

HARVEST INSPIRATION DISCOVERIES
[HTTP://PRODISCOVERIES.COM](http://prodiscoveries.com)

CHAPTER 9

THE FINAL ATONEMENT-TRUTH VS ERROR

LINK TO COMPLETE DOCUMENT:

http://prodiscoveries.com/images/stories/SDA-ONLY/THE_GREAT_CONSPIRACY/THE-GREAT-CONSPIRACY-COMPLETE-REV-L.pdf

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	3
We must first understand the correct method to follow in our study of Scripture and the Spirit of Prophecy.....	3
This inspired counsel on how to study the Testimonies is simple.....	3
The Past Fifty Years (1844-1900).....	4
The pioneer Seventh-day Adventist message given this people in the past century is the true end-time “Gospel” to a perishing world.....	4
Strange Fire	4
The Sacred Fire Of God	4
Old Landmarks and Pillars Of Adventism	5
(1) The Sanctuary, the Foundation Pillar of Adventism.....	6
A Most Subtle Deception	6
A Safeguard and A Bulwark Against Heresy	7
“They are to bear their testimony as to what constitutes the truth for this time.”.....	7
The True Doctrine of the Final Atonement As Taught From 1844 To 1931 (87 years).....	7
What was left out by the ellipses in Froom’s quotation? Here is the statement as written without the ellipses:	8
The Final Atonement.....	8
Four very important facts must be acknowledged in this passage if we are to understand the times in which we live:.....	11
Christ and the Father Enter the Most Holy In 1844	12
There are five important facts that must be acknowledged in this vision given Ellen White. Note carefully the time-frame of the vision.	12
There are two other important facts that must be acknowledged in this early vision given to Ellen White.	13
The Two Locations Of God’s Throne	13
Daniel and John Confirm Ellen White	14

Contemporary Adventism Opposes Daniel, John, and Ellen White On the Location Of God’s Throne Before 1844	14
Elmer Ellsworth Andross.....	14
Compromise First Published In 1912	15
Andross Influenced By Ballenger.....	15
Roy Adams Praises Ballenger’s Erroneous Concept	16
Roy Adams Opposes Pioneer Adventist Concept Of Moveable Thrones.....	17
The Work Of Jesus In the Most Holy Of the Heavenly Sanctuary	17
Pioneer Adventist Writers On the Final Atonement	17
Contemporary SDA Opposing Position	19
Ellen White’s Statement	19
Erroneous Contemporary Adventist Church Statement	20
2. Pioneer Adventist Joseph Bates	20
3. Pioneer Adventist Stephen N. Haskell	21
4. Pioneer Adventist Alonzo Trevor Jones.....	21
5. Pioneer Adventist J. N. Loughborough.....	21
6. Pioneer Adventist E. J. Waggoner	21
7. Pioneer Adventist Joseph Harvey Waggoner.....	22
8. Pioneer Adventist James White.....	22
Ellen White On the Final Atonement.....	23
Early Statement - 1852	23
Later Statement, 1912.....	23
Erroneous Contemporary Adventist Teaching On the Final Atonement	24
Current Heretical Statements-Church Manual	25
This “new theology” first began to be taught in 1957,.....	26
In the year 1952 the truth of the final atonement finalized in the heavenly sanctuary was still being taught by the editor in chief of the <i>Review and Herald</i>	26
Ballenger’s Heresy Now Accepted By the Contemporary SDA Church.....	27
What erroneous concepts did A. F. Ballenger teach on the sanctuary truth?.....	27
Notice the three heretical concepts of Ballenger’s teaching.....	27
Ellen White’s Reply To Ballenger’s Teaching.....	28
Contemporary Scholars Endorses Ballenger’s Theories	28
Is the book of Hebrews a problem for Seventh-day Adventist’s?	29
Table 1 SANCTUARY TERMINOLOGY IN HEB 9:1-10.....	29
Table 2 SANCTUARY TERMINOLOGY IN HEB 9:11-28.....	30
I submit that the following is an accurate interpretation of scripture and the writings of Ellen White:	
.....	31
Chapter nine divides naturally into two parts, one of which describes, while the other explains,....	31
Uriah Smith Again the Scapegoat	32

Roy Adams' Erroneous Conclusion	33
Moveable Thrones	33
Pioneer Adventist Opposition To Adams' Statement	33
"Within the Veil"	34

His work as high priest completes the divine plan of redemption by making the final atonement for sin.

Manuscript. 69, 1912, page 13.

INTRODUCTION

"We are engaged in a mighty conflict, and it will become more close and determined, as we near the final struggle," Ellen White warned. "We have a sleepless adversary, and he is constantly at work upon human minds that have not had a personal experience in the teachings of the people of God for the past fifty years." (Selected Messages, Book 1, page 102, emphasis supplied).

Satan knows that if we forget "the way the Lord has led us," and especially if we should forget "His teaching in our past history," (*Life Sketches*, page 196), then it would be easy to introduce heresy into the greatest movement of truth the world has ever known. What did Ellen White mean by "His teaching in our past history?" Before we can proceed with our research and find the correct answer to this question,

We must first understand the correct method to follow in our study of Scripture and the Spirit of Prophecy.

The Bible answer to the proper method of study is that "precept must be upon precept, precept upon precept; line upon line, line upon line; here a little, and there a little." (Isaiah 28:10). Does it not follow that we should use the very same method to interpret passages in the Spirit of Prophecy? Yes, indeed.

"The Spirit of the Lord will be in the instruction, and doubts existing in many minds will be swept away," Ellen White counseled. "The testimonies themselves will be the key that will explain the messages given, as scripture is explained by scripture." (Letter, 73, 1905, also, Selected Messages, book. 1, pages 41, 42, emphasis supplied).

Notice that we are instructed to study the Spirit of Prophecy "as scripture is explained by scripture," and further, "The testimonies themselves will be the key that will explain the messages given." That is very plain, is it not? However, there is one more important aspect that must be remembered in the study of the Spirit of Prophecy – "time and place must be considered."

"Regarding the testimonies, nothing is ignored, nothing is cast aside," Ellen White wrote, "but time and place must be considered." (ibid., Letter, 73, 1905, emphasis supplied).

This inspired counsel on how to study the Testimonies is simple.

- (1) Do not cast aside any part of the Testimonies.
- (2) Compare all that is written on a subject.
- (3) "Time and place" must also be considered.

This is sound and logical advice, is it not?

The Past Fifty Years (1844-1900)

Ellen White warned many times that some in the Church would bring in “new strange doctrines,” and “something odd and sensational to present to the people.” (*Letter*, 73, 1905). The safeguard, of course, is to remember “the way the Lord has led us, and His teaching in our past history.” (*ibid.*, *Life Sketches*, page 196). Not only that, but Ellen White was very specific about what she meant by the phrase, “His teaching in our past history.”

Many times she stated, writing at the turn of the century (again keeping in mind “time and place”) that, “the value of the evidences of truth that we have received during the past half century, is above estimate.” (Review and Herald, April 19, 1906, emphasis supplied).

“Study the Bible truths that for fifty years have been calling us out from the world,” Ellen White counseled. (ibid., Review and Herald, April 19, 1906, emphasis supplied).

In other words, noting time and place, 1906, when this testimony was penned, the truth that pioneer Adventists taught from 1844 to the turn of the century, was, and still is, “the three angel’s messages.”

The pioneer Seventh-day Adventist message given this people in the past century is the true end-time “Gospel” to a perishing world.

God does not change. His message does not change. Any message that is not in harmony with this “most precious message” is what Ellen White called “strange fire,” what we know today as “new theology.”

Strange Fire

“For all in responsible positions I have a message spoken by the mouth of the Lord,” Ellen White wrote. (Testimonies to Ministers, page 357, emphasis supplied). And what was this message from God to the leadership of the Seventh-day Adventist Church?

“He [those in responsible positions] will represent the sacredness of the work, he will magnify the truth, and will ever present before men and angels the holy perfume of the character of Christ [the law of God],” Ellen White related the message from God. “This is the sacred fire of God’s own kindling. Anything aside from this is strange fire, abhorrent to God, and the more offensive as one’s position in the work involves larger responsibilities.” (ibid., Testimonies to Ministers, page 357, emphasis supplied).

There are 115 references to the phrase “strange fire” in the writings of Ellen White. We have learned that false doctrine is “strange fire” presented to the Seventh-day Adventist Church by “those in responsible positions.” We will now learn what is the “sacred fire of God.”

The Sacred Fire Of God

When the power of God testifies to what is truth, the truth is to stand forever as the truth. . . . The truth for this time, God has given us as a foundation for our faith. He Himself has taught us what is truth. . . . And while

the Scriptures are God's Word, and are to be respected, the application of them, if such application moves one pillar of 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. Ellen G. White, A Call to the Watchmen, pages 14, 15. (emphasis supplied).

Notice that, "He [God] Himself has taught us what is truth," and, "When the power of God testifies to what is truth, the truth is to stand forever as the truth." Could anything be more plain?

An application or interpretation of Scripture that "moves one pillar of the foundation that God has sustained these fifty years, is a great mistake." In this statement Ellen White emphasized that it was "the Holy Spirit that gave power and force to the past messages that have come to the people of God."

The past fifty years have not dimmed one jot or principle of our faith as we received the great and wonderful evidences that were made certain to us in 1844, after the passing of the time. . . . Not a word is changed or denied. That which the Holy Spirit testified to as truth after the passing of the time, in our great disappointment, is the solid foundation of truth. . . . Ellen G. White, The Upward Look, page 352. (emphasis supplied).

"Not a word is changed or denied," of the Advent truth for "the past fifty years," and this truth that was laid down after the great disappointment in 1844 "is the solid foundation of truth." The emphasis again, and again is stated to be the truth that was held by Seventh-day Adventists for "the past fifty years." (See also, *Gospel Workers*, 1915 page 307).

"The pillars of truth were revealed, and we accepted the foundation principles that have made us what we are -- Seventh-day Adventists," Ellen White stated, "keeping the commandments of God and having the faith of Jesus." (Upward Look, page 352, emphasis supplied).

Notice that, "The pillars of truth were revealed," and pioneer Adventists "accepted the foundation principles" of truth. They were truly the remnant who were "keeping the commandments of God and having the faith of Jesus." Notice Ellen White said "having" the faith of Jesus. They possessed the faith of Jesus. Pioneer Adventists were people of obedience to all of God's commandments. Their lives were in harmony with the law of God because they possessed faith like Jesus. Thus the apostle Paul said, "I can do all things." How? "Through Christ which strengtheneth me." (Philippians 4:13). This is righteousness by faith. Obedience by faith.

Again, about the pillars of our faith, Ellen White stated, "And while the Scriptures are God's Word, and are to be respected, the application of them, if such application moves one pillar of the foundation that God has sustained these fifty years, is a great mistake." (A Call to the Watchmen, pages 14, 15, emphasis supplied).

Old Landmarks and Pillars Of Adventism

What are the "pillars" and "old landmarks" of truth? According to the Spirit of Prophecy, there are really only three pillars of Adventism. Notice carefully the description of these three pillars, also known as the old landmarks.

