

THE EVANGELICAL CONFERENCES

Forgotten Seventh-day Adventist history

As recorded and told by Vance Ferrell

Table of Contents

Introduction

EVENTS BEFORE THE CONFERENCES (1941-1954)

Unruh Writes a Letter (1949)	1
Martin Commissions to Write a Book (1954)	1
Branson Was Gone (1954)	2
Enter Froom and Anderson (1955)	2
Anderson's Earlier Successes at Changing the Church (1941, 1949)	3

THE 18-MONTH MEETINGS (March 1955 - August 1956)

The First Meeting (March 1955)	5
Getting Barnhouse on Board (August 1955)	6
Worldwide All-expenses-Paid Trips (1955)	7
The Three Points	7
How Froom and Anderson Helped Walter Martin Change our Beliefs	9
The Beliefs of Calvinists	10
How Martin Changed Our Other Books	12
Adventist books in one library which have been eliminated	14
Something Else That Martin Changed	15
Later Meetings	16

THE NON-ADVENTIST MAGAZINE ARTICLES (Sept 1956 - Jan 1957)

Introduction	17
The Bombshell Article (September 1956)	18
Martin's October 1956 Eternity Article	23
Martin's November 1956 Eternity Article	23
E. Schuyler English's November 1956 Our Hope Article	25
The December 1956 Time Magazine Article	25
Martin's January 1956 Eternity Article	25
Barnhouse's November 1957 Eternity Article	26

THE ADVENTIST MAGAZINE ARTICLES (December 1956 - April 1960)

Introduction to the Seven Articles	27
Froom's December 1956 Ministry Article	28
Ministry Editorial, April 1957	29
Ministry Editorial, June 1957	29
Mrs. Cox's December 1957 Ministry Article	30
W.G.T. Shedd's December 1957 Ministry Statement	32
Ministry Editorial, March 1958	33
Figuhr's April 1960 Review Article	34

DURING PREPARATION OF QUESTIONS ON DOCTRINE (1956-1957)

Personnel at the Review Deeply Concerned	35
Andreasen Begins Publishing	37

PUBLICATION OF QUESTIONS ON DOCTRINE (October 1957)

The Book That Changed the Adventist Church	40
Looking Back at the Wreckage Produced	41
Walter E. Read Retires (1958)	42
Spreading the Book Everywhere	42
Fraudulent Questions on Doctrine Statements about the Nature of Christ	45
Trying to Keep a Lid on the Hoax	45
Other Evangelical Leaders Recognized the Hoax	47
Barnhouse's Ongoing Disgust	48
The Hudson-Barnhouse Conversation	49

EVENTS FROM 1980 TO THE PRESENT (1960-2008)

Martin's Book, The Truth about Seventh-day Adventists, is Published (February 1960)	54
A Meeting with Barnhouse (late 1959)	56
The Death of Donald Grey Barnhouse (November 1960)	58
The Death of W.H. Branson (1961)	59
The Death of M.L. Andreasen (1962)	59
R.R. Figuhr Places B.B. Beach on WCC Committee (1965)	62
Figuhr Retires from GC Presidency (1965)	62
Froom's book, Movement of Destiny (1971)	62
The Change in Appendix B (1972)	63
Froom Realized the Truth before His Death (1974)	65
The Death of L.E. Froom (1974)	65
Decision Not to Republish Questions on Doctrine and Movement Of Destiny (1975)	66
The Dallas Statement (1980)	66
Death of Ruben R. Figuhr (1983)	67
Martin's Napa Lecture (1983)	68
The Gulley Quarterly and Book (1983)	68
Martin's Revision of Kingdom of the Cults (1985)	69
The Ankerberg Debate (January 1985)	70
The Death of R.A. Anderson (1985)	71
Ralph Larson's Books (1986, 1988)	72
Samples' Threatening Article (1988)	72
The publication of Seventh-day Adventists Believe (1988)	73
The Statement by the Biblical Research Institute (1989)	74
The Death of Walter Martin (1989)	75

Publication of an Annotated Edition of QD (2003)	76
The New Baptismal vow (July 8, 2005)	76
Questions on Doctrine 50 th Anniversary Conference (2007)	77
Adventist colleges teaching from Evangelical doctrinal books (Sept. 2008)	77
The Latest Erroneous Sabbath School Quarterly (2008)	77
Decades of Gradual Change (1960 onward)	77

APPENDIX 1

Statement by a General Conference Worker (1983)	80
---	----

APPENDIX 2

Statement by a Seminary Student (1983)	82
--	----

APPENDIX 3

Doctrinal Errors in Questions on Doctrine and the Truth about Seventh-day Adventists	89
The Human Nature of Christ	89
The Atonement	92
The Two-Apartment Sanctuary	95
The Investigative Judgment	96
Sanctification	99
Obedience	100
Perfection	101
Salvation	101

APPENDIX 4

Doctrinal Errors in Gulley's Quarterly and Book	103
Gulley on the Nature of Christ	103
Gulley on the Atonement	104
Gulley on the Two-Apartment Sanctuary	104
Gulley on Obedience	105
Gulley on the Investigative Judgment	105

INTRODUCTION

To faithful Seventh-day Adventists back in the mid-fifties, it was a fearful doctrinal crisis in our church. But to the faithful in our day it is recognized as marking the beginning of a doctrinal split which has shaken our denomination as an earthquake.

This is because the errors that the 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 leaders had not welcomed its theological roots back in the mid-fifties.

The saddest thing today perhaps, is that members have no idea about this, and they allow the new theology to live on mostly thru ignorance.

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 make us doctrinally “acceptable” to leaders in the other Protestant denominations.** This seemed but a small concession in view of the golden opportunity held out before us: the possibility of unity and close 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 Sunday keeping 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.**

Sister White said: “...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”- Review & Herald, July 24, 1894**

“Babylon is fallen” and “Come out of her, My people” is the call; that call is not “Go in and have doctrinal unity with her” (Revelation 14:8 with 18:1-5; and Great Controversy, 603-604, 390).

It is now several decades later, and many today do not realize how firmly the error was placed into the foundation of our denomination 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. And if we study the past, we are better prepared to understand the present and meet its challenges.

By the early 1980s, by his own admission Walter Martin was once again demanding “answers” from the General Conference. A new set of “questions on doctrine” had again been submitted to them. In response, our leaders published a new doctrinal book which mirrored many of the errors in their earlier doctrinal book, published in 1957 to placate Walter Martin and his associates.

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 and Spirit of Prophecy teachings bequeathed to the Adventist Church are more precious than all else besides. God wants men and

women who will stand up and “sigh and cry” for the abominations that now threaten our people from all sides.

The plan of this book is to concisely present the key points which explain exactly what happened and why, as well as the windstorms which followed for years.

This historical study 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 Evangelical Conferences, how they came about and what followed in later years. This is the story of the beginning of a great doctrinal compromise which has since developed into a major “new theology “ invasion.

Here is the story of how it began and what it led to—at a time when we are nearing the end of time.

— Vance Ferrell

List of Abbreviations:

GC = General Conference

QD = The 1957 General Conference book, Questions on Doctrine (The full title was Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine)

TASDA = Walter Martin’s 1960 book, The Truth about Seventh-day Adventism

SDAB = The General Conference’s 1988 book, Seventh-Day Adventists Believe

COS = Norman Gulley’s 1982 book, Christ Our Substitute

3SSQ = The Senior Sabbath School Quarterly for the Third Quarter, 1983, authored by Norman Gulley, the primary author of the 1988 General Conference doctrinal book, Seventh-day Adventists Believe

EVENTS BEFORE THE CONFERENCES (1941-1954)

Unruh writes a letter (1949) — Many wonder in bewilderment how all this began. The event which led up to the conferences themselves started when T. Edgar Unruh, president of the East Pennsylvania Conference, heard several radio sermons by Donald Grey Barnhouse (1895-1960) on righteousness by faith in the book of Romans. Barnhouse was the well-known editor of Eternity magazine and a foremost leader of conservative Protestantism (T.E. Unruh, letter to Donald G. Barnhouse, November 28, 1949).

On November 28, 1949, Unruh commended Barnhouse for those radio sermons. At the time, he was a popular radio preacher, minister of the Tenth Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia, author of a number of books, and founder and senior editor of Eternity magazine.

Barnhouse wrote back that he was astounded that one of the heretics, an Adventist minister, would commend him on righteousness by faith. He then invited Unruh to have lunch with him (Barnhouse letter to Unruh, December 22, 1949).

We know about the entire incident because later, in 1977, Unruh wrote a complete article about it in Adventist Heritage.

Although they never ate together, the two men continued to correspond until June 1950. In response to a copy of Steps to Christ, which Unruh had sent to him, Barnhouse who was always ready for an opportunity for a fight, published a scathing review of the small book. He called Ellen White the founder of a cult and denounced the book as “false in all its parts” (Barnhouse, “How to Read Religious Books,” Eternity magazine, June 1950, pp. 42-44).

“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.’ ”—Unruh, “The Seventh-day Adventist Evangelical Conferences, 1955-1956,” Adventist Heritage, Vol. 4, No. 2, 1977.

So Unruh canceled plans to meet with Barnhouse, and stopped writing him.

“Unruh, who thought he had Barnhouse’s word that he would publish nothing more against Adventists before their conference, lost both confidence and interest.” — Keld J. Reynolds, “Coping with Change,” Adventism in America, p. 185.

Time passes by.

Martin commissioned to write a book 1954 — Walter Ralston Martin (1928-1989), director of cult apologetics for Zondervan Publishing Company was contributing editor of Barnhouse’s Eternity magazine.

He had already written a chapter critical of Adventism in his book, Rise of the Cults, along with several other books about American cults which were considered standard works in that field.

So in 1954, still filled with loathing for Adventists, Barnhouse commissioned Martin to write a complete book on them, which would expose and denounce all their evil teachings.

(It is of significant interest that while Evangelicals enjoy writing books about the “cults,” they

never mention the Roman Catholic Church—which is the biggest cult of all, for its practices are totally unbiblical!)

In the spring of 1955, while checking through Barnhouse’s files, Martin discovered those earlier letters from Unruh. Martin immediately contacted Unruh and requested a “face-to-face contact with representative Seventh-day Adventists.” According to Unruh, Martin added that he wanted “direct access” to authoritative Adventists and their publications, so “he could treat Adventists fairly.”

Surprised, Unruh notified the General Conference (hereinafter referred to as the GC).

Branson was gone (1954) — Reuben R. Figuhr (1896-1983) had only recently taken office and would remain GC president until 1966. **If his predecessor, William H. Branson (1887-1961) had still been president, the terrible doctrinal sellout which occurred at the Evangelical Conferences would never have taken place.** But Branson had retired on May 24, 1954, at the age of 67, due to failing health.

Branson had a powerful understanding of our historic beliefs and had written extensively in defense of them. His books included *In Defense of the Faith*, *How Men Are Saved*, and *Drama of the Ages*.

On October 30, 1935, Branson presented the Branson Report to the GC Autumn Council. The controversy was whether our colleges should seek accreditation from worldly accreditation associations. Branson and other good men pled with the Council not to take this step. But it was done anyway. **But, by the spring of 1955, Branson was out of the picture—and Figuhr (elected May 24, 1954), who was not a doctrinal expert, was in the habit of entrusting lower-level responsibilities to men whom he trusted,** while he stood aside and occupied himself with attending committee meetings throughout the world field.

Enter Froom and Anderson (1955) — According to Unruh, Martin said he had a special request: He wanted to meet Froom, whose research books he deeply admired. He had his opportunity in the spring of 1955.

Leroy Edwin Froom (1890-1974) was the most in-depth researcher our denomination ever produced. His four-volume set, *Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers*, and his two-volume set, *Conditionalist Faith of Our Fathers*, showed how our basic teachings had been taught by many Christians in earlier centuries. A GC worker from 1926 to 1950, he had founded *Ministry* magazine and was its editor for 22 years.

However, Froom was primarily a researcher and writer and not a committee expert. So, when notified of this contact with Martin, Froom notified Roy Allen Anderson who had been head of the GC Ministerial Association since 1941.

Anderson, a former public Evangelist and powerful leader of men, immediately took charge and called in Walter E. Read (1883-1976), a GC field secretary who had earlier served overseas in various administrative capacities. But he was not a doctrinal expert either.

(Later in this present book, I will quote a report given me by a General Conference officer, at that

time, who said that **Froom tried to back out of taking part in the meetings when he realized that he would have to compromise our denominational beliefs** in order to satisfy Martin's demands. But Anderson talked him into it, declaring that the results would greatly help our church. So Froom capitulated, much to his sorrow in the last few years of his life, when he realized what those compromises had resulted in.)

However, once Froom started working on the project (for he was the one who did all the research and primary writing), a strange fascination seemed to grip his mind. **He became intent on bending everything to the one great objective of making our most controverted beliefs acceptable to Walter Martin.**

By the year 1955, Froom was 65 and Anderson (who I personally knew since I took a class from him at the Seminary at the time) was not much younger. It is apparent that both recognized that this project would be the final capstone of success to their long lives of service to the denomination.

Although Froom initially entered upon the task with some misgivings, once he had become deeply involved, he along with Anderson really believed that it would greatly help the future progress of our denomination if they could win the full approval of the other Protestant denominations. **The challenge was immense; and they gave their total energies to making both the conferences and the book which followed it a great success,** which was fully approved by the other churches and our own.

R. A. Anderson believed that, with Froom's marvelous ability to frame everything in smooth words, they would be able to please Walter Martin.

Anderson's earlier successes at changing the church (1941, 1949) — As for himself, **Anderson had earlier pushed through every project he had attempted.** Let me give you two examples; each had a strange similarity to what he tried to do during the Evangelical Conferences and in the book which followed it:

When Anderson gained General Conference level status, as head of the Ministerial Association in 1941, **he immediately set to work to help eliminate two songbooks our people had loved for years: Christ in Song and Hymns and Tunes.** A committee had been selected in 1936 to work on the project of placing the songs in a more useable format with larger print, and musical accompaniment with all the words.

He told a class at the Seminary (which I attended about the year 1956) that he had gotten rid of Christ in Song, which our people so much loved, and substituted in its place the new "higher-class" Church Hymnal, first published in 1941, which contained a number of unknown songs which few wanted or ever sang. He was able to do this because he placed himself in charge of the song selection committee.

Anderson personally selected many of the replacement songs; then he initiated a campaign for every conference and local church to haul in all the Christ in Songs, so they could be destroyed, and get each local church to order a full supply of Church Hymnals.

"It is the General Conference plan that this hymnal shall take the place of Hymns and Tunes and

Christ in Song in our public services.”—Preface, 1941 original edition, The Church Hymnal.

Eight years later, and six years before the Evangelical Conferences began, **R.A. Anderson, with Froom’s help, was able to effect a second significant change.**

Anderson had for years established close friendships with pastors and leaders of other denominations. In the mid-1940s, Dr. E. Schuyler English, an important Protestant Bible scholar, wrote in the Evangelical journal, Our Hope, that the Adventists “deny Christ’s deity.”

“Friendly correspondence with L.E. Froom of the General Conference revealed that English had based his statement largely on a passage that had for many years appeared in the widely circulated Adventist book, Bible Readings.”—R.W. Schwarz, Light Bearers to the Remnant, p. 543.

English had found that nature of Christ statement in Bible Readings, which said that Christ was not born with an immaculate nature, but took our fallen, human nature. Although it added that, in that nature, He never once sinned, Schuyler as well as other Evangelicals were still displeased with it.

So, in 1949, Anderson decided to compromise that statement. Instead of accurately reflecting the teaching of the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy, he would tilt it so it would agree with modern Protestantism. **The revised statement was first published in the 1949 edition of Bible Readings.** The statement, which had been in that book for over 30 years, had been omitted because “it was recognized as being out of harmony with our true position.”

“The lingering ‘sinful-nature-of-Christ’ misconception was remedied by expunging the regrettable note in the revised Bible Readings of 1949.”—L.E. Froom, Movement of Destiny (1971), p. 465.

Anderson then contacted English who, in response, wrote a favorable comment in his journal, Our Hope, about the Adventists.

Interestingly enough, our people did not notice that this change had been made until Anderson, himself, revealed the fact as part of his argument seven years later that, unlike the rest of us, Christ was born with an immaculate nature. Here is what he wrote:

“Many years ago a statement appeared in Bible Readings for the Home Circle (1915 edition) which declared that Christ came ‘in sinful flesh’ . . . It has been quoted many times by critics, and all around the world, as being typical of Adventist Christology. But when that book was revised in 1949, this expression was eliminated, since it was recognized as being out of harmony with our true position.”—Roy A. Anderson. “Human– Not Carnal,” Ministry magazine, September 14, 1956.

But that phrase, “sinful flesh,” in the earlier Bible Readings, was actually based on a Bible quotation! **Reprinted below is that original note** (which is also in our Harvestime Books edition of Bible Readings). You will see that it is an excellent statement showing how we too may resist temptation just as Christ did:

“In His humanity Christ partook of our sinful, fallen nature. If not, then He was not ‘made like

unto His brethren,' was not 'in all points tempted like as we are,' did not overcome as we have to overcome, and is not, therefore, the complete and perfect Saviour man needs and must have to be saved. **The idea that Christ was born of an immaculate or sinless mother, inherited no tendencies to sin, and for this reason did not sin, removes Him from the realm of a fallen world and from the very place where help is needed.** On His human side, Christ inherited just what every child of Adam inherits,—a sinful nature. On the divine side, all this was done to place mankind on vantage-ground, **and to demonstrate that in the same way every one who is 'born of the Spirit' may gain like victories over sin in his own sinful flesh.** Thus each one is to overcome as Christ overcame. Rev. 3:21. Without this birth there can be no victory over temptation, and no salvation from sin. John 3:3-7."—Note for the sixth question in the chapter entitled, "A Sinless Life," in the 1915 edition of Bible Readings, p. 174 (emphasis theirs).

The Bible says the same thing: "God sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh."—Romans 8:3.

Also see Hebrews 2:14-18, which essentially says that **Christ took not the nature of angels (or, for that matter, unfallen Adam), but the nature of Abraham's descendants** (Hebrews 2:16).

Thus we see that Roy Allen Anderson had been in the habit of pushing through objectives which would bring our church more in line with other denominations for at least 15 years prior to meeting with the Evangelicals in the spring of 1955.

THE 18-MONTH MEETINGS (March 1955 - August 1956)

The First Meeting (March 1955) — At the time of this first meeting, Walter R. Martin was 27 years old, Donald G. Barnhouse was 60, Leroy Edwin Froom was 65, Walter E. Read was 72, and Roy Allen Anderson about 57 years old. All knew that this series of meetings, and the book which would follow it, would be the high point of their careers.

Froom did the research and writing; and Anderson gave him encouragement and led out in keeping the strong friendship of Martin and Barnhouse. Anderson was warm and friendly and excellent at making and keeping friends.

There were over one million Adventists in the 1950s (These Times, May 1981, p. 6). **Could this small group of three Adventists (Froom, Anderson, and Read) represent our entire church? They certainly did not represent the solid historical believers;** for their champion in the Review building, next door to the General Conference, Francis Nichol (senior editor at the Review)—was purposely excluded from the meetings. According to Martin, Nichol "was prohibited from making contact" with him (Martin interview, Adventist Currents, July 1983, p. 18).

W.E. Read was only a minor figure in all that occurred. **It is a significant fact that, only five years earlier, in front of the entire 1950 General Conference Session, Read defended our historic teaching about the fallen nature of Christ.** He quoted a Spirit of Prophecy passage, that "Jesus was in all things made like unto His brethren. He became flesh even as we are" (1950 General Conference Bulletin, p. 154; quoting Acts of the Apostles, 472).

Walter Martin brought with him **George R. Cannon**, a Greek teacher at Nyack Missionary College in New York. Unruh served as chairman at the initial meeting.

“These conferences, ranging in length from one to three days, stretched out over a period of eighteen months.”—R.W. Schwarz, *Light Bearers to the Remnant*, p. 544.

Through all the turbulent experiences which followed, **T.E. Unruh maintained close contact with Anderson and others** at the GC and Review. In his lengthy report (*Adventist Heritage*, Fourth Quarter, 1977), Unruh described what happened: “At first, the two groups looked upon each other with great suspicion.”

“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 D. M. Canright, on to the late defector E.B. Jones.”—L.E. Froom, *Movement of Destiny* (1971), p. 478.

Although Anderson was not at that first meeting, **a major change occurred within the first 24 hours.**

Martin, having already read a large amount of Adventist literature, presented the GC team with about 40 questions concerning points of doctrine. Unruh reveals that, after the group adjourned that day, **Froom, at this time at the height of his mental powers, spent the afternoon and evening preparing a 20-page study, in reply to Martin’s initial list of questions.** He had the ability to research, write, snip off parts of quotations, and tilt doctrinal concepts.

The manuscript was then sent over to Martin, who spent until 2 a.m. reading it carefully.

“**The second day will never be forgotten** by those who participated in the conferences. Anderson was present. And 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.**”—T.E. Unruh, “The Seventh-day Adventist Evangelical Conferences of 1955-1956,” *Adventist Heritage*, Fourth Quarter, 1977.

In spite of all the Adventist publications Martin had read, here was something new and refreshingly different. **Yet this small victory only served to whet the appetite of Anderson and Froom even more: If at all possible, they must gain full acceptance by the Evangelicals!**

The arrival of R.A. Anderson to the group, on the second day, added even more to the warmth. **R.A. Anderson knew how to make deep friendships with leaders of other churches.** Throughout the world field, in his travels as a General Conference representative, he had been doing it for years. In addition, it is known that President R.R. Figuhr frequently chaired these joint meetings with Martin.

Getting Barnhouse on board (August 1955) — Martin now needed to convince Barnhouse that the Adventists were Christians. For this reason, he arranged that, on August 25-26, the meetings were to be held at Barnhouse’s mansion in Pennsylvania.

“The meetings in Dr. Barnhouse’s home persuaded Barnhouse and his son, an adviser on the staff of Billy Graham’s Evangelistic crusades, that they, too, had held many misconceptions of Adventist teachings . . . The younger Barnhouse persuaded his father that justice demanded that they report their changed view in the columns of Eternity. Dr. Barnhouse agreed, although both he and his son knew that many of their subscribers with strong anti-Adventist prejudices would surely be displeased.”—R.W. Schwarz, Light Bearers to the Remnant, p. 544.

Worldwide All-expenses-Paid Trips (1955) — Not only did our leaders roll out the red carpet for Martin at General Conference headquarters, but **they also brought him over to the Adventist Seminary to speak, plus letting him speak at our large Takoma Park Church**, just across the street from the front entrance of the GC. (I was present at both events.) They also took him on an all-expenses- paid trip to Loma Linda—and, also in 1955, to mission stations around the world.

“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.”—T.E. Unruh, “The Seventh-day Adventist Evangelical Conferences of 1955-1956,” Adventist Heritage, Fourth Quarter, 1977.

The Three Points — **It was clear from the start that Martin had three points on which he would accept no disagreement. On all others, there might be some variations, but three were central to modern Protestantism.**

In addition to a belief that Christ had existed from all eternity, on which both sides already agreed, **Martin presented three key points—which if we compromised on them would ultimately work havoc in the Adventist Church.** Here is how, in a later article, while adding a fourth point with which we already agreed, he phrased the three special doctrinal beliefs which we must change:

“(1) That **the atonement of Christ** was not completed on 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.”—Walter Martin, “Seventh-day Adventism Today,” Our Hope magazine, November 1956, p. 275.

Item 3, dealing with the eternity of Christ as fully divine, was never a problem; and it is believed that Martin slipped that one in—knowing that we would agree with him on it. The belief that Christ is fully divine, equal to the Father, and has existed since all eternity is fully supported both by the Bible and the Spirit of Prophecy. It was the other three that has caused so much trouble and grief for our people.

We want to carefully consider each of those other three. This will be done in an Appendix of this book.

But, just now, before continuing the story of these conferences and their aftermath, we should

consider the implications of the doctrinal sellout that Froom and Anderson made on two of these three points:

1) They assured Martin that the atonement was essentially finished when Christ died on the cross. Nothing of any importance is said to have occurred in a Sanctuary in heaven after the ascension of Christ. **2) They told him that Christ never really took the human nature that we have;** but, instead, He took a kind of sinless, angelic nature. It was impossible for Him to sin when tempted.

Those were the two primary areas of historic Adventist belief which were compromised by Froom and Anderson.

But our beliefs about the atonement and the human nature of Christ are solid core doctrines. To tamper with them is to change many other beliefs, including the truths about salvation, grace, obedience, and the law of God.

As a result of those two compromises, our entire doctrinal foundation of obedience to God's law was fractured.

In order to better understand this, we need to recognize that the modern Protestant teachings about (1) a "finished atonement at the cross," and (2) "Christ had an inherent, sinless nature which could not be tempted"—were devised in order to get rid of the need to obey the law of God—the Ten Commandments!

If the atonement was finished at Calvary, then we today were saved at the cross—2,000 years ago! All we now need do is accept Christ with our lips. Conduct counts for nothing. Just accept Him one time, and you are saved.

If Christ did not actually take our human nature, then His sinless life is not an example we need to follow. This is because, according to this error, He could not sin, while we can. Therefore, we do not have to obey the Ten Commandments as He did. It is even claimed that if Christ had taken our nature—He could not have resisted sin! God is not willing to, or powerful enough, to enable anyone to resist sin and become one of the overcomers described eight times in the book of Revelation.

It is said that human beings do not need to try to stop sinning, because they cannot stop sinning. God is not concerned that they stop sinning, so He has provided salvation at the cross to save them in sin. **(This terrible error was invented; and it is eagerly accepted by millions because it teaches that they can continue to sin and still go to heaven.)**

This corruption of our basic truths about the atonement and the human nature of Christ changes the doctrine of obedience to the law of God, but **this error also eliminates the three angels' messages!**

The three angels teach that **we must worship the true God**, that **the judgment is taking place** in these last days, that **we must leave the churches which reject these truths**, and that **the mark of the beast will be placed on all who reject these truths**. Also, as a capstone, **the key salvation issue in these truths is clearly summarized:**

"Here is the patience of the saints: Here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the

faith of Jesus.”—Revelation 14:12.

