



"Watchman, what of the night?"

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

LET'S TALK ABOUT THE ATONEMENT - I

The word - atonement - is an English word coming from "atone," a word in Middle English meaning - at one. So we can say that atonement means simply to be at one again with a person from whom we have become estranged. When applied to theology, it indicates the reconciliation between God and man, and man and God. There is only one thing that has separated between God and man, and man and God, and that is sin.

In the case of man's alienation from God, the Scripture states it very simply - "All have sinned and come short of the glory of God." (Rom. 3:23) Paul summarizes the condition of man by quoting from the Old Testament -

As it is written, there is none righteous, no, not one: there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one." (Rom. 3:10-12)

With God, the alienation was forced upon Him by man's actions, not by any action initiated by Him. Isaiah declared - "Your iniquities have separated between you and your God, and your sins have hid His face from you, that He will not hear." (Isa. 59:2) God is holy and righteous. The Psalmist sang that "righteousness and judgment are the basis of His throne." (Ps. 97:2 Heb.) Sin - rebellion - on the other hand had challenged the very foundations of the government of God. Justice demanded that the traitors be executed. There is, however, another aspect to the character of God. His holiness and His righteousness emanate from a heart of love. Love devised an atonement that would meet the demands of justice and thus secure the Throne, and would provide a means for the healing and restoration of the traitor.

Before we can understand the atonement devised by God, we must understand the sickness of man. All sin represents degrees of insanity. We continue in our rebellion because "the whole head is sick." (Isa. 1:5) Sin originated with a created being whose mind became deranged. The prophet stated of Lucifer under the symbolism of the king of Tyrus - "Thou has corrupted thy wisdom by reason of thy brightness." (Eze. 28:17) How could a created being ever think that he could destroy an immortal God, and take His place? But once in the pathway of insanity, this arch-traitor led our first parents into sin by a derangement of their thought patterns, a subversion of the higher nature to the lower. The atonement must bring healing to the mind, and restoration of the glorious character lost through this deceptive derangement.

There is, however, that judicial aspect of judgment with which God had also to

deal so that He could be at-one-ment with sinful man, and thus effect the healing of man. "The wages of sin is death." (Rom. 6:23) But who would be willing to die as a substitute, and who could die in such a capacity so that the demands of justice might be met? There was only One, and that was the Son of God. To Abraham, who was bringing his "only son" as an offering to God, the Spirit encouraged his heart so that he could say to Isaac - "My son, God will provide Himself a lamb for a burnt offering." (Gen. 22:8) And He did! "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son." (John 3:16) "The Lord laid on Him the iniquity of us all. . . His soul [was made] an offering for sin." (Isa. 53:6, 10) Thus the first great question of the Atonement found an answer - How can God be just, and yet justify the sinner? (See Rom. 1:16-17; 3:24-26) We can, therefore, from the viewpoint of God - and only from that viewpoint - speak of the Cross as an atonement. The Cross is an atonement only in this phase of the relationship - God becoming at one with man. In the cross man is provided by God what could be called a "second chance," but which is in reality an opportunity to escape his corporate involvement in the first choice made for him by the father of the race, for "by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation." (Rom. 5:18)

The significance of this at-one-ment with man on the part of God is illustrated in covenant-history. Israel was assembled before Mount Sinai. They had heard the voice of God proclaim His law amid thunderings and lightnings. They listened carefully as Moses read "the book of the covenant" which he had prepared under the direction of God. To what they heard, Israel responded - "All that the Lord hath said will we do, and be obedient." (Ex. 24:7) In this book of the covenant had been written as its preamble the requirement of God for singleness of worship on the part of Israel. It read - "Ye have seen that I have talked with you from heaven. Ye shall not make with Me gods of silver, neither shall ye make unto you gods of gold." (Ex. 20:22-23) Within forty days following the ratification of this blood covenant, and the solemn commitment of Israel, they gave their adoration to the "golden calf" of Egyptian devil worship. They repeated the sin of Adam and Eve in giving their loyalty and allegiance to the enemy of God.

