

THE GATHERING CALL



"The sheep follow Him, for they know His voice." John 10:4

VOL. 49

Riverside, Calif., Sep-Oct., 1961

No. 5

In This Issue

How We Got Our Bible 3

(By Grace H. Todd)

A Review Of "Questions On Doctrine." 4

(By Your Assistant Editor)

**A. V. Olson Defends Froom's
Deviation On The Atonement** 7

(By Virgil C Staff)

Copyright, The Gathering Call Publ. Assn., 1961

THE GATHERING CALL

"A magazine published for the defense of the faith once delivered unto the Saints."

Board of Directors

John I. Easterly, Chairman
Watsonville, California
Peter Wagenleitner, Fresno, California
Robert Tower, Woodlake, California
Grace Pirtle, Sacramento, California
Forbes Davidson, Placerville, California

Editorial Staff

Editor, John I. Easterly
Associate Editor, W. H. Olson
Assistant Editor, Donald E. Mote

Subscription Rate: \$1 per year

Add 25c for postage on Foreign mailings.
Published bi-monthly (Six times in the year) by The Gathering Call Publishing Association, 3155 Date St., Riverside, Calif. Entered as second-class matter, June 29, 1915, at the post office at Riverside, California, under Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

AN APOLOGY

We were forced to run a shorter, 16 page issue this time, due to circumstances beyond our control. We have had a breakdown with our linotype machine in the process of setting up the type for the "Call," and inasmuch as we were running close to the deadline, we deemed it necessary to go ahead and run the magazine with what type we had. We hope to be able to make it up to you in the next issue.

EDITORIAL POLICY

The views expressed in these articles by the guest writers are not necessarily those of the editorial staff or Board of Directors. Our policy is to make The Gathering Call a magazine of religious

research, which will serve as a "melting pot" of ideas. We feel that by obtaining a cross-section of the views of many, we may strengthen our drive toward **truth**, and explore facets of truth which could be discovered in no other way.

THE BOOK MART

WANTED, The following books:
The Consecrated Way, A. T. Jones
The Bible From Heaven, M. Hull
(The same title), by D. M. Canright
A Solemn Appeal Relative To The Abuses And Excesses Of The Marriage Relation, White
Here And Hereafter, Uriah Smith
The Everlasting Covenant, Waggoner
Memoirs of Wm. Miller, Sylvester Bliss
God Is Love, George E. Fifield
Seventy Years Of Life And Labor, 2 Volumes, by Samuel Gompers
Bower's History Of The Popes
Dowling's History Of Romanism
Historical Sketches Of SDA Foreign Missions
Bible Sanctification, E. G. White
Critical Notes, D. M. Canright
Social Purity, J. H. Ballou
Appeal To Mothers, E. G. White
Our Faith And Hope, James White
Testimony Relative To Marriage Duties And Extremes In The Health Reform, E. G. White
Complete Testimony Of The Fathers, Andrews
Appeal To Working Men, Jas. White
Facsimiles Of The True Earliest SDA Periodicals
Exposition Of Resolutions Sent
If you have any of these old books that you wish to dispose of, write us a letter, stating your price.
In addition to the above, we will buy almost any old or rare S.D.A. books.

HOW WE GOT OUR BIBLE

THE MANUSCRIPTS

CODEX SINAITICUS (Codex Aleph), one of the oldest and best known manuscripts, was discovered by Tischendorf in 1859, in St. Catherine's monastery at Mt. Sinai. The N.T. is complete, but not the O.T. The MS came into the hands of the Russian government, and was sold to the British Museum in 1933 for \$510,000. The Oxford University Press published facsimiles in 1922. These may be found in some of our libraries.

Codex Vaticanus (Codex B) has been in the Vatican library for hundreds of years, but was not made available to translators generally till 1868 when Pope Pius IX ordered facsimiles made and these are now in our libraries. This MS lacks Genesis 1-46, Psalms 105-137, and all of the N.T. after Hebrews 9:14.

Codex Alexandrinus (Codex A) came from Alexandria in Egypt. It was presented to Charles I of England in 1628 by Cyril Lucar, Patriarch of Constantinople. This was seventeen years after the King James Version was published. This MS included most of the O.T. but a large part of Matthew and some of John and 2 Corinthians are missing. In all three of these MSS the O.T. was based on the Septuagint translation. None of these three outstanding MSS were available to the translators of the King James Version.

