

*"Watchman,  
what of the night?"*

"BEHOLD, THE BRIDEGROOM!  
Come out to meet Him."

(Matt. 25:6 RSV)



## "THE ORTHODOX DOCTRINE"

In the previous Thought Paper (WNN, XXI-8), we discussed the new phrasing of the Incarnation as found in the book - SDA's Believe.... The summary of the nature that Christ assumed in His humanity was quoted directly from Henry Melvill. (See p. 47, col. 1) Melvill in his sermon - "The Humiliation of the Man Christ Jesus" - prefaced the part quoted in SDA's Believe... with these words - "So that we hold - and we give it you as what we believe the orthodox doctrine [to be] - that Christ's humanity was not the Adamic humanity, ..." This preface was omitted in the new book, though alluded to in Footnote #13 (p. 57). However, it is obvious that this preface itself indicates that the whole is a summary of an assumption upon which this so-called "orthodox" position is based, being as it is, introduced by the word - "So." What then had Melvill assumed?

That the reader may see the full context, we quote at length the assumptions upon which this conclusion is based. Melvill stated:

He [Jesus] was "made of a woman," and not a new creation, like Adam in Paradise. When we say that Christ's humanity was unfallen, we are far enough from saying that his humanity was the same as that of Adam, before Adam transgressed. He took humanity with all those innocent infirmities, but without any of those sinful propensities, which the fall entailed. There are consequences on guilt which are perfectly guiltless. Sin introduced pain, but pain itself is not sin. And therefore Christ, as being "man, of the substance of his mother," derived from her a suffering humanity; but as "conceived by the Holy Ghost," he did not derive a sinful. Fallen humanity denotes a humanity which has descended from a state of moral purity to one of moral impurity. And so long as there has not been this descent, humanity may remain unfallen, and yet pass from physical strength to physical weakness. This is exactly what we hold on the humanity of the Son of God. We do not assert that Christ's humanity was the Adamic humanity; the humanity, that is, of Adam whilst still loyal to Jehovah. Had this humanity been reproduced, there must have been an act of creation; whereas, beyond controversy, Christ was "made of a woman," and not created, like Adam, by an act of omnipotence. And allowing that Christ's humanity was not the

Adamic, of course we allow that there were consequences of the fall of which it partook. We divide, therefore, these consequences into innocent infirmities, and sinful propensities. From both was Adam's humanity free before, and with both was it endowed after, transgression. Hence it is enough to have either, and the humanity is broadly distinguished from the Adamic. Now Christ took humanity with its innocent infirmities. He derived humanity from his mother. Bone of her bone, and flesh of her flesh, like her he could hunger, and thirst, and weep, and mourn, and writhe, and die. But whilst he took humanity with the innocent infirmities, he did not take it with the sinful propensities. Here Deity interposed. The Holy Ghost overshadowed the Virgin, and, allowing weakness to be derived from her, forbade wickedness; and so caused that there should be generated a sorrowing and a suffering humanity, but nevertheless an undefiled and a spotless; a humanity with tears, but not with stains; accessible to anguish, but not prone to offend; allied most closely with the produced misery, but infinitely from the producing cause. So we hold - and we give it you as we believe [to be] the orthodox doctrine - that Christ's humanity ... etc., (See p. 47)

Before discussing these assumptions of Melvill which underlie the now "representative" position of Adventism, we must correct a statement made in the previous Thought Paper. We wrote:

It is true as the White Estate has documented in a prepared paper that Ellen G. White paraphrased extensively from Henry Melvill's sermons, including the sermon - "The Humiliation of the Man Christ Jesus" - from which also the book, SDA's Believe..., quoted as noted above. The evidence cannot be gainsaid. BUT where in the Writings of Ellen G. White is a single paraphrase from p. 47 in Melvill's book of sermons, where the new book quotes from on its p. 47? (WWN, XXI-8, p 4, col. 2)

While it is true that nowhere in the Writings of Ellen G. White does she use the language which parallels the Melvill "orthodox" conclusion, she does use language parallel to at least one concept found in the above extensive quotes from p. 47 of Melvill's sermons. Note, Melvill stated - Jesus "derived humanity from his mother. Bone of her bone, and flesh of her flesh, ..." In 1900, Ellen G. White observed that God instead of destroying man when he sinned, "came still nearer to the fallen race. He gave His Son to become bone of our bone, and flesh of our flesh." (Ms. 21, 1900)

