

THE GATHERING CALL



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

VOL. 50

Riverside, Calif., July-Aug., 1962

No. 4

In This Issue

How We Got Our Bible 3

(By Grace H. Todd)

A Review Of "Questions On Doctrine." 5

(By Your Editor)

The 2300 Day Hassle In La Sierra 9

(Discussion from the floor between members of the Seventh-day Adventist Church and the Church of God, (7th day).

An Analysis Of The Figuhr - Staff Correspondence 11

(By Virgil C. Staff)

"NEWS AND VIEWS" 20

Copyright, The Gathering Call Publishing Association, 1962.

THE GATHERING CALL

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

OUR NEW MAILING ADDRESS

P.O. Box 4215, Hardman Center Station,
Riverside, California

Board of Directors

Peter Wagenleitner, Chairman,
Fresno, California
Robert Tower Woodlake, California
Grace Pirtle ... Sacramento, California
Forbes Davidson .. Placerville, California
D. M. Phillips Turlock, California

Editorial Staff

Editor Donald E. Mote
Associate Editor W. H. Olson
Associate Editor Virgil C. Staff

SUBSCRIPTION RATE: \$1.50 PER YEAR

Add 30c for postage on Foreign mailings, except for Mexico and Canada, add 25c. 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.

THE MINISTRY OF THIS MAGAZINE.

The publication of this magazine involves considerable financial burden, the weight of which is perhaps not fully realized by those to whom it is sent. We offer no complaint, for this ministry was inaugurated in love for God and devotion to His Word. We are determined to continue as long as means, time, and ability will permit. We are thankful to God for all whose hearts He has opened to labor together with us in this effort to glorify Him in the furtherance of His Word. We consider each subscriber as a fellow-laborer with us and request an interest in your prayers in behalf of the

work. Pray that God will give the wisdom, the understanding, and the enabling necessary unto a ministry glorifying to our Lord Jesus Christ. "By prayer and supplication with thanksgiving let your requests be made known unto God." (Phil. 4:6). "Pray without ceasing." (1 Thess. 5:17). "Brethren pray for us." (1 Thess. 5:25).

YOUR CORRESPONDENCE AND LITERATURE ORDERS

No doubt many of you are getting impatient waiting for replies to your letters and for the literature that you have ordered. We have been extremely busy, and try as we may, we can't seem to catch up with it. We are literally swamped with unanswered mail.

But now that we have finally gotten the July-August issue of the magazine into the mails, late, we will now turn our attention to the heap of unanswered mail.

We realize even more than you do what an important part of the totality of this publishing work the correspondence and literature orders is. We regret that it has suffered some neglect. But, we can only do just so much. Actually, we need a secretary, but there is no money to pay one with. Perhaps more of you would be willing to send us your tithe or donations, so that our operating budget would include at least a part time secretary. We hope that you will pray about this, and that the Lord will lay it on the hearts of you people to use your tithe in this way.

-The Editorial Staff.

How We Got Our Bible

Revised Versions - (Continued)

For more than ten years these committees worked before the New Testament was ready, and the Old Testament did not appear till four years later. The New Testament was put on sale in England, May 17, 1881. Three days later it appeared in the United States. Never, before or since, has there been such enthusiasm over any publication. About 3,000,000 copies were sold in less than a year. The translation was known as the Anglo-American Revision.

The appendices had been added as promised by the English committees, but they were incomplete and far from satisfactory to the American committees. The Americans, however, agreed to lend their support to this Anglo-American Revision for a certain period of time. In 1910 they published the American Standard Revised Version, which has, in this country, practically superceded the former version. Though the American Standard Revised Version is acknowledged to be far more accurate than the King James Version, fifty years has not yet given it a place above that version as far as general use is concerned.

The Revised Versions had the advantage of the co-operative efforts of some of the best Bible scholars in this country and England, but the disadvantages of the "two-thirds majority" rule, of the theological biases of the

translators, and of adverse public opinion. Many changes were made only in the footnotes, that most assuredly should have been made in the text itself. Other changes were not made at all, or were made in some places and not in others. This is very clearly demonstrated in connection with the translation of the Greek noun "aion" (age) and its derived adjective "aionios." The noun occurs 123 times, the adjective form of the word 70 times. The noun is correctly translated in the King James version just twice. (Different editions show various corrections in their notes.) In the A.S.R.V. we have it correctly rendered 90 times. But here is a most interesting fact. The noun occurs 13 times in the Gospel of John, and not once, either in the text or in the notes is the correct rendering given. It occurs 26 times in the book of Revelation and the notes give the correct rendering for every occurrence. This same fact may be noted in several translations. WHY - IN REVELATION AND NOT IN JOHN? Is it because the Gospel of John is so widely read and so much loved that the translators did not dare to change the long accepted text?

We need to find out as nearly as we possibly can what the original Scriptures revealed. The purpose of this article is not just to give a brief history of the

Bible, for that may be obtained in any good library. What we long to do is to show clearly that our English translations can not be taken as verbally inspired; that there is a deep need for the layman, as well as the preacher, to carefully search the Word. Even for the very few who can read Hebrew and Greek, a good Concordance is a necessary tool. If we would know what a word means, we must see how God has used it in the various passages where it occurs in His Word, and compare scripture with scripture. For those who can not read the Hebrew and the Greek, and hereby know what words are actually used, the only possible way of getting at vital facts is by the use of a good Concordance. Two such works are, "Young's Analytical Concordance," and "Strong's Exhaustive Concordance Of The Bible." Wigram's Englishman's Hebrew and Greek Concordances are also very valuable.

