

The Theology Crisis

THEOLOGY IN CRISIS

OR

ELLEN G. WHITE'S CONCEPT OF
RIGHTEOUSNESS BY FAITH
AS IT RELATES TO CONTEMPORARY
SEVENTH DAY ADVENTIST ISSUES

www.MaranathaMedia.com.au

ARTHUR LEROY MOORE

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the School of
Education of New York University

1979

Note to the reader:

The Author's permission to make this dissertation more widely available has been granted on condition that it be understood that no endorsement by the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists or any of its officers has been sought. We believe, however, that the concepts set forth are worthy of serious examination by everyone-Adventist or non-Adventist-who is concerned with contemporary Issues involving how God saves men and women.

The Publishers

Copyright by

Arthur Leroy Moore

January, 1980

All rights reserved. Reproduction or translation of any, part of this work beyond that permitted by Sections 107 or 108 of the 1976 United States Copyright Act without the permission of the copyright owner is unlawful. Requests for permission or further information should be addressed to the author, in care of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 6840 Eastern Avenue, N. W., Washington, D.C. 20012

Publisher: Life Seminars, Incorporated
302 Stages, Corpus Christi,
TEXAS 78412

Printer: Southwestern Publishing Company,
Post Office Box 9357. Amarillo,
TEXAS 19105

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My pre-conversion efforts to establish some basis for acceptance with God precipitated a search for answers which intensified as I later wrestled with the problem of believer assurance in light of personal weakness and failure. Thus I was predisposed when in 1950 Felix Lorenz very briefly introduced the question of what happened in the 1888 Minneapolis conference, to take a serious interest in the subject of righteousness by faith. Sharpened a few Months later by the reading of A.G. Daniells' Christ Our Righteousness, that interest was further whetted by discovery of Taylor G. Bunch's "The Exodus Movement In Type and Anti-type."

The decision to pursue the study on an academic basis resulted, later in the decade, from a growing conviction that intensifying discussions on several vital issues were producing considerable confusion because they lacked adequate insight into the nature of man. A master's thesis, completed in 1966, "Ellen G. White's Concept of the Nature of Man as It Relates to the Objectives of Bible Teaching," became the preliminary step toward this study.

It would be impossible to list all who in some way contributed to that study or to concepts developed since-these include parishioners and students, who helped sharpen issues and questions, as well as teachers, writers and other participants in dialogue.

It is my privilege to express appreciation for the help of dissertation committee chairman, Lee-Belford, who chose to assume this responsibility in spite of his impending retirement, which meant he had to serve a number of months beyond that time. Also appreciated was the service of committee members Thomas Colvell and Constantine Georgiou, who have uncomplainingly read this study which because of the nature of the issues has been permitted to expand considerably more than the average.

Among those offering vital suggestions was Paul Cordon, who represented the Ellen G. White Estate. J. J. Blanco and David Duffie provided particularly valuable assistance by reading each chapter immediately and forwarding their helpful suggestions while the issues were still fresh in mind. My thanks also go to Desmond Ford, who took considerable time from his very heavy schedule of activities for personal interviews which were both congenial and helpful.

Leslie and Evelyn Fisher and their son Franz, as well as Arnie and Millie Isaacson, offered very special personal assistance by providing a home away from home during those return trips to NYU for study. Their gracious hospitality and loving care will long be remembered with appreciation. Also greatly valued is the kindness of Rogers Wilcox and the General Conference Committee in arranging help at a critical time, with final costs of the study following my employment as Coordinator of Native American Work of the North American Division in July, 1979.

This study has been a family project. Without the financial assistance of my mother, [1] four sisters, and their spouses, the project could never have been completed. Of greatest significance was the assistance of Millicent and her husband Richard Westmorelands who offered an apartment for use during the writing of the dissertation and assumed primary responsibility for the typing. Last, but by no means least, was the assistance and support of my wife, Patricia, who not only provided the only source of income for a year and one half and did a considerable amount of typing, but also, gave continual encouragement toward completing the doctoral studies throughout a period of nearly a decade.

1. At age eighty-three, my Mother has just completed a book manuscript, "Our Rose Haven." For the past two decades, following the decease of my father she has continued their practice of taking into the home students and other youth-of all races-many with special-problems and needs (thus "Our Rose Haven"). This book is designed to encourage others to take a special interest in children and youth all of whom need the love and understanding of committed Christian friends that they may find true meaning and success in life. The stories of some of the approximately one hundred young people "adopted" into the family form the central part of the book. An earlier book, My Son Dan, (Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1978), presented the story of Dan Collins, who was thus reclaimed from alcohol and is now an SDA evangelist.

FOREWORD

Leroy Moore's doctoral dissertation, here entitled *Theology in Crisis*, emerges upon the denominational scene at a time when both its content and its-spirit are urgently needed. Nothing comparable to it has thus far appeared. Several of the issues raised by proponents of the new or "reformationist" theology have previously been addressed, but never with that degree of respect, empathy and forthrightness which characterizes Moore's thesis. It is a model of the fairness, humility and courage with which theological controversy should be carried on by Christian brethren whenever it has reluctantly been decided that controversy can no longer be avoided-as is now the case. One here detects no "drums playing and flags flying." [1] On the contrary, one senses a humble solidarity with the church's Laodicean condition, which in delaying completion of the Lord's work on earth now gives rise to a state of uncertainty and concern regarding how the church is to fulfill Its mission. Moore is convinced that "the message of righteousness by faith has never" been adequately perceived and received by any significant segment of the body largely because the prevalence through the decades of a general feeling that it is already understood and accepted. Any 'all is well' signal would thus betray the primary thrust of this study." He "suggests that 'our' failure to grasp Ellen White's insights is a prime factor in stimulating some concerned Adventists to seek within Reformation-theology the key to the dilemma.

A work of this nature unavoidably deals with published statements and views of specifically-named individuals. The focus of this study, however remains consistently upon issues rather than upon personalities. There is no judging of motives, nor impugning of sincerity.

1. Francis Schaeffer, The Church Before the Watching World, 74.

Chapter II is especially noteworthy in that it reflects Moore's "serious attempt to understand Reformed theology and psychology" and to "walk in Ford's shoes" [whose views are compared with E. G. White's] intellectually and emotionally so as best to understand what he is trying to say," and to feel his concern. It thus affords a most valuable overview of their position at its best, and not as the straw man which it is sometimes caricatured to be. That accuracy of Moore's portrayal-and-its overall fairness-has been acknowledged by Ford, makes all the more telling the evidence which he marshals elsewhere throughout the thesis (but not in Chapter II) to demonstrate the inadequacy of the "new theology" to express-the main thrust of Ellen White's larger view.

Regardless of whether he agrees with Moore's conclusions, the reader of *Theology in Crisis* will obtain a clearer understanding of the issues underlying what may well prove to be one of the most decisive dialogues in the history of the Adventist Church. When we as a people both-understand what constitutes the heart of the gospel and experience union with Christ through the 'Holy Spirit, important divisions among us will cease. We shall then be privileged to participate in the finishing of the mystery of God (Revelation 10:7) and the fulfillment of the opening verses of Isaiah 60: Arise, shine; for thy light is come and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee.

David Duffle, M.D.
Assistant Professor of Health Sciences
School of Health, Loma Linda University

INTRODUCTION

The church of God now faces the greatest crisis in its history in which its unity and even its very existence are at stake. In this crisis hour two forces threaten its integrity. With a focus upon our time, Jesus warned that "many false prophets [would] arise and mislead many"-would in fact, "if possible, deceive the very elect." He also warned that "many [would] fall away," and that a "lukewarm!" people's love would "grow cold." From lukewarmness to coldness-heart rending words! Unfortunately this very condition makes God's church a prey to false prophets.

In our present state these words of Jesus, etched in fire-yet dampened with His tears-words of warning and pleading, leap from the pages of Holy Writ to explain the spiritual emergency we face-today. As we shift from left - foot to right and back again, halting between two opinions, God lovingly attempts to

The Theology Crisis

reach through our lethargy to touch, as it were, a sensitive nerve center, hoping to arouse in us such a sense of need as to cause us to plead for deliverance as did Jacob of old.

How serious is our theological dilemma? Many feel we are merely involved in a pointless semantic conflict and that we ought not be disturbed by it and just go on in our usual way. But others believe our problem has arisen because we have been going on in the usual way for too many years—that we took a wrong turn at Minneapolis which has never been corrected and that the longer time continues without the necessary correction the further off course we will drift. With the succession of each new generation and the ever widening distance from providential guidance in the development of the pillars of our faith and from the special message God sent in 1888 through (Jones and Waggoner) His chosen messengers, we are in ever greater danger of making a “fatal mistake” as regards the truth once delivered to the saints. Looking to our time, God’s messenger said: “I tremble for our people.” (Selected Messages, 1:203.)

To provide a link with the past, God has raised up several men to call attention to the message and, history, of Minneapolis. Through their writings He has been knocking at our heart’s door calling attention again and again to our terrible neglect of Jesus Himself. Our hearts respond within us to do just the right thing, for the salvation of God’s people. Caution is necessary. On one hand we are admonished to press together:

Satan is ever seeking to divide the faith and hearts of God’s people. He well knows that union is their strength, and division their weakness. It is important and essential that all of Christ’s followers understand Satan’s devices and with a united front meet his attacks and vanquish him. They need to make continual efforts to press together even if it be at some sacrifice to themselves. Testimonies, 3:435.

But we are also cautioned: our church-members see that there are differences of opinion among the leading men, and they themselves enter into controversy regarding the subjects under dispute. But He does not call for us to unify on wrong practices [or false principles]. The God of heaven draws a sharp contrast between pure, elevating, ennobling truth and -false, misleading doctrines. I urge our brethren to unify upon a true, scriptural basis. Selected Messages, 1:175.

And again we are challenged: Agitate, agitate, agitate. Testimonies, 5:708. The fact that there is no controversy or agitation among God’s people should not be regarded as conclusive evidence that they are holding fast to sound doctrine. There is reason to fear that they may not be clearly discriminating between truth and error. When no new questions are started by investigation of the Scriptures, when no difference of opinion arises which will set men to searching the Bible for themselves to make sure that they have the truth there will be many now, as in ancient times, who will hold to tradition and worship they know not what God will arouse His people. If other means fail, heresies will core in among them, which will sift them, separating the chaff from the wheat. Testimonies, 5:707.

During the Kellogg crisis the church was warned: The track of truth lies close beside the track of error, and both tracks may seem to be one to minds which are not worked by the Holy Spirit, and which, therefore, are not quick to discern the difference between truth and error. Selected Messages, 1:202.

Concerning Kellogg’s pantheistic ideas Ellen White declared: “I am instructed to speak plainly. “Meet it,” is the word spoken to me. “Meet it firmly, and without delay.” Selected Messages, 1:200.

Commitment to unity must thus be accompanied by, a willingness to meet that which threatens the well-being of the church, which involves doctrinal issues as well as a serious Laodicean condition. But this requires recognition of vulnerability resulting from our having drifted so far from the message given and from the living, vital connection with Jesus intended to result from its acceptance. Every step in our march back to that message should be characterized by the commitment to “lift up Jesus,” who is Himself torn assunder in the division of His church. As we face the fact that the church will ultimately be separated into two distinct groups we do well to ponder the suffering brought to Him by division of His “body” and through the loss of even a single soul.

Many “surface readers anchored nowhere,” we are told, “will be swept away.” To minimize such loss, however, God in His mercy has again raised up a messenger who with great sensitivity, kindness, and love, yet-with perfect candor and objectivity (and with meticulous research) presents the issues before us. Those who have read a preliminary draft of Leroy Moore’s doctoral dissertation see in it evidence that God has ordained and directed the development of this work to provide guidance for the present emergency. The joy of this study has been to discern the working of the Holy Spirit in the lives of others—to see that they have been refining their thinking and experience during this troubled time.

Several denominational leaders have read this manuscript with appreciation, hoping that its study will challenge each reader to examine his own heart and seek his Lord in renewed commitment. The

The Theology Crisis

fundamental issues that have caused the present rift in SDA theology are clearly seen. Though a man of peace, Moore believes that only the truth about the past and an unimpassioned-grasp of the present will give proper perspective to face the future. This book is offering as a quiet contribution toward “pressing together” that all honest seekers after truth must ultimately experience.

God has moved upon some of us who have made a deep and concerned study of this subject to provide a copy of this book to every pastor in North America and In other critical areas of the world-and also to as many laymen as God provides the means to supply. Given the present crisis and-the importance of the influence each has over his congregation, we believe none should rest until he (or she) has digested well-this dissertation and made a firm decision to lead his congregation (or group) in the search for light regarding the principles involved in the closing up of God’s work on earth. Let us do so in a manner to become personally involved in the answer to Christ’s prayer in our behalf. “Holy Father, keep them In Thy name that they, may be one, even as we are one.” (John 17:1.)

I commend to you Jesus Christ and this book which I believe upholds Jesus and the truth as it is in Jesus-the light that is to lighten the world with His glory.

Richard E. Lange, Pastor
Corpus Christi S.D.A. Church, Texas
Director of Life Seminars. Incorporated,

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments
FOREWORD
INTRODUCTION

1. THE PROBLEM

Significance of the Problem
 Related Literature
 Historical
 General
Methodology
 Reformed Challenge
 Ellen White's Concept

2. REFORMATIONIST THEOLOGY

Perfectionism
 Contrary to, Scripture and Ellen White
 Contrary to Righteousness by Faith
 False Eschatological Premises
 Robe of Christ's Righteousness
 Joshua and the Angel
 The Time of Jacob's Trouble
 Enoch and Elijah
 Incarnation
 Example versus Substitute
 Body Temple
Righteousness by Faith
 The Gospel
 Justification is Forensic
 Sanctification, Fruit of Justification
 Eschatological Dimensions
Summary
 Justification (Chart)

3. THE NATURE OF MAN

Historical Backgrounds
Prophetic Call
Meeting Fanaticism
The Great Controversy
Great Controversy Vision Repeated
Health Message Vision
Man's Nature Before the Fall.
 Image of God
 Character Development
 Sovereignty and Self Government,
Control Center of the Body
 Two Centers of the Brain
 Electro-Chemical Communications System
 Cooperation Determines Communication
 Man's Animal Nature
 Body Temple
Man's Nature After the fall
 Faith Relationships Dissolved

The Theology Crisis

- Man's Kingdom Usurped
 - Habitation of Demons
 - Enslaved by Self
 - Higher Faculties Enslaved by Lower
 - Electro-Chemical System Imbalanced
- Image of God Debased
 - Misplaced Affections
 - Sin is Self Centeredness
 - Whole Human Organism Deranged
- Original Sin
 - Adam's Guilt
 - Inherited Separation Affirmed
 - Inherited Guilt Denied
 - Inherited Unholiness Affirmed
 - Echoes of Original Sin
 - Finishing the Reformation

Summary

4. RIGHTEOUSNESS

- The Proud Heart Strives for Merit
 - Works, Vital but Not-Meritorious
 - Basis of False Religion
 - Only Commendation-Great Need
 - Paradoxes-Keys to White's Theology
 - Self Respect vs. Unworthiness
 - All Sufficient vs. Necessary Human Cooperation
 - "For Us" vs. "In Us"
 - Christ's Merits Become Effective
 - When Mixed with Man's Works
 - Justified by Faith But Judged by Works
- Substitute and Surety
 - Price of the Perfect Atonement
 - Perfect Life-Vantage Ground
 - Power in the Cross
 - The Spirit and the Cross instill Enmity
- Great Controversy Motif
 - Justification Restores Relationships
 - Righteous Through the Word
 - Good News or Good Advice?
 - Christ, Law, and Gospel
- White's Covenant Concept
 - Christ, Law, and Covenant
 - Justifying the Ungodly?
 - Covenant Security
 - Reformed Security-Gap
- Restoring the Synthesis
 - Abraham's Covenant Relations
 - Security of Universe
 - Removing the Dichotomy
 - False Ideas of Justification by Faith
 - Negative-positive Elements
- Conclusions-Root and Fruit

5. FAITH OF JESUS

- Science of the Gospel
- The Dynamic of Faith

The Theology Crisis

- The Source of Power
- The Faith That Works
- Probationary Security
- How to Exercise Faith
- Volative vs. Emotive Center
- Motivating Faith, Love Guides in Righteousness
- Christ's Human Nature
 - Christ Was Unique-The God-Man
 - The Second Adam
 - Christ Meets The Big Lie
 - Reformationist Dilemma
 - Immaculate Conception?
 - Is Weakness Badness?
 - The Baker Letter
 - White Echoes Waggoner
 - White Endorses Prescott's Doctrine
- The Faith of Jesus
 - Uninfected Will.
 - Christ was Righteous By Faith
 - Original Sin and Perfectionism
 - Illogical Arguments
 - Perfection Does NOT Mean
 - Perfection DOES Mean
 - Perfection Before Christ's Coming

6. BEHOLD YOUR GOD

- Pre-1888 Laodicean Message
 - Double Jeopardy-Rejecting, Message/Messenger
 - 1882 Portents of Minneapolis
 - Testimonies Slighted
 - Warnings Subjectivism
- Cleansing the Soul Temple
 - Two Temples Must Be Cleansed
 - The Seal of God
 - Health Reform and the Sealing
 - Sabbath, God's Seal
- Minneapolis-Resistance of the Holy Spirit
 - A Living Connection With God
 - The Need of Advancement
 - Call to Deeper Bible Study
- Loud Cry of the Third Angel
 - Laodicean Message and Righteousness by Faith
 - Third Angel's Message and Righteousness by Faith
- The Final Atonement
 - Mediator in the Most Holy Place
 - Investigative Judgment
 - Without A Mediator.
 - God on Trial
 - Soul Searching and Cooperation
 - The Case of the "Wax Nose"
 - Good Advice
 - Satan's Final Deception

7. EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

- Harmonious Development of All Faculties

The Theology Crisis

Highest Education
Science of Discipline
Cooperation vs. Self Centered

8. SUMMARY

9. PERSONAL REFLECTIONS

No Traditional Defense Intended
At the Crossroads
Concluding Acknowledgments
Further Study

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX E

1. THE PROBLEM

The purpose of this study is to derive from the writings of Ellen G. White, a co-founder of the Seventh-day Adventist (SDA) Church, a unified doctrine of righteousness by faith¹ which may help resolve the current conflict within the SDA church and provide the basis for a restudy of the Church's educational program.

Significance of the problem

In a recent work on SDA soteriology, Geoffrey Paxton states:

"We have depicted the history of Seventh-day Adventism as the history of a struggle to be faithful to its goal of furthering the work of an arrested reformation in the contemporary era this ongoing struggle does not lessen but intensifies. Significant features emerge, including polarization within the church concerning what constitutes the heart of true Adventism."²

After identifying the two poles as "the theology of the Reformers," **[Page 2]** and "that of the Roman Catholic Council of Trent," Paxton states, "These two theological approaches to the gospel constitute the polarization referred to above," and adds:

"The modern era of Adventism is definitely different in important aspects from all that has gone before. Hence it is new in a very real sense. . . . The present period of the 1970's is the kairos-time (the time of opportunity) for Seventh-day Adventism as far as its goal is concerned."³

The recent emergence of new soteriological⁴ features has indeed produced what appears to be the greatest polarization since the historic debate over righteousness by faith at the SDA General Conference session in Minneapolis, Minnesota, autumn, 1888, which resulted from a series of studies presented by A. T. Jones and E. J. Waggoner. Focusing upon the merits of Christ as the sole basis for Justification, they warned fellow workers against what they considered a legalistic trend.⁵ Seeing in this emphasis a threat to the law and other distinctive doctrines, key denominational leaders strenuously opposed the men and their message.⁶ Though severe conflict lasted only a few years, intense discussions on righteous by faith continued to the close of the century, during which time White gave strong support to the Minneapolis message by voice and pen.⁷ A decline in emphasis during the first two decades of **[Page 3]** the twentieth century was reversed during the 1920's.⁸ Numerous books, articles and sermons on this topic continued throughout the next quarter of a century,⁹ but the conflict and sense of urgency characterizing the 1898 era were absent.¹⁰

The conflict of the past three decades was precipitated when two SDA minister-missionaries, R. J. Wieland and D. K. Short, argued at the 1950 General Conference session that recent books and seminary theses had so grossly misrepresented the history and message of righteousness by faith as to threaten the Church with a "false gospel" and a "false Christ."¹¹ Calling for recognition of the leadership's failure to accept that message, they urged a repentance which would prepare for its proclamation in power. After studying their manuscript a committee rejected the appeal¹² but did not resolve the questions raised.

Two developments occurred during the 1950's. A theological **[Page 4]** position was formulated by leading SDA's which repudiated the post fall understanding of the nature of Christ and the doctrine of a "final-generation perfection"; and a corresponding restlessness developed among those who believed that both the history and theology of the Church's position on righteousness by faith were being threatened by this new interpretation. During this time, except for M. L. Andreasen's sharp protest,¹³ most dissent was expressed by laymen.¹⁴ In 1955 Robert D. Brinsmead, freshman theology student at Australia's SDA Avondale College, began printing documents and small books charging contemporary leaders with a "reckless abandonment of faith."¹⁵ By 1958, when he discontinued his theological studies, Brinsmead had already initiated the "Awakening." With the help of his brother, John, he soon launched the movement in New Zealand¹⁶ and two young ministers left denominational employment to work with him.¹⁷

[Page 5] Early In 1961 the brothers brought the Awakening to North America.¹⁸ Focusing upon the seal of God to be received at the close of the investigative Judgment, they held that perfection would then result from divine removal of the sinful nature.¹⁹ Three soteriological-eschatological views²⁰ were

evident when Edward Heppenstall, chairman of SDA Andrews University Theology Department, denied the very possibility of perfection prior to the Second Advent.²¹ Some, with him, opposed Brinsmead's sealing concept altogether, while a third group held to perfection as being involved in the sealing, but placed it before the judgment as [Page 6] a prerequisite preparation and denied removal of the sinful nature.²² In 1970, following a decade and a half of conflict, a radical change in Brinsmead's theology stimulated hopes of reconciliation. Approaching denominational leaders, he at first appeared to harmonize with Heppenstall.²³ Conflict with both denominational positions became apparent, however, in his insistence that inclusion of sanctification in the doctrine of righteousness by faith represents papal heresy.²⁴ Ecclesiological factors were also involved in the eventual breakdown of talks; describing his discussions with a committee of nine theologians and churchmen, Brinsmead attempted to allay fears concerning schismatic tendencies:

"We want to make it crystal clear to the whole church that the awakening believers have no intention of ever starting another church. . . . We hope that it can soon be demonstrated to even the most wary that the Awakening phenomenon is no threat to the church."²⁵

Insisting on the validity of the Awakening²⁶ and retaining its leadership, Brinsmead expanded his influence by mailing his journal, *Present Truth*, to all SDA's and especially college students, ministers [Page 7] and other denominational employees.²⁷ Attempting to resolve the growing confusion resulting from this and from propagation of the same theology by Desmond Ford, chairman of the Avondale theology department,²⁸ Kenneth Wood and his associate editors of the *Review* prepared a special issue setting forth sanctification as an article of righteousness by faith.²⁹ Brinsmead promptly branded the *Review* theology "Undisguised Romanism," his subtitle reading: "Is Sanctification the Same as Righteousness by Faith? Rome says Yes! The Protestant Reformation says No! Where do Seventh-day Adventists Stand?"³⁰

A final attempt at reconciliation took place the following December, when Brinsmead was invited to meet with a committee of eight for discussion.³¹ Meanwhile, Ford's repudiation of the *Review* issue as heretical, "lit the fuse!" of controversy in Australia,³² precipitating a meeting between eight Australian and eight American theologians to reconcile differences.³³ In spite of the cordial atmosphere, these efforts failed. "One thing is clear," averred Martin warmly, "a new Adventism is emerging from Australia, and its shape is now quite visible."³⁴ With the publication of his lessons [Page 8] on the nature of Christ,³⁵ Herbert E. Douglass soon became the most visible-target of proponents of the new theology.

Geoffrey Paxton, who describes the polarization and indicates it introduces a "kairos-time", is by no means a disinterested by-stander.³⁶ Before making a month-long speaking tour of key Adventist centers in America, he had already held meetings with SDA groups in Australia, at which he unequivocally identified-Douglass as heretical. Expressing amazement that the denomination should publish his lessons, he charged him with teaching that Christ was a sinner and also with denying His divinity.³⁷

The present degree of openness for discussion despite tensions involved does indeed point to a kairos-time." To seize that opportunity it is vital, however, that discussions be placed on a sounder basis. Participants on both sides reveal an awareness of the importance of anthropological issues,³⁸ but as yet, a systematically [page 9] developed doctrine of the nature of man has never been utilized to integrate the soteriological, Christological,³⁹ and eschatological⁴⁰ concepts which are involved in the doctrine of righteousness by faith. It is hoped that insights resulting from such a study might prove helpful to those beyond the confines of the SDA Church who grapple with similar questions.

Related Literature

A selection of the literature reviewed which is directly involved in the historical build-up of the problem is presented chronologically so as to provide additional cause and effect insight into the issues. A selection of that literature which involves White's relation to the SDA Church; principles of hermeneutics; works not so directly related to the development of the contemporary conflict; and education, are placed in a general section.

Historical

Christ and His Righteousness,⁴¹ by E.J. Waggoner, participant in the Minneapolis debate, presents Christ's nature as the basis for righteousness by faith. His deity, involving full equality the Father, is seen as the only force in the atonement. To limit Christ's deity would threaten the integrity of the atonement, while limiting His humanity would threaten its reception. In order to identify fully with man, the divine Son partook of the "likeness of sinful flesh," which is understood to mean complete biological identity with fallen man.⁴² But, to die vicariously for man's sins, He must Himself possess a perfect moral nature and live absolutely above sin. Through imputation, His perfection of character covers man's sin, exemplifying the righteous character to be imparted through faith relationships. Sanctification, an element in righteousness by faith, is obtained through the personal presence of Christ.

The Consecrated Way to Christian Perfection,⁴³ by A.T. Jones, another participant in the 1888 debate, vitally influenced the development of Brinsmead's early Awakening doctrine as well as the traditional position. Three keys to Christian perfection are: Christ's nature and character, His atonement on the cross and His priestly ministry. Special attention is given to the final work of [page 11] judgment and cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary, which is seen to parallel the cleansing and removal of sin from the soul temple. Of particular significance is the rejection of the Protestant denial of the sinful nature of Christ, which denial Jones identifies with the Roman Catholic doctrine of the immaculate conception.

Christ Our Righteousness,⁴⁴ by A. G. Daniells, first retroactive attempt to define the doctrine and history of the 1888 message, identifies righteousness by faith with the third angel's message,⁴⁵ acceptance of which would have resulted in the loud cry.⁴⁶ Experience, in contrast to theology, characterizes the message which uplifts Christ as the only basis of merit and the sole source of [page 12] overcoming power, according to Daniells, who unhesitatingly acknowledges his own generation's failure to realize that experience: "In our blindness and dullness we have wandered far out of the way and for many years have been failing to appropriate the divine truth."⁴⁷ As General Conference president for twenty-one of the thirty-eight years following 1888 (1901-1922) and one who sustained a close relationship with White from 1891 until her death in 1915, Daniells' unique contribution has had an incalculable impact upon all subsequent discussion.

"The Exodus Movement in Type and Antitype,"⁴⁸ a compilation of thirty-six vespers, talks by Taylor G. Bunch, who identifies with Daniells, was also formative in the development of both polar positions. Responding to White's counsel to study the book of Deuteronomy for lessons pertaining to modern Israel, Bunch parallels the unbelief and rebellion of Ancient Israel, which delayed their entry into Canaan, with the Minneapolis rejection which delayed Christ's coming and spiritual Israel's entry into heavenly Canaan.

"Justification and Righteousness by Faith in the Seventh-day [page 13] Adventist Church Before 1900,"⁴⁹ a master's thesis by Norval Pease: 1) is the first systematic study of the history of the Minneapolis conference. 2) Departs from Daniells and Bunch by affirming the acceptance of the message following the conference. 3) Neglects the eschatological issues Daniells considered primary. 4) Surveys the doctrinal history of righteousness by faith since apostolic times, identifying SDA theology with Wesley; and 5) positively identifies sanctification as an article of righteousness by faith.

"Developments in the Teaching of Justification in the Adventist Church after 1900,"⁵⁰ a master's thesis, by Bruno Steinweg, reveals findings similar to those of Pease, but modifies his optimism by a note of uneasiness. Significant to this study are: 1) an extensive review of SDA literature; 2) identification of cooperation as the key to understanding righteousness by faith; and 3) failure to challenge or even note Pease's departure from Daniells, silent evidence of a shift in denominational perspectives.

Fruitage of Spiritual Gifts,⁵¹ a history of the SDA Church by L. R. Christian, far exceeds Pease's optimism, jubilantly describing Minneapolis as a towering mountain which "introduced a new period in our work."⁵² "Some," he expostulates, "have spoken of the Minneapolis conference as though it ended in apostasy. Nothing [page 14] could have been further from the truth. The Lord gave His people a marvelous victory."⁵³ Only slightly less optimistic is Spalding's history,⁵⁴ published two years later. Neither systematically studies the issues and both show weaknesses in handling their sources. Their significance lies in historic-theological perspectives which Wieland and Short sharply protested. These men also faulted Pease for turning attention from eachatological issues and rebuked Steinweg for his part in identifying righteousness by faith in doctrinal terms, contrary to Daniells' plea that it be understood in terms of a personal relationship to Christ.⁵⁵ The importance of this challenge to the ensuing dialog can hardly be overstated.

Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine,⁵⁶ published as an official statement of SDA beliefs, responds to Walter Martin's questions regarding Adventist soteriological beliefs.⁵⁷ Righteousness by faith is not dealt with specifically, but SDA doctrine is presented in that frame of reference.⁵⁸ Relevant to this study are: issues dealt with, historical setting, and impact upon subsequent discussion. M. L. Andreasen's "Letters to the Churches,"⁵⁹ warns that predictions of Wieland and Short regarding a "false gospel," were fulfilled by QOD's departure from the faith concerning [page 15] the nature of Christ and the atonement.

God's Eternal Purpose,⁶⁰ by Robert D. Brinsmead covering the atonement and cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary, refocuses attention upon eschatological issues. It is ironic that Brinsmead's zeal in promoting his sealing message was largely responsible for the conflict of the 1960's while the same sense of urgency directed against his former concept is largely responsible for the intensity of the conflict of the 1970's.⁶¹ Three unifying threads: denial that the message of righteousness by faith has ever been accepted; strong emphasis on justification and a tendency to remove sanctification from a central place in the Gospel.

Movement of Destiny,⁶² by LeRoy Edwin Froom, claims the blessing of A.G. Daniells who, four decades before had charged him to bring out the history of righteousness by faith in all its bearings.⁶³ Attempting to put to rest both historical and doctrinal questions, he portrays righteousness by faith as centering on the "verities of faith," which had been neglected in the interest of "distinctive doctrines."⁶⁴ The nature of Christ, the atonement and eschatological issues are considered central, as Wieland and Short insist, but Froom's prime objective is to refute their charges and defend QOD against Andreasen.⁶⁵ Definition of the verities of faith, begun by Jones and Waggoner, is seen to be completed by QOD, which is thus considered the mature expression of righteousness by faith.

[page 16] *Jesus--The Benchmark of Humanity*,⁶⁶ by Herbert E. Douglass and Leo Van Dolson. Jesus is introduced as God, fully equal with His Father and self-existent, but the prime focus is upon His humanity in order to reach man where he was, Christ is seen to take his nature in its fallen condition, though in no way becoming defiled by its sin. By taking the nature of man and looking to His Father for both wisdom and power in His conflict with temptation, Jesus demonstrated God's plan for giving complete victory to man.

Brinsmead responds: "Another guise of false religion, is salvation by the Imitation of Jesus Christ." After acknowledging that the "imitation theology" appears to recognize Christ's Godhead, he categorically states: "But in the Imitation theology the incarnate Christ is presented as man and not the God-man."⁶⁷

The Shaking of Adventism,⁶⁸ by Geoffrey J. Paxton. This survey of the SDA doctrine of righteousness by faith depicts Brinsmead and Ford as emerging with the only position consonant with Adventism's commitment to complete the reformation begun in the sixteenth century.⁶⁹ Identifying SDA theology as Roman Catholic, Paxton stressed denial of original sin as the key error.⁷⁰

General

[page 17] *A Prophet Among You*,⁷¹ by T. Housel Jemison surveys the gift of prophecy from earliest times, treating its nature, purpose, and manner of exercise. Measuring White's life and work against the Biblical criteria earlier established, Jemison confirms her claim to the prophetic gift. The hermeneutical principles outlined in chapters 23 and 24 will be observed here in analyzing White's writings and in evaluating their use by Reformers.

"Revelation. A Source of Knowledge. As Conceived by Ellen G. White,"⁷² by Frederick J. Harder compares White's concept of Revelation with Aquinas, Schleiermacher, Strong and Brunner. This epistemological study shows that White believed the message, communicated by prophets to be infallibly inspired, but the messengers themselves to be fallible. The wording and manner of communication are thus subject to human error or deficiency as is the prophet. Since God guarantees the integrity of the message, however, such communications bear divine authority. Nature also reveals God, but because of its degeneracy resulting from the fall, and man's inability to interpret correctly, its interpretation must be subject to the authority of prophetic revelation. Hermeneutical insights will be helpful to this study.

[page 18] "The Mind-Body Concept in the Thinking Of Ellen G. White,"⁷³ an unpublished doctoral dissertation by Joseph N. Barnes, analyzes the relationship between White's mind-body concept and the development of her religious beliefs and educational philosophy. In harmony with a holistic concept of man's nature, she was found to see a direct relationship between educational and religious

objectives, each involving physical as well as mental and spiritual dimensions. Barnes does not systematically analyze White's soteriological concepts or address certain anthropological questions vital to this study, but his findings and methodology were very helpful to this researcher's earlier master's thesis⁷⁴ which provides anthropological and educational insights to this study.

The Nature and Destiny of Man,⁷⁵ an historical-philosophical approach to man's nature, by J. R. Zurcher, harmonizes with White's holistic concept, and lends insight to anthropological questions.

*Was Jesus Really Like Us?*⁷⁶ by Thomas A. Davis, holds that Christ took the post-fall nature. Harry Johnson is quoted as saying that "Jesus could assume 'fallen human nature' without becoming [Page 19] a sinner, because in all His volitional acts He was sinless."⁷⁷ Davis does not systematically treat anthropological, soteriological, or eschatological questions vital to this study.

"The Theology of Ellen White,"⁷⁸ by Robert D. Brinsmead, develops White's concepts in a righteousness by faith context. Addressing himself to non-SDA's as a former SDA, Brinsmead proposes to set forth an objective appraisal of her views, neither defending nor attacking them; readers will likely see it as a defense. Systematic treatment is given to many questions critical to dialog with non-SDA's. Issues central to SDA dialog are reviewed briefly and dogmatically. The following claims and assumptions are pertinent to this study: 1) that Christ did not take man's fallen nature; 2) that perfection is not possible, and 3) that a strictly forensic concept of the gospel is implicit in White's theology.

"*Ellen G. White's Concept of Sanctification*,"⁷⁹ by Richard R. Leshner, completed at the beginning of the decade, does not systematically address contemporary questions, but treats sanctification, as an element in righteousness by faith. Findings on White's relationship to the theology of Luther and Wesley are significant.

Righteousness in Christ Alone,⁸⁰ a series of sermons by Morris [Page 20] L. Venden, focuses upon relationships and experience. *Righteousness by Faith and the Three Angel's Messages*,⁸¹ clearly identifies him with the Traditional final-generation concept.

Paxton equates *Can God Be Trusted*⁸² by Graham Maxwell with Abelard's moral influence theory.⁸³ Sin is portrayed as rebellion against a grossly misapprehended God. The cross reveals God's love and trustworthiness so as to remove from man's heart the enmity which motivates that rebellion. Loyalty is the key to perfection and one's standing in the judgment, the prime question being: "Does man trust God enough to unreservedly commit himself to Him?"

Our High Priest,⁸⁴ by Edward Heppenstall: 1). Seeks to allay fears introduced in the 1950's that viewing the atonement as completed on the cross denies the significance of Christ's sanctuary ministry; 2) Portrays righteousness by faith as involving sanctification as well as justification. 3) Denies that the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary involves a cleansing of the soul temple and that the saints will be perfected before Christ's Second Coming. Central to Heppenstall's theology is the relationship between the cross and the sanctuary. A complete, non-repeatable sacrificial atonement on the cross must be made effectual by Christ's priestly [Page 21] mediation of His own merits. Together, the cross and sanctuary reveal: 1) self-sacrificing love as the basis of God's character, which assures faithfulness to His creatures. 2) Perfect righteousness as the basis for an absolute justice which required that God Himself assume the penalty for His broken law; and 3) provisions for cleansing and ultimate eradication of sin from the universe.

Through the medium of the Sanctuary, *Ransom and Reunion*,⁸⁵ by W. D. Frazee, and "Shadows of His Sacrifice,"⁸⁶ by Leslie Hardinge, offer helpful eschatological and soteriological insights.

"The Concept of Character Development in the Writings of Ellen G. White,"⁸⁷ by John M. Fowler, compares White's concept of character development with six educational theorists. Harmonizing on many points, she extends moral principles into spiritual dimensions, holding that, because of sin, adequate development can take place only in the context of faith in Christ and submission to His Spirit. Seeing restoration of the divine image to be the supreme goal of education, she places physical development on a par with intellectual, social, emotional and spiritual.

*Adventist Education at the Crossroads*⁸⁸, by Raymond S. Moore challenges SDA's to a more effective application of White's threefold [Page 21] educational principle. Significant to this study is encouragement of the development of schools designed to place physical training on a par with mental and spiritual.

Methodology

The historical method, as presented by Barzun and Graff,⁸⁹ is used in the study. Subproblems involve: 1) Reformationist Challenge, 2) White's Concept, and 3) Educational Recommendations.

Reformationist Challenge

Primary Reformationist⁹⁰ challenges to Traditional SDA understanding of righteousness by faith are identified and described [page 23] in order to elicit contemporary questions by which to direct the study.⁹¹ The primary source of data is Ford's writings and material he has distributed.⁹² Arguments and ideas have been abstracted in the form of summaries or succinct quotes and placed on a 5 by 8 inch punch-coded cards with available bibliographic Information. Each category was assigned one of the numbers appearing on the card margin. When appropriately punched, the desired card was extracted by means of a rod inserted through the proper hole in a stack of cards which, when lifted, permitted the selected card to fall free.

The data and their sources were submitted to critical analysis to determine their context, meaning, accuracy, consistency, and probable meaning, as each card was studied inductively, category by category. Following a synthesis of ideas, sub-categories were formed and coded and a skeletal outline was prepared which organized sequentially the primary arguments and ideas involved.

With the implications of each argument in mind, the clearest and most succinct data were selected for each sub-category, after which the researcher connected the various ideas and arguments, together in an expository manner so as to expose and clarify issues as seen by Reformationists.

[Page 24]

White's Concept

White's concept of righteousness by faith was examined so as to harmonize her anthropological, soteriological, Christological, and eschatological views and to determine the degree to which these harmonize with Reformationist theology. The appropriateness of basing the study upon White's writings is indicated by their uniform acceptance within the SDA Church as an authoritative expression of its doctrine. Leshner states:

"Seventh-day Adventists accept the writings of Ellen White as the product of the prophetic gift as described in the Bible. With this privileged recognition it is not surprising that her writings held an important place in shaping the doctrines adopted by the early Adventists, nor that they are an authority, second only to the Bible, for the Seventh-day Adventist Church today."⁹³

All parties in the dispute appeal to White in support of their positions. Although emphasizing that she was not a theologian and hence cannot be expected to express concepts with theological precision, Ford nevertheless attests her prophetic inspiration and holds that her basic concepts consistently support his position. His use of White is extensive, some of his papers appealing exclusively to her writings.⁹⁴

For this study, eight volumes were selected for page-by-page search,⁹⁵ as representing her most mature views. This same [page 25] intensive study was given a cross-section of her chronological works.⁹⁶ A topical search of the rest of her published sources was⁹⁷ made, using the indexes. Pertinent data were processed and presented as described above.

¹ "The terms 'justification by faith' and 'righteousness by faith' are often used interchangeably, sometimes applying to justification, sometimes to sanctification, sometimes to both," according to Norval Pease ("Justification and Righteousness by Faith in the Seventh-day Adventist Church Before, 1900," hereinafter "Pease Thesis," unpublished M. A. thesis, SDA Theological Seminary, 1945, 101; Cf. 102). To be examined in this study is the claim that righteousness by faith is strictly forensic, or legal, and that to-

introduce a subjective element is to introduce Roman Catholic heresy; thus not only Is sanctification excluded, but also any subjective element in justification.

² Geoffrey Paxton, *The Shaking of Adventism*, hereinafter *Shaking*, Wilmington, Delaware, Zenith Publishers, Inc., 1977, 82

³ *Ibid.*, 84.

⁴ See this-study, 6ff.

⁵ Arthur G. Daniells, *Christ our Righteousness*, Washington, D.C. Review & Herald Publishing Association, 1941. Cf. 41 with 47-49, 27-40.

⁶ L. E. Froom, *Movement of Destiny*, Washington, D.C.: Review & Herald Publishing. Association, 1971, 244-250 passim.

⁷ Arthur W. Spalding, *Captains of the Host*, Washington, D.C.: Review & Herald Publishing Association, 1949, 298-299.

⁸ Daniells, *op. cit.*, 45-46.

⁹ Froom, *op. cit.*, 375-377.

¹⁰ Bruno W. Steinweg, "Developments in the Teaching of Justification and Righteousness by Faith in the Seventh-day Adventist Church after 1900," hereinafter "Steinweg Thesis," unpublished M.A. thesis- SDA Seminary, Andrews University, 1948, 72, 88.

¹¹ See Pease, Steinweg and Spalding above; L.H. Christian, *The Fruitage of Spiritual Gifts*, Washington, DC: Review & Herald Publishing. Association., 1947. During the 1940's, Church historians and Andrews University theology students provided an interpretation of the 1888 crisis which-while refuting the previously accepted view of A.G. Daniells (*Op. cit.*, 10.), that the message of righteousness by faith was rejected in 1888 and never since adequately accepted-ignored completely the eschatological implications. See this study, 11 for definitions; see R. J. Wieland and D. K. Short, "1888 Re-Examined," 1950, passim.

¹² General Conference, *Further Appraisal of the Manuscript, '1888 Re-Examined'*, Takoma Park, Washington, DC, 1, 2.

¹³ M. L. Andreasen, *Letters to the Churches*, c. 1957.

¹⁴ See especially A. L. Hudson, "A Message and Its Reception unpublished manuscript, c.1959.

¹⁵ Office of the Research and Defense Literature Committee, *The History and Teaching of Robert Brinsmead*, hereinafter, *History and Teaching*, Washington, D.C.: Review & Herald Publishing Association, 1961, 3, 23. In his "Does '1888 Re-examined' Lead to a Rebellious-Offshoot Movement?" Wieland acknowledges that it "inspired Brinsmead with courage to speak out," but indicates that Brinsmead's ideas were largely developed before hearing of "1888 Re-examined," which neither he nor Short ever circulated or gave permission to be circulated (p. 20-21). He expresses disagreement with five elements of Brinsmead's 1960's position, which involve his views on: eradication of the sinful nature, blotting out of sin, order of last-day events, attitude toward leadership, and what he identifies as "appeal to egocentric concern and . . . the motivation of fear which is contrary to the Jones-Waggoner message" (pp. 22-23).

¹⁶ *History and Teaching*, 3-5.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 12.

¹⁸ Ibid., 2.

¹⁹ According to White, a short time before Christ's return all professed believers will be judged. (White, *Great Controversy*, Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press Publishing. Association, 1888, 1907, 1911, 480-489; Cf. Romans 14:10; Acts 17:30-31; Ecclesiastes 12:13-14; Revelation 22:11-14.) Those whose acceptance of Christ proves genuine are understood to receive the stamp of His approval, known as the seal of God: "A brief form for seal of the living God in Rev. 7:2. In vision John saw this seal affixed to the foreheads of the 144,000 as the 'servants of our God.' In chapter 14:1-5 the 144,000 are said to have 'the Father's name written in their foreheads' (SDA Bible Commentary, hereinafter, SDA BC, 10 volumes, edited by Francis D. Nichol, Washington, D.C.: Review & Herald Publishing. Association, 1952-1957, Volume 10, 1163.) According to White this seal represents; not only acceptance by Christ, but a reflection of His character. Thus she speaks of a sealing time during which the saints are prepared to receive the seal. (White, *Early Writings*, Washington, D.C. Review & Herald Publishing. Association, 1962, 71, 48; and *Testimonies for the Church*, hereinafter *Testimonies*, 9 volumes, Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press Publishing. Association, 1948, volume 5, 216.) Regarding Brinsmead's, eradication concept see *Awakening bulletin*, 9/1/72, 55ff. The sealing of the believers was to be followed by the Loud Cry and Latter Rain. See Sanctuary Institute, Syllabus #3, 108-112; for Loud cry and Latter Rain, see this study, 11n

²⁰ This study, 9.

²¹ Edward Heppenstall, "Is Perfection Possible?" *Signs of the Times*, December, 1963, 10.

²² Herbert E. Douglass, Edward-Heppenstall, Han s K. LaRondelle, C. Mervyn Maxwell, *Perfection, the impossible Possibility*, Nashville: Southern Publishing. Association, 1975, 61-136, *passim*.

²³ Robert D. Brinsmead, "The Awakening Message-Then and Now," *Awakening Bulletin*, September, 1972, 15.

²⁴ Brinsmead, "Special issue: Justification by Faith and the Charismatic Movement," *Present Truth*, 1972, 22-26 *passim*. Review editors began more openly to promote what they considered to be the historic view, which reflected much of Brinsmead's theology (at about the, same time he repudiated them) but contrasted sharply with him on key issues.

²⁵ Brinsmead, "Special Editorial," *Present Truth*, August, 1971, 4, Cf. *History and Teaching*, 5.

²⁶ *Awakening Bulletin*, June, 1971, pages 12-24.

²⁷ Brinsmead's theological journal, published in Tweed Heads' NSW Australia and in Fallbrook, California, June, 1971, 12, 13, 15.

²⁸ Ray Martin, (an Australian Reformationist) *Objective Digest Report*, "What is Happening in Australia?" n.d., *passim*.

²⁹ Kenneth Wood, et al., "Righteousness by Faith, Special Issue," *The Adventist Review*, Volume 151, number 20, May 16, 1974 *passim*.

³⁰ Brinsmead, "A Statement to My SDA Friends" n.d., 3.

³¹ Martin, *op. cit.*, 3.

³² Ibid., *et passim*.

³³ Palmdale, California, April 23-30, 1976.

³⁴ Martin, op cit. 7.

³⁵ Herbert E. Douglass, "Jesus the Model Man," Adult Sabbath School Lessons, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists Sabbath School Department, Washington, D.C.: Review & Herald Publishing Association, April, May, June, 1977, passim.

³⁶ An Anglican clergyman who participates with Brinsmead in seminars, Paxton is listed as Editor-at-large in the latter's recently developed Verdict, a Journal of Theology. In the last of a series of three public services held in two SDA churches in the Washington, D.C. area, March 24-26, 1978 (first of his U.S. appearances, he described his visits to various seminaries in behalf of Present Truth, telling of enthusiastic receptions he received by students upon their learning of his connection with Brinsmead's magazine, to which he is a regular contributor.

³⁷ Paxton-address, given to an SDA audience at the Church of Christ, Croyden, Victoria, January 19, 1977, 4, 21, 22, 6.

³⁸ Theological Anthropology must particularly attend to the relation between . . . [the doctrine of man] and Christology." (Karl Rahner and Herbert Vorgrimler, in Theological Dictionary, edited by Ernst Cornelius, O. P., translated by Richard Strachan, New York: Herder & Herder, 1965, 27.) In this study, anthropology relates to the nature of man at creation, the consequences of the fall, and provides the basis for examining the human nature of Christ.

³⁹ Christology means "The doctrine of Christ and, as such . . . conventionally it has been restricted to that branch of the inquiry which addresses itself to the person of Christ, as distinct from his work, which is the subject of Soteriology." (Rahner and Vorgrimler, op, cit., 51.) In this study, Christological issues are restricted to those questions relating to the human-nature of Christ and focus almost exclusively upon whether or not He had a pre-fall or post-fall human nature. Soteriological issues for us largely upon those questions relating to justification and the priestly ministry of Christ.

⁴⁰ In SDA theology, this "doctrine of last things" (Rahner and Vorgrimler, op. cit., 149.) relates to a literal, final judgment followed by a literal Second Coming of Jesus. The emphasis in this study is upon the final judgment and soteriological issues connected with preparation for it.

⁴¹ E.J. Waggoner, Christ and His Righteousness, Oakland, California, Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1890.

⁴² Ibid. , 26.

⁴³ A.T. Jones, The Consecrated way to Christian Perfection, Oakland California: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1890.

⁴⁴ A.G. Daniells, Christ Our Righteousness, Takoma Park, Washington, DC: Review & Herald Publishing Association. 1926, 1941.

⁴⁵ The third angel's message is a comprehensive Adventist term referring to the three angel's messages of Revelation 14:6-12, which, understood to be cumulative, are seen as a single message. (Testimonies, 8:197; Great Controversy, 450.) Announcing the hour of God's judgment, the first is a call to worship the Creator; the second announces the spiritual decline in Christendom; and the third warns against worship of the creature. This message is to be given just prior to the Second Coming of Christ. White identifies righteousness by faith as "the third angel's message in verity." (The Ellen G. White Present Truth and Review and Herald Articles, hereinafter Review, 6 Volume, Washington, D.C.: Review & Herald Publishing Association, 1962, 2:381, 4/1/1890.) "The Lord in His great mercy sent a most precious message to His people through Elders Jones and Waggoner. This message was to bring prominently before the world the uplifted Savior, the sacrifice for the sins of the whole world. It presented justification through faith in the Surety; it invited the people to receive the righteousness of Christ, which is made manifest in

obedience to all the commandments of God. It is the third angel's message, which is to be proclaimed with a loud voice and attended with the outpouring of His Spirit in a large measure." (Ellen G. White, *Testimonies to Ministers*, Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1923, 91-92.)

⁴⁶ Referring to Revelation 18:1-4, the Loud Cry involves special power which augments the third angel's message, preparing the saints for Christ's coming. (SDA BC 7:984.) "The work of this angel comes in at the right time to join in the last great work of the third angel's message as it swells to...[the] loud cry" of the latter rain. (White, *Early Writings*, 277.) The relationship between the latter rain, the loud cry and the third angel's is seen: "It is the latter rain,.. the loud cry of the third angel." (SDA BC 10:1163.) *The third angel's message* is God's last warning to prepare for Christ's coming; the Loud cry is its final, powerful proclamation; while the latter rain represents the holy Spirit's bestowal, which makes the proclamation effective.

⁴⁷ Daniells, op. cit., 6.

⁴⁸ Taylor G. Bunch, "The Exodus Movement in Type and Anti Type," unpublished pamphlet, 1937.

⁴⁹ Pease, op. cit.

⁵⁰ Steinweg, op. cit.

⁵¹ L.H. Christian, *Fruitage of Spiritual Gifts*, Washington, DC, Review & Herald Publishing Association, 1947.

⁵² Ibid., 223.

⁵³ Ibid., 233, 219.

⁵⁴ Spalding, op. Cit.

⁵⁵ Wieland and Short, op. cit.; this study, 11; see also Daniells, Op. cit., 46-61, 75-89, passim

⁵⁶ Representative Group of SDA Leaders, Bible Teachers and Editors, *Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine*, hereinafter QOD, Washington, DC, Review & Herald Publishing Association, 1957.

⁵⁷ Ibid., 7, 8.

⁵⁸ Froom, op. cit., 476-492, passim.

⁵⁹ Andreasen, op. cit.

⁶⁰ Brinsmead, *God's Eternal Purpose*, Brisbane: Jackson & O'Sullivan Pty. Ltd., 1959.

⁶¹ This study, 4-7.

⁶² Froom, op. cit

⁶³ Ibid., 8, 17-18.

⁶⁴ Ibid., 33-36, 181-187.

⁶⁵ See Froom, op. cit., 357-358.

⁶⁶ Herbert E. Douglass and Leo Van Dolson, *Jesus-The Benchmark Of Humanity*, Nashville: Southern Publishing. Association, 1977.

⁶⁷ Brinsmead, “The Theology of Imitation, Is Salvation by Imitation or by Grace?” hereinafter “Imitation,” pages 7, 8.

⁶⁸ Paxton, op. cit., based on his Master’s thesis.

⁶⁹ Ibid., 114-132.

⁷⁰ Ibid., 98-109, 118-119, 123.

⁷¹ T. Housel Jemison, *A Prophet Among You*, Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1955.

⁷² Frederick E.J. Harder, “Revelation, A Source of Knowledge, As Conceived by Ellen G. White, hereinafter “Harder Dissertation,” unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1960.

⁷³ Joseph N. Barnes, “The Mind-Body-concept in the Thinking of Ellen G. White,” hereinafter “Barnes Dissertation,” unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1965.

⁷⁴ A. Leroy Moore, “A Study of Ellen G. White’s Concept of the Nature of Man as It Relates to the Objectives of Bible Teaching,” hereinafter “Moore Thesis,” unpublished M. A. thesis, Walla Walla, College, 1966.

⁷⁵ J. R. Zurcher, *The Nature and Destiny of Man*, translated by Mabel R. Bartless, New York, Philosophical Library, 1960.

⁷⁶ Thomas A. Davis, *Was Jesus Really Like Us?* Washington, DC, Review & Herald Publishing Association, 1979.

⁷⁷ Ibid., 39.

⁷⁸ Brinsmead, “The Theology of Ellen White,” Fallbrook, California, Present Truth, 1975

⁷⁹ Richard R. Leshner, “Ellen White’s Concept of Sanctification,” hereinafter “Leshner Dissertation,” New York University, 1970.

⁸⁰ Morris L. Venden, *Righteousness in Christ Alone*, ten booklets, Arroyo Grande, CA: Concerned Communications and La Sierra college, n.d.

⁸¹ Venden, *Righteousness by Faith and the Three Angel’s messages*, Mountain View, California: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1975.

⁸² A. Graham Maxwell, *Can God Be Trusted?* Nashville, Tennessee, Southern Publishing Association, 1975.

⁸³ Paxton, concluding lecture on Justification by Faith, Rockville, MD, SDA Church, March 26, 1978. Direct identification with Abelard was emphasized by the catch-phrase, “Maxwellian Abelardian.”

⁸⁴ Edward Heppenstall, *Our High Priest*, Washington, DC. Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1972.

⁸⁵ W. D. Frazee, *Ransom and Reunion*, Nashville, Tennessee, Southern Publishing Association, 1977.

⁸⁶ Leslie Hardinge, “Shadows of His Sacrifice,” n.d.

⁸⁷ John M. Fowler, "The Concept of Character Development in the Writings of Ellen G. White," hereinafter "Fowler Dissertation," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Andrews University, 1977.

⁸⁸ Raymond S. Moore, *Adventist Education at the Crossroads*, Mountain View, California, Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1976.