Each of these points in the messages of the three angels is keyed to the necessity of obedience to God’s law, by faith in the enabling grace of Christ, which is provided to us through the example of Christ’s obedient life, His self-sacrificing death, and His mediation in the Sanctuary above to provide us the strength needed to obey all that God commands in the Inspired Books.

Can you see how devastating that these changes are which Froom and Anderson agreed to? They gutted our entire system of beliefs. **According to these changes, it is not even necessary to keep the Bible Sabbath!**

Martin and Barnhouse clearly recognized that this momentous change was being made, otherwise they would not have so readily accepted us into fellowship with the Evangelicals.

An Appendix at the back of this present book will show (1) what the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy teach on each of those three key points (the atonement, the human nature of Christ, and obedience to the law of God as a requirement in the plan of salvation); and (2) how these errors were stated in our 1957 book, Questions on Doctrine, and its 1988 successor, Seventh-day Adventists Believe.

We will now return to the history of what actually happened:

How Froom and Anderson helped Martin change our beliefs — Throughout the pages which follow, you will find numerous evidences that Martin’s plan was to actually change our doctrinal beliefs—and remake Adventism into the mold of Evangelicals!

Certain core beliefs had to be radically altered. **The key point to be eliminated was the means of salvation**; that is, how are men saved? **The objective was to do away with obedience to the holy law of our Creator, who is a holy God.** By calling the atonement finished at the cross, all reason for a Sanctuary in heaven and Christ’s ministry in it, culminating in an investigative judgment would be eliminated.

By declaring that Christ could not have taken **our nature**, lest He too sin, the concept would be instilled in Adventist thinking that it is impossible for us to stop sinning.

As a result, conduct no longer mattered. Live as you please; ignore standards. Regardless of how you speak and act, as long as you have professed faith in Christ and are a member of the church, you are going to be saved anyway.

It was decided that, in some cases, the very words used to describe our beliefs should be changed. The resultant confusion of terms would make it easier to modify our beliefs so they would mirror those of the other churches.

“As the dialogue progressed, the Martin-Barnhouse group joined forces with the Adventists in formulating written questions and answers designed to bring out the actual teachings of Adventism with the greatest clarity. **In some instances this required translation of the inbred**

vocabulary of the church into language common among theologians of other communions.—Keld J. Reynolds, “Coping with Change,” *Adventism in America*, p. 186.

Froom and Anderson decided that they could accomplish their objective by primarily doing four things: (1) **Rephrasing Adventist beliefs** so Evangelicals would think they meant something different than what we actually believed. (2) **Quoting tiny snippets here and there from the Spirit of Prophecy.** (3) In Questions on Doctrine (QD), **they make “official” statements which assumed that all Adventists believed** that which almost none of them believed at that time. (4) **Repeatedly tell Adventist believers that nothing had really been changed.**

For example, in writing QD, **Froom emphasized two words, frequently used by Roman Catholics and Evangelicals**, to nullify the truth that Christ took our nature so we could obey God’s law.

Froom wrote that **Jesus was “exempt** from the inherited passions and pollutions that corrupt the natural descendants of Adam” (QD, 383).

He also wrote that “Jesus took all that He bore, whether the burden and penalty of our iniquities, or the disease and frailties of our human nature— all was taken and borne vicariously” (QD, 61-62, emphasis his).

Such words pleased Martin and Barnhouse, both Calvinists, who believed that men and women are not responsible for the sin, because they are born sinful and are saved only because God so elects them.

Yet Herbert Douglass, one of the Review editors at the time, maintains that “**these two words, exempt and vicariously, do not appear in the prepublication manuscript copy of QD.** In fact, considerable editing (by Froom, not the Review) is evident in the section The Incarnation and the Son of Man, between the prepublication manuscript and the printed book.”—H.E. Douglass, *A Fork in the Road*, p. 65.

In order to make his case that we had always believed that which we had never believed, dozens of times in QD, Froom twisted our beliefs and the Spirit of Prophecy writings.

The beliefs of Calvinists — Barnhouse and Martin were actually trying to make Calvinists out of us! Knight explains:

“Equally important for understanding many of the questions asked by Barnhouse and Martin, is that they **belonged to the Calvinistic/dispensational wing** of Evangelicalism.”—Knight, Introduction, QDAE (QD Annotated Edition), p. xxx [his numbering of pages].

“**Calvinistic**” means that they believed that God selects those who will be saved and those who will be lost. So personal conduct and obedience to the law of God is never involved in salvation. Because of that error, Calvinists believe that if Christ had taken human nature, He would also have been unable to resist temptation and would have sinned.

“**Dispensational**” means that God has divided human history into dispensations and the law period ended at Calvary, so we are now in the dispensation of grace. Therefore there is no need

of any intercession by Christ in heaven, nor any investigative judgment.

There is another point which should be mentioned here. In the course of researching for this book, the present author discovered that Martin, especially Barnhouse, believed that, while Christ did not take the same fallen nature that we have,—He did not take the nature of Adam either! Instead, His divinity overawed His humanity at the Incarnation— and He was the “God-man.” **His divine nature took a sort of composite humanity—which was not even the nature that Mary had! His humanity was merely an outer covering over His perfect, unsinnable higher nature.** As you read along in this present book, you will come across this point here and there. Here is one example:

“(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.**”—Donald Barnhouse, phone conversation with Al Hudson, May 16, 1958.

But wait! the Apostle John clearly teaches that those who deny that Christ came fully in the flesh— are the antichrist! (1 John 4:3; 2 John 1:7). Something to think about. Why are we trying to change our beliefs to match those in the antichrist camp?

That, of course, is but a brief overview of Martin and Barnhouse’s beliefs. **How could we possibly please such men?**

Here is a very clear statement from Great Controversy which shows how evil is the Calvinist doctrine of predestination, and how it totally destroys the need to keep the law of God:

“The spiritual declension which had been manifest in England just before the time of Wesley was in great degree the result of antinomian [anti-law] teaching. **Many affirmed that Christ had abolished the moral law and that Christians are therefore under no obligation to observe it;** that a believer is freed from the ‘bondage of good works.’ Others, though admitting the perpetuity of the law, declared that it was unnecessary for ministers to exhort the people to obedience of its precepts, **since those whom God had elected to salvation would, ‘by the irresistible impulse of divine grace, be led to the practice of piety and virtue,’** while those who were doomed to eternal reprobation ‘did not have power to obey the divine law.’

“Others, also holding that ‘the elect cannot fall from grace nor forfeit the divine favor,’ arrived at the still more hideous conclusion that **‘the wicked actions they commit are not really sinful,** nor to be considered as instances of their violation of the divine law, and that, consequently, they have no occasion either to confess their sins or to break them off by repentance’ (McClintock and Strong’s Cyclopaedia, art. “Antinomians,” ed. 1871). Therefore, they declared that **even one of the vilest of sins, ‘considered universally an enormous violation of the divine law, is not a sin in the sight of God,’ if committed by one of the elect,** ‘because it is one of the essential and distinctive characteristics of the elect, that **they cannot do anything that is either displeasing to God or prohibited by the law.’**

“These monstrous doctrines are essentially the same as the later teaching of popular educators and theologians—that there is no unchangeable divine law as the standard of right, but that **the**

standard of morality is indicated by society itself, and has constantly been subject to change.

All these ideas are inspired by the same master spirit—by him who, even among the sinless inhabitants of heaven, began his work of seeking to break down the righteous restraints of the law of God.

“The doctrine of the divine decrees, unalterably fixing the character of men, had led many to a virtual rejection of the law of God. Wesley steadfastly opposed the errors of the antinomian teachers and showed that this doctrine which led to antinomianism was contrary to the Scriptures. ‘The grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men.’ ‘This is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour; who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth. For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus; who gave Himself a ransom for all.’ Titus 2:11; 1 Timothy 2:3-6. The Spirit of God is freely bestowed to enable every man to lay hold upon the means of salvation. Thus Christ, ‘the true Light,’ ‘lighteth every man that cometh into the world.’ John 1:9. Men fail of salvation through their own willful refusal of the gift of life.”—Great Controversy, 260-262.

How Martin changed our other books — At their meetings with him during the Evangelical Conferences, Froom and Anderson were well-acquainted with Martin’s “rapid-fire” way of talking (Movement of Destiny, p. 478). He had a memory like an encyclopedia, a voice like a drill sergeant, and an intensity comparable to a field commander in a war. As the present writer will explain in the Appendix, he heard Martin speak at the Takoma Park church and the man spoke like a machine gun.

Martin not only changed our beliefs, but he also coerced the General Conference into getting rid of—or rewriting—a sizeable number of our denominational books!

Many do not realize that Martin not only changed certain of our official doctrines, but also our books. An extreme rapid reader, he scanned through our published books at that time (including many reprints from our earlier writers). **Martin not only demanded that many of our books must be expurgated by our published houses, but he started a trend that no more such books were ever again be printed—unless certain offending passages were eliminated prior to publication.**

This information comes from an audio tape of an address given by Walter Martin on February 22, 1983 in Napa, California. His message was stunning. **Here is a portion of what he said.** More will be quoted later in this present book.

“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!’ [they answered].

“I said, ‘Yes.’ **I said, ‘It gets even worse brothers.** It says here in your [non-Spirit of Prophecy] publications that Jesus didn’t complete the atonement on the cross. It says here in your

publications—and I went down the line on the subject. ‘Impossible!’ [they replied].

“I said, ‘All right, 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?’ **‘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.**”—Walter Martin, “We Must Help the Adventists Solve Their Problem,” address at Napa, California, February 22, 1983.

You might be interested in knowing that the purpose of that talk, held in a public auditorium, was to attract students and faculty from nearby Pacific Union College, to hear his threat that, if we did not either reissue Questions on Doctrine (which had only recently gone out of print), or publish a replacement with the same errors—he was going to publish a new book attacking us! He knew that the Adventists from the college (which filled the public auditorium) would send the message to the GC. Events which occurred in the later 1980s revealed that his warning reached receptive ears, which were quick to initiate plans to do his bidding. More on this later. The Introduction to QD, itself, mentioned Martin’s careful examination of all our books:

“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.”—QD, Introduction, pp. 7-8.

Froom and Anderson had a “desire to please” (Knight, QDAE [QD Annotated Edition], p. xxx). It was a strong desire, for both were determined to gain the acceptance of Evangelicals. Martin and Barnhouse recognized their opportunity and they made full use of it.

Scores of Adventist books were carefully changed, while many others were permitted to go out of print.

“The Seventh-day Adventist Church emerged from the 1950s with a sharply defined, but still open-ended, body of belief. The dialogues had much to do with both the focus and the defense. Benefited by knowing where it stood with the Evangelicals, **the Adventist Church went forward with efforts to purge from its older literature the fact or appearance of error.**”—Keld J. Reynolds, “Coping with Change,” *Adventism in America*, p. 188.

Later in this present book, we will quote a statement by Martin (Eternity, October 1956), that “less than 20 percent” of the Adventist books in print at that time were acceptable—the rest had to be changed or eliminated entirely!

Adventist books in one library which have been eliminated – Listed below are a number of Adventist books in just one private library (my own)—which are no longer in print. This reveals how many doctrinal books have been removed:

William A. Spicer, Above the Din, God Speaks; Arthur E. Lickey, Where is God?; Robert L. Odom, Is Your Soul Immortal?; George Vandeman, Hammers in the Fire; Charles D. Utt, Answers; Ralph H. Blodgett, Rapture, Is It for Real?; George E. Vandeman, Destination Life; Robert B. Thurber, The Repairing of Sam Brown; Eugene F. Durand, The Story of the Seventh-day Adventist Church; H.M.S. Richards, One World.

Here are several outstanding books from earlier years in my own library, which you will never see in a denominational Adventist bookstore today:

James S. White, Bible Adventism

William A. Spicer, Our Day in the Light of Prophecy; Beacon Lights of Prophecy

Uriah Smith, The United States in Prophecy; Here and Hereafter; Looking Unto Jesus; Synopsis of the Present Truth

Stephen Haskell, The Cross and Its Shadow; James E. White, Past, Present, and Future; Many other authors could be included, such as

Roy C. Cottrell, A.T. Jones, and Charles T. Everson.

Without taking the space to list authors, here are a bunch more: Rapture; Tormented Forever and Ever; Hard Nuts Cracked; Your Bible Answers; When We Die: What Then?; The Image of Nations; Wonder World of Tomorrow; Things That Belong to God; How to Survive Earth's Final War; God Loves Atheists; For Backsliders Only; Invasion from Outer Space; The Vicar of Christ; The Day the World Ends; Cut-Rate Religion; Famous Infidels Who Found Christ; Victory in Christ; Coming World Events; What the Bible Says about Absent from the Body; Man of Mystery; One World; Revival Sermons; Day After Tomorrow

In addition, I could list ten or more important earlier Adventist books in my library on each of the following topics: the Sabbath, prophecy, Spirit of Prophecy, and Sanctuary—which are no longer available.

Here are the last major doctrinal books, which went out of print by 1980:

Arthur E. Lickey, God Speaks to Modern Man

George E. Vandeman, Planet in Rebellion

H.M.S. Richards, What Jesus Said

Arthur S. Maxwell, Your Bible and You

Arthur Maxwell, Courage for the Crisis

William Branson, Drama of the Ages

George Vandeman, Planet in Rebellion

Martin had demanded that different books must be printed. So what kind of doctrinal books are we presented with now? Books ridiculing Ellen White. Books making fun of "perfectionism." Books praising Protestant churches. Books subtly denying the possibility that we can obey the law of God. Books teaching our youth how to be clowns and make movies. Books

about our wonderful breakthroughs in “planting churches” which have drums, bands, and swaying singers. Books that compare those of us who keep God’s commandments to legalistic Pharisees.

Keld Reynolds, a liberal, mentions this:

“In addition, the Adventist Church added to its achievements, **a considerable body of denominational literature on theology and related subjects written by its scholars.** These developments...were helping [to] create a more professional clergy.”—Keld J. Reynolds, “Coping with Change,” *Adventism in America*, p. 188.

Here are three outstanding doctrinal books, which were previously used to instruct our academy and college students in our doctrines. Each one was outstanding: Alonzo J. Wearner, *Fundamentals of Bible Doctrine*; no author listed, *Principles of Life*; T.H. Jemison, *Christian Beliefs*.

Examining all the above listed books in my library, I find that they were excellent!

Tragically, only within the last month I received a letter from a concerned parent that one of our colleges is now using an Evangelical doctrinal book to teach Bible doctrines to the students! When the Bible teacher was asked why he was doing this, he replied that our own denomination no longer publishes doctrinal books for our schools! Here is what I was told in a letter dated September 9, 2008:

“I learned that the doctrinal book used for the basic Bible Doctrines class at Southern Adventist University is a non-Adventist book, written by Charles Stanley, president of the Southern Baptist Convention, who has a large church in Atlanta area, with 15,000 members. He is a leading Evangelical speaker and writer. The book is called *Handbook for Christian Living*, and it contains a great variety of Protestant errors, including complete chapters entitled Hell, Millennium, Rapture, Tribulation, and Anti-Christ. This is what they are teaching all our youth at SAU! They are required to take this course before they can get a degree.

“When I asked the teacher why he was using that book, he replied that he could not find any currently published by the Adventist Church!”

The truth is that, in order to appease Martin and our Ecumenical friends, our denomination stopped printing full-message doctrinal books by 1980 (2008 - phone call to a large ABC by the present author)

I am currently writing a complete doctrinal book, in the sermon-type arrangement of our earlier out-of-print books. It will be extremely readable and, in small boxfuls, will sell for the lowest cost for widespread distribution. It will be printed by the end of 2008. Watch for announcement. The Evangelicals will not be able to stop publication of this book, as they have hundreds of our other denominational books!

Something else that Martin changed — In addition to changing our basic beliefs, and the books our church prints and sells, **Walter Martin also changed our broadcasting identification. Previously, like all the other churches, we broadcast our radio and television broadcasts without necessarily identifying our denomination.** But, with the idea in the back of his thinking that many of our teachings are poisonous and harmful to the audience,

he demanded that we must let people know who we are.

“Later, Martin spoke to 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’s 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.”—Statement by a General Conference Worker, March 1983 (from Appendix - 1 at the back of this present book).

Charles Fuller was a well-known religious radio speaker back in the mid-fifties. Walter R. Martin was also a Baptist. Yet he was not ordering Fuller to identify his broadcasts as Baptist!

Later meetings — The Evangelical meetings continued on for nearly two years. By the fall of 1955, both sides had agreed that each would publish a book exonerating Adventists in the eyes of the Evangelicals.

“Martin, in November 1955, reported talks with Pat Zondervan, who was to publish [Martin’s book], *The Truth about Seventh-day Adventism*, and was interested in the new direction the book was taking.”—T.E. Unruh, “The Seventh-day Adventist Evangelical Conferences of 1955-1956,” *Adventist Heritage*, Fourth Quarter, 1977.

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.**”—*Ibid.*

It is astounding but true, that **Martin also told Froom and Anderson that the Reformed (Calvinistic) denominations were seriously considering accepting the Adventist denomination as truly one with them in major doctrinal beliefs concerning the means of salvation!** (*ibid.*).

According to the Calvinists, do nothing and be saved! Your thoughts, words, and conduct have no effect on your salvation! —That is the point to which Martin believed we had arrived!

You will recall that E. Schuyler English published a favorable comment about Adventists after we changed Bible Readings. In late 1955, Froom corresponded with E. Schuyler English, editor of *Our Hope* magazine, who then published a February 1956 statement, that the Adventists were now Evangelicals (*ibid.*).

E. Schuyler English was a well-known Evangelical writer of the mid-fifties, and was considered important enough to be placed as chairman of the revision committee of the Scofield Bible.

A second two-day conference at the home of Barnhouse occurred in May 1956. At that gathering, **Barnhouse was shown a number of documents which Froom had patched together** from snippets here and there from the Spirit of Prophecy:

“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.”—Ibid.

It is very likely that what Barnhouse was shown may be that which later became Appendix A (pp. 641-646) and Appendix B (pp. 647-660) in Questions on Doctrine.

Few of us are aware of the fact that **Froom and Anderson actually read Barnhouse’s so-called “Bombshell” article, and his follow-up articles, before they were printed.**

“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.”—Donald Barnhouse, phone conversation to Al Hudson, May 16, 1958.

“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.”—Ibid.

Let us now consider these Eternity magazine articles which Froom and Anderson read prior to their publication:

THE NON-ADVENTIST MAGAZINE ARTICLES (September 1956 - January 1957)

Introduction — All the while that the Evangelical Conferences were in progress, not one word was mentioned to our people.

In August 1956, these eighteen months of meetings ended. Immediately afterward Barnhouse published the first announcement that anyone—in any denomination—had heard about what had been happening, or about the two books that were to be published shortly. It was the initial “Bombshell.”

Yet, after that, more months were to pass before even a peep or a mutter was heard from our team in Washington, D.C. **The GC seemed afraid to speak and did not know what to say—to announce to our own church any news of the biggest, fastest doctrinal sellout in our denominational history.**

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 striking contrast, the first inkling that the Adventist Church gave to its members of what was taking place did not appear until the December 1956 issue of Ministry magazine. And it was only a softtoned announcement, geared to the workers, rather than to church members.

Meanwhile, E. Schuyler English published a statement accepting us as Evangelicals in the November 1956 issue of his journal, Our Hope.

But more significant was the article that followed English's article, a few pages later in that same issue: a good-sized article by Walter R. Martin about Seventh-day Adventists, in which he said everyone should make "peace with the Adventists" because of their willingness to repudiate certain earlier doctrinal defects.

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 sellout was four Martin articles, one Barnhouse article, and the Martin book!** We never were officially accepted by established Protestantism, but we surely went the second doctrinal mile in our efforts to try to gain that acceptance. In the decades since then, our church leaders have repeatedly tried, through their Ecumenical connections, to draw closer to the other denominations, with a fair amount of success.

These Eternity articles by Barnhouse and Martin, along with Martin's book, The Truth about Seventh-day Adventism, contained four themes:

(1) **The strong push—almost a veiled threat—that the Adventists were 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, in September, especially brings this out. (3) Most important of all: **The Adventists were actually changing their beliefs.** (4) In several ways, these new beliefs of the Adventists were different from those which they formerly held as doctrinal truths.

And it may be added that **most of the common folk in our church still did not find out what was taking place** until someone slipped a copy of Elder Andreasen'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 into the new view, through the pages of Ministry magazine and in meetings Anderson and Fromm presented throughout the world field,—so they in turn could then indoctrinate their church members.

The fact that the doctrinal tornado hit Adventist leaders and pastors, with no mention of the actual changes being made to the church members, made the changeover all the more insidious.

Gradually, the new teachings were to replace our original ones; yet the average church members did not realize what was taking place. This had the effect of making the apostasy broad and deeply entrenched.

The Bombshell article (September 1956) — This first Eternity article about what was happening was the first inkling that many of our workers outside of Takoma Park had of what was taking place. **At the Seminary, next door to the General Conference building, it was all that we students could talk about.** Our teachers huddled in their offices discussing it.

In June 1956, I had started my second year of three years at the Seminary; and occasionally some of the professors mentioned some of the divisive points about **the atonement, the nature of Christ, and the error that Ellen White had nothing to do with formulating our beliefs.** But they were careful to adhere to the new positions approved by leadership. Other instructors

did not mention the errors at all.

Everyone at the Seminary, none of us excepted, quickly purchased copies of that September issue of Eternity magazine.

Here is part of an introductory statement on page 4 of this September issue:

“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 [Barnhouse], 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, Sept. 1956, p. 4.

Elsewhere in that issue was Barnhouse’s bombshell article. Because of its significance, I will quote extensively from it.

The article was entitled “Are Seventh-day Adventists Christians? A New Look at Seventh-day Adventism, by Donald Grey Barnhouse (Eternity magazine, pp. 6-7, 43, 45).

In his introductory statement (quoted above), Barnhouse himself called this a “Bombshell.” (Adventists quickly described this news release, about how our General Conference was changing our doctrines, as a “Bombshell” and a “blockbuster” article. Interestingly enough, it was also called a “blockbuster” by Barnhouse’s wife, Margaret, in her book, That Man Barnhouse (written after his death).

Here are key points in this article. Reading it, you can see why it struck us like a thunderclap:

“On a second visit he [Martin] 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 Sabbathkeeping 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 bookstore, 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 wild-eyed irresponsibles in every field of fundamental Christianity. This action of the Seventh-day Adventists was indicative of similar steps that were taken subsequently.”— Barnhouse, Are Seventh-day Adventists Christians? Eternity magazine, pp. 6-7.

Significantly, **it was obvious to Barnhouse that, in view of the new doctrinal changes by Adventists, they now held teachings very close to those of the Calvinists!**

“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.”—Ibid.

This would be understandable; for the Calvinists deny that man has anything to do with his salvation (“once saved, always saved”), while the new Adventist position is that the atonement was finished at the cross—and **we are saved entirely apart from any good or evil things we might do in this life. Conduct counts for nothing.**

What about that explosive statement by Barnhouse, quoted above, that any that held to those earlier beliefs belonged to a “lunatic fringe” in the church?

As mentioned earlier, **Froom and Anderson actually read Barnhouse’s so-called “Bombshell” article, and his follow-up articles, before they were printed.** Knight hints that they may have helped with some of the wording.

“The quoted words, ‘lunatic fringe’ and the other ideas in this quotation almost certainly came from the Adventist conferees. Unruh later wrote that ‘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.’ ”—T.E. Unruh, “The Seventh-day Adventist Evangelical Conferences of 1955-1956,” Adventist Heritage, Fourth Quarter, 1977.

“Beyond that positive statement from one of the Adventist participants [Unruh], **nowhere do we find the Adventist leaders arguing that the language was not theirs,**—even though Andreasen had claimed it was theirs in his Letters to the Churches (p. 15).”— QDAE, Introduction by Knight, p. xxxiv.

“According to Barnhouse, the Adventist leaders had told him and Martin that ‘the majority of the denomination has always **held’ the human nature of Christ ‘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 wild-eyed irresponsibles in every field of fundamental Christianity.”—Ibid., pp. xv-xvi.

Now, we will return to Barnhouse’s “Bombshell” article. **He had stated that Adventists believe that keeping the Bible Sabbath has nothing to do with salvation. If that is true, then it does not matter if we keep any part of the Ten Commandments!** We will still be saved. Truly, such a teaching is in- deed very close to Calvinism!

“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 [on this] **has no part whatsoever as a down payment or a part payment toward salvation** which they and we in common con- fess 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!...

“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 Sabbathkeeping 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.”**

Can you now see why this article struck like lightning out of a clear sky to those of our workers

who learned about it? In one fell swoop, **Barnhouse eliminated any significance in the Ten Commandments, the Bible Sabbath, the heavenly ministry of Christ, and the truth that Christ really took our human nature.**

“...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 Sabbathkeeping, 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.

“(3) And, 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, 43-45.

That concludes this initial article, which Barnhouse said was the first of four bombshell articles.

Bombshells do not improve things. They destroy property, kill people, and cripple those who survive. Martin and Barnhouse’s bombshells were destined to do the same thing:

(1) **Destroy the foundations of our basic beliefs**, which were our spiritual inheritance to be shared with the world, our entrusted property.

(2) **Kill the souls of men and women by teaching them that they can be saved in disobedience to God’s commands.**

(3) **Immensely cripple the efforts of the faithful who remain true to our original beliefs**, in their efforts to reintroduce them into the Adventist Church and vigorously carry them to the world. Prior to the 1950s, Seventh-day Adventists were conducting a strong evangelistic program throughout the world field; after that decade, we gradually fell into a slump, trying to hold our own but failing even to save most of our own children.

These first few Eternity articles were not accepted by a large number of Evangelicals and other Protestants.

“As a result of these initial articles by Barnhouse, “more than one-sixth of the approximately 35,000 *Eternity* subscribers canceled their subscriptions in protest.”—R.W. Schwarz, *Light Bearers to the Remnant*, p. 544.