Cruden's Concordance, which has been so widely used, shows only what English words were used in our King James Bible, and locates the passages where those words are found. It gives not the slightest clue as to what the words in the original languages were. There is also a "Complete Concordance To The American Standard Bible." It is to the American Standard Revised Version just what Cruden's is to the King James Bible. When a Hebrew or Greek word has been translated in many different ways, and conversely when one English word has been used to translate several Hebrew or Greek words, without any differ-

entation it is no wonder that men are blinded and follow many false teachings.

Whatever version one may use, he should also have a King James Bible, as our best concordances are all based on that version. There are many translations available at the present time and in studying they may be compared with profit. Two which have attempted more than others to give uniform renderings are Rotherham's Emphasized Bible (both Old and New Testaments), and the Concordant Version of the New Testament. What ever Bible we may use we must always remember that expositional notes are not a part of the inspired text and should be carefully tested by the Word as a whole, before being accepted.

"Thy Word is truth." (Jn. 17: 17). "The words of Jehovah are pure words; as silver tried in a furnace on the earth, purified seven times." (Ps. 12:6). May He lay it upon our hearts to diligently seek out these words and to conform our lives and teachings to them.

—by Grace H. Todd,
in **Reconciliation** magazine,
December, 1942.

"Some people simply will not like you unless you commit the same sins and nurse the same prejudices they do."

—Selected.

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.

A Review Of "Questions On Doctrine."

QUESTION 16

"THE SABBATH AND THE MORAL LAW."

"The Christian World generally holds (1) that the moral law is eternal and has not been abolished; (2) that the Sabbath principle, anchored to the creation week, especially in the distinction between the six-and-one days--marking them off by divine authority for different purposes--is likewise permanent and eternal; (3) that the specific seventh-day time element is but ceremonial and typical, and therefore temporary--being fulfilled and abrogated by Christ at the cross; and (4) that there is a clear continuity between the Sabbath of Old Testament times, based on creation, and the Lord's day of the New Testament, based on redemption, with the redemption rest greater than the creation rest. What is the position of Seventh-day Adventists on these four points?" (1)

We might answer this question with a question; Where in the world do they get the idea that a so-called "redemption rest" would be greater than the Creation rest? And, who made it so? Was it God's idea, or did it originate with the modern-day evangelicals?

This, of course, is a lot of duplicity and double talk. To begin with, the Christian world as a whole, does not hold that the moral law is eternal, and that it has not been abolished. There are large numbers of professed Christians of various denominations who will tell you that the law was done away with and the Sabbath with it, in one package deal. Not only that, but many of them will not even recognize that there is any distinction between "moral" and "cere-

monial" law. There is but one law to them and it done away with by Christ as a part of the plan of redemption. Moreover, it is their contention that we seventh-day people seek to make this distinction which does not really exist. We will concede, however that most of the old-line evangelical denominations such as the Methodists and the Baptists (who are not so irresponsible in their theology) do hold that the decalogue is eternal. The old-line organizations only pick at the Sabbath, so they come much nearer being on the side of right.

The Martin committee contends that the specific seventh-day time element is but ceremonial and typical. But it isn't any more so than are the other nine commandments. Where do they

get the idea that they are justified in singling out the fourth commandment and branding it as "ceremonial and typical?" "Consistency, thou art a jewel." Not only that but where is the biblical authority for saying that the Sabbath commandment was fulfilled and abrogated by Christ at the cross? Was Paul wrong? If what the evangelicals say is true, then why did the apostle Paul continue to keep the seventh day Sabbath long after the cross? The record indicates that he did.

New Testament Christians look to Paul for their example of faith and practise because he was the outstanding figure in the history of the New Testament church. Therefore, if any change was made in apostolic times with regards to the observance of a weekly day of rest, we would naturally expect Paul to live and teach it. Did Paul observe the Sabbath? The record shows that he did.

It must be remembered that Paul was a Pharisee, a member of the strictest sect of the Jews. (2) As a Pharisee he would naturally be very straight-laced concerning all of the specified observances of Judaism, and the observance of the Sabbath was stressed above all else.

Paul spent about ten years on his missionary journeys into Asia Minor, Macedonia and Greece. And the record states that Paul preached "as his manner was," on at least 84 Sabbaths which are specifically mentioned. (3)

From his own testimony, Paul observed the Sabbath. Moreover, he stated that he had not violated any of the laws of the Jews

or the customs of the fathers. Could Paul make this statement if he had given up the seventh-day Sabbath for another day? (4) At no time did Paul ever teach that the Sabbath was ceremonial, or that it had been abrogated or fulfilled at the cross.

The 15th chapter of the book of Acts tells of an early church council which was called to settle various points of difference between the various groups in the early church. The topics discussed were not relative to the weekly Sabbath, but to matters of conscience, and setting forth the law of love concerning doubtful practises, such as the eating of meat offered to idols, the drinking of wine, and observing the feast days. The church at Galatia had taken up the ceremonial practises of the old covenant. The matter of whether or not Christians should observe the 7th or first day of the week did not enter into it. In fact, the observance of the 7th day Sabbath was all that was known then. There was no such thing as a quarrel between Saturday and Sunday. It did not even exist until centuries later, as discussed at considerable length in the book. In fact, we feel that the Adventist book committee have done an excellent job of citing church history to show the true origin of Sunday observance, and when it began to develop.