⁸⁹ Jacques Barzun, Henry F. Graff, *The Modern Researcher*, New York; Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1957.

⁹⁰ Reformationist here refers to an SDA interpretation of a branch of Reformation theology which, claiming to authentically represent the sixteenth-century Reformers, identifies its specific formulations with the Articles of Concord. In his sympathetic review of Paxton's *Shaking*, Ford asserts that his positions "cohere perfectly with the Formula of Concord prepared a few years after Luther's death." ("The Truth of Paxton's Thesis," *Spectrum* College Place, WN: Association of Adventist Forums, July, 1978, Volume 9, 41.) Of the Articles of Concord, Brinsmead declares: "This statement on righteousness by faith is one of the great classics in the history of the Christian Church." ("An Answer to 'Conflicting Concepts of Righteousness by Faith in the SDA Church'," Sydney: Wittenberg Steam Press Publishing Association, 1976.) For a brief history of the Articles see this study, Appendix A. The Reformationist position is traceable to James Buchanan, whose *The Doctrine of Justification* (1867) is cited by Ford as "The greatest classic in print on this topic." (Documents From the Palmdale Conference on Righteousness by Faith, hereinafter *Documents*, a collection of the [Ford and Salom] papers presented by the Palmdale, California meeting of April 23-36, 1976, privately reproduced and circulated by Jack Walker, Goodlettsville, Tennessee, August 2, 1976, page 2). A contemporary exponent of this view is F.F. Bruce, Rylands Professor (Emeritus) of Biblical Criticism and Exegesis, university of Manchester, Ford's major doctoral professor. All other SDA positions on righteousness by faith contain the subjective element, and are here referred to as Traditional.

⁹¹ Advocated first in Australia by Brinsmead and Ford during the early 1970's and, following a period of insemination by way of Brinsmead's *Present Truth*, this view has been vigorously promoted in the U.S. by Ford; the primary Reformationist charge is that the doctrine of righteousness by faith has been confused in the SDA Church by the denial of the doctrine of original sin. This, they hold, has given rise to three related heresies: a) that the gospel includes sanctification as well as justification; b) that the Christ took the fallen nature of Adam; and c) a "final generation" must develop perfect characters before Christ's return.

⁹² See this Study, Bibliography Section B.

⁹³ Leshar Dissertation, 8.

⁹⁴ *Documents*, 42ff.

⁹⁵ The first five entries are known collectively as The Conflict of the Ages series:

- a) Ellen G. White, *Patriarchs and Prophets*, Mountain View, California, Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1890, 1913.
- b) Ellen G. White, *Prophets and Kings*, Mountain View, California: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1917.
- c) Ellen G. White, *The Desire of Ages*, Mountain View, California: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1898, 1946.
- d) Ellen G. White, *The Acts of the Apostles*, Mountain View, California: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1911.
- e) Ellen G. White, *The Great Controversy Between Christ and Satan*, hereinafter *Great Controversy*, Mountain View, California: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1911 ed. (minor changes from 1888 ed.).
- f) Ellen G. White, *Thoughts From the Mount of Blessing*, herein- after *Mount of Blessing*, Mountain View, California: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1896, 1956.
- g) Ellen G. White, *Christ's Object Lessons*, Mountain View, California: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1900, 1941.

h) Ellen G. White, *The Ministry of Healing*, Mountain View, California: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1905, 1946.

⁹⁶ The three chronological works, which follow, span a period of 64 years:

- a) Ellen G. White, *The Ellen G. White Present Truth and Review and Herald Articles*, hereinafter *Review*, 6 volumes, Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1962.
- b) Ellen G. White, *Signs of the Times Articles*, hereinafter *Signs*, 4 volumes, Mountain View, California: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1974.
- c) Ellen G. White, *Testimonies for the Church*, hereinafter *Testimonies*, 9 volumes, Mountain View, California: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1948.

⁹⁷ *Comprehensive Index to the Writings of Ellen G. White*, 3 volumes, Mountain View, California, Pacific Press Publishing Association., 1962; *Subject Index to the Ellen G. White Periodical Articles*, 2 Volumes, Washington, D.C.: Ellen G. White Estate, Incorporated, hereinafter, *White Index*.

2. REFORMATIONIST THEOLOGY

Reformationist theologians¹ have a strong sense of urgency concerning the message rejected at Minneapolis in 1888, which they identify with the Third Angel's Message² and the loud cry³ and which they believe has never since "been fully understood or received."⁴ "The very destiny of the church" is seen to hang on "Righteousness by Faith which alone can clothe the naked Laodiceans and prepare the remnant for glory as well as enable them to warn the world."⁵ Indeed, White's statement in 1893 that Christ could have come before that time had the message been accepted in 1888 is seen to indict Adventists with responsibility for both world wars and the numerous small ones since that time.⁶

[Page 27] The key to the "debacle at Minneapolis," according to Ford, was failure to clearly distinguish between the law as a standard and the law as a method of salvation. This resulted from a "wrong understanding of the relationship between the law and the Gospel."⁷ The primary contention is seen to have centered in the question of which law Paul, in Galatians, so forcefully declares to be entirely excluded from justification.

In response to strong antinomian insistence that these passages in Galatians and similar ones in Romans prove the law was done away with at the cross, Adventists had developed extensive arguments to prove the law in question was the ceremonial law.⁸

Convinced that Paul was opposing the concept that man could in any wise merit salvation by keeping the law, Waggoner editorialized in the *Signs of the Times* that the law in question was the moral law. Alarmed, General Conference president George I. Butler circulated a pamphlet⁹ in 1886 to disprove Waggoner and support the ceremonial law concept. Waggoner's delayed response, which "was designed only for those in whose hands Elder Butler's pamphlet on Galatians was placed and perhaps a few others whose minds have been specially exercised on the subject,"¹⁰ completed the stage for the 1888 debate, according to Ford, who states:

[Page 28] "The Jones-Waggoner position therefore, that the issue in Galatians was not over the ceremonial law, but over the principle of the law itself was anathema."¹¹

Initially uncertain regarding the law in Galatians, White was "wholeheartedly in agreement" with the Waggoner position "that salvation could never be by the law," and repeatedly warned against "the great peril of legalism," according to Ford, who notes her later assessment that "both the ceremonial law and the moral code of ten commandments were involved," but that the apostle is speaking especially of the moral law."¹² He sees two factors preventing Adventist leaders from accepting this vital concept:

"...An imperfect recognition of human sinfulness as it exists both before and after conversion, and therefore "the impossibility of fallen man meriting anything by his own best efforts" and an imperfect recognition of man since the fall fulfilling it without the imputed righteousness of Christ."¹³

Belief "that justification has to do with pre-conversion works and that after conversion our efforts must establish our acceptance with God,"¹⁴ are two consequent misconceptions. All such errors are seen to involve man's standing, rather than his state, false concepts of sanctification invariably springing from inadequate views of justification. Based upon "earned acceptance" and "meritorious faith," these views are nourished by the "innate depravity" of a human nature which masks the depths of the sin problem while demanding the assumption of some measure of merit for human effort.¹⁵ Paxton repeatedly voices the Reformationist conviction that the rejection of righteousness by faith at Minneapolis, and subsequently, [Page 29] has resulted from rejection of the historic doctrine of original sin. Moreover, he specifically identifies original sin as that "foundational principle of Reformation theology" by which the present "breakthrough" within Adventism has come.¹⁶

To understand the intensity of Reformationist efforts to challenge all members of the Adventist Church to share in that break through, it is important to note their conviction that "a single false teaching vitiates the entire doctrine" of righteousness by faith, and that even in the absence of false teaching, one's entire theology is wrong unless he "rightly distinguishes the law and gospel from each other."¹⁷ Belief that both the destiny of the Church and its preparation of the world for Christ's long-delayed second advent

hinge upon a true conception of righteousness by faith, demands the commitment of every effort to expose what is seen as serious confusion regarding this heart of the gospel.

Affirmation of the doctrine of original sin¹⁸ underlies each of the three primary challenges to traditional Adventist theology: 1) repudiation of perfectionism, 2) denial of Christ's assumption of sinful flesh, and 3) restriction of the doctrine of justification by faith to strictly forensic, objective factors.

[Page 30]

Perfectionism

"First to openly advocate no perfection in the believer until the Second Advent of Christ was Heppenstall," who, considering such a concept to be "inimical to salvation by grace alone," confronted Brinsmead's emphasis upon perfection.¹⁹ Sharing Heppenstall's "repudiation of the possibility of moral perfection in this life," as corollary to the doctrine of original sin,²⁰ Ford's writings strongly affirm the validity of Paxton's declaration:

"Ford has set his face against the perfectionism of contemporary Adventism as a false gospel which is inimical to the movement's goal of finishing the work of an arrested Reformation."²¹

Following Heppenstall's denial of the doctrine of perfection before Christ's coming and his labeling it as perfectionist.²² Ford insists that: 1) It is contrary to both scripture and White; 2) It is contrary to the doctrine of righteousness by faith; 3) It involves dualistic concepts; and 4) It rests upon false eschatological premises.

Contrary to Scripture and White

Stating unequivocally that "the chimera of sinlessness in this life is not a New Testament hope,"²³ [Page 31] Ford exhibits Heppenstall's argument from New Testament usage and from White that the invariable meaning of perfection is maturity, or being fully equipped, and that, sinlessness is never intended.²⁴ White's abhorrence of the "holy flesh" doctrine and her protests against any claim to sinlessness are stressed, including her assertion: "If those who speak so freely of perfection in the flesh could see things in the true light, they would recoil with horror from their presumptuous ideas."²⁵ Moreover, her references to deep-seated sinful motives which pollute even good actions are linked with statements concerning sanctification and character development as continuing until Christ's second coming.²⁶

White's repeated insistence that Christ's image must be fully reflected is interpreted by her claims that in copying the pattern we can never equal it,²⁷ and that "an excellence of character [is] found in Him, which never had been found, neither could be, in another."²⁸ White's representation of the Apostle Paul as an example of Christian perfection is shown in the context of his own disclaimer of having reached a state of sinlessness and White's insistence that he had to war daily against his own sinful nature. Ford asks:

[Page 32] "According to Ellen White, Paul attained the ideal point of a perfect man. Perfect? Was he so beyond this world in nature and life that we would have felt uncomfortable in his presence? Was he so above the world as never to be tossed and stirred by sorrow and trial?"²⁹

White is appealed to in each of the following arguments:

Contrary to Righteousness by Faith

Perfection is seen to be so contrary to the depravity of human nature and the absolute demands of a righteous law as to require denial of the doctrine of original sin and for the infinite perfection of God's

law to believe in it.³⁰ While sin involves guilt, reducing as in Eden, absolute righteousness in thought and motive as well as man's capacities, the law's demands upon the sinner remain the same in deed.³¹

The very effort to attain perfection is seen to result in legalism, a denial of the principle of righteousness by faith and an encouragement to pride and self-centeredness, the essence of sin.³²

The only perfect righteousness is the free gift of Christ's own **[Page 33]** righteousness. Any effort to merit or acquire it on any other basis denies the validity and sufficiency of the gift and results in "works of righteousness." Thus, the only route to perfection is through the Imputed righteousness of Christ.³³ To associate it with sanctification is seen to deny White's claim that sanctification is the work of a lifetime and that "repentance will be our meat and drink until the resurrection."³⁴

The effort to reconcile perfection with the sinful nature, identifying the sinful nature with the body and perfectability with the mind, is categorically refuted as representing dualism. The Biblical teaching of the unity of man forbids any such dualism, declares Ford, who continues:

"Propensities are realized only in the mind and it is not possible for one part of man's nature to be depraved and another not. Any such dichotomy of nature as proposed by these theorists is completely unbiblical."³⁵

False Eschatological Premises

The traditional concept of perfection involves the revelation of God's character through His people in such a marked manner as to fully exonerate God of all Satanic charges of being a selfish God who uses His creatures for His own benefit and of having a law **[Page 34]** which cannot be kept. Thus any effective denial of perfection must inevitably deal with this central eschatological nerve, referred to by Paxton as "the doctrine of the perfecting of the final generation [which] stands near the heart of Adventist theology."³⁶

Any concept requiring a final generation perfection different from that required in all ages represents dispensationalism; while salvation based upon character development represents legalism, according to Ford who warns:

"We need to beware of the error of dispensationalism which has generations of men saved according to different standards and of a kindred error which contemplates salvation as dependent upon a long process of character development which finally attains to perfection."³⁷

Four Biblical types represented by White as symbolic of the perfection required of the "final generation" are considered:

Robe of Christ's Righteousness

The following caution, with which Ford initiates his paper on "The Wedding Garment," aptly applies to each of the four points:

"First of all it should be stressed that any theological argument which draws heavily upon the imagery of the parable is immediately suspect. In all ages interpreters have agreed that doctrine should not be proved from parables though it may be illustrated thereby."³⁸

Concerning one of White's primary references to the wedding garment, Ford comments:

"Notice that Ellen White in discussing the judgment speaks of an examination of the books of record to determine who, through repentance of sin and faith in Christ are entitled to the benefits of his atonement.' (G.C. 422). Therefore, we should not for a moment suppose that it is our inherent **[Page 35]** character or our outward good works which earn for us acceptance in the judgment. On page 428 of G.C. Ellen White speaks about the same parable in Matthew 22 and there speaks of the wedding garment as 'the spotless robe of character washed and made white in the blood of the lamb. It is stressed

The Theology Crisis

that our 'spiritual sacrifices' are accepted of God through Jesus Christ' that is, through his merits alone, the merits of his shed blood."³⁹

By thus contrasting the atonement and the shed blood with "our inherent character or our outward good works which earn for us acceptance in the judgment," Ford seeks to show that the terms of the judgment are identical to those of justification--the forensic declaration of righteousness by virtue of Christ's perfect life and vicarious death. He acknowledges that the robe also represents "a holy character," but only on a secondary basis and "not a character viewed apart from Christ's imputed merits."⁴⁰

Regarding White's comment on Philippians 3:9 that Paul "ever kept before him the ideal to be attained, and this ideal he strove to reach by willing obedience to the law of God, his words, his practices, his passions, all were brought under the control of the Spirit of God," Ford declares:

"In order to rightly interpret E.G. White here we must take into account the fact that righteousness is not only a gift imputed immediately upon the acceptance of Christ but also an eschatological goal attained only in the judgment when the heavenly gift of acquittal at justification is ratified eternally."⁴¹

The wedding garment is thus understood as being conditionally received in justification, subject to the final eschatological decision of the heavenly Judge. This eternal ratification follows an examination of the books of record to determine whether the [Page 36] individual continued to receive the imputed merits of Christ.

Most arguments for imputed righteousness as the sole basis for this eschatological act involve White's reference to "that robe of perfect righteousness woven in the loom of heaven and in which there is not one stitch of human devising."⁴²

Joshua and the Angel

A special application of the robe involves Joshua, the high priest, who is seen "standing before the angel of the Lord, and Satan standing at his right hand to resist him." Satan is rebuked, and the order given. "Take away the filthy garments . . . and I will clothe thee with change of raiment."⁴³ White repeatedly applies this prophetic Imagery to the final generation, indicating that God's people will be forever cleansed of sin. After contrasting her treatment of the robe of Matthew 22 with her commentary on Joshua and the Angel, Ford states:

"But here the people of God who are to be ultimately accepted and who have embraced the gospel invitation are viewed not in a perfect robe prepared by the King but in filthy garments which are said to be "their defective characters" p. 470. Each believer is said to stand before God in his sin-stained garment confessing his guilt. (p. 471.)"

He then quotes Ellen White:

"While we should realize our sinful condition, we are yet [Page 37] to rely upon Christ as our righteousness, our sanctification and redemption. We cannot answer the charge of Satan against us. Christ alone can make an effectual plea on our behalf. He is able to silence the accuser with arguments founded not upon our merits, but on his own. (Page 472)"⁴⁴

As to White's statement that "the spotless robe of Christ's righteousness is placed upon the tried, tempted, yet faithful children of God," Ford states:

The reason why Ellen White can picture the saints as coming into the judgment clad in beautiful wedding garments (Christ Object Lessons, page 310) but also in filthy garments (5 Testimonies 470, 475), is made clear by her statements elsewhere such as the following: "In ourselves we are sinners, but in Christ we are righteous."

The Theology Crisis

(1 Selected Messages, page 394) “He does not see in us the vileness of the sinner, but the likeness of His Son in whom we believe.” (Desire of Ages, page 667)⁴⁵

Thus Ford uses even this special case to deny the Traditional concept and to prove White is in harmony with the Reformationist position that final generation perfection is exactly the same as in all preceding generations--the imputed merits of Christ as received by faith in a forensic act of justification.

The Time of Jacob's Trouble

Perhaps the most significant challenge facing Reformationist theology relates to the close of probation and the time of Jacob's trouble. Jacob's experience in wrestling with the angel is understood to represent final victory over sin. As Jacob had previously prepared for his trial by deep repentance, so the final generation, it is understood, must prepare for its trial before the close of probation, at which time Christ ceases to mediate for sin in the **[Page 38]** heavenly sanctuary.⁴⁶

Characteristically, Ford strikes at the very heart of the problem, denying that Christ ceases His intercession for the saints at the close of probation. “Many misunderstand the words of Ellen G. White ‘without an Intercessor.’ The context, he notes, shows that it is those outside Christ who are primarily in view.”⁴⁷ Thus, “even after the close of probation we are defective in faith, hope and love.”⁴⁸ The following statement, which refers to Joshua and the angel, is identified as transpiring during the time of Jacob's trouble and is exhibited to prove that “defective characters” and “unlikeness to Christ” still characterize God's people after the close of probation:

“As he [Satan] sees that his time is short he will work with greater earnestness to deceive and destroy. He is angry when he sees a people on earth who, even in their weakness and sinfulness have respect to the law of Jehovah. He points to their filthy garments, their defective characters, their unlikeness to Christ, which has dishonored their Redeemer. All this he urges as an argument proving his right to work his will in their destruction. Christ Object Lessons, Page 168.”⁴⁹

[Page 39] Most significant in Ford's thinking is Ellen White's portrayal of the believers “at the end of the time of trouble when Christ, the great judge approaches.”⁵⁰

But those whose life is hid with Christ in God can say. “I believe in Him who was condemned to be crucified. Look not upon me, a sinner, but look upon my Advocate. There is nothing in me worthy of the love He manifested for me; but He gave His life for me. Behold me in Jesus. He became sin for me, that I might be made the righteousness of God in Him.” (Youth Instructor, May 31, 1900)⁵¹

Thus, to the very last, the believer is seen to depend for His righteousness upon his Advocate.

Enoch and Elijah

A final question concerns White's depiction of Enoch and Elijah as types of final generation who, as the result of complete victory, are prepared for translation at Christ's coming without seeing death. Of this, Ford declares:

“Neither of these men were sinless. Elijah as well as Enoch, was a man of “like passions” as ourselves. James 5:17. His translation was not the automatic result of the development of a sinless nature, but the special reward of his loyalty in the midst of a perverse apostate generation.”⁵²

The following statements are linked to show that White did not teach a special Enoch or Elijah perfection which differed from that which has always been necessary to be ready for death:

The Theology Crisis

“If you are right with God today, you are right if Christ should come today. (In High Places, page 227) The moment we surrender ourselves to God, believing in Him, we have His righteousness. [Page 40] (Review and Herald, July 25, 1899) “As the sinner, drawn by the power of Christ approaches the uplifted cross, and prostrates himself before it, there is a new creation. A new heart is given him. Holiness finds that it has nothing more to require. (Christ Object Lessons, page 163)⁵³

Thus, Instead of a peculiar work of preparation, all that is needed is a continued state of justification as the sole prerequisite for facing the judgment and the coming of Christ. Introducing twenty-two White quotations, Ford makes the following declaration regarding what is not entailed in preparation for the end:

Notice that the following statements make it clear that the perfect love, trust, courage, hope, demanded by the law is not present in the saved saints, and that the complete abolition of every defect of soul takes Place only at Christ's second coming.”⁵⁴

Ford subsequently warns against any interpretation of Christian perfection which negates the great truth of glorification,” which takes place at Christ's coming.⁵⁵ Giving his own definition of final generation perfection as “absolute loyalty” in the final warfare against God's law, he quotes: “Every character will have been fully developed; and all will show whether they have chosen the side of loyalty or that of rebellion.”⁵⁶

As to how perfection could have become so fixed in Adventist theology if White so clearly opposed it, Reformationists point to Jones and Waggoner as the culprits. Failing to recognize the conflict between perfection and their message of righteousness by faith, they are seen to have embedded it in their presentations. Ford's wife, Gillian, responds to the dilemma posed by this answer:

[Page 41] “The question naturally comes up--If Ellen White on the one hand takes the Reformation stand, how can she support Waggoner on the other hand when he has elements which are more Catholic in theology than Reformation. How can this be reconciled? 1. Waggoner's teachings were not fully developed at Minneapolis. As the years went on he defected into a type of Pantheism, which is really a version of perfectionism.”⁵⁷

Meanwhile, Paxton sees Daniells⁵⁸ as transmitting the Jones-Waggoner error, while Ford indicts the late M. L. Andreasen, who taught that “in order to become one of the 144,000 we must successfully overcome our sinful natures as he believed Christ to have done.”⁵⁹ [sic] Douglass and Wieland are identified as contemporary champions of perfection.⁶⁰

Incarnation

Ford sets forth the Apostle Paul as the theologian of the incarnation as well as of righteousness by faith and finds this very logical since each provides the key to the other, neither being independently understandable.⁶¹ In countering the traditional view of Romans 8:3, a crucial Pauline text which speaks of Christ's coming “in the likeness of sinful flesh,” Ford declares: “‘likeness’ never means ‘sameness.’ According to Philippians 2:7 He was made ‘in the likeness of men’ but he was not just a man, but the God man.”⁶²

The emphasis above is not intended to imply a conflict regarding the divinity of Christ. Notwithstanding Brinsmead's charge [Page 42] that Douglass effectively denies the divinity of Christ,⁶³ Ford acknowledges total agreement among SDA's regarding His divinity and the relations between His divine and human nature.⁶⁴ Thus the point in tension involves only the integrity of human nature itself, centering in the significance of “in the likeness of sinful flesh.” “What merits there be in Christ's life and death depends [sic] upon who and what He was,” observes Ford, and quotes White that “Man could not atone for man. His sinful fallen condition would constitute him an imperfect offering, an atoning sacrifice of less value than Adam before his fall.” Hence His divine nature, which was “equal with God,” and met

the demands of the divine law which is as sacred as God Himself.”⁶⁵ must be connected with a sinless human nature, else it would have no atoning value. Although those holding the sinful flesh concept are careful to differentiate between Christ’s flesh and His mind, thus insisting that in thought processes and in character development Christ was absolutely sinless, Ford denies this distinction:

“Some among us have wished to have a Christ who experienced evil propensities in His flesh but not in his mind. The Biblical teaching of the unity of man forbids any such dualism. Propensities are realized only in the mind and it is, not possible for one part of man’s nature to be depraved and another not. Any such dichotomy of nature is completely unbiblical.”⁶⁶

Denial that Christ inherited the nature of Adam after sin is necessitated by the Reformationist equation of sinful flesh with **[Page 43]** propensity to sin.⁶⁷ In describing Christ as “the second Adam in sinlessness,” Gillian Ford acknowledges the fact that Christ could have sinned, but that he had “no propensities to sin” and declares Him to be “a new creation.”⁶⁸ She extends the pre-fall concept, that Christ began where Adam began,⁶⁹ to include the thought that “as regards sinlessness, He began where we shall end.”⁷⁰

As the second Adam, He became head of the entire human family. Through faith, we are now legally found in Him and are represented in Him. It is thus considered imperative that His headship be represented in the sinless nature, otherwise He could not represent the human family as perfect.⁷¹

According to the Reformationists, the Adventist post-fall position that Christ took the nature of Adam after sin, results from failure to correct the erroneous Jones-Waggoner teaching that Christ had sinful propensities.⁷²

Ford attributes Waggoner’s, later fall into pantheism to three errors in his doctrine of righteousness by faith. The first two, belief in Christ’s acquisition of sinful flesh⁷³ and the doctrine of perfection, have been noted. The third involves the relationship between justification and sanctification, to be considered under, “Justification.”

[Page 44] According to Ford, White attempted to correct the Jones-Waggoner error on the nature of Christ by writing extensively on that subject in the decade following 1888. This, he claims, was most effectively accomplished in *The Desire of Ages*.⁷⁴

Example Versus Substitute

Ford expresses concern that emphasis upon Christ’s hereditary solidarity with humanity detracts from His substitutionary death:

“These believers talk about Christ having a sinful nature, and then the Holy Spirit so subduing this sinful nature that He was able to live without sin. They say if Christ can do it, we can do it. And there are some Protestants that have made much more of Christ as an example than as a substitute. When they do that they follow the Roman Catholic error which has ever tended to make incarnation more important than the cross, and they stress what theologians call deification, whereby we become little Christ’s and little Gods.”⁷⁵

In her recent allegory, “Enquiry’s Progress,” Gillian Ford identifies Douglass as spokesman for the exemplary emphasis.⁷⁶ Labeling this legalistic, Jones, expostulates: “As if our salvation is based on following the example of Christ’s obedience to the law of God.”⁷⁷ Norman H. Young refers to Douglass’ view:

“The thesis is simple and moving. For Christ to satisfy the required example, he must have taken humanity in its fallen condition.... (H)e committed no act of sin either in thought or deed. How? By the same divine power and means of grace open to every man. Jesus then in his overcoming-humanity has become, to use Douglass’s titles, The **[Page 45]** Model-Man, The Benchmark of humanity. The Model in overcoming. He has in a word “showed us the possible.”⁷⁸

In opposing this concept, Young holds-that to be an absolute example Christ would have to start as a sinner and overcome through the protracted struggle against the experience of sin.”⁷⁹ Regarding White’s

numerous references to Christ's assumption of "fallen nature." Tolhurst insists that she "must refer to weakened physical nature and not moral character or propensities"⁸⁰. Concerning one such statement, Ford declares "that it refers to what Christ TOOK in the incarnation, not to His character development or behavior during life."⁸¹

Body Temple

Gillian Ford aptly describes Adam's sin as involving-loss of the Holy Spirit, with a consequent sense of nakedness and loss of the tree of life, resulting in the onset of increasing decay, lack of vigor, and finally death. Of Christ she states:

"Adam was created sinless and physically perfect., with an ideal environment. Christ was also born sinless, but took on the physical, mental, and moral weakness of the human race. That is, he assumed the results of the loss of the Tree of Life, but not sin, which is the result of the loss of the Holy Spirit. Because of the law of heredity he took on a human nature of much less capacity physically, mentally and spiritually, than did Adam."⁸²

She finds that all mankind suffers both losses, and thus [Page 46] from birth, we are sinful by nature. Sin is a state, rather than merely acting of wrong acts. Our wrong thoughts, words and actions are only symptoms of the true disease inside us. As a result of the limits of our impaired capacity," the Holy Spirit's return at the new birth is "only partial."⁸³ Since the sinful nature is only legally dead, but not actually destroyed, our best efforts at attaining the goal of likeness to Christ seem always fall short, but our acceptance is never in doubt, for it is based upon the merits of Christ, our "middle man."⁸⁴

Proposing that Christ was affected, but not infected by sin, Ford states:

"Thus He was affected but not infected by it. He took the results of exclusion from the Tree of Life but was never without the perfect indwelling of the Spirit of God, where as every other human being is born without the Holy Spirit and must be born of it in order to be saved."⁸⁵

That man, having suffered the twofold loss, is never fully able to overcome sin, represents no insurmountable problem to the Reformationists, for to them,

"The issue before the universe is not whether fallen man can keep the commandments of God faultlessly, but whether "man, as God created him, connected with the Father and the Son, could obey every divine requirement." QD 650.⁸⁶

The key phrase here is "connection with God," which Ford relates to man's original connection with God, through the Holy Spirit's occupation of the sinless body temple. "Because of sin man is seen to have ceased to be a temple for God," but the new birth was intended to restore man to his original position of [Page 47] rectitude (though not completely till glorification.)"⁸⁷

Two reasons why the restoration is seen to be always incomplete are: 1) man's reduced capacities, and 2) the continued presence of the old, sinful nature, which continually engages the new spirit-directed nature in 'deadly conflict.'⁸⁸ By contrast, Christ, whose body was always a temple for God, and the only one whose "character revealed a perfect hatred for sin," was able to live an absolutely righteous life. In so doing and dying, He provided the all-sufficient grounds for saving repentant, but failing man.⁸⁹

Righteousness by Faith

Reformationist theology insists "...that a church stands or falls according to its understanding of, and committal to, the truth of righteousness by faith," and claims that "this theme was the distinguishing doctrine of the Reformation and perhaps the only one where all Protestants were entirely agreed."⁹⁰ Assured that a distinct, clearly defined, sixteenth-century Reformation doctrine continues unadulterated to the present considerable use is made of Reformation theology. James Buchanan's *The Doctrine of*

The Theology Crisis

Justification, which Ford identifies as “the greatest classic in print on this topic...”⁹¹ is quoted by him extensively to prove that the urgent issue is “the righteousness of God,” as distinguished from the righteousness of man, “and to deny sanctification as an element in righteousness by faith.”⁹² White’s support is claimed below:

[Page 48] “Christ was a protestant. Luther and his followers did not invent the Reformationist religion, they simply accepted it as presented by Christ and the Apostles.” Review and Herald, June 1, 1886, 338.”⁹³

Ford acknowledges that she sometimes appears to contradict Reformation theology. Declaring that “the great bulk of E.G. White quotations” do harmonize, however, he warns:

To try to exegete the meaning of Paul’s technical expression “Righteousness by Faith” by means of some instances only of E.G. White usage is quite contrary to:

1. Our denominational position that “the Bible and the Bible only is our creed.”
2. The counsel of E. G. White herself.”⁹⁴

“There is much religion in Adventism that is not New Testament religion,”⁹⁵ declares Ford, insisting that Paul be recognized as the authority for determining the doctrine of righteousness by faith, and that Romans 3: 21 to 5:21 be the norm.⁹⁶

The Gospel

It is the true distinction between the law and the Gospel that has so forcibly broken up the dense darkness of the Pope’s dominion.”⁹⁷ according to C. F. W. Walther, who declares:

“The Law tells us what we are to do. No such instruction is contained in the Gospel. On the contrary, the Gospel reveals to us only what God is doing. The Law is speaking concerning our works; the Gospel concerning the works of God. In the Law we hear the tenfold summons, “Thou shall.” Beyond that the Law has nothing to say to us. The Gospel, on the other hand, makes no demands whatever.”⁹⁸

Failure to clearly distinguish between the law (which they [Page 49] relate to sanctification) and the Gospel (identified with justification) is to imbibe Roman Catholic error,⁹⁹ according to Reformationists. Moreover, each must be given its proper priority. Ford declares that “the cross of Christ justified the law and the character of God better than if all the human race had kept every jot and tittle of the law from the time of Adam onwards,” and claims that “Justification is the most important of the areas of soteriology.”¹⁰⁰

Traditionalists are accused of undermining the Gospel by reversing these priorities, treating justification as of secondary importance. Paxton charges Adventists with reducing it to “mere” justification. Chiding Robert H. Pierson for quoting White approvingly that: “We are dependent upon Christ, first for justification from our past offenses and secondly, for grace whereby to render acceptable obedience to His holy law in time to come,” he adds:

“The tendency to subordinate justification to sanctification receives its strongest representation in the special issue of the Review and Herald on Righteousness by Faith, which, as we have already mentioned, was published by those who wanted to counteract the new-face of Brinsmead of the 1970’s.”¹⁰¹

Paxton’s protest includes identifying justification with forgiveness of past sins. This he considers a denial of Christ’s imputed righteousness to cover the repentant believer’s sinful state, [Page 50] thus dealing with the sin principle, which a perfect standing before God necessitates. Justification, insists Ford, “covers my past, present, and future.”¹⁰² Such limitless coverage involves the horizontal time level as well as the vertical level of quality. Both levels are discernible below:

“One hundred percent righteousness is found only in Christ. It has to be his gift, it can never be our attainment in this life, for sanctification is the work of a lifetime.”

The Theology Crisis

Thus Righteousness by Faith must always mean justification whereby we receive as a gift the imputed merits of Christ we need this justification at every step of our Christian walk, for our own works (even those prompted by the Spirit) are ever defective, deserving only the wrath of God.”¹⁰³

Thus 100 percent coverage, effective 100 percent of the time, is alone considered to be the “good news.” By contrast, sanctification, identified with the law, is considered “good advice.”¹⁰⁴ Emphatically denying sanctification in Paul’s gospel. Ford states:

Such [good news] would not be true of the demands for imparted righteousness. Righteousness by faith is seen to be by grace alone rather than by “blood, sweat and tears which-accompany imparted righteousness.”¹⁰⁵

Justification is Forensic

Reformationists are equally emphatic that justification must be understood as objective and forensic. J. H. Morrison is quoted as saying: “The great Pauline doctrine of justification by faith brings with it the aroma of law courts. It is suggestive of legal proceedings in some criminal case, with a judge on the bench and [page 51] a prisoner at the bar anxiously awaiting sentence.”¹⁰⁶ Carnell’s testimony is introduced that:

“He does not pronounce the sinner subjectively righteous, which he is not, but forensically righteous which he is, because Christ has satisfied the demands of justice on his behalf.”¹⁰⁷

Ford sees two legal elements: the sentence of death upon the entire human family, through Adam, its head, and fulfillment of that sentence at Calvary in Christ, the second head:

“When He died, legally the whole world died. We were ruined ages before. Without our participation, by the first Adam. At Calvary, again without our personal participation, we were redeemed by the second Adam.”¹⁰⁸

The good news declares that all men have been redeemed, that justification has been secured for-all, that the whole human race has been restored to favor with God, and that all sins which could never have found forgiveness through human effort are now cancelled for the whole world.”¹⁰⁹

Two major factors are understood to influence the widespread tendency of Christians to include subjective elements such as sanctification in the doctrine of righteousness by faith. First is man’s instinctive desire to earn merit, which Roman Catholicism and the Holiness Movement are seen to exemplify.¹¹⁰ Concerning the Catholic position, Ford states:

This very point as to whether justification means “to declare righteous” or to “make righteous” was the central issue of the protestant Reformation. Catholics agreed salvation was by grace through faith, but they also believed justification was God’s acknowledgment of a prior infused sanctification, while the Reformers contended that God “justifies the ungodly.”¹¹¹

The second factor is that translation of the various SADAQ words disguises their common root. Thus, “to justify” is the SADAQ verb, while its noun is translated “righteousness.”¹¹² As a result, justification and righteousness have been seen as separate concepts, the latter thought to consist of the former plus sanctification and to represent the making of the penitent righteous. Raoul Dederen denies this understanding, identifying it with the Catholic concept of “Sanctification and renewal of the inner man by the infusion of grace.”¹¹³ To counteract such subjectivism, the distinction between Christ’s work “for us” in justification, and the Spirit’s work “in us” through sanctification is dramatically emphasized.

“To the extent that justification is regarded God’s work in us rather than for us, attention is diverted from grace alone and focused on man, whose cooperation is regarded as meritorious. Instead of renunciation of one’s own works and an utter rest and trust in God’s work, faith becomes another of man’s deeds. Hence man’s life is nothing but continuous exertion, a journey toward the house of servitude, for it is deprived of any assurance of salvation. It also becomes impossible to come to a genuine experience of sanctification.”¹¹⁴

[Page 53]

Sanctification, Fruit of Justification

Dederen’s statement clearly indicates the desire to encourage genuine sanctification by restoring the true meaning of justification. Also seeing this as his mission, Ford is sensitive to charges that he belittles sanctification.¹¹⁵ Conscious of the impact of White’s warning against committing “the error of trying to define minutely the fine points of distinction between justification and sanctification,” he insists that her caution not to “be more minute than is inspiration on the vital question of righteousness by faith,” requires that we be at least as specific.¹¹⁶

To clarify what inspiration does have to say, Ford presents an entire paper on Paul’s theology of justification and its relation to sanctification¹¹⁷ and another on White’s position.¹¹⁸ Repeatedly insisting that while distinguishing sharply between justification and sanctification he does not separate them, he calls upon Buchanan’s testimony that sanctification, though invariably the fruit of righteousness by faith, should never be confused with its root.¹¹⁹

The fruit of our new relationship with God must ever be distinguished from its root. We are saved by faith alone, but the faith that saves is never alone. We are not saved by a mixture of faith and works but by that true faith which inevitably works.¹²⁰

Stressing the certainty of fruits, Ford says, “Sanctification [Page 54] is the inevitable fruit in a man who is truly justified.”¹²¹ And again “To be truly Justified always guarantees our sanctification.”¹²²

But sanctification is seen as relational rather than ethical, though an ethical dimension is seen. Numerous factors influence ethical conduct, some of which are not immediately related to the gospel or its fruits. “There are some atheists that outwardly look more ethical than some Christians,” he points out, “and the reason is hereditary and environmental.”¹²³ Thus, justification represents an objective, forensic or legal relationship, while sanctification, its fruit involves a personal relationship. Justification, solely the work of God and administered by grace alone, without blood, sweat and tears, contrasts with sanctification, which involves cooperation. Ford endorses Walther who states, “God created us without our cooperation, and he wants to save us the same way.”¹²⁴

Eschatological Dimensions

Central to the Reformationist concept of justification is the eschatological element. In emphasizing the “alien character” of righteousness by faith as it relates to the judgment Ford quotes Laeuchli as saying: “Eschatological realism for us is ‘in Christ,’ in faith, in living dependence upon the Spirit of God.”¹²⁵ Thus even [Page 55] in the judgment:

“Repentant sinners are simultaneously righteous and unrighteous. They are righteous by reason of their mystical union with Christ; while in themselves, considered apart from Christ, they are unrighteous. The validity of this construction will be acknowledged by all careful students of jurisprudence.”¹²⁶

The Theology Crisis

Concerning this concept, Dederen states: At the same time, however, the future eschatological justification *has already taken place*.¹²⁷ Hence, the conditional act of justification is treated as though it were already ratified.

Summary

Reformationists believe the destiny of the church and its mission to the world hang on the message of righteousness by faith. Both its 1888 rejection and continued neglect are attributed to the denial of the doctrine of original sin, from which three primary doctrinal errors are seen to ensue, involving perfection, the nature of Christ, and righteousness by faith. Each is identified with Roman Catholicism's "works of righteousness."

The effort to achieve perfection is faulted for drawing attention from the finished work of Christ to one's own efforts. The concept of Christ accepting sinful flesh in order to be a perfect example is seen to direct attention from Christ's primary substitutionary role to His secondary role as example, thus encouraging man to associate righteousness with his own merit in following Christ's example. Contributing to a "final generation" concept, both [Page 56] doctrines are seen to be contrary to Scripture and White; so also is placing sanctification in the doctrine of righteousness by faith, which is thought to substitute man's own efforts for the righteousness of Christ. Not only do man's efforts fall far short of the perfect demands of the law, but even sanctified efforts, which are equated with one's own righteousness, would become the very basis of condemnation in the judgment. The dichotomy involved in prodigious Reformationist efforts to clarify the issues through contrasting definitions of the true versus false-gospel is tabulated:

JUSTIFICATION (GOSPEL)

Strictly Forensic

a. Declared	NOT	Made Righteous
b. Imputed	NOT	Imparted
c. Free Gift	NOT	Cooperation
d. Root	NOT	Fruit
e. Good News	NOT	Good Advice
f. Reformation	NOT	Roman Catholic Theology

Never Work of Spirit

a. Christ	NOT	Holy Spirit
b. Objective	NOT	Subjective
c. Outside	NOT	In the heart
d. In Heaven	NOT	On Earth
e. For Us	NOT	In US
f. In Christ	NOT	Christ In Us
g. 2,000 Years Ago	NOT	Present Experience

(Failure to remove all, elements in the right-hand columns from the GOSPEL [left columns] is believed to represent the FALSE GOSPEL.)

Chapters three to six test claims to White's support, particular attention being given the claim that she recognized and deliberately attempted to "correct" the errors of Jones and Waggoner, who are held to be responsible for perpetuating the false concepts.

¹ This chapter's overview should be held in focus throughout the reading of this study; its perspective is vital to an adequate understanding of the relationships between Reformationists and White.

² Desmond Ford, “An ‘interview’ With Ellen G. White on Righteousness by Faith,” hereinafter “First Interview,” 3, (Ford, 4 #5). For the remainder of this chapter, Ford’s name will not precede his works, as the majority of references will be to him, or to material he has duplicated for distribution. Identification will follow the entry in parentheses, and include Ford’s name, and set and article numbers which correspond to their entry in Bibliography. Section B.

³ “Ellen White, the Law in Galatians, and the Loud Cry,” hereinafter “White, Galatians, and the Loud Cry,” 12, 13. (Ford 1 #9).

⁴ Documents, 2.

⁵ Ibid., 1.

⁶ “Post Palmdale meetings #1,” 2. (Ford 5#1)

⁷ “White, Galatians, and the Loud Cry,” 5. (Ford 1, #9)

⁸ Ibid., 1.

⁹ Ibid., 2.

¹⁰ E.J. Waggoner, *The Gospel of the Book of Galatians: A Review*, Oakland, California, 1888.

¹¹ Ford, Ibid.

¹² Ibid., 3.

¹³ Ibid., 6.

¹⁴ Ibid., 8, 9

¹⁵ Ibid., 9

¹⁶ Paxton, *Shaking*, 98-114.

¹⁷ C. F. W. Walther, *The Proper Distinction Between Law and Gospel*, hereinafter *Distinction*, St. Louis: Concordia Publishing. House, From the German edition of 1897, (Ford 7 #4), passim; see this study, 27

¹⁸ Ford’s only suggestion was the inclusion of White’s statement: “As related to the first Adam, men receive from him nothing but guilt and the sentence of death.” (Letter 68, 1899.) This is examined in context in chapter three.

¹⁹ Paxton, *Shaking*, 105-106, author’s emphasis; unless otherwise noted, all emphasis will be supplied by the researcher.

²⁰ Ibid., 115.

²¹ Ibid., 144.

²² Heppenstall, *Perfection*, 61-68 passim.

²³ “Proving Christianity,” 3, (Ford 6 #8).

²⁴ Heppenstall, “Theological Answer to Perfectionist Doctrine,” passim, (Ford 4 #4).

²⁵ “First Interview,” 10. (Ford 4 #5).

²⁶ Cf. Ibid., 11, with “Sin in Believers,” 1, 3, 7-8, (Ford 1 #6).

²⁷ “A Second ‘Interview’ with Ellen G. White on the Christian Life,” hereinafter “Second Interview,” 5, (Ford 4 #6).

²⁸ “First interview,” 12, (Ford 4 #5).

²⁹ “Paul-Pattern of Perfection,” hereinafter “Paul-Pattern,” 1, (Ford 7 #5).

³⁰ “Ellen G. white and Righteousness by Faith,” hereinafter, “White and Righteousness,” 8, (Ford 2 #4).

³¹ “Nature of Sin, Is it merely the Transgression of a Known Law?,” hereinafter “Nature of Sin,” 2, (Ford 8, #3), To prove the utter impossibility of attaining sinlessness prior to the resurrection, Ford lists behaviors subject to condemnation by the law; sins of omission, forgetting, negligence, sickness-caused by neglect, thoughtlessness, misuse of a single penny or any part of our organism, worry, lack of perfect faith, hope and love, and the “least vestige of selfishness in attitude, desire, thought, word, look or action.” (Ibid., 3, and “Condition of the Saints At and After the Close of Probation,” hereinafter “Saints,” 1, [Ford 3 #2]).

³² Cf. G. S. Loftus, “Justification” and “Sanctification,” Ford 4 #8, #9.

³³ “White, Galatians, and the Loud Cry,” 6, 7, 13, 15, (Ford 1 #9).

³⁴ “Ignorance and His Modern Counterparts,” hereinafter “Ignorance,” 1 (Ford 10 #6).

³⁵ “Sin in Believers,” 8, (Ford 1 #6); Elsewhere he states: “The Apostle Paul desired, that the whole man might be practically set apart for God. Each of the three parts that go to make up a man-spirit, soul, and body-was to be affected. It goes without saying that if the old nature be not eradicated, no believer can consider himself perfect or beyond the reach of temptation.”

³⁶ Paxton, Shaking, 114.

³⁷ “Saints,” 1, (Ford 3 #2).

³⁸ “White and Righteousness,” 2, (Ford 2 #4a)

³⁹ Ibid., 2.

⁴⁰ Loc. cit.

⁴¹ Ibid., 6.

⁴² Christ’s Object Lessons, 311; Ford customarily adds qualifying phrases such as “not even a sanctified stitch,” or “even sanctified devising,” to enforce the idea that sanctification (character development) is specifically excluded by her statement. (Documents, 10; “Post Palmdale #1,” 11, [Ford 5 #11])

⁴³ Zechariah 11:1-4; unless otherwise noted, all Scriptural references in this study will be to The Holy Bible, King James Version, Cambridge: The University Press.

⁴⁴ “White and Righteousness,” 3, (Ford 2 #4).

⁴⁵ Loc. cit.

⁴⁶ See Great Controversy, 423-432, 479-491, 613-634.

⁴⁷ “When Probation Closes: Absolute Loyalty or Absolute Sinlessness?”, hereinafter “Probation Closes,” 5, (Ford 1 #1); See also: Gillian Ford, “The Human Nature of Christ in Salvation.” Hereinafter “Human Nature of Christ,” 54, (Formerly: “The Soteriological Implications of the Human Nature of Christ.”).

⁴⁸ “Post Palmdale #2.11 16, (Ford 5 #2).

⁴⁹ “Probation Closes,” 2, (Ford 1 #1); Additional evidence that Ellen White recognized the need for Christ’s mediation for the ‘saints after probation’s close is seen in her statement: “It is needful for them to be placed in the furnace of fire. Their sinfulness must be consumed, that the image of Christ may be perfectly reflected, (Great Controversy, 621.) Ford comments: “Let it be noted that this quotation appears in the chapter ‘The Time of Jacob’s Trouble’ and applies after probation’s close when the furnace fires of the experience of the seven last plagues consumes the dross of character from God’s people. They are by no means immaculate in nature.” “Probation Closes,” 3).

⁵⁰ “Probation Closes,” 9, (Ford 1 #1).

⁵¹ Loc. cit.

⁵² Ibid., 5.

⁵³ “Saints,” 1, (Ford 3 #2).

⁵⁴ Loc. cit.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 4

⁵⁶ “Probation Closes,” 1. (Ford 1 #1).

⁵⁷ “Doctrinal Decline of Dr. E.J. Waggoner: Its Relationship to the Omega Apostasy,” hereinafter “Doctrinal Decline,” 31, (Ford 8 #1).

⁵⁸ This study, 11.

⁵⁹ Documents, 32.

⁶⁰ Loc. cit.

⁶¹ Ibid., 25.

⁶² “The Sinful Nature of Christ,” 4, (Ford 3); author’s emphasis).

⁶³ Brinsmead, “Imitation,” 7-17.

⁶⁴ Documents, 27.

⁶⁵ Ibid., 26.

⁶⁶ Ibid., 30, Cf. 34; See also G. Ford, “Human Nature of Christ”, 19.

⁶⁷ L. P. Tolhurst, “The Doctrine of Salvation,” 3, (Ford 4 #2)

⁶⁸ G. Ford. “Human Nature of Christ,” page 19.

⁶⁹ A. D. Jones, “That Holy Thing.” (Ford 7 #3; Not A. T. Jones).

⁷⁰ G. Ford, loc. Cit.

⁷¹ Ibid., 4-8.,

⁷² Documents, page 40.

⁷³ “Doctrinal Decline,” passim, (Ford 8 #1).

⁷⁴ Documents, 40-41.

⁷⁵ “Post-Palmdale #2,” 6, (Ford 5 #2); Cf. Brinsmead, “Imitation,” 11; G. Ford, “Human Nature of Christ,” 11.

⁷⁶ G. Ford, “Enquiry’s Progress,” (Ford 9 #1).

⁷⁷ A. D. Jones, “That Holy Thing,” (Ford 7 #3).

⁷⁸ Norman H. Young, “Righteousness by Faith and Sanctification: A Personal Point of View,” 5, 6, (Ford 9 #3).

⁷⁹ Ibid., 6.

⁸⁰ Tolhurst, “Doctrine of Salvation,” 3, (Ford 4 #3).

⁸¹ Documents, 38.

⁸² G. Ford, “Human Nature of Christ,” 6.

⁸³ Loc. cit.

⁸⁴ Ibid., 7.

⁸⁵ “Sinful Nature,” 4.

⁸⁶ Documents, 33.

⁸⁷ Loc. cit.

⁸⁸ G. Ford, “Human Nature of Christ,” 6, 7.

⁸⁹ Documents 31.

⁹⁰ Ibid., 1.

⁹¹ Ibid., 2.

⁹² Loc. cit.

⁹³ Ibid., 3.

⁹⁴ Ibid., 10.

⁹⁵ “Post Palmdale #2,” 13, (Ford 5 #2).

⁹⁶ Documents, 4-6.

- ⁹⁷ “Probation Closes,” 3. (Ford 1 #2).
- ⁹⁸ Walther, “Distinction,” 9 et passim, (Ford 7 #4).
- ⁹⁹ “The Early Loss of the Pauline Gospel,” hereinafter “Pauline Gospel,” 10, (Ford 1 #2).
- ¹⁰⁰ “Redemption: Objective and Subjective,” hereinafter “Redemption,” 1, (Ford 1 #8).
- ¹⁰¹ Paxton, Shaking, 137-138.
- ¹⁰² “Redemption,” 3, (Ford 1 #8).
- ¹⁰³ Documents, 5.
- ¹⁰⁴ “Despite a Million Sermons to the Contrary, the Gospel is Not Good Advice,” hereinafter “Million Sermons,” (Ford 2 #6).
- ¹⁰⁵ Documents, 8.
- ¹⁰⁶ J. H. Morrison, “Justification,” (Ford 4 #1).
- ¹⁰⁷ “Million Sermons,” (Ford 2 #6).
- ¹⁰⁸ Loc. cit.
- ¹⁰⁹ Documents, 10.
- ¹¹⁰ Cf. G. S. Loftus, “Justification,” (Ford 4 #8) with “Galatians and the Loud Cry,” 8, 9, (Ford 1 #9).
- ¹¹¹ “The Scope of Righteousness by Faith: Distinct but not Separate from Sanctification,” hereinafter “RF Distinct, not Separate,” 7, (Ford 10 #3).
- ¹¹² A. J. Mattill, Jr., “Andrews University Seminary Studies-Word Study on the Stem DIK in Romans,” hereinafter “Seminary Studies-DIK,” (Ford 3 #9).
- ¹¹³ Raoul Dederen, “What Does God’s Grace DO?” hereinafter “God’s Grace,” 2. (Ford 8 #5).
- ¹¹⁴ Ibid., 3.
- ¹¹⁵ G. Ford, “Enquiry’s Progress,” 4, 8, (Ford 9 #1).
- ¹¹⁶ “Post Palmdale #1,” 16, (Ford 5 #1) and SDA Bible Commentary 6:1072.
- ¹¹⁷ “Pauline Gospel,” passim, (Ford 1 #2).
- ¹¹⁸ “White and Righteousness,” passim, (Ford 2 #4).
- ¹¹⁹ Documents, 3.
- ¹²⁰ “I Believe in the Righteousness of Christ,” hereinafter “I Believe,” 19, (Ford 1 #3).
- ¹²¹ “Post Palmdale #2,” 8, (Ford 5 #2).
- ¹²² “Post Palmdale #1,” 3, (Ford 5 #1).

¹²³ “Post Palmdale #2,” 9.

¹²⁴ Walther, “Distinction,” 40, (Ford 7 #4; see also Ford 1, #6).

¹²⁵ “Pauline Gospel, 6, 7, (Ford 1 #2).

¹²⁶ Ibid. , 8.

¹²⁷ Dederen, “God’s Grace,” 6, (Ford 8 #5; author’s emphasis).

3. THE NATURE OF MAN

So crucial is the nature of man to White's soteriological concepts and educational views as to require its inclusion as the basis for this study.¹ Moreover, the historical nature of the current conflict suggests the need for a historical orientation.

Historical Backgrounds

In 1840, William Miller's lectures on the imminent coming of Christ brought "a terrible sadness" to twelve year old Ellen Harmon (White) of Portland, Maine, at the thought that she "was not good enough to enter heaven..."² The despondency and gloom she experienced in the following months was partially removed by a camp meeting sermon which stressed the pardoning love and mercy of Christ and warned against the idea that one "must make some wonderful effort in order to gain the favor of God."³ The thought that "it is only by connecting with Jesus through faith that the sinner becomes a hopeful, believing child of God," was comforting, but Ellen's "mind was often in distress, because [she] did not [Page 58] experience the spiritual ecstasy" she thought would evidence her acceptance with God. She declares, "How much I needed instruction concerning the simplicity of faith!" She describes her later release as follows:

"While bowed at the altar with others who were seeking the Lord, all the language of my heart was: Help, Jesus; save me or I perish! Suddenly my burden left me, and my heart was light. I can never forget this precious assurance of the pitying tenderness of Jesus toward one so unworthy of His notice. I learned more of the divine character in that short period of time when bowed among the praying ones, than ever before."⁴

She thus relates this freedom to a new understanding of Christ's character of love. She did not yet see Christ as the perfect expression of the Father's character however, and was eventually brought back into darkness as a result of false concepts regarding His character. Adding to her problem was confusion as to the nature of salvation. Concerning this she writes.

"Among the Methodists I had heard much in regard to sanctification, but had no definite idea in regard to it. This blessing seemed away beyond my reach, a state of purity my heart could never know. I had seen persons lose their physical strength under the influence of strong mental excitement, and had heard this pronounced to be the evidence of sanctification. But I could not comprehend what was necessary in order to be fully consecrated to God."

"My ideas concerning justification and sanctification were confused. These two states were presented to my mind as separate and distinct from each other; yet I failed to comprehend the difference or understand the meaning of the terms, and all the explanations of the preachers increased my difficulties."⁵

Concerning the character of God, she testifies:

"In my mind the justice of God eclipsed His mercy and love. The mental anguish I passed through at this time was very great. I had been taught to believe in an [Page 59] eternally burning hell; and as I thought of the wretched state of the sinner without God, without hope, I was in deep despair. I feared that I should be lost, and that I should live throughout eternity suffering a living death."⁶

When the thought took possession of my mind that God delighted in the torture of His creatures, who were formed in His image, a wall of darkness seemed to separate me from Him. If the love of God had been dwelt upon more, and His stern justice less, the beauty and glory of His character would have inspired me with a deep and earnest love for my Creator.⁷

Two vivid dreams, a remarkable experience during prayer, and her own labors for the unsaved,⁸ together with the Biblical discovery that the dead sleep in their graves until the resurrection and that the wicked are not burned eternally,⁹ combined to give Ellen a concept of God's goodness and love, and of His acceptance of the penitent. The Biblical discovery also represented her first step in developing a holistic concept of man's nature which would underlie all her theological and educational perspectives.