“*Eternity* lost one-fourth of its subscribers in protest, and the sale of Martin’s books plummeted.”—T.E. Unruh, “The Seventh-day Adventist Evangelical Conferences of 1955-1956,” *Adventist Heritage*, Fourth Quarter, 1977.

This was confirmed by Kenneth Samples, who was a close associate of Walter Martin:

“Martin said that when they revealed their findings in several editions of Eternity magazine, 25 percent of the magazine’s subscribers withdrew their subscriptions.”—Kenneth Samples, formerly with Martin’s organization, in a presentation at the QD 50th Anniversary Conference, October 24-27, 2007.

Samples also mentioned that “following this announcement, Adventists were gradually invited to participate in Billy Graham’s crusades” (ibid.).

This accusation of a “lunatic fringe” was incredible when we take a quick look at those who did believe that Jesus took on Himself sinful flesh to live a sinless life. Consider the following list of prominent “lunatic” Adventist leaders: Francis Nichol, W.H. Branson, Don Neufeld (all living in Washington, D.C. during the 1950s, as well as a century of previous Adventist leaders), including E.J. Waggoner, A.T. Jones, S.N. Haskell, W.W. Prescott, Uriah Smith, M.C. Wilcox, G.W. Reaser, G.B. Thompson, M.E. Kern, C.M. Snow, C.P. Bollman, Mead MacGuire, C.B. Haynes, I.H. Evans, L.A. Wilcox, William Wirth, E.F. Hackman, A.G. Daniells, Oscar Tait, Allen Walker, Merlin Neff, W.E. Howell, Gwynne Dalrymple, T.M French, J.L. McElhany, C. Lester Bond, E.K. Slade, J.E. Fulton, D.H. Kress, Frederick Lee, L.H. Wood, A.V. Olson, Christian Edwardson, J.C. Stevens, F.M. Wilcox, A.W. Truman, F.G. Clifford, Varner Johns, Dallas Young, J.B. Conley, Fenton Edwin Froom (L.E. Froom’s son), W.E. Read, J.A. McMillan, Benjamin Hoffman, H.L. Rudy, plus the writings of M.L. Andreasen and hundreds of statements that Ellen White unambiguously wrote.

“Clad in the vestments of humanity, the Son of God came down to the level of those He wished to save. In Him was no guile or sinfulness; He was ever pure and undefiled; yet He took upon Him our sinful nature.”— Review and Herald, December 15, 1896.

“He took upon His sinless nature our sinful nature that He might know how to succor those that are tempted.”—Medical Ministry, 181.

Martin’s October 1956 Eternity article — Aside from a repeat of what Barnhouse had earlier written, **here is the only statement of special significance about this in Martin’s first Eternity article:**

“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 [she is in agreement with Evangelicals].**”—Martin, “Seventh- day Adventism: Its Historical Development from Chris- tian Roots,” Eternity, October 1956.

Martin’s November 1956 Eternity article — Now we turn to the second of Walter Martin’s three articles in Eternity magazine. It bore a lengthy title: “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?”

Near the beginning of the article, Martin says this:

“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.”—Ibid.

This is followed by a five-paragraph statement from the forthcoming book, Questions on Doctrine, repudiating our basic beliefs on the atonement and the nature of Christ.

Later in this article, **Martin says that only 20% of the current Adventist books in print are truly safe, doctrinally; but that Adventist Church leaders are busily amending or eliminating the rest! Now that is a bombshell all on its own!**

Here is his statement:

“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.”—Ibid.

So in this article, which is ostensibly recommending the Adventists and their revised beliefs to the other churches,—he is actually warning those other churches to beware of what Adventists print!

Martin mentions that the new book by Adventists will be printed “in the early months of 1957.” But QD did not come off the press until October of that year. Froom was busy revising the many corrections which the Review editors vainly tried to make in it.

Martin also reveals another fact: As you may know, **most Adventist commentators on QD state that they have no idea who wrote the book.** Well, the facts already presented, plus my statement on what I found in his office make it clear that Froom wrote it. (See “Statement by a Seminary Student” in an Appendix of this present book.) Notice what Martin says:

“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...

“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.”—Ibid.

Very significantly, **Martin was also told by Froom and Anderson that only Hiram Edson and**

“early Adventists” believed that there was a Sanctuary in heaven! Our men were speaking direct mistruths to him! In a court of law, these words would be called “lies.” (See Great Controversy, chapter 23, pp. 409- 422.)

“In [Hiram] Edson’s mind [on October 24, 1844] 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.”—Walter R. Martin, “What Seventh-day Adventists Really Believe,” Eternity, November 1956, pp. 20, 21, 38-43.

E. Schuyler English’s November 1956 Our Hope article —In this article, English did a total turnaround, and accepted us as fellow Evangelicals:

“The editor once held, with many of our beloved reader-family, that Seventh-day Adventism is heretical and not Christian. Investigation that has lasted through- out nearly a year has convinced us that we were mistaken, that **SDA-ism has been undergoing a change** through the past decade, and that there are many brethren in Christ who are within the fold of Adventism.”— E. Schuyler English, Our Hope, November 1956, p. 271.

The December 1956 Time magazine article — Three months after the bombshell article, **Time magazine declared the conferences to be a great event**, which brought healing between the fundamentalist wing of Evangelicals and the Adventists. It also stated that **the Adventists had “announced that they would publish—probably next spring— a new, definitive statement of their faith”** (“Peace with the Adventists,” Time, December 31, 1956, pp. 48-49). Questions on Doctrine was not published until late October of 1957.

Martin’s January 1957 Eternity article —Two months later, the third of Martin’s three Eternity articles was printed. It was entitled “The Truth about Seventh-day Adventism: Adventist Theology vs. Historic Orthodoxy. Are there serious differences concerning cardinal doctrines of Christianity?”

The only significant item I found in this entire article was a statement that **only “early members” of the Adventist Church believed they were the remnant**. But all through the later decades, and at the present time—they believe that lots of other Chris- tians are also part of the remnant. **However, Revelation 12:17 clearly identifies the remnant as only those who keep the commandments of God.**

“(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, ‘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*, Jan. 1957, pp. 12-13, 38-40.

Did you know that all the churches are part of the last-day remnant? That is what the above statement said.

Barnhouse’s November 1957 Eternity article — Ten months later, Barnhouse wrote the next *Eternity* article about the Adventists. In it, **he announced that Questions on Doctrine had been printed**. He also stated that Martin’s book was being published “at the same time.” In reality, **Martin’s The Truth about Seventh-day Adventism was not printed until over two years later, in 1960**. Here are the significant portions of this article:

“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 . . . **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.”—“Postscript on Seventh-day Adventism.” *Eternity*, November 1957, pp. 22, 23, 45.

Here are the other interesting paragraphs:

“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....

“The most serious charge ever made against the Adventists has arisen out of a series of booklets written by one of their former workers [Andreasen] 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."—Ibid.

THE ADVENTIST MAGAZINE ARTICLES (December 1956 - April 1960)

Introduction to the seven articles — Oddly enough, Froom and Anderson waited until **December 1956**—three months after Barnhouse's "Bombshell" article—before they mentioned a word of it in print, and **the first several articles were only published in Ministry magazine, which was sent out to pastors and church leaders.** Apparently, their consistent plan was to indoctrinate church workers first.

In this first Ministry article, printed in December 1956, **R.A. Anderson mentioned for the first time the revision in Bible Readings**, and gave as the reason why that earlier change, back in 1949, had been made,—because non-Adventists did not like it! He said it this way:

"In fact, this particular point in Adventist theology had drawn severe censure from many outstanding Biblical scholars both inside and outside our ranks."— R.A. Anderson, Ministry magazine, September 1956.

Anderson went on to state the idea, that on His human side Christ partook of man's sinful, fallen nature was eliminated from Bible Readings because it did not represent our "true position."

In this same December 1956 issue of Ministry magazine, in which he disclosed for the first time the change made in the 1940s in Bible Readings, **Anderson also recommended the Appendix B inclusion as completely reliable and trustworthy**— when in reality, upon careful examination, it was later considered by many to be scholarly fraud.

"It provides 'as full coverage of this subject as can be found in the writings of Ellen White...' As far as we have been able to discover, **this compilation faithfully represents the thinking of the messenger of the Lord** on this question. A few other statements have been found, but these are either repetitions or mere verbal variations, and add no new thought."—R.A. Anderson, Ministry, September 1956.

That was a totally false statement. It is very likely that Froom wrote it, since he is the one that prepared that Spirit of Prophecy compilation.

Froom not only placed Appendix B (a Spirit of Prophecy compilation on the human nature of Christ) into the back of the forthcoming Questions on Doctrine,—**but he also quietly slipped it into the back of the later Volume 7A of the Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary (also entitling it Appendix B).** —Yet he did this without the Commentary editors ever knowing about that inclusion in advance!

In 1972, Appendix B was significantly revised by the Review in order to remove some of its flaws.

More on that later.

Anxious to make sure that he would not cause trouble, Froom wrote President Figuhr a month after the first meeting with Martin and his associates:

“Some of the statements are a bit different from what you might anticipate . . . If you knew the backgrounds, the attitudes, the setting of it all, you would understand why we stated these things as we have.”— L.E. Froom letter to President R.R. Figuhr, April 26, 1955.

Froom was well-aware of the radical changes he was making in our beliefs, and quotations from the Spirit of Prophecy.

Froom’s December 1956 Ministry article — Entitled “The Atonement the Heart of Our Message,” this was the very first article published by our denomination about the Evangelical Conferences! Yet it only gave a bare hint of what was taking place, and came months after Barnhouse’s bombshell and Andreasen’s papers were circulating widely.

The message of the article was that some had not been teaching the correct view about the atonement. Here are a few of its key points. Remember that **while this is the very first intimation published by the General Conference—it was only printed in a journal which went to pastors and leaders.** This “editorial” states that the problem had been that our church rarely wrote on the subject of the atonement and the Sanctuary, so they were not understood well!

“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.... 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....

“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 ...

“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 only a group of Christian theologians [sic., only by one person, Martin] 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 [not true].

"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, Ministry magazine, December 1956, pp. 15-17.

Repeatedly, false statements are made in these articles.

Ministry Editorial, April 1957 —Entitled "Adventism's New Milestone," this first of a series of unsigned Ministry editorials bragged about the "new milestone" which was being attained by our church, without saying much about what it was, except that it was going to bring us closer to the Evangelical churches.

"When the incarnate God broke into human history and became one with the race, it is our understanding that **He possessed the sinlessness of the nature with which Adam was created in Eden . . . He was indeed a man, but withal He was God manifested in the flesh.** True, He took our human nature, that is, our physical form, but He did not possess our sinful propensities."— Ministry, April 1957.

They even got Louise Kleuser, head of our denominational Bible workers at the time, to write a comment on this "milestone" mentioned in the unsigned editorial. In that same April 1957 issue, which was released after Martin and Barnhouse had accepted the answers provided by Froom and Anderson, she said that the soon-to-be-published Questions on Doctrine was going to be "a new milestone" in the history of the Adventist Church.

Ministry Editorial, June 1957 —Also unsigned, this next editorial carried the title, "Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine." **It announced that QD was about to be published (although that did not happen until four months later, in October).**

Unruh told the number of months (eighteen) that the Evangelical conferences lasted, but **this editorial was the only place that told the actual number of times that Martin and/or Barnhouse met with them (sixteen).** Several times Froom or Anderson wrote about how they worked together for months to hammer out those replies. Now we know that it was Froom and Anderson that worked feverishly most of those 18 months. They were trying to divide the Word of God into small enough pieces to be satisfactory to Martin.

Assuming that Martin stayed for two days each time he came, this would mean he only stopped by once every two months or so.

"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 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 . .

“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.”—Ministry Editorial, June 1957.

The present writer would like to here state that he never saw such a room anywhere in the General Conference building at that time, and he entered or saw inside all of them back then! It would have had to be a sizeable room, and it had to be filled with book shelves. No such room existed there at that time. There was no library there. Froom’s office had no library, and the room next door on the right, where the office of Ministry magazine was located at that time, had only a small bookcase. All of the Ministerial Association offices were located on the second floor of the GC at that time. I cleaned all of them, night after night, for months. (See “Statement by a Seminary Student” in Appendix - 2 of this present book.) Perhaps they met in the GC Executive Committee room on the second floor, or the chapel in the basement, although neither was lined with books. On one occasion, I was in the GC chapel for a special meeting and it had no book shelves.

“In order to make the work more articulate, these visitors prepared a list of important questions covering the main features of our faith. They desired clear and comprehensive answers. **They began with about twenty questions, which soon grew to thirty-three, and later to approximately sixty ...** 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 Adventism.*”—Ibid.

Froom had elsewhere stated that, not twenty, but forty questions were presented by Martin at that first March 1955 meeting, to which he wrote a 20-page reply that evening.

Mrs. Cox’s December 1957 Ministry article — It is highly significant that **both this and the next article were the first to be printed after QD came off the press** earlier in 1957, which could be considered in support of that book. Yet both articles appear to have been written by non-Adventists.

Froom and Anderson had to scrounge around in order to find something which could support their errors. They only managed to locate two; this one and the next, both of which were in the December 1957 issue of Ministry. Shedd was a well-known Protestant commentator; “Mrs. Cox” may have been a non-Adventist also. That which she has to say does not sound like something an Adventist would write.

This ministry article, entitled “The Immaculate Christ,” was strange because it tried to split the human nature of Christ into two pieces. The complicated wording of this “Mrs. Cox” article sounds like something Froom would write.

“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 of God’s pure Spirit? To say that Christ took a sinless nature from Mary (as the Catholics do), **or 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 . . . Surely no dogmatic restriction of mortal man can set a limit to the Spirit’s power in her and through her....

“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).”—Mrs. Ernest W. Cox, *The Ministry* magazine, December 1957, pp. 9-10.

Paul is here referring to how Christ thought and acted; how He was born and how He lived are two different things. He was born with a nature like ours, but in that nature, He never once sinned.

“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.’ ”—Ibid.

It is of the highest significance, that Froom and Anderson could not locate even one quotation by an Adventist that taught the strange errors in this issue of Ministry magazine.

W.G.T. Shedd's December 1957 Ministry statement —We now come to the second strange article in this December issue. It was odd in that it consisted of a reprint from an article written by a non-Adventist theologian. **Froom and Anderson had to go outside our church in order to find someone who taught doctrines which had never been in our church. They surely had to dig around in the trash cans of modern Protestant theology in order to come up with this.**

Entitled "The Theanthropic Nature of Christ," this article is a reprint of a portion of Shedd's 3-Volume set. Shedd also wrote Sermons to the Natural Man and The Doctrine of Endless Punishment, in which he extolled the merits of eternal torment.

The paragraph below was a bracketed statement by the Ministry editor. It was immediately followed by Shedd's statement:

"[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.]"

Worldly theologians use complicated words and logic to hide the fact that their theories are not Scriptural, and so the reader will consider them very wise.

From Dr. Shedd: "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: Curdeus homo, II. Vii....

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

This next paragraph declares that Christ had a composite human nature, which consisted of lots of different people, making Him different than normal humans!

"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."—Ibid.

The next paragraph by Shedd says that this “complex person” theory originated with the

Catholics! All through Shedd’s statement, we find the theological confusion of modern, liberal theology. It is written in a style intended to confuse and overwhelm the mind into thinking that Shedd is a brilliant man.

“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, without 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 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.

Some people use big words to convey shallow thoughts, while other people, like Ellen White, use simple words to present deep truths.

Ministry Editorial, March 1958 —After the first Ministry article by Froom (in December 1957), all the rest (four in all) that followed it are unsigned “editorials.” **Apparently, Froom received so many complaints from that first one, that it was thought best that the rest should be anonymous.**

This was the first editorial to be issued after the publication of QD (almost half a year after it was printed!), and bore the title of “Unity of Adventist Belief.” **It stated that all (all!) of the “250 denominational leaders” who received advanced copies of QD fully approved it and “no change in content was called for.”** Such a claim is astounding! It goes on to say that, **since then, expressions of heartfelt gratitude” have poured in** from all over the world field, praising the GC for printing that book! Considering the errors which were blatantly taught in that book, this has to be a fabrication. Here are the key paragraphs:

“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...

“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.”—“Unity of Adventist Belief,” The Ministry magazine, March 1958, pp. 28-29.

Totally, totally untrue!

Figuhr’s April 1960 Review article — Finally, 43 months after Barnhouse’s bombshell article shocked our church, and 30 months after QD came off the press—at last—an article was printed in the Review for our people to read! —But it was not about the QD, but about Martin’s new book.

Entitled “The President’s Page: The General Conference President Speaks to the Church.” This very brief April 1960 article is about the recently published book, The Truth about Seventh-day Adventism, by Walter Martin. Here are key portions:

“The author [of TASDA] 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...

“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... 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... 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.

What did this first article in the Review for all our people to read actually say? (1) Someone else’s book is soon to be published. (2) No mention of what it says. (3) Still no mention of QD (published nearly two years earlier) or what it teaches. Add to this the fact that the GC refused to sell TASDA in our bookstores. It appears that the ongoing objective was to keep our people in ignorance until their pastors had become fully indoctrinated with the new errors.

“That bold QOD heading, “[Christ] Took Sinless Human Nature” certainly removes any credibility from General Conference President Reuben Figuhr’s assertion that, while QOD presented the Seventh-day Adventist beliefs in language understood by Evangelicals, “there has been no attempt to gloss over our teachings or to compromise.”—Larry Kirkpatrick, QD 50th Anniversary Conference.

The previous two sections of excerpts from non-Adventist and Adventist journals were purposely kept together, in order to show the continuity of their messages. We will now go back in time to just after the Evangelical Conferences ended, when preparation of Questions on Doctrine began in earnest.

DURING PREPARATION OF QUESTIONS ON DOCTRINE (1956-1957)

Personnel at the Review deeply concerned — **Froom was busily writing and rewriting the draft for the forthcoming book**; all the while he and Anderson kept publishing articles in Ministry, assuring our workers that all was well.

The original version of QD was even more blatantly erroneous than that which was later published in book form.

“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!’** ”— Statement by a General Conference Worker, March 1983 (from Appendix - 1 at the back of this present book).

But, of course, watering the error down with additional truth, as ultimately occurred, only made the finished book more insidious—and able to mislead all who read it.

So much switching back and forth occurred during the preparation of QD that the editors at the Review, just across the alley from the General Conference building, were deeply concerned. They would repeatedly try to correct exaggerations, omissions, and outright mistruths; yet the errors would be placed right back in again. The only main correction they were able to get into QD was that a **complete “sacrificial atonement,”** instead of complete atonement” was made at the cross. **But this mingling of truth with error had the effect of causing many who read the statements to consider the errors as possibly true.**

Francis D. Nichol, editor of the Review and Herald magazine, **wrote a confidential letter to President Figuhr.** In it he said that some statements were being made to Martin which “many of us, on mature consideration, are unable to support.” He feared that Froom and Anderson had “either not sensed, as they should, the full import of most distinctive doctrinal differences with the world or else, unwittingly, succumbed to the temptation to blur deficiencies in order to find a middle ground of fellowship” (quoted in Julius Nam, “Reactions to the Seventh-day Adventist Evangelical Conferences and Questions on Doctrine 1955-1971,” p. 255).

But, consistently, in spite of repeated attempts by the editors at the Review to edit out the problems, Froom and Anderson always won. Ignoring all advice, Froom wrote in the Introduction to QD, these words: “These answers represent the position of our denomination . . . This volume can be viewed as truly representative” (Questions on Doctrine, 1957 edition, p. 8).

The pathway by which these men destroyed our church is littered with outright lies.

Raymond Cottrell, one of the associate editors at the Review, wrote a letter to L.E. Froom shortly after he, Froom, gave a presentation to the workers at the Southwestern Union Conference, in which he emphasized that the atonement was completed on the cross.

“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... that the emphasis is in the wrong place. **Paul stated that the central features of the work of atonement and the plan of salvation is seen in our High Priest ministering in the Sanctuary above...** 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...**

“It would appear that in your numerous conversations with 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 which our heavenly Father cannot approve.”—Raymond F. Cottrell, Letter to L.E. Froom, February 23, 1958.

Cottrell also wrote this:

“Let us be certain that nothing gets into the proposed book that will take us the next 50 years to live down.”—Ibid.

October 2007 was fifty years later, and the effects of QD continue to weaken our courage and damage our very morals. The errors slipped in back then have spread through our church body like a virulent cancer.

In a 2008 book which he wrote, Douglass, who was on that Review editorial team, wrote this:

“I remember it as if it were yesterday **when the QD trio finally told the Review and Herald editing committee on January 30, 1957, that ‘no more editing would be permitted.’** From that time forward, the publishing house ‘accepted the manuscript on a text basis,’ that is, the publishing house would not be providing any editorial oversight, but simply would serve as a printer and distributor. Thus they would not be held responsible for its content.”—H.E. Douglass, A Fork in the Road, p. 37; quoting T.E. Unruh, “The Seventh-day Adventist Evangelical Conferences of 1955-1956,” Adventist Heritage, Fourth Quarter, 1977.

But, nowhere in the book was that fact mentioned; and, since the Review printed the book, readers assumed their editorial staff had carefully checked it over.

“That morning in the Commentary office, Raymond Cottrell left the room and returned with a towel over his left arm and a basin of water in his right. Then each of us on the Commentary staff took turns washing our hands of anymore input or responsibility for QD. We didn’t know then the full implications of what we were doing together around that basin!”—H.E. Douglass, A Fork in the Road, p. 37.

“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 [i.e, without any further editing on their part]. And on January 30, the executive committee of the publishing house accepted the

manuscript for publication on a ‘text basis.’”—T.E. Unruh, “The Seventh-day Adventist Evangelical Conferences of 1955-1956,” *Adventist Heritage*, Fourth Quarter, 1977.

Consider the facts: In **August 1956**, the Evangelical Conferences ended, and Froom began sending 8 1/2 x 11 printed sheets of QD to the Review and to the world field for checking. In **January 1957**, by GC “executive order” (i.e., from Figuhr), all further checking of QD ended. After that, Froom continued revising and reworking QD for more months. In **June 1957**, a Ministry magazine editorial said QD was about to be published. But then Froom decided to go back and work the book over still more. Finally, in late **October 1957**, QD was finally published.

Never, anywhere in the book, or at any other time—was the authorship of QD mentioned. It was always stated that a “**representative group of Seventh-day Adventist leaders, Bible teachers, and editors**” produced it. **In reality, it was Leroy Edwin Froom who wrote the book—all of it.**

The entire book, QD, had the special, unique writing style to be found in Froom’s four-volume *Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers*, his two-volume *Conditionalist Faith of Our Fathers*, and his *Movement of Destiny*. — **It was Froom who wrote Questions on Doctrine!**

Andreasen begins publishing — Milian Lauritz Andreasen (1876-1962). **Beginning with a paper he wrote on February 15, 1957, Andreasen wrote paper after paper in condemnation of what was happening** until just before his death. He was 81 years old when he started, and 86 when he died. He had earlier been the denomination’s leading expert on the Sanctuary service. And he had written numerous articles and at least 16 books, including *The Sanctuary Service*, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, *A Faith to Live By*, *The Faith of Jesus*, *What Can a Man Believe*, and *Saints and Sinners*.

“The most vocal critic was M.L. Andreasen, longtime educator, and for many years a respected instructor in the Adventist Seminary. Andreasen claimed to have discovered seventeen ‘divergencies’ from accepted Seventh-day Adventist doctrine in *Questions on Doctrine*. In the main, these clustered around the role of Christ as priest, a complete atonement being made at the cross, and the divine-human nature of Christ.”—R.W. Schwarz, *Light Bearers to the Remnant*, p. 545 (italics his).

Heaven values men and women who will stand up and be counted in a crisis, who will defend God’s truth when it is being trampled by those intent on modernizing the faith. Are you such a man or woman? Will you be faithful to God’s Word, the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy, to the end?

“Andreasen, who had been the denomination’s most influential theologian and theological writer in the late 1930s and throughout the 1940s, had been left out of the process in both the formulation of the answers and the critiquing of them, even though he had been generally viewed as an authority on several of the disputed points.”—QDAE, xxiii.

It was not until Andreasen read Barnhouse’s September 1956 bombshell article that he fully realized what was taking place back at the General Conference. Not only were certain of our most precious doctrines under attack, but those who denied them were said to be part of the “lunatic fringe” of the church! Froom’s words in a later article appalled this champion of truth:

“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, Ministry, February 1957, p. 10.

Another statement by Froom was repeatedly referred to in Andreasen’s letters:

“The sacrificial act on the cross [is] **a complete, perfect, and final atonement for man’s sins.**”—Froom, quoted in M.L. Andreasen, “The Atonement,” February 15, 1957; “A Review and Protest,” October 15, 1957.

Central to Andreasen’s view of the atonement was a division of it into “three phases.” The first phase related **to Christ’s living a perfectly sinless life, which provided an example of how we are also to live** in obedience to God’s commandments.

The second phase was **His self-sacrificing death on the cross on our behalf.**

“In the third phase, **Christ demonstrates that man can do what He did, with the same help He had. This phase includes His session at the right hand of God,** His priestly ministry, and the final exhibition of His saints in their last struggle with Satan, and their glorious victory . . . [italics ours]

“The third phase is now in progress in the Sanctuary above and in the church below. Christ broke the power of Satan by His death. **He is now eliminating and destroying sin in His saints on earth. This is part of the cleansing of the true Sanctuary.**”—M.L. Andreasen, The Book of Hebrews, pp. 59-60, cf. 68.

This “last generation” position of Andreasen is that Christ is the example of what can be accomplished in the lives of His followers. They can be overcomers to the fullest extent! A chapter at the back of his The Sanctuary Service, entitled The Last Generation, specifically dealt with this. The final generation of God’s people (those who go through the final crisis and the great time of trouble) will be total overcomers in the battle with temptation and sin.

What a glorious privilege has been extended to our people! Yet Froom and Anderson tried to exchange it for the friendship of just three men: Martin, Barnhouse, and English.