*The passing of the time in 1844 was a period of great events, opening to our astonished eyes the cleansing of the sanctuary transpiring in heaven, and having decided relation to God's people upon the earth, [also] the first and second angels' messages and the third, unfurling the banner on which was inscribed, "The commandments of God and the faith of Jesus." [1] One of the landmarks under this message was the temple of God, seen by His truth-loving people in heaven, and the ark containing the law of God. [2] The light of the Sabbath of the fourth commandment flashed its strong rays in the pathway of the transgressors of God's law. [3] The nonimmortality of the wicked is an old landmark. I can call to mind nothing more that can come under the head of the old landmarks. . ." Ellen G. White, *Counsels to Writers and Editors*, pages 30, 31. (emphasis supplied).*

(1) The Sanctuary, the Foundation Pillar of Adventism

The first "pillar" or "landmark" that Satan would attack is the foundation pillar of the Advent movement. This landmark is the first angel's message, *the message that the remnant people were commissioned to give to a perishing world*. This sanctuary truth is the one doctrine held only by Seventh-day Adventists. For Satan to attack the second pillar, the Sabbath truth, or the third pillar, the state of man in death, would be too obvious for alert Seventh-day Adventists. Satan must be more clever than to attack the obvious. If Satan attacked the sanctuary truth outright, by stating "there is no sanctuary in heaven," the Advent people would detect the deception immediately. Too many testimonies had been written against that kind of an assault upon this foundation pillar of Adventism.

A Most Subtle Deception

History reveals that Satan would shrewdly concentrate his assault on the most important "phase" of the sanctuary truth. Satan would cleverly attack, and try to negate, the "final atonement" and the "blotting out of sins" work of Jesus Christ, our heavenly High Priest. Satan would introduce into the Seventh-day Adventist Church the false concept held by the fallen churches of Babylon, *that the atonement was final, completed and finished on the cross*. This false concept would lead the people to feel secure in their sins. This most subtle deception would at the same time do away with the truth of the 1844 message – *that the final atonement is being completed in heaven by our High Priest, Jesus Christ, the true Lamb of God*.

To complete his masterful deception, Satan, after establishing the erroneous "complete and final atonement on the cross" concept, would then introduce into the Seventh-day Adventist Church a false concept of the human nature Christ assumed while in the flesh. This second false concept would give the people a false "assurance" and lead them to believe that Christ is their substitute only. This deception would lead the people to accept the false doctrine of "free grace" held by all so-called "contemporary Christians." *This would be Satan's most cunning and subtle deception, for it would lead the people to be lost in their sins!* This overwhelming deception the Spirit of Prophecy describes as "the Omega of apostasy."

"The Omega would follow in a little while," Ellen White warned. "I tremble for our people." (Sermons and Talks "The Foundation of Our Faith," page 341, emphasis supplied).

Jesus warned that in the last days Satan's battle strategy against the remnant people of God would be so deceptive that "if it were possible, it should deceive the very elect." (Matthew 24:24b). Thus Paul stated, "And no marvel; for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light, *therefore it is no great thing if his ministers also be transformed as the ministers of righteousness.*" (2 Corinthians 11:14, 15a, emphasis supplied).

“One will arise and still another with new light which contradicts the light that God has given under the demonstration of His Holy Spirit,” Ellen White cautioned. “We are not to receive the words of those who come with a message that contradicts the special points of our faith.” (A Call to the Watchmen, page 14, emphasis supplied).

How can we know what is truth? How can we identify heresy in these last days? How can we avoid being deceived by our cunning adversary?

“When the power of God testifies to what is truth, the truth is to stand forever as the truth,” Ellen White replies. “No after suppositions, contrary to the light God has given are to be entertained.” (ibid., A Call to the Watchmen, page 24, emphasis supplied).

A Safeguard and A Bulwark Against Heresy

A few are still alive who passed through the experience gained in the establishment of this truth. God has graciously spared their lives to repeat and repeat till the close of their lives, the experience through which they passed even as did John the apostle till the very close of his life. And the standard bearers who have fallen in death, are to speak through the reprinting of their writings. I am instructed that thus voices are to be heard. They are to bear their testimony as to what constitutes the truth for this time. ibid., Ellen G. White, A Call to the Watchmen (pages 14, 15). (emphasis supplied).

Notice the words, “I am instructed.” The instruction came directly from heaven. The instruction from heaven was that “voices are to be heard.” Who’s voices are to be heard? “The standard bearers [pioneer Adventists] who have fallen in death, are to speak through the reprinting of their writings.” Not only that, but, **“They are to bear their testimony as to what constitutes the truth for this time.”**

So that is the key, the doctrinal rock we should hold on to – *the truth in our past history!* “We have nothing to fear for the future, except as we shall forget the way the Lord has led us, and His teaching in our past history.” (ibid., Life Sketches, page 196). This statement was published in 1915. We must go back to the beginning of the Advent movement, the first “fifty years” of our past history to discover what was the truth that was endorsed by “the wonderful demonstration of the Holy Spirit that gave power and force to the past messages that have come to the people of God.” (ibid., A Call to the Watchmen, page 15). Then we must compare any new teaching, any “new theology,” to the teachings of pioneer Seventh-day Adventists from 1844 to the turn of the century.

The True Doctrine of the Final Atonement As Taught From 1844 To 1931 (87 years)

“The doctrine of the Sanctuary was enunciated soon after the Great Disappointment of October 22, 1844,” Leroy Froom wrote. “The earliest declaration of this doctrine was the published statement written out by O. R. L. Crosier – but representing the joint studies of Hiram Edson, Crosier, and Dr. F. B. Hawn – which studies took place in Port Gibson and neighboring Canandaigua, New York, in the week or months following the crisis in October.” (Leroy Edwin Froom, Movement of Destiny, pages 111, 112).

“Published first in 1845 in the local Adventist paper, The Day-Dawn, in Canandaigua,” Froom continued, “it appeared in fuller form in The Day-Star Extra of February 7, 1846, printed in Cincinnati, Ohio.” (ibid., Movement of Destiny, page 112).

Froom went on to state that,

“Concerning the published results of these studies, Ellen Harmon White wrote this statement in a letter to Eli Curtis, dated April 21, 1847, and published the same year in one of our earliest pieces of denominational literature, A Word to the Little Flock.” (ibid., Movement of Destiny, page 111).

Froom then quoted the statement of Ellen White. However, because he did not agree with the “final atonement” aspect of Crosier’s article, Froom omitted an important part of the Ellen White endorsement of the article by adding ellipses at the end of the first sentence as follows:

The Lord shew me in vision, more than one year ago, that Brother Crosier had the true light, on the cleansing of the Sanctuary. . .; and that it was His will, that Brother C, should write out the view which he gave us in the Day-Star, Extra, February 7, 1846.

(ibid., Leroy Edwin Froom, Movement of Destiny, page 111).

What was left out by the ellipses in Froom’s quotation? Here is the statement as written without the ellipses:

The Lord showed me in vision, more than one year ago, that Brother Crosier had the true light, on the cleansing of the sanctuary, et cetera, and that it was His [God’s] will that Brother C. should write out the view which he gave us in the Day-Star Extra, February 7, 1846. I feel fully authorized by the Lord to recommend that Extra to every saint. Ellen G. White, A Word to the Little Flock, page 12. (emphasis supplied).

Froom purposely left out the “et cetera,” that Ellen White had written. Why? Because the “et cetera,” implied that Crosier had published the complete truth on all aspects of the Sanctuary truth, especially the “final atonement” phase of the Sanctuary truth. Notice Ellen White stated that, “The Lord showed me in vision,” and that “Brother Crosier had the true light, on the cleansing of the sanctuary, et cetera,” and that it was God’s will “that Brother C. should write out the view which he gave us in the Day-Star Extra.” Unquestionably a solid endorsement from the Lord through the Spirit of Prophecy of O. R. L. Crosier’s *Day-Star, Extra*, article. If Leroy Froom, contemporary historian of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, could not agree with all the aspects of truth in Crosier’s article, then he also could not agree with the Spirit of Prophecy which endorsed the article. It will be shown below that most contemporary Adventist historians, writers and scholars are also out of harmony with pioneer Seventh-day Adventists and the Spirit of Prophecy on the teaching of the “Final Atonement” phase of Christ’s ministry in the heavenly sanctuary.

The Final Atonement

What had Crosier written that Froom and contemporary Adventist leadership could not agree with? It was Crosier’s “final atonement” emphasis – that the atonement was not finished and completed on the cross, but that as our High Priest, Christ is now making the “final atonement” in the heavenly Sanctuary.

While doing research for this manuscript, the author placed a call to the James White Memorial Library at Andrews University to purchase a photo-copy of Crosier’s original article as it appeared in the *Day-Star*,

Extra, February 7, 1846. The photo-copy of the article arrived, *minus the “atonement” portion of the article!* Another letter was mailed, with the required funds, requesting that the full article be sent, including the “atonement” portion of Crosier’s *Day-Star, Extra* article. As of this writing (more than ten years), and no further correspondence has been received. What is the corporate Seventh-day Adventist Church trying to hide? Thanks to the faithful work of Adventist laymen the complete article was published on the *Adventist Pioneer Library* CD-ROM disk. (*Adventist Pioneer Library*, P. O. Box 1844, Loma Linda, CA 92354-0380, USA). Here, then, is the complete “atonement” portion of Crosier’s article in full. This is the true position on the “final atonement” phase of the heavenly Sanctuary as it was endorsed by the Spirit of Prophecy:

*“But again, they say the atonement is made and finished on Calvary, when the Lamb of God expired,” Crosier began. “So men have taught us, and so the churches and world believes; but it is none the more true or sacred on that account, if unsupported by Divine authority.” (Owen R. L. Crosier, *Day-Star, Extra*, February 7, 1846. (emphasis supplied).*

“Perhaps few or none who hold that opinion have ever tested the foundation on which it rests,” Crosier suggested. He then explained the “Final Atonement” phase of Christ ministry in the heavenly sanctuary in following six areas:

If the atonement was made on Calvary, by whom was it made? The making of the atonement is the work of a Priest; but who officiated on Calvary? Roman soldiers and wicked Jews. The slaying of the victim was not making the atonement; the sinner slew the victim. (Lev. 4:1-4, 13-15), after that the priest took the blood and made the atonement. (Lev. 4:5-12, 16-21).

Christ was the appointed High Priest to make the atonement, and He certainly could not have acted in that capacity till after His resurrection, and we have no record of His doing anything on earth after His resurrection, which could be called the atonement.

The atonement was made in the Sanctuary, but Calvary was not such a place.

He could not, according to Hebrews 8:4, make the atonement while on earth, “If He were on earth, He should not be a Priest.” The Levitical was the earthly priesthood, the Divine, the heavenly.