Prophetic Call

As Miller and his associates in preaching the imminence of Christ's return became convinced that according to the prophecy of Daniel 8:14, Christ would come on October 22, 1844, they began to preach that was termed the Midnight Cry, proclaiming, "The Bridegroom comes, go you out to meet Him."¹⁰ A few weeks after the great disappointment, when He did not come as expected, Ellen received a vision in which a bright light behind the Advent believers (representing the "Midnight Cry"), directed them toward the heavenly [Page 60] kingdom. In this first vision she saw the 144,000 saints sealed in their foreheads and prepared to meet Christ at His second coming, at which time the righteous dead were raised.

When, upon seeing Christ coming in the clouds, the 144,000 cried out, "Who shall be able to stand? Is my robe spotless?" Jesus' significant response was: "Those who have clean hands and pure hearts shall be able to stand; My grace is sufficient for you."¹¹ While the focus is upon the sufficiency of Christ's grace, the practical application of that grace is seen as vital to divine approval. Both elements are discernible in Christ's later statement, as He welcomes the saints into the holy city: "You have washed your robes in My blood, stood stiffly for My truth, enter in." Of significance also is Ellen's reference to the saints being restored to the tree of life, from which the human race had been cut off by sin.¹²

A week later Ellen was instructed in vision to "go out among the people and present the truth."¹³ This seemed impossible. An injury at the age of nine had left her a semi-invalid for several years, preventing her from proceeding beyond the third grade of school, and her health was still fragile.¹⁴ Now, only a timid girl of seventeen, she had neither finances nor any one to accompany her. Even more distressing however, was her fear of self-exaltation.¹⁵ Of this she states:

"I coveted death as a release from the responsibilities that were crowding upon me. At length the peace I [Page 61] had so long enjoyed left me, and despair again pressed upon my soul."¹⁶

Encouragement of friends was not sufficient to remove the sense of depression, but during a third vision, which came while special prayer was being offered for her, she was again commanded, "Make known to others what I have revealed to you." In response to her plea that she be preserved from exaltation, she was told:

"Your prayers are heard, and shall be answered, the hand of God will be stretched out to save you by affliction He will draw you to Himself, and preserve your humility. Deliver the message faithfully; endure unto the end and you shall eat of the fruit of the tree of life."¹⁷

Meeting Fanaticism

The way was soon open for Ellen to travel in company with those who could assist her. From the beginning of her work she was called upon to reprove sin and oppose fanaticism.¹⁸ One of the earliest cases involved two men who, claiming to be wholly sanctified and thus unable to sin, exercised a hypnotic power over others. In commenting on this case, White says:

"And this naturally led to the belief that the affections and desires of the sanctified ones were always right, and never in danger of leading them into sin. In harmony with these sophistries, they were practicing the worst sins under the garb of sanctification, and through their deceptive, mesmeric influences were gaining a strong power over some of their associates..."¹⁹

The Theology Crisis

As a result of her testimony regarding the spirit which controlled these men, the Advent believers in that community were freed from their influence. The following statement regarding their claims is significant to this study:

[Page 62] “Believe in Christ,” was the cry of these-claimants to sanctification. “Only believe; this is all that is required of you. Only have faith in Jesus.

The words of John came forcibly to my mind, “If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.” 1 John 1:8. I was shown that those who triumphantly claim to be sinless, show by their very boasting that they are far from being without taint of sin.”²⁰

A statement following this characteristic denunciation of any claim to perfection gives insight into both White’s doctrine of perfection and of the nature of Christ:

“The more clearly fallen man comprehends the character of Christ, the more distrustful will he be of himself, and the more imperfect will his works appear to him, in contrast with the spotless Redeemer. But those who are far from Jesus cannot comprehend the character of the great Exemplar, conceive of Him as altogether such a one as themselves, and dare to talk of their own perfection of holiness. But they are far from God; they know little of themselves and less of Christ.”²¹

In facing the various fanatical elements which plagued the disheartened believers following their disappointment, Ellen was to learn much about the deceitfulness and corruption of the human heart, and of the grace and power of God in giving victory. Among the forms of fanaticism were: religious excitement and noise; rejoicing over persecution aroused by unbecoming conduct. Crawling upon hands and knees (“like little children”); belief that it is a sin to work. Deistic tendencies denying God’s personal involvement in human affairs; and pantheistic denials of the personality of God by seeing Him as residing in nature.²²

At that time Ellen’s own confidence in the source of her **[Page 63]** visions was severely tested. Although she had opposed the various fanatical elements, denying that emotional phenomena evidenced true religion or acceptance with God, the supernatural phenomena associated with her own visions were branded as fanatical and an exercise in self-hypnosis. So distressed did she finally become that she resisted going into vision and was temporarily struck dumb for her unbelief.²³ Throughout her lifetime, White taught the validity of spiritual phenomena, but always opposed emotionalism and sensationalism, urging a close scriptural testing of the spirits.

The Great Controversy Vision

Drawn from various religious and non-religious backgrounds, the Advent believers had been bound together by their hope in the imminent coming of Christ. Now, with neither organization nor doctrinal structure around which to unite, the majority had given up their faith in the Advent Movement. Those retaining confidence in Christ’s soon coming were few, scattered, and in need of spiritual guidance.²⁴

In 1846 Ellen married James White, a young preacher of the Midnight Cry who also traveled widely ministering to the scattered believers.²⁵ About that time they came in contact with Joseph Bates, who held the seventh day as Sabbath and was actively engaged in encouraging the believers. Ellen felt Bates was placing undue stress upon the Sabbath until she had a Vision of the heavenly **[Page 64]** sanctuary a few months later, where she saw the ten commandment law in the ark of the covenant within the most holy-place. She writes:

“I was amazed as I saw the fourth commandment. A halo of glory was all around it; for it was the only one of the ten which points out to man who the living God is, the maker of heaven and earth.”²⁶

The Theology Crisis

This significant vision represents White's first panoramic view of the conflict between good and evil, the very basis of her understanding of righteousness by faith. The history of the Sabbath was portrayed in connection with Christ's priestly ministry in the most holy place, and she witnessed the change to Sunday and Earth's final conflict, in which the true Sabbath was seen to be the test of loyalty to the Creator.²⁷

Thus at age nineteen, the major features of her mature theological concepts were visible. These Included: 1) a merciful, compassionate Father whose character was perfectly represented by the loving ministry and sacrificial death of His son. 2) The deep seated sinfulness of human nature; 3) acceptance with God based solely upon the merits of Christ. 4) A holistic concept of man's nature, soul and body forming an inseparable unity which sleeps in death. 5) The Imminence of Christ's Coming and the resurrection of the righteous. 6) A universal conflict between good and evil which sees the Sabbath as a test of loyalty to the Creator, and is central to the third angel's message, final warning and appeal to the whole world. 7) Spiritual gifts and her own call as a special messenger of the Lord. 8) Opposition to emotionalism and fanaticism. 9) The priestly ministry of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary; [Page 65] and 10) A final generation, the 144,000, who are alive when Christ returns and whose robes must be spotless In order to join the resurrected saints in their welcome to the tree of life-nevermore to experience pain or corruption.

Formed through personal conflict and study of the Scriptures and matured through personal service and converse with Him in prayer and vision, her dynamic and growing love-relationship with Jesus was as important as these theological principles to her understanding of righteousness by faith.

Great Controversy Vision Repeated

In March, 1858, a little over a decade later, White was again shown the conflict between good and evil and instructed to write it out. In spite of a paralyzing stroke experienced immediately afterward which she was later shown was Satan's attempt to take her life to prevent her from carrying out her commission-she promptly began-to write.²⁸ Concerning this she relates:

"At first I could write but one page a day, and then rest three days; but as I progressed, my strength increased. The numbness in my head did not seem to becloud my mind, and before I closed that work [Spiritual Gifts, Volume 1], the effect of the shock had entirely left me."²⁹

The task of writing out these principles occupied a major portion of her time and strength for the remaining fifty-seven years of her life. During that time the conflict was often presented to her, some scenes being given many times. Decades later she writes:

[Page 66] "From time to time I have been permitted to behold the working, in different ages, of the great controversy between Christ, the Prince of life, the Author of salvation, and Satan, the prince of evil, the author of sin."³⁰

Never absent from White's mind was this conflict in which the government, character, and law of God, as well as man's destiny and the proclamation of the gospel are determined by human decisions regarding the issues of the conflict. Despite the severe physical affliction, within months a first volume was published outlining the conflict. Volumes three and four were published by the end of the next six illness-plagued years,³¹ during which time Ellen and James committed their energies to organizing the scattered but growing body of believers into a church.³²

Health Message Vision

A few days after the church was formally organized, Ellen White received her first major vision on Health Reform.³³ The harmfulness of tobacco, tea, and coffee had been revealed in 1848,³⁴ but now the relation between the body and mind, "between physical welfare and spiritual health, or holiness,"³⁵ was revealed and White "saw that it was a sacred duty to attend to our health, and to arouse [Page 67] others to

their duty.³⁶ The importance of this vision is indicated by her statement four years later that on “June 6, 1863 the great subject of Health Reform was opened before me in vision.”

The body temple concept thus became central to SDA theology.³⁷ In 1872, nearly two decades before righteousness by faith was identified with the third angel’s message and loud cry,³⁸ Ellen White speaks of the health message as being “as closely connected with the third angel’s message as the hand is to the body,”³⁹ declaring:

“For years the Lord has been calling the attention of His people to health reform. This is one of the greatest branches of the work of preparation for the coming of the Son of Man. John the Baptist went forth in the spirit and power of Elijah to prepare the way of the Lord and to turn the people to the wisdom of the just. He was a representative of those living in these last days to whom God has entrusted sacred truths to present before the people to prepare the way for the second appearing of Christ. John was a reformer. John was a rebuke to the indulgence of appetite. Those who are to prepare the way for the Second Coming of Christ are represented by faithful Elijah, as John came in the spirit of Elijah to prepare the way for Christ’s first advent.”⁴⁰

Thus, closely connected to the third angel’s message health reform is seen to be a necessary factor in preparing for the loud cry. Identifying it as “part and parcel” of the third angel’s message,⁴¹ five years before White had urged:

Ministers and people must act in concert. God’s people are not prepared for the loud cry of the third angel. They have a work to do for themselves which they should [Page 68] not leave for God to do for them.⁴²

Repeated emphasis is given to health reform as a means of co-operating with God in purifying the body temple and the church:

“The work of health reform is the Lord’s means . . . for purifying the church. Teach the people that they can act as God’s helping hand by cooperating with the master worker in restoring physical and spiritual health. This work bears the signature of heaven, and will open doors for the entrance of other precious truths.”⁴³

White’s strong emphasis upon health reform as a primary factor in preparing for the latter rain and Christ’s second coming emerges from her understanding of the nature of man, the consequences of the fall, and of God’s plan for his restoration. It is in this context that the great controversy and health concepts merge to form the basis for understanding righteousness by faith. Moreover that doctrine represents the convergence of White’s own Bible study, her personal conflict with the forces of evil, and direct communication with the rightful Prince of this world through visions.

Man’s Nature Before the Fall

White’s first description of man at creation, following her 1858 great controversy vision, represents him as:

1. Made in the image of God;
2. Of noble height and beautiful symmetry;
3. Glowing in health, with ruddy complexion;
4. Clothed with a covering of light and glory;
5. Occupied with a) caring for the garden, b) visiting with angels and the Lord himself, and c) meditation;
6. Ruling monarch with unlimited control over all creatures;
7. Created after Lucifer’s fall in harmony with plans which previously excited his jealousy and precipitated rebellion;

[Page 69]

8. A free moral agent whose choices would both test his loyalty and develop his character;
9. Having access to the tree of life subject to his loyalty;
10. Informed of Lucifer's fall and intent to deceive;
11. Being urged to stay close to Eve and away from the tree of knowledge, where only they could be tempted;
12. Being on probation only until his loyalty should be tested, after which he would be eternally secure.⁴⁴

She here sets a lifelong pattern of viewing man's nature in terms of the conflict between the forces of good and evil. The tree of life reveals man's dependence upon God for life, and the tree of knowledge his freedom of choice. Testing his loyalty, it would prove his right to the tree of life and determine the direction and quality of character development. God's protection is seen in: a) Restricting Satan to that one tree. b) Warning man to avoid it, and c) providing eternal security after testing.

This emphasis is clearly evident a decade later in "Redemption Number 1,"⁴⁵ first of two articles on the nature of Christ which are preliminary to a series of articles written between July 28, 1874 and April 15, 1875 entitled "The Temptation of Christ." The Redemption articles contributed to Patriarchs and Prophets, second volume to be released (1890) in White's final expansion of the great controversy theme. No significant change of concept or emphasis concerning the nature of man is discernible between the 1874 work and that of 1890, though the latter provides a more detailed discussion of God's government, character, and law of love in contrast to the principle of evil. Attention is also given to Eve's creation as being equal to, but under the headship of Adam, and [Page 70] marriage is seen to safeguard social relationships; while the Sabbath, a special token of God's love, provides for the enhancement of divine human relationships.

Both sources focus upon man's probationary status, the 1874 article revealing God's purpose, subject to man's loyalty, to exalt him to equality with the angels.⁴⁶ They also stress dependence for happiness upon both active labor and meditation and emphasize man's mental powers, indicating that "his mind was capable of continual cultivation, expansion, refinement and noble elevation. ***This relating of the physical and mental/spiritual--represented by labor and meditation is central to every facet of White's thought regarding man's nature, purpose, and destiny.***

Image of God

The evolutionary theory which would "degrade man, and defraud him of the dignity of his origin," White portrayed man as "the crowning work of the Creator," made in God's Image, both in outward appearance and in character."⁴⁷ In creating man in His own image, she understood it to be God's intention, by creating man as "a new and distinct order," to present the universe with a unique insight into His own nature and character.⁴⁸ In her earliest complete description of man's creation and fall, White points to Lucifer's jealousy at being left out of plans for the [Page 71] creation of mankind,⁴⁹ the last of God's creative works:

"Before the fall of Satan, the Father consulted with His Son in regard to the formation of man. They purposed to make man in the image of God, to reign as a ruling monarch over every living thing. Satan was envious of Christ, and jealous because the Father had not consulted him in regard to the creation of man. Satan was of the highest order of angels; but Christ was above all. Until his rebellion all heaven was in harmony, and perfect subjection to the government of God."⁵⁰

Two factors should be observed: ***God's original purpose to display His nature and character through man and His design--even before his creation--that man play a vital role in the conflict between Christ and Lucifer over the Creator's nature, government, and prerogatives, as these relate to the nature and role of the creature.*** Significantly, White also held that God created man immediately after the removal from heaven of Lucifer and the disloyal angels, intending-on condition of his loyalty-to exalt him to equality with the angels and thus repopulate heaven.⁵¹

The Theology Crisis

“God created man for His own glory. It was His purpose to re-populate heaven with the human race, if after test and trial they proved to be loyal to him.”⁵²

God’s glory was to be revealed in man’s entire being. Every attribute, properly used, would glorify the Giver.⁵³ “**(D)esigned to be a counterpart of God, even man’s biological faculties were to be a part of that revelation, for the body itself “is designed to represent God to the world.”**⁵⁴ The uniqueness of this revelation is not spelled out. White appears, however, to [Page 72] have understood it to involve marriage, procreation, and family relations, which angels do not share⁵⁵ and in which she saw represented God’s self-sacrificing love and intimacy of relationship to his creatures.⁵⁶ Reflecting vital facets of God’s nature and character, each of these offered peculiar opportunities for development. In fulfillment of the plan that “throughout eternal ages” should more fully reflect the Creator’s glory.”⁵⁷

Character Development

Character development is seen to be of prime importance:

“God might have created them without the power to transgress His requirements; but in that case there could have been no development of character; their servitude would have been forced. Therefore He gave the power of choice--the power to yield or to withhold obedience.”⁵⁸

Divine requirements, together with the human faculty and freedom of choice are seen to be vital ingredients in character development. In the absence of either law or free will, character development could not take place, as can be seen below:

“God placed man under law, as an indispensable condition of his very existence. He was a subject of the divine government, and there can be no government without law. God might have created man without the power to transgress His law, but in that case man would have been, not a free moral agent, but a mere automaton, without freedom of choice, his obedience would not have been voluntary, but forced. There could have been no development of character.”⁵⁹

There is no conflict between this principle regarding [Page 73] character as the product of man’s own choices, and White’s position that God “gave him noble traits of character, with no bias toward evil.”⁶⁰ Earlier in the same passage she declares:

“Man was to bear God’s image, both in outward resemblance and in character. His nature was in harmony with the will of God. His mind was capable of comprehending divine things. His affections were pure; his appetites and passions were under the control of reason. He was holy and happy in bearing the image of God, and in perfect obedience to His will.”⁶¹

Two elements are discernible: divine purpose and provisions for its fulfillment. With his whole nature “In harmony with the will of God,” it would be natural to make the kind of choices which would bring to maturity a yet undeveloped character. Not only was “his mind capable of comprehending divine things,” but “his affections were pure; his appetites and passions were under the control of reason.” Moreover, God had “endowed him with high intellectual power and presented before him the strongest possible inducements to be true to his allegiance.”⁶² Thus in-inclination, as well as in potential and direction, man’s faculties harmonized with the object that he bear the divine image in character. This 1890 insight reflects the following 1874 statement regarding man’s probationary status:

“Adam was then created in the image of God and placed upon probation. He had a perfectly developed organism. All his faculties harmonized. In all his emotions, words, and actions there was a perfect conformity to the will of his maker.”⁶³

In White's thinking, probation represents man's freedom of choice to retain this harmony and balance, thus maturing a character [Page 74] reflecting the will and character of God, or to destroy himself by acting, contrary to his own nature.⁶⁴ Upon this decision hung both man's own destiny and the broader divine purpose. Just as man was bound up in the controversy between Christ and Satan before his creation, even so, the Creator's ultimate purpose of self-revelation was bound to the choices man would make after his creation.

Sovereignty and Self Government

Concerning this momentous test, White states:

"The first great moral lesson given Adam was that of self-denial. The reins of self-government were placed in his hand. Judgment, reason and conscience were to bear sway."⁶⁵

Through voluntary self-denial man was to demonstrate the most fundamental principle of God's sovereignty and nature, "self-government based upon self-sacrificing love."⁶⁶ The honor of being crowned "king in Eden,"⁶⁷ "to reign as ruling monarch over every living thing,"⁶⁸ carried with it a comparable responsibility to represent the sovereignty of "the supreme ruler of the universe."⁶⁹ By demonstrating that "the law of self-renouncing love is the law of life for earth and heaven..."⁷⁰

According to White, Lucifer had charged God with using His creatures for His own self-gratification, thus attributing to Him his own selfish characteristics.⁷¹ He then placed blame for the confusion resulting from such charges upon the divine government [Page 75] and laws.⁷² Insisting that these robbed heavenly beings of their rightful freedom, he offered to rectify the situation by establishing a government without law.⁷³

Man was thus destined to be tempted both to doubt God's self-sacrificing love and to repudiate the principle of self-denial by seeking to exalt self. Since finite creatures are incapable of comprehending the infinite,⁷⁴ only a voluntary finite witness to the divine character could effectively answer such charges. To provide for such a test,⁷⁵ Adam and Eve were denied access to the tree of knowledge:

"Before they could be rendered eternally secure, their loyalty must be tested. At the very beginning of man's existence a check was placed upon the desire for self-indulgence, the fatal passion that lay at the foundation of Satan's fall."⁷⁶

Comparison of this 1890 portrayal with that of 1874 reveals two options, self-denial and character development in harmony with God's purpose, or self-indulgence, leading to self-destruction.

Control Center of the Body

Only months after the Minneapolis conference, White stated categorically: "Pure religion has to do with the will. The will is the governing power of the nature of man, bringing all other faculties under its sway."⁷⁷ The importance of this principle was further emphasized three years later as follows:

[Page 76] "What you need to understand is the true force of the will. This is the governing power in the nature of man, the power of decision, or of choice. Everything depends upon the right action of the will. The power of choice God has given to men; it is theirs to exercise."⁷⁸

Both before and after 1888, White clearly distinguishes between the will and desires or inclinations, which are to be controlled by the will.⁷⁹

The Theology Crisis

“The will is not the taste or inclination, but it is the deciding power which works in the children of men unto obedience to God or unto disobedience.”⁸⁰

“There is no such thing as following Christ unless you refuse to gratify inclination and determine to obey God. It is not your feelings, your emotions, that make you a child of God, but the doing of God’s will.”⁸¹

Control of desire and inclination by the will is thus consistently represented as of eternal consequence. The mind itself is to be disciplined by the will to prevent it from wandering.⁸² Though subject to the will’s discipline, however, other higher faculties of the mind are designed, according to White, to instruct and enlighten that will in harmony with the divine will. “Judgment, reason, and conscience were to bear sway.”⁸³ Thus, through the will, all man’s faculties were to become extended faculties of the divine mind.

“It was a wonderful thing for God to create man, to make mind. He created him that every faculty might be the faculty of the divine mind.”⁸⁴

[Page 77] Just how the faculties of man’s mind were to become the faculties of the divine mind will be clarified below.

Two Centers of the Brain

White consistently recognized two sets of faculties. The higher mental faculties were designed to rule over the lower faculties, identified with the body. “We are possessed of physical as well as mental faculties,” and “our impulses and passions have their seat in the body...”⁸⁵ Nearly a decade later she insists:

“The body is to be brought into subjection. The higher powers of the being are to rule. The passions are to be controlled by the will, which is itself under the control of God.”⁸⁶

Barnes holds that in White’s view each set of faculties has a physiological control center located in the brain.⁸⁷

“The lower areas near the base of the skull were understood to be the seat of animal impulse, passion, and propensity. The higher centers of the forebrain were identified with the more sensitive and specialized mental activities, such as reasoning, judgment, and decision. It was here in these higher areas of the brain that the moral and spiritual activities of the mind, often referred to as the soul, were believed to originate.”⁸⁸

He sees in this two center model the conceptual basis for White’s holistic understanding of man’s nature.⁸⁹ As “the capital of [Page 78] the body,” the brain organically coordinates both sets of faculties, thus precluding any possible dualism in which one faculty can exist, or even function, independently from the others. In White’s thinking, there is but one organism, whose various faculties are designed to function harmoniously according to a divine blueprint calling for the lower powers to be governed by the higher. The following counsel to a woman who feared to bathe lest she catch a cold vividly illustrates this principle:

“If your mind is impressed and fixed that a bath will injure you, the mental impression is communicated to all the nerves of the body. The nerves control the circulation of the blood. Therefore the blood is, through the impression of the mind, confined to the blood vessels, and the good effects of the bath are lost. All this is because the blood is prevented by the mind and will from flowing readily, you are impressed that if you bathe you will become chilly. The brain sends this intelligence

The Theology Crisis

to the nerves of the body, and the blood vessels, held in obedience to your will, cannot perform their office and cause a reaction after the bath.”⁹⁰

[Page 79] In spite of the degenerative results of sin⁹¹ the will is thus seen still to be capable of significant control, even over the autonomic system. Intended to control the body, the mind was nevertheless designed to respond to and serve the body in fulfillment of its needs. “The sympathy which exists between the mind and the body is very great. When one is affected, the other responds.”⁹² Moreover, “Any part of the body that is not treated with consideration will telegraph its injury to the brain.”⁹³

Electro-Chemical Communications System

Though not using the modern term, White clearly describes both internal and external communication as taking place through the electro-chemical system. The brain is understood to operate through “electrical energy that God gave man at his creation,”⁹⁴ the nerves serving as “telegraph wires,” to deliver messages and effect control over “the vital action of every part of the system.”⁹⁵

“All the physical organs are servants of the mind, and the nerves are the messengers that transmit its orders to every part of the body, guiding the motions of the living machinery.”⁹⁶

The higher faculties, operating within this electro-chemical system, are understood to be the channels through which God **[Page 80]** communicates with man to direct his entire being, including the lower faculties, in harmony with its own nature. As early as 1869 White identified this as heaven’s only method of communicating with man:

“The brain nerves which communicate with the entire system are the only medium through which Heaven can communicate to man and effect his inmost life. Whatever disturbs the circulation of the electrical currents in the nervous system lessens the strength of the vital powers, and the result is a deadening of the sensibilities of the mind.”⁹⁷

Cooperation Determines Communication

In this divine-human communication through the electro-chemical system, man was ever to be a free and active participant. “Formed in the image of God,” he was “capable of partaking of the divine nature, of cooperating with his Creator and executing His plans.”⁹⁸ “In harmony with his free will however, voluntary cooperation was required as the single condition for that divine communication through which his faculties were to be harmonized and maintained.”⁹⁹

“God, the Creator of our bodies, has arranged every fiber and nerve and sinew and muscle, and has pledged himself to keep the machinery in order if the human agent will cooperate with him and refuse to work contrary to the laws which govern the human system.”¹⁰⁰

Such cooperation thus can not be haphazard. Man must carefully study the laws of his own being and act accordingly.¹⁰¹ This includes **[Page 81]** physical as well as spiritual laws, for both have the same author,¹⁰² and are designed to serve man. In 1896 White declared:

“God’s law is written by his own finger upon every nerve, every muscle, every faculty which has been entrusted to man.”¹⁰³

Three months before the Minneapolis conference, White warned:

The Theology Crisis

“There are great laws that govern the world of nature, and spiritual things are controlled by principles equally certain; the means for an end must be employed if the desired results are to be obtained. Those who make no decided efforts themselves, are not working in harmony with the laws of God. They are not using the provisions of the heavenly Father, and they can expect nothing but meager returns.”¹⁰⁴

While laws are divinely implanted within the very nature of all things animate and inanimate, White in harmony with her understanding of higher and lower faculties makes a clear distinction between natural and moral law:

“Everything, whether great or small, animate or inanimate, is under fixed laws which cannot be disregarded. There are no exceptions to this rule; for nothing that the divine hand has made has been forgotten by the divine mind. But while everything in nature is governed by natural law, man alone is amenable to moral law.”¹⁰⁵

Far from reducing the significance of natural law, the higher moral law gives it a higher dimension. The principle which holds the higher faculties responsible for the lower actually elevates natural law to the level of moral principle. Outside the context of moral responsibility, violation of natural law results only in natural consequences, but in the context of moral responsibility, every deliberate or careless violation also carries with it **[Page 82]** spiritual and eternal consequences. This principle of moral responsibility for cooperation with natural law is expressed seven years before the memorable conference:

“Every law governing the human system is to be strictly regarded; for it is as truly a law of God as is the word of Holy writ; and every willful deviation from obedience to this law is as certainly sin as a violation of the moral law. All nature expresses the law of God, but in our physical structure Jehovah has written his law with his own finger upon every thrilling nerve, upon every living fiber, and upon every organ of the body. We shall suffer loss and defeat, if we step out of nature’s path, which God has marked out, into one of our own devising.”¹⁰⁶

Three important points should be noted: a) violation of any law governing the human system may represent a moral violation; b) this is the case in every willful violation; c) there are natural consequences even when there is no moral responsibility. Moreover, although moral responsibility accompanies only violations for which the moral faculties are accountable, this includes more than consciously willful acts of violation, for man is responsible to study the laws of his being so as to be able to act in harmony with them. Thus, “ignorance in these things is sin,”¹⁰⁷ when such ignorance results from carelessness or willful neglect.

Man’s Animal Nature

White identifies the lower faculties with the animal kingdom. Referring to the brain as the capital of the body, she warns that intemperance “brings the higher faculties in subjection to the animal appetites and passions,” and refers to “animal propensities,” **[Page 83]** which should be held in rein by “enlightened intellect.”¹⁰⁸ This identification is made in 1870 when she insists that “the animal part of our nature should never be left to govern the moral and intellectual.”¹⁰⁹

One common characteristic between man’s lower nature and the animal world is that its basic functions are instinctual.¹¹⁰ Other characteristics are identified below with reference to Adam “as God’s representative, over the lower orders of being”: a) lack of understanding, b) affection, and c) dependent subservience. White declares: “They cannot understand or acknowledge the sovereignty of God, yet they were made capable of loving and serving man.”

By loving and caring for the animal kingdom, in harmony with the individual needs of each one, Adam was privileged to demonstrate the Creator’s commitment to care for all His creatures in harmony with their specific needs. As part of the animal kingdom, over which he was to rule, man was viewed capable of appreciating and emotionally identifying with the animals and thus able to portray the

sovereignty of God who, though distinct from and infinitely superior to man, designs to be intimately involved in his life. As the Creator's sovereignty over every living creature is a sovereignty of service,¹¹¹ satisfying every need and encouraging the development of every capacity, even so was man's sovereignty to be one of service. "The great law of life is the law of service."¹¹²

[Page 84] Man's dominion, however, was subject to faithfulness in ruling over his own animal nature, through the higher faculties under the direction of the Spirit.¹¹³ Note White's reverence for this plan:

"We are God's workmanship, and his word declares that we are fearfully and wonderfully made. He has prepared this wonderful habitation for the mind; it is curiously wrought, a temple which the Lord himself has fitted up for the indwelling of the Holy Spirit."¹¹⁴

Body Temple

White's Image of God and mind-control-center concepts are both rooted in her understanding of the body temple:

"From eternal ages, it was God's purpose that every created being, from the bright and holy seraph to man, Should be a temple for the indwelling of the Creator."¹¹⁵

The Creator's communication with man through the higher faculties harmonizes with the concept that the body itself is the temple of God, the true place of worship.¹¹⁶ Thus even the physical organs are to be looked upon as sacred.¹¹⁷ Through that body temple the Creator designed to operate upon "the human heart, bringing soul body, and spirit into conformity" to Himself and His law of self-sacrificing love.¹¹⁸ This relationship is seen to elevate and diffuse the being with creative energy. It "diffuses love through the whole being. It touches every vital part, the brain, the **[Page 85]** heart, the helping hands."¹¹⁹

A striking parallel is seen between this concept of the body temple and the tree of life. Each represents creative power on God's part and a dependent nature on man's part. It will be seen that only so long as the body, through man's free and active choice, remained a temple of the Holy Spirit, would he be privileged to eat of the tree of life. Just so long also would he retain the garments of light and his faculties remain perfect and balanced.¹²⁰

Adam's freedom was determined by his dependence upon God,¹²¹ whose guarantee of freedom was subject to the body's surrender as a temple of the Spirit. He was free to refuse such dependence, but in declaring his independence he would cease to be free.¹²² Created to be a temple, both the stability and completeness of man's being are thus understood to be realized only in union with the Creator. The reward of communion resulting from such dependent union is, according to White, beyond calculation:

"When the mind of man is brought into communion with the mind of God, the finite with the Infinite, the effect on body, and mind and soul is beyond estimate. In such communion is found the highest education. It is God's own method of development."¹²³

[Page 86]

Man's Nature After the Fall

White's first account of the fall of man, prepared immediately after the 1858 Great Controversy vision,¹²⁴ comprises only two and one-half pages. The following summary of a twelve-page 1864 presentation contains the substance of her most mature concepts.¹²⁵

Having wandered away from her husband, Eve's curiosity was aroused-by what appeared to be a talking serpent. Instead of fleeing, she unwittingly entered into controversy with the great deceiver in the serpent's guise. Flattered by the "familiar" voice of one who appeared to be a special friend with great interest in her welfare, Eve considered herself capable of making decisions of right and wrong independent of divine guidance. Accepting the assurance that she was immortal, she concluded that God had indeed

denied them the tree to prevent their gaining knowledge which would exalt them to equality with Himself.¹²⁶

Exhilaration of feeling, upon eating the fruit, appeared to confirm the promise of entering a new and higher sphere. Upon the basis of this experience she became an eager agent in Adam's subversion, assuring him that instead of death she had experienced a pleasing influence. Recognizing Eve's deception, Adam chose to eat and die with her rather than suffer separation. The great knowledge withheld was that of the experience of sin and of guilt.

The covering of light disappeared, and seized by a shivering, they sought to cover their naked forms, flattering themselves [Page 87] nevertheless, that their punishment would be moderated. But overwhelmed with fear at the approach of the Creator-previously the source of great delight--they hid themselves.

Removal from the garden--(and an angel guard)--thwarted Satan's desire that they immortalize sin by continuing to eat of the tree of life. Struggle with the soil, in battling thorns and thistles, dramatized their forfeiture of the right of sovereignty over the earth; while the declaration that they must eat in sorrow was in harmony with their choice to experience evil. They must continue eating the fruit of the knowledge of good mixed with evil and thus "be acquainted with evil all the days of their life."¹²⁷

Because the law could not be changed in the least particular to meet man's necessity, God's wrath fell upon the whole human family. Cut off from communion with God, they were plunged into hopeless misery, the only solution being for the Son of God to take man's sin and guilt upon Himself and die as ransom. The Father stayed the execution of death to provide a probationary period during which all who should accept the atonement would be saved. Both pity and the divine plan to restore the lost garments of righteousness are manifest in the coats of skins provided to cover their nakedness and protect them from the extremes of temperature resulting from atmospheric changes due to sin.

Faith Relationships Dissolved

In 1864 White enunciated a lifelong conviction that faith in the Creator is the key to eternal life, while the power of choice [Page 88] determines its use.

"Our first parents chose to believe the words, as they thought, of a serpent, yet he had given them no tokens of his love. He had done nothing for their happiness and benefit; while God had given them everything. Eve was deceived by the serpent to think there was something withheld which would make them wise, even as God. Instead of believing and confiding in God, she basely mistrusted His goodness and cherished the words of Satan."¹²⁸

Thus, Eve did not cease to believe, she simply chose to transfer her faith and loyalty¹²⁹ from the Creator to a creature who offered, through "superior knowledge," exaltation to equality with God.¹³⁰ In 1890 White discusses the principles involved:

"Eve really believed the words of Satan, but her belief did not save her from the penalty of sin. She disbelieved the words of God, and this was what led to her fall. In the judgment, men will not be condemned because they conscientiously believe a lie, but because they did not believe the truth, because they neglected the opportunity of learning what is truth."¹³¹

Faith and will are consistently seen as faculties crucial to divine-human relationships. The problem is not believing, but choosing in whom to believe. Through faith in Satan's misrepresentation of God, man's character and destiny were changed, for:

"Faith is the medium through which truth or error finds a lodging place in the mind. It is by the same act of mind that truth or error is received, but it makes a decided difference whether we believe the Word of God or the sayings of men."¹³²

Changing man's very nature, false faith distorts the concept of God and of truth,¹³³ producing a chronic state of rebellion [Page 89] and disobedience.¹³⁴ "Adam and Eve at their creation had a knowledge of the original law of God. It was imprinted upon their hearts,"¹³⁵ but sin so disoriented the mental faculties as to make it impossible naturally to determine truth.¹³⁶ Worse, it brought about a state in which the loving, merciful God is feared as an enemy.¹³⁷ Moreover, with a loss of the knowledge of God and faith in Him comes "the principle that man can save himself by his own works [which lies] at the foundation of every heathen religion."¹³⁸

Man's Kingdom Usurped

Failing in his bid to overturn heaven's government, "Satan determined to sit upon the throne of God in the earth,..."¹³⁹

When Satan was thrust out of heaven, he determined to make the earth his Kingdom. When he tempted and overcame Adam and Eve, he thought that he had gained possession of this world; "because," said he, "they have chosen me as their ruler."¹⁴⁰

Christ would later disprove his right to rule,¹⁴¹ but Satan did succeed in usurping control, according to White, who says:

"But not only had man come under the power of the deceiver, but the earth itself, the dominion of man, was usurped by the enemy."¹⁴²

[Page 90] In separating himself from heaven¹⁴³ man exchanged his companionship with good angels for a "desperate companionship" with "fallen angels."¹⁴⁴ There was no freedom in this relationship however, for "separating himself in his egotism from God,"¹⁴⁵ and declaring his independence from His authority,¹⁴⁶ man bowed to a new master¹⁴⁷ who only used him in his effort to dethrone God.¹⁴⁸ From Adam until the time of Christ, Satan controlled the minds and bodies of men."¹⁴⁹ Of Satan's object and its accomplishment, White asserts:

"But the law that none "lives to himself" Satan was determined to oppose. He desired to live for self. He sought to make himself a center of influence.... A demon became the central power in the world. Where God's throne should have been, Satan placed his throne."¹⁵⁰

Habitation of Demons

Thus, free to declare his independence from God, dependent man could only transfer his allegiance to another ruler. Only the Creator could or would guarantee his freedom of choice; thus freedom disappeared in the transfer. Moreover, freedom to choose whether or not to worship his Creator did not free man to choose whether to worship. Compulsion to worship is a badge of his dependent nature, for dependence and worship are inherently related.

Placing his own seat of government where the throne of God **[Page 91]** should be, White states, "Satan has been the central object of the world's worship."¹⁵¹ ***Thus, in responding to a creature's suggestion that she exalt herself to supreme ruler ship by becoming as God, Eve found her entire being enslaved by that creature.***¹⁵²

"They had chosen a ruler who chained them to his car as captives. Bewildered and deceived, they were moving on in gloomy procession toward eternal ruin, death in which there is no hope of life."¹⁵³

Continuing, White describes how fully Satan has established his rule over the body temple:

The Theology Crisis

“Satanic agencies were incorporated with men. The bodies of human beings, made for the dwelling place of God had become the habitation of demons. *The senses, the nerves, the passions, the organs of men, were worked by supernatural agencies in the indulgence of the vilest lust.*”¹⁵⁴

This description illustrates the principle that “Satan will always rule the will that is not under the control of the Spirit of God.”¹⁵⁵ It also indicates that in seizing the body temple, he utilizes the same electro-chemical system in man’s enslavement that God had ordained to use in maintaining his freedom, while enabling him to reveal the divine Image.¹⁵⁶

Enslaved by Self

The power of Satan’s control, according to White, results from man’s false illusion of independence and freedom.

“Whosoever commits sin is the servant of sin. They were in the worst kind of bondage, ruled by the spirit of evil. Every soul that refuses to give himself to [Page 92] God is under the control of another power. He is not his own. He may talk of freedom, but he is in the most abject slavery.”¹⁵⁷

Enslaved man considers himself free because bondage occurs through his appetites and desires. Before 1888, White held that being “controlled by impulse and feeling,”¹⁵⁸ under “passion and self rule” represents servitude to Satan in which man has neither “self control nor power over [his] will.”¹⁵⁹ Thus men “are slaves to temptation and passion,” because they follow their carnal desires.¹⁶⁰

Willful man’s problem is “not too much will,” but in placing that “will on the side of the first great rebel.”¹⁶¹ Choosing to act upon desire in the indulgence of appetite “our first parents lost Eden and their sovereignty. Not only does indulgence of appetite “violate nature’s laws,” but in so doing “we create unnatural appetites,”¹⁶² forging chains of sinful habits by which we are led captive by Satan at his will...”¹⁶³ The result of intemperance upon the rational faculties is expressed as follows:

“Those who by habits of intemperance injure mind and body, place themselves in a position where they are unable to discern spiritual things. The mind is confused, and they yield readily to temptation, because they have not a clear discernment of the difference between right and wrong.”¹⁶⁴

The willfully indulgent may “feel a sense of estrangement from God, a realization of their bondage to self and sin;... [but] [Page 93] their desire to do God’s will is based upon their own inclination, not upon the Holy Spirit.”¹⁶⁵ Thus, their repentance is not adequate, for their inclinations are both perverted and enslaved. Note White’s understanding of results which follow such bondage:

“This will, that forms so important a factor in the character of man, was at the fall given into the control of Satan; and he has ever since been working in man to will and to do of his own pleasure, but to the utter ruin and misery of man.”¹⁶⁶

Higher Faculties Enslaved by Lower Faculties

Speaking of the relationship between indulgence of appetite and criminality, White says: “The intellect has been brought down and enslaved to the animal appetites.”¹⁶⁷ Previously she declared: “Sin can triumph only by enslaving the mind.”¹⁶⁸ More than a year before the fateful conference she stated:

“But although made in the image of God, man has, through intemperance, violated principle and God’s law in his physical nature. Intemperance of any kind benumbs the perceptive organs, and so weakens the brain nerve power that eternal things are

not appreciated, but are placed upon a level with common things. The higher powers of the mind, designed for elevated purposes, are brought into slavery to the baser passions. If our physical habits are not right, our mental and moral powers cannot be strong; for great sympathy exists between the physical and moral. Habits which lower the standard of physical health enfeeble mental and moral strength.”¹⁶⁹

Forfeiture of his right of sovereignty by thus surrendering the higher faculties to the control of the lower animal nature, [Page 94] testified to by the inanimate rebellion represented by the thorn and thistle, is more vividly portrayed by the fear and ferocity of animal evasion or challenge to his rule. The latter in particular dramatizes the consequences of loss of control over his own animal nature, which, in warring against him, continually testifies to the results of rebellion against the Creator.¹⁷⁰

Under the curse of sin, all nature was witness to man of the character and results of rebellion against God. When God made man, He made him ruler over the earth and all living creatures. So long as Adam remained loyal to Heaven, all nature was in subjection to him. But when he rebelled against the divine law, the inferior creatures were in rebellion against his rule. Thus the Lord, in His great mercy, would show men the sacredness of His law, and lead them, by their own experience, to see the danger of setting it aside, even in the slightest degree.¹⁷¹

The very toil and discipline incumbent upon him as a result of nature’s rebellion would, moreover, aid in man’s restoration.

And the life of toil and care which was henceforth to be man’s lot was appointed in love. It was a discipline rendered needful by his sin, to place a check upon the indulgence of appetite and passion, to develop habits of self control. It was part of God’s great plan for man’s recovery from the ruin and degradation of sin.¹⁷²

Electro-Chemical System Unbalanced

In 1902 White portrays indulgence of “wrong habits of eating and drinking” as “war against the truth,” asserting:

“Eating has much to do with religion. The spiritual experience is greatly affected by the way in which the stomach is treated. Eating and drinking in accordance with the laws of health promote virtuous actions. But if the stomach is abused by habits that have no foundation in nature, Satan takes advantage of the wrong that [Page 95] has been done, and uses the stomach as an enemy of righteousness, creating a disturbance which affects the entire being. Sacred things are not appreciated. There is dissension, strife, and discord and all because the nerves of the brain are disturbed by the abuse heaped upon the stomach. The affliction of the stomach affects the brain. He cannot discern spiritual things because the food he has eaten has benumbed his brain power.”¹⁷³

The basis for this understanding is clearly presented in 1874 with reference to the brain as “the capital of the body.”

“If the perceptive faculties become benumbed through intemperance of any kind, eternal things are not discerned. God gives no permission to man to violate the laws of his being. But man, through yielding to Satan’s temptations to indulge intemperance, brings the higher faculties in subjection to the animal appetites and passions. When these gain the ascendancy, man surrenders to be controlled by Satan. And he gains easy access to those who are in bondage to appetite. ***Those who***

would have clear minds to discern Satan's devices must have their physical appetites under the control of reason and conscience.”¹⁷⁴

These quotations do not denigrate pleasurable exercise of one's faculties. They only warn against surrendering reason and conscience to an animal nature whose instincts--never designed to distinguish between truth and error--have become perverted by being willfully exercised contrary to nature's laws. A vital key to this confusion of the instincts in the development of perverted appetites, is the excitation of the nervous system. Ellen White's description of Eve's sin is instructive.

“As she ate, she seemed to feel a vivifying power and imagined herself entering upon a higher state of existence. In a state of strange, unnatural excitement she sought Adam's presence, and related all that had occurred. She reasoned that this must be true, for she felt no evidence of God's displeasure, but on the contrary realized a delicious, exhilarating [Page 96] influence, thrilling every faculty with new life, such she imagined, as inspired heavenly messengers.”¹⁷⁵

The cause of this excitation is not identified but two factors are implicit: the excitement of a new adventure, accentuated by the high stakes and the surrender of the higher faculties of the mind to Satan, permitting him to stimulate her nervous system so as to convince her of the validity of his claims. thus securing her immediate and enthusiastic support in seducing Adam.¹⁷⁶ Thus psychological and spiritual forces blend in this reversal of the creative order which enslaved man by subordinating the rational to the emotional nature. A year before the 1888 conference, and long before modern claims concerning the creative effects of mind-expanding drugs, Ellen White points to a third addictive factor.¹⁷⁷ The systemic effects produced by tea, coffee, and flesh:

“Under their influence, the nervous system is excited and, in some cases, for the time being the intellect seems to be invigorated, and the imagination to be more vivid. But there is always a reaction. The nervous system, having been unduly excited, borrowed power for present use from its future resources; and all this temporary invigoration of the system is followed by depression. The appetite, educated to crave something stronger, soon calls for tobacco, wines, and liquors.”¹⁷⁸

Appearing to give new life, chemically induced mental activity is here seen to be a deceptive cheat, robbing the system of needed [Page 97] vital energies, while establishing a depraving addiction.¹⁷⁹ White sees the tremendous power of the brain at creation and its ability to withstand the abuse it has received as truly amazing:

“This fact of itself is enough to evidence to us the strength and electrical energy that God gave to man at his creation. It took more than two thousand years of time and indulgence of base passions to bring bodily disease upon the race to any great extent. If Adam, at his creation, had not been endowed with twenty times as much vital force as men now have, the race, with the present habits of living in violation of natural law, would have become extinct.”¹⁸⁰

Thus, instead of glorifying God by cooperating with Him in the development of their faculties, men became “the agents of Satan, and...cooperate with him in obliterating the moral image of God from the soul.”¹⁸¹ The effects are not limited to the individual whose “emotional nature is untrue” to himself and who, “in slavery to doubt,” finds his will to be subservient to inclination.;¹⁸² Surrounded by an atmosphere heavy with gloom of discontent and selfishness, or poisonous with the deadly taint of cherished sin...,¹⁸³ man becomes an active agent for evil. White says:

“There is a power in impenitence and rebellion which can be accounted for only on the supposition that it is supernatural. Satan imbues his willing subjects with his own spirit.”¹⁸⁴

This harmonizes with her understanding that:

[Page 98] “The heart is the citadel of the being, and until the heart is surrendered to God, the enemy will claim it as his stronghold, and no power on earth can dispossess him.”¹⁸⁵

Image of God Debased

“Sin is a hateful thing. It marred the moral beauty...and well nigh obliterated the moral image of God in man,”¹⁸⁶ declares White, who contrasts man’s nature at creation and after the fall:

“In the beginning God created man in His own likeness. He endowed him with noble qualities. His mind was well balanced, and all the powers of his being were harmonious. But the fall and its effects have perverted these gifts. Sin has marred and well-nigh obliterated the image of God in man.”¹⁸⁷

“Rebellion had struck its roots deep into the heart, and the hostility of man was most violent against heaven,” but Satan, who “debased the image of God in humanity,”¹⁸⁸ could not wholly eradicate it without destroying every faculty of his being.¹⁸⁹ Concerning his purpose, White asserts: “It is Satan’s work to dethrone God from the heart, and to mold human nature into his own image of deformity.”¹⁹⁰

Although consistently identifying sin with the rule of the lower faculties over the higher,¹⁹¹ White ever views the lower faculties with respect and appreciation as gifts of God intended to serve a beneficent purpose. The following 1896 statement is in the context of the body temple.

[Page 99] “Our impulses and passions have their seat in the body, -and therefore we must do nothing that would defile this entrusted possession. Our bodies must be kept in the best possible condition physically, and under the most spiritual influences.”¹⁹²

Misplaced Affections

Thus, instead of passions being treated with contempt as the source of sin, they are honored as heavenly gifts, implanted in man’s “nature for high and holy purposes.”¹⁹³ ***According to White, the problem is not in the passions, but in their use.***

“The fall did not create in man new faculties, energies, and passions. These powers were perverted; the affections were misplaced, and turned from the high and holy purpose to a lower aim and to meet a lower standard.”¹⁹⁴

Clearly distinguished are love--a divine attribute available only through the presence of the Holy Spirit.¹⁹⁵ --and the human faculty of affection, which was to be elevated by responding to divine love. ***By choosing to focus these affections upon God, man is to be motivated and empowered to control the passions.***¹⁹⁶ Thus, love is not an emotion, but an “attribute of heavenly origin,”¹⁹⁷ which the natural heart “cannot originate.”¹⁹⁸ It is “the underlying principle of God’s government”¹⁹⁹ which, when permitted, “intensifies affections”²⁰⁰ and expands the soul.²⁰¹

[Page 100] “Supreme love for God and unselfish love for one another, this is the best gift that our heavenly Father can bestow. This love is not an impulse, but a divine principle, a permanent power. The unconsecrated heart cannot originate or produce it.”²⁰²

Sin represents the misuse of the affections by exercising them in “service for self,” rather than in response to the Creator and in the service of others.²⁰³ By the exercise of man’s own will,

“Sin had expelled from the heart the love of God, and instead of the love of God was found ...the love of sinful indulgences of evil passions.”²⁰⁴

Sin is Self Centeredness

“Selfishness,” asserts White, “lies at the foundation of all sin.”²⁰⁵ Selfishness took the place of love.”²⁰⁶ Consequently, man “by nature...has no love for God. It is not natural for him to think of heavenly things,”²⁰⁷ for “self rules, self controls, and God and heaven scarcely enter into the mind.”²⁰⁸ Further, “Adam became a law unto himself.”²⁰⁹ the law of self was set up. This law harmonizes with the will of sinful humanity.”²¹⁰

...Satan’s aim has been to lead men to self first, and to assert his control over them. Selfishness is the essence of depravity, and because human beings have yielded to its power, the opposite of allegiance to God is seen in the world today. Nations, families, and individuals are filled with a desire to make self a center. Man longs to rule over his fellow men. Separating himself in his egotism from God and his fellow beings, he follows his unrestrained inclinations.”²¹¹

“Selfishness” is thus “the great law of our degenerate **[Page 101]** nature”²¹² --self-centered will dictating rejection of God and refusal to cooperate with Him.”²¹³ Such “self-exaltation” is the “key to rebellion,”²¹⁴ and represents war: “In doing that which God had expressly forbidden,” says White, Adam “set his will against the will of God, thus waging war with his requirements.”²¹⁵

In this organized war, man places himself under the “black banner of rebellion,”²¹⁶ following “the directions of another leader,” and ranging himself with those “who are warring against God.”²¹⁷ Thus instead of being a “center” for good he becomes “an influence for evil.”²¹⁸ Concerning this course, White reveals great distress:

“Who can afford thus to do? There is no madness in our world so disastrous as that which leads men to live in rebellion against God. We are now deciding our destiny for both time and eternity.”²¹⁹

Whole Human Organism Deranged

“Through sin the whole human organism is deranged, the mind is perverted, the imagination corrupted. Sin has degraded the faculties of the soul. Temptations from without find an answering chord from within the heart, and the feet turn imperceptibly toward sin.”²²⁰

[Page 102] In this derangement of the whole human organism, three elements are mentioned, mind, imagination, and soul, all of which relate to the higher faculties.”²²¹ The last sentence, referring to the affectionate nature, relates more particularly to the lower faculties. Both sets of faculties are thus involved in the perversion. Operating uncontrolled below the level of consciousness, the lower causes “the feet to turn imperceptibly toward sin.” The following pre-1888 and post-1888 statements reveal the impact of the lower and the responsibility of the higher faculties.

“Every natural trait of character should be brought under the control of the will, and this must itself be kept in harmony with the will of God. Man is impulsive and changeable. Even the best acts prompted by the natural heart are faulty.”²²²

“There is not an impulse of our nature, not a faculty of the mind or an inclination of the heart, but needs to be moment by moment, under the control of the Spirit-of God.”²²³

Three factors can be seen:

- a) Even the best impulses and inclinations are defective and unreliable;
- b) these must, therefore, be brought under the discipline and control of the will; and
- c) the will itself must be directed every moment by the Holy Spirit.

This concept, which localizes responsibility for the derangement of man's entire being in the higher faculties, is basic to White's concept of the problem of the sinful nature.

Original Sin

Preceding sections amply demonstrate the concurrence of White [Page 103] in the Reformationist view of the radical nature of human depravity. Because of the overwhelming importance of this issue to righteousness by faith and an adequate response to the Laodicean message, however, extracts from *Christ's Object Lessons* will precede specific consideration of their doctrine of original sin, which involves imputation of Adam's guilt to all his descendants.

"The Pharisee and the publican represent two great classes into which those who come to worship God are divided. Their first two representatives are found in the first two children that were born into the world. Cain thought himself righteous, and he came to God with a thank offering only. But Abel came with the blood that pointed to the Lamb of God. He came as a sinner, confessing himself lost; his only hope was the unmerited love of God."²²⁴

"Never can we safely put confidence in self or feel, this side of heaven that we are secure against temptation. Our only safety is in constant distrust of self, and dependence on Christ."²²⁵

"But we must have a knowledge of ourselves, a knowledge that will result in contrition, before we can find pardon and peace. We must know our real condition, or we shall not feel our need of Christ's help. We must feel the pain of our wounds, or we shall not desire healing."²²⁶

Immediately after the last statement, White quotes the Laodicean message. Portraying the inability of the natural heart to understand its sinfulness, she adds:

"It is not only at the beginning of the Christian life that this renunciation is to be made. At every advance step heavenward it is to be renewed. Only by constant renunciation of self and dependence on Christ can we walk safely.

The nearer we come to Jesus and the more clearly we discern the purity of His character, the more clearly we shall discern the exceeding sinfulness of sin and the [Page 104] less we shall feel like exalting ourselves."²²⁷

Looking at the consequences of sin before and then after the fall, White states:

"But should they once yield to temptation, their nature would become so depraved that in themselves, they would have no power and no disposition to resist Satan."²²⁸

"Their nature had become depraved by sin; they had lessened their strength to resist evil and had opened the way for Satan to gain more ready access to them. In their innocence they had yielded to temptation; and now, in a state of conscious guilt, they would have less power to maintain their integrity."²²⁹

Referring only to Adam's guilt, the above reference is not useful in determining the question of transference of guilt to mankind.²³⁰ A fundamental change is seen in man's own will, however, by which he is no longer disposed to obey.²³¹ A corresponding loss of [Page 105] power is partially explained by his own personal guilt, but unbalanced and inharmonious faculties would also be significant. Moreover, the demonic "antagonistic power"²³² affect both man's will and his power to obey, as would the addictive effects of past sin. Shortly before the 1888 conference White presented the dilemma of man, "sinful by, natures"²³³ and "born to evil,"²³⁴ as follows:

"It was impossible for those who had once weakened themselves by transgression to fulfill the requirements of God; the consequences and penalty of sin was upon the human race; but the Lamb of God paid the penalty of the past transgressions."²³⁵

That "the consequences and penalty of sin" implies imputation of guilt is not evident from the context. Numerous consequences can be found in the article, but none even remotely suggests imputed guilt, while the penalty is clearly death, paid for by the Lamb.