On March 11, 1957, M.L. Andreasen expressed his deep concern in a letter to the General Conference president:

“If the book [QD] is published, there will be repercussions to the end of the earth, that the foundations are being removed.”—M.L. Andreasen, March 11, 1957, letter to R.R. Figuhr, quoted in QDAE, p. xxi.

About the only response he received was an April 1957 Ministry article, which trumpeted the developing Evangelical recognition of the Adventists as a “thrilling chapter in the history of Adventism.”

Andreasen, a theology expert of many years’ experience, recognized the terrible results that would follow such a publication by the General Conference. A little over three months later, he sent a second letter:

“If the officers condone the action of these men, **if these men are permitted to author or**

approve of the book to be published, I must protest, and shall feel justified by voice or pen to reveal this conspiracy against God and His people... **It is in your hand to split the denomination or heal it.**—M.L. Andreasen, June 21, 1957, letter to R.R. Figuhr, QDAE, p. xxi.

Two weeks later, Andreasen again wrote to Figuhr.

“It is hard to concentrate while Rome is burning, or rather **while the enemy is destroying the foundations** on which we have built these many years. The very essence of our message, that there is now in the Sanctuary above going on a work of judgment, of atonement, is being discarded. Take that away, and you take Adventism away . .

“To me, Brother Figuhr, this is the greatest apostasy this denomination has ever faced, and it will surely divide the people. It is not one or two men who are advocating this monstrous proposition, but a ‘group’ of General Conference men, plus a number of ‘Bible students’ with whom they are conferring.”—M.L. Andreasen, July 4, 1957, letter to R.R. Figuhr, QDAE, p. xxi.

The above sentence reveals that even Andreasen had been deceived by the Ministry articles into thinking that many men were responsible for making those changes—when it was only Froom and Anderson, working closely with Martin.

Froom may have been the ghost writer for many of Figuhr’s articles. Over the years—important and very busy—our church leaders have frequently had capable writers on their payroll who produced journal articles whenever they requested them.

This would help explain why Figuhr could sometimes take one position in print, and another in his speeches. Here is a paragraph emphasizing the importance of Christ’s work in the heavenly Sanctuary, which was written after the release of Questions on Doctrine:

“The sole hope of our salvation is 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.”— R.R. Figuhr, address at the 1958 General Conference Session, printed in the Review, June 23, 1958, p. 56.

On September 12, 1957, Andreasen sent Figuhr an ultimatum, that he would go public the first week of October with his concerns “unless I receive word from you that you will consider that matter at or before the Autumn Council.” On October 15, he mailed out his “Review and Protest” article.

On March 9, 1958, after QD came off the press, Andreasen wrote:

“I weep for my people. This is the apostasy foretold long ago... I have counted the cost it will be to me to continue my opposition; but I am trying to save my beloved denomination from committing suicide. I must be true to my God, as I see it, and I must be true to the men that trust me.”— M. L. Andreasen, letter to Figuhr, March 9, 1958.

Andreasen ultimately published nine widely circulated papers in late 1957 and early 1958 under the general title of “The Atonement.” That was followed in 1959 by a second series, called “Letters to the Churches,” which was later published as a 100-page booklet by the same name.

As we look back on the situation today, a key problem was that **there was only one man at the time who would stand up and be counted! If 10,000 Adventists had been as resolute as Andraesen was, perhaps our church today would still have its original, pure beliefs.**

PUBLICATION OF QUESTIONS ON DOCTRINE (October 1957)

The book that changed the Adventist Church—It was not until late October 1957 that Questions on Doctrine was finally printed.

Hoping to dampen the expected storm of protest the book was likely to generate, **Froom wrote in its Introduction that it only contained our standard beliefs.** Here are several of his astounding statements:

“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 . .

“**These answers represent the position of our denomination** in the area of church doctrine and prophetic interpretation.”—QD, p. 8 (italics his).

“The writers, counselors, and editors who produced the answers to these questions have labored conscientiously to state accurately the beliefs of Seventh-day Adventists.”—QD, pp. 8-9.

“**The answers in this volume are an expansion of our doctrinal positions** contained in the official statement of Fundamental Beliefs.”—QD, p. 9.

The publication of that book sent a shock wave through the leadership of our church, which has reverberated into every aspect of church life and morality in the years since then. Questions on Doctrine clearly repudiates some of our earlier teachings, while using deceptive reasoning, such as the following, to explain it away:

“One thing in the series of previous Adventist clarifications and rectifications [sic.]... 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.”—Questions on Doctrine, pp. 481-482.

“But they [the Ecumenicals] insisted, unless and until these 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 . . That surely called for a disavowal.

“Their point could scarcely be gainsaid—that **the early erroneous concepts of a minority clearly needed to be repudiated.**”—Questions on Doctrine, p. 483.

“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.”— Questions on Doctrine, p. 32.

All the while that they were giving our church beliefs into the hands of Calvinists, they lied about what they were doing—both their objectives and their actions.

Looking back at the wreckage produced — In later years, viewing the damage that Questions on Doctrine had wrought to our doctrines and standards since its initial publication, many were aghast. **All of the following remarkable statements were written about 50 years after the initial publication of Questions on Doctrine.** The devastation which the book produced has continued on for decades, and still divides our church today.

“Questions on Doctrine **raises uncertainties about what Adventists actually believed**—that made the Evangelical era that followed the most destabilizing in the church’s history.”—Malcolm Bull and Keither Lockhart, Seeking a Sanctuary, 2007, p. 106.

“Questions on Doctrine... **alienated various factions of the church theologically.** The publication of Questions on Doctrine **did more than any other single event in Adventist history to create what appears to be permanently warring factions within the denomination.**”—George R. Knight, January 2003, quoted on the third page of the 2003 Annotated Edition of Questions on Doctrine.

“Questions on Doctrine . . . is a volume that has stood at the very center of Adventist theological dialogue since the 1950s, **setting the stage for ongoing theological tension.**”—George Knight, Questions on Doctrine, Annotated Edition, p xi.

“Questions on Doctrine easily qualifies as **the most divisive book in Seventh-day Adventist history.** A book published to help bring peace between Adventism and conservative Protestantism, its release brought prolonged alienation and separation to the Adventist factions that grew up around it.”—George Knight, QDAE, xiii.

“It appears that **much of the doctrinal controversy that divided Adventists into competing ‘traditional’ versus ‘Evangelical’ camps** in the 1970s and 1980s can be traced to issues addressed in that book.”—Kenneth R. Samples, a Baptist formerly a staff member in Martin’s organization, in a presentation at the Andrews University QD Conference on October 25, 2007.

“Following its [QD’s] publication, M.L. Andreasen, a respected Adventist scholar severely criticized QD, stating that **in his opinion it had sold Adventism down the river to the Evangelicals.** Several years later, under Robert Pierson’s administration, two prominent scholars, Kenneth Wood and Herbert Douglass, declared that **the publishing of QD had been a major mistake.**”— Kenneth Samples (one of Martin’s close associates in the 1970s), “From Controversy to Crisis: An Updated Assessment of Seventh-day Adventism,” Christian Research Journal, Summer, 1988, p. 12. (This journal is published by Martin’s anti-cult organization, the Christian Research Institute.)

“**With the Evangelical courtship of the 1950s, the Adventist leaders started something the extent of which they did not anticipate. The traditional Adventist landscape was being radically changed...** Good intentions and the enormous energy invested in the project could not compensate for the secrecy, theological revisionism, and heavy-handedness surrounding the book.”—Larry Kirkpatrick, QD 50th Anniversary Conference.

“I believe that the Evangelical dialogues and publication of Questions on Doctrine created

a climate in the church favorable to criticism, suspicion, uncertainty, rumor, and a loss of confidence in leadership.”—Kenneth H. Wood.

Thoughtful men, such as Merlin Neff and Richard Lewis, both book editors at the Pacific press, expressed urgent concerns in defense of Andreasen. M.E. Kern, GC administrator speaking for others, was deeply concerned.

North American leaders, such as R.R. Bietz [later Pacific Union Conference president], **predicted a great disaster ahead, declaring that ‘a tornado was yet to come.’**

As for Froom himself, looking back on the situation from a vantage point **14 years later, he happily wrote that even the Catholics loved QD:**

“Catholic Writer Cites Questions—In mid-December, 1965, a 24-page Roman Catholic booklet appeared (The Seventh Day Adventists) 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.”—L.E. Froom, Movement of Destiny (1971), p. 490.

And, he added, so did the World Council of Churches:

“Cited 28 times in WCC Ecumenical Review—Another striking example of scholarly acceptance and reliance upon Questions on Doctrine for an authoritative portrayal of Adventism appeared in The Ecumenical Review, official organ of the World Council of Churches, edited by Dr. W.A. Visser’t Hooft, longtime general secretary of the WCC.”—L.E. Froom, Movement of Destiny (1971), p. 491.

Walter E. Read retires (1958) — Only a year after Questions on Doctrine was finally printed, W.E. Read decided to retire. We are told that he was prematurely worn-out from the back-and-forth controversy over the Evangelical Conferences and the book it resulted in. Although only a minor figure in the discussions, Read was blamed, along with Anderson and Froom, for the changes which had been made in our beliefs.

However, in the seclusion of retirement, Read regained much of his strength—so that he did not pass away until 18 years later, in 1976 at the age of 93. He had a longer life span than any of the other key men involved in the QD crisis.

Spreading the book everywhere — Questions on Doctrine was first printed by the denomination in late October 1957. Only 5,000 copies were in this initial print run.

But those were not the last copies to be printed; for **Froom and Anderson planned for an immense print run**, which would lower the cost to our people and then let the General Conference subsidize free copies to Protestant seminaries and church leaders throughout the world! (Yet it would be over two years later that the first mention of QD would be made in an article in the Review.)

About a month after the publication of QD, Andreasen, shattered by what he found in the book, wrote this letter to Elder Figuhr: “I am grieved at heart, deeply grieved, at the work your advisers have recommended. The unity of the denomination is being broken up, and still Questions on Doctrine is being circulated and recommended. It must promptly be

repudiated and recalled, if the situation is to be saved.”—M.L. Andreasen, December 3, 1957, letter to R.R. Figuhr, QDAE, p. xxi.

Unknown to Andreasen, nearly a month earlier, **on November 6, a letter went out over Elder Figuhr’s signature to all the union conference presidents** in North America. **He appealed for large group orders** that would amount to between 100,000 to 200,000 copies. **Froom and Anderson’s plan was to smother the opposition** by blanketing the Adventist denomination with low-cost copies of the book.

A month-and-a-half later, a second letter was mailed to church leaders that a second print run would be for 50,000 copies. But that was soon increased to 100,000, **as the leaders recognized that, in spite of Andreasen’s published booklets, it was best for them to fall into line** and give QD the large circulation that the GC requested.

R.A. Anderson, who was extremely influential, had arranged for thousands of free copies to be mailed to every Christian college and seminary in the world.

“In September [1957], the [General Conference] officers recorded a series of [committee] 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 four-page 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.”—T.E. Unruh, “The Seventh-day Adventist Evangelical Conferences of 1955-1956,” Adventist Heritage, Fourth Quarter, 1977.

By 1970, Froom estimated that the total circulation had exceeded 138,000 copies. The book by that time had a worldwide circulation (L.E. Froom, Movement of Destiny, 1971, p. 492).

“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, Movement of Destiny (1971), p. 492.

To our knowledge, **Elder Theodore Carcich, president of the Central Union Conference, was the only church leader who would dare to ultimately refuse to accede to the pressure.** He refused to permit the book to be sold within his territory. A powerful man with deep convictions, he determined to stand for the right though the heavens fall. (About 1954, I had been confidentially told by one of my teachers in college that the GC had blocked the chances for Carcich to ever move up to a higher position in the church because he refused to be a yes-man.)

Over two years after its initial publication, Elder Carcich had witnessed the turmoil that Questions on Doctrine was causing in the field. So, in March 1960, he sent this letter to his conference presidents:

“Under a guise of sweet-honeyed words oozing with so-called Christian fellowship, **Mr. Martin proceeds to serve up the same theological hash... that our spiritual forefathers had to**

refute years ago.—Theodore Carcich, letter dated March 24, 1960, to all presidents within the Central Union Conference.

On the same date, he wrote this to the General Conference President:

“Questions on Doctrine is a clever and subtle attempt to undermine the foundational doctrines of Seventh-day Adventists.”—Theodore Carcich, letter dated March 24, 1960, to R.R. Figuhr.

In that letter, Carcich told Figuhr that none of the Adventist bookstores in his union conference would be stocking the book “because it would confuse the faith of man.”

Recalling the events back then, Herbert Douglass wrote this in 2006:

“In 1957, I had reason to discuss certain Biblical subjects with Arthur White, the director of the Ellen G. White Estate. QD was fresh on his mind, only weeks off the printing press.

“He said, ‘Herb, I thought I would die trying to make my views known to Froom and Anderson.’

“[But] we still felt that QD would die a quick death and the less we all said about it the better.

“What we did not expect was the crescendo of Ministry editorials and articles that joined with a remarkably orchestrated PR [public relations] program in workers’ meetings throughout North America from 1957 on. The new president of the General Conference, **R.R. Figuhr**, recently from South America, **was captivated by what appeared to be a magnificent achievement**—heading off Walter Martin from identifying Adventists as a cult in his next book.

“Many felt that **if Elder Branson (General Conference President, 1950-1954) had not become ill, thus removing his name from the nominating committee at the General Conference of 1954, Questions on Doctrine may never have seen the light of day.**

“Within seven years the impossible happened! Few really were reading QD but the story line was out; the vice presidents, union presidents and conference presidents **were assured that any misunderstandings were only semantic. Denominational workers generally were either lulled to sleep or went underground.**”— Herbert E. Douglass, *Opportunity of the Century*, pp. 11-12.

Froom and Anderson had taken on the entire Seventh-day Adventist Church, and had won! They succeeded in changing, or suppressing, the beliefs of over a million Advent believers!

In the years between 1957 and 1971, L.E. Froom and R.A. Anderson were particularly active in their defense of the Evangelical Conferences, and the resultant book, *Questions on Doctrine*. **Hundreds of speaking trips, made by them to the far corners of the world were paid for out of General Conference funds.** (As you may know, all funds allocated from the World Budget to the General Conference each year come from the sacred tithe paid in by faithful members.) It was a tragedy that this money could not have been sent on to our foreign mission stations throughout the world, and used for overseas evangelism in spreading the truth about what we believe to a world lost in sin.

Fraudulent QD statements about the nature of Christ — Definite, knowing fraud was committed in the statements made by Froom at the Evangelical Conferences and in his book, *Questions on Doctrine*. He said and wrote that, from the very beginning of our church, all Adventists had always believed that Christ did not take our fallen nature.

George Knight reports that **the authors of QD told Martin that “ ‘the majority of the denomination had always held’ the human nature of Christ ‘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.’ ”** George Knight, QDAE, pp. xv, xvi. These writers “who occasionally” got into print confirming the fallen human nature of Christ, were categorized as part of the “lunatic fringe” by the authors of QOD. See *ibid*.

But, in reality, quite the opposite is true!

Many of the so-called “lunatic fringe” happened to be General Conference presidents, church leaders, editors of the Review, major authors, and well-known college teachers.

Fenton Froom, LeRoy Edwin Froom’s own son, wrote an article in which he said that Christ took our fallen human nature.

“He was born as a babe in Bethlehem, subject to like passions as we are... If Christ had been exempt from temptation, without the power and responsibility to choose, or without the sin-filled inclinations and tendencies of our sinful nature, He could not have lived our life without sin.”—Fenton Edwin Froom, *Our Times*, December 1949, p. 4.

It was mentioned earlier in this book that, only five years before the Evangelical Conferences began, **W.E. Read**, one of the three representing the church on that committee, had approvingly quoted from Sister White at the 1950 General Conference that “Jesus was in all things made like unto His brethren. He became flesh even as we are” (1950 General Conference Bulletin, p. 154).

In his exhaustive research of the subject, **Ralph Larson did not find one Seventh-day Adventist writer prior to 1952 who wrote anything other than that Christ took upon Himself our fallen, sinful nature.** Larson also found that, over a period of almost sixty years, **Ellen White never wavered in her position that Christ took upon Himself our fallen, sinful nature.** More on his two books later.

“Froom took a poll of Adventist leaders and discovered that ‘nearly all of them’ felt that Christ had our sinful nature [because that is what they had been reading in the Spirit of Prophecy]. Further, the recently retired General Conference president, W.H. Branson, plainly wrote in the 1950 edition of his *Drama of the Ages* that Christ in His incarnation took ‘upon Himself sinful flesh.’ ”—*Ibid.*, pp. 13-14.

But in spite of such evidence, Froom pushed forward in maintaining that his false assertions were true. Keeping Walter Martin’s friendship was considered more important than preparing to answer for his actions in the Judgment.

Trying to keep a lid on the hoax — While telling our people that no changes had been made in our teachings, Froom and Martin had to confront the fact that **not only faithful Adventists—but also critical non-Adventists—recognized that this was simply not true! Adventist**

doctrines were being changed!

Just before the publication of Figuhr's article in the December 13, 1956, issue of the Review, Anderson attached a copy of the forthcoming article with a letter to Martin, in an effort to avoid the potential disappointment that Martin might feel with Figuhr's clear statement that no changes have been made in our beliefs. ("You may wonder why [Figuhr] is stating so definitely that this is not a modification or alteration of our beliefs, etc.") Froom went on to explain that such a statement was necessary because of "a man or two here and there that is inclined to feel that what we are doing is something that will seriously change our position, etc." Anderson added, "You know and I know that some statements have been made publicly and have appeared in print which are not in harmony with the actual truth." Then he concluded by reassuring Martin that the Adventist leaders were "very conscious of" the problem.

At the same time, Anderson reminded Martin that **"it will serve the best interests of all concerned if we help our own people to know that there is no serious movement to change our belief, but rather to clarify it"** (Roy A. Anderson to Walter R. Martin, December 11, 1956, TL, ADF 3773.06c, Ellen G. White Estate, Loma Linda Branch, Loma Linda University).

Anderson wanted to avoid any comments by Martin that Adventist teachings were in any way being modified.

As for Barnhouse, he clearly recognized that the Adventist teachings were being changed, and said so in print!

"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."—Donald Barnhouse, *Eternity*, September 1956.

Other Evangelicals also perceived these changes.

"The editor 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, that **SDA-ism has been undergoing a change** through the past decade, and that there are many brethren in Christ who are within the fold of Adventism."— E. Schuyler English, *Our Hope*, November 1956, p. 271.

Nearly 50 years later, Ralph Larson said it this way:

"The 'group' at our world headquarters had a very difficult assignment. **They had to produce a double deception** for two different audiences. **They had to prove to the Calvinists that we had changed our doctrines, and at the same time prove to the Adventists that we had not changed** our doctrines . .

"Fact number one: There is no way, absolutely no way, that a trained scholar with a Doctor's degree, like Dr. Leroy Edwin Froom, could put forth such a mass of mangled, misrepresented and misstated materials as this without knowing what he was doing. No Ph.D. is that dumb. **This 'presentation' could not have been an accident. It had to be a deliberate and intentional deception.**

“Fact number two: **There is no way, absolutely no way, that** a trained scholar with a Doctor’s degree, like **Dr. Walter Martin, could accept such a mass of mangled, misrepresented, and misstated materials as this without knowing what he was doing.** No Ph.D. is that dumb. **This ‘acceptance’ could not have been an accident. It had to be a deliberate and intentional deception.**”—Ralph Larson, Firm Foundation, May 2004.

Other Evangelical leaders recognized the hoax — They saw through the fraudulent **doubletalk**, by which Froom and Anderson tried to convince Martin and Barnhouse that our denomination had never believed certain key doctrines.

Kenneth Samples (who had worked closely with Martin for years), in a presentation at the October 2007 QD Anniversary Conference at Andrews University), fully recognized that, as a result of the publication of that book, our denominational beliefs had actually changed.

M.E. DeHaan, a Michigan pastor, wrote:

“Some of their statements are slightly modified and rephrased . . . **The book abounds in double-talk and flagrant contradictions.**”—M.E. DeHaan, “Questions on Doctrine,” in The King’s Business, March 1958.

Norman Douty, a Baptist minister from Grand Rapids, charged that **Barnhouse and Martin were “taken in by the statements given them by the Adventists.”**

“Adventism is characterized by heresy . . . Adventism denies a body of doctrine which the church as a whole has always declared, and declares another body of doctrine which the church as a whole denied.”—Norman Douty, Another Look at Seventh-day Adventism, pp. 24-25.

Several Evangelical critics recognized that no General Conference Session ever approved Questions on Doctrine, or any of its doctrinal revisions. They recognized that only those five-year Sessions have the authority to give such approval on behalf of the entire denomination.

“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 [4-year; now quinquennial, 5-year] **Sessions**, when accredited delegates from the whole world field are present.”—Questions on Doctrine, p. 9.

The Evangelical writer, **Kenneth Samples** (a later associate of Walter Martin’s), **clearly recognized that only a small group of men in the General Conference building ever approved QD** (Samples, “From Controversy to Crisis: An Updated Assessment of Seventh-day Adventism,” Christian Research Journal, Summer, 1988, pp. 9-10).

Harold Lindsell, of Fuller Theological Seminary, correctly stated, concerning the first of a series of articles entitled “What of Seventh-day Adventism?:

“The authors of QD cannot and do not speak with authority, since ‘official’ statements come only from the General Conference in Quadrennial Session.”—Harold Lindsell, “What of Seventh-day Adventism?” in Part 1 of Christianity Today, March 31, 1957.

In the same article, **Lindsell added that if the Adventist doctrines of eschatology (last-day events) and the Sanctuary were removed, it would end Adventism!** “Destroy these, and certain conclusions are self-evident. **There would then be no adequate basis for the existence**

of Adventism” (ibid.).

Astounding! Thinking non-Adventists recognize that which many of our leaders and people do not! Froom and Anderson permitted Martin to tunnel underneath our church and knock out the primary pillars supporting it. —Yet others who followed permitted this desolation to continue unabated.

In the next article in his series, Lindsell said that **if Adventists at all considered it necessary to keep the Bible Sabbath, then the doctrinal changes in QD could not be correct.**

“Adventism, in my judgment, is not Evangelical and never will be until this serious error [that Sabbathkeeping is required by God] in its teaching is rectified.”— Christianity Today, April 14, 1958.

“Frank A. Laurence, a Presbyterian clergyman who reviewed Martin’s book...predicted that Martin’s volume would cause ‘consternation and bitterness,’ and said further: ‘This is a book which will be kicked around in Evangelical and Adventist circles until the Southern Baptists appoint an envoy to the Vatican.’” — Keld J. Reynolds, “Coping with Change,” *Adventism in America*, p. 188.

Unfortunately, the deceptive talk of Froom and Anderson, in their articles and lectures to our workers throughout the world field, convinced many of our own people that fundamental Protestant errors were actually part of our historic beliefs! What a terrible tragedy!

Barnhouse’s ongoing disgust — In that same “Bombshell” issue (September 1956) of *Eternity* magazine (which first disclosed the objective of the Evangelical Conferences), **those who remained steadfast in the faith established from the Bible in our church’s earlier history were defamed by the vitriolic language of Dr. Barnhouse.** He stated that these loyal Seventh-day Adventists were those “. . . among their numbers [who were] of their ‘lunatic fringe’ ” (Barnhouse, *Eternity*, September 1956). Both Donald Barnhouse and Walter Martin were men of caustic tongues. George Knight referred to Barnhouse’s vicious response to those who disagreed with him.

“The Adventists were dealing with some fairly prejudiced and aggressive fundamentalist leaders. That was certainly true of Barnhouse, who has been described as ‘merciless with other views, including . . . those who did not share his premillennial [dispensational] view of the second coming.’ **Other authors have described him as ‘fiery,’ ‘fearless and brusque,’ and one who was willing to criticize ‘freely’** (Knight, *QDAE*, p. xvi, xvii).

“The repeatedly aggressive language of the ever combative Barnhouse undoubtedly did much to create division. Soon after the book’s publication, for example, he wrote that **Questions on Doctrine ‘is a definitive statement that lops off the writings of Adventists who have been independent of and contradictory to their sound leadership’** (“Postscript on Seventh-day Adventism,” *Eternity*, November 1957, p. 22). That is only one of the many statements made by Barnhouse who appears to have actively sought to create distance between those of Andreasen’s persuasion and [what he called] **the ‘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’** (“Are Seventh- day Adventists Christians?” p. 7). Given the fact that no one likes to be lopped off or to be in opposition to those

who are sane, it should be evident that Barnhouse himself did much to exacerbate the internal difficulties among the Adventists.”—Knight, QDAE, p. xxvi.

The Hudson-Barnhouse conversation — **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. 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 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.**”—Al Hudson, Preliminary Memorandum, p. 13.

On May 16, 1958, Hudson telephoned Donald Barnhouse. Unknown to Barnhouse, Hudson taped the conversation and later printed it.

This occurred 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.

The information given by Barnhouse 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, he said, and they knew it.** In marked contrast, Froom and Anderson were telling our people, 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 not only been told by Froom and Anderson that although this was indeed an outright repudiation of earlier Adventist “errors,”— but that the entire membership of the Adventist 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 during this phone conversation.

In addition, we can also sense the fury of Barnhouse’s feelings about the utter stupidity of the crazy Adventist doctrines.

Although to Anderson and Froom, Barnhouse spoke with an air of friendship as they continually made more concessions and compromises; in his conversation with Hudson, **Barnhouse expressed utter disgust for both Adventists and their beliefs.**

In the following conversation, “(H)” indicates that Hudson is speaking and “(B)” that Barnhouse is speaking.

Here are a very few excerpts from this lengthy conversation.

“(H) Good morning. (B) Good morning. (H) This is Al Hudson, in 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, in 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) 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 [magazine], 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...**

“(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, 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 . .**

“(B) I think they’re doing, as I say, I think these men are educated men, and some of them know 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’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 Eternity magazine, and which you have just set forth here to me. You actually believe 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 [QD] 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 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...

“(B) 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....

“(B) But you wait a minute. Let’s ask a question. That’s up to God, but **do you think that I am 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) **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 . .

