

THE BEGINNING OF THE END: DH:101

The Martin-Barnhouse “Evangelical Conferences” and their aftermath

To faithful Seventh-day Adventists back in the mid-fifties it was a fearful doctrinal crisis in our Church. But to the believers in our day it is now seen to have marked the beginning of the end.

For the errors that the so-called “Evangelical Conferences” brought into our denomination grew throughout the sixties and seventies and were used by modernists in our Church, such as Desmond Ford, to lay a solid foundation for what is now called the “new theology.”

There would be no “new theology” in our Church today if certain of our leaders had not welcomed its theological roots back in the mid-fifties.

At that time, certain Evangelical Protestants asked a small group of our leaders to reconsider the stated doctrinal beliefs of our denomination—and, if possible, to restate them in “theological terms” that would be acceptable to the Protestant world around us. This seemed but a small concession in view of the golden opportunity held out before us: unity and fellowship with the other Protestant Churches.

There is wisdom in many counselors. And if many counselors had been consulted, they would have pointed out that unity and fellowship with the other Protestant Churches is not one of the objectives of the Second Angel's message of Revelation 14:8, much less that of the Third Angel which follows it.

“Babylon is fallen” and “Come out of her, My people” is the call; not “Go in and have doctrinal unity with her.” (Revelation 14:8 with 18:1-5, and Great Controversy, 603-4, 390)

But many in our time do not realize how firmly the error was placed in the foundations of the Church back in the mid-fifties. In fact, many do not realize that it was laid at all back then! But history is a wise teacher. As we study the past we are better prepared to understand the present and meet its challenges.

And the present has challenges. You will find as you read Section Twenty-one, of this lengthy documentary—that you are suddenly being thrust into the present.

Walter Martin is again demanding “answers” from the General Conference. He has recently told us so himself. The new set of “questions on doctrine” have already ready been submitted to them. What will our leaders do in reply? -What kind of doctrinal replies will they give?

And what kind of letters are you going to write? –urging them to stand true to historic doctrinal Adventism, in spite of the liberals and the Fordites in our midst and the Martin's and the other churchmen without?

This is no time to haul down our banner. The Third Angel's Message is inscribed upon it. God has placed you in this world at this time in history for a purpose. Stand true to that purpose, no matter what the cost may be. The Bible-Spirit of Prophecy teachings bequeathed to the Adventist Church are more precious than all else besides. Some go out to the modernists and others flee to the offshoots. But God wants men and women who will stand up IN the Church and “sigh and cry” for the abominations that now threaten it from all sides.

"The Beginning of the End" is urgently needed now;—more so than at any earlier time in our history. Read it carefully and then share it with others. Discuss the issues with those who need to know these issues, Seventh-day Adventists whom you are acquainted with.

Here is the story of the beginning of the end—how it came about and what it led to many years ago. Here is the story of the beginning of the great doctrinal apostasy of our time, that has since developed into a major "new theology "attempted takeover.

Here is the story of the beginning —at a time when we are nearing the end.

-Vance Ferrell, for Pilgrims' Rest

- SECTION ONE - 1977 -

"ADVENTIST HERITAGE" ARTICLE

(Although written and published twenty years later (in 1977), yet this article provides a very helpful introduction to the entire Martin-Barnhouse General Conference affair. We shall reproduce the entire article here. It is written from the standpoint of both a defense of the General Conference participation in these conferences and their subsequent publication of the book, "Questions on Doctrines." And this is good. This major documentary, "The Beginning of the End, " will start with a thoroughgoing defense of what was done back in the mid-fifties. In this way, as you read through this entire documentary, you will be enabled to have seen both sides of the issue from the large number of materials from articles, books, letters and personal statements that will be presented to you.

T.E. Unruh, along with Roy Allen Anderson, and LeRoy Edwin Froom, were the primary figures leading out in the Adventist side of those Evangelical Conferences. Walter R. Martin and Donald Grey Barnhouse were the leaders on the Evangelical Protestant side. Anderson was the coordinator and authority figure that kept the wheels rolling toward Adventist-Protestant unity in these Conferences. Froom was the researcher and the one, along with Anderson, who did most of the writing. Martin was the one who approached the Adventists for information and possible conferences to help him in the writing of his forthcoming book about our Church and its doctrinal positions. Although a little dubious about it all, Barnhouse was Martin's influential backer both in the Conferences and the writing of his book. Unruh was the man that initially got them all together to start with. His part in the later Conferences was not as significant. It was primarily Anderson, Froom, and Martin that made the decisions, wrote the books and led out in the defense of entire transaction, by which Adventists moved several significant steps closer to the fallen churches.

The following was a magazine article. It was entitled "The Seventh-day Adventist Evangelical Conferences of 1955-1956, " and was written by Elder T.E. Unruh (the Unruh mentioned above). By the time it was written (1977) only Unruh, Anderson, Fighur and Martin were still alive. One individual (the General Conference man who comments on the Evangelical Conferences later in this documentary) maintains that this magazine article was Okayed by Unruh but due to his advanced age not actually written by him.

Here is the complete article. It originally appeared in the Fourth Quarter, 1977 issue of "Adventist Heritage", a scholarly journal containing articles of miscellaneous interest to the lover of minute points of earlier Adventist history. Unruh is now deceased.]

The Seventh-day Adventist

Evangelical Conferences of

1955-1956

T. E. Unruh

Now living in Grand Terrace, California, T. E. Unruh is a retired minister. When the events described here took place, Unruh was president of the East Pennsylvania Conference.

A series of conferences between Seventh day Adventist and Evangelical leaders, begun in the spring in 1955 and running into the summer of 1956, led to the publication of two books: the first, *Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine*; the second, *The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism*. The first is a definitive statement of contemporary Adventist belief, established on a broad international consensus of church leaders and prepared for publication by a representative committee appointed by the officers of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists. The second work, by Walter R. Martin, a leading expert on American cults, defines and examines Seventh day Adventist doctrines, using the first work as source and authority. In his book Martin removed the Seventh-day Adventist church from his list of non-Christian cults and acknowledged that all whose beliefs followed the Questions on Doctrine should be counted members of the Body of Christ (the Christian church in the Evangelical definition) and therefore his brethren. While some Adventist and non-Adventist dissidents have been vociferous in their denunciation of the Adventist definitions and the Evangelical evaluation, in retrospect the conferences improved the understanding and appreciation of the Seventh-day Adventist church on the part of many Evangelical leaders, and likewise warmed many Adventist leaders toward the Evangelicals. It was a time when the gates between sheepfolds stood open.

There was no thought of precipitating anything of such historic consequence when I wrote a letter on November 28, 1949, commending Dr. Donald Grey Barnhouse for his radio sermons on righteousness by faith based on the book of Romans. At the time, Dr. Barnhouse was a popular radio preacher, minister of the Tenth Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, author of a number of Evangelical books, and founder and senior editor of the influential *Eternity* magazine. I was the president of the East Pennsylvania Conference, with headquarters in Reading.

In his reply to my letter Barnhouse expressed astonishment that an Adventist clergyman would commend him for preaching righteousness by faith, since in his opinion it was a well-known fact that Seventh-day Adventists believed in righteousness by works. He went on to state that since boyhood he had been familiar with Adventists and their teachings, and that in his opinion their views about the nature and work of Christ were Satanic and dangerous. He concluded by inviting this strange Adventist to have lunch with him.

We did not then get together for lunch, but we did correspond for a time. I returned a soft answer to the first letter from Barnhouse and sent him a copy of *Steps to Christ*, at the same time affirming the evangelical character of Adventists doctrine. I thought we had an agreement that Barnhouse would publish no further criticism of Adventists before there was further contact and clarification. However, in *Eternity* for June 1950, he sharply criticized *Steps to Christ* and its author. After that, I saw no point in continuing the correspondence.

The Barnhouse article was entitled, "Spiritual Discernment, or How to Read Religious Books." It illustrated the difficulty that conservative Christians sometimes have in understanding one another. Here a man of great spiritual stature, a bold crusader for truth, revealed his prejudice against Adventism and Ellen G. White, whom he erroneously called, "founder of the cult." Concerning the first chapter of Steps to Christ, entitled "God's Love for Man." Barnhouse charged that so much emphasis on God's love neutralize His justice and that extending that love to unregenerate man smacked of the universalism characteristic of the writings of the cult. He quoted a number of statements which he called half truths introducing Satanic error, like a worm on a hook, "the first bite is all worm, the second bite is all hook. That is the way the Devil works." Yet this man came to respect Ellen White as a sincere Christian and a great spiritual leader and to acknowledge that Seventh-day Adventists were his brethren in Christ.

In the spring of 1955, almost six years after my correspondence with Dr. Barnhouse began, I heard from Walter R. Martin, who had seen our correspondence and who asked for face-to-face contact with representative Seventh-day Adventists. Martin had written a chapter critical of Adventism in his Rise of the Cults and now wanted to talk with Adventists before doing further writing on the subject of our doctrines.

Walter Martin had come to the attention of Dr. Barnhouse when the former was in his early twenties, a graduate student in the history of American religion at New York University. By 1955 Martin had to his credit several books about American cults, which were recognized as standard works in that field. He was a consulting editor on the Eternity staff, a Southern Baptist clergyman, and a member of the Evangelical Foundation, known to the faithful as "How Firm a Foundation," an organization started by Christian businessmen who managed the financial aspects of the Barnhouse enterprises.

It was understood at the outset that Martin, a research polemicist, had been commissioned to write against Seventh-day Adventism. Nevertheless, he declared that he wanted direct access so he could treat Adventists fairly. When I explained this to friends at the Adventist headquarters in Washington, D.C., they agreed that Martin should be treated fairly, and provided with the contacts he sought. Martin expressly asked to meet LeRoy E. Froom, with whose Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers he was already familiar. Froom suggested the inclusion of W. E. Read, then a field secretary of the General Conference. I served as moderator or chairman throughout the series of conferences.

In March 1955, Martin came to Washington for his first meeting with the Adventists. With him was George E. Cannon, a professor of theology on the faculty of the Nyack, New York, Missionary College. At this first conference the two groups viewed each other with wariness. As the Adventists had anticipated, Martin had read widely from D. M. Canright, E. S. Ballenger, and E. B. Jones, as well as other detractors or defectors. Martin, for his part, seemed to expect a degree of resistance and cover-up, such as he may have met in some of his other investigations. This first meeting can best be described as a confrontation.

Martin began going through a list of questions which reflected his reading. We Adventists, rather than launching into a defense, began with a positive presentation in which we emphasized those doctrines held by our church in common with Evangelical Christians of all faiths in all ages. We stated our conviction that the Bible is the inspired Word of God and the only rule of Adventist faith and practice. We affirmed our belief in the eternal and complete deity of Christ, in his sinless life in the incarnation, in his atoning death on the cross, once for all and all-sufficient, in his literal resurrection, and in his priestly ministry before the Father, applying the benefits of the atonement

completed on the cross. And, finally, while setting no time, we affirmed our belief in the imminent premillennial return of Jesus Christ.

It quickly became clear to the Adventist conferees that both questions and answers would have to be formally stated in writing, that the answers would have to be made crystal clear to the Evangelical conferees and to those they represented, and that a way would have to be found to demonstrate the consensus we were sure we had. Martin was given books and periodicals to substantiate the claims we had made in our opening statement.

Following the first day of discussion both groups were busy into the night. The immediate concern of the Adventists was the list of questions with which Martin had begun his interrogation. Froom, who had a facile pen, took the responsibility of composing the initial answers, in a document running into twenty pages, whipped into shape by his secretary after hours. Until two o'clock in the morning Martin gave his attention to the reading matter we had given him.

The second day will never be forgotten by those who participated in the conferences. As the morning session began Martin announced that, as the result of the first round of discussion and the reading matter he had been given, he was admitting that he had been wrong about Seventh-day Adventism on several important points and had become persuaded that Adventists who believed as did the conferees were truly born-again Christians and his brethren in Christ. In a dramatic gesture he extended his hand in fellowship.

Martin faced serious problems as a result of his turn-about. He had become convinced that Adventists stood with other evangelical Christians on an impressive number of basic doctrines. He was not convinced that Adventists were right on doctrines we describe as "present truth," nor was he ever convinced of these. But how was he to write a book in which he would expose what he considered the errors of Adventism, while at the same time revealing his honest conviction that there existed sufficient common denominators to justify the inclusion of Seventh-day Adventists in the Evangelical Christian community - and still satisfy those who had commissioned him to write a book against Seventh-day Adventism? In his concern, he asked the Adventist conferees to join him in praying for divine guidance.

From the first formal meeting, to the publishing of the book QUESTIONS ON DOCTRINE, LeRoy E. Froom was actively involved in composing the written distillation of the conferences.

We Adventists also faced problems. The Evangelical conferees were satisfied that we were presenting contemporary Adventist doctrines, because we were supported by the 1931 statement of fundamental beliefs, which appeared regularly in official yearbooks and manuals of the church, and by the amplified statement in the baptismal covenant. But, they asked, if the Adventist church had reached a firm consensus why did they find contrary or misleading statements in Adventist publications, for sale in Adventist book and Bible houses? We explained that this was the result of efforts by the church to avoid an officially adopted creedal statement, and the denomination's preference for an open-end theology which permitted new light to penetrate in depth. This explanation did not impress them. They asked if we did not think that we ourselves were to some extent to blame if these erroneous statements were used against us. We could only reply that correction had begun.

While church leaders had known of the conferences from the start, a point was reached where we thought it was wise to make a formal report to the church. In a long letter to Froom and Read, dated July 18, 1955, I reviewed the progress in understanding achieved so far in the conferences, and expressed the hope that the Adventist conferees could be relieved of other responsibilities so as to have more time for what

was expanding into a significant encounter, soon to include such a notable Evangelical as Dr. Donald Grey Barnhouse. A copy of this letter was sent co R. R. Figuhr, president of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists. Thereafter Figuhr gave the support of his office to the conferences and the publication of the definitive statement of Adventist belief which resulted.

Martin's immediate concern was his relationship with his sponsor, Dr. Barnhouse. He reported to his chief his conviction that both had been wrong in their judgment of contemporary Adventists, whom he had become convinced were not cultists but truly members of the Body of Christ. He then asked Barnhouse if he, Martin, was still a member of the team, and if he should go ahead with the book he had been commissioned to write, which now would have to be different from the one they had projected. Barnhouse gave him some reassurance but was not troubled himself. Shortly thereafter he asked to have the conferees meet with him at "Barchdale," his home in Doylestown, Pennsylvania.

In anticipation of the extension of Evangelical participation in the conferences Froom early in August urged the enlargement of the Adventist conferee group. He recommended the inclusion of R. Allan Anderson as a regular member because of the latter's background as evangelist, college teacher of religion, author, and especially because of his gift for diplomatic dialogue with leaders of other communions. Anderson was the secretary of the Ministerial Association of the General Conference and editor of Ministry magazine. Since April he had been participating in the conferences. Thereafter he was a member of the team, a tireless and valuable participant in the preparation of the text of the developing questions and answers. We four Adventists were authorized by the General Conference to plan with Martin and Cannon for the meeting with Barnhouse at his home in Doylestown. The planning session was held in Anderson's Washington office on August 22.

So it came about that on August 25 and 26, 1955, we four Adventists, with Walter Martin and George Cannon, sat down with Donald Grey Barnhouse, one of the most influential men among American Protestants and internationally famous as a representative Evangelical, to discuss what Seventh-day Adventists really believe.

Having welcomed the conferees, our host expressed his deep desire that love might prevail, and invited the small company to kneel with him while he prayed for the Spirit of the Lord to be present and to guide.

Dr. Barnhouse, always a very articulate man, began the conference by explaining his attitudes towards Seventh-day Adventists. He told about his boyhood in California, near Mountain View, where he imbibed the prevailing view that Adventists were ignorant fanatics who believed the Devil to be the sin-bearer, and that a person had to keep the seventh-day Sabbath in order to be saved. Later, his bad opinions had been confirmed, he said, by reading books by men who had been Adventists but had left the movement, notably E. B. Jones. But since Martin had begun his conversations with the Adventists, and had shared his findings, Barnhouse had come to see that there were sober, truly born-again Christians among Seventh-day Adventists. With them he was glad to fellowship as brethren, while reserving the right strenuously to refute the two or three positions taught by Adventists which Evangelicals hold to be in error. On this candid note the Doylestown conference began.

In the first Doylestown conference there was much discussion of Froom's Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers, as providing an historical background for Adventism. It was clear that the Evangelicals had respect for Froom's scholarly attainments. Also, the questions and answers so far developed were reviewed in depth during both days of the conference. We came to see that many misunderstandings rested on semantic grounds, because of our use of an inbred denominational vocabulary. Our friends helped us to

express our beliefs in terms more easily understood by theologians of other communions.

Donald Grey Barnhouse, Jr., a theology consultant on Billy Graham's staff, sat with us for a time on the first day. That evening, having seen his father's attitudes change, the son challenged the father to reveal through the pages of *Eternity* his new position on Seventh-day Adventism. Before we separated that evening our host told us he had decided to do this, though he knew it would precipitate a storm and would cost him many subscriptions.

That same evening, in our motel, Martin and Cannon came to express their amazement over the change they had witnessed in Dr. Barnhouse. To them it seemed a miracle. To Martin it meant that he would not have resistance from Barnhouse in writing the truth about Seventh-day Adventism, as he had come to see it.

On the second day we observed a change in the attitude of Barnhouse toward Ellen G. White. Anderson called Walter Martin's attention to a statement in Mrs. White's *Testimonies to Ministers and Gospel Workers*, which Martin in turn passed to Barnhouse. The latter was so impressed with it that he excused himself to take it upstairs for his secretary to copy. The statement reads in part:

We should come to the investigation of God's work with a contrite heart, a teachable and prayerful spirit ... We should not study the Bible for the purpose of sustaining our preconceived opinions, but with the single object of learning what God has said.

... If there are those whose faith in God's word will not stand the test of an investigation of the Scriptures, the sooner they are revealed the better; for then the way will be opened to show them their error. We cannot hold that a position once taken, an idea once advocated, is not, under any circumstances, to be relinquished. There is but One who is infallible, - He who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life.

We appreciated the warmth, honesty and deep spiritual dedication of the man who was our host at "Barchdale." We have pleasant recollections of his hearty hospitality and that of his charming wife. Our entire days were spent at the Barnhouse home, necessitating our having our meals there. For these, Margaret Barnhouse went to great lengths exploring the unfamiliar land of vegetarian cookery.

Following the two days with Dr. Barnhouse the conferees went to their tasks with renewed confidence. We Adventists had come to see that we could state our doctrinal positions with clarity, in language understood by theologians of other churches, yet never bending for the sake of clarity or harmony alone. Our position was clearly stated by Froom in a letter to Martin:

In our statements we seek to honor and safeguard truth, not merely to pass ... scrutiny of some group. We are not seeking the approbation of any organization. All we ask is understanding of our actual teachings. We must live our own denominational life under the eye and scrutiny of God. Our sole purpose is to please Him, to whom we are accountable and whom we adore.

We saw that, while there had been doctrinal deviation, and this was still a possibility, it was essential for us to demonstrate the existence of a majority position, a preponderant view, that a consensus actually existed, and that we were correctly reflecting that consensus. As means to this end the General Conference arranged a trip for Martin to the West Coast, where Anderson was to introduce him to representative Adventists. On this trip Martin spoke in Adventist churches and met the staff of the Adventist radio station, *Voice of Prophecy*. In the East, Martin met with the staff of the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary and spoke at an assembly there. On

overseas trips he observed Adventist missions in action and found occasion to clarify misconceptions about Adventists held by missionaries of other denominations.

In another dimension, it was planned to demonstrate consensus by submitting the questions and answers to Adventist leaders in North America, and then around the world, using a mailing list of more than 250 names. The document by this time had grown to some sixty questions and answers, and was beginning to be thought of as having book possibilities - a definitive statement of contemporary Adventist theology, in convenient reference book form. A committee of fourteen members was appointed with General Conference approval, to prepare the document for distribution to church leaders, then to analyze and evaluate the feedback. Figuhr, the president of the General Conference, was chairman of this committee.* Correspondence relating to the project was entrusted to J.I. Robison, the president's secretary. The response was good, the consensus was demonstrated, and the decision to publish was made. Thus Questions on Doctrine came into being.

The conferees on the Evangelical side were also assessing the support of their new stand on Adventism. Martin, in November 1955, reported talks with Pat Zondervan, who was to publish *The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism* and who was interested in the new direction the book was taking. A month later, Martin reported going over the questions and answers in their entirety in a five-hour session with Dr. Barnhouse, and stated that Barnhouse was satisfied that Adventists were fundamentally evangelical in all matters concerning salvation.

Martin also reported that Frank E. Gaebelien had written to James DeForest Murch, stating his opinion that the Seventh-day Adventist church would qualify for membership in the evangelical group, if they so desired. Dr. Gaebelien was the founder and director of the famed Stony Brook School (of which Martin was a graduate), a member of the Reformed Episcopal church, and an official in the National Association of Evangelicals. Dr. Murch, prolific author of religious works, publications director and later president of the National Association of Evangelicals and the editor of *United Evangelical Action*, was a member of the Disciples of Christ.

**Members of the committee: R. R. Figuhr (chairman), A. V. Olson, W. B. Ochs, L. K. Dickson, H. L. Rudy, A. L. Ham, J. I. Robison, W. R. Beach, C. L. Torrey, F. D. Nichol, T. E. Unruh, R. A. Anderson, L. E. Froom, W. E. Read.*

An editorial committee chosen by the General Conference prepared the book SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS ANSWER QUESTIONS ON DOCTRINE, based on the points raised in the evangelical conferences. credit: Review and Herald

Meanwhile, correspondence between Froom and E. Schuyler English, editor of *Our Hope* and chairman of the revision committee of the Scofield Reference Bible, resulted in an editorial statement by Dr. English in February 1956, correcting misconceptions about Adventist doctrines as to the nature of Christ in the incarnation, the Trinity, and the completed atonement on the cross, followed by an article by Walter Martin in November 1956, the earliest affirmation of the essential Christianity of the theology of Adventism on matters relating to salvation to appear in a non-Adventist journal of note.

A second two-day conference at the home of Dr. Barnhouse took place in May of 1956, days which Barnhouse described as spent in mediation, communion, and discussion. This time our host questioned the Adventist conferees closely about our concept of the role of Ellen G. White as God's messenger to the remnant church and the weight the Seventh-day Adventist church gave to her writings compared to the Scriptures. There was also thorough discussion of the Adventist teaching regarding the

heavenly sanctuary and the role of Christ as priest, mediating the sacrificial atonement completed on the cross. By this time we had assembled an impressive exhibit of references which demonstrated that, from the early days of our church, Mrs. White had held the doctrinal concepts we were espousing, and showing that deviations of persons or groups were misrepresentations of the inspired messages, however sincerely held.

In August 1956, Russell Hitt, the managing editor of Eternity, came to Washington to go over with us the long-awaited Barnhouse article repudiating his former position on Adventism. Supporting articles by Martin, to follow in Eternity, were also gone over. We were given permission to quote or otherwise refer to these articles.

So it came about that a year after the first Doylestown conference, where Dr. Barnhouse had come to see that he would have to report his new position on Adventism, Eternity for September 1956, carried his article, entitled "Are Seventh day Adventists Christians?" The article was written with courage and clarity, and it was lengthy. The author began:

In the past two years several evangelical leaders have come to a new attitude toward the Seventh-day Adventist church. The change is a remarkable one since it consists of moving the Seventh-day Adventists, in our opinion, out of the list of anti-Christian and non-Christian cults into the group of those who are brethren in Christ; although they still must be classified, in our opinion, as holding two or three very unorthodox and in one case peculiar doctrines. The steps in our change of attitude must be traced and the justification of our changed attitude documented. Adventists who read this should realize that evangelical readers have been conditioned through the years for thinking that Adventists must be classified as non-Christians. This present article will explain reasons why this should no longer be so.

Barnhouse went on to give an account of the conferences and the mutual understandings resulting, and to announce the two forthcoming books, Martin's and ours. He defined the areas of agreement which he considered sufficient for identifying Adventists as members of the Body of Christ, within the evangelical definition. The three major areas of disagreement he described as conditional immortality, observance of the Seventh-day Sabbath, and the investigative judgment. To these he could give no credence at all, though the first two had historical foundation in the Christian church. The last he described as a doctrine never known in theological history until the second half of the nineteenth century.

The supporting articles by Martin appeared in later issues of Eternity. The first gave the historical background of modern Adventism, the second a comprehensive statement of what Adventists really believe, and the last dealing with Adventism's unique or unusual doctrines. In these articles Martin was both lucid and fair. And while Adventists did not find his criticism of their distinctive doctrines either palatable or convincing, they did appreciate his candor, as he wrote at the end of his second article:

However, whatever else one may say about Seventh-day Adventism, it cannot be denied from their truly representative literature and their historic positions that they have always as a majority, held to the cardinal, fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith which are necessary for salvation, and to the growth in grace that characterizes all true Christian believers.

Barnhouse, speaking for Martin as well as himself, ended his historic article with these words:

In conclusion, I should like to say that we are delighted to do justice to a much-maligned group of sincere believers, and in our minds and hearts take them out of the group of utter heretics to acknowledge them as redeemed brethren and members of the Body of Christ. It is our sincere prayer that they may be led to consider further the points on which they are so widely divergent from the rest of the Body of Christ and in so doing promote their own spiritual growth and that of their fellow Christians.

It was a sobering experience as the conferees came to this point in the lengthy dialogue to see the warm Christian friendliness of the Evangelicals. They expressed a concern that the Adventists might come to see as they saw. But they also realized that we Adventists, moved by the same Christian spirit, hoped that exposure to the special truths we believed would lead the Evangelicals to believe as we did. This we all saw as a dilemma of the Body of Christ, which only the Holy Spirit could resolve.

The expected storm broke quickly. There were at least a few of the peers of Barnhouse and Martin, English, Caebelein and Murch, for whom their stand was gall and wormwood. The Sunday School Times, published in the City of Brotherly Love where Dr. Barnhouse had his pastorate, carried a series of articles against Adventism. The King's Business, official organ of the Bible Institute of Los Angeles (BIOLA), ran articles by Louis Talbot, the editor, attacking not only the Adventists but the editor of Eternity as well. While these attacks could not be considered typical, they at least showed that the editor of Time was less than correct when he announced in the December 31, 1956 issue that the Fundamentalists had made peace with the Adventists.

The three part series Martin wrote for ETERNITY magazine cited points of agreement and difference between Evangelicals and Adventists. Though he still argued against certain doctrines, he acknowledged that they had been held by Church leaders throughout history, such as Luther. credit: Eternity Magazine

When Eternity lost one-fourth of its subscribers in protest, and the sale of Martin's books plummeted, Barnhouse asked anxiously, "Are you sure of your positions?" On Martin's affirmative answer, Barnhouse said, "Then we will go ahead." Within a year the Eternity subscriptions were higher than before, and there was again a good market for Martin's books.

Meanwhile, the General Conference of Seventh day Adventists was taking a direct hand in planning the book taking shape from the questions and answers. In September 1956 the General Conference Officers appointed a small editorial committee.* On January 23, 1957, the Review and Herald Publishing Association was invited to manufacture the book "as compiled by a committee appointed by the General Conference," accepting the manuscript in its completed form.

**Members of the editorial committee: A. V. Olson (chairman), W. E. Read, M. Thurber (book editor of the Review and Herald Publishing Association), W. G. C. Murdoch, R. Hammill, L. E. Froom, and R. A. Anderson, consultants.*

ETERNITY magazine, which carried both Barnhouse's and Martin's articles acknowledging Adventists as Christians, lost nearly one-fourth of its subscriptions as a result. The loss was temporary though, for within a year circulation was higher than ever. credit: Eternity Magazine

And on January 30 the executive committee of the publishing house accepted the manuscript for publication on a "text basis." The General Conference officers approved the title, Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine, and also the short title, Questions on Doctrine. The officers also approved the exact wording of the introduction as it later appeared in the book over the signature of the editorial committee. Here it was made clear that the book was the work of a representative

selection of participants, not of an individual, nor even of the committee, and that those preparing the answers made no claim to having provided the final word on Christian doctrine.

In September the officers recorded a series of actions having to do with publicity and distribution. Union conference papers and Adventist magazines would be asked to run advertisements. Non-Adventist periodicals would be invited to run ads and to publish book reviews. A suitable fourpage folder was to be printed for distribution to non-Adventist clergymen. High-ranking religious leaders in North America were to receive complimentary copies. Churches were to be invited to put copies in their libraries and to present complimentary copies to Protestant ministers in the community. Book and Bible houses were to stock Questions on Doctrine.

Questions on Doctrine was published late in 1957. It was designed to begin with the "Statement of Fundamental Beliefs of Seventh-day Adventists," first published in 1931, later given General Conference approval, and regularly included in church manuals and yearbooks of the denomination. This was to make clear to Adventists and non-Adventists alike, that in presenting an amplified statement on doctrine the General Conference was not setting forth a new theology, but was clarifying and amplifying the doctrines most generally believed by contemporary Seventh-day Adventists. Included in appendices was an extensive compilation from the writings of Ellen G. White, covering such subjects as the Deity and eternal preexistence of Christ and His place in the Trinity; His divine-human nature in the incarnation; His completed sacrificial atonement on the cross; and His priestly ministry in the heavenly sanctuary. These were the areas which had been found to be most frequently misunderstood and misquoted. This compilation was later included in Volume 7-A of the Seventh-day Adventists Commentary series. Many of these same quotations appeared in the Ministry magazine, between May 1956, and March 1957, under the title, "Counsels from the Spirit of Prophecy."

The editor of Ministry, R. A. Anderson, made sure during the months preceding the publication of Questions and Doctrine, that the Adventist clergy was fully informed of what to expect. He described the conferences with the Evangelicals and the removal of century-old misunderstandings. He explained the procedure for getting a doctrinal consensus from world leaders in the church. The unity of belief so demonstrated he attributed to the influence of the writings of Ellen G. White. There were also articles during this period from W. E. Read on the nature of Christ and from L. E. Froom on the atonement.

It came as a surprise to the planners, after the demonstration of a solid consensus from world leaders in the church and the preview in Ministry of what was to come, that Questions on Doctrine should be subjected to attack from Adventist sources. The critics seemed to be saying the same things, suggesting a common source. This was not hard to find. M.L. Andreason, a respected retired Adventist theologian, author and Bible teacher, had widely circulated eleven mimeographed documents and six printed leaflets addressed to the churches. In these the writer accused the compilers of Questions on Doctrine of attempting to change traditional doctrines, and he accused the officers of the General Conference of planning to revise the writings of Ellen White to conform.

A formal denial of these charges was prepared by A. V. Olson, a General Conference vice president, and chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Ellen G. White Estate. This reply, dated September 6, 1960, was sent at the request of the General Conference officers to officers of the overseas divisions of the church and to all union conference officers and local conference presidents in the North American Division. The incident was soon closed, and the author of the criticism made his peace with the church to which he had formerly given distinguished service.

The Zondervan Publishing House had originally scheduled publication of Walter Martin's *The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism* for January 1957, as part of the series on cult apologetics. There were delays, but so long as there was a possibility of his book coming out first he was supplied with page proofs of the Adventist book, so he would have reliable references. Martin had promised that in describing the teachings of contemporary Seventh-day Adventists he would only use statements from the book to be published with the approval of the General Conference. As late as October 1959, R. A. Anderson and W. E. Read, with H. W. Lowe, chairman of the Biblical Study and Research Group of the General Conference, were going over Martin's galleys, preparatory to writing a statement to be included in the book. *The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism* was, and is, a notable book. In the "Foreword" Barnhouse stated:

Since leaders of Adventism agree that this book fairly represents their theological position, this work is a milestone in Christian apologetics; for, during this study, brethren talked and prayed together, assessed each other's position and agreed to disagree while still obeying the Lord's command to love one another.

In the author's "Preface" Martin reminded both Adventists and non-Adventists that still to be healed were wounds caused by ignorance, prejudice, and an unforgiving spirit, of which Adventists as well as non-Adventists were guilty. But, he wrote, the place of healing is at the cross. Meeting there, we find strength and grace to keep the "lost commandment," that we love one another.

The Adventist statement, over the name of H. W. Lowe, as it appeared in Martin's book, asked that members of the Adventist church, when reading the last chapter of the book, in which Martin described his points of disagreement with Adventism, would remember the fair and accurate statement of Adventist teachings set forth in the earlier portions of the book. Lowe also expressed the gratitude and respect the Adventist leadership felt toward Martin for his correct recording of their beliefs and for his attitude of Christian brotherhood.

In retrospect, the publication of *The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism* and *Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine*, improved relations between Evangelicals and Seventh-day Adventists. Martin's book did not convince all Adventist isolationists that its author and Barnhouse spoke for the Evangelicals, or that fraternal relations were desirable or safe. And the publication of *Questions on Doctrine* did not convince all Evangelicals that Adventists were not heretics in Christian robes. Isolated attacks on Adventism continued. And Martin's book could not be bought in Adventist book stores.

Paul. Hopkins, the executive secretary of the (Barnhouse) Evangelical Foundation, struck a hopeful note in a letter to me, dated May 6, 1960:

Quite honestly, I can see that what you began with us is still only the beginning and I recognize that you are going to have the same problems within your group that we have in ours. There is much land still to be possessed before the members of the Body of Christ can recognize one another as we should. In the meantime, let us continue to work and pray that the day may come sooner than we might normally expect.

SELECTED SOURCES BOOKS

From. LeRoy Edwin. *Movement of Destiny*. Washington. Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1961.

Martin. Walter R. *The Truth About Seventh-day Adventists*. Grand Rapids. Zondervan Publishing House, 1960.

Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine. Washington. Review and Herald Publishing Association. 1957.

PERIODICALS

Eternity. June 1950. September 1956 - January 1957.

Ministry. May. September, December. 1956, January. March, April. 1957, March, 1958.

Sunday School Times. December 1. 1956 - January 12. 1957. The King's Business. April - June. 1957. Time. December 31, 1956.

INTERVIEWS

Mrs. Margaret Barnhouse. September 24, 1976.

Roy A. Anderson. December. 1976. January. 1977 (numerous).

LETTERS

Roy A. Anderson. to: LeRoy E. Froom. Oct. 1956.

Donald G. Barnhouse. to: T. E. Unruh, Dec. 1949.

LeRoy E. Froom, to: R. A. Anderson. Aug. 1956: Walter R. Martin

Jan. 1956: T. E. Unruh, Aug. Nov. and Dec. 1955, May 1960.

Paul Hopkins. to T. F.: Unruh. May 1960.

T. E. Unruh. to: Donald G. Barnhouse. Nov. 1949: LeRoy E. Froom and W. E. Read. July 1955

- "The Seventh-day Adventist Evangelical Conferences of 1955-1956," by T.E. Unruh, in "Adventist Heritage," Fourth Quarter, 1977, pages 35-46.

- SECTION TWO - STATEMENT BY A GENERAL CONFERENCE MAN

[The following statement is from a Seventh-day Adventist who was a leader in our denominational work at the time that the Martin-Barnhouse sessions (the 'Evangelical Conferences') were being conducted in Washington D.C. and elsewhere. He is now retired and living in North America. His comments are the result of personal observation and many private interviews and discussions that he had, at the time and in succeeding years, with Froom, Anderson and other fellow workers and leaders in our Church. He was a General Conference leader in Takoma Park at the time that the Martin-Barnhouse affair took place.]

Before publishing "Questions on Doctrines," typed copies of the manuscript were first sent to all of our top leaders throughout the world field. But although those copies went to our leading executives and editors, they were all very busy men. Most did not have time to personally examine all those papers. They just sent them back. Then too, the return address of the papers was Washington D.C. This was another deterrent. Many did not wish to be found opposing the General Conference.

One of our workers was at that time in an overseas division when the papers started coming in. [I was told the name of this individual. He is today very well known and now, as then, is very faithful to historic Adventism.] His president handed the sheets to him to look over. "I'm too busy for all this. See what you can make of it," he commented. Later he [the president's worker] told me, "If you think that book is bad, -you should have seen the originals! My president handed them to me. He was too busy to read it, so gave them to me to read. But when I told him what was in it, he wouldn't do anything about it. He just sent them back as they were."

When those copies of the "Questions on Doctrine" manuscripts went out, the Bible teacher at Avondale [College in Australia], told his reader [the one who corrected his class papers], "I've got a manuscript from the G.C. I'm busy. Read it and see what you think of it." When news of that went around the campus it created a furor.

But there were those who did object. And some very strongly. And when those original copies came back to Anderson and Froom, a lot of toning down had to be made. But then the revised copies were sent over to the Review for typesetting into the book. But the book editors at the Review and Herald couldn't swallow it. And so back it went to the G.C. for further revisions. This is why the book is so mixed up. Part of it is heresy and part of it is okay. The heresy was then more carefully worded to slip by the Review book editors.

Later, Martin held a meeting of Evangelicals that I attended. In his talk he told several things that the Adventists were going to do differently now because of his and Barnhouse' meeting with them. One of these was that the VOP [Voice of Prophecy] and Faith for Today would now be identifying themselves publicly for what they were. When the question period came afterward, I stood up and asked, "Is Charles Fuller going to identify the fact that he is a Baptist on his radio programs now?" Martin didn't answer it. [Charles Fuller was a well-known religious radio speaker back in the mid-fifties. Walter R. Martin is a Baptist]

R.A. Anderson told me personally that Froom didn't want to get into it. He said Froom wanted to stand for the landmarks, but we told him that for the sake of fellowship with the Protestants, we must do this. This will bring a new day for Adventists. He backed down so we could agree with the Evangelicals.

That is what I was told by Elder Anderson.

Barnhouse regularly blasted Adventists in his magazine. I was told that Martin found that Barnhouse would only quote from Adventist enemies in his article attacks on us. Martin has a lot of push to him. He told Barnhouse that if he wrote one more article against Adventists "without my okay, you can have my resignation." He told his wife about his decision, and that it may cost him his job. She said to go ahead. "Do what you have to; I am with you."

Martin was more willing to talk to both sides than Barnhouse was.

When they had those conferences, Martin was in the pilot's seat. He is smart. Some think he has a photographic memory. Froom would say something in a conference, and Martin would quote from his [Froom's] books where he had said it differently. Several times Froom had to eat humble pie. All this kept Martin one step ahead of the others.

One of the reasons they sent copies of the manuscript out to the top leaders was to implicate them in the responsibility for the publication. For the fact was that nobody would take responsibility for it at all. Here, a major book on Seventh-day Adventist doctrines, and under G.C. sponsorship-and no one would take the responsibility for writing it! To this day, few people have any idea who really wrote it. The by-line on the book just says "representative group of leaders, teachers and editors." (On the title Page of the book, beneath the book title, we are only told: "Prepared by a representative Group of Seventh-day Adventist Leaders, Bible Teachers, and Editors.") In a Review article, Figuhr [the General Conference President at that time] did back it up in an article. But that couldn't prove genuineness of doctrine, for he was the one who said in a Review article: "There was apostasy in Israel, but there is no apostasy today." And in another: "When Jesus comes, Seventh-day Adventists will be in the midst of the biggest building boom in their history." –And we had thought that the Adventists would be hiding in the woods before He came back!

You ought to read the R.A. Anderson letter to Grieve in Australia. Grieve [President of the Queensland Conference at that time] was more alert than many, but liberal at the same time. When he received copies of the "Questions on Doctrine" manuscript, he wrote Anderson and asked him what was going on. They both knew each other well, since Anderson was from Australia too. Anderson wrote him back and said, "Yes, we are trying to change the doctrines, but we want to take it to the ministry before we go to the people with it." Grieve later began teaching another error–instantaneous sanctification,–then was called to New Zealand, and then went out entirely and joined a Protestant Church. He had kept that letter on file, and still later, he showed it to an Adventist who Photostatted and printed it.

M.L. Andreasen was our foremost theologian in the 40s and early 50s. When he learned about "Questions on Doctrine," he violently opposed it. But it did him no good. He was living in the Loma Linda area at the time, retired. The brethren cut off his sustentation [denominational retirement pay] for opposing that book. Finally things became so tight that he was forced to go to the welfare office for help. [Back at that time, ministers on denominational sustentation did not receive Social Security benefits.] The poor guy asked if they would let him get on welfare. They asked him, "Aren't you an Adventist minister?" He was well-known among Adventists generally, and among non-Adventists in the Loma Linda area. "Yes, but they cut me off." So the welfare people got their lawyer to check what was going on, and pretty soon Andreasen was back on denominational sustentation again.

The whole thing was a mess. It got started and then grew like Topsy. Pretty soon the whole church was enmeshed in it. And we are still living with the problem today. No one has been able to get those errors out, once they got in.

It was Unruh, Anderson, Froom and Read that got it started, from the best I can tell. But Anderson and Froom did most of the writing. Anderson was the real leader on our side in the conferences. Martin and Barnhouse on the other side. And the two sides got together. All of them are dead now except Anderson and Martin. And we're still living with the problems they left us with.

-SECTION THREE - STATEMENT BY A SEMINARY STUDENT

The following statement, made by the editor of Pilgrims' Rest, will provide background information on the Martin-Barnhouse episode, from one who was a student at our Theological Seminary (then located in Washington D.C) during the time that the Evangelical Conferences were taking place, and when the "new views" began to be taught in the Seminary.

In June of 1955 I graduated with a Bachelor of Arts degree in Theology and Biblical Languages from Pacific Union College and packed for a plane flight to the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary to begin work on a Master's degree in the same two subjects. (The morning I was to board the plane in San Francisco, Cherie phoned and gave me her answer—she would marry me.) I flew on the cloud's to D.C. The following June, after four quarters of required work, I received the Masters' degree, and then drove west for our marriage in California. Two additional years and the Bachelor of Divinity degree was obtained, and we began denominational work as a pastor in the Adventist ministry.

Thus, I was in Washington D.C. and in attendance at the Seminary from June, 1955 to June, 1958. The conferences between Seventh-day Adventist and Evangelical leaders took place between the spring of 1955 and the summer of 1956. The effect of this did not filter down to the Seminary until the spring of 1956. And it did not reach the workers in the field until later in the year. Carefully placed articles in the "Ministry" magazine prepared the workers for the publication of "Questions on Doctrine." But relatively little was said about the matter in the regular church papers, and so the appearance of QD, itself, in our conference Book and Bible Houses (now called Adventist Book Centers) excited relatively little attention. It was just another book, although this one was released under the auspices of the General Conference and seemed to have helpful doctrinal information.

My major field throughout my Seminary work was in Systematic Theology, and with this focus I had the opportunity to be well aware of what was being taught at this important educational institution, located as it was, just next door to the General Conference Building and the Review and Herald Publishing Association. Until the spring of 1956, there was no word or hint in the Seminary classrooms of a "completed atonement" ("completed," not "complete") and "finished atonement" on the cross (with but merely an application later in the Sanctuary of the atonement ended at Calvary). I shall mention this "new view" and the controversies it generated in the Seminary classrooms, below.

Seminary students had to support themselves back in those days. In the late winter of 1955-1956, I was hired by the General Conference to work as a janitor in the General Conference Building. This was fortunate, for I badly needed the employment just then. A friend who was completing his B.D. was leaving the position, and he helped me slip into the job when he terminated it. The work assignment was night janitor and watchman. The several men working at this, dusted, stripped and waxed floors, emptied wastebaskets, and kept watch over the premises during the night hours.

Although not there during the day, I yet had the opportunity to observe and speak with many of our leaders who, with their many duties, came in after hours to keep up with all that needed to be done. I was decidedly impressed with the fact that a very few men directed the activities of the entire building. These were the General Conference President, Treasurer, Secretary (I do not mean the field secretaries), Lay Activities Secretary, and Ministerial Association Secretary. They alone carried about with them an atmosphere of authority that could speak and it would be done. The other officers seemed more subservient, cautious, and frequently, less secure in their hold on their position.

Each night janitor was assigned a different floor (1st, 2nd, and 3rd), and my job was to take care of the basement and to rotate with each of the other men so they could have a night off. In this way, week by week, I alone worked on all of the floors and cleaned all of the rooms. I was thankful for the work, although it was difficult to carry Seminary studies during the day while working in the General Conference Building at night. But my mind was quick and active and I had little difficulty in studying and memorizing. My work varied. Sometimes it began thirty minutes before closing time, and then went on through the night. At other times it began later and continued until the General Conference leaders and their secretaries came into the building the following morning.

One of the rooms that I cleaned was somewhat different than the others. This was the office of LeRoy Edwin Froom. It seemed more like a mimeograph processing center than a formal office. Entering it, one would find stacks of stapled 8 1/2x11 sheets ready to be sent off. These were usually stacked in two fairly equal piles on two wooden office chairs that were set on the entrance side of the single desk in the room. Around the room were files of various kinds. I would not know whether or not they were locked, for I never opened a drawer or file of any kind all the while I worked at the General Conference.

However, occasionally something out in the open would attract my attention. It was my assignment to clean the room, and here these stacks of papers were laying about, in my way. And worse, they were all about theology and I was a theology student. I would estimate that each of the two stacks of paper, resting on top of the office chairs, was about 30 inches high. Examining one, you would find that it was stapled in the upper left corner and was composed of several pages of typewritten material, on one side only of each sheet. As I recall, I believe they were printed rather than mimeographed. This was probably done on one of the small Multiliths in the General Conference Print Shop, located in the basement. The print shop was off-limits for the night janitors; they were never permitted to clean it) At the top of each stapled set of sheets was a question number. This was followed by a question, and then by an extended answer.

I was looking at the prototypes of single chapters of "Questions on Doctrine," immediately before they were sent out throughout the world field to the leaders of our various conferences, unions, divisions, institutions and publishing houses. (An interesting question: Was there only one mailout to the field, or in response to replies, was there a second revised one? From all the information I can obtain, only one edition of 'these questions and replies was sent out to those selected men in the field.)

By the late spring of 1956, talk about the Martin-Barnhouse conferences was beginning to make itself known in the corridors and classrooms of the Seminary. So I was no stranger to what was taking place. But I separated my janitorial duties from my Seminary work, in that I did not discuss that which I saw in Elder Froom's office with others.

I might mention at this point that there were no stacks of QD papers in anyone else's office in the General Conference. And this included that of Elder Anderson, Read, and Lowe, and all of the rooms of the office secretaries. At the time, my impression of the situation was that Elder Froom was primarily doing his actual writing and research work at his residence in the Takoma Park area, not far from the General Conference headquarters, and that he was only using his office in the General Conference as a distribution center, and for miscellaneous correspondence that he had not tended to at home. Perhaps this might have included dictation. The office definitely did not look as if it were used very much. And there were few, if any, books in it. (Whether there were any books in it, I do not now recall. Froom probably had one of the largest libraries of any man working in the General Conference at that time. He had been doing research for the Church for many years.)

Those stacks of paper on the chairs would frequently change. For each week there were new numbered items; usually the next in sequence.

In the spring of 1956, the full impact of the Martin-Barnhouse conferences was being felt. At this time, the great majority of the students in attendance at the Seminary were older and more mature men—ministers and overseas missionaries. Very few were young men, fresh out of college. Because of this, when the changes came in, there was a much stronger reaction than would have occurred if the conferences and subsequent changes had taken place in our own day. Here is the theological picture, as it emerged at that time in the Adventist Theological Seminary:

The Nature of Christ theological cluster did not become a prominent issue. But this would be understandable. The Seminary at that time reflected General Conference thought far more than it does today. And the leadership had expurgated the old view of the Nature of Christ nearly a decade earlier from denominational books and magazines. The Adventist ministry was already partially acquainted with the new view. Although there was some comment and disputation over this area, it was much less noticeable than the errors regarding the Finished Atonement and the Spirit of Prophecy relationship to our doctrinal beliefs.

In regard to the error of the Finished Atonement, it was quite obvious that the Seminary faculty had been carefully briefed by somebody that Spring in the new view. And it came with such authority that they either solidly stood by the new dictum or they avoided the subject. Definitely, no one opposed it. For example, Earle Hilgert and Edward Heppenstall presented it in their classes, while W.G.C. Murdoch was more careful to side step discussion of it:

But some of the men sitting in the classes would speak up and quietly mention that this was something new to Adventism that had never been heard among our people before. After some discussion, they would quiet down, and gradually their complaints would subside. But they never appeared convinced that the new view was the correct one.

Then there was the issue of how the Spirit of Prophecy was involved in the formation of our doctrinal beliefs. At exactly the same time that the Finished Atonement began to be presented, we began to be summarily told that Ellen White had nothing to do in any way with the formation or development of Seventh-day Adventist doctrines. We were told that all of our doctrinal positions, without exception, were given to us by men in the Church who developed them independently of Ellen White and her writings. No doctrinal beliefs of Seventh-day Adventists comes to us from or through the Spirit of Prophecy. –Do you believe that? I do not. And with some others, and more than most, I vigorously protested at this innovation. Exchanging the Spirit of Prophecy for fellowship with the Evangelicals seemed a poor trade.

What was the proof for their contention? One passage from the Spirit of Prophecy, and only one, was cited: 1SM 206:4207:1. We were told that in this passage Ellen White clearly showed that as our doctrines were developed [in the 1840s, and especially at the "Sabbath Conferences" of 1848], her mind was locked to an understanding of doctrines until all of the men in attendance at those "Sabbath Conferences" were fully in harmony and settled on each and every doctrinal point. But a careful reading of this passage (1SM 206-207) reveals something different: Her mind was locked so that the brethren would have confidence in knowing that what she then gave them in answer to their confusion was direct light from God, rather than from her own thinking. In their prayer and study they could only go so far, and they would reach an impasse. At this point, she would be taken off in vision-and then give them the correct interpretation of the matter being discussed. This happened time after time. -It was the God of heaven through the Spirit of Prophecy that gave us our doctrines, not men--this man or that man or any group of men--and not Ellen White by herself. The teaching was Heaven born. Why are some of us so anxious to exchange the heavenly origin of our teachings for majority votes based on the varied thinkings and speculations of His creatures? We have here a striking parallel to the concern of the evolutionists to trace their physical origins to the creature rather than to the Creator.

This theme of "no Spirit of Prophecy involvement in our doctrinal development" is not as clearly shown in QD or Martin's book, TASDA, but it was very prominent at the Seminary at that time, and from what I was told, was prominent in workers' meetings in various places. (After the changes were crystallized, they were presented to Adventist workers in special meetings all over North America and overseas. It seemed that the primary concern was to take the message to the workers, rather than to the laymen. Apparently it was felt that if the workers were brought into line, the laymen would soon follow along. In 1956 the new message was that no doctrinal messages came to Adventism through the Spirit of Prophecy. In the 1980s the message coming to us is but a variant: The Spirit of Prophecy has no doctrinal authority in the Church. This was clearly implied in QD, and for twenty-five years we have been reaping the effects of that teaching.

At the Seminary at that time, there was also some talk about obedience to the Law of God as being only "the fruit of salvation," rather than the Bible-Spirit of Prophecy truth in the matter. (Obedience is the fruit of conversion. Our salvation is not assured at conversion, and salvation is not imparted to us irrespective of obedience to the written will of God. Any man, who knowingly disobeys God, will not be saved while continuing in that disobedience.)

It requires only a cursory examination of the issues developed in "Questions on Doctrine," and in Martin's reply, "The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism," as well as the many accompanying magazine articles issuing from both camps, to see that the above four were the primary issues in the Martin-Barnhouse doctrinal sell-out. [1. Christ inherited the nature of Adam and not the nature of His human forbears. 2. The Atonement was completed on the cross. All that followed it, in Christ's heavenly ministration, was post-atonement in nature. 3. Doctrinal authority in our Church lies with men and with their interpretation of Scripture, not with the Spirit of Prophecy. We know this to be true because no doctrinal position or knowledge of any kind came to us through the Spirit of Prophecy. The visions always followed human speculation and merely confirmed them. 4. Obedience to the Laws of God are merely something nice to do. It is "fruit" of salvation and follows salvation. But it is never necessary to salvation.]

After classes during the day, I would study and rest a little and then go to my evening work assignment at the General Conference Building. But there was one evening that I shall never forget. Here is the story.

Opening Elder Froom's office door in order to clean his room, I was by now quite used to the stacks of papers. Hurriedly, I dusted into every corner of the floor, strode over to the wastebasket and began to take it out, so I could get on to the next room,—when I noticed a letter resting open and neatly placed, squarely in the center of what was always an otherwise barren desk top. Now, I am not the type to read other people's mail. But it seemed that I should stop just then and read that letter. I did not copy the letter, nor did I take it, but I have often recalled its contents over the years. On a very few occasions I have mentioned a little of the experience. Here is the information given in that letter:

A girl had fairly recently accepted the Adventist message and had been baptized. Her father and mother upon learning of this were deeply upset. In reaction, they wrote to a well-known defender of Evangelical Protestantism of the —dayDr. Donald Grey Barnhouse,—a widely-known speaker and editor of "Eternity" magazine. They told him of the terrible thing that was happening to their daughter and then pled with him for help. Their daughter was defecting from Christianity to Adventism and they felt terrible about the matter. Dr. Barnhouse wrote them a letter in reply. In it, he said that he and his associate, Walter R. Martin, had been carrying on a deepening series of consultations with the Adventist leaders in Washington D.C. for about a year. He then told the girl's parents that he and Dr. Martin were working to bring Seventh-day Adventists into harmony with Evangelical Protestantism—by actually changing their doctrines. And he encouraged the couple with the assurance that he and Mr. Martin were succeeding.

The point was clearly made in the letter that he and Martin were working to change Adventist doctrines and that they were succeeding.

The letter then went on to explain that when the parents received the letter, they felt somewhat relieved. But they also saw it as proof that the Adventist message was so bad that even its leaders were being talked into forsaking it. They then showed the letter to their daughter, hoping that it would convince her to come back to the religion and church of her parents. But they did not merely let her read it; they gave it to her. Greatly upset, she took it to church and showed it to her Adventist pastor. Someone got in contact with someone, and as a result, this letter from a denominational worker was addressed to Elder L.E. Froom.

And enclosed with it, was the original typewritten letter that Barnhouse had sent to the girl's parents. I read that letter also. The letterhead was entitled "Eternity Magazine," with "The Evangelical Foundation, Inc." beneath it. Below that, to one side in smaller print, was Dr. Barnhouse' full name. It was the originally typed letter, and was signed by Barnhouse, with indication beneath that a secretary had done the actual typing.

