Errors in Our Two Doctrinal Books

QUESTIONS ON DOCTRINE – SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS BELIEVE

W
M
1
1
8
8

PART ONE OF THREE

The most controversial book in the history of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, *Questions on Doctrine* (hereafter referred to as QD), has been reprinted. Its republication has brought the entire Martin-Barnhouse conferences with our leaders in Washington, D.C.—and our subsequent doctrinal sellout—back into focus.

Therefore, it is urgent that we once again turn our attention to a dark day for our church, which began nearly fifty years ago in the spring of 1955.

Advertisements for this new book reprint declare it to be "a completely new typeset of the monumental 1957 classic . . Originally produced by the Ministerial Association of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, *Questions on Doctrine* was widely acclaimed and distributed in the late 1950s and early 1960s as a forthright answer to questions from Evangelicals about key elements of Adventist doctrine."

The present writer was in attendance at the Adventist Seminary, next door to the General Conference from June 1955 to July 1958. Therefore he was very close to the scene of action throughout nearly all of the 1955-1956 Evangelical Conferences, the release of the "bombshell" *Eternity* articles, and the publication of *Questions on Doctrine.* He personally observed changes in instruction at the Seminary during that time.

In 1983, he wrote the most complete history of, what become known as, the Evangelical Conferences and events which followed them down to 1983.

Because of the re-release of *Questions on Doctrine* (QD), a fresh, retypeset, and improved edition of that history is being prepared. It will include new facts not previously known, along with additional historical events which occurred after 1983. Watch for the announcement date of its release.

Especially from the mid-1950s, onward, two separate trends were at work. One was the growing apostasy in our colleges and universities, caused by our slavish devotion to accredited schools, which required our books, instruction, and teachers to conform to worldly standards and doctoral degrees, which necessitated hiring men and women trained in secular, Protestant, and Catholic universities. **The entire history of that downward trend is recorded in the present author's book, *Broken Blueprint*;** you can obtain these low-cost copies in boxful quantities for widespread distribution.

The other fatal trend began with the Evangelical Conferences and the publication of *Questions on Doctrine,* which emboldened the liberals in our church to more openly urge students and church members to accept Evangelical concepts (errors which we today collectively refer to as "the new theology").

If you want to understand the basics of the new theology in our ranks, it is really quite simple: Twist various doctrinal concepts to agree with the premise that it is all right to keep sinning and still go to heaven.

It should be mentioned here that a spin-off from the Evangelical Conferences was the involvement of our leaders in the ecumenical movement. Although the release of QD did not achieve the coveted goal of gaining our acceptance by the other denominations, many of our leaders determined to use Vatican II, to help us penetrate the council halls of other churches and enter into friendly theological agreements with them

This began in the late 1950s with contacts with the National Council of Churches in New York City, at the very time that QD was first printed. But Pope John XXIII's convening of Vatican II greatly helped. We sent unofficial representatives to attend the meetings. In the hallways of St. Peters and in the hotels of Rome, we made contacts with leaders of other denominations and gradually worked ourselves into position—so that, **in 1966, two "special non-members" of the World Council of Churches (WCC) began sending representatives to a special doctrinal committee at their headquarters in Geneva, Switzerland: the Roman Catholic Church and the Seventh-day Adventist Church. Our participation at WCC headquarters in that doctrinal committee has continued down to the present day.** Indeed, Bert Beverly Beach, our leading WCC representative (he fluently speaks many European languages) from 1966 on-

DATE OF PUBLICATION: JANUARY 2004

ward, was chairman of that committee for decades.

For more information on our ecumenical connections, we recommend two of our books which summarize it up to 1999: *Seventh-day Adventist / Vatican Ecumenical Involvement, Book 1: History, 80 pp., 8½ x 11, $7.00 + $2.50; and Book 2: Documents, 140 pp., 8½ x 11, $11.00 + $2.50.*

Because of the continued, ongoing controversy over the book, QD was permitted to go out of print. But, as will be related later in detail, by 1983, Walter Martin was openly threatening our church leaders that, if we did not republish QD or something similar, he would publish a scathing doctrinal attack on our denomination—and, as he said, denounce us as a fanatical cult "in 6,000 religious bookstores" in America.

So, in 1988, a sequel to QD was released. Entitled *Seventh-day Adventists Believe* (SDAB), it contained a rehash of most of the doctrinal errors which had been in the previous book. Martin's threatened denunciation of us was never printed. We had acceded to his demands.

As QD was written by Leroy Edwin Froom, a General Conference researcher, so SDAB was penned by Norman Gulley, a Bible teacher at, what is now called, Southern Adventist University, in Collegedale, Tennessee (as explained *on p. v,* of *Acknowledgement,* in SDAB).

Please understand that both books (QD and SDAB) constitute the only official doctrinal books ever published by our denomination! No other book ever published by our church, including *Bible Readings,* ever received that accolade.

The publication of QD was delayed over a year, because of repeated rejections of it by the Review and certain leaders. As SDAB neared publication, over 75 pages were removed from the book! (More on that later in this report.) Warnings were sounded that, if it was not expurgated to some extent, a terrible uprising would occur in the church. **As a result, there is a mingling of truth with often subtly worded error in both books. This only makes them more dangerous.**

Here is a brief analysis of several doctrinal problems in both books:

THE HUMAN NATURE OF CHRIST

When Christ came to earth, He took our fallen human nature. This is the teaching of Hebrews 2:14-18. Christ took the nature of Abraham's descendants, not his ancestors (Heb 2:16). This is also the teaching of the Spirit of Prophecy. In research of the Spirit of Prophecy, which he conducted over a decade ago, Ralph Larson found over 2,000 passages clearly supporting this truth about the human nature of Christ. **It is a continual marvel to the present writer that the Spirit of Prophecy would contain so many accurate statements on the human nature of Christ; yet the controversy over this topic did not begin until decades after her death.**

Here are two sample quotations. They are incontrovertible:

> "It would have been an almost infinite humiliation for the Son of God to take man's nature, even when Adam stood in his innocence in Eden. But **Jesus accepted humanity when the race had been weakened by four thousand years of sin.** Like every child of Adam He accepted the results of the working of the great law of heredity. What these results were is shown in the history of His earthly ancestors. **He came with such a heredity to share our sorrows and temptations, and to give us the example of a sinless life.**"—*Desire of Ages, 49.*
>
> "**Satan had pointed to Adam's sin as proof that God's law was unjust, and could not be obeyed. In our humanity, Christ was to redeem Adam's failure.** But when Adam was assailed by the tempter, none of the effects of sin were upon him. He stood in the strength of perfect manhood, possessing the full vigor of mind and body. He was surrounded with the glories of Eden, and was in daily communion with heavenly beings. It was not thus with Jesus when He entered the wilderness to cope with Satan. **For four thousand years the race had been decreasing in physical strength, in mental power, and in moral worth; and Christ took upon Him the infirmities of degenerate humanity. Only thus could He rescue man from the lowest depths of his degradation.**
>
> "**Many claim that it was impossible for Christ to be overcome by temptation.** Then He could not have been placed in Adam's position; He could not have gained the victory that Adam failed to gain. **If we have in any sense a more trying conflict than had Christ, then He would not be able to succor us. But our Saviour took humanity, with all its liabilities. He took the nature of man, with the possibility of yielding to temptation.** We have nothing to bear which He has not endured."—*Desire of Ages, 117.*

While retaining His divinity, Christ took for Himself the same human nature we have; and in that nature, He relied on His Father for help. He successfully resisted every temptation that Satan could hurl at Him. **He is our example; and, by faith in Him, we too are to overcome on every point and be overcomers.**

Although He fully took our fallen, sinful nature, not once did He ever yield to temptation or entertain a sinful thought. He was sinless.

For an in-depth study on this subject, we refer you to our extensive compilation, *The Nature of Christ, 8½ x 11, 84 pp., $7.00 + $2.50.*

Why does the new theology—and the Evangelicals—seek to deny this truth? Because they

want to theologically excuse the fact that they want to remain in their sins till they die.

As they do on several other doctrines, both truth and error are to be found in QD and SDAB in regard to the human nature which Christ took when He came to earth. Some are thankful that some truth is included in both books; but we should not praise the fact that some accurate statements are there. Instead, **we should protest the inclusion of any error amid truth in official Adventist doctrinal books.**

Pages 50-65 (question 6) and 383 (part of question 33) is where you will find the human nature of Christ discussed in the original 1957 edition of QD. In the 2003 reprint, those pages are 49-60 and 304-305. Here is how QD said it:

"Although born in the flesh, He [Christ] was nevertheless God, and was exempt from the inherited passions and pollutions that corrupt the natural descendants of Adam. He was 'without sin,' not only in His outward conduct, but **in His very nature**."—*QD (1957), 383:1.*

"But though sinless in His life and **in His nature**, He was nevertheless 'in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin' "—*QD (1957), 383:1.*

"He was the second Adam, coming in the 'likeness' of sinful human flesh."—*QD (1957), 52:1 [quote marks theirs].*

Only in the "likeness." QD declares that Christ only bore our humanity "vicariously"! This is rank heresy! Here, read it for yourself:

"It could hardly be construed, however, from the record of either Isaiah [53:3-4] or Matthew [8:17], that Jesus was diseased or that He experienced the frailties to which our fallen human nature is heir. But He did *bear* all this. **Could it not be that He bore this *vicariously*** also, just as He bore the sins of the whole world?"—*QD (1957), 59:3 [italics theirs].*

"These weaknesses, frailties, infirmities, failings are things which **we, with our sinful, fallen natures, have to bear. To us they are natural, inherent, but when He bore them, He took them not as something innately His**, but He bore them as our substitute. **He bore them in His perfect, sinless nature.** Again we remark, **Christ bore all this vicariously**, just as vicariously He bore the iniquities of us all. It is in this sense that all should understand the writings of Ellen G. White when she refers occasionally to sinful, fallen, and deteriorated human nature [which Christ had while on earth]."—*QD (1957), 59:4-60:0.*

QD then reverses itself and declares that Christ did take our humanity, but only the sinless part.

"Whatever Jesus took was not His intrinsically or innately. [He did not really take any part of human nature.] His taking the burden of our inherited weakness and failings, even after four thousand years of accumulated infirmities and degeneracy *(The Desire of Ages, pp. 49, 117),* did not in the slightest degree taint His human nature. [He did take the sinless part of human nature.]"—*QD (1957), 61:4.*

QD then returns to the concept that Christ only bore our humanity in a make-believe manner:

"**All that Jesus took**, all that He *bore,* whether the burden and penalty of our iniquities, or the disease and frailties of our human nature—**all was taken and borne vicariously**. Just as bearing vicariously the sins of the whole world did not taint **His perfect, sinless soul**, neither did bearing the diseases and frailties of our fallen nature taint Him in the slightest degree with the corrupting influences of sin."—*QD (1957), 61:7-62:0.*

Froom (the primary writer of this confusion) is begging the question. Christ took our real nature; but, in that nature, He never sinned nor did He become sick.

Let us next turn our attention to the sequel doctrinal book, *Seventh-day Adventists Believe.* Here is how the human nature of Christ is described in SDAB:

"Jesus Christ took upon Himself our nature with all its liabilities, **but He was free from hereditary corruption**."—*SDAB, 49/1:4 (Seventh day Adventists Believe, page 49, column 1, paragraph 4).*

According to that statement, Jesus took our hereditary physical weakness, but not our hereditary moral weaknesses. He did not thus fully take our fallen nature.

Here is a two-positioned statement in SDAB:

"**He took the nature of man in its fallen state** [that is, He took our fallen nature], bearing the consequences of sin, **not its sinfulness** [that is, He did not take our fallen nature]. He was one with the human race, except in sin."—*SDAB, 49/1:2.*

Such contradictory statements in a single sentence are possible because of the highly doctored attention these books received during the editing process. While some were attempting to crowd in error to appease Martin and his Evangelicals, others were trying to push the errors out.

THE ATONEMENT

"The atonement is finished at the cross" is the teaching of those chapters in QD which deal with the atonement. Keep in mind that when the atonement is finished, our salvation is completed. All that comes after Calvary, according to the modern Protestant view, is merely our acceptance of the salvation completed there. **"Only believe and you are saved," is their cry.** Clearly, the doctrine of a "finished atonement at the cross" is diametrically opposed to the Bible teaching that mankind must obey the law of God. **The truth is that if we will not actively cooperate in trustful, day-by-day reliance on Christ—with God in His work for our salvation—we will not be saved.**

Here is how QD presented the error:

"Most decidedly the all-sufficient atoning sacrifice of Jesus our Lord was offered **and completed** on the cross of Calvary. This was done for all mankind."—*QD (1957), 350:2.*

Originally, the word was "atonement," but editors changed it to "atoning sacrifice." Nowhere in QD will you find the word, "atonement," applied to anything done after the cross. (The phrase, "day of atonement," is mentioned a couple times; but it is repeatedly stated to mean judgment, not atonement.)

