in a "subtle form of legalism."

Tetzel claimed that indulgences, once paid, covered all future sins, without a man having to stop sinning. Jack thinks that the grace of Christ, paid at Calvary, covers all future sins, regardless of whether anyone changes his ways. Sequeira may, and does, encourage us to give sin

some attention, but the fact our salvation was completed at the cross undermines the best intentions of new theology advocates to put away sin. We have witnessed this repeatedly in the lives of individuals who accept that philosophy of Christian experience.

According to Sequeira, the law of God has nothing to do with our salvation (*BB*, 16, 156, 157, 173). We can despise and spit on it. But we must beware of valuing it, lest we be accused of legalism.

Does the “fight of faith” have little to do with resisting temptation and sin?

“The fact that Christ has conquered should inspire His followers with courage to fight manfully the battle against sin and Satan.”—*Great Controversy*, 510.

“The Lord does not propose to perform for us either the willing or the doing. This is our proper work. As soon as we earnestly enter upon the work, God’s grace is given to work in us to will and to do, but never as a substitute for our effort.”—*Testimonies to Ministers*, 240.

“Each day he must renew his consecration, each day do battle with evil. Old habits, hereditary tendencies to wrong, will strive for the mastery, and against these he must be ever on guard, striving in Christ’s strength for victory.”—*Acts of the Apostles*, 477.

“There must be a constant, earnest struggling of the soul against the evil imaginings of the mind. There must be a steadfast resistance of temptation to sin in thought or act.”—*Sons and Daughters of God*, 109.

“The Christian life is a warfare. The apostle Paul speaks of wrestling against principalities and powers as he fought the good fight of faith.”—*5 Testimonies*, 222.

13 - OUR SINS: NOT A SALVATION ISSUE

Sequeira says the human sin problem is outside the realm of choice or the control of the will. Because man could do nothing about it, God settled the matter outside Jerusalem long centuries ago. Henceforth, you are guaranteed a ticket to heaven. All you have to do is accept it one time, according to Jack. Elsewhere, he says that all we need do is not reject the gift (*BB*, 8). This recalls to mind another error that is circulating: “It is easy to be saved, and hard to be lost.”

Is that a teaching you want your teenage son and daughter to hear, as they are preparing to leave that night for a date? Will you tell them: “My children, as you prepare for adulthood, keep in mind that you need not worry about the possibility of being overcome by sin. God takes care of all that. Simply accept Christ and He will take you to heaven. You need to understand that everyone was automatically saved at the cross. We were all totally justified at that time, and justification is all that is needed to guarantee that we will go to heaven. If you are tempted tonight, don’t worry about it; you are covered by the righteousness of Christ.”

Jack: **“Stumbling under grace, falling into sin, does not deprive us of justification.”—*Beyond Be-***

lief, 166.

Sequeira teaches that everyone is automatically a sinner (*BB*, 15, 52, 53, 56). According to him, the commission of sin has nothing to do with it. Other than a one-time accepting of the gift of salvation—and doing whatever it takes to make sure you are not disfellowshipped by your local church board,—you are bound for heaven, and cannot be lost. Every aspect of your salvation is accomplished corporately; the words “*individual*” and “*individuality*” can be disregarded. We are corporate sinners, corporately condemned, corporately saved at Calvary, corporately in the church, and corporately cleansed of sin at the Second Coming.

Sequeira is an expert at twisting reasoning to prove his point:

Jack: “If we insist that verse 12 (of Romans 5) means that all men died because ‘all have sinned’ as Adam sinned [true]—**then we must** make the analogy fit by arguing that all men live (or are justified) because all have obeyed as Christ obeyed [which, cooperating with Christ, we are to do]. Such an argument turns justification by faith into salvation by works, the very opposite of Paul’s clear teaching in Romans.”—*Beyond Belief*, 53.

But the Bible says that “sin is the transgression of the law” (1 John 3:4). “Our only definition of sin is that given in the Word of God; it is ‘the transgression of the law.’ ”—*Great Controversy*, 493. Sequeira lists several different definitions, but Inspiration tells us there is only one which really tells us what sin is.

The new theology teaches that sin is separation from God, and quotes Isaiah (*Isa* 59:2) to prove it. But they confuse the cause (sin) with the effect (separation from God). The verse itself establishes the fact: “But your iniquities have separated between you and your God, and your sins have hid His face from you, that He will not hear.”—*Isaiah* 59:2. Sequeira does a variation on this, and equates sinful human nature with sin. **“A sinful human nature is itself sin.”** (*BB*, 42). Did you know that your nature was sin? He did not say “sinful,” but “sin itself.” That appears to be a step lower than Augustine’s view of the matter.

Sequeira claims that following Christ’s example has no effect on our salvation (*BB*, 53). He also says that every baby is born a sinner and condemned to death because of it (*BB*, 61). And he adds that is eternal death, not the first death.

Jack: **“The life we receive at birth is . . . a life that is condemned by the law. This means that the just demand of the law leave us facing nothing but eternal death.”**—*Beyond Belief*, 63.

According to Sequeira, mere birth into this world condemns a man to eternal death; whereas, a mere one-time verbal acceptance of Christ guarantees the ongoing

Continued on the next tract

The Teachings of Jack Sequeira

Continued from the preceding tract in this series

sinner eternal life in heaven.

Strictly speaking, according to Jack's premises, one cannot fall away from salvation, after having earlier accepted it. And keep in mind that his premises and conclusions are promises and guarantees to anyone accepting them. Again, I say, there is a very real danger in reading the writings of a man who refuses to be instructed by the Spirit of Prophecy. One does it at his own peril.

We have here a corporate salvation which, he tells us, is without conditions. It is a salvation unrelated to a personal relationship with Christ, and our thoughts and behavior have nothing to do with it.

Jack: "**Full and complete salvation has already been obtained in Jesus Christ . . . [It is incorrect to believe that] salvation ultimately depends to some degree on his or her behavior.**"—*Beyond Belief*, 91.

But, read God's Word:

"Not one of us will ever receive the seal of God while our characters have one spot or stain upon them. It is left with us to remedy the defects in our characters, to cleanse the soul temple of every defilement. Then the latter rain will fall upon us."—*5 Testimonies*, 214.

As clearly indicated in the above passage, our part is an individual one. But Sequeira carefully eliminates our personal responsibility in dealing with the sin problem in our own lives. By doing this he sidesteps our part in Heaven's plan for our salvation. But, in reality, our day-by-day, personal cooperation with God in putting away sin is vital.

"The work of preparation is an individual work. We are not saved in groups. The purity and devotion of one will not offset the want of these qualities in another. Though all nations are to pass in judgment before God, yet He will examine the case of each individual with as close and searching scrutiny as if there were not another being upon the earth. Everyone must be tested and found without spot or wrinkle or any such thing."—*Great Controversy*, 490.

14 - ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ON THE BOOK

Here are several additional statements from Jack Sequeira's new book, *Beyond Belief*:

Everything needful for our salvation has already been done:

Jack: "The objective truth of the gospel is that Jesus Christ **has already accomplished everything necessary** for sinful men and women to be declared righteous and candidates for heaven."—*Beyond Belief*, 33.