The Barnhouse letter had been neatly placed below the cover letter on the desk in a very precise manner that squared and centered it with the larger rectangle of the desk edges. Somehow, in the florescent light from overhead, I had thought that there was but one letter there. I probably wouldn't have stopped to read the first one if I had thought that there was more beneath it.

But then below it— I found the Barnhouse letter. But in picking up the single-page letter by Barnhouse, I noticed that another typed letter was directly beneath that one. Having completed the Barnhouse letter, I turned my attention to what was beneath it, and found it to be a letter on General Conference stationery. Written and signed by Froom, it was addressed to Barnhouse.

In reading it, I had the impression that Froom, having read what I had just read, was so upset that he had written this letter to try to obtain some renewed confidence

from Barnhouse that all was all right after all, and that Barnhouse was not really trying to pull something over on the Church. The thought of the letter was essentially this: I have not heard from you for so many weeks [a number given], and I do not understand. I have written you several letters and you have not replied. Brother Barnhouse, I do not understand. You have not replied to certain things I have asked. And there are problems that I am hearing of. I have never had reason to question your motives. But the fact that you do not reply is causing me to wonder.

Now, that may not seem like a very clear letter. But I give it as I recall it. Froom did not intend that it be clear, but rather to prompt a reply. One would think that Froom would have just telephoned Barnhouse. That is what you would expect of busy executives. Why he wrote the letter instead of phoning him, and why he wrote it in that way, and what he may have had in mind,

I cannot say. It was known that Barnhouse was often on the road traveling and lecturing. One issue of "Eternity" mentioned the difficulty they had in contacting him, themselves, for executive editorial decisions in regard to the magazine. But one would still think that Froom could have reached him by phone, with the help of someone in the "Eternity" headquarters in Philadelphia.

But it was the cover letter from an Adventist denominational worker, with the information it contained, and the enclosed letter by Barnhouse that was important. For it revealed a primary reason why Martin and Barnhouse were involved in the conferences. Their concern was not merely to write a book; Martin could have tended to that very well without embroiling Barnhouse and several top Adventist leaders in discussions that lasted over a year. Their concern was to convert an entire church!

But the Froom letter was nonetheless significant. For it revealed that, even at this late date, he was not yet clear as to the real objectives of Martin and Barnhouse. If Froom had been fully a party to what they were trying to do, I would not expect him to pen such a letter in reply.

I recall very distinctly (it came almost as a shock to my mind) that it was not over a week after reading this letter, that I sat in the chapel at the Seminary with students and faculty and listened to a half-hour up-to-date summery by Elder Froom of events in the Evangelical conferences with Martin and Barnhouse. In this talk he said this: "In all the time that I have known Dr. Barnhouse, I have never had reason to doubt his motives." He then went on to say that he had always found the integrity of Dr. Barnhouse to be unimpeachable. I was stunned as I listened to this. For I had read those letters only a few days earlier. And there was no doubt in my mind that Dr. Froom had read the top two letters on his desk also, and that he had penned the pleading one beneath them that had his signature on it. I shall never forget what I have just told you. I have shared it with few people over the years, but it is graven on my mind. I have often thought about it.

In the providence of God, those letters were laying on that table that night. And, truly, I do not think I should keep quiet about it now, 26 years later, as I prepare this lengthy study about the Martin-Barnhouse incident.

Among our various Church articles, later published to describe the conversations with Martin and Barnhouse, one of our leaders mentioned that in connection with them Walter R. Martin gave three major talks before Adventist assemblies. These were in the Takoma Park Church, the Adventist Seminary, and the Loma Linda [Hill] Church. I heard the two of these lectures that were given on the East Coast. And it was a revelation to hear Mr. Martin in person. When he speaks, the words come out as overpowering bullets. Powerful and convincing is his personality. And those who met with him for a full year did well if they resisted the dynamic force of his convictions and personality. I still recall his sermon in the 11 o'clock hour that Sabbath morning at the Takoma Park

Church. Significantly, his text was Acts 17:23. With powerful rhetoric he told us that morning about the Athenians who were ignorantly worshipping an unknown God. They were being "too religious," he pointed out (citing the original Greek of "too superstitious" in verse 22). And then, in a strong and powerful voice he cried, "Him whom ye worship ignorantly; -Him declare I unto you!" And he went into a decisive presentation of salvation by grace alone, while at the same time avoiding a direct attack on our beliefs.

Recently I listened to tapes of a February, 1983 lecture by Dr. Martin. (Since I heard him in Takoma Park he has obtained a doctorate.) Seventeen years have passed and he now exhibits a calm intensity. But the Walter Martin of the mid-fifties that molded the course of those Evangelical Conferences was a powerfully persuasive and forceful individual. Urging "unity" he pled for conformity. And with strong feeling and words he obtained it. This was the man who led out in the conferences with Seventh day Adventist leaders from the Spring of 1955 to the Summer of 1956. This was the man that "Questions on Doctrine" was written to please.

-Vance Ferrell

- SECTION FOUR - - 1971 -

FROOM'S "MOVEMENT OF DESTINY"

[LeRoy Edwin Froom had been a key researcher for the General Conference staff since the 1930s. He had been around a long time, and had had his finger in many doctrinal puddings, according to what he tells us in his book, 'Movement of Destiny,' published in 1971.

He was present when R.A. Anderson and others revised Uriah Smith's "Daniel and Revelation " and our precious "Bible Readings for the Home" in the 1940s. And to this must be added the efforts of Froom in the 40s and early 50s to win friendships in Protestant theological circles. Later, as he relates, others in the General Conference united with him in this task as they sought to effect doctrinal reconciliation with their "separated brethren. " The one most in error is the one who needs to make the most amends. And apparently there were some who felt that what Adventism inherited from God through the pioneers and the Testimonies were less accurate and pure than the assorted vagaries of modern Protestantism.

It is a striking fact that we know of not one instance in which Schyler English or Walter Martin or Donald Barnhouse gave in on a single doctrinal point in the entire affair. – All the submitting came from the Adventists. All the compromises were for us to make. From start to finish, Evangelical Protestantism provided the STANDARD of doctrinal purity that should be attained. Not once was it ever suggested by W.R. Martin or D.G. Barnhouse or E.S. English that anything of worth was to be found in Adventism that Protestantism did not already have.

As LeRoy Edwin Froom neared the end of his life 's journey, he wrote a book: 'Movement of Destiny. "And, quite frankly, we are indebted to him for having done so. In "From Author to Reader " (pages 17 to 23 of the book), he tells us that he wrote the volume in order to explain (or rewrite?) Adventist doctrinal history. But he is careful to mention that he could not do so until enough others had died off to make such an attempt practical.

Then, as we traverse the book, we find that the theme parallels the concerns of 'Questions on Doctrine: "Arianism must go; the nature of Christ teaching must be revamped; the atonement must be seen as being finished at the cross; Ellen White did not originate Adventist doctrines; Adventists have been too much concerned about obedience to the Law of God.

What is this about 'Arianism?" Arianism is the erroneous teaching (attributed to Arius of Alexandria about the year 320 A.D.) that Christ was created at some time back in antiquity, or to put it another way, did not exist prior to some time in eternity past. Over the years a few Adventists have believed this concept (as have members of many other churches, as well). Why then all the fuss by Froom over Arianism, if so few espoused it in the past and there are few debates about the matter in our day? In "Questions on Doctrine, " in Martin's articles and book, and in 'Movement of Destiny," we find a common theme: Some Adventists members in the past have had a few strange oddities; but these are now being corrected. One good example of these doctrinal inaccuracies was Arianism. Of course, we had to get rid of that! Oh, by the way, we got rid of a few other peculiarities also. Uh, such as the Atonement completed after Calvary; the nature that Christ inherited was that of those He was born of–his forbears; etc.

"Movement of Destiny" is a lengthy attempt to explain how we gradually put away all those errors. The significant portions of this book are quoted below. They will tell you that most of the efforts to make the changeover in the crucial doctrines took place in the 1940s and 1950s, and were nicely completed by then. There is reason why the "new theology " has grown so wondrously in the 60s and 70s. The reason is to be found in the changes that were made in the 40s and 50s in our published doctrinal statements.

It is true that Froom and Martin did not try to destroy our Sanctuary Message. What they did was to lay a strong foundation upon which the "new theology " could later do this vital work. If there is no atonement after Calvary, there is no need of a Sanctuary ministry by Christ in heaven. And there is no need of an Investigative Judgment to conclude that atoning work in heaven. Martin and Froom provided the bullet; the 'New theology "provided the gun to propel it; now the shots are being fired.

We should here note one other common theme of "Questions on Doctrine," Martin's writings about Adventism, and "Movement of Destiny:" the reason for the changes was to help us have fellowship with the Protestant churches and thus fulfill our destiny. Doctrinal purity is less important than is the ecumenical unity that is sought. According to Froom, the destiny of the Movement is fellowship with the fallen churches. And, he tells us, it has taken years to bring the Church around to the point where this can be done.)

We are living in an age when people like to have the whole story. It should be as honest and as accurate as possible, and the facts should support our conclusions. Providentially, we believe, God prepares certain individuals to answer specific needs. I am convinced that one of these unique persons of God's choosing is Dr. LeRoy E. Froom, the author of this book.

The preparation of this volume began about forty years ago, when the author was alerted by church leaders to prepare himself for this particular long-range assignment. At times the responsibility of this spiritual mission weighed heavily upon his soul. There seemed to be so many roadblocks, and there were scores of times when it seemed likely that the value of this book might never be recognized. But now, in retrospect, we can see God's timetable and wisdom. He knew exactly when the Remnant Church, and its leadership, would be under attack. He knew when this book would be needed most! Accumulating these materials has taken years of work with relentless determination.

Neal C. Wilson, Vice-President
General Conference for the North American Division
Chairman of Guiding Committee for Movement of Destiny

[The above Preface to the book was written by Elder Wilson. The remainder of the book was authored by Leroy E. Froom.]

How This Portrayal Came to Be Written

Proposal Originated With A.G. Daniells. –Back in the spring of 1930 Arthur G. Daniells, for more than twenty years president of our General Conference, told me he believed that, at a later time, I should undertake a thorough survey of the entire plan of redemption—its principles, provisions, and divine Personalities—as they unfolded to our view as a Movement from 1844 onward, with special emphasis upon the developments of "1888," and its sequel.

.. His urge met with a definite response in my heart, for I was keenly interested in such a project. But I was awed by its magnitude and far-reaching character. I thought of it as for someone else, more mature and experience, to undertake. No, he said, he felt it

was for me to do-for I had gotten a vision of it, and had a background and burden for it. And I was a connecting link between past leaders and the present. But, he said, it is to be later -not yet, not yet.

Difficulties to Be Surmounted.-Elder Daniells recognized the serious problems involved, and sensed almost prophetically certain difficulties that would confront. He knew that time would be required for certain theological wounds to heal, and for attitudes to modify on the part of some. Possibly it would be necessary to wait until certain individuals had dropped out of action, before the needed portrayal could wisely be brought forth.

.. Then came assigned participation, as one of a team, in a series of conferences with Evangelical leaders, and a part in connection with "Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine, " under R.R. Figuhr's presidency. This was followed by the two-volume "Conditionalist Faith of Our Fathers," as an outgrowth of "Question 44"- "Champions of Conditionalism Span the Centuries." Thus once more in preparing "Conditionalist Faith," I was led across the centuries, reviewing and strengthening the sweep of the historical theology of the Christian Era.

And all the while I was teaching these subjects one quarter a year at our Theological Seminary, at Andrews University, which afforded opportunity not only for continuing research but for releasing my findings in the classroom. All this was invaluable.

Signals to Proceed Indicate the Time.-Then the hour came, indicated by a series of unquestionable providences and directives, along with encouragement by Seminary leaders to proceed with this exacting search, and the development of Seminary course. Charts were produced and source materials assembled. Then came unexpected calls for workers' institutes, local and union ministerial retreats, theological workshops, and presentations to special groups-Bible teacher, professional, university, college, colporteur. The project was definitely under way.

This was followed by the widespread urge from leaders at General, union, local, and institutional levels that I now carry this enterprise through to completion in written form. These counselors included administrative education leaders, together with Andrews University, Ministerial Association, and Research Department leaders, as well as certain editors, Bible teachers, evangelists, and mass-communications men. The time had clearly come to proceed with the writing.

.. Last was A.V. Olson. A loyal and sound Adventist leader, fearless and forthright, he would never trim or compromise. He had a rich background of experience, and we constantly conferred together over my researches. He knew precisely what I was doing and much that I had found, and rejoiced over the results. He sensed their value to the Church, for he had made a paralleling search into this particular area. He too charged me straightly not to falter, but to get to the bottom of the facts, to reveal the resultant findings, and to be candid and undeviating in my presentations, correcting misconceptions and false impressions where needed-and providing a sound setting for the final advances.

LeRoy Edwin Froom

Washington, D.C. January 1, 1970

[The following are excerpts from later in this book:]

IV. Elimination of Erroneous Note in "Bible Readings"

1. Erroneous Position Injected by Colcord.-Cognizance must also be taken of the correction, in 1949, of a definite error appearing in a note on the nature of Christ during

the Incarnation. For years it had appeared, unchallenged, in the standard "Bible Readings for the Home Circle." It was in the section on "A Sinless Life." Apparently it was first written in by W.A. Colcord, in 1914. It likewise involved one of those questions upon which there had been variance of view through the years. Colcord had declared that during His incarnate earthly life Christ "partook of our sinful, fallen nature"(p. 174).

This was another of those issues upon which there had been definitely divided opinion, although the witness of the Spirit of Prophecy and the involvements of the note had not been brought to issue. It had not been considered of sufficient import to be touched upon in our statement of "Fundamental Beliefs" of 1931.

Latitude had therefore been the accepted attitude on the question. As a result, Adventists had long been censured by theologians not of our faith for tolerating this erroneous minority position, and this particular printed statement.

2. Erroneous Note Deleted.-In 1949, Prof. D.E. Rebok, then president of our Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, when it was still in Washington, D.C., was requested by the Review and Herald to revise "Bible Readings for the Home Circle." Coming upon this unfortunate note on page 174, in a study on the "Sinless Life," he recognized that this was not true. But in eliminating the note he found that some still held with Colcord in his position.

.. So the inaccurate note was deleted, and has remained out in all subsequent printings. Thus another error was removed through these revisions of the 1940's, as concerned some of our standard and otherwise helpful books.

[The following introduces the Evangelical Conferences:]

I. Door of Access and Dialogue Open to Us

1. Inquiries Come When We Are Prepared.-Time and circumstance had done their work. A new day had dawned. As a Church we had achieved unity of view as concerns the complete and eternal Deity of Christ-expressed initially through our

"Fundamental Beliefs" statement of 1931, followed by others. The Act of Atoning Sacrifice completed on the Cross -in right relation to Christ's Priestly Mediation -was similarly set forth in the Baptismal Certificate of 1941, with both permanently ensconced in the Church Manual.

The removal of the last standing vestige of Arianism in our standard literature was accomplished through the deletions from the classic D&R in 1944. And the lingering "sinful-nature-of Christ" misconception was remedied by expunging the regrettable note in the revised "Bible Readings" of 1949.

It is significant that once these were cared for . . . searching questions began to be asked with remarkable frequency, and vital contacts through inquiry made by scholars as to the fundamental faith of Seventh-day Adventists in relation to the Eternal Verities. It seemed to be spontaneous and simultaneous, and became a pronounced phenomenon. It was clearly the beginning of a new outreach for understanding by non-Adventist scholars.

2. Succession of Invitations Rolls In.-A succession of inquiries, with invitations to speak, began to come from various quarters in the religious world. Along with others, I had personal opportunity to respond to requests from many study groups to tell "why I am a Seventh-day Adventist"-with essentially the same topic always assigned. These invitations came from non-Adventist churches, colleges, universities, seminaries-and even secular organizations.

The church groups included Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist, Reformed, Congregationalist, United Brethren, and even Pentecostal and Unitarian faiths—as well as an organization of converted Roman Catholic priests. So I write from personal knowledge, for I spoke to each of these groups.

Universities such as Marburg (Germany), Rutgers (N.J.), and Pittsburgh (Pa.) extended unusual invitations, with gratifying results from the presentation opportunities, with question periods. And following these came various dialogues with Roman Catholic student priests—both groups and individuals—which were highly fruitful and refreshingly frank. In one instance the contact was with thirty-eight student priests-in-training from the Catholic University of America, in Washington, D.C.—an hour for presentation, and an hour for questions. Out of this, smaller follow-up groups of five to eight. Later, I was privileged to address a class of graduate students at the same "Catholic U.," on the same theme.

.. There were even extended exchanges with Father Petrus Nober, of the Pontifical Biblical Institute of Rome and editor of "Verb um Domine." And recently with other priests, such as Father Luis Rivera, of Rome and Argentina, who translated and printed articles of mine in his "Revista Biblica. " . .

6. Corrections in Encyclopedias and Reference Works. Furthermore, after our corrected denomination declarations had become matters of historical record and common knowledge, and with regrettable statements that gravely misrepresented our Faith. Opportunity opened to make corrections in various encyclopedias and religious reference works, and even in the books of harsh critics—those classing us among the "anti-Christian cults," etcetera.

The readiness of many to correct misstatements concerned, our beliefs, and misunderstandings of our basic positions, was most gratifying. Many of these corrections went on behind the scenes, quietly accomplishing their objectives.

Many were frankly glad to learn the facts and to discover the truth concerning our Faith, and to make—or ask help in making—corrective statements in their writings. One conspicuous example must suffice, here noted in some detail because of its early significance.

. [There] appeared in 1955 in a brief editorial note in "Our Hope," published in Philadelphia and edited by Dr. E Schuyler English, also chairman of the Revision Committee of the Scofield Reference Bible. A chain of unique circumstances grew out of this editorial item that should be told, for his journal led[?]

.. The following chain of circumstances began before the contacts with Walter R. Martin and Dr. Donald Gray Barnhouse presented in the chapter that follows. However, this earlier exchange with Dr. English had a definite bearing upon—though it was separate from the conferences with Martin and Barnhouse.

II. Precedent-breaking Contacts With Dr. E. Schuyler English

1. Significant Exchanges With Editor of "Our Hope."—In order to understand the latter portion of this and the next chapter, dealing with the conferences with Evangelicals Martin and Barnhouse—and the resultant book, "Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine" (1957)—it is necessary to go back to 1955, and certain preliminary exchanges with Dr. English, of "Our Hope." In an editorial note in his January, 1955, issue, English stated, erroneously, that Seventh-day Adventists "deny Christ's Deity" (p. 409). And he added that we are a group that "disparages the Person and work of Christ" (p. 410).

As to the latter expression, Dr. English based this misconception upon his understanding that we hold that Christ, during His incarnation, "partook of our sinful, fallen nature." In this expression he was clearly alluding to the then oft-cited note in the old edition of "Bible Readings." (E. Schuyler English letter to L. E.F., Mar. 11, 1955, p. 1.)

2. Honorable and Christian Rectification.-We immediately wrote to Dr. English expressing concern over his mistaken understanding of our teachings on these and other points. Ample authoritative documentary evidence was furnished to show that, instead of depreciating the Deity of Christ-as many Modernists in various denominations constantly do-we, as a Church, ring as true as steel to the Biblical truth of the full and complete Deity of Jesus Christ. And further, that the old Colcord minority-view note in "Bible Readings"-contending for an inherent sinful, fallen nature for Christ-had years before been expunged because of its error, and again furnishing incontrovertible evidence to sustain these statements. This led to a highly gratifying and profitable exchange of letters.

At the close of the interchange, extending over several months, Dr. English in a most manly and truly Christian spirit stated that he was convinced that he had "certainly been mistaken in the charges," and said that he would assuredly "acknowledge those mistakes through the columns of "Our Hope." (Ibid.)

.. Dr. English honorably and graciously fulfilled his promise in the February, 1956, issue of "Our Hope."

Here is my statement that he quotes in "Our Hope:

"Seventh-day Adventists place their sole hope of salvation in Jesus Christ, pre-existent from all eternity, who took our flesh through the virgin birth, lived a sinless life, wrought many miracles, was betrayed and went to the cross where His blood was shed in our stead. There He died a vicarious, atoning death, rose the third day, ascended personally and bodily to heaven where, as our merciful High Priest, He ministers in our behalf the full and complete atonement He made on the cross. And from thence we look for His imminent second advent, to raise the righteous dead and translate the righteous living, who are thereafter to be ever with the Lord.

"We believe in salvation solely through grace by faith, all and only in Christ-good works following after salvation as the fruitage and evidence of its genuineness. We believe in the imperative necessity of the new birth, in justification by faith from the guilt and penalty of sin through the imputed righteousness of Christ; of sanctification through the operation of the Holy Spirit, thus to receive the imparted righteousness of Christ. And we believe in glorification at the second, personal, premillennial advent of Christ, when we will be delivered from the very presence and possibility of sin. "(L.E.F., quoted in "Our Hope," vol. LX II, no. 8, Feb., 1956, p. 458.)

ill. Walter Martin Affirms SDA's Are "Brothers in Christ"

1. English Considers Us Truly "Christian."-A few months later Dr. English published an article in "Our Hope" from Baptist Polemicist Walter R. Martin. In introducing this, English frankly stated, in a preliminary editorial, headed "Seventh-day Adventism":

"The Editor [Dr. English] once held, with many of our beloved reader-family, that Seventh-day Adventism is heretical and not Christian. Investigation that has lasted throughout nearly a year has convinced us that we were mistaken...

"Any man or woman who holds as essential Christian doctrine the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures, the virgin birth and Deity of Christ, the necessity for and

completeness of Christ's vicarious atonement for sin, justification by faith, and the personal and visible second advent of Christ, is a Christian in the strictest sense of the word." ("Our Hope," November, 1956, p. 271.)

2. Urges Prayerful Reading of Martin Article.-Then, directing the reader to Walter Martin's major article in the same issue, titled "Seventh-Day Adventism Today," Dr. English urged:

"Read it with understanding. Read it prayerfully. And even if you do not agree with it wholly, rejoice that some within this [SDA] denomination (multitudes, we believe) are members of Christ's body through faith in His atoning sacrifice, and are eternally saved. " (Ibid.)

3. Martin Cites Four Misconceptions.-Then beginning on page 273, there follows the 12-page Martin article ("Seventh-Day Adventism Today"), introduced by the explanatory subtitle, "Here we have an up-to-date appraisal of a misunderstood denomination." A foot-note by English says this of Martin:

"The author is Director of Cult Apologetics for the Zondervan Publishing House, Contributing Editor of "Eternity Magazine," and a member of the staff of the Evangelical Foundation in Philadelphia."

According to Martin, the four leading charges commonly brought against Adventism, dealt with in his article, were:

"(1) that the atonement of Christ was not completed upon the cross; (2) that salvation is the result of grace plus the works of the law; (3) that the Lord Jesus Christ was a created being, not from all eternity; (4) and that He partook of man's sinful fallen nature at the incarnation. " (Ibid., p. 275.)

This, Martin said, sums up the four major misconceptions concerning Adventism, held in scholarly religious circles.

4. Early Faulty Views "Totally Repudiated."-Then comes this key paragraph that sums up Martin's seven-year search:

"After an exhaustive examination of the history and theology of the Seventh-day Adventist denomination covering a seven-year period, the last year and a half of which have been spent in top-level conferences with officials [representatives] of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, this writer as a research polemicist has no hesitation whatsoever in stating that those previous positions so widely seized upon by the enemies of Adventism have been totally repudiated by the Seventh-day Adventist denomination for some years. To charge the majority of Adventists today with holding these heretical views is unfair, inaccurate, and decidedly unchristian!" (Ibid.)

.. Martin then lists, as evidence, our fundamental Christian beliefs, which accord with "historic orthodox Christianity":

"Seventh-day Adventists believe without reservation, and in the context of historic orthodox Christianity, the following doctrines: (1) the complete authority of the Bible as the solid rule of faith and practice and the inerrant Word of God; (2) the virgin birth of Christ; (3) the eternal Trinity and Deity of Christ; (4) the personality of the Holy Spirit; (5) the perfect sinless human nature of Christ; (6) the sinless life and vicarious atoning death of our Lord; (7) the physical resurrection and ascension of Christ; (8) His intercessory ministry for man before the Father; (9) the second personal premillennial coming of Christ; (10) the everlasting bliss of the saints; (11) the physical resurrection of the body; (12) justification by faith alone; (13) the new creation; (14) the unity of the Body of Christ; (15) salvation by grace apart from the works of the law through faith in Jesus Christ. "(P. 276.)

6. Outspoken Belief in Our "Christianity."-Then follows this strong Martin declaration:

"If adherence in the orthodox sense to the previously enumerated doctrines of the Bible does not place one in the category of evangelical Christianity, then this writer fails to see what would." (Ibid.)

.. Then follows this rather remarkable concluding urge for extension of the hand of recognition to Seventh-day Adventists as Christians:

"Since there is no conceivable doctrinal ground, in the light of verifiable evidence, where the fundamental tenets of the historic Gospel are concerned for refusing that outstretched hand, I for one encourage the extension of our hand which will usher in a new era of understanding and spiritual growth among the Church which is Christ's body." (P. 284.)

That is the heart of the Martin article appearing in "Our Hope" before his article in "Eternity" came out not long after. This was Martin's first published statement of conviction.

Now let us turn to a more far-reaching development.

The developments set forth in the previous chapter parallel, in part, a series of eighteen conferences with Evangelical representatives in 1955 and '56. These interviews and discussions eventuated in our own volume "Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine" (1957), as well as Walter R. Martin's "The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism" (1957, revised in 1960)-along with important editorials and articles in "Our Hope," and the magazine "Eternity" by Dr. Donald Grey Barnhouse and Walter Martin. These conferences are of such importance as to warrant a covering sketch in some detail, because of their larger involvements and developments.

I. Series of Unprecedented Sessions Alter Attitudes

1. Wholesome Results from Contacts.-It will be helpful for the reader-and especially our worker groups-to have the gist of the story. It all started when T.E. Unruh, then president of our East Pennsylvania Conference, here in North America, listened to a series of weekly radio broadcasts on the book of Romans, impressively setting forth Righteousness by Faith. These were given by Dr. Donald Grey Barnhouse, pastor of the Tenth Presbyterian church, of Philadelphia, and at the same time editor of "Eternity" magazine, speaker on a large radio network, and teacher of an extensive weekly Monday night Bible class in New York City, which he had conducted for some ten years.

Unruh wrote to Barnhouse commending him on the Biblical soundness and spiritual helpfulness of his presentations over the airwaves on Righteousness by Faith. This unexpected commendation puzzled Barnhouse, for he had understood that Seventh-day Adventists held to righteousness by works.

This incident, and what grew out of it, ultimately led Walter R. Martin-Baptist polemicist and cult specialist, contributor to "Eternity" magazine, and affiliated with the National Foundation of Evangelicals and the Stony Brook School, as well as director of the Division of Cult Apologetics of Zondervan Publishing House-to locate Unruh as the point of contact with the Adventists. And this for a writing assignment that had been given him.

2. Martin's Twofold Request.-Locating the new conference headquarters (which had been transferred from Philadelphia to Reading) and explaining his mission, Martin asked for copies of our most representative and authoritative doctrinal books. He also requested a series of interviews with responsible Adventist leaders, who could answer a battery of probing questions that he had drawn up pertaining to our faith. This was all in

preparation for a book on the doctrinal errors of Seventh-day Adventism that he had been commissioned to write. But he wanted to be fair, he said, and to have the full facts before writing-and so asked our cooperation.

After a long-distance telephone contact with our headquarters by Unruh, assurances were given. The books would be provided for Martin's scrutiny, and a committee of three representative men was named. T.E. Unruh would act as initial chairman, to get the conferences under way. These four met as a team, with Walter Martin and a colleague, Dr. George Cannon, professor of New Testament Greek at a college on the Hudson. There were eighteen conferences, lasting one to three days and usually with three sessions a day. These were held periodically, in Washington, D.C., Reading, Philadelphia, and New York City.

Two of the most important in the series took place at the home of Dr. Barnhouse, at Doylestown, Pennsylvania, near Philadelphia. Dr. Russell Hitt, then managing editor of "Eternity," was present at the second conference in the Barnhouse home. And Dr. Barnhouse' son, Dr. Donald Grey Barnhouse, Jr., was at the first Doylestown conference.

3. Martin's Questions and Our Responses.-The first conference with Martin and Cannon, followed by others, took place in an available office at our General Conference headquarters, in Takoma Park, Washington, D.C. Martin came armed with a formidable list of definitely hostile and slanted questions, most of them drawn from well-known critics of Seventh-day Adventists among them the inevitable Canright, on to the late defector E.B. Jones. Before undertaking any response to Martin's initial rapid-fire complex of questions, privilege was asked of making, first, a succinct statement on our fundamentally Protestant position on the Bible and the Bible only as the rule of Adventist faith and practice. This was also to lay the groundwork for later discussion of the relationship of the Spirit of Prophecy to the Bible.

Then, similarly, as regards our basic Adventist beliefs on the Eternal Verities-the eternal pre-existence and complete Deity of Christ, His miraculous conception and virgin birth and sinless life during the Incarnation, His vicarious atoning death on the Cross-once for all and all-sufficient-His literal resurrection and ascension, His Mediation before the Father, applying the benefits of the completed Act of Atonement He had made on the Cross. And climaxing with His personal premillennial Second Advent, which we firmly believe to be imminent, but without setting a time...

6. Persuaded We Are "Brethren in Christ."-It was evident that these brief but comprehensive portrayals of our fundamental belief and trust in-and complete loyalty to-the Eternal Verities of the Everlasting Gospel, made a deep and lasting impression. It was a totally different picture from what Martin had fancied and expected. And in these brief introductory presentations many points of confusion were already beginning to clarify. Our declarations had registered.

.. As a result of this unexpected development, a new problem now faced Martin, which was, How to write a book that would be both fair to us, and would also state his own convictions as to the genuineness of our Christianity, but would, at the same time, show up what he believed to be certain of our errors and heresies, as he then saw them. And all this in such a way as to satisfy, if possible, those who had commissioned his writing assignment-who wanted him to expose the errors of Adventism. It was a most difficult order under such changed circumstances.

.. 8. Started Afresh With New Questions.-With a new attitude and objective on the part of Martin, we virtually started all over again. A new list of serious, basic questions was submitted in writing, covering salvation by grace versus salvation by works, the distinction between moral and ceremonial law, the antitype of the scapegoat,

the identity of Michael-and on through the wide range of fundamental Adventist beliefs and practices, covering doctrine and prophecy, and the rest. These formed the basis for our considered written answers, presented during the conferences and appearing in due time, after wide-ranging approval,* in "Questions on Doctrine. "

*[Footnote:] These answers, prepared for presentation to the Evangelical representatives, were submitted for approval first to the authorizing Committee of Fourteen-leaders at and around headquarters, with GC President R.R. Figuhr as chairman. These approved answers were then sent out, after approval, to more than 225 of our world leaders-not only administrators but embracing our leading Bible teachers, editors, mass-communications spokesmen, and veteran leaders such as M.E. Kern, former secretary of the General Conference and president of our Theological Seminary. No more eminent or representative group could have been consulted. No more competent group could approve. And that they did.

Our primary purpose was to set the record straight, and to show what Adventists really believe in relation to the array of questions covering Martin's searching inquiries, and to present sound Adventist answers to his specific questions. It was to show that our teachings are truly Biblical and Christ-centered-definitely rooted in the Everlasting Gospel for today.

9. Read Amazing Number of Books.-At the outset we had placed in Martin's hands approximately \$100 worth of standard Seventh-day Adventist books, which he most carefully examined, to get our viewpoint and stated positions. .

II. Need for Repudiating Discarded Errors

1. Had Been No Published Disavowals.-One thing in the series of previous Adventist clarifications and rectifications, presented in previous chapters, had never been done. There had been no published disavowal of erroneous earlier individual or minority views that had later been abandoned. That was because neither its need nor its importance had as yet been recognized.

.. In addition to the complete Deity of Christ, Adventists had long been emphasizing the completed Act of Atonement on the Cross, with our ascended High Priest applying its wondrous benefits through His heavenly ministry. This was now our standard and general teaching-for decades before the time of the interviews.

.. Martin and Barnhouse asked us pointedly about our early Adventist views in the aforementioned two areas of teaching first, our historical position on the Deity of Christ; and, second, our historical stand on the Atonement as a completed Act on the Cross.

In response, abundant documentary evidence was presented from our most authoritative Adventist literature of recent decades, showing that Adventists ring true as steel on these two major Eternal Verities. .

That satisfied our questioners as to the soundness of the present position of Adventists. But, they pressed the point, Had we ever gone on public record denying certain patently erroneous early personal statements that they knew had been printed-for they had had access to the books and cited the statements.

Our response was, No-that Adventists had not heretofore felt the need of making such, inasmuch as we were now fully united on these points, and had been so for more than a score of years. Furthermore, those early statements were the declarations of individuals or groups, not of the Church as a whole, and had never committed the Denomination. Our later formal declarations were clear, Biblical, sound, and "orthodox. "

But, they insisted, unless and until those early declarations -although they might have been only the voice of prominent individuals-were definitely disavowed, we as a denomination were justly held accountable for them, and any misunderstandings growing out of their early issuance. Further, they said that many hostile critics thought that such personal expressions really constituted our actual and general early teaching on these cardinal points. That surely called for a disavowal.

5. Preponderant Support for Clear Declarations.-Their point could scarcely be gainsaid-that the early erroneous concepts of a minority clearly needed to be repudiated. So the appointed framers of the answers to their questions prepared a simple statement disavowing these personal, individual, minority positions, for inclusion in the forth-coming book, to be called "Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine."*

It reads:

"The belief of Seventh-day Adventists on these great truths is clear and emphatic. And we feel that we should not be identified with, or stigmatized for, certain limited and faulty concepts held by some, particularly in our formative years.

"This statement should therefore nullify the stock 'quotations' that have been circulated against us." ("Questions on Doctrine," Question 3, pp. 31, 32.)

* [Footnote:] There were some who saw no need for such a disclaimer. But the preponderant view of the counseling "Committee of Fourteen" leaders was that we should set the record straight, disavow any and all erroneous early views that had unfortunately gotten into print, and should reaffirm before all men -and in more explicit terms than ever before employed-the fundamental belief of Seventh-day Adventists in the basic Eternal Verities of the Everlasting Gospel on the points under scrutiny. That counsel prevailed.

6. Definitive Spirit of Prophecy Declarations Assembled. To complete the rather comprehensive presentation, and to give it maximum weight, complete search was made for all pertinent Spirit of Prophecy statements, through the years, bearing on the vital questions of (1) the eternal pre-existence and complete Deity of Christ, and His relation to the Trinity; (2) His sinless nature during the Incarnation-without our sinful propensities; and (3) the broader, twofold truth of the Atonement-as the completed sacrificial Act of Atonement on the Cross, and Christ's application of its benefits through His subsequent High-Priestly Ministry, climaxing with the closing event of the antitypical Day of Atonement, or Judgment Hour. These are the three crucial areas.

.. After various sections setting forth the soundness and the uniqueness of the Adventist position on our various doctrines, and the clear historic principles and applications of prophetic interpretation that we hold, the reader is finally brought, in Section VII, to the "wider concept of the Atonement"-the Sacrificial Atonement provided-once for-all and all-sufficient and the complete Atoning Act of the Cross applied. Here the comprehensive Adventist position is expressly spelled out. That clarified the second of the two main areas of historic misunderstanding on the Atonement.

.. The relationship of the Spirit of Prophecy to the Bible was carefully and satisfactorily explained. There were, of course, many other related phases that were considered.

IV. Questions on Doctrine Influences Non-SDA Scholars

1. Has Changed Distorted Concepts.-The molding influence of "Questions on Doctrine" upon non-Adventists scholars especially preachers and teachers, Protestant and Catholic-has been more widespread and profound than many have realized. This writer and other members of the "Questions on Doctrine" team-have been the recipients

of periodic letters from non-Adventist scholars ever since its publication in 1957. Many thousands of copies have been placed with clergymen and theology teachers not of our faith-in a few instances thousands in a single conference. And they have had their wholesome effect. Its total circulation by 1970 had exceeded 138,000.. .

3. Priests and Rabbis Have Benefited.-It has been similarly esteemed by various Roman Catholic priests and student priest, as bringing before them the fundamental features wherein Seventh-day Adventists differ from all other Protestant groups . .

4. Catholic Writer Cites "Questions."-In mid-December, 1965, a 24-page Roman Catholic booklet appeared-"The Seventh Day Adventists" (Chicago: Clarentian Publications), by Roman Catholic Prof. William J. Whalen, of Purdue University. It was first issued as an article in the "U.S. Catholic," in September, 1965, and twice reprinted in "Universal Fatima News"-another Catholic journal-before being put into revised leaflet form. Writ numerous colleges and many seminaries not of our faith, particularly when a class is studying Adventism, or when a student is to prepare a paper on some assigned phase of Adventism. This is because of its recognized standing as a lucid and comprehensive Seventh-day Adventist presentation. Such is one of the results of this book, brought forth under such unusual but providential circumstances.

5. Cited 28 Times in WCC "Ecumenical Review."-Another striking example of scholarly acceptance and reliance upon "Questions on Doctrine" for an authoritative portrayal of the World Council of Churches . . [Another, a Catholic publication, quotes from QD, and] written in a kindly vein, . . asks what Catholics can learn from Seventh-day Adventists.

Mark this significant point: In this tract, "The Seventh Day Adventists," Professor Whalen three times quotes favorably from "Questions on Doctrine." And no other book is quoted. At the close, on a page headed "Other Reading," he lists "Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine," the four-volume "Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers," and Herndon's "The Seventh Day."

"Questions on Doctrine" has been assigned reading in of the World Council of Churches, edited by Dr. W.A. Visser 't Hooft, longtime general secretary of the WCC.

The January, 1967, issue contains a very fair and comprehensive ten-page "essay" on "The Seventh-day Adventist Church," by Dr. M.B. Hanspicker of the WCC staff. .

"QD" is Dr. Hanspicker's abbreviation for "Questions on Doctrine"-which he quotes, and cites a remarkable total of 28 times in his ten-page "sketch." Eight of its ten pages have quotations from or references to QD. .

[We have personally examined this article published by the World Council of Churches. It appears to be a statement on Seventh-day Adventist doctrinal beliefs, based on the information given in "Questions on Doctrine," showing that in view of the present teachings of the Adventist Church they should be acceptable to the World Council of Churches. We have not had opportunity to read the Roman Catholic booklets and papers referred to above.]

7; Cited in Printed and Oral Form.-Out of many thousands of scholars, of many faiths and lands, who have been presented with "Questions on Doctrine," many hundreds have cited and quoted it in article or book form, used it in classroom reference and assignment, and in oral public presentation. This their many articles, books, and letters attest. "Questions on Doctrine" was (by 1965) in several thousand seminary, university, college, and public libraries. Many have been placed overseas. That is a remarkable record for only a decade of distribution.

Written in language that religionists understand, and avoiding Adventist cliches, it covers succinctly the scope of leading Adventist teachings. It has accomplished and is accomplishing increasingly the specific purpose for which it was prepared and authorized by the General Conference.

Above all, its clear declarations, in "Questions on Doctrine," on the eternal pre-existence and complete Deity of Christ, His sinless nature and life during the Incarnation, and the transcendent Act of Atonement consummated [finished] on the Cross, are the determining factors, many non-Adventist scholars frankly tell us, that have caused us to be recognized as truly Christian believers-and thus to consider our other beliefs without the well-nigh insurmountable barrier of prejudice. They accept "Questions on Doctrine" as representative and reliable, and trustworthy for citation. -Movement of Destiny, 15-23, 427-428, 465-492.

- SECTION FIVE - November, 1956 -

ARTICLES IN "OUR HOPE" MAGAZINE

(E. Schuyler English was a well-known Evangelical writer of the mid fifties. (He was considered important enough to be placed as chairman of the revision committee of the Scofield Bible.) He was also the editor of "Our Hope" magazine. In the January, 1955 issue of "Our Hope," English mentioned several teachings of Adventists that he considered terrible. In response, LeRoy Froom began a correspondence with him to assure him that concepts such as the one that Christ inherited the human nature of His earthly ancestors was something totally rejected by modern Seventh-day Adventists. This surprised English, and after considerable correspondence back and forth, English published something of a retraction in the November, 1956 issue of "Our Hope." An excerpt is reprinted below.

But more significant was the article that followed English's retraction, a few pages later in that issue: This was a good-sized article by Walter R. Martin about Seventh-day Adventists, and it was to mark one of the first of Martin's efforts, in print, to make "peace with the Adventists" because of their willingness to repudiate certain earlier doctrinal defects.

Note the timing of all this: Barnhouse's first article announcing the Evangelical Conferences was published in his own "Eternity " magazine in September, 1956. Martin's three "bombshell" articles appeared in the October and November, 1956 and the January, 1957 issues of "Eternity." In stark contrast, the first inkling that the Adventists Church gave to its members of what was taking place was in the December, 1956 issue of "Ministry " magazine. And this was a soft-toned announcement, geared to the workers, rather than to the members in the pew.

The heart of all the above-mentioned articles are reprinted in the present documentary that you are now reading.

In the midst of these important several months, Martin's article to English appeared in "Our Hope " magazine in November, 1956. Aside from "Eternity," "Our Hope" was to prove to be one of the only conciliatory Protestant magazines in the controversy over whether Protestantism should accept the Adventist black sheep back into its ranks. To put it another way: All we gained for our sell-out was four Martin articles, on Barnhouse article, and the Martin book. We never were accepted by established Protestantism, but we surely went the second doctrinal mile in our efforts to try to gain that acceptance.]

November 1956

"SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISM-by E. Schuyler English, Our Hope Magazine.

. Investigation that has lasted throughout nearly a year has convinced us that we were mistaken, that SDAism has been undergoing a change throughout the past decade .. For after all, any man or woman who holds as essential Christian doctrine the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures, the virgin birth and Deity of Christ, the necessity for and completeness of Christ's vicarious atonement for sin, justification by faith, and the personal and visible second advent of Christ, is a Christian in the strictest sense of the word."-"Seventh-day Adventism", Our Hope, November 1956, p. 271.

"SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISM TODAY-Here we have an up-to-date appraisal of a misunderstood denomination-by Walter R. Martin, Our Hope Magazine.

.. Through the years that followed 1844 individuals with varying backgrounds strove to find a common basis of agreement, and over this period of time it is a well-known fact that many unfortunate statements concerning doctrinal theology were published by the Seventh-day Adventists, though the overwhelming majority never held to those divergent views. Chief among these views was the teaching: (1) that the atonement of Christ was not completed upon the cross; (2) that salvation is the result of grace plus the works of the law; (3) that the Lord Jesus Christ was a created being, not from all eternity; (4) and that He partook of man's sinful fallen nature at the incarnation. Other fringe views revolved around the concept that the Seventh-day Adventist Church alone constituted the 144,000 of Revelation 7 and 14, and that all those who did not worship on Saturday bore the mark of the beast of Revelation 13.

"After an exhaustive examination of the history and theology of the Seventh-day Adventist denomination covering a seven-year period, the last year and a half of which have been spent in top-level conferences with officials of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, this writer as a research polemicist has no hesitation whatsoever in stating that those previous positions so widely seized upon by the enemies of Adventism have been totally repudiated by the Seventh-day Adventist denomination for some years. To charge the majority Adventists today with holding these heretical views is unfair, inaccurate, and decidedly unchristian!

.. His [Canright] writings are outdated and cannot be quoted authoritatively in refutation of the great part of contemporary Seventh-day Adventist theology. There are of course some well meaning persons who continue to criticize Seventh-day Adventists on the basis of certain fringe publications, which the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists is systematically attempting to control; and there are also some professional detractors or previous defectors from the Adventist faith who circulate a great deal of material quoted mostly out of context and from older publications in an attempt to prove that Seventh-day Adventists are not Christians-which they most decidedly are, as any honest perusal of their literature on the cardinal doctrines of the Christian faith will quickly reveal. Relative to the contemporary theology of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, to which the overwhelming majority of the membership of that denomination adheres, the following facts cannot be disputed by any who have thoroughly investigated Adventism. Seventh-day Adventists believe . (12) justification by faith alone; (13) the new creation; (14) the unity of the Body of Christ; (15) salvation by grace apart from the works of the law through faith in Jesus Christ.

• . And though there are probably some defectors they are in a decided minority. As an aside, were such defectors to become too vocal regarding their divergences, discipline would rapidly be undertaken by the denomination, as stated in their own Manual of Church Government.

11 . One of the most interesting facts that emerges from a thorough study of Seventh-day Adventist history is the truth that not one doctrine of Seventh-day Adventist history is the truth that not one doctrine of Seventh-day Adventist practice can be ascribed to Ellen G. White.

• .. The General Conference plainly states that they do not make belief in Mrs. White's writings a test of fellowship in the denomination, and further, that they never have and do not now place her writings on a parity with Scripture.

• . . This, in a concise statement, is the doctrine of the heavenly sanctuary and the investigative judgment in Seventh-day Adventist theology, and, while admittedly peculiar and at times almost bizarre, it is in no way heretical since it admits the validity of the completed atonement on the cross by Christ alone. The doctrine of the heavenly

sanctuary and the investigative judgment, then, should constitute no bar to fellowship with Seventh-day Adventists when it is understood in this light.

.. For just so long, then, as the Seventh-day Adventist denomination does not attempt to legislate Saturday as a form of worship upon other Christians as a symbol of fuller consecration to God, their fellow Christians should not discriminate against them as legalists for worshiping on the seventh day.

- .. We may safely say, however, that no single or collective group of doctrines held by the Seventh-day Adventist denomination are unorthodox enough to be heresy or unorthodox enough to prohibit fellowship between Adventists and other evangelicals, once a clear objective view has been obtained through honest investigation. Today in practically every Christian bookstore throughout the United States one may obtain information on Seventh-day Adventism-all of it unfavorable, and over 80% of it filled with outdated quotations, mangled paragraphs, and extreme distortions of the true contemporary Adventist position.

.. There are, of course, many problems which have yet to be solved in Adventist publications, in public relations, in missionary activities and other fields of endeavor. On the whole, however, Adventism today presents a unified picture. Should any doubt the validity of the facts which are herein stated, he is urged to address a letter or postal card to the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Department I, Takoma Park, Maryland, and confirmation of the Adventists adherence to the cardinal doctrines of the Christian faith will be rapidly forthcoming.

.. Since there is no conceivable doctrinal ground, in the light of verifiable evidence, where the fundamental tenets of the historic Gospel are concerned for refusing that outstretched hand, I for one encourage the extension of our hand which will usher in a new era of understanding and spiritual growth among the Church which is Christ's body."-"Seventh-day Adventism Today," Walter R. Martin, Our Hope, November 1956, pp. 274284.

- SECTION SIX - April, 1978 -

BARNHOUSE'S SEARCH FOR FELLOWSHIP

The following article excerpt may seem somewhat parenthetical, but it will help reveal the background setting for the Martin-Barnhouse meetings with our leaders in Washington D.C.

Published in his 'Eternity ' magazine in April, 1958, this article indicated Barnhouse's continuing interest in bringing the various churches together.]

April 1958

"FINDING FELLOWSHIP WITH PENTECOSTALS-by Donald Grey Barnhouse, Eternity Magazine.

"Several years ago we announced that we desired fellowship with any members of the body of Christ who desired fellowship with us. If there is separation, we want our spirit to give evidence that the onus is not on us. If God has saved a man, we shall call him brother.

"Since making that announcement, we have talked and prayed with men of the divergent backgrounds. Our fellowship is with all who are our brothers in Christ, no matter how much they may differ from us in secondary matters.

" .. About twelve of the top leaders of the Assemblies of God met with us in one of their beautiful air-conditioned glass and steel buildings. This denomination has some 8,000 churches in the United States and some 770 missionaries in various parts of the world. .

"Our conference began with prayer, and long before the last man had prayed I was convinced that these were Christian brethren..

"During our conversations, we mentioned the fact that Billy Graham had never passed through the 'experience' which the Pentecostals believe necessary to greater usefulness. They admitted that he was mightily used by God even if he had not had the 'baptism.' One brother wondered whether Billy had had the experience without knowing it!! I telephoned Billy and asked him. His reply was that he had never spoken in tongues though he had on several occasions had some very precious experiences in the presence of the Lord. .

"in the summer of 1956 one of the leading men of the National Council of Churches wrote an article in the 'Christian Century' describing his visit to the Caribbean. He found that Pentecostal missionaries in Cuba and elsewhere had led more people to Christ in fifteen years than the old-line denominations had done in sixty years. He concluded by saying that the leaders of the ecumenical movement should get acquainted with the Pentecostals."-'Finding Fellowship with Pentecostals, Donald Grey Barnhouse, Eternity Magazine, April 1958, pp. 8-10.

- SECTION SEVEN -

- August 1956 to November 1957 -

THE "BOMBSHELL" ETERNITY MAGAZINE ARTICLES

[Barnhouse and Martin 's "Eternity" magazine articles, "Questions on Doctrine, " and Martin's book, "The truth About Seventh-day Adventism, " constitute the centerpoint of the whirlwind that arose out of the Evangelical Conferences in the fifties.

Here are the "Eternity " magazine articles:

(1) August 1956-Formal announcement that Walter Martin had joined the staff of "Eternity " magazine. He had, of course, been working closely with Barnhouse for at least a year or two prior to this time. The Evangelical Conferences, initiated by Martin and Barnhouse, ran from the Spring of 1955 into the Summer of 1956.

(2) September 1956-This was on the masthead page of this issue and constituted an announcement of the "bombshell" (to use their word) that the accompanying article by Barnhouse would be to many readers.

(3) September 1956-'Are Seventh-day Adventists Christians?' was the title of this article by Barnhouse. It was the first of four articles to appear within this magazine within a span of five months.

(4) October 1956-On the masthead page an introduction is given to the first of Martin's three articles.

(5) October 1956-This is the first of Walter Martin's three "Eternity" articles about Seventh-day Adventists and their beliefs. This article is almost entirely composed of a brief historical survey of the origins and development of the Millerite Movement and the Adventist Church. This study is relatively kindly to Adventists in tone. Two passages, however, should be noted (quoted below) for their theological implications.

The first is to be found in the middle of a statement by Martin about Ellen White. He says "One may disagree with Mrs. White 's interpretation of the atonement.. "There is much meaning in that phrase, for room and Anderson tried to give the impression that Adventists now believe in the "finished atonement" concept and that this was what Ellen White had always taught. But Martin obviously recognized that this was not so.

The second point in the article is a footnote. In it Martin suggests that Canright's objections to Adventism are not necessarily as valuable today in light of the modifications that church has made in their views since his time.

(6) November 1956-By now, no masthead introduction was needed for this second of Martin's three "Eternity " articles.

(7) January 1957-Here we find the third of Martin's articles. Why the articles were not consecutive (December was omitted) we do not know. Perhaps, in view of the torrent of protests that were pouring in to "Eternity " headquarters from Protestant ministers and leaders, Martin had taken time to rewrite this article somewhat. It deals with differences between Adventist beliefs and those of Protestantism at large.

(8) November 1957-Ten months after the last Martin article appeared, Barnhouse published a follow-up postscript, in which he announced the imminent publication of "Questions on Doctrine" by the Adventists. Mentioning that he was soon to expose in a series of articles the errors of Adventism, he concluded with the thought that it would be better for the reader to purchase Martin's forthcoming book about Adventist doctrine, rather than to bother with the Adventist book about their own doctrine.

In summary, let me say that there is quite a bit of information to be found in these "bombshell" articles in ' Eternity . " They should be read with our excerpts from Martin's book, "The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism. "From it all, you will clearly see many things about the whole matter. Among these are: (1) The strong push-almost a veiled threat-was for the Adventists to come to terms in order to receive "unity and fellowship" with the Protestants. This point is especially to be noted in Martin's book. (2) Both Martin and Barnhouse objected to a number of Adventist beliefs, and thought them ridiculous. Barnhouse's lead article (August 1956) especially brings this out (3) Most important of all: Both of them clearly showed that Adventists are now willing to CHANGE their beliefs and are now doing so. (4) The new beliefs of the Adventists are different in several respects from those which they formerly espoused.

Along with this is a related point which you will not find in these articles: Our Church leaders were very willing to start the Evangelical Conferences, continue them for over a year, work our changes in our doctrines, and lay plans to publish a book (QD) which would excuse those changes under the cover of "something we always taught" - and never breathe a word to man or beast throughout the vast majority of the local churches of the denomination-until Barnhouse and Martin told us- what was going on in the pages of `Eternity " magazine! And it may be added that most of the common folk still did not find out what was taking place until someone slipped a copy of Elder Andreasens 's "Letters to the Churches" into their hands. For after the news broke in "Eternity, " our leaders focused their attention on training the Adventist ministry, world-wide, into the new view so they could then pass it on to their church members.]

ETERNITY MAGAZINE

August 1956

"APPOINTED TO STAFF-by Editors, Eternity Magazine.

"The Rev. Walter R. Martin of Paterson, N.J., has been appointed to the staff of the Evangelical Foundation, Inc., as a Bible teacher and writer. Readers of 'Eternity' are

already familiar with Mr. Martin's contributions to the magazine in the field of the non-Christian religions and cults. He will continue to serve as a Contributing Editor, and articles by his hand are scheduled for all the coming issues in 1956.

"An ordained Baptist minister, Mr. Martin has spent the last ten years in research in the fields of philosophy, contemporary theology, apologetics, and cults, and is recognized by prominent Christian scholars and leaders as the foremost authority in evangelical circles on cultism. He also serves as director of the division of cult apologetics for the Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, and has introduced the 'Modern Cults Library.' Currently five of these volumes are available.

"At the present time Mr. Martin is pursuing his doctoral (Ph.D.) studies at New York University, having received his Master of Arts degree from that institution in June."- Eternity, August 1956, p. 4.

September 1956

"NOW AND LATER-by Editors, Eternity Magazine.

"The lead article of this month's issue will come like a bombshell to many of our readers who have always viewed Seventh-day Adventists with suspicion. We have no doubt that there will be many questioning letters and perhaps some grave shaking of heads.

"But this manuscript comes from our Editor-in-Chief after many hours of consultation and deliberation extending over months of time. In view of the deep-seated feelings of evangelicals toward cultists and those who hold to deviant views of Christian doctrine, it has taken some courage on the part of the Editors to present this clearer picture of Seventh-day Adventism. We have been comforted by the thought that this is a 'magazine of Christian truth,' and that we have a solemn responsibility as stewards of the truth.