"We believe that the **atonement** provides an all-sufficient, perfect, substitutionary sacrifice for sin, which completely satisfies the justice of God and **fulfills every requirement [for salvation]**."—*QD (1957), 352:4-353:0.*

"**When, therefore, one hears an Adventist say, or reads in Adventist literature—even in the writings of Ellen G. White—that Christ is making atonement now, it should be understood that we mean simply that Christ is now making application of the benefits of the sacrificial atonement He made on the cross.**"—*QD (1957), 354:8-355:0.*

"This sacrifice [on Calvary] was completely efficacious. **It provided complete atonement for all mankind.**"—*QD (1957), 357:0*

"Jesus our surety entered the 'holy places' and appeared in the presence of God for us. **But it was not with the hope of obtaining something for us at that time, or at some future time. No! He had already obtained it for us on the cross.**"—*QD (1957), 381:1.*

On pages 341-364, 369-390, in the original 1957 book (in the sections on questions 29-31 and 33), and pages 271-290, 295-312 (in the new 2003 reprint), QD repeatedly uses the phrase, "atoning sacrifice"; this is **always in the sense that Christ's death on Calvary was the only atonement** (often called the "completed atonement") **while its "benefits" were merely applied thereafter** to humanity from His ministry in the Sanctuary in heaven.

Read through those sections. You will repeatedly find the phrases, "sacrificial atonement" and "completed atonement," as that which Christ did on Calvary; and "benefits of the (finished) atonement" refers to what He does in heaven thereafter. **What are the "benefits"? Forgiveness alone.** More on this later.

Did you notice that, in QD 381 (quoted above), Froom did not give the correct translation of *hagia*? His QD footnote on p. 381 says this:

"The Greek word here translated 'holy place' is *hagia*, and is in the plural form. **A correct translation would be 'the holies,' or 'holy places,'** as in Hebrews 9:24."—*QD (1957), 381, footnote. [A similar footnote is on p. 385.]*

Those who have read the present author's book, *Biblical Defense, pp. 251-263*, know that Hebrews 9:1-3 explains the correct translation of *hagia*. At His ascension, Jesus entered the first apartment of the heavenly Sanctuary.

If you will read pages 381 and 385 in QD, you will sense that **Froom was trying to mollify the Evangelicals, who believe that Christ entered the Most Holy Place in A.D. 31, not its first apartment.**

QD (1957) 341:2 also mistranslates the Hebrew word for atonement, *kaphar (kippur)*, as meaning "to cover." But **this interpretation means that the atonement only covers over our sins instead of getting rid of them.** The correct Hebrew meaning of *kaphar* is "to wipe." See Genesis 6:14. Thus the atonement wipes away our sins. (See my book, *Biblical Defense, pp. 129-130.*) Knight, in his notes, overlooked this flaw, which favors the new theology.

The 1988 doctrinal sequel, SDAB, presents the same fundamental error: The atonement was finished at the cross:

"Christ's serving as the surety meant that if the human race would fall into sin He would bear their punishment; He would make the atonement for their sin . . At the cross Jesus fulfilled His pledge to be humanity's surety in the covenant. **His cry 'It is finished' marked the completion of His mission.**"—*SDAB, 94/1:3, 94/2:2.*

"**The atonement, or reconciliation, was completed on the cross** as foreshadowed by the sacrifices, and the penitent believer can trust in **this finished work** of our Lord."—*SDAB, 315/2:1.*

The reader is encouraged to believe that forgiveness of our past sins and a "clothing in the righteousness of Christ," by His heavenly mediation—without reference to any need on our part to obey God—is all that is necessary to insure that Christ's finished atonement on the cross will open heaven's gates to us.

"**The mediatorial ministry of the resurrected Christ has the twofold objective of forgiving and clothing**—the application of His death and life to our life and our standing before God. **Calvary's 'It is finished' marked the completion** of a perfect life and a perfect sacrifice. Sinners need both."—*SDAB, 114/2:2.*

In SDAB, the phrases, "atoning death" and "atoning sacrifice," are repeatedly used. For example, it is found 20 times in just five portions of the new book: 53/2:1, 110/2:4, 111/1:1, 111/1:2, 111/1:3-111/2:0, 111/2:1, 112/1:4, 115/2:1, 115/2:2, 116/1:1, 116/

Continued on the next tract

Errors in Our Two Doctrinal Books

QUESTIONS ON DOCTRINE – SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS BELIEVE

PART TWO OF THREE

Continued from the preceding tract in this series

1:1, 157/2:3, 160/1:1, 242/1:1, 243/1:4, 243/2:0, 315/1:3, 315/2:4, 315/2:1, 315/2:3.

In contrast, there are only six places in SDAB where the atonement is also applied to the work within the tabernacle or the heavenly Sanctuary (SDAB, 110/1:3, 110/2:1-2, 315/2:1-3-316/1:0, 318/1:2, 317/2:1-3, 327/2:2). Some editors slipped them in.

Some may say that everything is all right if both positions are in the book. But **the fact remains that, in this official Adventist doctrinal book, the error is there and predominantly so. The Spirit of Prophecy tells us that Satan works most effectively when he can mingle truth with error.**

The sleeping giant in both doctrinal books is the lack of any necessity for active obedience on the part of the Christian. In the late 1950s, M.L. Andreasen (a godly soul who will be in heaven) was deeply concerned, and rightly so, about the fact that QD ended the atonement process at the cross. According to QD, no atonement was made in heaven; and even the day of atonement of Leviticus 16 was said to only be concerned with judgment, not atonement.

In contrast, **George Knight, in his notes in the reprinted QD, repeatedly declares that QD teaches our correct position on the atonement.** He says that QD says the "benefits" of the atonement made on Calvary were applied later; therefore, the entirety of our atonement message is properly stated in that book.

But the time bomb in the atonement chapters involves the lack of required obedience. If you will very carefully read pages 341-364, 369-390 in the original 1957 book (dealing with questions 29-31, and 33) and 271-290, 295-311 (in the new 2003 reprint), you will come upon an astounding fact: **Nearly every fact about the heavenly Sanctuary, as given in *chapters 23-24,* and *28* of *Great Controversy (pp 409-432, 479-491)* is totally missing from QD! That is because those details directly lead to enabled obedience on our part.**

Read those QD sections on the atonement and Sanctuary again; and the Evangelical / new theology will begin to dawn on you: **There is nothing in QD about power to obey being provided by Jesus to His followers! It is all forgiveness, forgiveness, forgiveness!** This is the heart of our current new theology crisis.