*Therefore, He did not begin the work of making the atonement, whatever the nature of that work may be, til after His ascension, when by His own blood He entered His heavenly Sanctuary for us. Owen R. L. Crosier, *Day-Star, Extra*, February 7, 1846. (emphasis supplied).*

*“Let us examine a few texts that appear to speak of the atonement as past,” Crosier continued. “Rom. 5:11; ‘By whom we have now received the atonement, (margin, reconciliation).’ This passage clearly shows a present possession of the atonement at the time the apostle wrote; but it by no means proves that the entire atonement was then in the past.” (ibid., Crosier, *Day-Star, Extra*, 2/7/1846, emphasis supplied).*

When the Savior was about to be taken up from His apostles, He “commanded them that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the

promise of the Father,” which came on the day of Pentecost when they were all “baptized with the Holy Ghost.” Christ had entered His Father’s house, the Sanctuary, as High Priest, and began His intercession for His people by “praying the Father” for “another Comforter,” John 14:15, “and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost,” Acts 2:33, He shed it down upon His waiting apostles. Then, in compliance with their commission, Peter, at the third of the day began to preach, “Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins.” Acts 2:38. This word remission, signifies forgiveness, pardon or more literally sending of sins. Now, put by the side of this text, another on this point from his discourse at the ninth hour of the same day. Acts 3:18, “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.” Here He exhorts to repentance and conversion (turning away from sin); for what purpose? “That your sins may be (future) blotted out.” Every one can see that the blotting out of sins does not take place at repentance and conversion; but follows and must of necessity be preceded by them. Repentance, conversion, and baptism had become imperative duties in the present tense; and when performed, those doing them “washed away” (Acts 22:16) remitted or sent away from them their sins. (Acts 2:28). And of course are forgiven and have “received the atonement;” but they had not received it entirely at that time, because their sins were not yet blotted out. How far then had they advanced in the reconciling process? Just so far as the individual under the law had when he had confessed his sin, brought his victim to the door of the tabernacle, laid his hand upon it and slain it, and the priest had with it’s blood entered the Holy and sprinkled it before the veil and upon the alter and thus made an atonement for him and he was forgiven. Only that was the type and this the reality. That prepared for the cleansing of the great day of atonement, this for the blotting out of sins “when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord, and He shall send Jesus.” Hence, “by whom we have now received the atonement” in the same as “by whom we have received the forgiveness of sin.” At this point the man is “made free from sin.” The Lamb on Calvary’s cross is our victim slain; “Jesus the Mediator of the new Covenant” “in the heavens” is our intercessing High Priest, making atonement with His own blood by and with which He entered there. The essence of the process is the same as in the “shadow.” 1st. Convinced of sin; 2nd. Repentance and confession; 3d. Present the Divine sacrifice bleeding. This done in faith and sincerity, we can do no more, no more is required. Owen R. L. Crosier, Day-Star, Extra, February 7, 1846. (emphasis supplied).

“In the heavenly Sanctuary our High Priest with His own blood makes the atonement and we are forgiven,” Crosier concluded. He then quoted 1 Peter 2:24; “Who His own self bare our sins in His own body on the tree.” (see also Matt. 8:17; Isa. 53:4-12).” (ibid., Crosier, Day-Star, Extra, 2/7/1846, emphasis supplied).

“His body is the ‘one sacrifice’ for repenting mortals, to which their sins are imparted and through whose blood in the hands of the living active Priest they are conveyed to the heavenly Sanctuary,” Crosier explained. “That was offered ‘once for all’ ‘on the tree;’ and all who would avail themselves of its merits must through faith, there receive it as theirs, bleeding at the hands of

sinful mortals like themselves.” (ibid., Crosier, Day-Star, Extra, 2/7/1846, emphasis supplied). “After thus obtaining the atonement of forgiveness we must `maintain good works,’ not the `deeds of the law;’ but `being dead to sin, should live unto righteousness,’” Crosier concluded. “This work we will understand to be peculiar to the Gospel Dispensation.” (ibid., Crosier, Day-Star, Extra, 2/7/1846, emphasis supplied).

This article makes it clear that pioneer Adventists did not believe in a “completed and final atonement on the cross.” Indeed, the “Fundamental Principles of Beliefs” written by James White and published in the Seventh-day Adventist *Yearbook* (1874-1914) stated almost the very words of Crosier on the final atonement. Note carefully the statement by James White:

That there is one Lord Jesus Christ. . .that He. . .died our sacrifice, was raised for our justification, ascended on high to be our only Mediator in the sanctuary in heaven, where, with His own blood, He makes the atonement for our sins; which atonement, so far from being made on the cross, which was but the offering of the sacrifice, is the very last portion of His work as priest, according to the example of the Levitical priesthood, which foreshadowed and prefigured the ministry of our Lord in heaven. James White, 1874 Fundamental Principles, op. cit. The Living Witness, “Significant Articles From the Signs of the Times,” 1874-1959, Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1959, page 2. (emphasis supplied).

Did Ellen White agree with this “Fundamental Principles” statement on the final atonement? Did she also agree with Crosier’s article in the *Day-Star, Extra*? Indeed she did! She stated that, “I feel fully authorized by the Lord, to recommend that Extra, to every saint.” (*ibid.*, letter to Eli Curtis, 4/21/1847). In one of Ellen White’s earliest visions she was shown the concept of the sanctuary truth symbolized by the first angel’s message:

Sub-Title–End of the 2300 Days: I saw a throne, and on it sat the Father and the Son. . . Before the throne I saw the Advent people--the church and the world. I saw two companies, one bowed down before the throne, deeply interested, while the other stood uninterested and careless. Those who were bowed before the throne would offer up their prayers and look to Jesus; then He would look to His Father, and appear to be pleading with Him. A light would come from the Father to the Son and from the Son to the praying company. Then I saw an exceeding bright light come from the Father to the Son, and from the Son it waved over the people before the throne. But few would receive this great light. Many came out from under it and immediately resisted it; others were careless and did not cherish the light, and it moved off from them. Some cherished it, and went and bowed down with the little praying company. This company all received the light and rejoiced in it, and their countenances shone with its glory. Ellen G. White, Early Writings, pages 54, 55. (emphasis supplied).

Four very important facts must be acknowledged in this passage if we are to understand the times in which we live:

- (1) At the end of the 2,300 days, Ellen White saw the Father and the Son sitting on the throne *in the holy place or first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary.*
- (2) Before the throne were all the people of the world divided into three groups – (1) God’s true Advent people, (2) the professed church, (3) the world.

(3) Although there were three groups before the throne, only two were divided. “I saw two companies, one bowed down before the throne, deeply interested.” The Church and the world “*stood uninterested and careless.*”

(4) God’s true Advent people are a very small portion of professed Christians and the world’s teeming billions.

Ellen White stated that only a “few would receive this great light” and that only a few would join with “the little praying company.” God’s true people are always a small company. (See Luke 12:32; Matt. 7:14). Indeed, did not Jesus say, “But as the days of Noe were, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be.” (Matthew 24:37). What was the most important fact about the days of Noah?

“When once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing,” the apostle Peter replies, “wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water.” (1 Peter 3:20b, emphasis supplied).

Christ and the Father Enter the Most Holy In 1844

Evangelical Christians and contemporary Adventists state that Christ entered the most holy place at His ascension. This teaching is heresy, and is not the teaching of pioneer Adventists. Note carefully the following statement from the Spirit of Prophecy:

“End of the 2,300 Days”

“I saw a throne, and on it sat the Father and the Son,” Ellen White began. “I gazed on Jesus’ countenance and admired His lovely person. The Father’s person I could not behold, for a cloud of glorious light covered Him. . .” (Early Writings, page 54, emphasis supplied).

*I saw the Father rise from the throne, and in a flaming chariot go into the holy of holies within the veil, and sit down. Then Jesus rose up from the throne, and the most of those who were bowed down arose with Him. I did not see one ray of light pass from Jesus to the careless multitude after He arose, and they were left in perfect darkness. . . Then a cloudy chariot, with wheels like flaming fire, surrounded by angels, came to where Jesus was. He stepped into the chariot and was borne to the holiest, where the Father sat. There I beheld Jesus, a great High Priest, standing before the Father. . . Those who rose up with Jesus would send up their faith to Him in the holiest, and pray, “My Father, give us Thy Spirit.” Then Jesus would breathe upon them the Holy Ghost. In that breath was light, power, and much love, joy, and peace. *ibid.*, Ellen G. White, Early Writings, page 55. (emphasis supplied).*

There are five important facts that must be acknowledged in this vision given Ellen White. Note carefully the time-frame of the vision.

- (1) The time of the vision was at the ““End of the 2300 Days” The end of the 2300 days was October 22, 1844.
- (2) In vision Ellen White saw God the Father arise from His throne in the holy place, or first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary, and move into the holy of holies, “within the veil,” and sit down. (See Daniel

7:9, 10). God the Father moved “through the Veil” into the most holy place of the heavenly sanctuary in 1844.

(3) Jesus also arose from His throne in the holy place, or first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary in 1844 and “stepped into the chariot and was borne to the holiest, where the Father sat.” (See Daniel 7:13). There Ellen White saw Jesus our great High Priest, “standing before the Father.”

(4) Those who by faith entered the most holy place in the heavenly sanctuary with the Father and the Son received “light, power, and much love, joy, and peace.”

(5) Ellen White did not see even “one ray of light” pass from Jesus to the careless multitude after He had arisen and entered the most holy place of the heavenly sanctuary. Further, she stated that the people who did not enter the holy of holies by faith “were left in perfect darkness.” Mark this point well. *The fallen churches of Babylon have not one ray of light and are in total darkness!* “To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.” (Isaiah 8:20, emphasis supplied). Do the Sunday-keeping churches believe in the Law and the Sabbath? No, there is no light in them. “He that turneth away his ear from hearing the law, even his prayer shall be abomination.” (Proverbs 28:9).

*I turned to look at the company who were still bowed before the throne; they did not know that Jesus had left it. Satan appeared to be by the throne, trying to carry on the work of God. I saw them look up to the throne, and pray, “Father, give us Thy Spirit.” Satan would then breathe upon them an unholy influence; in it there was light and much power, but no sweet love, joy, and peace. Satan’s object was to keep them deceived and to draw back and deceive God’s children. *ibid.*, Ellen G. White, *Early Writings*, page 56. (emphasis supplied).*

Again, pioneer Adventist doctrine points out that the Sunday-keeping churches became Babylon because they refused to follow by faith the Father and Son into the most holy place of the heavenly sanctuary in 1844! They refused the first angel’s message!

There are two other important facts that must be acknowledged in this early vision given to Ellen White.

(1) Satan appeared to be by the throne in the first apartment, or holy place, “trying to carry on the work of God.”

(2) Satan breathes upon the fallen churches of Babylon “an unholy influence,” and in this unholy influence there is “light and much power.” We see this unholy influence and false power in the erroneous faith healing and counterfeit joy and peace of the contemporary Evangelical and Pentecostal churches. We also see this “unholy influence” and false “joy and peace” in the “Celebration” movement within the contemporary Seventh-day Adventist Church. Only a delay of the Lord’s coming will reveal the acceptance of “tongue-speaking” and “divine healing” in public services of the Church.

Dr. Walter Martin, noted Evangelical writer on the cults, stated on the John Ankerberg television show that Ellen White was a false prophet “because she approved the false position of Crosier on the final atonement.” Martin’s opinion should not concern Adventists, because he belongs to that group who are in darkness.

