

the "trial" in Washington I was accused of having been several times invited to me to Washington for a trial but had refused to come. Here is the truth.

M E M O R A N D U M

In the month of February 1958 a few of our leaders were in Glendale, and one evening I was called down to meet with them. They wanted to know if it was my intention to continue my agitation, and I answered, I was. Elder Figuhr invited me to come to Washington for a hearing or discussion, and the interview ended. A few days later I wrote him:

"If this is your desire, I am ready to come. I have only one request; that the hearing be public, or that a stenographer be present, and that I get a copy of the minutes."

---0---

Feb. 10, I received this answer:

"In compliance with your wish, the brethren see no objection whatever to recording our conversation. It is suggested that a tape recording would likely be the most practical way of doing this." R.R.F.

(I wanted a hearing; they spoke of a conversation. Several letters passed, but there was no further mention of a tape recording, nor of my getting a copy. So I wrote on Feb. 21:)

... "You did not answer my request that I be given a copy of the minutes. This is necessary for in any discussion of what is said or not said, it will be my word against that of twelve. I cannot afford to put myself in that position. I must have a copy of the minutes. This is the condition upon which I come." M.L.A.

Feb. 28, I received this reply:

"In regard to the matter of a record of the meeting, I think I indicated in my letter of Feb. 10, that the brethren had in mind recording on tape the proceedings of the meeting. This would provide a full record of what is said and done. We assume that such a complete record would be agreeable to you." R.R.F.

(This would be agreeable. But he avoided saying anything about my getting a copy, and this is what I had inquired about. I had already made the request twice. If he did not want to give me a copy, why did he not say so? Later it became clear that he never intended to give me a copy, yet he left the impression that I would get a copy. So I wrote again March 4:)

"I have received no answer. I am still awaiting it. On this point I must have definite assurance. I would appreciate an early reply." M.L.A.

(To this I received no answer, so I wrote again March 12:)

"I am still waiting for definite word that not only will a tape recording be made, but that I will receive a copy. As stated, this is a necessary condition." M.L.A.

---0---

(By this time five letters had passed, but I had received no answer to my repeated request. But this time I received an answer. On March 18 Eld. Figuhr wrote:)

referred to the desire to have minutes kept of the meeting and also a copy of the tape recording. In discussing this with the officers it occurs to the brethren to do this, which would seem fair to all concerned - a secretary to be appointed by the group to write out the conclusions we arrive at, and these to be submitted to the entire group for approval, after which each will be given a copy. We believe, brother Andreasen, that this suggestion will be agreeable to you. R. R. F.

---0---

(I had been promised a tape recording that would provide "a full record of what is said and done", and the hope was expressed that "such a complete record would be agreeable to you." Letter of Feb. 28. Now I was informed that there will be no stenographer, no tape recorder, no minutes, no record of any kind; a complete violation of the promise of "a full record".)

Four times I had asked for a copy of the tape recording. It may appear that I was oversuspicious, but each time I had received an answer which was intended to quiet my fears that anything was wrong, but instead they had aroused my fears that Eld. Figuhr was not playing the game straight. He wrote me later that he never intended and never said he would give me a copy. If so, his letters gave a wrong impression.

Elder Figuhr's letter of March 18, stunned me. Had I been writing to a man who could not be trusted, and who only told the truth after I kept prodding him? Whose every letter was a sidestepping epistle? It was of the same character that was used in the Barnhouse affair when our leaders completely refused to commit themselves on whether or not they had "totally repudiated" the Sanctuary and Investigative Judgment doctrines. Silence, of course, is an admission of guilt.

After some further and prayerful consideration I decided to write Elder Figuhr again. So I wrote;

"I have your letter of March 18 that I will not get a copy of the minutes, though I had been led to believe that I would. You state that a "secretary appointed from the group would write out the conclusions we arrive at, and these be submitted for approval to the entire group, after which each will be given a copy." What I want and what I was promised was a "full record, a complete record." YOUR BROKEN PROMISE CANCELS THE AGREEMENT."

---0---

("I could wish that the story ended here. But it is only the beginning. Eld. Figuhr wrote again on April 3 an explanation of what he had done, completely ignoring my statement of his broken promise, and making some amazing and untrue assertions.)

Writes he: "It is true as you state, that a tape recording was suggested at first, without a promise, however, of giving you a copy. Since making that suggestion, we have thought further about the matter, and believe that such recording would not be a wise plan to follow." (He himself had recommended it as the "most practical plan".)

"A tape recording", he continues, "of every little remark would not be fair to the participants." (Why not? It would be as fair to one side as to the other.)

He then affirms that the conclusions are all that is needed, and then makes the astonishing and violent untruth, "AS I LOOK BACK OVER YOUR LETTERS, THIS WOULD APPEAR TO BE IN ACCORD WITH YOUR OWN ORIGINAL SUGGESTION."

FALSEHOOD I

This is the greatest falsehood ever uttered. After I have argued page after page for a full, a complete tape recording, he now turns and says that I am the originator of the plan to have only the conclusions recorded. I would like to use a little three letter word which Christ used in John 8:55.

It is hard when a lay member lies. It is worse when a minister does. It is still worse when an officier falsifies. What shall we say then when the head of the denomination does not tell the truth, but deliverately and purposely falsifies? Note the situation; The elder sits and looks over my letters - those that are before the readers in the two preceding pages. I am arguing in them strongly for a tape recording, that I must have it, that that is the condition on which I come, that it is absolutely essential that I get it. And with these strong statements before him, he blandly suggests that not to have a tape recording but only a statement of the conclusions, a line or two, is my original suggestion. As it turned out, the conclusion is recorded as; "We hereby suspend M. L. Andreasen's credentials". And this, he says, is what I originally suggested! Now, this is not a slip of the tongue, or a hasty expression. He is sitting quietly, and deliberately falsifies. It is a monstrous falsehood. His attention has been called to it. He has made no confession of his sin. Therefore, it stands against him still.

FALSEHOOD II

I wrote him, "Your broken promise cancels the agreement". He pretended not to have seen it, and a month after writes, "Through others I have learned that you feel we have broken our promise." I had written, "Your broken promise". There is no "we" in my statement. For reasons best known to him, he says we have broken our promise. For reasons I do not care to discuss, he takes the omus away and says we. I said you. To pretend not to have read my statement with the letter before him, is not honest. He is trying to hide something. Why not tell the truth?

FALSEHOOD III

To the next letter he says, "You have now asked for a hearing". I often wondered why the Bible says to the angel of the Laodicean church that he is "faithful and true", and stresses that is the speaker; and that when he has done his work, those that are left are "without guile".

Of this, more in the following "letters".

M. L. Andreasen