Some are want to quote Colossians 2:13-17 in an effort to prove that the Sabbath was abrogated, or done away with at the cross. But, if the reader will honestly scrutinize the context, he will readily see

that the "sabbath days" mentioned here are those which were based on the phases of the moon--lunar sabbaths, or ceremonial days, and that they do not refer to the weekly Sabbath. The ceremonial sabbaths certainly were a shadow of things to come, but not the weekly Sabbath. (5)

We also wish to go on record as stating that we heartily agree with most of what this 16th chapter of the book under review contains. For the most part the Adventist committee have done an excellent job in refuting the position of the Martin committee, or of the evangelicals as a whole. In the light of the scriptural truth, and clear logic, along with the background of church history which this chapter presents, it is impossible for us to see how they can still cling to their claims for Sunday. We dissent from practically everything that the Adventist brethren did. So, with these added thoughts concerning the apostle Paul, we again find ourselves defending the Adventist position where the Sabbath is concerned.

We must go on record, however as dissenting from at least one position taken by the Adventist committee. For instance, at the bottom of page 159, they discuss the subject of the Passover. They state that, "His death occurred on the designated day of the Passover (Nisan 14), which in that year fell on a Friday."

This we can not abide. They are correct in stating that He (Jesus) is our Passover, and that His death occurred on Nisan 14, but it would not be correct in the

fullest sense to say that it occurred "on the designated day of the Passover." His death occurred, not on the Passover itself, but on the Preparation day, or the day preceding the Passover, when the paschal lamb was prepared for the feast. Not only this but the Adventists accept the popular tradition that Jesus was crucified on Friday and resurrected early Sunday morning. With this we most heartily disagree. They actually injure and weaken their own position by falling into line with popular tradition, a tradition which is no better than that of Sunday observance itself. If Adventists could only accept the truth of this matter they would have a powerful argument which would sweep the one remaining prop out from under the Sunday tradition. But, they are handicapped because of the position taken by their prophetess on the subject. They dare not admit the truth on this wise for it would refute the word of Ellen G. White. She inferred that Christ was crucified on Friday and resurrected early Sunday morning, so denominational teaching **must** follow evangelical tradition. (5) This places them in the unenviable position of being forced to reject truth, even as the evangelicals have concerning the Sabbath.

It has been said, "Any time that you find truth standing in your way, you may be sure you are headed in the wrong direction."

How much longer will it be before the Adventist brethren learn to discard anything that

stands as a barrier to accepting new light? This myth about the divine inspiration of Mrs. White is as a veil covering their eyes through which they are blinded to the truth.

(For a complete discussion concerning our doctrinal position on the subject of the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ, order the Bible study, entitled, "The Creation And Redemption Sabbaths," by Grace H. Todd. Price 25 cents, or five copies for a Dollar, postpaid.)

--by Donald E. Mote,
Editor.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- (1) Anonymous, **Questions on Doctrine**, R. and H., 1957.
- (2) Acts 23:6; 26:5; Philippians 3:5, 6.
- (3) Acts 13:14, 44; 16:13; 17:2; 18:4, 11.
- (4) Acts 25:8; 26:4, 5; 28:17; Philippians 3:6.
- (5) Acts 15:1-35.

The 2300 Day Hassle---

(Continued from page 10)

use the chart here that we used last night, that explains the he-goat and ram, and the four horns, with the little horn, here. (Indicates chart). Now, 457 was way before 331, so why go back to 457 and count 2300 years, from there to 1844? Well, there are many other things, too, but if the brethren will **PROMISE** to be here tomorrow evening again, for me to explain these thoughts; --I can do it now if you care to wait. But I know that some of you are rather anxious to go home, and I don't want to de-

(Concluded on page 19).

PACIFIC PINES CAMP

Your editor drove up into the San Bernardino Mountains over the Labor Day week end to visit Pacific Pines Camp, near Crestline, Calif., owned and operated by the Pacific Coast Assn. of Seventh Day Baptists.

It was a great relief to get out of the heat and smog of the valley cities, up where one may commune with nature. It was a glorious feeling to just lie on my cot at night out under the stars and hear the wind sighing in the Pine trees.

There was also the spiritual feast at the out-of-doors chapel services led by Alton Wheeler, Pastor of the Riverside Seventh Day Baptist Church.

There are the barracks for those who prefer to sleep indoors, and the dining hall, kitchen, and other camp facilities.

All in all, our Labor Day week end was most enjoyable and it was with a good deal of reluctance that we headed our Ford down the mountain again.

Pacific Pines Camp is sometimes rented to other Church groups, and also secular groups. If your Church group is interested in obtaining an ideal spot for a general gathering, we strongly recommend Pacific Pines Camp. For further information write to Mr. Gleason Curtis, Whose address is 4145 Orange Street, in Riverside, California.

In the near future, we hope to have pictures and complete information to put in the "Call" as a service to our readers.

--the Editor.

The 2300 Day Hassle in La Sierra

The Discussion From The Floor Between The Members Of The Seventh-day Adventist Church, And The Church Of God (7th day), of Bloomington, California.

