



"Watchman, what of the night?"

The watchman said, The morning cometh, and also the night: if ye will enquire, enquire ye: return, come. Isaiah 21:11-12

THE HEART OF THE PROBLEM

In the emotionally charged atmosphere surrounding the controversy in the Church regarding the work and ministry of Ellen G. White, the real issue - basic doctrinal teaching - is being kept in the background. Elder Walter Rea's much publicized research holds the foreground of attention with non-definitive answers coming from the Ellen G. White Estate which allege - "Borrowing does not dilute her claims to inspiration because originality is not a test of one's inspiration." (Newsweek, Jan. 19, 1981, p. 72) The hardcore issues involving the E. G. White writings - such as the manipulation of her writings, and doctrinal conflicts within the writings themselves - have not been addressed, but are rather being avoided. Far more serious than this emotionally charged situation is the issue involving Dr. Desmond Ford. The leadership of the Church in taking action against him have made it appear that they took a bold and decided stand in behalf of the truth involving historic doctrinal positions which are the foundation of our faith. This simply is not true, and the laity are being deceived.

We can talk, write, discuss all we want to about the investigative judgment, and the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary in 1844, but unless we come face to face with the heart of the problem, we have solved nothing. The heart of the problem is simply - Was Christ's death on the Cross a completed atonement? If it was, then all of the basic Adventist doctrine becomes null and void, because the Seventh-day Adventist concept of the work of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary is based on the earthly type which teaches that not until after the sacrifice was completed could the atonement begin. Furthermore, the type also teaches that while there was a daily atonement involving the first apartment, there was a final atonement involving the second apartment. Now, I repeat, that all of this becomes an empty shell if we hold to and maintain that the Atonement to which all of these types pointed was completed on the Cross. This is the issue which Dr. Desmond Ford is presenting in all the coverage he is receiving in both the religious and secular press. In the release in Christianity Today (Oct. 10, 1980, p. 76) one of the assistant editors wrote:

The reason Ford has grown so popular among some Adventists is that he is throwing all of that [the investigative judgment and the blotting out of sins] out the window, telling Adventists they can indeed be happy and sure of salvation because Christ finished his work on the Cross, where their sins were forgiven and the eternal punishment due them erased.

Now in the secular press, Ford is quoted as stating that the basic Adventist sanctuary teaching is an "aberrant gospel." [aberrant = deviate and erroneous] And

what is his reason? Note carefully:

Ford contends that Mrs White's notion of a "judgment" phase in Christ's redemption violates the orthodox Christian doctrine that Jesus' atonement for sin was completed with his death on the cross. "I am not a disloyal Adventist," he says. "I just believe the aberrant gospel should be pruned away." (Newsweek, op. cit.)

Tragically, the Adventist leadership is on record as believing the same thing Ford believes in regard to the Atonement. This doctrine that Jesus completed the atonement on the Cross was specifically stated as Seventh-day Adventist belief to the Evangelical conferees in the Adventist-Evangelical dialogue back in 1955-1956. Elder T. E. Unruh, chairman of the conferences, has written:

We affirmed our belief in the eternal and complete deity of Christ, in his sinless life in the incarnation, in his atoning death on the cross, once for all and all-sufficient, in his literal resurrection, and in his priestly ministry before the Father, applying the benefits of the completed atonement on the cross. (Adventist Heritage, Vol. 4, #2, 1977, p. 38)

One has only to look at this report in Adventist Heritage to see the pictures of the Adventist leadership involved in this affirmation of belief, - LeRoy E. Froom, R. Allen Anderson, W. E. Read, and R. R. Figuhr - besides the names of the members of the collaborating committees which read like a Who's Who of the then General Conference hierarchy. (Ibid., p. 41) If these men were not disloyal in affirming that the atonement was completed on the Cross, then neither is Ford now for so affirming. The only difference is that Ford has carried to the ultimate conclusion the affirmation made at the Seventh-day Adventist Evangelical Conferences. To this day, as far as I have any knowledge, there has been no action taken repudiating the denial of faith by the men themselves, or their successors. Neither has there been any action to defrock them. To defrock a man who has carried to its ultimate conclusion the repudiation of basic Adventist doctrine by previous leaders of the Church, without defrocking these first apostates is a mere sham, and an attempt to perpetrate upon the laity a gross deception. In fact, one of the ringleaders in the Conferences with the Evangelicals, R. Allen Anderson, has written of his present intentions, stating:

I expect to be in Australia during the months of March and April [1981] and have been invited by the Division leaders and the new president of Avondale to give a lectureship on preaching which I am planning to call "Up to Date Preaching of the Apocalyptic Prophecies." They haven't been having much of that in the classrooms of Avondale College for many years. (From a Letter signed by R. A. Anderson)

Unless properly perceived, this will be hailed as a great break-through in Australia by the older retired "concerned" clergy and will be accepted as an indication that the Church is again returning to its historic teachings, when in reality the cancerous core of the deadly heresy which is at the heart of the problem still remains, and one of its chief advocates will be at center stage at Avondale. Well did Andreasen write in the midst of the battle over the conferences with the Evangelicals - "I have not recanted. The denomination is departing from the fundamentals, and I must protest." (See Andreasen Letter, WNN, Jan., 1981, p. 9)

But this is not all. The deception which is still being practiced on the laity with regards to the doctrine of the Atonement was practiced from the very beginning in reporting the Conferences. The result of these conferences for the Seventh-day Adventist was the book - Questions on Doctrine. Prior to its release to the Church, copies of what was being written and set in type were given to Walter R. Martin, one of the Evangelical conferees. He published paragraphs from this pre-publication edition in an article - "What Seventh-day Adventists Really Believe." (Eternity, Nov., 1956) Then when the book was released to the Church, there were simple alterations to make it palatable to the laity so they would not detect the sell-out of our belief in regard to the doctrine of the Atonement. Here are the columns side by side as given by Martin, and as found in Questions on Doctrine: [Underscored words in the quotes from Q on D indicate the added, and altered words.]

(Martin's Copy)

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

All of this has made it desirable and necessary for us to declare our position afresh upon the great fundamental teachings of the Christian faith, and to deny every statement or implication that Christ, the second Person of the Godhead, was not One with the Father from all eternity, and that His sacrifice on the Cross was not a full and complete atonement. The present belief of Seventh-day Adventists on these great truths is clear and emphatic. (Eternity, Nov., 1956)

(Q on D)

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

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

["Sacrificial atonement" could mean "sacrifice of the atonement." This would agree with the statement - "Christ's sacrifice in behalf of man was full and complete. The condition of the atonement had been fulfilled." AA, p. 29. But it could also mean as in the text to Martin - "His sacrifice on the Cross was a full and complete atonement." It should be kept in mind that Unruh states that the Evangelicals "helped us to express our beliefs in terms more easily understood by theologians of other communions." (Adventist Heritage, op. cit, p. 40) There was no question in the minds of the Evangelical conferees what the Adventists meant by their use of words. Barnhouse wrote - "They believe that since His ascension Christ has been ministering the benefits of the atonement which He completed on Calvary." (Eternity, Sept., 1956)]

[You may obtain a copy of all the source articles on these Evangelical Conferences for \$2.50 postpaid by writing to the Adventist Laymen's Foundation. Then you can make your own comparison.]

When the 1955-1956 apostasy is clearly understood, it will be seen that the present attacks of the hierarchy on Ford, Cottrell, and others is just so much stage acting to lead the laity to believe the leaders in Washington are really defending the historic faith of Adventism. The only way that the historic faith committed to the trust of the Church can be clearly defended is to officially and publically repudiate the surrender to the Evangelicals at the 1955-1956 Conferences, and to affirm once again that the death of Christ on the Cross was but the sacrifice, and that upon His entrance into the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary, He began His atoning ministry that would finally be consummated on the antitypical Day of Atonement, when Christ would complete His ministry in the second apartment of that sanctuary.

✓

JUDGED BY THE GOSPEL ¹

This is the title of a book recently published which seeks to eradicate the Advent Movement, and all that it has stood for. Turning to the Word of God - for this is the basis upon which this book is supposedly founded, sola Scriptura - I fail to find a single reference in any Concordance which suggests that I or anyone else will be judged by the Gospel. Rather, I find that I will be "judged by the law of liberty." (James 2:12) "The word" which Jesus has spoken will "judge [me] in the last day." (John 12:48) God has "appointed a day, in which He will judge the world in righteousness by that Man whom He hath ordained." (Acts 17:31) To this Man, He has committed "authority to execute judgment also, because He is the Son of man." (John 5:27)

Since all have sinned and come short of the glory of God (Rom. 3:23); since I am carnal, sold under sin (Rom. 7:14); and since "the carnal mind is enmity against God" not being subject to the law of God, nor indeed can be (Rom. 8:7); the Gospel is the good news of God's provision for deliverance, and how He plans to deal with the whole sin question. The supreme confrontation of God with sin was in and through the earthly life of Jesus Christ who came in our nature, and defeated the enemy. This Paul declared to be the Gospel, which he was called to preach. He wrote - "Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle, separated unto the gospel of God, . . . concerning His Son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh; and declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead." (Rom. 1:1, 3-3) To merely declare the Gospel to be "concerning. . . Jesus Christ our Lord," and to ignore the specific aspects of His Lordship - His power - is to proclaim another gospel.