Now let us consider what Melvill is actually stating. His position does not differ from the previous position taken by the hierarchy of the Church in Questions on Doctrine,

except in the "how." Questions on Doctrine taught that Christ "was exempt [a good Papal theological word] from the inherited passions and pollutions that corrupt the natural descendants of Adam." (p. 383) This concept Melvill categorizes as "sinful propensities" and indicated that the Holy Spirit intervened to exempt Jesus. However, while Melvill stated that Christ did receive from Mary what he terms as "innocent infirmities," Questions on Doctrine taught that Christ bore these "weaknesses, frailties, infirmities," not as something "innately His;" but He bore them "vicariously." (pp. 59-60)

Melvill rightly stated that Christ's humanity was not a created humanity, for if it had been, He would not have been identified with us. He was verily "made of a woman." But Melvill's bottom line is simply that God not being able to cope with man's fallen nature in its awful reality, interposed and permitted the body received from Mary to possess only "innocent infirmities." Every other child of Adam has received a **complete** fallen nature. It matters not whether we accept the Catholic doctrine of the Immaculate Conception; or the Evangelical concept that the Holy Spirit "sanctified" a portion of Mary's womb, and from that "sanctified" section, Jesus developed; or the assumption of Melvill that the Holy Spirit presided over the selection of the "genes" so that Christ partook of a hybrid humanity, the end objective is the same: Jesus did not take upon Himself the fallen nature as we receive it from our mothers.

This is the bottom line in the whole controversy over the doctrine of the Incarnation. It is also the bottom rung in the ladder which was set up on the earth and which reached into heaven. (Gen. 28:12; John 1:51)

Unless we can in reality accept the tremendous victory achieved by Christ in humanity, all of our talk about "righteousness by faith" is a meaningless mouthing of words - an "east wind." (Hosea 12:1) Those who accept and teach the Holy Flesh doctrine of the incarnation (Tom Davis, Ron Spear, and now, A. V. Wallenkampf) that Christ came into humanity "born, born again" are merely trying to find "acceptable language" to convey the same basic heresy which underlies all the other perversions of truth noted above. And we repeat again, that it is the failure to understand and know what took place when "the power of the Highest" overshadowed Mary. (Luke 1:35) [The "how" will

# "THY WAY, O GOD IS IN THE SANCTUARY"

On May 28, 1916, E. J. Waggoner died suddenly. On his desk was found an unfinished letter. It was being written to a minister who had visited him the previous year with the purpose of talking "over some items of denominational belief." However, since no "leading topic" had been interjected into the conversation, this letter was written with that objective in mind. Waggoner considered this letter to be "a confession of faith." (p. 2)

Here are the main points of his confession:

- 1) I believe the Scriptures to be **The Word of God.**
- 2) Christ is primarily the Word of God, the expression of God's thought; and the Scriptures are the Word of God simply because they reveal Christ. It was with this belief that I began my **real** study of the Bible, thirty-four years ago. [1882]
- 3) It was the Spirit of Christ that testified in the ancient prophets; and so the Scriptures are "the testimony of Jesus" - the "testimonies" to which the Psalmist so frequently refers.
- 4) Sin is a **condition, not an entity.**
- 5) Jesus "is come in the flesh," fully identified with humanity.
- 6) The gift of God's life, which since the fall, comes only by the cross of Christ, is not the event of a day, but the great fact of eternity.
- 7) Neither at the cross, nor before or since, has there been any new feature introduced - any change in the way for sinners to approach the Throne of Grace. Christ has from the foundation of the world been the Lamb slain; His life has always been the one perfect sacrifice for sin; and His royal priesthood unchangeable.

Then Waggoner drew a conclusion:

Also, twenty-five years ago [1891], these truths, coupled with the self-evident truth that sin is not an entity but a condition that can exist only in a person, made it clear to me that it is impossible that there is any such thing as the transferring of sins to the sanctuary in heaven, thus defiling that place; and that there could be no such thing, either in 1844 A.D., or at any other time, as "the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary."