Elder Padilla--Thank you, Elder Delafield. That was a wonderful explanation, and I am glad that the people of the Church of God were privileged to hear this explanation from one of the ministers of the Seventh-day Adventist church, concerning their interpretation of the 2300 days. Now, before we do anything else, I would like to ask any of the brethren who would like to have anything to say, or comments on anything that has been said here, you are welcome to, and we will come to a close in just a few moments. We don't want to detain you too long, or delay you. The brother over here, I believe, Johnny--

Johnny-- Right. Did you make the comment that the Sign and Seal are not the same thing?

Elder Padilla--That's right. That was concerning the 144,000.

Johnny--Well, I just wondered. You just come out and said they aren't the same, and I believe the apostle Paul says in Romans 4:11, "And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet----" Well, and so it goes on; but anyway he refers to it as the same thing--
--(blank spot in tape of some

few seconds)----- he says, anyway, this is a new kingdom established and a requirement for all generations.

Elder Padilla:--Yes.

Johnny:-- (The words are indistinguishable due to being so far in the background)

Elder Padilla:-- I don't know whether I should comment on that, or on the other thing. But if the brethren would like to say anything else, you are welcome to. Maybe brother Carlin has something he would like to say, or brother Mote, or anybody who would like to have something to say about the 2300 days. In fact, tomorrow night we can talk on the 144,000 if you would like to. I just don't want to bring the two subjects together and get them mixed up, and get our minds all confused. Brother, ah--, I forget your name; --Wagner, yes.

Brother Wagner:--I was thinking about the statement you made about the name of God, and the seal received in the forehead, with the name of the living God. The seal of God is really the mark of the character of God, so they are interchangeable, a sign or seal of righteousness, because we keep the command-

ments of God. If we keep the commandments of God we are sealed, by the Spirit, with the Law of God, or with the name of God. That's my thought.

Elder Padilla:--Well, thank you. You have explained the whole thing. It's those that keep the commandments of God that have the seal of God, or the name of God. That's what I think. Well, anyway, we are bringing in the 144,000 instead of the 2300 days. Actually, I wanted those folks to comment on the 2300 day prophecy,--those that will. Brother Mote--

Brother Mote:-- I wasn't here last night, but I understood that the Adventist brethren took a tape recording of your sermon.

Elder Padilla:--Yes.

Brother Mote:--Since that time, the Adventist brethren have had opportunity to listen to that recording and prepare a rebuttal. I would just suggest that Brother Padilla be allowed the same privilege, to play Elder Delafield's talk back and make a study of his thoughts, and give his side of the question.

Elder Padilla:-- Brother Coulson --thank you, brother Mote.

Brother Coulson: -- I wonder about the two beasts mentioned in the 8th chapter. There were only two beasts mentioned, and there are four horns that came out of one horn, or they come out after the one horn is broken off. Now, if there are four horns that come out, and they represent the Grecian empire, and the other one comes out afterwards, out of one of the other four, how does it represent Rome from the Grecian empire? In

other words, the head which was the power of the goat there represented was the ruling power of that kingdom, does it not? The head? It represents the strength and the ruling power of Grecia, and if this horn comes out of Grecia, how can it represent another ruling power that has not yet come into action? It is still in the time of the Greek empire. In the 8th chapter there are only two beasts mentioned. We have no third power. We have only two. It is at the breaking up of the kingdom, we all agree on that, but it still represents that power. There are only two beasts. One has the two horns which are on the ram. The other has one horn which is still on the he-goat, after which comes out the four horns, after the one is broken, and from one of the four comes out the little horn from the Syrian horn. Still the representing power is that of the he-goat. There is no third power represented there.

Elder Padilla:-- Thank you, brother Coulson. Like brother Mote said,--I have a lot of notes here and it would take me probably another half hour to go through the explanation, because I have some notes here that answers everything that Elder Delafield just said. And exactly as brother Coulson said just now. I have that thing marked out here, that the little horn, brother Delafield claimed, like I mentioned last night, some people claim that it is Rome. But he starts the count in 457, and Rome did not exist in 457. Now, you see, I have so many things to present to you, and Brother Delafield did not

(Continued on page 8)

AN ANALYSIS OF THE FIGUHR-STAFF CORRESPONDENCE.

(PART 3)

Since there appears to have been considerable confusion concerning whether or not certain members of the General Conference Corporation were attempting to revise the creed, it has been thought that publication of pertinent portions of the correspondence between myself and R. R. Figuhr might tend to introduce further evidence on the subject and thus ease the path toward an understanding of just what has been taking place in the headquarters of the Advent movement. It is also the intention in this series to consider the validity of certain of the views presented and to attempt contextual analysis wherever this is believed to possess utility.

It is likely that this series will lack a certain smoothness and continuity. This can hardly be avoided without covering the basically socratic question and answer pattern with a blanket of words which would destroy much of the terseness and directness of what I think is essential if this trend in Adventism is to be understood. This, then, is no attempt to consider the basic **Weltanschauung** of the Adventists. Rather is it a response to assertions on both sides of the fence relative to what the Adventist bureaucracy attests to be doctrinally sound. It is hoped that the arguments will be apodictically useful in helping to clarify the problems at hand and that the materials presented will adscitiously corroborate a framework

consonant with what is already known.