"Actually this article is the introduction to a series of three which will be presented by Contributing Editor Walter R. Martin in the next three months. We ask that our friends consider all the facts before coming to a final decision.

"Walter Martin is emerging as one of the leading authorities of the day in the field of the non-Christian cults. He, like our Editor-in-Chief, has no softness toward heresy or error but strongly feels he has been called to be a defender of the historic faith. That's why what he has to say about Seventh-day Adventists will be significant reading."- Eternity, September 1956, p. 4.

"ARE SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS CHRISTIANS?-A new look at Seventh-day Adventism-by Donald Grey Barnhouse, Eternity Magazine.

.. On a second visit he was presented with scores of pages of detailed theological answers to his questions. Immediately it was perceived that the Adventists were strenuously denying certain doctrinal positions, which had been previously attributed to them. As Mr. Martin read their answers he came, for example, upon a statement that they repudiated absolutely the thought that seventh-day Sabbath keeping was a basis for salvation and a denial of any teaching that the keeping of the first day of the week is as yet considered to be the receiving of the anti-Christian 'mark of the beast.' He pointed out to them that in their book store adjoining the building in which these meetings were taking place a certain volume published by them and written by one of their ministers categorically stated the contrary to what they were now asserting. The leaders sent for the book, discovered that Mr. Martin was correct, and immediately brought this fact to the attention of the General Conference Officers, that this situation might be remedied and such publications be corrected. This same procedure was

repeated regarding the nature of Christ while in the flesh which the majority of the denomination has always held to be sinless, holy, and perfect despite the fact that certain of their writers have occasionally gotten into print with contrary views completely repugnant to the Church at large. They further explained to Mr. Martin that they had among their number certain members of their 'lunatic fringe' even as there are similar wildest irresponsibles in every field of fundamental Christianity. This action of the Seventh-day Adventists was indicative of similar steps that were taken subsequently.

.. I discovered, however, in our long talks together that these brethren have what I think is a misconception of Calvinism. They would not find it too hard to get along with the modern Calvinism which is held by most evangelical Baptists and Presbyterians today and vice versa. .

"We also disagree on the question of the Seventh-day Sabbath. A great amount of time was spent in our early meetings to spell out the fact that Adventists do not believe in legalism as a part of salvation though everything in their practice seems to indicate that they do. They recognize clearly that some of their teachers have taught the contrary, but they take a position (to us very illogical) that the Ten Commandments are to be obeyed, but that their teaching has no part whatsoever as a down payment or a part payment toward salvation which they and we in common confess to be by Christ alone on the basis of His expiatory death on Calvary.

" . The latter doctrine [the investigative judgment] , to me, is the most colossal, psychological, face-saving phenomenon in religious history! . .

"Now the time has come to make known to the general public the results of the hundreds of hours of labor that have been expended by Mr. Martin and the similar time that has been put forth by many Adventist leaders.

"Mr. Martin's book on Seventh-day Adventism will appear in print within a few months. It will carry a foreword by responsible leaders of the Seventh-day Adventist church to the effect that they have not been misquoted in the volume and the areas of agreement and disagreement as set forth by Mr. Martin are accurate from their point of view. All of Mr. Martin's references to a new Adventist volume on their doctrines will be from the page proof of their book, which will appear in print simultaneously with his work. Henceforth any fair criticism of the Adventist movement must refer to these simultaneous publications.

"The position of the Adventists seems to some of us in certain cases to be a new position; to them it may be merely the position of the majority group of sane leadership which is determined to put the brakes on any members who seek to hold views divergent from that of the responsible leadership of the denomination.

"(1) Notably, the Adventist leadership proclaims that the writings of Ellen G. White, the great counselor of the Adventist movement, are not on a parity with Scripture.

"(2) While the Adventists keep Saturday as the Sabbath, they specifically repudiate the idea that Sabbath-keeping is in any way a means of salvation.

• .. It is to my mind, therefore, nothing more than a human, face-saving idea! It should also be realized that some uninformed Seventh-day Adventists took this idea and carried it to fantastic literalistic extremes. Mr. Martin and I heard the Adventist leaders say, flatly, that they repudiate all such extremes.

• Further, they do not believe, as some of their earlier teachers taught, that Jesus' atoning work was not completed on Calvary but instead that He was still carrying on a second ministering work since 1844. This idea is also totally repudiated. They believe that since His ascension Christ has been ministering the benefits of the

atonement which He completed on Calvary. Since the sanctuary doctrine is based on the type of the Jewish high priest going into the Holy of Holies to complete his atoning work, it can be seen that what remains is most certainly exegetically untenable and theological speculation of a highly imaginative order.

11 .. We personally do not believe that there is even a suspicion of a verse in Scripture to sustain such a peculiar position, and we further believe that any effort to establish it is stale, flat, and unprofitable! . .

"To sum up, I would say that the differences between other evangelicals and the Seventh-day Adventist position are three:

"(1) The unimportant and almost naive doctrine of the 'investigative judgment'

"(2) The more serious doctrine of Sabbath-keeping, which is not sufficient to bar Seventh-day Adventists from the fellowship of true Christians but which makes such fellowship very difficult because of the overtones of legalism that has a tendency to gnaw at the roots of the truth of sovereign grace to unworthy sinners; and

"(3) Finally, the most serious difference, to me, is their belief in conditional immortality (i.e., soul-sleeping and the annihilation of the lost)."- "Are Seventh-day Adventists Christians?," Donald Grey Barnhouse, Eternity, September 1956, pp. 6, 7, 4345.

October 1956

"NOW AND LATER-by Editors, Eternity Magazine.

"In this issue Walter R. Martin begins his series of three articles on 'The Truth about Seventh-day Adventism.'

"For several years now Mr. Martin has been making a diligent study of the non-Christian cults, and he did not start out to write about Adventists in appreciative terms. However, in the course of his research he came to the conclusion that Adventists should rightfully be included within the fellowship of evangelicalism.. "-Eternity, October 1956, p. 3.

October 1956

"The truth about Seventh-day Adventism-ITS HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT FROM CHRISTIAN ROOTS-What was the true role of William Miller in the great advent awakening movement?-by Walter R. Martin, Eternity Magazine.

. • There can be no doubt that Mrs. White was a "born again" Christian woman who truly loved the Lord Jesus Christ and who dedicated herself unstintingly to the task of bearing witness for Him as she felt led. It should be clearly understood that in some places orthodox Christian theology and the interpretations of Mrs. White do not agree; in fact, in some places they are at direct loggerheads, but on the cardinal doctrines of the Christian faith necessary to the salvation of the soul and the growth of the life in Christ, Ellen G. White has never written anything which is seriously contrary to the simple, plain declarations of the gospel. One may disagree with Mrs. White's interpretation of the atonement and the scapegoat; one may challenge her stress upon the Seventh-day Sabbath, health reform, and conditional immortality, etc.; but no one can fairly challenge her writings on the basis of their conformity to the basic principles of the gospel, for conform they most certainly do!

. D.M. Canright 1 in his two books on Ellen G. White, has gone into great critical details.

"1 An ex-Adventist leader of great magnitude and a personal friend for many years of Ellen G. White. He left the movement, became a Baptist minister, and wrote

much against SDA. His criticisms where they bear upon the Sabbath, soul sleep, annihilation of the wicked, the sanctuary doctrine, the investigative judgment, the spirit of prophecy as manifested in Mrs. White, and health reform in SDA are frequently well taken; however, much has changed since Canright's day and his work must be viewed in the light of current SDA theology."-Eternity, October, 1956, pp. 38, 39.

November 1956

"The Truth About Seventh-Day Adventism-WHAT SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS REALLY BELIEVE-Are the differences between Adventist and orthodox Christian doctrines sufficient to deny them fellowship?-by Walter R. Martin, Eternity Magazine.

- . A concise statement of what Seventh-day Adventists do believe from an authoritative source will probably serve to establish their adherence to the basic principles of Christian theology far better than a hundred articles by a non-Adventist. Therefore, the following statement, prepared by a group of leading theologians of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, appearing in a new book soon to be released by the Review and Herald publishing Association, covers the subject quite thoroughly and is reproduced here by permission. .

- 'But with the passage of years the earlier diversity of view on certain doctrines gradually gave way to unity of view. Clear and sound positions were then taken by the great majority on such doctrines as the Godhead, the deity and eternal preexistence of Christ, and the personality of the Holy Spirit. Clear-cut views were established on righteousness by faith, the true relationship of law and grace, and on the death of Christ as the complete atonement for sin.

- 'A few, however, held to some of their former views, and at times these ideas got into print. However, for decades now the church has been practically at one on the basic truths of the Christian faith.

- 'The very fact that our positions were now clarified seemed to us to be sufficient. Our teachings, we felt, were clear. And no particular statement of change from those earlier ideas appeared necessary. Today the primary emphasis of all our leading denominational literature, as well as the continuous presentations over radio and television, emphasizes the historic fundamentals of the Christian faith.

- 'But the charges and attacks have persisted. Some continue to gather up quotations from some of our earlier literature long since out of date and print. Certain statements are cited, often wrested out of context, which give a totally distorted picture of the beliefs and teachings of the Seventh-day Adventist Church of today.

" 'All this has made it desirable and necessary for us to declare our position afresh upon the great fundamental teachings of the Christian faith, and to deny every statement or implication that Christ, the second Person of the Godhead, was not One with the Father from all eternity, and that His sacrifice on the cross was not a full and complete atonement. The present belief of Seventh-day Adventists on these great truths is clear and emphatic. And we feel that we should no longer be identified with or stigmatized for certain limited and faulty concepts held by some in our formative years.

- ' .. We are one with our fellow Christians of denominational groups .. '

"It is true that there is still some literature in print and on the shelves of libraries that reflects some of the earlier positions just mentioned, but precautions are being taken to limit further circulation and to present a unified and true picture of Seventh-day Adventist adherence to the cardinal doctrines of the Christian faith.

" .. Less than 20 per cent of these volumes are now up to date or contain the true Seventh-day Adventist positions as they are stated and published in contemporary Adventist circles.

"My research has uncovered the fact that not only have many unrepresentative quotations cited from earlier Seventh-day Adventist publications been expunged from the current editions .. seemingly to indict the Adventists for holding beliefs that they most strenuously reject.

• The need for abandoning the out-of-print quotations and questionable statements that have been repudiated by the Adventist denomination ought also to be recognized by Christian publishers who wish to present the truth.

• .. Should anyone reading this article desire proof of the official Seventh-day Adventist position on these statements they should address a letter or postal card to: The General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Department I, Takoma Park, Washington 12, D.C., and confirmation sufficient to convince any honest investigator will be forthcoming immediately. In the early months of 1957 the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists will release a new book dealing with contemporary Seventh day Adventist theology, which should supersede individual-author publications on the basis of authoritative theological positions, stating unequivocally the adherence of the General Conference, and of all true Seventh-day Adventists, to the fundamentals of the gospel just stated.

"Seventh-day Adventism in 1956 is a far cry from the Adventism-rightly criticized in certain areas-of Dudley M. Canright in his book 'Seventh-day Adventism Renounced.' Whoever attempts to refute Adventism today by using Canright and by quoting him as authoritative in every area of his criticism of Seventh-day Adventism is tearing down a straw man. Where Canright deals with the divergent views of Adventism as they affect the historic Christian message, he is relevant. However, many of the earlier minority positions in Adventism have either been reversed or revised in line with the convictions of the leadership of the Seventh-day Adventist denomination that advancing light and progressive truth make necessary clarification . .

"Dr. LeRoy E. Froom, one of the Secretaries of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, writing in a new theological publication 'to be released early in 1957, clearly states the Seventh-day Adventist denomination's repudiation of all extremist or personal positions of the past that misrepresent the clear teachings of the church and of distorted positions wrongly attributed to them. Writes Dr. Froom:

.. We utterly repudiate the postulate that human works are in any way a ground of acceptance with God..'

"The positions presented in this covering statement by Dr. Froom, speaking as a leading authority on Adventist history and theology, are fully supported by the declarations of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists. It is one more evidence that Seventh-day Adventists wish to correct all misrepresentations, and any misinterpretations of some in the past, and to fellowship with the other members of the body of Christ. .

"In Edson's mind then, and in the minds of many early Adventists, Heaven contained a literal sanctuary with a first apartment and a second apartment, constructed along the lines of the ancient Hebrew tabernacle."-"what Seventh-day Adventists Really Believe"; Walter R. Martin, Eternity, November 1956, pp. 20,21,38-43.

January 1957

"The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism-ADVENTIST THEOLOGY vs. HISTORIC ORTHODOXY-Are there serious differences concerning cardinal doctrines of Christianity?-by Walter R. Martin, Eternity Magazine.

" .. We are concerned in this article with some of the differences between Seventh-day Adventist theology and the theology of 'historic orthodoxy.' We have two questions: (1) Are there major differences regarding the cardinal doctrines of the Christian faith, between Seventh-day Adventist theology and evangelical orthodoxy? (2) Are the other differences that exist an insuperable barrier to fellowship between Seventh-day Adventists and evangelicals?

"Extensive study reveals seven areas of disagreement. We shall note these seven areas, discuss them, and attempt to reach a conclusion based upon all available evidence, bypassing the morass of prejudice accumulating for almost one hundred years.

" .. Thus, say the Adventists, Christ is ministering the benefits of the atonement which He completed on the cross. .

"Contemporary Seventh-day Adventist theology accepts the doctrine in the figurative sense as great heavenly realities, and teaches that the Lord Jesus Christ is still interceding for all Christian believers before the throne of His Father. It should be carefully observed here, that this doctrine of the investigative judgment in no way implies, in Seventh-day Adventist thinking, the concept of a dual or partially completed atonement; rather, Adventists emphasize a completed, final work accomplished by Christ alone on Calvary for them as well as all believers. .

"As Dr. Barnhouse pointed out in his article in September the investigative judgment is purely a speculative dogma, inherent within the structure of Adventist theology, and when properly understood can offer no real objection to fellowship between Adventists and their fellow Christians.

" .. In the eyes of many it smacks of legalism . .

"Adventists regard the 'spirit of prophecy' counsels of Ellen G. White as counsels to the Adventist denomination, and there is no reason why this view should prohibit Christians of other denominations from having fellowship with Adventists, so long as Adventists do not attempt to enforce upon their fellow Christians the counsels that Mrs. White specifically directs to them.

"(6) Health Reform (unclean foods, etc.).-The ministry of Mrs. White, throughout her many years of association with the Seventh-day Adventist denomination, uniformly encouraged what has been called 'health reform.' This term is much broader than the matter of diet. Mrs. White believed and taught that the Scriptures give the best outline for the care of the human body. Throughout her life she gave to the Seventh-day Adventist denomination frequent counsels on health principles, including dietary matters. .

"(7) The Remnant Church.-The last area of conflict between Seventh-day Adventism and contemporary evangelical Christianity is the 'remnant church' idea, espoused by early members of the Seventh-day Adventist denomination. Still taught, in the denomination, though in a vastly different sense from its original conception the idea is that Adventists constitute a definite part of the 'remnant church,' or the 'remnant people' of God, of the last days. .

"Today, the term involves a time element-the 'remnant church' indicates the great last segment of the true Christian church of the Christian Era, existing just before the second coming of the Lord Jesus Christ. Adventists further recognize that God's true followers everywhere, whom He owns as His people E are true members of this

'remnant,' which will constitute the Bride of Christ at His glorious return to usher in the Kingdom of God."-'Adventist Theology vs. Historic Orthodoxy," Walter R. Martin, Eternity, January 1957 pp. 12,12,38-40.

November 1957

`POSTSCRIPT ON SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISM-by Donald Grey Barn house-Eternity Magazine.

"The long-awaited 'Answers to Questions on Doctrine,' 'prepared by a Representative Group of Seventh-day Adventist Leaders, Bible Teachers, and Editors,' has come from the press. It is the vindication of the position we have taken in recent months and will soon be recognized as such by fair-minded Christians.

.. The volume is an authoritative statement of their doctrines. They say that it is not a new statement of faith, but rather 'an answer to specific questions concerning their faith.' However it is a definitive statement that lops off the writings of Adventists who have been independent of and contradictory to their sound leadership and effectively refutes many of the charges of doctrinal error that have been leveled against them. The writings of those who have in the past attacked Seventh-day Adventism in those areas are now out of date. From now on anyone who echoes these criticisms must be considered as willfully ignorant of the facts or victims of such prejudice that they are no longer to be trusted as teachers in this field.

"At the same time that the Adventists issue their new volume Zondervan Publishing House is releasing Walter Martin's appraisal and criticism of the Adventist position.

" .. When Mr. Martin went to the Adventist headquarters in Washington, he was given complete access to all their records. The honesty of the Adventists can be seen in their attitude. When Mr.

Martin asked the custodian of their vault to let him see material unfavorable to the Adventists, the man replied, 'My instructions are to give you absolutely anything that you ask on this matter.' All references in Mr. Martin's volume are paged to this Adventist statement. In the front of Mr. Martin's book is a statement signed by an official of the Adventist denomination that they have not been misquoted or misrepresented by Mr. Martin. .

" 'Eternity' lost some subscribers by telling the truth about the Adventists.

" .. In fact, as my already heavily burdened schedule allows, we expect to publish biblical expositions showing some of what I hold to be fallacies in the S.D.A. position. .

"The most serious charge ever made against the Adventists has arisen out of a series of booklets written by one of their former workers and disavowed again and again by the responsible leaders of the church. One writer in particular set forth that Jesus Christ had a sinful human nature. The present volume approaches this statement from several different points of view and repudiates it with horror.

" .. In my opinion she [Ellen White] lacked profundity, accuracy, and scholarship. . "While most of our readers may not wish to attempt the 720 pages of the new Adventist volume, though it is illuminating in many areas, I would recommend that they purchase, read, and circulate Mr. Martin's volume, which renders obsolete every other non-Adventist book that has been written on the appraisal and criticism of Seventh-day Adventism."-'Postscript On Seventh-day Adventism" ; Eternity, November 1957, pp. 22, 23, 45.

- SECTION EIGHT - - 1957 - "QUESTIONS ON DOCTRINE"

[Several months after the appearance of the three Martin articles in "Eternity" magazine, "Questions on Doctrine" was released.]

Its publication marked the termination of a lengthy spat of arguments among Seventh-day Adventist editors and a few leaders. (And it also marked the beginning of an even larger chorus of complaints that continues down to our own day.) Although many of the leading workers to whom the earlier copies of the manuscript were sent cared little for such things as checking out a new doctrinal book by Seventh-day Adventists, there were those who did care –cared enough to carefully read it and then write letters of protest to General Conference headquarters.

We have been told that perhaps the greatest amount of negative attention to the book came from editorial workers in our publishing houses. They were more accustomed to analyzing books before their publication. The worst furor over the pages of QD arose in the editorial offices of the Review and Herald Publishing Association in Washington D.C. Repeatedly the book was sent back across the alley-way to General Conference headquarters. And repeatedly, after touching it up a bit, they sent it back. The best emendations, however, came from the editorial staff at the Review. We were told recently by an individual, who wishes not to be named, that in every instance in which the book, "Questions on Doctrine," said something to the effect that the "atonement" was completed on the cross, the Review editorial office changed the noun to "atoning sacrifice," "sacrifice," or some such phrase.

This is somewhat similar to the changes made by the General Conference Sabbath School Department, in response to protests from the field, that were made on the First Quarter, 1983 Senior Sabbath School Lesson Quarterly (the notorious "Gulley Quarterly") prior to its release, in order to tone down its original statements—and the blatant Introduction that it contained.

But after going through the hassle of opposing this Quarterly, the present writer has come to the conclusion that watering down error just doesn't work. So many people are not sharp on the correct doctrinal positions of the Church, having studied so little in our historical positions and in the writings of Ellen G. White, that when error mingled with truth is then presented to them, they imagine that surely the error must be true for it lies alongside the truth!

Here is one example of the pre-publication changes: First, we shall quote a statement from the pre-release book, QD, as it was earlier banded to Martin and quoted by him in his November, 1956 article in "Eternity: "

"But with the passage of years the earlier diversity of view on certain doctrines gradually gave way to unity of view. Clear and sound positions were then taken by the great majority [of Adventists] on such doctrines as the Godhead, the deity and eternal preexistence of Christ, and the personality of the Holy Spirit. Clear-cut views were established on righteousness by faith, the true relationship of law and grace, and on the death of Christ as the complete atonement for sin . . .

"All of this has made it desirable and necessary for us to declare our position afresh upon the great fundamental teachings of the Christian faith, and to deny every statement or implication that Christ, the second Person of the Godhead, was not One with the Father from all eternity, and that His sacrifice on the Cross was not a full and complete atonement. The present belief of Seventh-day Adventists on these great truths

is clear and emphatic."-Walter Martin, in "Eternity" magazine, November, 1956, quoting a statement by our leaders.

Of course, all aside from theology, the above is untrue. Seventh-day Adventists did not at that time clearly and emphatically believe that the atonement was completed on the cross. In the above passage the italicized words were later changed in the final copy of the manuscript for QD when it was published. Here is the published form. Note the italicized changes:

"But with the passage of years the earlier diversity of view on certain doctrines gradually gave way to unity of view. Clear and sound positions were then taken by the great majority [of Adventists] on such doctrines as the Godhead, the deity and eternal preexistence of Christ, and the personality of the Holy Spirit. Clear-cut views were established on righteousness by faith, the true relationship of law and grace, and on the death of Christ as the complete sacrificial atonement for sin . . .

"All of this has made it desirable and necessary for us to declare our position anew upon the great fundamental teachings of the Christian faith, and to deny every statement or implication that Christ, the second Person of the Godhead, was not One with the Father from all eternity, and that His sacrifice on the Cross was not a full and complete sacrificial atonement. The present belief of Seventh-day Adventists on these great truths is clear and emphatic."-"Questions on Doctrine," pages 30, 31.

One highly-placed individual told me that at the time that all this was taking place, the pressure upon Elder Arthur L. White, Secretary of the Ellen G. White Estate (and her grandson) was so great that he hardly knew what to do. Then the comment was made: "He told me that he feared for his life at that time." I assume that this is due to the emotional tension of seeing Spirit of Prophecy statements so terribly twisted by Froom and his associates in their zeal to bring us back to Babylon. Elder White probably was not threatened physically.

But the result of all this was a book that was a masterpiece of intermingled truth and error. The error by itself would have been more quickly rejected by our people. But the sincere, in their efforts to doctor it up so that there would be less error, only succeeded in making the book more plausible to many Adventists.

It was "Questions on Doctrine" on the theological level, and lowered standards on the everyday level, that laid the foundation for the "new theology" octopus that is now trying to enfold our Church in its tentacles.

Two years ago I spoke with one of the administrative leaders at Andrews University. He did not know that I was the editor of Pilgrims' Rest, but recognizing that I was an Adventist researcher of some kind, he took the time to try to win me over to the "new theology. " Some day I will print the conversation, for I took careful notes on it immediately afterward. I was told that there is no literal Sanctuary in heaven and that Ford was right after all. When I pressed him, he told me with an assured smile that he stood by "Questions on Doctrine" and "The Dallas Statement [of Beliefs]." With those two in his band, he well knew that he could quietly defy the most basic of our doctrinal beliefs: the Sanctuary Message and the necessity of obedience by faith to the Law of God.

"Questions on Doctrine" was finally published in 1957, on the Review and Herald presses. Copies were then mailed at General Conference expense, to the library of every Adventist secondary, college and graduate-level educational institution in the world. Here is the title page of this book:]

Seventh-day Adventists Answer QUESTIONS ON DOCTRINE

AN EXPLANATION OF CERTAIN MAJOR ASPECTS
OF SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST BELIEF
Prepared by a Representative Group of
Seventh-day Adventist Leaders, Bible Teachers,
and Editors
REVIEW AND HERALD
PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION
WASHINGTON, D.C.

[This 720-page book is arranged in three sections. The first is introductory, and is an attempt to explain to the Adventist and non-Adventist reader why the book was published.

The second section is the largest, and contains 607 pages of questions and answers (pp. 21-628). The questions were supplied by Walter R. Martin in collaboration with fellow evangelicals. Responses that attempt to satisfy these questions were prepared by certain of our leaders. The third section is composed of a bibliography (book listing) of "representative Adventist Doctrinal Literature," three appendixes, and a Scriptural and general index. In this third section of materials, the second and third appendix are the most significant.

The Introductory Section contains an "Introduction" from "The Editorial Committee. " You will note that nowhere in this book, or in any denominational advertisement or comment on it, is to be found the names of the individuals who authored it. At the heart of the whole problem is the fact that it is poor planning to write a major theological work for the specific purpose of deepening unity with non-Adventists. A theological work should seek to be an extremely clear and accurate statement of beliefs-written for the believers themselves. Such a major work, the first in Adventist history, should not be an effort to conciliate the questionings of non-Adventist theological positions-while at the same time trying through careful wording to keep our own people satisfied that nothing in our doctrines has been damaged in the process. It is simply not possible to pen an accurate statement of beliefs that will satisfy the minds of both believers and nonbelievers.

In this "Introduction," you will note several themes: (1) This new book is uniquely our first major theological production. (2) It is the result of two years of discussions in trying to meet the minds of the evangelicals. (3) It was not supposed to be a new statement of faith. (4) It represents the doctrinal position of our denomination. (We were repeatedly told in other denominational articles at the time that this book does not represent the official position of the church. But a major doctrinal book released by the General Conference and published by the Review as "truly representative" and "the position" of Adventist doctrinal beliefs-IS equivalent to an official statement in the minds of all concerned. And Martin considered it an official doctrinal statement in his book, "The Truth About Seventh-day Adventists. " That is the impression they had given him.). Continually we see in this book and in connection with this book-decided efforts to hedge on both issues and concepts.]

INTRODUCTION

This book came into being to meet a definite need. Interest concerning Seventh-day Adventist belief and work has increased as the movement has grown. But in recent years especially, there seems to be a desire on the part of many non-Adventists for a clearer understanding of our teachings and objectives. Uncertainty regarding our basic beliefs is abundantly evident in much of the literature published concerning us. There are already many books purporting to give the story of this people. [7:1]

Recently, however, one of the large Protestant publishing houses here in the United States planned the production of still another book. An author of several works dealing with the history and beliefs of certain religious groups was requested to produce this new book, the purpose of which was to present a general review of our history and belief. It was to be an objective analysis, with particular emphasis in those areas wherein Adventist teachings differ from some other Christian groups. [7:2]

In order to be factual in his treatment of the subject this author did what authors in general have failed to do: he visited our denominational headquarters in Washington, D.C., and obtained firsthand information. Moreover, he came not for just a single visit, but in company with other scholars made a number of trips to the General Conference covering a period of almost two years. Hundreds of hours went into this research, and hundreds of books and pamphlets, both Adventist and non-Adventist, were examined. In addition there were a large number of interviews. During these many months of study, the major aspects of Adventist teaching were carefully analyzed. The inquiries growing out of this investigation were ultimately couched in a series of searching questions to which comprehensive answers were requested. [7:38:0]

The replies were prepared by a group of recognized leaders, in close counsel with Bible teachers, editors, and administrators.

The goal was to set forth our basic beliefs in terminology currently used in theological circles. This was not to be a new statement of faith, but rather an answer to specific questions concerning our faith. It was natural that these answers would come within the framework of the official statement of Fundamental Beliefs of Seventh-day Adventists which appears in our "Church Manual" and is included in this volume, pages 11-18. In view of this fact, these answers represent the position of our denomination in the area of church doctrine and prophetic interpretation. [8:1]

As the work on the answers progressed, it was felt that our church members would be equally benefited by the material being prepared, and therefore it was decided to publish the completed work in book form. So this volume came into being. While the form of the work is rather unusual, it will, we trust, meet a definite need. [8:2]

The writers, counselors, and editors who produced the answers to these questions have labored conscientiously to state accurately the beliefs of Seventh-day Adventists. But because of the very nature of the Seventh-day Adventist Church organization no statement of Seventh-day Adventist belief can be considered official unless it is adopted by the General Conference in quadrennial session, when accredited delegates from the whole world field are present. The answers in this volume are an expansion of our doctrinal positions contained in the official statement of Fundamental Beliefs already referred to. Hence this volume can be viewed as truly representative of the faith and beliefs of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. [8:3-9:0]

The officers of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists felt that the material appearing in this volume would not only be helpful to the members of their own church but that it would also furnish reliable information on Adventist beliefs and teachings to the many inquiries that, in recent years, have arisen regarding Adventist doctrines. They have therefore requested that this book be published for general use with the fervent prayer and hope that it may be useful in making clearer the way of salvation through our Lord Jesus Christ. [10:2]

The Editorial Committee

[Then follows the 22 point Statement of "Fundamental Beliefs of Seventh-day Adventists." This was our official Statement for a number of decades and was replaced in 1980 by the Dallas Statement. In looking over the 22-point Statement we note that it,

too, was something of an effort to please many minds. Perhaps that is the best that man can do in creedal statements—please as many theories as possible. For example., "He took upon Himself the nature of the human family. ' Everyone can be satisfied with such wording, for though it says that Christ took our nature, yet the sentence is generalized enough to satisfy both sides. The Bible and the Spirit of Prophecy do not do this. They were written to state truth clearly, not written to satisfy minds. The 1980 Dallas Statement carries this pattern (of careful wording that avoids our distinctive truths) even further. Fortunately, although this Statement omits several aspects of our historic beliefs (such as the existence of a two-apartment Sanctuary and ministry by Christ), yet it does show that the Investigative Judgment ministry of Christ in the Sanctuary in heaven is the antitypical "Day of Atonement," and that mankind must obey the Ten Commandments—both of which are weakened, if not denied, in some of the concepts given later in "Questions on Doctrine. " QD cannot be considered to be an "accurate" statement and "expansion " of the 22 point Statment (p. 8:3-9:0)].

FUNDAMENTAL BELIEFS OF SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS

Seventh-day Adventists hold certain fundamental beliefs, the principal features of which, together with a portion of the scriptural references upon which they are based, may be summarized as follows: [11:1]

3. That Jesus Christ is very God, being of the same nature and essence as the Eternal Father. While retaining His divine nature He took upon Himself the nature of the human family, lived on earth as a man, exemplified in His life as our example the principles of righteousness, attested His relationship to God .. [11:4]

6. That the will of God as it relates to moral conduct is comprehended in His law of ten commandments; that these are great moral, unchangeable precepts, binding upon all men, in every age (Ex. 20:1-17). [12:3]

7. That the fourth commandment of this unchangeable law requires the observance of the seventh-day Sabbath. This holy institution is at the same time a memorial of creation and a sign of sanctification, a sign of the believer's rest from his own works of sin, and his entrance into the rest of soul which Jesus promises to those who come to Him. (Gen. 2:1-3; Ex. 20:8-11; 31:12-17; Heb. 4:1-10.) [12:4]

Seventh-day Adventists believe that "all scripture," both Old and New Testament, from Genesis to Revelation, was "given by inspiration of God" (2 Tim 3:16), and constitutes the very word of God .. [26:11]

Doctrines We Share With Other Christians

- QUESTION 1 -

What doctrines do Seventh-day Adventists hold in common with Christians in general, and in what aspects of Christian thought do they differ?

[This is the first of the 28 questions dealt with in this book. The reply is divided into three sections: (1) "In Common with Conservative Christians and the Historic Protestant Creeds, We believe-" Beneath this heading are listed 19 concepts that Adventists hold that other Christians believe. "The nature of Christ "doctrine is slipped in here, between phrases, in the sixth proposition. And the error of a finished atonement at the cross is carefully taken care of in the seventh. The heavenly ministry-without-atonement is touched on under the tenth (and the first proposition under the third category). (2) "On Certain Controverted Doctrines Among Conservative Christians, We Hold One of Two or More Alternate Views. We Believe-" Twelve concepts are listed here, such as free-choice, baptism by immersion, tithing, foot-washing, abstinence from tobacco and alcohol. Martin expressed his strong dislike for certain of our views under this heading (see TASDA)- such as obedience to the Ten Commandments, a brief

hellfire, Sabbath-keeping, creation in six literal days, and the Adventist focus on the historicist school of prophetic interpretation, -yet most of the doctrines in this second category did not constitute the battleground in the two-year conferences. You will note that we are not told that man must obey the Ten Commandments or keep the Sabbath. Required obedience to the Law of God is not taught by QD, if you will read the sections carefully dealing with this topic. (3) The third category is entitled "In a Few Areas of Christian Thought, Our Doctrines Are Distinctive With Us. We Believe-" Five points are listed here, and we shall quote them all, below. Note the wording here: The heavenly ministration of the atonement is simply called "ministries in two phases. " The Seal of God and the Mark of the Beast are merely "the symbols of the opposing forces of good and evil in the last great conflict. " Apostate Protestantism and Rome and all the other issues in Revelation 13 and 14 are omitted. Revelation 14 is the last message, but we are not told what it is. The Spirit of Prophecy is "one of the gifts. " Behind the scenes, this was a major area of challenge and compromise: The Spirit of Prophecy no longer has any doctrinal significance to Seventh-day Adventists.]

Seventh-day Adventist Relationship to Past Positions
- QUESTION 3 -

Have Seventh-day Adventists changed from some of the positions advocated by certain adherents of earlier years, from whom citations are still currently circulated? Do such citations misrepresent the present teachings of Adventist leadership?

[The point of this question and reply is to point out that Adventist leadership is right in repudiating some earlier positions found in the Church. Thus our minds are prepared to consider the fact that doctrinal revision in our day is a good thing.

As with various other religious groups, our early days were characterized by transition and adjustment. A church was being brought forth. As these men were already born-again believers the initial study and emphasis was placed upon the distinctive teachings of the movement. And they were similarly occupied in developing an effective organization. [29:3-30:0]

In those early years relatively little attention was paid to the respective merits of Arminianism in contrast with the Calvinist position. The historic differences of thought involved had reached back to Augustine and Chrysostom. They did not concern themselves with "absolute decrees," "divine sovereignty," "particular election," or "limited atonement." Nor did they, at first, seek to define the nature of the Godhead, or the problem! of Christology, involving the deity of Christ and His nature during the incarnation; the personality and deity of the Holy Spirit; the nature, scope, and completeness of the atonement; the relationship of law to grace or the fullness of the doctrine of righteousness by faith; and the like. [30:1]

But with the passage of years the earlier diversity of view on certain doctrines gradually gave way to unity of view. Clear and sound positions were then taken by the great majority on such doctrines as the Godhead, the deity and eternal pre existence of Christ, and the personality of the Holy Spirit. Clear cut views were established on righteousness by faith, the true relationship of law and grace, and on the death of Christ as the complete sacrificial atonement for sin. [30:3]

A few, however, held to some of their former views, and a - times these ideas got into print. However, for decades now the church has been practically at one on the basic truths of the Christian faith. [30:431:0]

The very fact that our positions were now clarified seemed to us to be sufficient. Our teachings, we felt, were clear. And no particular statement of change from those earlier ideas appeared necessary. Today the primary emphasis of all our leading

denominational literature, as well as the continuous presentation over radio and television, emphasizes the historic fundamentals of the Christian faith. [31:1]

But the charges and attacks have persisted. Some continue to gather up quotations from some of our earlier literature, now since out of date, and print. [31:2]

Deity of Christ and Church Membership

- QUESTIONS -

Is it possible for an individual to remain in good and regular standing if he consistently refuses to submit to church authority regarding the historic doctrine of the deity of Jesus Christ?

Seventh-day Adventist ministers are required thoroughly to instruct all candidates for membership preparatory to baptism. This period of instruction usually continues for some months. If a candidate persists in holding erroneous views concerning our Lord and Saviour, who alone can save the sinner, then only one course could be followed: the applicant would have to be told frankly that he is totally unprepared for baptism, and could not be received into our fellowship. He would be counseled to study further until he understood and had fully accepted the deity of Jesus Christ and His redemptive power. We could not permit one who denies what we believe, and believes what we deny, to become a member, for we could never dwell together in harmony. Strife and disintegration would result. [42:2-43:0]

Ellen G. White's Writings and Their Relation to the Bible

- QUESTION 9 -

Do Seventh-day Adventists regard the writings of Ellen G. White as on an equal plane with the writings of the Bible? Do you place her in the prophetic class with such men as Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel? Are her interpretations of Bible prophecy regarded as final authority, and is belief in these writings made a test of fellowship in the Seventh-day Adventist Church?

Whatever the intent of these questions may be, we would note, as is more fully developed later on in this chapter:

1. That we do not regard the writings of Ellen G. White as an addition to the sacred canon of Scripture.

2. That we do not think of them as of universal application, as is the Bible, but particular, for the Seventh-day Adventist Church. (89:1-3)

The Relationship of Grace to Law and Works

- QUESTION 14 -

It is generally understood that Adventists teach that salvation is by the grace of God-but plus the works of the law. What is the actual Adventist concept of the relation of grace to law and to human works and obedience, rather than on the abounding saving grace of God?

There has been regrettable misunderstanding as to our teaching on grace, law and works, and their interrelationships. According to Seventh-day Adventist belief, there is, and can be, no salvation through the law, or by human works of the law, but only through the saving grace of God. [135:1]

And when Christ came, at His incarnation, He likewise observed the seventh day as the Sabbath (Mark 6:1, 2; Luke 4:16, 31), and was "Lord also of the sabbath" (Mark 2:28)-the Creator who had established the original seventh-day Sabbath of creation week. . He also fulfilled, in antitypical reality, the Old Testament types of redemption-

dying as the "Lamb of God," a vicarious, completely efficacious, and atoning death for man, on the specified fourteenth (or Passover) day of the first month. [151:1-2]

Seventh-day Adventists do not rely upon their Sabbathkeeping as a means of salvation or of winning merit before God. We are saved by grace alone. Hence our Sabbath observance, as also our loyalty to every other command of God, is an expression of our love for our Creator and Redeemer. [153:3]

We believe that the moral law in its original form, though the wording has not been recorded, finds comprehensive expression in the principles set forth by Jesus-loving God supremely and loving our fellow men equally with ourselves. These primary principles are the foundation of God's throne, and the eternal law of His beneficent moral government. [155:1]

Who Constitute the "Remnant Church " ?
- QUESTION 20 -

It is alleged that Seventh-day Adventists teach that they alone constitute the finally completed "remnant church" mentioned in the book of Revelation. Is this true, or do Seventh-day Adventists recognize by the "remnant" those in every denomination who remain faithful to the Scriptures and the faith once delivered unto the saints? Do Adventists maintain that they alone are the only true witnesses of the living God in our age and that their observance of the seventh-day Sabbath is one of the major marks that identify them as God's remnant church?

The answer to this threefold question will depend quite largely on the definition given to the word "remnant." If, as is implied in the second part, "remnant" is taken to mean the church invisible, our answer to the first part is an unqualified No. Seventh-day Adventists have never sought to equate their church with the church invisible-"those in every denomination who remain faithful to the Scriptures." [186:1]

We would re-emphasize what we have already stated on grace alone. Our Lord's sacrifice on Calvary is mankind's only hope. But having been saved, we rejoice that the righteous requirements of the law are fulfilled in the experience of the Christian "Who walks not after the flesh but after the spirit," and who by the grace of God lives in harmony with the revealed will of God. [189:2-190:0]

We believe that all who serve God in full sincerity, in terms of all the revealed will of God that they now understand, are presently potential members of that final "remnant" company as defined in Revelation 12:17. We believe it to be the solemn task and joyous privilege of the advent movement to make God's last testing truths so clear and so persuasive as to draw all of God's children into that prophetically foretold company making ready for the day of God. [196:1]

What Constitutes "Babylon " ?

- QUESTION 21 -Do Seventh-day Adventists teach or believe, as a body, that the members of the various Protestant denominations, as well as the Catholic, Greek, and Russian Orthodox churches, are to be identified with Babylon, the symbol of apostasy?

We fully recognize the heartening fact that a host of true followers of Christ are scattered all through the various churches of Christendom, including the Roman Catholic communion. These God clearly recognized as His own. Such do not form a part of the "Babylon" portrayed in the Apocalypse. The matter of loyalty or disloyalty to truth is, in the ultimate, a question of personal relationship to God and the fundamental principles of truth. What is denominated "Babylon," in Scripture, obviously embraces those who have

broken with the spirit and essence of true Christianity, and have followed the way of apostasy. Such are under the censure of Heaven. [197:1]

Groups and organizations such as the Fundamentalists, the International Council of Christian Churches, and the National Association of Evangelicals have withdrawn from the older organizations because of what they believed to be modernist apostasy entrenched in the controlling leadership of various denominations. [201:2]

A Wider Concept of the Atonement
- QUESTION 29 -

Seventh-day Adventists have frequently been charged with teaching that the atonement was not completed on the cross. Is this charge true?

Quite generally those who teach that a completed atonement was made on the cross view the term in its popular theological sense, but really what is meant by them is that on Calvary, the all-sufficient atoning sacrifice of Christ was offered for our salvation. With this concept all true Christians readily and heartily agree. "We are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all" (Heb. 10:10). Those who view this aspect of the work of Christ as a completed atonement, apply this term only to what Christ accomplished on the cross. They do not include in their definition the application of the benefits of the atonement made on the cross, to the individual sinner: [342:3]

There are those however, who believe the atonement has a much wider connotation. They fully agree with those who stress a completed atonement on the cross in the sense of an all-sufficient, once-for-all, atoning sacrifice for sin. They believe that nothing less than this took place on the cross of Calvary. [342:4343:0]

Some of our earlier Seventh-day Adventist writers, believing that the word "atonement" had a wider meaning than many of their fellow Christians attached to it, expressed themselves as indicating that the atonement was not made on the cross of Calvary, but was made rather by Christ after He entered upon His priestly ministry in heaven. They believed fully in the efficacy of the sacrifice of Christ for the salvation of men, and they believed most assuredly that this sacrifice was made once for all and forever, but they preferred not to use the word "atonement" as relating only to the sacrificial work of Christ at Calvary. We repeat, they believed as fully as we do that the sacrificial work of our blessed Lord on Golgotha's hill was full and complete, never again to be offered, and that was done once and for all. Their concept was that the sacrifice of Jesus provided the means of the atonement, and that the atonement itself was made only when the priests ministered the sacrificial offering on behalf of the sinner. Viewed in this light, it will be seen that the question after all is a matter of definition of terms. Today, not meeting the same issues that our earlier writers had to meet, we believe that the sacrificial atonement was made on the cross and was provided for all men, but that in the heavenly priestly ministry of Christ our Lord, this sacrificial atonement is applied to the seeking soul. [347:5348:0]

Sacrificial Atonement Provided; Sacrificial Atonement Applied
- QUESTION 30 -

Seventh-day Adventists are frequently charged with minimizing the atoning sacrifice completed on the cross, reducing it to an incomplete or partial atonement that must be supplemented by Christ's priestly ministry; perhaps it might be called a dual atonement. Is this charge true? Does not Mrs. White state that Christ is now making atonement for us in the heavenly sanctuary? Please explain your position, and state wherein you differ from others on the atonement.

May we at the outset state most earnestly and explicitly that Seventh-day Adventists do not believe that Christ made but a partial or incomplete sacrificial atonement on the cross. The word "atonement," in the Scripture, has a wide connotation. While it involves basically the atoning sacrifice of our Lord Jesus Christ on the cross, it also embraces other important aspects of the work of saving grace. [349:1]

Most decidedly the all-sufficient atoning sacrifice of Jesus our Lord was offered and completed on the cross of Calvary. This was done for all mankind, for "he is the propitiation .. for the sins of the whole world" (1 John 2:2). [350:2]

But this sacrificial work will actually benefit human hearts only as we surrender our lives to God and experience the miracle of the new birth. In this experience Jesus, our High Priest, applies to us the benefits of His atoning sacrifice. Our sins are forgiven and the peace of God dwells in our hearts. [350:3]

In the tabernacle days of old, when the mysteries of redemption were foreshadowed by many typical sacrifices and ordinances, the priest, after the death of the sacrificial victim, would place the blood on the horns of the altar. And the record states that in this act "the priest shall make an atonement for him [the sinner] as concerning his sin, and it shall be forgiven him" (Lev. 4:26). Here the atoning sacrifice provided is followed by the benefits of the same atoning sacrifice applied. In Old Testament days both were recognized as aspects of the one great overall work of atonement. The one aspect provided the atoning sacrifice; the other, the application of its benefits. [350:4351:0]

Hence, the divine plan of redemption involves more than the vicarious atoning death of Christ though this is its very core; it also includes the ministry of our Lord as our heavenly High Priest. Having completed His sacrifice, He rose from the dead "for our justification" (Rom. 4:25) and then entered into the sanctuary above, there to perform His priestly service for needy man. "Having obtained eternal redemption for us" (Heb. 9:12) on the cross, He now ministers the benefits of the atonement for those who accept of His mighty provision of grace. Thus the atoning sacrifice, having been completed on Calvary, must now be applied and appropriated to those who are heirs of salvation. Our Lord's ministry is thus involved in the great work of atonement. So as we think of the mighty sweep of the atonement, in its provisions and its efficacy, it is seen to be vastly more comprehensive than many have thought. [351:1]

In order to be saved, there must be individual repentance and turning to God. The sinner must lay hold of the provisions of the fully completed atoning sacrifice made by Christ on Calvary. And application of the atoning provision of the cross, to repentant sinners and supplicating saints, becomes effective only through Christ's priestly ministry- and this whether a man fully understands it theologically or not. [352:1]

The atonement therefore involves not only the transcendent act of the cross, but also the benefits of Christ's sacrifice which are continually being applied to needy man. And this will continue on to the close of human probation. [352:2]

In common with conservative Christians, Adventists teach an atonement that necessitated the incarnation of the eternal Word-the Son of God-in order that He might become the Son of man; and living His life among men as our kinsman in the flesh, might die in our stead to redeem us. We believe that the atonement provides an all-sufficient, perfect, substitutionary sacrifice for sin, which completely satisfies the justice of God and fulfills every requirement, so that mercy, grace, and forgiveness can be freely extended to the repentant sinner, without compromising the holiness of God or jeopardizing the equity of His rule." [352: 4-353:0]

We feel it to be most important that Christians sense the difference between the atoning act of Christ on the cross as a forever completed sacrifice, and His work in the sanctuary as officiating high priest, ministering the benefits of that sacrifice. (353:3)

When, therefore, one hears an Adventist say, or reads in Adventist literature—even in the writings of Ellen G. White—that Christ is making atonement now, it should be understood that we mean simply that Christ is now making application of the benefits of the sacrificial atonement He made on the cross; that He is making it efficacious for us individually, according to our needs and requests. [354:7-355:0]

Salvation Prefigured in the Sanctuary Service
- QUESTION 31 -

Does your teaching of the sanctuary service mean that the work of Christ on Calvary was not an all-sufficient, complete, once-for-all sacrifice—a sacrifice that obtained for us eternal redemption? OR WAS SOMETHING SUBSEQUENTLY NECESSARY TO MAKE THE SACRIFICIAL WORK OF CHRIST EFFECTIVE FOR THE SALVATION OF MAN?

To the first part of the question our answer is an unequivocal NO. The death of Christ on Calvary's cross provides the only sacrifice by which man can be saved. [356:1]

This sacrifice was completely efficacious. It provided complete atonement for all mankind, and will never be repeated, for it was all-sufficient and covered the needs of every soul. [357:0]

1. The Morning and Evening Sacrifices.—The morning and evening sacrifices were offered every morning and evening, every day of the year, irrespective of the day—even on the Feast of the Passover, Pentecost, the Day of Atonement, or any other special festival. These offerings were consequently called the "continual" sacrifices (Ex. 29:38, 42) and prefigured in a unique sense the sacrifice of Christ our Lord as always available and ever efficacious (Heb. 7:3, 24; 10:12). It is to be particularly observed that this offering was not provided by any individual. It was offered for the people as a whole. It was not the sinner's offering to God; it was, on the contrary, the Lord's offering for His people. It was offered irrespective of whether the individual Israelite took advantage of its provision or not. [358:0]

2. The Sinner's Daily Sacrifices.—There were certain offerings that the individual sinner and the congregation were instructed to bring—burnt offerings, peace offerings, meal offerings, sin offerings, and trespass offerings. These might be called the sinner's responsive offerings. [359:11]

It is to be borne in mind that these individually and congregationally provided offerings differed markedly from the morning and evening sacrifices. With the provision of the morning and evening sacrifices the individual sinner had absolutely nothing to do. They were offered on his behalf, whether he sought their benefits or not. [360:2]

To us today, this procedure may have the appearance of human works, for every act thus far mentioned was performed by the person presenting the sacrifice. But this provision also was in the plan of God. These works on the part of the offerer were not as a means of salvation, but were an evidence of faith. These individual offerings, therefore, were not primary; they were secondary. In other words, the morning and evening sacrifice was fundamental; it was first and foremost. In a special sense this was the type of what was accomplished on Calvary's cross in antitype for all mankind. [360:3]

5. The Goat for the Sin Offering.—The goat for the sin offering on the Day of Atonement was a unique sacrificial offering. There was nothing like it in the whole round of sacrifices. It differed from all the other offerings in that it had a dual significance. In the

first place, it provided atonement for the people "to make an atonement for the children of Israel for all their sins" (Lev. 16:34). In the second place, it was used by the Lord in cleansing the very sanctuary that was the center of their worship throughout the year (verses 16, 20). [363:3]

Observe how complete the cleansing work of the atoning blood was represented to be. The precious blood provided cleansing-(a) for the high priest and his house; (b) for all the people; (c) for the sanctuary, its altar, et cetera. [363:41]

6. The Grand Climax.-Now comes the climactic act of this great day. After full and complete atonement has been provided for the people, and they are safe and secure from the wiles of the great deceiver, God gives His people a preview of the way in which we is going to banish iniquity from His great universe. [363:5364:0]

The High-Priestly Ministry of Christ
- QUESTION 33 -

Since Adventists hold that complete sacrificial atonement was made on the cross, what do you teach concerning the ministry of our Lord as High Priest in Heaven? When did Christ assume His responsibilities as priest? What do you understand by the expression "he ever liveth to make intercession"? How can Christ officiate as priest in a sanctuary, and at the same time occupy His Father's throne?

The priesthood of Christ is a cardinal doctrine in New Testament teaching. The atoning death of Christ, and His all-sufficient sacrifice for man's redemption, is for us, as for all evangelical Christians, the central truth of Christianity. Yet without our Lord's resurrection and ascension, the provisions of His atoning sacrifice would not be available to man (1 Cor. 15:17). [369:1f]

Much study should be given to Christ's ministry in the sanctuary above, and especially to the concluding phase of that ministry, which we understand to be a work of judgment. And to understand the judgment, we must of necessity understand what is involved in His priestly ministry. [370:3]

As the perfect High Priest, who has made a perfect propitiation for the sins of His people, Christ is now at God's right hand, applying to our lives the benefits of His perfect atoning sacrifice. [375:1]

It is better to see and study the great realities of the sacrifice and priestly ministry of Christ than to dwell too much upon the details of the typical service, which gave but an inadequate portrayal of the sacrifice and ministry of Christ. Far better to interpret the earthly tabernacle in the light of the heavenly, rather than to circumscribe the antitypical realities by the limitations of too close an application of the type. (379:1)

While He is our High Priest ministering on our behalf, He is also co-executive with the Father in the government of the universe. How glorious is the thought that the King, who occupies the throne, is also our representative at the court of heaven! This becomes all the more meaningful when we realize that Jesus our surety entered the `holy places, "and appeared in the presence of God for us. But it was not with the hope of obtaining something for us at that time, or at some future time. No! He had already obtained it for us on the cross. (381:11

He could rightly be "chosen out of the people" because He was "holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners" (Heb. 7:26). He came into humanity, not by natural generation, but by a miracle. His birth was supernatural; God was His Father. Although born in the flesh, He was nevertheless God, and was exempt from the inherited passions and pollutions that corrupt the natural descendants of Adam. He was "without sin," not only in His outward conduct, but in His very nature. He could truly say, "the prince of this

world cometh, and hath nothing (or "findeth no response") in me" (John 14:30). There was nothing in Him that responded to the evil one. And just such a priest we needed. Had He been defiled by even the taint of sin, He would have been disqualified from being either our sacrifice or our High Priest. But though sinless in His life and in His nature, He was nevertheless "in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin" (Heb. 4:15). And because of that, He is able to sympathize with us in every sorrow or trial. (383:1]

Adventists do not hold any theory of a dual atonement. "Christ hath redeemed us" (Gal. 3:13) "once for all" (Heb. 10). (390:1]

(You will note that part of the material under this section was typeset in the wrong line width. This is our error, for which we apologize. It seemed best not to take the time to retype those sections. Here are a few brief comments on Questions 5 and onward, which were quoted above (DH-108, page 2 over to DH-109, page 1):

Question 5: The implication here is that those not adhering to Adventist teachings, as given in "Questions on Doctrine" will be refused baptism and membership in the Adventist Church. This could later extend to disciplining and disfellowshipment.

Question 9: The teachings, doctrinal concepts and personal living standards given in the Spirit of Prophecy are only for Seventh-day Adventists. Others who may read those writings may disregard what they find, without sin. The Bible prophets wrote for all men, but Ellen White only wrote for a small number of earth's inhabitants before the final crisis.

Question 14: Obedience to the Law of God has nothing to do with salvation. Christ's death on Calvary was a complete atonement. Sabbath-keeping has nothing to do with the plan of redemption or man's salvation. "We are saved by grace alone." We cannot even know what the Ten Commandments are, in order to obey them, for we do not know what their original forth was.

-Note here that a key point of Anderson and Froom in "Questions on Doctrine" is that "grace" is "new theology" grace: Forgiving grace and not enabling grace. Ford and Froom say, We are saved by grace alone; therefore we do not need to keep the Law of God,-because they believe it to be only forgiving power. But historic Adventists can say, We are saved by grace alone, -because they believe "grace" empowers one to obey-fully-God's Law. And if anyone refuses to accept this aspect of grace into his life HE WILL BE LOST.

Question 20 and 21: It is no longer necessary to call men out of Babylon (via the Three Angel's Messages) for the other churches are not fallen; they are not the daughters of Babylon and partakers with her in her sins (of Sunday-keeping, rejection of full obedience to the Ten Commandments, etc.). AND the Adventist Church and its message is not the Church they must be brought to anyway for it is not the Remnant and has no more claim on the title than any other church in our world today!

Also note the point under Question 20: Obeying God's Law is a nice thing, but that all comes AFTER we have already been saved at initial conversion. (And therefore obedience is obviously not necessary.) This is clear-cut Fordism.