Justification is all that is needed; no other qualification need be or can be added.

Jack: "**The devil has deceived many Christians into believing** that justification by faith does not fully qualify them for heaven—**that something more is necessary: that they must keep the law** and do 'good works.'"—*Beyond Belief*, 104.

Every aspect of our salvation was totally finished 2,000 years ago.

Jack: "**All three of these aspects of our salvation—justification, sanctification and glorification—have already been accomplished** in the birth, life, death, and resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ."—*Beyond Belief*, 30.

That which the Holy Spirit does within us has nothing to do with the "objective facts of the gospel." (By "objective," Sequeira means the working of the Holy Spirit within us is done regardless of any cooperation or activity on our part.)

Jack: "Second, Scripture also refers to salvation as what God accomplishes in us through the Holy Spirit. This aspect of salvation is **not** something in addition to the objective facts of the gospel."—*Beyond Belief*, 36.

So, according to Sequeira, the work of the Holy Spirit within us has no effect on whether or not we will be saved. Our salvation was totally completed 2,000 years ago.

He says that Jesus was our total substitute, not our example. He not only substituted as our sacrificed Lamb, but He also substituted as our Example. Jack would say that "Christ exemplified in our stead, so we wouldn't have to."

Jack: "**The entire human race is corporately one 'in Jesus Christ,'** just as we are one 'in Adam.' **What Jesus did, we have done,** because we are corporately one in Him. **His perfect life and death are considered to be our life and death as well.**"—*Beyond Belief*, 37.

So he changes the Scripture from "Be ye perfect," to "Jesus was perfect." According to Jack, when Christ lived, obeyed, and died for us, He, at that time, cancelled all our personal sins and fully justified us in advance. And that was done unconditionally. No matter what we do henceforth, we cannot be lost if we accept Him. The cancellation is unconditional.

Jack: "When **Adam** sinned, Paul says, he **brought the judgment of condemnation and death to 'all men.'** **In the same way, when Christ obeyed, He** not only redeemed humanity from the results of Adam's sin, but much more He **cancelled all our personal sins** ('many offenses') and brought the verdict of 'justification of life' to all men (verses 16, 18). **This is the unconditional good news** that the gospel proclaims."—*Beyond Belief*, 54-55.

You have just read the terms of a complete, total, unconditional salvation. Accept it and you cannot be lost (Sequeira says).

How can Sequeira teach such things? He can do it because he twists definitions. For example, "the power of sin." After a person accepts Christ, according to Jack, his sins are different! Although they are still "sins," they no longer "have power to" condemn him,—because he

is no longer under law but under grace! This kind of twisted thinking enables Sequeira to conclude that as soon as a person accepts Christ, sin never again “has power over him,” because henceforth he is “sinning under grace,” instead of “under the law”!

Jack: “According to Paul, it is impossible for someone who truly understands salvation by grace, and who appreciates Christ’s cross, to go on condoning sin. Righteousness is by faith, and if the faith is there, the righteousness is sure to be there as well—and there is no sin in righteousness.

“But that sin no longer has authority to condemn or control a believer, because such a person is no longer under the law’s control but under grace.

“A believer is no longer under the law’s authority, sin can no longer bring upon the believer the law’s condemnation of eternal death. The believer is delivered from the power of sin.

Jack: **“There is a world of difference between sinning under the law and sinning under grace.** In this sense, the law and Christ differ radically.”—*Beyond Belief*, 163-165.

In the above quotation, notice that the blame is put on the law, not on sin.

This is why Jack can declare that it is all right to sin under grace because he believes that sinning under grace cannot condemn us in the judgment.

Jack: **“Stumbling under grace, falling into sin, does not deprive us of justification. Nether does it bring condemnation.”**—*Beyond Belief*, 166.

As soon as you accept Christ, sin no longer matters. That is new theology teaching. If sin does not matter, neither does the law of God. You can enjoy the one and ignore the other, while letting the Holy Spirit “subjectively” work in you.

Jack: **“How should we Christians view the law? Is it still binding on us? The answer is emphatically NO; the law is not binding on us as a means of salvation.** But the answer is a most definite Yes, if we are speaking of the law as a standard for Christian living.”—*Beyond Belief*, 173.

Have you met people who got into the new theology—and then they went off into sin? It is a commonplace occurrence. The new theology, like Kellogg’s pantheism, is full of roses and flowers. It all looks so beautiful, but it directs the unwary into a pathway to death. “*Oh, yes, we don’t have to keep the law anymore, but it is still good as a Christian standard.* By the way, let’s go to the movies tonight . . . Sure, it’s Friday night, but who cares? We’re saved!”

Do you faithfully keep the Sabbath, or do you work part of the time or do your shopping on that day? According to Sequeira, it will not matter in the Judgment—unless you are putting forth effort to keep that day holy.

Jack: **“When we make Sabbath keeping a requirement for salvation, we are not entering rest at all. We are not pointing to a finished, complete salvation.** Instead, we are turning the Sabbath into the very

opposite of salvation by works. Such Sabbath keeping is meaningless.”—*Beyond Belief*, 183.

Reading his entire book, you will find: (1) It is not necessary to keep the Sabbath. You can just as easily be a Sundaykeeper and be just as assured of salvation. (2) If you try to keep the Sabbath, because you think you ought to, then you will be condemned in the judgment as a legalist. (3) But, in the Final Crisis, only Sabbathkeepers will be sealed, because they did it effortlessly, without really trying.

But what about imputed and imparted righteousness? According to Sequeira, there is such a thing as imparted righteousness, but you can totally lack it and still be fully saved in the kingdom. No activity of man means anything. Live as you please; your future is assured. (And that last sentence is a true one, no matter which side of the controversy you choose to be on.)

Jack: “We often describe the first aspect of salvation [justification]—the objective gospel—as the imputed righteousness of Christ. This is what qualifies the believer for heaven, both now and in the final judgment. We describe the second aspect of salvation—the subjective gospel [sanctification]—as the imparted righteousness of Christ in the life. It does not contribute in the slightest way to our qualification for heaven; it witnesses, or demonstrates, what is already true of us in Christ. Imparted righteousness does not qualify us for heaven.”—*Beyond Belief*, 32.

You probably thought that people are lost because they are sinners. No, according to Jack, that has nothing to do with why they are lost.

Jack: **“It simply isn’t true that everyone dies because they have personally sinned** as Adam did . . . **Sinful man is not lost because he has committed sins,** but because he is without Christ—that is to say, **because he is born of Adam and therefore already stands condemned in him even before he commits sins of his own.**”—*Beyond Belief*, 134.

Beware, if you try to obey God, you might become “self-concerned.”

Jack: **“If a person believes that salvation ultimately depends to some degree on his or her behavior, then the faith such a person is able to generate will naturally be polluted with self-concern.”** *Beyond Belief*, 91.