At the time that this is being written, which is the month of May, R. R. Figuhr is President of the General Conference Corporation. It is assumed that the next President has already been chosen by the executive committee and that resolute action is being taken to assure the success of the candidate already chosen. But this is of no basic importance to the past. The initial steps in the present apostasy were taken under the administration of President Figuhr and his answers ought to be considered authoritative.

In my first letter to R. R. Figuhr, dated March 19, 1960, the following question was posed: "In Letter 329, 1905, Mrs White says we must stand by the old landmarks. Is complete and final atonement on the cross an old landmark of the denomination? Was this doctrine taught by James White, J. N. Andrews, Uriah Smith, C. H. Watson, E. E. Andross, Camden Lacey, R. S. Owen, E. R. Johnson, etc?" Figuhr's answer is as follows: - "First let me refer to the list of names you quote. You asked whether or not **Questions On Doctrine** is in harmony with what these men have taught. Frankly, Brother Staff, I can not tell you as I have not read all that they have written. What I have been concerned about is that the book be in harmony with the Scriptures and the teach-

ings of the Spirit of Prophecy. Regarding the old landmarks and whether or not the Atonement is included in these, I would refer you to **Counsels To Writers And Editors**, pp. 28-31. I shall quote just a few sentences from page 30 and the top of page 31, on the old landmarks:

"The passing of the time in 1844 was a period of great events, opening to our astonished eyes the cleansing of the sanctuary transpiring in heaven, and having decided relation to God's people upon the earth, (also) the first and second angel's messages, and the third, unfurling the banner on which was inscribed, 'The commandments of God and the faith of Jesus.' One of the landmarks under this message was the temple of God, seen by His truth-loving people in heaven, and the ark containing the law of God. The light of the Sabbath of the fourth commandment flashed its strong rays in the pathway of the transgressors of God's law. The nonimmortality of the wicked is an old landmark. I can call to mind **nothing more that can come under the head of the old landmarks. All this cry about changing the old landmarks is all imaginary.**' --**Counsels to Writers and Editors**, pp. 29, 31.

"You will notice that Sister White does not particularly include the Atonement in the Fundamentals, although we believe it to be included under the Sanctuary Service. It certainly is one of our great fundamental teachings." (2:2, 3)

It will be noted that Figuhr admits that he does not know whether or not **Questions on Doctrine** is in line with the beliefs and writings of the men listed in the question. Certainly this was an honorable admission if indeed Figuhr does not know whether these men were in harmony with **Questions on Doctrine**. Yet, one would most likely be able to give an objective answer to the question without having read the totality of their writings. If Figuhr does not know for certain whether or not **Questions on Doctrine** is in harmony with these men, how can some in high positions contend that no changes are being initiated? How do such individuals know that no changes are being instituted if they are not aware of what early Adventists believed and taught? For Figuhr is the leader of the movement and he ought to be as well-informed as anyone with respect to such an important issue.

It will be noticed that this writer did not question Figuhr as to whether or not the concept of atonement was a landmark according to Mrs. White. The question concerned the denomination. Figuhr makes it clear that he was not really concerned about what the denomination had believed but rather with what could be found relative to this question in the writings of Mrs. White, and in the Scriptures.

I must admit that I am not quite clear about what Mrs. White means in the above quotation. For "landmarks" seem to be distinct from certain "events." The "landmarks" in this quotat-

ion seem to refer to certain objects or concepts while the events seem at least equally important. It would seem that Figuhr's view is an extremely narrow one. For it has been believed by Adventists that the doctrine of the atonement was indeed one of the most important landmarks in the Adventist point of view. If Adventists generally believed that the doctrine of the atonement was a landmark of the church, and Mrs. White did not, why did she not dispute with these people? Figuhr does admit that the doctrine is one of the fundamentals of the organization. But he says it was not a "landmark" according to Mrs. White. Mr. Figuhr tells us that he is only concerned with what light Mrs. White or the Scriptures might offer on this point. He is not interested in what Adventists believed.

But this is not realistic since E. G. White probably would have taken these people to task had they been out of line with what she believed to be correct. Since there is no record that she did so there is some question about the validity of Figuhr's argument. The question is an important one because recent critics have accused the denomination of departing from the old landmarks. This was one of the arguments of the late Elder M. L. Andreasen who finally managed to get himself disfellowshipped for supporting traditional Adventist theology.

In my next letter to Figuhr this same problem was again considered. In that letter, this writer posed the following question: "On pages 2 and 3 of your

letter of March 23rd you mentioned the possibility that the Atonement was not a "landmark" of the faith. Is it not true, however, that Mrs. White spoke of the Atonement as a "pillar" of our Faith?" This question seemed important since "pillar" and "landmark" seemed in many ways to be roughly synonymous. (9:1)

Figuhr answered as follows: "I did not intend to convey the thought that the atonement is not a landmark of the faith. It is not one of the landmarks that Sister White specifically mentions in the quotation I referred to in my previous letter. We certainly do recognize it, however, as a fundamental pillar of our belief; though not specifically mentioned there, it undoubtedly was intended to be included in the temple or the sanctuary that Sister White did mention as one of the landmarks." (3:2)

Figuhr therefore admits the atonement to be a landmark, although he hedged on this point in the earlier letter. As a matter of fact, Mrs. White seems to make the **landmarks** subordinate to the **events**. Read again the statement which Figuhr quotes. This is important for the cleansing of the sanctuary can hardly be separated from the atonement. It is this writer's understanding that it was through the atonement that Adventists believed that the sanctuary was to be cleansed. So that again we see a play on words which hardly seems justified. But now that we have Figuhr's word that the atonement probably should be classi-

fied as a landmark, it is up to the reader to decide, from what has been published at a previous time, whether or not the General Conference brethren are compromising one of the landmarks. It might also be interesting to remember that more recently it has been reported that an influential Adventist leader preached a sermon in which it was contended that there is no temple in heaven. (7) This ought adequately to take care of another of the landmarks.