“(B) 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 had 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) **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 . .**

“(B) I came out and said that Seventh-day 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) 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. (B) 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 inspiration. 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 . .**

“(B) 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 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.”—Al Hudson phone call to Donald Barnhouse, May 16, 1958.

That concludes the most important excerpts from Al Hudson’s telephone conversation with Donald Barnhouse in May 1958. Later in this book we will learn that Barnhouse died only two years later. Because Hudson published against the Martin-Barnhouse meetings with our leaders, he was dis-fellowshipped from the church.

EVENTS FROM 1960 TO THE PRESENT (1960-2008)

Martin’s Book, The Truth about Seventh-day Adventists, is published (Feb. 1960) — Martin had assured Anderson and Froom that he would release his book at the same time that Questions on Doctrine was published.

But it did not happen. With growing suspense, they awaited his book. **Finally, over two years later, in February 1960, The Truth about Seventh-day Adventism was printed** by Zondervan. Our leaders at the GC breathed a sigh of relief to discover that it contained pretty much what Martin said would be in it.

T.E. Unruh, who had a rather complete understanding of everything that occurred at the General Conference in regard to those meetings, **revealed that Martin was given a copy of QD prior its publication; and, in turn, our leaders had carefully gone over TASDA before it was printed.**

“The Zondervan Publishing House had originally scheduled publication of Walter Martin’s *The Truth about Seventh-day Adventism* for January 1957...but 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....

“As late as October 1959, R.A. Anderson and W.E. Read, with H.W. Lowe, chairman of the Biblical Study and Research Group [now Biblical Research Institute] **were going over Martin’s galleys** [preprinted page proofs], preparatory to writing a statement to be included in the book.”—T.E. Unruh, “The Seventh-day Adventist Evangelical Conferences of 1955-1956,” *Adventist Heritage*, Fourth Quarter, 1977.

Here was Barnhouse’s key statement in the Preface to Martin’s book:

“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.

“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.”—Donald Grey Barnhouse, “Forward,” in Walter R. Martin, *The Truth about Seventh-day Adventism*, p. 7.

So, according to Barnhouse, those who opposed the changes were still considered to be cultists and not Christians.

On page 15 of Martin’s book was a statement by Harry W. Lowe, “Chairman, Bible Study and Research Group of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists.” In addition to expressing some concern about Martin’s negative comments about a number of Adventist doctrines, **Low expressed deep appreciation for Martin’s approval of those beliefs which, in reality, Froom and Anderson had compromised on.**

“His [Martin’s] presentation of our doctrines and prophetic interpretations as found on pp. 47-86 is accurate and comprehensive . . . The reader will not overlook the fair and accurate statements of Adventist teachings so clearly set forth on pages mentioned above, 47-86... This author has earned our gratitude and respect for his earnest endeavor to set forth correctly our doctrinal positions and by his attitude of Christian brotherhood.”—H.W. Lowe, statement in Martin’s book, *The Truth about Seventh-day Adventism*, p. 15.

Commenting on the above statement by Lowe, **in early 1960, F.D. Nichol wrote this to Figuhr:**

“The non-Adventist world would take Lowe’s words as a kind of endorsement of the book. I don’t think we should ever have put such a prefatory page in a book that is subtly attempting to

show that many of our teachings are wrong.”—F.D. Nichol, Review Senior Editor, letter to R.R. Figuhr, March 10, 1960.

It is of interest that both sides had agreed that not only would they print both books at the same time, but they would also sell both books in their respective bookstores. But **Martin was upset when our bookstores did not stock his book, TASDA**, when it was finally published.

When was Truth about Seventh-day Adventism first published? While others 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.

But the copyright page of my copy of the book 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 an earlier 1957 edition of this book, it would say so on the copyright page** of the book.

T.E. Unruh, in his article, “The Seventh-day Adventist Evangelical Conferences of 1955-1956,” wrote 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 prepublication pages of his book], preparatory to writing a statement to be included in the book, *The Truth about Seventh-day Adventism*.”— T.E. Unruh, “The Seventh-day Adventist Evangelical Conferences of 1955-1956,” page 45.

Ministry magazine first announced publication of TASDA in its April 1960 issue, in these words: “Recently a book—*The Truth about Seventh-day Adventism*, by Walter Martin—has come out” (R.R. Figuhr, “President’s Page,” *Ministry*, April 7, 1960, page 3).

Frankly, this is rather clear evidence that Froom was accustomed to shaving the truth. He had done it so much while preparing his articles, QD, and in his lectures publicizing the book, that he did it whenever it made something look a little better. He wanted to avoid the supposed embarrassment that TASDA was not printed in 1957 when originally planned.

However, when Froom did this with the Spirit of Prophecy writings, it brought grief to our church. He would twist the truth just enough to turn it into a lie.

A meeting with Barnhouse (late 1959) — In February 1983, Kern Pihl, M.D., a Seventh-day Adventist medical doctor who had a medical practice in southern California, told me that he and his wife attended a meeting with Barnhouse in South America, about twelve months prior to Barnhouse’s death.

It appears that, **by 1959, Barnhouse was very antagonistic to Seventh-day Adventists, their**

beliefs and their objectives. But we should keep in mind that Barnhouse had been systematically misinformed by certain Adventist leaders about the true beliefs of our church. He had been told that our people had never really believed in certain concepts found widely in our books, and that only a few “on the lunatic fringe” still believed such fooleries.

It was on the basis of such misleading 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 our leaders, and then publish in *Eternity* that the Adventists had changed from their “unchristian” teachings. In addition, he had experienced a significant loss of *Eternity* subscribers for having done so.

However, the most bitter part of it all was the gradual discovery, from the many letters that Adventists sent him—that the assurances of our leaders were not really true after all!

Martin brought back reports to Barnhouse 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!

But this did not happen; and, **by 1959, Donald Grey Barnhouse was no friend of Adventists. It was late in that year that he spoke to a group of missionaries in South America.**

Here is their report:

“At the time when this took place, **late in 1959, my wife and I were salaried Seventh-day Adventist medical missionaries in Peru.**

“**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 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 meetinghouse 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, when the question and answer session occurred at the close of his lecture, **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, up to that point, it had been a very congenial meeting.

“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” is when a Protestant converts someone from another Protestant church to his own. 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 oonee-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.”—Letter from Kern Pihl, M.D., February 1983.

From his reaction to the discovery of Adventist foreign missionaries, **it appears that Froom and Anderson had given Barnhouse assurances that they would remove all missionaries from foreign fields!**

The death of Donald Grey Barnhouse (November 1960) — According to biographical data I obtained this week, **Donald Barnhouse died about a year after that incident in Peru on November 5, 1960, at the age of 70.** He passed away in a Philadelphia hospital one month “after being diagnosed with a large, malignant brain tumor.”

His death occurred only five years after the start of the Evangelical Conferences. Here is the

official Eternity notice of his death:

“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.)

Shortly after the death of Barnhouse, Walter Martin began his own separate “cult research” organization, The Christian Research Institute (CRI), and its magazine, the Christian Research Journal.

The death of William H. Branson (1961) — William Henry Branson (1887-1961) had for years been one of our leading defenders of historic Adventism. He was the one who presented the Branson Report to a special General Conference meeting in the 1930s. He wrote a number of important books defending the faith, including *The Way to Christ*, *In Defense of the Faith*, *How Men are Saved*, and *Drama of the Ages*. In 1950, he was elected General Conference president, but, unfortunately, had to retire because of failing health in 1954.

It is well-known that if he had remained president, the Evangelical Conferences (which began in 1955) never would have occurred.

Because he died in 1961, Branson surely must have received word about the entire doctrinal sellout as it progressed. He probably died in deep grief.

The death of M.L. Andreasen (1962) —I am going to quote a few brief sections of the book, *Without Fear or Favor*, by Virginia Steinweg. That biography of Andreasen was published in 1979, shortly before the conservative control of the Review ended with the retirement of Kenneth Wood as its senior editor. **The following excerpts will provide you with additional background material on the terrible grief experienced by this man of God, M.L. Andreasen, which resulted in his death:**

“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 bombshell article in Eternity magazine would set off a series of reactions on his part that would long outlive him . .**

“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, “Are Seventh-day Adventists Christians?” Eternity, September 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.

“Farther 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 Sanctuary and the atonement—the subject on which he had centered his thought all these years.

“When [earlier] privileged to spend some time at the home of Ellen White [in 1909], 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 [of the atonement and the Sanctuary], as were several of the nine quarters of Sabbath school lessons he has 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.) . .

“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** (R.A. Anderson, “Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine,” Ministry, June 1957, p. 24)....

“A subsequent article explained the process used in preparing the book: ‘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, Ministry, January, 1958, p. 29).

“Who were these 250 men who had received copies before publication? Andreasen wondered. The answer was in that same article: ‘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 [after the death of his first 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.”—Virginia Steinweg, *Without Fear or Favor*, 166-172.

After pleading letters were ignored, Andreasen began publishing and mailing out warnings to our people. Finally, the end drew near. His books were removed from our bookstores in November 1960; and on April 6, 1961, his ministerial credentials were removed.

“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.’

“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 [R.R. Figuhr], 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 [R.R. Bietz].

“The three had met together on previous occasions, when the results had been unsatisfactory. Now they talked together frankly about past experiences and actions. **M.L. made it plain that although he differed regarding some of the procedures followed in the handling of 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.”—Virginia Steinweg, *Without Fear or Favor*, pp. 180-183.

In summary, from **November 1957 until January 1962**, Elder M.L. Andreasen had continued his earnest efforts to issue small publications to warn the faithful of the terrible compromises which were being made in our core doctrinal beliefs.

On **April 6, 1961**, the GC Spring Council voted to suspend Andreasen's ministerial credentials. Upon learning of the forthcoming action, Andreasen issued a circular letter on **January 19**, entitled Shooting the Watchdog.

But the deep anguish, which had overwhelmed him for years, caused Elder Andreasen to gradually weaken physically. Learning that he was in the Glendale Sanitarium, on **February 16**, Elder Figuhr, accompanied by Elder R.R. Bietz, visited Elder Andreasen in the hospital. Andreasen wept, for he so much wanted to be at peace with his brethren. This was done and they prayed together.

Andreasen's death, on **February 19, 1962**, was directly attributable to grief over the major doctrinal change being made in our denomination. It was this crisis which led to his death, for he had actually been in very good health. That which few of us recognized at the time, Andreasen fully understood. In deep grief he saw the implications of this major change.

We expect to meet this godly man, M.L. Andreasen, in heaven; for he did his best to warn God's people of what was taking place.

"I am so grateful for your talk with my Dear Husband, and [that] all was made right and cleared up before he died. He said he could not die until it was cleared up. He spent many nights sobbing his heart out. Poor dear, I am so glad he died happy . . . Thank you so much for your kind letter. I shall keep it and treasure it."—Mrs. M.L. Andreason, letter to R.R. Figuhr, February 27, 1962.

On March 1, the GC Committee revoked the action of the previous year, which had suspended Andreasen's credentials. **It would have been well if that committee had, in addition, issued an order stopping the publication of Questions on Doctrine. Unfortunately, that was not done.**

As has happened so often in history, the whistle-blower was considered to be the cause of all the problems.

R.R. Figuhr places B.B. Beach on WCC committee (1965) — At the close of Vatican II, Figuhr arranged for B.B. Beach to be, for the first time in our denominational history, placed on an ecumenical board. This one was a key doctrinal board of the World Council of Churches in Geneva. Beach remained as chairman of that board (which included leading Protestant churches and the Catholic church) until Beach's retirement in 2000.

Figuhr retires from the presidency (1965) — After causing irreparable harm to the church for over a decade, R.R. Figuhr finally retired from the GC presidency after a 12-year term,

Froom's book, Movement of Destiny (1971) — Over a decade after the publication of Questions on Doctrine, L.E. Froom published his version of the 1888 and 1950s theological crises. It was printed by the Review. The section on the Evangelical Conferences and the publication and contents of QD is on pp. 465-560. Everything in it which is unique enough to be quoted will be found elsewhere in this present book.

In Movement of Destiny, Froom tells us that he worked to produce doctrinal reconciliation with our “separated brethren.” The implied thought was that the one most in error was the one who most needed to make amends. Apparently, it was felt that what we inherited from earlier Adventism was 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 Schuyler English, Walter Martin, or Donald Barnhouse yielded on a single point of doctrine! 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 did any of those men hint that there was anything of worth in Adventism—which they did not already have.

Movement of Destiny was a lengthy attempt to show how we gradually put away errors of former years, and how this work was nicely completed in the 1940s and 1950s.

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 eradicate it. 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. **Martin and Froom provided the bullet; the new theology provided the gun to propel it; now the shots are being fired. Many have fallen, wounded, never to recover.**

One other important teaching was given to us by the Evangelical Conferences: **Doctrinal purity is of far less importance than is Ecumenical unity with the other churches.**

According to Froom, the destiny of our movement is unity with the fallen churches. He told us that it took years to bring our denomination around to the point where this could be done.

Every since 1957, our leaders have been trying to draw closer and closer to the other churches, and to their Ecumenical organizations.

But, in order to do this successfully, we have had to stop mentioning the truths of Daniel 7 and Revelation 12, 13, and 14. How can we call ourselves the remnant of Revelation 12:17, if we choose to no longer give the message of Revelation 14:6 to 12?

The Change in Appendix B (1972) — From the very beginning of the Evangelical Conferences, **Martin’s concerns about the atonement and the human nature of Christ were crucial. He well-knew that if we accepted his position on both, this would effectively overthrow the truth about the importance of obedience to the law of God** (including Sabbathkeeping) as an integral part of our salvation.

Not recognizing the danger, Froom and Anderson capitulated. Martin was smarter than they were. Froom prepared a warped set of doctrinal statements, said to be those of our people since the earliest years, plus a mangled patchwork of Spirit of Prophecy sentences and phrases, designed to teach the errors that would please Martin and Barnhouse. Froom explains:

“But 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 [nature 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. Most convincing of all was the clear and consistent witness of the Spirit of Prophecy thereon, all the way through history.”—L.E. Froom, *Movement of Destiny* (1971), p. 483.

“Complete search was made for all pertinent Spirit of Prophecy statements, through the years, bearing on the vital questions . .

“These were placed conspicuously on record in Questions on Doctrine, as Appendices A [Christ’s divinity], B [Christ’s human nature], and C [the atonement]. **Thus was completed the long process of clarification**, rectification [sic.] of misconceptions, and declarations of truth before the church and the world, presenting our united and truly authoritative position on these long-misunderstood points. In this the Spirit of Prophecy writings played a determinative part. Every worker and theological student should have these authoritative compilations at hand for reference.”—L.E. Froom, *Movement of Destiny* (1971), p. 484.

As you may recall, **R.A. Anderson had not only placed Appendix B** (a Spirit of Prophecy compilation on the human nature of Christ) **into the back of the forthcoming Questions on Doctrine** (pp. 647-660), **but he also quietly slipped it into “Appendix B” at the back of the later Volume 7A of the Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary. Yet he did this without the Commentary editors ever knowing about that inclusion in advance!**

Over a decade later, in 1970, careful research in the editorial offices of the Review disclosed the fraudulent nature of these quotations.

“I remember well those days in 1970 when **I at last had the opportunity to examine QD’s references**. As associate editor of the Review and Herald, I had the luxury of research in the publishing house’s magnificent library. I began to read the context of each of QD’s statement that seemed to be cherry-picked by someone who tried to emphasize a certain point of view. One by one I would bring those statements to Kenneth H. Wood, editor in chief, and **we stared with amazement at someone’s remarkable disregard for the context**.

“This collection of tampered quotations became ever since [their initial publication in QD, and especially in its appendices] the armament factory for teachers and pastors and authors who relied on this collection for their understanding of Christ’s human nature, thus missing the big picture [of what the Spirit of Prophecy actually said].”—Herbert E. Douglass, *Opportunity of the Century*, pp. 43-44.

When Kenneth Wood, senior editor of the Review, notified **the Biblical Research Institute** about this situation, it **decided to correct Appendix B, in both its reprints of QD and also Volume 7A**. That revised and corrected version was also published in a 12-page insert in the February 1972 issue of Ministry magazine.

In the back of the Annotated Edition of Questions on Doctrine, published in 2007 (beginning on p. 647), you will find both the original Appendix B, followed by the revised one.

It is of interest that the flawed nature of Appendix B was published two years before Froom, himself, died. He probably felt humiliated.

Froom realized the truth before his death (1974) —In my last year of college, I met a young man who was slightly older than myself, who graduated the year after I did. By the 1960s, he had become a worker at the Review. Because of his position, he was able to learn much of what was taking place, and was deeply troubled by the Evangelical crisis.

By the 1980s, he was retired, and his wife would phone or write me frequently, providing me with information which I printed. By the late 1990s, my friend's health was failing.

On June 19, 2002, I received the following letter from his wife. By this time her husband was deceased. Since I have not heard from her since then, I believe she has also passed away. But, since in earlier years they were anxious that I not identify them, I will not do so now.

In the summer of 2002, she decided to tell me about the last days of Leroy Edwin Froom. It was one of the last letters I ever received from her.

In order to simplify this letter, I will call her husband, "Jim," although that was not his real name:

"When we first came to the Review back in __ [year], Raymond [Cottrell] was straight. At that time, Raymond was as dead set against Froom and Andreasen as [Don] Neufeld was. However there was one thing that worried Jim, and that was this: Brother Cottrell was always greatly impressed with his own 'brilliant mind.'

"Over the years, we have been aware of the downward road he has been taking [Cottrell is now deceased].

"On the subject of Elder Leroy E. Froom, Jim did a lot of editing for that man and Froom went out of his way to cultivate Jim's friendship, while Cottrell was giving him a rough time.

"When Froom was on his death bed, he sent for Jim. The lasting impression that has remained with Jim all these years was the look of stark terror on Froom's face near the end. Jim told me he'd never seen anything like it. Surely, Froom had to know what he had done to God's remnant church."—North America.

For an almost mirror-image portrait of the final months of A.G. Daniells, (our longest-serving GC president who died in 1935), read pages 342-344 in "The Broken Blueprint" (by Vance Ferrell). **Daniells, with his insistence on school accreditation, destroyed our educational system. You will want to read the whole book. Froom, with his driving concern for approval by the Evangelicals, set the stage for the entrance of the new theology into our church. Here is one paragraph from it:**

"One evening, a medical student found him walking in the hallways. Daniells was weeping. Turning to the young man, in an agony of voice **Arthur said, 'Obey the Spirit of Prophecy. I didn't and paid the price!'**" —Broken Blueprint, p. 343.

The death of L.E. Froom (1974) — Herbert Douglass had an opportunity to see Froom one last time prior to his death:

"I had the unusual pleasure of knowing Drs. Froom and Anderson personally. Long after Dr. Froom retired, while I was associate editor of the Adventist Review in the 1970s, he would sit in

my office, time after time, to discuss theological topics. All the while he had been reading a number of my editorials that contradicted his positions in QD. We were friends and did not let theological differences poison our friendship. In 1974, **I was one of the very last persons to stroke his hand just before he died** in Sligo Gardens Nursing Home, Takoma Park [Maryland].”—Herbert E. Douglass, *Opportunity of the Century*, pp. 41-42.

Decision not to republish Questions on Doctrine and Movement of Destiny (1975)
— **A year after Froom’s death, it was decided not to republish his two books:** Questions on Doctrine and Movement of Destiny.

“In 1975, a representative group of us gathered in Washington in response to the Review and Herald publishing house’s call for counsel regarding the republication of QD. The leadership of the General Conference were generally opposed to its reprinting... **The more the book was examined, the firmer their denial for a reprinting became.**”—Herbert E. Douglass, *Opportunity of the Century*, pp. 25-26.

“In the same year [1975], a call was made to republish L.E. Froom’s [1971] Movement of Destiny. Again a representative group studied the question. **Again, because of a number of assertions in it that were dubious and misleading, Movement of Destiny has not been republished.**”—Herbert E. Douglass, *Opportunity of the Century*, p. 45.

Unfortunately, the conservatives lost control of the GC and Review in the 1980s. As we will discover later, as new leaders came in, they were much more willing to consider placating Martin.

The Dallas statement (1980) — **The official Statement of Beliefs of Seventh-day Adventists, enacted at the 1980 General Conference Session in Dallas, Texas, was designed to please both conservatives and new theology advocates in the church.**

The wording of this Statement was arranged with extreme care, so as not to disturb most historic believers and those who had accepted the modifications in Questions on Doctrine. It was done so effectively that Desmond Ford startled President N.C. Wilson shortly afterward at the close of the Glacier View meeting, on August 15, 1980, when Ford told him that he, Ford, could agree with the Dallas Statement!

Here is an example of three key points in this 1980 statement:

“He became also truly man, Jesus the Christ. He was conceived of the Holy Spirit and born of the virgin Mary. He lived and experienced temptation as a human being, but perfectly exemplified the righteousness and love of God.”—“Statement 4:Son.” 1980 Dallas Statement. [Nothing here about Christ taking our fallen nature.]

“The great principles of God’s law are embodied in the Ten Commandments and exemplified in the life of Christ. They express God’s love, will, and purposes concerning human conduct and relationships . . . Through the agency of the Holy Spirit they point out sin and awaken a sense of need for a Saviour. Salvation is all of grace and not of works, but its fruitage is obedience to the Commandments. This obedience develops Christian character and results in a sense of well-being.”—“Statement 19: Law of God.” 1980 Dallas Statement.

(Note: Missing from this historical account is the adoption of a full-blown Trinity doctrine)

“There is a Sanctuary in heaven, the true tabernacle which the Lord set up and not man. **In it Christ ministers on our behalf, making available to believers the benefits of His atoning sacrifice offered once for all on the cross.**”—“Statement 24: Christ’s Ministry in the Heavenly Sanctuary,” 1980 Dallas Statement.

Julius Nam makes this comment:

“**Since the Review and Herald Publishing Association discontinued the printing of the book [QD] in 1975, the General Conference has neither repudiated the book nor defended it.** While the status of the book as a whole may be uncertain within the church, it is clear that the book’s stance on the atonement has been affirmed by the majority of the church. **The church’s statement of fundamental beliefs adopted by the General Conference in session in 1980 affirmed Questions on Doctrine’s emphasis on the centrality of the cross and the delineation of Christ’s post-1844 heavenly ministry as an application of Christ’s atoning sacrifice on the cross.**”—Julius Nam, presentation at the 50th Anniversary Conference, October 24-27, 2007, at Andrews University.

But the innovation made at the 2005 St. Louis GC Session - is the worst of all! More on this later.

Death of Ruben R. Figuhr (1983) — The 15th president of the General Conference, he was called in 1950 to a position as a GC vice-president, and to the GC presidency in 1954 (May 24), when, due to ill health, William H. Branson retired.

As mentioned earlier, **if Branson had not retired in 1954,— there would never have been a doctrinal sellout and the Evangelical Conferences would never have begun that year. Deeply shaken by what Froom, Anderson, and Martin were doing to his beloved church, Branson died in 1961 at the age of 74.**

It is known that Figuhr frequently chaired the meetings of Froom and Anderson with Martin. **By his continued assent, he heavily implicated himself in all the decisions made and actions taken thereafter to please Martin.** As the head of the GC, Figuhr had the authority to quickly stop this Evangelical project when he early saw where it was headed.

But, somehow, he apparently never recognized the enormity of what he was doing. **In 1965, one year before his retirement, Figuhr arranged for the placement of Bert Beverly Beach, for the first time, on a major World Council of Churches committee:** Faith and Doctrine, where Beach remained, most of the time as its chairman, until his retirement in 2000.

Following this 1965 penetration into the heart of major Ecumenism, our church began an intense drive to draw nearer and nearer to the other denominations. But the demands made by these other churches, in order to grant us this closer fellowship, only diluted our doctrinal message all the more. Eventually, the messages of Daniel 7 and Revelation 12 to 14 were no longer given in public. Today our primary evangelistic meetings are only presented on video screens and DVDs within the privacy of our own churches. More on the impact of our Ecumenical connections in our other books.

It is remarkable that, after his doctrinal giveaway in the 1950's, our world leaders reelected Figuhr twice (in 1958 and 1962). They probably still did not grasp the full implications of what had been done. Figuhr continued on as GC president until June 16, 1966. He lived seventeen more years after that when, at the age of 87, he passed to his rest in 1983.

Martin's Napa lecture (1983) — The primary objective of this meeting was to issue a warning to the General Conference to reprint Questions on Doctrine, or else.

On February 22, 1983, in a public meeting hall in Napa, California, Martin spoke to a packed house filled with Adventists, primarily from nearby Pacific Union College (which by that time was solidly in support of Desmond Ford and his errors). **Martin announced that if the General Conference did not reprint Questions on Doctrine, he would write a book against our denomination—and reduce us to the status of a cult.**

Another important disclosure at that meeting, of which I once had a complete cassette tape, was the dramatic method by which he successfully got our leaders to change or get rid of a sizeable number of our books which taught the beliefs that Martin opposed. You will find that quotation in an earlier section of this present book, entitled "How Martin Changed Our Books."

Two important admissions occurred during the follow-up question period:

(1) Martin said that (not the Bible but) the book, Creeds of Christendom, contained all the "basic theology" of all true Christian churches. (2) Martin gave as the excuse why he did not classify the Roman Catholic Church as a cult was because it claimed to accept some of those early creeds. A complete transcript of his taped lecture will be found in my book, *The Evangelical Conferences and Their Aftermath*.

What is the real cult? It is those religious groups which violate the law of God and teach salvation in sin. Not only Catholicism but modern Protestantism are the real cults.

Indeed, **what is the real anti-Christ?** According to the Apostle John, **it is someone who denies that Christ really became a man and really took our human nature!** (1 John 4:3; 2 John 7).

The Gulley Quarterly and Book (1983) — The first quarter Sabbath School Quarterly for 1983 was the very first Adventist Senior Quarterly that taught the blatant errors in QD. Both the quarterly and its accompanying book, Christ Our Substitute, were very daring in presenting new theology errors. Why did our GC authorize publication of such a Quarterly? They knew very well what it contained.

Norman Gulley was a Bible teacher at Southern Missionary College (later renamed Southern Adventist University). He has been on the teaching staff there ever since, all the while instilling error into the minds of the students.