Considering the above statement, we note that Morris Venden and Helmut Ott have said the same thing in their books. But why do they do it? These men will sanctimoniously give theological reasons for why it is alright sin. Then they will turn around and urgently warn against trying to obey the law of God, because it will be “legalism.” The uniform message of the new theology is that sin is harmless, but obedience to God’s law is dangerous. Is this some kind of Jesuit plot to destroy obedience to the law of God in these last days?

As soon as you once accept Christ, according to Sequeira, you are covered for the rest of your life.

Jack: **“Justification is the work of a moment, although it remains effective all our believing lives.”**—

Beyond Belief, 91.

○ Remember that Sequeira's teaching is that you need only profess Christ one time in your life, and you will be eternally saved because of it.

The truth about the covering righteousness of Christ is most wonderful. But, we are told in God's Word, His righteousness never covers sin. It is our part to cooperate with our Lord in putting sin out of our lives. Of ourselves, this is totally impossible to do. But, in His strength, all things are possible.

What is righteousness by faith? People in search of the answer attend seminars. Or they buy books, such as *Beyond Belief*. Apparently, it is something very special. Ellen White said so.

Let me tell you what it is:

First, you will find the 1888 Message explained in detail in the 1892 Message, the 1896 Message, the 1898 Message, the 1900 Message, the 1903 Message, and the 1905 Message.

Who gave those messages?

○ Are they now in print? Yes! After the Minneapolis meeting, Ellen White took time to travel around the countryside to encourage the people to learn and accept the message given there. Then she set to work to put it into print. You will find the 1888 Message of Righteousness by Faith explained in great detail in *Steps to Christ* (1892), *Mount of Blessing* (1896), *Desire of Ages* (1898), *Christ's Object Lessons* (1900), *Education* (1903), and *Ministry of Healing* (1905). For example, read the first six chapters of *Ministry of Healing* on your knees. Then tell me if you did not find the message of Righteousness by Faith in those pages.

Why is it that so many are eager to hear every new speaker who passes by, while neglecting the most precious discourses ever given by Heaven about the pathway to heaven? If you want to know what righteousness by faith is, go to God alone on your knees and read and pray over *Steps to Christ* or one of the other books named above.

Second, in 1980 I did a detailed study of the books containing quotations about Righteousness by Faith. The results were written up in a four-tract set, *Message of Minneapolis [FF—22-25]* (now in our *Inspiration Tractbook*). It is almost entirely composed of Bible/Spirit of Prophecy/Jones/Waggoner statements.

I discovered, to my surprise, that every statement, except two or three, discussed righteousness by faith in relation to the importance of obeying the law of God, and how Jesus strengthens us to do it!

○ That tract set is still available, if you wish to obtain one or more copies. It contains every righteousness-by-faith statement from the 1950 book, 1888 Reexamined, by Weiland and Short, and the 1928 book, *Christ Our Righteousness*, by A.G. Daniells, plus additional quotations.

The righteousness of Christ is given to forgive our past sins and enable us to obey God's law in the future. It

is not given to excuse us from obedience, or sidestep the need to put away our cherished sins!

Let us wake up. There is only a little time left. Others need to be warned about the errors creeping in among us. The world must be warned to obey the law of God by faith in the Son's enabling grace. (Revelation 14:12). For that is righteousness by faith, in verity.

The truth is that Christ died on the cross for everyone, and then in heaven He applies its benefits individually to those willing to accept and cooperate with His plan to save them. Jack's view is that Christ died for, and saves only, a large group. The individual application of salvation is lacking from his message. That is why personal behavior does not matter. We are saved as a church, not as individuals.

Jack: "The central theme of the apostle Paul's theology regarding the gospel is the *"in Christ" motif* or idea. It is based on the biblical teaching of solidarity or corporate oneness, a concept that is largely foreign to the Western mind, although still common in many parts of the world today. The Bible plainly teaches that the whole of humanity is linked together in a common life and therefore constitutes a unit or a shared identity—a corporate oneness."—*Beyond Belief*, 33.

Totally ignoring such passages as Matthew 1:21, Sequeira denies that Christ became incarnate in order that we could keep the law of God.

Jack: "**Christ became a man to prove that men and women can keep God's law.** The problem with this answer is that **we cannot explicitly substantiate it from Scripture.**"—*Beyond Belief*, 41.

That is not true; read our tract, *You Can Obey [IC—1]* for many quotations. See the rest of our *Indwelling Christ Series* for more.

According to Sequeira, it was 2,000 years ago that everyone died to sin—not now. It was back then that they all were perfect in character. That is why it is not necessary now.

Jack: "**When Christ died on the cross, all humanity was legally justified** because all humanity died with Him there."—*Beyond Belief*, 43.

Jack: "**In Him we lived a perfect life;** in Him we died the penalty for sin."—*Beyond Belief*, 48-49.

Notice that that is *"lived,"* not *"live."* Your perfect life was lived out two millennia ago, according to Sequeira. You need not concern yourself with trying to live a perfect life in Christ now. And the reason? you were not saved individually, but in a group:

Jack: "Biblically, **the doctrine of substitution is based on the concept of corporate oneness.** God can legally justify sinners because **all humanity corporately obeyed the law in one Man, Jesus Christ.** Only when we identify the humanity of Jesus with the corporate fallen humanity He came to redeem can we teach an ethical gospel that is **unconditional** good news."—*Beyond Belief*, 48.

Sequeira rejoices that Romans 5:11 is in the Bible, and places it in italics.

Jack: "In Romans 5:11, the apostle Paul states a

glorious truth of the gospel. He says that we Christians can rejoice *because we have already received the atonement.*—*Beyond Belief*, 51.

Paul wrote the book of Romans during his three-month stay in Corinth in the winter of A.D. 57-58. Jesus had already entered the heavenly Sanctuary and begun applying the benefits of the atonement individually, which included reconciliation with God and forgiving, enabling grace. But its concluding benefits could not be made available until the investigative judgment, which began in 1844, is completed.

What Jack fails to mention is a fact commonly known to historic Adventist Bible teachers: The word, translated “*atonement*” in the KJV of Romans 5:11 does not mean that. It is *katallage*, and means “*reconciliation*.” Through the sacrifice of Christ on Calvary, we have been reconciled with Heaven, and can now experience it. Through Christ, we can come to the throne of God and receive forgiveness and empowering help. When Paul wrote the book of Romans, over 25 years after Christ died, he had been reconciled, but he had not received the completed atonement.

In one of his sermons, Jack says that Ellen White was not a theologian, because she did not know Greek and Hebrew. That is laughable. A prophet of God—not being a “theologian” by not knowing Greek and Hebrew! Yet her understanding of the atonement indicates that she knew her Greek better than Sequeira. (For much more on this, see our in-depth “*Biblical Sanctuary*,” now in our “*Sanctuary Tractbook*.”)

Did you know you were born to receive eternal death? At least, that is how Sequeira sees it. Rome says that God condemns men to everlasting fire for the few sins of a brief lifetime. But Sequeira says God condemns them to the flames for what their ancestors did thousands of years before (read Ezekiel 18 for the truth of the matter).

Jack: “**All humanity stands condemned to death in Adam.**”—*Beyond Belief*, 53.