Jesus was made "of the seed of David according to the flesh." He identified Himself with our fallen nature, and conquered in that nature, bringing it into subjection to the will of God. He could pray after thirty-three plus years in the nature of the seed of David - "Thou hast given Him power over all flesh." (John 17:2) The Gospel is the assurance that as Christ was raised from the dead - though He had taken upon Himself the seed of David according to the flesh, and had become sin for us - so also the same power "shall quicken [our] mortal bodies

by His Spirit" which is to dwell in us. (Rom. 8:11)

The Gospel is not merely the proclamation of an historical event in which all things find their fulfillment. Paul plainly teaches that "as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law. . . in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my gospel." (Rom. 2:12, 16)² Paul's proclamation - Gospel - included a day of Judgment - not one which had come and met fulfillment already, but one which was to come. Standing before Felix, "he reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come." (Acts 24:25) Paul did not stop at righteousness but included in the gospel which he preached - temperance - and a judgment to come! To the Advent Movement was committed "the everlasting gospel." (Rev. 14:6) The words translated, "everlasting gospel" are defined in Thayer's Lexicon as "a gospel whose subject-matter is eternal, in other words the saving purpose of God adopted from eternity." This age-long Gospel included the proclamation of the fact "the hour of His judgment is come." (verse 7) We are also to fear God, and glorify Him (I Cor. 10:31); and "worship Him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters." (Ex. 20:8-11)

While the "saving purpose of God adopted from eternity" - the Gospel - was most clearly revealed when "the time [was] fulfilled" as foreordained by God, and He sent Jesus Christ into the world to both live and preach the Gospel (Mark 1:15; Gal. 4:4); nevertheless, the Scriptures witness to its age-long revelation. The book of Hebrews plainly states that the Gospel being proclaimed in that hour was the same Gospel which had been proclaimed to their fathers through Moses who "was faithful in all his house." (Heb. 4:2; 3:5) The revelation of the Gospel in the Old Testament - though shadowy, and by type only, having no virtue to "make the comers thereunto perfect" - was through the sanctuary service. God patterned the sanctuary, outlined its services, adapting it to the limitations of earth and the dimensional concepts of men. Yet through these earthly representations, He set forth "the way, the truth" which was revealed to man fully when "the Word was made flesh and tabernacled among us," and who was to enter as "a minister of the true tabernacle" in the heaven of heavens. To set forth as "gospel" an interpretation of the New Testament revelation which mitigates and contradicts "the saving purpose of God" as revealed in the God-patterned outline to be found in the Old Testament is to impeach the wisdom of God as a true Educator.

The Gospel is not just an earthly innovation for the salvation of men. It is cosmic in its aspect. In the prophetic portrayal of "war in heaven," the victory of the Cross by which the "old serpent" was cast out, is proclaimed as the coming of "salvation and strength, and the kingdom of our God, and the power of His Christ." (Rev. 12:7-10) Because of this, those that dwell in heaven were to rejoice. Sin did not begin on this earth, neither is the final judgment on sin to be pronounced on this earth, but from "the Temple of heaven, from the Throne." (Rev. 16:17) When this proclamation is made, "the ark of His testament" becomes very visible. (Rev. 11:19) As mercy and truth met together in the Most Holy Place of the typical sanctuary; as mercy and truth blended together in the fulness of the Life made flesh, so mercy and truth will remain united when the final decree is issued from the Throne - "It is done." To this eternal union the Gospel - "the saving purpose of God" - witnesses. "For it is the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth. . . for therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith." (Rom. 1:16-17) In each redeemed soul will be revealed the mercy of God, and the truth as it is in Jesus.

To proclaim another gospel, and declare that men, and organizations are to be judged by that gospel, is to preach another gospel, and Paul declares that all who do so are to be anathema. (Gal. 1:9 Gr.)

¹Robert D. Brinsmead, Judged by the Gospel - A Review of Adventism, 1980.