The Two Locations Of God’s Throne

Was God the Father's throne in the holy place, the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary, at the ascension of Christ, and the years prior to 1844? Did pioneer Adventists believe in "moving throne?" Was Ellen White correct about the location of God's throne prior to 1844 when she saw in vision the Father and the Son move from the holy place, the first apartment, through the Veil, into the holiest, or second apartment in 1844? The answer to these three questions is an absolute, indisputable, definite yes!

Daniel saw the 1,200 reign of the "little horn," the Papacy would extend from A.D. 538 to A.D. 1798. He saw God the Father seated in the most holy place, the second apartment of the heavenly sanctuary, sometime following the reign of the little horn – shortly after 1798.

Daniel and John Confirm Ellen White

"I beheld till the thrones were cast down," Daniel saw in vision, "and the Ancient of days did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool: his throne was like the fiery flame, and his wheels as burning fire." (Daniel 7:9).

Daniel said that "I beheld till," or past the time of the little horn, the Papacy. It was after the little horn when Daniel saw "the Ancient of days did sit." Notice also that the "wheels" of God the Father's throne appeared "as burning fire." Then, like Ellen White, Daniel saw Jesus, the Son, move into the most holy, the second apartment of the heavenly sanctuary.

"I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of man [Jesus] came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days [the Father]," Daniel wrote, "and they brought him [Jesus] near before him [the Father]." (Daniel 7:13, emphasis supplied).

Why did the Father and the Son move into the most holy place of the heavenly sanctuary in 1844? The angel told Daniel that, "Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." (Daniel 8:14). What is the cleansing of the sanctuary?

"A fiery stream issued and came forth from before him [the Father]," Daniel replies, "thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him: the judgment was set, and the books were opened." (Daniel 7:10, emphasis supplied).

"And the nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead, that they should be judged," the apostle John wrote, "and that thou shouldest give reward unto thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and them that fear thy name, small and great; and shouldest destroy them which destroy the earth." (Revelation 11:18, emphasis supplied).

In the first ten chapters of Revelation the apostle John places God the Father's throne in the holy place, the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary. Then John was allowed for the first time to look into the most holy place. There he saw the golden ark containing the ten commandments.

"And the temple of God was opened in heaven," John wrote, "and there was seen in his temple the ark of his testament." (Revelation 11:19a).

Contemporary Adventism Opposes Daniel, John, and Ellen White On the Location Of God's Throne Before 1844

Elmer Ellsworth Andross

There was contention between pioneer Adventists and Evangelical Christians over the location of God's throne.

(1) Pioneer Adventists believed and taught the concept of moving thrones. They taught that the Father's throne was in the holy place, or first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary until 1844, at which time the Father moved into the most holy, or second apartment of the heavenly sanctuary and was seated. (Daniel 7:9, 10). This concept was Biblical and was confirmed by the Spirit of Prophecy. (See above).

(2) Evangelical, Sunday-keeping Christians do not believe in a heavenly sanctuary. They teach that all of heaven is a most holy place and the exact location of God's throne is unknown.

(3) Contemporary Seventh-day Adventist theology seeks to compromise the two positions. Modern Adventism teaches that the Father's throne is confined to the most holy, or second apartment of the heavenly sanctuary. More liberal Adventists teach the Desmond Ford thesis that there is no heavenly sanctuary, and that all of heaven is a most holy place.

Historically the two opposing concepts between pioneer Adventists and Evangelical Christians had to be compromised if ecumenical ties were to be established between the Seventh-day Adventist Church and other Christian churches. But how could these two opposing concepts be compromised?

Compromise First Published In 1912

E. E. Andross was the first Seventh-day Adventist to publish the compromising concept that God's throne has always been located in the most holy place, and "at His ascension" Christ entered the most holy place to appear before the Father to be confirmed. Then Christ returned to the holy place, or first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary, to perform the "first phase" of His heavenly ministry. The Father remained in the most holy, or second apartment of the heavenly sanctuary where His throne has always been. Christ then, in 1844, reentered the most holy to perform the judgmental, or "second phase" of His heavenly ministry. (See, E. E. Andross, *A More Excellent Ministry*, Pacific Press Publishing Association, Mountain View, California, 1912). This erroneous concept is the current position of contemporary Adventism. This concept is not Biblical. (See, Daniel 7:9, 10). The concept that Christ entered the most holy and then returned to the holy place of the heavenly sanctuary was never taught by pioneer Adventists, nor was it ever confirmed by the Spirit of Prophecy. Where in the world did E. E. Andross get the idea for such an erroneous concept?

Andross Influenced By Ballenger

E. E. Andross was associated in England with A. F. Ballenger, an Adventist minister who taught erroneous concepts on the sanctuary doctrine. Ellen White opposed all the erroneous concepts presented by Ballenger. (See, Ellen G. White, "The Integrity of the Sanctuary Truth," *Manuscript Release*, No. 760, page 4).

"Elder A. F. Ballenger. . . for a time was a minister in Great Britain," Arthur White wrote. "Associated with him in the work in Britain were such men as Elder E. W. Farnsworth and E. E. Andross." (EGW: The Early Elmshaven Years, Vol. 5, 1900-1905, pages 405, 406, emphasis supplied).

*"In early 1905, A. F. Ballenger was over in Great Britain while I was there, and he had not been very thoroughly instructed in some points of the faith," Andross recalled. "He had been preaching around over the country on certain practical points of the faith, and had had considerable success in that line, but he had not been thoroughly grounded in the doctrinal points of the faith." (E. E. Andross, *Bible Study No. II, July 13, 1911, pages. 13, 14, emphasis supplied).**

Notice the date of Andross' report of Ballenger's apostasy, 1911. One year later Andross published his book, *A More Excellent Ministry*, 1912, on the sanctuary service as he saw it. Andross admits in his report that he worked closely with Ballenger:

*One night while laboring with me in London, it came his turn to preach on the subject of the sanctuary. He [Ballenger] did so, but he was very much discouraged over his effort on the subject of the sanctuary that night. And then he said, "If the Lord will help me, I will never preach again until I know what I am preaching." "I am not going to get it from our books. If our brethren could obtain it from the original sources, why can't I? I will go to the books or commentaries and all these various sources from which Elder Uriah Smith obtained light on the subject of the sanctuary, and I will get it from the same sources that he did. I will not know it because Elder Uriah Smith knew it, but I will know it because God is teaching it to me directly." *ibid.*, E. E. Andross, Bible Study No. II, July 13, 1911, pages. 13, 14. (emphasis supplied).*

"The result was, he [Ballenger] developed a theory with reference to the sanctuary that is very subtle," Andross concluded, "and resulted in his being disconnected from the work entirely since 1905 at the General Conference." (ibid., Bible Study No. II, p. 14, emphasis supplied).

"In his 1911 talks at the Oakland camp meeting Elder Andross carefully traces through various texts that were employed by Ballenger in support of his views," Arthur White wrote. "Then he traces through the interpretation of these texts as held by Seventh-day Adventists, a position strongly supported by the repeated testimony of Ellen White as having been given to her in confirmation of truth in the early days of studying doctrinal points." (EGW: The Early Elmshaven Years, Vol. 5, 1900-1905, page 408, emphasis supplied).

Again notice the date, 1911, one year prior to the publication of Andross' book *A More Excellent Ministry*. Contrary to the last statement by Arthur White, the Spirit of Prophecy did not "confirm" the concept published by Andross in his 1912 book. Ellen White did not confirm the erroneous concept that Christ entered the most holy, or second apartment of the heavenly sanctuary, at the time of His ascension to appear before the Father to be confirmed, and then returned to the holy, or first apartment, to perform the first phase of His heavenly ministry. **Although this erroneous concept cannot be found in the Bible or the Spirit of Prophecy, it is promoted as the pioneer Adventist concept by contemporary Seventh-day Adventist theology.**

Roy Adams Praises Ballenger's Erroneous Concept

*"Ballenger's stress on. . . Christ's entry into the most holy place at His ascension may be retained," Roy Adams stated, "and shown to be compatible with the notion of an antitypical day of atonement commencing in 1844." (Roy Adams, *The Sanctuary Doctrine*, "Andrews University Doctrinal Dissertation Series," page 255, emphasis supplied).*

Notice that Roy Adams, states that Ballenger's erroneous concept of Christ's entry into the most holy place at His ascension "may be retained." Moreover, Roy Adams believes that Ballenger's erroneous concept can be "shown to be compatible with the notion of an antitypical day of atonement commencing in 1844." This

is liberal “new theology” Adventism in its most subtle and deceptive form. This is the “Omega” of apostasy that Ellen White saw and that caused her to “tremble for our people.”

“The Omega would follow in a little while,” Ellen White warned. “I tremble for our people.” (Sermons and Talks, Vol. 1, page 341, emphasis supplied).

Roy Adams Opposes Pioneer Adventist Concept Of Moveable Thrones

“Yet there is an inner conviction on the part of many [new theology] Bible students that the correspondence between the earthly and heavenly sanctuaries could not be in terms of a one-one relationship,” Adams concluded. “[Uriah] Smith caught this point. . . Ballenger recognized it and hurled it against Smith’s notion of a mobile heavenly throne.” (ibid., The Sanctuary Doctrine, emphasis supplied).

The Work Of Jesus In the Most Holy Of the Heavenly Sanctuary

On October 22, 1844, at the end of the 2,300 days (years), Jesus came before the Father to serve as our High Priest. Daniel saw this great event in vision.

“I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of man [Jesus] came with the clouds of heaven,” Daniel wrote, “and came to the Ancient of days [the Father], and they brought him near before him.” (Daniel 7:13).

It was at that time that Jesus was given His kingdom. This event was the marriage of the Lamb. Pioneer Adventist saw the fulfillment of this prophecy in the parable of the ten virgins (Matthew 25:1-13) and the “midnight cry” given in the summer of 1844. “And at midnight there was a cry made, Behold, the bridegroom cometh; go ye out to meet him.” (Matthew 25:6).

“And there was given him [Jesus] dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him,” Daniel wrote, “his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.” (Daniel 7:14).

At this time “the judgment was set, and the books were opened.” (Daniel 7:10). “And the nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead, that they should be judged, and that thou shouldst give reward unto thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and them that fear thy name, small and great; and shouldst destroy them which destroy the earth.” (Revelation 11:18, emphasis supplied).

Pioneer Adventists saw that the work of Jesus our High Priest in the heavenly sanctuary consisted, not only of judgment, but in the blotting out of sins. In the blotting out of sins Jesus is making the final atonement.

Pioneer Adventist Writers On the Final Atonement

What about other pioneer Adventists? Was O. R. L. Crosier the only one who believed the final atonement is finished in heaven by our High Priest? No, indeed. Notice carefully a few statements from the most acknowledged pioneer Adventists.

“The Final Atonement” and “The Blotting Out Of Sins” I. Pioneer Adventist James N. Andrews

*“By many, the idea of the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary will be treated with scorn, ‘because’ say they, ‘there is nothing in Heaven to be cleansed,’” Andrews began. “Such overlook the fact that the holy of holies, where God manifested his glory, and which no one but the High Priest could enter, was, according to the law, to be cleansed, because the sins of the people were borne into it by the blood of sin-offering. Lev. 16.” (James N. Andrews, *The Sanctuary and Twenty-Three Hundred Days*, Steam Press of the Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association, Battle Creek, Mich. 1872, page 90, emphasis supplied).*

“And they overlook the fact that Paul plainly testifies that the heavenly sanctuary must be cleansed for the same reason. Heb. 9:23, 24. See also Col. 1:20,” Andrews continued. “It was unclean in this sense only: the sins of men had been borne into it through the blood of sin offering, and they must be removed.” Then Andrews added, “This fact can be grasped by every mind.” (ibid., page 91, emphasis supplied).