THE VERSIONS

A version is a translation from the original language into some other tongue. Of the hundreds

of versions we will list only a few of the most outstanding, those that have had a special place and influence among English speaking peoples.

THE SEPTUAGINT

285-200 B.C.

The Septuagint (LXX), so called from the number of men who took part in its preparation, is a GREEK translation of the O.T. It included the Apocrypha, fourteen books not accepted as belonging to the true Hebrew canon, but which were placed in the Vulgate and also, in many old English versions. The Septuagint was in common use for over 600 years and was the text most commonly used in the time of Christ.

THE LATIN VULGATE

385-420 A.D.

As the Latin language gradually supplanted the Greek, many Latin versions appeared. This caused confusion, so Pope Damasus called upon Eusebius Hieronymus, better known as St. Jerome, to prepare a more accurate version. His translation into Latin is almost as old as our earliest Greek MSS. He based his O.T. on the Hebrew text. The Latin Vulgate was the text in use for over 1000 years and became the basis for all other translations made in Western Europe until the time of Luther and Tyndale. The first book ever printed was the Gutenberg Bible in 1456.

-by Grace H. Todd
in **Reconciliation** magazine,
July, 1942.

A Review Of "Questions On Doctrine."

Question 11

"The Basis and Fruitage of Christian Experience."

"Can one who holds seventh-day Adventist views have the assurance in his soul of present salvation, of sins forgiven, and of full acceptance with the Lord? Or does he have to live in uncertainty, pending whatever decision might be rendered in the investigative-judgment? And is not this uncertainty reflected in the writings of Ellen G. White?" (1)

The evangelicals have here posed a question that without a doubt caused the Adventist leadership considerable embarrassment. And yet what inspired the question? For some reason the evangelicals were in doubt, at least, about the character of the Adventist creed giving one who holds such views the assurance in his soul of "present salvation;" ...that his sins are forgiven and that he has full acceptance with God. It would be a faulty religion at best that could not give one that complete assurance. Most evangelical faiths are able to supply such a sense of security; but is the Adventist faith capable of doing so? If not, why not?

The answer to this question seems to hinge on the doctrine of the so-called "investigative-judgment." What is there about this tenet of the Adventist creed that might fail to give one that complete assurance?

The doctrine of the so-called "investigative-judgment" is one

that is peculiar to Adventists. It is highly improbable that any one would come to believe in the doctrine through independent study. One would need to be schooled in Adventist slanted Bible lessons in order to arrive at any conclusions about any supposed Biblical basis for the doctrine. The terminology itself is not Biblical. The Bible speaks of the "judgment" many times, **but never of an "investigative-judgment!"** Exactly what is the so-called investigative-judgment? How define it? This is necessary first, of course, in order to understand the effect of this teaching on the Adventist people.

We will let the definitions supplied by Adventist literature, written by the pioneers of their movement, give a clear picture of just what is meant by the terminology.

"The investigative - judgment takes place prior to the second advent, and the resurrection of the just, that it may be known who are worthy of the first resurrection." (2)

"This work of examining of character, of determining who are prepared for the kingdom of God is that of the investigative-judgment, the closing work in the sanctuary above." (3)

"The judgment is now passing in the sanctuary above. Forty years has this work been in progress. Soon--none know how soon--it will pass to the

cases of the living.” (4)

The above explanations of the investigative-judgment are from the pen of Mrs. E. G. White and Elder James White. (See Bibliography)

As late as 1938, Elder M. L. Andreasen adds this to the definitions already given, in his book, **“The Sanctuary Service:”**

“The cases of the righteous must be settled before the Lord comes—else how can it be known who is to be saved?” (5)

The materials in this book were first presented in lecture form at the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, and published for the 1938 Ministerial Reading Course. So, we have an authoritative definition of more recent date, as well as those given by the founders of the movement.

Now, what is the alleged purpose and function of the so-called investigative-judgment? **It takes place before the first resurrection and it is for the purpose of determining who are worthy of that resurrection.** Then no one can be perfectly certain of being in the first resurrection, at least not until the “inquisition” has decided his case. Even then it cannot be made known to each individual what the decision has been in his case until Christ comes.

Perhaps this is why Mrs. White said, **“Those who accept the Saviour, however sincere their conversion, should never be taught to say or feel that they are saved. This is misleading.” (6)**

In other words, there can be no assurance of present Salvation because there is none,

according to Adventist doctrine. No one can know the outcome of the investigative-judgment until Christ comes. Surely, this is the answer to the question, “does one have to live in uncertainty pending whatever decision might be rendered in the investigative-judgment?”