Questions 29, 30 and 31: The "questions" introducing each of these General Conference replies are "loaded." Each one assumes that Seventh-day Adventists accept the error of a finished atonement on the cross. It is obvious that Martin was pressing for denominational acceptance of this error, and, from the responses, it appears that Froom and Anderson were willing to accommodate him in this matter. And more-their replies are but a series of vigorous reassertions that the atonement WAS completed on the cross. (Recall the point we discovered earlier that in each instance in which "atoning

sacrifice" is given as being concluded on the cross, it was supplied by the Review book editors; the original was "atonement." The above quotations from "Questions on Doctrines" clearly show that this was the intent of the General Conference authors of this volume.) The full caps in the question for number 31 are from QD.

- SECTION NINE - - 1960 - "THE TRUTH ABOUT SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS"

[From nearly the very beginning of the Evangelical Conferences it was seen that both Martin and the Adventist Church should publish doctrinal books on Adventist beliefs. And the plan was that the two would be published simultaneously. This point was mentioned in print several times-even close to the publication date of QD ["Questions on Doctrine"]. But strangely enough, this it did not happen. Why, we do not know. QD made its appearance in 1957, but Walter Martin's book, "The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism" ITA SDA] was not released until 1960. Why that three year delay? We are not told. It is very possible that so much commotion had taken place in the Evangelical world about Barnhouse and Martin's apparent willingness to make peace with the Adventists, that they had to retrench their positions and make the book even more thorough in its point-by-point doctrinal repudiation of Seventh-day Adventism than they had earlier planned on. And this possibility is even more likely when one considers the fact that most of Martin's books are in larger print and are more summary in their analysis. But TASDA went in deep. Small print, detailed comparisons and rebuttals mark it throughout.

Another fact, very closely related to the above, is the significant point that both sides had agreed not only to release the two books at the same time, but to sell both books in the book stores of both camps-Protestant book stores as well as Adventist book stores. But when TASDA was released in 1960, the Adventist Church refused to stock it in their bookstores. This also would indicate that Martin had done extensive reworking of TASDA in those three extra years. We were told at the Seminary that the manuscripts and galleys for both books were being examined and approved by both sides in preparation for publication.

(When was "The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism" first published? We say it was first published in 1960. Froom says it was first published in 1957. Here is the evidence for a 1957 initial publication date for this book: "These interviews and discussions [in the Evangelical Conferences] eventuated [resulted] in our own volume "Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine" (1957), as well as Walter R. Martin's "The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism" (1957, revised in 1960)." Froom, "Movement of Destiny," page 476: 1. Here is the evidence for a 1960 initial publication date: (1) My copy of the book, on the copyright page, says this: "The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism - Copyright 1960 by - Walter R. Martin - Library of Congress Catalog Card No. 60-10154 - Printed in the United States of America." -If there was a 1957 edition of this book it would say so on the copyright page of the book that I have. (3) T.I. Unruh in his article "The Seventh-day Adventist Evangelical Conferences of 1955-1956" says this: "The Zondervan Publishing House had originally scheduled publication of Walter Martin's: "The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism" for January 1957, a part of the series on cult apologetics. There were delays, . . . As late as 1959, R.A. Anderson and W.E. Read, with H.W. Lowe, chairman of the Biblical Study and Research Group of the General Conference, were going over Martin's galleys [the pre-publication pages of his book], preparatory to writing a statement to be included in the book. "The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism" was, and is, a notable book . . . In retrospect, the publication of "The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism". . . improved relations between Evangelicals and Seventh-day Adventists. ""T.E. Unruh, "The

Seventh-day Adventist Evangelical Conferences of 1955-1956," page 45. (3) The "Ministry" magazine first announced publication of TASDA in its April, 1960 issue. "Recently a book-'The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism,' by Walter Martin-has come out."- "President's Page" [article by R.R. Figuhr, General Conference President], "Ministry" magazine, April 7, 1960, page 3.

According to "Questions on Doctrines:" We Adventists have several ideas that are sort of nice, but not necessary. And some of them may not even be true:

- 1-The Law of God.
- 2-The Spirit of Prophecy.
- 3-Our Remnant Church concept.
- 4-The doctrinal apostasy of Rome and the Protestant Churches.
- 5-The call of the Second and Third Angel to come out of Babylon and its daughters.
- 6-The atoning work of Christ within the heavenly Sanctuary.
- 7-The Final Atonement during the Investigative Judgment in our time.
- 8-The Scapegoat Transaction as believed by Seventh-day Adventists.

Many fundamental Adventist doctrines have been carefully revamped to meet the critical eye of modern Protestant Evangelicals. One may say that many of our beliefs were not disturbed. But the significant fact is that those that were altered were the most basic of our doctrines.

For example: We were not asked to deny the Virgin Birth. Nearly all Protestants believe that. We were asked to accept the error that Jesus, though born of a virgin, really received His heredity direct from Adam rather than from Mary. We were not asked to deny the divine origin of the Spirit of Prophecy,- we were asked to espouse the new teaching that the Advent people received nothing new from it. It may bring comfort but no doctrinal concepts or standards that we need obey.

If "Questions on Doctrine" is correct, then there isn't much reason to join the Seventh-day Adventist Church. Even God doesn't consider Sabbath-keeping and obedience to the Ten Commandments as a necessary part of salvation. And you might as well give up trying to find the Remnant Church of Revelation 12:17 and 14:12 -for there isn't one!

The great objective of the innovators responsible for "Questions on Doctrine" was to bring us back to the daughters of Rome. Although it is true that they may not have realized the terrible implications of this objective, yet that was the purpose of the book A doctrinal togetherness with Protestants, to the degree that our people would be willing to go along with such togetherness,-this was the plan throughout the conferences, the framing of the questions and the replies written to them.

The following are points especially to be noted as one reads through TASDA: (1) That which Martin was told by our leaders (the majority of our people don't believe there is any atonement after the cross, etc.). (2) That which be urged upon them for over a year in those Conferences (either you come into line on the essential doctrinal points-or we Evangelicals will not have unity and fellowship with you, etc.). (3) The willingness of the Adventist Church to change its views in recent years (The current position should be considered, etc.). (4) The concern of responsible leadership within the Church to put the

brakes on its erratic members who teach something different (taking steps to harmonize..).

Just prior to beginning the quotation excerpts from "The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism" for this section, we shall here quote front a letter that we received last fall:

September 22, 1982

Dear Vance,

Just a short note about the reference in Walter Martin's book, "The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism." The problem is on page 88, section 2, entitled "The Incomplete Atonement Concept." Here he writes:

"Current Adventist writings teach that the atonement was completed on the cross; and no less an Adventist than Ellen G. White, writing in the Review and Herald, September 21, 1901, stated: "Christ planted the cross between Heaven and earth and when the Father beheld the sacrifice of His Son, He bowed before it in recognition of His perfection. 'It is enough,' He said, 'The atonement is completed.' "

If you check this out in the big green books of the Review and Herald photocopies you will find that the last word is not completed' but complete' which is in harmony with historic Adventism. Notice how Martin makes a big issue out of this when he says, "no less an Adventist than Ellen G. White." Too bad he did not check this one out as this discredits the whole book. In the next sentence he says:

"In the same periodical, under the date of August 16, 1899. Mrs. White stated, "No language could convey the rejoicing of heaven or God's expression of satisfaction and delight in His only begotten Son that He saw the completion of the atonement.

There are, of course, still extant in certain Adventist publications not yet revised, unfortunate statements like those of Smith and Watson, but the Adventists are aware of this and are taking steps to harmonize all such writings with the true position of the denomination. Many more quotations could be cited, but critics usually overlook the greater number of statements relative to the completeness of the atonement which are readily available in past and present Seventh-day Adventist literature."

The above words, "In the same periodical" are not true as the quotation cited is taken from the Signs of the Times not the Review and Herald as Mr. Martin wrote. As to the difference between "complete" and "completed," Elder gave an excellent sermon on that at the Washington Conference Campmeeting two years ago. He said in effect that if the atonement were completed on the cross then probation would have closed then and there would be no hope for us who live after the cross.

Here now are some of the key points in the book, "The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism.'

The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism. Walter R. Martin contributing editor, Eternity Magazine

FORE WARD

As the result of our studies of Seventh-day Adventism, Walter Martin and I reached the conclusion that Seventh-day Adventists are a truly Christian group, rather than an antichristian cult. When we published our conclusion in "Eternity Magazine" (September 1956), we were greeted by a storm of protest from people who had not had our opportunity to consider the evidence. [7:1]

Let it be understood that we made only one claim; i.e., that those Seventh-day Adventists who follow the Lord in the same way as their leaders who have interpreted for

us the doctrinal position of the church, are to be considered true members of the body of Christ. We did not, and do not, accept some of their theological positions which we consider to be extravagant, or others which we consider to be non-biblical. [7:2]

We celebrate the first day of the week, the day of the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ, and we keep no sabbath on any day of the week. We believe that every soul has eternal existence and that those who have been redeemed by the Lord Jesus Christ also have eternal life. There is no suspension of consciousness after death . . . I believe that the ideas of investigative judgment and a secondary sanctuary ministry have no basis in Scripture . . . [7:3]

Although my knowledge of Seventh-day Adventism is not confined to the evidence presented in this study, I am indebted to Walter Martin for his thorough and painstaking research. We had the great joy and privilege of twice entertaining several representatives of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists for two or three days of prayer and discussion. The Holy Spirit bore witness to our spirits that these men are godly, sincere, Christ centered, Bible-loving Christians. [7:5-8:0]

Out of these days of meditation, communion and discussion came their own volume, "Seventh-day Adventist Answer Questions On Doctrine" described by Mr. Martin in his introduction to this book .. [8:11]

Since leaders of Adventism agree that this book fairly presents their theological position, this book is a milestone in Christian apologetics; for, during this study, brethren talked and prayed together, assessed each other's position and agreed to disagree while still obeying the Lord's command to love one another. [8:2]

In the present context, I am sure that Adventist leaders will not take it amiss if I express the hope that Mr. Martin's incisive refutation of Adventist doctrinal differences will keep wavering souls from embracing those errors! And they probably hope that their volume will have a corresponding effect! [8:3]

May the Lord draw all members of His body to each other in mutual respect and love, knowing that each of us is answerable to Him alone. [8:4]

Donald Grey Barnhouse

PREFACE

While an undergraduate student in New York City in 1949, the writer extensively studied Seventh-day Adventist history and theology, and concluded that "Adventists" were a cult of Christian extraction but with enough heretical error in their doctrine to exclude them from the Body of Christ. In the summer of 1955, however, the writer began a serious research project to discover just what comprises Seventh-day Adventist theology. As he burrowed under the surface of Adventist semantics and teaching, the number of doctrinal "heresies" markedly diminished. He read every major anti-Adventist publication, and was considerably disturbed because quotations from some Adventist books were at variance with statements made by the great majority of Adventist writers. This condition, however, is now being remedied by the Adventist church with a renewed effort toward consistency. [9:1]

"The Truth about Seventh-day Adventism", then, is based upon seven years of intensive reading of primary sources, and of every available anti- and pro-Adventist book and pamphlet. The writer has also had personal interviews with hundreds of Adventist leaders* and laymen, and has enjoyed the full cooperation of the General Conference (the central governing body) of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. The officials graciously gave whatever information was requested, even when findings did not favor their cause. The information in this book has also been checked and cross-checked with

authoritative Adventist and non-Adventist sources, so that there can be little doubt of its validity. To eliminate misunderstanding of the true position of the Seventh-day Adventist Church with regard to theology, history, and prophetic interpretation, the writer has drawn heavily from recognized Adventist writers and the latest and most authoritative volume on

Adventist theology entitled, "Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine". This definitive work, which presents the true position of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, was written to answer questions about their theology and doctrine. Its very title indicates willingness to meet evangelicals halfway, and nowhere is this better illustrated than in the following quotation from the Introduction where, speaking of this writer's questions and their answers, they state:

"The replies were prepared by a group of recognized leaders in close counsel with Bible teachers, editors and administrators. . This was not to be a new statement of faith, but rather an answer to specific questions concerning our faith. It was natural that these answers would come within the framework of the official statement of Fundamental Beliefs of Seventh-day Adventists which appears in the "Church Manual". In view of this fact, these answers represent the position of our denomination in the area of church doctrine and prophetic interpretation. .

"The writers, counselors and editors who produced the answers to these questions have labored conscientiously to state accurately the beliefs of Seventh-day Adventists. . The statement of Fundamental Beliefs as mentioned above is our only official statement. The answers in this volume are an expansion of doctrinal positions contained in that official statement of Fundamental Beliefs. Hence this volume can be viewed as truly representative of the faith and beliefs of the Seventh-day Adventist Church" ("Questions on Doctrine," , pp. 8, 9). [9:2-10:3]

The author has labored conscientiously to present accurately the history and theology of the Seventh-day Adventist denomination. He has based his findings squarely upon what the leaders of Adventism have stated to be the true position of their church today. He has also assumed the basic honesty of the leaders whose Christian co-operation and fellowship he has enjoyed. Since the General Conference issued "Questions on Doctrine", and it is fully empowered to represent Adventist thought, this volume certainly is the primary source upon which to ground an evaluation of Adventist theology. [10:3]

Walter R. Martin

Philadelphia, Pa. March, 1959

(Footnote: *Including a mission field survey of some 2 months in Europe and Asia.]

A STATEMENT

For more than a century, Seventh-day Adventists have been proclaiming their beliefs to the world. During the years their motives and teachings have all too often been misunderstood and at times misrepresented. A number of books have been written in criticism of their doctrines, many of which books have been filled with inaccuracies, both historic and doctrinal.

The author of this present volume came directly to Seventh-day Adventists in a sincere desire to study fully at firsthand what they really do believe. This we wholeheartedly welcomed. We appreciate deeply the kindly Christian attitude displayed throughout this book, even in those areas where he is in marked disagreement with us.

His presentation of our doctrines and prophetic interpretations as found on pages 47-86 is accurate and comprehensive.

There are places, however, in this book where we believe the author has erroneously criticized some features of our early history and our contemporary theological teaching. His interpretation and criticism of Ellen G. White in quite a few instances are we believe unfounded. We are naturally in disagreement with his critical arguments in certain areas of our theology and it is also incorrect when he says that Adventists equate eternal life with immortality, pages 118-122, 130. We emphatically teach that a true believer in Christ has eternal life abiding in him now, "and this life is in his Son," 1 John 5:11. We believe that immortality, or that quality of being that makes death impossible, is something bestowed on the believer at the resurrection when our Lord returns.

We trust that in studying the latter chapters of this volume, with which we naturally do not agree, where the author expresses his own beliefs and registers certain definite disagreements with Adventism, the reader will not overlook the fair and accurate statement of Adventist teachings so clearly set forth on pages mentioned above, 47-86 of *The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism* by W. R. Martin.

For one to be completely objective when stating the beliefs of another is perhaps impossible, especially in those areas where there is definite divergence of interpretation. But this author has earned our gratitude and respect by his earnest endeavor to set forth correctly our doctrinal positions and by his attitude of Christian brotherhood. [15:1-5]
November 4, 1959

H. W. Lowe, Chairman

Biblical Study and Research Group

General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists Takoma Park, Washington 12,
D.C.

CHAPTER ONE

THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISM

Footnote: 10" *The Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers*," Vol. IV, p. 881. An extremely literalistic concept, which is refuted by Hebrews 9:12, 24 and Acts 1, which show that at His ascension Christ entered into the "holy places" not the "second apartment" of the heavenly sanctuary in 1844. Seventh-day Adventists have re-defined their teaching in terms of "phases." See "Questions on Doctrine, p. 381.1 [footnote:32]

The three distinctive doctrines of Seventh-day Adventism -the Sabbath, the Sanctuary and the "Spirit of Prophecy"-will be discussed in later chapters. The Adventists had a definite theological platform, which for many years remained almost constant. In recent years, however, there has been a definite movement toward a more explicit declaration of belief in the principles of the Christian faith and the tenets of Christian theology. In short, "clarification" and "redefinition" have characterized recent Seventh-day Adventist theological activities. [35:31]

Succeeding chapters will tell more of Seventh-day Adventist history as it is related to their theology. Although this chapter is but a background sketch, the reader can readily see that in Seventh-day Adventism, religious historians have an interesting subject for study, a subject from which many unusual theological speculations have emerged and continue to emerge. [37:11]

CHAPTER THREE THE HEART OF ADVENTIST THEOLOGY

Author's Note

1. The Concept of Christ's Sinful Human Nature

Since almost all critics of Seventh-day Adventism contend that Seventh-day Adventists believe Christ possessed a sinful human nature during the incarnation, a word should be said to clarify this point. These charges are often based on an article in "Signs of the Times," March 1927, and a statement in "Bible Readings for the Home Circle," edition of 1944. Regarding the first reference, a critical article states:

"My . . . quotation is from L. A. Wilcox, for many years an editor of 'The Signs of the Times, which according to the latest figures given by the Adventists has been published by them for 82 years. Certainly a statement by an editor of that publication may be considered official. I'm sure that anything that Mr. Wilcox wrote did not just happen to get in. In March 1927 he wrote, 'In His (Christ's) veins was the incubus of a tainted heredity like a caged lion ever seeking to break forth and destroy. Temptation attacked Him where by heredity He was weakest, attacked Him in unexpected times and ways. In spite of bad blood and an inherited meanness, He conquered.'

"And again in the December 1928 issue of 'Signs of the Times' this editor Mr. Wilcox stated: 'Jesus took humanity with all its liabilities, with all its dreadful risks of yielding to temptation.' "[86:1-3]

First, L. A. Wilcox was never on the editorial staff of "Signs of the Times." Moreover, Mr. L. A. Wilcox, who wrote the article, in the letter dated April 26, 1957 states:

"The writer of the 'Signs' article was a very young man in 1927 and not by any means always felicitous in his phraseology. I know, for I was the writer. The first sentence quoted is crude and shocking and theologically inaccurate, and I was properly spanked for it by Adventist officials, which proves that this article cannot be truly represented as 'official' or 'authoritative.' [86:4-5]

Virtually every critic of Seventh-day Adventism, including the authors quoted above, also uses a statement quoted from "Bible Readings for the Home Circle" (1944 edition, p. 174) even though in 1945 the statement was expunged by Adventists because it was not in line with official Adventist theology. 187:1]

We have already quoted at length from current official Seventh-day Adventist sources which deny the sinful-nature theory with which critics have relentlessly charged them. Would it not be fairer to consider their publication, "Questions on Doctrine," released in 1957 and endorsed by the denominational leadership of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, than to cite statements from much older publications that have since been outdated or revised in these respects? [87:1-88:0]

2. The Incomplete Atonement Concept

It is also charged that inherent in SDA theology is the unbiblical teaching that "the atonement was not finished on the cross of Calvary." Certain Seventh-day Adventist sources are cited to bolster these charges. For instance, Uriah Smith, a prominent Adventist of the past, stated in his book "Looking Unto Jesus," 'Christ did not make the atonement when He shed His blood upon the cross.' Other earlier writers such as J. H. Waggoner have expressed the same thought. He said, 'There is a clear distinction between the death of Christ and the atonement' (f.n. "The Atonement in the Light of Nature and Revelation," p. 181). Even some later writers like C. H. Watson have been influenced by these early exponents of Adventism.

However, a little investigation of these writings would show that Smith and Waggoner wrote eighty years ago. As demonstrated elsewhere in this book this concept has been repudiated by the SDA denomination. The current position of the Seventh-day Adventist denomination-not the opinions of a few scattered writers over a hundred year period-should be considered in judging this charge of "incomplete atonement. " Current Adventist writings teach that the atonement was completed on the cross.

There are, of course, still extant in certain Adventist publications not yet revised, unfortunate statements like those of Smith and Watson, but the Adventists are aware of this and are taking steps to harmonize all such writings with the true position of the denomination. Many more quotations could be cited, but critics usually overlook the greater number of statements relative to the completeness of the atonement which are readily available in past and present Seventh-day Adventist literature. [88:4-89:0]

Nothing could be clearer than the Adventist declaration that "when one hears an Adventist say or reads in Adventist literature in the writings of Ellen G. White that Christ is making atonement now, it should be understood that we mean simply that Christ is now making application of the benefits of the sacrificial atonement He made on the cross; that is, He is making it efficacious for us individually according to our needs and request." [89: 1]

It may be seen from these quotations [from "Questions on Doctrine] that Seventh-day Adventists hold to the restoration of the "gift of prophecy" in the last days of the Christian Church, and that they believe this restoration occurred in the life and ministry of Ellen G. White. The Adventists differ from other churches, then, in that while they hold the Bible to be the unique, complete, infallible, inerrant Word of God, they maintain that in specific contexts Ellen White's writings are to be accepted by Adventists as "testimonies" from the Spirit of God to guide their denomination activities. [95:4]

This writer rejects this concept of inspiration but one should carefully note that, for Adventists, "inspiration" in connection with Mrs. White's writings has a rather different meaning from the inspiration of the Bible. Adventists freely admit that the Bible is objectively the Word of God, the final authority in all matters of faith and morals. But the writings of Mrs. White cannot be so regarded, and they are the first to say so. Apparently, they have adopted a qualified view of inspiration as related to her writings-"a lesser light to lead men and women to the greater light"-which emphasizes subjective interpretation as the criterion for determining specifically where in Mrs. White's writings the "spirit of prophecy" has decisively spoken. There is no doubt in my mind that the Adventists are defending a situation which is at best paradoxical and at times contradictory. . They do not consider Mrs. White's teachings the source of their expositions of faith. [96:3-97:0, 97:1]

The Church Fathers provide a mass of evidence that the first day of the week, not the seventh, is the Lord's Day. Some of this evidence is here submitted for the reader's consideration. In company with the overwhelming majority of historians and scholars, we believe that not only the New Testament but the following citations refute Sabbatarianism.[152:1]

"The question is, what do the Scriptures teach in regard to the length of the creative days described in Genesis 1:1-2:4? This is primarily a question of hermeneutics and exegesis. . We hold that the word day is used here as elsewhere figuratively and represents a period of time of undesignated length." [159:3-4]

The founders of Seventh-day Adventism, and the one in whom Adventists believe the "spirit of prophecy" was manifested, Ellen G. White, all held this concept of creation. Thus their case rests very heavily upon a literal 24-hour-day creation theory

which is contradicted by the findings of the majority of responsible scientists. (160:1-161:0]

Much; much more could be written concerning the Seventh-day Adventist concepts of the sanctuary, investigative judgment and the scapegoat since they are inseparably linked together. The saving grace of the entire situation is that the Adventists fortunately deny the logical conclusions to which their doctrines must lead them; i.e., a negation of the full validity of the atonement of Christ which validity they absolutely affirm, and embrace with considerable fervor-a paradoxical situation at best! [187:1]

By believing they are God's commandment-keeping church, Adventists have exposed themselves to the charge of Pharisaism. . (3) "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city" (Rev. 12:17, 14:12, 22:14). We admire the desire of our Adventist brethren to obey the commandments of God; but, we ask, what commandments? If they answer, "The Decalogue," we reject their effort to bring us under bondage, for we "are not under the law, but under grace". . Such people speak like "a noisy gong or a clanging cymbal," because they do not give supremacy to the "new" and "great commandment." 201:1-2]

As we saw in Chapter Three, Seventh-day Adventists believe in salvation by grace alone, and vehemently deny that "law" plays any part as a basis for redemption. In their own words, "Salvation is not now, and never has been, by law or by works; salvation is only by the grace of Christ. Moreover, there never was a time in the plan of God when salvation was by human works or effort. Nothing men can do or have done, can in anyway merit salvation. 1204:1]

One of the teachings of Seventh-day Adventist theology which has hindered fellowship with other denominations is that of the "Remnant Church." A survey of their literature from the early days of the movement indicates that Adventists consider themselves a "special people" called by God to perform a special mission which will culminate in the second coming of Christ. [212:11

Although it is possible to have fellowship with Seventh-day Adventists, we cannot accept the "remnant church" concept which is exclusivism, in the light of the Biblical teaching concerning the unity of the Body of Christ. The Adventists officially state: "We do not believe that we alone constitute the true children of God-that we are the only true Christians-on earth today." ["Questions on Doctrine," p. 187.] [212:2]

The "remnant church" concept is also linked inseparably to Adventists' belief that they alone constitute "God's commandment-keeping church." This expression occurs frequently in the writings of Ellen White and other Adventist authors. It has resulted in a spirit of pharisaism of which not a few Adventists appear to be guilty. This legalistic attitude says in effect, "We are keeping all the commandments of God because we keep the Fourth Commandment, the Seventh-day Sabbath, while Sunday keepers do not." As the result of interviews with a large number of Adventists, it is my conclusion that they firmly maintain this position. They hasten to add, however, that although Sundaykeepers are definitely transgressing the laws of God, He does not impute their sin to them because "they have not received light on the subject." In all kindness, I must say that such an attitude of condescension often discourages fellowship between -Adventists and non-Adventists. [214:2-215:10

In connection with this doctrine of the "remnant church," it is apparent that many present-day Adventists have somewhat mellowed in attitude. . In its current literature, however, the Adventist Church is attempting to harmonize all writing with the official position on this subject. [217:1]

We do not wish to belittle the accomplishments of the Adventists, for God has blessed and increased them in their comparatively short history. They have established many hospitals and publishing houses and have pioneered mission projects throughout the world. Nevertheless, it is obvious to the student of the Word of God that their success has resulted from their faithful preaching of the gospel of Jesus Christ, since God has promised to bless His Word despite whatever human interpretations and doctrines may be appended. It has not been due to the proclamation of their "special truths." [218:2]

The many inflammatory assertions which they have published about Sunday as the "mark of the Beast," the "remnant church," "144,000," and their unfortunately divisive presentation of "special truths," have caused Seventh-day Adventists not only to alienate their fellow Christians but to create hostility and prejudice against Adventism in general. [223:3]

The writer has assembled scores of volumes and hundreds of pamphlets, tracts and articles by Seventh-day Adventist writers which bear out these contentions, and many Adventists who have had wide association with other groups admit this. In a word, Seventh-day Adventists have discouraged fellowship with Christians of other communions because they have overemphasized their so-called "special truths." Also, they have assumed that their fellow Christians know what Seventh-day Adventists believe relative to the cardinal doctrines of the Christian faith. Sad to say, this is not the case. Many Christians still are under the impression that the "special truths" of the Advent message are the principal doctrines of Seventh-day Adventism, and what they have seen they have disliked, because of the Adventists' lack of love and tolerance in the presentation of their beliefs. [223:4224:01]

The principal problem facing us is how to achieve fellowship between Adventists and non-Adventists who recognize their common Christian faith but apparently cannot attain spiritual communion interdenominationally. They are separated by the wall of prejudice erected by the Orthodoxy vs. Adventism conflict of the last hundred years. We need only turn to the new Seventh-day Adventist volume, "Questions on Doctrine," which presents the current position of the denomination, to see that Seventh-day Adventists today eagerly desire and encourage fellowship with Christians of other communions who love the Lord Jesus Christ and are seeking a common basis of fellowship. [224:1]

Seventh-day Adventists have repudiated the concept that all who disagree with them are a part of apostate "Babylon" and that they are the only ones who "have a corner on Heaven." They have also stated in numerous places their desire for fellowship with Christians of other denominations. Leading Adventist periodicals ("The Ministry," "Signs of the Times," et al.) have devoted much space to this subject, over the last few years particularly. Seventh-day Adventists, far from opposing Christian fellowship, are apparently in favor of it and are willing to cooperate. [225:11]

We conclude this section by quoting from Arthur E. Lickey's book, "God Speaks to Modern Man." The author therein doubtless gives the conclusion of many Seventh-day Adventists about the Sabbath:

"Not only is the Sabbath the memorial of the original creation but it is God's own appointed sign of redemption and sanctification. It is the symbol of the new birth, the spiritual creation. We read his words, `Verily my sabbath ye shall keep, for it is a sign between me and you. . . that you may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you'(Exodus 31:12). . . The cross of Jesus Christ cast a glorious rainbow of heaven's redeeming love around the Sabbath of God on that holy day of rest nearly 2,000 years ago. . . The Sabbath emblem of creative power and the creator's gift of peace, unfurls its

folds of sacred time over a rugged cross and a rock-bound tomb where-in lay the world's redeemer who died that men might live. The Lord of creation who made the Sabbath a memorial of his creative power says to us, 'My day, the Lord's Day, the Seventh Day, the Sabbath Day is the sign of my creative, redeeming, sanctifying power. It is at Calvary that you will find that saving power. The Sabbath and Calvary stand together for my creative reddening power. What I have joined together, let no man put asunder.' [149:2-150:1]

Mr. Lickey's statement embodies what appears to be a mixture of law and grace. He goes beyond Ellen G. White and most other Adventists in making the Sabbath not only a memorial of creation but a "sign of redemption and sanctification.. the symbol of the new birth, the spiritual creation. ". . Then, in effect, he makes the Sabbath envelop the cross and the open tomb as the "emblem of creative power." This is peculiar language from the pen of one who claims to be "not under the law but under grace." . Mr. Lickey's position contradicts "Questions on Doctrine" and numerous other Adventist writings; his casual treatment of Scriptural context at this point is, we think, hazardous to the cause of Christian fellowship. It also provides fodder for certain critics of Adventism who, ignoring the majority position,

In many of their publications, Adventists reiterate their belief that 4004 B.C. is the date of the creation of the world. This is commonly known as Ussherism, after Bishop James Ussher (1581-1656) who thought that by tracing the genealogy of individuals mentioned in Scripture, one arrives at 4004 B.C. as the date of creation. [157:2

The Adventists tenaciously hold the six-day creation concept; that is, six 24-hour days during which God created the earth. No doubt, one of the basic reasons for their tenacity is that their Sabbath theory would suffer a real setback if it could be shown Biblically and scientifically that the days of creation were actually eras or long periods of time during which the earth's great geological structures were formed. Of course we know that God could have created the earth in six literal days, but without contradicting Genesis, scientific evidence indicates that this was not the case. [157:31

In this connection, Ferguson and Bruun make the following statement: "Throughout the past century, each decade has seen fresh evidence uncovered by the geologists to substantiate their estimates of the all but incredible antiquity of this planet that we inhabit. It is not possible to enumerate here the eras, periods and epochs into which the scientists have divided the eons of geologic time, but only to analyze the methods by which they have calculated the ages required for the sedimentary deposits to form and harden into the rocks they study. Their reckonings have recently been checked by delicate measurements based upon the rate at which radioactive elements like uranium disintegrate to form lead, and the figures thus obtained indicate that the earth has been circling in its particular orbit for a period in excess of four thousand million years." [157:4-158:01

THE FOLLOWING LETTER
WAS SENT TO US RECENTLY

"I asked a worker what was the decision doctrinally and he said Elder Andreasen yielded his former doctrinal position [before his death]. Your statement does not seem to cover this and I would like to know if he [the worker] was right or wrong and what was the final view of Elder Andreasen. (The truth is that Andreasen stood solidly for historic Adventism and never retracted or soft-pedaled any part of it in order to make peace with leadership.)

"The tract by Elder Larson on Documentary Fraud [FF-26] was very interesting to me as we were involved in the cleaning up of the five heretical teachers of Walla Walla

College some 47 years ago. We knew at that time that Elder Froom and a group of leaders in high office favored the same heretical doctrines as the five Walla Walla teachers. So I was not surprised at his (Elder Froom's) mishandling of evidence [as shown in FF261. My husband's notes reveal that the same points of doctrine that were fostered by those five teachers are now the very ones the Ford group are fostering, and the same threats are being used as the Australian group have had to contend with [as shown in FF-5-7], that were used then.

"At that time the evidence of false teaching was gathered from reliable students, workers and teachers, then presented, to the Board under the General Conference presidential assistant, and the five men were faced with the evidence and were then discharged. They were not allowed to continue their heretical program to spread it." - Washington State.

This conviction is based on their particular interpretation of the Book of Revelation, not on systematic theology or textual values. . The historicist school, however, is but one of several methods of interpreting apocalyptic literature, and it is disheartening to note that our Adventist brethren build their teaching about the "remnant church," "which keep the commandments of God and have the testimony of Jesus Christ," upon this particular school of interpretation and do not recognize the claims of other schools on interpretation. [213:0-11

The "remnant church" concept is also linked inseparably to Adventists' belief that they alone constitute "God's commandment keeping church." This expression occurs frequently in the writings of Ellen White and other Adventist authors. It has resulted in a spirit of pharisaism of which not a few Adventists appear to be guilty. This legalistic attitude says in effect, "We are keeping all the commandments of God because we keep the Fourth Commandment, the Seventh-day Sabbath, while Sunday keepers do not." As the result of interviews with a large number of Adventists, it is my conclusion that they firmly maintain this position. They hasten to add, however, that although Sundaykeepers are definitely transgressing the laws of God, He does not impute their sin to them because "they have not received light on the subject." In all kindness, I must say that such an attitude of condescension often discourages fellowship between Adventists and non-Adventists. [214:2-215:01

To see the result of what is exclusivism in Seventh-day Adventist theology, one need only study the following quotations from Course 2, Lesson 9, of the Twentieth Century Bible Course of the Review and Herald Publishing Association, Takoma Park, Washington, D.C.:

"The New Testament Church was called to come out and be separate (II Cor. 6:17). The apostate church united with the world, and state, and paganism. Protestant churches separated partially from apostasy. Today God is calling for complete separation from Babylon. Babylon means confusion. From the Papal confusion and mixture of truth and error, her mixture of the church and the world and the church and state, God says come out. From apostatizing Protestantism, clinging to unbiblical doctrines, uniting with the world, federating with false systems and beliefs, seeking to reform the world by civil law, God says come out" (p. 2).

Such an attitude toward fellow Protestants and members of the Body of Christ helps to explain why there are often unhappy relationships between Seventh-day Adventists and other Christians. Those who indict fellow believers as "apostates" should realize that they are causing offense and weakening the possibilities of unity and fellowship in the Body of Christ. [215:3-216:21

The issues are plain for anyone to honestly evaluate. We would understand our responsibility to fellowship with Christians of all denominations whether they be Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian or Seventh-day Adventist. No one has suggested organizational union and, in the light of Dr. Hodge's statement, this would be impossible where Adventism and Orthodoxy is concerned. On the other side of the picture, however, the Adventists are not "wolves" who deny the foundations of the faith, rather, at the very worst they might at times be classed as "disobedient sheep" who have from time to time sown schism within the Body of Christ. But in this they are not alone as other groups in reputable denominations have been guilty of the same. Today, Seventh-day Adventists are happy to fellowship with Christians of other denominations. By and large they are not eager to emphasize areas of disagreement which cause schism, but rather to fellowship upon the large majority of truths which all Evangelicals hold in common. [233:1]

Whatever it might be that causes Christians to become divisive and unloving must be dealt with by the church as a whole. None must be allowed to "overturn" the faith of other sheep. . It is in this area alone, where valid objection to fellowship with Seventh-day Adventists could be raised, and it is our conviction that the Seventh-day Adventists on the whole do not qualify for such judgment in our day! [233:2-3]

During the course of the preparation of this book, the author delivered a series of lectures in the field of comparative religion in a well-attended Baptist church in upper New York State. The closing lecture of the series was on Seventh-day Adventism, and the pastor of the local Adventist church and his parishioners were invited 'to attend the service. Throughout the lecture we contrasted the teachings of Adventism with those of historic orthodoxy, pointing out our areas of agreement and disagreement; and concluded, as is our custom, with a question and answer period during which questions from the floor were presented and answered. At the close of the period, the Adventist minister rose and stated that for the first time in his ministry he had heard an objective presentation and critique of Seventh-day Adventism, and further stated that he was delighted to be in Christian fellowship with a church which would present so objective a study. The result was that both Adventists and Baptists realized for the first time their oneness in the Christian faith. At the close of the meeting, they joined in a profitable half hour of true fellowship. [234:1]

This writer, a Baptist minister, in no sense endorses the "special truths" of the Adventist message. But in order to be objective and in the light of certain selected passages of Scripture which definitely deal with these problems (especially the Sabbath), we must not allow these aberrations to blind us to the facts that clearly reveal Seventh-day Adventists to be sincere Christians. [236:2]

We urge those who have further questions about Adventism to read "Questions on Doctrine," the recent comprehensive volume of Adventist theology which has been prepared and published in full collaboration with the General Conference leadership of Seventh-day Adventists. [239:4]

- SECTION TEN -
- December 1956 - March 1958, April 1960 -
THE "MINISTRY" MAGAZINE ARTICLES

In preparing this lengthy documentary, "The Beginning of the End, ' we had to decide whether to keep everything strictly chronological, or to place it in logical sections. We chose the latter in order to help you more clearly see the overall picture and what each side had to say.

Barnhouse's "Eternity" article came out in September, 1956; Martin's articles appeared in the October, November and January issues. His "Our Hope" article was published in November 1956. By December of that year, many Adventists were becoming greatly disturbed. Nearly the whole gamut of the Evangelical newsbreak on the Conferences had already taken place. -Especially so, the Barnhouse article in September 1956! By October, letters of questioning and protest were arriving at the General Conference headquarters. Why had the Church not been told about these "doctrinal meetings?" What was going on anyway? The Seminary in Takoma Park, where I was at the time, was a beehive of discussion. But it was one of the few places that had been notified prior to the publication of Barnhouse's 'Bombshell' article that something was taking place. Yet the majority of Adventists outside of Takoma Park knew next to nothing about all this.

-And yet, the first clear-cut announcement by our Church leaders did not appear until December 1956. And this was an announcement in the "Ministry" magazine-primarily subscribed to only by some of our church workers.

It is very possible that those leading out in the Evangelical Conferences hardly know how to present their announcement. Also they probably recognized that they did not know what kind of reaction they would receive from the membership of the Church. At any rate, they decided to print nothing until they could see from the phone calls and letters that came in from the field, how to word their initial announcements. Also it might help them see to what degree they would have to tone down the errors in the galleys of "Questions on Doctrine" already lying on their desks.

It is a most marvelous fact that Froom was busy week after week writing a new book of Adventist doctrine-months before the average Adventist knew anything about what was taking place. Months! More than that! The decision to write the Adventist book of doctrine was made very early in the Evangelical Conferences. Those conferences continued for a full eighteen months, until August 1956. The "Ministry" magazine announcement about the forthcoming publication of "Questions on Doctrine" was not made until December of 1957 four months later. The announcement came about twenty months after work on this major new doctrinal book began. "Questions on Doctrine" was taking shape-and being opposed by some Adventist editors and leaders-long before the members knew anything about what was taking place. What has happened before can happen again. Be on guard.

The concluding "Ministry" article is an announcement made in April of 1960 that Martin's TASDA has finally been published. (It was supposed to have been released simultaneously with QD three years before.) This announcement was made by Reuben R. Figuhr, President of the General Conference. Figuhr was something of a key man in this whole affair. Although not particularly taking part in the sessions of the Evangelical Conferences, yet he was the one who gave the entire undertaking his personal backing. Without that backing, the Conferences could never have continued beyond the first one or two, and QD could never have been written and published. It was because of that

backing that the Martin-Barnhouse-Adventist meeting's took place and became history. Elder Figuhr was President of the General Conference from 1954 to 1966, at which time Elder Robert Pierson took his place. Figuhr was very close to R.A. Anderson, and as far as he was concerned, if Anderson said that the progress of the Conferences and the projected doctrinal book in reply to Martin's questions was doing well, then that settled the matter for Figuhr. Froom, for his part, was just the General Conference researcher; he had no power to carry out such a project without Anderson's backing. Roy Allen Anderson, as head of the Ministerial Association, gave him that backing and actively worked with him in writing up the "answers" to Martin's questions that were to later appear in "Questions on Doctrine." And in turn, Anderson could not have carried on this project without Figuhr's backing. -This is why such an extremely small coterie of men could rewrite Adventist doctrines! All it took was the solid backing of the General Conference President, and the day-by-day backing of one major General Conference departmental chief under him. Yes, it is true that Figuhr was chairman of an especially appointed fourteen-man committee assigned to oversee these Conferences and the writing of QD, but all that mattered was Figuhr's backing and Anderson's enthusiastic endorsement of events as they transpired. The other twelve men on that committee just came along for the ride. Although they constituted a wide spectrum of the leaders of the General Conference at that time, they had two strikes against them: (1) They knew that they were not to vote against Figuhr; (2) They were administrators rather than doctrinal experts.

The truth is that many men in the work do not know the message well enough to defend it. And who are the ones that do? The pastors, Bible workers and public evangelists out on the firing lines who are proclaiming our truths to the world. Ellen White said that ministers are not to be on financial or business committees (see AS-1-2 for her statements on this). They are disqualified for their work when they do this, we are told. The months run into years of presiding over committee meetings-and they have retrained their minds for a different work. They are now businessmen, not Bible and Spirit of Prophecy vindicators. But there is another class that should be most excellently qualified to analyze and defend our historic beliefs: our college Bible teachers. But, unfortunately, in the 60s and 70s our Church decided that the time had come for our Bible teachers to acquire doctorates in order to be "qualified" to properly teach the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy to our youth. Coming back from intensive training programs under worldly, Protestant and Atheistic Biblical "scholars" in the universities of the land, they began teaching error to the future workers, leaders and business professionals of our Church. We have come to the time when a man is qualified for his work by titles and degrees rather than by spirituality, belief in historic Adventism and personal living standards. Paul's title was more lowly: "least of the apostles."

Here are selections from the "Ministry" magazine articles. For this purpose, we went through every "Ministry" magazine from January 1955 through December 1963.]

December 1956

"CHANGING ATTITUDES TOWARD ADVENTISM Editorial, The Ministry Magazine.

"During recent months articles concerning Seventh-day Adventists have appeared in a number of leading journals, both religious and secular. This was not by plan or design of the denomination, yet we are unable to escape the conviction that in this there must be a divine purpose. Seventh-day Adventists have for years been mentioned with favor by national and religious leaders for their welfare work, especially in times of national disaster. And the contribution of some of our men in the noncombatant branches of the military services, particularly the medical corps, has

called forth high praise. This has naturally brought joy to the church. Yet, because of certain features of our belief which have too often been misunderstood and at times misstated by others, some well-meaning Christians have commonly classified us with the non-Christian cults.

"It has been a source of deep regret that certain Christian groups, largely through a lack of full information, have classed us with those who do not believe the very fundamentals of the gospel. It is very possible that we ourselves share in the responsibility of this misunderstanding, because of our failure to state clearly what we believe on these fundamental issues and our failure to place chief emphasis where it really belongs. Nor can we deny that at times certain expressions conveying the ideas of individuals rather than those of the body of believers have appeared in print and added to the misunderstanding. Believing in the fullest freedom of the conscience within certain reasonable bounds, we have never required our preachers and writers to state their convictions in any precise form. Moreover, we have never developed a comprehensive systematic theology within the framework of our doctrines. In fact, many have felt a degree of satisfaction that as Adventists we have no creed. And that is still true. We still have no precise creed as such, for the Bible and the Bible only is the platform of our faith.

"It is not too strange, therefore, that certain difficulties have arisen because of the way our teachings have at times been expressed. A sentence or even a word may convey an entirely different people. This has been especially impressed upon us during recent months. We have been made aware that the utmost care needs to be exercised in setting forth certain features of our faith, because it is easy for us to use language when stressing the necessity of obedience, et cetera, that could convey the idea that we overemphasize the saving value of works.

"The particular doctrines that have been most misunderstood, however, deal with our exalted Lord, His atoning sacrifice, His priestly ministry, and the part played by the antitypical scapegoat in the final disposition of sin. These have been major points of attack, and because of certain mistaken concepts Adventism had come to be regarded by many as out of harmony with fundamental Christianity.

"Seventh-day Adventists do recognize that the heart of the gospel is Christ, His deity, His sinless nature, His all-sufficient atoning sacrifice on the cross, His heavenly ministry, and His gift of righteousness by which any and all who accept of His great salvation are delivered from sin. Nothing is dearer to Adventist Christians than the truth that salvation is wholly by grace 'without the deeds of the law.' True, we teach the importance of keeping the commandments of God, but this is not in order to be saved but rather because we are saved through His grace. To us, obedience is the result of salvation, not the ground for salvation.

"The underlying issue between evangelical Christianity and Adventism has not been our attitude to the commandments of God as such ..

"Our concept of our Lord's ministry in the heavenly sanctuary has been a matter of serious question, for certain Christians have maintained that our teaching implies that Christ is actually making another atonement in heaven in addition to what He accomplished on the cross. If we really did believe that, then we could rightly be censured, for such teaching would rob our Lord of His full and final victory at Calvary.

"Adventists, on the contrary, trust implicitly in the finished all-sufficient, once-for-all atonement made on the cross. But we recognize that our ascended Lord as our great High Priest is now applying the benefits of His atonement to the believer, and is making effectual in the lives of His people that which He made available to us in His marvelous atoning sacrifice on the cross. Having risen from the dead, He now, from the Father's

throne, sends forth His Spirit into our hearts, not only as the Comforter but as the One who is pledged to guide His people 'into all truth' (John 16:13).

"When certain Christian leaders discovered recently that we believe absolutely in the sovereign deity of our Lord, in His preexistence with the Father, in the absolute sinlessness of His nature during His incarnation on earth, in His all-sufficient atoning sacrifice on the cross, and in salvation by grace alone, then the basis of the misunderstandings which for a century have been a barrier between other Christian bodies and Adventists was removed. This has called forth our deepest gratitude to God. And it has heartened us to know that our fellow Christians of other groups are coming to understand us for what we are. Thus the concept of Adventism has been clarified with many. But, we repeat, the real change of attitude on the part of these good friends in Christ came when they recognized that we stand firmly with all true Christians on the great fundamentals of the Christian faith. Those who have been closest to these leaders of evangelical thought have rejoiced in the privilege of gathering around the Word of God and together plumbing its depths on these great subjects.

" .. Over a period of a year or more, some fifty or sixty important questions concerning our faith have come to the General Conference. These were sent in by a group of Christian theologians who desire to know exactly what Adventists believe. These were asked in sincerity with the request that our answers be amply supported by Scripture and history.

"These answers, covering all the main features of our faith, are expressed entirely within the framework of our statement of 'Fundamental Beliefs of Seventh-day Adventists' that appears in the 'Yearbook' and the 'Church Manual.' No attempt whatsoever has been made to add to, take from, or change our doctrines, but only to explain 'those things which are most surely believed among us.' These answers represent the thinking of a large circle of our preachers, teachers, and administrators, not only in North America, but in many other lands.

"It is thought to publish these questions and answers shortly, together with an abundance of supporting evidence from the Spirit of prophecy writings. This new volume will be well documented, so that our Christian friends of all denominational groups will be able to ascertain the features of our faith that have made us a peculiar people."- "Changing Attitudes Toward Adventism," Editorial, The Ministry Magazine, December 1956, pp. 15-17.

December 1956

"THE ATONEMENT THE HEART OF OUR MESSAGE by LeRoy Edwin Froom, General Conference Field Secretary, Ministry Magazine.

" Atoning Grace, the Theme of All Themes-The wondrous provision of atonement-complete, vicarious, expiatory, propitiatory atonement: yes, ransoming, reconciling, restoring atonement accomplished by Jesus Christ for all who will accept its provisions-is the most sublime and moving theme that can be contemplated by the mind of man. It has a height, a depth, a breadth, and a length that is beyond human comprehension. Throughout all eternity the redeemed will ponder and wonder at its vastness, and will never be able to exhaust the marvels of God's atoning love and grace.

"The amazing provision of atonement is complete, perfect, and final. It is without defect. No unknown contingency in the sin problem can arise that was not foreseen and provided for. Nothing further can be needed or desired, by way of complete remedy for sin. God's plan has been, and will continue to be, a perfect provision to meet and vanquish the great intruder-sin. Atoning grace is the best news and the greatest news that can be heralded by the lips of men or angels. It is 'good news' indeed. It is, more-

over, news that appeals to the highest hopes and aspiring instincts of needy man. It satisfies every holy desire and fulfills every spiritual aspiration of the human heart.

"More than that, the atonement will appeal to the highest intellects on earth-when presented in its awesome beauty and majesty-if there is a latent spark of holy desire that can be nurtured into a flame of faith and acceptance. It affords the basis of our most successful approach and final appeal to men. It will come sharply to the forefront in the climax of our witness to the world. Only as we present Christ in His love and majesty can we reach the neglected classes. More than that, only thus can we touch the universal chord of every human heart of every nation, kindred, tongue, and people, and bridge the gap between God and man; only thus can we restore the lost harmony between the soul and its Maker.

"The atoning cross, we are repeatedly admonished, is to be the underlying theme for every effective sermon, every decisive Bible study, and every successful personal appeal. It is to constitute the overtone of every representative statement, spoken or printed, of the Advent faith. It is the inner heart of Adventism the basis of our belief, the motive of our service, the substance of our Christian experience, the theme of all effective witness. It is the irresistible magnet that will draw all men unto Christ, and that will melt the hardest hearts, even those that are chilled or congealed by sin.

"Call it the cross, the atonement, or the divine provision for man's complete salvation; it nevertheless remains the neglected emphasis, the missing note in all too many of our presentations. Its absence, or its hazy mention, is an inadvertent cause of our weakness of appeal and the underlying reason for our meagerness of fruitage for God. .

"Some, in our early days, had a constricted concept of the atonement. Such largely failed to connect the atonement with the cross. They considered the transaction of Calvary only a propitiatory sacrifice, and virtually limited the atonement to the priestly function in the sanctuary on the Day of Atonement, whether typical or antitypical.

"This misconception evidently sprang from the faulty procedure of interpreting the antitypical gospel reality by the figurative pattern of the earthly type, rather than the reverse procedure. Actually this latter procedure is the only proper and safe method of determining basic doctrinal truth. .

"They were at first unmindful of the primary fact that the complete, comprehensive, atoning sacrifice on Calvary was the actual, full, and final provision of atonement made 1900 years ago. But with this basic truth goes this inseparable corollary: that Christ, our heavenly High Priest, has since been ministering its provisions, benefits, and effects to the beneficiaries of His grace the subjects of His intercession. And this intercession continued all through the intervening years prior to 1844, at which time He entered upon the second and final or judgment phase of His twofold ministry. But in addition to judging, He still is ministering the benefits of His atoning sacrifice made on Golgotha, and pleading His shed blood for sinners throughout this final judgment phase of His priestly ministry, which will terminate at the close of human probation and the cessation of His mediatorial ministry for man."-"The Atonement the Heart of Our Message," Le Roy Edwin Froom, Ministry Magazine, December 1956, pp. 12, 13.

April 1957

`ADVENTISM'S NEW MILESTONE-Editorial, The Ministry Magazine.

"Recently a thrilling chapter in the history of Adventism was written. We feel that our denomination, for so long looked at askance by some Protestant leaders, is on the road to better relationship. It would indeed be unwise for us to go overboard about this experience, but we would certainly be remiss if we failed to recognize the significance of

having reached this milestone. The point is that the confusion about Adventism's classification with some of the more 'undesirable cults' has been clarified. Without taking the initiative in this significant gesture, we have been accepted by a fundamentalist sector of Protestantism as 'born again' Christians.

"The main issue in question seemed to be whether Adventists believed in the deity and divinity of Christ, in His atoning sacrifice, and in a finished work on the cross. While some among us wonder why these facets of our faith have not been discovered sooner it might be well for us to weigh the significance of such changes of feeling. We must assume that the readers of 'The Ministry' have kept pace with the articles and special theological features of recent months. We would merely point up a few of our own impressions relative to these recent theological investigations.

"It appears that this (on our part) unsought discussion of our doctrines with Evangelical brethren has been most profitable. Adventists recognize such experiences as providences. It does not go to our heads; it rather humbles us as we try to learn some lessons from this recent stir in the ranks of our Evangelical brethren in Christ, whose motives we wish to recognize as pure and solicitous. Truth can bear investigation and it speaks for itself when God's time comes.

".. We are a people with convictions, but we seek fellowship with all true Christians. Let us now ask one another: Has the full purpose of the Protestant Reformation been accomplished, or should we unitedly continue its forward march until Christians everywhere are conscious of, and have prepared themselves for, the soon return of our Lord?"-'Adventism's New Milestone, Editors, The Ministry Magazine, April 1957, pp. 31, 32.

June 1957

"SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS ANSWER QUESTIONS ON DOCTRINE-
Editorial, The Ministry Magazine.

"We are Happy to announce that the new book 'Questions on Doctrine' is about ready for release. Several references to this forthcoming publication have already appeared in 'The Ministry.' Of all the books we have ever published, none has had more careful scrutiny than this one. It is a group project, and not the work of one author, and it came into being to meet a definite need.

"Some two years ago a group of sincere Christian scholars visited our headquarters to make inquiry about certain phases of our belief. That initial interview was but the beginning of some fifteen subsequent interviews. These were not just for a few hours, but sometimes as much as a whole week was occupied in the close examination of the Word of God. Our beliefs were being subjected to the most careful and exegetical study.

"Up until that time these men, like thousands of other sincere Christians, looked upon Seventh-day Adventists as a 'cult' holding beliefs that were at striking variance with the fundamentals of historic Christianity. They came expecting to find heretics, but were surprised when they discovered that we rang true on all the great cardinal doctrines of the Christian faith.

"This editor's office in the General Conference building proved a hallowed spot where some six earnest men, sometimes more, sat around the table searching the precious Word of God. This editorial room is more than an office, for it is lined with books comprising the major part of the Ministerial Association library. Many of the theological sources for such investigation are here.

'This experience seemed to us to be one fulfillment of a statement made by the messenger of the Lord many years ago:

" 'Every position of our faith will be searched into, and if we are not thorough Bible students, established, strengthened, settled, the wisdom of the world's great men will be too much for us.-Ellen G. White letter 65, 1886.'

"It was natural that on certain points of interpretation we differed, yet in our prayerful penetrating study of the Word of God we shared a wonderful fellowship in Jesus Christ and experienced a new sense of our Saviour's love, His sufferings, and His triumph.

"In order to make the work more articulate, these visitors prepared a list of important questions covering the main features of our faith. The desired clear and comprehensive answers. They began with about twenty question, which soon grew to thirty-three, and later to approximately sixty. These searching inquiries were not just stock quibbles, but earnest questions that required the deepest study, theologically and historically. Our answers were to be complete and well documented, for they were to constitute a frame of reference for the new book 'The Truth About Seventh-day Adventists.'

"While a small group was charged with the definite responsibility of providing these answers, yet every reply was carefully examined by a large group of representative leaders, including the leading General Conference officers.

"It was soon realized that if these questions and answers could be published, it would aid greatly in making clear our position on the major phases of our belief. Consequently this book of about five hundred pages has come into being. Some questions have been combined, and this has brought the number down to about fifty.