Even worse, Gulley was selected as the one to later write the basic manuscript of the official doctrinal book, Seventh-day Adventists Believe (SDAB), which took the place of QD! Why did the GC not select Kenneth Wood, Herbert Douglass, and other conservatives of the highest stature in our church to write the doctrinal book that replaced QD? **Why did they select the one man who had dared to write a Quarterly and book which totally undermined our core beliefs?** It was not long after his brazen attack on our key doctrines that Gulley was selected as the one to begin writing SDAB.

As soon as SDAB was published in 1988, all further complaints by Walter Martin and his organization totally ceased. They were satisfied that the same errors were in SDAB as previously had been in QD.

In the Appendix of this present book, you will be presented with sample errors from both books, plus Gulley's Quarterly and book.

Martin's revision of Kingdom of the Cults (1985) —This had always been Martin's primary "cult book." It was originally published in 1965, with a slight update in 1977.

But, in 1985, Martin published a revised and updated edition of this book. The appendix dealing with Adventism, at the back, is the same as in earlier editions, with the exception of an added section on p. 410. (The new addition begins on paragraph one with the words, "Doctrinally, the church has developed... and concludes at the end of the fifth paragraph.")

Here is the significant portion of this addition:

"During the last ten years, the Seventh-day Adventist denomination has seen turbulence, both administratively and doctrinally, that is more extensive than any turmoil in the denomination's history...

"Since I have always stressed the importance of doctrinal integrity in my evaluation of religious movements, the doctrinal upheaval in Adventism is of special concern. Consequently, **on February 18, 1983, I wrote the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists (Washington, D.C.), calling for the [General] Conference's public and official statement reaffirming or denying the authority of the Adventist book, Questions on Doctrine**, which was the representative Adventist publication on which I based my earlier evaluation and book."— Martin, Kingdom of the Cults, revised edition, p. 410.

Notice the above date: February 18, 1983. His letter to the General Conference was written only four days prior to the talk that he gave at Napa. Martin's plan was to give a double-barreled warning to the General Conference: in a talk given to influential Adventists, and in a letter sent directly to the General Conference—demanding a reply. (However, **in the Napa lecture, he also demanded that Questions on Doctrine be brought back into print.**) In addition, he was careful to send the letter so close to the Napa talk, that it would be impossible for the GC to return a submissive reply before he delivered that lecture. This would alert our leaders (and leaders of other churches) that he was still in charge of our doctrines.

In this new appendix note, **Martin goes on to state that he received a reply (dated April 29) from W. Richard Leshner**, a GC vice president (who the following year would become president of Andrews University). In his reply, as quoted by Martin, Leshner stated:

"You ask first if the Seventh-day Adventists still stand behind the answers given to your questions in Questions on Doctrine as they did in 1957. The answer is yes. You noted in your letter that some opposed the answers given then, and, to some extent, the same situation exists today. But certainly **the great majority of Seventh-day Adventists are in harmony with the views expressed in Questions on Doctrine.**"—W. Richard Leshner, letter dated, April 29, 1983; quoted in *ibid.*

This placed the General Conference in a difficult position. As mentioned earlier, in 1975 it had voted not to republish QD because of all the controversy it kept stirring up. But now, with

Martin's two February 1983 demands (his letter and lecture), they had to decide what to do next. **Would they—at last— make a clean break with Martin**, which would result in his writing a book against our denomination, **or would they capitulate as was done in the 1950s?** Many others had denounced our church in print; why should we care what Martin could now write against us?

However, by the early 1980s, the situation had changed. By this time there were many liberals in high positions, the new theology was growing stronger, and our ties with the Ecumenicals had greatly strengthened over the years.

So it was decided that instead of reprinting QD, the General Conference would print a **replacement doctrinal book**. Because they were careful to select the one man to write it who had earlier shown himself to be a dedicated new theology writer of doctrinal studies, they could be assured that the forthcoming book would be acceptable to Martin— because it would contain many of the same errors that had been in QD. More on this later in this book and in an Appendix at the back.

The Ankerberg debate (January 1985) — In January 1985, William Johnsson and Walter Martin flew to Chattanooga for the video-filming of a five-part television interview. According to a friend of ours who was there, the filming took place in one lengthy three-and-a-half hour session. The auditorium, which held about a hundred was packed. A very small part of the subsequent question-and-answer period was also included halfway through the fourth televised program. **Instead of acting as an impartial moderator (which it was his duty to do), Ankerberg worked closely with Martin in alternately voicing rapid-fire attack questions—so fast that it would have been difficult for even an expert in Adventist theology to reply**, much less Johnsson.

The television presentations were not aired until May and June. All through them, John Ankerberg and Walter Martin were primarily concerned with (1) **Ellen G. White: If you Adventists accept her writings as an authority in your denomination, then you are a cult.**

Somewhat less attention was given to (2) **the Sanctuary message, focusing on the investigative judgment** and final atonement: If you Adventists accept these ideas, which were not in your earlier official doctrinal book, Questions on Doctrine, then you are apostates from genuine Protestantism.

Attention was also paid to (3) **obedience by faith**: If you Adventists accept the possibility that the individual Christ has any part of the working out of his salvation, then you are legalists and non-Christians. And worse yet, you are “perfectionists.”

Not once was mention made of the Sabbath or our other doctrinal beliefs. But, when one stops to think about it,—**if the enemy is successful in casting out those three basic aspects of our faith, he will successfully smash the foundations of all our distinctive beliefs!**

Tragically, William Johnsson, the senior editor of the Adventist Review, fumbled all the way through the programs. But worst of all was his theological position: **Claiming to represent Adventism today, Johnsson maintained that our faith was entirely based on the 1980 Dallas Statement of Belief!** Not the Bible, and not the Spirit of Prophecy; but only that 27-point Statement.

On all other points, he collapsed; but he stood firm in his position that our church was founded on those 27 paragraphs, and nothing else. **But this makes us a creedal church, instead of one founded on the Word of God.**

Martin Luther, when confronted with powerful foes at a meeting designed to test his beliefs, said this: “I consent...with all my heart, that the emperor, the princes, and even the meanest Christian, should examine and judge my works; but **on one condition, that they take the Word of God for their standard. Men have nothing to do but to obey it.** Do not offer violence to my conscience, which is bound and chained up with the Holy Scriptures.’ ”—Great Controversy, 166. “ **‘Prove from the writings of the prophets and apostles that I have erred.** As soon as I am convinced of this, I will retract every error, and be the first to lay hold of my books and throw them into the fire.’ ”— Ibid, p. 159.

And we are given this warning:

“ **‘I am much afraid that the universities will prove to be the great gates of hell, unless they diligently labor in explaining the Holy Scriptures,** and engraving them in the hearts of youth. **I advise no one to place his child where the Scriptures do not reign paramount. Every institution in which men are not unceasingly occupied with the Word of God must become corrupt.’ ”**—Ibid., pp. 140-141.

The Death of R.A. Anderson (1985) — Colin Standish has mentioned a conversation he had with Anderson many years later, which revealed that Anderson continued to defend what had happened earlier:

“In what proved to be my last conversation with Elder Roy Allan Anderson in the San Bernardino mall in the early 1980s, **Elder Anderson vigorously defended Walter Martin as a “great friend” of the Seventh-day Adventist Church.**”—Colin Standish, presentation at the 50th Anniversary Conference, October 24-27, 2007, at Andrews University.

Yet, Colin explains, there is clear evidence that Anderson was well-aware that Martin and Barnhouse’s objective was sinister; for they planned to radically change Adventist doctrinal beliefs from what they had previously been!

“It was Elder Anderson who made it plain that the real purpose of Questions on Doctrine was a planned attempt to reshape the beliefs of our church. This was revealed in a letter to Pastor Robert Greive (president of the North New Zealand Conference in the 1950s) who left the faith.”—Colin and Russell Standish, *The Theology of Questions on Doctrine*, p. 40.

(Briefly, here is the background of this: R.A. Greive had earlier been Queensland Conference president, in Australia, and then became North New Zealand Conference president. Anderson wrote two letters [January 19 and April 23, 1956] to him at his Auckland headquarters. **But Greive was teaching instantaneous sanctification,** which meant that when we accept Christ we are instantly prepared for heaven, without any obedience to the law of God.

In his two letters to Greive, **Anderson agreed with him that Christ did not take the fallen nature of man, and that Greive’s other teachings would soon be supported by the meetings Anderson and his associates were holding with the Evangelicals. But, for the present, Anderson told him to not spread the news until later.**

Later Greive quit the Adventists entirely, became a Protestant, and afterward declared that he had never believed in the Spirit of Prophecy or our unique doctrines.)

Herbert Douglass' recollections of the last years of Froom and Anderson are of interest:

"I had the unusual pleasure of knowing Drs. Froom and Anderson personally... **For many years after Dr. Anderson retired to his condo in Loma Linda, I would look forward to his telephone calls. His frequent questions went like this: 'Herb, what is happening to our church?'** This went on for years until his death in 1985. **It seemed that they both [L.E. Froom and R.A. Anderson] regretted the consequences of their labors in the 1950s** [during the Evangelical Conferences and the publication and defense of Questions on Doctrine]."— Herbert E. Douglass, Opportunity of the Century, pp. 41-42.

Ralph Larson's Books (1986, 1988) — Ralph Larson was a staunch defender of historic Adventism. His 1986 book, *The Word Was Made Flesh*, provided the most complete Adventist coverage (Spirit of Prophecy and other writers) available anywhere on the human nature of Christ.

In his research, **Larson did not find one Seventh-day Adventist writer before 1952 who wrote anything other than that Christ took upon Himself our fallen, sinful nature! He also revealed that, over a period of almost sixty years, Sister White did not waver in her position that Christ took upon Himself our fallen, sinful nature!**

His 1988 book, Tell of His Power, provided a wealth of Spirit of Prophecy statements on the nature of grace, obedience, and perfection of character and the human nature of Christ. Both books, together, provided an excellent refutation of some of the errors in Questions on Doctrine.

"Dr. Ralph Larson was one of the most perceptive scholars from the 1970s, prominent in his courageous stand against QOD and its authors. Larson's articulate pen was exercised with forceful impact, even late in his life. These extracts from an article published in 2004 reflected three decades of deep concern over the misrepresentations of the Seventh-day Adventist faith in QOD."—George Knight, QODAE, p. xvi.

In his book, The Word Was Made Flesh, Larson presented about 1,200 quotes from periodicals and other sources in North America, Great Britain, South Africa and Australasia. About 400 of these quotes were from Ellen White. This book offers unchallengeable evidence that Ellen White emphatically stated that Christ took 'our sinful nature' and that 'He took upon Himself fallen, suffering human nature, degraded and defiled by sin.'

Samples' Threatening article (1988) — The summer 1988 issue of the Christian Research Journal (the quarterly publication of Walter Martin's Christian Research Institute) carried an article, entitled "From Controversy to Crisis: An Updated Assessment of Seventh-day Adventism," by Kenneth R. Samples, one of Martin's associates.

In this 15-page article, Samples portrayed "Evangelical Adventists" (his name for those of us accepting the new theology) as being persecuted and chased out of the Adventist denomination. We, who have lived through the 1980s and into the 1990s, know the opposite to be true.

Kenneth Samples' article was prepared in the spring of 1988, and published that summer. Shortly afterward, our new doctrinal book, Seventh-day Adventists Believe (SDAB) came off the press; and all talk of relabeling us immediately ceased. This is because SDAB had the same doctrinal errors that its predecessor, Questions on Doctrine had. Indeed, the very fact that such talk of casting us into the ranks of cults immediately stopped—is proof in itself that the new Adventist doctrinal book, SDAB, contained the errors previously in QD.

That which Walter Martin did in 1983, he repeated in 1988. In 1983, Martin sent a threatening letter to the GC and immediately afterward spoke at Napa. This got our leaders started toward preparing a replacement book which would please him.

In 1988, Martin had his associate, Samples, publish a threatening article in their journal just before our new doctrinal book, Seventh-day Adventists Believe was released.

In both instances, Martin wanted Evangelicals everywhere to know that it was due to his threats that the Adventists continued to submit to his demands. But Martin was not to glory in his success in corrupting our core beliefs very long, for we will discover that he would be dead within a year at the young age of 61.

The publication of Seventh-day Adventists Believe (1988) — Because of the continued, ongoing controversy over the book, QD was permitted to go out of print. But, by 1983, Walter Martin was openly threatening our church leaders that, if we did not republish QD or something similar, he would publish a scathing doctrinal attack on our denomination, and denounce us as a fanatical cult “in 6,000 religious bookstores” in America.

So, in 1988, a sequel to QD was released. Entitled Seventh-day Adventists Believe (SDAB), it contained a rehash of most of the doctrinal errors which had been in the previous book. For this reason, Martin's threatened denunciation of us was never printed. We had acceded to his demands.

As QD was written by Leroy Edwin Froom, a General Conference researcher, so SDAB was penned by Norman Gulley, a Bible teacher at, what is now called, Southern Adventist University, in Collegedale, Tennessee (as explained on p. v of Acknowledgment in SDAB).

Please understand that SDAB is the only official doctrinal book ever published by our denomination! No other book ever published by our church, including Bible Readings, ever received this official doctrinal status. QD never was official; that is, it was never commissioned by a General Conference Session.

The publication of QD was delayed over a year, because of repeated rejections of it by the Review and certain leaders. As SDAB neared publication, over 75 pages were removed from the book! (More on that below.) Warnings were sounded that, if it was not expurgated to some extent, a terrible uprising would occur in the church. As a result, a mingling of truth with subtly worded error occurred in both books. But this only makes both books all the more dangerous.

In the summer of 1988, when SDAB was released, we noticed an odd discovery: **Nowhere in the 1988 Third Quarter Sabbath School Quarterly was the new doctrinal book advertised as the accompanying study book** for that and the next quarter, even though each lesson in the

third and fourth quarter exactly matched the 27 successive chapters in the new doctrinal book. **What had happened?**

Because Quarterly scheduling begins three years beforehand, it was obvious that something very unusual had taken place within a few months prior to publication—something so serious that, by the spring of 1988, it appeared quite likely that the new doctrinal book might not be published in time—or at all.

Later the present writer learned what took place. The information came from a worker at the Review plant:

After the covers for the new doctrinal book had been printed—havoc descended upon the book's scheduling. **Word came to the printing house that approximately 75 pages were being removed from the new doctrinal book!**

Now, there are only 392 pages of text in the new doctrinal book, Seventh-day Adventists Believe. Each page is a large 7 x 9 inches in size and has two columns, heavy with printed material. **So the amount of text suddenly removed from here and there in the book—amounted to one-fifth of its entire content!**

This sudden change is nothing short of astounding. Just before the book printing date—and after the covers for the larger-size book had already been printed—an equivalent of one page in every five was removed from the new doctrinal book!

What was in the missing 75 pages? We may never know. It must truly have been wild.

As Leroy Edwin Froom was the basic author of Questions on Doctrine, so Norman Gulley was the original and principal author of Seventh-day Adventists Believe.

Gulley, the Bible teacher at Southern Adventist University who wrote the basic manuscript which became our 1988 doctrinal book—**had six years earlier written the notorious 1983 Senior Quarterly and the accompanying book, Christ Our Substitute**; both of them contained serious error about the atonement and the nature of Christ. This had marked him as a decided theological liberal. — Yet he had been the one selected to write the later doctrinal book!

The theme of his earlier book, Christ Our Substitute (COS), was that Christ was our substitute in all things, including providing the obedience that God required in order to save us, so that we do not need to obey. In order to arrive at that conclusion, he had to especially twist our doctrines on Christ's human nature and the atonement.

The errors in SDAB, Gulley's Quarterly, and the accompanying book are quoted in an Appendix at the back of this present book.

The statement by the Biblical Research Institute (1989) — In spite of such evidence, as cited above, it seems unbelievable, — but only shortly after the publication of Ralph Larson's mammoth collection of historical data on the subject, the GC Biblical Research Institute (BRI) published a 1989 book through the Review that totally rejected the importance of our historic truths which had been earlier set aside by Questions on Doctrine!

“The World Church has never viewed these subjects [the nature of Christ, the nature of

sin] as essential to salvation nor to the mission of the remnant church... There can be no strong unity within the world church of God's remnant people so long as segments who hold these views verbalize and agitate them both in North America and overseas divisions. These topics need to be laid aside and not urged upon our people as necessary issues."—Issues: The Seventh-day Adventist Church and Certain Private Ministries, Appendix XVI, pp. 238-244.

Walter Martin had won his last battle for the souls of the Adventist Church. At about the time of the release of this BRI book, Martin died.

The death of Walter Martin (March 1989) — On March 15, 1989, four years after publicly ridiculing Adventism for the last time, in 1989 Walter Ralston Martin (1928-1989) died. He was only 61 years old.

Some of the key events in his life which concern us are these:

- In **1954**, Barnhouse commissioned Martin to write a complete book on Seventh-day Adventists, which would expose and denounce all their evil teachings.
- The Evangelical Conferences began in March **1955** and ended in August **1956**.
- Martin's book, *The Truth about Seventh-day Adventism* was released in **1960**.
- As soon as Donald Barnhouse died, Martin left Eternity and founded his own separate "cult research" organization, The Christian Research Institute (CRI) and its magazine, the Christian Research Journal.
- *Questions on Doctrine* had gone out of print. So on February 22, **1983**, Martin spoke to an audience in Napa, California, in which he declared that if they did not reprint *Questions on Doctrine*, he would write another book about our denomination, in which we would be reduced to cult status.
- In **1985**, Martin published a revised and updated edition of his book, *The Kingdom of the Cults*. In an appendix on Adventists, he mentioned his demand and Leshner's submissive response. Because of that reply, Martin condescendingly said that, for the present, he would continue to list Adventists as Evangelical in their primary doctrines.
- In January 1985, Martin took part in the advance filming of a five-part television interview by himself and John Ankerberg with William Johnsson. The primary focus of attack was the Spirit of Prophecy, the investigative judgment, and obedience by faith in Christ.
- **On March 15, 1989, Martin suddenly returned to the attack in a talk he gave in Fresno, California. In this lecture, he downgraded the Spirit of Prophecy more viciously than he had ever done before.**
- **Shortly after that, another lecture was arranged; this one to be held not far from Loma Linda. Martin's notes were prepared, and the date was announced: Monday, June 26, 1989. A friend in southern California told me that this session was intended to be a major blast against Adventism. Martin awoke that morning at his San Juan Capistrano, California, home—and had a sudden heart attack. He was pronounced dead on arrival at the hospital.**

Martin was the last of the major players who defended or opposed the Evangelical Conferences to pass away. All the others (Barnhouse [1960], Andreasen [1962], Froom [1974], Read [1976], Figuhr [1983], and Anderson [1985]) had previously died.

It should be stated that Walter Martin changed the Seventh-day Adventist Church more than any other non-Adventist in history!

God could have protected us from the threats of Walter Martin back in 1955, if we had clung solidly to our Bible/Spirit of Prophecy foundation of doctrinal beliefs. But that was not done. A determined attempt was made by a few men to compromise our beliefs; and the great majority of our church workers fell into line, and then passed the errors on to our people. **In later decades, accelerating in the early 1980s, a terrible desolation was to follow. Only in the Final Day of Judgment will the full story be told.**

Please, dear reader, read the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy every day and obey those hallowed writings; and you will be safe.

Publication of an Annotated Edition of QD (2003) — As if we had not had enough of that book, Andrews University reprinted QD over two decades after it went out of print.

This is an exact reprint, plus an introduction and editorial notes throughout the book by George R. Knight, a church history teacher at Andrews University. A number of his comments are quite interesting.

Knight's position, in his annotated notes, is that QD only changed our doctrine of the human nature of Christ. In an Appendix at the back of this present book, abundant evidence will be provided that more doctrinal beliefs than that were changed.

The new baptismal vow (July 8, 2005) — At the St. Louis GC Session (June 29-July 9, 2005), a 28th "Belief" was adopted. It is entitled "Growing in Christ" (which is supposed to include all that is involved in sanctification). **But the entire paragraph said not one word about obeying the law of God, or anything else that God commands!**

However, the new Alternative Baptismal Vow, also enacted in 2005 (on July 8) is, by far, the worst of all!

This alternative baptismal vow originated with the South Pacific Division branch of the Biblical Research Committee. **It consists of just three sentences! They basically say this: (1) Accept Christ. (2) Accept the Bible, as interpreted by the Dallas Statement. (3) Pay tithes and offerings. —That is all you have to do to come into the Adventist Church and be assured of going to heaven!**

"1. Do you accept Jesus Christ as your personal Savior and Lord, and do you desire to live your life in a saving relationship with Him?

"2. Do you accept the teachings of the Bible as expressed in the Statement of Fundamental Beliefs of the Seventh-day Adventist Church and do you pledge by God's grace to live your life in harmony with these teachings?

"3. Do you desire to be baptized as a public expression of your belief in Jesus Christ, to be

accepted into the fellowship of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, and to support the church and its mission as a faithful steward by your personal influence, tithes and offerings, and a life of service?" — The new 2005 Alternative Baptismal Vow.

QD 50th Anniversary Conference (2007) — On October 24–27, 2007, a four-day symposium was held at the Theological Seminary at Andrews University, in Berrien Springs, Michigan, during which 24 lectures were presented, some by conservatives, others by liberals, and still others by non-Adventist Evangelicals. Most of the presentations were given on Thursday and Friday, the 25th and 26th. Some presenters defended the book, some were neutral, while a few strongly opposed it.

Adventist college teachers teaching from Evangelical doctrinal books (Sept. 2008) — As mentioned earlier in this book, on September 9, 2008, I received the following letter:

"I learned that the doctrinal book used for the basic Bible Doctrines class at Southern Adventist University is a non-Adventist book, written by Charles Stanley, president of the Southern Baptist Convention, who has a large church in Atlanta area, with 15,000 members. He is a leading Evangelical speaker and writer. The book is called Handbook for Christian Living, and it contains a great variety of Protestant errors, including complete chapters entitled Hell, Millennium, Rapture, Tribulation, and Anti-Christ. This is what they are teaching all our youth at SAU! They are required to take this course before they can get a degree.

"When I asked the teacher why he was using that book, he replied that he could not find any currently published by the Adventist Church!"

In order to appease Martin and our Ecumenical friends, our denomination stopped printing full-message doctrinal books by 1980 (2008 phone call to a large ABC by the present author).

The Latest Erroneous Sabbath School Quarterly (2008) —The Senior Sabbath School Quarterly for the fourth quarter 2008, entitled Atonement and the Cross of Christ, is directly teaching the same "finished atonement on the cross" error that Martin got Froom and Anderson to put into QD, and which Norman Gulley placed in the first quarter of the 1983 Senior Sabbath School Quarterly, and then into the 1988 doctrinal book, Seventh-day Adventists Believe.

Decades of Gradual Change (1960 onward) — After the publication of QD, major changes quietly began occurring. They came so slowly that few of our people did not realize what was taking place.

First, there were changes which occurred as the direct result of errors printed in QD. Second, there were changes from other causes which combined with the desolating effect of QD.

It cannot be the purpose of this book to list them all here, for this book would then become too large. But **you will find the history and nature of a large number of these other changes in the books listed at the back of the book you now have in hand.**

Three separate trends have been at work, which have weakened our denomination.

The first trend was the gradually increasing doctrinal apostasy and worldliness in our colleges and universities, caused by our slavish devotion to gaining outside accreditation, which required our books, instruction, and teachers to conform to worldly standards and doctoral degrees, which necessitated hiring men and women trained in secular, Protestant, and Catholic universities. The entire history of that downward trend, from about 1911 onward, is recorded in Vance Ferrell's book, *The Broken Blueprint*.

The second compromising trend began with the Evangelical Conferences and the publication of *Questions on Doctrine* in the 1950s, which emboldened the liberals in our church to more openly urge students and church members to accept Evangelical concepts (errors which we today collectively refer to as "the new theology").

The third unfortunate trend was an outgrowth of the Evangelical Conferences—a determination to gain direct acceptance by Protestant, Catholic, and Orthodox churches, through meetings with their leaders, participation in Ecumenical gatherings throughout the world, membership on a key doctrinal committee at the World Council of Churches, and actual membership in national Ecumenical organizations in a number of foreign countries.

If you want to understand the basics of the new theology in our ranks, it is really quite simple: Twist various doctrinal concepts to agree with the premise that it is all right to keep sinning and still go to heaven. The whole package is devilishly simple!

It should be mentioned here that a spin-off from the Evangelical Conferences was the involvement of our leaders in the Ecumenical movement. Although the release of QD did not achieve the coveted goal of gaining our acceptance by the other denominations, many of our leaders determined to use Vatican II, to help us penetrate the council halls of other churches and enter into friendly theological agreements with them.

This began in the late 1950s with contacts with the National Council of Churches in New York City, at the very time that QD was first printed. But Pope John XXIII's convening of Vatican II greatly helped. We sent unofficial representatives to attend the meetings. In the hallways of St. Peter's and in the hotels of Rome, we made contacts with leaders of other denominations and gradually worked ourselves into position—so that, **in 1966, two "special non-members" of the World Council of Churches (WCC) began sending representatives to a special doctrinal committee at their headquarters in Geneva, Switzerland: the Roman Catholic Church and the Seventh-day Adventist Church. Our participation at WCC headquarters in that doctrinal committee has continued down to the present day.** Indeed, Bert Beverly Beach, our leading WCC representative (because he fluently speaks many European languages) from 1966 onward, was chairman of that committee for decades.

Dating back all the way into the early 1960s, it became standard procedure to frown upon presentations of our Sanctuary beliefs—as related to Christ's work in heaven. This became a "no-no." Later, all mention of the correct view of the human nature of Christ became suspect.

Church leaders on all levels desired conformity, not clarification. Historians tell us that, both by pagan and papal Rome, the "peace of Rome" consisted of eliminating all opposition and calling that "peace." Unfortunately, after the 1950s, this attitude had penetrated our own church.

