

Note: The following is taken from the book *Hindsight* by Dave Fiedler.

The following night was a busy one: L. E. Froom prepared an initial response of twenty pages to the questions posed; Martin read Adventist literature until 2:00 A.M. When the two groups met the following day, the Adventists were pleased to hear that their examiner found them deserving of the name Christian—provided, that is, that the materials they had given him correctly represented the denomination as a whole. 235.5

Referring to the 1931 statement of fundamental beliefs was only partially convincing. He claimed to have found unorthodox statements in books, pamphlets, and periodicals, and he wanted to know why. When he produced examples which he considered "unequivocally heretical," "the Adventist scholars were both shocked and appalled." They could only reply that "*correction had begun.*" 235.6

Note: Not only by his own creed is Martin making this determination, but also by Ignorance.

The troublesome issues involved accusations of teaching '*Arianism* (the view that Christ was a created being), a sinful *nature of Christ*, incomplete atonement" (finished at the cross) "theory, *Galatianism* (salvation by law keeping), and *extreme sectarianism.*" The Evangelicals pointed to the lack of a formal Seventh-day Adventist creed as the root of the problem. How could any denomination ever maintain doctrinal integrity without a creed to define the boundaries of what was to be considered acceptable? 236.4

For their part, the Adventists asserted that these areas of difficulty were not representative of mainline Adventism and that the General Conference would investigate such instances. If the Adventists were to distance themselves from these points of concern, it would be necessary to demonstrate to the Evangelicals that there was indeed a widespread consensus within the denomination which did not countenance such teaching. 236.5

Note: See quote 259.2 below, and <https://sdapillars.org/media/Creeds.pdf>

This privilege is presented before every soul. Each may have heaven's light to guide him. If we discern the truth, and obey it, our whole course of action will be in accordance with the truth; for the truth sanctifies the receiver. But if men refuse to search for the truth as for hidden treasure, *if the mind is pleased with the theories of error, the soul will remain in darkness. The*

course of the life, the development of the character, will be corrupted by false sentiments. Error *never sanctifies*. It can do no good. And how full of darkness is the soul that receives error as truth, and shapes his course of action in accordance with it. {RH, August 23, 1898 par. 2}

The Adventist brethren, in 1955, had assured the Evangelicals that the "unorthodox" points of doctrine were "being corrected." Perhaps this response was simply spur of the moment, a general reply as to what the denomination tried to do with all heretical teachings. On the other hand, perhaps it was more. *There is evidence to support the contention that some within the denomination were already taking active steps to eliminate from the collective Adventist mind certain doctrines which did not accord well with the orthodox views of the Evangelical world.* 237.2

Perhaps *a very few extremely perceptive readers had noticed a revision in the 1946 reprinting of the book Bible Readings for the Home Circle.* Certainly nothing much was said of it at the time. But a simple comparison of this edition with former ones quickly shows that the section entitled 'A Sinless Life' had been rewritten. No longer did this volume reflect the consistent position held by the denomination over the last ninety-four years. It stood as the bellwether of things to come *in muting* the heretofore unanimous position of the Adventist Church that Christ had accepted, not the sinless nature of man at his creation, but rather the nature of the sinful men whom He sought to save. 237.3

Six years passed before the first echoes of this new line of thought were to be heard. The July 10 and 17, 1952, editions of the *Review and Herald* carried a two-part editorial which picked up the strain: 'Adventists believe that Christ, the 'last Adam,' possessed, on His human side, a nature like that of the 'first man Adam,' a nature free of any defiling taint of sin.' 237.4

In his article Dr. Barnhouse told of the shock caused to his new-found brethren when, in the course of one of the early conference meetings, they were presented with evidence of Adventist teaching contrary to the positions they were now advocating. "He pointed out to them that in their bookstore adjoining the building in which these meetings were taking place a certain volume published by them and written by one of their ministers categorically stated the contrary to what they were now asserting. The leaders sent for the book, discovered that Mr. Martin was correct, and immediately brought this fact to the attention of the General Conference officers, that this situation might be remedied and such publications be corrected. This same procedure was repeated regarding the nature of Christ while

in the flesh, which the majority of the denomination has always held to be sinless, holy, and perfect despite the fact that certain of their writers have occasionally gotten into print with contrary views completely repugnant to the church at large. They further explained to Mr. Martin that they had among their number certain members of their 'lunatic fringe' even as there are similar wild-eyed irresponsibles in every field of fundamental Christianity."⁵ 238.3