Jack: “**Adam’s sin brought all humanity under the death sentence—both the first and second deaths.**”—*Beyond Belief*, 61.

Sequeira wants to give us a sin which it is totally impossible for us to repent of, and a salvation which is totally apart from us. The fact that sin is OUR fault, and that WE have a part in putting it out of our lives—is a fact which the modernists want to theorize away.

Jack: “Since the whole human race is simply Adam’s life multiplied, these three results of Adam’s sin [guilt, condemnation, bondage] passed on all of us. Thus **the life we receive at birth is: 1. a life that has sinned; 2. a life that is condemned by the law.** This means that the just demands of the law leave us facing nothing but **eternal death; 3. a life that is bondage to sin and the devil.**”—*Beyond Belief*, 63.

Remember those words, the next time you look into the face of an innocent child in its mother’s arms.

Jack: “The eternal life Christ offers us as a free gift is always in contrast to **the eternal death we inherit**

from Adam.”—*Beyond Belief*, 85.

In his book, *Beyond Belief*, Sequeira speaks of God’s part, which is total salvation provided at the cross, and our part, which is faith alone. We are told that it must never be mingled with good works, unless they flow forth of themselves. We are never to try to repress sin, for that would be legalism. We are never to try to obey God’s requirements, unless it comes naturally. That is Sequeira’s teaching. We are simply to wait in faith and let the Holy Spirit bring forth the fruit of the Spirit. Good works must flow forth of themselves effortlessly, or they are bad works. This means that, when you are tempted to sin, you must not resist the temptation unless it comes naturally to do so.

Jack: “The objective gospel [one of his synonyms for justification] can become a reality to us only when we experience its power in our lives.” “One reason why so many Christians today fail to demonstrate the power of the gospel in their lives is that their faith is a self-centered faith. It is self-centered because they have failed to understand the facts of the objective gospel—Christ our righteousness. **If a person does not believe that full and complete salvation has already been obtained in Jesus Christ, if a person believes that salvation ultimately depends to some degree on his or her behavior, then the faith such a person is able to generate will naturally be polluted with self-concern.**”—*Beyond Belief*, 89, 91.

Jack: “Saving faith, therefore, involves much more than simply trusting in Christ for eternal security. It means much more than simply depending on Christ to help us keep the law or ‘be good.’ **God will never help the flesh to be good, for the flesh is Satan’s domain and unalterably opposed to God.** The formula for successful Christian living is always ‘Not I, but Christ’; having faith demands that we maintain a humble attitude of complete surrender to the reality that when Christ was crucified, we were crucified in Christ. He, not self, must live in us and manifest Himself through us.

“Active faith, understood and practiced, amounts to following Jesus’ advice, ‘Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation,’ or ‘Pray without ceasing.’ **This is how we live by faith alone.** Thus not only do **we stand justified by faith alone**, but **we are sanctified by faith alone** as well.”—*Beyond Belief*, 94.

Sequeira says there are two kinds of human effort: “*works of faith*” and “*works of the law.*” According to Jack, “*works of faith*” is faith alone and the only kind that God accepts. “*Works of the law*” are efforts to do good, help others, resist sin, etc. These, in his opinion, are terrible actions, because they proceed from the carnal heart, whenever they do not automatically occur. As do the other new theology advocates in their books, Jack is silent about earnestly working with Christ under great difficulties for

Continued on the next tract

More WAYMARKS - from —

PILGRIMS REST

HCR 77, BOX 38A - BEERSHEBA SPRINGS, TN 37305 USA

The Teachings of Jack Sequeira

Continued from the preceding tract in this series

souls, or steadfastly resisting sin when it is not easy to do so. According to Sequeira, only effortless actions which flow forth by themselves are good works and accepted by Heaven:

Jack: “*Works of faith* originate from the indwelling life of Christ; *works of law* always originate from the flesh, the natural life. **In works of faith, the believer is living by faith alone; in works of law, the sinner attempts to keep the law through a concern for self.**”—*Beyond Belief, 97.*

Notice that, in his vocabulary, evil deeds are “*works of the law.*” But the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy teach something very different: Evil works are those done in rebellion against the law. (Remember that the only definition of sin is “the transgression of the law.” See GC 493 and 1 John 3:4.)

Jack: “**Performing works of law is a subtle form of rebellion against God** because all such works are actually independent of Him. **In the judgment, God will condemn all such works as iniquity.**”—*Beyond Belief, 97.*

Faith *alone*, not obedience to God’s law, is the message of these modernists.

Jack: “**God did not give us His only-begotten Son so that we could copy Him**, but so that we could receive Him . . . **God is not looking at us to see how good we are or how hard we are trying to keep His law.**”—*Beyond Belief, 98.*

That is a classic example of Sequeira’s method of persuasion: “God did not give us” Jesus “so that we could copy Him, but that we could receive Him.” Who can argue with that? Of course, our heavenly Father gave Jesus so we would receive Him—so Sequeira must be right. To deny it is to say He did not give Jesus for us to receive Him.

That is an excellent example of how the new theology uses subtle arguments to overpower thinking. That sentence has an element of confusion in it, and the reader senses something wrong, but then assumes that Sequeira must be smarter since he “mixes” with the theologians. Thus, an error is shrewdly implanted in unwary minds.

The truth is that BOTH aspects of that sentence are true, and Jack is actually slipping in an untruth on the tails of a truth. God gave us Jesus so we could both copy and receive Him. We are not only to receive Jesus into our hearts, but—which Sequeira repudiates—we are to also imitate the clean, good life of Jesus (sample texts which prove that fact: 1 Peter 2:21; 1 John 2:6; Colossians 2:6; Philippians 2:5. Also note Matthew 3:13-15; Luke 6:12 with 9:28.) If Sequeira rejects so simple a truth as the fact that, in our daily lives, we are to emulate the godly living of Jesus,—then how dare we trust Sequeira’s more complex opinions about justification, sanctification, sin, and salvation?

In his opinion, sanctification is just a matter of “faith

alone” also.

Jack: “**It is by faith alone that we receive and experience both justification and sanctification.**”—*Beyond Belief, 101.*

With Sequeira, everything is “faith alone” or “only believe.” According to the above quotation, Christ obeyed on our behalf, so all we need to do today is have “faith.” He died for us and obeyed for us, have faith and receive the substitutionary work done on our behalf. By exercising that faith, “**Justification is meritorious: it qualifies us for heaven now and in the judgment . . . Christ also kept the whole law on our behalf. All this becomes ours the moment we are justified** by faith. Justification means *all* of Christ’s righteousness that He provided for us **so that nothing more is required of us to qualify for heaven.** In other words, we stand perfect in Him.”—*Beyond Belief, 103.*

According to Sequeira, everything which affects our salvation is vicarious and substitutionary, and was done—finished—at the cross, You can forget about the sin problem. By faith, let the Holy Spirit working in you take care of that.