Adam's Guilt

In claiming Ellen White's support for the doctrine of original sin, it is incumbent upon Reformationists to provide substantive evidence that her theology requires or at least lends itself naturally to that doctrine and/or to demonstrate that she at some time clearly proclaimed or obviously and intentionally supported the doctrine of original sin. The following statement concerning "the perpetuating of Adam's sin," offers promise concerning the latter:

"Human beings have degenerated. One after another they fall under the curse, because sin has entered the [Page 106] world, and death by sin. The truth is not made precious by practice. It does not sanctify the soul. It fades from the mind because the heart does not appreciate its value. In consequence, the mind becomes more and more darkened by the atmosphere, which is malarious because of the perpetuating of Adam's sin."²³⁶

One coming to this statement with a prior commitment to the doctrine of original sin might understandably see in it support for his position. Examination of the context in the light of White's overall concept of the nature of man, however, fails to furnish any strong evidence. That men "one after another fall under the curse." seems to imply the consequence of individual choice. Even viewing the statement as a reference to inheritance does not prove the Reformationist case, for it could just as well refer to inheritance of sinful nature, which when individually responded to, "one after another," results in sin and guilt. The following emphases suggest perpetuation of the curse through individual choice rather than by imputation:

- a) Truth is seen not to sanctify the soul because not practiced.
- b) The heart fails to appreciate-truth; and
- c) The mind "becomes more and more darkened,"

in consequence of the atmosphere created by its own perpetuation of Adam's sin. The remainder of the paragraph is significant:

"Through a repetition of sin, the impression made on the conscience by sin has no longer force enough to arrest the transgressor... The heart in which God should be enthroned, is a place from which come forth all kinds of abominations. Man has lost the reflection of God's character."²³⁷

Thus White's familiar concept of the usurper's enthronement in the heart and his control of perverted senses is central to the [Page 107] context. Other factors involve repetition of sin, the process of dulling of the conscience, and loss of God's image. The following paragraph speaks of "the curse

increasing as transgression increases”; while the next refers to Satan’s perversion of man’s senses and his promise to our first parents that they would “be as gods,” concluding, “so he tempts men and women today.” After discussing Christ’s substitution role and His offer of rest to all who take His yoke, Ellen White states:

“If they are determined to walk in the path of disobedience, Satan will exercise his power over them, after deceiving them, to destroy. We may choose God’s way, and live; we may choose our own way, and know that sin has entered into the world, and death by sin.”²³⁸

The entire discussion regarding “the perpetuating of Adam’s sin” involves Satanic forces pitted against man under circumstances in which, through Christ’s mediator role, he continually stands at the Adamic crossroads. His own decision thus determines whether or not he shall perpetuate Adam’s sin by continuing his submission to the deceiver. The article closes with the clarification:

“The sinner is saved without having done anything worthy of salvation. He is wholly without merit. But, clothed with the spotless robe of Christ’s righteousness, he is accepted by God. The living way has been laid open. Life and immortality have been purchased by Christ. Through obedience to God’s commands, sinners may find pardon and peace.”²³⁹

Finding “pardon and peace” through obedience is consistent with the preceding denial of man’s merits, for to White, true obedience always involves first the choice to accept Christ’s merits and secondly the claiming of His power to bear His yoke in submission [Page 108] to His government. Thus, through the very last sentence, focus is upon sin and guilt as they relate to responsibility and choice.

Inherited Separation Affirmed

Two statements which specifically refer to reception of Adam’s guilt must be examined to determine whether they offer the necessary evidence. The first, written less than two years after the Minneapolis conference: “Adam sinned and the children share his guilt and its consequences.”²⁴⁰ The second, coming nearly a decade later, appears in context:

“Parents have a more serious charge than they imagine. The inheritance of children is that of sin. Sin has separated them from God. Jesus gave His life that he might unite the broken links to God. As related to [Page 109] the first Adam, men receive from him nothing but guilt and the sentence of death. But Christ steps in and passes over the ground where Adam fell. He redeems Adam’s disgraceful failure and fall by coming forth from the trial untarnished. This places man on vantage ground with God. It places him where, through accepting Christ as his Savior, he becomes partaker of the divine nature. Thus he becomes connected with God and Christ. Christ’s perfect example and the grace of God are given teaching them how to give the heart and will up to Christ that Satan’s power is broken.”²⁴¹

The reception from Adam of “nothing but guilt and the sentence of death,” is strongly linked to separation from God. Neither this nor the 1890 statement that “children share his guilt speaks of guilt as imputed by God or inherited from Adam. White’s concern appears to relate to the consequence of separation from God and enslavement to Satan which is inherited from Adam. A cause and effect chain is seen, in which sin separates from God and leaves the soul with guilt.

The contrast is drawn between Adam, through whom the race is separated from God, who thus experiencing sin and guilt is subject to death, and Christ who in passing over the ground where Adam failed, redeems man, restoring the broken links and thus reuniting man with God. Parents are unable to bequeath to their children a nature united to God. Unable naturally to resist the clamors of sin from without or within, children thus inevitably become enmeshed in sin and guilt. Parents are seen to be responsible to

point them to Christ's vicarious death and examples however, encouraging a surrender of the rebel wills to Christ, through which He may break Satan's control over their lives.

Neither here nor elsewhere in the incredible volume of writings [Page 110] concerning the nature of sin and of righteousness does White set forth the theology of forensically imputed guilt. To read such into a few disconnected statements showing no contextual evidence of intent to proclaim or support the doctrine of original sin is to do violence to her own clearly stated concept that sin originated and is perpetuated by choices which deny the Spirit's authority over the body temple, thus causing enslavement to Satanic powers bent on defacing the divine image. The following illustrates the importance of Ford's own caution against developing a doctrine on the basis of isolated references:²⁴²

"In your study of the Word, lay at the door of investigation your preconceived opinions and your hereditary and cultivated ideas."²⁴³

Evidence here for inheritance of ideas is just as substantial as is that for inheritance of guilt in other White passages.²⁴⁴ Context and theology, which indicate hereditary ideas to represent the extended chain of parental influence, demand guilt to be understood as transmitted through channels of human nature and influence, and received through experience. Each perpetuates Adam's sin, thus receiving of its guilt, by giving expression to his own sinful nature.

Failure to "lay at the door of investigation... preconceived opinions," permits one to find isolated statements, in the vast [Page 111] reservoir of White writings, to support almost any doctrine. Her words must be interpreted by context and by her own clearly expressed anthropological beliefs--not through superimposed lenses of another theology, however similar it may appear. For example, following the reference Ford considers strongest in support of original guilt,²⁴⁵ is an excellent sample of White's often repeated reference to man's sinful nature in the context of the conflict between good and evil, but offers no support to the concept of imputed guilt.

"The infinite value of the sacrifice required for our redemption reveals the fact that sin is a tremendous evil. Through sin the whole human organism is deranged, the mind is perverted, the imagination corrupted. Sin has degraded the faculties of the soul. Temptations from without find an answering chord within the heart, and the feet turn imperceptibly toward evil."²⁴⁶

The chapter, "The Importance of Seeking True Knowledge," opens with the statement that "the issues at stake in the great conflict," be more clearly understood. Immediately after the above quote, the third paragraph begins: "As the sacrifice in our behalf was complete,²⁴⁷ so our restoration from the defilement of sin is to be complete." White then applies this restoration to the present experience in sanctification, outlining the struggle involved and showing that in the conflict man must be both motivated and empowered by God.²⁴⁸ Success in this warfare against self, from which there is no release," requires the mastery of the "science of Christianity":

[Page 112] "The mind is to be disciplined, educated, trained; for we are to do service for God in ways that are not in harmony with inborn inclination. Hereditary and cultivated tendencies to evil must be overcome. We are to form habits of thought that will enable us to resist temptation."²⁴⁹

"Man's great danger is in...self-sufficiency, and thus separating from God, the source of his strength." only through constant renunciation of self and keeping the thoughts "centered upon God," is victory assured through being "vitaly connected with God."²⁵⁰ This, in turn, requires that "we turn away from a thousand topics that invite attention,"²⁵¹ refusing to dwell "largely upon theory," and "behold Jesus," the knowledge of whom "is the key that opens the portals of the heavenly city."²⁵² *Thus in confirming the radical nature of man's sinful condition, the emphasis of the context upon experience--victory over "inborn inclinations" places it in direct conflict with the doctrine of original sin.*

Inherited Guilt Denied

Ellen White's references to inherited sin are generally in the context of the results of choice as it pertains to relational and biological factors and often specifically deny the transfer of guilt. The following statements, coming nearly a decade before and after 1888, respectively, are typical of references to biological inheritance.

"If he [Satan] can lead astray the heads of families through appetite he is mostly sure of a harvest in their children, and children's children to the third and fourth generation. He studies from cause to effect. Children generally have transmitted to them as a legacy, the appetite and passions of their parents, intensified."²⁵³

[Page 113] "He knew that the enemy would come to every human being, to take advantage of hereditary weakness, and to ensnare by his false insinuations, all whose hope and trust is not in Christ....

The tendencies thus cultivated are transmitted to the offspring, as Adam's disobedience was transmitted to the whole family."²⁵⁴

The 1880 article deals solely with the sin of Nadab and Abihu and the results of intemperance; while that of 1897 considers provisions for man; restoration through the incarnation. Both deal with natural transmission to future generations through "cause and effect" relationships of the consequence of violating divine law of transmission of "Adam's disobedience" is seen to involve, among other things, the rebel nature of an "imperious will."²⁵⁵

Note the emphasis upon cause and effect relationships in the following post-1888 statement regarding the curse of Canaan:

"Though the prophetic curse had doomed them to slavery, the doom was withheld for centuries. The prophecy of Noah was no arbitrary denunciation of wrath or declaration of favor. It did not fix the character and destiny of his sons. But it showed what would be the result of the course of life they had severally chosen and the character they had developed. It was an expression of God's purpose toward them and their posterity in view of their own character and conduct. As a rule, children inherit the dispositions and tendencies of their parents, and imitate their example; so that the sins of the parents are practiced by the children from generation to generation. Thus the vileness and irreverence of Ham were reproduced in his posterity, bringing a curse upon them for many generations."²⁵⁶

Opposing inherited guilt, Ellen White thus treats this key passage, often used in its support, so as to reveal the cause and effect chain of example whereby children participate in parental guilt **[Page 114]** through their own choices. Speaking in 1880 of the curse contained, in the second commandment, White unequivocally declares:

"God did not mean in his threatening that children would be compelled to suffer for their parents sins, but that the example of the parents would be imitated by their children. If the children of wicked parents should serve God and do righteousness, he would reward their right doing. But the effects of a sinful life by the parents are often inherited by the children. They follow in the footsteps of their parents. Sinful example has its influence from father to son, to the third and fourth generation."²⁵⁷

The law of "cause and effect" is clearly seen to be that of "example and imitation." A second cause and effect chain involves biological inheritance, as indicated by another reference to the second commandment a decade later:

"It is inevitable that children should suffer from the consequences of parental wrong doing, but they are not punished for the parent's guilt, except as they participate in their sins. By inheritance and example the sons become partakers of the father's sin.

The Theology Crisis

Wrong tendencies, perverted appetites, and debased morals, as well as physical disease and degeneracy, are transmitted as a legacy from father to son, to the third and fourth generation.”²⁵⁸

Imputation of parental guilt is here specifically denied. The consistent and emphatic manner in which White deals with the law of cause and effect as the basis of inheritance is most significant. In an 1886 discussion of the effect of “right physical habits” in promoting “mental superiority,” Ellen White states that “Heaven will not interfere to preserve men from the consequences of the violation of natural laws.” Then, in the context of parental responsibility “for the stamp of character,” she asserts:

[Page 115] “Let old and young remember that for every violation of the laws of life, nature will utter her protest. The penalty will fall upon the mental as well as the physical powers. And it does not end with the guilty trifler. The effects of his misdemeanors are seen in his offspring, and thus hereditary evils are passed down, even to the third and fourth generation.”²⁵⁹

Thus natural law, in contrast to imputation by decree, is consistently referred to. In 1876, White discusses the “vital force” given at creation which, through “indulgence of appetite and passion combined,” led to a dissipation of these energies and the onset of disease. So great was the original electrical energy that the results did not begin to be seen until the third generation, and only became significant following the flood.²⁶⁰

Inherited Un-Holiness Affirmed

Unholiness begetting unholiness is a third cause and effect chain. “No man receives holiness as a birthright or as a gift from any other human being. Holiness is the gift of God through Christ.”²⁶¹

“As Adam lost the gift of life and immortality by his disobedience, so all born-of-Adam forfeit this gift. Adam had no power in himself to redeem the past, or to win back the gifts bestowed by Christ. But by his incarnation, Christ was made fully competent to place man where he would not longer be an outcast, excluded from the tree of life. Christ himself bore the penalty of sin, that he might bring life and immortality to light.

If man will cooperate with God by returning willingly to his loyalty, and obeying... (w)e become partakers of the life of Christ, which is eternal. We derive immortality from God by receiving the life of Christ. This life is the mystical union and cooperation of the divine and the human.”²⁶²

[Page 116] In Adam’s separation from God by a voluntary act of disobedience, the entire race thus lost both holiness and immortality. But individual restoration to God’s presence, through a divine human reunion restores both gifts. That the primary loss was man’s position in relationship to the Creator, is indicated in the next paragraph:

“As children of the first Adam, we partake of the dying nature of Adam. But through the imparted life of Christ, man has been given opportunity to win back again the lost gift of life, and to stand in his original position before God, a partaker of the divine nature.”²⁶³

“Holiness is wholeness for God; it is the entire surrender of heart and life to the indwelling of the principles of heaven,”²⁶⁴ which takes place only through surrender of the body temple to the control of the Holy Spirit.²⁶⁵ Holiness is not rapture; it is an entire surrender of the will of God....²⁶⁶ Note, disobedience forfeits holiness and places one under the control of Satan; only through individual decisions that control broken and holiness restored.²⁶⁷

“Through disobedience man forfeited holiness, accepting in its place the principles of unrighteousness. But by breaking the yoke that Satan has fastened upon him, and

taking the yoke of Christ. Man is created anew. Christ has promised to write in the heart of every repentant sinner His law, which is holy, just and good. He promises to renovate the soul through the medium of truth. He diffuses His own life through the entire being.²⁶⁸

[Page 117] Forfeiting holiness, the disobedient is bound to unrighteousness by Satan's yoke. Truth is the medium by which Christ diffuses His own life through the entire body temple, restoring in the heart His holy law, and thus, holiness. By an act of the will Adam surrendered his sovereignty to Satan, and with it, control of the body temple.²⁶⁹ Consequently, neither he nor any of his natural descendants can pass the original legacy of holiness on as a birthright.

Echoes of Original Sin

Significantly, the statement, "Every sin committed awakens echoes of the original sin,"²⁷⁰ refers neither to inheritance nor to guilt. While a passage directly linking inheritance and guilt to original sin would be impressive, it would still have to be weighed in the balance of a lifetime of teaching. In its absence, claimants to White's support could be expected to open their case by at least providing clear indirect evidence that she, on this or some other occasion, had in mind the historic doctrine of original sin.

The context however indicates the use of common language rather than a theological term.²⁷¹ Thus, the echoes are reminders of the issues involved in the first sin. The opening paragraph of "The Warfare Between Good and Evil," which contains the statement under discussion, follows:

"Satan is the originator of sin. In heaven he resolved to live to himself. He determined to make himself a center of influence. If he could not be the highest authority in heaven he would be the highest authority in rebellion against the government of heaven. Head he would be, to control, not to be controlled."²⁷²

Coming in the context of this reference to "the originator of sin," it appears as though the "original sin" may be identified with making self a center.²⁷³ The next three paragraphs begin thus:

"When Satan made this choice, when he ceased to cooperate with God in His plans for the universal good, he became by his own choice the leader in rebellion...

Satan was dependent on God for his life. He resolved to ignore this dependence, but he could not destroy the fact....

Satan separated himself from God, and selfishness became the law of those who placed themselves under his leadership."²⁷⁴

Pertinent factors are: 1) In choosing to make self the center, Satan defied the laws of his own being, declaring himself independent from his Creator. 2) Sin originated in the choice no longer to cooperate with God in His plans for universal good. 3) The original sin involved dependence upon the creature rather than the Creator. 4) Separated from God, man is under the law of selfishness.

"Through the medium of influence, taking advantage of the action of mind on mind, he prevailed on Adam to sin. Thus at its very source human nature was corrupted. And ever since then sin has continued its hateful work, reaching from mind to mind. Every sin committed awakens echoes of the original sin."²⁷⁵

Thus identification of "original sin" with self-centeredness is sustained. "At its very source human nature was corrupted," [Page 119] and continues to be corrupted "ever since," by the action of mind on mind. The source of this corruption is clearly the mind which makes itself a center rather than imputed guilt and/or a degenerate body. Through mind control, Satan usurps God's place in the body temple, manipulating the electro-chemical system in the defilement of the divine image and in the destruction of man. In this way, each sin echoes the original sin. White's very next words:

“Mutual dependence is a wonderful thing. Reciprocal influence should be carefully studied. We should find out without doubt on what side we are exerting our influence.”²⁷⁶

It should be noted that: 1) The focus remains upon the influence of mind upon mind. 2) In context, stress is upon human channels used in perpetuating the original sin by willful substitution of demon-human cooperation for divine-human cooperation. 3) There is no suggestion of imputed guilt or of guilt attached to inherited pollution resulting from organic degeneration or imbalance.

Finishing the Reformation

Denial of the doctrine of original sin lies at the heart of Ellen White’s understanding of the conflict between good and evil. God is accused of authoritarianism, arbitrarily using His subjects for His own benefit. Imputation of guilt appears to confirm this charge, while undermining White’s answer.²⁷⁷ Moreover, historically, that doctrine involves the predestination concept that God preordained the existence of sin and the role of every man, each of whom brings glory to Him, either in his salvation or in his [Page 120] damnation.²⁷⁸ ***The sixteenth-century failure to throw out this Augustinian package explains why Reformationists consider the doctrine of original sin to be central to the gospel a concept White denies as a perversion of the gospel.***²⁷⁹ Correctly identifying the SDA mission to complete the Reformation,²⁸⁰ Paxton offers the following insight into the source of the present conflict:

“Brinsmead could find little help within Adventist theology on the subject of original sin. Our investigation into the theology of Adventism has revealed that, apart from some occasional references in Mrs. White, the subject of original sin has been almost entirely absent. Brinsmead therefore turned to the Reformers for guidance.”²⁸¹

In turning “to the Reformers for guidance,” Brinsmead, whom Paxton designates as “first within Adventism to develop and set forth the doctrine of original sin in a systematic way,”²⁸² turned from White to an aspect of medieval theology with which Luther, the Augustinian monk, failed to come to grips.²⁸³ It is unfortunate that Ford, in White’s name, should follow his lead.

Paxton’s comment concerning “occasional” White references is revealing. Of the ten references provided, numbers one and four [Page 121] were presented above.²⁸⁴ The third, a Ford favorite, follows:

“From the cross to the crown there is earnest work to be done. There is wrestling with inbred sin; there is warfare against outward wrong.”²⁸⁵

Both statement and context harmonize with Ellen White’s understanding of sinful nature, with no inference that “inbred sin” refers to “original sin.” Though each White reference affirms the corruption of the natural heart,²⁸⁶ not one supports inherited guilt, upon which the Reformationist case against the Traditional SDA position rests.²⁸⁷ Paxton’s second reference, relating to “original propensities to sin,” illustrates the Reformationist dilemma. [Page 122] In “The Righteousness of Christ,” which deals particularly with those “who have received the precious light of the righteousness of Christ, but...do not act upon it;...,” White speaks of ideas and theories made up of “a mixture of truth and error,” and states:

“A failure to appreciate the value of the offering of Christ, has a debasing influence; it blights our expectations, and makes us fall short of our privileges; it leads us to receive unsound and perilous theories concerning the salvation that has been purchased for us at infinite cost. The plan of salvation is not understood to be that through which divine power is brought to man in order that his human effort may be wholly successful.

To be pardoned in the way that Christ pardons, is not only to be forgiven, but to be renewed in the spirit of our mind.”²⁸⁸

With their focus upon the cross, ***Reformationists would understandably protest any suggestion of their belittling “the offering of Christ.” Nevertheless, their forensic-only doctrine is challenged in Ellen***

White's demand that salvation be understood in terms of the relation between justification and the new birth. Continuing:

“Without the transforming process which can come alone through divine power, the original propensities to sin are left in the heart in all their strength, to forge new chains, to impose slavery that can never be broken by human power.”²⁸⁹

Whether removal of the “original propensities” or of “their strength” to contaminate the experience is intended, there is no indication that Ellen White refers to ineradicable original sin. The position that “the original sin problem will remain until the coming of Christ,”²⁹⁰ is further eroded by White’s next sentence:

[Page 123] “But men can never enter heaven with their old tastes, inclinations, idols, ideas, and theories. Heaven would be no place of joy for them; for everything would be in collision with their tastes, appetites, and inclinations, and painfully opposed to their natural and cultivated traits of character.”²⁹¹

Thus White’s use of “original propensities” is wholly incompatible with the Reformation thesis. The significance of Paxton’s ten references is that: a) they are the product of a graduate thesis²⁹² which, representing original sin as the key to the contemporary SDA conflict over righteousness by faith, repeatedly points the finger at the Traditionalist “error” in rejecting it.²⁹³ b) Every reference, presumed to demonstrate Ellen White’s support of Reformationist claims only substantiates the Traditional position--not one suggesting the inheritance of guilt--the basis for their charge of heresy.²⁹⁴

Summary

Ellen White’s seminal anthropological concepts were clearly evident by 1847 when at nineteen years of age, she received her first Great Controversy vision. Broadly developed by the time of her 1863 vision on health reform, three major presentations and numerous references to the nature of man were made during the next quarter of a century. The “Conflict of the Ages Series,” the most comprehensive presentation of the great controversy theme, was developed over more than half a century, beginning three decades before Minneapolis. Since no new basic ideas are introduced during or after 1888, it is **[Page 124]** evident that no significant anthropological concepts were either derived from or generated by the Minneapolis conference.

Made in God’s image as a unique revelation of His nature and character, man is seen to be designed with higher faculties linking him with God and lower faculties identifying him with the animal world. He was to reveal God’s self-sacrificing nature by freely exercising self-discipline in ruling over the animal kingdom, of which his own animal nature was the highest representation. Biologically centered in the brain and functioning through a network of nerves which connect every organ and member of the body, the higher and lower faculties are seen to be interdependent, organic and functional units of a single electro-chemical system.

White saw the higher, rational faculties as being designed to balance and harmonize the whole organism by controlling the lower, instinctual faculties. Since man was both free and dependent, this was possible only through voluntary dependence upon and cooperation with the Holy Spirit, who would personally assume responsibility for the coordination and development of every faculty of the whole organism. Man’s own life, as well as his sovereignty over the world, was subject to continued voluntary dependence upon God.

Submitting to the tempter, man’s body temple became the habitation of demons. Taking control of the electro-chemical system, Satan subjugates the rational faculties to the perverted, lower instincts. Thus, organs designed to reveal the Creator function in such violation to His purpose and in such violence to their own nature as to largely reflect the image of the destroyer. Having thus surrendered his sovereignty, Adam could bequeath to his descendants nothing but subservience to a cruel master who works the body organs in their own destruction. Moreover, controlled through his own perverted, ego-centered desires, man instinctively defies all attempts at rescue from bondage in a misguided effort to maintain the illusion of freedom.

The Theology Crisis

Ellen White supports Ford regarding man's radically sinful nature, but denies the doctrine of original sin, which he attributes to her. A cause and effect key to this problem can be found in his insight that loss of the tree of life, and the consequent organic imbalance and degeneracy, is caused by loss of the Spirit and a corresponding loss of the state of holiness.

Sin and guilt, resulting from rebellion against God's government, corrupt all faculties which, manipulated by Satanic agencies operating through an enslaved will, perpetuate the state of independence and accelerate degeneracy. While all faculties contribute to man's decreasing moral worth and volitional capacity, guilt resides only within those higher faculties responsible for the derangement, not in lower faculties which, suffering the effects of exercise contrary to their own laws, become part of an addictive, sin-perpetuating cycle involving the whole organism. Guilt cannot reside in an amoral creation but in man who is responsible for its perversion. Thus, guilt attaches not to man's animal faculties but to those moral faculties involved in exercising the power of choice.

¹ Cf. Review 1:333, 10/10/1882.

² E.G. White, Life Sketches, Mountain view, California, Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1915, 21.

³ Ibid., 22, 23.

⁴ Ibid., 23, 24.

⁵ Ibid., 28, 29.

⁶ Ibid., 29.

⁷ Ibid., 31

⁸ Ibid., 32-42.

⁹ Ibid., 48-50.

¹⁰ Ibid., 54-59.

¹¹ Ibid., 66.

¹² Ibid., 67.

¹³ Ibid., 69.

¹⁴ Ibid., 17, 19, 26.

¹⁵ Ibid., 70, 71.

¹⁶ Ibid., 70.

¹⁷ Ibid., 72.

¹⁸ Ibid., 74-79.

¹⁹ Ibid., 83.

²⁰ Ibid., 84.

²¹ Loc. cit.

²² Ibid., 85-88, 92-94; Spiritual Gifts, 1:45-52, 62-79.

²³ Life Sketches, 89.

²⁴ General Conference of SDA, The Story of Our Church, Mountain View, California: Pacific Press Publishing. Association, 1956, 215-217.

²⁵ Life Sketches, 97.

²⁶ Spiritual Gifts, 1:83.

²⁷ Early Writings, 32-35.

²⁸ Life Sketches, 163, 164.

²⁹ Ibid., 163.

³⁰ Great Controversy, x.

³¹ E. G. White, Spiritual Gifts, Volumes 1-4, Battle Creek, Michigan: Review & Herald, 1858. Volume 2, My Christian Experience, Views and Labors in Connection with the Rise and Progress of the Third Angel's Message, published in 1860 to meet the need for a history of the movement and to meet false charges which, among other things, identified white with Mormonism. One man reported that he had known her and her husband when they "were leaders among the Nauvoo" twenty years before when White was semi-invalid and only twelve years of age!

³² Story Of Our Church, 217-220.

³³ Ibid., 66.

³⁴ Ibid., 47.

³⁵ Ibid., 67.

³⁶ White, Letter 4, 1893.

³⁷ Story of Our Church, 69, 70.

³⁸ Review, 2:381, 04/01/1890.

³⁹ Testimonies, 3:62, 1872.

⁴⁰ Ibid., 61, 62.

⁴¹ Ibid., 1:469, 470, 1867.

⁴² Ibid., 1:486, 1867.

⁴³ Ibid., 9:112, 113, 1909.

⁴⁴ Spiritual Gifts, 3:33-39.

⁴⁵ Review, 1:139-141, 02/24/1874.

⁴⁶ Review, 1:139; This thought was introduced in 1870 in volume 1 of the Spirit of Prophecy, which was otherwise almost identical to the 1864 depiction.

⁴⁷ Patriarchs & Prophets, 44, 45.

⁴⁸ Review, 4:380, 02/11/1902.

⁴⁹ Bible Echo, 01/01/1888.

⁵⁰ Spiritual Gifts, 3:36.

⁵¹ Letter 91, 1900.

⁵² Signs, 4:182, 05/29/1901.

⁵³ Ibid., 2:139, 08/11/1887.

⁵⁴ Review, 3:265, 06/18/1895.

⁵⁵ Selected Messages, 1:172-173; Review, 4:380, 2/11/1902.

⁵⁶ Manuscript 16, 1899; Ministry of Healing, 356, 1905.

⁵⁷ Education, 15.

⁵⁸ Ibid., 25.

⁵⁹ Patriarchs and Prophets, 49.

⁶⁰ Loc. cit.

⁶¹ Ibid., 45.

⁶² Ibid., 49.

⁶³ Review, 1:140.

⁶⁴ Christ's Object Lessons, 84.

⁶⁵ Review and Herald, 1:139.

⁶⁶ Desire of Ages, 20.

⁶⁷ Review and Herald, 1:139.

⁶⁸ Spiritual Gifts, 3:36.

⁶⁹ Signs of the Times, 2:32.7

⁷⁰ Desire of Ages, 20.

⁷¹ Ibid., 21-22.

⁷² Patriarchs & Prophets, 42.

⁷³ Ibid., 35-53; Great Controversy, 49.

⁷⁴ SDA Bible Commentary, Volume 7, page 913, Manuscript 128, 1897.

⁷⁵ Signs, 2:32.

⁷⁶ Patriarchs & Prophets, 48.

⁷⁷ Testimonies, 5:513, 1889.

⁷⁸ Steps to Christ, 47.

⁷⁹ Signs, 1:334.

⁸⁰ Testimonies, 5:513.

⁸¹ Ibid., 515.

⁸² Ibid., 4:414.

⁸³ Review, 1:139.

⁸⁴ Ellen G. White, Healthful Living, Battle Creek: The Medical Missionary Board, 1898, 12.

⁸⁵ Review, 3:415, 12/01/1896.

⁸⁶ Ministry of Healing, 129-130, 1905.

⁸⁷ This appears to adequately harmonize White's thinking with modern concepts of the physiology and function of the brain. Her use of "faculties," in common usage in her day, should not be understood to imply the concepts of "faculty psychology."

⁸⁸ Barnes' dissertation, 136.

⁸⁹ White's concept of the conflict between good and evil represents no dualism within the Godhead, which she sees as unified in character, purpose, thought and even action; but may be thought of as a temporary dualism within the universe. Spiritual forces remain in conflict only long enough to remove rebellion and schism in a manner to guarantee the integrity of the rational-volitional powers of His creatures. (This concept harmonizes with Rupp's interpretation of Luther; see Gordon Rupp, *The Righteousness of God*, Luther Studies, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1968, 34-35.) In perverting man's nature (which in creation was whole and totally undefiled), sin fractured its unity. This involves no true dualism however, for man remains a psychosomatic unity. Though torn between the forces of good and evil, each dimension of his nature is part of-and effects-the whole being moreover, denying the inescapability of this "schizophrenic" state, White holds that through the power of the Holy Spirit it is possible for fallen man to become whole. (See this study, 279ff.) Thus, her "holism" differs from "dualism" in its denial of the permanency of evil, as well as the existence of a soul or spirit apart from or independent of the body. (See G.C. Berkouwer, *Sin*, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing. Co 1971, 67-129, where dualism is generally consonant with White's concept.)

⁹⁰ Testimonies, 3:69-70.

⁹¹ Ministry of Healing, 173.

⁹² Testimonies, 4:60, 1876.

⁹³ Healthful Living, 195.

⁹⁴ Testimonies, 3:138.

⁹⁵ Ibid., 69.

⁹⁶ White, Fundamentals of Christian Education, hereinafter Fundamentals, Nashville, TN: Southern Publishing. Association, 1923, p. 426, 5/11/1896.

⁹⁷ Testimonies, 2:347.

⁹⁸ Review, 1:515, 4/21/1885.

⁹⁹ Healthful Living, 22, 1/11/1897.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., 8/30/1896.

¹⁰¹ Ibid., 17, 1896.

¹⁰² Ibid., 21, 8/5/1896.

¹⁰³ Ibid., 20, 8/30/1896.

¹⁰⁴ Review, 2:229, 7/17/1888.

¹⁰⁵ Signs, 2:321, 4/15/1886.

¹⁰⁶ Review, 1:290, 10/18/1881.

¹⁰⁷ Healthful Living, 20, 27, 13.

¹⁰⁸ Review, 1:151, 9/8/1874.

¹⁰⁹ Testimonies, 2:364.

¹¹⁰ Ibid., 3:561.

¹¹¹ Desire of Ages, 20-21.

¹¹² Education, 103, 1903.

¹¹³ Patriarchs & Prophets, 59.

¹¹⁴ Healthful Living, 9.

¹¹⁵ Desire Of Ages, 161.

¹¹⁶ White, Counsels on Diet and Foods, Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing. Association., 1938, 160; Testimonies, 8:364.

¹¹⁷ Signs, 1:13, 4/29/1875. Review and Herald, 3:415, 12/1/1896. Healthful Living, 9, 10, 20.

¹¹⁸ Review, 4:71, 7/25/1899.

¹¹⁹ Signs, 4:511, 05/10/1910; A similar statement was made in 1905: “The love which Christ diffuses through the whole being is a vitalizing power. Every vital part-the brain, the heart, the nerves-it touches with healing power.” (Ministry of Healing, 115.) Five years earlier, White commented that “the Holy Spirit gives nerve power.” (Signs, 4:150, 10/3/1900.).

¹²⁰ This study, 73-74.

¹²¹ Mount of Blessing, 142.

¹²² Desire of Ages, 258.

¹²³ Acts of the Apostles, 126, 1913.

¹²⁴ Spiritual Gifts, 1:21-22.

¹²⁵ Ibid., 3:36-47.

¹²⁶ The 1858 account states: “She was jealous that God had withheld from them that which was really good.” Spiritual Gifts, 1:21.

¹²⁷ Spiritual Gifts, 1:45.

¹²⁸ Ibid., 3:43, 1864.

¹²⁹ Review, 5:216, 2/22/1906.

¹³⁰ Signs, 1:82, 1/6/1879.

¹³¹ Patriarchs & Prophets, 54.

¹³² Selected Messages, 1:346, 1893.

¹³³ Review, 5:281, 10/11/1906.

¹³⁴ Ibid., 4:89, 10/24/1912.

¹³⁵ Ibid., 1:163, 4/29/1875.

¹³⁶ An additional problem in knowing truth was-the disorientation of nature. (Review, 5:26, 3/17/1904.)

¹³⁷ Cf. Spiritual Gifts, 3:45, with Signs, 1:63, 3/7/1878.

¹³⁸ This study. 74.

¹³⁹ Signs, 3:213, 6/13/1895.

¹⁴⁰ Patriarchs a Prophets, 69, 1890.

¹⁴¹ Signs, 2:325, 9/30/1889; Desire of Ages, 49.

¹⁴² Signs, 4:529, 12/22/1914.

¹⁴³ Review, 2:175, 12/13/1887.

¹⁴⁴ Signs, 3:221, 7/11/1895.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid., 4:214, 12/25/1901.

¹⁴⁶ Ibid., 4:477, 2/19/1909; *Desire of Ages*, 57.

¹⁴⁷ *Signs*, 4:237, 5/7/1902.

¹⁴⁸ *Review*, 4:492, 2/10/1903.

¹⁴⁹ *Signs*, 1:340, 4/5/1883.

¹⁵⁰ *Review*, 6:305, 1/16/1913.

¹⁵¹ *Signs*, 3:38, 5/8/1893.

¹⁵² *Review*, 6:305.

¹⁵³ *Desire of Ages*, 36.

¹⁵⁴ *Loc. cit.*

¹⁵⁵ *Signs*, 4:82, 12/20/1894.

¹⁵⁶ *This study*, 79.

¹⁵⁷ *Desire of Ages*, 466.

¹⁵⁸ *Signs*, 2:154, 9/29/1887.

¹⁵⁹ *Testimonies*, 4:91, 1876.

¹⁶⁰ *Review*, 3:137, 4/10/1894.

¹⁶¹ *Signs*, 2:176, 1/6/1888.

¹⁶² *Review*, 1:290, 10/18/1881.

¹⁶³ *Signs*, 2:85, 1/6/1887.

¹⁶⁴ Ibid., 4:473, 1/27/1909.

¹⁶⁵ Ibid., 3:366, 3/11/1897.

¹⁶⁶ *Testimonies*, 5:515, 1899.

¹⁶⁷ *Review*, 4:73, 7/25/1899.

¹⁶⁸ *Signs*, 3:341, 11/19/1896.

¹⁶⁹ Ibid., 2:139, 8/11/1887.

¹⁷⁰ *This study*, 82, 86.

¹⁷¹ *Patriarchs and Prophets*, 59-60.

¹⁷² Ibid., 60.

¹⁷³ Review, 4:415, 5/27/1902.

¹⁷⁴ Ibid., 1:151.

¹⁷⁵ Patriarchs & Prophets, 56, 1890.

¹⁷⁶ This study, 86.

¹⁷⁷ Since White holds that the fruit was good, the only evil being man's decision to disobey, no physiological factor could have been involved in the exhilaration experienced. (Education, 25.)

¹⁷⁸ Signs, 2:145, 9/1/1887; Cf. Testimonies, 4:44, 1876.

¹⁷⁹ White consistently advocated natural remedies which restore and balance the weakened faculties rather than drugs which stimulate and/or deaden the nerves so as to mask the pain. (See Ministry of Healing, 126-127, 234-268.)

¹⁸⁰ Testimonies, 3:139, 1872.

¹⁸¹ Signs, 3:155.

¹⁸² Testimonies, 5:513, 1889.

¹⁸³ Signs, 4:305, 10/21/1903.

¹⁸⁴ Ibid., 1:459, 9/11/1884.

¹⁸⁵ Ibid., 4:145, 9/12/1900.

¹⁸⁶ Review, 5:91, 11/24/1904.

¹⁸⁷ Patriarchs and Prophets, 595.

¹⁸⁸ Desire of Ages, 37, 1898.

¹⁸⁹ See this study, 70ff.

¹⁹⁰ Review, 4:492, 2/10/1903.

¹⁹¹ See this study, 93ff.

¹⁹² Review, 3:415, 12/01/1896.

¹⁹³ Signs, 3:21, 24, 84, 1872.

¹⁹⁴ Review, 2:115, 03/01/1887.

¹⁹⁵ Acts of the Apostles, 319, 1913; Testimonies, 5:169, 1885.

¹⁹⁶ Testimonies, 4:223, 1876.

¹⁹⁷ SDA Bible Commentary, 5:1140.

¹⁹⁸ Ibid., 7:952.

¹⁹⁹ Christ's Object Lessons, 49.

²⁰⁰ Counsels to Teachers, 53.

²⁰¹ Desire of Ages, 302.

²⁰² Acts of the Apostles, 551.

²⁰³ Review, 6:225, 29/02/1912.

²⁰⁴ Signs, 3:83, 12/11/1893.

²⁰⁵ Ibid., 4:109, 04/11/1900.

²⁰⁶ Steps to Christ, 17.

²⁰⁷ Review, 4:271, 3/12/1901.

²⁰⁸ Testimonies, 4:459, 1879.

²⁰⁹ Signs, 4:388, 14/06/1905.

²¹⁰ Ibid., 4:14, 25/01/1899.

²¹¹ Review, 5:422, 15/06/1908.

²¹² Signs, 1:266, 08/12/1881.

²¹³ Review. 6:225. 29/02/1912

²¹⁴ Ibid., 2:380, 28/04/1890.

²¹⁵ Ibid., 1:84, 23/01/1879.

²¹⁶ Ibid., 2:226, 06/07/1888.

²¹⁷ Review, 3:198, 30/10/1894

²¹⁸ Signs, 2:456, 14/12/1891.

²¹⁹ Review, 3:191, 09/10/1894.

²²⁰ Testimonies, 8:312, 1904; Cf. Review, 2:499; Sin is primarily a self-centered state. In a secondary sense ***acts*** also represent sin and involve guilt-but the guilt is measured by the attitudes and motives which prompted the acts. ***A deranged organism represents sinful nature but not personal sin and guilt, except as its tendencies are given self-centered expression.***

²²¹ For White on faculties of the soul, see Barnes dissertation, 136.

²²² Signs, 1:209, 13/01/1881.

²²³ Patriarchs and Prophets, 421.

²²⁴ Christ's Object Lessons, 152.

²²⁵ Ibid., 155.

²²⁶ Ibid., 158.

²²⁷ Ibid., 160.

²²⁸ Patriarchs and Prophets, 53.

²²⁹ Ibid., 61.

²³⁰ This study, 28-29; The issue is not man's radical depravity, which has been amply confirmed by White. ***Reformationist charges against fellow-SDA's involve the claim of divine imputation of Adam's guilt upon each of his descendants. Such a transfer of guilt and pollution is understood to make inconceivable a communion with God so intimate as to provide the possibility of cessation from sin***, though remarkable victories are to be expected. (Ibid., 30ff.). Thus, Christ could not possibly have taken man's post-fall nature-even biologically, as many SDA's claim-without having become an active sinner. (Ibid., 48-52.) Paxton's primary purpose in his Shaking was to establish this doctrine of original sin and prove that SDA's have fallen into a three-fold heresy (as indicated above) as a consequence of rejecting it. (See Shaking, 116-117 for specific identification of these three with that doctrine, and his portrayal of Ford as repudiating each.) In a telephone interview (28/01/1979), Ford defined his concept of original sin (See this study, 28-29) as the Traditional view of Christendom," stating, "It involves not only inherited guilt, but also pollution, which itself involves a form of guilt."

²³¹ SDA Bible Commentary 1:1083-1084, Manuscript 1, 1892.

²³² See also Education, 29.

²³³ Signs, 1:456, 21/08/1884.

²³⁴ Ibid., 1:281, 18/09/1879.

²³⁵ Ibid., 2:186, 10/02/1888.

²³⁶ Ibid., 4:126, 27/06/1900.

²³⁷ Loc. cit.

²³⁸ Ibid., 127.

²³⁹ Loc. cit.

²⁴⁰ Signs, 2:384, 19/05/1890; Note: Tim Crosby suggests "mediate imputation" in contrast to the Calvinistic Reformationist concept of "immediate imputation," as a means of expressing White's concept. The latter forensic position asserts "that both man's depravity and death are penal consequences of Adam's death." In other words, God decreed that Adam's descendants should be depraved and bear the guilt of Adam's sin. In the mediate position, righteousness and guilt both "are imputed on the condition of a certain quality in the imputed faith and depravity respectively. Adam's guilt comes upon all who by personal choice and action verify that they are in conflict with God as he was. Thus the mediate imputation theory of original sin proves to be a mirror image of the SDA doctrine of righteousness by faith, in which the imputed is (ultimately if not initially) conditional upon the imparted." (Tim Crosby, "A New Approach to an Adventist Doctrine of original Sin," hereinafter, "Original Sin," unpublished paper, Andrews University, 1977, 6, 8.) While evidence is lacking that White ever formalized such a concept and was likely unaware of its existence, Crosby's suggestion offers a theological explanation close enough to her concept to merit further

study. No external theological structure should be considered normative for interpreting the theology of another, however, as the present dialog demonstrates. Thus, while the “mediate” concept may prove useful as a tool for examining and illustrating White, under no circumstances should it be considered authoritative.

²⁴¹ White, Letter 68, 1899.

²⁴² This study, 48.

²⁴³ Signs, 4:430, 03/10/1906.

²⁴⁴ Does Paxton imply that Brinsmead holds ideas to be inherited when he quotes his reference to the hereditary Adventist idea of being sinless in order to live without Christ’s mediation after the close of probation”? (Shaking, 101.) It is as logical to see advocacy of inheritance of ideas in this passage as it is to read original sin into White’s reference to inheritance of guilt.

²⁴⁵ Ford specifically points to this passage, which he repeatedly referred to in personal conversation and telephone (28/01/1979, 01/02/1979), as the strongest.

²⁴⁶ Ministry of Healing, 451.

²⁴⁷ Loc. cit.

²⁴⁸ Ibid., 452.

²⁴⁹ Ibid., 453-454.

²⁵⁰ Ibid., 455.

²⁵¹ Ibid., 456

²⁵² Ibid., 457.

²⁵³ Signs, 1:167, 17/06/1880.

²⁵⁴ Ibid., 3:386, 27/05/1897.

²⁵⁵ Ibid., 2:514, 26/09/1892; Review, 3:123, 20/02/1894.

²⁵⁶ Patriarchs and Prophets, 118.

²⁵⁷ Signs, 1:161-162, 30/06/1880.

²⁵⁸ Patriarchs and Prophets, 306, Cf. 561.

²⁵⁹ Signs, 2:17, 11/02/1886.

²⁶⁰ Testimonies, 4:29, 1876.

²⁶¹ Signs, 4:274, 17/12/1902.

²⁶² Ibid., 3:391, 17/06/1897.

²⁶³ Loc. cit.

²⁶⁴ Desire of Ages, 556.

²⁶⁵ Christ's Object Lessons, 48.

²⁶⁶ Acts of the Apostles, 51.

²⁶⁷ See Review, 2:499, 30/06/1891.

²⁶⁸ Signs, 4:391, 29/06/1905.

²⁶⁹ This study, 89ff.

²⁷⁰ Ibid., 105ff.

²⁷¹ Though he did not originate the concept, "Augustine gave the doctrine of original sin its major formulation and impetus." (Crosby, "Original Sin." 3.)

²⁷² Review, 4:281, 16/04/1901.

²⁷³ This study, 100.

²⁷⁴ Review, loc. cit.

²⁷⁵ Loc. cit.

²⁷⁶ Loc. cit.

²⁷⁷ This study, 68ff.

²⁷⁸ See SDA Bible Commentary, 10:1144-1145.

²⁷⁹ Though denying predestination, Brinsmead and Ford rely upon theologians who hold vigorously to this native root of original sin. Buchanan, whose *The Doctrine of Justification* Ford calls "The greatest classic in print," (Documents, 2.) is a committed predestination believer. (See page 388.) Another recommended theologian states: "Jesus has achieved our entire salvation. That is why we were so determined in our predestination controversy." (See this study, 169.)

²⁸⁰ Shaking, 18.

²⁸¹ Ibid., 99.

²⁸² Loc. cit.

²⁸³ See G. Rupp, Righteousness of God, 185-191.

²⁸⁴ This study, 105; Cf. 489 110.

²⁸⁵ Review, 2:171, 29/11/1887.

²⁸⁶ significant elements in #5-10 follow: "Our hearts are naturally sinful, and slothful in the service of Christ;" (Testimonies, 2: 710). "There is in the nature of man, when not under the direct influence of the Spirit of God, a disposition to envy, jealousy, and cruel distrust, which, if not subdued." (Ibid., 3:343) "In the human heart there is natural selfishness and corruption, which can only be overcome by most thorough discipline and severe restraint; and even then it will require years of patient effort and earnest resistance." (Ibid., 4:496) "The tendencies of the natural heart are downward. He who associates with the skeptic will

soon become skeptical;” (Ibid., 4:587) “The natural heart is full of hatred to the truth, as it is in Jesus;” (My Life Today, 261) “In the unregenerate heart there is love of sin, and a disposition to cherish it. In the renewed heart there is hatred of sin, and determined resistance against it.” (Great Controversy, 508).

²⁸⁷ These Review editorial excerpts represent the Traditional position: “The ‘original sin’ concept is a philosophical deduction read into the text. The words of Paul do not state the original sin theory. The apostle here sets forth a series of contrasts. Adam and Christ are thus contrasted one opened the door to sin. The other to salvation. A sinful nature can be inherited, but the moral responsibility cannot. If the ‘original sin’ theory be accepted-if moral guilt passed upon all men as a result of Adam’s transgression-then by parity of reasoning the grace of Christ should likewise pass upon all men as a result of Christ’s gift. irrespective of their choice. (Review, 23/10/1865; SDA Bible Commentary, 10:748, 1197.)

²⁸⁸ Review, 2:419, 19/08/1890.

²⁸⁹ Loc. cit.; Cf. This study, 48, 148ff.

²⁹⁰ Shaking, 102.

²⁹¹ Loc. cit.

²⁹² Ibid., Preface.

²⁹³ Ibid., 98-123p Cf. 124-156.

²⁹⁴ Reformationists identify all non-Reformationists as traditional. A number of viewpoints exist however, none of which is evaluated in this study. Some of the emphases do appear to inadequately portray the radical nature of man’s condition, thus stimulating the development of the Reformationist movement and strengthening its efforts.

4. RIGHTEOUSNESS

Merit¹ is the central issue revolving around the doctrine of original sin in Reformationist charges that it is heretical to include sanctification (or any other subjective element) in the gospel; while the question of *security* gives to the issue its sense of urgency and a powerful psychological drive. Convinced that the security chain must break if it includes a weak human link, Reformationists, who consider even Spirit-directed works to be polluted², hold that by including the subjective one is robbed of his *sense of security* to the degree that he senses the sinfulness of his nature; while failure to see that sinfulness robs him of the reality of *security* by nourishing in him an experience of self-righteous legalism. In examining Ellen White's concept to determine the degree to which she supports these claims, attention will first be given to the question of merit. A 1901 article, *Work Out Your Own Salvation*, serves to illustrate how both sides may seek support from identical [Page 127] references. Some Traditionalists would emphasize the following:

The salvation of the soul requires the blending of divine and human strength. God does not propose to do the work that man can do to meet the standard of righteousness. Man has a part to act... Man must heartily cooperate with God, willingly obeying His law, showing that he appreciates the great gift of grace³

Reformationists, however, would emphasize that “the human agent must remember that he has in himself no merits to present to God”, and that Christ is the fountain of life.”⁴ Believing that “Justification has [already] been secured for all,” and “the whole human race has been restored to favor with God...” they consider it axiomatic that all striving must represent grateful human response to an already completed salvation to which man can make no contribution.⁵ Four years before Minneapolis White expressed the following concern over the problem of merit:

We have long desired and tried to obtain these blessings, but have not received them, because we have cherished the idea that we could do something to make ourselves, worthy of them. We have not looked away from ourselves believing that Jesus is a living Savior. We must not think that our own grace and merits will save us; the grace of Christ is our only hope of salvation.⁶

Aversion to the “idea that we could do something to make our selves worthy” marks both White and Reformationists. A typical positive expression of her feelings on this subject follows:

What love, what wonderful love, was displayed by the Son of God! The death we deserve was suffered to come upon Him, that immortality might be given to us, who could never merit such a reward.⁷

“The great danger with the people who believe the truth for this [Page 128] time,” declares the first of an 1892 series on the beatitudes, “is that they shall feel as if they were entitled to the blessing of God because they have made this or that sacrifice, done this or that good work, for the Lord.” White's solution: “If we would draw upon His grace we must feel our poverty”.⁸ In the third article:

He who has mourned for sin knows that there is nothing in him whereby he has merited the returns that God has bestowed. He beholds in Jesus ‘the chiefest among ten thousand’ and ‘the One altogether lovely,’ and he centers his affections upon Christ.⁹

The Proud Heart Strives for merit

The problem is that natural man is infected with the spirit of Lucifer who sought to “be like the Most High”¹⁰ Blindly, “the proud heart strives to earn salvation”¹¹ which can be provided only by “the Most High.” In 1896 White wrote:

We gain heaven not through our own merits, but through the merits of Jesus Christ. We cannot find salvation in our own individual selves; we are to look to Jesus who is the author and finisher of our faith, and as we look, we live. Satan would point us to ourselves, and seek to make us feel that we must bear our own sins. How hard poor mortals strive to be sin-bearers for themselves and for others! But the only sin-bearer is Jesus Christ. He alone can be my substitute and sin bearer.¹²

[Page 129] *One can thus seek to “be like the Most High” by striving to bear his own sin or that of others*¹³ This effort to bear one's own sin may result from self-satisfaction which disdains the atoning blood, as in Cain's case,¹⁴ or from a feeling of unworthiness.¹⁵ Both involve turning away from the only source of hope.¹⁶ Two years after the famed conference, White speaks of Paul's experience:

He walked with Christ, and Jesus became to him—not a part of salvation, while his own good deeds were another part, but—his all in all, the first and last and best in everything.¹⁷

White here repudiates any possibility of even partial dependence upon human effort or behavior. “We are not safe in trusting in ourselves.” “Separated from God, leaning to their own understanding, men become fools; and yet in their own estimation, and in the estimation of others, they are often the wisest of men.”¹⁸ “... [We] must understand,” she asserts, “that not one holy thought, not one unselfish act, can be originated in self. It is only through Christ that there can be any virtue in humanity.”¹⁹ Denying any virtue or merit to prayer,²⁰ Ellen White declares:

This idea of prayer is an outworking of the principle of self-expiation which lies at the foundation of all systems of false religion... Prayer is not an expiation for sin; it has no virtue or merit in itself.²¹

Self-expiation, which characterizes false religious worship, **[Page 130]** lies at the heart of all attempts to secure heaven by human merit. Another universal principle is found in the following warning:

All religious service, however attractive and costly, that endeavors to merit the favor of God, all mortification of the flesh,... whatever prevents us from making Christ our entire dependence, is abomination in the sight of God.²²

Both self-expiation and merit-seeking are abominable because entire dependence is removed from Christ and shared with self.

Works, Vital but Not Meritorious

Denial of any human virtue or merit does not in any way decry good works, however.²³ Three months before Minneapolis White wrote:

It is true that our works will not save us, and yet no one will be saved without good works. A pure life, a holy character, must be attained by everyone who would enter the portals of the city of God. The moralist, trusting in his own goodness, will be found wanting. Like Cain, he presents a sacrifice which does not recognize the blood of Jesus... Every sinner must have virtue that is not possessed by himself. Our door-post must be marked by the atoning blood, thus acknowledging our own inefficiency, and the merits of the Lamb of God,...²⁴

To correct man's inherent drive-to seek personal merit, the Holy Spirit must function as a reprover as well as a revealer.

[Page 131] The comforter is to come as a reprover, as one who is to lay open before us our defects of character, and at the same time to reveal to us the merit of Him...

But many of you say, "I have prayed, I have tried, I have struggled, and I do not see that I advance one step." What is the trouble? Have you not thought you were earning something, that you were by your struggles and works paying the price of your redemption? This you can never do... [Take] the gift of God...[P]lead the merits of a crucified and risen Savior.²⁵

So the effectiveness of human effort is dependent solely upon acknowledging the Spirit's appraisal of one's sinfulness and responding to His revelation of Christ by pleading His merits.

Basis of False Religion

White also distinguishes between true and false religion in terms of the divine purpose in creation and redemption.

This illustrates the working of all false religions. They originate in man's desire to exalt himself above God, but result in degrading man below the brute. Every religion that wars against the sovereignty of God defrauds man of the glory which was his at creation, and which is to be restored to him in Christ.²⁶

Self-exaltation is thus seen to result in degrading man. Two paradoxical principles essential to an understanding of White's concept of righteousness by faith are implicit: on one hand, self exaltation, seen as the foundation of all false religion,²⁷ must be met by a comprehension of the creatureliness of man and the sinfulness of his nature as opposed to the sovereignty of God and the perfection of His law. On the other, depreciating man is seen to depreciate the Creator. Moreover, to defraud man of the glory given **[Page 132]** at creation, a glory of character which Christ came to restore²⁸ is to deny the power of God and to defraud Christ Himself of the fulfillment of His creative purpose.