Another series of questions posed to Figuhr concerned whether or not the atonement was presently existent. "Did most early Seventh-day Adventists believe and teach that they were living in the day of Atonement?" (9) Figuhr's answer follows: "I believe that Seventh-day Adventists did believe that they were living in the day of the investigative judgment since 1844, and still do." (3:2)

Here Figuhr answered the question rather indirectly. For I did not ask about the investigative judgment but about the atonement. If Figuhr were to employ the word "atonement" there would be no basis for the recent assertions that the atonement was completed on the cross. He therefore stated that the investigative judgment was believed to be existent and it was asserted that this remains the belief to our day. In answering my question in this manner, Figuhr substituted the words "investigative judgment" for the word "atonement" for the reason given above. It was undoubtedly felt that this writer would not note the mean-

ingful substitution. This is important for one cannot really distinguish between the atonement and the investigative judgment in traditional Adventist theology. Figuhr's use of the word above, and his substitution of one term for another, would further indicate the truth of this statement.

In the same letter to Figuhr a related question was posed. "Mrs. White says that 'Christ is making atonement now.' Is this in line with the present denominational position?" (9) In answer to this Figuhr wrote: "Yes, when we understand the mediatorial phase of the atonement which is now in progress in heaven." (3:2)

Yet atonement was completed on the cross. Apparently atonement took place without mediation. If so, then it was not in line with the type. But Figuhr says he agrees that Christ is making atonement now. Only it is the mediatorial part of an atonement that is already completed. Yet it is not completed. We are told that Figuhr believes the statement of Mrs. White. If this is not confusion, I fail to know what confusion is. It is obvious that the General Conference brethren do not believe that Mrs. White meant "atonement" when she used the word "atonement." More probably, and this does not exclude the previous statement, they are as confused as their arguments. For any argument predicated on the belief of a mediatorial phase of an atonement not yet completed, cannot possibly be made to coincide with or be made to accommodate a final and complete

atonement on the cross.

On April 2, I wrote: "In my second question to you of March 27th, I asked if most early Seventh-day Adventists believed that they were living in the day of atonement. In your answer you did not really make clear the answer to the question which I had posed since I did not ask about the investigative judgment but rather about the atonement. I would still like to know the answer to that question." (10) In answer to this question, Figuhr referred me to **Patriarchs and Prophets**. "For answer to this, I would refer you to **Patriarchs and Prophets**, pp. 357-8, which states clearly our position. I would suggest you begin reading the beginning of page 357 to the bottom of page 358. The answer there is very clear. You will notice that it is very closely related to what we call the investigative judgment." (4:2)

The reader should consider the pages listed above. It is the atonement concerning which Mrs. White here writes. Of course it is true that this atonement does indeed relate to what Figuhr calls the investigative judgment. For Figuhr has already indirectly made it clear that in some way or another they are similar. This latter statement of his corroborates this relationship. Here again it is useful for Figuhr to substitute "investigative judgment" in place of "atonement" for similar reasons already given. Again Figuhr had failed to answer my question. For again he had avoided the use of the word "atonement" as a meaningful word for our time.

Finally, in my letter of April 11, the question was again put to Figuhr. "I recognize the almost intimate connection between the investigative judgment and the day of atonement, however, I would still like to know whether or not in your opinion, most early Adventists believed that they were living in the day of Atonement." (11:2) Figuhr's answer is sly and devious. "Yes, I believe that most early Adventists believed that they were living in the day of atonement after the question of the cleansing of the sanctuary was fully clarified to them, following the disappointment of 1844." (5:3)

Thus, ultimately, Figuhr answered the question. There was hardly any alternative other than to offer a stark refusal. Early Adventists did believe that they were living in the time of the atonement. This is interesting in terms of the assertions of some that the Adventist people unchangingly continue to believe that the atonement was completed on the cross. Here is a direct statement that early Adventists did believe that they were living in the time of the atonement. Any alteration of this view must quite evidently be a change in theology.

However, the assertion is not so direct as it might seem, and the exact importance of Figuhr's admission is unknown at this time since he predicates a belief in atonement on an understanding of the investigative judgment. The idea, of course, is that these early Adventists interpreted the investigative judgment in the same manner as is now popular with the General Conference.

But Figuhr did not present any evidence for his assertion. Nor is it believed that he can do so.

The following question was also posed: "Is not the mediation and the offering of blood a part of the atonement? Were either of these completed on the cross?"

(9) The answer received was that "I think this is answered in the preceding question. The word 'blood' of course is symbolic of the death of Christ and certainly figures in His present mediation in the heavenly sanctuary. The actual shedding of His physical blood was completed on the cross." (3) Blood is therefore symbolic when speaking of the heavenly sanctuary. There is none to be found there. So obviously Jesus could not be sacrificing or offering up His blood. For there is no blood there. Again one must decide for himself as to whether these things are in line with traditional Adventist theology.