“The work of cleansing the sanctuary changes the ministration from the holy place to the holiest of all. Lev. 16; Heb. 9:6, 7; Rev. 11:19,” Andrews continued. “As the ministration in the holy place of the temple in heaven began immediately after the end of the typical system, at the close of the sixty-nine and a half weeks (Dan. 9:27), so the ministration in the holiest of all, in the heavenly sanctuary, begins with the termination of the 2300 days.” (ibid., page 91, emphasis supplied).

“Then our High Priest enters the holiest to cleanse the sanctuary,” Andrews concluded. “The termination of this great period marks the commencement of the ministration of the Lord Jesus in the holiest of all.” (ibid., page 91).

“This work, as presented in the type, we have already seen was for a two-fold purpose, viz.: [1] the forgiveness of iniquity, [2] and the cleansing of the sanctuary,” Andrews stated. “And this great work our Lord accomplishes with His own blood; whether by the actual presentation of it, or by virtue of its merits, we need not stop to inquire.” (ibid., page 91, emphasis supplied).

“No one can fail to perceive that this event, the cleansing of the sanctuary, is one of infinite importance,” Andrews wrote. “This accomplishes the great work of the Messiah in the tabernacle in heaven, and renders it complete.” (ibid., page 91, emphasis supplied).

Notice that Andrews concedes that the work of final atonement and cleansing of our High Priest in the heavenly sanctuary “renders it complete.” This is done in heaven, not at the cross.

“The work of cleansing the sanctuary is succeeded by the act of placing the sins, thus removed upon the head of the scape-goat, to be borne away forever from the sanctuary,” Andrews concludes. “The work of our High Priest for the sins of the world will then be completed, and He be ready to appear without sin unto salvation.” (ibid., page 92, emphasis supplied).

Notice that Andrews states that, “The work of our High Priest for the sins of the world will then be completed.” Is this statement in harmony with Crosier? Yes, indeed. “In the heavenly Sanctuary our High Priest with His own blood makes the atonement and we are forgiven,” Crosier stated. (Day-Star, Extra, February 7, 1846).

Is this statement by Andrews in harmony with Ellen White? Yes, indeed.

“His [Christ’s] work as high priest completes the divine plan of redemption by making the final atonement for sin.” (Manuscript 69, 1912, page 13, emphasis supplied).

Contemporary SDA Opposing Position

Are these statements by Andrews, Crosier, and Ellen White in harmony with contemporary Seventh-day Adventist doctrine? No, they are not.

“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.” (Questions on Doctrine, page 354, (1957), emphasis supplied).

Satan’s conspiracy against the Advent truth is so subtle, so deceptive, that without constant study by the Christian, detection is almost impossible. Did not Jesus warn that “if it were possible it should deceive the very elect?” Notice very, very, carefully the two opposing statements below, the truth as stated by Ellen White, followed by the error as stated by the contemporary Seventh-day Adventist Church:

Ellen White’s Statement

When Christ, the Mediator, burst the bands of the tomb, and ascended on high to minister for man, [1] He first entered the holy place, where, by virtue of His own sacrifice, He made an offering for the sins of men. With intercession and pleading He presented before God the prayers and repentance and faith of His people, purified by the incense of His own merits. [2] He next entered the Most Holy Place [in 1844], to make an atonement for the sins of the people, and cleanse the sanctuary. His work as high priest completes the divine plan of redemption by making the final atonement for sin.--Ms. 69, 1912, p. 13. (“The Sin and Death of Moses,” copied Sept. 10, 1912.) Ellen G. White, Manuscript Releases, Volume 11, page 54. (emphasis supplied).

Erroneous Contemporary Adventist Church Statement

This becomes all the more meaningful when we realize that 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. And now, as our High Priest He ministers the virtues of His atoning sacrifice. Questions on Doctrine, page 381. (emphasis theirs).

Notice that Ellen White states that Jesus “entered the holy place, where. . . He made an offering for the sins of men.” The contemporary Seventh-day Adventist Church says, No. They admit that Jesus did enter 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.”

Ellen White says, “He next entered the Most Holy Place, to make an atonement for the sins of the people, and cleanse the sanctuary.” And, “His work as high priest completes the divine plan of redemption by making the final atonement for sin.” (Ms. 69, 1912, p. 13). The contemporary Seventh-day Adventist Church says, “No! He had already obtained it for us on the cross.” (QD, p. 381).

“The sins of those who have obtained pardon through the great sin-offering, are, at the close of our Lord’s work in the holy places, blotted out (Acts 3:19),” J. N. Andrews concluded, “and being then transferred to the scape-goat, are borne away from the sanctuary and host forever, and rest upon the head of their author, the devil.” (ibid., The Sanctuary and Twenty-Three Hundred Days, page 92, emphasis supplied).

James N. Andrews then endorsed the writings of O. R. L. Crosier: “The following valuable remarks on this important point are from the pen of O. R. L. Crozier, written in 1846.” (*The Sanctuary and Twenty-Three Hundred Days*, p. 91). Andrews then quoted a passage from the *Day-Star, Extra*, written by Crosier.

2. Pioneer Adventist Joseph Bates

“First, then to be perfect in time it must begin on the 10th day of the 7th month, and no where else,” Bates stated. “Then please look back to the 10th of the 7th month, 1844, where all the virgins were out looking for the Bridegroom, or as in the type, waiting for Jesus our great High Priest, to finish the atonement for the sanctuary and ourselves, and bless us by his glorious appearing.” (Joseph Bates, Eighth Way Mark, “Bridegroom Come,” page 101, emphasis supplied).

“Then we say at the commencement of this second type, the symbol of our trial, was where the Bridegroom came, and commenced the cleansing of the sanctuary,” Bates concluded. “When God speaks and shakes earth and heaven, Joel says Jerusalem will be holy, the sanctuary will be complete, the atonement finished; for God will then be the hope of his people.” (ibid., page 102, emphasis supplied).

3. Pioneer Adventist Stephen N. Haskell

In Acts 3:19 we read: “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.” Then your sins are blotted out when the times of refreshing come. We are to-day in the time of the blotting out of our sins. We are now looking for the times of refreshing, and the outpouring of the Spirit. The Lord teaches knowledge to those who are weaned, and those who study the Word have the refreshing. The refreshing is the outpouring of the Spirit of God in the time of the blotting out of sins, and that is where we are now. Stephen N. Haskell, “Preparation For Reception Of the Holy Spirit,” 1909 General Conference Daily Bulletin, May 20, 1909, page 106. (emphasis supplied). [Address given at 9:15 A. M. Thursday, May 20, and Friday, May 21, 1909.]

4. Pioneer Adventist Alonzo Trevor Jones

*“We are also in the time of the utter blotting out of all sins that have ever been against us,” A. T. Jones wrote. “And the blotting out of sins is exactly this thing of the cleansing of the sanctuary; it is the finishing of all transgression in our lives; it is the making an end of all sins in our character; it is the bringing in of the very righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ, to abide alone everlastingly.” (A. T. Jones, “The Times of Refreshing,” *The Consecrated Way To Christian Perfection*, page 124, emphasis supplied).*

“Therefore now as never before we are to repent and be converted that our sins may be blotted out,” Jones concluded, “that an utter end shall be made of them forever in our lives and everlasting righteousness brought in.” (ibid., p. 124, emphasis supplied).

5. Pioneer Adventist J. N. Loughborough

*“Still later Elder [J. H.] Waggoner wrote a third pamphlet of about the same size, entitled, *The Atonement in the Light of Reason and Revelation*,” Loughborough wrote. “About the year 1884 this was revised and enlarged to a volume of some 400 pages. It is a clear and concise treatise upon the subject indicated by its title.” (J. N. Loughborough, *Great Second Advent Movement*, page 334, emphasis supplied). [note:-J. H. Waggoner was the father of E. J. Waggoner.]*

6. Pioneer Adventist E. J. Waggoner

*“The blotting out of sin is the erasing of it from the nature, the being of man. . .,” E. J. Waggoner wrote. “The erasing of sin is the blotting of it from our natures, so that we shall know it no more.” (E. J. Waggoner, *Review and Herald*, September 30, 1902, emphasis supplied).*

“The worshipers once purged”—actually purged by the blood of Christ—have ‘no more conscience of sin,’ because the way of sin is gone from them. . .,” Waggoner wrote. “This is the work of Christ in the true sanctuary which the Lord pitched, and not man,—the sanctuary not made with hands, but brought into existence by the thought of God.” (ibid., Review and Herald, September 30, 1902, emphasis supplied).

7. Pioneer Adventist Joseph Harvey Waggoner

*And yet another question has been raised, on which some minds have been perplexed. If the blotting out of sins is done in the closing work of the priest, when the sanctuary is cleansed, that is to say, in the Judgment, then the sins of all the saints must stand on record till that time. Now it has been shown (Chapter Three) that justification by faith and salvation are not identical; the former is a fact of experience at the present time, while the latter is contingent on “patient continuance in well-doing” on the part of the justified one. As was remarked, “justification by faith is not a final procedure; it does not take the place of the Judgment, nor render the Judgment unnecessary. It looks to something beyond itself to be accomplished in the future.” Joseph Harvey Waggoner, “The Judgment,” *The Atonement*, page 226. (emphasis supplied).*

8. Pioneer Adventist James White

*How natural, then, the conclusion, that as the Jewish priests ministered daily in connection with the holy place of the sanctuary, and on the tenth day of the seventh month, at the close of their yearly round of service, the high priest entered the most holy place to make atonement for the cleansing of the sanctuary, so Christ ministered in connection with the holy place of the heavenly sanctuary from the time of his ascension to the ending of the 2300 days of Dan.8, in 1844, when, on the tenth day of the seventh month of that year, he entered the most holy place of the heavenly tabernacle to make a special atonement for the blotting out of the sins of his people, or, which is the same thing, for the cleansing of the sanctuary. The typical sanctuary was cleansed from the sins of the people with the offering of blood. The nature of the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary may be learned from the type. By virtue of his own blood, Christ entered the most holy to make a special atonement for the cleansing of the heavenly tabernacle. James White, “The Sanctuary,” *Bible Adventism*, pages 185, 186. (emphasis supplied).*

The doctrine of a “final atonement in heaven” is stated by James White in several places. Three other references are, *Life Incidents*, pages 192, 193; *Life Sketches*, page 111; *Our Faith and Hope*, pages 175, 176.

Pioneer Adventists taught the “final atonement” completed in heaven in perfect harmony with the *Day-Star, Extra* as written by O. R. L. Crosier. Many other examples could be presented. This position was one of the “foundation” truths that was endorsed by the Spirit of God at the beginning of the Advent movement.