Jack: “**All that is necessary for our salvation from sin is already an accomplished fact** in Christ.”—*Beyond Belief, 118.*

Only once in the book does Sequeira discuss whether or not there is a Sanctuary in heaven, and you will note, in that paragraph (quoted below) how he sidesteps it. We know from his sermon tape (“*Issues: The Sanctuary*”) that he has three opinions about the existence of a Sanctuary in heaven: (1) It is symbolic of some unidentified thing. (2) There is no Sanctuary in heaven. (3) All heaven is the Sanctuary.

Jack: “Please note that the application of the earthly sanctuary to the believer does not in any way deny the real existence of a heavenly sanctuary. The Bible clearly teaches that.”—*Beyond Belief, 139.*

In Sequeira’s opinion, when believers sin—they remain justified all the while they are sinning! He even implies that they could not be condemned to eternal death if they died while carrying on that sin. So, in good new theology fashion, Jack is telling us that professed believers will be saved even though they are sinning. An interesting concept. Very comforting. Full of assurance. There is no condemnation for those who are “sinning under grace,” because they have previously accepted Christ. That is his theory of sin in the life of the Christian.

But how can he be so sure, when he only goes by modernist Protestant interpretations of the Bible,—and refuses to be counseled by the Spirit of Prophecy writings? Is it safe to trust yourself to the ideas of a man who refuses to consider what the Spirit of Prophecy has to say on any given subject? I dare not do so. Do you?

Jack: “**There is a world of difference between sinning under law and sinning under grace . . . Stum-**

bling under grace, falling into sin, does not deprive us of justification. Neither does it bring condemnation.”—*Beyond Belief*, 165, 166.

Just before your teenage daughter goes out tonight on a date, sit down with her and explain the new principles of Christian living: “Whatever happens, don’t worry about it. And if you fall into sin a little, it really won’t matter. God understands, and you cannot be lost because of any sin you commit. You see, you are under grace now. You were justified at the cross and you cannot lose it.”

In Sequeira’s opinion, the law is no longer binding on Christians:

Jack: **“How should Christians view the law? Is it still binding upon us? The answer is most emphatically No; the law is not binding on us as a means of salvation.”**—*Beyond Belief*, 173.

But then he adds: “But the answer is a most definite Yes if we are speaking of the law as a standard for Christian living” [Italics his]. Tell your children, if you dare, that keeping the law really has nothing to do with their salvation. Tell them it’s just a nice Christian standard.

The truth is that the law is the standard of the judgment! Until recent years, we were one of the only people in the world who upheld obedience to the law of God by the faith of Jesus Christ (Rev 14:12). We were raised up as a people to give that as a worldwide message. But, now, look at what is happening! *Sequeira’s theories are given leadership approval and published by Pacific Press!*

Surely we must be close to the end of time!

We are being told, “Do not worry about the law of God, for your sins are nicely covered by the ‘righteousness of Christ.’ ” And along with that, we are told, “Your righteousness is way off in heaven and has nothing, in any way, to do with your current behavior. All you need is ‘faith,’ and you are safe. No action needed or required; just faith”:

Jack: **“The righteousness that saves us is always in Christ, and since He is in heaven, where no thief can enter, it cannot be touched.”**—*Beyond Belief*, 174.

The truth is that the righteousness of Christ is forgiving, enabling grace which will not cover willful, intentional sin. But Jack makes “faith” a god in itself:

Jack: **“He [Satan] makes it appear that salvation comes not by faith alone, but that it depends to some degree on our own behavior.”**—*Beyond Belief*, 174.

Throughout this book, Sequeira’s teaching is the same: We are to do nothing except have faith; anything more than that is legalism. Evil activities, crime, efforts to do good—all are bad actions in his thinking. But efforts to obey God and help others, he especially castigates as actions to be condemned in the Judgment. Sequeira calls condemned actions “works of the law,” apparently to downgrade the law even more in our estimation as something we should stay away from.

There is nothing dangerous about the law; it is our friend and guide. There is nothing wrong with trying to do good, or actually doing it. Oh, that far more people in the

world would do good! Of course, there are genuine “legalists” who try to work their way to heaven. But that fact should not be used as a reason to warn everyone to not attempt to do anything good!

Only “faith alone” is acceptable to Sequeira—and nothing must be added to it:

Jack: “To be under grace means that Christ is our righteousness in every way and in every sense of the word. Through the gospel, we receive Christ’s righteousness both as an objective fact (**imputed righteousness**) and as a subjective experience (**imparted righteousness**). **Both are received by faith alone, and nothing must be added to our faith. Anyone who tries to justify himself before God in the slightest by his own actions is actually denying that Christ is his righteousness. He is fallen from grace.**

“We simply cannot have it both ways. We cannot . . . claim that we can save ourselves by somehow having our good works add something toward our salvation. This subtle form of legalism puts us in danger of losing Christ entirely.

“Salvation is not partly from Christ and partly from ourselves. To be under law or under grace are opposites that cannot be mixed. Either we receive Christ by faith as our title to righteousness both in terms of our standing before God and in our daily living, or we must try to justify ourselves entirely by our own law keeping, which is impossible. It is either one or the other; we cannot have some of both.”—*Beyond Belief*, 175.

And that is where the error is. The person who is “in Christ” CAN HAVE both: all of grace and all of active work because of that grace. Through the merits of Christ, both are available to us. Moment-by-moment, he can (1) receive the forgiving, enabling grace of Christ, and (2) hand-in-hand with Christ, he can actively work to do good and defend the right.—For that second part is half the reason the grace was given him “in Christ.” Our Lord wants to empower us to live right, think right, be right!

Sequeira perverts the gospel when he attempts to clothe clean, honest living in the attributes of evil, but tries to hide this fact—by declaring that it is those who try to live right who are perverting the gospel:

Jack: **“Perverting the gospel: Satan tries to make us believe that salvation is not entirely by faith alone, but that it depends to some degree upon our behavior.”**—*Beyond Belief*, 178.

We have now covered the entire book, except for the final chapter. Earlier in this study we analyzed that final chapter, and found it teaches two things: (1) The atonement was totally finished on the cross, and (2) the issue in the coming Final Crisis will include the Sabbath-Sunday question, but will be keyed to whether or not people have accepted Sequeira’s teaching that we are saved by faith alone, all apart from behavior.

A thoughtful reading of the inferences in this final chapter (chapter 18) reveals that Sequeira tends to the belief that most Adventists will be lost and most Protestants will be saved—since, as he explains, many Protestants are

“resting in Christ” and not trying to change their behavior. Whereas, too many Adventists are not “resting in Christ,” but are trying to put away their sins. Jack theorizes that, in the Final Crisis, those who believe in doing things in a positive way will switch over to Sundaykeeping and receive the mark of the beast. Whereas, those who do nothing at all but have “faith,” will accept the Bible Sabbath and be sealed:

Jack: “The real issue is not the one we usually think of—Sabbath keeping versus Sunday keeping. **Many sincere Sunday-keeping Christians today are fully resting** in Christ for salvation . . .