The reaction of God to this apostasy was swift. Moses was immediately informed by God as to what was happening in the camp below, and was told that He no longer considered them His people. (Ex. 32:7) Moses after returning to the encampment of Israel from his dialogue with God in the Mount, removed the "tabernacle" of meeting without the camp. (Ex.33:7) Then he told the people - "Ye have sinned a great sin: and now I will go up unto the Lord, peradventure I shall make an atonement for your sin." (Ex. 32:30) The result of this interceding of Moses, and the exchange that took place between him and God is given in God's final answer to Moses's pleadings - "The Lord said to Moses, Write thou these words: for after the tenor of these words I have made a covenant with thee and with Israel." (Ex. 34:27) Israel's commitment was not secured to this covenant. It was a covenant by which Moses stood as surety for Israel's compliance, and through which God could once more become at-one-ment with Israel. It was a "type" covenant of the "atonement" achieved by Christ for man to effect God's reconciliation with man. God became at one again with humanity in Christ Jesus. Even as God talked with Moses face to face (Deut. 34:10) so Christ in His glorified humanity is in the very presence of God to speak for man. (Heb. 4:14-15)

The fact should not be overlooked that at the time when Israel was forfeiting

their rights as God's people in the worship of the golden calf, and demonstrating the inability of man to keep any covenant to which mentally he would agree, God was giving to Moses "the plan" by which man can become at-one with God. The sanctuary and its services, which were to operate as "types" under a type-covenant, were being revealed to Moses. (See Ex. 24:18-32:1)

This second aspect of the atonement - man becoming one with God - begins at the same point - the Cross. Here his healing begins for in the Cross he comes to see the real significance of where his mental derangement will lead. If God had only the judicial aspect of the atonement in mind to effect the redemption of man - justification - Gethsemane would have sufficed. There the cup was accepted, and there the blood first touched the ground. (Luke 22:44) Thus Gethsemane could have become the antitypical Altar. Why then the Cross? The Cross brings to our poor deranged and dull senses that sin is the will to kill God. Jesus had told the Jews that the lusts of their father the devil they would do. Being a murderer from the beginning - desiring to kill the Immortal Potentate, Satan would have them do that very thing to God's Son in whom all the fulness of the Godhead dwelt. (John 8:44) When we truly perceive what sin really is, our thinking is rearranged, and we see in Him whom we have pierced, our Sacrifice and Substitute.

However, with the healing of our thought processes, we are still short of the glory of God. We are still just as unable to meet the judicial requirements of God as stated in His law, as we were before we found our place at the foot of the Cross. But He who became our Sacrifice and Substitute speaks to us, and says I will be your Mediator - your Priest. I will accomplish your at-one-ment with your God. And so "of Him are [we] in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption." (I Cor. 1:30) "Wisdom" - for by the Cross we see the real meaning of sin; "righteousness" for by His righteousness God is able to declare "the remission of sins that are past." (Rom. 3:25); "sanctification" for by His sanctification the truth is to be inwrought in our lives (John 17:19); and "redemption" for by that redemption our vile bodies shall be changed into the likeness of His "glorious body" (Phil 3:21); - yea all this is for us by Jesus Christ that "in all things He might have the pre-eminence." (Col. 1:18) But in this divine process whereby we become at-one with God and see His face again (Rev. 22:4), there are specific acts to be performed on both the part of the priest and the individual. These conditions were outlined in the types of the earthly sanctuary which foreshadowed the work and ministry of our great High Priest as He makes atonement for us in the sanctuary of the heavens.

In the Court

The principle article of furniture as far as the individual was concerned was the Brazen Altar. On this Altar was offered the sin offering. While the disposition of the blood varied with the status of the sinner, the process by which it was presented, and the ultimate result reflecting back on the sinner was the same. The one presenting the animal of the sin offering must bring it "to the door of the tabernacle of the congregation before the Lord." (Lev. 4:4) Then he would "lay his hand upon the head of the sin offering, and slay the sin offering" before the Lord. (Lev. 4:29) With this ritual the participation of the sinner ceased. But in his participation, he had performed two very meaningful acts.