“A line of truth extending from that time to the time when we shall enter the city of God, was plainly marked out before me,” Ellen White wrote, “and I gave my brethren and sisters the instruction that the Lord had given me.”

(Ellen G. White, "Establishing the Foundation of Our Faith," Manuscript 135, 1903, page 3, emphasis supplied).

Ellen White On the Final Atonement

The Spirit of Prophecy teaches that the "atonement" was not completed on the cross, as the fallen churches of Babylon, and the contemporary Seventh-day Adventist Church now teach. Although there are many more examples, the following are seven clear statements by Ellen White that the "atonement" was not completed and finished on the cross, but is finalized in the heavenly Sanctuary.

Early Statement - 1852

*As Jesus died on Calvary, He cried, "It is finished," and the veil of the temple was rent in twain, from the top to the bottom. This was to show that the services of the earthly sanctuary were forever finished, and that God would no more meet with the priests in their earthly temple, to accept their sacrifices. The blood of Jesus was then shed, which was to be offered by Himself in the heavenly sanctuary. As the priest entered the most holy once a year to cleanse the earthly sanctuary, so Jesus entered the most holy of the heavenly, at the end of the 2300 days of Daniel 8, in 1844, to make a final atonement for all who could be benefited by His mediation, and thus to cleanse the sanctuary. Ellen G. White, *Early Writings*, page 253, 1852. (emphasis supplied).*

Later Statement, 1912

*When Christ, the Mediator, burst the bands of the tomb, and ascended on high to minister for man, He first entered the holy place, where, by virtue of His own sacrifice, He made an offering for the sins of men. With intercession and pleading He presented before God the prayers and repentance and faith of His people, purified by the incense of His own merits. He next entered the Most Holy Place [in 1844], to make an atonement for the sins of the people, and cleanse the sanctuary. His work as high priest completes the divine plan of redemption by making the final atonement for sin.--Ms. 69, 1912, p. 13. ("The Sin and Death of Moses," copied Sept. 10, 1912.) Ellen G. White, *Manuscript Releases, Volume 11*, page 54. (emphasis supplied).*

Notice the dates of these two statements, 1852 and 1912. After sixty years the Spirit of Prophecy was yet consistent with the original message of the "final atonement" completed in heaven.

*"As in the final atonement the sins of the truly penitent are to be blotted from the records of heaven," Ellen White wrote, "no more to be remembered or come into mind, so in the type they were borne away into the wilderness, forever separated from the congregation." (*Patriarchs and Prophets*, page 358, emphasis supplied).*

As he [Christ] repeated these words he pointed to the heavenly Sanctuary. The minds of all who embrace this message are directed to the Most Holy place where Jesus stands before the ark, making his final intercession for all those for whom mercy still lingers, and for those who have ignorantly

*broken the law of God. This atonement is made for the righteous dead as well as for the righteous living. Jesus makes an atonement for those who died, not receiving the light upon God's commandments, who sinned ignorantly. Ellen G. White, *Early Writings*, page 254; See also, *Spiritual Gifts*, Vol. 1, pages 162, 163. (emphasis supplied).*

*“The blood of Christ, while it was to release the repentant sinner from the condemnation of the law, was not to cancel the sin; it would stand on record in the sanctuary until the final atonement,” Ellen White stated, “so in the type the blood of the sin offering removed the sin from the penitent, but it rested in the sanctuary until the Day of Atonement.” (ibid., *Patriarchs and Prophets*, page 357, emphasis supplied).*

“In the typical service only those who had come before God with confession and repentance, and whose sins, through the blood of the sin offering, were transferred to the sanctuary, had a part in the service of the Day of atonement,” Ellen White stated. “So in the great day of final atonement and investigative judgment the only cases considered are those of the professed people of God. .

*..” (The Great Controversy, page 480; See also, The Faith I Live By, page 210, emphasis supplied). “In the type, this great work of atonement, or blotting out of sins, was represented by the services of the Day of Atonement--the cleansing of the earthly sanctuary,” Ellen White stated, “which was accomplished by the removal, by virtue of the blood of the sin offering, of the sins by which it had been polluted.” (ibid., *Patriarchs and Prophets*, pages 357, 358, emphasis supplied).*

This teaching of the final atonement in heaven, the blotting out of sins, was the true message of the First Angel, the “Present Truth” as taught and believed by pioneer Seventh-day Adventists and endorsed by the Spirit of Prophecy. Are these statements by Ellen White in harmony with the *Day-Star, Extra* article written by O. R. L. Crosier? Indeed they are!

Erroneous Contemporary Adventist Teaching On the Final Atonement

Satan knew that to ensure victory in his battle plan against the Seventh-day Adventist truth, he must influence the leaders and teachers of the Church to falsify historical documents and to even lie about doctrinal positions once held by the pioneers of the Advent movement. Again we ask, how can we know what is the real truth when historical teachings have been falsified by modern teachers, ministry and Church leaders?

“We have nothing to fear for the future, except as we shall forget the way the Lord has led us, and His teaching in our past history,” Ellen White replies (LS, p. 196). “The value of the evidences of truth that we have received during the past half century, is above estimate.” (R&H, 4/19/06).

In 1957 the leadership of the Seventh-day Adventist Church published their position on the “final atonement” in *Ministry* magazine, official organ to the ministry of the Church. In this editorial, Roy Allen Anderson, then editor of *Ministry* magazine and Ministerial Secretary of the General Conference, stated that

“the sacrificial act of the cross (was) a perfect, complete, and final atonement.” (Ministry, February, 1957, emphasis supplied).

Is this statement in harmony with the article written by Crosier, endorsed by the Spirit of God, and taught by pioneer Adventists for over 100 years? No, it is not.

“Jesus entered the Most Holy of the heavenly, at the end of the 2300 days of Dan, viii, in 1844, to make a final atonement,” Ellen White replies. (ibid., Spiritual Gifts, Vol. I, pages 161, 162, emphasis supplied).

In opposition to pioneer teaching the ministry of the contemporary Church says, “No, the sacrificial act of the cross was a perfect, complete, and final atonement.”

In the “official” book, *“Seventh-day Adventists Answer, Questions on Doctrine*, also published in 1957, can be found the following statement on the final atonement:

“Adventists do not hold any theory of a dual atonement.” (QOD, p. 390, emphasis theirs).

This book was endorsed by the highest authority of the Seventh-day Adventist Church.

Is this statement by the highest authority of the contemporary Seventh-day Adventist Church in harmony with the position held by Crosier, Ellen White and the pioneer Adventists? No, indeed.

“But again, they say the atonement is made and finished on Calvary, when the Lamb of God expired. . .so the churches and world believes; but it is none the more true or sacred on that account.” Crosier replies. (Day-Star, Extra, February 7, 1846, emphasis supplied).

“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,” contemporary Church leadership concludes, “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.” (ibid., Questions on Doctrine, page 354, emphasis theirs).

This was the official position of the Church in 1957. Is this position still held today by the Seventh-day Adventist Church? Yes, indeed. Note carefully the following statement from the official *Seventh-day Adventist Church Manual*.

Current Heretical Statements-Church Manual

In Christ’s life of perfect obedience to God’s will, His suffering, death and resurrection, God provided the only means of atonement for human sin, so that those who by faith accept this atonement may have eternal life, and the whole creation may better understand the infinite and holy love of the Creator. This perfect atonement vindicates the righteousness of God’s law and the graciousness of His character, for it both condemns our sins and provides for our forgiveness. . . The resurrection of Christ proclaims God’s triumph over the forces of evil, and for those who accept the atonement assures their final

victory over sin and death. Seventh-day Adventist Church Manual, 1986, page 25. (emphasis supplied).

Is the “official” statement in the *Seventh-day Adventist Church Manual* in harmony with the original statement written by Crosier? No, it is not. Is it in harmony with the writings of Ellen White? No, a thousand times no!

“The blood of Christ, while it was to release the repentant sinner from the condemnation of the law, was not to cancel the sin; it would stand on record in the sanctuary until the final atonement.” (ibid., Patriarchs and Prophets, page 357, emphasis supplied).

“There is a sanctuary in heaven, the true tabernacle which the Lord set up and not man,” contemporary SDA Church leadership states. “In it Christ ministers on our behalf, making available to believers the benefits of His atoning sacrifice offered once for all on the cross.” (Seventh-day Adventist Believe. . . 27 Fundamental Doctrines, 1988, page 312, emphasis supplied).

These statements, beyond question, confirm the erroneous idea that the atonement was finished and completed on the cross. The contemporary Church leadership say “the benefits of His atoning sacrifice offered *once for all on the cross.*”

“No, brethren, that is not the truth,” Ellen White would reply if she were alive today. “This teaching is one of the errors of Babylon.”

How do we know Ellen White would speak this way? Because her writings speak this way. Note the following statement:

Ellen White refutes this error:

“The blood of Christ, while it was to release the repentant sinner from the condemnation of the law, was not to cancel the sin,” Ellen White wrote, “it would stand on record in the sanctuary until the final atonement.” (ibid., Patriarchs and Prophets, page 357, emphasis supplied).

This “new theology” first began to be taught in 1957,

after more than 100 years of the existence of the Advent truth as taught by Ellen White and pioneer Adventists! (See, *Questions on Doctrine*, pages 354, 355). Where is the proof of this statement?

In the year 1952 the truth of the final atonement finalized in the heavenly sanctuary was still being taught by the editor in chief of the *Review and Herald*.

Of those who charge us with teaching strange doctrines because we believe that Christ’s work of atonement for sin was begun rather than completed on Calvary, we ask these questions: If complete and final atonement was made on the cross for all sins, then will not all be saved? for Paul says that He “died for all.” Are we to understand you as being Universalists? “No,” you say, “not all men will be saved.” Well, then, are we to understand that you hold that Christ made complete atonement on the cross for only a limited few, and that His sacrifice was not world embracing, but only partial? That would be predestination in its worst form. Francis D. Nichol, Answers to Objections,

Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1952 edition, page 408. (emphasis supplied).

Ballenger's Heresy Now Accepted By the Contemporary SDA Church

Satan has been very clever in his last-day deceptions. However, he made a serious blunder in 1905 when he directed his first assault on the "final atonement" phase of the sanctuary truth. His great mistake was the timing – *the messenger of the Lord was still alive!*

"There was in their midst one through whom the Spirit of God was able to point out what was truth and what was error." E. E. Andross wrote. (Bible Study, No. II, page 14).

What erroneous concepts did A. F. Ballenger teach on the sanctuary truth?

We must know, because Satan has introduced the same erroneous concepts again into the Seventh-day Adventist Church, and because we have been admonished that we should not "forget how the Lord has led us, and His teaching, in our past history." (*Life Sketches*, page 196).

Elder E. W. Farnsworth, who was also working in England with Ballenger and Andross at the time, reported on Ballenger's erroneous teachings in a letter addressed "to the General Conference president, who in turn conveyed the information to W. C. White on March 16, 1905." (Arthur L. White, *Early Elmshaven Years*, Vol. 5, page 407):

There was another feature of the meeting which was really sad to me. Brother Ballenger has got into a condition of mind which would seem to me to unfit him entirely to preach the message. He has been studying the subject of the sanctuary a good deal lately, and he comes to the conclusion that the atonement was made when Christ was crucified and that when He ascended He went immediately into the Most Holy Place and that His ministry has been carried on there ever since. E. W. Farnsworth to Arthur G. Daniells, in Arthur G. Daniells to W. C. White, March 16, 1905. (emphasis supplied).