"Time is needed to prepare any worth-while book, but this volume by its very nature demanded the most exacting care, to make sure that not only each subject was fully covered and truly representative of the actual beliefs of the movement, but also all our beliefs were expressed in language that could be clearly understood by all both inside and outside Adventist circles.

"The manuscript, after being carefully studied by a large group here, was sent to our leadership in all the world divisions. In addition, it went to the Bible teachers in our senior colleges and the editors of our major journals. Copies were also sent to our union and local conference leaders in North America.

"With the initial work completed, a competent editorial committee was given the responsibility of thoroughly checking all the materials, and their work was in turn rechecked. No manuscript has been more carefully prepared, and no book has been awaited with more eager anticipation. Our evangelists, pastors, teachers, and administrators will all be using this book, to say nothing of thousands of students and hundreds of thousands of our laymen all over the world. We think also of the many thousands of those not of our faith who will be eagerly scanning its pages.

"Adventists' beliefs are being discussed by evangelical Protestantism in all parts of the world today. Our next issue will carry a further announcement of this volume, but we felt that our workers would appreciate knowing that it is now on its way."

-"Seventh-day Adventist Answer Questions on Doctrine, Editors. The Ministry Magazine, June 1957, p. 24.

December 1957

"THE IMMACULATE CHRIST"- by Mrs. Ernest W. Cox The Ministry Magazine.

"There are some good souls who seemingly believe that when Jesus was born of the virgin Mary He inherited from her those carnal tendencies that have marred our race since Adam fell. But, does not this attitude tend unduly to exalt the physical, and lesser, role of Mary in the incarnation at the expense of the ineffable operation and power of the Holy Spirit?

"Roman Catholics concede that Jesus was completely immaculate. They cannot, however, conceive of His being born of an erring woman. Consequently, they proclaim the doctrine that Mary also was immaculate. It was in December of 1854 that Pius IX decreed that by a singular act of God, Mary, the mother of Jesus, was 'preserved exempt from all stain of original sin.'

"But do not some Protestants stumble over the same difficulty when they assume that Mary must inevitably have transmitted her carnal tendencies to her child, in spite of the active and powerful intervention the God's pure Spirit? To say that Christ took a sinless nature from Mary (as the Catholics do) to say that Christ took a carnal nature from Mary, is surely in either case markedly to exalt Mary's role and to emphasize it beyond what seems warranted by Scripture. In either case, the overwhelming power of the Holy Spirit in the virgin birth is not adequately considered.

"Seventh-day Adventists believe that the same divine power resides in each of the three persons of the Godhead. Frequently, when our Saviour was here, He demonstrated that He had power to cleanse and renew men's minds by the forgiveness of their sins. Also He showed that He possessed ample power over their physical frames-a power that was only limited, at times, by the degree of their faith in Him. (Matt. 9:5,6.)

"Obviously, God's power was most graciously and wondrously manifested when Mary was willing to surrender herself unquestioningly to the Spirit's operation 'With God nothing shall be impossible. . Be it unto me according to thy word' (Luke 1: 37, 38). Surely no dogmatic restriction of mortal man can set a limit to the Spirit's power in her and through her.

"Gabriel's precise words to Mary are worthy of careful note. His utmost commendation of her was: 'Thou that art highly favored.. blessed art thou' Luke 1:28). Mary was, without any doubt, a most exemplary young woman, a pattern to all her sex. But she was still of our frail and fallen nature. She was not, of course, in the ultimate sense, holy, as God is holy.

"Mary's Child the Holy Son of God-The significant words with which the angel Gabriel speaks of her Child declare, "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." Mary was one of God's saints, but she was not immaculately preserved from the stain of original sin; she was good, but not immaculately holy, the holy Son of the holy God, born to her through the direct and miraculous action of the Holy Spirit. Well might Gabriel declare in this connection, "With God nothing shall be impossible."

"Moreover, we may realize, with the utmost reverence, that the very developing frame of the divine babe, even before birth, was the object of the heavenly Father's creative solicitude, for 'when he [Jesus] cometh into the world, he saith,.. A body hast thou [the Father] prepared me' (Heb. 10:5). Surely that sacred body, initiated by the Holy Spirit and nurtured by the heavenly Father, would also be holy, without any defiling taint of sin.

'.. And Peter, recalling his own experience with his Master, adds his testimony. He says of Christ, He 'did no sin' (1 Peter 2:22). Paul speaks of our Saviour's completely immaculate mind when he declares that He 'knew no sin' (2 Cor. 5:21).

"Before Adam fell, he was pure and clean, without any taint of sin. He possessed human nature, undefiled, as God created it. When Jesus, 'the second man,' 'the last Adam' (1 Cor. 15:45-47), came, in addition to His divine nature, He also possessed human nature, undefiled, as God had originally created it. Naturally, Christ was without Adam's stature and pristine physical splendor, thus fulfilling the Messianic forecast of Isaiah 53:2: 'He hath no form or comeliness; and when we shall see him, there is no beauty that we should desire him.'

'.. Even a superficial reading of the Gospels is sufficient to show that He was far from-deficient in mental power. His keen perception was the terror of His foes. Equally, He was shown to far transcend the sons of men in moral worth . .

"When He was but twelve years old His thoughts and ways were already passing beyond her comprehension. Again, at the Cana wedding, she showed herself still further removed from the sphere of His thought and intention. Later, she palpably misunderstood Him (Mark 3:21, 31). Beyond His early care and childhood lessons, including His instruction in the Scriptures, the Bible does not reveal that Jesus either derived anything of superior moral worth immaculately from Mary, or that He inherited moral frailty from her."-"The Immaculate Christ," Mrs. Ernest W. Cox, The Ministry Magazine, December 1957, pp. 9, 10.

December 1957

"THE THEANTHROPIC NATURE OF CHRIST-by William G. T. Shedd, The Ministry Magazine.

"[Here is an abbreviation of Dr. Shedd's discussion on Christology from his monumental work 'Dogmatic Theology.' He was for many years a professor in the University of Vermont. He held the chair of systematic theology in several theological seminaries. Zondervan Publishing House has provided a classic three-volume reprint edition of Dr. Shedd's very helpful work. These volumes provide much valuable material which could be used by our workers. For a complete treatise on the above subject see 'Dogmatic Theology,' vol. 2, pp. 261-308.] [This para. is their's.

"Incarnation must be distinguished from transmutation, or transubstantiation. The phrase 'became man' does not mean that the second person in the trinity ceased to be God. This would be transubstantiation. One substance, the divine, would be changed or converted into another substance, the human; as, in the Papal theory, the substance of the bread becomes the substance of Christ's body. See Anselm: Cur deus homo, II. vii.

"In saying the 'the Word was made flesh' (John 1:14), it is meant that the Word came to possess human characteristics in addition to his divine, which still remained as before. The properties of the divine nature cannot be either destroyed or altered. A human nature was united with the divine; in order that the resulting person might have a human form of consciousness as well as divine. Previous to the assumption of a human nature, the Logos could not experience a human feeling because he had no human heart, but after this assumption he could; previous to the incarnation, he could not have a finite perception because he had no finite intellect, but after this event he could; previous to the incarnation, the self-consciousness of the Logos was eternal only, that is, without succession, but subsequent to the incarnation it was both eternal and temporal, with and without succession. . Prior to the incarnation, the second person of the Trinity could not have human sensations and experiences; but after it he could. The

unincarnate Logos could think and feel only like God; he had only one form of consciousness. The incarnate Logos can think and feel either like God, or like man.

"When, therefore, it is said that 'God became man,' the meaning is that God united himself with man, not that God changed himself into man. Unification of two natures, not transmutation of one nature into another is meant.. In the God-man, the divine nature remains divine in its properties, and the human remains human.

"The distinctive characteristic of the incarnation is the union of two diverse natures, a divine and a human, so as to constitute one single person. . by the incarnation, not a God, not a man, but a God-man is constituted. A theanthropic person is a trinitarian person modified by union with a human nature..

"It is the divine nature, and not the human, which is the base of Christ's person. The second trinitarian person is the root and stock into which the human nature is grafted. The wild olive is grafted into the good olive, and partakes of its root fatness.

" .. If the human nature and not the divine had been the root and base of Christ's person, he would have been a man-God not a God-man. The complex person, Jesus Christ, would have been anthropotheistic, not theanthropic. .

"In another passage (Trinity Vindicated), Owen is still more explicit. The person of the Son of God, in his assuming human nature to be his own, did not take an individual person of any one into a near conjunction with himself, but preventing the personal subsistence of human nature in that flesh which he assumed, he gave it its subsistence (i.e. its personality) in his own person, whence it hath its individuation, and distinction from all other persons whatever. This is the personal union.' . .

"An American theologian, Samuel Hopkins, I. 283, adopts the Catholic Christology. . 'The Word assumed the human nature, not a human person, into a personal union with himself, by which the complex person exists, God-man.

.. Says Pearson (Creed, Art. III.), 'The original and total sanctification of the human nature was first necessary to fit it for the personal union with the Word, who out of his infinite love humbled himself to become flesh, and at the same time out of his infinite purity could not defile himself by becoming sinful flesh. Therefore the human nature, in its first original, with out any precedent merit, was formed by the Spirit, and in its formation sanctified, and in its sanctification united to the Word; so that grace was co-existent and in a manner co-natural with it.' Says Owen (Holy Spirit, II. iv.), 'The human nature of Christ, being thus formed in the womb by a creating [supernatural] act of the Holy Spirit, was in the instant of its conception sanctified and filled with grace according to the measure of its receptivity.' . "-'The

Theanthropic Nature of Christ," William G. T. Shedd, The Ministry Magazine, December, 1957, pp. 11-14.

March 1958

"UNITY OF ADVENTIST BELIEF-Editors, The Ministry Magazine.

"Our hearts thrill as reports come to us constantly telling of the progress of God's work in all the earth. Our world mission program reveals our unity of purpose as a people. From our very beginning we have sensed a divine commission to proclaim to all the world the everlasting gospel and to give that message in the prophetic setting of God's great judgment hour. As a people we stand together on our common objectives. That very thing makes us somewhat unique.

"But there is something else that makes us unique as a people, and that is the unanimity of our witness before the world. This was impressed upon us in a particular

way when the manuscript for our recent book 'Questions on Doctrine' was sent for appraisal to representatives in all the world field. Some 250 denominational leaders-ministers, Bible teachers, editors, administrators-carefully studied that manuscript before it went to the publishers. And the heartening thing was that except for minor suggestions, no change whatsoever in content was called for. In view of the purpose of this book, and knowing that it would be studied by critical readers, and that an accurate statement of our beliefs was imperative, this group of readers was asked to be particularly careful in their examination of the answers given.

"It was months before we received all the reports, for as already indicated, these readers were situated in every division of the world field. When the reports came back, the unanimous and enthusiastic acceptance of the content of the manuscript gave remarkable testimony to the unity of belief that characterizes us as a people. Some valuable suggestions were offered, but in no area of doctrine was any major change called for. And that is all the more impressive when we realize that as a denomination we have no 'creed' except the Bible, nor have we ever published a systematic theology.

. . . The book 'Questions on Doctrine' as well as 'The Ministry' magazine teaches that Christ was both Priest and Victim on the cross, and that Christ, 'having obtained eternal redemption for us,' then entered upon His heavenly ministry. This is what the Scripture and the Spirit of prophecy teach.

"The reason for our mentioning this is that a number who have become aware of this misunderstanding have expressed their surprise that anyone reading the book or 'The Ministry' article referred to should get such obviously wrong impressions. While we are quite confident that the great majority of our workers will make their own evaluation of the situation, yet lest some might become confused, we feel it wise to make some facts clear.

"As already stated, from all parts of the world field have come expressions of heartfelt gratitude for the convincing and scholarly answers this book contains. The questions asked are not new; they have challenged us for many decades. Nor are the answers new. However, the way some of the questions were asked called for protracted answers. The unanimous approval of the book from all parts of the world field reveals the unanimity of our denominational beliefs, and a careful reading of 'Questions on Doctrine' will reveal that it is in complete accord with the clearest statements of the Spirit of prophecy, which we have had in our libraries for more than half a century.

"The real point at issue centers in the atonement. As already mentioned, the book teaches that Christ was 'both priest and victim,' both 'offerer and offering.' But these expressions are taken directly from the pen of Sister White."-'Unity of Adventist Belief,' The Ministry Magazine, March 1958, pp. 28, 29.

April 1960

"THE PRESIDENT'S PAGE-The General Conference President Speaks To The Church-Review and Herald Magazine.

"Seventh-day Adventists have, through the years, been attacked, criticized, misrepresented, and, at times, ridiculed by writers and speakers alike. We have grown accustomed to such treatment. But recently a book-The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism," by Walter Martin-has come out, written in an entirely different vein. The author has endeavored to discuss Adventists and their beliefs in a calm, friendly manner, even though not agreeing with them on many points of their teaching.

"Some time back he undertook an assignment of writing on the so-called cults. Adventists were classed among them. Investigation on his part, however, as well as personal contact with representatives of our church, led him to take Adventists out of this

class. He came to the conclusion that Seventh-day Adventists are true Christians; that they and their teachings have been misrepresented and unfairly treated by many former writers. A series of pointed questions in written form were asked us about our doctrines. We, in turn, gave written replies. (These questions and answers now appear in the book 'Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine.)

"The author's evaluation of a number of our doctrines can hardly be expected to be acceptable to Seventh-day Adventists. This should come as no surprise, for he did not set out to defend Adventist beliefs, but to state frankly what they do believe and to give his opinion of them and their teachings.

"We had nothing to do with his undertaking to write a book about Seventh-day Adventists. It was part of a larger plan of the author's. But we do appreciate his sincere endeavor to correctly set forth our teaching. "-'The President's Page," The Ministry Magazine, April 7, 1960, p. 3.

- SECTION ELEVEN - -1979

"Without Fear or Favor"

(In every crisis God has someone who will step in and protest. Although that which he has to say may be ignored, yet he is convicted by the Spirit of God that he must speak up anyway.

Milian Lauritz Andreasen (1876-1962) was such a man. A firm believer in historic Adventism and the teachings of the Spirit of Prophecy, he gave his lifetime to public evangelism, college Bible teaching, administration, and finally, instruction at our Theological Seminary.

Here is a brief background on this man: Ordination (1902); President, Greater New York Conference (1909-1910); President Hutchinson Adventist Theological Seminary (1910-1918); Dean, Union College (1918-1922); Dean, Washington Missionary College (1922-1924); President, Minnesota Conference (1924-1930); President, Union College (1931-1938); Field Secretary General Conference (1941-1950); Professor, SDA Theological Seminary in Washington D.C. (1938-1949).

For practical purposes, it was Elder Andreasen who was selected as the one to lead out in the initiation of advanced theological instruction for our young men and older workers. This "beginnings of our Seminary" was first held at Pacific Union College in the late 30s, and later transferred to the Theological Seminary back east alongside the General Conference headquarters.

By the 1940s, it was generally recognized that Elder M.L. Andreasen was one of our leading Biblical scholars. And he was also known to be our leading scholar in the Adventist Biblical doctrine of the Sanctuary.

Over the years, Andreasen wrote numerous magazine articles and at least thirteen books that were published by our Church. These included "The Sanctuary Service," "The Epistle to the Hebrews," "A Faith to Live By" "What Can a Man Believe?" and others. The first two of the above-named books were written in the mid-40s at the time that he authored three consecutive Senior Sabbath School Lesson Quarterlies on the topic of the Sanctuary.

The SDA Encyclopedia Says that Andreasen "gave special study to the doctrine of the Sanctuary and was considered an authority in that field." (1976 edition, page 43.) And yet, following his retirement in 1950, although still very active both in mind and energies, he was avoided when the "Questions on Doctrine" galleys were mailed out to the "scholars" and "administrators" in the field. -And Andreasen had been one of the few

men who had an outstanding record both as a scholar and an administrator. The striking fact is that, prior to the publication of "Questions on Doctrine," Andreasen was one of the only men who had ever written a major doctrinal work on our historic Sanctuary Message. (I know this to be true, for in writing the lengthy "Biblical Sanctuary" [BH-1-35J I found that Andreasen was one of the only Adventists to have given careful study to the doctrinal aspects of this teaching in an entire book on the subject. Other books on this topic generally dealt only with spiritual and metaphoric applications.)

And yet Andreasen was ignored when advisors were sought to check over the pre-publication manuscript copies of QD. And the reason was obvious: His books, "The Sanctuary Service" and "The Epistle to the Hebrews" did not jibe with the new views to be found in the galleys of "Questions on Doctrine." Andreasen's books agreed with the Spirit of Prophecy, and he knew the topic well-so Andreasen was told nothing about the new doctrinal writing project as it developed over the approximately two years before QD was actually published.

But M.L. Andreasen also had another unusual combination: He had faithfulness to historic Adventism, a thorough knowledge of it,-and a rocklike firmness to principle. He was a man who was willing to stand for the right when few were willing to do so. And this he now did. Loudly did he protest the publication of "Questions on Doctrine." And it cost him dearly. The brethren felt embarrassed. If Andreasen were right, then they were wrong in releasing a book with error in it. At this point, they chose to defend their action instead of doing some heart-searching comparisons of the twisted teachings in QD with the clear statements of the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy. So they denounced him, refused to let him speak in the churches, revoked his ministerial ordination and credentials, and then, illegally, withdrew his sustentation (retirement pay from the Church). They were willing to walk away and just let him starve to death. Men can be dangerous when their pride of authority has been touched.

Andreasen's most prominent protest was lodged in a series of mimeographed papers that he issued. Later, these were gathered together and reprinted under the title "Letters to the Churches." Still later in the 1950s they were reprinted again under the same title. I have here an incomplete set of his first mimeographed edition, and copies of the subsequent reprints.

In connection with the publication of this major documentary on the Evangelical Conferences which you are now reading, we are also REPRINTING the entire set of studies known as "Letters to the Churches," by Elder M.L. Andreasen. You will find this reprint in DH-151+. It will be made available simultaneously with "The Beginning of the End" or shortly thereafter.

A few years ago a biography of M.L. Andreasen's life was written by Virginia Steinweg. Here are some excerpts from this biography, which is entitled "Without Fear or Favor." Everything in Roman serif type face, such as this sample, is from an unpublished autobiography by Andreasen that was given to Steinwig, and which she included, here and there, throughout the book. Everything in this type face is of Steinwig's own writing.

Here, now, are excerpts from this excellent book. You may wish to purchase a copy for yourself and read all of it.]

"Things were beginning to look up educationally in the denomination, and the need of an advanced school for young ministers was being felt. Many young men were coming into the ministry, but there was no place to which they could go and do any advanced work. Also, each Bible teacher taught what he had been taught, and all did not teach alike. Different views on some subjects were being set forth, and in time this might lead to difficulties. We did not need a university-such was not even mentioned but we did

need an advanced Bible school. But who could or would teach in such a school? His responsibilities would be great. He must be orthodox.

"I shall not attempt to tell the story, or weary the reader. But at last the lot fell on me. I had some of the needed qualifications, but was I 'safe'? Would they dare to put me in charge and leave the Biblical education of all young ministers to me? What would I teach on various subjects, some of which were in dispute? After long counseling it was at last decided to conduct a kind of trial school, where only Bible teachers and general officers could attend."

The "Central Union Reaper," of July 3, 1934, reports: "President M. L. Andreasen, accompanied by his wife and daughter, is en route to Pacific Union College, Angwin, California, where he will instruct in the advanced Bible school during the second term of the summer session. Shortly before his departure the Union College summer school faculty and students gave a surprise picnic supper in Pioneer Park in honor of his birthday [fifty-eight] ."

The "Reaper," August 14: "Advanced Bible school: The enrollment is thirty-three to date. . The students are teachers in our colleges and academies.. All but two of the nine union conferences in North America are represented, and four foreign divisions. M. E. Kern is secretary. . W. W. Landeen and G. M. Price [are teaching classes]. . Lectures [have been] by A. G. Daniells, W. A. Spicer, William Branson, L. E. Froom.. A number are expressing hope that the idea of an advanced school of theology may be ,maintained, and that the school may become a permanent feature of our educational system."

M. L. resumes his account: "I was to conduct a school such as I would in the school itself when it was established. The students-the denominational officers-would sit in school benches, and raise their hands as other students when they wanted to speak. But they could ask any question that occurred to them and present their views. We decided that we would give opportunity for expression, take the Bible for our textbook, and ascertain whether we could speak freely on Bible subjects and in the end come out Seventh-day Adventists. The rankest heresy might be propounded, and we would discuss it freely, express our opinions, but reserve the right to change our views if we saw we were wrong, without any embarrassment.

"It was an interesting class, held at Pacific Union College in the summertime. There was no summer school there. . It was interesting for me to find myself teacher for such a group. When I had misbehaved, they had sent me up to stand in the corner. Now I could send them up. But no one was sent up to stand in the corner. We had a delightful time, and after a little embarrassment for a few days on the part of some to find themselves in school again, all entered heartily into the school program. Perfect freedom prevailed, and no one took offense if others disagreed with him. Again and again some would deliver an oration on a certain point of doctrine, and in a few minutes retract it all. One day a veteran discoursed on Creation. Another veteran rose to a point of order, and stated in effect, and in words, `Brother X, I have listened intently to all you have said, and I must confess I do not see a bit of sense in your ideas.' We were a little apprehensive, for the first speaker was a kind of authority. To our astonishment he got up, and, looking at the second speaker unhesitatingly, said: 'That is just what I was thinking,' and, completely reversing himself, he went on with his speech.

"Another speaker denied the deity of Christ and used some common arguments. A Bible teacher arose when the first speaker had finished, and said, 'The arguments you have used are exactly the ones Satan used in heaven. I know now what you are: you are a Luciferian.' Next day he apologized, and no harm was done.

"Another veteran arose one day and said, 'Brother Andreasen, I don't believe what you are now saying. I have preached the opposite for forty years, and you are the first to say I am wrong.' I let the matter pass, but later in the class I turned to him and asked whether he still held to his opinion. He affirmed that he did. I let the matter go, but once more at the conclusion of the class I asked whether he was of the same opinion. This time he banged his fist on the desk and said, 'I have always believed and preached this, and always shall.' I knew that when that man banged his fist, he was in earnest. It took him three days to come around. Then he got up and said he had been wrong, and we were good friends again. We learned in that class that we could disagree and remain friends. It was a wonderful time we had, and a profitable one. We were every day coming close to one another and to truth, and at the conclusion of the institute it was decided that I was 'safe' and that I could teach the new school. The 'Review' editor even stated in his paper, 'Andreasen is always orthodox.'

"So the school began with Elder M. E. Kern as principal and me as Bible teacher. It was all very primitive, but it soon demonstrated that such an institution was needed. As long as the school was located in California and was held only in the summertime I continued as president of Union College, and each summer went West to Pacific Union. After three summers at Pacific Union College, it was moved to Washington, D.C., where it was installed in the Review and Herald cafeteria building."

A dean of the SDA Theological Seminary, asked in an interview whether he had known Elder Andreasen, replied: "He was my teacher at the Seminary. I appreciated his incisive mind and deep theological insight, and his sense of humor. . His personality was not seen on casual acquaintance but stood the test of time. The longer one knew him, the greater became one's admiration. His store of knowledge on many subjects seemed unlimited; he touched life at many points. Elder Andreasen combined the quality of an administrator with that of the research student, a rare combination. He had a profound respect for the writings of Ellen G. White and for her personally, having lived in her home. He did not attempt to answer questions with which he was not acquainted and did not speculate on theological problems where revelation is silent." (W. G. C. Murdoch.)

For a Period of eight years M. L. Andreasen occupied two distinct posts at world headquarters. In 1941 he was invited to be a field secretary for the General Conference. In the Seminary section of the church's 1945 "Yearbook" he is listed as a visiting instructor in Bible and systematic theology, of which he had previously been professor. Wearing two hats was nothing new for him. Back in Council Bluffs days he worked, not for one tailor, but two. Thereafter he was always doing at least two things at the same time. For that matter, a number of the early Seminary teachers had other responsibilities, and were merely called in to teach a class for nine weeks during a given year.

For years, writing had been M. L.'s second occupation. In Takoma Park, when he couldn't sleep at night, he would go down to the basement and type at his big desk. The girls who lived in the basement apartment used to hear his typewriter at all hours. It was there that he prepared Sabbath school lessons for three quarters during the year 1948. To accompany these lessons he wrote his most scholarly volume, "The Book of Hebrews." a verse-by-verse commentary replete with spiritual lessons.

[Then he attended] the 1950 General Conference in Exposition Building in San Francisco.

Although M. L. had every reason to expect that his name would come up for retirement, even though no General Conference official had mentioned the subject to him, he had hoped that he would be among those permitted to go on serving for at least another term, as a very few stalwarts had been. But, on July 14, as he was listening to a report of the Nominating Committee, he heard his own name read at the head of an

alphabetical list of fourteen ministers to be retired. Almost before he realized what was happening it had been voted.

As it worked out, retirement for M. L. meant he would now be more available to the churches that wanted to hear him. After Gladys got off from work at the Glendale Sanitarium at 3:00 P.M., she would drive him as far as 200 miles round trip to an evening appointment. On Sabbaths he would often be booked for four sermons- afternoon and evening as well as two in the morning. As he summed it up some years later: "Since my retirement in 1950 I have been busy every minute. The first five years I continued my work as if I were still employed, and did my full share of the work on hand. But having no settled field, I had more leisure than I had had for a long time. So I studied as I had never done before, and got much reading done."

When M. L. moved back to Glendale, the Southern California Conference gave him the title of Ministerial Secretary. This official recognition gave him a new lease on life. He went from church to church, giving ten-day revivals based on the sanctuary and the Spirit of Prophecy. He spoke at camp meetings. Wherever he appeared, he was, as he always had been, crowd-getter. "No one slept when he preached."

On a certain morning in the autumn of 1956, M. L. as usual dedicated his life anew to the Saviour he had served for more than sixty years. As he read that day, a reprint of Donald Barnhouse's article in "Eternity" magazine, would set off a series of reactions on his part that would long outlive him.

What did he read on those four pages? Barnhouse, an evangelical scholar, was giving his evaluation of present-day Seventh-day Adventism. M. L. took at face value this report from an outsider looking in, without waiting for confirmation.

A phrase caught Andreasen's attention: "Immediately it was perceived that the Adventists were strenuously denying certain doctrinal positions which had been previously attributed to them." (Donald Barnhouse, editor, "Are Seventh-day Adventists Christians?" "Eternity," Sept., 1956.)

Under what circumstances? Andreasen asked. He read the setting: Two years before, a researcher, Walter Martin, had been asked to write a book on Seventh-day Adventism, which was considered by evangelicals a non-Christian religion. To get firsthand information, Mr. Martin had made contact with Adventist leaders at their headquarters.

Further along M. L. read, "This idea is also totally repudiated." What idea was this? None other than what he considered the basic concept of the basic concept of the sanctuary and the atonement- the subject on which he had centered his thought all these years.

When privileged to spend some time at the home of Ellen White, he had especially examined the subject of the atonement and had copied a great number of quotations he had later used in his teaching. Of the fifteen books he had written, two were directly on this subject, as were several of the nine quarters of Sabbath school lessons he had been asked to prepare through the years.

Now he read this sentence: "They do not believe, as some of their earlier teachers taught, that Jesus' atoning work was not completed on Calvary but instead that He was still carrying on a second ministering work since 1844." ("Ibid.") What do they believe? he asked. "They believe that since His ascension Christ has been ministering the benefits of the atonement which He completed on Calvary." ("Ibid.")

What a discovery! By the simple device of using the phrase "benefits of the atonement" describing Christ's work in heaven, it could be implied that the atonement

had been completed on Calvary. The only trouble was that Ellen White had written, "The great plan of redemption, which was dependent on the death of Christ, had been thus far carried out." (2 Testimonies, p. 211.)

But why would the brethren be so anxious to rephrase the standard Adventist doctrine? M. L. found the answer on another page of the article: "The final major area of disagreement is over the doctrine of the 'investigative judgment' .. a doctrine held exclusively by the Seventh-day Adventists. At the beginning of our contacts with the Adventists Mr. Martin and I thought that this would be the doctrine on which it would be impossible to come to any understanding which would permit our including them among those who could be counted as Christians believing in the finished work of Christ." (Barnhouse, "op. cit.")

So that was the reason why there must be a rephrasing! "Investigative judgment" has to do with the atoning work being done by Christ in the heavenly sanctuary. Early Adventist writers had been so impressed with the importance of this distinctive doctrine that they had not applied the word "atonement" to Christ's sacrifice on the cross. (" . . . which atonement, so far from being made on the cross, which was but the offering of the sacrifice, is the very last portion of his [Christ's] work as priest" ("Fundamental Principles," "Signs of the Times," June 4, 1874; quoted in L. E. Froom, "Movement of Destiny" [Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Pub. Assn., 1971;], p. 514).) M. L. could see that the present trend was to swing to the opposite extreme, limiting the atonement to the cross, while calling the heavenly work merely the "application of the benefits of the atonement." In reality, as attested by Scripture and confirmed by Ellen White, both phrases constitute the atonement.

M. L. knew that Ellen White had used the phrase, "the benefits of His atonement," (Early Writings, p. 260.) to refer to Christ's work in heaven. But he also knew that in the same book she had written, "As the priest entered the most holy once a year to cleanse the earthly sanctuary, so Jesus entered the most holy of the heavenly, at the end of the 2300 days of Daniel 8, in 1844, to make a final atonement for all who could be benefited by His mediation, and thus to cleanse the sanctuary." ("Ibid.," p. 253.) "This atonement is made for the righteous dead as well as for the righteous living." ("Ibid.," p. 254.)

Regarding the sacrifice of the cross, she had written, "The brightness of the Father's glory, and the excellence and perfection of His sacred law, are only understood through the atonement made upon Calvary by His dear Son." (Signs of the Times, Aug. 25, 1887.) "The intercession of Christ in man's behalf in the sanctuary above is as essential to the plan of salvation as was His death upon the cross. By His death He began that work which after His resurrection He ascended to complete in heaven." (Great Controversy, 489.)

In almost all of the fifteen books M. L. had written on theology, he had devoted the last chapters to describing, in varying ways, the final work of atonement. For example:

"At the end of the twenty-three hundred days [1844] a people shall arise who will have light on the sanctuary question, who follow Christ by faith into the most holy, who have the solution to break the power of the mystery of iniquity, and who go forth to battle for God's truth. Such a people is invincible. It [sic] will proclaim the truth fearlessly. It will make the supreme contribution to religion in its advocacy of the sanctuary truth." (M. L. Andreasen, 'The Sanctuary Service, "p. 274.)

"The final demonstration of what the gospel can do in and for humanity is still in the future. Christ showed the way. He took a human body, and in that body demonstrated the power of God. Men are to follow His example and prove that what God

did in Christ, He can do in every human being who submits to Him. The world is waiting for this demonstration (Rom. 8:19). When it has been accomplished, the end will come. God will have fulfilled His plan. He will have shown Himself true and Satan a liar. His government will stand vindicated." ("Ibid.", "p. 279.)

As if M. L. had not been sufficiently shaken, he read other statements in the Barnhouse article that disturbed him: "The position of the Adventists seems to some of us in certain cases to be a new position; to them it may be merely the position of the majority group of sane leadership which is determined to put the brakes on any members who seek to hold views divergent from that of the responsible leadership of the denomination." (Barnhouse, "op. cit. ") "Put the brakes on" and "divergent views" sounded, M. L. wrote later, like a return to the days of the Inquisition. He must not be reading correctly.

M. L. went back to the first page of the reprint and reread a statement concerning variant teachings in the church regarding the mark of the beast and the human nature of Christ. In regard to these teachings, the Adventist brethren were described as stating to Mr. Martin "that they had among their number certain members of their 'lunatic fringe' even as there are similar wildeyed irresponsibles in every field of fundamental Christianity. This action of the Seventh-day Adventists was indicative of similar steps that were taken subsequently." ("Ibid. ")

This last sentence Andreasen apparently considered a call to take up sentinel duty.

Soon "The Ministry" magazine announced that greatly enlarged answers to Mr. Martin's questions were in the process of being prepared and would be published in book form:

"This editor's office in the General Conference building proved a hallowed spot where some six earnest men, sometimes more, sat around the table searching the precious Word of God. . It was soon realized that if these questions and answers could be published, it would aid greatly in making clear our position on the major phases of our belief." (R. A. Anderson, "Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine,- "The Ministry, " June 1957, p. 24.)

A subsequent article explained the process used in preparing the book:

"Probably no other book published by this denomination has been so carefully read by so large a group of responsible men of the denomination before its publication as the one under consideration. Some 250 men in America and in other countries received copies of the manuscript before it was published. The preliminary manuscript work by a group of some fourteen individuals had been so carefully prepared that only a minimum of suggestions of improvement were made. There was, however, a remarkable chorus of approval." (R. R. Figuhr, "Questions on Doctrine, " "The Ministry," January, 1958, p. 29.)

Who were these 250 men who had received copies before publication? Andreasen wondered. The answer was in "The Ministry."

"The manuscript, after being carefully studied by a large group here, was sent to our leadership in all the world divisions. In addition, it went to the Bible teachers in our senior colleges and the editors of our major journals. Copies were also sent to our union and local conference leaders in North America." (Anderson, "op. cit. ")

According to M. L.'s friends, it greatly bothered him that anyone would think that sheer numbers could necessarily add up to expertise. No post in the church automatically made a man a theologian. It was not the task of men whose major work

was administrative to be arbiters of truth. Such men were elected to see that the business of the church was carried on in an efficient manner. An administrator had no more right to take the role of a theologian than a theologian had the right to assume the role of an administrator. For even though the ability might be there, training and experience was, in most cases, lacking. So theological matters were for those who had been able thoroughly to study the subject over many years. As for college teachers, M. L. had heard some admit that they had not studied the atonement.

One thing M. L. knew: he who probably could have detected serious pitfalls in the presentation of the atonement and of the nature of Christ had not been given the opportunity. Even one unwisely-chosen word in a written exposition of truth could cause embarrassment.

M. L. gave consideration as to why he had not been among the 250 readers of the manuscript. He could not deny his age. It was six years since his name had been read for retirement that day at the 1950 General Conference. He had written at that time, "Active service has not ceased. I have no disability." Indeed, it had been all his younger, second wife could do to keep up with him after his retirement. He had been in constant demand as a speaker. She would chauffeur him to as many as four appointments on a Sabbath.

More than two years after M. L. retired, a "Review" editor made some belated comments under the title "Our Elder Statesmen":

"These living heroes of the faith linger with us in the late afternoon of life, and we esteem their counsel a priceless heritage from the past. . We think of the vast reservoir of wisdom, sired by experience, in the wide circle of the Fraternity of Retirement. Men's minds do not go into retirement at the time they become eligible for sustentation. Why should we not draw more often and systematically upon this reservoir of wisdom and experience for counsel to meet the problems of today?" (Raymond F. Cottrell, "Our Elder Statesmen," "Review and Herald," April 16, 1959.)

Some have thought that another possible reason for M. L.'s not having been among the 250 readers went back to when he had first moved to the Seminary in Washington in 1938. He had been invited to hold evening classes on the sanctuary service, which employees of the Review and Herald and the General Conference had enjoyed attending. Could it have been that other scholars who were not invited to give evening classes on their specialties had felt a bit envious of his popularity as a teacher?

More recently, in connection with his preparing Sabbath school lessons for the first two quarters of 1957, M. L. had been asked to update his commentary, "Isaiah, the Gospel Prophet." When the manuscript was ready, M. L. had been told it was not going to be published. The department head who had made the contract had retired, and the Book and Bible House managers had taken the opportunity to vote to have no more lesson helps for a while, possibly because those of recent years had not sold out. Had M. L. not felt it a matter of principle to insist that the publishing house reimburse him the \$3,000 he had asked for the expense of his time, secretarial help, and so on, the brethren might have been more kindly disposed toward him.

When "Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine" came off the press, M. L. read the 720 page volume with care. He was pleased that an adjective he had objected to in a "Ministry" article, "final," ("that is the tremendous scope of the sacrificial act of the cross—a complete, perfect, and final atonement for man's sin."—L. E. Froom, "The Priestly Application of the Atoning Act," "The Ministry," February, 1957.) applied to the atonement on the cross, had been omitted. But he could not find any reassuring statement, such as had appeared in the article, to the effect that Christ's present ministry in heaven forms an integral part of the atonement. ("The atonement is

twofold-first a single, comprehensive act, then a continuing process or work of application.. It takes the two phases to have a complete, effectual, applied atonement. . These [are] two complementary aspects of the one indivisible atonement. "-Ibid. ") Instead of a clear-cut presentation, he found this: "When, therefore, one hears an Adventist say, or reads in Adventist literature-even in the writings of Ellen G. White-that Christ is making atonement now, it should be understood that we mean simply that Christ is now making application of the benefits of the sacrificial atonement He made on the cross." ("Questions on Doctrine," pp. 354, 355.)

This sentence loomed so large in M. L.'s evaluation that he seemed completely unimpressed by the high scholarship evidenced elsewhere in the book including such special features as forty-two pages on "Champions of Conditional Immortality," thirty-eight pages on "Basic Principles of Prophetic Interpretation," and two chapters on the scapegoat.

Other matters disturbed M. L., such as the omission from a Sabbath school quarterly on Revelation of the study on the mark of the beast. He connected this with Mr. Martin's contacts with the brethren. Then one day, while he was visiting a former chairman of the E. G. White Board of Trustees, a courtesy copy of the latest minutes arrived. His host passed them over for M. L. to read without having read them himself, just as a matter of interest. M. L.'s eye caught a phrase about appending a few notes to certain Ellen G. White writings, explaining "our understanding of the various phases of the atoning work of Christ."

As the slightest tremor can startle an earthquake survivor, M. L. feared what might happen next. Could not such notes undermine the authority of the Ellen White writings? he asked.

In actuality, the men working with the evangelicals had discovered that the phrase in "Early Writings" regarding "the benefits of His atonement" had been of great help to those scholars in understanding the sanctuary ministration. The brethren had therefore suggested that this passage might be used as an appendix note or a footnote in a place or two in "The Great Controversy." The board chairman was leaving in a few hours for an overseas trip, hence more than a quarter of a year passed before the board decided not to append the notes.

Meanwhile, M. L. had been exchanging letters with headquarters. He was not satisfied with the answers which included, "I have discussed this with the brethren concerned and would like to leave the matter there." Again, "I have considered the matter to which you have referred as closed."

From this M. L. concluded that he had worn out the welcome for his letters to the leaders in Washington. Under the strong conviction that something must be done, he began mimeographing a series of letters on the atonement, which he mailed to former students, and possibly to others who sent him postage.

M. L. recalled that during his first months as an Adventist, while still in his teens, he had been exposed to discussions among the "Iowa gang" of ministers. He had once commented, "In retrospect I doubt that the meetings I attended were the best for a young convert.. I was astonished at the freedom with which they discussed personalities." Now, in his own written discussions, he found himself using such sentences as: "Our leaders are on the wrong track." "Pray for the leaders. They are taking upon themselves more responsibility than they can bear." "They are very near taking the last step. God save His people." (Andreasen, "Atonement VII," Jan. 19, 1958, p. 7.)

For M. L. the scholar, the great focal point of the church was sound doctrine, emanating from Christ, the Way, the Truth, and the Life. From the administrative point of

view, the great focal point of the church was expressed by the president of the General Conference in his opening talk at the 1957 Spring Council, in which he stated principles that needed emphasis at this time:

"What holds our denomination together? We cannot by force hold a single individual in the church. It is all voluntary. Our people are united because they believe in God's church and in the leadership, be it president or church pastor. We must retain this confidence by our example, by the life we live, the way we live, the way we act, by what we say, and the way we say it. . We must be earnest, but never extreme, neither fanatical nor over liberal." (Figuhr, "A Sound From Heaven, ' " 'The Ministry, " June, 1957, p. 26.)

Thus, for the chief administrator, any words directed against the leadership constituted a threat to the very unity of the church.

An administrator is not expected to be an expert on all subjects. He is surrounded by specialists to whom he refers some matters, confident that all will be well taken care of. Therefore, when the chief administrator had received several letters from M. L., he discussed their contents with the specialists [and] then wrote to him stating that he considered the matter closed, and earnestly entreating him to cease his agitation.

M. L offered to go to Washington for a hearing, on the condition that he could have a copy of the proceedings. A tape, recording was suggested, and he understood that he would receive one. However, further correspondence revealed that ii would not be prudent to give him a tape. M. L. thereupon decided that a hearing was impossible.

Other persons besides M. L. were concerned about "Questions on Doctrine." One of these affirms that he was authorized by M. L. to print and circulate "Letters to the Churches," re written from the atonement messages. This naturally increased the number of readers. Some others reprinted and circulated them without M. L's permission, which made it appear that he was abetting their movement.

Through it all, however, M. L. wanted nothing to do with offshoots. It is reported that one day a committee came to his home in Glendale. They wanted him to become the leader of their group. As soon as he understood their mission, he rose up and with all dignity showed his visitors to the door.

In June, 1958, the General Conference convened in Cleveland, Ohio. M. L. was conspicuous by his absence; he was not delegate. But he was apparently in the speakers' thoughts. The opening sermon was on "The Blessedness of Unity." Another was on "The Intercessory Ministry of Christ" On the first Sabbath near the end of his sermon of "The Faith Once Delivered to the Saints," the reelected president of the General Conference [R. R Figuhr] said,

"The sole hope of our salvation, Christ, His atoning sacrifice on Calvary, the final phase of His atoning ministry now going on in the heavenly sanctuary, must by word and voice be clearly proclaimed to the world so that people will understand and appreciate this fundamental Biblical teaching. The sacrifice and ministry of our Lord and Saviour have not been too clearly understood, nor too deeply appreciated, even by our own people. Through a fuller comprehension of it, the preciousness of our Lord, as well as our own personal relation to Him, will be greatly clarified and enhanced." (Figuhr, "The Faith Once Delivered to the Saints," "Review and Herald, "June 23, 1958, p. 56.)

A month before the General Conference session, the "Review" had carried an associate editor's article, "Can Truth Be Popular?"

"The distinctive truths proclaimed by Seventh-day Adventists for more than a century have never been popular in theological circles, and it is futile to expect that they

ever will be. Were Seventh-day Adventists to yield their distinctive teachings in order to win and wear the robe of theological respectability, they would doubtless be accepted by other Christian bodies. But in so doing they would be traitor to the truths that have made them people. . They would no longer be Seventh-day Adventists."(Cottrell, "Can Truth Be Popular?" "Review and Herald," May 15 1958.)

The editor-in-chief continued along the same vein nine months later:

"There is a subtle temptation facing Adventists today-this day of our increasing popularity-to feel that if we rephrase our beliefs a little, setting them forth in less disturbing form, we can have good fellowship on all sides. . Greatly would the evil one like to persuade us to fall into that trap. . The Advent message is pole removed from the modern religious thinking that would give us foggy, inspirational kind of emotion as a substitute for rugged doctrines, and those sharply etched concepts of God and His requirements, that are vital to true religion." (Francis D. Nichol, 'Warning Lesson From Bogus Books,' "Review and Herald, Feb. 26, 1959.)

Part of his writing was tinged with the critical spirit he had observed in some of those who had been through the 1888 General Conference. The editor-in-chief wrote in the "Review" in July of that same year,

"It is incredible that critics should seek to find in the Bible prophets and Mrs. White's writing a precedent for their critics course of action. They stand guilty of presumption in placing themselves on a plane with the prophets.. No, the critics are not inspired men." (Francis D. Nichol, "Are the Critics Also Among the Prophets?," "Review and Herald, "July 21, 1960.)

M. L. had been acting as a critic because "I knew it was time to sound the alarm.. I have received my orders from God MEET IT, MEET IT. And I must be true to my Lord." (Andreasen, "Suspension Story," p. 1.)

His faithful wife of more than fifty-two years was no longer by his side to remind him that the Bible prophets were to deliver their message, "whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear." Once they had delivered it, they were to go home. "Annie would have straightened him out in two minutes," it has been observed, "but he refused to go home." Instead, he stood up and shouted all the louder.

During the years of controversy, five of Andreasen's books were regularly listed in the Christian Home Library Series, of which announcement read: "Each book going into this series was good yesterday, is good today, and will be equally good tomorrow. Each is worthy of a permanent place on your library shelves." After November 17, 1960, this announcement continued to appear in the "Review," but without Andreasen's titles being included in the list (The book "Prayer" rejoined the list during the fourth quarter of 1966.)

[A little more than a year after M. L.'s death, F. D. Nichol's "Answers to Objections," which M. L. had stated set forth correctly the position of the church on the atonement, was published in a new compact edition, priced to sell widely. In 1969, seven years after his death, four of Andreasen's books were republished to begin a new library named the Shield Series. These titles read: "The Sanctuary Service," "The Faith of Jesus," "The Sabbath," and "A Faith to Live By."]

In spite of his difficulties, the veteran had not lost his spirit of fight nor his sense of humor.

"It is a wonderful thing to live in such a time and under such circumstances as these. I am enjoying life as never before. 'To be living is sublime.' So I rest a little until

my good friends think I have given up, am sick, or passed on. Then I come to life again, and continue my work." (M. L. Andreasen, "The Living Witness," p. 5.)

But the denomination could not condone M. L.'s activities. Therefore, on April 6, 1961, the members of the General Conference Committee assembled in Spring Council reluctantly voted to suspend his ministerial credentials. This was done for (1) bringing discord and confusion into the ranks by voice and pen, and for (2) refusing to respond favorably to the appeals to make a statement of his differences to the General Conference except on his own particular terms. (Minutes of the Spring Council filed in General Conference archives.) "It was a sad, sad meeting. We all honored Elder Andreasen. We loved him." (Arthur White, letter to Thomas A. Davis, Oct. 23, 1978.)

In a personal letter, Andreasen wrote, "As you may know, I have had my credentials 'suspended.' .. I didn't know about it till later. But I am an SDA . . . I am of good courage. 'Stay by the ship' is somewhat hard when they throw you out." He had previously written, "Three times I heard Sister White repeat that, 'Stay by the ship.' Good counsel."

That summer, two former students came to visit him, resolved not to mention his troubles. The first thing he said was, "Well, they've suspended my credentials." With tears in his eyes he added, "I've not left the church. I have no intention of leaving the church."

But in spite of his second wife's devotion in giving him the best possible physical care, M. L.'s body could not withstand the grief that assailed him, especially during the long nights. He even wrote letters to God. No longer was he permitted to preach even one sermon on Sabbath. That his zeal for what he understood to be the Lord's cause should have gotten him into this predicament was more than he could take. He developed a duodenal ulcer that eventually began to hemorrhage. Less than a week before his death, which occurred on February 19, 1962, he was taken to the hospital. His heart was not strong enough for surgery.

He spent his last night at home praying and weeping over his sad situation relative to the ministry of which he had formed a part for almost sixty years. His wife sent word to the General Conference president, who was in the vicinity at the time, explaining that M. L. wanted to see him. He went, accompanied by the president of the Pacific Union Conference.

The three had met together on previous occasions, when the results had been unsatisfactory. Now they talked together frankly about past experiences and actions. A. L. made it plain that although he differed regarding some of the procedures followed in his handling his case, he wanted to be at peace with his brethren and with God. He wanted no animosities. The president responded in kind. Then each prayed. The bitterness was eliminated. At last the old warrior was ready to leave the whole matter in the Lord's care. There were tears of gratitude in his eyes as the visitors left. "Now I can die in peace," he told his wife.

On March 1, 1962, the General Conference Committee voted to restore M. L.'s ministerial credentials and to list his name in the "Yearbook" along with the other sustentees. But M. L. never learned of this action; he had already gone to his rest. ("Without Fear or Favor," by Virginia Steinweg, pp. 144-151, 161, 163, 165-183.)

SECTION TWELVE - - c. 1961 - "SATAN'S LAST DECEPTION"

[The following manuscript is of anonymous origin, although I believe I know the one who authored it. As a result of the "Questions on Doctrine" furor, not only Andriessen but others arose and strongly objected to this flagrant setting aside of our historic teachings. Among those that objected in print was a group of over two-dozen medical doctors who funded the publication and wide distribution of a number of small booklets and tracts that were issues in the early 60's (primarily from 1960 to 1962). They titled themselves the "True Medical Missionary Association" and mailed these publications from a Loma Linda address. One who was a principal in this project personally told me in a letter recently that it was because of his acquaintance with Andriessen that he urged the organizing of the TMMA and the writing and publishing of its little booklets. The TMMA ceased operations about the year 1962.

The following is a reprint of most of a twelve-page booklet entitled "Satan's Last Deception.] "

"The very last deception of Satan will be to make of none effect the testimony of the Spirit of God. "-S.M., 1, p. 48.

Many members of the Seventh-day Adventist church are prone to interpret this testimony by the Servant of the Lord to mean that the final Great Apostasy in these closing days of this earth's history, will be the open denunciation, by leading members of our church of the teachings and truths contained in the Spirit of Prophecy. However, closer analysis of this statement by Sister White, reveals that what she actually says is something entirely different. The phrase 'to make of none effect' does not imply an attitude of open and avowed defiance to the Lord's instructions, but rather the adoption of an outward appearance of compliance to them, while actually adhering and engaging in beliefs and practices directly contrary to the plain, unmistakable meaning of the Lord's word as given by His Servant.

If the teachings of the Spirit of Prophecy were openly discredited and denounced by our leading church officials, it would be a simple matter for any of our church members to detect the falsity of such and not be deceived. But Sister White, referring to the final, Great Apostasy that will be experienced by our church before the end, explains how subtly it will take place-how she fears that many of God's people will be deceived thereby:

"I knew that the Omega would follow in a little while, and I trembled for our people."-Special Testimonies, Series B; Mimeographed Edition, p. 49.

After denouncing the Alpha of Apostasy which shook the very foundations of our church, Sister White predicted:

"The Omega will follow, and it will be received by those who are not willing to heed the warning God has given. "-Idem, p. 47. "The Omega will be of a most startling nature.'=Idem, p. 29. cf 1 SM 48, 19Z

In writing to a leading church member whom Satan influenced to bring on the Alpha of Apostasy, and which statement seems particularly applicable today in regard to the Omega, the Servant of the Lord delivered the following scathing comment:

"You were professedly believing the Testimonies, and yet walking and working contrary to them, following your own impulses, turning from the plain 'Thus saith the Lord,' to carry out your own plans and devisings." -Letters and Manuscripts Relating to Medical Missionary Work and Going to Battle Creek, p. 119.

The late Elder M. L. Andreasen, who for many years was considered the dean of Seventh-day Adventist theologians, in his forceful series of booklets entitled "Letters to the Churches" pinpoints the areas in which Satan has succeeded in his efforts to make the Omega of Apostasy a reality. As we read through Elder Andreasen's letters, we realize anew how the hellish technique that Satan used with Dr. Kellogg, has succeeded in bringing on this last great Apostasy within our church. Brother Andreasen makes a summation of the crisis we are facing today, as follows:

"We have reached a crisis in this denomination when leaders are attempting to enforce false doctrine and threaten those who object. The whole program is unbelievable. Men are now attempting to remove the foundations of many generations, and think they can succeed. If we did not have the Spirit of Prophecy we would not know of the departure from sound doctrine which is now threatening us, and the coming of the Omega which will decimate our ranks and cause grievous wounds."-Letters to the Churches, No. 3, p. 9.

As Elder Andreasen so ably brings out, the Omega of Apostasy consists of an open downgrading of the teachings of the Spirit of Prophecy, along with an attempt to alter our doctrinal beliefs concerning the Nature of Christ, and the Atonement, so that these will be in line with worldly doctrines. In his "Letters to the Churches," Elder Andreasen gives a number of examples of how some of our leaders have downgraded the teachings of the Spirit of Prophecy.

In 1957, the General Conference released a book entitled, "Questions on Doctrine." It was published as the outcome of a series of conferences between certain of our leaders with evangelical representatives Martin, Barnhouse and Cannon. The book was supposed to answer some pertinent questions raised by Mr. Martin, as spokesman for the evangelicals, but it seriously compromised and apostasized on some of the fundamental doctrines of our church.

The late Elder Andreasen, whom we mentioned earlier in this study, was the first prominent Adventist theologian that 'made himself a man of no reputation' by calling attention to this apostasy which he identified as the Omega.

Now, let us consider briefly, some of the points of apostasy which crop up in the book "Questions on Doctrine." One of the most important and far-reaching of these is the position taken by our G. C. representatives that negates our church's fundamental belief that Christ inherited fallen human nature. "Questions on Doctrine" states flatly that Christ possessed the same sinless nature that Adam had before he succumbed to temptation in Eden. (See Q. D., pp. 50-66; 647-660) It is disconcerting and disturbing in the extreme to note that this position is in complete agreement with the views of Catholic and apostate Protestant sects. In fact, the book takes the identical position on this important subject that our leading theologians and leaders of the past unhesitatingly branded as being the teachings of the anti-Christ. (A new book, released in September 1962, entitled, "Another

Look At Seventh-day Adventism" by Norman F. Douty, calls attention to the historic Adventist position on the Nature of Christ and other Foundations of our Faith. A host of Adventist writers are quoted to show that our position in the past is not what we are teaching today. While he attacks all our distinctive doctrines in a brotherly way, he conclusively makes the point that "Questions on Doctrine" distorts our true and historic Adventism. Mr. Douty is a Baptist minister, former president of Hephzibah House, New York City, and of the Grand Rapids Theological Seminary and Bible College.)

It should be noted also that the book "Questions on Doctrine" rarely uses texts of Scripture to support its untenable new view on the Nature of Christ. Instead, it bases its

stand on an erroneous and misleading use of quotations from the Spirit of Prophecy, many taken out of context.

For instance, on page 650 of the book, the section headed "Took Sinless Human Nature" is not only misleading, but also lends a false aura to all the subsequent statements made in it. The initial statement under this false heading is taken out of context and utterly fails in its attempt to prove that Christ took sinless human nature. Three paragraphs prior to the appearance of this statement, Sister White declares unequivocally that Christ "took our nature in its deteriorated condition." 1 S.M., p. 253. This last statement has been disconnected from the first part and placed under another section heading entitled "Bore the Imputed Sin and Guilt of the World" (See Q.D., pp. 655, 657). One of our basic Adventists doctrines is, as most S.D.A.'s should know, THAT WHEN CHRIST TOOK OUR NATURE IN ITS SINFUL DETERIORATED CONDITION, HE TOOK IT THROUGH INHERITANCE AND NOT BY IMPUTATION AS "QUESTIONS ON DOCTRINE" MISREPRESENTS.