The Evangelical Conferences and the resultant book, QD, was one of the two primary channels where our present doctrinal apostasy originated. QD emboldened liberals in our denomination to begin preaching salvation regardless of conduct. **The other primary channel is explained in my book, *Broken Blueprint:*** the control of the books, teachers, and curricula of our colleges and universities, by worldly accreditating agencies, and the accreditation requirement that our teachers obtain doctorates. They got "doctorates" all right! They receive indoctrination. Thoroughly indoctrinated into atheistic sentiments, Roman Catholic concepts, and / or modern Protestant errors (in accordance with the university they attended), they were hired by our schools of "higher education" to teach sophisticated error to the young of our church.

In the midst of more than two dozen passages in QD which speak about forgiveness, I found only one which gave the right message. Some editor must have slipped it in at the last minute:

> "And in His capacity as High Priest, He gives His people power to overcome sin."—*QD (1957), 382:3.*

For the most accurate and complete research study on the atonement and the heavenly Sanctuary, which you can find anywhere, we refer you to the writings of one who knows the most about the subject: Read *Great Controversy, chapters 23, 24, and 28 (pp. 409-432, 479-491).*

THE TWO-APARTMENT SANCTUARY

The concept of **an actual two-apartment Sanctuary in heaven** is one which is especially disliked by the new theology. **They prefer to view Christ as entering a single place, the Most Holy Place (which they consider to be heaven itself), and doing nothing thereafter.**

However, *chapters 23-24, and 28* of *Great Controversy* are very clear on this point.

But, in order to please the Evangelicals, QD was very careful to avoid discussing the matter. **There is little or no mention of the two apartments in QD; and there is almost nothing about a structure in heaven** that is called the Sanctuary.

"**It is better to see and study the great realities of**

the sacrifice and priestly ministry of Christ than to dwell too much upon the details of the typical service, which gave but an inadequate portrayal of the sacrifice and ministry of Christ. **Far better to interpret the earthly tabernacle in the light of the heavenly**, rather than to circumscribe the antitypical realities by the limitations of too close an application of the type."—*QD (1957), 379:1.*

In the above passage, Froom is telling us to not study the meaning of the furnishings or apartments of the heavenly Sanctuary. In the next one, he makes no mention of a structure in heaven.

"**When our Lord ascended into the heavens He appeared before the Father**, in the presence of the angels, at which time He was installed as our High Priest . . **He is also the King-Priest** of the Melchizedek order, **upon His Father's throne.**"—*QD (1957), 378:2.*

Nowhere in Scripture or the Spirit of Prophecy is Christ a "King-Priest" before the end of time.

"Jesus our surety **entered the 'holy places,'** and appeared in the presence of God for us . . And now as our High Priest He ministers the virtues of His atoning sacrifice to us."—*QD (1957), 381:1.*

We are not told what those "holy places" consist of. But one passage does speak of it as a Sanctuary in heaven:

"Now where and how does our Lord officiate? The Scripture leaves no room for speculation. **He ministers in the heavenly sanctuary** (Heb. 8:1-2). So long as the ancient ritual continued, 'the way into the holiest of all [holy places] was not . . made manifest' (Heb. 9:8)."—*QD (1957), 384:3-385:0 [bracket in the original].*

In the sequel doctrinal book, SDAB, the emphasis is also on forgiveness.

"The sanctuary could be characterized as a ministry of intercession, **forgiveness**, reconciliation, and restoration . . the **repentant sinner** has immediate and constant access to God through Christ's priestly ministry as intercessor and mediator."—*SDAB, 316/1:4-2/:0.*

"The penitent offered a sin offering, confessing his errors. **He went away forgiven**, assured of God's acceptance. So in the antitypical experience, when a sinner is drawn in penitence by the Holy Spirit to accept Christ as his Saviour and Lord, ***Christ assumes his sins and accountability.*** **He is freely forgiven**. Christ is the believer's Surety as well as his Substitute."—*SDAB, 316/2:3-317/1:0 [Italics are Gulley's].*

"**Christ's priestly ministry provides for the sinner's forgiveness** and reconciliation to God."—*SDAB, 317/1:1.*

Not one word about overcoming power to resist and conquer sin in this book.

According to SDAB, this "sanctuary" is the place where God dwells. So it must consist of the inner part of heaven.

"The heavenly sanctuary is the primary dwelling place of God."—*SDAB, 314/2:2.*

In one extended passage, SDAB mentions that Christ entered the most holy place when He ascended to heaven *(SDAB, 319/2:3-320/1:0)*.

INVESTIGATIVE JUDGMENT

QD contains no reference to any atoning work in this investigative judgment. The following quotation mentions judgment alone as the last work of Christ's heavenly ministry; it also mentions the fact that **the two "apartments" of the earthly tabernacle only refer to two "phases" of Christ's work in heaven, not to two apartments:**

"**This priestly ministry of our Lord, we believe, climaxes in a work of judgment.** And this takes place just before He returns in glory. While **He does not minister in 'places made with hands'** (Heb. 9:24), seeing He is sovereign Lord, yet the **two types of ministry** carried out in the ancient sanctuary—first, that of reconciliation in the holy place, and second, that of judgment in the most holy—illustrate very graphically **the two phases** of our Lord's ministry as High Priest. And then, that ministry finished, He comes in glory."—*QD (1957), 389:3.*

". . Christ's ministry in the sanctuary above, and especially to **the concluding phase of that ministry, which we understand to be a work of judgment**."—*QD (1957), 370:3.*

"The work of this special day [the day of atonement] was a type, or illustration, of the last aspect of the great work of God for man. In ancient Israel, it was **a day of judgment**."—*QD (1957), 362:7.*

". . the concluding phase of that ministry, which we understand to be **a work of judgment**."—*QD (1957), 370:3.*

We fully agree that the investigative judgment is concerned with a work of judgment—but **it is also a time for the people of God on earth to put away their sins, so they can pass that judgment!** See *Great Controversy, chapter 28 (pp. 479-491).* **This concept is totally ignored in QD.**

As far as Froom was concerned, Calvary did it all; nothing was to follow except forgiveness. As he explained it, improperly translating *hagia*, Jesus entered both holy places in A.D. 31, and everything afterward was mercy and forgiveness.