1891 carries us back to the Studies in Romans

which Waggoner gave at the General Conference session that year. Recently I had an occasion to recheck some of these studies. As I was reading the 9th study, it flashed across my mind - Here is where Waggoner couldn't put it together and which ultimately led to the conclusion he confessed in 1916. In 1891, he said:

When God declares His righteousness upon one who believes, that man stands as clear as though he had never sinned, and cannot be punished as a sinner, unless he denies the faith. Jesus said: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that heareth my word, and believeth on Him that sent Me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation [Gr. - krisis = "judgment"], but is passed from death unto life." John 5:24

It is a sad commentary that with the introduction of the message of Righteousness by Faith as given in 1888 and onward, the major defections from the Truth as committed to the Seventh-day Adventist Church have hinged on the Sanctuary teaching. This list includes Ballenger, Fletcher, Ford, and many, many others. The effect of the Ford influence on Australia is appalling. Spectrum carried the following report:

The apostasy rate in the [Austrian] home unions leapt in 1982 to a staggering 62.7 percent. In 1981 New Zealand experienced a net loss in membership for the first time in the history of the Advent mission there. Besides the number involved, the quality of the people lost in the carnage added to the tragedy. The younger ministerial workers were decimated. Of the 170 who graduated from the theology course in the period 1973-1982, 75 either did not enter or left the ministry...

In North New South Wales (one of the largest conferences in Australia), of the 26 ministers in the field, only one is under 30 years of age, whereas of the 100 teachers in the same conference, approximately 25 are under 30. (Vol. 18, #5, pp. 14-15)

[Note: The difference is that the students preparing for teaching did not come directly under the influence of Desmond Ford.]

A recent Alumni Journal from Loma Linda (March-April 1988) asked on its cover the question - "Why Do They Leave?" Various graduates of the University gave their reasons. In these testimonials, one text surfaced - John 5:24 - to justify the rejection of the sanctuary truth; and it was this truth which was pinpointed as one of the key

doctrinal reasons for leaving the Seventh-day Adventist Church by these graduates.

This text - John 5:24 - based on the force of the Greek verb tenses is simply saying - "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that continues to hear my word, and continues to believe in Him that sent Me, has life eternal [quality of life], and is not coming into judgment, but has passed out of death into the life." The word translated "has passed" is in the Greek perfect tense for which there is no corresponding English tense, even though we do have a perfect tense. The Greek perfect tense denotes the present state resultant upon a past action. In this text "the past action" is a continuous action. The question is, does this continuous action preclude a judgment, or does it tell us the way by which the judgment is successfully passed? Secondly, does this text nullify the sanctuary teaching? These questions we addressed in the recent Seminar on "The Sanctuary in the Light of the Great Controversy" held in connection with the Annual Fellowship, August 1 thru 6 on the campus here in Arkansas.

There is an historical record that we dare not overlook in such a study. Our "roots" are in what is called, "Millerism," or the Great Second Advent Movement. William Miller along with his associates finally concluded Christ would return the second time on or about October 22, 1844. That date passed and Jesus did not come. There was a great hemorrhaging. The vast majority renounced their faith. Another group continued to set time. A third group said that the prophetic calculations are correct, but what was to occur on that date may be wrong. What did this group do?

It meant the study of the Bible and the laying aside of presuppositions. This led to the discarding of the false concept that the earth was the sanctuary to be cleansed. This also meant that **one half** of the basis of their previous faith had to be recognized as wrong. In its place had to be substituted truth as it is in Jesus - the sacrifice and the priest. This led to the study of the sanctuary in type as given at Sinai so that the Heavenly reality might be perceived more clearly.

In the recent seminar, we asked ourselves, can it be that we, too, need to take another look at our cherished assumptions to discover why, the present defections from Adventism. Is it possible that we have misinterpreted, or have not included all factors in our

study of the type which if truly understood would place our position beyond question? We sought to address these questions guided by the following counsel:

The Lord has made His people the repository of sacred truth. Upon every individual who has had the light of present truth devolves the duty of developing that truth on a higher scale than it has hitherto been done. (M.V.H., March 30, 1897)

We did not discard the sanctuary truth. **"That"** truth we accepted, because it is found in the Word of God. "Thy way, O God is in the sanctuary." (Ps. 77:13) We did take a detailed look at that truth, and precious rays of light shown forth as we progressed in the study. It is true that the Word set forth concepts which we couldn't correlate at the moment of perception, but as we pursued our study more light broke forth from God's Word which clarified and enhanced the beauty of the sanctuary truth.

The studies were as follows:

- I - The Biblical Basis of the Sanctuary as a Doctrinal Revelation of God's Plans and Purposes.
- II - Basic Principles from God's Viewpoint.
- III - The Place of the Sanctuary in the Great Controversy.
- IV - A Study of Daniel Seven - the Judgment Before the Ancient of days.
- V - The Message of the Sanctuary - A & B.
- VI - The Validity of Our Understanding of Daniel 8:14.
- VII - The Message of the Book of Hebrews.

Interwoven into the last studies were concepts relating to the Final Atonement. These studies were taped and are available.

WHG

#### A Few Concepts from the Studies:

The sanctuary is God's revelation of how to meet the judgment, and how victory over sin is realized.