²The Greek word for "day" - ἡμέρα - occurs approximately 383x in the New Testament depending which Greek text is used. Of these 383x, it occurs with the article 107x. In a number of these instances, the article is demanded by the rules of grammar when used with the pronouns, this and that. Other times, when used with the article, it is clearly identified with a specific day as indicated in the text itself, such as, "the day of the Lord," or "the day of temptation." However, there are two instances in the New Testament, in which the expression - "the day" - stands alone. One is Romans 2:16, and the other Hebrews 10:25. The NIV translates the words in Hebrews 10:25 as "the Day." In the Hebrew mind, there was only one - "the Day" - and that was the Day of Atonement, Yoma. Likewise, this same usage in Romans 2:16 could apply to the same great day. The Gospel which Paul preached not only included the Cross, but also the final mediation of that sacrifice during the great antitypical Day of Atonement.

✓

THE RIGHT HAND DOESN'T KNOW WHAT THE LEFT HAND WRITES

In the Special Sanctuary Issue of the Ministry (Oct., 1980) one page was devoted to the listing of available study materials on the question of the Sanctuary. The Biblical Research Institute offered a set of six Glacier View papers, while the Ellen G. White Estate offered a set of their own on the same subject, giving historical background material.

Among the White Estate papers was one entitled - At the General Conference of 1905. This brochure is a portion of two chapters from the forthcoming biography of Ellen G. White, by her grandson and former secretary of the Estate, Dr. Arthur L. White. It deals primarily with the Ballenger question. Of real interest is the statement by Elder E. W. Farnsworth who has left on record a summary of Ballenger's views as he presented them "at a meeting of the British Union Conference held in London in early 1905." (p. 5) Here is Farnsworth's summation:

Brother Ballenger. . . has been studying the subject of the sanctuary a good deal lately, and he comes to the conclusion that the atonement was made when Christ was crucified and that when He ascended He went immediately into the most holy place and that His ministry has been carried on there ever since.

He takes such texts as Hebrews 6:19 and compares them with twenty-five or thirty expressions of the same character in the Old Testament where he claims that in every instance the term "within the veil" signifies within the Most Holy Place. He says the outer veil or door of the tabernacle is never called the veil of the tabernacle, only once and then by implication (Hebrews 9:3), and doesn't think that one instance should be so construed as to practically overthrow the rest. (p. 6)

It should be of special interest to observe that Ballenger's final conclusions were based on his primary premise "that the atonement was made when Christ was crucified." This was the basis of the apostasy involved in the Adventist-Evangelical Conferences of 1955-1956; it is the root of the Ford apostasy. From such a position it is a simple step to conclude that Christ upon His ascension went directly into the Most Holy place - into the presence of God - a phrase considered to be synonymous with the Most Holy place. If so, what need is there for any final ministry involving Daniel 8:14, 1844? The whole sanctuary teaching based on Old Testament type is thus obliterated.

Regarding this position taken by Ballenger - and by implication all others who have adopted the same premise since then - Ellen G. White, who at 78 years of age travelled across country by train to attend the 1905 General Conference Session, recorded in her journal on May 20 these words:

Our Brother Ballinger is presenting theories that cannot be substantiated by the Word of God. It will be one of the great evils that will come to our people to have the Scriptures taken out of their true place and so interpreted as to substantiate error that contradicts the light and the Testimonies that God has been giving us for the past half century. (Ms. 59, 1905) [p. 7]

In the same journal she also wrote - "Let us cling to the established truth of the sanctuary." (ibid., p. 8)

Among the Glacier View papers released by the Biblical Research Institute of the General Conference is one by Elder A. P. Salom - "Exegesis of Selected Passages of Hebrews 8 & 9." [A. P. Salom attended the Glacier View meeting as a delegate from the Australian Division. (Adventist Review, Sept. 4, 1980, p. 10) The 1976 Yearbook lists him as one of the ordained ministers of the North South Wales Conference. A learned paper appearing in the Andrews University Seminary Studies (January, 1967) notes Elder Salom as being from Walla Walla College.] Digressing from the exegesis of Hebrews 8 & 9, Elder Salom devotes three pages to Hebrews 6:19-20 - the text used by Ballenger. He writes - "For Adventists, the crucial phrase in this passage is to esōteron tou katapetasmatos ('the inner shrine behind the curtain' RSV)" (p. 17) Then he cites nine references where a corresponding word in the Hebrew text refers to the curtain between the two apartments of the sanctuary; and three references where another Hebrew word is used to denote the same. After having quoted with approval various writers to indicate that the veil of Hebrew 6:19 is referring to the veil before the Most Holy place of the heavenly sanctuary, Salom concluded:

As significant as it is to establish the meaning of "the curtain" in Hebrews 6:19, it is more important to see what this verse says about Christ. The first thing to note is that Christ "has gone" (eisēlthen) behind the veil into the presence of God and that He ministers as "high priest forever after the order of Melchizedek." (p. 19)

Salom uses the very same techniques as Ballenger, and arrives at the same identical conclusions. In "Additional Note A," Salom again comments on Hebrew 6:19. He writes:

Thus Christ is located as ministering as high priest in the very presence of God (tō prosōpō tou theou, 9:24) from the time when He

commenced His ministry in the heavenly sanctuary. This is shown more explicitly by the connections between Hebrews 9:24-26 and 6:19-20. In 9:24 "Christ has entered" (eisēlthen) into the heavenly sanctuary, "now to appear in the presence of God for us." In 6:19, 20 Jesus "has gone (eisēlthen) into the inner shrine behind the curtain. . . having become a high priest forever after the order of Melchizedek." [He is here using an interpretive text -RSV- and not the Greek text.] It can be concluded from this comparison that "in the presence of God" means the Most Holy Place of the heavenly sanctuary. (p. 24)

Assumed premises without regard to definitive statements appearing in the book of Hebrews, can only lead to false conclusions! Yet this is sent forth as basic truth from the Research Institute of the General Conference.

Thus from Washington - the Curia on the Sligo - comes confusion compounded - from one agency of the hierarchy comes the history of Ballenger; from another the release of the Glacier View documents which teach the same things that Ballenger taught. Ballenger was dropped from the ministry, and disfellowshipped; Salom is retained as a minister in good and regular standing in the Australian Division; while Ford teaching the same thing is defrocked. Yet the leadership would have the laity believe they are standing four-square for the historic sanctuary truth, when in reality the right hand doesn't even know what the left hand is writing. In psychic phenomena, when a human being can write two different messages at the same time - one with the right hand, and the other with the left, we conclude that that individual is possessed. Is there such a phenomenon as "institutional possession"? I read:

Organizations, institutions, unless kept by the power of God, will work under Satan's dictation to bring men under the control of men; and fraud and guile will bear the semblance of zeal for truth and for the advancement of the kingdom of God. (7T:180-181)

¹Within the book of Hebrews are to be found definitive statements as to the meaning and force which the writer attaches to these words and phrases. To ignore these is to arrive at false conclusions. In Hebrews, it is plainly set forth that the veil between the two partments of the sanctuary is called "the second veil." (Heb. 9:3) Thus unless stated "second veil" when the term "veil" is used as in Hebrew 6:19, one to be honest in his own thinking must conclude it to refer to the entrance into the first apartment. The Altar prefigured the sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross, and that was located in the Court. Thus Christ leaving the "court" would pass within the tabernacle through the first veil.

Another definitive statement is to be found in Hebrews 9:2 - the first apartment is designated as Ἁγία (Hagia); while the second apartment is called, Ἁγία Ἁγίων (Hagia Hagiōn) in verse 3. To then teach that the other places in Hebrews where the word Hagia is to be found refers to the second apartment is to ignore the writer's own definition of terms. All of this juggling of word meanings is resultant from the first false premise that the atonement was completed on the Cross. Begin with the simple message of the God-patterned type

which teaches that the sacrifice was made before the priest began his work of atonement, and accept the definitions within the book of Hebrews as the basis for understanding the book, and there is no confusion, but rather the establishment of the sanctuary truth as held by and taught in historic Adventism.

Furthermore. Paul, after describing the second apartment (Heb. 9:4-5) assures his hearers that "we" cannot now consider its significance. Then in Hebrews 10:25, he speaks of the Day of Atonement as still future. (See Footnote #2, p. 6) He is talking in the "now" time as far as his hearers were concerned, leaving the meaning and lessons of the services of the Day of Atonement to the time when God would choose to make it "present truth." (For a previous analysis of the use of the terms in the book of Hebrews, see WWN, May, 1980, pp. 5-10)

✓

UNAVAILABLE - WHY?