“In the end time, **those who have deliberately turned their backs on God’s free gift** of salvation in Christ **will worship the dragon that gives power to the beast. They will exalt Sunday** as man’s day of rest in defiance of God’s rest day. **The issue, then, in the final conflict will not be between two groups of Christians, or even between two rest days, but between two opposing methods of salvation.**”—*Beyond Belief, 184-185.*

So, according to Sequeira, every Advent believer who does not accept his (Sequeira’s) teachings on “faith alone,” “salvation finished at the cross,” “corporate death in Adam,” and “corporate—not individual—salvation” will later become a Sundaykeeper.

But, in reality, the final issue in the great controversy will be the same one which has been the center of action since its inception by Lucifer in heaven: obedience to the law of God. Refusal to put away one’s sins in the strength of Christ and obey that law will be the special deception in the last days.

But, in stark contrast, although he gives lip service to the true Sabbath, Sequeira claims the issue is just the opposite: *the importance of not obeying!* Commenting on the heart of the Final Crisis, he says:

Jack: “**The fundamental issue throughout Scripture is salvation by faith versus salvation by works.** At the heart of the Bible message is salvation by grace made effective through faith alone.”—*Beyond Belief, 185.*

Faith Alone should have been the title of his book. But, we agree, *Beyond Belief* does fit its content.

15 - ISSUES: THE SANCTUARY

This is a partial transcript of a sermon tape by Jack Sequeira, given at Walla Walla Seventh-day Adventist Church about the year 1988.

This was a doctrinal message presented to the students, faculty, and village folk of the College Place/Walla Walla, Washington area. But it was a strange sermon, indeed. Instead of describing the wonderful truths found in Leviticus, Daniel, Revelation, and Great Controversy, chapters 23, 24, and 28,—this sermon consisted of an apology for three beliefs of Jack Sequeira: (1) Has there been one or two rooms in the heavenly sanctuary since A.D. 31? His answer: One. (2) Is there a sanctuary in heaven. His answer: All heaven, where

God is, is the sanctuary. (3) Is the sanctuary in heaven literal or symbolic? His answer: It is symbolic.

Christ did not come to help us be good, but to save us . . . My message today is on the heavenly sanctuary . . . You may disagree with the non-fundamentals of my message, but let us work together to reach others . . . [All he talks about is the Sanctuary, so it must be “non-fundamental.”]

If you disagree with my message, you disagree with God . . .

Is there one room or two in the sanctuary in heaven? Does it matter? . . . Is it literal or symbolic? I will tell you where I stand on this, so you will know . . . It [the sanctuary in heaven] is symbolic . . .

If the earthly veil was torn apart, so was the heavenly veil. We have to be consistent with our theology . . . Ever since 1844 . . . we have been teaching that there are two rooms in the heavenly sanctuary, and we have been quite comfortable with that theology. But in the 50s we began sending our scholars to outside universities. Brethren and sisters, I would like to recommend something: If you want to prove your theology is watertight, please mix with Christians of other churches. They will be merciful to you. We have no problem among ourselves with our theology. But please mix with other Christians. You will be pestered! Our scholars came under fire [when they did that]! Let me give you the arguments of other scholars, and if you can give me the solution, I will be happy to listen to you.

Here is the argument: If there are two rooms in the heavenly sanctuary, . . . then we are teaching that the Father who is in the most holy place, and the Son who represents our priest in the holy place, have been separated by a curtain for 1,800 years! . . .

We came to the conclusion that the two rooms, just like everything else in the sanctuary, was symbolic. And we came to the conclusion that the two rooms represented the two-phased work [of Christ] . . .

We know from the Bible that the judgment is always an end-time event; therefore the two rooms do not necessarily mean that there are two rooms in heaven. But they represent the two-phased ministry of Christ in heaven . . .

There was a hot argument over it; they took a vote—this was the GC [in Washington, D.C.], I wasn’t there—and they decided that the two room idea—the literal view—is a contradiction . . .

Please check the *SDA Church Manual* of ‘86, the last one which came out after the ballot [at the 1985 General Conference Session], and please check the *27 Beliefs* . . .

You don’t mix with these people; I do. But you say the church is going against Ellen G. White . . . Close investigation; I have done it. I don’t know how many of you have

Continued on the next tract

The Teachings of Jack Sequeira

Continued from the preceding tract in this series

done it!

I want to make it very clear: I have never taught there is no sanctuary in heaven! . . . Do you know what the word, "sanctuary," means? . . . It means "dwelling place" [No, it means "holy place"]. Now, where does God dwell? If I deny a sanctuary in heaven, I am denying what? I am denying God is dwelling there! And if I don't know where He is, I don't know where I am going to go when Christ comes. Ha! [laugh] . . .

"Thus saith the high and lofty One, who inhabiteth eternity; I dwell in the high and holy place, and with him who is of a contrite heart . . ." So God dwells in heaven; so heaven is His sanctuary. And God dwells in the believer, so he is the temple of what? God!

"Hebrews 9 describes the heavenly sanctuary as "heaven itself," did you know that? . . . So, to us, heaven itself is the sanctuary.

Now, let us go back to Ellen G. White herself . . . She saw Christ moving from the holy to the most holy place . . .

"I believe that. I believe she saw it. The question is how do we interpret the vision? In the Old and New Testaments, God revealed truth by symbolic language . . . Revelation 1:10 . . . If you take this literally, you are in trouble. [Quotes Revelation 1:10-16, which obviously contains metaphors and similes.] John said, 'I saw'—just like Ellen G. White said, 'I saw.' 'I saw seven golden candlesticks . . . and His feet like unto fine brass.'"

"I believe [that] in 1844 Christ entered the second phase of His ministry . . . And whether the heavenly sanctuary had one room or two rooms, I don't know, because Jesus said, "In My Father's house are many mansions"—rooms. So is Jesus wrong too? Hey, Jesus! [Laugh.] You made a mistake; there are supposed to be two rooms. No!

"Every month, I get *Firm Foundation* magazine in the mail, although I did not subscribe to it . . . But I do not like his [Spear's] method. To me the truth of Christian living is justification by faith [and he preaches sanctification also]; I can't produce Christian living by hammering on the head with do's and don't's. It has been tried for a hundred years, and all we have produced is hypocrites . . .

"Now, dear people, there is a sanctuary in heaven. Now, let me conclude:

"Whether you still want to believe in two rooms, I do not condemn you. But, please, respect me too. For I have given you reasons . . . But, please, do not tell people that this pastor from the Walla Walla Adventist Church is a heretic. Because you may lead people into false paths which will end up in eternal damnation [!], and you will have to answer in the judgment for those souls . . .

We must defend our doctrines from sound Biblical exegesis, and I here believe this church is bringing the gospel to all mankind . . . The only book that is infallible is

this book [the Bible]!

16 - ISSUES: THE SPIRIT OF PROPHECY

This is a partial transcript of a sermon delivered by Jack Sequeira at the Walla Walla Seventh-day Adventist Church since the summer of 1990 (because he mentions Folkenberg as being General Conference president).