Worse than that, we must wait until the second advent of our Lord before they break the news to us. **What a terrible feeling of uncertainty to experience in the face of this life or death question!**

We are doomed to live with fear and doubt until the Lord comes to put our minds at rest. Only then can we breath a sigh of profound relief, providing the decision in our case has been a favorable one. But with what trepidations must we gaze aloft at the coming King and await our unknown fate?

“Is not this uncertainty reflected in the writings of Ellen G. White,” the question was asked, and yet the book committee denies the charge. The book assures us that, **“one who truly understands and accepts the teachings of the Seventh-day Adventist Church can assuredly know that he is born again, and that he is fully accepted by the Lord.” He has in his soul the assurance of present salvation, and need be in no uncertainty whatever.” (7)**

In the light of the above evidence, we can voice but one word with a pardonable show of vehemence. **HOW?** How can one ever feel anything but doubt pending the outcome of the investigative-judgment? With this “sword of Damocles”

hanging over their heads how could one conceivably feel secure in the acceptance of anything? There can be no sense of security, whatever. There is naught but fear and uncertainty with the vague hope that the outcome may be favorable. If any loyal Adventist reading this will but stop and reflect for a moment, he will realize how true this is. He has but to examine his soul, his own secret doubts and fears. What kind of a religion is this? We have stated on various occasions that the Adventist religion consists mainly of a subconscious dread that the investigative-judgment may catch up with the individual in an unguarded moment. Say what you will, the vast majority of Seventh-day Adventists live in this constant state of dread, being only as good as trying not to be bad makes them. Each one has only to examine himself to know that this is true. But when the church leaders paint the Lord of the Universe in such a vindictive and arbitrary light, what else can be expected?

Mrs. White's statement alone refutes their claim that an Adventist need feel no uncertainty and the denial that this uncertainty is reflected in "the writings."

This example quoted from **Christ's Object Lessons** is but one, and such testimony has been penned by the "prophet" in spite of the fact that the Bible plainly says, **"There is therefore no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit."** (8)

-by Donald E. Mote

(A much more detailed study of this subject may be had by sending us 15 cents for the Ballenger tract entitled, **"The First Angel's Message, or the Investigative-Judgment."**)

Bibliography

- (1) R&H Publ. Assn., **"Questions on Doctrine,"** p. 105, 1957.
- (2) Jas. White, **"Life Incident,"** p. 323. SDA Publ. Assn., Battle Creek, Mich., 1868.
- (3) Mrs. E. G. White, **"Great Controversy,"** p. 428. Pac. Press Publ. Assn., Mt. View, Calif., 1911.
- (4) Mrs. E. G. White, **"Spirit Of Prophecy,"** Vol. 4, p. 315. SDA Publ. Assn., Battle Creek, Mich., 1884.
- (5) M. L. Andreasen, **"The Sanctuary Service,"** p. 305, R&H Publ. Assn., Takoma Park, D.C., 1937.
- (6) Mrs. E. G. White, **"Christ's Object Lessons,"** p. 155. Pac. Press Publ. Assn., 1900.
- (7) R & H Publ. Assn., **"Questions On Doctrine,"** p. 105, 1957.
- (8) Romans 8:1.

"Wine is so strange and potent a thing that it has been used in the central ritual of religion in one place and time, and attacked by a virago with a hatchet in another."

--Beatrice Warde.

"For thus hath the Lord said, the whole land shall be desolate; yet will I not make a full end."

--Jeremiah 4:27.

A. V. Olson Defends Froom's Deviation On The Atonement

In every generation since the founding of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, there have been those who were willing to reap the abuse of the leadership and to take their stand for what they believed to be true. Such a stand was never a very popular one, and those who were willing to step forward usually found themselves on the outside of the camp.

Most of the readers now know that Elders' John Slade, Ray Martin, and M. L. Andreassen have been weighed in the denominational balances and have received the bureaucratic axe. These had unequivocally taken their stand on what they believed to be the side of the pioneers and in consequence have learned that the wages of independent study are ostracism from the organized body of the remnant of God's people--"the best people in the world." (10:569)

As might be expected, the majority of the leaders have seen fit to lend the support of their "sacred calling" to revisionist attempts to downgrade the propheticess and the pioneers of the movement. There are numerous motives or forms of enticement which might have tended to cause such individuals to deviate from the old landmarks.