On page 652, at the top of the page, we find another garbled and distorted instance which purports to prove that "Christ took sinless human nature." If we consider this statement in its entirety it serves to prove just the opposite, i.e. that He actually partook of our fallen nature. (See 1 S.M., pp. 267, 268).

Statements made by Sister White in which she refers to Christ's sinless life, have been distorted to prove that He actually took sinless human nature. Thus there is created in the reader's mind unnecessary confusion between the human nature He took by His inheritance and birth into the human family, and the sinless life He led on earth. Jesus was conceived by the Holy Spirit (Luke 1:35), and thus was able, through the Grace of His Father, to tread the weaknesses of His human flesh under foot. AND THUS IF WE ARE BORN AGAIN OF THE HOLY SPIRIT, WE TOO CAN OVERCOME THE EVIL OF OUR HUMAN NATURE AND TREAD IT UNDER FOOT.

"Questions on Doctrine" also quotes statements which show that Christ did not have evil propensities and passions, but uses these as evidence that He did not take fallen human nature. This is an extremely fallacious line of reasoning because we all share in a fallen human nature, yet need not retain one sinful propensity, and through Grace need not have any sinful passions. (See "The Faith I Live By," p. 23).

Under the section heading "Bore the Imputed Sin and Guilt of the World," (p. 655 of Q.D.), we find several statements which would more appropriately be found under some heading such as "Took Fallen Human Nature," but as the authors profess not to believe this doctrine, the statements referring to Christ's taking our fallen nature are speciously explained away by saying that His fallen nature is merely imputed and not inherited.

The Spirit of God, through His Servant, has told us what the damaging effect of this type of reasoning does to our concept of the completeness of Christ's humanity.

"When we give to His human nature a power that it is not possible for man to have in his conflicts with Satan, we destroy the completeness of His humanity." 7 B. C., p. 929.

Elder Andreasen, in his "Letter to the Churches," states this same truth very plainly: "A Savior who has never been tempted, never has had to battle with passions, who has never 'offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto him who was able to save him from death,' who 'though he were a son' never learned obedience by the things He suffered, but was 'exempt' from the very things that a true Savior must experience: such a savior is what this new theology (as given in 'Questions on Doctrine') offers us. It is not the kind of Savior I need, nor the world. One who has

never struggled with passions can have no understanding of. their power, nor has he ever had the joy of overcoming them. If God extended special favors and exemptions to Christ, in that very act He disqualified Him for His work. There can be no heresy more harmful than that here discussed. It takes away the Savior I have known and substitutes for Him a weak personality, not considered by God capable of resisting and conquering the passions which He asks men to overcome."-Letters to the Churches, No. 1, p. 7.

"That God exempted Christ from the passions that corrupt men, is the acme of all heresy. It is destruction of all true religion and completely nullifies the plan of redemption, and makes God a deceiver and Christ His accomplice. Great responsibility rests upon those who teach such false doctrine to the destruction of souls. The truth, of course, is that God 'spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us' (Romans 8:32); rather, -because His nature was sensitive to the least slight or disrespect or contempt, His tests were harder and His temptations stronger than any we have to endure."-Idem, p. 8.

"It is, of course, patent to all, that no one can claim to believe the Testimonies and also believe in the new theology (as expounded in Q.D.) that Christ was exempt from human passions. It is one thing or the other. The denomination is now called upon to decide. To accept the teaching of 'Questions on Doctrine' necessitates giving up faith in the Gift God has given this people."-Idem, p. 7. "The question of the nature of Christ while in the flesh is one of the foundation pillars of Christianity. On this doctrine hangs the salvation of man."-Idem, p. 8.

Just before Elder Andreasen went to sleep to await the call of the Life Giver, he expressed a desire to see Elder Figuhr to express his regret that during the heat of their controversy over doctrinal matters, words were passed that might better have been left unsaid. However, it should be made plain that at no time did Elder Andreasen depart from the theological position he takes in his "Letters to the Churches."

Elders Wieland and Short quote the same thought as Elder Andreasen in these words: "This is just what the religious world generally does deny. For while admitting in words that Christ took upon Himself our flesh, they assert that He had a sinless nature; that, unlike the Christian, in whose flesh 'dwells no good thing,' His flesh was without sinful desires and infirmities, and therefore not the same flesh as that of other men. Thus they deny the explicit statements of the apostolic writers that He really and truly took our flesh upon Him. . It is to make His conflict an unmeaning abstraction, a conflict and yet no conflict, tempted and yet not being tempted, a being wholly without relation to man, and incapable of attracting his sympathy.'"-1888 Re-Examined, p. 189.

A.L. Hudson, well-known true Sabbath-keeper, has this to say on the subject at hand:

"The officers of the General Conference give evidence that either they have largely lost the spiritual eyesight to distinguish clearly the difference between Christ and Satan, or having the requisite eyesight are unwilling to shoulder the cross of Christ and bear the shame.

"This basic spiritual malady (incidentally charged by Christ Himself in the message to Laodicea) has resulted in an inordinate love of the world, compromise with sin and illicit relationship with Babylon .. We wish to make our position clear that we hold the book (Questions on Doctrine) to be the illegitimate child of gross spiritual adultery."-Preliminary Memorandum, pp. 13, 29.

It is made abundantly clear that Christ, while He was on earth, was not given any divine advantage that is not freely offered to man, if he will but seek it as Christ sought it.

"He withstood the temptation through the power that man may command. He laid hold upon the throne of God, and there is not a man or woman who may not have access to the same help through faith in God." -5 B.C., p. 1082. "And he exercised in His own behalf no power that is not freely offered to us. As man, He met temptation, and overcame in the strength given Him from God . . . His life testifies that it is possible for us also to obey the law of God. "-D. A., p. 24.

"..He met man as man, and testified by His connection with God that divine power- was not given to Him in a different way to what it will be given to us. . "-7 B.C., p. 925. "He was wholly dependent upon God, and in the secret place of prayer He sought divine strength, that He might go forth braced for duty and trial. As a man He supplicated the throne of God till His humanity was charged with a heavenly current that should connect humanity with divinity .. His experience is to be ours. "-D.A, p. 363.

We are told clearly and specifically that angels do not need Grace, and that Adam did not need Grace to keep the law before his fall. (T.M., p. 519; 1 S.M., pp 331-332; S.C., p. 62). But now, let us give you more evidence to show that Christ, because of His human heredity through Mary, His mother, required God's Grace to live a sinless life.

"And the child grew, and waxed strong in spirit, filled with wisdom; and the Grace of God was upon Him." Luke 2:40. "And the Grace He received is for us "-D.A., p. 73. ".. His soul and His lips were anointed with Grace that He might impart to others"- C.O.L, p. 139. "To the consecrated worker there is wonderful consolation in the knowledge that even Christ during His life on earth sought His Father daily for Fresh Supplies Of Needed Grace,. . . His own example is an assurance that earnest, persevering supplication to God in faith-faith that leads to entire dependence upon God, and unreserved consecration to His work-will avail to bring to men the Holy Spirit's aid in the battle against sin. "-A.A., p. 56.

The Inspired writers give us the reason why the Lord received the Holy Spirit without measure:

"He emptied Himself." Phil. 2:6, R. V. Because (He) `hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity . "Heb. 1:9. 'To Jesus, who emptied Himself for the salvation of lost humanity, the Holy Spirit was given without measure."-M. B. p. 19, "But the Son of God was surrendered to the Father's will, and dependent upon His power. So utterly was Christ emptied of self that He made no plans for Himself. He accepted God's plans for Him, and day by day the Father unfolded His plans. So should we depend upon God, that our lives may be the simple outworking of His will. "-D.A., p. 208.

As true followers of Christ, we too are called upon to empty ourselves completely of self before we will be able to receive a full measure of Heaven's light. In Christ, we are told 'dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily, and in Him ye are made full.' Col. 2:9, 10, R.V. But we must remember that of our own selves it is impossible to empty ourselves of self. This can only be done by us in the same way in which Jesus did it.

"When we place our will in unison with the will of God, the holy obedience that was exemplified in the life of Christ will be seen in our lives."-O.H.C., p. 107.

Christ while He was on earth, received the Holy Spirit by daily supplication and prayer:

"Daily He received a fresh baptism of the Holy Spirit. In the early hours of the new day the Lord awakened Him from His slumber and His soul and His lips were anointed with grace, that He might impart to others."-C.O.L., p. 139. "It was by faith and prayer that He wrought His miracles "D. A., p. 536. "He came not to our world to give the obedience of a lesser God to a greater, but as a man to obey God's Holy Law, and in

this way He is our example. The Lord Jesus came to our world, not to reveal what a God could do, but what a man could do. "-7 B. C., p. 929.

Because many quotations from the Spirit of Prophecy have been taken out of context to support the new theology on the Nature of Christ, we would like at this point in our study, to give some quotations from the Bible and the Spirit of Prophecy which will give the reader a true concept of what the Inspired Writers actually teach on this subject: Galatians 4:4 tells us that Christ was made of a woman. Romans 1:3 says He was made of the seed of David according to the flesh. Romans 8:3 says He was made 'in the likeness of sinful flesh.' (Likeness here is 'homoioima' which signifies not just 'resemblance,' but likeness in actuality. See Rom. 9:29; 1 John 3:2; Rev. 1:13; Phil. 2:7). We are also told in Hebrews 2:14, R.S.V. that He partook of the 'same nature' as the children He came to redeem. All this being true, Hebrews 2:17, 4:15, and 2:18, agree that 'Wherefore in all things it behooved Him to made like unto His brethren,' 'was in all points tempted like as we are,' and He 'suffered being tempted.'

We are told that He took our heredity: [D.A., p. 49 quoted]

No make-believe: [Q.D., p. 653 quoted]

Took weakened physical mental and moral powers: [D.A. p. 117 quoted]

Took degenerate nature: (1 S.M., p. 268 quoted] Took fallen human nature: E.W., p. 152 quoted]

Took sinful nature: [M.M. p. 181 quoted]

Christ's humanity reached lowest depths: 11 S.M., p. 272, 273 quoted]

Took nature of Adam the transgressor. [7 B.C., p. 926 quoted] Bore humanity we bear: [7 B.C., p. 925 quoted]

He knew what was in man: (D.A., p. 329 quoted) No evil propensity: [F.C.E., p. 385 quoted]

No sinful passions: "He was a mighty petitioner, not possessing the passions of our human, fallen nature . . ." -2 T., p.202. ". He . . suffered in proportion to the perfection of His Holiness.. "-5 T., p. 422. ("We are to have our tastes, inclinations, ambitions, and passions all subdued, and brought into harmony with the mind and spirit of Christ. ") -M. L, p. 252.

Coming to dwell in humanity, received no pollution: [D.A., p. 266 quoted]

There are several other areas in which the book "Questions on Doctrine" compromises and distorts our church's true position, such as to what is meant by the terms 'The Remnant Church,' and 'Babylon,' as these are defined and applied by the Servant of the Lord.

We would like to conclude this study by considering for a few moments the shameful apostasy by some of our leaders on the subject of the Atonement. (See Q.D., pp. 341-402, 661-692). We have mentioned earlier in this study, the series of meetings between General Conference representatives of the Evangelicals. As a result of these conferences, the book

"Questions on Doctrine" bent over backward in its efforts to modify the Adventist concept of the Atonement to bring it more nearly into harmony with the beliefs of Protestantism in general. We have no serious objection to "Questions on Doctrine" emphasizing that there was a perfect, final, and complete Atonement on Calvary, provided it is clearly understood that this applies only to the sacrificial phase of the Atonement. But when we examine the book's position on the mediatorial phase of the

Atonement, we find a glaring evasion of our church's historic position. This consists of an absolute silence on the subject of the special phase of the Atonement, which we have always believed, commenced in 1844. In the earthly sanctuary service there were two divisions: the daily and the yearly (Heb. 9:6, 7). The priest went every day into the first apartment to make Atonement (Lev. 6:30), but the special yearly Atonement was made in the second apartment, or the most holy place. (See Lev. 16:17 & 1 S.M., p. 344).

At Christ's Ascension, He 'shed upon His disciples the benefits of His Atonement.'-E.W., p. 260. This mediatorial work of Atonement by the Lord began at His Ascension to the first apartment of the sanctuary in heaven, and will continue daily until the close of human probation. This mediatorial Atonement has been carried on since 1844 in the second apartment or most holy place. In "Questions on Doctrine," the authors have found it expedient to discuss only the mediatorial ministrations of Christ in the first apartment and made it clear to the Evangelical representatives already mentioned that they do not believe in any distinct, special, and final work of Atonement that is taking place in the most holy place.

The Evangelicals summarized what the General Conference representatives had told them about the Atonement in the following statement which appeared in the magazine "Eternity" for September, 1956:

"Further, they (the Adventists), do not believe, as some of their earlier teachers taught, that Jesus' atoning work was not completed on Calvary but instead that He was still carrying on a second ministering work since 1844. This idea is also totally repudiated. They believe that since His ascension Christ has been ministering the benefits of the atonement which He completed on Calvary. Since the sanctuary doctrine is based on the type of the Jewish high priest going into the Holy of Holies to complete his atoning work, it can be seen that what remains is most certainly exegetically untenable and theological speculation of a highly imaginative order. What Christ is now doing, since 1844 'according to this version,' is going over the records of all human beings and deciding what rewards are going to be given to individual Christians."

The above statement was never denied by any of our church leaders while Dr. Barnhouse was alive, but since his recent death there seems to be a tendency to infer that he was mistaken in some of the statements he made in "Eternity" magazine. It is significant that no one had the temerity to make these insinuations while Dr. Barnhouse was alive. But now they are coming forward with the flimsy excuse that the reason they didn't contradict Dr. Barnhouse's statement was that they had already effectively answered it in the book "Questions on Doctrine." The only weakness in this argument that causes it to fall apart at the seams is that these answers closely parallel the "Eternity" magazine report. This will become increasingly apparent to all as this study is concluded.

The General Conference representatives who met with Dr. Barnhouse and his associates told the latter the only work that began in 1844 was a talk of 'going over the records of all human beings.' In this manner the special Atonement is completely glossed over and left out, although it is a fundamental, historic Adventist belief. By way of contrast, note what the Spirit of Prophecy has to say regarding the two-fold nature of the special work of Atonement which began in 1844:

"Attended by heavenly angels, our great High Priest enters the Holy of Holies and there appears in the presence of God to engage in the last acts of His ministration in behalf of man-to perform the work of investigative judgment and to make an atonement for all who are shown to be entitled to its benefits."-G. C., p. 480.

In examining the appendix in "Questions on Doctrine," the reader will find a flagrant example of 'intellectual dishonesty' which we have little choice but to feel is a

deliberate attempt to evade the facts. Here is an excerpt from the Appendix of "Questions on Doctrine":

"Because the writings of Ellen G. White have often been garbled when allegedly 'quoted' by critics or detractors, we here give a comprehensive assemblage of her teachings on the deity and eternal pre-existence of Christ, and His place in the Godhead, or Trinity; His nature during the incarnation; and His atoning sacrifice and priestly ministry."-Q.D. p. 641.

Now, when the authors state that the appendix contains a 'comprehensive assemblage' of Sister White's statements about Christ's 'priestly ministry,' this is just plain untruth. Every statement from the Spirit of Prophecy which refers to the final, special, closing atonement in the most holy place, has been completely omitted. By no stretching of the imagination could this have been done inadvertently or by oversight, because Sister White has written voluminously on this topic and has made many statements in which she has systematically outlined the basic Adventist doctrine of the heavenly sanctuary.

It is significant to note that the Servant of the Lord foresaw that this very situation would arise which Elder Andreasen terms the Omega of Apostasy.

"I was told that men will employ every policy to make less prominent the difference between the faith of Seventh-day Adventists and those who observe the first day of the week.. This is no time to haul down our colors. A company was presented before me under the name of Seventh-day Adventists, who were advising that the banner or sign which makes us a distinct people should not be held out so strikingly,- for they claimed it was not the best policy in securing success to our institutions. This distinctive banner is to be borne through the world to the close of probation . . . The world and the churches are uniting in transgressing the law of God, in tearing away God's memorial, and in exalting a sabbath that bears the signature of the man of sin.

Satan realized only too well, because of his profound knowledge of sign to show the difference between the obedient and the disobedient. I saw some reaching out their hands to remove the banner, and to obscure its significance . . . Shall anyone then choose to hide this banner, to relax his devotion? Shall the people whom God has honored, blessed and prospered, refuse to bear testimony in behalf of God's memorial at the very time when such a testimony should be borne? Shall not the commandments of God be more highly esteemed when men pour contempt upon the law of God?"-2 S.M., p. 385.

Satan realizes only too well, because of his profound knowledge of Inspired Writings, that it is the general study and acceptance of the great Sanctuary Message that will bring about the final revival, reformation and shaking in the church of God. He also realizes that this Sanctuary truth is to prepare it to stand in the time of trouble without a mediator. Thus the Enemy of Souls is frantically engaged in seeking to create confusion and division in our church by the introduction of false doctrines and fallacious theories that will cause the unwary to stumble. We must earnestly pray for these souls through whom Satan has succeeded in introducing the Omega of Apostasy and for those who are now being deceived by it.

"One thing is certain: those Seventh-day Adventists who take their stand under Satan's banner will first give up their faith in the warnings and reproofs contained in the Testimonies of God's spirit."- Spalding-Magan Collection, p. 305.

- SECTION THIRTEEN - - May, 1958 - HUDSON'S CONVERSATION WITH BARNHOUSE

(The first individual to reprint Andreasen's mimeographed collection of papers was Al Hudson in Baker, Oregon. A concerned Seventh-day Adventist, he was another who dared to stand up and speak. And it cost him dearly also. He was stripped of his church offices and later his church membership. A small town printer, he was in an admirable position to speak up, and speak up he did.

The following is a reprint of most of a telephone conversation that Brother Hudson had with Donald Grey Barnhouse on May 16, 1958. This a year and a half after the conclusion of the "bombshell" articles in "Eternity" and a little less than a year after QD was released and created its own bombshell among our people.

-The information given in this telephone conversation is devastating. Barnhouse repeatedly tells his caller that the Seventh-day Adventist leaders who took part in these Evangelical Conferences were totally repudiating certain earlier teachings of their Church. He knew it and they knew it. But whereas our people had been told by Froom and Anderson, both in articles and in the pages of QD, that these changed teachings had always been the belief of the majority of sane Adventists, -Barnhouse had been told that although this was indeed an outright repudiation of earlier Adventist "errors," yet the membership of the Church fully went along with the repudiation. The very idea that some of the members might now be in disagreement with the repudiation seemed to come as a shock to Barnhouse.

In addition, we also here see a hint of the fury of Barnhouse's feelings about the utter stupidity of the crazy Adventist doctrines.

In the following conversation, "(H)" indicates that Hudson is speaking and "(B)" that Barnhouse is speaking.

A TELEPHONE CONVERSATION

(H) Good morning. (B) Good morning. (H) This is Al Hudson, Baker, Oregon. (B) Bob Hudson? (H) Al Hudson. (B) Al Hudson. (H) Yes. (B) Yes? (H) On the 28th of last month I wrote to you and Mr. Martin and Mr. Bryant a letter relative to some of the articles which have appeared in your magazine on Seventh day Adventists, etc.

(B) [to secretary] Have we a letter from a Mr. Al Hudson, Baker, Oregon, concerning articles on subject Adventists? All right, go ahead. (H) The reason I mentioned that was to try to identify myself. (B) Yes. (H) Now, I'm, in this letter-. (B) What church are you connected with? (H) I'm a Seventh-day Adventist. (B) Yes.

(H) In my letter I stated what I'm calling you about. That's the reason I mentioned the letter. I thought if you might have caught it, why then you would know what--. (B) Well, we get so many thousands of letters that it takes generally a long time to filter up to me.

(H) Sure, I appreciate that. Well, then I can give you just a brief resume of the situation. I'm writing a paper dealing with certain phases of developments in the Adventist church, particularly in the last decade. Of course this matter of our relationship to the Evangelicals has come along as part of the picture. And I've read your articles in "Eternity", also Mr. Martin's articles, and other articles that other Evangelicals have written. Now, some time ago, I talked to Mr. Martin, oh, I guess it's been about a month ago. I was interested in when his book was coming out, and so on. I had talked to Mr. Bryant of Zondervan publishing, and Mr. Martin. Then I wrote up the result of our conversation as I understood it, and sent it to Mr. Martin, asking him to confirm it, or

correct it as fee might see fit, and I haven't heard from him. In fact, he seems unwilling to either confirm or deny the facts that we discussed in our conversation.

(B) Well, I tell you, I know this, that I know that his book has been cleared by our office, and it is on the way. (H) I see. (B) That's the situation. The book proposition. They don't want to, (H) I see. It's a matter of financial-- (B) I don't know. It's a matter of, (H) I see. (B) But what can I do for you?

(H) Well, now the question: there's quite a bit of controversy over this matter in the Evangelical press, and of course it is also appearing in our press. Now, there seems to be one angle of the thing that I would like to get cleared up. Have, to your knowledge, either you or Mr. Martin, or anyone else, have Seventh-day Adventist leaders indicated formally or informally that they desire fellowship in the National Association of Evangelicals?

(B) I don't know anything about these things. My staff keeps me protected from all controversy so that I can sit here at my desk and write, etc. (H) I see.

(B) Now, I don't know, I don't think there is any doubt of the fact that Seventh-day Adventists, that is the top leaders, understand that it is a very important thing for Seventh-day Adventists to be recognized as evangelical. But you see, the difficulty lies in the fact, that--the one thing that I stated about Seventh-day Adventists, namely that they are believers, has been totally overlooked by Talbot, and "King's Business", and these people. The fact that I have said, and I've said to thousands of people, I said, "All I'm saying is that the Adventists are Christians." I still think their doctrines are about the screwiest of any group of Christians in the world. I believe this beyond any question. In fact, the doctrine of the investigative judgment is the most blatant, face-saving proposition that ever existed to cover up the debacle of the failure of Christ to come in 1844 as they said. When the two men walked through the cornfield, and suddenly one of them struck his head and said, "Why, Christ did come." Why, this is ridiculous, asinine nonsense. The whole of the investigative judgment is a face-saving thing, and now that a hundred years have gone by, if the Adventists had the courage--because now the Adventists are becoming educated. A hundred years ago, the Adventists were practically illiterate. And now they are becoming educated, and they know that their doctrines will not hold the light of exegesis. Just simply cannot stand. There is no Greek, no Greek scholar in the world, that will fail to accept the fact that Christ died once and for all. And that He didn't go in and out, and that He wasn't wandering around in the tabernacle. He was seated, and that He has never gotten up to walk anywhere in 1844, or anyplace else. Now, failure to understand this is intellectual, ah, laziness or fear. Now, you see, [the] Seventh-day Adventist group was formed by three groups that came together, each one holding a pet doctrine that was false. One group held Sabbatarianism, the others didn't at all. The second group held the investigative judgment, the other groups didn't at all. And the third group held the doctrine of conditional immortality, and the other groups didn't hold it at all. They were all united on the great truth of the second coming of Christ. And so, in order to come together in one union, they effected what is a compromise. Each accepted the folly of the other in order to get their own folly accepted. Because-- Now, if you'll drop a post card to my office, they'll send you my booklet, "The Christian and the Sabbath", which has just been published about a week ago. You can get it free.

(H) "The Christian and the Sabbath"? (B) Yes, Box 2000, Philadelphia. I have just made an exhaustive study of the folly of Sabbatarianism preaching on "one man esteemeth one day above another, and another man esteems every day alike." And I have just published this, and it's on--in fact if you listen next Sunday morning on National Broadcasting system, I'm on this subject, the Christian and the Sabbath, right now. I'm preaching six sermons on the Sabbath coast to coast on NBC, pointing out that the

Adventists are wrong in keeping Saturday, the Protestants are wrong in keeping Sunday, and that that the only thing to keep is, to have the attitude that every day is alike and that God not only is not entering into this day, but He hates the Sabbath today. You see. (H) Well, now, in your contact with Adventist leaders, which you mention in your magazine, and also Mr. Martin, do you feel that our top ranking leaders, who have as you say, become educated, are tending away from this concept of the investigative judgment as you have mentioned it? (B) You see, what we know is this. I cannot speak for any of these men, Roy Anderson and Froom, etc. these are intelligent men. They'll speak for themselves. They'll tell you what they're believing and what they are doing. You wouldn't want anybody to call you up, or call somebody else up, and ask what the inside of your thinking was.

(H) No, except that you have had association with them, have talked with them. (B) We have had great association; in fact I have a letter on my desk this minute. When I asked my secretary she just handed me a letter from L.E. Froom, and we are in correspondence right along, with the leaders of the Seventh-day Adventist movement

(H) Well, then, that was the basis of my question. Now, you have mentioned in your articles in "Eternity" that it seems to you that there is a sort of a transition period, or a--. (B) There has to be. (H) Or a metamorphosis as it were out of the--.

(B) I mean there has to be . . . Now, I recognize clearly that Mrs. White very frequently wrote some very spiritual things, but God Almighty never spoke through a woman. Let's face it. You can't justify a woman preaching and usurping authority over a man. It can't be done. Now, this is the position, psychologically we can understand the Seventh-day Adventists very well, and the fact that I took the lead in clearing them, in fact, I picked the Seventh-day Adventists out of the association of Christian Scientists and Jehovah's Witnesses, and have said, "These people are Christians." Seventh-day Adventists are immature Christians. I don't think there is any doubt of the fact that Seventh-day Adventists have a tremendous immaturity. And this immaturity rises from the psychological complex of their background. Because, I mean, have you read Froom's history? (H) I have it here. I use it as a reference book. I haven't read it through, no.

(B) All right, well, if you go to the last volume of it and let him describe for you the whole Millerite proposition, he puts in capital letters, THE GREAT DISAPPOINTMENT, capital G, capital R, capital E, all capitals, THE GREAT DISAPPOINTMENT! Well, the great disappointment was that Jesus didn't come back on that day. Well, all of the people that were in that movement, were Presbyterians, Methodists, Episcopalians, -it was an evangelical movement in all the great churches, looking for the second coming of Christ. Miller was a Baptist, Miller wasn't a Seventh-day Adventist. He didn't believe in Saturday the Sabbath; he didn't believe in the investigative judgment; he didn't believe in conditional immortality. Now, you see, those men, as I say, I forgot the name of the man who went by the back way through the cornfield, you know who I mean. Well, let's face it. What happened to him that day was a great and terrible sin for what he was doing instead of getting down on his knees and saying, "Lord God, I've been a fool, and the Bible says that if any man make a prophecy and it does not come to pass, you will know that I have not sent him." And there, I don't believe the Seventh-day Adventists are ever going to be any real witness unless the Seventh-day Adventist gets down on his knees and says, "Lord God, in the beginning we were founded on a lie", because you were founded on a lie.

(H) Well, of course those are moot points that, (B) Why, they're not even moot. I mean, if you take anybody that is not a Seventh-day Adventist, the five most honest men in the world, in fact if you take a Jew who is not a Christian, even, or a Roman Catholic,

and put the thing up to them and say, "Now, historically, judge!" why, they're all going to say, "This is a face-saving proposition, at most; certainly it has nothing to do with the Bible." (H) Well, I can see your line of reasoning.

(B) Now, I love all Christians. I love, and I have found-why, when these men came to my home-I happen to have a nice place in the country-and these men came to my home for days. And we were down on our knees together; we prayed together; we walked in the garden together. And let me tell you, Roy Anderson is one of the finest men I have ever met in my life and Unruh. We've prayed together. I know these men are brothers in Christ, you see, all that Talbot and the rest of them say-- I mean, you take this last copy of the magazine "Evangelical Action," the organ of the National Association of Evangelicals. Brother, they came out in a big blast of Talbot and DeHaan against me and against the Seventh-day Adventists, on the basis of the SDA book, but anybody who reads, have you read the big SDA book? (H) Yes, I have a copy here.

(B) Well, let's face it, in a very nice way, the leaders who have written this book, have moved from the traditional position of the SDA movement. They've come back toward the Bible. (H) But they insist that they haven't. Now, that's the controversy, you see.

(B) What you fellows ought to do, now I don't know what your position is, but if you want to strike a blow for the truth, write an article and come right out and say something like this, "Let's face the fact that we have error in our fundamental position. Let's abandon them and go forward with truth."

(H) Now, you feel that Anderson and Fromm are more or less of that disposition? (B) No, I don't say that at all. (H) You don't think so? (B) No, I don't say that at all. They should be, but I think there are a lot of fellows that are holding sticks over them, and they don't dare advance as much as they should. (H) You think they would advance more if they weren't being held back.

(B) Look, I think you would advance more if you weren't being held back. If you follow the Holy Spirit, you would abandon the investigative judgment in one minute. (H) Well, on the, of course, there is a lot of doctrinal controversy there, but on the practical end, as I said before, it seems to me this matter of fellowship--. Now, if Adventist leaders made overtures to the Association for recognition-. (B) I don't think they have. (H) You don't think they have. Well, then the controversy in the Evangelical press to the effect that we are asking for fellowship has no foundation.

(B) I don't think it has any foundation. You see, in a large measure, let's face it, Mr. Hudson, in a large measure--. You see, I was a University professor, and have had a great education, and they know that if I say something that I have background for it. And they know what I've done in coming out and saying that Seventh-day Adventists are Christians. You see, one guy has earned half his living giving lectures against the cults, Christian Science, etc. Now, this is the reason why he's attacking, and he's attacking me as much as he's attacking Seventh-day Adventists. You see this we know.

(H) Well, now what is the basis of Mr. Martin's statement that there is no question, I think I have it here. "There is no doubt that Seventh-day Adventists desire to receive and extend the hand of fellowships to all truly within the body of Christ," meaning, at least in part, the members of the National Association of Evangelicals.

(B) Well, I would put it this way: There is no doubt of the fact that any man who is a truly born-again man wants to extend the hand to everybody else who is born again. If he doesn't, he is out of the will of God. Now, I know that some of the men at Takoma Park are not only saved, but they want to be led by the Holy Spirit. Now, any man who wants to be led by the Holy Spirit-. Now, this year, the year 1958, I have already spoken

in a Seventh-day Adventist meeting; I held a week of meetings in the Pentecost Assembly in Missouri; last week I was in the Episcopal cathedral in Cleveland under the great Cleveland Federation of Churches, and I have already preached this year in Northern and Southern Baptist, Northern and Southern Presbyterian, (?) Methodist church in Kansas City, and I want to work with the whole body of Christ. If you were born again, and you are going to be in heaven, then you are my brother. But if you are a sectarian-I don't know what your attitude is. You called me up on the telephone and I'm speaking to you plainly although I don't know who you are at all. But if you are a person trying to stir up trouble, if you are a person trying to find out if you can sharpen your knife using me as a whetstone in order that you may try to sink it in some of the leaders who are trying to be godly men, then I tell you that you are being led by the antichrist, and not led by the Holy Spirit.

(H) No, I'm not. Now what I had, I don't mean No to that last question. I'm not trying to fly under any false colors. That's the reason I mentioned my letter which if it had reached you, you would have known exactly what my position is. Now, you and Mr. Martin have made certain representations as to Adventist beliefs, etc. in your magazine. I have been in correspondence with our men in Washington. I have on my desk now a letter I received from the secretary of the general conference just yesterday. There is quite a wide discrepancy between your interpretation of our belief and what has been and is still current in our midst. I'm just trying to iron out the facts.

(B) Look, we have written and signed by the leaders of the Seventh-day Adventist movement that we have not misrepresented Seventh-day Adventist positions.

(H) Now, that's what Mr. Martin told me as we talked this matter informally more than a month ago. Now, I have asked our men in Washington about this purported, not recommendation, but I think it is called a forward, which was to be signed by an officer of the General Conference stating that you had not misrepresented doctrine. I can't get any satisfaction out of our men in Washington as to just what they agreed to and didn't agree to do, but it doesn't agree with what you wrote in "Eternity." Now, I'm just trying to get at the facts, that's all I'm trying to do, because I'm writing a paper myself, and I think later on, will be incorporated into a book.

(B) Now, what is your position? Are you trying to keep Seventh-day Adventism as it has been for the last 100 years or so? (H) Frankly, my personal position, I am not convinced of the necessity of a change, no.

(B) I mean, you know that Christ didn't come back in 1844; you know if you know anything at all, that Jesus hasn't been wandering around in heaven since 1844. He did not get up off the throne to go into any inner sanctuary. You know that this was a face-saving device of men who were so scaredy cat that they were walking through a cornfield in order to keep off the main road. You know this wasn't the Holy Spirit. You know it in your heart, and if you ever take the position, God is going to nullify your ministry, and at the judgement seat of Christ, you are going to answer for it.

(H) Now, I appreciate your frankness. I wish our men would be just as frank as to their relationship to you and Mr. Martin, and also the doctrinal positions they are taking. Frankly, there is a considerable difference between what you have published and what our men are telling us. I'm just trying to find out if we have changed, if we should change, just what the status of the thing is.

(B) Everything I have published was read by Seventh-day Adventist leaders before we published. Not one line have I ever printed that was not previously read by Froom, for instance.

(H) Well, I'm not trying to stir up any trouble. I'm a Seventh-day Adventist, and I'm not convinced even from what you say, that I should change, but I'm willing to consider it provided it is brought out in the open and handled in a business-like way. Now, if our leaders in Washington feel that we should modify our position, my position is that they should come out to us as Seventh-day Adventists in the field, and say, "Brethren, we have been in error on this. We'd better change to so and so and so and so." Now, they're not doing that. They're telling us that we have not changed, and yet apparently they are giving you and Mr. Martin the idea that we are at least in the process of changing or are willing to change. Now, I'm just trying to get the facts.

(B) I think they're doing, as I say, I think these men are educated men, and some of them know Greek. We sat here with their Greek professor, some of these men know Greek, and Walter Martin pointed out, "By one offering he had perfected forever them that are sanctified." That is the aorist tense. And one man of the top leaders said, "Now, I don't know Greek," he said, "myself, but three of us have had a lot of Greek." And all of the wonderful part of fellowship with Anderson and Froom and Unruh, and I forget the other men that came up from Washington, the top men, and we spent two days one time and two and a half another, here in my home. We entertained these men, and fed them vegetarian meals, and had a nice time together. We had a wonderful time together.

(B) I spoke for Richards in a Seventh-day Adventist group to all his people, etc. and I'm going to preach in the Seventh-day Adventist church in Takoma Park, Washington. And we had Dr. Roy Anderson come to my pulpit in the Presbyterian church and my people heard him with great profit. He is a godly man. Now this is a whole lot better than having everybody taking Talbot's position and saying that you are all antichrist. (H) Well, that is a complicated proposition.

(B) Let me tell you this, if you don't want, I mean if you try to write a book or anything that there has been no change in Adventism, then we're going to have to go back and say, "You are anti-Christ." I will have to make a public retraction, and send it to "Time" magazine, and say, "Your article,"-did you read it when it came out in "Time?" (H) No.

(B) Well, you see "Time" magazine wrote a big article about my article on Seventh-day Adventism and called it "Peace with the Adventists." Well, I'll have to write "Time" magazine and publish in "Eternity" and write an apology to Talbot for "King's Business," "Moody Monthly," and say, "I was wrong. These people are still anti-Christ. Put them back with Jehovah's Witnesses where they belong," if you start writing the way you're contemplating. (H) You actually believe, then, that our book, "Questions on Doctrine," supports the attitude that you have put forth in your magazine "Eternity", and which you have just set forth here to me. You actually believe that that book supports that?

(B) I say this, I have a copy of it within three feet of me at the present moment. and what you have done beyond any question in that book, is taking the position, for example, that everybody that ever said that it was necessary to keep Saturday in order to be saved, was wrong. Your book states this. Now, for instance, you don't hold that Sunday is the mark of the beast, do you?

(H) Yes. (B) You do? (H) Yes. (B) Well, then we might as well hang up. You belong to the anti-Christ party. I'll tell you this, brother, and you, I doubt if you're saved. (H) Well. (B) You don't know what salvation is. Hudson, you don't know what salvation is. (H) Well, perhaps that's right, Mr. Barnhouse, but the Adventists believe that, too.

(B) They, now, that's the point, the Adventists do not believe this. This is the point I'm making. And everywhere we said, for instance, a man in the Presbyterian Church, wrote an article and he said they believe that there is no hell, and that they don't believe.

That's what a screwball on the fringe believes. Now, in the believe. That's what a scewball on the fringe believes. Now, in the Seventh-day Adventist movement you've got screwballs and people on the fringe. (H) Yeah, that's apparently where I am.

(B) Well, if you believe that keeping any day but Saturday is the mark of the beast then you are of the party of anti-Christ because you deny salvation by grace alone. You do not believe that salvation is by grace alone, do you?

(H) Not in the same sense that you use it, no. (B) Yeah, in other words you believe that a man has to add something to the work of Christ in order to be saved. (H) Yes, that's right. (B) Then, I say that is of the devil, beyond any question, and you see, you're the one that's making the difficulty, and I will print this in our magazine. Are you the pastor of a church there in Oregon? (H) No, I'm a layman. (B) You're a layman? (H) I'm an officer of the church, but I'm not an ordained minister. I studied for the ministry, however, in the Adventists Church, and I think I know what Adventists believe.

(B) You really believe then, that everybody who is not a Seventh-day Adventist is lost? (H) Oh, no. I didn't say that. (B) Well, this is what you say, because the people who are not Adventists don't keep Saturday, and won't, I hate Saturday as a Sabbath religious day. I hate it because Christ hates it! - .

(B) Do you feel that you are the remnant church? (H) That is Adventist teaching. (B) Well, if you believe that, then you are a megalomaniac. Now, let's face it. I'm not going to pull words. You just are not following the Bible. (H) I appreciate your position. Now, of course, over the telephone here I couldn't defend that position, but, friend, that is Adventist teaching. (B) Well, it isn't Adventist teaching. Excuse me, but it is not. (H) Well, that's the point. What makes you think it isn't? (B) Well, their book, their statement, and even Ellen G. White. I can show you in Ellen G. White that she doesn't believe this. (H) She doesn't believe that the Adventist church is the remnant church?

(B) She does not believe, she believes that God gave some vital truth, some latter day truth, but she does not take the position that anybody that is not a Seventh-day Adventist is not a believer in Christ (H) No, She doesn't. Neither do we. (B) Oh, yes you do. (H) No. (B) That's it. You just said that not keeping Saturday, keeping Sunday, was the mark of the beast. Your trouble is that you don't realize what you say. (H) Yes, I do realize what I say. (B) Well, if you say for instance, let me ask you this. Do you think I'm a lost soul? (H) Friend, that is up to God.

(B) No, No, No. But you wait a minute. Let's ask a question; that's up to God but do you think that I cursing Saturday as the Sabbath, cursing everything that is of the law, and wanting grace alone, and wanting to live in holiness, believing that all sin is removed by the blood of Jesus Christ alone, do you believe that therefore I am a lost soul? (H) I believe that you are a disobedient follower of Christ, and that disobedience, if continued in, will ultimately cause the loss of your soul, yes. (B) Yeah, well, you see there's no use in your talking. You don't even believe that I'm saved. (H) Now, I think that you will find if you will investigate the matter a little more closely that --

(B) Thank God the leaders of Seventh-day Adventism do not hold your position. (H) You don't think they do. (B) I know they don't. I know they don't. We've gone on our knees together, and have gotten up from our knees together, and they say, "Brother, this is wonderful. We are redeemed and fellows in Christ." (H) And you don't think that Seventh-day Adventist leaders believe that you are a disobedient follower of Jesus.

(B) I didn't say that. They believe that I am a born again person. That I am saved and have eternal life. They know that I hold the Calvinistic position that I am saved forever and can never be lost. They say to me, they hold the Armenian position, but

nevertheless, they definitely believe that I am a born-again believer and a brother in Christ.

(H) Well, now here, I had one of these very men who have been foremost in this relationship tell me when I was in Washington D.C. last November; I went back for some conferences and study. He told me--. (B) Which man? (H) I'd rather not give his name. (B) Oh, come on now. If you're not honest enough to talk, what did you call me for? (H) Well, you accuse me, didn't accuse me, but wondered if I was trying to stir up personal trouble. I'm not. But I am trying to arrive at some facts. Now, if I tell you this man's name personally, that is a personal thing. If I tell you the position he took, then it becomes--. (B) You said one of the men who came to my house. (H) Well, let's put it this way. One of the men that has been--. (B) You said one of the men that came to my house. (H) You've got me on the spot. (B) Sure I do. It's either Froom or Anderson or Richards. (H) Unruh? (B) No, Unruh is from Pennsylvania. You said Washington. That's Froom and Anderson and the fourth man, what's his name? (H) I don't know. (B) You don't know. Well, that leaves it, it's Froom or Anderson who told you this.

(H) All right, I'll tell you, it was Froom. He told me that he had you men right where you were going to have to admit the seventh day is the Sabbath. (B) Oh, he never said anything of the kind. (H) Well, that's what he told me. (B) We know that the seventh day is not the Sabbath. (H) That's what he told me, and he told me in the offices of the General Conference in Washington.

(B) Well, you listen to the National Broadcasting System coast to coast next Sunday morning at 8:30. I'm preaching against the Sabbath right now. (H) My point is this. As near as I can get the information together, here, our men have been representing one thing to you and they are representing another thing to us. (B) Well, put that down in so many words. (H) Well, now, I'll put it in writing, and will you prove to the contrary? In other words, you say you have in your files stuff that will support everything that you have written in "Eternity" magazine. Well, now, will you come out with that? (B) Well, uh--

(H) Our men are denying that. Now let's get the thing straight. I have a stack of correspondence here from our officials in Washington I'm trying to get at the basis of this thing, and I don't know what is in your files. I know what Martin told me, and I know that he will not answer my letters in confirming what he told me, but our men are representing --. (B) Possibly he believes that you are just a trouble maker. (H) I think that's entirely possible. I appreciate his position. I'm not trying to cause trouble to anybody, but I want to know what our men are teaching and if we should change, I want to change with them, provided that they can convince me that I should change, but to try to give the idea to you and Mr. Martin that we have changed, and to give the idea to us that we haven't changed, I don't go for that. Now, I think our men ought to come out and be honest on the proposition.

(B) Well, look, the important thing is this, where the great change has come, they have absolutely denied, and in the book, 700-page book which you have, they have denied beyond question that they hold any position which makes Christ anything other than the eternal second Person of the Godhead. (H) I grant that. (B) Do you believe that Jesus is the Lord Jehovah? (H) Yes, if I understand what you mean by the Lord Jehovah. I believe that He is the second Person of the Godhead, eternally existent, He became incarnate and became a man. Now, on that point, however, there is a great controversy.

(B) Exactly. Now, you see there were Seventh-day Adventists who held that He was sinful, that He did not have a sinless nature, and they took the Docetism principle

from back in the early church history. Now your leaders have come out in the strongest possible repudiation of that phase of Seventh-day Adventist teaching.

(H) They are taking the position, are they not, that Christ has the nature of Adam before he sinned, isn't that true? (B) I hope not! (H) What is their position as you understand it? (B) That Christ had, that He was the God-man. Adam was created a being subject to fall. Jesus Christ was the God-man, not subject to fall.

(H) And that's your understanding of the position of our leaders? (B) Of course! They have taken it so strongly and it is in their book. We hold, they say, with the church of all the centuries that Jesus Christ was the eternal sinless Son of God, etc. etc.

(H) Well, I don't want to take longer of your time. I was trying to clear up specifically the item of whether our leaders had made overtures to the National Association of Evangelicals for fellowship. (B) I don't think they have. (H) Now, that is what I am trying to get at. That puts it in a different category. (B) This would precipitate a fight that might break the National Association in pieces. (H) In other words, it still is a matter of a theological discussion in comparative religions. It's not a practical matter of determining whether or not Adventists should be admitted to the National Association of Evangelicals. (B) Why, that has never been under our discussion. I never heard about it until you told me, this morning.

(H) It has come out in the Evangelical press. We have been represented as standing before the door of the National Association of Evangelicals asking for entrance. Now, I'm just trying to run that down and see if it is nothing but rumor. (B) I'll tell you what was said was this. The Seventh-day Baptists are already in. You see the Seventh-day Baptists have been a member of the National Association of Evangelicals for years. And someone stated, I believe, I wasn't at the convention, that Seventh-day Adventists had as much right in it as the Seventh-day Baptists. But I do not believe that anybody in the Seventh-day Adventist group applied or made overtures. If it had been done it would have been done through us because, brother, I came out and said that Seventhday Adventists were Christians. But I'm going to have to say that a man called me up from Oregon and spent half an hour on the telephone telling me that he was not a Christian. For that's what you've told me this morning. (H) Well, of course, that is a matter of opinion.

(B) No, it isn't. Excuse me, but this is the matter. It says, if anybody come and bring not the gospel of Christ, this is the spirit of anti-Christ. Now you see, if you do not believe that Jesus Christ is the eternal, sinless Son of God, that He could not have sinned, and goodness, we have 18 quotations from Mrs. White saying the same thing, 18 quotations from Ellen G. White stating exactly this position, and denying what you are telling me.

(H) On the other hand I have quotations that state just the opposite. (B) One quotation. (H) We have more than that. (B) No. (H) You don't have them all.

(B) Oh yes we do. Look, Froom and the rest of them say that Walter Martin knows more about Seventh-day Adventists than any professor in Takoma Park, Washington,-. (H) Well, that again is a matter of opinion.

(H) You know she wrote about 25 million words. That's quite a lot for a man to read. (B) That's too much, you know. She was running off at the mouth, and the Holy Spirit certainly was not doing it. (H) Do you think that Anderson and Froom agree with you on that position?

(B) Look, I know that these men are intelligent enough to know that she was a fallible human being, and that she said so herself. You don't believe that she was infallible, do you? Do you? (H) You get into the matter of the various concepts of in-

spiration. You asked me a question. I'll answer it. I believe she was a prophet. (B) Do you believe she was infallible? (H) Well, I say that she was a prophet the same as any other true prophet. (B) Do you believe that she was in error ever? (H) As a human being? (B) In her writing. Do you believe that in some of her writing that you have to point to certain sentences and say, "Boy, she sure pulled a blooper! That's for the birds! It is not true!" (H) I haven't encountered any of those quotations, no. (B) You haven't? (H) No. (B) Oh, brother, are you a dupe. You are not as honest as the people at Takoma Park.

(H) They feel that she has written error? (B) Of course they do. Every one of these men have said this to me. Every man. Every man. They believe that she was raised up of God to be a great blessing, and that the Spirit of Prophecy was upon her, but they all agree that she wrote error in some places. (H) You gather from your association with those men that they believe that she was a prophet though. (B) They believe that God came upon her in a special way, and for a message to His people at a special time. (H) Would you gather the impression in your talking with them that they feel that she was a prophet in the same sense that Isaiah and Jeremiah were?

(B) Of course not. Certainly not. They're intelligent men, and they are Christians. I mean, anybody who would say that Ellen G. White was a prophet in the same sense as Isaiah-- in the first place, they are denying the Bible's word about prophecy concerning a woman. You see you simply have to put all that out of your mind before you ever accept such a thing, and you see, I mean, if you take this position, Seventh-day Adventism will have to go back into the same position as Mormonism with their Book of Mormon. A guest has just arrived for lunch, and I've got to go.

(H) I appreciate your time. Now, I'll tell you my position on Mrs. White, just for the record. I don't know what you're going to publish that I have said. I hope that you have it accurately. My position is this-- the Bible mentions two kinds of prophets, a true prophet and a false prophet I believe Mrs. White was a true prophet. Now that is my position.

(B) Yeah, I know that's your position. She was just a good woman who was greatly blessed and greatly mistaken, frequently. (H) And you don't think Elder Froom and Richards and the others take my position? That she was a true prophet?

(B) Of course they don't. (H) I see. (B) None of them do. (H) Well, I appreciate your time.

- SECTION FOURTEEN - January and April 1956 -

TWO ANDERSON LETTERS TO GREIVE

[As you will recall, we have chosen in this lengthy documentary to lump certain items together instead of keeping everything strictly chronological. We shall now provide you with three letters. The first two were written by Roy Allan Anderson, Secretary of the Ministerial Association of the General Conference, to R.A. Greive, at that time President of the North New Zealand Conference.

Greive was an original thinker who liked to come up with new ideas. He had already developed a peculiar concept of "instantaneous sanctification" while he was president of the Queensland Conference in Australia. We are told that as soon as he presented it, nearly all of the ministers in the conference immediately began preaching it, even though inherent in it was the idea that at the moment of conversion one is "instantaneously sanctified and therefore need not concern oneself with obedience to the Law of God, for he is already fully prepared for heaven. (Ford's heresy is but a variant of this. Greive taught a sanctification that is a momentary act that is in reality a denial of its

existence; Ford and the "new theology " teach that sanctification (obedience by faith in Christ) may exist but has no significance in the plan of salvation; justification (forgiveness by God of one's past record) is all that is needed.) When Greive went from Queensland to the presidency of the North New Zealand Conference, he took the teaching with him and upon presenting it to the pastors and church workers in workers' meetings, they accepted it as wonderful new light and began teaching it to their church members. It doesn't take long to ruin a church: All that is required is one man who likes to dream up new theologies-and a majority of hirelings beneath him.

Then, a year before the publication of "Questions on Doctrine, " Greive learned about Anderson and Froom's attempt back in Washington D.C. to change still other doctrines. Greive was a forceful man, so he twice wrote to find out what was taking place. Anderson's two replies are low-key but of interest. Here they are.

Within a few years, Greive left Adventism entirely, joined a Protestant church and became one of their ministers. His reason for leaving: He no longer believed that Moses and Paul were right when they said there is a literal Sanctuary in heaven. This is the identical point that Ford now rejects. But Ford continues on as a member of the Pacific Union College Church. It is our understanding that this is because a majority of its members agree with his thinking and therefore refuse to dis-fellowship him.

Ministerial Assoc. Gen. Conf. of S.D.A.
Washington 12, D.C.
January 19, 1956

Pastor R. A. Greive
North N. Z. Conference
Box 8541, Upper Symonds St., P.O.
Auckland, N. Z.
My dear Brother Greive:

This letter is long, long overdue and it carries sincerest apologies for what is an unpardonable neglect. At the time of your accident in New Guinea I was under a terrific pressure with appointments away from the office, and as you know when you get back things pile high, and somehow this was overlooked. I wrote to Stan Gander and it somehow was in the back of my mind that I had written you as well. How thankful we are that the Lord spared your lives, although it was a terrible experience.

Well now, brother, we are in the midst of a most interesting study. For your sake I wish you could be here in Washington right now. You remember the things we discussed in both Australia and Auckland, especially concerning the nature of Christ. Well, at that time some things that Sister White wrote more than half a century ago were kind of in the background. Practically nobody knew of their existence although they were published in the Review and also in personal letters and counsels, etc. The pity of it is that these statements which throw a great deal of light on the subject had not been made available to our workers generally long before now.

As soon as I returned from Australia I was plunged into the thick of a very important series of counsels with some outstanding theologians belonging to several different groups, but remarkable Christians, each of them. They had been given the task of writing against us, and when they came down here to get first handed material they discovered that instead of our being a cult we were sound evangelical Christians. This discovery was a shock to them and after some days of study they openly and joyfully received us as brethren in Christ, gripping our hands in the spirit of fellowship. Their eyes filled with tears as they told of their remarkable change of concept and of how

thrilled they were to discover that on the great fundamentals of Christianity we rang absolutely true.

Now this is just a wee note to tell you that while we have not yet finished our research and our work with these men, yet the present situation is very encouraging. What I am saying is not for publication right now, although doubtless within a few months we will be able to share these things with all our workers; and they should be shared. Brethren L. Froom and W. E. Read and I have been a trio working very closely with these men and it has demanded much of our time, for we have been studying to state our beliefs in terms that could not be misunderstood by the theologians.

You may remember drawing my attention to a book you were reading just as we were going into a meeting on the Sabbath morning there in Auckland. You read a fine paragraph from it; but I failed to take the name of the book or even the name of the author. We discussed Campbell Morgan and others, but this man I think was an English theologian and his statements seemed so clear. I would appreciate it if you could let me know the title of the book and the author for I would like a copy.

You are absolutely right in the contention that Jesus did not partake of our sinful nature. If I could put it simply it would be in these words: He partook of human nature but not carnal nature. He was made in the likeness of sinful flesh, not just sinful flesh, so that He could say to His apostles, "The Prince of this world cometh and hath nothing (findeth no response) in Ale."

Well, this opens up a very big question and in a very little while I will send you some things that I know will delight your heart. This is just a friendly letter to tell you how much I appreciated the many kindnesses you showed us and to express the hope that the Lord is giving you success in the leader of that important field.

If I could drop one little sentence of friendly counsel it would be: Don't stress theology among your workers for the time being. Your best intentions can be and often are misunderstood. But be assured that some of these very points of discussion will be brought into the open, and then maybe you can give them the emphasis they will need.

Well God bless you. Give my greetings to all the workers there.

Sincerely your brother, (Signed)

R. Allan Anderson

Ministerial Assoc. Gen Conf. of S.D.A.

Washington 12, D.C.

April 23, 1956

Pastor R. A. Greive

Box 8541, Auckland Dear Brother Greive:

It would seem from your letter that there are some out there in the Australasian field who have the impression that these questions and answers have been prepared by just a small group and because the General Conf. Committee has not passed action upon them that they are not authoritative. Actually, the General Conf. Committee does not rule on matters of faith and doctrine or church policy. All such matters must be dealt with at a General Conf. in session. Between such sessions, however, the General Conf. officers who represent the administration of the cause of God serve as a body of counsel on all such matters, but of course these brethren have no authority to change any teaching. It was to this group that these questions and answers were presented. A number of the leading officers with certain selected individuals have given much time to

the study of these answers. In fact very careful attention has been given to every particular word. These answers therefore represent responsible leaders of the denomination, the General Conf. President being the chairman at every such meeting. .

One thing should be made clear; we are not trying to harmonize our beliefs with those of other Christian groups. In fact the ministers with whom we have been working represent different denominations, and are therefore in disagreement among themselves on minor points of faith, such as the mode of baptism, church organization, etc. But on the essentials of the gospel, as they relate to the person and work of Jesus Christ, they stand together. And when they have discovered that we stand with them on these vital issues, it has brought them a great joy and satisfaction. Some of these men have been among the most able opponents of Adventism but that was because they did not know what we actually believe, having received their concepts from some of our older books. And of course, believing that Sister White had also taught these things, they regarded her as a false prophet and branded the whole denomination as a cult, eaten through and through with heresy. Their discovery of our understanding of real New Testament truth has made them our friends and has led them to a very deep and thorough study of our other points of faith which, as they point out, are not at the heart of the gospel but rather on the periphery; they are works of righteousness which grow out of our relationship to Christ and not the basis of that relationship. Such doctrines are the Sabbath, tithing, health reform, etc.