During the years when Brinsmead flashed his way across the Adventist horizon, others chose to proceed in less spectacular style. As has been said, by the late 1960s the prevailing view of the church seemed to be quite solidly settled into the no-perfection-short-of-glorification position. *This view was, of course, logically built on the pre-Fall nature-of-Christ concept found in Questions on Doctrine. Combined with the traditional Evangelical teaching of the completed atonement, this concept made the theological landscape of our church quite acceptable to those who were looking on from the outside.* 243.4

It takes no imagination to see that, no matter which branch of this theology one might choose, accepting the doctrine of an atonement finished at the cross will rule out the truth of Christ's high priestly ministry in heaven. Once that concession is made, other truths quickly erode. If there is no high priestly ministry in heaven, what possible need is there for a heavenly sanctuary? What merit would there be in cleansing a nonexistent sanctuary? What could be said for the 2300-day prophecy of Daniel? And what need would there be for a remnant church if it had no greater truth to proclaim or special mission to fulfill? 259.2

Note: Peter certainly didn't believe in a complete atonement, for he states after the resurrection, after the ascension that its completion is still future—

Acts 3:19: Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord;

Neither did Paul:— 2Tim. 4:8 Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day: and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing.

Arianism—

Note: Search online for Sunday studies on who raised Jesus. If He raised Himself

then for what purpose did He do so—see below incomplete Atonement quotes. More importantly for whom did He do so? And to whom is left for Him to present His offering to? No One. Here is the deception of Arianism, one God performing these offices.

ArianCreatedBeing.pdf

<https://sdapillars.org/media/Trinity4.pdf>

Sinful nature of Christ—

<https://sdapillars.org/media/seconddeath5.pdf>

<https://sdapillars.org/media/WhoRaisedJesus.pdf>

<https://sdapillars.org/media/Begotten.pdf>

THUS the divine Son of God came into this world—born of a woman. The mystery of his glorious incarnation is among the wonders which the angels desire to look into. 1Pet.1:11,12. Here the skeptic grows facetious, and the ribald scoffer waxes merry over his innuendos concerning the miraculous conception and birth of the Son of Man. Could such overcome the vacuity of their minds long enough to bestow a serious and sensible thought upon the subject, they might be asked, on the hypothesis that a plan of redemption was to be devised, how they would propose to accomplish that purpose. *Given this condition to be met, that a divine being is to come into this world on the plane of humanity, taking upon himself the nature of man, how would they have this change effected? Could there be a member of the human family not born of a woman? Could a divine being become a man among men without being born into this plane of existence? And to this end, what kind of woman would be chosen? Would it be any other than a pure and lovely youthful virgin, as the Scriptures assure us the virgin Mary was, who was the mother of Jesus?* Let, then, all cavilers retire abashed before the unavoidable conditions of the case, and the divine condescension revealed in its accomplishment. Instead of seeking some point at which to jeer and mock, as skeptics do, as the turkey-buzzard scans the landscape, not for its honeyed fruits and flowers, but for some putrid carcass on which to prey, the Christian enters

rather into the spirit of the song which the angels sang, and the declaration made by the heavenly messenger when he said: "Behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. For unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord." Luke 2:10,11. Pressed with a burden of sin, and a longing desire for freedom from its power, the thoughtful penitent is only too glad to know that a way was devised whereby a divine being, to be called "Jesus," because he would "save his people from their sins," could come to his help —too glad for this, to be tempted to stop and indulge in ribald quibble over the means by which God chose to bring it to pass. { LUJ US 25.1 }

Note: Christ born with man's nature after the fall does not mean after does not equal sinful! What saith the scripture? Unless it can be proved that Abraham lived before Adams fall, Christ took on man's nature after Abraham.