Many are weary of what some undoubtedly feel to be an old fashioned religion, for their own social stature in the world would be immensely elevated with the increased good will that more liberal doctrines might bring to the rapport of the cult.

Many support the new deviationist line because they are a cog in a bureaucracy that will not tolerate obstructionism. It may be that T. E. Unruh and numerous others belong to this group. We do not really know since they cannot safely inform us. Certainly, such individuals are not very courageous, and one is reminded of what Ellen G. White wrote in one instance concerning the sacred politicians of her day. "The agitation of the subject of organization has revealed a great lack of moral courage on the part of the ministers proclaiming present truth. . . . No; he was displeased with their cowardly silence and lack of action. They feared blame and opposition. They watched the brethren generally to see how their pulse beat, before standing manfully for what they believed to be right." (10:271)

Thirdly, there are those whose conformity is at least in part supported by economic conditions, and it is these individuals to whom Elder Andreassen has

given published consideration (3) The prophetess also had words to say concerning such individuals: "Some ministers have their minds too much on the wages they receive. They labor for wages, and lose sight of the sacredness and importance of the work." (10:467)

And lastly, there are undoubtedly a few who are too dull or too uninformed to understand the seriousness of the situation for those of the group who sincerely believe that the founders of the movement had something vital to say. Elder Andreasen believes that the church may come to its demise as a conclusion to the recent tampering with the views of these pioneers. (1) This might well be, although it does not seem likely that the bureaucracy would intentionally destroy its manipulatable world.

In order that the hierarchy may not topple from its commanding heights of honor and respectability, few devices, if necessary, will be left untried. One series of devices which have always been most useful to those in control were those relating to the use of confused and distorted logic in order to prove a point. Logic of this nature can be found among numerous Adventist writers, and Francis D. Nichol most consistently brandishes this device with the consummate skill of an accomplished artist. A typical example of Nicholian logic, of which there are hundreds of examples, concerns one of Nichol's attempts to show that his prophetess was not a hysteric. "While the majority of hysterics are women, the malady

is by no means confined to one sex..." (6)

The leaders have also been adept at lifting out of context. Seventh-day Adventist leaders have accused their critics of taking statements from context but not one critic that we know about has been more adept at this than the denomination. The two devices just previously mentioned are devices which have been brought to the status of an art, and one of the most recent instances of such reasoning can be seen in A. V. Olson's defense of the bureaucratic attempts to downgrade the influence of Ellen G. White. (7)

In an article entitled "The Priestly Application Of The Atoning Act." Elder Olson takes his stand with the revisionists. Olson begins his article by denying that the leaders have "abandoned the doctrine of the atonement now going on in heaven, where Christ pleads his atoning blood in favor of every repentant sinner." He goes on to report that such an accusation is "false and very unjust." Olson continues that the writer of the article in the February, 1957 issue of **The Ministry**, far from denying the "final" atonement, "believes and teaches the scriptural Adventist doctrine of the atoning sacrifice made on the cross and the application of that atonement being carried out through the ministry of our great High Priest in the heavenly sanctuary."

Reading the above words with care the reader will undoubtedly understand that while they appear to be in line with the traditional view, what we actually have is the new view with

a subtly tailored wording to give it the appearance of being the traditional one. The above view of A. V. Olson is therefore meaningless since we do not know whether Olson is supporting the traditional "scriptural Adventist doctrine of the atoning sacrifice" or the present one. Nor can they both be scriptural since belief in one will necessarily exclude belief in the other. We must read further to learn which view Olson is supporting.

Olson's article is in large part a defense of L. E. Froom's stand in the February, 1957 issue of **The Ministry**. Let us consider the position. Speaking of Froom's article, he writes: "It is a bold, confident, positive declaration of the faith in the two fold aspect of the atonement--namely, the sacrificial act of atonement on the cross, and the atonement now going on in the heavenly sanctuary." Here, then, we have a statement of the two part nature of the atonement. This **sounds** traditional. But let us read further. Quoting Froom: "...Christ's atoning death on Calvary provided redemption potentially for all mankind ... That is the tremendous scope of the sacrificial act of the cross--a complete, perfect, and final atonement for man's sin."