"Jesus our surety **entered the 'holy places,'** and appeared in the presence of God for us. **But it was not with the *hope* of obtaining something for us at that time [after He entered the Sanctuary], or at some future time. No! *He had already obtained it for us on the cross.*** And now as our High Priest He ministers the virtues of His atoning sacrifice to us."—*QD (1957), 381:1 [italics Froom's].*

"We believe that **the atonement [on Calvary] provides an all-sufficient, perfect, substitutionary sacrifice for sin, which completely satisfies the justice of God and fulfills every requirement, so that mercy, grace, and forgiveness can be freely extended to the repentant sinner, without compromising the ho-**

liness of God or jeopardizing the equity of His rule."—*QD (1957), 352:4-353:0.*

That is a daring statement! **According to it, God can take sinners to heaven, without jeopardizing His government! All that is needed is repentance and forgiveness.**

"**In order to be saved, there must be individual repentance** and turning to God."—*QD (1957), 352:1.*

Did you know that **not even the Israelites needed to repent of their sins**? **They were automatically forgiven each day, without even asking for forgiveness!**

"By means of the daily morning and evening sacrifices, **they could know their sins were forgiven** each day."—*QD (1957), 359:1.*

"With the provision of the morning and evening sacrifices **the individual sinner had absolutely nothing to do. They were offered on his behalf, whether he sought their benefits or not.**"—*QD (1957), 360:2.*

QD did teach that the sins of God's people were blotted out of the books of record during the investigative judgment. But **not one word was mentioned about the fact that God's people needed to put away those sins from their lives so they could be blotted out!** As Froom presents it, **the sins eliminated from the universe will be forgiven sins, but not put away sins.**

"The Day of Atonement was **a special day when the confessed sins were** also **blotted out**. On this day God gave to Israel a graphic illustration, we believe, of **His purpose to eliminate sin forever from His universe**."—*CD (1957), 430:0.*

"In Scripture, a difference is to be noted between the forgiveness of sin and the blotting out of sin. The **forgiveness of our sins** is very real, and is something that can be known and experienced by living faith in our Lord. **In the divine act of forgiveness our sins are removed from us, and we are freed, delivered, saved.** But the final destruction of sin awaits the day of God's reckoning, **when sin will be blotted out forever from the universe** of God."—*QD (1957), 439:2.*

The new theology teaches that the investigative judgment of Daniel 8:14 is only concerned with judging the little horn, not anyone else!

Although this error was not in QD, **George Knight inserts it into his notes in the newly reprinted edition**, where he laments the fact that it was not included in QD's analysis of that verse:

"One aspect of the investigative or pre-advent judgment not adequately dealt with in this section or anywhere else in *Questions on Doctrine* is the fact that **the 'cleansing' or judgment of Daniel 8:14 is contextually related to the little horn rather than to God's people**."—*George Knight's note, in the reprinted QD (2003), 213.*

As far as the new theology is concerned, the investigative judgment is only some "pre-advent judgment" that concerns the little horn power, and is not an investigation into the lives or obedience of the people of God. This is logical enough; for since modern Protestantism does not believe anyone needs to obey God—why should anyone be judged for not having done so?

The new theology teaches that there will be an "end-time judgment" which will only apply to the little horn power.

We find the same definition of the investigative judgment as providing no atonement, but solely a work of judgment on the little horn (in the sequel book, SDAB).

"Daniel's visions point to a pre-Advent judgment in which **God will secure a verdict of condemnation upon the little horn**, and thus upon Satan himself."—*SDAB, 325/1:3.*

Where in the chapter on the Investigative Judgment, in *Great Controversy (chapter 28, pp. 479-491),* do you find that the investigative judgment is a condemnation of Satan?

The following quotation presents another pleasing fable of the new theology: The final "pre-advent judgment" will only bring favor to God's professed people.

"While **the judgment brings condemnation upon the apostate little horn power, it is 'made in favor of the saints of the Most High.**' "—*SDAB, 325/1:4-2:0.*

We fully agree that the "saints" are vindicated by the investigative judgment; but those saints will all be overcomers.

As mentioned earlier, both truth and error will be found in this book. The original author slipped in new theology while later editors tried to insert some truth. The last sentence in SDAB, 326/2:0, is excellent; it declares that the disobedient will not be saved while the subsequent, lengthy paragraph condemns those who dare to do good works.

The following quotation teaches that the Day of Atonement in antitype does not end until after the millennium!

"The events on the Day of Atonement illustrate the three phases of God's final judgment. They are (1) the 'premillennial judgment' (or 'the investigative judgment') which is also called the 'pre-Advent judgment'; (2) **the 'millennial judgment'**; and (3) **the 'executive judgment' which takes place at the end of the millennium.**"—*SDAB, 317/2:2.*

That is an incorrect concept, and is found nowhere in the Bible or Spirit of Prophecy. At the end of the Leviticus 16 sequence of events, the scapegoat is consigned to the wilderness—which, in antitype, occurs at the beginning of the millennium *(GC 658).*

SANCTIFICATION

Many of the statements in the new doctrinal book appear quite acceptable in relation to the topic

of sanctification, but not as they relate to obedience. Yet, frankly, that is what sanctification is about! It is obedience to the law of God through the enabling grace of Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour. But, according to a number of statements **in the new book, sanctification is wrought out in us by the "grace" of Christ, apart from any obedience on our part.** (But do remember that, on this point as well as on others we discuss, some statements in this book will teach new theology views while others will teach our historic teaching on this point. This makes the entire picture somewhat confusing. Yet it is a confusion caused by what is written in the book.)

"**Many wrongly believe that their standing before God depends upon their good or bad deeds.**"—*SDAB, 121/2:3.*

"**Neither justification nor sanctification is the result of meritorious works.** Both are solely due to Christ's grace and righteousness."—*SDAB, 123/1:3-123/2:0.*

On page 123 a peculiar passage is to be found; here the reader is taught that, **when the sinner first comes to Christ, he is instantly sanctified and redeemed (saved). After that, there follows two additional "sanctifications"** In his life:

"**The three phases of sanctification** the Bible presents are: (1) an accomplished act in the believer's past; (2) a process in the believer's present experience; (3) and **the final result that the believer experiences at Christ's return**. As to the believer's past, **at the moment of justification the believer is also sanctified** 'in the name of the Lord Jesus and by the Spirit of our God.' **He or she becomes a 'saint.' At that point the new believer is redeemed** ['redeemed' means 'saved' throughout Scripture], **and belongs fully to God.**"—*SDAB, 123/2:1-2.*

There is enough error in that paragraph to fill a book of refutation.