First, he had presented a substitute to meet the demands of justice, and secondly, he himself slew the substitute.

At the point when the victim was killed, the priest took over. He either ministered the blood directly before "the vail of the sanctuary" (Lev. 4:6), or he partook of the flesh of the sin offering. (Lev. 10:17) Through the priestly act, atonement was made, and forgiveness was extended to the sinner. (Lev. 4:20) Again this ritual tells us something. The at-one-ment of man with God was not made until after the sacrificial substitute was offered. The result of the at-one-ment was forgiveness - judicial in its results, because the sinner had just as much a potential to sin after the sin offering was presented as he had before its presentation. The forgiveness extended had only one effect upon him - he could rest in the consciousness of freedom from the guilt caused by his sin. He stood before his God as though he had never sinned. The victim had borne his sin, and had been accepted in his place.

The Hebrew word translated "atonement" in describing the ritual of the sanctuary is kah-phar (כִּפָּר). It means literally "to cover." Its first use in Scripture had to do with Noah's ark. There God commanded Noah - "Make yourself an ark of gopher wood, and cover it inside and out with pitch." (Gen. 6:14 RSV) In the sanctuary service as pertaining to the sin offering, the priest made the "covering." The sin of the sinner was open - he confessed, and was deserving of death, but had presented a substitute. By the means of the blood of the substitute, the priest had in turn "covered" his sin. In the reality, Jesus became both Substitute, and Priest, one following the other. As the great High Priest over the house of God, He has effected the judicial atonement - whether individual or corporate - covering the sins of all who "come unto God by Him seeing He ever liveth to make intercession for them." (Heb. 7:25)

If in the sanctuary service, the ritual of the Court had been all that was to be performed, and the first apartment into which the priest went with the blood of the sin offering was a vacant vestibule, then we might conclude that the "new theology" had some merit. But the Scripture plainly teaches that beyond the judicial at-one-ment was much more to be performed by the priests on behalf of the sinner directly effecting his final at-one-ment with God. There was the Holy Place, not vacant and meaningless, and the Most Holy Place, where the final decree regarding sin and sinners was prefigured each year in the great Day of Atonement. These we shall discuss in the next thought paper, God willing.

✓

MORE DOCUMENTATION

On the next three pages you will read an exchange of correspondence regarding the SDA-Evangelical Conferences of 1955-1956. There are several important facts confirmed in the letter written by Walter Martin which should be carefully noted. Those who have not obtained a facsimile copy of the articles in Eternity, and the historical summary by T. E. Unruh which appeared in the Adventist Heritage will surely want to do so after reading these letters. They are still available for \$2.50 postpaid by writing to the Adventist Laymen's Foundation, P. O. Box 178, Lamar, AR 72846

Prof. Walter Martin
Post Office Box 500
San Juan Capistrano, CA 92693

Dear Prof. Martin:

Sometimes I wonder if the "truth" will ever be made known? It seems we are still going over the ground you and your late friend Dr. Barnhouse walked over some twenty plus years ago.

Since our last correspondence concerning the writing of the book Questions on Doctrine, I have gone over carefully a communique by Dr. Barnhouse wherein he stated: "We (referring to you and himself) have written and signed by the leaders of the Seventh-day Adventist movement that we have not misinterpreted Seventh-day Adventist positions."

Perhaps he was speaking about the foreword of your book, which was signed by one of our officers. However, he also stated: "Everything I have published was read by Seventh-day Adventist leaders before we published. Not a line have I ever printed that was not previously read by Froom."

Was Dr. Froom the only one that gave his consent and placed an indorsement upon the writings in ETERNITY? The reason I raise the question is because of a letter I received from the Editor of The Ministry Magazine. (The one that took Dr. Roy Anderson's place) He told me that "when it comes to your quoting ETERNITY magazine, you must remember that this is their interpretation of the story. . . You cannot hold the Adventist Church leadership responsible for our saying what others said we said. . . So what Barnhouse and Martin said our leaders said, still has to be taken in that context."