But let us continue. Figuhr says that this question is answered by the answer he gave in the previous one. The previous question was as follows: "Mrs. White says that 'Christ is making atonement now.' Is this in line with the present denominational position?" Figuhr's answer follows: "Yes, when we understand the mediatorial phase of the atonement which is now in progress in heaven." It is clear that if we do not understand this as Figuhr does it will be because we do not "understand the mediatorial phase of the atonement which is now in heaven." This is a fine way to bring an argument to an end. We have shown

the contradictions involved. If we accept these contradictions and believe that Christ is making atonement now even though He completed it on the cross, then we understand the atonement and see it in its true light. If we cannot understand this kind of logic, then we do not comprehend the atonement. I cannot argue with this kind of argument since it puts all arguments to shame. There is no answer to an argument of this nature. It is obvious that I do not understand the atonement.

So again Figuhr did not answer the question. He had already made clear that atonement did include the mediation as well as the offering of the blood. Both were part of the atonement which was completed on the cross, yet he tells us above that the mediation continues.

A further question was as follows: "Is there a difference between Christ the **victim** and Christ the **priest**?" (7) Figuhr answers that "in reply to this, let me quote Sister White from the appendix of **Questions on Doctrine**, page 667, 'As the high priest laid aside his gorgeous pontifical robes, and officiated in the white linen dress of a common priest, so **Christ emptied Himself**, and took the form of a servant, and **offered the sacrifice, Himself the priest, Himself the victim.**' ---**The Southern Watchman**, Aug. 6, 1903." (3:3)

In the above statement Figuhr did not answer the question. The quotation is inserted in such a manner that it would appear that the two functions were not

greatly different. Was Christ **priest** and **victim** at the same time, or at different times? Many Adventists have traditionally believed that these two functions were fulfilled at somewhat different times, and M. L. Andraesen has given what is probably the most recent consideration to this problem. (1;12) Of course the type and antitype will not favorably compare. The priest did not kill himself. He was the priest and not the victim. Mrs. White says that Christ was **Priest** and **victim**. If atonement was completed on the cross, then Christ died as victim without the benefits of priesthood. For Roman soldiers can hardly be expected to fulfill the needs of the antitype. It was believed traditionally that by His priesthood in the Most Holy Place Christ was in some way able to perform the functions of a priest and at the same time eventuate in being the victim. Just how this could take place was never quite clear but it was believed that the sacrifice continued long after the death on the cross. This was somewhat akin to the Roman Catholic Mass only in this case Christ slowly committed **suicide**. One can respect the attempts of the Catholic-hating clergy to determine a way out of this tangle. While they have not succeeded as yet, F. D. Nichol comes closest to meeting the problem. (6) We shall consider his inventions at a later time. What is important above is that Figuhr does not answer the question as to whether there is a difference between Christ as **priest** and Christ as **victim**.

It is true that he gives a quote from Mrs. White, but while I do not possess the issue in question I am not convinced that the quotation is presented in context. Had Figuhr not been trying to conceal something important, he could have unequivocally answered my question with a clear "yes" or with a resounding "no." On the other hand, if the statement is presented in context, which it may well be, it is then an additional indication for the new interpretation which was mentioned in the previous issue. At any rate, the priest-victim dichotomy raises more problems than it solves since type and antitype tend not to correspond whatever the interpretation may be.

In bringing this article to a close it is probable that there are those who will be interested in any comments concerning the present relationship of the critics to those with whom they are censorious. It increasingly becomes evident that the Seventh-day Adventist organization is in danger of dissolution only to the extent that members of one or the other of the two categories are unwilling to cease their propaganda activities. As long as the members of neither category are willing to accommodate their views to those of the other, there will be increasing disquietude within the ranks of the organization.

There are participants in both camps who seem to realize this truism. Yet at the moment of writing this, members in both camps seem to feel that they are sufficiently right to justify their endangering the organization as

it now stands. Neither category seems to be composed of individuals who are presently willing to allow the organization to remain as it is. Both want changes..

Significant numbers of the **bureaucracy** are desirous of continuing the status quo which is a movement away from traditional Adventism. These undoubtedly carry with them the following sub-categories: (1) the better informed and more highly educated in the church who through the years have been silently scandalized by the informed charges of people like E. S. Ballenger, E. B. Jones and W. H. Olson; (2) many of the more poorly informed who follow the bureaucracy because it is the bureaucracy, or because they do not recognize the issues involved; (3) many of the mentally unhealthy who, informed or otherwise, feel the need to be on the side of material power and authority.

The social category of the **critics** must be broken down into at least three sub-categories. **Sub-category 1** should be composed of those critics, healthy and otherwise, who might be called **traditionalists** and who desire to carry the church back to a golden age when it was more of a sect and less of a church, and when decisions tended more to be based on principle rather than on utility. **Sub-category 2** consists of those who at least outwardly agree with the traditionalists but who indicate some tendencies toward personal ambition. The economic motive may be significant here and at

the moment I know of only one critic who might fit this type. Finally, there are in **sub-category 3** those who feel that the movement has been a fraud from the very beginning and they therefore advocate reform or destruction depending on which of the two the leaders seem to prefer.