Man's instinctive desire to resolve tension understandably results in the tendency to reduce the tension involved in this paradox by emphasizing one element at the expense of the other. But to do so is to destroy the balance and to develop an alien theology. *According to White, to treat lightly man's inability to meet the Creator's requirements inevitably results in a self-righteousness which degrades him by perpetuating his independence from the source of all goodness and power.*²⁹ *To belittle Christ's ability to restore, however, undermines both the sovereignty of God and power of the gospel.* Warning against the first danger follows:

He [God] saw that the weakness, the curse of the church, would be a spirit of self-righteousness, that would lead men to think that they could do something by which they might earn a right to a place in the kingdom of heaven. He saw that they would imagine that when they had attained to certain goodness, made certain advancement, then the Lord would come in and help them, and in this way there would be an abundance of self but little of Jesus. Many have made but little advancement,...³⁰

Worthless in terms of human merit, effort becomes effective as man realizes that under no circumstances can he merit anything with God. Failure to thus focus away from self to Christ is seen to be both the "weakness [and] curse" of the church. Those who indulge in self-righteousness "have only measured themselves with a standard of their own creating, and with sacrilegious hands they have **[Page 133]** torn down the true standard of all righteousness."³¹ Whether that self-imposed standard results from a legalistic narrowing of God's law by overlooking its internal principles, or involves a presumptuous attempt to improve upon it, the divine verdict against self righteous sacrilege applies.³²

Thus while self-righteousness may lead to lowering the standard by failure to recognize selfishness and pride as the basis of sin, it may also result from presumptuous refusal to "submit to the will

of Christ” on the part of those who set up “a standard for themselves, [Page 134] forming characters according to their own will and pleasure,” and who “weave into the fabric of their characters so many threads of personal imperfections that the beautiful pattern is spoiled.” Whether therefore from a pharisaical attempt to keep the law or from a rebellious redefinition of its terms, the self-righteous misrepresent the perfect character—the righteousness— of Christ³³ by denying the sinfulness of sin. Note how the following strongly-worded statement covers both:

Many will see beautiful characteristics in Christ and will admire them; but that love which embraces His entire character, will never dwell in a heart filled with self-righteousness, will never dwell in a heart that does not realize and abhor its own sinfulness. Not to hate ourselves in sin, is not to love Jesus. Not to see our own deformities, is not to see the beauty of Christ; for it is when the heart is fully aroused to its own state of degradation that Jesus will be appreciated. The more humble our views of self, the more exalted will be our views of Christ, and the more clearly we shall discern the sacred spotless character of our redeemer.³⁴

Only Commendation—Great Need

The Pharisee who despises the publican on the false assumption that he is himself fulfilling the law clearly comes under this rebuke. But what of one who, in the name of Christ’s merits, eulogizes the publican while scorning as a “Pharisee” one who seriously attempts to keep the law, thanking God all the while that he sufficiently recognizes the sinful nature as to deny any possibility (even through the Spirit’s power) of fulfilling the law’s demands?³⁵

[Page 135] While the former errs in looking upon duty and obedience as meritorious, the latter undermines the importance of both.³⁶

According to White, the great need of all Pharisees is to recognize their self-righteous tendencies. But alas, Pharisees tend to be unwilling to part from the gratification of self-righteousness and are too conscious of the problems of others to recognize their own great need, which is their only recommendation to Christ. “Our great need is itself an argument and pleads most eloquently in our behalf,” says White, continuing:

Our own merit will never commend us to the favor of God; it is the worthiness of Jesus that will save us, His blood that will cleanse us; yet we have a work to do in complying with the conditions.³⁷

True greatness in the sight of heaven comes when, in response to the afflictions which reveal “to us the plague spots in our characters,” we learn lessons of humility and self-control, together with a trustful spirit which will not rob “God of His right to reveal in [us] His own perfection of character.”³⁸ On the basis of this principle, White advises:³⁹

When Satan comes to you to tell you that you are a great sinner, begin to look up to your Redeemer and to talk of His merits; that which will help you is to look to his light. Acknowledge your sin; but... Tell the enemy that “Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners,” and that you are saved by his matchless love... The merits of his sacrifice are sufficient to present to his Father in our behalf.⁴⁰

[Page 136]

Paradoxes—Keys to White’s Theology

Though White reveals a remarkable consistency over the seven decades of her ministry, some find it expedient to deny or mute certain apparently contradictory elements in their attempts to “harmonize” her

writings. Unfortunately, this only obscures and confuses her theology, which is interpenetrated by paradoxical elements which—constituting *keys* to her concepts—must be honored if she is to be understood. The following examples are given to illustrate the numerous paradoxes present in her works.⁴¹

Self-Respect vs. Unworthiness

In her strong emphasis upon Christ's merits and denial of all human merits, White is always careful not to denigrate man. She insisted in 1888 that "it is not pleasing to God that you should demerit yourself," and advised the cultivation of "self-respect" by living a life "approved by your own conscience."⁴² So recognition of one's weakness and unworthiness need not result in a low self-concept, for "the Lord would not have us depreciate ourselves."⁴³

The Lord is disappointed when His people place a low estimate upon themselves. He desires His chosen heritage to value themselves according to the price He has placed upon them. God wanted them, else He would not have sent His son on such an expensive errand to redeem them. He has a use for them, and He is well pleased when they make the very highest demands upon [Page 137] Him, that they may glorify His name.⁴⁴

While man is to recognize the radical sinfulness of his nature and even to hate himself "in sin,"⁴⁵ acknowledging the total lack of merit in his own works, he is simultaneously to cultivate a high self-concept measured by the value placed on him by Christ.⁴⁶ Two distinct factors form the basis for this self-concept, — "the atoning sacrifice of Christ,"⁴⁷ and "the union of divinity with humanity that brings to the human race a value that we scarcely comprehend."⁴⁸

"All-sufficient" Sacrifice vs. Necessary Human Cooperation

Although a *twofold basis* for self-worth—a wholly sufficient sacrifice and divine-human union—has already been established, nonetheless a *twofold human response* is essential to its individual acquirement. On the basis of Christ's atoning sacrifice, man must *choose to enter* that "union of divinity and humanity," provided by Christ,⁴⁹ and *consequently reflect the divine attributes*. Note:

[Page 138] If men do not reflect the spirit and attributes of Christ, God cannot take pleasure in them... Those only who, by prayer and watchfulness and love, work the works of Christ, can God rejoice over with singing. The more fully the Lord sees the character of his beloved Son revealed in his people the greater is his satisfaction and delight in them.⁵⁰

This striking statement indicates a subjective element which, though secondary, is no less essential to a meaningful valuation of one's self "according to the price paid." It also helps explain the significance of the following: "Not to hate ourselves in sin, is not to love Jesus."⁵¹ To be "in sin" is to be "out of Christ," and to deny both the merits of His atoning sacrifice and the provisions established for re-union of the human and the divine. The two preceding paragraphs begin as follows:

But it is only because of the value of the sacrifice made for us that we are of value in the Lord's sight. It is only because of Christ's imparted righteousness that we are counted precious by the Lord...

Were it not for Christ's atoning sacrifice, there would be nothing in us in which God could delight. All the natural goodness of man is worthless in God's sight."⁵²

[Page 139]

“For Us” vs. “In Us”⁵³

Note that while the Sacrifice alone establishes the basis of human worth, the value is found in redeemed man. ***Only through Christ’s (imparted)⁵⁴ righteousness, resulting from union with Him, is the individual “counted righteous.”*** Through righteousness which is objectively provided (cross) and subjectively received, God does find “in us” something in which to delight. That the objective atonement can only be received subjectively⁵⁵ does not permit man to [Page 140] boast, for merit is found only in Christ, whose goodness ever contrasts with the false “natural goodness of man.”

Christ’s Merits Become Effective When Mixed with Man’s Works

“The divine favor, the grace of God,” is only “bestowed upon us through Jesus Christ,” for it is the

... fragrance of the merit of Christ that makes our good works acceptable to God, and it is grace that enables us to do the works for which he rewards us.⁵⁶

Thus it is the mixture of the incense of Christ’s merit with man’s works which ultimately determines his value. Absence of either spells disappointment for God and disaster for man, while the combination of these two elements is the basis for rejoicing for both God and man in the judgment.

Justified by Faith but Judged by Works

That the fragrance of Christ’s merit is released only as faith applies it to one’s works is the principle underlying White’s declaration that man is justified by faith, but judged by works.⁵⁷ Thus, “Our acceptance with God is not upon the ground of our good [Page 141] works, but our reward will be according to our works”.⁵⁸ If works were the *ground* of reward, man’s case would be hopeless. But as the *basis* of judgment they provide hope through the incense of His merit.⁵⁹ Since man’s present acceptance of Christ’s merit and his future standing in the judgment on the basis of that merit are thus character related,⁶⁰ neither God’s present pleasure nor future judgment can be viewed as solely forensic, or objective.⁶¹

Then the virtue of character we have received from Christ’s righteousness will ally us to true greatness of the highest order. Every action of ours will be rewarded. In the day of final reckoning, Christ presents before them the faithful work they have done for him.⁶²

There will then be no confusion, however, as to merits. Accepting His “free gift,” in humility,⁶³ believers who “cannot be saved without good works,” will declare, ‘We are unprofitable servants’.⁶⁴ More than a decade before 1888 Ellen White stated clearly:

It is now or never that you must perfect Christian character. There will be no following term that you may enter the school of Christ... It is of the highest importance that in the great examination to come you can stand in the merits of your heavenly Redeemer by having gained the victory in his name... We want you to swell the triumph of “worthy, worthy, worthy is the lamb that was slain...” We want to see everyone of you with your laurels of honor that you shall cast at the feet of your Redeemer;...⁶⁵

[Page 142] Three factors are evident: a) Man’s destiny is determined by the judge’s examination of his character; b) the significant factor in that judgment is the permeation of his works by Christ’s merit;

c) rewarded as though the merit were his, man gratefully casts his “laurels of honor... at the feet of [his] Redeemer.”

Thus, just as man’s value is set by Christ’s sacrifice but ultimately established by the imparting and subsequent reflection of His life,— through divine-human relationships,⁶⁶ — so the judgment is based upon the merits of Christ but determined by man’s character and works. In each case, the second factor is determinative because reception of the first is governed by it.⁶⁷

Substitute and Surety

“We must center our hopes of heaven upon Christ alone, because He is our substitute and surety”,⁶⁸ White declared in 1890. More than two decades earlier she portrayed Christ as “the only sacrifice of sufficient value to fully satisfy the claims of God’s perfect law,”⁶⁹ explaining that even angels—as created beings and hence of less value than the law—could not meet its requirements. “Christ’s sacrifice in behalf of man was full and complete. The condition of the atonement had been fulfilled.”⁷⁰

Entire justice was done in the atonement. In place of the sinner, the spotless Son of God received the penalty, *and the sinner goes free as long as he receives and holds Christ as his personal Savior*. Though guilty, [Page 143] he is looked upon as innocent. Christ fulfilled every requirement demanded by justice.⁷¹

Note the continued subjective condition of the objective gift: “as long as he receives and holds Christ as His personal Savior.” Ellen White concurs with Reformationists, however, in her strong emphasis concerning the demands of the law and the satisfaction of justice in an atonement for sin, the demands of the law being the same as in Eden—perfect obedience—which could be met by only One.⁷²

Under the covenant of grace God requires from man just what he required in Eden,— perfect obedience. The believing sinner, through his divine Substitute and Surety, renders obedience to the law of God. Christ kept the law perfectly, and through him the believer shall not perish...⁷³

White’s covenant concept is considered later,⁷⁴ but it should be noted that the obedience required can only result from covenant relationships involving Christ’s role both as Substitute and Surety. With reference to the substitutionary transfer of Christ’s righteousness and virtues to the believer through faith, she declares:

Through the atoning blood of Christ, the sinner is set free from bondage and condemnation; through the perfection of the sinless Substitute and Surety, ‘ he may run in the race of humble obedience’ to all of God’s commandments. Without Christ he is under the condemnation of the law, always a sinner, but through Christ ‘he is made just’ before God, he keeps his commandments.⁷⁵

[Page 144] Thus White is unequivocal—reception of the Substitute *does make righteous*, placing man in such a relation to his Surety that he is enabled to “run in the race of humble obedience.”⁷⁶ Three months before Minneapolis she wrote:

He bore the penalty of man’s disobedience, that man might be reinstated in the favor of God, and by a life of humble obedience might form such a character as would be accounted worthy of a place in the kingdom of God... He can rejoice in Christ as his living Savior, his substitute, his surety, his strength, and righteousness.⁷⁷

While in a variety of ways Christ is set forth as the basis of salvation, man’s being “accounted worthy of a place in the kingdom,” is, nevertheless, still seen to be contingent upon his own character.⁷⁸ This paradox is resolved by White’s understanding that character development is made possible by and through Christ. Presented nearly twenty years later, the statement below contains a vital clue to White’s thinking:

He made an offering so complete that through his grace every one may reach the standard of perfection. Of those who receive his grace and follow his example it will be [Page 145] written in the book of life,—‘Complete in him’—without spot or stain.”... We are to surrender ourselves to him. When this surrender is entire, Christ can finish the work he began for us by the surrender of himself. Then he can bring us to complete restoration.⁷⁹

Note the nature of the secondary but *determinative* condition: although Christ’s offering was complete and sufficient at the cross, (nothing either needed to be or could be added) its reception—with the consequent restoration—is effected only when Christ’s surrender in making it is met by man’s surrender in receiving it.⁸⁰ Man’s obedience, though accruing no merit and though of infinitely less value than Christ’s atonement, is nevertheless seen to be of equal importance in determining man’s destiny,— not as a supplement to salvation but as the only means of acquiring that all-sufficient salvation which has already been provided. Christ’s merits prove of no value to the individual unless applied to his own works.⁸¹ In such application, however, man earns nothing but gains everything.

Price of the Perfect Atonement

Only through a comprehension of the great cost of salvation can man truly understand either the hatefulness of sin⁸² or the value of the sacrifice.⁸³ Describing Christ’s suffering as beyond comparison [Page 146] with that of the martyrs,⁸⁴ White declares concerning the crushing weight of the “Father’s anger in consequence of sin,” “Christ was amazed with the horror of darkness which enclosed him.”⁸⁵ Writing two decades later, she describes his separation from the Father:

Christ was now standing in a different attitude from that in which he had ever stood before. Hitherto he had been as an intercessor himself... He was bearing the penalty of transgressions for a sinful world... realizing his Father’s frown.⁸⁶

Speaking of His “enduring the curse of the law,” in “vindicating the justice of God,” she exclaims:

The human nature of Christ was like unto ours, and suffering was more keenly felt by him; for his spiritual nature was free from every taint of sin... How intense was the desire of the humanity of Christ to escape the displeasure of an offended God... Separation from his Father, the punishment for transgression, was to fall upon him, in order to magnify God’s law and testify to its immutability. And this was to settle the controversy between Satan and the Prince of heaven in regard to the eternity of that law.⁸⁷

Little wonder White ever exalts the cross, considering it the “science of all education,”⁸⁸ “center of hope for humanity,”⁸⁹ to be presented in the final judgment,⁹⁰ and the science and song of the redeemed.⁹¹ The intensity of the Father’s suffering as well as the willingness of Christ to die is graphically portrayed by White in her treatment of Abraham’s supreme sacrifice, which was designed for the instruction of heavenly beings as well as of man.⁹² “It had [Page 147] been difficult even for the angels to grasp the mystery of redemption,— to comprehend that the Commander of heaven, the Son of God, must die for guilty man.”⁹³

Perfect Life—Vantage Ground

The atonement made by the Lamb of God, which Isaac symbolized, had to be without spot and blameless.⁹⁴ Thus, Christ’s sinless life was seen to be a part of the atonement,⁹⁵ both aspects of the atonement, his death and victory, raising “humanity in the scale of moral value with God,”⁹⁶ White never tired of referring to the divine declaration, “This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased,” as the

The Theology Crisis

basis for humanity's acceptance with heaven and its exaltation "in the scale of moral worth with God,..."⁹⁷ Closely related is another favorite expression, "vantage ground":

Equal with the Father, yet His divinity clothed with humanity, standing at the head of the fallen race, that human beings might be placed on vantage ground... In Him divinity and humanity were united... He lived in this world a perfect life, revealing the character to which, through divine grace, man may attain.⁹⁸

Thus not simply a legal (forensic) standing,⁹⁹ but an incarnation-provided divine-human relation raises man to vantage ground.

[Page 148]

Power in the Cross

Reformationists recognize a cause and effect relationship between Christ's merits and man's efforts in sanctification, but insist that the latter is only spontaneous fruit of justification,¹⁰⁰ whereas White holds that even after justification, man's will in retaining a relationship of cooperation is determinative.¹⁰¹ Note:

The beautiful mansions are opened to those who have practiced self-denial, who have brought their wills into subjection to the will of God, and in life and character have conformed to the divine standard... (I)f through the grace of Christ they subdue their unlovely traits, and [Page 149] fight the good fight of faith, they will receive the overcomer's reward.

The work before every one of us who have named the name of Christ is to copy the divine Pattern. We must rely in loving confidence upon the merits of Christ, and take hold of His strength. Day by day we must subdue the evil traits that strive for the mastery. Earnest faith and loving obedience will bring us into close relationship with Christ.¹⁰²

Thus the divine, objective will (imputation of Christ's merits and obedience) is effective only when experientially claimed by the active will of man, who nevertheless sees himself as an unprofitable servant, doing only what is required and earning no merits thereby.¹⁰³ Long before the 1888 crisis, White dwelt upon "the infinite sacrifice" as providing transforming power "through obedience."¹⁰⁴

Christ in his own life has given us proof that man can keep the law of God, and through his merits be a final overcomer... Christ would have us understand that our righteousness must include not only the observance of the letter of the law, but also the spirit and principle of it...(T)he spirit of the law points to Jesus Christ as the atoning sacrifice, through whose merits the sinner can fulfill the requirements of the law,... There is perfect harmony between the law and the gospel.¹⁰⁵

Thus obedience, both internal and external, is required, being [Page 150] made possible through the atonement. Pointing to the cross, the Spirit of the law harmonizes the law and gospel in the life of the believer, thus giving validity to the letter. The centrality of effort in claiming Christ's merits by faith is repeatedly indicated before Minneapolis.¹⁰⁶

Our Substitute and Surety has given power by faith, to become victors through his merits.¹⁰⁷

The white raiment is the righteousness of Christ that may be wrought into the character...

You may say that you believe in Jesus, when you have an appreciation of the cost of salvation. You may make this claim, when you feel that Christ died for you on the cruel cross of Calvary; when you have an intelligent, understanding faith that his death makes it possible for you to cease from sin, and to perfect a righteous character through the grace of God, bestowed upon you as the purchase of Christ's blood... The plan of salvation... is made altogether a cheap affair; whereas to unite the human with the divine, required an exertion of Omnipotence.¹⁰⁸

While the Reformationist stress is almost exclusively upon the external obedience and merits of Christ,¹⁰⁹ White habitually stresses both divine and human factors, the first as the basis for the second, but the second determining the effectiveness of the first. While their stress is *forensic*, hers is *relational*,¹¹⁰ with absolutely [Page 151] no change in emphasis being seen during the period of intense conflict following Minneapolis.¹¹¹

The Spirit and the Cross Instill Enmity

A vital clue to the power of the cross is that when illuminated by the Spirit, its revelation of the demonic hatred of Satan, in stark contrast to the self-sacrificing love of God, facilitates breaking Satan's power over man's mind.¹¹² To remove sin's yoke of bondage requires two distinct agencies: the *cross* and the *Holy Spirit*— by which alone its power is realized. Separated from God there is “a continual opposition” to His “will and ways,”¹¹³ as reflected by the cross. Thus the cross is an offense which, instead of drawing, only further estranges man from God—unless interpreted to the soul by the Spirit. On the other hand, the Spirit cannot remove enmity [Page 152] and restore unity except through the *cross* which, as the only basis of atonement for a broken law, provides the best instrument the *Spirit* can use to break man's heart and thus break his infatuation with sin.¹¹⁴ Both factors are evident in the following:

The followers of Christ and the servants of Satan cannot harmonize. The offense of the cross has not ceased... Satan summons all his forces and throws his whole power into combat... All who are not decided followers of Christ are servants of Satan. In the unregenerated heart there is love of sin and a disposition to cherish and excuse it. In the renewed heart there is hatred of sin and determined resistance against it.¹¹⁵

A cause of offense against God in the unregenerate, the cross becomes the source of enmity against Satan in the regenerate. Without the Spirit who alone can effect such a transfer of allegiance and enmity, the atonement made on the cross is in vain:

Sin could be resisted and overcome only through the mighty agency of the Third Person of the Godhead who would come with no modified energy... It is the Spirit that makes [Page 153] effectual what has been wrought out by the world's Redeemer.¹¹⁶

Since only through the combined agency of the Spirit and the cross is the atonement effectual, it is inconceivable that justification be forensic only.

Great Controversy Motif

Reformationist claims regarding the all-sufficiency of Christ's merits in contrast to the negative value of man's merits have been fully substantiated, but White's position contradicts their charge that inclusion of subjective elements in justification is heretical.¹¹⁷ White's view is based on her Great Controversy theme. In creating man, God desired to provide a unique revelation of His own nature and character.¹¹⁸ Far from “using” man for His own ends, His purpose was to provide for the happiness and security of a universe threatened by sinister misrepresentations of His character. Because finite beings

cannot comprehend the infinite, only a finite representation would do.¹¹⁹ Though dependent in nature, man was both free and capable of continual and unlimited development.¹²⁰

This divine self-revelation would demand the union of the human and divine. The Spirit's direction of the body temple in a self-government based upon self-sacrificing love could be effected only by man's free response in exercising his higher faculties in control of the lower, animal faculties.¹²¹ Using his freedom in rebelling against his Creator, man not only thwarted the divine plan but became a tool in the hands of Satan to further misrepresent God and **[Page 154]** His government.¹²² Moreover, in separating from God he lost his freedom, together with both the purpose and power of life.¹²³

White's entire soteriology is dominated by her understanding that Christ prevented the full results of man's rebellion by immediately placing Himself before the Father as man's Substitute, thus offering to die for him, and by giving him a second probation, make it possible for him yet to fulfill the original purpose. The execution of this plan, which was designed before man's creation,¹²⁴ envisioned a primary revelation of God's character through the incarnation and a secondary revelation through restored man.¹²⁵ Excerpts from the 1874 portrayal of the issues follow:

The majesty of heaven,... proposed to become his substitute and surety. He would bear man's guilt... The sin of Adam brought a deplorable state of things. Satan would now have unlimited control over the race, unless a mightier being than Satan was before his fall should take the field and conquer him and ransom man..., give man another trial, and place him again on probation. Christ consented to leave his honor, his kingly authority,... With the sins of the world upon him, he would go over the ground where Adam stumbled. He would bear the test... almost infinitely more severe... He would overcome on man's account, and conquer the tempter, that through his obedience, his purity of character... his righteousness might be imputed to man, that through his name man might overcome the foe on his own account... He would take man's fallen nature and engage to cope with the strong foe who triumphed over Adam.¹²⁶

In summary, Christ: a) left His kingly throne to become man's Substitute and Surety; b) took man's fallen nature and subjected **[Page 155]** himself to the temptations of the heretofore victorious foe; and c) *through the imputed righteousness of Christ*, man was given opportunity to overcome on his own account.

The difference between White and Reformationists, as revealed above, is not in the elements themselves, but in their relations and implications. Viewing man's justification in terms of God's original creative plan, which involved man's reflection of the divine character through the free exercise of the will, White typically unites objective and subjective elements, the subjective being understood as the direct aim of the objective and imperative to its realization—which Reformationists put forth their greatest energies to refute.¹²⁷

God requires the entire surrender of the heart, before justification can take place; and in order for man to retain justification, there must be continual obedience, through active, living faith that works by love and purifies the soul.¹²⁸

This statement is significant for: a) it came only months after the Minneapolis conference; b) it positively identifies "entire **[Page 156]** surrender of the heart" as a precondition of justification, thus introducing a subjective element in justification; c) it presents continued obedience as a condition for retaining justification; d) both initial justification and the retention are seen to be conditional upon "active, living faith that works by love and purifies the soul;" e) it introduces a statement regarding the conditions of Abraham's justification which is followed by an assertion that through grace sin is to be "discerned in its hateful nature, and finally driven from the soul temple"¹²⁹

Attributing White's failure to clearly separate the "fruits" (subjective) of the gospel from the gospel itself (objective)¹³⁰ to lack of theological expertise, *Reformationists have felt justified in reinterpreting her works* so as to bring them into line with their understanding.¹³¹ This, however, places White in conflict with **[Page 157]** White. For example, concerning forgiveness which she identifies with justification,¹³² she emphatically declares:

The Theology Crisis

But forgiveness has a broader meaning than many suppose... God's forgiveness is not merely a judicial act by which He sets us free from condemnation. It is the outflow of redeeming love that transforms the heart.¹³³

Fully harmonizing with her own creation/redemption focus, this statement refutes the forensic-only position.¹³⁴

Justification Restores Relationships

White's theology sees relationships as: designed in creation; broken by sin; and restored through Christ. This restoration is central to her understanding of justification:

By assuming human nature, Christ elevates humanity. Fallen men are placed where, through connection with Christ **[Page 158]** they may indeed become worthy of the name 'Sons of God'.¹³⁵

This agrees with her position regarding man receiving worthiness through surrender to the cross and subjective participation in the union of divinity and humanity.¹³⁶ That the "connection with Christ" is not just a legal connection is clear, for she continues by extolling the "matchless love of God," which "has a subduing power upon the soul and brings the mind into captivity to the will of God."¹³⁷ The dynamics of this relationship are seen below:

'Our righteousness' is found in 'obedience to God's law through the merits of Jesus Christ'... An infinite sacrifice has been made that the moral image of God may be restored to man, through willing obedience to all the commandments of God. Exceeding great is our salvation, for ample provision has been made through the righteousness of Christ, that we may be pure, entire, wanting in nothing.¹³⁸

Note that White is as emphatic that righteousness is contingent upon obedience as she is that it is entirely without merit on the part of man, being found in "the righteousness of Christ," and being made possible through His merits. This harmonizes with her Great Controversy concept that subject to man's active choice, connection with the infinite empowers the will in bringing the faculties into obedience to the will of God.

Genuine 'faith' appropriates the righteousness of Christ, and the sinner is 'made an overcomer with Christ'; for he is 'made a partaker of the divine nature', and thus humanity and divinity are combined.¹³⁹

This obedience-producing union was related to faith shortly before the 1888 conference, as follows:

[Page 159] It is impossible for any of us to have a practical knowledge of this union with Christ, without the constant exercise of faith... for we are powerless to do anything from acceptable motives, except through the grace of Christ, and this grace can be supplied only through the channel of faith, that opens the way of direct communication between our souls and God. In accordance with our faith we are enabled to overcome... Selfishness will not be permitted to flourish in the heart that is exercising living faith... Jesus came into the world to save sinners, not 'in' their sins but 'from' their sins, and to sanctify them through the truth;... we must enter into union with him by personal faith.¹⁴⁰

This emphatic stress upon union with Christ as the key to that faith through which alone justification must take place is typical.

Righteous Through the Word

Reception of “the righteousness of Christ” is causally effected by the restoration of “the life of God... in the soul.” Justification is a consequence of this subjective restoration, the product of which is being “clothed in the righteousness of Christ.”¹⁴¹ “When a soul receives Christ, he receives His righteousness.”¹⁴² The immediate context reveals that Christ is received by studying His life and partaking of His flesh and blood, through His Word.¹⁴³

When his Word is abiding in the living soul, there is oneness with Christ; there is a living communion with him; there is in the soul an abiding love that is the sure evidence of our unlimited privilege.¹⁴⁴

Three factors stand out: a) righteousness is received by receiving Christ; b) Christ’s presence is mediated through His Word, [Page 160] as the believer contemplates His life and spiritually partakes of His body and blood; and c) the presence of Christ and His righteousness involves “an abiding love.” The last harmonizes with White’s equating righteousness with love:

Righteousness is holiness, likeness to God, and God is love. (1 John 4:16) It is conformity to the law of God, for “all Thy commandments are righteousness” (Psalm 119:172), and “love is the fulfilling of the law” (Romans 13:10). Righteousness is love, and love is the light and life of God. The righteousness of God is embodied in Christ. We receive righteousness by receiving Him.¹⁴⁵

Righteousness is seen to correspond to holiness, obedience, and love, which itself is identified with light and the “life of God,” which is received by receiving Christ. The dynamic nature of White’s view of righteousness¹⁴⁶ is seen in the following statement:

The savor of salt represents the vital power of the Christian—the love of Jesus in the heart, the righteousness of Christ pervading the life. The love of Christ is diffusive and aggressive... The sincere believers diffuse vital energy, which is penetrating and imparts new moral power to the souls for whom they labor. It is not the power of the man himself, but the power of the Holy Spirit that does the transforming work.¹⁴⁷

[Page 161] *Such affirmation of the Spirit’s participation in Righteousness contradicts Reformationist claims that Christ’s righteousness is only in heaven and not on earth, and that to posit a subjective element is to adopt the doctrine of Trent.*¹⁴⁸ Concerning whether White here refers to justifying righteousness, note the following passage from the same presentation on the Sermon on the Mount:

While the law is holy, the Jews could not attain righteousness by their own efforts to keep the law. The disciples of Christ must obtain righteousness of a different character from that of the Pharisees... If they would open their hearts fully to receive Christ, then the very life of God, His love, would dwell in them, transforming them into His own likeness, and thus through God’s free gift they would possess the righteousness which the law requires.¹⁴⁹

That White is not simply introducing a secondary, imperfect righteousness, such as Reformationists associate with sanctification, [Page 162] can be seen from the following five earmarks of forensic righteousness: a) it is contrasted with the legalism of pharisaical efforts; b) it is “the perfect righteousness of the law,” “the righteousness which the law requires,” c) it is offered “in His Son,” a phrase understood always to designate objective status in contrast to the subjective, sanctification state, expressed as “Christ in you”¹⁵⁰ d) it represents “God’s free gift” in contrast to that sanctification, which they consider not to be free but to result from man’s own “blood, sweat, and tears,”¹⁵¹ and finally, e) it contrasts with that of those who, “ignorant of God’s righteousness,” go “about to establish their own righteousness.”

The Theology Crisis

These earmarks of what Reformationists term “Pauline” righteousness¹⁵² are interspersed with elements characterizing subjective righteousness, such as receiving a) Christ, b) the divine life, and c) love. Moreover, such reception is only by d) open hearts in which e) righteousness is to dwell as a transforming power.¹⁵³

[Page 163] Removing the subjective element from White’s concept of righteousness is like removing both heart and blood vessels from the body, for it violates the deepest principle of her creation/redemption concept. *Original righteousness came through union with God.¹⁵⁴ unrighteousness (sin) is the result of separation from God; and restoration of righteousness involves restoration of the body-temple to the control of the Spirit.¹⁵⁵* In White, this reunion takes place in justification,¹⁵⁶ and through sanctification the believer learns to live in union. Only that righteousness mediated through Christ in this twofold manner is genuine. All else is counterfeit.¹⁵⁷

[Page 164]

Good News or Good Advice?

Pure and undefiled religion is not a sentiment, but the doing of works of love and mercy. This *religion* is necessary to health and happiness. It *enters* the polluted *soul-temple* and with a scourge *drives out the sinful intruders*. *Taking the throne*, it consecrates all by its presence,... letting in the sunshine of God’s love... Physical, mental, and moral strength increase, because the atmosphere of heaven, as a living active agency, fills the soul. *Christ is formed within*, the hope of glory... Supreme love for God and unselfish love for their fellow men will place them on vantage ground.

The gospel is good tidings of great joy. Its promises bring light to the soul and shine forth... “Let your light so shine...”¹⁵⁸

To dismiss this mixing of the law and gospel as simply reflecting a lack of theological expertise denies White’s grasp of spiritual issues and destroys the unity of her Great Controversy theme.¹⁵⁹ **[Page 165]** In White, the Law’s good advice contrasts with the Gospel’s good news when the latter is not permitted to incorporate the former in the life. Failing to appropriate the gospel, one has no capacity to keep the law, whose good advice, thus becoming *bad* news, stimulates rebellion and/or legalism.¹⁶⁰ *Only that gospel which includes the power-filled presence of Christ to enable man to follow the* **[Page 166]** *“good advice” is here recognized as the true gospel. This gospel alone sanctifies.*

It is the gospel, and the gospel alone, that will sanctify the soul. It is this that makes possible to the receiver the life that measures with the life of God. This is the record that God hath given us, even eternal life; and that life is in his son. He who is partaker of the divine nature will escape the corruption that are in the world through lust. His faith in Christ as the life-giver, gives him life. Those who submit their will to the will of God will grow in grace.¹⁶¹

Any other gospel is either incomplete, or downright fraudulent. Reception of this gospel, which involves submission of the will, is the reception of the life of God as revealed by the Son and ministered by the Spirit.¹⁶²

Christ, Law, and Gospel

Note the following unequivocal statement regarding the relation between law and gospel:

[Page 167] Christ in his own life has given us a proof that man can keep the law of God, and through his merits be a final overcomer... Christ would here have us understand that our righteousness must include, not only the observance of the letter

The Theology Crisis

of the law, but also the spirit and principle of it. The letter of the law specifies how... to please God; the spirit of the law points to Jesus as the atoning sacrifice, through whose merits the sinner can fulfill the requirements of the law. Christ said, 'I and my Father are one.' There is perfect harmony between the law and the gospel.¹⁶³

Note the twofold aspect of the law—letter and Spirit—the last coinciding with the gospel, thus forming an internal bond between the two which can be removed only by destroying both. Presenting righteousness and the gospel in this customary objective/subjective frame of reference—observance of the letter as well as the spirit of the law—is based on the atoning sacrifice and merits of Christ. Significantly, the unity of the law and gospel is illustrated by the unity of the Father and Son.

The angel that proclaims the everlasting gospel proclaims the law of God; for the gospel of salvation brings men to obedience to the law, whereby their characters are formed after the divine similitude... Christ was both the law and the gospel.¹⁶⁴

So far from acknowledging a dichotomy between a “legal” law and a “saving” gospel, White binds law and gospel together in the person of Christ. Note:

[Christ] presented to men lessons whereby their souls were brought into comparison with the law of God, not in a legal light, but in the light of the Sun of Righteousness, that [Page 168] man by beholding might be changed into the divine image.¹⁶⁵

To view the law in a legal (forensic) light, rather than as an introduction to Christ, whose character it expresses, threatens to prevent one from understanding and receiving Him.¹⁶⁶ In one of her strongest post-1888 appeals in behalf of righteousness by faith, White speaks of the necessity of discovering Christ “in His true position in relation to the law” and continues:

‘The law and the gospel are so blended’ that the truth cannot be presented as it is ‘in Jesus’¹⁶⁷ without blending these subjects in perfect agreement. The law is the gospel of Christ veiled; ‘the gospel of Jesus is nothing more or less than the law defined’, showing its far-reaching principles.¹⁶⁸

White may never have heard of Walther, a contemporary theologian, but vigorously refuted his extreme separation of law and gospel and his insistence that the gospel contains “unconditional promises,” “making no demands whatsoever,” and having “no conditions whatsoever,” while the law only tells us what to do and [Page 169] “beyond that has nothing to say to us”¹⁶⁹ Her terse response:

The enemy has ever labored to disconnect the law and gospel. They go hand in hand.¹⁷⁰

According to Walther, predestination assumptions were involved in the theology of divergence between the law and the gospel which now alienates Reformationist theology from White. He writes:

That is why we were so determined in our Predestination controversy. For the basic element in the controversy has been that we insisted on keeping the Law and Gospel separate, while our opponents mingle the one with the other.¹⁷¹

He considers the commitment to keep the law and gospel separate to be a necessary part of a “determined” effort to maintain the doctrine of predestination with its election of some to salvation and others to damnation.¹⁷² Another assertion contrary to White is that: “God has created us without our cooperation, and He wants to save us the same way.”¹⁷³

White's Covenant concept

While Reformationists base their covenant concept upon the doctrine of original sin, whose roots are thoroughly interpenetrated by **[Page 170]** predestination,¹⁷⁴ White's covenant concept has creation/redemption roots, which draw their nourishment from her Great Controversy doctrine,¹⁷⁵ in which self-sacrificing love characterizes God's nature, the freedom and happiness of rational creatures in a secure but dependent universe being His grand end in creation *and* redemption.¹⁷⁶ This plan involves God's guarantee of the freedom of the will and man's responsibility to respond to the divine intervention by which it may be set free and through which it must remain free. References to new covenant promises of the law written in the heart, directing the will and "bringing the imaginations and even the thoughts **[Page 171]** into subjection to the will of Christ,"¹⁷⁷ mushroomed after Minneapolis, salvation being seen as contingent upon covenant relations.¹⁷⁸ Thus while Reformationists find their security in justification, White's security is found in covenant relations, into which the believer is initiated by justification.

Are we co-operating with him in his great work above?... Shall we not with grateful hearts show that we appreciate the heavenly gifts, bringing every power into captivity to Christ?

If we would come into possession of the heavenly inheritance,... we must be in covenant relation with God,...¹⁷⁹

We ourselves owe everything to God's free grace. Grace in the covenant ordained our adoption. Grace in the Savior effected our redemption, our regeneration, and our exaltation to heirship with Christ.¹⁸⁰

"Grace in the covenant ordained our adoption" may be taken to focus primarily upon the cross since substitutionary atonement is the basis for adoption and entry into the covenant.¹⁸¹ Far from forensic only, however, this initiates man's filial relation with the Covenant-Giver and Savior through whom redemption is effected.

Christ, Law, and Covenant

The unity previously seen between the law and gospel in Christ takes place through the covenant. Based upon the law, it contains the only provision for receiving the gospel.

The law of God was the basis of this covenant, which was simply an arrangement for bringing men again into harmony with the divine will, placing them where they could obey God's law.¹⁸²

We must learn in the school of Christ. Nothing but His righteousness can entitle us to one of the blessings of the covenant of grace.¹⁸³

The purpose of the covenant is not simply to justify forensically, but to restore man to harmony with the divine will,¹⁸⁴ thus fulfilling within him the "righteousness of the law," which, unaided, he is incapable of fulfilling. So the covenant involves justification and sanctification¹⁸⁵ — both conditional upon accepting the authority of God¹⁸⁶ as expressed in His law.¹⁸⁷ That justification comes only through the covenant and by acceptance of its conditions **[Page 173]** is clearly stated:

God's people are justified through the administration of the 'better covenant', through Christ's righteousness. A covenant is an agreement by which parties bind themselves and each other to the fulfillment of certain conditions. Thus the human agent enters into agreement with God to comply with the conditions specified in His Word. His conduct shows whether or not he respects these conditions.

Man gains everything by obeying the covenant keeping God. God's attributes are imparted to man,... It is not enough for us to have a general idea of God's requirements. We must know for ourselves what His requirements and our obligations are. His requirements are, 'Thou shalt love...' These are the conditions of life.¹⁸⁸

The terms of sanctification, as of justification, are determined by the covenant: "By this covenant every blessing that heaven could bestow for this life and the life to come was theirs."¹⁸⁹

Our sanctification is the work of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. It is the fulfillment of the covenant God has made with those who bind themselves with Him, His Son, and His Spirit in holy fellowship. Have you been born again? Have you become a new being in Christ Jesus? Then cooperate with the three great powers of heaven who are working in your behalf.¹⁹⁰

Certain conclusions may be drawn from the preceding two quotations in the context of the preceding presentation:

a) Fulfillment of the covenant terms are dependent upon God's covenant faithfulness,¹⁹¹ but he can only fulfill these terms for those who willingly remain in covenant relation.¹⁹²

b) Thus man's hope is not based upon justification, *per se*, with sanctification being automatic,—but upon entering and remaining in covenant relation with Christ, (which involves the surrender of his will).¹⁹³

c) In the covenant relation sanctification requires cooperation "with the three great powers of heaven", which invalidates the Reformationist argument that sanctification involves only the work of the Spirit, while justification represents only the work of Christ.¹⁹⁴

d) To break this synthesis between justification and sanctification¹⁹⁵ is thus to sunder White's entire covenant concept; for it involves a transaction in which a man receives the objective gift only as he makes a subjective commitment of his entire being.

Justification is seen below to involve a transaction by which one enters the covenant, while through sanctification he learns to live in covenant relation so as to experience "conquering power."

Saving faith is a transaction by which those who receive Christ join themselves in covenant relation with God. Genuine faith is life. A living faith means an increase of vigor, a confiding trust, by which the soul becomes a conquering power.¹⁹⁶

The only way one enters or remains in the covenant is by participating in Christ's sacrifice, by death to self.¹⁹⁷

[Page 175]

Justifying the Ungodly?

The Reformationist denial of a subjective element in justification involves an interpretation of Paul's allusion to God's justifying the ungodly which is incompatible with White.¹⁹⁸ A favorite White analogy is that "Christ alone would adjust the claims of heaven and earth."¹⁹⁹ But as a perfect "claims-adjustor," He is limited in the cases He can serve. Only "those who will submit to the drawing power of Christ, may be justified by a just God."²⁰⁰ In 1893 White corrected Jones for negating works and for insisting "that there were no conditions" to justification:

The Theology Crisis

There are conditions to our receiving justification.... While good works will not save even one soul, yet it is impossible for even one soul to be saved without good works. God saves under a law, that we must ask,... seek,... knock,...²⁰¹

[Page 176] Here conditions to justification include effort (ask, seek, knock),²⁰² but that effort is not meritorious.²⁰³ Removal of both enmity against the law and of self-righteousness,²⁰⁴ through repentance²⁰⁵ and surrender of heart and will, are specified as conditions, as are bearing Christ's yoke and obedience,²⁰⁶ all of which are subjective. Surrender of the will to God, by which Jesus is "enthroned in the soul," through whom "he may hope for everything",²⁰⁷ underlies all other conditions.

Christ does not clothe sin with his righteousness, but he removes the sin, and in its place he imputes his own righteousness... (I)nstead of making self a center, you will make Christ a center,...²⁰⁸

True to her Great Controversy theme, justification is conditional on a voluntary recentering of the mind from self to Christ.²⁰⁹ **[Page 177]** Thus righteousness is regained only by reversal of the volitional action that lost it, and this is possible only through Christ.

Jesus regained heaven for man by bearing the test that Adam failed to endure; for he obeyed the law perfectly, and all who have a right conception of the plan of redemption will see that they cannot be saved while in transgression of God's holy precepts. They must cease to transgress the law, and lay hold on the promises of God that are available for us through the merits of Christ...

Our faith is not to stand in the ability of men but in the power of God.²¹⁰

"A right conception of the plan of redemption" thus involves the necessity to cease disobeying as a condition for claiming "the merits of Christ." But what does this mean?

We should contemplate the infinite sacrifice of Calvary, and behold the exceeding sinfulness of sin and the righteousness of the law... (Y)ou can then testify to men of the immutable character of the law manifested by the death of Christ on the cross, the malignant nature of sin, and the righteousness of God in justifying the believer in Jesus, *on condition* of his future obedience' to the statutes of God's government in heaven and earth.²¹¹

White does not make man's track record a condition of justification, for she insists upon its immediate accessibility "without the deeds of the law."²¹² The above dilemma is resolved by her covenant concept in which restoration to the presence and favor of God is conditioned by a contrite submission to His will, which God accepts **[Page 178]** as representing entire obedience. Thus, the believer is proleptically justified "on condition of his future obedience," which is recognized in man's faith-will to obey. The preceding quote indicates, moreover, that justifying faith stands not "in the ability of men but in the power of God." Justification and enabling power are, in White's thinking, received simultaneously on the simple condition of a commitment of will²¹³ to turn from sin to righteousness by surrender (at the cross) to a divine-human union. Actual obedience results from covenant relations thus formed:

No sacrifice would be acceptable to God which was not salted nor seasoned with divine fire, which represented the communication between God and man that was opened through Jesus Christ alone. The holy fire which was to be put upon the censer was kept burning perpetually... This incense was an emblem of the mediation of Christ.²¹⁴

To remove the cross from the Christian would be like blotting out the sun. The cross brings us near to God, reconciling us to him... (H)e looks upon the suffering his Son endured in order to save the race from eternal death, and he accepts us in the Beloved.

Without the cross, man could have no connection with the Father.²¹⁵

The Theology Crisis

Do not fail to look upon yourself as a sinner in the sight of God. Do not fail to look upon Jesus lifted up upon the cross; and as you look, believe and live; for by faith in the atoning sacrifice you may be justified through... Jesus. Believe that you are forgiven, that you are justified, not in transgression and disobedience, but in submission to the will of God. If through faith you lay hold of the righteousness of Christ,... Through an appreciation of the character of Christ, through communion with God, sin will become hateful to you.²¹⁶

Conclusions regarding obedience and justification are:

a) Both communion and mediation of Christ's merits (incense) underlie justification, but the cross, through which man **[Page 179]** is connected with God—being the only basis of mediation—must precede and give significance to all else.

b) Humble recognition of one's sinfulness must accompany faith in the incense of Christ's righteousness, but motivation to hate sin and surrender the will is a gift to be received only through the cross and presence of Christ.

c) Man's surrender frees Christ to adjust heaven's claims, in which moment he stands justified. Thus, surrender of the will and justification take place simultaneously, the former conditioning the latter, through which one is initiated into the covenant and recognized as obedient.²¹⁷

Covenant Security

Contrary to "forensic-only justification" as the basis of believer security, White uses a number of Biblical models—such as justification, forgiveness, adoption, and new birth—to portray a comprehensive concept of covenant security.²¹⁸ Among the most **[Page 180]** common and assuring is the new birth sonship model.²¹⁹

Through the simple act of believing God, the Holy Spirit has begotten a new life in your heart. You are as a child born into the family of God, and He loves you as He loves His Son.²²⁰

Few symbols are more assuring than that of the Father's love. White's intensification of the symbol by equating love for the covenant son with love for His only-begotten underlines the degree of His commitment. The argument that introducing a subjective element still threatens security by giving man at least part of the credit holds no weight with White, who consistently affirms the subjective element while emphatically denying human merit.²²¹

[Page 182] So we have nothing in ourselves of which to boast. Our only ground of hope is in the righteousness of Christ imputed to us and that wrought by His Spirit working in us.²²²

Grounded in the person of Christ,²²³ hope rests upon two pillars: objective and subjective—"The righteousness of Christ" being the antecedent of "that wrought by His Spirit," as well as to "imputed". To remove either pillar is to destroy true security by collapsing the covenant structure upon which it depends. Based objectively on the doing and dying of Christ, its reception requires a transaction in which "myself" is placed on the altar in exchange for "Himself." Only such death to self²²⁴ releases the resurrection power of the new birth which issues in the growth of the newborn covenant child.²²⁵ That security rests on both pillars is seen below:

When souls are converted, their salvation is not yet accomplished. They then have the race to run... We are made partakers of Christ's sacrifice here in this life, and if

we hold the beginning of our confidence steadfast **[Page 183]** unto the end, we are assured that we will be partakers of... eternal life... But you cannot enjoy this blessing without any action on your part. 'Salvation is a gift' offered to you free; on no other condition can you obtain it than as a free gift. But 'cooperation on your part is essential' for your salvation.²²⁶

Far from contrasting the "free gift" with sanctification,²²⁷ White sees the latter as part of the former, which in covenant terms does not jeopardize hope, but secures it.

Let the mind dwell upon the marvelous plan of salvation, the great sacrifice made by the King of glory, that we might be elevated through the merits of his blood, and finally, by obedience, be exalted to the throne of Christ. . . To have our corrupt natures renovated by grace, our lustful appetites and animal propensities in subjection, and to stand forth with noble moral independence, achieving victories every day, will give peace of conscience which can alone arise from right doing.²²⁸

Christ's merits (perfect life and atoning death), are habitually portrayed as one security-pillar, while His obedience, as reflected in lives transformed through covenant relations, is another. Both pillars always represent Christ's righteousness; both are appropriated by faith through a freely-acting will; and both are absolutely imperative to White's Covenant-centered, Great Controversy motif, in which man's own will determines his destiny.

Reformationist Security Gap

The condition of eternal life is now just what it always has been,—just what it was in paradise before the fall of our first parents,—perfect obedience to the law of God, perfect righteousness. If eternal life were granted **[Page 184]** on any condition short of this, then the happiness of the whole universe would be imperiled. The way would be open for sin,... to be immortalized.²²⁹

Such quotations are used to refute the subjective element. Considered incapable, even through the Spirit's power, of meeting the requirements,²³⁰ man is urged to depend solely upon Christ's "alien" righteousness, in doing and dying 2,000 years ago, to meet the dilemma sin poses to the universe. Failure to do so is seen to result in legalism.²³¹ This is not stated or contextually implied by White, as excerpts from the next two paragraphs reveal:

a) Though in his perfect state Adam could "form a righteous character by obedience," with fallen natures, *'we can not make ourselves righteous . . . [having] no righteousness of our own'*. "But Christ has made a way of escape for us... He lived a sinless life..., offers *to take our sins and give us His righteousness*."

b) "If you give yourself to Him [subjective] and accept Him as your Saviour, [c]) then sinful as your life may have been for His sake you are accounted righteous... just as if you had not sinned." (objective)

[Page 185] d) More than this, Christ changes the heart. He abides in your heart by faith. You are *to maintain this connection with Christ by faith and the continual surrender of your will* to Him; and so long as you do this, He will work in you to will and to do according to His good pleasure... Then with *Christ working in you*, you will manifest the same works,—works of righteousness, obedience.²³²

"a" and "b" contrast man's ability before and disability after the fall to meet the law's demands without mediating grace; "b" reveals a transactional condition for receiving the divine intervention which places man on "vantage ground,"²³³ and "c" shows that justification covers past sins and present state; while "d" indicates that future security, as well as having Christ's righteousness revealed in the life,²³⁴ is

conditional upon “maintain[ing] this connection with Christ by [i] faith and [ii] the continual surrender of your will to Him.”²³⁵ Excerpts from the preceding five paragraphs confirm the foregoing evidence that Reformationists lift the statement out of its covenant-related, Great Controversy setting.

But notice here that obedience is not a mere outward compliance, but the service of love... When the principle of love is implanted in the heart,... the new covenant is fulfilled, “I will put My laws into their hearts,...” Obedience... the true sign of discipleship... enables us to render obedience. We do ‘not earn salvation’... for salvation is the free gift of God to be received by faith. ‘But obedience is the fruit of faith’... “because ‘Christ’ also suffered for us, leaving us an ‘example’, that ye should follow His steps.”²³⁶

It is thus evident that use of such statements to refute the [Page 186] subjective element in the gospel neither honors the context nor recognizes the internal demands of White’s covenant concept.²³⁷

Restoring the Synthesis

There is hope for us only as we come under the Abrahamic covenant, which is the covenant of grace, by faith in Christ Jesus. The gospel preached to Abraham, through which he had hope, was the same gospel that is preached [Page 187] to us today, through which we have hope.²³⁸

The covenant, which is identified as the *gospel*—the only source of hope—by nature requires personal relations. Thus the gospel, and both justification and righteousness, which are equated with it, must include the subjective elements.²³⁹ Such inclusion in no way belittles Christ’s righteousness, but its *exclusion* threatens man’s security by sundering the covenant.

There is perfect harmony between the law of God and the gospel of Jesus Christ... The ‘gospel’ is the good news of grace, or favor, ‘by which’ man may be released from the condemnation of sin and ‘enabled to render acceptable obedience’ to the law. The gospel points to the moral code as a law of life. The law, by its demands for undeviating obedience, is continually pointing the sinner to the gospel for pardon and peace... There are persons professing to be ministers of Christ who declare with the utmost assurance that no man ever did or ever can keep the law of God. But... (a)ll who are in Christ will follow the example of Christ... God’s law is a copy of his mind and will... ‘(O)beyed, man shall live by it, through the merits of Christ’. Transgressed, it has the power to condemn. The law sends men to Christ, and Christ points them back to the law.²⁴⁰

Printed just before Minneapolis, this passage, which presents [Page 188] the position White held till her death, touches the Reformationist nerve—concern that man’s security not be left to the vagaries of human will. Any subjective element in the covenant is felt to leave man insecure.²⁴¹ White’s Great Controversy-covenant concept demands, however, that security involve *freedom* in covenant relations, including freedom to remain or to withdraw from it.²⁴²

Every man is ‘free to choose what power he will have to rule over him’. None have fallen so low... but that they can find deliverance in Christ... Those who will consent to enter into covenant relation with the God of heaven are not left to the power of Satan or to the infirmity of their own nature.²⁴³

Those who perish will perish because they ‘refuse to be adopted’ as children of God through Christ Jesus. The pride of man hinders him from accepting the provisions of salvation.²⁴⁴

Then if we are not saved, the fault will not be on the part of God, but on our part, that we have failed to cooperate with the divine agencies. Our will has not coincided with God's will... In working out what divine grace works in, the believer becomes spiritually great... and through [Page 189] union of divine and human efforts, the work is made complete.²⁴⁵

To White, this is the “good news.”—the “union of human and divine.” Indeed, hope centers only in covenant union.²⁴⁶ It requires only man's consent to its conditions to be drawn by the Spirit and the cross into the covenant.²⁴⁷ Christ's merits and union with the divine empower the believer to surrender his will to God in the accomplishment of His purposes. To retain his security, *all he must do is to continue to consent* to the discipline which is calculated to correct and direct in ever more mature covenant relations.²⁴⁸

Abraham's Covenant Relations

The nature of Abraham's imputed righteousness is the *acid-test* of forensic-only claims.²⁴⁹ Nearly one-half the verses which Reformationists hold to be “the only systematic Scriptural treatment of righteousness by faith” speak of his experience. Of the confirmation of the “everlasting” covenant with Abraham, White says:

[Page 190] Abraham was human; his passions and attachments were like ours; but... He did not stay to reason with an aching heart... and he obeyed the command to the letter.

“Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness; and he was called a friend of God.” And Paul says, “They that are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham.” But Abraham's faith was made manifest by his works. “Was not Abraham our father justified by works... Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect?”

It was to impress Abraham's mind with the reality of the gospel, as well as to test his faith, that God commanded him to slay his son... The sacrifice required of Abraham was not alone for his own good, nor solely for the benefit of succeeding generations; but it was also for the instruction of the sinless intelligences of heaven and of other worlds..., ‘lesson-book of the universe’. Because Abraham had shown a lack of faith in God's promises, ‘Satan had accused him before the angels, and before God of having failed to comply with the conditions of the covenant, and as unworthy of its blessings. God desired to prove the loyalty of his servant before all heaven, to demonstrate that nothing less than perfect obedience can be accepted, and to open more fully before them the plan of salvation... Satan's accusations were shown to be false...’²⁵⁰

Note how naturally White uses Genesis to harmonize Paul and James. No defense of one against the other is called for in a theology which involves a fusion of the emphasis of both. No interpretation of Paul which questions the subjective element in imputed righteousness or of James which overlooks its objective base is compatible with White. The following principles reveal her Great Controversy-covenant construct:

- a) Abraham in his covenant relation possessed sinful human nature.
- b) Internal demands of covenant loyalty involve external demands of obedience to the very letter.

[Page 191]

The Theology Crisis

- c) Through the merits of the lamb, imputation of righteousness involves a state of obedience by faith.
- d) Abraham's experience demonstrates provisions for failure.
- e) Divine approval of faulty Abraham occasioned charges both against him and against the covenant.
- f) Covenant violation reflects upon the Covenant Giver.
- g) Satan's charges were countered by a portrayal of the infinite value of the sacrifice provided for covenant violation as well as for pre-covenant sin.
- h) They were also met by Abraham's demonstration of the covenant's provisions for perfecting faith and obedience.

Satisfying the demands of a broken law, the covenant blood thus provides for a finite reflection of its principles—the very character of God—through the sharing of Christ's own righteousness.

Security of Universe

It was in order that the heavenly universe might see the conditions of the covenant of redemption that Christ bore the penalty on behalf of the human race. The throne of Justice must be eternally and forever made secure, even though the race be wiped out, and another creation populate the earth. By the sacrifice Christ was about to make... all doubts would be forever settled, and the human race would be saved if they would return to their allegiance...²⁵¹

In contrast to the overwhelming Reformationist focus on believer security,²⁵² White sees preservation of the universe as the highest issue in the atonement. Ultimately contingent upon the security of the universe, individual security can only be understood in that context.²⁵³ Covenant loyalty, in loving obedience, is the key to both.