Here we have semantical gibberish like we have never seen. If the atonement on the cross is said to be "complete, perfect, and final" then one can say that either there is such an atonement on the cross or there is not. But to say that atonement is "**provisional**" is to say that it is not "**final**." It cannot possibly be final if there are other fac-

tors that make it provisional. So to say that the atonement is provisional is to say that it is not necessarily final. For even though one part of the dichotomy may be complete, one cannot say that the totality is final until the second portion of the dichotomy has been fulfilled or accomplished.

Froom writes that the atonement embraces two aspects and then he precedes to say that the "sacrificial act of the cross" ... is a "final atonement for man's sin". If Froom writes that the "sacrificial act of the cross" is a "final atonement," we are willing to believe that this is his view. And although he is forced to give lip service to the second phase, it is a phase, nonetheless, the importance of which he must partially annul. He must partially annul the importance of the second phase because he has given prime importance to the first phase by saying that it is final. This is by virtue of the fact that if it be final, there is then no need for a second act or phase. But he says there is a second act or phase, so it is necessary to say that the first phase was provisional. But if it was provisional, then it was not necessarily final. It is obvious that the leaders do not understand this, although the very subtle twists which they give to certain words indicate that there are some who are attempting to force the importance of the first act without making it apparent that such an interpretation is out of the mainstream of traditional Adventist thought.

Olson notes that Froom under-

stands the death of Jesus to be a complete sacrifice. "This sacrifice was complete, and . . . it will never be repeated." Such words repudiate nearly everything that Adventists have ever taught concerning the sanctuary. Moreover, such words are a blight on the views of Edward S. Ballenger, O. H. Olsen, E. B. Jones and others with whom the General Conference has been trying to find some harmony and agreement. It is ironic that the leaders should accept the views of Olsen and Jones and others, while at the same time they despise the individuals from which such views have arisen. And this is not all. Such arguments as Olson uses are a blundering and pitiless monstrosity of logic. Let us study what Olson tries to do and how he attempts to achieve it.

Early Adventists did not believe that the sacrifice was completed on the cross. Jesus sacrificed his blood in the Holy of Holies. Mrs. White wrote: "Our Saviour is in the sanctuary pleading in our behalf. He is our interceding High Priest, making an atoning sacrifice for us, pleading in our behalf the efficacy of His blood." (9:370) But Olson wants one to believe that Adventists have believed that the sacrifice was terminated on the cross. Whatever conclusion Olson comes to will be of little importance since he has perverted the use of the word "sacrifice." I must emphasize. According to Adventists living in the period up to 1957, the sacrifice was not completed on the cross, for Jesus was sacrificing at that very time in the heavenly sanc-

tuary. I have just proven above that this was what Mrs. White taught. But let us return to Olson's argument.

Olson says that the sacrifice was completed on the cross. He notes that when Jesus cried, 'finished,' it must have been final. Now, what does Olson mean by "it"? Does he mean that the sacrifice was final or that the atonement was final? There is a great difference. One has a feeling that in a sense he means both. But this is absurd. The High Priest did more than sacrifice a life. He also had to do something with the blood. And since Jesus is said to have been sacrificing his blood in heaven, the sacrifice could not possibly have been completed on the cross.

But to be very specific, it is evident that Olson is referring to the sacrifice. It is the sacrifice which he has been writing about and a little further on he refers to the same thing as "the first aspect of the twofold atonement" which he says was finished, "hence **final** when Jesus died, and thereby it atoned for the sins of the whole world." This calls for even more faith than Olson's previous statements. Olson has here indulged in the semantic trick of transferring over to the word "atonement" a type of cathected meaning that was attached to the improper use of the word "sacrifice." Even if the word "sacrifice" were properly used, the logic would be faulty. Olson is thereby able to infer that the atonement was completed on the cross whereby in reality it is possible that only the first

portion of the atonement, what he improperly calls the "sacrifice" was traditionally believed to have been completed there. According to conventional Adventist theology, the only thing that was completed on the cross was the death of Jesus. And Adventists were not quite certain about that. For Jesus also was to sacrifice in heaven. So one could not say that the sacrifice was completed on the cross, nor could one say that the atonement was completed there.

Olson's new interpretation, previously used by others with not quite so many pitfalls, has come to have a certain aura of respectability among the leaders since they have recently brought forth a statement or two in which the prophetess used the word "atonement" and "final" to refer to the first part of the atonement. There was in her time no likelihood that she would be misunderstood since entire articles were written in which an attempt was made to show that the atonement on the cross could not have been final.