I must say, this rather muddies the water and makes it most difficult to discern which person has spoken "truth". I would like to believe that God is still leading the honest in heart and those who are seeking to know Him as their personal Saviour. However, as a professor of religion here at O.K.A., it sometimes becomes rather hard to determine just where we stand as a denomination. Are we divided?

I would appreciate anything you might have from your files that could help clear up this issue in my mind once and for all. I might add, Dr. Barnhouse also mentioned a book you had read there in Washington by Ellen G. White that few Adventists knew anything about. Would that book be of any value in helping one to see the picture clearer?

Let me thank you in advance for your time and consideration and
May I remain Sincerely,



Willard L. Santee

WLS:cc PS Thanks for information you sent on John Todd

1035 HOLLYWOOD RD.

KELOWNA, B.C. V1X 4N3



CHRISTIAN RESEARCH INSTITUTE

1980

December 9, 1980

Professor W. L. Santee
1035 Hollywood Road
Kelowna, B. C.
CANADA V1X 4N3

Dear Brother Santee:

I am sorry for a late reply to your letter of last January, but my schedule has been horrendous. As I stated in my Eternity articles and Dr. Barnhouse stated in his editorial, and as I have further stated in The Truth About Seventh-Day Adventism and The Kingdom of the Cults, representatives of the Seventh-Day Adventist denomination with the full approval of Reuben Figue, then president, entered into lengthy dialogue with myself, Dr. Barnhouse, and Dr. George Cannon for the purpose of ascertaining Seventh-Day Adventism's agreement or disagreement with historic Christianity. Dr. Roy Allen Anderson, Dr. W. E. Read, Dr. LeRoy Froom, and Dr. Unruh referred our dialogues to selected members of the Seventh-Day Adventist seminary in Washington and to Reuben Figue. When the book, Questions on Doctrine was published, it was stated that it represented historic Adventism as understood by the leaders of the church at that time. The book was in response to the questions I addressed to the Seventh-Day Adventist denomination. The current editor of the ministry, who is maintaining that what went on in those dialogues and the material that was printed was merely the interpretation Eternity magazine placed upon it is not only woefully ignorant, but he apparently can't read. "Barnhouse and Martin" didn't say what your leaders said, Barnhouse and Martin reproduced exactly what they said; and after they had read it, as the book Questions on Doctrine and my book accurately represents it all.

It is sorry to see after such a short period of time that some leaders of Adventism have not only short memories, but are now attempting to say things which are blatantly erroneous.

If this dialogue must be public once more, I shall be happy to produce the documentation. Dr. Roy Anderson is still alive as is Dr. Unruh. This was not a matter of interpretation. This was a matter of very thorough documentation and the editor of

Board of Directors

President - Prof. Walter Martin
Vice President/Treasurer - Stanley Tomnesson
Secretary - Dr. Douglas F. Allen
Assistant Secretary - Donald S. Reddington
Everett R. Jacobson

Post Office Box 500
San Juan Capistrano, CA 92693
714/991-1280

Professor W. L. Santee
December 9, 1980
Page 2

the ministry had better start doing his homework or his attitude will further what is now a growing schism within the Seventh-Day Adventist denomination.

One cannot simply have his cake and eat it too. Either the Seventh-Day Adventist denomination stood behind the book Questions on Doctrine, or they printed it under false pretenses. I do not accept the latter; and all the evidence is in favor of the former. You may consult Dr. Anderson if you wish. He is an honorable man with a good memory; and if we have to get down to the area of factual data, the editor of the ministry will not be very successful in defending this double talk.

With appreciation for your correspondance and a continuing interest in the ministry of the Seventh-Day Adventist denomination, I remain,

In the Fellowship of our Lord,



Walter Martin

WM:kt

COMMENTS

The above letter written by Dr. Walter Martin adds another important document to our understanding of what took place, and what was said at the SDA-Evangelical Conferences in 1955-1956. I reiterate again, what I have written so many times before, that no one desiring truth can fully understand the present condition in the Church without a correct understanding of what took place at these conferences. Further, the Ford syndrome is only carrying to its ultimate conclusion the deviations from historic Adventism which the leaders of the Church perpetrated at that time.