You have asked concerning the nature of Christ during the incarnation. This is a point on which many of our writers and preachers have not been clear. . It is a point of faith in which our preachers and writers have expressed themselves very emphatically at times but usually on the wrong side of the truth. .

If you would suffer me this little word of counsel as a friend, I would suggest that you hold these thoughts in your heart and not make an issue of them until we as a people have come to the place where we understand this doctrine as clearly as we should, and as clearly as we do other points of faith. The fellowship of the brethren and the communion of saints is too precious an experience to have destroyed by the spirit of controversy. I am confident that the time is near when this great mystery of godliness will be understood better by us as a people. But until then it would seem wise if we could confine ourselves to a prayerful discussion of it between us as workers. While it is truth, we should be very careful not to set it before the laity until we are prepared to speak with a united voice. I think you will recall a suggestion I made to you on this point before and will not misunderstand my mentioning it again. .

In closing let me declare as my personal conviction that we have come to the time in our history and the history of the evangelical Christian church in general that we are moving into the experience of the Pentecostal outpouring of power. . (signed)

R. Allan Anderson

- SECTION FIFTEEN - - February 1958 - COTTRELL'S LETTER TO ANDERSON

(Roy F. Cottrell was an editor at the Review and Herald Publishing Association from 1952 till 1980. Back in the late 50s he wrote a personal letter of protest to Roy Allen Anderson. As a Review editor, just across the alley from the General Conference in Washington D.C., he had witnessed the storm of protest that had arisen in the Review over the galleys of "Questions on Doctrine" as they were gradually sent over from the General Conference to check over. Then, following complaints from the world field and a limited amount of redoing, the entire manuscript was sent over to the Review for publication! Upon arrival it was met by men who were shocked that the errors were still

in the thing-even after having been "checked over" by enough men around the globe so that the title page of the book could give as the "author" of the book: `Prepared by a Representative Group of Seventh-day Adventist Leaders, Bible Teachers, and Editors. "And they were still more shocked that Anderson on behalf of the General Conference now wanted them to go ahead and print it!

We have already mentioned the fact that at this point the Review editorial staff took the liberty to tone down some of the errors and to substitute "atoning sacrifice" for "atonement" as that which was completed at the cross, in a number of passages in the book manuscript.

But then in 1957 this mingling of good and evil came off the presses and went out to Adventism at large. And a surge of protest poured in to the Review offices from laity and workers out in the field. Half a year of this passes, and then Raymond F. Cottrell wrote a letter to Roy Allen Anderson. I believe that you will be impressed with the clarity of the letter: 1

February 23, 1958

Elder R. A. Anderson

Seventh-day Adventist Ministerial Association

Takoma Park, Washington 12, D.C.

My dear Brother Anderson:

Along the years I have held you in highest esteem, and recalling the past, I have considered your series of evening sermons at Lynwood some years ago to be the most uplifting and outstanding series of campmeeting messages, I have ever been privileged to hear.

A few days ago, an outline of your address presented to the Southeastern Conference workers, was placed in my hands, and I have been surprised and pained as I read its contents. I am writing to you as a beloved brother in the Lord, and trust you will receive it in the same spirit as it is written.

Now I am persuaded that all who wholeheartedly accept the Spirit of Prophecy, will stand solidly on the platform of truth that has stood unshaken for over a century; and no one should attempt to change our fundamental beliefs concerning the atonement. The Bible and the Spirit of Prophecy teach that there are two important phases to the atonement; that Christ's work of atonement was begun, rather than completed, on Calvary; and that the final phase of the atonement is now being carried forward in the heavenly sanctuary.

In the ancient sanctuary service, the atonement was not made by the victim that was slain, but by the priest who carried the blood into the tabernacle, sprinkling it before the veil, and in this way making the atonement. See Leviticus 4, and "Patriarchs and Prophets," p. 354.

Concerning the latter phase of Christ's atoning work, we read: "As in the typical service there was a work of atonement at the close of the year, so before Christ's work for the redemption of men is completed, there is a work of atonement for the removal of sin from the sanctuary." G.C., p. 421.

"At the termination of the 2300 days in 1844, Christ then entered the most holy place of the heavenly sanctuary to perform the closing work of atonement."-id., p. 422.

"it is those who by faith follow Jesus in the great work of atonement who receive the benefits of His mediation in their behalf."-id., p. 430.

"So in the great day of final atonement and investigative judgment, the only cases considered are those of the professed people of God."-id., p. 480.

"The sanctuary in heaven is the very center of Christ's work in behalf of men. It concerns every soul living upon the earth. .

"The intercession of Christ in man's behalf in the sanctuary above is as essential to the plan of salvation as was His death upon the cross. By His death He began that work which after His resurrection He ascended to complete in heaven. . We are now living in the great day of atonement."-id. pp. 488, 489.

"The blood of Christ, while it was to release the repentant sinner from the condemnation of the law, was not to cancel the sin; it would stand on record in the sanctuary until the final atonement . . Then by virtue of the atoning blood of Christ the sins of all the truly penitent will be blotted from the books of heaven." -P.P., pp. 357, 358."

Many similar quotations could be given, but this will suffice to present the undeviating testimony of the Spirit of Prophecy on this question. We also note the quotations that you present stating that Christ's sacrifice was "a perfect atonement;" that the atoning sacrifice was all-sufficient; and that it need never be repeated. This is in perfect harmony with Hebrews 9:24-26.

Your presentation, however, carries the thought that the cross is central in the work of atonement. The same thought is emphasized again and again in the new book, "Questions on Doctrine;" but I am confident, dear Brother Anderson, that the emphasis is in the wrong place. Paul stated that the central feature in the work of atonement and the plan of salvation is seen in our High Priest ministering in the sanctuary above. Hebrews 8:1-5. Again note the words from Great Controversy: "The sanctuary in heaven is the very center of Christ's work in behalf of men." It appears most unfortunate that in the portions of the book, "Questions on Doctrine." dealing with Christ's ministry in the sanctuary, the word "atonement" appears to be scrupulously avoided. A crucified and risen Saviour was present truth in New Testament times, but in this the time of the end, Christ's ministry in the final phase of the atonement, is present truth today for this remnant people.

We therefore must utterly deplore any attempt at downgrading and belittling the atoning work of our great High Priest in the heavenly sanctuary. And at this late date to attempt to change the terminology regarding this great pillar of our faith, can only result in bringing in confusion and disruption.

Long years ago, the servant of the Lord declared: "Satan h striving continually to bring in fanciful suppositions regarding sanctuary, degrading the wonderful representation of God and the ministry of Christ for our salvation into something that suits the carnal mind. He removes its presiding theories invented to make void the truths of the atonement, and destroy our confidence in the doctrines which we have held sacred since the Third Angel's Message was first given"-Series B, No. 7, p. 17.

It would appear that in your numerous conversations with Dr. Walter Martin, you have been insidiously led to compromise the truth, so as to state it in terms acceptable to the popular evangelical churches. You have evidently endeavored to give the doctrine of the atonement "a new look;" but it appears as a doubtful, dubious look, and one of which our heavenly Father cannot approve.

During my more than a half century in the ministry, I havoc seen quite a number of good men, and some of them General Conference men, slip off on a tangent. Some of them returned to the full acceptance of the message, but others did not. And now, deal brother, I appeal to you to study again the great fundamental truth of the atonement.

Study the counsel given on page 63 of Early Writings; and with the rest of us present those themes that will "establish the faith of the doubting, and give certainty to the glorious future."

The Lord has mightily blessed your ministry in the past and I pray He will grant to you clear vision, and the unction of the Holy Spirit to proclaim the three-fold message with soul winning vigor and effectiveness in the days to come.

Cordially your brother,

Roy F. Cottrell

- SECTION SIXTEEN - - April 1957 to 1966 - THE PROTESTANT REACTION

(It is unfortunate but true, that the General Conference placed such a value on the book, "Questions on Doctrines, " that it was not content to merely approve the content of the book and urge that the Review print it, advertise it widely in our denominational journals and place it in Adventist Book and Bible Houses (now called Adventist Book Centers, or "ABCs") around the world;-they decided that they must go a long step farther than that: The 14-man small General Conference committee that had oversight of the "Questions on Doctrine" publication project gave its approval to a plan suggested to it by someone to subsidize from General Conference funds a large-scale free distribution of the book to Protestant leaders, colleges, churches and libraries.

"Many thousands of copies have been placed with clergymen and theology teachers not of our faith-in a few instances thousands in [within the territory of] a single [Adventist local] conference. And they have had their wholesome effect. Its total circulation by 1970 had exceeded 138,000 ... Out of the many thousands of scholars, of many faiths and lands, who have been presented with 'Questions on Doctrine,' many hundreds have cited and quoted it in article or book form, used it in classroom reference and assignment, and in oral public presentation. This their many articles, books, and letters attest. 'Questions on Doctrine' was (by 1965) in several thousand seminary, university, college, and public libraries. Many have been placed overseas. That is a remarkable record for only a decade of distribution."-L.E. Froom, in "Movement of Destiny," pages 489, 492.

Not only were Seventh-day Adventists to be taught the "new view" of the fundamentals of the Third Angel's Message but men were determined that this erroneous version of historic Adventism be the one now to be presented to Protestant, Catholic and Jewish leaders of thought. Talk about stifling the message! This was a systematic blanket-coverage approach intended to revise the message of Adventists-and the non-Adventist understanding of it-in less than a generation: within just ten years of intensive free hook distribution.

How much all this cost the General Conference we do not know. But we do know that the major portion of funds sent on to conferences, unions and the General Conference from the local churches is composed of tithe funds and mission funds. One of these two funds was robbed of a sizable amount in order to place books with error into the bands of religious thought leaders and onto the shelves of their schools and libraries. -And what was the purpose of it all? -To convince the other churches that we are one with them on some of their errors and therefore should receive their band of fellowship. "Okay, boys, your errors are all right after all. It isn't necessary to keep God's Law, and there isn't much to be done on earth or in heaven after Calvary. We've given up our truths so we can come in with you. "

When "Questions on Doctrine" came out in 1957, it was originally advertised at \$5.00 per copy, plus shipping. Assuming that only 25,000 copies were distributed in that decade free, this would amount to \$125,000 in tithe or overseas mission funds that were diverted from the use that the faithful membership had in mind when they contributed those funds.

The storm of protest came in four waves. The first was the "representative group of leaders, etc." who initially examined the first sheets of the pre-publication book. This storm was not large, and reached Takoma Park during the middle and latter part of 1956 and the first few months of 1957. The second storm came from the Review editorial offices, and this was primarily in the winter and spring of 1956-1957. The third storm

came from Adventist workers and laity. This was, of course, decidedly larger, and began in the summer of 1957. But there was a fourth wave of protest, and it was large also, but many of us never knew much about it. This was the Protest of the Protestants, twentieth-century style.

For the truth is that, aside from "Our Hope" and "Eternity" magazine and Martin's "The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism," -almost no other major Protestant journal, book, writer or thought leader came out publicly with a major statement to the effect that Adventists were somewhat all right after all! And this fact is the more dramatic when we recall that all those tens of thousands of free copies of "Questions on Doctrine" to the Protestants were not responsible for the suggestions of friendship in the pages of "Our Hope," "Eternity," and TASDA!

The Protestants decided that the Adventists were still suspect, either because they had not really changed their teachings after all, and were just saying so,-or because if they had genuinely renounced a few of their errors, more renunciations were still needed before the band of welcome could be extended.

The handing out of free copies of truth mixed with error is not the answer to the world's problems. What is needed is the powerful voice of the Third Angel-in the Sanctuary, Sabbath, Obedience by Faith and Second Advent proclamations to the world, as he wings by voice and by tract throughout the nations of mankind.

Here is the Protestant Reaction. As you read it, you may find some of it sadly humorous: many Protestant writers clearly saw that which Anderson and Froom had tried to deny: that the "new views" in "Questions on Doctrine" WERE NOT the genuine article: they were NOT the historic teachings of the Adventist Church-and they were NOT the present teachings of most of its members and clearly-at least not in the 1950's!!

April 1957

"WHY SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISM IS NOT EVANGELICAL

-by Louis T. Talbot, Chancellor, Bible Institute of Los Angeles, Inc. - The King's Business Magazine.

.. The hitherto highly regarded 'Eternity' magazine devoted much of its space in its September, October, November 1956 and January 1957 issues to a defense of one of these systems, Seventh-day Adventism, declaring it to be an evangelical denomination and insisting therefore that, as a Christian body, it should be received as part of the true Church of Christ. .

"Let me state first, without equivocation, that I believe these editors who are thus interpreting present-day Seventh-day Adventism as 'evangelical' and advocating that the Christian church should receive its adherents with all of their heresies as 'brethren beloved,' are utterly wrong, both in their methods and in their conclusions.

"By methods, I mean this: It is claimed by 'Eternity' magazine editors that Seventh-day Adventism has abandoned many of its old beliefs, and that 'sometime in 1957' a book is to be published by top Seventh-day Adventist leaders, setting forth the 'new Adventism.' .

"And while these Seventh-day Adventist officials are the proper spokesmen for a new position (if there is actually to be any) these views must be ratified by the hundreds of individual Adventist churches before they can be considered as representative Seventh-day Adventism. One book-or a dozen books-are not going to change the minds of those who have been indoctrinated with their teachings for more than half a century.

" .. Take, for instance, this statement which appeared in the 'Signs of the Times,' an official Adventist publication, for October 2, 1956 under the heading, 'Adventists Vindicated,' in which the 'Eternity' articles are discussed:

'As to the effect of Dr. Barnhouse's courageous reappraisal of Seventh-day Adventism, we are convinced that it will not only create a sensation in evangelical circles, but will lead thousands of the best people in all denominations to restudy the "message" which Seventh-day Adventists feel called to give to the world in these last days.'

"Please note that it is here claimed that 'Adventists [are] Vindicated' as they are at present, not as they are to be when they make the changes that the leaders have told the 'Eternity' editors they are going to make and these editors in turn have told the Christian public! There is no mention here of any proposed change in their views.

.. The news magazine, 'Time,' in its December 31, 1956 issue, took up this subject of Seventh-day Adventism under the title, 'Peace with the Adventists.' The writer of this piece stated: 'As a result of his researches [that is, those of the editor of "Eternity"], Fundamentalists have stretched out a hand, and Seventh-day Adventists have accepted it gladly.' 'Eternity' does not speak for Fundamentalists. The information furnished 'Time' by 'Eternity's' editors simply represented the interpretation of Seventh-day Adventism by 'Eternity's' editors. I have received letter after letter from Fundamentalists deeply deploring this action.

"Here is one Fundamentalist (and, of course, I speak for our entire Bible Institute of Los Angeles' constituency at home and abroad now numbering in the thousands) who does not extend the hand of fellowship to those whose official textbooks, both new and old at present teach:

- 1) That the Lord Jesus Christ in His incarnation assumed a sinful, fallen human nature
- 2) That immortality is conditional
- 7) That we are not saved by grace alone, apart from works of any kind
- 8) That the seventh-day Jewish Sabbath is God's test and seal.

"In all fairness to them, they have stated emphatically that they do not believe these heresies I have listed. .

"Leaders of this denomination have persuaded the 'Eternity' editors that some of these statements 'occasionally got into print'; that they were not official; and that some of the writers may be considered as being on the 'lunatic fringe.' I think you will agree with me that the three sources from which I quote are official, impeccable and authoritative; not only that, but it happens that in each case these identical statements have been going into Seventh-day Adventist homes for more than 50 years!

. At least from 1888 to 1944, and maybe longer, the book, 'Bible Readings for the Home Circle' went into Adventist homes to be read to their children, supposedly bearing the true message of the Lord. That is a long time-56 years! Do you think this statement 'just happened to get in'? That is too absurd to consider.

.. Much has been said of their withdrawing certain books from publication and sale but books like Everson's 'Mark of the Beast; Ashton's 'The Bible Sabbath,' and Lickey's 'God Speaks to Modern Man' were all purchased within the month in Adventist bookstores.

"These books are official publications of Adventist Review and Herald Pub. Co., Washington, D.C., and they all contain the teachings I have mentioned. Will the

correspondence courses call 'Faith for Today' all be withdrawn? I have a complete up-to-date set filled with the same old heresies. .

"Keep in mind that Seventh-day Adventism is not just a few 'big shots,' but is composed of hundreds of churches and individual members. Even if these leaders were to repudiate some of their heresies, how about the local churches and their membership who have been 'brain-washed' for three generations with such teachings as that of annihilation of the wicked? Will they accept it from stem to circumference of the denomination- because these leaders say it is not so any more? . .

"Now the question is: Will Mrs. White have to go? Will the 'keystone of the arch' be removed and thus all the superstructure fall in a heap? This will have to be done if the heresies are abandoned, as 'Eternity' claims."-"why Seventh-day Adventism is Not Evangelical ",Louis T. Talbot, The King's Business, April, 1957, pp. 23-30.

March 1958

"REVIEW OF CURRENT RELIGIOUS THOUGHT- by John H. Gerstner- Christianity Today Magazine.

. The most interesting thing presently occurring in the world of churches and sects is the controversy concerning the classification of the Seventh-day Adventists. This group, since it came into being about a century ago, has usually been treated as a sect rather than a church by evangelicals. The Adventists today are contending vigorously that they are truly evangelical. They appear to want to be so regarded. And what is more interesting than this is that many evangelicals are now contending that they ought to be so regarded. But, on the other hand, many believe that the old classification as sect should not be changed. We shall not discuss that matter here, since 'Christianity Today' proposes soon to present an article by Prof. Harold Lindsell on this whole question. Sufficient to note here, by way of anticipation, that Donald Grey Barnhouse, Walter Martin and others (cf. editorial in 'Eternity,' Sept., 1956, and elsewhere) are calling for a re-evaluation of the SDA's, while E.B. Jones and others believe that they are as deserving their sectarian classification as ever (Sword of the Lord, Aug. 2, 1957-. Just this week the new volume, 'Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrines,' has reached my desk. It begins: 'This book came into being to meet a definite need. Interest concerning Seventh-day Adventist belief and work has increased as the movement has grown. But in recent years especially, there seems to be a desire on the part of many non-Adventists for a clearer understanding of our teachings and objectives.' This book is the 720-page Adventist answer to the question whether it ought to be thought of as a sect or a fellow evangelical denomination."-"Review Of Current Religious Thought". John H. Gerstner, Christianity Today, March 3, 1958, p. 39.

"WHAT OF SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISM?-by Harold Lindsell-Christianity Today Magazine.

"In recent months the question, 'Are Seventh-day Adventists evangelical?' has been troubling many Christians. This question has been accentuated by many articles on both sides.

"The recent publication of an important volume by the Seventh-day Adventist leaders gives the discussion added significance (Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine, a commentary on questions addressed to the movement).

"Among The Cults-For many years SDA has been labeled a cult. Conservative Christians, particularly, have said hard things about the group and its doctrines. But this situation is changing. Some voices now lifted in defense of SDA are from theologically conservative ranks. Walter Martin, in several recent magazine articles (expected soon to

be expanded into book form) comes to the defense of SDA, declassifying it from the list of false religions, and approving it, for the most part, as evangelical. .

"The SDA book, 'Questions on Doctrine,' does not disclose the names of its authors. They remain anonymous."-"What of Seventh-day Adventism?" Harold Lindsell, Christianity Today, March 31, 1958, pp. 6.

December 1960

"A CLEFT IN SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISM?-Editorial in Christianity Today.

"Since the current controversy over the classification of Seventh-day Adventists (denomination or cult?) was first initiated in 1956, one interesting factor in the conflict has gone largely unnoticed. The Adventists apparently have been faced by growing internal tension and division as a result of the publication of their definitive volume, 'Questions on Doctrine,' and of Walter Martin's new book, 'The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism.'

" .. The editors of the 'Call' point out that some of the old Adventist landmarks have been moved, notably the alleged inerrancy of Ellen White, the vicarious nature of the scapegoat translation of Leviticus 16, and the literal interpretation of the Heavenly Sanctuary doctrine.

.. A. L. Hudson, former elder in a large Adventist church in Oregon, in company with retired yet powerful Adventist leader Dr, M.L.Andreasen, has spearheaded a movement to have those responsible for the publication of 'Questions on Doctrine' censured for 'misrepresenting the historic position' of the Adventist , Church. From as far away as Australia and New Zealand letters have reached us concerning the small but apparently vocal segment of Adventism that still wants to brand Sunday keepers with the 'mark of the beast,' teach a literalistic sanctuary and scapegoat transaction, and hold Ellen White in esteem as an infallible prophetess.' Dr. Andreasen at one time was professor of theology at the Adventists' seminary in Washington, D.C.

Leaders of the Seventh-day Adventist denomination have, however, discounted this faction as unrepresentative of the views of the major constituency of the Church. This affirmation is apparently underscored by the fact that the book, 'Questions on Doctrine'; authorized by the General Conference as the denominational position, has had the widest circulation and general approval of the denomination of any volume of recent years. But the fact remains that there is a segment of Seventh-day Adventists vocal and apparently powerful enough to reverse some of the trends originally undertaken in good faith by the leadership of the denomination in 1956.

"It is significant to note that 'The Signs of the Times' and 'these Times,' major Adventist publications, have identified themselves for the first time as publications of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, only to have the identification rescinded and withdrawn from the masthead. Certain publications which allegedly did not represent the position of the denomination are still widely circulated despite the assurance of the leadership of the Seventh-day Adventist denomination that 'plans were already operative' to dispense with such inconsistencies in Adventist publishing houses. (Adventist spokesmen assert that, in a sense, each of their publishing houses is autonomous, having its own board of control, and that the reasons for masthead changes lie with the editors.)

' .. Martin's book was to be stocked by Adventist publishing houses according to commitments made by top Adventist officials. Authorization to place his book on sale was not forthcoming, however, despite the fact that two non-critical non-Adventist publications were accepted for distribution. .

'The cleft in Seventh-day Adventism seems, however, to be deeper than appears on the surface. Some Seventh-day Adventist officials seem not to welcome any investigation of their views due to their divergence from what the church maintains as its true position.

'One thing, however, is certain. Certain elements in the theology of Seventh-day Adventism are in flux; some of the old landmarks have apparently been moved; and some old errors have been or are being rectified.'"-'A Cleft In Seventh-day Adventism, Editorial from Christianity Today, December 19, 1960.

CONFRONTING THE CULTS

Gordon R. Lewis

Presbyterian And Reformed Publishing Company
Box 817, Phillipsburg, New Jersey 08865
Copyright 1966

Walter R. Martin and the late Donald Grey Barnhouse for two years probed Adventism's leading spokesmen. In September, 1956, an editorial in "Eternity" magazine stated Dr. Barnhouse's tradition-breaking conclusion. No longer can Seventh-day Adventists be classed as a cult and its adherents non-Christian, he declared. Adventists are "redeemed brethren and members of the body of Christ." And Walter Martin, who had roundly denounced Christian Science and Jehovah's Witnesses as cults, now argued as vehemently that Seventh-day Adventism is Evangelical. In spite of some secondary deviations from orthodox Christian teaching, Martin said, the Adventists "have always as a majority, held to the cardinal, fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith which are necessary to salvation, and to growth in State that characterizes all true Christian believers." (Walter R. "[in "What Seventh-day Adventists Really Believe," "Eternity," VII November, 1956), p. 43.] [101:4-102:0].

The Adventists' response to Martin appeared in a 700-page Volume called "Questions on Doctrine." "Prepared by a Representative Group of Seventh-day Adventist Leaders, Bible Teachers and Editors," the book came out in 1957 from the Washington, D.C., Review and Herald Publishing Association. Although not an official statement adopted by the General Conference in quadrennial session, "this volume can be viewed as truly representative of the faith and beliefs of the Seventh-day Adventist Church." (N Questions on Doctrine" (Washington, D. C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1957). p. 9.) (102:1]

Three years and much controversy later, Zondervan Publishing House printed Martin's complete analysis, "The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism." The "Foreword" by Dr. Barnhouse narrowed the previous thesis that the majority of Adventists had always held an evangelical position. He wrote, "let it be understood that we made only one claim; i.e., that those Seventh-day Adventists who follow the Lord in the same way as their leaders who have interpreted for us the doctrinal position of their church, are to be considered true members of the body of Christ." (Walter R. Martin, "The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism" (Grand Rapids: The Zondervan Publishing House, 1960). p. 7.1 In supporting this thesis Martin explicitly assumes: (1) that the Adventist leaders contacted were honest and (2) that "Questions on Doctrine" is "the primary source upon which to ground an evaluation of Adventist theology." ("Ibid.,"p. 10.) On this basis Martin concluded the leadership is evangelical, and as we shall see, evangelical with an Arminian system of theology which denies eternal Security. (102:2)

But not all evangelicals were willing to grant these assumptions or, if they did, not all concurred in Martin's conclusion. That conclusion was challenged by Professor

Harold Lindsell, then Dean of Fuller Theological Seminary, in "Christianity Today," March 31, 1958. Dr. Lindsell concurred that Seventh-day Adventism is not a cult like Christian Science or Jehovah's Witnesses, since it does not deny the absolute deity of Christ nor reject His atoning sacrifice on Calvary. But, Lindsell suggested, Seventh-day Adventism is not therefore evangelical. Like Romanism, it denies the sufficiency of Christ's death for man's salvation. Mixing works with grace Adventism errs with the legalism Paul disputed in Galatians. Grace simply supports man's will so that through his good works he may obtain eternal life. Works remain the basis of man's hope. (Harold Lindsell, "What of Seventh-day Adventism?" "Christianity Today," April 14, 1958, pp. 13, 15.) This differs from Arminianism, which makes faith as distinct from works the single condition of salvation. [102.3-103:0]

In reviewing Martin's book, "The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism," Dr. Merrill Tenney, Professor of New Testament at Wheaton College, raised a question about Martin's second assumption. "Is the doctrinal platform of Seventh-day Adventism determined by what a few of its scholars define, or by what the majority of its followers believe and practice?" Tenney apparently feels that though Martin did not compromise on the level of the leaders' teaching, he failed to give sufficient consideration to the movement's policies and practices and to the bulk of its teachings. (Merrill C. Tenney, "Review of the Truth About Seventh-day Adventism," "Eternity," May, 1960, p. 40.1(103:3])

Norman F. Douty, in a book entitled "Another Look at Seventh-day Adventism" (Baker Book House, 1962), not limiting himself to "Questions on Doctrine," found that the movement denied doctrines the church has always declared, and taught doctrines the church as a whole has always denied. In spite of the differences he said, "It is our duty to manifest love and kindness toward those who are in Adventism." (Norman F. Douty, "Another Look at Seventh-day Adventism" (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1962, p. 189.) But Douty concluded, "They who would be loyal to God rather than be swayed by sentiment must avoid any alliance with the Adventist system. No other course is open to them." (-Ibid., "p. 188.) [104:1]

And in 1963 Anthony A. Hoekema, Associate Professor of Systematic Theology at Calvin Theological Seminary, published a book categorizing Seventh-day Adventism as one of "The Four Major Cults." [104:21

- SECTION SEVENTEEN - - 1959 - A MEDICAL MISSIONARY RECALLS DR. BARNHOUSE

[Approximately two years ago I made contact with a Seventh-day Adventist medical doctor who is carrying on a medical practice somewhere in North America. He told me of his meeting with Dr. Barnhouse about twelve months before that individual's death. We briefly noted this recollection in an issue of "Waymarks" at the time. But in preparation for this present documentary I again phoned this physician and obtained a more complete report on the incident, which you will read below.

We cannot know the heart, but it does appear that by 1959 Dr. D. G. Barnhouse (of the Martin and Barnhouse team) was very antagonistic to Seventh-day Adventists, their beliefs and their objectives. Not only antagonistic, but highly suspicious) But remember that Dr. Barnhouse had been systematically misinformed by certain Adventist leaders about the true beliefs of our Church. He had been told that we never really had believed in certain concepts that our earlier books –and current books proclaimed. He had been told that all but a few "on the lunatic fringe" within our Church no longer believed such fooleries now.

And it was on the basis of these lying comments, plus his own deep concern to see Adventists somehow pulled out of error, that he was willing to go out on a limb, extend his own hand in fellowship to Anderson, Froom, Unruh, and Reed, and then proclaim in the pages of "Eternity" that the Adventists had changed from their "unchristian" teachings.

And he experienced a great loss in subscribers to "Eternity" for having done so. But the bitterness of it all was the gradual discovery (from the many letters from Seventh-day Adventists that he was to receive) that "Questions on Doctrine" and the assurances of our leaders in the Evangelical Conferences really weren't true after all! Barnhouse was trying to bring us back to Protestantism, and the shock of it all was difficult to take. Some were saying that Adventists never did think that obedience to God had any relationship to salvation. They were saying that the 'errors' found in our books for so many years that Christ did not really take human nature, and that whatever He was now doing within a "Heavenly Sanctuary" wasn't too important after all-.were no longer accepted by Adventists. It was quite obvious from the reports that Martin brought back to him, month by month, from the Evangelical Conferences-that he was on the verge of seeing an entire denomination possibly coming back to the great mother church of Protestantism. Obviously, with all the cooperation he was receiving in Washington, with the passage of time even more changes should be forthcoming.

By 1959, Donald Grey Barnhouse was no friend of Adventists. Exactly why, and how long he had been no friend of Adventists we may never know in this life.

When Dr. Barnhouse in an unprovoked frenzy of anger cursed the Sabbath, this physician's wife was convinced that he would be dead before long. Deeply convicted of this thought, they learned of his death the next year.

The present section is concluded with an obituary notice of his death that appeared in the December 1960 issue of Eternity. Three months after that, Walter Martin began his own separate "cult research" magazine:]

A MEDICAL MISSIONARY RECALLS DR. BARNHOUSE

The following incident occurred in late 1959, not too long before the death of Dr. Donald Grey Barnhouse.. [Dr. Barnhouse died the following year in November.]

At the time when this took place, my wife and I were Seventh-day Adventist medical missionaries in Peru. (This was a medical doctor who was salaried for this work by the Church).

Dr. Barnhouse came to Lima, Peru, to speak, and the missionaries of the various Protestant churches were notified so that they could hear him. This gathering included interdenominational missionaries, denominational missionaries, and Seventh-day Adventist missionaries. Dr. Barnhouse was well-known in the Protestant world and since his sponsorship of and participation in the Evangelical Conferences with Seventh-day Adventists that took place 4-5 years before, it is understandable that we would all be eager to hear him speak.

I would estimate that 50 or 60 people were gathered in the small meeting house selected for his talk with us. He was very friendly and seemed to be the kind of man able to win friends easily.

But then the question and answer session took place, following his lecture. During it, one of our Adventist missionaries stood up and asked a simple question about justification and sanctification. He had not identified himself as to his religion and he spoke in a kindly manner. Also he had said nothing about the Sabbath. In reply, Barnhouse talked a little while, and then, sensing that it was a Seventh-day Adventist

who had asked the question, he suddenly turned a livid red and began speaking loudly. Then he struck the palm of his hand with the clenched fist of the other, making a strong slap, and shouted, "In the name of Jesus Christ, I curse that Seventh-day Sabbath!"

In the diatribe that followed, he clearly showed that he hated us as a people. When he spoke that "I curse the Sabbath" sentence, my wife turned to me and said, "That man is going to die!"

The whole incident was a strange one. For it had otherwise been a very congenial meeting, up to that point. All were friendly to one another. And in the midst of it came Barnhouse's unprovoked verbal torrent and violent remarks.

After the meeting had adjourned and Dr. Barnhouse was about to enter the car waiting for him out front, I stepped up to speak with him briefly. My intention was not to deepen his violent feelings but in some way to assuage them. I said in a kindly way, "I want to thank you, Dr. Barnhouse. We Seventh-day Adventists are thankful you have taken us out of the class of sects and put us into the class of mainstream Protestantism."

I had identified myself as an Adventist medical missionary and I was trying to soothe him to enhance his future contacts with our church. But in response, he turned red again, and shouted at me, "When I get back to the States, I'm going to see your leaders in Washington D.C. about this proselytizing that you Adventists are doing!" And then he went into another tirade. He was terribly angry at the very thought of seeing an Adventist missionary in front of him.

(And I must say, I was quite impressed with the apparent authority he seemed to think he had over our leaders in Takoma Park.)

["Proselytizing" means one Protestant converting other Protestants to his own church. It is also called "sheep stealing." The nominal Protestant view is that all the churches are pretty much alike anyway, so conversions among Protestants should not be carried on between them. The Adventist view is that we have a special message to all peoples, for the crisis over the Mark is just ahead and the end of the world, following that.]

My wife and I had been in this mission field for several years and I knew how our work was being carried on, and I replied and told him in a calm, dignified tone that we were mainly working with the heathen natives and with Roman Catholics.

"I can take you right now to Unini [pronounced "oo-nee-nee"] Mission on one of the main tributaries of the Amazon in Peru," I said. "We had brought the natives out of raw heathenism, and we were caring for this station. But when we left, due to restricted funds, we had hoped that the Indians there could maintain themselves in the hope of the Advent Faith. But then another Protestant group came in and took them all away from us. They proselytized; we didn't. I can show you the place."

Now, even hotter with anger, Dr. Barnhouse jumped into the car, slammed the door, and ordered the chauffeur to drive off.

It was in January of 1960, not too long after this that my wife and I returned to the States, so I have a pretty good idea of the approximate date when this incident occurred.

- SECTION EIGHTEEN - - November 1960 - DEATH OF DONALD GREY BARNHOUSE

"DONALD GREY BARNHOUSE - MARCH 1895 November 1960-Long before this magazine reaches the homes of most readers, the news of the death of its distinguished editor-in-chief and founder will be known. Donald Grey Barnhouse, whose

superb gift as an expositor of the Word of God was unparalleled in our generation, completed his earthly assignment November 5 in his home city of Philadelphia.

"He was stricken with a baffling illness in September that physicians finally diagnosed as a massive tumor of the brain. An emergency operation was performed October 8. During the four weeks he lay upon his bed at Temple University Hospital, Dr. Barnhouse indicated that he understood what was going on even though he found it difficult to speak except in halting phrases .."-*Eternity*," December 1960, p. 6. [This was a full-page announcement, including a photograph.]

March 1961

"CULT RESEARCH-Editors, *Christianity Today*.

"A new quarterly devoted to the study of cults made its debut last month under the name 'Religious Research Digest' Editor is Walter R. Martin."-*Cult Research*," Editors, *Christianity Today*, March 13, 1961, p. 31.

- SECTION NINETEEN -- 1965 - "KINGDOM OF THE CULTS"

[In 1965, Walter Martin published a major analysis of the cults in America. (By "cults," we mean the denominations which Martin considers to be cults. In his estimation, a "cult" is a supposedly Christian church which teaches non-Christian doctrines.) By agreement with Anderson and Froom in 1956, if we would redesign some of our doctrinal points, he would remove us from the list of cults. And in 1956-1957 in his *"Eternity"* magazine articles and in his 1960 book, *"The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism,"* he did this. Then, in 1965 he came out with another important book on the cults. And again the pressure was on him to include Adventists along with the cults (such as the Mormons, Jehovah's Witnesses, etc.).

What he did was to include a section on Adventists. In it he gave an introductory statement (quoted below) and then, in small print, reprinted a number of pages from his book *TASDA*.

By 1965 Martin was still remaining true to his pledged word to Anderson and Froom. They had done their part; he was staying by his.]

ADVENTIST THEOLOGY AND CLASSICAL ORTHODOXY

For many years Seventh-day Adventists have been handicapped by the lack of a comprehensive volume which adequately defines their doctrinal position. Many publications clearly set forth certain aspects of Adventism, particularly the writings of F. D. Nichol, L. E. Froom and Ellen G. White, whose role is that of inspired commentator and "messenger" to the Adventist denomination. (369:7)

Except for the brief statement of fundamentals in the Seventh-day Adventist Yearbook the average Adventist has been somewhat at a loss to explain conflicting theological opinions within his denomination, and even expressions in the writings of Ellen G. White were in certain contexts so ambiguous as to frustrate even the most devout believer. As a result of this in 1957 the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists released the first definitive and comprehensive explanation of their faith, an authoritative volume entitled *"Questions on Doctrine."* [369:8]

This book truthfully presents the theology and doctrine which the leaders of Seventh-day Adventism affirm they have always held. Members of other denominations

will find it a reliable source to consult when seeking to understand what the Adventists themselves describe as "the position of our denomination" in the area of church doctrine and prophetic interpretation."(Introduction "Questions on Doctrine," Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1956, page 8.) [369:9]

There can be no doubt of the fact that there are conflicting statements in Adventist publications and diverse opinions about certain areas of Adventist theology and interpretation, some of which is quite the opposite of classical orthodox Christianity; but this situation is not peculiar to the Adventist since all Christian denominations have various "wings" in most instances quite vocal, which are a source of constant embarrassment because they represent their own particular interpretations of the denomination's theology as the viewpoint of the denomination itself. [369:101]

It is therefore unfair to quote any one Adventist writer or a group of writers as representing "the position of our denomination in the area of church doctrine and prophetic interpretation" even though the writings of such persons may in a large area qualify as Adventist theology. One must consult in good faith what the denomination itself represents as its theology and assume that the Seventh-day Adventist theologians know better than non-Adventists the implications and conclusions which they are willing to admit as representative of their church's theology. -370:0]

This section is divided into several parts, each of which contains statements of the official Adventist position of particular aspects of theology and is thoroughly documented from the primary source material providing questions on doctrine. It is hoped that the reader will weigh carefully the declarations of the Seventh-day Adventist Church as represented by its general conference which alone is empowered to speak for the denomination. They have spoken in "Questions on Doctrine" and their statements should be examined in the light of honest scholarship and Christian ethics. [370:1]

It is unnecessary to document at great length the fact that Seventh-day Adventism adheres tenaciously to the foundational doctrines of Christian theology as these have been held by the Christian church throughout the centuries. Dr. Anthony Hoekema who believes that Seventh-day Adventism is a non-Christian cult makes this interesting admission, and since Dr. Hoekema is no friend of Adventism, his testimony on this point could hardly be called prejudiced:

I am of the conviction that Seventh-day Adventism is a cult and not an evangelical denomination. . It is recognized with gratitude that there are certain soundly Scriptural emphases in the teaching of Seventh-day Adventism. We are thankful for the Adventists' affirmation of the infallibility of the Bible, of the Trinity and of the full deity of Jesus Christ. We gratefully acknowledge their teachings on creation and providence, on the incarnation and resurrection of Christ, on the absolute necessity for regeneration, on sanctification by the Holy Spirit, and on Christ's literal return. ("The Four Major Cults," pages 389 and 403.) [370:3]

It is puzzling to me, as a student of non-Christian cult systems, how any group can hold the above doctrines in their theology and still be a non-Christian cult! However, we shall deal with this aspect of the critics of Adventism at the end of the chapter, therefore, suffice it to say that the Adventists do have a clean bill of health where the major doctrines of Christian theology are involved. [370:4]

Lest there be any doubt on the subject, the following quotations taken from "Questions on Doctrine" forthrightly declare the Seventh-day Adventist position in relation to historic Christianity as well as those areas where Adventism differs from the orthodox Christian position. [370:5]

[The remainder of the section in his book, pertaining to Seventh-day Adventists, is composed of small-print material selected from his earlier "The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism."]

-"The Kingdom of the Cults," Walter R. Martin, Bethany Fellowship, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1965, pages 369-370.

- SECTION TWENTY - - 1980 - CORRESPONDENCE WITH WALTER MARTIN

(Reproduced here is a letter written in 1980 to Martin by a Seventh-Day Adventist Bible teacher. Following it, is Martin's reply. It is clear that Walter Martin was becoming increasingly impatient with the letters he had received from traditional Adventists—and from modernist ones—that indicated a concern on the part of some of our church members and workers to see a retrenchment into more historic Adventism in our doctrinal statements. It was but a premonition of coming events, as we shall see later in this present study, "The Beginning of the End."

Prof. Walter Martin

Post Office Box 500 Capistrano, Ca. 92693 Dear Prof. Martin:

Sometimes I wonder if the "truth" will ever be made known? It seems we are still going over the ground you and your late friend Dr. Barnhouse walked over some twenty plus years ago.

Since our last correspondence concerning the writing of the book "Questions on Doctrine," I have gone over carefully a communiqué by Dr. Barnhouse wherein he stated: "We (referring to you and himself) have written and signed by the leaders of the Seventh-day Adventist movement that we have not misinterpreted Seventh-day Adventist positions."

Perhaps he was speaking about the foreword of your book, which was signed by one of our officers. However, he also stated: "Everything I have published was read by Seventh-day Adventist leaders before we published. Not a line have I ever printed that was not previously read by Froom. "

Was Dr. Froom the only one that gave his consent and placed an endorsement upon the writings in "Eternity?" The reason I raise the question is because of a letter I received from the Editor of "The Ministry Magazine." (The one that took Dr. Roy Anderson's place) He told me that "when it comes to your quoting "Eternity" magazine, you must remember that this is their interpretation of the story . . . You cannot hold the Adventist Church leadership responsible for our saying what others said we said.. So what Barnhouse and Martin said our leaders said, still has to be taken in that context."

I must say, this rather muddies the water and makes it most difficult to discern which person has spoken "truth. " I would like to believe that God is still leading the honest in heart and those who are seeking to know Him as their personal Saviour. However, as a professor of religion here at O.K.A., it sometimes becomes rather hard to determine just where we stand as a denomination. Are we divided?

I would appreciate anything you might have from your files that could help clear up this issue in my mind once for all.

Let me thank you in advance for your time and consideration and may I remain Sincerely,

(Signed)

December 9, 1980

Dear Brother ____;

I am sorry for a late reply to your letter of last January, but my schedule has been horrendous. As I stated in my "Eternity" articles and Dr. Barnhouse stated in his editorial, and as I have further stated in "The Truth About Seventh-Day Adventism" and "The Kingdom of the Cults," representatives of the Seventh-day Adventist denomination with the full approval of Reuben Figuhr, then president, entered into lengthy dialogue with myself, Dr. Barnhouse, and Dr. George Cannon for the purpose of ascertaining Seventh-day Adventism's agreement or disagreement with historic Christianity. Dr. Roy Allan Anderson, Dr. W.E. Read, Dr. LeRoy Froom, and Dr. Unruh referred our dialogues to selected members of the Seventh-day Adventist Seminary in Washington and to Reuben Figuhr. When the book, "Questions on Doctrine" was published, it was stated that it represented historic Adventism as understood by the leaders of the church at that time. The book was in response to the questions I addressed to the Seventh-day Adventist denomination. The current editor of The Ministry, who is maintaining that what went on in those dialogues and the material that was printed was merely the interpretation "Eternity" magazine placed upon it is not only woefully ignorant, but he apparently can't read. "Barnhouse and Martin" didn't say what your leaders said, Barnhouse and Martin reproduced exactly what they said; and after they had read it, as the book "Questions on Doctrine" and my book accurately represents it all.

It is sorry to see after such a short period of time that some leaders of Adventism have not only short memories, but are now attempting to say things which are blatantly erroneous.

If this dialogue must be public once more, I shall be happy to produce the documentation. Dr. Roy Anderson is still alive as is Dr. Unruh. This was not a matter of interpretation. This was a matter of very thorough documentation and the editor of the ministry had better start doing his homework or his attitude will further what is now a growing schism within the Seventh-day Adventist denomination.

One cannot simply have his cake and eat it too. Either the Seventh-day Adventist denomination stood behind the book "Questions on Doctrine", or they printed it under false pretenses. I do not accept the latter; and all the evidence is in favor of the former. You may consult Dr. Anderson if you wish. He is an honorable man with a good memory; and if we have to get down to the area of factual data, the editor of The Ministry will not be very successful in defending this double talk.

With appreciation for your correspondence and a continuing interest in the ministry of the Seventh-day Adventist denomination, I remain,

In the Fellowship of our Lord,

Walter Martin

- SECTION TWENTY-ONE - -August 1982 -

LETTER FROM W. DUNCAN EVA

(The following letter was sent to a layman in North America in the to summer of 1982. W. Duncan Eva, its author, is Special Assistant to President of the General Conference. For many years a close friend of Desmond Ford, he has continued to the present time to favor both the doctrines and the advocates of Ford's modernistic views. (The most recent example of this was his trip to Australasia in spring of 1982-see CN-4, pp. 2-3, and the tape "The Cuckoos," both available from Pilgrims' Rest.)

This letter provides us with, several insights and two very significant facts. The two facts are these: (1) The publication costs of "Questions on Doctrine" was subsidized by the General Conference so that it could be more widely circulated. We have earlier learned in this extensive study, "The Beginning of the End," that for ten years the General Conference paid the full cost of printing and mailing out thousands of copies of QD to non-Adventist thought leaders and their schools and libraries, so that they would think that we believed much as they did. But now we learn that the cost of all the copies that were sold were also partly paid for by the General Conference! A study made in the early sixties by a layman revealed that nearly all of the money that the General Conference has to work with, comes from foreign mission offerings and tithe. Should foreign mission offerings be used to send QD out everywhere,- when it teaches non-Adventist teachings? Frankly, some of this seems a little high-handed. What right do a small group of men in the General Conference have to initiate, carry out, and then subsidize such a project? The General Conference in Quadrennial Session never gave approval to such a project (and probably never heard about it until after the books were selling in the Adventist Book and Bible Houses).

(2) The second point is even more important: A successor to "Questions on Doctrine" is already in the planning stages. It will be published "in several years. " What slant will the doctrines have in that book? This is very serious. Especially in view of the fact that (a) our college Bible teachers will probably do most of the writing of articles, and (b) a poll of our college Bible teachers made by Raymond Cottrell in 1980 [see details in WM-22J revealed that a large number no longer believed basic Adventist teachings dealt with in the poll. Here is W. Duncan Eva's letter:]

Office of the President

General Conference of
SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS
Church World Headquarters:
6840 Eastern Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20012 USA
Telephone: (202) 722-6000
Cable: Adventist, Washington
Telex: 89-580

August 24, 1982 Dear Brother ____:

Thank you very much for your letter of July 28 addressed to Elder [Neal C.] Wilson. As you know and have said in your letter, he is not able to reply to all the correspondence that comes to his desk and has, therefore, requested that I endeavor to reply to the questions that you have asked.

In regard to the book Questions on Doctrine, you ask why there has never been any semblance of an official repudiation of it.

Questions on Doctrine was prepared, at the request of the General Conference officers, by a group of conservative Adventist scholars in the 1950's. Its circulation around the world field was subsidized by the General Conference so it could be sold at the price of \$1.50 (if I remember correctly) per copy. [You will note on DH-107, p. 3, that the price of the book to our own members, when originally released, was \$5.00.] It has never been republished in English, though there has been considerable demand for it. However, it was recently published in South America, I believe, in the Portuguese language. It is the plan for the Review and Herald to prepare a book on systematic theology, representing the Adventist view and understanding, to replace Questions on Doctrine. It will appear in a few years as Volume 11 of the Commentary Series. It will, of

course, be a new book and will not follow the format and pattern of Questions on Doctrine.

I am not altogether clear on what you mean in regard to the "errors" in Questions on Doctrine. You are probably referring to the stand it takes on Christology ["Christology" = the doctrine of Christ," i.e., the human nature of Christ] and certain aspects of Soteriology ["Soteriology" = the doctrine of how we are saved, i.e., when the atonement was completed, and whether mankind needs to keep the Law of God as part of that salvation process]. I can only say that its writers, after careful study, and the General Conference administration at the time it was published, believed it set forth the truth correctly. Many, I am inclined to think not a minority, still believe the same way today . .

In regard to Movement of Destiny, I might say that it has been revised in some places recently to correct some statements that tended to be misleading. There is, however, no intention to withdraw it from circulation for the brethren feel it makes a contribution to our understanding of the history of our church and the developments that have led us through the years. Elder Pearson, the former president of the General Conference, spoke of it as "a must for every worker, every theological student, and every church officer-in fact, for every church member who loves this message and longs to see it triumph in the near, very near future."

There are some who speak and write disparagingly of Dr. L.E. Froom, but he writes as one who has studied into these questions deeply and who lived close to the situation through the years of his ministry. As a long-time secretary of the Ministerial Association, he had opportunity to know many things intimately that others, perhaps, were not so fortunate to understand.

In regard to Dr. Heppenstall and his stand on original sin, may I say first of all that the Seventh-day Adventist Church has never clearly stated where it stands in regard to original sin as a doctrine. There are no references to it as such in the 27 articles recently revised and adopted at the Dallas General Conference session in 1980. Dr. Heppenstall is a respected scholar of this church. His understanding of some things may be different from yours but he sees support for his understanding in both the Bible and the Spirit of Prophecy and what he has written was written to be helpful. As I know him, he has always acted as a Christian gentleman and at the recent Glacier View meeting made one of the most moving appeals to Dr. Desmond Ford to stay by the church, accept the counsel of the brethren and seek to work out with his fellow scholars some of the questions that he had raised. Many of us regret deeply that Dr. Ford did not heed that appeal [to remain a church worker].

I am not in a position to say more than this about what you call "this heresy." You ask how many of the leaders believe it. I cannot answer that question because I do not know exactly what you mean by "this heresy." I suppose it includes Dr. Heppenstall's understanding of original sin, maybe some of the faults you have to find with Movement of Destiny and perhaps also modern protestant evangelical theology. You say that Mrs. White is clearly opposed to these errors and their proponents are proceeding to make her testimony of none effect. I would have to understand a great deal more clearly what you are saying, Brother ____, before I would venture to reply. At this point there is for me wise counsel in Proverbs 18:13 [quoted].

You ask secondly why there is no official propaganda or literature against the new theology published from our headquarters as there was against Brinsmead. Here again I am not altogether clear on what you mean by "new theology." It is very easy for us to attach labels which have a meaning as far as we personally are concerned, but are not always understood by others. If you are talking about the controversy that has been continuing for some time- in regard to the interpretation of Daniel 8, the Sanctuary, the

Day of Atonement, and certain chapters in the book of Hebrews, then it would seem to me that the church has made very clear answers.

With warm Christian greetings,

Sincerely your brother,

(Signed)

W. Duncan Eva

Special Assistant to the President

bs

- SECTION TWENTY-TWO - - February 1983 - GETTING READY FOR A NEW BOMBSHELL:

MARTIN'S UPDATE ON ADVENTISM

("The Beginning of the End" was a major historical analysis of a theological compromise that took place nearly twenty years ago.

But at this point, the past becomes the present and we find ourselves confronted with -a new bombshell in the very near future.

Now we are no longer dealing with history; we are faced with either a repetition of this General Conference compromise again -this year-or a dramatic reversal of Walter Martin's position in regard to our Church.

On February 22, 1983 in an address in Napa, California, Walter Martin told the audience that he was again seeking more doctrinal "answers" from the General Conference. He said that he had already demanded these answers-and if they were not forthcoming, he was going to do; some revising of his official statement of our Church.

For seventeen years he has publicly stated that Seventh-day Adventism is not a cult: -But in this lecture it is obvious that he has been receiving letters from 'a large number of Fordite Adventists', and non Adventist Fordite, sympathizers who are urging Martin to now revise his classification of our denomination

As a result Martin says he has contacted the General Conference, and has submitted another listing of doctrinal "questions": to which he wants "answers" that are satisfactory to him. No reply or the wrong reply will be sufficient cause for unpleasant action on his part "in his new book" which he will be releasing in a short time

So, those of you who thought you were reading history now find you are reading current news. And it is news that you should yourself act upon.- In 1955 we were told nothing about Martin's questions -much less our answers- Not until the Protestant magazines leaked the news in their "bombshell ", articles did Adventists, as a whole, learn what was taking place. Today another set of "questions " has-been submitted to the General Conference. And the Church has known nothing about it. But, fortunately on February 22., of this year, Walter Martin told us what was happening... . .

It is now time to read-and then WRITE.

'Write the General Conference and demand that our leaders stop yielding to Evangelical demands for doctrinal compromise. We are compromising with the Evangelicals within our Church on the matter of doctrine. (The "Evangelicals within our

Church" are the Fordites and "new theology" advocates.) And now the pressure is on to yield more to the Evangelicals without the Church.

What will you do about it? Will you stand for the right and urge the right--or will you cowardly shrink into a corner and decide that it is somebody else's business to speak up.

Here are major portions of Walter Martin's lecture on Seventh-day Adventism today, delivered at the Napa Christian Mission-Church, Napa; California (very close to Pacific Union College) to a large audience composed of Adventists and non-Adventists: j

WALTER R. MARTIN
"WE MUST HELP THE ADVENTISTS SOLVE THEIR PROBLEM"
February 22, 1983-Napa, California

In 1955 I published a book called "The Rise of The Cults."

In that book I discussed various cult structures, and one of the groups that I mentioned was the Seventh-day Adventists. I was contacted shortly afterwards by a very fine Christian man now with the Lord, T. E. Unruh, a Seventh-day Adventist. He was concerned that I, an expert on cults, would classify him and Seventh-day Adventists along with Jehovah's Witnesses and Mormons, and Christian Science. He asked for a meeting so we could talk about it. I said: I'm always interested in truth, always interested in examining facts and evidence; yes, I'd be glad to meet with you. I met with him; and that meeting led to another series of meetings with a committee appointed by the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists (which is the highest government body of the Adventist denomination).

We met together. We proceeded to discuss together issues of Seventh-day Adventism. This was the first time that this had ever happened in the history of that denomination. As a result of it, after these got going, the then president of the Seventh-day Adventist denomination, Reuben Figuhr (who is still alive) appointed this study for the purpose of arriving at an area of discussion and of truth, so that there would be a bridge between Evangelical Christianity and Seventh-day Adventism, and that the communication gap could be bridged.

Now these meetings went on over a period of two years. Literally hundreds and hundreds of hours of work and research were gone into it.

It seemed that it would be a good idea to publish a book on the subject that would answer questions about Seventh-day Adventist theology. I went with this proposal to Dr. Donald Grey Barnhouse, my teacher, who was absolutely convinced that Seventh-day Adventism was a non-Christian cult, and thought I had lost whatever reasoning I had by coming back with material that indicated otherwise.