Nor is this the same kind of finality of which the General Conference now speaks. Mrs. White undoubtedly meant that the first part of the atonement was final and complete by virtue of the death of Christ. This is not what the General Conference means although they have manipulated the key words in an attempt to make it appear that there is no change from the old view. Olson is probably correct when he says that the words of Jesus that 'it is finished' is in agreement with M. L. Andreasen's statement that "On

the cross Christ finished His work as victim and sacrifice.'" For Andreasen was considering the sacrifice as part of the atonement. But Olson's attempt to transfer the cathected image of the word "sacrifice" over to that of the word "atonement" and thus to make it appear that Andreasen and Froom were in agreement cannot be successful. For one is speaking of a totality whereas the other is referring only to a portion of a totality. It will also be noticed by careful readers that Andreasen may have taken certain liberties with the word "sacrifice" which though closer to the original view seems not to be completely in harmony with it.

Olson gives himself away when he writes that the "first aspect of the twofold atonement . . . atoned for the sins of the whole world." According to the founders of the movement, the first act, without the second, did not atone for anything. In a sense, as Froom has already stated, it was provisional. In could not therefore be final except as we refer only to its first phase. Adventists have always said that they believed in the type as being a kind of the antitype. The sacrifice of the goat was not an atonement in itself but a step in the direction of fulfilling the requirements of an atonement. The sacrifice of the victim was more or less believed to be equivalent to the death of Jesus. Although this was the first phase of the atonement, there was always some confusion in the camp since Christ also offered or sacrificed his blood in the Holy

of Holies. Moreover, Adventists were never clear on the importance of the death of Christ, for although his death was considered to be a necessary stage, it was not really considered as a legitimate sacrifice in itself since the victim, Christ, was killed by Roman soldiers rather than by a priest.

The first phase of the atonement thereby participated in the final phase to the extent that it is difficult to separate them. Each phase depends upon the other and the only thing that could be said about the first phase on earth, was that Jesus died in the first phase. One cannot even say that the sacrifice was completed in the first phase. This certainly, then, was not atonement. And although the death of the victim encompassed or participated in the completion of the first phase, the atonement, according to traditional Adventist theology, was only half completed. The blood must also be offered or sprinkled within the second apartment.

Olson therefore makes himself clear. For "the first aspect of the twofold atonement... atoned for the sins of the whole world." This is the argument found in **Questions On Doctrine** (4) and the conclusion is one that Albion and Edward Ballenger came to believe several decades ago.(5) The leaders continue to indicate their hatred for the Ballengers' although on this question, as on many others, they have in large part come around to the Ballenger point of view.

But the article continues, and

mention is made of the second phase of the atonement. This phase is what Froom undoubtedly includes in what he terms the "much broader meaning than has been commonly conceived." Olson admits that the ultimate success of the first phase is dependent upon that of the second, and he quotes Froom as saying that the "atonement on the cross is valueless... unless, and until, it is applied by Christ our High Priest." Froom's words undoubtedly mean that those who died between the death of Christ and 1844 had not experienced atonement for their sins. To put it another way, he may be saying that in a sense Christ's sacrifice on the cross in this time was valueless. Only in 1844 would it become of value to those who had lived and died in the generations since the death of Christ. To put this in still another way, the saints who arose at the crucifixion of Jesus, according to Froom's view, would not be saved at that time but were taken to heaven as lost souls who would be saved sometime after 1844. But Froom does not know what he is talking about, for while he utters all these pleasant sounding statements about the final phase, he makes it quite clear that the atonement was completed on the cross. Undoubtedly this is the kind of refinement in which theological students at the seminary become so adept.

We are not certain that we understand how Christ applies atonement as Froom says that he does. It is my understanding that the founders of the move-

ment believed that Christ applied the blood, as did the High Priest, but I know nothing of his actually applying the atonement. For the atonement was a series of acts, according to the above view, and not an object, such as, let us say, a bottle of vinegar or a brush saturated with paint. It may be supposed that "application" refers to the atoning act of applying something or other. In this sense the use of the word is perhaps legitimate. One suspects that Olson uses "applied atonement" in order not to use the word "blood" which many will incorrectly assume that he means.

But what did Jesus apply when he applied the atonement? The founders believed that He applied His blood. Olson says that he is "now ministering the merits of the atonement." At a previous time it has been shown that the concept of merits is taken out of context and that "merits" does not mean "blood."