The problem is not difficult, nor covered in mysticism. If the atonement was completed on the Cross as the Evangelicals teach, and to which the leadership of the Church agreed both during the conferences, and in the book that followed - Questions on Doctrine - then there can be no final atonement, and our spiritual forefathers misinterpreted the meaning of Daniel 8:14 as they related it to the times in which they were living. This is what I understand Ford is saying.

Why then have the hierarchy condemned a man for merely applying to its ultimate conclusion what they themselves are on record as believing? As Walter Martin wrote - "Either the Seventh-day Adventist denomination stood behind the book Questions on Doctrine, or they printed it under false pretenses. I do not accept the latter; and all the evidence is in favor of the former."

Let us cite a case in point. If you have been following the latest issues of the Adventist Review - the "General Organ of the Seventh-day Adventist Church" - you will note a complete absence of any material which would inform the laity of what Martin calls "a growing schism within the Seventh-day Adventist denomination." And this schism involves the Ford syndrome. The present editor of the Adventist Review is on record as having written that the book - Questions on Doctrine "in no way changes our fundamental beliefs. In fact, it probably sets them forth more clearly than any publication that has been issued from our presses in many a year." (Letter dated, Feb. 28, 1968) This is what Martin writes that they said. Note - "When the book, Questions on Doctrine was published, it was stated that it represented historic Adventism as understood by the leaders of the church at that time." Now this book declares plainly that Christ upon His ascension "appeared in the presence of God for us. But it was not in the hope of obtaining something for us at that time, or at some future time. No! He had already obtained it for us on the cross." (Q on D, p. 381, Emphasis theirs) And this is what Ford is teaching - the Ford syndrome. This is what Wood, the editor of the Adventist Review, declares to be a part of our fundamental beliefs. Why then a schism? Perhaps the editor might wish to explain.

Now Martin comes back into the picture again and states that if the hierarchy in Washington cannot remember what they have written, and stated, and approved, and "the dialogue must be public once again, I shall be happy to produce the documentation." It is the hope and prayer of this writer that such will soon come to pass, for then the laity will have the indisputable proof of the apostasy which has been perpetrated on them by men entrusted with the preservation of the truth, but who betrayed that trust.

It is no doubt true that some seeing the fruitage of their apostasy would like to recall their unfaithfulness, but having gone out and slept with the "harlot" they are now hard pressed by the threat of her revelation of what took place the "night" they were with her - for dark was that night in the history of Adventism! Little did they realize that in that "night of lust" they were approaching that unseen line which they would cross a decade later. Now like Esau of old who for a morsel of food sold his birthright, these spiritual adulterers "can find no place of repentance." (Heb. 12:16-17) So they are ignoring the situation hoping that it will go away.

Some in reading Martin's letter may think that he was a bit hard on Elder J. R. Spangler, present editor of Ministry, and head of the General Conference Ministerial Department. One must keep in mind that Spangler was a protege of R. Allan Anderson, and at the time of the Evangelical conferences was basking in the "upward mobility" being provided for him by his mentor. It is most interesting to note how he views that period and how he compares his own expertise in theological comprehension to a tennis ball that can be hit back and forth between courts. Here is what he wrote:

Prior to the publication of Questions on Doctrine and certain articles

appearing in Ministry, I hadn't given much thought to the precise nature of Christ. I simply believed He was the God-man and presented Him as such in evangelistic campaigns. During the early years of my ministry, I leaned heavily toward the view that Christ had tendencies and propensities toward evil as I did. I believed Christ possessed a nature exactly like mine, except that He alone never yielded to temptation.