We had a long session and Dr. Barnhouse said: "I think you should investigate this further." So with that I proceeded to meet with the Adventists-with Professor George Cannon, with the great Adventist historian, Professor LeRoy Froom; W.E. Read, one of the top researchers of Old Testament material; T.E. Unruh, one of their conference presidents; and of course, with Roy Allan Anderson, Editor of the "Ministry Magazine."

It was agreed that my book, "The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism," would be released in Seventh-day Adventist bookstores. It was agreed that we would push their volume in Evangelical bookstores, so that more than four-thousand stores could get the information, and get it through the Adventists and through the Evangelicals. It was not a tiny project. It was a great project-- It had the support of the president of the General Conference and the committees he personally appointed. We had cooperation from

everybody in attempting it. It was not considered to be a new statement of faith but an expansion of what they considered to be historic Seventh-day Adventism.

Now we learned early on in our discussions that there was a division in Seventh-day Adventism that had to be recognized. There was a lunatic fringe that believed doctrines that appalled even the Adventists. And I came in one day with a suitcase, literally a suitcase, full of publications from Adventist publishing houses. Before I opened the suitcase, I said to my brothers on the committee, do you know that your denomination teaches these things? And I listed them, and they were appalled. I said I have the mark of the beast, and they looked at each other and said, "Impossible!" I said, "Well I have." I said, "I have been told that by three Adventist publishing houses." "NO!" I said, "Yes." I said, "It gets even worse brothers. It says here in your publications that Jesus didn't complete the atonement on the cross. It says here in your publication-and I went down the line on the subject. "Impossible!" I said, "Alright," I said, "Look in the suitcase." So I put the suitcase up on the table and spread out about two hundred documents. And they spent a couple of days going through the documents. When they came back, they said, "Who would ever have believed that all of this was in print." and; "We certainly have to do something about it immediately." I said, "Good! But this is what is confusing the whole Evangelical world and this is what is confusing the Seventh-day Adventist denomination. You've got to speak with one voice on the great foundations of the gospel. You've got to speak with one voice so the sheep (the people) can hear it. And there are problems. You must face them."

They were very responsive, and we entered into work in earnest. "Questions on Doctrine" was published. It was a great success. More than 150,000 copies went forth. And then strange things began to happen. I published my book about Seventh-day Adventism, and the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists refused to put it in Adventist bookstores. That was our first clue that there were some problems on high levels. Secondly we began to find out that there were Adventists writing us, who were saying; "This is not what the Adventist Church really believes. You have been deceived." And they gave us information. Then other ministers and others began to come to us giving us more information. We went back over the information. It was a great sifting process.

Then we began to realize that a great body of information was beginning to surface, and progressively it has over the years. I could not bring here tonight all of the material which I have collected now and preach in the Search Institute. Suffice it to say there are four cartons, that would be stacked up to the height of this pulpit, of material which is coming from Adventists all over the world, pointing out to us things which are still inconsistent in the denomination.

What I want to begin with is to tell you, that there are Seventh-day Adventists, a great body of them, who are born-again Christians, and love the Lord Jesus Christ as their Saviour. That is absolutely true. In fact some of the Adventists are here tonight. Then there are some important representatives of Seventh-day Adventism who are at this point beginning to move the denomination back from where they came in 1957.

This group believes that Jesus Christ had a sinful human nature. This group believes that the atonement was not completed on the cross. This group believes that Ellen G. White is not only a prophetess of God, but that Ellen G. White was an infallible interpreter of the Bible, so that now ministers are being disfellowshipped and people are being removed from the Adventist denomination on grounds which are completely repudiated by the book, "Questions on Doctrine." In fact there are ministers here tonight that I know. Two of whom were unfrocked in the Adventist denomination because they favored "Questions on Doctrine" to their own General Conference.

A prophet is not without honor except in his own country and among his own people, she [Ellen White] said. The Scripture also says that a Pharaoh arose who knew not Joseph, which means there have been some very subtle and progressive changes going on in Seventh-day Adventism theology. They have reached a crisis point.

It is not a small group of people anymore that are disenchanted. We have hundreds and hundreds of letters from Adventist pastors, missionaries, and leaders. They are more than disenchanted with some of the things that they are seeing. We also have a body of information now, which originally the denomination denied existed but which now exists, and is documented evidence. It is therefore very important to understand that our Seventh-day Adventist brothers and sisters, who want to stay with "Questions on Doctrine" are sticking with what I was told, and Dr. Barnhouse was told and the Evangelical world was told in 1957 and through 1960.

These people are in great jeopardy right now. They need a lot of prayer and a lot of support, because they are trying to hang on to the basic foundations, whereas an "old guard" with Seventh-day Adventism in positions of power and authority are very systematically rooting out the people that do not agree with this. That is simply going right now, and it is denied as absolute folly.

The core of the entire problem is the role of Ellen G. White in Seventh day Adventism and the Sanctuary doctrine, which has generated enormous controversy. Now, tonight we don't have time to go through four boxes of material. We do not have time to review all the problems connected with Adventist theology.

This is very important: If you have an infallible interpreter then you have developed a paper pope. Now the move is afoot to establish the papacy of Mrs. White, and that move is deadly.

The claim was made for Mrs. White in "Questions on Doctrine" and in Adventist publications, that she is not a canonical writer of scripture .. that is the claim in "Questions on Doctrine."

I was originally told by some Seventh-day Adventists, that in the early days of the Church, they maintained that they were the "Remnant Church," to the exclusion of all others. I said that's heresy, there is no remnant church, there is only the body of Christ. You can talk about a remnant to the book of Revelation under the tribulation conditions. But we're not in the tribulation period. And they said, "Well, our view has been vindicated somewhat." And they gave me a new statement on it.

I am now getting literature telling us that we are right back where we were in 1956, and they are indeed the "Remnant Church"! . . . The Seventh-day Adventist denomination in 1957 stated, that it did not believe that it was the "Remnant Church" to the exclusion of everybody else. Now we are beginning to get feedback to the contrary. The Adventist Church in the clearest possible terms stated in 1956, that the atonement of Christ was completed on the cross, that it was over with, no continuation. We are now beginning to receive considerable material quite the opposite. The Adventist Church told us in 1956 that Jesus Christ had an absolutely sinless nature, and they repudiated publications even by their own magazines, that said that Christ had a sinful human nature.

In 1957, the Adventist denomination said nobody will be excommunicated for not understanding or believing in, in effect, Mrs. White's prophetic gift. Today people are being excommunicated from the denomination because they call under question those things. Now these are issues that the Adventist church must face.

I do not question the integrity of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists. I have addressed a series of questions to them and I am eagerly awaiting their response to those questions.

What I did in 1956, I have done again for the purpose of helping my Adventist brothers and sisters and the whole body of Christ. Seventh-day Adventism has made enormous strides and has made great contributions to the life of the Christian church. Their medical works are unchallenged. Their dedication I have seen on the mission fields of the world.

The fact that they are concerned and do preach Christ and the many people that have come to Christ through that preaching is undeniable. But side by side, there has grown up with this, a body of teaching which if permitted to continue will classify Seventh-day Adventism along with the cults all over again.

One of the great highlights of my life, was to stand in Jerusalem with Roy Allan Anderson of the Seventh-day Adventist Church about ten years ago, and there to see a Seventh-day Adventist minister serve communion, an ecumenical prophetic conference for the whole church of Christ, with thousands of people there, and they asked Roy to serve communion. Before Dr. Barnhouse's work and my work in 1956 to 1960, Roy Anderson would have been considered by that group, unworthy of an invitation and would never have been received as a Christian minister. But the Holy Spirit took that work and "Questions on Doctrine" and that committee; and Reuben Figuhr who had the courage to do it, and they transformed the image of Seventh-day Adventism.

Now the great threat is that it may go back again. This cannot be permitted to happen if at all possible in the body of Christ. We must fight for the integrity of our Seventh-day Adventist brothers to believe what their church says they believed. That's the real question, whether they stay with "Questions on Doctrine" and back it, will they republish it?

They deliberately suppressed it at one time. It was up for publication. I have the whole story. It was suppressed by powers of the Adventist denomination that didn't agree with what it said. Well what did it say? I'll tell you. This is what "Questions on Doctrine" said: that the trinity is Biblical theology and is to be believed; that Jesus Christ is God in human flesh with a perfect human nature; that He died on the cross and paid the price for all our sins once for all. "Questions on Doctrine" said, he rose bodily from the dead, he is sent to heaven as our great High Priest. "Questions on Doctrine" said, the atonement was finished on the cross. "Questions on Doctrine" said, salvation is solely by grace through faith in Jesus Christ. That's what it said, and that's good solid Christian theology.

Today, we are hearing voices within the Adventist denomination that are not teaching good solid Christian theology. They are teaching heresies, which the church originally repudiated.

I even have to say that Mrs. White is a false prophet, that she is an enemy of the gospel. I have received, you wouldn't believe how many letters, and how many telephone calls, from people trying to get me to write an article on Ellen White, the false prophet. I have been trying to do so. Now I'm going on record with this publicly, it'll probably offend some people, but it has to be said. Joseph Smith denied the great doctrines of the Bible. Joseph Smith was a false prophet. False prophets are known by the fact that they are enemies of the cross of Christ. That is the mark of a false prophet. Enemies of God, who turn you away from the Lord, your God. That is what a false prophet is. Tomorrow night we talk about Mormonism, and we'll see that very clearly.

Mrs. White by that definition could never be called a false prophet. She did preach the gospel. She did draw Christ; only read her book "Steps to Christ," you'll recognize that. Mrs. White exercised; I believe, at certain times, spiritual gifts. But Mrs. White was a sinner saved by grace.

There is no need for any investigative judgment at any time, because Jesus took care of it all on the cross. If you have the kind of a God that's got to go over a set of books to decide whether or not you have been justified, you have not got the God of the Bible. The God of the Bible knew who was justified before time began. He did not need the Millerite movement of 1843 to update Him on it, or 1844. The Bible does not teach that Jesus Christ went from the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary into the second apartment of the heavenly sanctuary in 1844, but the Bible teaches at His resurrection Jesus Christ entered into the holiest of all with His own blood, and it obtained eternal redemption for us.

The doctrine of the incomplete atonement is incomplete reality. It is not Christian theology. It denies justification by faith. There is a book published by the Adventist denomination now. It's called the "Omega" book. This has to be repudiated as rapidly as possible, if the Adventists are to have credibility in the eyes of the Christian church. Because in that book they go back to attempting to establish righteousness, not on the basis of grace alone and salvation by grace alone, but bringing in the very legalism which got them in the trouble we had years and years ago.

There are lunatic Baptists, Episcopalians, you name it. I wouldn't want to be represented by a lunatic Baptist. I don't think that a good bunch of Seventh-day Adventists want to be represented by some of the lunacy that is coming out by Adventist publications today. So I wouldn't want to judge that as representative of total Seventh-day Adventism.

But they have a problem. [The Adventists] And that problem now becomes the problem of the body of Christ. The body of Christ must work together with them to try and solve it. That is why I have not taken positions publicly against the General Conference. That is why I have not published lots and lots and lots of material in Christian magazines when I've been asked to. Because the Adventist denomination deserves the chance to look squarely in the face of questions and answer them. If they answer them so they repudiate "Questions on Doctrine," they deserve what happens. And if they will affirm what they said they historically believed, that the people who are now in positions of power, who are propagating these false teachings should be removed from the denomination immediately. But godly Adventists should not be discriminated against, when they are definitely trying to solve the problems.

There are Seventh-day Adventist ministers in this valley who have left the Seventh-day Adventists Church out of conviction. Some have been thrown out of this church by conviction. They deserve the heartfelt apologies of their denomination.

"Questions on Doctrine" dealt with this, beautifully, clearcut. Salvation by grace through faith. On the basic areas of Christian theology, Christians of all denominations had better be prepared, as we move toward the end of the ages, to hang together.

The center of the gospel is evident, and we've got to stay with that. The Seventh-day Adventist denomination will affirm the centrality of that gospel, if the Seventh-day Adventist denomination will repudiate those who are misrepresenting them. If the Seventh-day Adventist denomination will stop talking out of both sides of the mouth, then the Christian public and the Adventists will then at last hear one thing.

Let them [the Adventist Church] repudiate the "Omega" publication, and then let the denomination squarely and forthrightly say this—here we stand on the foundations we

announced in 1956— and discipline the people that don't believe in them. Then they will once again have credibility in the eyes of the Evangelical world and in the eyes of many disappointed and frustrated Adventists.

Martin, preface to Question Period: "I will be publishing on the subject of the puzzle of Seventh-day Adventism, and what I publish, on tape and in book form, will be available in over 6,000 Christian bookstores with 90 days after it is released. So we are going to get a good response from the Christian public, and now you know why I am concerned, and why I feel this is a matter of great importance for the Adventists and their fellow Christians."

Martin: I'm interested in only one thing: I'm interested in the official position of your denomination, and what it says. I'm willing to accept what they say is their position as I did in 1956, provided it is backed up with documentation. And I think that's fair.

Question from the audience: You will be having a book come out very soon, and is it Seventh-day Adventism as you presented tonight, and is it [General] Conference supported?

Answer by Martin: Wait for the book. Wait for the book. And that will tell you exactly. As I said at the beginning of the lecture, that I don't prejudice [or is the word "prejudice"?) the General Conference. I'm giving them every chance to respond as brothers.

Different questioner: You're saying that in your book [you're going to publish that] you're going to classify this church as a cult-.

Martin interjecting: I didn't say that.

Questioner: Okay, I mean, are you? That's my question.

Martin reply: I'm not answering that question tonight-.

Questioner interjecting: Oh, you're not answering it tonight-.

Martin interjecting: I'm waiting for answers myself [from the General Conference]

Different questioner: Where in the Bible does it state that the Sabbath that Jesus kept has been changed to Sunday?

Martin reply: It hasn't. The Seventh-day Sabbath still stands as a memorial of Creation. That has not been changed. The early Christian Church maintained the first day of the week . . .

[The majority of the early Christian Church did not keep Sunday, even down to the fifth century A.D. Read BS-3-4 "The Story of the Change of the Sabbath."]

The [Christian] Church by the middle of the second century was all meeting on the first day of the week, essentially, throughout the world where the gospel was preached. Now, [it is true that] the Lord Jesus kept the Seventh-day Sabbath, -of that there is no doubt . . . This [the Seventh-day Sabbath] is a shadow; the substance is Christ. I believe you keep the Seventh-day Sabbath to the glory of God and I have no quarrel with you. I just don't want to have the Mark of the Beast because I happen to believe what the historic church kept as the first day of the week. But the first day of the week is not the Sabbath. You are perfectly correct.

[A good question and a fascinating reply. Martin said or implied this: "According to the Bible we should keep the Seventh-day Sabbath. Jesus kept the Bible Sabbath. However, we should not keep the Sabbath of Jesus-the Sabbath that Jesus kept. Instead, we should observe the day that the Christians of the first few centuries consecrated as sacred, which is Sunday. " But there are three flaws here: (1) We should

obey and adhere to the practices of the Bible, not those of Christians of a later time. (2) If Jesus kept the Sabbath, then we should keep it also. Christ is substance and His Sabbath is substance, too. (3) His point that we should keep the holy day of most Christians in the second century, instead of the Sabbath of Jesus and the Bible has already been seen to be shallow. It is following men instead of the Word of God. But the truth is that most Christians in the second century-and even down to the fifth century A.D. kept the Seventh day Sabbath. Both Martin and Bacchiochi teach that by the second century A.D. the majority of Christians kept Sunday. But this is not true. It is disproved by historical records. (Read BS4-5 and 19-20 for ancient citations bearing on this.) The truth is that a majority of Christians were keeping the true Sabbath a hundred years after Constantine I enacted the first Sunday Law in 321 A.D. And this is understandable when we recall that most Christians did not live in Alexandria or Rome. These were the two centers of Sunday-keeping. There are both Biblical and historical reasons to keep the Bible Sabbath. And there is no excuse, either in the Bible or in history, to reject it.]

Different questioner: I believe in the Bible and in the Spirit of Prophecy. And I'm thankful I do. But about doctrinal authority: Where does the authority for doctrine end? You mentioned that it ended with the Bible and the early church fathers-.

Martin interjecting: No, No, No.

Questioner continuing with sentence: -and a systematic study of their theology.

Martin interjecting: No.

Questioner continuing: -That's what you said-.

Martin interjecting: No. I'm sorry. I didn't say that doctrine was decided on the basis of the early church fathers. I never said that-.

Questioner interjecting: Authority-! Where does the end of it come? Because you can't take the theologians-because they all disagree!

Martin interjecting: Would you listen to me for a second?

Questioner: Sure.

Martin: Are you acquainted with the book entitled "The Creeds of Christendom"?

Questioner: No, I'm not.

Martin: You should be. It's 400 pages of-.

Questioner interjecting: The Bible alone is enough for me . .

Martin: "The Creeds of Christendom" is based upon Scriptures, spanning nineteen hundred centuries of careful scholarship in tracing the doctrines of Biblical theology and the teachings of the Christian Church. Your own great historian forgot more history than you'll ever know, Leroy Froom, used it [COC] as a reference work-and he was a great historian. In the "Creeds of Christendom" you will find a body of systematic doctrine which the Christian Church has always believed. It is Biblical theology. .. I'm telling you that there is a body of doctrine [which, however, is mutually conflicting] that the Church has always used to test other people's ideas . . When Mrs. White's theology is presented-or anybody's theology;-you test it by Scripture and by the basic doctrines of the Scriptures, which are contained in the "Creeds of Christendom" book, which I am recommending. I did not say; I never told you, that the church fathers decided anything. Never; so don't misquote me.

[The above is an extremely important conversation. The questioner recognized that Martin and the Protestants were arbitrarily deciding what was truth and what was

error, what was a "Christian body" and what was a "cult," on the basis of some kind of standard of doctrinal authority. Martin's reply is that the conflicting creeds of the various Catholic councils and, later, of the various Protestant churches constitutes the standard by which all correct doctrine is to be determined today. But it is obvious that that it is placing man's decisions, ideas, and councils above the Written Word of the living God. It is the inspired messages of God through His prophets that are to govern the lives, conduct and beliefs of His people and the operation of His Church on earth. Martin is but mirroring the great error of modern Christendom: the thinking that the interpretations of men are more important than the clear statements of Inspiration.]

Different questioner: What about Roman Catholicism?

Martin: Roman Catholicism is not a cult [!] But within the Roman Church there are cults, such as the cult of Mary. But the basic doctrines of the Roman Church is Christ's Catholic theology [his exact words] which most Protestants subscribe (to). It is what they have added that we disagree with. So don't just buzz off and say that the Catholic Church is a cult. You need to do a lot more homework on the subject.

[A second highly significant point. Martin and his associates classify all churches as (1) Christian, (2) cults, or (3) pagan. Churches which teach truths that lead souls to Christ are in the first category; those that do not are in the second or third categories. Martin considers Romanism as teaching such essentially sound doctrine that it can be considered as a non-cult, or Christian church. This is incredible! He is on the verge of declaring Seventh-day Adventists as a non-Christian or "cult" church, and yet he extends the hand of fellowship to Rome! "But within the Roman Catholic Church there are cults, such as the cult of Mary, " he says. The cult of Mary is the worship of Mary, through kneeling before her statues and praying on beads to her and invoking her aid in time of need. ALL genuine Roman Catholics do this. And yet Martin thinks that Mariolatry can somehow be separated from mainstream Catholicism as being something that only a few Catholics are involved in.

The previous question about Martin's basis of doctrinal authority is closely related to this one about the doctrinal legitimacy of the teachings of Rome. Martin said that it is the creeds in the "Creeds of Christendom " which should decide all doctrinal correctness. But the creeds in that book include every major doctrinal creed enunciated by Catholic councils for a number of centuries. And he adds: "The basic doctrines of the Roman Church is Christ's Catholic theology, which most Protestants subscribe [adhere] to. " How well we agree! The rejection by Rome of the Bible Sabbath has been mimicked and defended by its Protestant daughters for centuries.

The truth is that Catholicism is paganism disguised in Christian terminology, Adventism is solidly Bible-based, and most of modern Protestantism is in quiet rebellion against a number of Biblical teachings, such as the Bible Sabbath.]

- SECTION TWENTY-THREE - - March 1983 - IMPLICATIONS OF MARTIN'S LECTURE

[The following was prepared by one who, according to our knowledge, was in attendance at Walter Martin's Napa valley lecture. Dear reader, it is time that you take your stand as to which side you will defend in this controversy between historic Adventism and modernism in our Church. -Vance Ferrell]

In response to a request by the Evangelical of Napa Valley, including the Napa Valley Gospel Fellowship (headed by Alan Crandall, editor of Evangelical magazine, and Alexander LaBrecque), Dr. Walter Martin discussed the crisis of the Seventh-day Adventists. He stated that his reason for speaking was that the problems within the

Seventh-day Adventist denomination were spilling over into the Evangelical world, and people were choosing sides over the book "Questions on Doctrine". It will be remembered that in 1955 Dr. Martin had written a book entitled "The Rise of the Cults," in which he included the Seventh-day Adventist Church. Certain leaders of the denomination took exception to what he had written, and requested a discussion with Dr. Donald Grey Barnhouse and Dr. Martin.

A committee for this purpose was appointed by Reuben Figuhr, Then president of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, so that there would be a BRIDGE of communication between the Evangelical community and Adventism.

In this connection let us note the following statements from the Messenger of the Lord, in the Review and Herald, July 24, 1894: ". . . It is a grave mistake on the part of those who are children of God to seek to bridge the gulf that separates the children of light from the children of darkness by yielding principle, by compromising the truth . . . "Also in Testimonies to Ministers, page 470:".. We are not to make less prominent the special truths that have separated us from the world, and made us what WE are; for they are fraught with eternal interest." And on page 471: There is no time now to range ourselves on the side of the transgressors of God's law, to see with their eyes, to hear with their ears, and to understand with their perverted senses. "

Dr. Martin stated that the members of this special committee overwhelmingly approved of the book "Questions on Doctrine" which was published after two years of work, and that it represented "historic Adventism". When he informed the Seventh-Day Adventist leaders that many books and publications of the church contained doctrines completely contrary, these men were "appalled"; said it was "impossible," and they never would have believed such things were in print. They said that there was a "lunatic fringe" that did believe in the "mark of the beast," the "unfinished atonement," the "investigative judgment," etc., but that these did not represent "historic Adventism".

According to Dr. Martin, the book "Questions on Doctrine" was a great success. But then strange things began to happen. Many Adventist wrote to him and a great body of information began to surface, that was not according to the views expressed in the book "Questions on Doctrine." He stated that there is among Seventh-day Adventists a great body who are "Born-again" Christians, then there are some unfortunate representatives who are at this time beginning to move the denomination back to where they were before 1957 (when "Questions on Doctrine" was published). These "false" doctrines, he said, were that "Christ had a sinful human nature, "an unfinished atonement;" that Mrs. White was "an infallible interpreter, etc." That there were some very subtle changes going on, and they have now reached a crisis point. "Our Seventh-day Adventist brothers and sisters who want to stay with the doctrines as stated in "Questions on Doctrine" are in great jeopardy. They need a lot of prayer and support." He feels it is the "old guard" in the Seventh-day Adventist church who are at the core of the problem. The Seventh-day Adventists do not need to be pushed now, but need to be loved, to be cared for. No one is "trying to destroy the denomination," but it must "submit to the authority of the Christian world. "To place Mrs. White as an infallible authority can be lethal. He would discourage those who are trying to start another denomination. (Evidently a reference to Gospel Fellowship and Gospel Unlimited (Ford) groups.) We have no need of an "investigative judgment"; nor did we need the Millerites or 1844. "The Omega book must be repudiated as soon as possible," because it established righteousness by "legalism". The Sabbath is legalism when you "try to enforce it with extra-Biblical revelations".

He stated that there are lunatic Baptists, Episcopalians, etc., and that Seventh-day Adventists would not want to be represented by some of the lunacy being published

today. Some Seventh-day Adventists have problems, which now become the problems of the "body of Christ". The denomination deserves the chance to look squarely into the problem regarding "Questions on Doctrine," and should cease speaking out of both sides of its mouth. Within the denomination are those of the "lunatic fringe" (a term used by Seventh-Day Adventist leaders in the 1956 discussions), and those promulgating false teachings should be removed. "There are Seventh-day Adventist ministers in this valley who have left the church, and who deserve the apologies of the denomination. (Apparently referring to the two former Andrews University students who are now editing the "Evangelical" magazine, a copy of which Dr. Martin displayed in his hand as he talked-- it was the issue with the picture of Ellen White comprising the front cover, and in which she was described as being an "epileptic" who had visions when under "seizures".)

Dr. Martin went on to maintain that salvation is by grace through faith alone, and that righteousness requires obedience to faith (?) not to law! -- that the law cannot be kept, though keeping the commandments is a marvelous goal. It is not the seal of God. "As we move toward the end of the age, we must hang together, or we'll hang separately." We cannot afford to argue over peripherals.

He stated that Seventh-day Adventists must reject Mrs. White because we dare not accept any authority that in its role becomes the supreme arbiter of Scripture, for that is Roman Catholic -- not Protestant; also that it is the same as Mormonism. He also attacked her first vision, her teaching about the shut door, and other such distortions and falsifying and materials that have been supplied to him by those in and out of the Seventh-day Adventist church who have a "Satanic hatred" for the Spirit of Prophecy, as she herself described it, and which would be one of the signs of the 2nd coming -- in fact she stated that "The very last deception of Satan will be to make of none effect the testimony of the Spirit of God."

.."There will be a hatred kindled against the testimonies which is satanic. The workings of Satan will be to unsettle the faith of the churches in them, for this reason: Satan cannot have so clear a track to bring in his deceptions and bind up souls in his delusions if the warnings and reproofs and counsels of the Spirit of God are heeded." 1 Selected Messages, page 48.

Again Dr. Martin stated strongly that we must "repudiate the Omega publications," and stand on the foundations arrived at in 1956 and "discipline" those who do not believe them; that it is terrible to be torn apart, and we are called to healing by acknowledging truth so that

God may bless. He stated: "Now is the time to make a decision. Now is the moment of truth." "Our role as non-Seventh-day Adventists is to be empathetic and insistent that the members submit to the authority of the church."

He said that if Seventh-day Adventists continued to believe they are "the remnant church", that Christ did not have a sinless nature, and that the atonement was not finished at the cross - that if this body of teaching is permitted to continue, they will be classed with the cults. They will have so much to lose if they do not take the correct position as stated in "Questions on Doctrine"-that the Holy Spirit and Reuben Figuhr had transformed Seventh-day Adventism. "We must fight for our Seventh-day Adventist brethren that the church will take the right position: "Questions on Doctrine" has been suppressed, and now voices are teaching heresy which the church originally repudiated. This must be 'remedied'. Adventism is answerable to the authority of the Word of God, not to those who would perpetuate heresy and are now bankrupt." He stated that he has submitted a list of questions to the General Conference, to be answered by the hierarchy

and not the "lunatic fringe", so that he will know what information to put in his forthcoming book and tapes, entitled "The Puzzle of Seventh-day Adventism."

'There is to be no compromise with those who are worshiping an idol Sabbath. We are not to spend our time in controversy with those who know the truth, and upon whom the light of truth has been shining, when they turn away their ear from the truth to turn to fables. I was told that men will employ every policy to make less prominent the difference between the faith of Seventh-day Adventists and those who observe the first day of the week. In this controversy the whole world will be engaged, and the time is short. This is no time to haul down our colors. " Ibid.

"Our people have been regarded as too insignificant to be worthy of notice, but a change will come; the movements are now being made. The Christian world is now making movements which will necessarily bring the commandment-keeping people to notice. There is a daily suppression of God's truth for the theories and false doctrines of human origin. There are plans and movements being set on foot to enslave the consciences of those who would be loyal to God. The law-making powers will be against God's people. Every soul will be tested. O that we would as a people be wise for ourselves and by precept and example impart that wisdom to our children! Every position of our faith will be searched into, and if we are not thorough Bible students, established, strengthened, settled, the wisdom of the world's great men will be too much for us." 2 Selected Messages, 386.

Those who apostatize are voicing the words of the dragon. We have to meet satanic agencies who went to make war with the saints. 'The dragon was wroth with the women, and went to make war with the remnant of her seed, which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ. Those who apostatize leave the 'true' and 'faithful' people of God, and fraternize with those who represent Barabbas By their fruits ye shall know them.' "2 Selected Messages, 395.

"A company was presented before me under the name of Seventh-day Adventist, who were advising that the banner or sign which makes us a distinctive people should not be held out so strikingly; for they claimed it was not the best policy in securing success to our institutions. This distinctive banner is to be borne through the world to the close of probation. In describing the remnant people of God, John says, 'Here is the patience of the saints- here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus'.. I saw some reaching out their hands to remove the banner and obscure its significance. . "-2 Selected Messages, 385.

"Satan is at work among God's people, even as he worked among the angels in the heavenly courts, and many are being ensnared. "-The Upward Look, 351.

'When Satan shall have accomplished his work of ensnaring all who will subject themselves to his deceptive influence, when he shall have finished his work of scattering abroad, Christ will rise up and bring deliverance to every one whose name is found written in the book of life. "-The Upward Look, 365.

"As has been foretold in the Scriptures, there will be seducing spirits and doctrines of devils in the midst of the church, and these evil influences will increase; but hold fast the beginning of your confidence firm unto the end. . The perils of the last days are upon us Devote not precious time in trying to convince those who would change the truth of God into a lie." -The Upward Look, 168.

"Now is our time of peril. . Without cause, men will become our enemies. The motives of the people will be misinterpreted, not only by the world, but by their own brethren .. God's servants must arm themselves with the mind of Christ. They must not expect to escape insult and misjudgment They will be called enthusiasts and fanatics..

But let them not become discouraged. God's hand is on the wheel of His providence, guiding His work to the glory of His name. '-The Upward Look, 177.

"To stand in defense of truth when the majority forsake us, to fight the battles of the Lord when champions are few,-this will be our test. '5 Testimonies, 228.

PILGRIMS' REST - Beersheba Springs, TN 37305

THE SCAPEGOAT TRANSACTION

It seemed best, for the sake of clarity, to briefly summarize this topic all in one place. In the late fifties one individual sent a detailed analysis of the 'Questions on Doctrine' error on this point, to Church leaders. Here is a recent letter that he sent us:

"Regarding our telephone conversation about the scapegoat, I had to think back about it to get it clear, for it has been so many years now. "The point is as follows:

"E.G. White says, in effect, that Jesus lays the sins of the redeemed on Satan because he started it all, both originally and specifically. Primarily because he originated and continued the rebellion. –But not because he tempted some poor sinner.

"QD says that only his sin of tempting the righteous to sin is rolled back on him. This is false on two counts:

"1. The sin of tempting the righteous never was removed from Satan, so it could not be rolled back.

"2. Satan's sins were never in the Sanctuary as he never repented or confessed. Jesus does not bear Satan's sins.

"Their argument of joint responsibility is irrelevant.

"The legality of Mrs. White's argument is totally clear and does not need, and is in fact, destroyed by QD.

"1. Satan originated sin.

"2. All sin and sinners will be destroyed.

"3. Satan is therefore the legitimate and legal choice to bear the sins of the righteous into the lake of fire. All the wicked will agree at the end on this point.

"4. This fact has nothing to do with the redemption or cleansing of the righteous. That is totally the work of Jesus and the Holy Spirit.

"This doctrinal change was the first crack in the breakdown of the doctrine of the final atonement. It [the correct view of the scapegoat transaction] is a very important point because without getting this clear, one would have difficulty proving that there is actual sin in the Sanctuary now that is being removed by the blood of the final atonement by Jesus.

"This leaves only one alternative. The sins which Jesus bears out of the Sanctuary are the sins that are confessed and repented of. They are the only ones that can be cleansed from the record books. Also, they are the sins of the righteous because only the righteous confess and repent and forsake their sins. Hence, the sins that Jesus bears out of the Sanctuary are those that the Sanctuary was cleansed of—namely the sins of the righteous.

"All other sins of professed believers which were confessed but not cleansed, because of no forsaking of the sins themselves, remain on record against the professed believer.

"Sins not confessed (such as those of Satan and the wicked who made no profession) are borne by the guilty parties concerned and never enter into the Sanctuary service at all.

"The QD book as it reads has Satan defiling the Sanctuary with his sins, and it has Jesus bearing Satan's sins. QD is thus totally false in its scapegoat concept.

"Not only that, but this concept destroys the historic Adventist belief in the cleansing of the Sanctuary and the final atonement. Historic Adventism teaches that the Sanctuary is defiled by sin coming into it by virtue of the blood of the sin offering. (in actuality, it enters the Sanctuary by virtue of the blood of Jesus.)

"The fuzzy thinking of the authors of QD is worthless and is a discredit to the so-called scholarship of the authors. The authors knuckled under to the criticism [against Adventists] that we make Satan our sin bearer. And so, rather than to expose the shallowness of that bit of modern Protestant theological stupidity, they want unity instead.

"In addition, the moving of the sins to hell fire has nothing to do with salvation but with purification [eradication of the sin itself and those clinging to it from the earth].

"So in brief:

"SIN is transferred by the authority of the blood sacrifice of Jesus TO the Sanctuary. The SANCTUARY is cleansed by the blood of Jesus, and the SIN is transferred to Satan, by the authority of the blood of Jesus. The SIN, along with SATAN, is then transferred to HELL FIRE, where both perish forever. The condemnation and sentencing was fully justified because Satan caused the death of Jesus and persecuted and slew the saints."

We are thankful to know and believe correct doctrine. But there are some who are willing to openly stand up and defend that correct doctrine when it is threatened. The writer of the above letter was just such an individual. The following is the letter that he wrote and mailed to Seventh-day Adventist leaders back in the late fifties:

Officers of the General Conference

Officers of the Washington Conference

Ministers and Workers of the Seventh-Day Adventist Church

THE SCAPEGOAT

References:

(1) "Seventh-day Adventist Answer Questions on Doctrine," prepared by a Representative Group of Seventh-day Adventist Leaders, Bible Teachers, and Editors, Review and Herald, Washington D.C., 1957. (2) "Patriarchs and Prophets," Ellen G. White, Pacific Press, 1890, 1913, 1945. (3) "The Great Controversy," Ellen G. White, Pacific Press, 1888, 1907, 1911, 1951. (4) "The Story of Redemption," Ellen G. White, Review and Herald, 1947. (5) "Early Writings," Ellen G. White, Review and Herald, 1882, 1945. (6) "Spiritual Gifts, Vol. 1," Ellen G. White. (7) "Education," Ellen G. White, Pacific Press, 1903, 1942.

Greetings to all believers in Christ and Brethren in the faith:

The subject of the scapegoat is presented in reference (1) "Questions on Doctrine," pp. 396 to 401, question 35. I will quote the question for consideration:

"What is the actual teaching of Seventh-Day Adventist regarding the scapegoat in the Sanctuary service? Do you hold that the sins of the righteous are rolled back upon Satan so that in the end he becomes your sin bearer?"

Paragraphs 1 and 2, page 400, "Questions on Doctrine," state: "Satan makes no atonement for our sins. But Satan will ultimately have to bear the retributive punishment for his responsibility in the sins of all men, both righteous and wicked.

"Seventh-day Adventists therefore repudiate 'in toto' any idea, suggestion, or implication that Satan is in any sense or degree our sin bearer. The thought is abhorrent to us, and appallingly sacrilegious. Such a concept is a dreadful disparagement of the efficacy of Christ and His salvation, and vitiates the whole glorious provision of salvation solely through our Savior."

Since I believe in "proving all things and holding fast to that which is good," I decided to find the answer in the Bible and the Spirit of Prophecy. The Spirit of Prophecy answers this question clearly and concisely.

"Spiritual Gifts," Vol. 1, p. 61. "For the sins of those who are redeemed by the blood of Christ, and overcome, at last will be rolled back upon the originator of sin, the Devil, and he will have to bear their sins, while those who do not accept salvation through Jesus will bear their own sins. - , 'Early Writings,' pp. 294,-295:

"Satan and his angels suffered long. Satan bore not only the weight and punishment of his own sins, but also of the sins of the redeemed host, which had been placed upon him, and he must also suffer for the ruin of souls which he had caused. "

From reference (2) "Patriarchs and Prophets," pp. 354 to 356, I am taught that the following process was carried on: (1) The sinner placed his hand on the head of his sin offering, confessed his sin, and slew it with his own hand. (2) The priest carried the blood into the holy place and by this ceremony the sin was, through the blood, transferred in figure to the sanctuary. (3) On the day of atonement, two goats were brought to the door of the tabernacle. One was slain as a sin-offering for the people. His shed blood was sprinkled upon the mercy seat to satisfy the claims of the law. (4) The high priest in his character of mediator took the sins upon himself, and leaving the sanctuary, he bore with him the burdens of Israel's guilt. (5) At the door of the scapegoat he laid his hands upon the head of the scapegoat, and confessed over him "all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them on the head of the goat. (Lev. 16:21). (6) The goat bearing these sins was sent away to a land not inhabited.

In "Patriarchs and Prophets," pp. 356 to 358, this ancient ceremony is applied to the work of Christ. All should read it.

Page 358, paragraph 2: "Since Satan is the originator of all the sins that caused the death of the Son of God, justice demands that Satan shall suffer the final punishment. Christ's work for the redemption of men and the purification of the universe from sin, will be closed by the removal of sin from the heavenly Sanctuary and the placing of these sins upon Satan, who will bear the final penalty."

The whole aim of the Sanctuary service is to get sin out of the camp. This cannot be done until the Sanctuary is cleansed, the sins are placed on the scapegoat, and he is sent away.

"Patriarchs and Prophets, p. 357, paragraph 5: 'The blood of Christ, while it was to release the repentant sinner from the condemnation of the law, was not to cancel sin.'"

The thought, idea and implication of these passages from "Patriarchs and Prophets" is that Satan is to be our sin bearer. These ideas cannot be "abhorrent" or "appallingly sacrilegious" because they are revealed to us by God through the Spirit of Prophecy.

Reference (4), "The Story of Redemption," page 403, states: Jesus tarried a moment in the outer apartment of the heavenly Sanctuary, and the sins which had been confessed while He was in the most holy place were placed upon Satan, the originator of sin, who must suffer their punishment. "

These sins cannot be Satan's responsibility for tempting us to commit our sins because he never confesses his sins. His sins could never get into the Sanctuary. Christ does not bear the Devil's sins and cannot place them upon His head. Satan already has them!

When I confess my sins I do not confess the Devil's responsibility. He will bear his own sin and responsibility. Jesus Christ bears my sin in the Sanctuary and will put them on Satan at the close of probation.

"Great Controversy," p 420, paragraph 1: The High Priest 'confessed over him all these sins. "

Ibid., p. 422: "The scapegoat typified Satan, the author of sin, upon whom the sins of the truly penitent will finally placed.." 'When Christ by virtue of His own blood, removes the sins of His people from the heavenly Sanctuary at the close of His ministration, He will place them upon Satan, who, in the execution of the judgment, must bear the final penalty."

Ibid., p. 485: ". . Satan bearing the guilt of all the sins which he has caused God's people to commit. . . "

I can only understand "Questions on Doctrine" by what it says. I do not know who wrote it or what they thought when they wrote it. It is a published statement and must now stand or fall by what is printed in it.

Speaking of Satan, "Questions on Doctrine" teaches that "The crushing weight of his responsibility in the sins of the whole world—of the wicked as well as the righteous—must be rolled back upon him [Satan] ." This is in error because both the Bible and the Spirit of Prophecy teach that it is the sins of Israel that will be rolled back upon the originator of sin.

"Questions on Doctrine" also teaches that the reason for having two goats is that there is a dual responsibility for sin. This reasoning is also false. The real reason is that one goat represents Christ's sacrifice and the other represents Satan. Both bear the sins of Israel in sequence.

The true answer to the question is that the sins of the righteous are not now being rolled back upon Satan,—but that they will be when Jesus leaves the Sanctuary. The scapegoat has no part in the Sanctuary service. Neither the scapegoat nor his blood ever enters the holy place.

Extracts from a vision given to E.G. White at Dorchester, Mass., October 23, 1850 (transcribed by Elder S.N. Haskell): 'Then I saw that Jesus' work in the Sanctuary will soon be finished, and after His work there is finished, He will come to the door of the first apartment, and confess the sins of Israel upon the head of the scapegoat. Then he will put on the garments of vengeance, then the plagues will come upon the wicked, and they do not come until Jesus puts on that garment, and takes His place upon the great white cloud,— then while the plagues are falling the scapegoat is being led away. He

makes a mighty struggle to escape, but is held fast by the hand that leads him. If he should effect his escape, Israel would lose their lives. I saw it would take time to lead away the scapegoat into the land of forgetfulness, after the sins were put upon his head."

When Christ brings the sins of those who deny the inspired truth on this subject out of the Sanctuary to place them on Satan, he [Satan] could say, "I don't have to bear those sins. Those people think the very thought of such a thing is abhorrent, and appallingly sacrilegious. They ought to bear their own sins. They have denied the Testimony of Jesus."

I consider Satan to be a trashcan into which the sins and the iniquity of the redeemed will finally be placed. The Devil and the sin he bears will finally be burned in the lake of fire together with all sin and unrepentant sinners. He did not atone for sin; he is just the place where it is put after the atonement is finished.

When the Devil tempts us to sin, he sins. That is his responsibility. If we fall under the temptation, we sin. The Devil bears his responsibility for our sin. Jesus bears our responsibility for our sin after we repent and confess by His grace. Our sins are in the Sanctuary until they are cleaned out by Jesus. He will place them on Satan. In the end, Satan will bear them.

The "Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary," Volume 1, pp 777-778, in its comment on the live goat is in agreement with the Bible and the Spirit of Prophecy.

How would these glaring inconsistencies herein presented look if some of our enemies printed them in their journals? It seems to me that we are wide open to become the laughing stock of the religious world. They can spot these obvious contradictions if we cannot. The only possible consistent course to follow is to immediately repudiate this book and cease to print it. Perhaps this will save us from some of the reproach that appears certain to come.

"Education," p. 57: "The greatest want of the world is the want of men, men who will not be bought or sold,— men who do not fear to call sin by its right name; men whose conscience is as true to duty as the needle to the pole; men who will stand for the right though the heavens fall."

Sincerely your Christian brother,

(Signed)

THE SCAPEGOAT TRANSACTION

It seemed best, for the sake of clarity, to briefly summarize this topic all in one place. In the late fifties one individual sent a detailed analysis of the 'Questions on Doctrine' error on this point, to Church leaders. Here is a recent letter that he sent us:

"Regarding our telephone conversation about the scapegoat, I had to think back about it to get it clear, for it has been so many years now. "The point is as follows:

"E.G. White says, in effect, that Jesus lays the sins of the redeemed on Satan because he started it all, both originally and specifically. Primarily because he originated and continued the rebellion. –But not because he tempted some poor sinner.

"QD says that only his sin of tempting the righteous to sin is rolled back on him. This is false on two counts:

"1. The sin of tempting the righteous never was removed from Satan, so it could not be rolled back.

"2. Satan's sins were never in the Sanctuary as he never repented or confessed. Jesus does not bear Satan's sins.

"Their argument of joint responsibility is irrelevant.

"The legality of Mrs. White's argument is totally clear and does not need, and is in fact, destroyed by QD.

"1. Satan originated sin.

"2. All sin and sinners will be destroyed.

"3. Satan is therefore the legitimate and legal choice to bear the sins of the righteous into the lake of fire. All the wicked will agree at the end on this point.

"4. This fact has nothing to do with the redemption or cleansing of the righteous. That is totally the work of Jesus and the Holy Spirit.

"This doctrinal change was the first crack in the breakdown of the doctrine of the final atonement. It [the correct view of the scapegoat transaction] is a very important point because without getting this clear, one would have difficulty proving that there is actual sin in the Sanctuary now that is being removed by the blood of the final atonement by Jesus.

"This leaves only one alternative. The sins which Jesus bears out of the Sanctuary are the sins that are confessed and repented of. They are the only ones that can be cleansed from the record books. Also, they are the sins of the righteous because only the righteous confess and repent and forsake their sins. Hence, the sins that Jesus bears out of the Sanctuary are those that the Sanctuary was cleansed of—namely the sins of the righteous.

"All other sins of professed believers which were confessed but not cleansed, because of no forsaking of the sins themselves, remain on record against the professed believer.

"Sins not confessed (such as those of Satan and the wicked who made no profession) are borne by the guilty parties concerned and never enter into the Sanctuary service at all.

"The QD book as it reads has Satan defiling the Sanctuary with his sins, and it has Jesus bearing Satan's sins. QD is thus totally false in its scapegoat concept.

"Not only that, but this concept destroys the historic Adventist belief in the cleansing of the Sanctuary and the final atonement. Historic Adventism teaches that the Sanctuary is defiled by sin coming into it by virtue of the blood of the sin offering. (in actuality, it enters the Sanctuary by virtue of the blood of Jesus.)

"The fuzzy thinking of the authors of QD is worthless and is a discredit to the so-called scholarship of the authors. The authors knuckled under to the criticism [against Adventists] that we make Satan our sin bearer. And so, rather than to expose the shallowness of that bit of modern Protestant theological stupidity, they want unity instead.

"In addition, the moving of the sins to hell fire has nothing to do with salvation but with purification [eradication of the sin itself and those clinging to it from the earth].

"So in brief:

"SIN is transferred by the authority of the blood sacrifice of Jesus TO the Sanctuary. The SANCTUARY is cleansed by the blood of Jesus, and the SIN is transferred to Satan, by the authority of the blood of Jesus. The SIN, along with SATAN, is then transferred to HELL FIRE, where both perish forever. The condemnation and sentencing was fully justified because Satan caused the death of Jesus and persecuted and slew the saints."

We are thankful to know and believe correct doctrine. But there are some who are willing to openly stand up and defend that correct doctrine when it is threatened. The writer of the above letter was just such an individual. The following is the letter that he wrote and mailed to Seventh-day Adventist leaders back in the late fifties:

Officers of the General Conference

Officers of the Washington Conference

Ministers and Workers of the Seventh-Day Adventist Church

THE SCAPEGOAT

References:

(1) "Seventh-day Adventist Answer Questions on Doctrine," prepared by a Representative Group of Seventh-day Adventist Leaders, Bible Teachers, and Editors, Review and Herald, Washington D.C., 1957. (2) "Patriarchs and Prophets," Ellen G. White, Pacific Press, 1890, 1913, 1945. (3) "The Great Controversy," Ellen G. White, Pacific Press, 1888, 1907, 1911, 1951. (4) "The Story of Redemption," Ellen G. White, Review and Herald, 1947. (5) "Early Writings," Ellen G. White, Review and Herald, 1882, 1945. (6) "Spiritual Gifts, Vol. 1," Ellen G. White. (7) "Education," Ellen G. White, Pacific Press, 1903, 1942.

Greetings to all believers in Christ and Brethren in the faith:

The subject of the scapegoat is presented in reference (1) "Questions on Doctrine," pp. 396 to 401, question 35. I will quote the question for consideration:

"What is the actual teaching of Seventh-Day Adventist regarding the scapegoat in the Sanctuary service? Do you hold that the sins of the righteous are rolled back upon Satan so that in the end he becomes your sin bearer?"

Paragraphs 1 and 2, page 400, "Questions on Doctrine," state: "Satan makes no atonement for our sins. But Satan will ultimately have to bear the retributive punishment for his responsibility in the sins of all men, both righteous and wicked.

"Seventh-day Adventists therefore repudiate 'in toto' any idea, suggestion, or implication that Satan is in any sense or degree our sin bearer. The thought is abhorrent to us, and appallingly sacrilegious. Such a concept is a dreadful disparagement of the efficacy of Christ and His salvation, and vitiates the whole glorious provision of salvation solely through our Savior."

Since I believe in "proving all things and holding fast to that which is good," I decided to find the answer in the Bible and the Spirit of Prophecy. The Spirit of Prophecy answers this question clearly and concisely.

"Spiritual Gifts," Vol. 1, p. 61. "For the sins of those who are redeemed by the blood of Christ, and overcome, at last will be rolled back upon the originator of sin, the Devil, and he will have to bear their sins, while those who do not accept salvation through Jesus will bear their own sins. - , 'Early Writings,' pp. 294,-295:

"Satan and his angels suffered long. Satan bore not only the weight and punishment of his own sins, but also of the sins of the redeemed host, which had been placed upon him, and he must also suffer for the ruin of souls which he had caused. "

From reference (2) "Patriarchs and Prophets," pp. 354 to 356, I am taught that the following process was carried on: (1) The sinner placed his hand on the head of his sin offering, confessed his sin, and slew it with his own hand. (2) The priest carried the blood into the holy place and by this ceremony the sin was, through the blood, transferred in figure to the sanctuary. (3) On the day of atonement, two goats were brought to the door of the tabernacle. One was slain as a sin-offering for the people. His shed blood was sprinkled upon the mercy seat to satisfy the claims of the law. (4) The high priest in his character of mediator took the sins upon himself, and leaving the sanctuary, he bore with him the burdens of Israel's guilt. (5) At the door of the scapegoat he laid his hands upon the head of the scapegoat, and confessed over him "all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them on the head of the goat. (Lev. 16:21). (6) The goat bearing these sins was sent away to a land not inhabited.

In "Patriarchs and Prophets," pp. 356 to 358, this ancient ceremony is applied to the work of Christ. All should read it.

Page 358, paragraph 2: "Since Satan is the originator of all the sins that caused the death of the Son of God, justice demands that Satan shall suffer the final punishment. Christ's work for the redemption of men and the purification of the universe from sin, will be closed by the removal of sin from the heavenly Sanctuary and the placing of these sins upon Satan, who will bear the final penalty."

The whole aim of the Sanctuary service is to get sin out of the camp. This cannot be done until the Sanctuary is cleansed, the sins are placed on the scapegoat, and he is sent away.

"Patriarchs and Prophets, p. 357, paragraph 5: 'The blood of Christ, while it was to release the repentant sinner from the condemnation of the law, was not to cancel sin.'"

The thought, idea and implication of these passages from "Patriarchs and Prophets" is that Satan is to be our sin bearer. These ideas cannot be "abhorrent" or "appallingly sacrilegious" because they are revealed to us by God through the Spirit of Prophecy.

Reference (4), "The Story of Redemption," page 403, states: Jesus tarried a moment in the outer apartment of the heavenly Sanctuary, and the sins which had been

confessed while He was in the most holy place were placed upon Satan, the originator of sin, who must suffer their punishment. "

These sins cannot be Satan's responsibility for tempting us to commit our sins because he never confesses his sins. His sins could never get into the Sanctuary. Christ does not bear the Devil's sins and cannot place them upon His head. Satan already has them!

When I confess my sins I do not confess the Devil's responsibility. He will bear his own sin and responsibility. Jesus Christ bears my sin in the Sanctuary and will put them on Satan at the close of probation.

"Great Controversy," p 420, paragraph 1: The High Priest 'confessed over him all these sins. "

Ibid., p. 422: "The scapegoat typified Satan, the author of sin, upon whom the sins of the truly penitent will finally placed.." "When Christ by virtue of His own blood, removes the sins of His people from the heavenly Sanctuary at the close of His ministrations, He will place them upon Satan, who, in the execution of the judgment, must bear the final penalty."

Ibid., p. 485: ". . Satan bearing the guilt of all the sins which he has caused God's people to commit. . "

I can only understand "Questions on Doctrine" by what it says. I do not know who wrote it or what they thought when they wrote it. It is a published statement and must now stand or fall by what is printed in it.

Speaking of Satan, "Questions on Doctrine" teaches that "The crushing weight of his responsibility in the sins of the whole world—of the wicked as well as the righteous—must be rolled back upon him [Satan] ." This is in error because both the Bible and the Spirit of Prophecy teach that it is the sins of Israel that will be rolled back upon the originator of sin.

"Questions on Doctrine" also teaches that the reason for having two goats is that there is a dual responsibility for sin. This reasoning is also false. The real reason is that one goat represents Christ's sacrifice and the other represents Satan. Both bear the sins of Israel in sequence.

The true answer to the question is that the sins of the righteous are not now being rolled back upon Satan,—but that they will be when Jesus leaves the Sanctuary. The scapegoat has no part in the Sanctuary service. Neither the scapegoat nor his blood ever enters the holy place.

Extracts from a vision given to E.G. White at Dorchester, Mass., October 23, 1850 (transcribed by Elder S.N. Haskell): 'Then I saw that Jesus' work in the Sanctuary will soon be finished, and after His work there is finished, He will come to the door of the first apartment, and confess the sins of Israel upon the head of the scapegoat. Then he will put on the garments of vengeance, then the plagues will come upon the wicked, and they do not come until Jesus puts on that garment, and takes His place upon the great white cloud,— then while the plagues are falling the scapegoat is being led away. He makes a mighty struggle to escape, but is held fast by the hand that leads him. If he should effect his escape, Israel would lose their lives. I saw it would take time to lead away the scapegoat into the land of forgetfulness, after the sins were put upon his head."

When Christ brings the sins of those who deny the inspired truth on this subject out of the Sanctuary to place them on Satan, he [Satan] could say, "I don't have to bear

those sins. Those people think the very thought of such a thing is abhorrent, and appallingly sacrilegious. They ought to bear their own sins. They have denied the Testimony of Jesus."

I consider Satan to be a trashcan into which the sins and the iniquity of the redeemed will finally be placed. The Devil and the sin he bears will finally be burned in the lake of fire together with all sin and unrepentant sinners. He did not atone for sin; he is just the place where it is put after the atonement is finished.

When the Devil tempts us to sin, he sins. That is his responsibility. If we fall under the temptation, we sin. The Devil bears his responsibility for our sin. Jesus bears our responsibility for our sin after we repent and confess by His grace. Our sins are in the Sanctuary until they are cleaned out by Jesus. He will place them on Satan. In the end, Satan will bear them.

The "Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary," Volume 1, pp 777-778, in its comment on the live goat is in agreement with the Bible and the Spirit of Prophecy.

How would these glaring inconsistencies herein presented look if some of our enemies printed them in their journals? It seems to me that we are wide open to become the laughing stock of the religious world. They can spot these obvious contradictions if we cannot. The only possible consistent course to follow is to immediately repudiate this book and cease to print it. Perhaps this will save us from some of the reproach that appears certain to come.

"Education," p. 57: 'The greatest want of the world is the want of men, men who will not be bought or sold,— men who do not fear to call sin by its right name; men whose conscience is as true to duty as the needle to the pole; men who will stand for the right though the heavens fall.'

Sincerely your Christian brother,

(Signed)