“If ye be Christ's then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise.”
If we are Christ's our title to the heavenly inheritance is without flaw, for we are then under the only saving covenant, the covenant of grace; **[Page 192]** and through grace we shall be able to make our calling and election sure by putting on the excellency of Christ in faith, in spirit, in character; for no one will be entitled to the heavenly inheritance who has not been purified,... wholly sanctified'. Those whose lives are hid with Christ in God, who have been clothed upon with his righteousness, will have a right to the inheritance,...²⁵⁴

Note the synthesis between justification and sanctification in the Abrahamic covenant. As the life of each one of Siamese twins sharing vital organs is totally dependent on the life of the other, so justification and sanctification are inseparably bound together. Justification may be likened to the heartbeat (life-giving union with the Creator) and sanctification to the circulatory system (life-giving flow of nourishment-providing blood), with the Spirit, acting through man's will, providing the bond of union between the two. Affirming the perfection and adequacy of the title (justification), White conditions its retention upon sanctification. Thus, both “title” and “fitness” are “found in the righteousness of Christ.”²⁵⁵ Only under a covenant based on both pillars can man rightfully enter upon his inheritance.

[Page 193] Christ's death provides every fallen son of Adam,²⁵⁶ through the covenant, a second period of probation. The Substitute (justification) offers to introduce him into that covenant, while the Surety (sanctification) assures his ultimate possession of the lost inheritance. Just as in the case of Adam and Eve, loyalty is the only test involved,²⁵⁷ for the Substitute removes all guilt and the Surety guarantees

The Theology Crisis

that “if you yield yourself to Him, He that hath begun a good work in you will carry it forward to the day of Jesus Christ.”

God will not jeopardize the security of the universe by populating heaven with those who, under the probationary covenant of grace, do not learn to submit to the divine will.²⁵⁸

There is no safety for any of us unless we trust fully in God, and take a decided stand, guarding the avenues of the will...²⁵⁹

According to her Great Controversy motif, Christ’s death provided a second period of probation following Adam’s failure.²⁶⁰ The whole race is given opportunity to accept the Substitute and Surety; but only by coming under the covenant through justification does man enter upon the probationary provisions through which he must make his calling and election sure.²⁶¹

Here are the conditions upon which every soul may be elected to eternal life. Your obedience to God’s commandments will prove that you are predestinated to a glorious inheritance. You are elected to be laborers together with God,... **[Page 194]** to wear his yoke,... You have been provided the means whereby you may ascertain what to do to make your calling and election sure. Search the Scriptures, and you will find that not a son or daughter of Adam is elected to be saved in disobedience... Those who are disloyal to Christ in this life would be disloyal to Christ in the world to come, and would create a second rebellion in Heaven... Jesus Christ has died in order that all men may have a chance to make their calling and election sure; but the standard of righteousness in this gospel age is no less than it was in the days of Adam,... Christians are elected to faith, loyalty, and sanctification. They are elected to obey the commandments of God, although in so doing they must lift the cross.²⁶²

This intimate, organic synthesis of justification and sanctification calls forth White’s warning:

Removing the Dichotomy

Many commit the error of trying to *define minutely the fine points of distinction between justification and sanctification*. Into the definitions of these two terms they often bring their own ideas and speculations. Why try to be more minute than is inspiration on the vital question of righteousness by faith?... *All cannot see in the same line of vision*.²⁶³

[Page 195] How could Reformationists make a greater cleavage and still hold (as they do) to the importance of sanctification?..²⁶⁴ Their insistence that they “distinguish but do not separate,” appears to have three flaws: it sounds more like a “sight-of-tongue trick” than a statement of fact; second, White warned not against separation, but against undue distinctions between the two; third, **[Page 196]** their charges of heresy ignore her reminder that “all cannot see in the same line of vision.”²⁶⁵ The reality and extent of dichotomy:

<i>Reformationist’s Dichotomy</i>			<i>White’s Holism</i>	
Hist. Christ	vs.	Indwelling Christ	CHRIST	
Gospel	vs.	Fruits	Covenant	Gospel
Substitute	vs.	Mediator	Substitute	Surety
Righteousness	vs.	Works (inferior)	Christ our Righteousness	
Justification	vs.	Sanctification	Justification/Sanctification	
Security		Automatic	Only Hope	

[Page 197] The tremendous energies expended in sharpening the distinction between the objective and subjective are motivated by the conviction that inclusion of any subjective item with the objective is Roman Catholic heresy.²⁶⁶ White, however, consistently unites both, never contrasting Christ's historical doing and dying with His priestly ministry and the Spirit's work. While they insist on a dichotomy to avoid legalism, her holism demands its *removal* as the only basis upon which to avoid a subtle legalism resulting from removal from the covenant of grace by neglecting its conditions.

Legalism in her perspective has two faces: claiming of merit, which invalidates covenant provisions (Substitute); and rejection of covenant conditions governing relations with the Surety. While effort expended under the covenant is of saving faith, effort outside the covenant being works, can only damn.

The cleavage between Reformationists and White involves their failure to grasp her doctrine of atonement. She sees the sacrifice of the lamb and the ministry of the priest as involving a timeless blending, both before and after the cross. Seeing responsibility [Page 198] for man's security (future) as falling (in all ages) upon Christ for all who enter and remain in Him through the covenant, the past (Christ's obedience and sacrifice on the cross) is brought into the present (priestly ministry in heaven and Spirit's work on earth)²⁶⁷, as the objective (sacrifice-sinner) relationship. This concept is forcefully brought to view by Haddock.

After referring to White's concept of "himself both high priest and victim," and her statement that "after giving his life for the [Page 199] world... [Christ] cast the virtue of his offering, a crimson current, in the direction of the Holy Place, reconciling man to God through the blood of the cross",²⁶⁸ Haddock states:

But she not only viewed Christ as simultaneously priest and victim, she in some way understood Christ's priestly work as commencing with the first appearance of sin.²⁶⁹

After showing that she unequivocally identifies the *atonement* with the *cross*, she further demonstrates her understanding of the intimate relation of the cross to His mediation by quoting:

Christ as High Priest within the veil so immortalized Calvary that though He liveth unto God, He dies continually to sin and thus if any man sin, he has an advocate with the Father.²⁷⁰

He concludes: "Thus the work of Christ as mediator and sacrificial death to sin are of the same essence."²⁷¹

*Summary—Manuscript 36, 1890*²⁷²

The primary Reformationist exhibit in claim of White's support [Page 200] forms a summary of key points in this chapter. Substantiating her Great Controversy concept, it reveals how words and phrases are commandeered to serve as vehicles for conveying a theology which conflicts with her own.²⁷³

The first two paragraphs focus on the seriousness of sin and of acting "against God's decision," in light of the impending judgment which will measure responsibility by the cost of the atonement. White speaks on page nine of weeping over those who, having rejected light (Minneapolis), sense their mistake but are too proud to confess. Two classes are pointed out: Those who "neglect to comply with the conditions," and "those who claim to believe and obey the commandments... but [oppose] the precious light—new to them—from the cross of Calvary." The first class fails to see "wondrous things in the law of God for all who are doers of His Word;" while the others "neglect... the love of God."

Note that while the first group failed passively in will and [Page 201] act, the opposers of light erred actively in motive. Both problems involve relationships and neither is placed in a forensic setting. White continues:

Many have not opened the eyes of their understanding to discern the wondrous things in the law of God... (R)eligionists generally have divorced the law and the gospel, while we have, ... almost done the same from another standpoint. We have not held up before the people the righteousness of Christ and the full significance of

The Theology Crisis

the plan of redemption. We have left out Christ and His matchless love, brought in theories and reasonings and preached argumentative discourses.²⁷⁴

Her burden: that preaching *theoretical* sermons, instead of uplifting Christ and His matchless love, is as serious as divorcing “the law from the gospel.” Instead of stressing the legal aspect of the atonement, she focuses upon the person of Christ and His righteousness. The next paragraph shows why the sermons were theoretical: unconverted preachers had not experienced the love and forgiveness of God; beholding the sacrifice of Christ would melt their hearts, preparing them “to surrender to God heart and soul.” The next three paragraphs begin as follows:

Let this point be fully settled in every mind: If we accept Christ as a Redeemer, we must accept Him as a Ruler. We cannot have the assurance and perfect trust in Christ as our Saviour until... obedient to His commandments...

The will must be brought into complete harmony with the will of God. When this is done, no ray of light... will be resisted.

How much do we believe from “the heart: Draw nigh to God and God will draw nigh to you.”²⁷⁵

Reinforcing the covenant concept that obedience conditions security, the first reveals lack of surrender to Christ’s authority. The second underlines the Great Controversy-covenant concept that **[Page 202]** man’s will determines his destiny; while the third shows that the faith by which we lay claim to the covenant must involve heart response to God’s initiative in cementing divine-human relations.

False Ideas of Justification by Faith

The danger has been presented to me again and again of entertaining, as a people, false ideas of Justification by faith. I have been shown that Satan would work in a special manner to confuse the mind on this point. The law of God has been largely dwelt upon,... as ‘destitute of the knowledge of Jesus Christ and His relation to the law’ as was the offering of Cain... mixed, confused ideas of salvation,... The point which has been urged upon my mind for years is the imputed righteousness of Christ. I have wondered that this matter was not made the subject of discourses in our churches throughout the land, when the matter has been so constantly urged upon me, and I have made it the subject of nearly every discourse and talk that I have given to the people.²⁷⁶

This primary Reformationist exhibit, protesting “false ideas of justification” which “confuse the mind” and produce the legalistic “offering of Cain,” represents a vital key to White’s understanding of the Minneapolis message. She clearly identifies that message as having been “urged upon... [her] mind for years,” “the subject of nearly every discourse and talk [she had]... given to the people,” which reveals “Christ and His relation to the law” and the “imputed righteousness of Christ.” This provides a simple *test of the forensic-only claims*. If the Reformationist position is correct, it should not be difficult to demonstrate from the immediate context that she distinguishes between Christ’s historical “doing and dying,” as alone representing “imputed righteousness,” **[Page 203]** and the work of the Spirit (associated with “the law”) in conversion and sanctification²⁷⁷ as being the *fruit* of justification, the *root*. Note, however, her very next words:

In examining my writings ‘fifteen or twenty years’ old I find that they present the matter in the same ‘light’—that those who enter... the ministry should first be given a preparation in lessons upon the teachings of Christ and the apostles in living principles of ‘practical godliness’. They are to be educated in regard to what constitutes earnest, ‘*living faith*’.

Many young men are sent forth to labor, who do not' understand the plan of salvation and what true conversion is; in fact they need to be converted... and the ministers need to be educated to dwell more particularly upon subjects which explain true conversion... There is not a point that needs to be dwelt upon more earnestly, repeated more frequently, or established more firmly in the minds of all, than the *impossibility of fallen man meriting anything by his own best and good works*.²⁷⁸

Harmony between White and Reformationists on the denial of all human merit is confirmed, but the context just as unequivocally denies legitimate use of this passage to defend the forensic-only concept.²⁷⁹ Her writings for the previous “fifteen or twenty years,” [Page 204] which “present the matter in the same light”²⁸⁰ as the Minneapolis message clearly reveal a dominant subjective element,²⁸¹ harmonizing perfectly with the entire manuscript, including every element of the immediate context of this “imputed righteousness” statement. In her assertion concerning “the impossibility of fallen man meriting anything by his own best good works,”²⁸² her urgent focus is upon “practical godliness,” “conversion,” and “subjects which explain conversion.” Ignorance of these subjective elements prevents young ministers from understanding “the plan of salvation”—the gospel.

Such direct linking of “imputed righteousness” with “practical godliness,”²⁸³ in identifying the 1888 message is definitive: it does not present a forensic-only justification, or even focus principally upon the forensic;²⁸⁴ but does reflect White’s own emphasis upon experience and the work of the Spirit; does affirm her understanding of “Christ and His relation to the law” in such a manner as to show their unity and reveal the law primarily as an expression of His character of love; and is opposed to giving a legal focus to the law.²⁸⁵ Moreover, her identification of Minneapolis with years of urging “the teachings of Christ” concerning “practical godliness,” denies the Reformationist claim that the reason the gospels do not reflect a forensic-only view is that Christ came not to preach [Page 205] gospel but to provide it in His doing and dying.²⁸⁶ The evidence clearly supports the conclusion that White’s warning against “entertaining... false ideas of justification by faith,” applies to Reformationist theology.

Negative-Positive Elements

Negatively, the article warns against a twofold evil: self exaltation—which inculcates a controversial spirit—and merit-seeking. A controversial spirit and “the habit of glorifying... [and] exalting men,” are shown to reveal lack of conversion,²⁸⁷ while strife for supremacy resulting in misrepresenting the truth “as it is in Jesus,” must be removed by the “fire of Christ’s righteousness”.²⁸⁸ In denying all human merit, specific warning is given against seeking merit in the gifts of repentance and faith.²⁸⁹ Significantly, every blessing is shown to come both *from the cross and “through a Mediator.”*²⁹⁰ That warnings against creature-merit, do not warn against effort is evident from the positive warning against the idea that “Jesus,... will do some of the saving; they must do the rest.”²⁹¹

[Page 206] God works and cooperates with the gifts He has imparted to man, and man, by being a partaker of the divine nature,... may be an overcomer and win eternal life. The Lord does not propose to do the work He has given men powers to do. Man’s part must be done. He must be a laborer together with God, yoking up with Christ,... God is the all controlling power. He bestows His gifts; man receives them and acts with the power of the grace of Christ as a living agent...²⁹²

White’s covenant concept is here confirmed in considerable detail, the important thing being that all praise and glory goes to the Creator and Giver of all good gifts. The following two paragraphs relate this concept of divine-human cooperation (in the use of gifts given for that purpose) to the body temple—central key to the Great Controversy theme:

... always cooperating with the faculties and powers given of God to man. The Redeemer must find a home in His building. God works and man works. In order

The Theology Crisis

that there be an outflowing, there must be an income of divinity to humanity. “I will dwell in them,…”

The soul temple is to be sacred,... a co-partnership in which all ‘the power is of God and all the glory belongs to God. The responsibility rests with us’. We must receive in thoughts and in feelings, to give in expression. The law of the ‘human and the divine action’ makes the receiver a laborer together with God. It brings man where he can, united with divinity, work the works of God... Divine power and the human agency combined will be a complete success for *Christ’s righteousness accomplishes everything*.²⁹³

This principle establishes a most intimate relation between cooperation in one’s own salvation and in saving other souls. Both involve the law of divine-human action in which man is responsible for his response to divine action. Both involve objective-subjective covenant relations, in which “Christ’s righteousness accomplishes everything.” This forceful summary of White’s holistic concept of **[Page 207]** righteousness by faith categorically refutes any dichotomy.

The paradox of placing total confidence in Christ’s covenant faithfulness, but corresponding responsibility upon man for that union is revealed through the following deeply personal expressions:

The absence of devotion, piety, and sanctification... comes through denying Jesus Christ our righteousness. The love of God needs to be constantly cultivated.

Oh, how my heart cries out to the living God for the mind of Jesus Christ; I want to lose sight of self... There are many erring... The Lord loves them notwithstanding their sins and follies. He gave His only beloved Son... I must ever keep close to Jesus Christ that I may constantly be a partaker of the divine nature... The love of Christ must not be extinguished in the soul.²⁹⁴

Conclusions—Root and Fruit

Presuming to be strictly Pauline, based upon Romans 3:21-5:21, removal of the fourth chapter²⁹⁵ leaves an extremely narrow base of thirty-two verses, a few of which admittedly refer to sanctification. The real, though unrecognized, base appears to be a theological construct²⁹⁶ supported by powerful analogies, most striking and effective being justification-as-root and sanctification-as-fruit.²⁹⁷ **[Page 208]** No analogy has been found in White which identifies the root with “justification,” but it is—rarely—related to “justification by faith.”

The present message—justification by faith—is a message from God; it bears the divine credentials, for its fruit is unto holiness.²⁹⁸

Coming less than a year after Minneapolis, this assertion refers to the message Reformationists confirm—even as they deny—was presented in an objective-subjective context.²⁹⁹ The same article clearly reveals the Great Controversy covenant context:

The thought that the righteousness of Christ is imputed to us, not because of any merit on our part, but as a free gift from God, seemed a precious thought... The enemy of man and God is not willing that this truth should be clearly presented; for he knows that if the people ‘receive it fully, his power will be broken’... Those who believe that God for Christ’s sake has forgiven their sins, should... press on to fight the good fight of faith...

Our only safety is in continually looking to Jesus. By living faith we must appropriate the precious promises; for every promise and command necessary for our salvation, must become a part of us, that we may become one with Christ... Unless divine power is brought into the experience...false theories and erroneous

ideas will take minds captive, Christ and his righteousness will be dropped out of the experience of many and their faith will be without power or life.³⁰⁰

[Page 209] Thus, justification and imputed righteousness are themselves rooted in an *experiential* faith. To “receive it fully” is to break the enemy’s power. Life and power come through union with Christ, characterized by obedience and submission to His will. Recognition of faith, rather than justification, as the root harmonizes this statement with White’s habitual pattern of relating the root either to faith or to Christ. While justification is never seen as root, faith and holiness (sanctification), which Reformationists insist **[Page 210]** are exclusively fruit, are here identified as *sources* (root) of fruit. Note, moreover, that the context reveals a change from legalistically oriented experience to saving faith.³⁰¹

He [Wesley] continued his strict and self-denying life, ‘not now as the ground, but the result of faith; not the root but the fruit of holiness.’ The grace of God in Christ is the foundation of the Christian’s hope, and that grace will be manifested in obedience. Wesley’s life was devoted to preaching... justification through faith in the atoning blood of Christ, and the renewing power of the Holy Spirit upon the heart, bringing forth fruit in a life conformed to the example of Christ.³⁰²

Under the covenant of grace God requires from man just what he required in Eden,—perfect obedience. The believing sinner, through his divine Substitute and Surety, renders obedience to the law of God... Good works will follow as the blossoms and ‘fruit of faith’. Appropriation of the righteousness of Christ will be manifested.³⁰³

Thus, justification, based upon both “atoning blood “and, renewing power of the Holy Spirit,” becomes a “first-fruit” of that faith-union which also produces sanctification. That White alternately presents faith and Christ as root indicates that she always sees saving action in a cooperative, divine-human context.³⁰⁴ In the union with the divine taproot, human faith-roots channel nourishment to the branches. The sap thus coming from Christ produces the fruits of righteousness in justification *and* sanctification. Note the *affectional nature* of the “righteousness which is of faith.”

Paul writes: “But the righteousness which is of faith... For with the heart man believeth ‘unto righteousness;... **[Page 211]** The ‘faith’ that is unto salvation is not a casual faith, it is ‘belief rooted in the heart, that embraces Christ as a personal Saviour,... This faith leads its possessor to place all the ‘affections of the soul upon Christ’, and his character is molded after the divine likeness.”³⁰⁵

Only as “with the heart man believeth unto righteousness,” does faith embrace “Christ as a personal Saviour.” Before and after 1888, White focuses on the *subjective* elements of faith and will in divine-human union which results in righteousness by faith.³⁰⁶

An amalgam of root-fruit, Father-son, and justification-sanctification models will summarize the basis of covenant security.³⁰⁷ The son’s acceptance is based upon his faith commitment to obey, *not* the *quantity* or *quality* of fruit borne. Moreover, the Father disinherits no son for disobedience, but honors the son’s will, as revealed in his ultimate decision regarding his Father’s authority.³⁰⁸ Meanwhile, love demands that He spare no pains to discipline his son (prune the branch) in order to fit him (sanctification) to claim the perfect title (justification) provided for all who remain in the covenant. So long as this purging-pruning process is accepted, the **[Page 212]** branch remains a living part of the vine—a true son of the covenant. But it is impossible to remain in the Vine unless the Vine remains in him; this takes place through the Word.³⁰⁹

“If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you,”... not a dead letter, but they are spirit and life. They are ‘motive power to all action... Christ’s words are to a purpose, to lead men to will and to do’. They are an impelling power, causing men to resolve and to act... (N)one are forced against their will. God’s grace will not supply the place of man’s cooperation. No amount of light, conviction, or grace can transform the character, only as man shall arouse to cooperate with God... (T)he

will must yield human cooperation must be enlisted, for this is the indispensable condition of salvation. “Work out your own salvation...” What! Must man do this work of himself unaided? —No, no. This is his part in the action, but hear the conclusion: “For it is God that worketh in you, both to will and to do of his good pleasure.” ‘Your will must blend with the divine will, and you must submit to the divine working’. Your energies are required to cooperate with God. Without this, if it were possible to force upon you with a hundredfold greater intensity the influences of the Spirit of God, it would not make you a Christian, a fit subject for heaven. ‘The stronghold of Satan would not be broken. There must be the willing and doing on the part of the receiver’.³¹⁰

The Great Controversy-covenant theme is here outlined. Most important is identification of His Word as the medium through which the divine-human union is formed. Covenant security is assured by remaining in the Word, through which are transmitted the motive and action power needed in responding in love and gratitude to God. Even the discipline through which the Father reveals His covenant faithfulness is administered largely through the Word:

For when we are judged, we are chastened of the Lord, that we should not be condemned with the world... In order to maintain spiritual life and health, we must feed on Jesus Christ by studying his word, and doing the things he has [Page 213] commanded in the word. This will constitute a close union with Christ. The branch that bears fruit must be in the vine, a part of it, receiving nourishment from the parent stalk.³¹¹

Applying the root-fruit analogy to Word-sanctification harmonizes with White. Through the Word (Scripture) we are rooted in the Word (Christ), and bear fruit of the Spirit. On the other hand, *forensic-only justification reduces righteousness to legalism and “thingifies” it by removing from it the Spirit, of which all true justification must be a fruit, thus providing a false hope which does not rest upon a subjective relation with the One making divine-human union possible by His own substitutionary sacrifice on Calvary.*³¹² What covenant security requires, at every stage of development, is the affirmative action of man’s will regarding covenant relations. But this requires that the will be continually motivated by that Word through which one lays hold of Christ’s perfect obedience, sacrifice, and mediation.

In the following “nutshell” portrayal of White’s concept of the relationship between Christ’s provisions and man’s response, note that the great honor, even for the effective exercise of man’s will falls upon Him who alone could make such possible:

What is the ‘honor conferred upon Christ? Without employing any compulsion, without using any violence, He blends the will of the human subject to the will of God. This is the science of all true science’; for by it a mighty change is wrought in mind and character—the change that must be wrought in the life of every one who passes through the gates of the city of God.³¹³

[Page 214] ‘By his perfect obedience, He has made it possible for every human being to obey God’s commandments’. When we submit ourselves to Christ, the heart is united with His heart, the will is merged in His will, the mind becomes one with His mind, the thoughts are brought into captivity to Him; ‘we live His life. This is what it means to be clothed with the garment of His righteousness’. Then as the Lord looks upon us He sees, not the fig-leaf garment, not the nakedness and deformity of sin but ‘His own robe of righteousness, which is perfect obedience to the law of Jehovah.’³¹⁴

Thus, White consistently presents righteousness by faith in the Great Controversy-covenant setting,³¹⁵ with its driving goal of “complete recovery from the power of Satan,”³¹⁶ by restoring the body temple through the active exercise of man’s own will.

¹ This study, 48-50.

² *Documents*, 9: “Never in Scripture is ‘the righteousness of God’ represented as something wrought within the sinner by the Spirit.” “Sanctification, because ever incomplete and imperfect is not Righteousness by faith, but its inevitable fruits.” (“White and Righteousness,” 16, Ford 2 #4.)

³ *Signs*, 4:200, 9/25/1901.

⁴ *Loc. cit.*

⁵ This study, 51, 54.

⁶ *Review*, 1:413, 4/15/1884.

⁷ *Ibid*, 6:295, 11/28/12.

⁸ *Signs*, 2:488, 5/9/1892.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 2:491; The frequency with which, in sermon, letter, and article, White refers to Him as “Chiefest among ten thousand” and “The One altogether lovely” indicates the depths of her own personal sense of lover for Christ and gratitude for His sacrifice and ministry. The extent of her conviction regarding the impossibility of any man meriting salvation is indicated by her statement regarding the mother of Jesus: “The only hope of redemption for our fallen race is in Christ; Mary could find salvation only through the Lamb of God. In herself she possessed no merit. Her connection with Jesus placed her in no different spiritual relation to Him from that of any other human should.” (*Desire of Ages*, 147.)

¹⁰ *Desire of Ages*, 435.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 300.

¹² *Review*, 3:365, 6/9/96.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 4:242, 11/27/1900

¹⁴ *Patriarchs and Prophets*, 72-73.

¹⁵ *Signs*, 2:466, 2/22/1892.

¹⁶ *Patriarchs and Prophets*, 203; *Signs*, 2:402, 8/18/1890.

¹⁷ *Signs*, 2:412, 11/24/1890.

¹⁸ *Review*, 3:424, 12/29/1892.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 2:438, 11/11/1890.

²⁰ See also *Signs*, 4:311.

²¹ *Mount of Blessing*, 86.

²² *Signs*, 2:244, 8/24/1891.

²³ *Review*, 5:379, 12/19/1907.

²⁴ *Signs*, 2:228, 7/18/88. The danger then, is not in efforts, but in attitudes regarding the value of those efforts, which “are as filthiness without Christ.” (*Signs*, 2:436.) “But do all that we may, yet we can do nothing to pay a ransom for our souls. But while we see our helplessness, we are to be continually looking unto Jesus, who is the author and finisher of our faith. We can do nothing to originate faith, for faith is the gift of God... The Lord has commanded us ‘Work out your own salvation...’ But what does this mean? It means that you feel your necessity, that you are poor in spirit, that you rejoice with trembling. It means that you know that in the very words you utter you may make a mistake, that in the very best of your work self may be so mingled that your efforts may be valueless, that you realize that your efficiency is in Christ.” (*Ibid.*, 489.)

²⁵ *Signs*, 2:488, 5/9/1895.

²⁶ *Desire of Ages*, 286-287.

²⁷ *Education*, 75-77, 1903; *Testimonies*, 5:540, 1889; 2:344, 1869.

²⁸ *Christ’s Object Lessons*, 415ff.

²⁹ *Prophets & Kings*, 709.

³⁰ *Review*, 3:165, 7/10/94, emphasis supplied.

³¹ *Signs*, 2:288, 5/27/89.

³² “Self-righteousness is the danger of this age; it separates the soul from Christ. Those who trust to their own righteousness cannot understand how salvation comes through Christ. They call sin righteousness and righteousness sin... The reason there are so many spurious conversions these days, is that there is so low an appreciation of the law of God.” (*Signs*, 1:398.) A pre-1888 article both warns against trying to scale the walls of heaven, and points out the necessity of combining *human effort with divine power* in claiming the victory of Christ. (*Review*, 2:119; Cf. *Acts of the Apostles*, 15 *Desire of Ages*, 172, 180.) “In his sermon on the mount, Christ presented to the people the fact that personal piety was their strength. They were to surrender themselves to God, working with Him with unreserved cooperation.” (*Review*, 3:251.) In this context she warns against “the insufficiency of legal or natural religion,” which does not recognize the necessity of the Spirit and grace through which alone man may cooperate with God. The problem of a legal religion, in White’s view, has nothing to do with effort of “works” *per se*, (*Signs*, 3:172.) but with the failure to “see Jesus in His relation to the law,” and to “rest in the merits of Christ, accepting His righteousness and believing in His mercy.” (*Review*, 3:131-132, 3/20/94)

It is significant that White links true worship with obedience, which she bases upon transformation by the Spirit that “renew[s] the mind and give[s] us a new capacity for knowing and loving God. It will give us willing obedience to all His requirements. *This is true worship.*” (*In Heavenly Places*, 372.) Thus, while false worship is self-centered worship which cannot yield true obedience no matter how great the effort and regardless of appearances, true worship results from a life transformed by the Spirit so that obedience springs from a “a new capacity for knowing and loving God.”

³³ *Signs*, 4:295, 6/24/1903.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 3:398, 7/21/1890.

³⁵ This study, 393.

³⁶ Note *Review*, 6:39; *Signs*, 3:162, 172; 4:208.

³⁷ *Steps to Christ*, 95; Cf. *Signs*, 2:464, 516, 1892.

³⁸ *Desire of Ages*, 301; Cf. *Patriarchs & Prophets*, 738.

³⁹ *Signs*, 2:369, 497.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 2:268

⁴¹ In a lifetime of exalting the Bible, White was ever careful to maintain a balance of principles which, while appearing mutually exclusive, are actually complementary and essential to each other. Her own paradoxes may be seen as an evidence of faithfulness to Scripture. The same fidelity in honoring the integrity of paradoxical truth would go far in resolving the present conflict.

⁴² *Review*, 2:198, 3/27/1888.

⁴³ *Signs*, 2:474, 3/28/1892.

⁴⁴ *Desire of Ages*, 668; Cf. *Review*, 6:45.

⁴⁵ This study, 134.

⁴⁶ Cultivation of a positive self-image (self-respect) appears to be assured by the Reformationist emphasis on the forensic transfer of Christ's merit to the penitent, but White's understanding of the manner in which to cultivate a true self-concept is undermined by their denial of the subjective element. In White, self-respect is determined by the merits of Christ's sacrifice but realized by the believer only through obedience: "By your obedience to God, respect yourself as the purchased possession of His dear Son." (*God's Amazing Grace*, Wash., D.C., Review and Herald, Pub. Assn., 1973, 66.) Thus only through a subjective response (commitment to obedience through divine-human union; see this study, 189 and below) to God's forensic provisions can man realize the self-respect which justification is designed to provide.

⁴⁷ *Steps to Christ*, 15.

⁴⁸ *Signs*, 3:210, 5/30/1895.

⁴⁹ *Loc. Cit.*; In White, *legalism* is the exact opposite of divine-human cooperation. Note that it results from effort in our own strength, outside the covenant: "The spirit of bondage is engendered by seeking to live in accordance with a legal religion, through striving to fulfill the claim of the law in our own strength. There is hope for us only as we come under the Abrahamic Covenant." (*SDA BC*, 6:1077.) "When you submit to my yoke, when you give up the struggle that is so unprofitable, you will find rest... The yoke and the cross are symbols representing the same thing – the giving up of the will to God... Wearing the yoke places man in companionship with the Son of God. Lifting the cross cuts away selfishness, we are to deny our inclinations,... and follow in Christ's steps." (*Signs*, 4:352; Cf. this study, 214.)

⁵⁰ *Review*, 3:494, 8/24/1897.

⁵¹ This study, 132ff; Note: The context also provides for a second dimension, in which a believer continues to recognize and deplore the contrast between his "natural goodness" and Christ.

⁵² *Review*, 3:493, 8/24/1897.

⁵³ This study, 52, 56.

⁵⁴ It should be noted that the same statement printed in *Desire of Ages* the following year (1898), uses the word "imputed" instead of "imparted." (To determine which was prepared first would require examination of the prepublication copy, "Life of Christ.") In a personal discussion with this researcher, Leshar stated that previous to 1895 White sometimes used the words interchangeable, but that she consistently used them in the more restricted sense following her definition: "The righteousness by which we are justified is imputed; the righteousness by which we are sanctified is imparted." (*Review*, 3:261.) He suggests that the

above may have been a typographical error. It matters little to this discussion whether the above assumption proves true or not, however, for the subjective element is clearly evident in the above quote, regardless. If “imputed” were indeed intended, it only confirms her reflection of the subjective element in “imputed” righteousness as late as 1897.

⁵⁵ *Subjective* refers to the element of personal relations with Christ through the Spirit and contrasts with the doing and dying of Christ in atoning for sin – historical acts *objective* to man because he had no part in them. Reformationist concern to break the synthesis is partly a reaction to modern liberal thought which sees a continuum between human and divine, and between nature and God. Moving in a pantheistic direction, this tends to deny the radical sinfulness of natural revelation. White’s comments regarding Judas reflect her concern. In confusing the Spirit’s work upon his heart with his own natural disposition, he assumed former to represent his “essential attributes. By taking this view... he left an open door for Satan to enter and take possession of the entire man.” (*SDA BC*, 5:1101, MS 28, 1897; Cf. Acts of the Apostles, 15.)

Divergence from White involves their method of counteracting “subjectivism.” While they depend upon a theological dichotomy between justification and regeneration-sanctification, she advocates dependence upon the whole Word as protection against false concepts and self-centered, pseudo-spiritual experience. (See *Great Controversy*, 593-602; Cf. this study, 157n, 169: see also *Spectrum*, vol. 9, #3, 30, 36.)

⁵⁶ *Review*, 3:225, 1/29/1895.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 3:25, 3/7/1893.

⁵⁸ *Signs*, 3:210, 5/30/95; “In the divine arrangement, through his unmerited favor, the Lord has ordained that good works shall be rewarded.” (See *Review*, 3:225.)

⁵⁹ *Signs*, 4:140; Cf. 1:59; *Review*, 3:3, 413.

⁶⁰ *Review*, 5:413, 7/9/08.

⁶¹ *Signs*, 1:59, 6/26/1877.

⁶² *Review*, 3:608, 9/20/1898; also 3:25; *Signs*, 3:469, 4/21/1898.

⁶³ *Signs*, 1:472.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 1:32.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 1:59.

⁶⁶ This study, 138.

⁶⁷ *SDA BC*, 1:1096.

⁶⁸ *Review*, 2:408, 7/1/1890.

⁶⁹ *Spirit of Prophecy*, 2:9-10.

⁷⁰ *Acts of the Apostles*, 29; see also *Review*, 5:23.

⁷¹ *Youth’s Instructor*, 4/25/01, v. 49, #17, 130; Ellen G. White, *Youth’s Instructor Articles* (being compiled and published) span the period between 1852 and 1970; Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

⁷² *Review*, 2:436; “The father laid our sins where none but His own eyes could discern them. And as He hid His face from the innocence of Christ, so He will hide His eyes from the guilt of the believing sinner, because of the righteousness imputed to him.” (*Signs*, 3:522.)

⁷³ *Signs*, 2:510.

⁷⁴ This study, 169.

⁷⁵ *Signs*, 2:507.

⁷⁶ Those statements reflecting the distinction between Substitute and Surety relate the former to the Sacrifice at the cross and appear to relate the latter to Christ’s priestly ministry. (This study, 338ff.) Having been introduced into the covenant through the Substitute, the High Priest guarantees that so long as man remains in the covenant, He stands as his Surety, providing absolute *guarantee* of his ultimate salvation through a successful passage through the probationary period made possible by the Substitute. Thus, not only may man “run in the race of humble obedience,” but his Surety holds Himself responsible for his winning the prize of eternal life. (Cf. *Selected Messages*, 1:394.)

⁷⁷ *Signs*, 2:227, 7/6/88.

⁷⁸ This study, 134-135, 142; “...[God] accepted humanity as exalted through the righteous character and divine excellence of his beloved son. A way was opened for sinners that, through obedience to God’s law and faith in Christ as their Redeemer, they might form characters and become children of God.” (*Youth’s Instructor*, March, 1874, v. 22, #3, 20.) The basis of salvation is the character of Christ, but its effectiveness is determined by faith and obedience in the development of a righteous character.

⁷⁹ *Review*, 5:332, 5/30/07.

⁸⁰ This study, 139.

⁸¹ See *Ibid.*, 142.

⁸² *Review*, 2:231, 7/24/88: 2:240.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 2:231.

⁸⁴ *Signs*, 1:103.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 102.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 3:435.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 436.

⁸⁸ *Ministry of Healing*, 460.

⁸⁹ *Testimonies*, 8:206, 4:503.

⁹⁰ *Desire of Ages*, 58.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 20.

⁹² *Patriarchs & Prophets*, 155.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, 574; *Testimonies*, 4:591.

⁹⁴ *Life Sketches*, 246; *Review*, 2:401; *Desire of Ages*, 652; *SDA BC*, 7: 925, 933.

⁹⁵ *Signs*, 2:321, 9/16/89.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 1:344, 4/19/83.

⁹⁷ *Signs*, 2:321; Cf. 1:101, and *Review*, 2:270, 12/18/88.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 4:383; Cf. 2:400; *SDA CA*, 7:925; *Review*, 5:491.

⁹⁹ *Review*, 5:86, 11/3/04.

¹⁰⁰ Ford says: “In summary we would say that E.G. White agrees with Scripture... Sanctification, because ever incomplete and imperfect is not Righteousness by faith but its inevitable fruits.” (“White and Righteousness”, 16 [Ford 2 #4]) White would not say “sanctification is not Righteousness by faith,” *nor* would she say it is “*inevitable*” fruit or that its absence proves “justification has not been received,” for she would say it might have been received but not retained through divine-human relation. Reformationists would deny this conclusion, **but to say sanctification is “inevitable “ or “automatic” fruit implies “once saved always saved” and denies White’s covenant concept.** (See this study, 169ff; for discussion on root and fruit, see *Ibid.*, 207ff.) ***The fruit is inevitable only upon man’s choice to unite with Christ and his continued choice to remain in union.***

¹⁰¹ *Testimonies*, 5:384, 1885; Note: “But Christ gained a complete victory over this temptation, thus placing men and women on vantage ground, where they can overcome as He overcame.” (*Signs*, 4:107.) While the entire race is brought nigh by the Father’s acceptance of humanity in Christ, only as Christ’s merit works through man’s own obedience, can he actually stand on this vantage ground.” (*Ibid.*, 4:207.) “...(T)his victory will not benefit man unless he also gains the victory on his own account. Man now has the advantage over Adam.” (*Ibid.*, 1:75 .) “If we should obey this injunction, it would place us on vantage ground.” (*Ibid.*, 2:321.) “Christ imputes his perfection and righteousness to the believing sinner *when he does not continue in sin*, but turns from transgression to obedience to the commandments. Christ rendered perfect obedience to the law, and *man could not possible obey the holy precepts had it not been for the provision that was made...* Thus he placed the human family upon vantage ground...” (*Review*, 4:47-48.) Note the twofold set of causal relationships: Man’s obedience is possible only through the divine provisions; but reception of those provisions is conditional upon man’s commitment “not to continue in sin.”

¹⁰² *Signs*, 1:479, 1/8/85.

¹⁰³ This study, 140-142; She states emphatically: “No one who believes in Jesus Christ is under bondage to the law of God; for His law is a law of life, not of death, to those who obey its precepts... Through faith in Christ obedience to every principle of the law is made possible.” (MS 122, 1901, in *SDA BC*, 6:1088; Cf. *Review*, 6:330, 5/8/13) “Jesus died that through his merits men might be redeemed in view of the great sacrifice which has been made for us, we are exhorted to work out our own salvation with fear and trembling... They yield to Satan’s control the soul for whose redemption Christ has died. We are free to obey or to disregard the will of God; free to live without prayer or to pray. As God compels no man to be righteous...” (*Signs*, 1:499, 10/8/85.)

¹⁰⁴ *Signs*, 1:69, 8/1/78.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 68.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 2:190, 2/17/88.

¹⁰⁷ *Review*, 2:240, 7/21/88.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 321.

¹⁰⁹ This was one of the most dominant notes throughout Paxton's Washington lectures (see this study, 8). In *Shaking*, p.44 he states: "The righteousness of faith is... the doing and dying of the God-man," then explicitly denies any element of the Spirit. (*Et passim*; Cf. "Million Sermons," Ford 2 #6.)

¹¹⁰ A strong forensic note does run through White's theology, reflecting God's justice and His commitment to maintain the integrity of His laws, on which the stability of His government rests. Justice is seen to emerge, however, from the more basic principle of love and its attendant relationships. (*Christ's Object Lessons*, 40; *Desire of Ages*, 762.) The law itself – the rule by which justice is determined – is but an expression of God's character of love and the corresponding relationships His creatures were designed to experience. (*Desire of Ages*, 69; *Mount of Blessing*, 18; Cf. this study, 72ff.) Thus, while justification through the cross represents the legal basis upon which God may declare the guilty innocent, justice itself is but an adjunct of its totality. **Hence, all legal implications must be interpreted in terms of the demands and relationships required by love.** This is why, in consistently blending the objective and subjective, White gives a certain kind of priority to the latter even when the former is the point of emphasis. **The purpose of justification, above all else, is to restore those relationships which the law defines.**

¹¹¹ *Signs*, 2:344, 1889; Note: Reformationists sometimes emphasize a relational aspect of justification, but this is understood in a strictly legal sense. (For contrast between forensic and relationals, see this study, 54.) They do not deny the importance of experience, but consider it to be a spontaneous fruit of the legal relation, urgently distinguishing it from justification to protect the latter's purity.

¹¹² This study, 92ff.

¹¹³ *Review*, 6:286, 10/24/12.

¹¹⁴ Only by virtue of the cross can the Spirit implant in every heart enmity against sin (Gen. 3:15), thus providing the prison of sin a probationary opportunity by limiting Satan's power and freeing him to choose Christ as Substitute *and* Surety – justification *and* sanctification. In this divine arrangement, not only is the subjective, rational response to the Spirit's initiative in implanting – contrary to man's own nature – enmity against sin and a longing for righteousness as the only basis upon which the cross can become effective through justification. Note: "God declares: 'I will put enmity.' This enmity is not naturally entertained... It is the grace that Christ implants in the soul which creates in man enmity against Satan. Without this converting grace and renewing power, man would continue the captive of Satan, a servant ever ready to do his bidding. But the new principle in the soul creates conflict where hitherto had been peace. The power which Christ imparts enables man to resist the tyrant and usurper." (*Great Controversy*, 505-506; Cf. *Signs*, 3: 331; *Review*, 5:281; this study, 92ff.

¹¹⁵ *Great Controversy*, 507; *Signs*, 2:226.

¹¹⁶ *Desire of Ages*, 671.

¹¹⁷ This study, 48-49.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 70.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 75.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, 72.

¹²¹ *Ibid.*, 75ff.

¹²² *Ibid.*, 98.

¹²³ *Ibid.*, 87-92.

¹²⁴ *Patriarchs & Prophets*, 63; *Spiritual Gifts*, 3:36-37.

¹²⁵ *Patriarchs & Prophets*, 69-70; *Christ's Object Lesson*, 415-420; *Review*, 1:142, 2/24/74.

¹²⁶ *Review*, 1:140.

¹²⁷ The primary objective of Paxton's book was to demonstrate that traditional Adventism represents a Roman Catholic (Trent) theology and to challenge that body to break the synthesis between the objective and subjective as the only means of fulfilling its mission to finish the Reformation. (See *Shaking*, 135ff.) He concludes: "The crux of the problem in modern Adventism lies in understanding the relation of justification and sanctification... (T)hose who have included sanctification in the article of righteousness by faith have done so against the better judgment of Paul and the Reformers..." (*Ibid.*, 148, author's emph.) Ford and Brinsmead are set forth as a team whose primary responsibility is to bring about the desired change in the church (*Ibid.*, 128ff.); rejection of their efforts to break the synthesis requires, he suggests, that SDA's cease making their "naïve" claim to represent the Reformers, "for to reject this distinction is to lapse back into the synthesis of medieval Catholicism..." (*Ibid.*, 46)

¹²⁸ *Selected Messages*, 1:366, L3, 1889.

¹²⁹ *Loc cit.*

¹³⁰ This study, 50,53.

¹³¹ Ford's caution is revealing: "While we believe the foregoing summarizes the *agreement of E.G. White with Paul on Righteousness by Faith*, we would stress that there are places where Sister White uses the expressions... in a non-technical way, giving it a meaning which stresses... the life and *character* that faith in Christ brings." ("White and Righteousness," 18, Ford 2 #4.) Indeed, the subjective element pervades his preceding sixteen pages of references – designed to demonstrate White's concurrence with the forensic-only concept! This becomes particularly apparent when the numerous quotes are examined in context. For example MS 36, 1900, cited seven times – more than any other reference and representing their prime evidence – portrays White's positive inclusion of the subjective, while providing a sample of the Reformationist's pattern of violation context. (See this study, 157-165.) Ford no doubt believes his references do indicate a forensic-only concept, but uneasiness in that conviction is indicated in his assessment above. Paxton gives evidence of his uncertainty by such statements as: "*When I interpret Mrs. White at her best...*" (*Shaking*, 155.) Why the interpretation? But more important, why "at her best"? He repeatedly referred to "White at her best" in his Washington lectures. (See this study, 7.)

It is agreed that White was not a trained theologian and did not attempt to relate to professional dialogue. But for this reason it is imperative that her expressions not be forced into a "theological" mold. Failure to exegete her expressions from immediate context in light of thought patterns developed through the decades poses the greatest single problem to contemporary dialogue. (See this study, 111, 116, 124ff.; Cf. Appendix C.) White's amazing consistency greatly simplifies the challenge of determining her meaning.

¹³² *SDA BC*, 6:1070, MS 21, 1891.

¹³³ *Mount of Blessing*, 114; CF. *Review*, 4:422-423, 6/10/02.

¹³⁴ Reformationists assume that which they should prove – that their doctrine truly represents Luther and Calvin, whom evidence strongly suggests are more in agreement with White. For example, Luther equates personal faith, the person of Christ, and imputation. He also states; "... justified,... not for our own merits and works but for our faith, by which we take hold of Christ... *but faith, because the heart must behold and grasp nothing but Christ...* Here it is necessary to know the true definition of Christ... (T)he sophists have

made Him a judge and torturer, and have invented this stupid notion about the merit of congruity and condignity.” (Luther’s Works, Vol. 26, *Lectures on Galatians* – 1535, Ch. 1-4, St. Louis: Concordia Pub. House, 1963, 132.) Thus agreement with White exists on both denial of human merit and affirmation of justification as involving a heart relation to the person of Christ. (See *Christ’s Object Lessons*, 312.)

¹³⁵ *Steps to Christ*, 15.

¹³⁶ This study, 139.

¹³⁷ *Steps to Christ*, 15.

¹³⁸ *Review*, 2:363, 2/4/90.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, 408.

¹⁴⁰ *Signs*, 2:198.

¹⁴¹ *Review*, 2:395; Cf. *Selected Messages*, 1:397.

¹⁴² *Review*, 3:520.

¹⁴³ Cf. *God’s Amazing Grace*, 61.

¹⁴⁴ *Review*, 3:520.

¹⁴⁵ *Mount of Blessing*, 18.

¹⁴⁶ “For Luther, justification is not a naked imputation nor a simple declaration that the sinner is accounted righteous. Rather, a man is justified through, and because of a union with Christ that cometh of faith. Christ and the believer are united as Bridegroom and bride becoming ‘one flesh,’ or ‘one cake’.” (Robin Leaver, *Luther on Justification*, St. Louis: Concordia Pub. House, 1975, 62; Cf. 26-27, 31-36.) Luther relates even “passive righteousness” to the Holy Spirit: “ ‘Thus I put myself beyond all active righteousness,... I embrace only that passive righteousness which is the righteousness... of grace, mercy, and the forgiveness of sins.’ In other words, this is the righteousness of Christ and of the Holy Spirit, which we do not perform but receive, which we do not have but accept,...” (*Luther’s Works*, *Op.cit*, 6.)

¹⁴⁷ *Review*, 1:60 3/25/75.

¹⁴⁸ Distinguishing Reformationist from traditional SDA theology with respect to a synthesis of justification and sanctification “as in the Council of Trent,” Paxton states: “Prior to 1970, Adventism’s view of the gospel was a synthesis of Protestant and Roman Catholic elements. It was this synthesis which bound all Adventist theologians together in their articulation of the gospel.” (*Shaking*, 135, author’s emphasis.) This identification of SDA theology with the doctrine of Trent (See this study, 48; *Shaking*, 39ff.) strangely ignores the real points of conflict between Trent and Luther/Calvin, such as their claims that: a) the church is the sole repository of righteousness; b) it is received through the sacraments; c) it becomes the inherent property of the soul; d) man’s free will is meritorious; e) imputation does not involve the total righteousness of Christ, and consequently, f) it does not bring to the believer full assurance of salvation. (See H. Jedin, *A History of the Council of Trent*, London: Thomas Nelson, 1961, 104ff.) These presuppositions also contrast sharply with White and representative SDA theologians. Paxton’s charge that Gane teaches an “infused righteousness, “which becomes “the property of the believer as well as of Christ,” grossly distorts Gane’s position that the believer possesses righteousness only as he possesses Christ. (Cf. *Shaking*, 140, with Erwin Gane, “Is There Power in Justification?” c. 1977, and his series, “Christ and Salvation,” *Review*, March 22-April 19, 1979.)

¹⁴⁹ *Mount of Blessing*, 55.

¹⁵⁰ This study, 56.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 54

¹⁵² For example, see “Pauline Gospel,” (Ford 1 #2); they consider Paul’s gospel (righteousness) to be strictly forensic (legal) in spite of obvious evidence of his merging subjective and objective elements. (See Rom. 1:16; Gal. 2:20; Cf. *Review*, 3:192.)

¹⁵³ The following descriptions and definitions, packed into three paragraphs of a single article, form a summary: “Those who continually *feed upon the word* of God... [receive] grace and strength to work out the righteousness of Christ... Your soul’s sanctification and righteousness will result from *faith in the word of God, which leads to obedience of its commands*... *Righteousness is living the law of God as Christ lived it*; it is the health, the activity of spiritual energy in the service of God,... *Righteousness is the possession of increasing usefulness*. It is the hiding of the soul in Christ. It is experiencing fellowship with God. It is exemplifying to the world the fact that God has vindicated his word in the world, and his promise in saying, ‘We will come and make our abode with Him.’ Righteousness leads the human agent in preparing for the mansions which Christ has gone to prepare for those who love him.” (*Signs*, 43:235-236, 9/5/95; Cf. *Desire of Ages*, 504; this study, 159ff.)

¹⁵⁴ This study, 69, 85.

¹⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 153ff.

¹⁵⁶ In White, imputed righteousness and justification are used interchangeably. Thus, since justification involves the subjective element (heart experience) so also does imputed righteousness. Indeed, imputed righteousness is often used in a broader sense to cover both justification and sanctification.

¹⁵⁷ While there are degrees of maturity in relationship, since Christ is its only source, there can be no degrees of righteousness. Note the necessity and manner of appropriation: “Every soul must be saved by his own righteousness. Can we manufacture this righteousness? No. But Jesus has furnished it for us. When the sinner comes to him he takes his load of sin, and gives him his righteousness. The vilest sinner may claim all that was provided in the plan of salvation through the merits of Christ. He may have the attributes of the Saviour... Have you an experimental religion?” (*Signs*, 2:317.) Thus, White consistently links the subjective with the objective. A single righteousness, the very life and virtue of the divine-human person is shared with man, so that *in this relationship, His righteousness is acquired by the believer*.

“The work of overcoming is in our hands, but we are not to overcome in our strength; for of ourselves we cannot keep the commandments of God. The Spirit must help our infirmities. Christ has become our sacrifice and surety,... Through faith in His name, he imputes unto us His righteousness and it becomes a living principle in our life. ... There are *many who think that it is impossible to escape from sin*, but the promise is that we may be filled with all the fullness of God... (W)e are to *reflect the highest attributes of the character of God*... *The law of God is the standard to which we are to attain through the imputed righteousness of Christ*.” (*Review*, 2:671; Cf. *Desire of Ages*, 311-312.)

¹⁵⁸ *Review*, 4:343, 10/15/01; Cf. *Signs*, 2:412, 11/24/90.

¹⁵⁹ In “The Catholic Man Will Get You, If You Don’t Watch Out!” (Paper dated 8/4/1978.) David Duffie raises some significant questions regarding Reformationist tactics in offering only two alternatives: their own understanding of Reformation theology, or Roman Catholicism. (See also his “Ford and Paxton at Loma Linda,” May 11, 1978.)

But White identifies righteousness directly with the living abiding presence of Christ. (This study, 160ff.) Luther agrees with White: “Therefore faith justifies because it takes hold of and possesses this treasure, the present Christ. But how he is present – this is beyond our thought;... Therefore the Christ who

is grasped by faith and who lives in the heart is the true Christian righteousness, on account of which God counts us righteous and grants us eternal life.” (Luther’s Works, vol. 26,130.)

Just as love, the inner motivating force, is available only through the Spirit’s presence in the body temple, even so righteousness is received only through such union of the body temple with Christ. (This study, 85.) If separating these elements is essential to a faith uncorrupted by legalism, White’s lifetime efforts to encourage a faith free from legalistic overtones were obviously misdirected. Indeed, if we are to take Reformation theology seriously, her impassioned stress on perfection and consistent emphasis upon cleansing the soul temple through re-union between God and man must ultimately lead to the conclusion that she was herself the cause of the abortive efforts at Minneapolis and following.

White’s concept of the Spirit’s relation to man through the body temple should in no way be confused with the medieval concept on “infusion.” (Cf. this study, 161; see also Ford 5 #2, p. 5.) Nor does it encourage pantheism, for at no time are the divine and human confused. (See Ford 5 #1, p. 15.) Man is always considered a sinner by virtue of his own nature even as he is considered righteous by virtue of his relation to Christ. Ford fails to recognize the dynamics of White’s statement, “In ourselves we are sinners; but in Christ we are righteous,” which he frequently quotes in a setting to enforce a forensic concept of righteousness. (See Documents, 47.) Note her words which follow immediately: “Having made us righteous through the imputed righteousness of Christ, God pronounces us just,... Christ works against the power of sin, and where sin abounded, grace much more abounded.” (Selected Messages, 1:394.) It is the Spirit’s presence within the temple which makes it holy, not the nature of the temple.

For Reformationist confusion of Hebrew and Greek thought, see this study, 172n, 307n, and Appendix C.

¹⁶⁰ “The righteousness of God was revealed in the gospel. In it was made known the method by which man was to be reconciled to God... The law condemns, but it cannot pardon the transgressor. The penitent believing soul does not look to the law for justification, but to Christ, the atoning sacrifice, who is able to impart his righteousness to the sinner, and make his efforts acceptable before God. When we take Christ for our Saviour, we are enabled to become obedient children, keeping all the commandments of God... But those who believed in Christ attained unto righteousness through faith in Him. They accepted God’s law as the rule of character.” (Signs, 2:309, 8/5/89)

Revealing God’s righteousness, the gospel is to make known the “method” by which the sinner is reconciled to Him. That “method” cannot be through the law, as under it man stands sentenced to death. (See this study, 161ff; Signs, 1:64, 2:110.) But it does involve receiving Christ, through whose atoning sacrifice believers “become obedient children, keeping all the commandments of God.” The impartation of His righteousness, which takes place by looking to Christ and His objective “atoning sacrifice,” reconciles man to God subjectively as well as objectively, restoring him to the divine, power-filled presence.

¹⁶¹ Review, 5:526, 7/8/09.

¹⁶² “Reconciliation means that every barrier between the soul and God is removed... By reason of the sacrifice... Christ was the channel [through which] righteousness might flow from the heart of God to the heart of the sinner.” (Selected Messages, 1:396.) As in the case of righteousness (see this study, 159ff.) the gospel is seen to be received by receiving Christ, (context is sanctification, not legal standing) and with Him, “that life that measures with the life of God.” Such reception involves surrender of the will, through which both escape from corruption of lust and growth in grace must take place. “The gospel of Christ is not only to be believed, but to be acted.” (Review, 3:533; see also 5:56, 235; Great Controversy, 465; Medical Ministry, Mountain View, CA, Pacific Press Pub. Assn, 1905, 1946, p. 483.) Moreover, “The gospel is to be presented,... as a living force to change the life.” (Desire of Ages, 826.)

¹⁶³ Signs, 1:68.

¹⁶⁴ Selected Messages, 2:106, MS 32, 1896; Identifying the “everlasting gospel” with Eden, this article deals with false theories which undermine the three angel’s messages. One striking statement: “Yet because they can weave Scripture into their theories, they think they have a straight chain of truth.” (Ibid., 110-111, see 101-117; Cf. this study, 352ff., and Appendices B and C.)