Heb. 2:16 For verily he took *not on him the nature of angels*; but he took on him the *seed (nature) of Abraham (after the fall and not Adam's before)*. Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. For in that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted. 5:8 Though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered; 9 And being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him;

Incomplete Atonement—*not finished at the Cross,*

Note: Evangelicals teach The Atonement was finished at the Cross, but also that Christs ministry was interrupted—167 B.C. Daniel 8:13 before His incarnation, before His crucifixion, before His ascension. What did He intercede with in Epephanes time? You can't minister without a sacrifice, or before you present that sacrifice before the Father. This is most manifest in, The Church is the Bride; Daily as Christs ministry; 7 Trumpets in the future., etc., these remove 1844. To evangelicals a complete atonement is Jesus did it all, which removes repentance from dead works to only confessing Jesus's existence. If this is true then we only have an earthly ministry for sin, and a human sacrifice no better than the type given to Moses. This Apostasy has no end to its destruction of Biblical principle.

Heb. 6:1 Therefore *leaving the principles* of the doctrine of Christ, *let us go on*

unto perfection; not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith toward God,

When Christ left heaven to die for a lost world, *he left behind, for the time being, his immortality also.* but how could that be laid aside? That it was laid aside is sure, or he could not have died; but he did die, as a whole, as a divine being, as the Son of God, *not in body only, while the spirit, the divinity, lived right on; for then the world would have only a human Saviour, a human sacrifice for its sins;* but the prophet says that “his soul” was made “an offering for sin.” Isaiah 53:10. But how this could be done, is a question like a hundred other questions that might be asked concerning this heaven-devised transaction, the answers to which the finite mind could never grasp. The nature, though not the manner, of this marvelous event, Paul partially reveals in 1 Timothy 3:16: “And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory.” “The Word,” says John, “was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth.” John 1:14. Again we read: “But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death” (Hebrews 2:9), that is, that he might suffer death. LUJ 23.2. Ps. 16:10

John. 5: 19 Then answered Jesus and said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, *The Son can do nothing of himself,* but what he seeth the Father do: for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise.

5:30 *I can of mine own self do nothing:* as I hear, I judge: and my judgment is just; because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent me.

8:28 Then said Jesus unto them, When ye have lifted up the Son of man, then shall ye know that I am he, and *that I do nothing of myself;* but as my Father hath taught me, I speak these things.

Matt. 10:28 And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather *fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell.* . . . 26:38 Then saith he unto them, *My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death:* tarry ye here, and watch with me. Ps. 16:10 For *thou wilt not leave my soul in hell;* neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption.

Note: If He laid not aside immortality then the following would not be so. This

is not the only power He laid aside:—

The Saviour could not see through the portals of the tomb. Hope did not present to Him His coming forth from the grave a conqueror, or tell Him of the Father's acceptance of the sacrifice. He feared that sin was so offensive to God that Their **separation** was to be **eternal**. **Christ felt the anguish which the sinner will feel when mercy shall no longer plead for the guilty race**. It was the sense of sin, bringing the Father's **wrath** upon Him as man's **substitute**, that made the cup He drank so bitter, and **broke the heart** of the Son of God. {DA 753:2}

The temptations to which Christ was subjected were a terrible reality. As a free agent He was placed on probation, with liberty to yield to Satan's temptations and work at cross-purposes with God. *If this were not so, if it had not been possible for Him to fall, He could not have been tempted in all points as the human family is tempted.* {3SM 131.3}

Jesus revealed *no qualities, and exercised no powers, that men may not have* through faith in Him. His perfect humanity is that which all His followers may possess, *if they will be in subjection* to God as He was. {DA 664.4}

Satan in heaven had hated Christ for His position in the courts of God. He hated Him the more when he himself was dethroned. He hated Him who pledged Himself to redeem a race of sinners. Yet into the world where Satan claimed dominion God permitted His Son to come, a helpless babe, subject to the weakness of humanity. *He permitted Him to meet life's peril in common with every human soul, to fight the battle as every child of humanity must fight it, at the risk of failure and eternal loss.* {DA 49.1}