This "doctrinal presentation" turns out to be an urgent call to the Adventists in the Walla Walla/College Place area to stop referring to or quoting the Spirit of Prophecy writings, either (1) in public presentations or (2) in private conversations. He begins by telling us how, for over two decades he has not wanted to attend meetings where the Spirit of Prophecy was quoted. (L.E. Froom died in 1974.) Sequeira believes in the Spirit of Prophecy, yet he is adamant that information in it must never be shared with any church member, worker, or leader in the denomination. Clearly, Jack Sequeira does not believe in the Spirit of Prophecy. He also mentions that he has been asked by church leaders to hold ministerial retreats to urge the pastors to stop using the Spirit of Prophecy. You will also notice that, although he is hard on Ellen White's writings, he is great at making jokes in the pulpit.

[Many years ago] I was invited by Dr. [Leroy Edwin] Froom to a Bible Conference—and he emphasized "Bible"—and the conference was in Buffalo, New York. And I accepted the invitation for five days, but I left after three days. Because 90 percent of the messages spoken from the pulpit was Ellen G. White. And I turned to Dr. Froom and said, "Why didn't you call it an Ellen G. White Conference? . . . So I went back home, and I began to study what Ellen G. White said about using her writings.

And it was based on the fact that I made a statement on my very first day as pastor of this church on January '88. And a few of you misunderstood or misinterpreted that I don't believe in the Spirit of Prophecy. Because I've been hearing rumblings . . . But after today, I hope you will see where I stand on the Spirit of Prophecy . . .

Now, what about [the Spirit of Prophecy] in the church? . . . I'm going to read to you from the *Church Manual*. This is the official position. And I am also going to recommend that you read chapters 16 and 17 of that new book, called *Twenty-Seven Beliefs* [sic., *Seventh-day Adventists Believe*]. But this is the official position in the *Church Manual* concerning the Gift of Prophecy. It is *Fundamental Belief, #17*. " . . . The Bible is the standard by which all teaching and experience must be tested."

That's the official teaching of our church books. I'm not making that up. By the way, this is the 1986 edition of the *Church Manual*,—the latest.

Okay, now, having said that; let's go to Ellen G. White herself; let me read it to you. I have all these [sic.] quota-

tions. I normally don't take along all this stuff, but I want you to get it from the horse's mouth . . .

The purpose of her writings is to discover the principles of the Bible and apply them to our day . . . Approximately 70 percent of her writings apply to Christian living. You see, the principles of the Bible are *eternal*, but the application has to do with culture, historical setting; you know.

For example, in the days of Paul, he said, "Ladies, please do not braid your hair." "Women, cover your heads." But the principles still stand: We have to have reverence in the church . . . She [Ellen White] applies the principles. [So her's are just as out-of-date.] And, of course, some of the things in her day have changed. One of them is riding bicycles, by the way . . .

How do we use her writings, in terms of solving theological problems?

Now, I have a lot of material; I'm only going to give you one because of time. I don't want you to go to sleep from [sic.] up there [balcony] and fall down, because I don't have the gift of miracles; not *yet!* [Laugh] . . .

Ellen White was not a theologian; I am sure she did not know Hebrew or Greek . . .

We have the same problem with the two rooms in the heavenly sanctuary. Please, don't make an issue of that; it's minor. Your not saved by rooms, folks! . . .

How should we use the writings of Ellen G. White on [sic.] the pulpit? [Quotes Ellen G. White sentences about not using her.]

Last December, I was asked to give a series of studies to the pastors of the Carolina Conference and the Atlantic regional conference. I was requested [asked this] by the man who is now the General Conference president. He [earlier] had me for a campmeeting, and he said to me, "You know, our pastors are not giving the Bible sufficiently, so can you help them?"

So I went there, and one of the topics I had to deal with was Ellen G. White and her use of her writings in preaching . . .

We have misused her until the people of this conference are sick and tired of Ellen G. White! We have used her as a hammer! We have told our young people, "Unless you do this, unless you do that, you will not be translated; you will not go to heaven. Folks, God never gave us Ellen G. White to use her writings as a hammer! . . .

[We are wrong when we] . . . use the Spirit of Prophecy to prove or defend a doctrine!

One minister went up and told me, "I want to prove you wrong from Ellen G. White." "No [I replied, you must prove me wrong] from the Bible." "No, from Ellen G. White." And I had to remind him that he would be misusing her writings [to instruct me from her writings in a private conversation].

Ah, I see, Ha! [laugh] [name] is betting— [Laughs at a comment from the audience.] Ha! Ha! I will give you a star in your crown! Ha!

When the main thrust of our message is from the Spirit of Prophecy, instead of the word of God, we are substi-

tuting Ellen G. White for the Bible; this is misusing her writings. [Apparently, the proper use of her writings is to leave them on the shelf collecting dust.] . . . When we do this, we rightly deserve to be called a "cult" . . .

Let us try to undo the damage we have done to our young people . . . I believe Walter Martin was right.

17 - WHAT ABOUT ELDER WEILAND?

Where does Robert J. Wieland, Donald K. Short, and the other *1888 Study Committee* lecturers stand in relation to Jack Sequeira and his teachings? It is well-known that these men have been close friends with Sequeira for a number of years, and that Sequeira has regularly been scheduled to lecture at Study Committee seminars. Yet, for years, historic Adventists have been concerned about Sequeira's bold attempts to stop the sharing of the Spirit of Prophecy writings, both in public and private. Complaints have also been lodged with denominational leadership about Sequeira's position on the Sanctuary and salvation. We have copies of some of the letters, dating back to 1987 and 1988. Surely, the leaders and speakers of the 1888 Study Committee knew about this. Surely, letters of concern were sent to them. Surely, they were told of Sequeira's use of a false Spirit of Prophecy "document," and improper use of other Spirit of Prophecy statements in an effort to support his anti-E.G. White positions. The situation became so bad that the Ellen G. White Estate tried to stop him from what he was doing (see write-in packet).

On the other side, statements written by R.J. Wieland indicate he is in agreement with Sequeira's beliefs (see letter quoted below). A statement praising *Beyond Belief* was published in a recent issue of the *1888 Study Committee* newsletter. It was penned by the editor, Helen Cate, and indicates she is in full accord with Sequeira's new book. In that article (*1888 Study Committee Newsletter, Vol. 9, No. 4, July-August 1993*), she speaks of "the beauty of the message," and says "it has been revived in current books by Arnold Wallenkampf, Robert J. Wieland, Donald K. Short, and others. But, in *Beyond Belief*, the Adventist Church has a systematic theology of the gospel honed by years of teaching it on several continents," and quotes his words (*BB, 9*) where he says "I have tried to present what God has graciously revealed to me through my own study of the Word and through the writings of Spirit-filled individuals past and present." As admitted in earlier sermons (noted earlier in this study) Sequeira relied heavily on his "mix" of friends in the universities and other denominations, for the new understandings which have led him to his present theological positions.

At the present time, it is well to take the following position in regard to Wieland, Short, and the *1888 Study Committee*:

(1) Conclusions will not be made as to what is taught at *1888 Study Committee* seminars, or believed by its lecturers—including R.J. Wieland and D.K. Short. They have their own lives to live and their own decisions to make. In forthcoming months, they may choose to openly side with

Sequeira or, instead, to oppose his teachings. That, of course, could dramatically change the situation. But that will be their decision. So far R.J. Wieland's defenses of Sequeira have only been in relatively private correspondence.