“In many ways the word has been out since the 1960s that pastors and teachers should not speak out on subjects such as the Sanctuary and the humanity of Christ because such topics are divisive. But when did the divisiveness begin?”—Herbert Douglass, *A Fork in the Road*, p. 89 (italics his).

To a small group of men at our General Conference in the 1950s, it seemed as if a new era was about to open up before the church. A new era did indeed open up—but it was not what they expected.

Before concluding this, it should be mentioned that **a significant cause of weakness is our gradual changeover from the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy as the primary authority in our church—to that of committee meetings, policy books, and creeds.** Predetermined agenda items are discussed, and decisions favored by leadership are approved in consensus decisions by men who know their positions will be imperiled if they do not vote yes. By such means the policies keep enlarging.

“Creed power” has become a powerful force in our denomination. It matters not what may be the meeting, from the smallest church committee meeting to the largest church gathering, — **God’s Inspired Writings are not the basis of the decisions which are made!** Indeed, church leaders not only fear but they oppose the slightest suggestion that the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy should be the basis of any decision that is made.

APPENDIX 1 - STATEMENT BY A GENERAL CONFERENCE WORKER (1983)

In March 1983, the present writer (Vance Ferrell) wrote a series of 18 tracts, entitled *The Beginning of the End* (DH-101-118), which were later reprinted in our book, entitled *The Evangelical Conferences and Their Aftermath*, which contained a large number of documents. **At the time, I contacted a close friend, whom I had known while I was attending the Adventist Seminary in Washington, D.C. from 1955 to 1958. I asked him if he would provide me with a statement of what he had observed and heard at that time and afterward.** He kindly did this. At the time, he had been retired for many years and gave me permission to name him. But I only referred to him as a “General Conference man.” It is now 2008 and he has long been deceased, so I will now mention his name.

He was Ben Glanzer—who for years, before and after the 1950s doctrinal crisis, had been a staff member of the General Conference Ministerial Association, of which Roy Allen Anderson was the head. As an assistant in the preparation of *Ministry* magazine and continually conversing with friends in the GC, at the *Review*, and out in the field, Ben knew a lot of what transpired during those fateful years. His comments here were 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.

I made partial reference to his lengthy statement in different places in this present book. But it seemed best to present it all in one place. In this way, you will get the full impact of what he had to say. Here is his report:

“Before publishing *Questions on Doctrine*, typed copies of the manuscript were first sent to all of our top leaders throughout the world field. 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 tell me what you think.’ **His reader leaked the news of what was in it to others, and it created a furor when it went around the campus.**

“But there were those who did object. And some very strongly. So, **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 GC 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 so it would slip by the Review book editors.

“Later, Martin spoke to 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’s 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 was also 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, Anderson said, ‘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 had a lot of push with 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 byline 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 did back it up. But that couldn’t prove genuineness of doctrine, for he was the one who said in another 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 [discussed earlier in this present book]. Grieve [president of the North New Zealand Conference just then] 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. After he 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 copied 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. **Andreasen 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 [in Riverside, California, close to Loma Linda] 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 that Loma Linda area. **‘Yes, but they cut me off,’ he replied.**

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.

“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 [both of whom are also now deceased]. And we’re still living with the problems they left us with.”—Ben Glanzer, report prepared in early 1983, and sent to Vance Ferrell.

APPENDIX - 2 - STATEMENT BY A SEMINARY STUDENT (1983)

From his personal experience, the present writer (Vance Ferrell) prepared the following statement in early 1983. It will provide additional background information on the Martin-Barnhouse episode:

“I was a student at our Theological Seminary, which at that time was located in Washington, D.C. Fronting on Eastern Avenue, just across from the Takoma Park Church, the General Conference building was situated on the corner of Eastern and Carroll Avenues. Just to the north of it, across a narrow alley, was the Review building on Eastern Avenue. Immediately south of the GC building was the Adventist Seminary on Carroll Avenue. So we were all packed in closely together.

Here is this report which I wrote, in 1983, and slightly edited for this present book:

“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. **I was at the Seminary from June 1955 to June 1958.**

“**Nearly all of the eighteen-month Evangelical Conferences (March 1955-August 1956) occurred in the General Conference building, next door to the Seminary.** Then followed the “Bombshell” and other articles, and the process of completing and publishing Questions on

Doctrine, and the initial promotion of the book throughout the world field. **Throughout nearly all that time, I was in attendance at the Seminary**, where I obtained a Master's degree in June 1956, and Bachelor of Theology degree (equivalent to the M.Div degree) in June 1958.

"After later completing the Bachelor of Divinity degree, I and my wife went to California where I began pastoral work in the Adventist ministry.

"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.

"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 who worked at night (one on each of the three main floors), dusted, stripped and waxed floors, emptied wastebaskets, and kept watch over the premises throughout the night hours.

"Each night janitor was assigned a different floor (1st, 2nd, and 3rd), and my first assignment was to arrive at 5 p.m., closing time, and rotate on different floors so the other men could have a night off. In this way, week by week, I had opportunity to meet and talk with workers who remained over after hours. During this time, I met many General Conference workers.

"During that first assignment, I worked alone on all of the floors and cleaned all of the rooms. (The only exception was the President's office on the second floor; the Treasurer's suite of offices on the first floor; and the E.G. White Estate, the Chapel, and the GC Print Shop, which were in the basement. They were off-limits to the night janitors.)

"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.

"Later, my assignment was changed, and I was placed as full-time janitor on the second floor. Although not there during the day, I yet had the opportunity to observe and speak with many of our leaders who arrived before 6 a.m. in the morning when my work shift was over. The President's office, and Secretary's office, and the Ministerial Association offices were on the second floor.

"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 (Ruben R. Fighur), the Treasurer (C.L. Torrey), the Secretary (Walter R. Beach; father of Bert Beverly Beach), and the Ministerial Association Secretary (Roy A. Anderson); all of whom I met and spoke with at various times. 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.

"Looking back on it now, I consider it providential that I was later given charge, night after night, of the second floor. This was the floor which contained the offices of the entire

Ministerial Association.

“The GC building was a large rectangle, with most of the offices facing the outside of the building, and many facing an inner rectangular court. In this way, all the rooms had air and light from outside.

“One of the rooms that I cleaned was somewhat different than the others. Just to the left of the Ministry magazine office, it was situated on the narrow rear (south) part of the building, which was across from the Seminary. The room faced the inner rectangular court or open space. (On the right of it was the Ministry magazine office.) **This particular room was the office of Leroy Edwin Froom.**

“This room was different in one way, in that it never needed cleaning. No one worked there. **But for months, I would find stacks of stapled 8 1/2 x 11 sheets. These stacks changed very frequently.** They 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, which never had anything on it.

“Since no one worked in this room, it appeared that the room was just a staging area where these sheets were temporarily stacked, and then taken out so another two stacks could be brought in.

“Around the room were a few metal filing cabinets. 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. There was no library there.

“However, occasionally something out in the open would attract my attention. It was my assignment to clean the rooms, 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. If so, it was probably done on one of the small Multi-liths in the General Conference Print Shop. (Neither day nor night janitors were permitted in the GC Print Shop.)

“At the top of each stapled set of sheets was a question number. This was followed by a question, and then an extended answer.

“I was looking at the prototypes of single chapters of Questions on Doctrine, probably 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 the best I can recall, only one edition of these questions and replies was sent out to those selected men in the field. The later revisions, sent next door to the editorial offices at the Review, would not require stacks of each question, and I never saw copies of them in this office.)

“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.

“It should be mentioned 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. **I had been told that Elder Froom did his actual writing and research work at his residence in the Takoma Park area,** not far from the General Conference headquarters, and that he only used 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, although I saw no dictation equipment there. 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. One would expect that his books would be at his home, where he did his research and writing.)

“In the spring of 1956, the full impact of the Martin-Barnhouse conferences was beginning to be 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 like myself, 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 at the present time.

“In the classrooms of the Theological Seminary, although there was some comment and disputation about the nature of Christ, it was much less noticeable than the concern about the “finished atonement” and the Spirit of Prophecy relationship to our doctrinal beliefs.

“In regard to these errors, **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 sidestep discussion of it.

“But some of the seasoned workers 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 generally 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. Far more vigorously than anyone else in the classes, I protested at this innovation.

“What was the proof for their contention? One passage from the Spirit of Prophecy, and only one, was cited: Selected Messages, book 1, p. 206.4-207.1 - 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 (1 SM 206-207) reveals something quite 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, study, and conversations, they could only go so far, and then they would reach an impasse. **At this point, she would be taken off in vision—and 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 either gave us our doctrines or confirmed that they were the correct ones.** The teaching was Heaven born.

“Why are some among us so anxious to exchange the heavenly origin of our teachings for majority committee votes based on varied thinkings and human speculations? This is similar to the concern of evolutionists to trace their physical origins to the creature rather than the Creator.

“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 already received,’ rather than the Bible-Spirit of Prophecy truth in the matter. Obedience is indeed the fruit of conversion. **But 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.

“After classes during the day, I would study and rest a little and then go to my night 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 desktop. Now, I am not the type to read other people’s mail. But it seemed that I should stop just then and read that one sheet of paper. 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, Dr. 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 Barnhouse’s 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 Barnhouse’s letter to their daughter, hoping that it would convince her to come back to the church of her parents.** But they did not merely let her read it, they gave it to her. **Greatly upset, she took Barnhouse’s letter to church and showed it to her Adventist pastor.** Someone got in contact with someone; and, **as a result, this letter—that I had in hand telling about all this— was sent from a denominational worker addressed to Elder L.E. Froom.**

“**Enclosed with that first letter was the original typewritten letter which 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’s full name. It was the originally typed letter, and was signed by Barnhouse, with indication beneath that a secretary had done the actual typing.

“Froom was extremely organized in everything. **The Barnhouse letter had been neatly placed below the cover letter on the desk** in a very precise manner that squared and centered it toward the front of 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 would not have stopped to read the first one if I had thought that there was something else beneath it.

“But, below the first letter, I found the Barnhouse letter. **Then, when I picked up the single-page letter by Barnhouse, I noticed that still 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, this third letter 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 everything was all right** after all, and that Barnhouse was not really trying to pull something over on the church. The letter essentially said 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 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 the two letters 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 two years. Their objective was to convert an entire church!**

“Yet the Froom letter was nonetheless significant.

For it revealed that, even at this late date, he was not clear as to the real objectives of Martin and Barnhouse. **If Froom had fully been 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—for 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 summary by Elder Froom of events in the Evangelical conferences with Martin and Barnhouse. In this talk he distinctly 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, so many 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, it was mentioned that Walter R. Martin gave three major talks before Adventist assemblies: the Takoma Park Church, the Adventist Seminary, and the Loma Linda Church. I heard two of these lectures that were given on the East Coast.

“**It was a revelation to hear Mr. Martin in person. When he spoke, the words come out as over-powering bullets.** With a rapid-fire brain, and an authoritative manner, he talked like a machine gun. Powerful and convincing was 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 at the 11 o’clock hour on a Sabbath morning in the Takoma Park Church,

just across from the GC building. **Significantly, his text was Acts 17:23. With powerful rhetoric he told the audience 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). Dramatically, he walked around to the side of the podium and pointed at the front of it as though it were the Athenium monument he spoke of that day long ago. **There, Martin said, the words were engraved, ‘To the Unknown God.’**

“And then, turning to the audience, in a 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.

“Obviously, in Martin’s thinking, we were worshipping the wrong god, and he was there to set us straight.

“Recently I listened to tapes of a February 1983 lecture by Martin. Although much older, he still spoke with authority. He was clearly in charge. And the GC had better do what he wanted—or he would write another book, this one declaring them to be a cult.

“The Walter Martin of the mid-fifties that molded the course of those Evangelical Conferences was a powerfully persuasive and forceful individual. While urging ‘unity,’ he demanded conformity. And he always got what he was after. Not once at any time, throughout the entire conferences, did he yield a single point of his Calvinist beliefs; all the concessions and modifications were for us to make.

“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

APPENDIX - 3 - DOCTRINAL ERRORS IN QD AND SDAB

**Abbreviations: QD = The 1957 General Conference doctrinal book, Questions on Doctrine
SDAB = The 1988 General Conference book, Seventh-day Adventists Believe....27**

THE HUMAN NATURE OF CHRIST

When Christ came to earth, He took our fallen human nature. This is the teaching of Hebrews 2:14-18. Christ took the nature of Abraham’s descendants, not his ancestors (Heb. 2:16). This is also the teaching of the Spirit of Prophecy. In research of the Spirit of Prophecy, which he conducted over a decade ago, Ralph Larson found over 2,000 passages clearly supporting this truth about the human nature of Christ. **It is a continual marvel to the present writer that the Spirit of Prophecy would contain so many accurate statements on the human nature of Christ; yet the controversy over this topic did not begin until decades after her death.**

Here are two sample quotations. They are incontrovertible:

“It would have been an almost infinite humiliation for the Son of God to take man’s nature, even when Adam stood in his innocence in Eden. But **Jesus accepted humanity when the race had been weakened by four thousand years of sin.** Like every child of Adam He accepted the results of the working of the great law of heredity. What these results were is shown in the

history of His earthly ancestors. He came with such a heredity to share our sorrows and temptations, and to give us the example of a sinless life.”—Desire of Ages, 49.

“Satan had pointed to Adam’s sin as proof that God’s law was unjust, and could not be obeyed. In our humanity, Christ was to redeem Adam’s failure. But when Adam was assailed by the tempter, none of the effects of sin were upon him. He stood in the strength of perfect manhood, possessing the full vigor of mind and body. He was surrounded with the glories of Eden, and was in daily communion with heavenly beings. It was not thus with Jesus when He entered the wilderness to cope with Satan. For four thousand years the race had been decreasing in physical strength, in mental power, and in moral worth; and Christ took upon Him the infirmities of degenerate humanity. Only thus could He rescue man from the lowest depths of his degradation.

“Many claim that it was impossible for Christ to be overcome by temptation. Then He could not have been placed in Adam’s position; He could not have gained the victory that Adam failed to gain. **If we have in any sense a more trying conflict than had Christ, then He would not be able to succor us. But our Saviour took humanity, with all its liabilities. He took the nature of man, with the possibility of yielding to temptation.** We have nothing to bear which He has not endured.”—Desire of Ages, 117.

While retaining His divinity, Christ took for Himself the same human nature we have; and in that nature, He relied on His Father for help. He successfully resisted every temptation that Satan could hurl at Him. **He is our example; and, by faith in Him, we too are to overcome on every point and be overcomers.**

Although He fully took our fallen, sinful nature, not once did He ever yield to temptation or entertain a sinful thought. He was sinless.

Why does the new theology—and the Evangelicals—seek to deny this truth? Because they want to theologically excuse the fact that they want to remain in their sins till they die.

As they do on several other doctrines, both truth and error are to be found in QD and SDAB in regard to the human nature which Christ took when He came to earth. Some are thankful that some truth is included in both books; but we should not praise the fact that some accurate statements are there. Instead, **we should protest the inclusion of any error amid truth in official Adventist doctrinal books.**

Pages 50-65 (question 6) and 383 (part of question 33) is where you will find the human nature of Christ discussed in the original 1957 edition of QD. In the 2003 reprint, those pages are 49-60 and 304-305. Here is how QD said it:

“Although born in the flesh, He [Christ] 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.**”—QD (1957), 383:1.

“But though sinless in His life and **in His nature,** He was nevertheless ‘in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin.’ ”—QD (1957), 383:1.

“He was the second Adam, coming in the ‘likeness’ of sinful human flesh.”—QD (1957), 52:1 (quote marks theirs).

Only in the “likeness.” QD declares that Christ only bore our humanity “vicariously”! This is rank heresy! Here, read it for yourself:

“It could hardly be construed, however, from the record of either Isaiah [53:3-4] or Matthew [8:17], that Jesus was diseased or that He experienced the frailties to which our fallen human nature is heir. But He did bear all this. **Could it not be that He bore this vicariously** also, just as He bore the sins of the whole world?”—QD (1957), 59:3 (italics theirs).

“These weaknesses, frailties, infirmities, failings are things which **we, with our sinful, fallen natures, have to bear. To us they are natural, inherent, but when He bore them, He took them not as something innately His, but He bore them as our substitute. He bore them in His perfect, sinless nature.** Again we remark, **Christ bore all this vicariously**, just as vicariously He bore the iniquities of us all. It is in this sense that all should understand the writings of Ellen G. White when she refers occasionally to sinful, fallen, and deteriorated human nature [which Christ had while on earth].”—QD (1957), 59:4-60:0.

QD then reverses itself and declares that Christ did take our humanity, but only the sinless part.

“Whatever Jesus took was not His intrinsically or innately. [He did not really take any part of human nature.] His taking the burden of our inherited weakness and failings, even after four thousand years of accumulated infirmities and degeneracy (The Desire of Ages, pp. 49, 117), did not in the slightest degree taint His human nature. [He did take the sinless part of human nature.]”—QD (1957), 61:4.

QD then returns to the concept that Christ only bore our humanity in a make-believe manner:

“**All that Jesus took**, all that He bore, whether the burden and penalty of our iniquities, or the diseases and frailties of our human nature—**all was taken and borne vicariously**. Just as bearing vicariously the sins of the whole world did not taint **His perfect, sinless soul**, neither did bearing the diseases and frailties of our fallen nature taint Him in the slightest degree with the corrupting influences of sin.”—QD (1957), 61:7- 62:0.

Froom (the primary writer of this confusion) is begging the question. Christ took our real nature; but, in that nature, He never sinned nor did He become sick.

Let us next turn our attention to the sequel doctrinal book, Seventh-day Adventists Believe. Here is how the human nature of Christ is described in SDAB:

“Jesus Christ took upon Himself our nature with all its liabilities, **but He was free from hereditary corruption.**”—SDAB, 49/1:4 (Seventh day Adventists Believe, page 49, column 1, paragraph 4).

According to that statement, Jesus took our hereditary physical weakness, but not our hereditary moral weaknesses. He did not thus fully take our fallen nature.

Here is a two-positioned statement in SDAB:

“**He took the nature of man in its fallen state** [that is, He took our fallen nature], bearing the consequences of sin, **not its sinfulness** [that is, He did not take our fallen nature]. He was one with the human race, except in sin.”—SDAB, 49/1:2.

Such contradictory statements in a single sentence are possible because of the highly doctored attention these books received during the editing process. While some were attempting to crowd in error to appease Martin and his Evangelicals, others were trying to push the errors out.

THE ATONEMENT

“The atonement was finished at the cross” is the teaching of those chapters in QD which deal with the atonement. Keep in mind that, when the atonement was finished, our salvation was completed. All that comes after Calvary, according to the modern Protestant view, is merely our acceptance of the salvation completed there. **“Only believe and you are saved,” is their cry.** Clearly, the doctrine of a “finished atonement at the cross” is diametrically opposed to the Bible teaching that mankind must obey the law of God. **The truth is that if we will not actively cooperate in trustful, day-by-day reliance on Christ—with God in His work for our salvation—we will not be saved.**

Here is how QD presented the error:

“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.”—QD (1957), 350:2.

Originally, the word was “atonement.” But editors changed it to “atoning sacrifice.” Nowhere in QD will you find the word, “atonement,” applied to anything done after the cross. (The phrase, “day of atonement,” is mentioned a couple times; but it is repeatedly stated to mean judgment, not atonement.)

“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 [for salvation].**”—QD (1957), 352:4- 353:0.

“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.”—QD (1957), 354:8-355:0.

“This sacrifice [on Calvary] was completely efficacious. **It provided complete atonement for all mankind.**”—QD (1957), 357:0.

“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.**”—QD (1957), 381:1.

On pages 341-364, 369-390, in the original 1957 book (in the sections on questions 29-31 and 33), and pages 271-290, 295-312 (in the new 2003 reprint), QD repeatedly uses the phrase, “atoning sacrifice”; this is **always in the sense that Christ’s death on Calvary was the only atonement** (often called the “completed atonement”) **while its “benefits” were merely applied thereafter** to humanity from His ministry in the Sanctuary in heaven.

Read through those sections. You will repeatedly find the phrases, “sacrificial atonement” and “completed atonement,” as that which Christ did on Calvary; and “benefits of the (finished)

atonement” refers to what He does in heaven thereafter. **What are the “benefits”?** **Forgiveness alone.** More on this later.

Did you notice that, in QD 381 (quoted above), Froom did not give the correct translation of *hagia*? His QD footnote, on p. 381, gives the correct translation. The apostle Paul, in the book of Hebrews, consistently applies “holy places” (*hagia*) to the first apartment. See my book, *Biblical Defense*, for a detailed explanation.

“The Greek word here translated ‘holy place’ is *hagia*, and is in the plural form. **A correct translation would be ‘the holies,’ or ‘holy places,’** as in Hebrews 9:24.”— QD (1957), 381, footnote. [A similar footnote is on p. 385.]

Those who have read the present author’s book, *Biblical Defense*, pp. 251-263, know that Hebrews 9:1-3 explains the correct translation of *hagia*. It is “holy places,” which is plural of “holy place.” At His ascension, Jesus entered the first apartment of the heavenly Sanctuary.

If you will read pages 381 and 385 in QD, you will sense that **Froom was trying to mollify the Evangelicals, who believe that Christ entered the Most Holy Place in A.D. 31, not its first apartment.**

QD (1957) 341:2 also mistranslates the Hebrew word for atonement, *kaphar* (*kippur*), as meaning “to cover.” But **this interpretation means that the atonement only covers over our sins instead of getting rid of them.** The correct Hebrew meaning of *kaphar* is “to wipe.” See Genesis 6:14. Thus the atonement wipes away our sins. (See my book, *Biblical Defense*, pp. 129-130.) Knight, in his notes, overlooked this flaw, which favors the new theology.

The 1988 doctrinal sequel, SDAB, presents the same fundamental error: The atonement was finished at the cross:

“Christ’s serving as the surety meant that if the human race would fall into sin He would bear their punishment; He would make the atonement for their sin . . . At the cross Jesus fulfilled His pledge to be humanity’s surety in the covenant. **His cry ‘It is finished’ marked the completion of His mission.**”—SDAB, 94/1:3, 94/2:2.

“The atonement, or reconciliation, was completed on the cross as foreshadowed by the sacrifices, and the penitent believer can trust in this finished work of our Lord.”—SDAB, 315/2:1.

The reader is encouraged to believe that forgiveness of our past sins and a “clothing in the righteousness of Christ,” by His heavenly mediation— without reference to any need on our part to obey God—is all that is necessary to ensure that Christ’s finished atonement on the cross will open heaven’s gates to us.

“The mediatorial ministry of the resurrected Christ has the twofold objective of forgiving and clothing— the application of His death and life to our life and our standing before God. **Calvary’s ‘It is finished’ marked the completion** of a perfect life and a perfect sacrifice. Sinners need both.”—SDAB, 114/2:2.

In SDAB, the phrases, “atoning death” and “atoning sacrifice,” are repeatedly used. For example, it is found 20 times in just five portions of the new book: 53/2:1, 110/2:4, 111/1:1, 111/1:2, 111/1:3-112/2:0, 112/2:2, 113/1:4, 115/2:1, 115/2:2, 116/1:1, 116/1:2, 157/2:3, 160/1:1,

242/1:1, 243/1:4, 243/2:0, 315/1:3, 315/2:4, 315/2:1, 315/2:3.

In contrast, there are only six places in SDAB where the atonement is also applied to the work within the tabernacle or the heavenly Sanctuary (SDAB, 110/ 1:3, 110/2:1-2, 315/2:1-3, 316/1:0, 318/1:2, 317/2:1-3, 327/2:2). Some editors slipped them in.

Some may say that everything is all right if both positions are in the book. But **the fact remains that, in this official Adventist doctrinal book, the error is there and predominantly so. The Spirit of Prophecy tells us that Satan works most effectively when he can mingle truth with error.**

The sleeping giant in both doctrinal books is the lack of any necessity for active obedience on the part of the Christian. In the late 1950s, M.L. Andreasen (a godly soul who will be in heaven) was deeply concerned, and rightly so, about the fact that QD ended the atonement process at the cross. According to QD, no atonement was made in heaven; and even the day of atonement in Leviticus 16 was said to only be concerned with judgment, not atonement.

In contrast, **George Knight, in his notes in the reprinted QD [the 2003 annotated edition of QD] repeatedly declares that QD teaches our correct position on the atonement.** He says that QD says the “benefits” of the atonement made on Calvary were applied later; therefore, the entirety of our atonement message is properly stated in that book.

But the time bomb in the atonement chapters involves the lack of required obedience. If you will very carefully read pages 341-364, 369-390 in the original 1957 book (dealing with questions 29-31, and 33) and 271-290, 295-311 (in the new 2003 reprint), you will come upon an astounding fact: **Nearly every fact about the heavenly Sanctuary, as given in chapters 23-24, and 28 of Great Controversy (pp 409-432, 479-491) is totally missing from QD! That is because those details directly lead to enabled obedience on our part.**

Read those QD sections on the atonement and Sanctuary again; and the Evangelical/new theology will begin to dawn on you: **There is nothing in QD about power to obey being provided by Jesus to His followers! It is all forgiveness, forgiveness, forgiveness!** This is the heart of our current new theology crisis.

The Evangelical Conferences and the resultant book, QD, was one of the two primary channels where our present doctrinal apostasy originated. QD emboldened liberals in our denomination to begin preaching salvation regardless of conduct. **The other primary channel is explained in my book, Broken Blueprint: the control of the books, teachers, and curricula of our colleges and universities, by worldly accreditation agencies and the accreditation requirement that our teachers obtain doctorates. They got “doctorates” all right! They receive indoctrination. Thoroughly indoctrinated into atheistic sentiments, Roman Catholic concepts, and/or modern Protestant errors (in accordance with the university they attended), they were hired by our schools of “higher education” to teach sophisticated error to the young of our church.**

In the midst of more than two dozen passages in QD which speak about forgiveness, I found only one which gave the right message. Some editor must have slipped it in at the last minute:

“And in His capacity as High Priest, He gives His people power to overcome sin.”—QD (1957), 382:3.

For the most accurate and complete research study on the atonement and the heavenly Sanctuary, which you can find anywhere, we refer you to the writings of one who knows the most about the subject: Read Great Controversy, chapters 23, 24, and 28 (pp. 409-432, 479-491).