(8) It has also been shown that **Questions On Doctrine** speaks of "merits" or "benefits" as being offered by the High Priest in the heavenly sanctuary. A. V. Olson therefore shows that he has taken his position among the other revisionists of the creed.

For if the blood was not offered, then according to the traditional view, the antitype was not fulfilled. But the type was to be after the image of the antitype so that it must have been the antitype that was correct. The type was a shadow and it is by the details of the type that one learns of the antitype. So Adventists believed.

But the contemporary view would indicate that the type was incorrect since it and the antitype did not match. Since the antitype must be the correct and ultimate source, the type, which is not the same must be incorrect. Since the Bible describes only the type in detail, the Bible must also be incorrect. If the Bible is wrong then one might well forget the entire issue since there will be no way of knowing to what extent certain parts, if any, are true and to what extent they may be a hoax. Such then is the situation in which the General Conference has become involved. According to their own view, Jesus gains nothing by pleading with his Father during the second phase. For **Questions on Doctrine** has put it this way: "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 AT THE CROSS."

(4:381) Apparently the second phase is necessary to the completion of the atonement even though it accomplishes nothing more than being the second phase because it is the second phase. That is to say, it is apparently a piece of heavenly red tape which accomplishes the final phase, of an atonement that was completed on the cross, by accomplishing nothing in the final phase of an atonement that is already completed. It is there in existence and that is all that is required of it. How else can one interpret it? Froom says that the first phase is provisional and dependent on

the success of the second one. **Questions On Doctrine** tells us that nothing is accomplished by the second phase since anything to be obtained was already obtained at the cross. Thus we learn of the functional necessity of something that has no function. This kind of logic might also lead one to the conclusion that there is no atonement. Or perhaps the first phase is provisional upon nothing happening in the second.

Many ministers today feel it absurd to think that Christ could offer His slain blood in the heavenly sanctuary after a time span of more than 1844 years. This was no problem of faith for those pioneers who could think concretely and it should be no problem for those today who pretend to be following in the steps of those who came before them. For spiritual things are spiritually discerned. Jesus advocated that man's faith be at least as great as that of a grain of mustard seed. He also told us that faith could move mountains. One of the problems in the Adventist ministry today is that many do not have sufficient faith. This is not a new problem. Ellen G. White wrote that, "The churches, as a general rule, are farther advanced than some of the ministers. They have had faith in the testimonies which God has been pleased to give..." (10:369) "Preachers and people have too little faith, too little devotion and true godliness." (10:433) "The reason why there is so little of the Spirit of God manifested is that ministers learn to do without it." (10:383)

The discussion Adventists have become involved in concerning the finality of the sacrificial portion of the atonement on the cross is all rather contemptible, yet comic in its quizzical ramifications. Olson writes that "If 'the offering of the body of Jesus' on the cross was 'once for all,' 'finished' (as Jesus cried out with his dying breath), and never to be repeated, it must have been 'final.'" Such discussions are pointless. For we have shown that there is no complete correlation between the death of Christ on the cross and the word "sacrifice." Moreover, anything which takes place is final in itself. Until it is final, it is in the state of taking place or of becoming, or has not yet been initiated. Every minute state of matter in flux is final for that state. Additional flux creates additional states. So of course the death of Jesus was final. Does the General Conference believe that He could keep dying after he was dead? I have previously intimated that there seems to have been those who believed that this may actually have been the case.

However, Olson does not seem to know that the sacrifice and the death were not necessarily synonymous. Most church school children once knew this very well, but Olson does not seem to have remembered. For since the death of Jesus has been considered to be only the first half of the atonement, and possibly not quite the first half, one can say that the atonement in a sense was in the process of being completed. Such talk about

finality, until the last step has been taken, is pointless. Olson talks about the second phase of the atonement when he has already said that the termination of the first phase was a final atonement. He also writes that the second atoning act, or "priestly ministry" "makes the atonement effectual." Now an atonement is either an atonement or it is not. If it is not effectual, then it cannot be an atonement. To say that a second phase makes the atonement effectual is to say that the first phase was not final. The word "effectual" is just a misnomer calculated to confuse the issue. Atonement is either effectual or it is not atonement at all.