The blood of the sin offering says that the penalty for sin is paid! The finger printing of that blood is a record of confession made, and of the forgiveness extended for a sin already recorded in "books" not the sanctuary!

The atonement of forgiveness takes place for the individual at the Altar of the Court. No record is ever made in the sanctuary as no blood was ever taken in. But the record of that sin is on the "books." There is a gap! How is it closed?

# WHAT EVERY SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST SHOULD KNOW ABOUT 1888 \*

Perhaps the most common phrase in Adventism this year has been: "The 1888 Message." The Church has published three centennial books on 1888 and is now getting ready for the centennial Conference to take place at Minneapolis timed so as to correspond with the dates of the 1888 Conference. Two of the Church's main organs, The Adventist Review and Ministry have each published a special righteousness by faith issue. Also, recently the Review has released Dr. A. V. Wallenkampf's book, What Every Adventist Should Know About 1888. Not only is 1888 the subject within the frame of the organized Church, but the 1888 message is buzzing in the self-supporting ranks as well. Wieland and Short and The 1888 Message Study Committee; Ron Spear and Hope International; 3-Angels Broadcasting; and others are having campmeetings with the emphasis being placed upon the 1888 message.

While it seems as though few can agree upon which brand of righteousness by faith to teach, most are content to agree with the concept that righteousness by faith as a doctrine is our only legacy from the "messengers" of 1888. The majority of those preaching the 1888 message fail to perceive the broad platform that the real message was based upon. The 1888 message was not just a message of righteousness by faith, per se, but rather a three fold message consisting of the following:

1. **Righteousness by Faith** - The relationship between man and God.
2. **Religious Liberty** - The relationship between the believer and the state. (Separation of Church and State)
3. **Organization** - The relationship of the believer to the body of Christ. (Church Government)

While the messages presented at the 1888 Conference were not transcribed, most

concede today that the book, Christ and His Righteousness, written by E. J. Waggoner soon after the Conference was based on a series of talks that Waggoner gave at the 1888 Conference. It is also known that Waggoner discussed the law in Galatians and that A. T. Jones preached on the ten horns of Daniel 7. Yet this was not the total message given by the "messengers." In A. T. Jones' book, Civil Government and Religion, published in the year following the Minneapolis Conference, the following remarks are given in the preface dated Feb. 13, 1889.

This little work is the outgrowth of several lectures upon the **relationship between religion and the civil power**, delivered in Minneapolis, Minn., in October, 1888. The interest manifested in the subject, and numerous requests for the publication of the main points of the arguments presented, have led to the issuing of this pamphlet. (Civil Government and Religion, p. 3 - Emphasis supplied.)

The dating of the preface should be noted, for this was just a few months after the 1888 Conference. However, this was not the only thing that A. T. Jones presented in 1889 concerning religious liberty. At the Ottawa Kansas campmeeting in 1889 A. T. Jones spoke thirty-one times.<sup>1</sup> This campmeeting held just six months after the 1888 Conference finds Jones preaching three times as much on religious liberty than righteousness by faith. But this was not his whole burden, Jones spoke twice as much about church organization than righteousness by faith. Even when the Blair Sunday Law and the Breckenridge Bill, current issues of that time, are taken into account, Jones' preaching presented a much greater balance than do the so-called preachers of the 1888 message today.

Surely we cannot claim that we do not have need for the two forgotten pillars of the 1888 message! With the growing influence that the Papacy and the Protestants are

having on governmental leaders today, coupled with the growing strength of the Lord's Day Alliance (Which, interestingly is also celebrating its centennial this year.) one can hardly claim that there is not a real need for the message of religious liberty. Further, since the Church has gone into Federal court and claimed to be hierarchical in form, surely there would be a need for Biblical reform on the topic of organization.

The failure to give the whole message is a failure to give the whole truth! To fail to give the total message is misleading. Those most vocal today about the message realize that the Church is in a blackslidden state. They think by preaching righteousness by faith, the Church will repent and turn around. How foolish to think that the Church could be prepared to repent when the full truth needed for that repentance to be possible is withheld! While it is true that there was a time when the full message could have brought about a reformation had it been given, the sad fact is that the opportunity for that is past. The prophecy of Luke 21:24 tells us that the times of the Gentiles has been fulfilled. Also it is unfortunate that the one who knew the message possibly better than any human, hid his light and decided "to keep still."

How balanced was the three fold message of 1888? Read carefully the message of the three angels of Revelation 14 and see the complete 1888 message!