Notice the three heretical concepts of Ballenger's teaching.

- (1) "The atonement was made when Christ was crucified,
- (2) and that when He ascended He went immediately into the Most Holy Place,
- (3) and that His ministry has been carried on there ever since."

Astounding! This is exactly the teaching of the "new" theology currently devastating the Seventh-day Adventist Church. This erroneous concept is entirely at odds with the historic teaching of pioneer Adventists. Moreover, this teaching is in opposition to the Spirit of Prophecy.

"He [Ballenger] sees clearly that his view cannot be made to harmonize with the testimonies," Farnsworth wrote in his letter, "at least he admits freely that he is totally unable to do so." (ibid., Letter to AGD and WCW, 3/16/05).

Farnsworth stated further that, in his own mind, Ballenger felt that "there is an irreconcilable difference" between his theories and Ellen White.

(ibid., Letter to AGD and WCW, 3/16/05). “This, of course, involves the authenticity of the Testimonies and practically upsets them,” Farnsworth concluded. (ibid., Letter to AGD and WCW, 3/16/05).

“Farnsworth reported that a number of Adventist ministers in Great Britain were taking up these new views on the sanctuary, and confusion was coming in,” Arthur White observed. (EEY, vol. 5, p. 408). Arthur White stated further that, “Early in the 1905 session Ballenger laid before the leading brethren what he felt was new light, but they were unable to accept his reasoning and pointed out the errors in his application of Scripture.” (ibid., EEY, vol. 5, p. 408).

Ellen White’s Reply To Ballenger’s Teaching

What did Ellen White think of this “new theology” presented by A. F. Ballenger? What did she think of the erroneous concept that “the atonement was made when Christ was crucified and that when He ascended He went immediately into the Most Holy Place and that His ministry has been carried on there ever since.” Did she have any light from heaven on the subject? What would she say if this erroneous concept was taught today?

*“It will be one of the great evils that will come to our people to have the Scriptures taken out of their true place and so interpreted as to substantiate error that contradicts the light and the Testimonies that God has been giving us for the past half century,” Ellen White replied to Ballenger. “I declare in the name of the Lord that the most dangerous heresies are seeking to find entrance among us as a people, and Elder Ballenger is making spoil of his own soul.” (MS., S 59, 1905, emphasis supplied). (For further EGW statements on the teachings of A. F. Ballenger see, *Christ In His Sanctuary*, pages 3-18).*

“There is not truth in the explanations of Scripture that Elder Ballenger and those associated with him are presenting,” Ellen White cautioned. “I am instructed to say to Elder Ballenger, Your theories, which have multitudes of fine threads, and need so many explanations, are not truth, and are not to be brought to the flock of God.” (ibid., MS. S 59, 1905, emphasis supplied).

The attack of Satan on the sanctuary truth at that time came to not because the Messenger of the Lord was alive and confronted the false doctrine. However, today Ellen White is no longer with the Church. As Israel of old, we only have the writings of the prophet. Has the Seventh-day Adventist Church fallen for the old erroneous concepts of Ballenger? Although Ellen White had warned that these dangerous concepts “are not to be brought to the flock of God,” that is exactly what has been promoted by the “new” theology.

Contemporary Scholars Endorses Ballenger’s Theories

In 1981 Roy Adams wrote his Doctoral Dissertation at Andrews University. Adams wrote on the sanctuary doctrinal positions held by Uriah Smith, M. L. Andreason, and A. F. Ballenger. Notice carefully the following conclusion by Roy Adams on the position held by A. F. Ballenger:

Ballenger’s treatment of Hebrews 6:19, 20 is so strong, exegetically, that it has to be regarded as a significant movement towards a closer affinity to the biblical testimony in regard to the meaning of the phrase “within the veil.” His argumentation, based as it was on solid scriptural indications, far surpassed the

value of [Uriah] Smith’s on the same point. And inasmuch as the two positions were diametrically opposed to each other, Ballenger’s is to be preferred. Roy Adams, The Sanctuary Doctrine, “Three Approaches in the Seventh-day Adventist Church,” Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series, Andrews University Press, 1981, page 245. (emphasis supplied).

Notice that Roy Adams, speaking for contemporary Seventh-day Adventist theologians, states that Ballenger’s treatment of Scripture “is so strong,” and “that it has to be regarded as a significant movement towards a closer affinity to the biblical testimony.” On this point Adams concluded that Ballenger’s argumentations are “based as it was on solid scriptural indications.” Amazing!

“None of the figures [Smith, Andreason, Ballenger] appreciated the full implications of Hebrews 6:19,20,” Roy Adams concluded, “but it was Ballenger who came closest to recognizing it.” (ibid., The Sanctuary Doctrine, page 246, emphasis supplied).

“Now again our Brother Ballenger is presenting theories that cannot be substantiated by the Word of God,” Ellen White replies to Roy Adams’ statement. “It will be one of the great evils that will come to our people to have the Scriptures taken out of their true place and so interpreted as to substantiate error that contradicts the light and the Testimonies that God has been giving us for the past half century.” (Manuscript Release, S 59, 1905, page 409, emphasis supplied).

“Ballenger’s stress on the atonement at the cross and on Christ’s entry into the most holy place at His ascension,” Adams stated, “maybe retained and shown to be compatible with the notion of an antitypical day of atonement commencing in 1844. . . .” (ibid., The Sanctuary Doctrine, page 255, emphasis supplied).

In a biography of M. L. Andreasons a publishers note which erroneously states,

“While denominational literature has adopted the phrase ‘the benefits of His atonement,’ every effort is put forth to make clear to the world that Seventh-day Adventists believe that an important part of the atonement is taking place in the heavenly sanctuary.” (Virginia Steinweg, Without Fear or Favor, 1979, Review and Herald Publishing Company, page 183, emphasis supplied). This statement is just not true.

Seventh-day Adventist Church literature does not make “every effort. . .to make clear to the world that Seventh-day Adventists believe that an important part of the atonement is taking place in the heavenly sanctuary.” The heresy has been advanced in the new *27 Statement of Fundamental Beliefs*.

Is the book of Hebrews a problem for Seventh-day Adventist’s?

Table 1 SANCTUARY TERMINOLOGY IN HEB 9:1-10

Ref.	Term	Literally	Aramaic Peshitta
FIRST APARTMENT			
9:2	Skene.....he prote	The first tent	The first tabernacle
9:2	Hagia	Holies	The sanctuary

The Aramaic Peshitta translation agrees with the position of this paper. It is taken from the

9:6	Ten proten skenen	The first tent	Outer tabernacle
SECOND APARTMENT			
9:3	Skene	Tent	Tabernacle
9:3	Hagia hagion	Holies of Holies	The Holy of Holies
9:7	Ten deuteran(skenen)	The second (tent)	Inner Tabernacle
OTHER SANCTUARIES			
9:1	Hagion kosmikon	Earthly sanctuary	Earthly Sanctuary
9:8	Ton hagion	Of the holies	To the Holy Things
9:8	Tes protes skenes	The first tent	First Tabernacle

NOTE: In citing Heb 9:7 I have supplied the word skenen "tent" from context.

As regards the two terms from Heb 9:8, I have separated them from the references to the earthly sanctuary as being on a different level, which they obviously are, and have put them together as being counterparts of each other without creating a fourth category. We return to vs. 8 below.

In vss. 11-28 at least this much is clear: One group of passages describes earthly things (whatever those things are) and another group describes heavenly things (again without saying what they are in advance). See table 2.

Table 2 SANCTUARY TERMINOLOGY IN HEB 9:11-28

ef	Term	Literally	Aramaic Peshitta
Things on Earth			
9:21 9:24	ten skenen eis cheiropoieta antitupa	the tent into hand-made holies copy	The Tabernacle Sanctuary that was made by hands
Things in Heaven			
9:11 9:12 9:24	tes meizonos kai teleioteris skenes ou cheiropoieta ta hagia ton alethinon [hagion]	of the greater and more perfect tent not hand-made the holies of the true [holies]	The great and perfect tabernacle not made by hands The Sanctuary of that True Sanctuary
Other: Apartments			
:25	ta hagia	the holies	The Sanctuary

What does the text mean? In table 2, one of two references to things on earth uses skene "tent" (see vss. 8, 21) and two of three references to things in heaven use ta hagia "the holies" (see vss. 8, 12). But in vs. 24 the "man-made sanctuary" is called ta hagia and in vs. 11 the "greater and more perfect tabernacle" is called skene. **Thus, unless we give the "greater and more perfect tabernacle" an earthly application or the "manmade sanctuary" a heavenly application, we will have to conclude that the terms hagion and skene are being used interchangeably.**

In vss. 1-10 the distinction is primarily between apartments, whereas in vss. 11-28 it is between earthly things and heavenly things--whatever those might be. The terms are the same in both sections but they are used differently. Thus, in vs. 11 "the greater and more perfect tabernacle skene" is not the first apartment and vs. 12 "the Most Holy Place [ta hagia]"--despite all appearances to the contrary based on its mistranslation in NIV and some other versions--is not the second apartment.¹⁹ It is not a matter of choosing apartments. That is not the distinction.

NOTE: In citing Heb 9:24 I have supplied the word hagion "holies" from context.

The two verses (Heb. 9:11, 12) say identically the same thing. Christ "went through the greater and more perfect tabernacle that is not man-made" (vs. 11). In chap. 8 this structure is called "the true tabernacle set up by the Lord, not by man" (8:2). It serves as a "pattern" for the two-apartment "copy and shadow of what is heaven" (8:5) made by Moses and his assistants. In vs. 12 Christ "entered the Most Holy Place" (NIV)[a mistranslation which is common in the NIV], from *ta hagia*, lit., "the holies"--i.e., the two holies, consisting of -a first and a second apartment, just as in the earthly type. This assertion goes beyond what we find in Heb 6:19-20. There He simply enters heaven. Here He enters a sanctuary in heaven. But we are still not talking about which part of that sanctuary He ministers in first. The book of Hebrews does not address that question. For such additional information we must consult the books of Daniel and Leviticus.

I submit that the following is an accurate interpretation of scripture and the writings of Ellen White:

First, Heb 6:19-20 has in view only the fact that Christ is in heaven, and not His relative location within the heavenly sanctuary once He arrives there. I challenge the assumption that Heb 6 is speaking of what we call the heavenly sanctuary--a physical structure in heaven. On biblical evidence there is a physical sanctuary structure in heaven, but here our author is not talking about it. Even if he were, the distinction between apartments is not systematically introduced until later, in chap. 9.

And second, Heb 9:11-12 tells us the sanctuary, not the apartment, where Christ ministers upon His ascension. That sanctuary is in heaven. The contrast throughout the second part of chap. 9 is between heaven and earth. The same thought carries over into chap. 11.