That is the kind of teaching we would expect from Martin or Barnhouse, not from an Adventist or from an Adventist doctrinal book. (1) **This "accomplished act"of sanctification in the believer's past is declared to be instantaneous and accompanies redemption at the moment when**, years before, **he first came to God**. But such a concept of **instantaneous, completed sanctification** in our past experience is foreign to our Bible-Spirit of Prophecy teachings. (2) We are then told that a second species of sanctification also occurs in our life, right now. Now, we know that, in reality, this is the *only* true sanctification there is. But, elsewhere in this book, the reader is told that this present sanctification is really something that Christ does quite apart from any effort on our part. —But that would make this second type an untrue sanctification also. (3) **The third type of sanctification is as imaginary as was the first: Gulley tells us that we receive some new infilling of "sanctification" when Jesus returns. The truth is that, at the Second Advent of Christ, the faithful are translated; they are not sanctified!** Please note that the basic error here is that **we were saved at conversion and afterward we just cruise along in present "sanctification,"** awaiting heaven to come.

The new theology teaches that our sins are miraculously removed from us when Jesus returns. That is probably what Gulley has in mind when he says that we receive a mysterious third sanctification at the Second Advent.

"**Our sinful past has been cared for; through the indwelling Spirit we can enjoy the blessings of salvation.**"—*SDAB, 124/1:4.*

OBEDIENCE

Modern apostate Protestant theology teaches that we are not supposed to obey God's law (because Christ obeys it for us), we cannot obey God's law (because we are bound in Original Sin), and He does not want us to try to obey His law (because the law has been done away with). Obedience is simply "fruit" that will grow by itself on the Christian tree, quite apart from any effort on our part. Here are some sample passages in QD:

"Seventh-day Adventists do not rely upon their Sabbathkeeping as a means of salvation or of winning merit before God. **We are saved by grace alone**."—*QD (1957), 153:3.*

"Our Lord's sacrifice on Calvary is mankind's only hope. **But having been saved**, we rejoice that the righteous requirements of the law **are fulfilled** in the experience of the Christian."—*QD (1957), 190:0.*

"**Doing right, complying with God's commandments, meeting any or all of the conditions** we have mentioned, has never saved a soul—nor can it ever preserve a saint."—*QD (1957), 417:0.*

The evildoers are as preserved as the conscientious overcomers through Christ's grace.

Not one word in QD about striving against temptation and putting away sin. The new theology is armchair salvation. Not trust and obey, but profess and already saved.

The sequel doctrinal book (SDAB) also downgrades the importance of the soul's personal battles against temptations without and sins

Continued on the next tract

Errors in Our Two Doctrinal Books

QUESTIONS ON DOCTRINE – SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS BELIEVE

PART THREE OF THREE

Continued from the preceding tract in this series

within. We can agree with much that is said here; but, **when only half is said, it becomes a half-truth**:

"**Salvation is a gift** that comes by grace through faith, not by works of the law."—*SDAB, 241/2:2.*

"People cannot earn salvation by their good works. Obedience is the fruitage of salvation in Christ. Through His amazing grace, especially displayed at the cross, **God has liberated His people from the penalty and curse of sin.**"—*SDAB, 244/2:4.*

From time to time, the new theology will dare to teach that efforts to put away sin will only intensify the sinfulness. That is a diabolical teaching. It produces terrible results, when taught to young, inexperienced college students.

"Christians do not keep the law to obtain salvation—**those who try to do so will only find a deeper enslavement to sin.**"—*SDAB, 244/1:3.*

The new theology only considers obedience to be a result of salvation already received, with no causal relationship. But this is *not* the teaching of the Bible or the Spirit of Prophecy. **The new theology always places *salvation first* in point of time (at the moment of conversion) and good works, if they occur at all, as something incidental which might follow. But do not concern yourself whether it occurs or not.**

PERFECTION

Perfection of character is perfect obedience to the law of God. That is the goal we are continually to strive for. Through the enabling grace of Christ—and that alone—it can be achieved. Yet **the definition of perfection which you will find among the modernists is merely maturity of personality. No mention is made about *the necessity of obedience* to the law of God.**

"What is Biblical perfection? How can it be received? . . **In the New Testament *perfect* often describes mature persons** who have lived up to the best available light **and attained the potential** of their spiritual, mental, and physical powers."—*SDAB, 127/2:1, 4.*

"Full perfection in Christ. How can we become perfect? **The Holy Spirit brings** to us the perfection of Christ. **By faith** Christ's perfect character becomes ours. People can never claim that perfection independently, as if it were their innate possession, or theirs by right. **Perfection is a gift** of God."—*SDAB, 127/2:5-128/1:0.*

We quite agree that none can have perfection apart from Christ; but **perfection is *not* something that is handed to us** as a gift, apart from any effort on our own other than acceptance.

SALVATION

We have already noted that **the new theology teaches that salvation comes automatically at conversion**; and obedience may happen to come as a gift afterward. In the following passage in the sequel doctrinal book, **the reader is instructed that salvation has two phases: first, salvation at the cross; and, second, salvation when Jesus returns** in the clouds of heaven. This would mean that, **all the time between those two events, professed Christians would be *fully saved*.** Read the following quotation carefully. The context indicates that the "heavenly ministry" phase apparently applies only to our conversion; at which point we accepted what Christ did by His death and resurrection. As it says below, it was all done "once and for all."

The author is trying to explain away the Scriptural truth that our salvation is yet future.

"The scriptural view that in one sense adoption and **redemption—or salvation—have 'already' been accomplished** and that in another sense they have not yet been accomplished has confused some. A study of the full scope of Christ's work as Saviour provides the answer. [**An Adventist Seminary teacher** is now quoted:] 'Paul related **our present salvation** to the first coming of Christ. In the historic **cross, resurrection, and heavenly ministry** of Christ our justification and sanctification are secured once and for all. **Our future salvation, the glorification of our bodies**, Paul related, however, to the second coming of Christ.

"For this reason **Paul can say simultaneously**: 'We are saved,' in view of the cross and resurrection of Christ in the past; and 'we are not saved,' in view of the future return of Christ to redeem our bodies."—*SDAB, 130/1:2-3.*

Have you ever noticed that "theologians" and their "theology" are generally very confusing; whereas God's inspired books—the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy—are consistently clear and obvious in their meaning?