We do not have the time here to consider this typology although we shall do so at a later time. What is important to note is that the so-called **critics** are not a homogeneous group. Although there is a sense in which all three sub-categories are working toward the same end, the sense is only a superficial one. For **sub-category 3** has little in common with those of **1** and **2**. As a matter of fact, in many ways sub-categories **1** and **2** have much more in common with the denomination than they do with **sub-category 3**. For sub-categories **1** and **2** are basically Adventist. To be exact, they are more Adventist than the average Adventist. **Sub-category 1** would cease its work were the leadership to revert back to the ideals of traditional Adventism. **Sub-category 2** would undoubtedly be dragged along in the wake of **1**. The only ultimate danger to the Adventists therefore arises from **sub-category 3**, the members of which have through the years been adept at presenting uncomfortable facts, or from the refusal of the bureaucracy to silence the critics of sub-categories **1** and **2**. The latter is the easier task since there is only a need to get into line with the tradition without giving too

much concern to the unpleasanties presented by those of sub-category 3. Undoubtedly some of the clergy would be hurt by such a rapprochement but the movement itself would continue to be strong and vigorous.

So we see that the denomination has little or nothing to fear unless, of course, neither side will submit. Since the bureaucracy can always submit, there is a sense in which the movement is in little danger. For submission of the bureaucracy to sub-categories 1 and 2 would undoubtedly satisfy enough people to calm the storm. This might be of considerable sacrifice to some of the bureaucracy since the organization has come to function primarily for their benefit. Yet I have shown at a previous time how many of those in high positions might take little or no demotion and might concurrently admit the recent presence of apostasy. Even a few retirements would clear the scene. The problem then seems not so much to relate to when the denomination will disintegrate but rather who shall submit and when. In the meantime, the longer the struggle continues, the more will the laity be shaken and the clergy tend to lose their assumed prestige as servants of the Lord. Although there is always the possibility of a compromise, it seems unlikely that either side at this time will compromise away what each obviously feels so strongly about. In the meantime, the battle continues.

--by Virgil C. Staff
(May, 1962)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- (1) Andreasen, M. L., "The Atonement," Circular Letter dtd. Nov. 4, 1957.
- (2) R. R. Figuhr to Virgil Staff, March 23, 1960, 4 pages.
- (3) -----
March 31, 1960, 4 pages.
- (4) -----
April 7, 1960, 3 pages.
- (5) -----
April 27, 1960, 3 pages.
- (6) Nichol, F. D., "Have We Forsaken the Sanctuary Doctrine?"-2., **Review and Herald**, Vol. 139, No. 14, Apr. 5, 1962, pp. 16, 17.
- (7) Rue, G. H., **Newsletter**, Nos. 20-22, 1961.
- (8) Virgil C. Staff to R. R. Figuhr, March 19, 1960, 1 page.
- (9) -----
March 27, 1960, 2 pages.
- (10) -----
April 2, 1960, 3 pages.
- (11) -----
April 11, 1960, 3 pages.
- (12) Staff, Virgil C., "More About the M. L. Andreasen-General Conference Controversy." **The Gathering Call**, Vol. 48, No. 4, Jul-Aug., 1960, pp. 17-20.
- (13) White, Ellen G., **Patriarchs and Prophets**, c. 1943, p. 357.

The 2300 day Hassle---

(Continued from page 8)
tain you too long, and then tomorrow night maybe you won't be here. But, if you will promise to be here again tomorrow night, I will explain all this again. Now, how many of the brethren here from the Adventist church--
(Sorry, Folks! We just simply ran out of space. MORE in the next issue.)

News and Views

BILLY GRAHAM SAYS: AMERICA IS WANING!

As Billy Graham wound up a very successful evangelistic campaign in Chicago recently, and according to Associated Press, he told a crowd estimated at about 116,000 people, said to be the largest North American audience that he had ever spoken to, that the United States is on the wane..

According to Mr. Graham, there are "five major reasons for the decline of American society."

They are enumerated as follows:

- * "We in America have gone on a sex binge that has no parallel in history.

- * "Our preoccupation with materialism.

- * "Our lust for pleasure—Physical and sensual.

- * "Our building of armaments. And I tell you all the arms we build will not save us.

- * "The decay of religion in America. We play at being Christians. We believe in God with our intellects. We serve Him with our lips."

"May blessings be upon the head of Cadmus or the Phoenicians, or whoever invented books! . . . An art that carries the voice of man to the extremities of the earth, and to the latest generations."

—Thomas Carlyle.

NO WAY TO LIVE!

Joya Sherrill, a member of the Benny Goodman troupe, who completed a recent good-will tour of Russia, said, "Foreigners visiting Russia are not likely to be converted to Communism. This is certainly not the way of life. The government ought to have a fund for people with Communist inclinations and send them over there for a few weeks to see how people live."

WITH THIS WE CONQUER!

When the Communists celebrated their conquest of China, their parades were led by individuals carrying replicas of printing presses at the top of long poles. Underneath the picture of the presses was the inscription: "WITH THIS WE CONQUER!"

"I have found it safer not to undertake driving in a fatigued state and not to use caffeine to bolster a weary body," says Dr. George Lucas, pharmacologist, University of Toronto, in the May-June "Listen" Magazine.

Said the preacher seeking the soul of one who claimed to be a self-made man, "Sir, that relieves God of a great responsibility." —Selected.

"The best way to get ahead of Russia is to get behind America."
—Alexandria, Rural Minnesota
News.