¹³ These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of *them*, and embraced *them*, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth. ¹⁴ For they that say such things declare plainly that they seek a country. ¹⁵ And truly, if they had been mindful of that *country* from whence they came out, they might have had opportunity to have returned. ¹⁶ But now they desire a better *country*, that is, an heavenly: wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God: for he hath prepared for them a city. (Heb 11:13-16)

Chapter nine divides naturally into two parts, one of which describes, while the other explains,

certain features of the sanctuary. Structurally the dividing line between the two sections comes at vs. 11. Thus, with exceptions as noted below, vss. 1-10 are the description and vss. 11-28 the explanation.

Below I argue that the author uses his terms differently in these two sections. They do not disagree but should be distinguished from each other nevertheless. Thus, to determine what the text of Heb 9 says it is imperative that we keep straight which part of the text says it.

The Greek word *skene* occurs in both parts of the chapter--in Heb 9:2, 3, 6, 8, 11, and 21. In vss. 2, 3, and 6 it obviously refers to the first apartment of the earthly sanctuary as contrasted with the second apartment. In vs. 8 the reference is no longer to the earthly sanctuary and so there is a question how *skene* is used there. The real issue, however, is how the word is used in vs. 11, which in turn will largely determine our understanding of vs. 12

The contrast in much of Heb 9:1-10 is between two apartments. (This is not the case in vs. 8.) The contrast in Heb 9:11-28, on the other hand, is between two sanctuaries--the first on earth, the second in heaven. Human priests minister in the one, Christ ministers in the other. There is an old covenant governing the entire earthly system and a new covenant governing the entire heavenly system--the entire system of Christian worship. Why are these things so hard to understand? The contrast is simple and clear and as distinct as the difference between heaven and earth.

Verse 8 is an isolated example of the contrast between the heavenly and earthly sanctuaries in a section which deals mostly with the contrast between apartments in the earthly sanctuary. Similarly, vs. 25 ("the way the high priest enters the Most Holy Place every year with blood that is not his own") is an isolated example of the contrast between two apartments in a section which deals mostly with the contrast between sanctuaries. But the rule that these exceptions are exceptions to is that vss. 1-10 has in view a contrast between apartments while vss. 11-28 has in view a contrast between sanctuaries, earthly and heavenly.

The primary emphasis in the book of Hebrews is not on what would take place eighteen centuries later but on-what was happening at the time the book was written. From this it follows that Seventh-day Adventists should not try

to use Hebrews to prove that the events of 1844 are biblical, nor should it be used by those critical of the Seventh-day Adventist position to prove that those same events are not biblical.

It is good to realize that there are two apartments (see Heb 9:1-7) but that is not the authors emphasis in vss. 11-28. It is enough here to show that what the Holy Spirit led the author of Hebrews to write is consistent with what He led Daniel to write. These two men had different points of view and expressed themselves differently. But they do not contradict each other.

If the passage simply refers to Christ's being in heaven and does not declare on the nature of His work there at any given time, which is my position, then there is no conflict. The antitypical first apartment is in heaven and so is the antitypical second apartment. Christ ministers in both of them. When He does, in either case, His work falls within the scope of what the author of Hebrews is saying in the challenged passages under review and refutes Ballenger's assertions. I submit that this concept is reasonable as an interpretation of Heb 6:19-20 and is also reasonable as an interpretation of Ellen White's comments on the passage.

Uriah Smith Again the Scapegoat

Once more we have come full circle. Notice how Roy Adams, in his effort to present Ballenger's theories as truth, downgrades Uriah Smith:

“His [Ballenger’s] argumentation, based as it was on solid scriptural indications, far surpassed the value of Smith’s on the same point.”

Roy Adams admits that Ballenger and Smith were at opposite ends of theology on the sanctuary doctrine, “And inasmuch as the two positions were diametrically opposed to each other.” The truth is that Ballenger was “diametrically opposed” to all pioneer Adventists. Indeed, E. E. Andross, who had worked with Ballenger in England, stated that, “He [Ballenger] sees clearly that his view cannot be made to harmonize with the testimonies, at least he admits freely that he is totally unable to do so.” Even Ballenger himself had stated that “there is an irreconcilable difference” between his theories and Ellen White. (*ibid.*, pages 13).

Then Roy Adams, completely disregarding Spirit of Prophecy counsel, states that “Ballenger’s [position] is to be preferred,” to that of Uriah Smith. Adams could have chosen any other pioneer Adventist instead of Uriah Smith as an example of pioneer Adventist teaching on the sanctuary, because Uriah Smith’s writings on the subject are in perfect harmony with O. R. L. Crosier, James White, J. N. Andrews and others.

Notice that not one statement by Uriah Smith was quoted in our presentation of pioneer Adventist teachings on the sanctuary. Many of Smith's statements could have been used to verify his unanimity with other pioneer Adventists. This was not necessary. Any serious research of Adventist history can plainly establish that Smith's writings on the sanctuary are in perfect unanimity with those of his peers. Indeed, Roy Adams in his conclusion admits that there is little difference between Uriah Smith, M. L. Andreason, J. N. Andrews, and other pioneer Adventists. He champions the fact that there was a “radical departure in the area of the sanctuary” from pioneer writers such as Smith, Andrews, White, and Andreason.

“Ballenger’s radical departure in the area of the sanctuary was of immense significance to the purpose of this study,” Adams admits. (ibid., The Sanctuary Doctrine, page 256).

“But while it would be impossible to synthesize the sanctuary theology of these three figures [Uriah Smith, A. F. Ballenger, M. L. Andreason] into a unified whole, it is feasible to build a contemporary Adventist theology of the sanctuary, using their insights, however diverse they are in some points,” Adams reasons. “Such an eclectic approach would need to discard or modify

some features while retaining others with profit.” (ibid., The Sanctuary Doctrine, page 255).

This is the real problem with contemporary Adventist scholarship. They wish to teach truth mixed with error. Why? Because Adventist leadership aspires to join the great Ecumenical movement sweeping the world. They wish to be considered “Christian brethren” by the fallen churches of Babylon!

Roy Adams’ Erroneous Conclusion

“Clearly, this does not mean that Adventism may not learn a great deal from the issues Ballenger raised and championed,” Adams concluded. “His many positive contributions to the theology of the sanctuary have already been noted.” (ibid., The Sanctuary Doctrine, page 256).

“There is not truth in the explanations of Scripture that Elder Ballenger and those associated with him [Roy Adams] are presenting,” Ellen White cautioned. “I am instructed to say to Elder Ballenger [and Roy Adams], Your theories, which have multitudes of fine threads, and need so many explanations, are not truth, and are not to be brought to the flock of God.” (ibid., Manuscript S 59, 1905, emphasis supplied).

Moveable Thrones

“Yet there is an inner conviction on the part of many [new theology] Bible students that the correspondence between the earthly and heavenly sanctuaries could not be in terms of a one-one relationship,” Adams concluded. Smith caught this point. . . . Ballenger recognized it and hurled it against Smith’s notion of a mobile heavenly throne.”

Pioneer Adventist Opposition To Adams’ Statement

*The Ancient of Days, (God,) sets between the Cherubims, in the Most Holy Place. This is where he is sought unto when the National Atonement is made. Where then is His Throne during the daily ministration? Ans. - In the type. See Exo. 29:42-44, and 30:6,36. In the anti-type, Jesus says he sets on his Father’s Throne, Rev. 3:21. John in vision sees the throne in the Holy Place where the seven lamps of fire are. See Rev. 4:1,2 and 5; 5:1,7. God was thereon. Joseph Bates, *Anti-Type or Substance*, page 132. (emphasis supplied).*

Many other pioneer statements on the “moveable throne” of God could be presented. However, only one by Ellen White will suffice.

END OF THE 2300 DAYS: I saw a throne, and on it sat the Father and the Son. I gazed on Jesus’ countenance and admired His lovely person. The Father’s person I could not behold, for a cloud of glorious light covered Him. . . . I saw the Father rise from the throne, and in a flaming chariot go into the holy of holies within the veil, and sit down. Then Jesus rose up from the throne. . . . Then a cloudy chariot, with wheels like flaming fire, surrounded by angels, came to where Jesus was. He stepped into the chariot and was borne to the holiest, where the Father [now] sat. There I beheld Jesus, a great High Priest,

standing before the Father. . . . Ellen G. White, Early Writings, page 55. (emphasis supplied).

“Within the Veil”

In his statement, Roy Adams concluded that,

*“Ballenger’s treatment of Hebrews 6:19,20 is so strong, exegetically, that it has to be regarded as a significant movement towards a closer affinity to the biblical testimony in regard to the meaning of the phrase ‘within the veil.’” (ibid., *The Sanctuary Doctrine* page 245).*

As seen before, Ballenger believed that, at His ascension, and not in 1844, Christ entered directly into the most holy place in the heavenly sanctuary to perform the second phase of his priestly ministry. Pioneer Adventists believed and taught that Christ did not go into the most holy place in the heavenly sanctuary until October 22, 1844, at the end of the 2,300 days of Daniel 8:14.

Contrary to pioneer Adventists, contemporary Seventh-day Adventists teach that all of heaven is a sanctuary, and that “there is no veil at all in heaven – and all of heaven is a most holy place!” (Garry F. Williams, in a sermon at a major Seventh-day Adventist Church).

If you ask a contemporary Seventh-day Adventist minister or theologian he will tell you there is no veil in heaven, no two compartments in the heavenly sanctuary. Some may deny it, but they do believe this to be true. They really do not believe in a literal heavenly Sanctuary, but that “*all of heaven is a sanctuary and a most holy place.*” (ibid., Gary F. Williams). Indeed, contemporary Adventist literature (and the official 27 Statement of Fundamental Beliefs), since the Evangelical Conferences of 1955-56, state that Christ is now ministering “the benefits of His atonement which He made on the cross.”

“I declare in the name of the Lord that the most dangerous heresies are seeking to find entrance among us as a people, and Elder Ballenger is making spoil of his own soul,” Ellen White warned. “Your theories. . . are not truth, and are not to be brought to the flock of God.” (ibid., Manuscript S 59, 1905, emphasis supplied). (MS. S 59).

It will be one of the great evils that will come to our people, Ellen White predicted,

“to have the Scriptures taken out of their true place and so interpreted as to substantiate error that contradicts the light and the Testimonies that God has been giving us for the past half century.” (ibid., MS. S 59, emphasis supplied).

“Let us all cling to the established truth of the sanctuary,” Ellen White concluded. (ibid., MS. S 59, 1905). In 1905 this “truth of the sanctuary” would be the “established truth” presented by Crosier, James White, and other pioneer Adventists.

The contemporary Church is now teaching the false doctrines on the sanctuary that were first by introduced A. F. Ballenger. (See history above, Chapter #3, “Early Ecumenical Concessions”). On the first angel’s message, the sanctuary truth, the Seventh-day Adventist Church is now in apostasy. Is it any wonder that Ellen White, commenting on this “Omega of Apostasy” stated that,

“I tremble for our people.”(ibid., Sermons and Talks, page 341, emphasis supplied).

LINK TO COMPLETE DOCUMENT:

http://prodiscoveries.com/images/stories/SDA-ONLY/THE_GREAT_CONSPIRACY/THE-GREAT-CONSPIRACY-COMPLETE-REV-L.pdf