The above paragraph is what they are teaching our future ministers, all of whom are required to take their final year or two of training at the Adventist Seminary! The author of the new doctrinal book then adds this emphasis regarding the "future sal-

vation" at Christ's second advent:

"To emphasize our **present salvation** [received at the cross] to the exclusion of our **future salvation** [received at the Second Advent] creates an incorrect, unfortunate understanding of Christ's complete salvation."—*SDAB, 130/1:4-134/2:0.*

Preterism and Futurism applies all Bible prophecies to Christ's first advent or to His second. The new theology teaches a kind of preterism and futurism applied to the salvation of mankind: **They teach that your soul was saved at Calvary and your body will be at the second advent.**

According to statements in this doctrinal book, **all we need do now is to let the Holy Spirit automatically work in our lives, with no effort or resistance of sin on our part.** Our salvation is thus solely based on our acceptance of Christ's "finished work"—a finished atonement at Calvary.

"**The Holy Spirit brings the 'It is finished' of Calvary within, applying the only experience of God's acceptance of humanity to us.** This 'It is finished' of the cross calls in question **all other human attempts** to gain acceptance. In bringing the Crucified within, the Spirit brings the only ground of our acceptance with God, providing the only genuine title to and fitness for salvation available to us."—*SDAB, 131/2:2.*

According to the above paragraph, **man need not seek, through faith in Christ, to obey any of God's commandments. Any efforts to do so are totally unnecessary** in Heaven's plan for our salvation.

WHAT WAS IN THE MISSING 75 PAGES?

As Leroy Edwin Froom was the basic author of *Questions on Doctrine,* so Norman Gulley was the original and principal author of *Seventh-day Adventists Believe.*

In the summer of 1988, when SDAB was released, we noticed an odd discovery: **Nowhere in the Third Quarter *Sabbath School Quarterly* was the new doctrinal book advertised as the accompanying study book** for that and the next quarter, even though each lesson in the third and fourth quarter exactly matched the 27 successive chapters in the new doctrinal book.

Because *Quarterly* scheduling begins three years beforehand, it was obvious that something very unusual had taken place within a few months prior to publication—something so serious that, by the spring of 1982, it appeared quite likely that the new doctrinal book might not be published in time—or at all.

Later the present writer learned what took place. The information came from a worker at the Review plant:

After the covers for the new doctrinal book had been printed—havoc descended upon the book's scheduling. ***Word came to the printing house that the equivalent of 75 pages were being removed from the new doctrinal book!***

Now, there are only 392 pages of text in the new doctrinal book, *Seventh-day Adventists Believe.* Each page is a large 7 x 9 inches in size and has two columns, heavy with printed material. ***So the amount of text suddenly removed from here and there in the book—amounted to one-fifth of its entire content!***

This sudden change is nothing short of astounding. Just before the book printing date—and after the covers for the larger-size book had already been printed—an equivalent of one page in every five was removed from the new doctrinal book!

What was in the missing 75 pages? We may never know. It must truly have been wild.

Gulley, the Bible teacher at Southern Adventist University who wrote the basic manuscript which became the 1988 doctrinal book—**had six years earlier written the notorious 1982 *Senior Quarterly* and the accompanying book, *Christ Our Substitute;*** both of these contained serious error about the atonement and the nature of Christ. **This had marked him as a decided theological liberal. —Yet he had been the one selected to write the later doctrinal book.**

Reviewing some of the statements in his earlier publications may provide a glimpse of part of what may have been omitted from SDAB.

The theme of his earlier book, *Christ Our Substitute (COS),* was that Christ was our substitute in all things, including providing the obedience that God required in order to save us. In order to arrive at that conclusion, he had to especially twist our doctrines on Christ's human nature and the atonement.

GULLEY ON THE NATURE OF CHRIST

This is how Gulley described the human nature of Christ in COS:

"By contrast, Seventh-day Adventists believe that Jesus Christ is fully God and fully man. But we can look at the phrase 'fully man' in two ways. Jesus had either (1) unfallen human nature, such as Adam possessed prior to the Fall or (2) fallen human nature. Which is correct? He took both. For **Christ took the spiritual nature of man before the Fall**, and the physical nature of man after the Fall."—*COS, 33.2 [Christ Our Substitute, page 33, paragraph 2].*

The following statement is just as illogical. (New theology errors always are.)

"**Any idea that He became exactly like us in birth, including fallen human nature, receiving the results of heredity—calls in question His substitution** and often leads us to consider Him only as an example to copy."—*COS, 38:0-39:0.*

In the following paragraph, Gulley is saying that **Christ saved us by His divine nature alone, which**

perfected His human nature!

"Thus He came as the Second Adam, lived a human life, died as a human—for divinity cannot die—and offered man a perfect humanity to replace his. Jesus didn't come because He needed a perfect humanity. His divinity was enough."—*COS. 44:9-45:0.*

So, according to the above statements, **Christ took two types of human natures and saved us because of His divinity quite apart from His humanity.** That surely is new theology! And, on top of that, he tacks on Original Sin as our lot in life:

"Both Adam and Jesus were sinless before their temptations. We are not. In fact, **we do not have to do anything wrong to become sinners. We are born that way.** But Jesus was born sinless."—*COS. 53:1.*

It is one thing to be born with a carnal nature, which we all have; it is quite another to be born sinners.

GULLEY ON THE ATONEMENT

Norman Gulley, whose manuscript formed the basis for this sequel doctrinal book (according to *page v of* its *Acknowledgement),* described the atonement in these words:

" '**It is finished' blazes across the heavens, reaching both backward and forward in history** . . Just as surely as man's creation was completed on creation Friday, so **his salvation was finished on crucifixion Friday.**"—*COS, 101:0, 4-102:0.*

Here is how Gulley explains the "finished atonement on the cross" to his students at Southern Adventist University, in Collegedale, Tennessee. (Parents, do not send your children to Southern!) **Near the back of COS, he describes a hypothetical conversation between a questioning student and "Bob" who replies:**

"[Questions] 'Was His [Christ's] mission on earth not sufficient? **Does He need now to add to what He accomplished there? Is the 'it is finished' of Calvary only a qualified [inaccurate] fact** after all? . . How can we harmonize a completed work at the cross with a continuing work in heaven?' . . [Reply] 'Christ's death shut Satan's mouth and opened up the gates back into Eden for man. **'It is finished' really means the end of both the [great] controversy and man's salvation'** . . [Question] 'So Christ's post-resurrection ministry doesn't add anything to the cross, as if it were insufficient?' Bob smiled, **'No.'** "—*COS, 113:4, 114:1-4.*

So, according to Gulley, Christ's work in the heavenly Sanctuary is useless. In fact, as we will see below, he teaches his students that the entire Sanctuary truth is only "imagery."