**1st ANGEL'S MESSAGE** - "And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue and people, Saying with a loud voice, Fear God and give glory to Him; for the hour of His judgement is come: and worship Him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of water." Does not the message of the first angel contain the message of righteousness by faith?

**2nd ANGEL'S MESSAGE** - "And there followed another angel saying, Babylon is fallen, is fallen, that great city, because she made all nations drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication." Does not the message of the second angel tell us that a church which follows corrupt principles of organization will be condemned?

**3rd ANGEL'S MESSAGE** - "And the third angel followed them saying with a loud voice, If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb." Does not receiving the mark of the beast involve religious liberty?

During the 1987 fellowship meetings here on the Foundation campus, the morning and evening meetings dealt with the subject of righteousness by faith. This year the evening meetings considered the subject: "What Every Seventh-day Adventist Should Know About 1888." While all three phases of the message were given at least one night of consideration, the emphasis this year was on religious liberty. The studies were as follows:

1. "Christ Crucified, The Heart of the 1888 Message"
2. "An Introduction to Religious Liberty"
3. "The Origin of the Beast and His Image"
4. "The Powers that Be"
5. "Hierarchy, Anarchy, or Gospel Order"

These studies were taped and are available. These studies will also be the subject for articles in upcoming Thought Papers. A. S.

\* This title was chosen before this writer heard about Dr. Wallenkampf's new book.

1 Jones' studies along with four messages by Ellen G. White and others were recorded in the Topeka Kansas Daily Capital newspaper from May 7th through May 28th, 1889. Reprints of these articles are available from Laymen Ministry News, Route 4 Box 94-C, St. Maries, ID 83861.

\*\*\*\*\*

"Now the Lord wants his Spirit to come in. He wants the Holy Ghost king." (EGW - Talk given at the Battle Creek College Library, 1901. Spalding - Magan, p. 166, 1961 Ed.)

From page 2, "The Orthodox Doctrine"

forever remain a mystery.] So long as we continue to set forth the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity quoted in the 27 Statements of Belief via the Constitution of the World Council of Churches, we will be unable to arrive at truth in regard to the humanity Christ assumed in the Incarnation. We suggest that you read again the final three paragraphs of the article - "None Dare Call It a Conspiracy." (WNN, XXI-8, p. 4)

WHG

"For what the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh, God did by sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, on account of sin: **He condemned sin in the flesh.**" (Rom. 8:3 NKJV)

"Think of Christ' humiliation. He took upon Himself fallen, suffering human nature, **degraded and defiled by sin.**" (YI, Dec. 20, 1900)

"Now salvation, and strength, and the kingdom of our God, and the power of His Christ have come, for the accuser of our brethren, who accused them before our God day and night, has been cast down." (Rev. 12:10 NKJV)

\*\*\*\*\*

NEWS NOTES

What the Adventist Review didn't tell you -

"Seventh-day Adventists replaced their East Africa executive director, F. K. Wangai, and dismissed his wife and son from their posts. The action follows complaints by some African SDAs of corruption, nepotism and tribalism." (Religion Report, Vol. 2, No. 14, p. 3)

In the News -

"CANTERBURY - Though still overwhelmingly Anglican, this year's 12th Lambeth Conference had an ecumenical flavour.

"Besides the approximately 500 Anglican bishops from around the world, conference participants included a score of bishops from the four denominations on the Indian sub-continent in which Anglicans united with other traditions - the Churches of South India, North India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh. ...

"Nearly a dozen Christian world communions were present in the person of more than a score of **ecumenical** observers - Oriental Orthodox, Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Lutheran, Reformed, Methodist, Baptist, Disciples, Assyrian Church of the East, and **Seventh-day Adventist.**" (Ecumenical Press Service (WCC) Year 55/28: 88.07.65)

[Question - Was Wilson represented by his Secretary of State, B. B. Beach, or did he attend in person?] +

\*\*\*\*\*

+ If interested, you may write for the documentation that B. B. Beach is considered by Neal C. Wilson as his Secretary of State. Include a self-addressed stamped envelope.

\*\*\*\*\*

"Watchman, What of the Night?" is published monthly by the Adventist Laymen's Foundation of Mississippi, Inc., P. O. Box 789, Lamar, AR 72846, USA.

Editor  
Associate Editor

Wm. H. Grotheer  
Allen Stump

Any portion of this Thought Paper may be reproduced without further permission by adding the following credit line - "Reprinted from "Watchman, What of the Night?" - Lamar, Arkansas, USA.

First copy free upon request; duplicate copies - 50¢.