¹⁶⁵ Signs, 3:162, 11/5/84.

¹⁶⁶ Thus the danger of a forensic-only concept. Note: “The glory of Christ is His character, and His character is an expression of the law of God.” (Signs, 4:443, 7/3/07) “God has given us His holy precepts, because He loves mankind. To shield us from the results of transgression, He reveals the principles of righteousness. The law is an expression of the thought of God; when received in Christ, it becomes our thought. It lifts us above the power of natural desires and tendencies, above temptations that lead to sin.” (Desire of Ages, 308; see also Signs, 4:509.)

¹⁶⁷ As suggested by this context, White consistently uses “in Jesus” or “in Christ” as synonymous with “Christ in you.” (Cf. the Reformer view – this study, 52, 56.) A survey of Paul’s usage indicates that he also frequently does so: 2 Cor. 2:14; 3:14-18; 5:17; Cf. 13:5.

¹⁶⁸ Review, 2:398, 5/27/90; see also 4:402; 5:7.

¹⁶⁹ Walther, “Proper Distinction,” 9-11, (Ford 7 #4); see this study, 48.

¹⁷⁰ SDA BC, 6:1073.

¹⁷¹ Walther, op. cit., 40.

¹⁷² Loc. cit.

¹⁷³ Loc. cit.; See this study, 54, 180n. Neither Walther nor SDA Reformationists are antinomian. They do believe in the law and they also believe in cooperation, but their theological dichotomy, which has its roots in the doctrines of original sin and Predestination, gives them a completely different concept of the covenant. Though SDA Reformationists deny the latter doctrine, they still cling to that concept of “security of the believer” which is dictated by the Calvinist doctrine of the covenants. (See Louis Berkhof, A Summary of Christian Doctrine, London: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1938, 42-44, 61-79.)

¹⁷⁴ Walther, Loc. cit.; Cf. this study, 119, 120n.

¹⁷⁵ The correlation between White’s Great Controversy-covenant concept and recent theological patterns developed around E. Kasemann’s “Machtcharakter der Gabe” (power-character of the gift) concept involving “Herrschaftswechsel” (change of Lordship) and “Existenzwandel” (transformation of existence), which was inspired by H. Cremer’s understanding of *tsedagah* as “a ‘relational concept’ designating the action of partners in keeping with covenant (i.e., covenant-faithfulness).” *Dikaioyne theous* designates not “God’s essence, but... his activity as Lord and Redeemer.” Kasemann’s interpretation “... avoids the one-sidedness of an anthropocentric perspective simply an external phenomenon... The encounter takes place within man: the gift of righteousness demands response... Kasemann has provided a completely unified interpretation of Pauline *dikaioyne theou* in the context of Paul’s ‘universalizing’ of God’s covenant faithfulness in terms of a ‘new creation theology.’” (528-529) Significant is the claim that Paul’s understanding is dependent upon the OT covenant-faithfulness concept which involves a “cosmic, juridical trial which pits Israel (and the nations) against God. God’s covenant victory comes when through the faith acknowledgment of His right of rule, the believer enters covenant relations as an obedient subject.” (530) While “juridical-forensic overtones are present in Pauline use... they are not in the foreground. The forensic declaration: The man who is ‘declared righteous’ by God stands under his sovereign, creative-redemptive disposal.” (540) (E.B. Sanders. Paul and Palestinian Judaism, London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1977. Righteousness’ in recent German discussion,” 523-542.)

¹⁷⁶ This study, 69ff.

¹⁷⁷ Review, 2:137, 5/17/87

¹⁷⁸ The key to White's understanding of righteousness by faith is found in her covenant-concept. *Patriarchs and Prophets*, first published work following 1888 is a treatment of the Great Controversy motif in a covenant setting; see pages 117-119, 136-138, 187, 193-194, 197, 252, 278-279, 303, 312, 316-320, 323, 332, 335, 348, 363-373, 376, 379, 390, 406, 431, 476, 485, 495-496, 503, 511, 522, 522, 524, 714, and 754. Her last book, *Prophets and Kings*, is also covenant-centred; note pages 20-22, 37, 97, 151, 165, 216, 280, 292-295, 299, 368-369, 392-394, 400-41, 408-409, 414, 427-429, 447, 470, 569-576, 622, 632, 648, 661-668, 674-676, 705-706, 714.

¹⁷⁹ *Review*, 2:359, 1/21/90.

¹⁸⁰ *Christ's Object Lessons*, 250.

¹⁸¹ *Desire of Ages*, 300.

¹⁸² *Patriarchs & Prophets*, 371; Note carefully White's (Abrahamic) covenant insights as presented in *God's Amazing Grace*, 129-134.

¹⁸³ *Selected Messages*, 1:351; Cf. *Patriarchs & Prophets*, 373.

¹⁸⁴ See also Gane's extensive exegetical study of the Hebrew verb *tsadaq*, rendered "to justify" on the OT, and its noun and adjective counterparts. He finds that righteousness is an active quality which can be understood only in terms of covenant relations. It refers not to a quality in man, but to a faith relationship through which he stands accepted in the covenant. This relationship is valid only as it involves both the work of the Holy Spirit (who effects the new birth and thus "makes" righteous), and a "declared" element which signifies total dependence upon the merit of Christ, his substitute. "Righteousness in the Old Testament," c. 1977; Cf. this study, 164.)

¹⁸⁵ *Signs*, 2:486, 5/2/92.

¹⁸⁶ *Patriarchs & Prophets*, 379.

¹⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 370.

¹⁸⁸ *SDA BC*, 7:932, MS 148, 1897.

¹⁸⁹ *Desire of Ages*, 659.

¹⁹⁰ *SDA BC*, 7:908, MS 11, 1901.

¹⁹¹ *Prophets & Kings*, 581; *Patriarchs & Prophets*, 197; *Testimonies*, 8:23.

¹⁹² *Selected Messages*, 1:68, 1851; *Testimonies*, 4:153, 1876; *Christ's Object Lessons*, 291, 1900; Cf. *Testimonies*, 6:99; see this study, 189. Another vital factor in White's thinking is the relation of the cross to the heavenly sanctuary. The sacrifice of the lamb and ministry of the priest are seen to blend, thus bringing the past into the present and uniting the objective sacrifice with the subjective priest-sinner relationship. Frazee harmonizes with White: "Similarly, Christ bears our sins in His own body—not only on Calvary but in the heavenly sanctuary. He was offered in sacrifice in order that He might bear the sins of man.' (Heb. 9:28, Weymouth) On the cross He bore our sins as the Dying Lamb. In the sanctuary He bears them as the Living Priest." (*Ransom and Reunion*, 32)

¹⁹³ E.G. White, *Sons and Daughters of God*, Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association., 1955, 40.

¹⁹⁴ This study, 189, 198n; Cf. *Christ's Object Lessons*, 358.

¹⁹⁵ This study, 186.

¹⁹⁶ *Desire Of Ages*, 347.

¹⁹⁷ *Selected Messages*, 1:56, 1907.

¹⁹⁸ Ford states: “The Reformers contended that God ‘justifieth the ungodly,’” (Ford 10 #3, 17; Cf. this study, 51.) and insists upon a strictly forensic concept of justification in which a legal but not a personal relationship is recognized. White agrees that men cannot make himself holy and must come to Christ for justification just as he is, (Steps to Christ, 52.) holding that “before our Lord went to His agony of the cross He made [out] His will,” (Signs, 4:408.) thus indicating sinners to be included in His will while they are yet sinners. (Desire of Ages, 24, 343; Acts of the Apostles, 122.) The validity of their claim to that will, however, is based upon a subjective response to the divine initiative in which, through the Spirit, man is restored to unity with God. In denying the subjective element, Reformationists do not deny the reality of this reunion whereby man’s enmity for God is transformed to enmity for sin (subjective transformation). They insist, however, that the subjective is also present but is not to be confused with the objective, In agreeing that it is also present simultaneously but is not a part of justification they deny the cause and effect relationship which White understands exists between the Spirit and the cross. (See this study, 151.)

¹⁹⁹ Signs, 3:83, 12/11/93; see also this study, 157.

²⁰⁰ Signs, 3:83.

²⁰¹ *Selected Messages*, 1:377, L. 44, 1893.

²⁰² See *Selected Messages*, 1:393, 1893.

²⁰³ This study, 130. An 1867 letter is even stronger: “Strive to enter in at the strait gate, for if you merely seek, you will not be able “ (In Heavenly Places, Washington, D.C., Review and Herald, Publishing. Association., 1967, 367.) In 1888 she states: “In thinking of Heaven, we may put our imagination to the utmost stretch and think of the loftiest thoughts. . . . It is impossible for us to even make an effort to understand these things without the effort affecting our whole character for good. . . .” (Ibid., 368) Note the kind of effort referred to is that of focusing the mind upon Christ (heaven). she continues: “As we think of how Christ came to our world, to die for fallen man, we can understand something of the price . . . and we realize that there is no true goodness apart from God. Only by the light shining from the cross of Calvary can we know to what depths of sin and degradation the human race has fallen through sin.” Thus, effort is not only related to beholding Christ but is linked to the cross from which it receives its motive power.

²⁰⁴ *Signs*, 2:398, 7/21/90

²⁰⁵ *Selected Messages*, 1:390-393.

²⁰⁶ *Signs*, 3:399, 7/22/97, see also 2:226, 7/6/88; note also the fatal mistake--Review, 2:191.

²⁰⁷ *Signs*, 2:458, 12/28/91.

²⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 2:477, 4/14/92.

²⁰⁹ *Review*, 1:145, 4/22/84.

²¹⁰ *Signs*, 2:384, 5/19/90.

²¹¹ *Review*, 2:206, 4/24/88; In his treatment of the nature of the gospel through implications derived from Jesus, the apostles, Paul, Abraham, and White, Douglass points out that legalism results from separating

the law and gospel and quotes White: "The gospel of Christ is the law exemplified in character." (Selected messages, 2:108, in "What is the Gospel?" by Herbert E. Douglass. unpublished paper, 13-14, n.d.)

²¹² *Steps to Christ*, 25-28; *Signs*, 3:476-477 p.5/19/98.

²¹³ This study, 231-235.

²¹⁴ *Review*, 1:160, 3/25/75.

²¹⁵ *Ibid*, 5:405, 4/29/02.

²¹⁶ *Signs*, 2:413, 12/1/90.

²¹⁷ See *Testimonies*, 5:741, 1889; An eschatological dimension can be seen in justification, (See this study, 54.) since Christ has already been judged righteous and the believer is now accepted in Him- Thus, those in covenant relation not only find their righteousness in Him, but can proleptically be considered judged righteous in Him. Indeed, the primary concern of the judgment in examining the records is not so much man's past, but the validity of his covenant relations. "Unconditional pardon of sin never has been, and never will be." (Patriarchs & Prophets, 522.) Note that this judgment is conditional upon retention of covenant relations. The condition is not one of performance, however, but of substitutionary provisions as effected through covenant relation.

²¹⁸ White's holistic analogical thinking may be summarized as follows: by virtue of a new birth resulting from choice to die to self and live for Christ (faith transaction), one is legally and filially adopted (justification) into sonship (covenant) by God. Death with Christ to sin satisfies the law's demands, while the imputed righteousness of Christ (not just a record in heaven, but the very life of Christ) is revealed in a sanctified (set apart from self-will) life. This involves probationary status during which man decides whether he wants to remain separate from sin as a son of the covenant. Security resides in his relation to a loving Father who nourishes (Word) him through the Root (Christ) and disciplines him (purges, prunes) in preparing him to enter fully upon his inheritance. The father never disowns a son, but must ultimately respect the son's choice to honor or disallow his role as covenant son. Note that while each model gives insight not contained in the others, it is important to recognize that all are limited in their ability to convey the full realities involved in divine-human relations and none should be used as the primary basis for determining one's theology. (Ford's advice here is relevant. For a timely caution against mixing metaphors, see Don Neufeld, "Righteousness by Faith is Only One Way to Say it," *Insight*, July 3, 1979, 8.)

²¹⁹ See this study, 211.

²²⁰ *Steps to Christ*, 52.

²²¹ Note: White unequivocally places the ultimate validity of justification upon the continuation of covenant relations, holding that man must, by God's grace, make his calling and election sure (Patriarchs & Prophets, 208.), but the obedience required and relations involved are those of a son, not an alien; "Through Christ, man was severed from the slavery of the hateful apostate. . . . They would no longer be counted as sinners, sons of rebellion, but as sons of God, through their acceptance of the righteousness of Christ. . . .

"If man will cooperate with God by returning willingly to his loyalty, and obeying the commandments, God will receive him as a son. . . we derive immortality from God by receiving the life of Christ This life is the mystical union and cooperation of the divine and human .

"As children of the first Adam we partake of the dying nature of Adam. But through the imparted life . . . opportunity to win back again the lost gift of life..." (Signs. 3:391.) Note implications of "mystical union and cooperation of the divine and human." (Cf. this study, 271-278.)

Though a probationer, man by faith lays hold of eternal life by receiving Christ and His righteousness. (This study, 161; Cf. *Review*, 5:419.) Thus White's probation does not jeopardize covenant security. Note: "Some seem to feel that they must be on probation, and must prove to the Lord that they are

reformed, before they can claim His blessing. But they may claim the blessing of God even now. They must have His grace, the Spirit of Christ, to help their infirmities, or they cannot resist evil. . . . We may come with all our weakness. . .” (Steps to Christ, 52.)

The Father unquestionably accepts every covenant son, making ample provision for weakness and Sin. Failure to recognize this tends to legalism. The only question concern’s man’s willingness to remain a son of the covenant by claiming its provisions and acknowledging its conditions. (Cf. Signs, 4:15, 1/25/99; Note Christ’s obedience as model.) Freewill service on the part of a love-motivated son represents the fundamental twofold principle which determines the effectiveness of the Father’s covenant faithfulness and thus is alone able to validate the covenant relation.

Thought of reward motivates no son who understands the worthlessness of his labor in comparison to the inheritance. Moreover, security results from filial relations, not productivity. White sees the “elder son’s” desire for reward as denying his sonship, proving him, at heart, to be an ungrateful servant. In submitting to the father’s authority and seeking only the security of relationships, however, the “younger son’s” denial of any “rights” is met by full honors of sonship. Willing service under the Father’s authority is the only condition of inheritance, even for the prodigal, while reward-seeing is a denial of the inheritance, regardless of how otherwise faithful one appears to be. (Christ’s Object Lessons, 202-211.)

“When it is in the heart to obey God, when efforts are put forth to this end, Jesus accepts this disposition and effort as man’s best service, and makes up for the deficiency with His own divine merit. But He will not accept those who claim to have faith in Him, and yet are disloyal to His Father’s commandment. We hear a great deal about faith, but we need to hear a great deal more about works. (Signs, 2:395.) it is of interest that this was presented initially in AD 1885 talk given in Switzerland, and printed after 1888, indicating a continuity of thought, The same idea was repeated shortly before Minneapolis (Review, 2:240.). This statement concludes “Faith and Works,” an article warning against a “Faith, faith, only have faith” stance which denigrates effort. “Faith and works keeps us evenly balanced.” Earlier she had stated, “The Bible teaches that everything regarding our salvation depends upon our own course of action. If we perish, the responsibility will rest wholly upon ourselves.” (Signs, loc. cit.)

Significant in the above article is the synthesis found between “disposition” (“heart to obey”) and “effort.” Through the combined agency of the Spirit and the cross, (This study, 151.) a disposition to love and obey is implanted in the heart, but unless this divine motivation is responded to by human effort, it effects neither standing nor state; for man enters and remains in the covenant only by responding to the divine initiative. (Cf. Acts of the Apostles, 206; Signs, 3.27.) This explains White’s constant and imperative challenge concerning the urgency of effort. Moreover, the close relation this implies between justification, in which enmity against God is removed and a “new heart” instilled, and sanctification, in which the disposition is cultivated by expression, explains her caution cited in this study, 194n.

²²² Steps to Christ, 63.

²²³ Signs, 2:510, 9/5/92.

²²⁴ Desire of Ages, 172; White harmonizes with Luther. “‘Christ was put to death for our trespasses and raised for our justification.’ Consequently, he who presumes that he is righteous in any other way than by believing in Christ rejects Christ and considers Christ’s passion and resurrection useless... (H)e himself at the same time dies to sin together with Christ--...also rises and lives in Christ. . . . Therefore the resurrection of Christ is our righteousness, Paul’s practice of mentioning the resurrection in his salutations is this, that the Holy Spirit was given through the resurrection...” (Luther’s Works, Vol. 27, 168.) Note that Luther both equates man’s death to sin with justification, and righteousness with the resurrection and the Holy Spirit.

²²⁵ Cf. Signs. 2:157. 10/20/87; Patriarchs & Prophets, 372, 431; Steps to Christ, 60.

²²⁶ Review, 2:515, 8/2/91; That salvation is a *free gift*, reception of which requires cooperation, is a paradox--penetrating White’s entire theology--which must be honored. (See this study, 136.)

²²⁷ This study, 56.

²²⁸ *Review*, 1:226, Cf. 97, see this study, 77ff, 98ff.

²²⁹ *Steps to Christ*, 62; In an article (“Sin in Believers,” Ford 1 #6) arguing the certainty of “residual sin” (pp. 17, 21) and “carnal imperfection remaining in Christians” (13), Ford uses the above statement in introducing twenty-five pages of statements and arguments against “perfectionism,” (4, 5), by which he means any concept which holds that sin may be fully overcome in this life. His doctrine of original sin makes it impossible for him to recognize a distinction between sinful nature and sinful experience. Thus, all evidences of the former are seen to be proofs of the latter. (Cf. this study. 102ff, 110ff.)

²³⁰ See this study., 168. Note: “Men are always trying to make an easier way to heaven than that which the Lord has provided. . . . But we can see that there were conditions. . . .” (*Review*. 2;134.) Ford’s assertion, “our own works (even those prompted by the Spirit) are ever defective...” (*Documents* 5.) contains just enough truth to appear self-evident, but the constant emphasis upon the impossibility of being separated from selfishness by the Spirit undermines White’s consistent challenge to believe that just such is possible.

²³¹ See this study, 49ff.

²³² *Steps to Christ*, 62-63.

²³³ See this study, 147.

²³⁴ *Review*, 2:397, 5/20/90.

²³⁵ *Steps to Christ*, 62-63.

²³⁶ *Ibid.*, 60-62; Note;-White identifies faith as the root from which sanctification grows. Ford identifies it with justification, a vital distinction which will be considered later. (See this study, 208ff.)

²³⁷ Note this parallel statement published four years later: “The conditions of eternal life, under grace, are just what they were in Eden-perfect righteousness, harmony with God, perfect conformity to the principles of His law. The standard of character presented in the Old Testament is the same that, is presented in the New Testament. This standard is not one to which we cannot attain. In every command . . . there is a promise, God has made provision that we may become like unto Him, and He will accomplish this for all who do not interpose a perverse will and thus frustrate His grace.” (*Mount of Blessing*, 76, 1896; for a similar pre-1888 statement see *Review*, 2:80, 10/5/86, which warns against “only believe” -and insists that “faith is manifested by-works.”) Three factors characterize the parallel passages”

- a) True to the Great Controversy theme, man’s will is determinative;
- b) True to the covenant concept, obedience is a condition of eternal life;1
- c) True to covenant security, God is responsible for man’s salvation, if only man does not frustrate grace by interposing a perverse will.

Notice the final sentences of the chapter: “That life in you will produce the same character and manifest the same works as It did in Him. Thus you will be in harmony with every precept of His law; . . . Through love ‘the righteousness of the law’ will be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.” (*Mount of Blessing*, 78.) Note how this takes place:

“The first step in the path of obedience is to surrender the will to God. . . . Let him bring the principle-s of the law of God into his life to regulate and control his conduct, and his life will be a success. He will grasp the righteousness of Christ by faith, and becoming a partaker of the divine nature, will thus become a doer of the divine law.” (*Review*, 1:191, 10/9/94.)

Surrender of the will, as the first step in both justification and obedience, forms a synthesis between the two. Grasping Christ’s righteousness involves two subjective factors: introduction of the law’s principles into the life, and “becoming a partaker of the divine nature,” resulting in one’s becoming “a doer of the divine law.”

²³⁸ SDA BC, 6:1077, *Youth's Instructor*, 9/22/92.

²³⁹ Christensen's findings for which he cites C.K. Barrett, Quell & Schrenk, and Walter Eichrodt: "Righteousness- in the Old Testament . . . is not an inner virtue as a Platonic philosophy, but faithfulness to the God of the Covenant. . . . Greek thought conceived of righteousness as an inner virtue or static quality, upon which right action is based., Hebrew thought is distinct from this, in that righteousness is not an inner quality, but the actual concrete action itself, in which all inner motives find expression. . (F)or the Hebrew, the righteousness is a purely dynamic concept that exists only when an activity is taking place. . . . [and] may best be described as loyalty that exists between persons, which is manifested in deeds of faithfulness." (V. Christensen, *What Is Righteousness by Faith?* Artarmon, Australia: Graphic Business Services, 1977, author's emphasis; Cf. this study, Appendix C, and 158ff.)

²⁴⁰ *Signs*, 1:458, 9/4/88.

²⁴¹ Ford insists on a justification which gives "100 percent coverage, effective 100 percent of the time," thus "cover[ing] my past, present and future," ("Redemption," 1, Ford 1 #8; Documents, 5, Cf. this study, 50.) White's answer to his fear that the subjective element robs the believer of security is twofold: having chosen to break the pre-fall covenant relation, man can only be restored through freely established and freely maintained relationships (*Signs*, 3:391); as Surety as well as Substitute Christ not only justifies all who enter the covenant, but pledges Himself responsible for the sanctification of those willing to remain in it. (*Desire of Ages*, 790.) Moreover, faithfully supplying all man's needs (this study, 142.) He takes the initiative in retaining man in covenant relation. Through discipline, He warns the believer when the relation is threatened. Failure to respond results in further efforts to correct the loosening bonds; He warns of the hopelessness facing one who rejects covenant conditions. '(See *Signs*, 1:123; *Patriarchs & Prophets*, 129130, 437; *Review*, 3:137; *Desire of Ages*, 251; *Signs*, 4:281.) Meanwhile, the covenant provides for man's failures. "He has pledged Himself to give heed to our cry when we come to Him confessing our unworthiness and sin. The honor of His throne is staked for the fulfillment of His Word to us." (*Testimonies*, 8:23.) Thus, security comes from willingness to submit in repentance, confession, and commitment to discipline and correction.

²⁴² This study, 180ff.

²⁴³ *Desire of Ages*, 258.

²⁴⁴ *Signs*, 3:9, 1/2/93

²⁴⁵ *Review*, 2:607.

²⁴⁶ This study, 186ff.

²⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 151.

²⁴⁸ White forcefully guarantees the integrity of the atonement: "Centuries, ages, can never lessen the efficacy of His atoning sacrifice... [Nothing] can separate us from the love of God . . .not because we hold Him so firmly, but because He holds us so fast. If our salvation depended on our own efforts, we could not be saved; but it depends on the one who is behind all the promises. 'Our grasp on Him may be feeble, but . . . so long as we maintain our union with Him, no one can pluck us out of His hand.'" (*Acts of the Apostles*, 553.)

²⁴⁹ Paul "is not a dogmatic or systematic theologian," declares Fred Veltman, Pacific Union College Religion department chairman. 'We must not approach Paul through our specific concerns nor through those of the Protestant reformers. We must allow Paul to remain Paul if his words are to be authoritative.'" ("Study Papers, *Righteousness by Faith*," 1979, 11.) To provide an authority superceding all other Bible writers, Paul is set forth as a systematic theologian but limited in such role to Rom. III:21-V:21 (see this study, 48.) Violating the principle of *divine* authority in the prophetic gift, this also denies plain facts. Of

the 57 verses, the 21 in Ch. V clearly combine the *subjective* with the *objective* (3-11), as does Abraham's experience (see below). That leaves only 11 verses upon which to "enforce" a forensic-only concept upon the entire Bible!

²⁵⁰ *Patriarchs & Prophets*, 153-155.

²⁵¹ *Signs*, 4:44, 7/12/99.

²⁵² See "Imputed Sanctification," 4, (Ford 4 #7); "Post-Palmdale #1," 9, (Ford 5 #1).

²⁵³ Contrast White--see this study, 71, 169-172.

²⁵⁴ *Signs*, 2:486, 5/2/92; Cf. *God's Amazing Grace*, 1.29-134.

²⁵⁵ *Desire of Ages*, 300; Note that no distinction is made between the righteousness of justification and that of sanctification. Compare Luther.. "This is a righteousness that is bountiful, given without cost, firm, inward, . . . it does not earn, receive, or seek anything in this life. indeed, since it is directed toward Christ and His name, which is righteousness, the result is that the righteousness of Christ and of the Christian are one and the same, . . ." (Luther's Works., v. 27, 222.; See also SDA BC, 6:1074; *Selected Messages*, 1:393-394.1 White clearly did not identify Luther's doctrine with forensic-only justification, for she names Huss (Great Controversy, 140.) and Wesley (Ibid., 253 1 256.) as preaching the same "great truth of justification by faith." (Acts of the Apostles, 373-374; see D. Duffie, "John Wesley and Cross Currents in Adventism," May, 1978.)

²⁵⁶ Cf. this study, 69; *Signs*, 2:164, 11/24/87; 2:384, 5/19/90; 4:182, 5/29/01; *Review*, 1:140, 2/24/74; 3:504, 9/28/97.

²⁵⁷ *Signs*, 3:40, 5/15/93.

²⁵⁸ *Selected Messages*, 1:390-393

²⁵⁹ *Signs*, loc. cit.

²⁶⁰ See reference #1 above.

²⁶¹ *Signs*, 2:459; Cf. *Selected Messages*, 1:366; *SDA BC*, 7:908.

²⁶² *Review*, 3:503, 9/28/97; for pre-Minneapolis statement, see Ibid., 2:229-230, 7/17/88.

²⁶³ SDA BC. 6:1072, MS 21, 1891; White tends to see justification as a bond of union formed with Christ by accepting His merits. In consequent communion, the believer continues to share the gift of righteousness in a growing experience. (*Signs*, 2:198, 3/23/88) So close is the relation seen between justification and sanctification that she often uses "imputed righteousness" as comprehending also that which relates more specifically to *communion*. This harmonizes with Luther and Calvin, who according to Harvey, "did not draw a sharp line between justification and sanctification . . . tending to interpret the new life as one aspect of justification." (Harvey, Van, *A Handbook of Theological Terms*, New York: MacMillan Publishing., Co., 1964, 214-215, *emph. sup.*) White states: "In order to meet the requirements of the law, our faith must grasp the righteousness of Christ, accepting it as our righteousness. Through union with Christ, through acceptance of His righteousness by faith, we may be qualified to work the works of God." (*Review*, 2:607, 11/1/92.) Also in harmony with White is the concept of justification "as Christ bestowed; sanctification as Christ possessed." (Erwin Gane, *Review*, 4/5/1979, p. 8)

(Note carefully: Such strong evidence is not required. In the light of White's above warning, the burden of proof for the Reformationist charge lies squarely on their own shoulders. Absence of irrefutable evidence in the face of such a warning is alone sufficient to turn the charge against the accusers.)

²⁶⁴ This study, 53; cf. "Post Palmdale #2," 51 (Ford 5 #2); An interesting word-play—"distinguish but not separate"—marks their emphatic insistence on "Breaking the Synthesis," (subhead in Paxton's *Shaking*, and key expression used in his Washington meetings [this study, 7] to prove the necessity of removing sanctification from the gospel as the only means of avoiding Papal doctrine). They declare that justification and sanctification are only *distinguished* but not *separated*. This illustrates the power of theology to enforce misleading word-games on its adherents. What can "breaking the synthesis" mean if not to separate? And what motivates such driving efforts to remove sanctification from the gospel (under threat of Papal heresy) if the purpose is merely to distinguish? If this does not represent separation, what does separation mean? Is not reason subverted by rationalization when it is held that THE GOSPEL is "solely" forensic, introduction of the subjective element reflecting a FALSE GOSPEL, while insisting it is never to be separated? Indeed, is there not a twofold separation? If breaking the synthesis involves the removal of all subjective elements, is not justification itself internally bifurcated to isolate it from such elements as repentance and personal commitment (which are, after all, subjective)? A primary finding of this study is that in White, justification itself, wholly aside from sanctification, involves the subjective element, and that denial of such threatens to introduce a false (legalistic) gospel because of its inadequate concept of the role of the Spirit

An appropriate "distinction" for purposes of better understanding is not in question. What is questioned is the life or death emphasis given a particular perspective which so far "distinguishes" as to make heretical all positions held by those who "can not see in the same line of vision." Words simply lose their power to mean anything other than what the hearer wants to make of them if White's caution does not apply in this case. If Reformationists only distinguish but never separate, and if such-distinctions are held to be legitimate what kind of distinctions could she possibly have had in mind? And how could she have cautioned against such an approach short of denying all distinctions? Is theology to be reduced to a word game in which those who are not present to protest are forced through their writings to play by artificially imposed rules? (See this study, 352n, 355-356n.)

²⁶⁵ Significant in view of the neglected warning that "all cannot see in the same line of vision," is the repeated Reformationist identification as Roman Catholic any concept not in harmony with their view of the Formula of Concord. (For another perspective, cf. this study: 157n, 160n, 161n, 164n, 182n, 192n, 194n, 197n, 200n, 207n.) Indeed, they acknowledge that Luther himself mixed the subjective and the objective, but hold that this was the still-evangelical Catholic Luther, insisting that after 1519, following the tower experience of 1518 (?), as a now-mature Protestant he consistently denied the subjective element in justification. Critical weaknesses of this argument are:

a) Evidence favors 1514 or earlier as the date for the tower experience, in which Luther discovered God's righteousness to be a gift of grace. A 1515 reference to his earlier revulsion against divine righteousness would have to postdate the tower experience. (Rupp, op. cit., 126, cf. 122-137.)

b) That Luther did not consistently distinguish between the objective and subjective after 1519 has been shown in footnotes above. In 1531 he stated: "It is indeed impossible for me to grasp and attain to this one and only Redeemer from sin, Jesus, except through faith. . . . (*Only* faith, before and without works, grasps hold of this same as being or becoming righteous. . . . (Leaver, Luther on Justification, 24, author's emphasis, first two.)

c) Luther's own reference to the tower experience positively denies Reformationist claims. After stating that he felt "as though reborn," he continues: "I ran through the scriptures then, as memory served, and found the same analogy in other words, as the Work of God (opus) that which God works in us, Power of God (virtus dei) with which he makes us strong. . . ." (Rupp, Op. cit., 122) This testimony, coming at the end of his life (1545), puts him in harmony with White. (See Selected Messages, 1:394-396, 1893.)

²⁶⁶ This study, 50ff. Note: LaRondelle argues that the Reformationists did not break the synthesis, and points out the two real points at which Calvin opposed Trent: a) confusion of justification and sanctification in seeing them as one, so as to make justification a gradual process, thus denying the immediacy of full acceptance; and b) placing the sacraments as instrumental cause of justification, concerning which he

quotes Calvin that “the whole dispute is as to the Cause of Justification.” (Hans LaRondelle, “Paxton and the Reformers”, 11 Spectrum, vol, 9, #3, Autumn, 197C, 47-48. Cf. this study, 148n, 155n, 158-160. 207n.

²⁶⁷ Note the relationship between the intercession of Christ before the Father and the intercession of the Spirit “upon our hearts”; “Christ, our Mediator, and the Holy Spirit are constantly interceding in man’s behalf, but the Spirit pleads not for us as does Christ, who presents His blood, shed from the foundation of the world, the Spirit works upon the hearts, drawing out prayers and penitence, praise and thanksgiving The gratitude . . . is the result of the Spirit’s [intercession]” (selected Messages, 1:344.) Thus, three agencies are required in the imputation of Christ’s merits: the Spirit’s intercession in the heart; the heart’s response (choice) in penitence and praise; and Christ’s-presentation of that penitence and praise before His Father, mixed with His own merit. (Cf. this study, 140.) if any of these links were missing, the imputation could not take place, the only possible point of breakdown being man’s response to the divine initiative (Spirit’s’ intercession) which precedes and becomes a part of the human response which guarantees Christ’s intercession. (Ibid., 9) Further: “. . . the prayers, the praise, the penitent confession of sin ascend from true believers as incense to- the heavenly sanctuary, but passing through the corrupt channels of humanity they are so defiled that unless purified by blood, they can never be of value to God. They ascend not in spotless purity, and unless the Intercessor, who is at God’s right hand, presents and purifies all by His righteousness it is not acceptable to God. . . . O, that all may see that everything in obedience, in penitence, in praise and-thanksgiving, must be placed upon the glowing fire of the righteousness of Christ.” (Selected Messages, loc. cit.) Thus, once again White consistently harmonizes with the Reformed emphasis on the absolute necessity of Christ’s merits, but in a context which denies any dichotomy between the work of Christ. and that of the Spirit, which are seen to function organically, as one. (Cf. this study, 128-136.)

²⁶⁸ Robert Haddock, “A History of The Doctrine of the Sanctuary in the Advent Movement, 1800-1905,” hereinafter Haddock Thesis, Andrews University, 1970, 246. (Quoting White, MS 101, 1897.)

²⁶⁹ Loc. cit.

²⁷⁰ Ibid., 248.(Quoting White, MS 50, 1900.)

²⁷¹ Loc. cit. White’s concept must not be confused with the doctrine of the mass in which the sacrifice is perpetuated by repeated recreation of the body of Christ by priestly invocation. White recognizes a single Sacrifice, holding that man has no power over Him, but that lie laid down His life voluntarily. (Desire of Ages, 785.) But both His continued suffering over sin and His continued commitment as Substitute and Surety (victim and priest) are of such a nature as to be seen as a continual sacrifice. Moreover, Christ’s priestly ministry has no meaning except as He presents the blood of His sacrifice in atonement for sin. (See this study, 338ff.)

²⁷² White “The Danger of False Ideas of Justification by Faith,” Washington, D.C.: The Ellen-G. White Estate, 1890, Published under the title, “Salvation Is a Gift,” Review, march 3, 1977, 10-13; also listed as MS 36, 1890. (Ford 3 #4.)

²⁷³ Guy sees three weakness in Paxton’s Shaking which characterize Reformationist theology: *oversimplification*--a kind of monocular vision that is confined to a single idea,” which ignores “much of the New Testament”; “much of reformation theology”; “much fundamental Adventist belief”; and “other issues in the Church that are currently being discussed as vigorously as that of justification.” “...(A)n ‘eccentric’ theological norm--substituting for Biblical revelation some particular understanding of it, and thus making something other than Scripture the central theological criterion. . . . (R)ead[ing] only words, without going to the trouble of probing for their deeper, authentic meaning.” (Fritz Guy, “A View From the outside.” Spectrum-, vol. 9, #3, 1978, 30-31.)

LaRondelle notes A number of serious problems, including Paxton’s dogmatic claim that the Reformers held to a forensic-only justification. He quotes Luther; “Justification is in reality a kind of rebirth in newness,” and comments. “This statement of Luther in 1535 shows clearly that Paxton operates with a one-sided concept of the mature Luther.” (LaRondelle, Op. cit., 53.)

²⁷⁴ Manuscript 36, 10; Cf. this study, 166ff.

²⁷⁵ Loc. cit.

²⁷⁶ Ibid., 1; Cf. this study, 141.

²⁷⁷ For subsequent emphasis on the practical, see Review, 3:181, 445; Signs, 2:498; 4:99; McMahon and the editors of Verdict (see this study, 8n.) imply that White did not clearly enunciate the doctrine of Righteousness by Faith prior to 1888. (See Ibid., Appendix B) If she did not, her testimony is unreliable and their appeal to her witness in other questions relating to what was preached at Minneapolis is suspect. If her testimony was consistent before and after 1888, their witness concerning the message of 1888 is in question. Thus, in the light of White's claims, questioning her pre-1888 clarity causes them trouble either way. (See this study, Appendix C for an examination of their methodology.)

²⁷⁸ This study, 47; see also "White and Righteousness," 18, (ford 2 #4)

²⁷⁹ Cf. this study, 136-139, 142ff; For an examination of Reformationist use of the methods of systematic theology rather than Biblical theology and the consequent effect upon their approach to contextual evidence, see this study, Appendix C.

²⁸⁰ See this study, Appendix B and 293ff., regarding Reformationism's strange failure, in light of white's claims to examine her pre-1888 works in determining the "real" and exposing the "myths".

²⁸¹ This study, 323ff.

²⁸² Ibid., 128-134.

²⁸³ Ibid., 148ff.

²⁸⁴ Ibid., Appendix B, passim.

²⁸⁵ Ibid., 166-169, 172ff, 177ff.

²⁸⁶ In emphasizing this point, Ford asserts: "Jesus came to make the atonement, not to explain it." (Sabbath-school class, 2/9/79, Angwin, California) In a formal presentation he asks, "Where is the definitive word on the gospel to be found? . . . Not even in the gospels. . . . Christ's own reticence is just what He declared we should find in His words when He announced their incompleteness. . . ." (Pacific Union College Religion Department, Study Papers, Series One-Righteousness by Faith, 1979, 17-18.)

²⁸⁷ MS 36, 2, 6.

²⁸⁸ Ibid., 5

²⁸⁹ Ibid., 6, . . . 7; Cf. this study, 128ff.

²⁹⁰ MS 36, 4.

²⁹¹ Ibid., 7; cf. Signs, 2:392; Acts of the Apostles, 206.

²⁹² MS 36, 7.

²⁹³ Ibid., 8

²⁹⁴ Ibid., 9.

²⁹⁵ See this study, 48, 189.

²⁹⁶ In declaring that Paxton's positions in Shaking "cohere perfectly with the Formula of Concord prepared only a few years after Luther's death," Ford reveals the real foundation-stone upon which Reformationism rests. (Desmond Ford, "The Truth of Paxton's Thesis," Spectrum, vol. 9, #3, 41.) Referring to the testimony of L. Loofs and E. Schlinck, LaRondelle indicates that the Formula of Concord removed Luther's Mynamic view of justification," which no longer represents the living Luther or even the earlier Lutheran Confessions,

. . . It is significant that even the greatest Lutheran scholars-today admit that 'the living wholeness of Luther's conception' was lost within Lutheran Protestantism because of such compartmentalizing of justification." (LaRondelle, Ibid., 54.: Cf. this study, Appendix A and 189-191, 189n.)

²⁹⁷ See this study, 53.

²⁹⁸ Review, 2:329, 9/3/89; Cf. the following interesting statement: "The law is the root, the gospel is the fragrant blossom and fruit which it bears." (Christ's Object Lessons, 128; Cf. SDA BC, 6.1073, L 19, 1897; For the relationship between Christ, law, and gospel, see this study, 166.)

²⁹⁹ See this study, Appendix B.

³⁰⁰ Review, 2:330; Note the conceptual harmony of the following pre-1888 reference: "The stock and root were concealed from human sight,. . . grafts could be united to the vine, and, partaking of the nourishment, brought forth fruit.

"This figure of the vine is a perfect symbol . . . Christ was righteousness, . . . In this vine is all spiritual life. . . . Fiber by fiber, and vein by vein the graft adheres to the parent stock, till the life-giving sap flows to the adopted member, causing it to bud, and blossom and bear fruit.

"The scion becomes a part of the living vine by forming a perfect union with it. Thus it is with the 'sinner. By repentance and faith, he becomes connected with Jesus Christ, and lives in Him. This connection joins soul to soul, . . . brings forth, not fruit of its own kind, but the fruit of the vine. . . . The Spirit of Christ, flowing into the hearts of all who are indeed united with him makes them partakers of the divine nature. . . . It should be our lifework to be constantly reaching forward to perfection of Christian character, ever striving for conformity to the will of God. The efforts begun here will continue throughout eternity." (Review, 1:285, 9/20/81) Note how detailed was White's prt-1888 treatment:

a) The branch must be grafted into Christ, the root; before it can bring forth fruit. b) The "perfect symbol" portrays Christ as root-not justification, which, however, is involved in the grafting process. c) Root and vine are interchangeable symbols. d) While grafting takes place in point of time, the individual fibers unite only gradually, producing ever more luxuriant and abundant fruit. e) Through "faith and repentance," the primary elements in justification, "connection with Christ is formed, so that the believer "lives in him." f) "In Him" here clearly involves a subjective element. g) Thus, justification is subjectively oriented: "This connection joins soul with soul. h) Absolute identity is seen between Christ and the Spirit in their ministry. "Connected with Jesus Christ" becomes "The Spirit of Christ, flowing into the hearts of all who are indeed united with Him makes them partakers of the divine nature." i) The perfection of character, to which we are to strive, represents conformity to the Will of God.' (Signs, 2:518, 10/10/92) j) Earmarks' of the Great Controversy-covenant theme, including the restoration of the body temple, are clearly evident. k) The "in Him'--"in you" dimension of being in the sap-producing root indicates a fusion between the objective and subjective. Complete organic unity and movement between these is essential to the life of the branch. (See signs, loc. cit.)

³⁰¹ Signs, 1:352.

³⁰² Great Controversy, 256, Author's emphasis.

³⁰³ Signs, 2:510, 9/5/92.

³⁰⁴ SDA BC, 4:1167, Youth's Instructor, 8/20/03; SDA BC, 4:1173, L 201, 1899.

³⁰⁵ Selected Messages, 1:391, 1894.

³⁰⁶ Testimonies, 5:229; Review, 4:33, 309.

³⁰⁷ Other models could have been worked into the amalgam, such as new birth and adoption, which represent two perspectives as to how one is accepted under the covenant. They are thus alternative models for explaining facets of the “faith transaction” taking place in justification. Regarding various models used to express the total truth of salvation by grace, see Johnsson, Wm., “An Evaluation of Geoffrey Paxton’s THE SHAKING OF ADVENTISM,” pp. 26-28. For a good discussion regarding the misuse and limitations of metaphors and models, see Don Neufeld, “Righteousness by Faith is only One Way to Say It,” Insight, July 3,,1979, 8.

³⁰⁸ Cf. Signs, 4:432, 10/17/06, with this study, 202

³⁰⁹ This study, 159.

³¹⁰ Signs, 2:458, 12/28/91; see also 4:199, 432; Desire of Ages, 764.

³¹¹ Review, 3:576, 6/7/98.

³¹² My Life Today, 340.

³¹³ This study, 142ff.

³¹⁴ Christ’s object Lessons, 312.

³¹⁵ White consistently and emphatically unites the subjective with the objective in believer security through her covenant concept: “Accepting the mercy of Christ and His healing from the power of sin, he is brought into right relation with God. His life, cleansed from vanity and selfishness, is filled with the love of God. - His daily obedience to the law of God obtains for him a character that assures him eternal life. . .” (God’s Amazing Grace, 146.) TO the charge’ of legalism and its inherent bondage, White would reply., with reference to the example of Christ, “that transgression of the law, not obedience to it, brings him into bondage. . .” (Ibid., 144.) When obedience takes place in covenant relation (“right relation with God”) it cannot engender bondage, for it fulfills the very purpose of the covenant; when it takes place outside covenant relations, reflecting attitudes contrary to the principle upon which one enters the covenant-merits of Christ alone-it always leads to bondage, for it denies the only provisions (covenant) for salvation. (Cf. this work, 134136, 153ff, 169ff.)

³¹⁶ Desire of Ages, 311.

5. FAITH OF JESUS

The contrast between White and Reformationists (despite their common denial of all human merit) is marked by a very different emphasis with respect to the key elements in “righteousness by faith.” White places overwhelming emphasis upon Christ, with faith being subsidiary but still receiving considerably more stress than righteousness;¹ while Reformationist theology centers on righteousness with faith and Christ being subsidiary in stress; righteousness and security emerge as binary elements with faith in Christ bringing them together.² In White, Christ and faith are binary, with righteousness emanating from Christ’s presence through the Spirit and security a by-product. (Christ is central ‘as means and end, Author and finisher, object and subject of all man’s needs.) The power [Page 216] activated by the imputation of righteousness—which takes place through the union of the divine and human—continually increases in effect through continued impartation resulting from developing relations.³ Since the divine initiative offers that power to all men, the critical factor in the equation is a faith response.⁴

Science of the Gospel

Claiming Christ’s merits as alone of value is meaningless unless it is clear just what kind of faith is accepted for righteousness and how it is exercised. According to White, “understanding how to exercise faith . . . is the science of the gospel.”⁵ Failure to take this science seriously jeopardizes the gospel itself:

Faith is the only condition upon which justification can be obtained, and faith includes not only belief but trust.

Many have a nominal faith in Christ, but they know nothing of that vital dependence upon Him which appropriates the merits of a crucified and risen Saviour. . . . [They] fail to repent of their sins, fail to accept Jesus as their personal Saviour. Their faith is not brought into the heart. . . .⁶

Note that the faith which conditions justification is subjectively characterized. Affirming the necessity of the subjective elements, Reformationists insist that the subjective takes place automatically (and simultaneously) as a result of the legal transaction;⁷ but White conditions the legal element to a subjective commitment. Only through a repentance instructed dependence on Christ, [Page 217] (in receiving Him into the heart), are His merits appropriated.

By faith apply the blood of Christ to your heart, for that alone can make you whiter than snow. But you say, “This surrender of all my idols will break my heart.” . . . (U)nless you are broken, you are worthless. . . . (T)he righteousness of Christ will be revealed as your righteousness, . . . You will then understand that justification will come alone through faith in Christ; . . . (T)hrough the . . . sinless Substitute and Surety, he may run in the race of humble obedience. . . . Without Christ he is under the condemnation of the law, always a sinner but through faith in Christ he is made just before God.⁸

Only when through surrender faith applies the blood to the heart, can one understand justification through his Substitute and Surety, thus being enabled to “run in the race of humble obedience.” “Without Christ . . . always a sinner, but through faith in Christ he is made just,” sheds light on the parallel statement: “In ourselves we are sinners; but in Christ we are righteous.”⁹ Both statements contrast “in ourselves (without Christ)” with “in Christ.” Note that “having made us righteous through the Imputed righteousness of Christ, God pronounces us just Such relating of surrender to application of the blood as the basis for an experimental understanding of justification raises a serious question as to the appropriateness of Brinsmead’s sarcasm:

The Theology Crisis

Ah, surrender. . . . (S)o that's the missing ingredient in this cake called salvation! That's the missing number of the combination lock that will break open the Christian's secret to d happy life! Is it?¹⁰

Note how foreign such, an attitude is to White:

[Page 218] The righteousness of Christ, as a pure white pearl, has no defect. . . . This righteousness may be ours. . . . But there are some who are seeking, always seeking, for the goodly pearl. But they do not make an entire surrender of their wrong habits. They do not die to self that Christ may live in them. . . . They do not lift the cross. . . . Without entire surrender there is no rest, no joy.¹¹

Christ's death on the cross was one of willing obedience, else in it there would have been no merit; . . . So the sinner must freely surrender his own will to God, and accept Christ as his substitute and surety.¹²

The heart is the citadel of the being and until the heart is surrendered to God, the enemy will claim it as his stronghold, and no power on earth can dispossess him.¹³

Reformationists would deny application to themselves of the warning, "It is a dangerous theory that leads men to declare all that is necessary to salvation is to simply believe in Christ," since they do not "disregard His plain commands."¹⁴ But their bifurcation of righteousness,¹⁵ and holding that the imperfect, Spirit directed righteousness of the believer is the automatic result of justification violates White's holistic concept of righteousness and her understanding of the nature and function of faith. She warns:

Some will not make a right use of the doctrine of justification by faith. They will present it in a one sided manner, **[Page 219]** making everything of faith, and belittling works.¹⁶

While Reformationists do not intend to belittle works, a forensic-only justification and failure to adequately define the nature and exercise of faith places them in the path of such a caution.¹⁷

The Dynamic of Faith

Although he knows he is a sinner and deserves the wrath of God, yet he looks to Calvary, . . . (H)e knows that Christ has died for him, and that in Christ it is possible to keep the commandments of God. He has the witness in his soul of the virtue and the love of Jesus, which his faith grasps, and appropriates to himself.

His faith is not of that fraudulent character which refuses to lift the cross. . . . It is not of that presumptuous nature that lays claim to the promises of God without complying with the conditions. . . . True faith takes the word of God and weaves it into the life and character. . . . Faith is that mysterious and mighty principle that attracts the soul of man to God. As the sapless branch is united to the living vine, so we must be connected with Christ.¹⁸

Printed only weeks before Minneapolis, the above reveals faith as a "mighty principle which attracts the soul of man to God," forming a dynamic, divine-human union which, in releasing man from guilt **[Page 220]** empowers him to obey. In this transforming experience, he "has the witness in his soul of the virtue and love of Jesus," both of which he appropriates to himself in a single act of faith. The conditions for the exercise of such faith are willingness to lift his cross, accepting the conditions of obedience and loyalty, and weaving "the word of God . . . into the life and character."

We are not to be altogether passive. . . . No, No; God calls upon us to do our best with the powers that he has given us, to put to the stretch every faculty, and exercise

The Theology Crisis

every ability, that we may not fail of everlasting life. That man can be saved in indolence, in inactivity, is an utter impossibility. . . . Faith and works go hand in hand. That man has nothing to do but believe is a fallacy, a most dangerous doctrine. . . . Sin must be hated and put away. The works of the flesh must be warred against . . . We can obtain power from the Saviour of men, which will make us more than conquerors.¹⁹

This categorical statement presented at Minneapolis must be recognized as a most significant indication of White's understanding of how the message of Waggoner and Jones should be interpreted. Claiming no merits but Christ's, in laying hold of justification, man is empowered "by the Saviour of men" to go on conquering from "faith to faith." That this power is released only through surrender" was graphically portrayed three and one-half years earlier in a context which compares sloth in temporal and spiritual matters:

Endowing energy and constant reliance upon God are lacking. . . . The certain and effectual means of attaining this is the surrender of the soul to God. He will direct the intellect and affections, so that they will center upon the divine and eternal; and then the will possess energy without rashness, . . . When this submission to God is made, true humility will grace every action.²⁰

That energy is released through divine-human relations which **[Page 221]** are conditional upon surrender is a vital key to White's repeated warning against lethargy, sloth, and indolence.²¹ Divine energy is available, hence man's responsibility is to claim It. "We need the energy of the Holy Spirit to accompany our efforts."²²

The faith essential for salvation is not mere nominal faith, but an abiding principle, deriving vital power from Christ. . . . This faith is not merely an impulse, but a power that works by love and purifies the soul. . . . (T)hrough faith in Christ we must render obedience to all the requirements of God; through his merits we may be elevated to keep God's commandments. . . . We must appropriate these promises to ourselves that we may overcome unbelief and get the victory over every besetment, perfecting a character that will meet the approval of heaven.²³

White and Reformationists agree upon the sinful state of man, the absolute inability to overcome in his own strength, and the fallacy of claiming any merit for faith victories.²⁴ But insistence upon a forensic-only justification and emphasis that man is unable ever to gain complete victory over sin is contrary to her lifelong emphasis. She would see their method of bolstering man's assurance as neutralizing faith in the purpose and power of God.

The Source of Power

That in White's holistic understanding of righteousness, Christ's presence is equated with that of the Spirit has been demonstrated.²⁵ It will now be seen that the Word is also equated with **[Page 222]** the life of Christ, being the instrument by which the Spirit brings His life into the life of the believer.

The life of Christ, that gives life to the world, is in his Word. It was by his word that Jesus healed diseases and cast out demons; . . . (H)is word was with power. . . . The whole Bible is a manifestation of Christ. It is our source of power.²⁶

Only as the Word is subjectively responded to is the bond of union between sin and the sinner broken and a new bond of union between Christ and the penitent sinner forged (justification), through a faith-transaction which receives the living Christ who offers the merits of the cross subject only to acceptance of the conditions of covenant relation.²⁷ The secret of the cross in transforming lives is thus assimilation of and submission to the Word:

The Theology Crisis

Received, believed, obeyed, it [Bible] is the great instrumentality in the transformation of character it is the grand stimulus, the constraining force, that quickens the physical, mental, and spiritual powers, . . . The lack of firm will power, results from neglect of the sacred instruction of God's word.²⁸

Just to the degree in which the word of God is received and obeyed, will it impress with its potency and touch with its life every spring of action, every phase [Page 223] of character. It will purify every thought, regulate every desire.²⁹

Four factors deserve attention: a) the Word is the instrument of transformation. b) "It is the grand stimulus, the constraining force, that quickens" the whole being to life and power; c) Lack of that power evidences neglect of the Word; and d) It touches "with its life every spring of action," to the degree it "is recognized and obeyed." So the subjective element again proves determinative for all God's gifts must be received subjectively or not at all, even the objective gift of His own doing and dying.

We build on Christ by obeying his word. It is not he who merely enjoys righteousness, that is righteous, but he who does righteousness. . . . Religion consists in doing the deeds of Christ; not doing to earn God's favor, but because all undeserving, we have received the gift of his love. Christ places the salvation of man, not upon profession, merely, but upon faith that is made manifest in works of righteousness. . . .

To live by the word of God means to surrender to him the whole life.³⁰

Thus surrender of the will, key to the Great Controversy covenant concept,³¹ is also the key to faith. But such surrender is *never initiated by man*.³² It can only take place in response to the divine initiative through the Spirit-charged Word; man's response to that initiative must begin and end in merit-denying repentance.

[Page 224]

Gift of Repentance

The living oracles do not teach that the sinner must repent before he can heed the invitation of Christ . . . for if they could repent without coming to Christ, they could also be saved without Christ. It is the virtue that goes forth from Christ that leads to genuine repentance. . . . Repentance is as much the gift of Christ as is forgiveness. . . . And as Christ draws them to look upon his cross, . . . the deep seated sin of the soul, is revealed to them. They begin to comprehend something of the righteousness of Christ. . . . Christ is the only source of every right impulse. He is the only one who can arouse in the natural heart enmity against sin.³³

This statement, in light of the preceding, reveals that:

a) Repentance, with its submissive turning from self-will to obedience, is a gift which must be actively received.³⁴ b) That gift is offered by the Spirit/Word through a revelation of the cross, which alone is able to reveal the contrast between the sinfulness of man and the righteousness of Christ. c) Response to Christ, through His Spirit/Word, breaks man's heart, arousing "enmity against sin," and preparing him to accept the virtue of Christ which is manifest in works of righteousness.³⁵

The following reveals a Spirit/Word atonement which involves a transforming experience in justification.

In order to obtain the righteousness of Christ, it is necessary for the sinner to know what that repentance is which works a radical change of mind and spirit and action. The work of transformation must begin in the heart, and manifest its power through

The Theology Crisis

every faculty of the being; but man is not capable of originating such a repentance as this, and can experience it alone*through Christ. . . . **[Page 225]**

Who is desirous of becoming truly repentant? What must he do? He must come to Jesus, just as he is, without any delay. He must believe . . . pray and watch, and put away sins, making manifest his sincerity by the vigor of his endeavor to obey . . .