Let us view this article of A. V. Olson's in summary. In line with **Questions On Doctrine**, Olson does not emphasize the offering of the blood of Jesus in the heavenly sanctuary. According to Froom's article, Jesus is there to "minister the benefits" and **Questions On Doctrine** states that He pleads for nothing. By simple addition, this adds up to "nothing." We see then that the Seventh-day Adventist bureaucracy no longer seems to believe that blood was actually offered in heaven. This we have already shown at a previous time. Secondly, we see that neither Olson nor Froom apparently believe in the exact type and antitype scheme. Neither believe that the priest in the antitype is actually offering blood as was done by the priest in the type. Thirdly, it appears that Olson is willing to attempt to prove that the denomination has always believed this scheme

of things. He is willing to offer such proof even though it may be necessary to distort and mutilate everything ever written by the early Adventists on the subject of the atonement.

Such reasoning as that offered in Olson's article, would seem to be basically devoid of all cognitive content. It would appear that the leaders are not only talking out of both sides of their mouths in an attempt to pacify both the evangelicals and their own constituents but it would seem that there is an attempt to search out a metaphysical path that will make possible the inculcation of the new view without openly casting forth the old one. The bulk of Adventist literature is now sufficiently sizeable for them to locate an isolated instance here and there which they can take out of context and pervert to the edification of the new dogma. This they have done by the use of one or two items in which the prophetess speaks of atonement on the cross as being final. These men have more Ellen G. White writings than any of the rest of us and they know that she did not believe or teach the new view.(9)

We see then that Olson is not hostile to the accomplishment of bureaucratic ends by such devious means and we can assume that there are others who will try their hand at the game before the issue is settled.

--by Virgil C. Staff
P.O. Box 268
Berkeley 1, Calif.

(See **Bibliography** next page.)

..... **Bibliography**

- (1) Andreasen, M. L., "The Atonement." Circ. Ltr. dtd. Nov. 4, 1957, p. 5.
- (2) Circ. Ltr. dtd. Dec. 29, 1957, p.1.
- (3)
LETTERS to the Churches, Series A, No. 4, p. 13.
- (4) Anonymous, **Questions On Doctrine,** pp. 342, 343, 347-350.
- (5) Ballenger, E. S., "Seventh-day Adventists Deny That The Atonement was Made On The Cross." **The Gathering Call,** 29: No. 3, 1941, pp. 11-14; "Sanctuary Doctrine Proved To Be Unbiblical." **The Centennial Supplement,** pp. 4-15, n.d.; "The Sanctuary Special." **GC, 25:** No. 6, 1937, p. 48;

"Seventh-day Adventists and the Atonement." **GC, 24:** No. 3, 1936, pp. 28-31, etc.

- (6) Nichol, Francis D., **Ellen G. White and Her Critics,** 1951, p. 64.
- (7) Olson, A. V., "The Priestly Application Of The Atoning Act." **The Ministry, XXXIV,** No. 5, May, 1961, pp. 10-11.
- (8) Staff, Virgil C., "A Critical Evaluation of the General Conference Apostasy." **The Gathering Call, 49:** No. 1, Jan-Feb., 1961, pp. 14, 15, etc.
- (9) White, Ellen G., **Fundamentals of Christian Education,** 1923, p. 370.
- (10), **Testimonies for the Church, I.**

THE GENERAL CONFERENCE SPECIAL — The most convincing presentation of shocking facts regarding the teaching and practices of SDA founders and leaders ever appearing in one document. 68 pages. Price 25c.

THE SANCTUARY SPECIAL — The SDA Sanctuary teaching is the most unscriptural doctrine to be found in any Protestant creed. It is so unreasonable and so contrary to the Bible that no intelligent minister dares to defend it in public or private. 25c per copy.

MRS. WHITE'S WILL — Everyone familiar with Mrs. White's instructions regarding the disposition of property should read how she disposed of her estate. Duplicate of a certified copy, 10c.

FACSIMILE OF THE ORIGINAL 1843 CHART

We now offer for sale a photographic reproduction of the original 1843 chart used by William Miller and his associates in their lectures on the prophecies of Daniel and the Revelation. Graphically illustrated, is the evidence which seemed to them to indicate that Christ would come, first in October of 1843, and then again in October of 1844. First published by J. V. Himes, in Boston, early in the 1840's. Price 25 cents post-paid. Order from The Gathering Call, 3155 Date Street, Riverside, California.

EXAMINING SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISM—An eight-page leaflet dealing with the early history of their development. Furnished to all who want it free.