However, in the fifties, as the church focused on Christ's nature, my position changed. I now favored the idea that Christ was genuinely man, subject to temptation and failure, but with a sinless human nature totally free from any tendencies or predisposition toward evil. A barrage of brochures, articles, and letters plus seemingly endless discussion followed the publication of Questions on Doctrine. . . During this period, conflicting views of His nature were presented with such apparently irrefutable logic that my mind, like a tennis ball, bounced first in one court and then the other, depending on which racquet hit me last! Eventually, I landed more and more in the sinless nature "court." Ministry, April, 78, pp. 21-22)

In the light of his own self-evaluation, one is forced to conclude that Martin was rather restrained in his remarks concerning Spangler, and exhibited a degree of mercy which was more than justified.

✓

WEIMAR OPTS FOR APOSTASY

In the Adventist Review, February 12, 1981, a notice over the name of the president of Weimar Institute stated:

The Institute concurs with and actively supports the Statement of Beliefs adopted by the 1980 General Conference in session. (p. 23)

While the president is not listed among the delegates to the Dallas session, the academic dean, Colin Standish, though not a delegate, was present. (Adventist Review, April 24, 1980, p. 20) It is inconceivable that Dr. Colin Standish did not join his twin brother who was a delegate on the floor and follow closely the discussion in the formulation of the revised Statement of Beliefs. Anyone comparing what was voted with our previous Statements of Belief (See Oct., 1980 WWN) cannot help but recognize significant deviations from our historic positions. Also Dr. Standish could have heard - or read later in the Bulletin - Bishop Robert Terwilliger of the Anglican Church who expressed amazement at the narrowing of the gap that separates the new Adventist beliefs from his. The Bishop said - "I hoped to find some degree of disagreement. I had the most awful disappointment. I found increasingly that we are together in our faith." (Adventist Review, May 1, 1980, p. 16)

The leadership at Weimar are not ignorant of these facts, but instead of standing up for the historic faith, they opt to follow the hierarchy as it takes the church into the midnight darkness of the omega apostasy.

✓

To make this point even
quote some specific ap

Student Movement, Wednesday, November 12, 1980-5

Meier, Lamson Invaded

The account you are about to read is true. The names have been withheld to protect the guilty.

Approximately 45 guys, wearing masks and underwear on their heads, raided Lamson Hall the night of October 30.

The Lamson raid can be partially attributed to an earlier raid staged by a group of Lamsonites. These girls ran down Meier 2nd East hallway, spraying perfume, shaving cream, and baby powder. An assortment of panties were also scattered around.

The commotion the girls raid induced led to the organization of a formidable

counterattack force. The guys, the majority of which were wearing underwear on their heads, entered Lamson West lobby at 10:30.

"The mortified look on Miss Friestad's face gave me more pleasure than I've had in a long time," one fellow said.

The guys raced down first floor hallways, shouting and banging on doors. Shaving cream and toilet paper were dispersed generously.

The guys rallied outside East lobby, stormed back into Lamson, this time to the second floor. Girls met the guys at the top of the stairs, equipped with an arsenal of shaving cream. One guy said, "I thought for a

second they were going to spray us with mace."

Another guy mused, "I sure was surprised to see how many girls tried to pull us into their rooms."

An M-80 firecracker exploded, after which most of the guys bolted down the stairs, and back over to Meier. The security car attempted to chase the guys, adding even more excitement to the situation.

During the raid minor damage was done to several doors and windows at Lamson. One pajama clad girl said, "There was a big mess to clean up, but I sure hope they come again, when they can stay longer."

Community Bulletin Board

Note - Meier Hall and Lamson Hall are the dormitories on the Andrews University Campus. One wonders as he reads whether we are beginning to see the fruitage of the new theology?

FYI - The George H. Rue, M. D. listed on the Green Issue of the SDA Press Release p. 1, is not the G. Harvey Rue, M. D., editor of the Layworker. There are three G. H. Rue, M. D.'s.

Silver Lake - Silver Lake West-IV is planned for the same camping area as all previous campmeetings. Dates to be announced later. Silver Lake East-II will be held August 19-23. The place and information will be given later.

"WATCHMAN, WHAT OF THE NIGHT?" is published monthly by the Adventist Laymen's Foundation of Mississippi, Inc., P. O. Box 178, Lamar, AR 72846, USA.