"In the future, deception of every kind is to arise, and we want solid ground for our feet. We want solid pillars for the building. Not one pin is to be removed from that which the Lord has established. The enemy will bring in false theories, such as the doctrine *that there is no sanctuary*. This is one of the points on which there will be a departing from the faith. *Where shall we find safety unless it be in the truths that the Lord has been giving for the last fifty years?*" {RH, May 25, 1905 par. 28}

<https://sdapillars.org/media/LastFiftyYears.pdf>

Galatianism (*salvation by law keeping*),

There are many who try to blend these two systems, *using the texts that speak of the ceremonial law to prove that the moral law has been abolished; but this is a perversion of the Scriptures.* The distinction between the two systems is broad and clear. The ceremonial system was made up of symbols pointing to Christ, to His sacrifice and His priesthood. . . . But concerning the law of Ten Commandments the psalmist declares, "Forever, O Lord, Thy word is settled in heaven." Psalm 119:89. And Christ Himself says, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law.... Verily I say unto you", making the assertion as emphatic as possible "Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." Matthew 5:17, 18. . . . { PP 365.1 }

Extreme Sectarianism.

Note: SDA's extremely sectarian? Look at the nature of these accusations they are total extreme sectarian.

Matt. 7:14 21 Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven.
20:16

1John 2:3 And hereby we do know that we know him, if we keep his commandments. He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him. But whoso keepeth his word, in him verily is the love of God perfected: hereby know we that we are in him. He that saith he abideth in him ought himself also so to walk, even as he walked. Phil. 3:18

What shall be said of those who go to this period of church history, and even to later times, to correct their Bibles? Paul said that men would rise in the very midst of the elders of the apostolic church, who would speak perverse things, and that men would turn away their ears from the truth, and would be turned unto fables. Are the traditions of this period of sufficient importance to make void God's word? The learned historian of the popes, Archibald Bower, uses the following emphatic language:— HSF 198.4

"To avoid being imposed upon, we ought to treat tradition as we do a notorious and known liar, to whom we give no credit, unless what he says is confirmed to us by some person of undoubted veracity.... False and lying traditions are of an early date, and the greatest men have, out of a pious credulity, suffered themselves to be imposed upon by them." HSF 198.5

Mr. Dowling bears a similar testimony:—HSF 198.6

"*The Bible, I say, the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants!*" Nor is it of any account in

the estimation of the genuine Protestant *how early* a doctrine originated, if it is not found in the Bible. He learns from the New Testament itself that there were errors in the time of the apostles, and that their pens were frequently employed in combating those errors. Hence, ***if a doctrine be propounded for his acceptance, he asks, Is it to be found in the inspired word? Was it taught by the Lord Jesus Christ and his apostles?*** ... More than this, we will add, that though Cyprian, or Jerome, or Augustine, or even the fathers of an earlier age, Tertullian, Ignatius, or Irenaeus, could be plainly shown to teach the unscriptural doctrines and dogmas of Popery, which, however, is by no means admitted, still the consistent Protestant would simply ask, ***Is the doctrine to be found in the Bible?*** Was it taught by Christ and his apostles? ... ***He who receives a single doctrine upon the mere authority of tradition, let him be called by what name he will, by so doing steps down from the Protestant rock, passes over the line which separates Protestantism from Popery, and can give no valid reason why he should not receive all the earlier doctrines and ceremonies of Romanism upon the same authority.***" HSF 199.1

Charles Beecher, in a sermon in the year 1846, declared that the ministry of "the ***evangelical Protestant denominations***" is "not only formed all the way up under a tremendous pressure of merely human fear, but they live, and move, and breathe in a state of things radically corrupt, and appealing every hour to every baser element of their nature to hush up the truth, and bow the knee to the power of apostasy. ***Was not this the way things went with Rome? Are we not living her life over again? And what do we see just ahead? Another general council! A world's convention! Evangelical alliance, and universal creed!***"--Sermon on "The Bible a Sufficient Creed," delivered at Fort Wayne, Indiana, Feb. 22, 1846. When this shall be gained, then, in the effort to secure complete uniformity, it will be only a step to the resort to force. GC 444-445.

This is only a small portion of the info that disproves Martin, Froom and others about SDA's.