GULLEY ON THE TWO-APARTMENT SANCTUARY

Gulley puts these words into the mouth of his Southern Adventist University student. (I wonder how many other words he, and his associate teachers, are putting in his mouth each day in class.)

" 'Yes, I see now, Bob, that **the sanctuary imagery is helpful** . . I'm not worried about what a heavenly sanctuary means. While I know that Ellen White makes some specific statements that the sanctuary is a real place, I'm not sure that I know exactly what it is like. But I'm willing to wait till I get to heaven to understand exactly what the sanctuary there is—whether heaven itself or something symbolized by the earthly pattern.' "—*COS, 118:0.*

Although Ellen White provides a specific description, the student is said to not be able to figure it out! Read *Great Controversy, chapter 23 (pp. 409-422).* It could not be clearer. Gulley tells this to his students, so they will not bother to open the book and learn the truth. Horrors, they might even read *pp. 423-425* and learn their urgent "duties" at this time. —Perhaps they will read *pp. 482-491* and really wake up before it is too late!

And then Gulley immediately places **this subtle doubt about God** in the mouth of the student:

"But what does bother me is the intercession of Christ. Does He really need to intercede before God? **The concept reminds me of my mother trying to calm down my father when he was mad at me.**"—*COS, 118:0.*

The really strange question is why the General Conference would appoint one of the liberal theological writers in our church, in the 1980s, to write the basic text for our current official doctrinal book, *Seventh-day Adventists Believe*?

GULLEY ON OBEDIENCE

The *Sabbath School Quarterly*, written by Gulley as a companion piece for the sequel doctrinal book, agrees with the sentiments in SDAB that belittle the crucial importance of obedience to God's Word:

"The good news is that **Christ has paid our debt without any work or action on our part.** He only asks that we **reach out by faith and accept it.**"—*3SSQ, 70:1 [third Quarter, 1988, Sabbath School Quarterly, page 70, paragraph 1].*

Gulley's new theology: Nothing to do. Just sit around and wait for heaven to arrive. You can't lose out on salvation. Live as you please. Neither gluttony nor sensuality is a problem. Christ paid it all: He provided your obedience by substitution. He obeyed on your behalf.

"Recognizing that He alone could pay the price for our salvation, **our part in obtaining it is to accept redemption** by reaching out the hand of faith."—*3SSQ, 70:4.*

"However good in themselves, **works do not make us righteous**, nor do they earn merit in the sight of God. **Righteousness and salvation are Christ's free gifts.**"—*3SSQ, 75:1.*

The Greek word for "righteousness" is "right-doing." But, for Gulley, doing right and living right

is not what we need to be doing.

GULLEY ON THE INVESTIGATIVE JUDGMENT

Amid great fear, Gulley's SAU student voices his hatred of the investigative judgment:

"Then a pained expression crossed his face. 'Then what is the investigative judgment all about? **I rebel when I think of it.'** He kicked a stone forcefully. 'Look at all these birds, flowers, and trees He made for us. They show His love for us, His creation. Most important, consider Christ's life and death for us. **Why a judgment after all these evidences of love?** [Regardless of my actions, He should save me.] Seems contradictory to me. He's either for us or against us. And what if I sin the day my name comes up?' **He wrung his hands nervously. 'I hate this judgment idea! This dagger forever hanging over us!** Please, Bob,' John pleaded, 'please help me understand, to make sense of it."—*COS. 118:1.*

Then Gulley's "Bob" answers his question—by telling him the investigative Judgment has nothing to do with obedience or disobedience on his part; but it is just a love feast.

" 'There's another perspective that may also help.' 'What's that?' John blurted out. After all, anything that could throw light on the subject was just what he needed. [Bob says,] 'I believe that we can also view this day of atonement as a 'pre-Advent wedding day' . . [John says,] 'Pre-Advent wedding day! that's sure a new idea to me. But I like it. Tell me more' . . **'The pre-Advent inspection is to see whether those called have also accepted the free gift** of the bridegroom's wedding garment. The way to stay in the wedding and become the bride, married to Christ, is to accept His perfect life, or wedding garment . . **For it is not our works that get us through the inspection, but His**: His perfect human righteousness—that robe, or wedding garment, covering us. This means the pre-Advent judgment primarily concerns itself with our acceptance of Christ's substitutionary life (and death), rather than mainly with our life . .' [John says,] 'That's neat.' "—*COS, 120:1-3.*

Many more horrible quotations from Gulley's 1982 book, *Christ Our Substitute*, could be included (horrible because they either give a twisted truth or half a truth); but space is lacking. Yet Gulley was the one assigned to write the 1988 sequel doctrinal book! Little wonder that 75 pages were removed from it!

AN UNDERLYING PROBLEM

We are gradually setting aside the Spirit of Prophecy for the opinions and prejudices of so-called "highly educated" men.

The excuses offered for this course of action are twofold:

One is that the Spirit of Prophecy is out-of-date; it was only a worthwhile guidance for nineteenth-century Christians. (But when asked which part is out-of-date, we receive only hems and haws, and a change of subject.)

Another is that the Spirit of Prophecy was not given to explain doctrine, interpret the Bible, or clarify the standards we are to live by. It was only given, we are told by the liberals and modernists in our church, to comfort us.

But what comfort is there in "comfort" alone, when we are in danger of taking the wrong pathway? We need practical instruction in what to believe, how to live, and how to avoid the pitfalls of life.

If the Spirit of Prophecy was not given to explain doctrine, interpret the Bible, and clarify the standards we are to live by—what was it given for?

The Spirit of Prophecy was given in these last days to guard, protect, instruct, and guide the remnant people of God through the Final Crisis to the Second Coming.

"**When the power of God testifies as to what is truth, that truth is to stand forever as the truth. No after suppositions, contrary to the light God has given are to be entertained.** Men will arise with interpretations of Scripture which are to them truth, but which are not truth. The truth for this time, God has given us as a foundation for our faith. He Himself has taught us what is truth. **One will arise, and still another, with new light which contradicts the light that God has given** under the demonstration of His Holy Spirit . .

"**We are not to receive the words of those who come with a message that contradicts the special points of our faith.** They gather together a mass of Scripture, and pile it as proof around their asserted theories. This has been done over and over again during the past fifty years. And while the Scriptures are God's Word, and are to be respected, the application of them, if such an application moves one pillar from the foundation that God has sustained these fifty years, is a great mistake. He who makes such an application knows not the wonderful demonstration of the Holy Spirit that gave power and force to the past messages that have come to the people of God."—*1 Selected Messages, 161 (Letter 329, 1905).*