In the Adventist Review (Sept. 4, 1980, p. 5) a list of special research papers prepared by different scholars of the Church for the Sanctuary Review Committee was given. It was not a complete list, and evidently was not so intended, as the list given was introduced by the clause - "Among these were." However, as this list is checked with the papers made available for all to read who wish to do so (Ministry, October, 1980, p. 23), there are five notable omissions - papers by Bert Haloviak ("Pioneers, Pantheists, and Progressives: A. F. Ballenger and Divergent Paths to the Sanctuary"); Raymond F. Cottrell ("A Hermeneutic for Daniel 8:14"); Alfred S. Jorgensen ("A Report of the Salient Teachings of W. W. Fletcher and Administrative Actions Taken by the Australian Union Conference in Dealing With Him"); and two by Beatrice Neall ("The Contextual Problem of Daniel 8:13's 'Transgression That Makes Desolate'" and "An Attempt to Harmonize Daniel with Leviticus on the Cleansing of the Sanctuary").

Evangelica (December, 1980), the new Ford orientated theological publication, also notes this inconsistency, but fails to list the two papers by Professor Neall of Union College, citing only three from the list - those by Haloviak, Cottrell, and Jorgensen. This hardly helps the credibility of a new journal seeking "to promote the all-sufficiency of Jesus Christ within the Adventist Community." Perhaps its editors believe that the sufficiency of Christ will cover their apparent deliberate omission of part of the truth. How can the editors of Evangelica charge the hierarchy with "suppression" when they, too, are suppressing facts? (p. 44) Could it be - and I haven't been able to obtain the Neall papers - that the conclusions reached in these papers do not coincide with the theological viewpoint emphasized in Evangelica? But then also, is the question - Why didn't the Ministry list these two papers as available among the Glacier View documents? A member of the editorial staff of the Ministry indicated to the editors of Evangelica that Dr. Richard Leshar of the Biblical Research Institute in consultation with Elder Neal Wilson made the decision as to which papers would be made available for public distribution. Evangelica indicated that Leshar refused comment when contacted on this point. (ibid.)

In Spectrum (Vol 11, #2, p. 75) two other documents of "source material" and current historical data are noted as being given to the Sanctuary Review Committee prior to the Glacier View meeting, which are not listed as available. One by Wadie Farag contains relative material xeroxed from Bible Dictionaries,

the Talmud, the Bible, and Ellen G. White concerning the time element in the prophecies of Daniel. The other by Dr. Raymond F. Cottrell is a report of two polls of Adventist scholars taken in 1958 and 1980 concerning Daniel 8:14, and Hebrews 9.

Among the "supressed" documents, one of special interest is the report by Elder A. S. Jorgensen, field secretary of the Australasian Division regarding the W. W. Fletcher case. A Critique of this paper is to be found in Evangelica (Oct., 1980, p. 29) Jorgensen is quoted as follows:

Having argued that the Atonement was completed on the Cross, Fletcher had perforce to challenge the distinctively Seventh-day Adventist doctrine of the antitypical Day of Atonement, involving the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary, and especially the concept of the investigative judgment of the righteous. For what point is there in the latter if all sin - as it relates to the believer - was judged at the Cross and cancelled by the blood! (p. 15)

Then Jorgensen draws the conclusion - so reports Evangelica - that the doctrines of a completed atonement on Calvary and "the investigative judgment" are mutually exclusive.

Here again is the heart of the problem. Here is the basis of the new book by Brinsmead. Here is the teaching of the books, Questions on Doctrine and Movement of Destiny. Here is where Adventism comes to the Crossroads. Again, how can the hierarchy condemn Ford, Fletcher, and Ballenger, when they themselves believe, teach, and approve the heart of the theology of these men? [Perhaps, it might be of interest for a number to write Elder Neal Wilson, asking why these various documents - and name them - are being kept from you the concerned laity. Please share with us the answers you receive.]

✓

OF INTEREST

The Hewitt Report (Posted Dec. 11, 1980) prepared by Dr. Raymond Moore and Staff tells of the findings of a Seminary professor at Andrews University. "Entering seminary students are averaging poorly on a test that determines their decisiveness, their maleness, etc., in which a score of one (1) would be gross macho independence and ten (10) would be extreme femininity, indecisiveness, etc. The Seminary freshman average is above 8.0. This may help understand why so many of our young ministers are uncertain when the Fords and Reas come around.

"What is the suggested therapy for this problem? Crude physical labor. This was determined on the 16PF (Personality Factor) Test by IPAT. In a society which is more and more peer dependent. . . and more unisexual and often homosexual, this IPAT result is revealing." (Emphasis theirs)

✓

"WATCHMAN, WHAT OF THE NIGHT?" IS PUBLISHED MONTHLY BY THE ADVENTIST LAYMEN'S FOUNDATION OF MISSISSIPPI, INC., P. O. Box 178, Lamar, AR 72846, USA. (It is free upon request.)