THE TWO-APARTMENT SANCTUARY

The concept of **an actual two-apartment Sanctuary in heaven** is one which is especially disliked by the new theology. **They prefer to view Christ as entering a single place, the Most Holy Place (which they consider to be heaven itself), and doing nothing thereafter.**

However, chapters 23-24, and 28 of Great Controversy are very clear on this point.

But, in order to please the Evangelicals, QD was very careful to avoid discussing the matter. **There is little or no mention of the two apartments in QD; and there is almost nothing about a structure in heaven** that is called the Sanctuary.

“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.”—QD (1957), 379:1.

In the above passage, Froom is telling us to not study the meaning of the furnishings or apartments of the heavenly Sanctuary. In the next one, he makes no mention of a structure in heaven.

“When our Lord ascended into the heavens He appeared before the Father, in the presence of the angels, at which time He was installed as our High Priest... **He is also the King-Priest** of the Melchizedek order, **upon His Father’s throne.**”—QD (1957), 378:2.

Nowhere in Scripture or the Spirit of Prophecy is Christ a “King-Priest” before the end of time.

“Jesus our surety **entered the ‘holy places,’** and appeared in the presence of God for us.... And now as our High Priest He ministers the virtues of His atoning sacrifice to us.”—QD (1957), 381:1.

We are not told what those “holy places” consist of. But one passage does speak of it as a Sanctuary in heaven:

“Now where and how does our Lord officiate? The Scripture leaves no room for speculation. **He ministers in the heavenly Sanctuary** (Heb. 8:1-2). So long as the ancient ritual continued, ‘the way into the holiest of all [holy places] was not... made manifest’ (Heb. 9:8).”—QD (1957), 384:3-385:0 [bracket in the original].

In the sequel doctrinal book, SDAB, the emphasis is also on forgiveness.

“The Sanctuary could be characterized as a ministry of intercession, **forgiveness**, reconciliation, and restoration... **the repentant sinner** has immediate and constant access to God through Christ’s priestly ministry as intercessor and mediator.”—SDAB, 316/1:4-2/:0.

“The penitent offered a sin offering, confessing his errors. **He went away forgiven**, assured of God’s acceptance. So in the antitypical experience, when a sinner is drawn in penitence by the Holy Spirit to accept Christ as his Saviour and Lord, **Christ assumes his sins and accountability. He is freely forgiven.** Christ is the believer’s Surety as well as his Substitute.”—SDAB, 316/ 2:3-317/1:0. (Italics are Gulley’s.)

“**Christ’s priestly ministry provides for the sinner’s forgiveness and reconciliation to God.**”—SDAB, 317/1:1.

Not one word about overcoming power to resist and conquer sin in this book.

According to SDAB, this “Sanctuary” is the place where God dwells. So it must consist of the inner part of heaven.

“The heavenly sanctuary is the primary dwelling place of God.”—SDAB, 314/2:2.

In one extended passage, SDAB mentions that Christ entered the most holy place when He ascended to heaven (SDAB, 319/2:3-320/1:0).

THE INVESTIGATIVE JUDGMENT

QD contains no reference to any atoning work in this investigative judgment. The following quotation mentions judgment alone as the last work of Christ’s heavenly ministry. It also mentions the fact that **the two “apartments” of the earthly tabernacle only refer to two “phases” of Christ’s work in heaven, not to two apartments:**

“**This priestly ministry of our Lord, we believe, climaxes in a work of judgment.** And this takes place just before He returns in glory. **While He does not minister in ‘places made with hands’** (Heb. 9:24), seeing He is sovereign Lord, yet the **two types of ministry** carried out in the ancient sanctuary—first, that of reconciliation in the holy place and, second, that of judgment in the most holy—illustrate very graphically **the two phases** of our Lord’s ministry as High Priest. And then, that ministry finished, He comes in glory.” — QD (1957), 389:3.

“...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.**”— QD (1957), 370:3.

“The work of this special day [the day of atonement] was a type, or illustration, of the last aspect of the great work of God for man. In ancient Israel, it was **a day of judgment.**” — QD (1957), 362:7.

“...the concluding phase of that ministry, which we understand to be a **work of judgment.**” — QD (1957), 370:3.

We fully agree that the investigative judgment is concerned with a work of judgment—but **it is also a time for the people of God on earth to put away their sins, so they can pass that**

judgment! See Great Controversy, chapter 28 (pp. 479-491). This concept is totally ignored in QD.

As far as Froom was concerned, Calvary did it all; nothing was to follow except forgiveness. As he explained it, improperly translating hagia, Jesus entered both holy places in A.D. 31, and everything afterward was mercy and forgiveness.

“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 [after He entered the Sanctuary], or at some future time. No! He had already obtained it for us on the cross. And now as our High Priest He ministers the virtues of His atoning sacrifice to us.”—QD (1957), 381:1 (italics Froom’s).

“We believe that the atonement [on Calvary] 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.”—QD (1957), 352:4-353:0.

That is a daring statement! According to it, God can take sinners to heaven, without jeopardizing His government! All that is needed is repentance and forgiveness.

“In order to be saved, there must be individual repentance and turning to God.”—QD (1957), 352:1.

Did you know that not even the Israelites needed to repent of their sins? They were automatically forgiven each day, without even asking for forgiveness!

“By means of the daily morning and evening sacrifices, they could know their sins were forgiven each day.”—QD (1957), 359:1.

“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.”—QD (1957), 360:2.

QD did teach that the sins of God’s people were blotted out of the books of record during the investigative judgment. But **not one word was mentioned about the fact that God’s people needed to put away those sins from their lives so they could be blotted out!** As Froom presents it, **the sins eliminated from the universe will be forgiven sins, but not put away sins.**

“The Day of Atonement was a special day when the confessed sins were also blotted out. On this day God gave to Israel a graphic illustration, we believe, of His purpose to eliminate sin forever from His universe.”—CD (1957), 430:0.

“In Scripture, a difference is to be noted between the forgiveness of sin and the blotting out of sin. The forgiveness of our sins is very real, and is something that can be known and experienced by living faith in our Lord. In the divine act of forgiveness our sins are removed from us, and we are freed, delivered, saved. But the final destruction of sin awaits the day of

God's reckoning, **when sin will be blotted out forever from the universe of God.**"—QD (1957), 439:2.

The new theology teaches that the investigative judgment of Daniel 8:14 is only concerned with judging the little horn, not anyone else!

Although this error was not in QD, **George Knight inserts it into his notes in the newly reprinted edition**, where he laments the fact that it was not included in QD's analysis of that verse:

"One aspect of the investigative or pre-Advent judgment not adequately dealt with in this section or anywhere else in Questions on Doctrine is the fact that the 'cleansing' or judgment of Daniel 8:14 is contextually related to the little horn rather than to God's people."—George Knight's note, in the reprinted QD (2003), 213.

As far as the new theology is concerned, the investigative judgment is only some "pre-Advent judgment" that concerns the little horn power. It is not an investigation into the lives or obedience of the people of God. This is logical enough; for, since modern Protestantism does not believe anyone needs to obey God, why should anyone be judged for not having done so?

The new theology teaches that there will be an "end-time judgment" which will only apply to the little horn power.

We find the same definition of the investigative judgment as providing no atonement, but solely a work of judgment on the little horn (in the sequel book, SDAB).

"Daniel's visions point to a pre-Advent judgment in which God will secure a verdict of condemnation upon the little horn, and thus upon Satan himself."—SDAB, 325/1:3.

Where in the chapter on the Investigative Judgment, in Great Controversy (chapter 28, pp. 479-491), do you find that the investigative judgment is a condemnation of Satan?

The following quotation presents another pleasing fable of the new theology: The final "pre-Advent judgment" will only bring favor to God's professed people.

"While the judgment brings condemnation upon the apostate little horn power, it is 'made in favor of the saints of the Most High.'"—SDAB, 325/1:4-2:0.

We fully agree that the "saints" are vindicated by the investigative judgment; but those saints will all be overcomers.

As mentioned earlier, both truth and error will be found in this book. The original author slipped in new theology while later editors tried to insert some truth. The last sentence in SDAB, 326/2:0, is excellent; it declares that the disobedient will not be saved while the subsequent, lengthy paragraph condemns those who dare to do good works.

"The events of the Day of Atonement illustrate the three phrases of God's final judgment. They are (1) the 'premillennial judgment' (or 'the investigative judgment') which is also called the pre-

Advent judgment; (2) the ‘millennial judgment’; and (3) **the executive judgment’ which takes place at the end of the millennium.**”—SDAB, 317/2:2.

That is an incorrect concept, and is found nowhere in the Bible or Spirit of Prophecy. At the end of the Leviticus 16 sequence of events, the scapegoat is consigned to the wilderness—which, in antitype, occurs at the beginning of the millennium (GC 658).

SANCTIFICATION

Many of the statements in the new doctrinal book appear quite acceptable in relation to the topic of sanctification, but not as they relate to obedience.

Yet, frankly, that is what sanctification is about! It is obedience to the law of God through the enabling grace of Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour. But, according to a number of statements **in the new book, sanctification is wrought out in us by the “grace” of Christ, apart from any obedience on our part.** (But do remember that, on this point as well as on others we discuss, some statements in this book will teach new theology views while others will teach our historic teaching on this point. This makes the entire picture somewhat confusing. Yet it is a confusion caused by what is written in the book.)

“Many wrongly believe that their standing before God depends upon their good or bad deeds.”—SDAB, 121/2:3.

“Neither justification nor sanctification is the result of meritorious works. Both are solely due to Christ’s grace and righteousness.”—SDAB, 123/1:3-123/ 2:0.

On page 123 a peculiar passage is to be found; here the reader is taught that, **when the sinner first comes to Christ, he is instantly sanctified and redeemed (saved). After that, there follows two additional “sanctifications”** in his life:

“The three phases of sanctification the Bible presents are: (1) an accomplished act in the believer’s past; (2) a process in the believer’s present experience; (3) and **the final result that the believer experiences at Christ’s return.** As to the believer’s past, **at the moment of justification the believer is also sanctified** ‘in the name of the Lord Jesus and by the Spirit of our God.’ **He or she becomes a ‘saint.’ At that point the new believer is redeemed** [‘redeemed’ means ‘saved’ throughout Scripture] **and fully belongs to God.**”—SDAB, 123/2:1-2.

There is enough error in that paragraph to fill a book of refutation.

That is the kind of teaching we would expect from Martin or Barnhouse, not from an Adventist or from an Adventist doctrinal book. (1) **This “accomplished act” of sanctification in the believer’s past is declared to be instantaneous and accompanies redemption at the moment when, years before, he first came to God.** But such a concept of **instantaneous, completed sanctification** in our past experience is foreign to our Bible-Spirit of Prophecy teachings. (2) We are then told that a second species of sanctification also occurs in our life, right now. Now, we know that, in reality, this is the only true sanctification there is. But, elsewhere in this book, the reader is told that this present sanctification is really something that Christ does quite apart from any effort on our part. —But that would make this second type an untrue sanctification also. (3) **The third type of sanctification is as imaginary as was the first:**

Gulley tells us that we receive some new infilling of “sanctification” when Jesus returns. The truth is that, at the Second Advent of Christ, the faithful are translated; they are not sanctified! Please note that the basic error here is that we were saved at conversion and afterward we just cruise along in present “sanctification,” awaiting heaven to come.

The new theology teaches that our sins are miraculously removed from us when Jesus returns. That is probably what Gulley has in mind when he says that we receive a mysterious third sanctification at the Second Advent.

“Our sinful past has been cared for; through the indwelling Spirit we can enjoy the blessings of salvation.”—SDAB, 124/1:4.

OBEDIENCE

Modern apostate Protestant theology teaches that we are not supposed to obey God’s law (because Christ obeys it for us), we cannot obey God’s law (because we are bound in Original Sin), and He does not want us to try to obey His law (because the law has been done away with). Obedience is simply “fruit” that will grow by itself on the Christian tree, quite apart from any effort on our part. Here are some sample passages in QD:

“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.**”—QD (1957), 153:3.

“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.”—QD (1957), 190:0.

“Doing right, complying with God’s commandments, meeting any or all of the conditions we have mentioned, has never saved a soul—nor can it ever preserve a saint.”—QD (1957), 417:0.

The evildoers are as preserved as the conscientious overcomers through Christ’s grace.

Not one word in QD about striving against temptation and putting away sin. The new theology is armchair salvation. Not trust and obey, but profess and already saved.

The sequel doctrinal book (SDAB) also downgrades the importance of the soul’s personal battles against temptations without and sins within. We can agree with much that is said here; but, **when only half is said, it becomes a half-truth:**

“Salvation is a gift that comes by grace through faith, not by works of the law.”—SDAB, 241/2:2.

“People cannot earn salvation by their good works. Obedience is the fruitage of salvation in Christ. Through His amazing grace, especially displayed at the cross, **God has liberated His people from the penalty and curse of sin.**”—SDAB, 244/2:4.

From time to time, the new theology will dare to teach that efforts to put away sin will only intensify the sinfulness. That is a diabolical teaching. It produces terrible results, when taught to young, inexperienced college students.

“Christians do not keep the law to obtain salvation— **those who try to do so will only find a deeper enslavement to sin.**”—SDAB, 244/1:3.

The new theology only considers obedience to be a result of salvation already received, with no causal relationship. But this is not the teaching of the Bible or the Spirit of Prophecy. **The new theology always places salvation first in point of time (at the moment of conversion) and good works, if they occur at all, as something incidental which might follow. But do not concern yourself whether it occurs or not.**

PERFECTION

Perfection of character is perfect obedience to the law of God. That is the goal we are continually to strive for. Through the enabling grace of Christ—and that alone—it can be achieved. Yet **the definition of perfection which you will find among the modernists is merely maturity of personality. No mention is made about the necessity of obedience to the law of God.**

“What is Biblical perfection? How can it be received? . . . **In the New Testament perfect often describes mature persons** who have lived up to the best available light **and attained the potential** of their spiritual, mental, and physical powers.”—SDAB, 127/2:1, 4.

“Full perfection in Christ. How can we become perfect? **The Holy Spirit brings** to us the perfection of Christ. **By faith** Christ’s perfect character becomes ours. People can never claim that perfection independently, as if it were their innate possession, or theirs by right. Perfection is a gift of God.”—SDAB, 127/2:5-128/1:0.

We quite agree that none can have perfection apart from Christ; but **perfection is not something that is handed to us** as a gift, apart from any effort on our own other than acceptance.

SALVATION

We have already noted that **the new theology teaches that salvation comes automatically at conversion,** and obedience may happen to come as a gift afterward. In the following passage of the sequel doctrinal book, **the reader is instructed that salvation has two phases: first, salvation at the cross; and, second, salvation when Jesus returns** in the clouds of heaven. This would mean that, **all the time between those two events, professed Christians would be fully saved.** Read the following quotation carefully. The context indicates that the “heavenly ministry” phase apparently applies only to our conversion; at which point we accepted what Christ did by His death and resurrection. As it says below, it was all done “once and for all.”

The author is trying to explain away the Scriptural truth that our salvation is yet future.

“The scriptural view that in one sense adoption and **redemption—or salvation—have ‘already’ been accomplished** and that, in another sense, they have not yet been accomplished has confused some. A study of the full scope of Christ’s work as Saviour provides the answer. [An **Adventist Seminary teacher** is now quoted:] ‘Paul related **our present salvation** to the first

coming of Christ. In the historic **cross, resurrection, and heavenly ministry** of Christ our justification and sanctification are secured once and for all. Our future **salvation, the glorification of our bodies**, Paul related, however, to the second coming of Christ.

“For this reason **Paul can say simultaneously**: ‘We are saved,’ in view of the cross and resurrection of Christ in the past; and ‘we are not saved,’ in view of the future return of Christ to redeem our bodies.”—SDAB, 130/ 1:2-3.

Have you ever noticed that “theologians” and their “theology” are generally very confusing; whereas God’s inspired books—the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy— are consistently clear and obvious in their meaning?

The above paragraph is what they are teaching our future ministers, all of whom are required to take their final year or two of training at the Adventist Seminary! The author of the new doctrinal book then adds this emphasis regarding the “future salvation” at Christ’s second advent:

“To emphasize our **present salvation** [received at the cross] to the exclusion of our **future salvation** [received at the Second Advent] creates an incorrect, unfortunate understanding of Christ’s complete salvation.”—SDAB, 130/1:4-134/2:0.

Preterism and Futurism were theological concepts invented by two Jesuits at about the end of the 16th century, to oppose the Reformation. Preterism applies many important Bible prophecies to Christ’s first Advent, or earlier. Futurism applies them to the end of time when Christ returns for His people. The plan was for Jesuits to gradually infiltrate Protestant denominations, so they would no longer apply any Bible prophecies to the papacy. They have succeeded very well.

The new theology teaches a combination of preterism and futurism in regard to the salvation of the soul: **It teaches that your soul was saved long ago at a “finished atonement” at the cross. You now need only accept it. Your mind and body will remain locked into cherished sins until the Second Advent when they will miraculously be removed.**

According to statements in this doctrinal book, **all we need do now is to let the Holy Spirit automatically work in our lives, with no effort or resistance of sin on our part.** Our salvation is thus solely based on our acceptance of Christ’s “finished work”—a finished atonement at Calvary.

“The Holy Spirit brings the ‘It is finished’ of Calvary within, applying the only experience of God’s acceptance of humanity to us. This ‘It is finished’ of the cross calls in question **all other human attempts** to gain acceptance. In bringing the Crucified within, the Spirit brings the only ground of our acceptance with God, providing the only genuine title and fitness for salvation available to us.”—SDAB, 131/2:2.

According to the above paragraph, **man need not seek, through faith in Christ, to obey any of God’s commandments. Any efforts to do so are totally unnecessary** in Heaven’s plan for our salvation.

APPENDIX - 4 - DOCTRINAL ERRORS IN GULLEY'S QUARTERLY AND BOOK

**Abbreviations: COS = Norman Gulley's 1982 book, Christ Our Substitute
3SSQ = The Senior Sabbath School Quarterly for the Third Quarter, 1983, authored by Norman Gulley, the primary author of the 1988 General Conference doctrinal book, Seventh-day Adventists Believe.**

Although it seems incredible that this would be done, it was Norman Gulley who was selected to be the one to write the original draft of Seventh-day Adventists Believe. Therefore I here present the errors in his 1983 Senior Sabbath School Quarterly and his book, Christ Our Substitute, which accompanied it.

The errors were quite obvious and there was no excuse for the GC decision a year or so later to select him to write the basic manuscript for our only "authorized doctrinal book," Seventh-day Adventists Believe.

GULLEY ON THE NATURE OF CHRIST

This is how Gulley described the human nature of Christ in COS:

"By contrast, Seventh-day Adventists believe that Jesus Christ is fully God and fully man. But we can look at the phrase 'fully man' in two ways. Jesus had either (1) unfallen human nature, such as Adam possessed prior to the Fall or (2) fallen human nature. Which is correct? He took both. For **Christ took the spiritual nature of man before the Fall**, and the physical nature of man after the Fall."—COS, 33.2 (Christ Our Substitute, page 33, paragraph 2).

The following statement is just as illogical. (New theology errors always are.)

"Any idea that He became exactly like us in birth, including fallen human nature, receiving the results of heredity—calls in question His substitution and often leads us to consider Him only as an example to copy."—COS, 38:0-39:0.

In the following paragraph, Gulley is saying that **Christ saved us by His divine nature alone, which perfected His human nature!**

"Thus He came as the Second Adam, lived a human life, died as a human—for divinity cannot die—and offered man a perfect humanity to replace his. Jesus didn't come because He needed a perfect humanity. His divinity was enough."—COS, 44:9-45:0.

So, according to the above statements, **Christ took two types of human natures and saved us because of His divinity quite apart from His humanity.** That surely is new theology! And, on top of that, he tacks on Original Sin as our lot in life:

"Both Adam and Jesus were sinless before their temptations. We are not. In fact, **we do not have to do anything wrong to become sinners. We are born that way.** But Jesus was born sinless."—COS, 53:1.

It is one thing to be born with a carnal nature, which we all have; it is quite another to be born sinners.

GULLEY ON THE ATONEMENT

Norman Gulley, whose manuscript formed the basis for this sequel doctrinal book (according to page v of its Acknowledgment), described the atonement in these words:

“It is finished’ blazes across the heavens, reaching both backward and forward in history... Just as surely as man’s creation was completed on creation Friday, so his salvation was finished on crucifixion Friday.”—COS, 101:0, 4-102:0.

That is how Gulley explains the “finished atonement on the cross” to his students at Southern Adventist University, in Collegedale, Tennessee. **(Parents, do not send your children to Southern!)**

Near the back of COS, he describes a hypothetical conversation between a questioning student and “Bob” who replies:

“[Question] ‘Was His [Christ’s] mission on earth not sufficient? **Does He need now to add to what He accomplished here? Is the “it is finished” of Calvary only a qualified [inaccurate] fact** after all? . . . How can we harmonize a completed work at the cross with a continuing work in heaven?’ ...

“ ‘Christ’s death shut Satan’s mouth and opened up the gates back into Eden for man. **“It is finished” really means the end of both the [great] controversy and man’s salvation’...** [Question] ‘So Christ’s post-resurrection ministry doesn’t add anything to the cross, as if it were insufficient?’ [Reply] Bob smiled, ‘No.’ ”— COS, 113:4, 114:1-4.

So, according to Gulley, Christ’s work in the heavenly Sanctuary is useless. In fact, as we will see below, he teaches his students that the entire Sanctuary truth is only “imagery.”

GULLEY ON THE TWO-APARTMENT SANCTUARY

Gulley puts these words into the mouth of his Southern Adventist University student. (I wonder how many other words he, and his associate teachers, are putting in his mouth each day in class.):

“Yes, I see now, Bob, that **the Sanctuary imagery is helpful** . . . I’m not worried about what a heavenly Sanctuary means. While I know that Ellen White makes some specific statements that the Sanctuary is a real place, I’m not sure that I know exactly what it is like. But I’m willing to wait till I get to heaven to understand exactly what the Sanctuary there is—whether heaven itself or something symbolized by the earthly pattern.’ ”—COS, 118:0.

Although Ellen White provides a specific description, the student is said to not be able to figure it out! Read Great Controversy, chapter 23 (pp. 409-422). It could not be clearer. Gulley tells this to his students, so they will not bother to open the book and learn the truth. Horrors, they might even read pp. 423-425 and learn their urgent “duties” at this time. —Perhaps they will read pp. 482-491 and really wake up before it is too late!

And then Gulley immediately places **this subtle doubt about God** in the mouth of the student:

“But what does bother me is the intercession of Christ. Does He really need to intercede before

God? **The concept reminds me of my mother trying to calm down my father when he was mad at me.**—COS, 118:0.

The really strange question is why the General Conference would appoint one of the liberal theological writers in our church, in the 1980s, to write the basic text for our current official doctrinal book, *Seventh-day Adventists Believe?*

GULLEY ON OBEDIENCE

The Sabbath School Quarterly, written by Gulley as a companion piece for the sequel doctrinal book, agrees with the sentiments in SDAB that belittle the crucial importance of obedience to God's Word:

“The good news is that **Christ has paid our debt without any work or action on our part.** He only asks that we **reach out by faith and accept it.**”—3SSQ, 70:1 (the Third Quarter, 1983, Sabbath School Quarterly, page 70, paragraph 1).

Gulley's new theology: Nothing to do. Just sit around and wait for heaven to arrive. You can't lose out on salvation. Live as you please. Neither gluttony nor sensuality is a problem. Christ paid it all: He provided your obedience by substitution. He obeyed on your behalf.

“Recognizing that He alone could pay the price for our salvation, **our part in obtaining it is to accept redemption** by reaching out the hand of faith.”—3SSQ, 70:4.

“However good in themselves, **works do not make us righteous**, nor do they earn merit in the sight of God. **Righteousness and salvation are Christ's free gifts.**”—3SSQ, 75:1.

The Greek word for “righteousness” is “right-doing.” But, for Gulley, doing right and living right is not what we need to be doing.

GULLEY ON THE INVESTIGATIVE JUDGMENT

Amid great fear, Gulley's SAU student voices his hatred of the investigative judgment:

“Then a pained expression crossed his face. ‘Then what is the investigative judgment all about? **I rebel when I think of it.**’ He kicked a stone forcefully. ‘Look at all these birds, flowers, and trees He made for us. They show His love for us, His creation. Most important, consider Christ's life and death for us. **Why a judgment after all these evidences of love?** [Regardless of my actions, He should save me.] Seems contradictory to me. He's either for us or against us. And what if I sin the day my name comes up?’ **He wrung his hands nervously. ‘I hate this judgment idea! This dagger forever hanging over us!** Please, Bob,’ John pleaded, ‘please help me understand, to make sense of it.’”—COS, 118:1.

Then Gulley's “Bob” answers his question—by telling him the investigative judgment has nothing to do with obedience or disobedience on his part; but it is just a love feast.

“ ‘There's another perspective that may also help.’ ‘What's that?’ John blurted out. After all, anything that could throw light on the subject was just what he needed. [Bob says,] ‘I believe that

we can also view this day of atonement as a 'pre-Advent wedding day'. . [John says,] 'Pre-Advent wedding day! that's sure a new idea to me. But I like it. Tell me more'... **'The pre-Advent inspection is to see whether those called have also accepted the free gift of the bridegroom's wedding garment. The way to stay in the wedding and become the bride, married to Christ, is to accept His perfect life, or wedding garment... For it is not our works that get us through the inspection, but His: His perfect human righteousness—that robe, or wedding garment, covering us. This means the pre-Advent judgment primarily concerns itself with our acceptance of Christ's substitutionary life (and death), rather than mainly with our life...' [John says,] 'That's neat.'"**—COS, 120:1-3.

Many more horrible quotations from Gulley's 1982 book, *Christ Our Substitute*, could be included (horrible because they either give a twisted truth or half a truth); but space is lacking. Yet Gulley was the one assigned to write the 1988 sequel doctrinal book! Little wonder that 75 pages were removed from it!