(2) Everyone should continue to be on guard: Be careful what lectures you attend—anywhere! If you hear error, leave right away and try to take your loved ones with you! Error will be in disagreement with clear Bible/Spirit of Prophecy teachings. Do not dally with strange new novelties or truth-twisting concepts. And, above all, fear to listen to men who refuse to be instructed by the Spirit of Prophecy, and fear to listen to those who defend them. Jack Sequeira is clearly against personal or public use of the Spirit of Prophecy; in fact, he is being asked by conference presidents to teach our pastors to stop using it.

It is a significant fact that the *1888 Study Committee* and its speakers are the only "independents" in Adventism who are permitted to speak and hold seminars in local conference churches throughout the world field. Why are they accepted and others are not?—*vf*

18 - WHAT ABOUT ELDER FOLKENBERG?

First, one brother in the Walla Walla area had written a number of letters to Jack Sequeira, in which quotations from the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy were included, in an effort to convince Sequeira that he was on the wrong path. But all to no avail. He had also repeatedly contacted church leaders in the northwest. In a letter to a friend, he discussed the problem, and mentioned that he also appealed to church leaders to do something about the false teachings which Sequeira was presenting to the college students at Walla Walla. In that letter, he mentions that Elder Patzer (at that time president of the conference) said that Sequeira was probably being "misjudged"—and then added that Elder Folkenberg knew what Sequeira was teaching, and thought it was right.

Second, in a different letter—this one by R.J. Wieland—are these words:

"Jack Sequeira wrote me recently that he knows that in the General Conference there are some 'secret believers who believe that the 1888 Message Study Committee is of God.' The pastor in Greensboro [North Carolina] knows the Folkenbergs well, says that she [Mrs. Folkenberg] has my books and loves them. Elder F., himself, loves Jack's message, which is in reality our message too. Let us be of good courage."

Third, we know from Sequeira's statement, in his *"Issues: The Spirit of Prophecy"* sermon (see partial transcript elsewhere in this study), that, before leaving the Carolina Conference presidency to become our world leader, Elder Folkenberg heard a series of messages by Sequeira at the Carolina Conference campmeeting, and liked what he heard. So, according to Sequeira, Folkenberg took him aside and specifically asked him to chair a worker's seminar for pastors in the conference—specifically to get them to accept Sequeira's position on the use (no use) of the Spirit of Prophecy.

Thus it would appear that Elder Robert Folkenberg, our General Conference president, fully accepts the theological package preached by Jack Sequeira.

19 - WE HAVE BEEN WARNED

We have been warned. Will we heed the warnings? Humanity is always seeking an easier way.

"Men are trying to make an easier way to heaven than that which the Lord has provided."—*Review, November 29, 1887.*

"Men hang with admiration upon the lips of eloquence, while it teaches that the the transgressor shall not die, that salvation may be secured without obedience to the law of God."—*Patriarchs and Prophets, 124.*

Contrary to what the false prophets teach, there are conditions. We must learn them for ourselves.

"We must know individually the prescribed conditions of entering into eternal life . . . We cannot allow those questions to be settled for us by another's mind or judgment.

"We must search the Scriptures carefully with a heart open to the reception of light and the evidences of truth. We cannot trust the salvation of our souls to ministers, to idle traditions, to human authorities, or to pretensions. WE must know for ourselves what God has said . . .

"It is not to be our study as to what may be the opinion of men, or of popular faith, or what the Fathers have said. We cannot trust to the voice of the multitude, but we want to know what is the voice of God, what is His revealed will . . . The Lord positively demands of every Christian an intelligent knowledge of the Scriptures."—*Review, March 8, 1887.*

Onward progress in sanctification is required for sanctification.

"But we are bound to give thanks alway to God for you, brethren, beloved of the Lord, because God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth."—*2 Thessalonians 2:13.*

Not only imputed—but imparted—righteousness is necessary.

"The world is seeking for those things that perish with the using; its diligence and activity are not exerted to obtain the salvation gained through the imparted righteousness of Christ."—*Series B, 226.*

"The gospel of Christ is the good news of grace, or favor, by which man may be released from the condemnation of sin, and enabled to render obedience to the law of God."—*Review, September 27, 1881.*

"We have been commissioned to go forth and preach the good gospel to every creature. We are to bring to the loss the tidings that Christ can forgive sin, can renew the nature, can clothe the soul in the garments of His righteousness, bring the sinner to his right mind, and teach him and fit him up to be a laborer together with God."—*Fundamentals of Education, 199.*

"This goody-goody religion that makes light of sin and that is forever dwelling upon the love of God to the sinner, encourages the sinner to believe that God will save him

while he continues in sin and he knows it to be sin. This is the way that many are doing who profess to believe present truth. The truth is kept apart from their life, and that is the reason it has no more power to convict and convert the soul. There must be a straining of every nerve and spirit and muscle to leave the world, its customs, its practices, and its fashions.

“If you put away sin and exercise living faith, the riches of heaven’s blessings will be yours.”—*3 Selected Messages*, 155.

“If ever there was a time when we needed faith and spiritual enlightenment, it is now. Those who are watching unto prayer and are searching the Scriptures daily with an earnest desire to know and do the will of God, will not be led astray by any of the deceptions of Satan . . . We want the truth on every point. We want it unadulterated with error and unpolluted by the maxims, customs, and opinions of the world. We want the truth with all its inconvenience. The acceptance of truth ever involves a cross, but Jesus gave His life as a sacrifice for us, and shall we not give Him our best affections, our holiest aspirations, our fullest service?”—*In Heavenly Places*, 350.

“That religion which makes of sin a light matter, dwelling upon the love of God to the sinner regardless of his actions, only encourages the sinner to believe that God will receive him while he continues in that which he knows to be sin . . . Unless their hearts are sanctified through the truth . . . they will be bound up with the tares.”—5 Testimo-

nies, 540.

“Many have invented a gospel of their own in the same manner as they have substituted a law of their own for God’s law. The gospel of Jesus Christ gives full recognition to the law of God, and declares the authority of God supreme. The gospel of Christ requires penitence for sin; and sin is the transgression of the law.”—*Review*, September 3, 1901.

“The law and the gospel go hand in hand. The one is the complement of the other. The law without faith in the gospel of Christ cannot save the transgressor of law. The gospel without the law is inefficient and powerless. The law and the gospel are a perfect whole . . . The two blended—the gospel of Christ and the law of God—produce the love and faith unfeigned.”—*Our High Calling*, 141.

“The law and the gospel are so blended that the truth cannot be presented as it is in Jesus, without blending these subjects in perfect agreement. The law is the gospel of Christ veiled; the gospel of Jesus is nothing more or less than the law defined, showing its far-reaching principles.”—*Review*, May 27, 1890.

Concluded

More WAYMARKS - from —

PILGRIMS REST

HCR 77, BOX 38A - BEERSHEDA SPRINGS, TN 37305 USA