. (R)epentance and forgiveness are to be obtained through nothing less than the atonement of Christ. Assured of this the sinner must put forth an effort in harmony with the work done for him, and with unwearied entreaty he must supplicate the throne of grace, that the renovating power of God may come into his soul. Christ pardons none but the penitent, but whom He pardons He first makes penitent.³⁶

So effort precedes justification as surely as it accompanies sanctification, and is of the same kind.³⁷ -- a meritless work of faith.³⁸ The “works” which contrast with faith involve meritorious effort--self-oriented, and independent of the Spirit, who stimulates meritless, dependent effort which emerges from a “faith that works.”³⁹ All effective effort represents volitional response to the drawing, of the Spirit, in response to natural dispositions, involving a conflict which is most intense at the point of initial justification. Thus to “protect” the purity of Justifying Righteousness from the works of the Spirit is to “protect” the sinner from justification!

The Faith That Works

We must comply with the terms of salvation or we are lost. At the hour when we leave the service of Satan for the service of Christ, when true confession takes place, and by faith we turn from transgression to obedience, the severest of the heart struggles take place.⁴⁰

The battle which we have to fight-the greatest battle that was ever fought by man-is the surrender of self to the will **[Page 226]** of God, the yielding of the heart to the sovereignty of love. He who determines to enter the spiritual kingdom will find all the powers and passions of an unregenerate nature, backed by the forces of the kingdom of darkness, are arrayed against him. Selfishness and pride will make a stand against anything that would show them to be sinful. . . . God alone can give us the victory. He desires us to have the mastery over ourselves, our own will and ways. But He cannot work in us without our consent and cooperation. . . .

The victory is not won without much earnest, prayer and humbling of self at every step. Our will is not to be forced into co-operation with divine agencies, but it must be voluntarily submitted.⁴¹

An intense struggle taking place in the process of exercising faith, as a result of resistance from the natural heart in coalition with “the forces of the kingdom of darkness,” thus makes positive effort necessary in order to respond to the gift of repentance. “Selfishness and pride will make a stand against anything that would show them to be sinful” thus justification and sanctification both involve a struggle.⁴² Denial of this conflict involved in the exercise of faith --“science of the gospel” --axiomatically repudiates White’s concept of righteousness by faith. Severe struggle marks [page 227] “the hour when we leave the service of Satan for the service of Christ” and continues in the humbling of self at every step. “Our will is not to be forced into co-operation” for voluntary submission is required which, because of the deep-seatedness of pride and selfishness, demands at every step “painful effort, self denial and sacrifice.”⁴³ To identify such efforts with the “works” of man is to confuse White’s entire theology (and misrepresent Paul). Note carefully:

The Theology Crisis

The lawyer found himself a lawbreaker. He was convicted under Christ's searching words. The righteousness of the law, which he claimed to understand, he had not practiced. He had not manifested love toward his fellow man. Repentance was demanded; but instead of repenting, he tried to justify himself. Rather than acknowledge the truth, he sought to show how difficult of fulfillment the commandment is. Thus he hoped both to parry conviction and to vindicate himself in the eyes of the people.⁴⁴

Through His "searching words," Christ sought to bestow the gift of repentance, but acceptance would necessitate conflict with "heart centered in self." Evading this work of faith, the lawyer sought "to show how difficult of fulfillment the commandment" was, thus hoping "to parry conviction and vindicate himself in the eyes of the people." Despite strong contrary intentions,⁴⁵ Reformationist arguments tend to reduce the conflict and "parry conviction" by denying the possibility of full obedience. This threatens to hinder a continually renewed and ever deepening repentance which must prepare the way for total dependence upon Christ and His righteousness.

[Page 228]

Probationary Security

Typically, Ford's own insights would harmonize him with White but for his commitment to a forensic-only theology. "Justification by faith means Justification by choice," he correctly states; "of. . . our choice is to pull the switch. . . . that makes the circuit of power possible."⁴⁶ But denying effort in decisions leading to justification, he insists that because sanctification involves effort, it is by faith plus works. This conflicts with White's understanding that faith is *in itself the basis of all acceptable effort-not faith plus works*. Note Ford's position:

We are sanctified by faith indeed, but not by faith alone. That's why you should never say righteousness by faith is sanctification as well as justification. If you did you would be saying you're sanctified by faith alone, but we're not. 'Work out your own salvation.' As you receive Christ and walk, there is effort in sanctification. Not in justification, you just take it as it is with an empty hand, and there is no virtue in that.⁴⁷

This denies the vital paradox in White: that sanctification as well as justification is by faith alone, but that neither is without effort. Moreover, the empty (of human merit) hand is as true of sanctification as of justification. Man never offers anything but himself, but in giving himself in exchange for Christ, both hands are filled so full of Christ's merits in justification that they can hold nothing else in sanctification. Note that Reformationists seem ready to admit that which they set out to deny--a measure of merit [Page 229] to man, based on his own merit! Can the hand hold human virtue in sanctification any more than in Justification? White answers a resounding No! If Reformationists agree that there is no human merit in sanctification, which they theoretically do,--then their argument against sanctification as an element in righteousness by faith falls, (as does their faith-plus-works concept). for *if there is no human merit in sanctification, how can including the subjective in righteousness by faith infect the latter with human merit?* The effort faith requires is best understood in terms of the Great Controversy-covenant theme.⁴⁸ Note how faith, repentance, and effort combine-through the Spirit-to permit "our covenant-keeping God" both to justify and to uphold "us with His free Spirit."⁴⁹

It is through the influence of the Holy Spirit that we are convinced of sin. . . . (I)t is the grace of the Lord that makes the heart penitent. . . . (T)he reason that you do not receive more of the saving help of God is because the channel of communication . . . is clogged by worldliness, . . . desire for supremacy. . . . (W)e should be molding our lives after the divine model. And our covenant keeping God will restore unto us the joys of his salvation and uphold us with his free spirit.⁵⁰

Thus, security during a covenant-provided probationary period is determined by response to-the divine initiative, which provides everything essential to fulfillment of the covenant.⁵¹

[Page 230] A door of hope was opened, that man, notwithstanding his great sin, might not be under the absolute control of Satan. Probation would be granted him in which, through a life of repentance, and faith in the atonement of the Son of God, he might be redeemed . . . and thus be elevated to a position where his efforts to keep the law could be accepted.⁵²

Note the relationship between covenant-probation, repentance-obedience, and security through a “faith in the atonement” which continues to respond to the divine initiative.⁵³ Reformationists harmonize with White in holding that justification precedes sanctification, providing its only virtue. Moreover, receiving Christ’s righteousness neither eradicates the sinful nature nor provides a means of supplementing Christ’s perfect merits.⁵⁴ White protects against legalism, however, not by breaking the synthesis, but by binding justification and sanctification together in “a life of repentance, and faith in the atonement.”⁵⁵

Repentance is associated with faith, and is urged in the gospel as essential to salvation. . . . No impenitent sinner can believe with his heart unto righteousness. . . . This repentance has in it nothing of the nature of **[Page 231]** merit, but it prepares the heart for the acceptance of Christ. . . . God requires the entire surrender of the heart, before justification can take place and in order for man to retain justification there must be a continual obedience, through active living faith that works by love and purifies the soul.⁵⁶

Thus, the same repentance and surrender which activates justifying faith also activates sanctifying faith, for that faith is one and the same.⁵⁷ This is why White can fill thousands of pages with urgent pleas for effort and obedience with no fear of encouraging legalism. The issue is not effort, but “meritorious works.”

The forgiveness of sin is promised to him who repents and believes; . . . Faith and works go hand in hand, works will never save us; it is the merit of Christ that will avail. . . . Faith and works will keep us evenly balanced and make us successful in the work of perfecting Christian character.⁵⁸

How to Exercise Faith

The light shining from the cross reveals the love of God. His love is drawing us to Himself. If we do not resist this drawing, we shall be led to the foot of the cross in repentance for the sins that have crucified the Saviour. Then the Spirit-of God through faith produces a new life in the soul. The thoughts and desires are brought into obedience to the will of Christ.⁵⁹

Distrust of God is the natural outgrowth of the unrenewed heart, which is at enmity with Him. But faith is inspired by the Holy Spirit, and it will flourish only as it is cherished. No man can become strong in faith without a **[Page 232]** determined effort.⁶⁰

Salvation is assured by the simple act of responding to the drawing power of the cross, but such response is not automatic either before or after justification. A life and death struggle is involved, but one in which all the power needed is continually offered.⁶¹ Unfortunately, few choose to “cling with unyielding faith to” the promises of God,” because of failure to understand:

. . . how to exercise faith . . . [which] is the science of the gospel. The knowledge of what the Scripture means when urging upon us the necessity of cultivating faith, is

more essential than any other knowledge. . . . (W)e cannot obey the gospel unto salvation, until the science of faith is better understood and until more faith is exercised.⁶²

And altho [sic] the plan of salvation was carried forward according to the plan ordained . . . yet men and women will not be saved unless they themselves exercise faith, God works in and through the human agent who co-operates with Him by choosing to help compose the Lord's building. By receiving Christ and being conformed to His will, man goes on to perfection. This building up of individual characters, . . . constitutes a structure more noble than any workmanship.⁶³

Since "how to exercise faith . . . is the science of the gospel," it is clear that the will occupies a central place in the gospel. Operating outside faith, the will fosters legalism, but its action within faith epitomizes "the science of the gospel." Divine-human cooperation thus represents a faith-will action stimulated by the divine will and empowered by the Spirit/Word. The following [Page 233] pre-Minneapolis statement is significant:

It is impossible for any of us to have a practical knowledge of this union with Christ, without the constant exercise of faith. Faith binds our souls to him, and makes us partakers of the divine nature. . . . (W)e must enter into union with him by a personal act of faith. . . . But this union can only be preserved by constant watchfulness. . . . for we are free always to take another master if we so desire. Union with Christ means an unfailing preference for him in every act and thought of our lives.⁶⁴

In harmony with the Great Controversy-covenant motif, salvation necessitates free exercise of the will in "union with Christ." Such voluntary submission to the divine will represents the nature of faith's work in cooperation with Him. By an act of the will in response to the cross, faith brings us into the covenant by uniting with Christ. Continued exercise of the will in submission to Him retains us in that faith union and "makes us partakers of the divine nature."⁶⁵ Both cases involve acceptance of the atonement.

Our work is to place our will on the side of God's will. Then through the blood of the atonement, we become partakers of the divine nature; . . .⁶⁶

But this union costs us something. It is a relation of utter dependence, to be entered into by a proud being. All who form this union must feel their need of the atoning blood of Christ. They must have a change of heart. They must submit their will to the will of God. There must be a struggle with outward and internal obstacles. There must be a painful work of detachment, as well as a work of attachment. . . . After the union with Christ has been formed it can be preserved only by earnest prayer and untiring effort. . . . A mere assent to this [Page 234] union while the affections are not detached from the world, its pleasures and its dissipations, only emboldens the heart in disobedience.⁶⁷

There is no place here for effortless justification or automatic sanctification.⁶⁸ Both are fruits of a faith which either works or becomes invalid.⁶⁹ This involves "a painful work of detachment" from worldly elements, "as well as a work of attachment" to Christ, in a union which "can be preserved only by earnest prayer and untiring effort." Identifying any part of faith's response to the cross with "human works" is to distort White's concept of the gospel itself.⁷⁰ The urgency of understanding the science of true faith is heightened by the fact that unbelief is not lack of faith but the exercise of a faulty faith whose authority is human reason rather than the Word.⁷¹ A submitted will is central to true faith, while self-will is central to false faith. Thus confidence in one's own efforts is a form of belief which is classified as unbelief. Note the emphases in the following statement:

The greatest sin we can cherish is the sin of unbelief. . . . We need the riches of faith and love. But we can obtain these only by surrendering the will to Christ. . .

. When we practise the Word, we shall be perfect in Him who is **[Page 235]** our righteousness. If the Word is believed, ... received and appropriated, it will give us a precious experience. that will make us wise unto salvation. . . , (I)f we had trusted less to our own wisdom, God would have manifested His power in our hearts. . . . We exercised more faith in our own working than in God's . . .⁷²

Thus the true science of faith involves learning how to submit to the Word when it conflicts with personal inclination or reason. Moreover, the key to this dilemma lies not in the size or strength of faith, but in its exercise in claiming the promises inherent in every divine command.⁷³

Christ is the author and finisher of our faith. In bidding the man stretch forth his hand, he imbued him with faith in his word; and as the man made the attempt to obey, his will moving in harmony with the will of Christ, life and elasticity came back into the hand. . .⁷⁴

The centrality of the will in faith provides the key to the paradox of how the “author and finisher of our faith,” can take full responsibility for the fulfillment of the covenant promises and how man at the same time, is the arbiter of his own destiny.⁷⁵

Volative vs. Emotive Center

White shares the Reformationist concern regarding the danger of a subjectivism in which feeling and emotion sabotage the atonement, but meets it through her Great Controversy-covenant concept in which the validity of experience is determined by the degree to **[Page 236]** which the Spirit is permitted to direct the body temple by controlling the rational-volitional faculties.⁷⁶ This involves subjection to the authority of the Word, which alone can ‘enlighten the understanding and empower the will to bring the entire body under control.’⁷⁷ Introduction of this subjective element into righteousness by faith prevents subjectivism. Note:

Feeling and faith are as distinct as the east is from the west. Faith is not dependent on feeling.⁷⁸

Confound not faith and feeling together. They are distinct. Faith is ours to exercise. This faith we must keep in exercise. Believe, believe, let your faith take hold of the blessing, and it is yours. Your feelings have nothing to do with this faith. When faith brings the blessing to your heart, and you rejoice in the blessing, it is no more faith, but feeling.⁷⁹

Observe that neither before nor after 1888 does White’s synthesis focus upon the emotive. Not only is feeling secondary, it must be disregarded or even denied in the action of faith.⁸⁰ Even when feeling rewards faith emotion does not itself characterize **[Page 237]** faith, which at that point is quiescent. The following pre- and post-1888 quotations indicate why faith and feeling are kept distinct:

Every natural trait of character should be brought under the control of the will, and this must itself be kept in harmony with the will of God. . . . Even the best acts prompted by the natural heart are faulty.⁸¹

There is not an impulse of our nature, not a faculty of the mind or an inclination of the heart, but needs to be moment by moment, under the control of the Spirit of God. All who profess godliness are under the most sacred obligation to . . . exercise self-control under the greatest provocation. . . . However great the pressure . . . transgression is our own act. It is not in the power of earth or hell to compel anyone to do evil. . . . God as provided help for us and in His strength we may conquer.⁸²

These passages confirm the centrality of White's Great Controversy concept in Which the will, as the key that unlocks the store house of power, bears responsibility for the outcome of the conflict. This, in turn, necessitates moment by moment control of "every natural trait" and "inclination of the heart" by the Holy Spirit. Note how the following pre- and post-1888 statements combine to indicate how the soul temple is restored by the exercise of a faith in the atoning merits of Christ-independent of feeling:

We must believe the naked promise, and not accept feeling for faith. When we trust God fully, when we rely upon the merits of Jesus as a sin-pardoning Saviour, we shall receive all the help that we can desire. . . . In him is our hope, our justification, our righteousness.⁸³

Unless they have a living connection with Him they will mingle self. . . . All should constantly seek for the true faith that works, not by an earth born, emotional element, but by love that purifies the soul. This love cleanses **[Page 238]** the soul temple from pride, and expels every idol from the throne of the heart.⁸⁴

Thus it is not an intellectual distinction between the work of Christ and that of the Spirit, but a personal relation to the Holy Spirit which protects against pride. Restoration of the body temple to the control of its true owner alone solves the problem of egocentricity and permits expulsion of "every idol from the throne of the heart." Such "expulsion of sin is the act of the soul itself" as, "imbued with the divine energy of the Holy Spirit," it obeys "the dictates of the will in fulfilling the will of God."⁸⁵

Since this expulsion must represent free choice, deep repentance, based upon a penetrating understanding of the nature of that sin to be expelled is mandatory.

A knowledge of our wrongs should be more highly prized than a happy flight of feeling; for it is evidence that the Spirit of God is striving with us. . . . Let the heart-searching work go forward; let it be deep and earnest. . . . In true contrition for sin, come to the foot of the cross, and leave your burdens; come exercising repentance toward God because you have broken his law, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ to pardon your transgressions and reconcile you to the Father.⁸⁶

Covet repentance? Yes, because it, rather than feeling, is the basis of the believer's security.⁸⁷ It is urgent that wounded pride and self-will not be permitted to resist this most precious gift. Only means of receiving the merits of the cross in justification, repentance remains the only channel through which those merits may be revealed in a life of submission. A deepening repentance is proof of the faithfulness of a covenant-keeping God,⁸⁸ evidence that **[Page 239]** He will fulfill. His pledge to complete the work He has begun.

Moreover, it reveals a growing bond of union with Christ.⁸⁹

The closer you come to Jesus, the more faulty you will appear in your own eyes; for your vision will be clearer, and your imperfections will be seen in broad and distinct contrast to his perfect nature. Do not be discouraged. This is evidence that Satan's delusions have lost their power; that the vivifying influence of the Spirit of God is arousing you. . . . No deep seated love for Jesus can dwell in the 2 heart that does not see and realize its own sinfulness.⁹⁰

While self-examination is the essential human factor in such deepening repentance, this must take place in the context of covenant relations.⁹¹ Moreover, White warns against criticizing "every feeling and emotion," indicating that correct self-examination and repentance should result in confidence, trust and victory, not in neurotic anxiety and defeatism.⁹²

Do not wait to feel that you are made whole. Believe the Saviour's word. Put your will on the side of Christ. Will to serve him, and in acting upon His word you will receive strength.⁹³

[Page 240] Significant paradoxes in White's understanding of repentance are: that deepening repentance represents increasing victory, "repentance . . . [being] the only process by which Infinite Purity reflects the Image of Christ in His redeemed subjects,"⁹⁴ and that repentance offers security and joy. Some factors in this paradox:

a) Accompanied by faith in Christ's merits, a sense of unworthiness intensifies grateful praise that for Christ's sake, God reckons one righteous.

b) Focusing on the pain brought to Christ, rather than fear of punishment, heart sorrow stimulates joy in the knowledge of union with Christ, to which repentance testifies.

c) Recognized as a gift, repentance is a token of God's covenant faithfulness in fulfillment of His pledge to finish the salvation He has authored.

Motivating Faith, Love Guides in Righteousness

Moreover, rejoicing--in acceptance with God, developing fellowship with Christ, and assurance in the covenant--has a cumulative-cyclical effect. Faith is strengthened to claim fresh victories which confirm faith and increase the sense of security and joy, but growing fellowship also contrasts more painfully one's own sinful nature and Christ's perfection;⁹⁵ while a greater sense of security (which fellowship brings) lowers natural resistance against exposure of one's weakness, thus permitting a deeper state of repentance to prepare for greater security and joy. Note:

When the joy of the saving power of Christ's righteousness is rightly understood by experimental knowledge, . . . sinners will be converted. . . . The soul that is brought into personal contact with Christ becomes a holy temple unto the Lord; . . . He who has fully surrendered to God has a consciousness of Christ's saving presence. [Page 241] What is the joy of the Christian? It is the result of the consciousness of the presence of Christ. What is the love of the Christian?--it is the reflection of the love of Christ. It is the effect of the operation of the Holy Spirit. Looking to the cross of Calvary, we see Jesus dying for the sins of the world, . . .⁹⁶

The Great Controversy-covenant theme, habitually intermingled with righteousness by faith speaks convincingly of White's consistency. The saving power of Christ's righteousness is known experimentally by full surrender of the body temple to the indwelling Spirit, whose operation reflects the love of Christ. Emphasis on experimental religion before, during, and after Minneapolis argues in favor of the subjective element.⁹⁷ Implied above is that only by "*experimental knowledge*" is "*righteousness . . . understood.*"

Note the consistency of this emphasis:

We must renounce our own righteousness, and plead for the righteousness of Christ to be imputed to us. We must depend wholly upon Christ for strength. Self must die. . . . Genuine faith is followed by love, and love by obedience. All the powers and passions of the converted man are brought under the control of Christ. His Spirit is a renewing power, transforming to the divine image all who will receive it. . . .

Experience is knowledge derived from experiment. What we need is experimental religion.⁹⁸

The experimental knowledge of God and of Christ transforms man into the image of God. It gives man the mastery of himself, bringing every impulse and passion of the lower [Page 242] nature under the control of the higher powers of the mind. It makes its possessor a son of God and an heir to heaven. It brings him into communion with the mind of the infinite.⁹⁹

The Theology Crisis

Justification, specifically referred to in 1883, is implied in the 1906 reference to making one “an heir.” Bearing unmistakable Great Controversy earmarks, each establishes the necessity of an experimental knowledge resulting from divine/human relations. Basic to such relations is a death to self which reinstates the authority of higher faculties over the lower. Moreover, the relationship between faith and love ties these statements to the preceding, which identifies righteousness with the body temple and love as a reflection of Christ who is enthroned within. Love is elsewhere equated with righteousness;¹⁰⁰ hence righteousness is the reflection of Christ’s own presence in the body temple. Faith and love thus reflect a relation to Christ which produces His righteousness in the soul temple. This gives significance to White’s favorite expression, “the faith that works by loves and purifies the soul.”¹⁰¹

There it only one power that can guide the heart and mind in paths of truth and righteousness. We must know the love of Christ in our individual experience. This love in the soul will purify the entire being and renew it in the likeness of God (T)he righteous character of Christ will be revealed in us we are changed into the same image our life becomes one with His life.¹⁰²

Christ’s Human Nature

Since Jesus’ own faith is the primary referent of “the faith of Jesus,” a consideration of His nature--and the nature of His faith-- follows, using Ford’s statement as a point of departure: **[Page 243]**

Whereas some of our earlier students of the Word including W.W. Prescott, and Waggoner and Jones believed that Christ had propensities to sin, E.G. White studiously avoided using the term “propensities” with reference to our Lord. Interestingly enough, the great bulk of her statements regarding the sinless human nature of Christ were written after the Minneapolis Conference when under inspiration she corrected some of the errors of the men God had used at that significant conference. . . . At no time did E.G. White endorse all the positions of Waggoner and Jones.

Instead she agreed with their central emphasis, namely, that perfect righteousness can be ours only by accepting what Jesus has already done. When *Desire of Ages* was written some years after the Minneapolis Conference . . . E.G. White not only set forth a perfectly balanced position on righteousness by faith, but she did likewise in presenting the human nature of the Redeemer. There she showed that in accepting the physical law of heredity He came with a lessened capacity, physically, mentally, and morally and yet without the taint of sin. He came without infirmities and liabilities (i.e. handicaps which resulted from exclusion from the Tree of Life) yet His Spiritual nature was spotless.¹⁰³

Christ Was Unique-The God-Man

In response to the above statement, evidence is first given affirming the uniqueness and impeccable sinlessness of Christ:

Christ was the only one who walked the earth upon whom rested no taint of sin. . . . The virtue of his Heavenly Father animated and regulated his life. He was sinless.¹⁰⁴

. . . (H)e here identifies himself with sinners as their representative, in taking upon him their sins, and numbering himself with transgressors His sinless humanity supplicates support and strength A way was opened for sinners that, through obedience to God’s law and faith in Christ as their Redeemer, they might form righteous characters and become children of God.¹⁰⁵

The Theology Crisis

The world had lost the original pattern of goodness. . . . (T)he life of Jesus was one of laborious, self-denying [Page 244] effort to bring man back to his first estate by imbuing him with the spirit of divine benevolence and unselfish love. . . . It was a continual pain for Him to be brought in contact with the enmity, depravity, and impurity which Satan had-brought in; but He had a work to do to bring man into harmony with the divine plan, and earth in connection with heaven. . . . He . . . suffered in proportion to the perfection of His holiness. But the prince-of darkness found nothing in Him; not a single thought or feeling responded to temptation.¹⁰⁶

Hating sin with a perfect hatred, He yet gathered to His soul the sins of the whole world. Though the guilt of sin was not His, His spirit was torn and bruised by the transgressions of men, and He who knew no sin became sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.¹⁰⁷

Note the features of uniqueness as White understood them before and after Minneapolis: a) He was the only sinless human; b) He vicariously assumed the guilt of all sin; c) He provided a way for penitent sinners to “form righteous characters; d) He restored the original pattern of goodness,” which had been lost; e) He was continually pained by contact with sin and depravity, which He hated with a perfect hatred; f) His suffering was as much greater than sinful man’s as was His perfection; and g) He never, by “a single thought or feeling responded to temptation.”

Thus, Satan was unable to find anything in Him by which to cause His fall. It is thus clear that even in His humanity Christ was unique, there never having been or could be a human being to compare with Him. It is this uniqueness, indeed, upon which Christ’s intercessory ministry must depend. Had He not been sinless and thus failed to restore the “Original pattern,” He could not be man’s [Page 245] Savior. Moreover, had He declined to accept the full weight of man’s guilt, He could not be a perfect high priest. Thus, any effort to make Him in every respect like man would be to rob one of a Savior.¹⁰⁸

Nevertheless, there is nothing in the foregoing statements or in all White’s writings to support the above claim that her central emphasis (before, during, or after Minneapolis) was upon the objective, historical acts of Christ in contrast to their subjective implication.¹⁰⁹ Neither her focus upon Calvary nor Ford’s recognition of the importance of the believer’s victory is in question, but rather *how these are related*. This question must be considered in light of White’s Great Controversy concept.

The Second Adam

The Lord placed man upon probation that he might form a character of steadfast integrity for his own happiness and for the glory of his Creator. . . . The first great moral lesson given to Adam was that of self-denial. The reins of self-government were placed in his hands. Judgment, reason, and conscience, were to bear sway. . . . The Son of God, undertaking to become the redeemer of the race, placed Adam-in a new relation to his Creator. He was fallen; but a door of hope was opened to him. . . . (T)hrough Christ alone will the Lord hold communion with man.¹¹⁰

[Page 246] When Satan was thrust out of heaven, he determined to make the earth his kingdom (H)e thought that he had gained possession of this world; . . . But God gave His own dear Son . . . to bear the penalty of transgression, and thus He provided a way by which they might be restored.¹¹¹

The Saviour is our substitute and surety. He stands at the head of the human family. . . . *In him all power is provided for us if his word abides in us*, and it is for us to choose whether we will serve God or Baal.¹¹²

He knew that by paying the ransom he could end the reign of the enemy, and vindicate the justice of God....IN the place where Satan has his seat, there will I set my cross....*It is the work of God to expel evil from the soul by connecting humanity with divinity.* All difference and disunion are destroyed by a union with the Great Center.¹¹³

Reformationists harmonize with White in their emphasis upon Christ as the second Adam. There is also agreement that Christ must assume responsibility in Adam's nature for the original test which he failed to endure. Concerning this, White states:

. . . Christ was on probation. . . . Had He failed in His test and trial, He would have been disobedient to the voice of God, and the world would have been lost. Satan has asserted that men could not keep the commandments of God. To prove that they could, Christ became a man, and lived a life of perfect obedience, an evidence to sinful beings, that man could keep God's law through the divine power that is abundantly provided for all that believe. . . . (I)n His power, humanity can obey God. . . . for by His perfect life He threw upon the world a perpetual reproach, and made manifest the contrast between transgression and be pure, spotless righteousness of one that knew no sin.¹¹⁴

[Page 247] White's position regarding Christ's probationary status, during which time He could have failed, is unequivocal,¹¹⁵ as is her assertion that "Christ became a man" to prove that "sinful beings . . . could keep God's law through the divine power." So also is her conflict with Ford in his agreement with A.D. Jones (not A.T. Jones) that "He had the sinless nature of Adam before the fall,"¹¹⁶ and his corresponding claim that the real issue is "not whether fallen men can keep the commandments of God faultlessly but whether 'man, as God *created* him, connected with the Father and the Son, could obey every divine requirement.'"¹¹⁷ White's 1874 testimony:

The Son of God humbled himself and took man's nature after the race had wandered four thousand years from Eden. . . . When Adam was assailed . . . (a)ll the organs and faculties of his being were equally developed, and harmoniously balanced. . . . Christ overcame in the sinner's behalf, four thousand years after Adam. . . . Christ bore the sins and infirmities of the race as they existed when he came to the earth to help man. . . . (W)ith the weaknesses of fallen man upon him, he was to stand the temptations of Satan upon all points wherewith man would be assailed."...Christ must reach him where he was.¹¹⁸

Reformationists almost recognize the paradoxical nature of White's view of Christ's' humanity that the Sinless One took fallen nature in order to reach man where he was:

[Christ came with] lessened capacity physically, mentally, and morally, and yet without the taint of sin. He came with our infirmities and liabilities (i.e., handicaps which resulted from exclusion from the Tree of Life) yet, His Spiritual nature was spotless,...¹¹⁹

[Page 248] But they then nullify the paradox by denying the post-fall biological inheritance,¹²⁰ thus obscuring their own position and rendering meaningless White's repeated insistence that Christ took man's nature as it was after 4,000 years of sin. Insisting that the incarnation related not to "whether fallen man could keep the commandments" but whether a pre-fall Adam "could obey every divine requirement," *they directly contradict White's strongest statements!*

Christ Meets The Big Lie

Satan declared that it was impossible for the sons and daughters of Adam to keep the law of God, and thus charged upon God a lack of wisdom and love. If they could not keep the law, then there was fault with the lawgiver. Men who are under the control of Satan repeat these accusations against God, in asserting that men can not keep the law of God. Jesus humbled himself, clothing his divinity with humanity, in order that he might stand as the head and representative of the human family, and by both precept and example condemn sin in the flesh, and give the lie to Satan's charges.¹²¹

Thus Satan's charges regarding the law included Adam's children, all of whom have the post-fall nature. "if they could not keep the law," the deceiver argues, "there is something wrong with the law and its giver." White is unequivocal:

[Page 249]No one can keep God's commandments except in Christ's power. . . . Christ is our example in all things. . . . God requires nothing that is impossible. . . . Christ kept the law, proving beyond controversy that man also can keep it. [Not "could have kept it in Eden."] ¹²²

Those who live the life of a Christian are battling against the devil's lie, that man cannot keep God's law.¹²³

Everyone who by faith obeys God's commandments, will reach the condition of sinlessness in which Adam lived before his transgression.

Christ took upon Himself the nature of man, and by a perfect life demonstrated the falsity of the claims of him who constantly accuses those that are trying to obey God's law.¹²⁴

He came to this world to be tempted in all points as we are, to prove to the universe that in this world of sin human beings can live lives that God will approve. . . .Satan declared that human beings could not live without sin.¹²⁵

The Reformationist problem is that White's consistent and emphatic insistence upon Christ's absolute sinlessness appears so obviously to demand a pre-fall nature as to make it impossible to accept equally clear indications that Satan's charge and its answer involve fallen nature. Note, however, how White enforces the post fall concept even in maintaining His sinlessness.¹²⁶

[Page 250] In taking upon Himself *man's nature in its fallen condition*, Christ did not in the least participate in its sin. . . . we should have no misgivings in regard to the *perfect sinlessness of the human nature of Christ*.¹²⁷

He took upon himself *fallen, suffering nature, degraded and defiled by sin*.¹²⁸

He took humanity, *uniting the offender with his divine nature*, . . .¹²⁹

. . . He consented to an actual union with man. . . . *Christ did in reality unite the offending nature of man with his own sinless nature*. . . . Thus he made it possible for us to partake of his nature.¹³⁰

Thus consistently identifying the sinless Christ with a fallen nature, White demonstrates her belief that He could and did take fallen nature without being corrupted by it.¹³¹ Absence of defensive [Page 251] argument in such numerous statements indicates absence in her thinking of that tension troubling Reformationists. The varied expressions include "nature, degraded and defiled by sin," and "offending nature." Wieland points out that Jones, Waggoner, and White speak not of Christ having but of His taking such nature;¹³²

nevertheless, she always treats this as a bio-genetic acquirement, identifying the assumption with the incarnation, never with the beginning of His ministry, as one Reformationist solution suggests.¹³³

Reformationist Dilemma

Holding Paul to be the theologian of the incarnation (as of righteousness by faith) Ford uses Romans 8:3, which speaks of Christ coming “in the likeness of sinful flesh,”¹³⁴ as the key.

Let it be specially noted that the only passage of Scripture which uses the expression “sinful flesh” affirms that Christ only came in “the likeness” of such. “Likeness” never means “sameness.” According to Phil. 2:7 He was made “in the likeness of men” but He was *not* just a man, but the God-man.¹³⁵

Comparison with Phil. 2:7 is apt, for both verses involve the same words by the same author on the same subject. But the argument proves too much. For if “likeness” never means “sameness,” the docetists are right! The question is not whether Christ became “just a man,” but of what God did become. Was He true man or only similar [Page 252] to man? Philippians and Romans stand or fall together.¹³⁶ If “in the likeness of men” means “very man,” then being made “In the likeness of sinful flesh” must mean actual “sinful flesh” (not to be confused with sinfulness). If on the other hand, “likeness” never means “sameness,” then Christ only “appeared to be” but was not true man. White holds that He took to Himself that which was ours, making it His own. To argue that what He took was not really “sinful flesh” is to argue that what He took was not really ours.

It would have been an almost infinite humiliation for the Son of God to take man’s nature, even when Adam stood in his innocence in Eden. But Jesus accepted humanity when the race had been weakened by four thousand years of sin. Like every child of Adam He accepted the results of the working of the great law of heredity. What these results were is shown in the history of His earthly ancestors. He came with such heredity . . . to give us the example of a sinless life.¹³⁷

Thus according to Desire of Ages, Ford’s primary witness:

a) White does not sharply contrast Christ’s preincarnate state with the Edenic nature but with the results of 4,000 years of sin, clearly signaling no change from her 1874 incarnate contrast with Adam whose organs and faculties “were equally developed and harmoniously balanced.”¹³⁸

b) White’s key: examine the “results . . . shown in the history of His earthly ancestors.” Which ancestor’s history shows evidence of having been afflicted only with lessened capacities? This statement obviously points to a postfall nature.

c) That the stated purpose of “such a heredity” was “to give us the example of a sinless life,” undermines Reformationist insistence on making example secondary, and also their denial of “sinful flesh,” for of what purpose is His example to fallen man if He does not touch his nature? [Page 253]

It is agreed that Desire of Ages represents “a perfectly balanced position on righteousness by faith, [and] . . . the human nature of the Redeemer,” but Ford’s understanding that only “lessened capacities” are involved--in denial of the post-fall nature--is unsupported. It is significant, also, that Reformationist appeal to her post-1888 work lacks substance, as no conceptual changes are seen. Note Desire of Ages treatment of “sinful flesh”:

. . . But now that Jesus had come “in the likeness of sinful flesh” (Rom. 8:3), the Father Himself spoke. He had before communicated with humanity through Christ; now He communicated with humanity in Christ.... Many look on this conflict between Christ and Satan as having no special bearing on their own life; . . . But within the domain of every human heart this controversy is repeated. . . . The enticements which Christ resisted were those that we find it so difficult to withstand.

The Theology Crisis

They were urged upon Him in as much greater degree as His character is superior to ours. . . .

Satan had pointed to Adam's sin as proof that God's law was unjust, and could not be obeyed. In our humanity, Christ was to redeem Adam's failure. But when Adam was assailed by the tempter, none of the effects of sin were upon him. . . , full vigor of mind and body. . . it was not thus with Jesus. . . . For four thousand years, the race had been decreasing in physical strength, in mental power, and in moral worth; and Christ took upon Him the infirmities of degenerate humanity. Only thus could He rescue man from the lowest depths of his degradation But our Saviour took humanity, with all its liabilities For our sakes He exercised a self-control stronger than death.¹³⁹

Far from qualifying "likeness of sinful flesh" as Ford does, this vivid portrayal intensifies the reality of the sameness. Each part of the quotation helps establish the consistency of the Great Controversy-covenant concept with a post-fall nature. Moreover, [Page 254] though agreeing with Ford regarding the interdependency of the incarnation and righteousness by faith,¹⁴⁰ White forcefully enunciates just what Ford is at pains to deny--the primacy of Christ's example to fallen man¹⁴¹--revealing the complete lack of tension in her thinking between Calvary and example. Indeed, her stress upon the latter is but a proclamation of the triumph of the cross. To contrast these is to seriously diminish her exaltation of the cross.¹⁴²

Immaculate Conception?

Ford states: "What is not assumed is not healed, and thus God adopted true humanity in order to heal the race."¹⁴³ True humanity is not the real humanity of fallen man in his thinking, however, but the ideal humanity as God created it except for size, strength, and capacity. Nevertheless, his own statement calls for healing--not just strengthening or increased capacity--and if that which needs healing is not assumed, it cannot be healed. Ford declares:

In chapter one of Romans he [Paul] reminds us that Christ descended from David according to the flesh; in the fifth chapter he shows that the provision of righteousness was made possible only by the advent of the Second Member of the Godhead as *immaculate Man* . . .¹⁴⁴

How far removed Ford's "immaculate Man" is from White is seen in his assessment of the nature of Christ's conception:

[Page 255] It is not true to say that Christ's [body] was born of Mary in the way that water passes through a pipe assuming nothing from the substance of the pipe, but it is true to say that the substance of Mary was moulded into a perfect nature for our Lord just as in the beginning the Holy Spirit took chaos and made a perfect world.¹⁴⁵

If the Spirit truly molded Mary's substance "into a perfect nature" just as He "took chaos and made a perfect world," then according to Ford's own dictum, the whole world is lost, for He would have assumed nothing which needed healing. White asserts that "like every child of Adam He accepted the results of the great law of heredity."¹⁴⁶ But Ford's description, "applying to no other child"--directly denies the operation of the "great law of heredity." Though avoiding the Papal position regarding the nature of Mary, it most certainly represents the same principle of immaculate flesh.¹⁴⁷

Is Weakness Badness?

Linking "propensities to sin" directly with the assumption of "fallen nature," Reformationists automatically read this into the **[Page 256]** post-fall position. Thus they misrepresent Jones, Waggoner, and contemporary

The Theology Crisis

theologians, whom they falsely charge with teaching that Christ had sinful propensities.¹⁴⁸ This “straw man” issue finds one of its strongest and strangest expressions below:

Others confuse infirmities with propensities, but there is a world of difference between weakness and badness.¹⁴⁹

Indeed there is a world of difference! The misrepresentation involved in the implication that some SDA’s confuse “weakness with badness” appears to be an example of instinctively reading into another’s concepts the requirements of one’s own logic regarding that position.¹⁵⁰ White would certainly come under the same charge except [Page 257] that on the basis of inspiration, logic requires that whatever she may have “said,” she could not have “taught” error--thus their reinterpretation of White, Who states plainly;

Christ’s life represents perfect manhood. Just that which you may be. . . He was not only made flesh, but He was made in the likeness of sinful flesh.¹⁵¹

Written after “Life of Christ” (original draft of Desire of Ages) was in use,¹⁵² this statement loses its meaning if it does not affirm the reality of “sinful flesh.” The obvious significance of “not only flesh, but . . . the likeness of sinful flesh” is destroyed by the claim that “‘likeness’ never means ‘sameness.’” The construction requires the meaning that the element “flesh” is insufficient to fully explain the humiliation, which is grasped only by the qualification “*sinful* flesh.”¹⁵³

It was not indwelling sin which caused him [Adam] to yield; ... There were in him no corrupt principles, no tendencies to evil. But when Christ came to meet the temptations of Satan, He bore “the likeness of sinful flesh.” In the wilderness, weakened physically by a fast of forty days, He met His adversary.... Humanity was placed upon vantage ground. He endured,...believed God,...learned obedience,...And He overcame, as we must overcome.¹⁵⁴

[Page 258] Written four years later, this even stronger statement is unequivocal.¹⁵⁵ The “but” can only contrast Christ’s adopted humanity with Adam’s pre-fall nature. Otherwise it becomes not just meaningless, but a confusing contradiction. Moreover, victory in “sinful flesh” alone provides significance to Christ’s four-fold example: enduring, believing, learning obedience, and overcoming, in showing what “we must do.

The Baker Letter

By far the most effective argument and most oft-quoted statements used to deny the post-fall doctrine since the 1950’s, come from five long-undiscovered paragraphs buried in an 18-page, 1896 letter to W. L. H. Baker, a little known, young Australian minister.¹⁵⁶

Note paragraphs one and five:

Be careful, exceedingly careful as to how you dwell upon the human nature of Christ. . . . Do not set Him before the people as a man with the propensities of sin. He is the second Adam. The first Adam was created . . . without a taint of sin upon him; he was in the image of God. He could fall, and did. . . . Because of sin his posterity was born with inherent propensities of disobedience. But Jesus Christ was the only begotten Son of God. He took upon Himself human nature, and was tempted in all points as human nature is tempted. He could have sinned; He could have fallen, but not for a moment was there in Him an evil *propensity*.

... (T)he second Adam held fast to God and His Word under the most trying circumstances, and His faith in His Father’s goodness, mercy, and love did not waver for one moment. “It is written” was His weapon of resistance, and it is the sword of the Spirit which every human being is [Page 259] to use. . . . “(T)he

The Theology Crisis

prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in me,”--nothing to respond to temptation. *On not one occasion was there a response to his manifold temptations. Not once did Christ step on Satan's ground,....*¹⁵⁷

Note the Great-Controversy-covenant orientation; Christ as the second Adam; the Word as sole authority and basis of victory, to be grasped by faith; and divine-human relations as the basis for the covenant. Moreover, as the second Adam, Christ entered covenant relations with His Father in order to bring humanity into covenant relation with Him.¹⁵⁸ The primary issue is that Christ had no propensities to sin, though He faced temptation as a man and could have sinned. Paragraphs two and three stress His perfect sinlessness:¹⁵⁹

In treating upon the humanity of Christ, you need to guard strenuously every assertion, lest your words . . . dim the clear perceptions of His *humanity as combined with divinity*.... “The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, [Mary]. . . (A)lso that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.**[Page 260]** These words do not refer to any human being, except to the Son of the Infinite God. Never, in any way, leave the slightest impression upon human minds that a taint of, or inclination to corruption rested upon Christ, or that He in any way yielded to corruption. . . . (L)et every human being be warned from the ground of making Christ altogether human, such as one as ourselves; for it cannot be.”¹⁶⁰

Distinctions between Christ's nature and ours are: He was divine as well as human; in His humanity were no “propensities of sin.”¹⁶¹

White Echoes Waggoner

Using eight pages to substantiate his supposition that Baker was influenced by Waggoner and Prescott's “sinful nature” concepts Heise strangely infers that White corrected Baker for voicing their views. Note Heise's statement, and his quote from Waggoner:

[Page 261] It is well understood that Waggoner . . . was quite specific in His understanding that Christ possessed a sinful nature. . . . And it cannot be denied that the type of counsel contained in Letter 8, 1895 could most certainly have been addressed to one with similar views to those held by Waggoner.

56 “Moreover, the fact that Christ took upon Himself the flesh, not of a sinless being, but of sinful man, that is, that the flesh which He assumed had all the weaknesses and sinful tendencies to which fallen human nature is subject, is shown by the statement that He was made of the seed of David according to the flesh.”¹⁶²

Total lack of evidence that White ever rebuked, corrected, or even questioned Waggoner on his position offers mute but powerful testimony against Heise's inference and in favor of White's agreement with him on his post-fall nature.¹⁶³ Referring only to Christ's biological inheritance, which in no wise relates to His moral or spiritual nature, Waggoner anticipated Heise's charge. Note his explanation, found only two pages beyond the above quote:

Some may have thought, while reading thus far, that we were depreciating the character of Jesus, by bringing him down to the level of sinful man. [This includes Heise and Fletcher, neither of whom seem to have comprehended this caution/explanation.] On the contrary, we are exalting the “Divine power” of our blessed Saviour, who Himself voluntarily descended to the level of sinful man, in order that He might exalt man to His own spotless purity, which He retained under the most adverse circumstances. His humanity only veiled His Divine nature by which He **[Page 262]** was inseparably connected with the invisible God, and which was more than able successfully to resist the weaknesses of the flesh. . . . (M)oved

upon by the enemy of all righteousness, [it] would tend to sin, yet His Divine nature never for a moment harbored an evil desire, nor did His Divine power for a moment waver. Having suffered in the flesh . . . He returned . . . as spotless as when He left the courts of glory. . . . He “knew no sin.”¹⁶⁴

The close parallel between this 1890 Waggoner statement and White’s 1896 warning to Baker indicates the possibility that her phraseology may have been influenced by his. The clause “Divine nature never for a moment harbored an evil desire, [propensity],”¹⁶⁵ covers both White’s emphasis on Christ’s divinity and that He never **[Page 263]** had an “evil propensity” or desire to sin--as the Baker letter stresses six years later--and both ideas reinforce the fact that Christ was not “altogether human, such an one as ourselves.”

Part of the argument that White, through Baker, corrected Waggoner’s concept, is that *Christ and His Righteousness* (See Heise’s footnoted

quote) was advertised in *The Bible Echo* from January, 1892, until 1895, often with Steps to Christ. Baker, so the argument goes, was doubtless familiar with Waggoner’s position and likely owned his book¹⁶⁶ Waggoner’s influence is not here questioned¹⁶⁷ but that White rebuked Waggoner’s concept through him is subject to serious challenge, particularly since both content and phraseology of White’s 1896 counsel to Baker echoes Waggoner’s 1890 *Christ and His Righteousness*. It would, moreover, have been totally out of character for White to rebuke an obscure and comparatively unsuccessful young minister in order to correct the errors of several of the most prominent denominational theologians.¹⁶⁸ Finally, **[Page 264]** it is highly improbable that she would have permitted the pairing of Steps to Christ with Christ and His Righteousness had she felt the latter undermined her own concept of the nature of Christ.

White Endorses Prescott’s Doctrine

Heise’s treatment of Prescott’s 1895 sermon, “The Word Become Flesh,” and his assumption that White’s letter was intended to correct its influence is even more damaging to his premise than is the above argument concerning Waggoner. His Appendix F reproduces the entire sermon, which he introduces as follows:

The W.W. Prescott sermon. “The Word Became Flesh,” is reproduced here. It was preached at Australian camp meetings at the end of 1895, and published in *The Bible Echo*, shortly before Ellen White wrote to W.L.H. Baker. The view it presents on the human nature of Christ, and its proximity in time to the Ellen White letter, make it significant in the present study. It appeared in two successive issues of *The Bible Echo*: January 6, 1896, pp. 4,5; and January 13, 1896, pp. 12, 13.¹⁶⁹

Note the significance attached to both the time and content of this Prescott sermon, from which Heise previously quotes to prove his influence on Baker and the consequent probability that White’s letter attempted to correct the Waggoner/Prescott error:

Baker would certainly have heard Prescott speak, and met again with Ellen White at one of these camp meetings, only four months at most before she wrote the letter. . . . In this sermon Prescott affirms with great emphasis that Christ took sinful flesh. He uses similar texts to those used by Waggoner before him, to establish this. “He took on Him the seed of Abraham.” Prescott . . . strongly endorses the Adam-Christ theme, but with an emphasis not **[Page 265]** present in Ellen White’s later letter to Baker. “And notice, it was in sinful flesh that He was tempted, not in the flesh in which Adam fell. All this is basic in Prescott’s mind to the wonderful truth that He is our Righteousness. . . . Ellen White was traveling with Prescott during this time too. Is it possible that she could see a dangerous trend in this Christology? . . . enough of an issue to force its inclusion into her letter to Baker, written only one month after the appearance of this sermon in *The Bible Echo*. The unmistakable connection [?] between Prescott’s sermon and Ellen White’s letter to Baker suggests strongly that the warnings and cautions in Ellen White’s letter apply most strikingly to a view which the Prescott sermon represents.”¹⁷⁰

The Theology Crisis

Did White “see a dangerous trend” in Prescott’s Christology which prompted her Baker caution? Her own unequivocal answer to that very question was printed on January 7, 1896, just one day after the first part of Prescott’s sermon was published in *The Bible Echo*. Her article, “The Australian Camp-Meeting,” begins:

Our third Australian camp-meeting was held at Armadale a populous suburb of Melbourne, . . . The evening discourse given by Elders Prescott, Corliss, and Daniells, all presented truth as it is in Jesus Christ. . . . In every sermon Christ was preached, and as the great mysterious truths regarding his presence and work in the hearts of men were made clear and plain, the truths regarding . . . his relation to man as the source of life, appeared in a glorious and convincing light that sent conviction to many hearts. .

In the evening Professor Prescott gave a most valuable lesson, precious as gold. . . Truth was separated from error, and made, by the divine Spirit, to shine like precious jewels. It was shown that perfect obedience to all the commandments is essential for the salvation of souls. Obedience to the laws of God’s kingdom reveals the divine in the human, sanctifying the character.¹⁷¹

The Identity of this camp meeting with the one Heise speaks of is incontrovertible, according to his own testimony:

January 6, 1896, carried the most significant sermon for our purposes. This had been preached as far back as [Page 266] October in the Melbourne camp meeting, and later in Tasmania,, and probably around the field. . .¹⁷²

The directness and completeness with which White’s article answers Heise’s question, as well as the timing, is startling. Prescott is specifically named, as is the Melbourne camp meeting. Moreover, Prescott’s discourses “all presented truth as it is in Jesus,” and he is specifically noted as being the agent of the Spirit by which “truth is separated from error.” It is unusual, indeed, to have such a ready-made, clear, and decisive answer--printed only one day after Prescott’s sermon was printed--to the question raised in a research whose methodology prevented its discovery.¹⁷³

That White did not specifically refer to his sermon on the incarnation and nature of Christ is irrelevant; for she speaks of “all” his sermons. Moreover, concerning the centrality of the nature of Christ to Prescott’s doctrine of righteousness by faith (which White does specify) Heise asserts, “All this is basic in, Prescott’s mind to the wonderful truth that He is our Righteousness most significant in White’s enthusiastic report of Prescott’s messages is confirmation of the Great Controversy-covenant concept. “The Truth as it is in Jesus” reveals “that perfect obedience to all the commandments is essential for the salvation of souls.” Moreover, “perfect obedience” is, as might be expected, seen in relation to “the divine in the human, sanctifying the character.” Thus, in providing the basis for refutation of his own theory, Heise’s [Page 267] question unwittingly provides the basis for refuting Reformationist claims to White’s support for a forensic only gospel.

The Faith of Jesus

In the same year White wrote the Baker letter, she departed from her usual terminology-- “fallen nature,” “likeness of sinful flesh,” “offending nature,” etc., to use the more explicit term, “sinful nature.” The context is most revealing:

Obedience or disobedience decides every man’s destiny. Those who obey God are counted worthy to share his throne, while those who disobey will be forever lost. But sin has weakened our powers of obedience, and in our own strength we can never obey God. Knowing this, God sent Jesus to our world to live his law. Only the mind that is trained to obedience to God can do justice to his divine claims, and God

The Theology Crisis

gave Christ up to be afflicted with all the temptations wherewith humanity is afflicted, that we might be enabled to keep His law.

Christ, the second Adam, came to a world polluted and marred, to live a life of perfect obedience. The race, weakened in moral power, was unable to cope with Satan, who ruled his subjects with cruel authority. Christ came to stand on the field of battle in warfare against all the Satanic forces . . . , to win man back to his allegiance.

Clad in the vestments of humanity, the son of God came down to the level of those he wished to save. In Him was no guile or sinfulness; he was ever pure and undefiled yet he took upon him our sinful nature.¹⁷⁴

[Page 268] This focus upon example and obedience, reveals the typical manner in which White relates the nature of Christ to the various Great Controversy-covenant elements. Note that because man was helpless to obey in his own strength, Christ became the second Adam suffering all the temptations man is subject to “that we might be enabled to keep his law.”¹⁷⁵ Moreover, -He entered the very battlefield in which man was the helpless slave of a tyrant “who ruled his subjects with cruel authority,” in order to break that authority and return man to allegiance to God.¹⁷⁶ Meanwhile, though totally without “sinfulness,” “He took upon him our sinful nature.”

In White “There is a world of difference” between sinfulness (“badness”) and “sinful nature”¹⁷⁷ (“weakness”), the former relating to experience and character and the latter to inheritance--a vital distinction the doctrine of original sin denies. Strenuous Reformationist repudiation of the post-fall inheritance results from denial of this critical distinction-which Ford elsewhere insists upon! Thus “sinful nature” is equated with the infection and corruption of the disease of sin, not just its effects.¹⁷⁸

Ford holds the key, however, which, if used in connection with White’s Great Controversy theme, would open the door to reconciliation with her. Christ, he holds, ‘took the results of exclusion **[Page 269]** from the Tree of Life but was never without the perfect indwelling of the Spirit of God.’¹⁷⁹ Since his higher faculties were thus always under the control of the Spirit, no sinfulness could have resulted from His acquirement, under “the great law of heredity”, of “sinful flesh”; for the infection of sin involves the exercise of an aberrant will in conflict with the will of God.¹⁸⁰

This concept is critical to understanding the “faith of Jesus.” The nature and function of Christ’s own faith reveal the nature of that gift which He offers us to exercise.¹⁸¹ Only by taking that which needed healing, can He offer that healing to all who claim the faith gift by which such healing is made possible.

Uninfected Will

The secret of Christ’s perfect sinlessness was an uninfected will, as Desire of Ages reveals:

“Lo, I come (in the volume of the Book it is written of Me,) to do Thy Will, O God.” Heb. 10:5-7. In these words is announced the fulfillment of the purpose . . . to become incarnate in “the body of our humiliation.”¹⁸²

Of the bitterness that falls to the lot of humanity, there was no part which Christ did not taste. . . . If He had responded by an impatient word or look, . . . Had He even admitted that there could be an excuse for sin, Satan would have triumphed. . . .¹⁸³

“The prince of this world cometh,” said Jesus, “and hath nothing in me.” John 14:30. There was nothing in Him that responded to Satan’s sophistry. He did not consent to sin. Not even by a thought did He yield to temptation. So it may be with us. Christ’s humanity was united with divinity; He was fitted for the conflict by the indwelling **[Page 270]** of the Holy Spirit.¹⁸⁴

The Theology Crisis

Note that in surrendering His will to the Father--“Lo, I come . . . to do Thy will, O God.”--, who fitted Him “for the conflict by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit,” Christ guaranteed total occupation of His body temple by the Spirit. Thus He was able to take “the body of our humiliation” without being “infected” by it; the tempter could find no response in Him, for “not even by a thought did He yield to temptation.” This principle explains White’s assurance, “so it may be with us.” Christ proved that there is no “excuse for sin” by demonstrating His Father’s power to give total victory when the will is totally surrendered.¹⁸⁵ Note:

Christ was seeking to lead them from the low condition of faith to the experience they might receive if they truly realized what He was God in human flesh. He desired them to see that their faith must lead up to God, and be anchored there. . . . The Saviour was deeply anxious for His disciples to understand for what purpose His divinity was united to humanity. . . . God was manifested in Him that He might be manifested in them.¹⁸⁶

[Page 271] Such emphasis upon divinity as well as humanity sheds light on her insistence in the Baker letter that the divinity of Christ not be overshadowed.¹⁸⁷ In White, divinity and humanity together form the key to man’s salvation. Any lack in His divinity would make man’s case hopeless, while failure to identify fully with the nature of those He came to save would likewise remove hope.¹⁸⁸

If He did not have man’s nature, He could not be our example. . . . In Christ divinity and humanity were combined.¹⁸⁹

Christ did not make believe take human nature; He did verily take it. . . . He was of the seed of David according to human descent.¹⁹⁰

He vanquished Satan in the same nature over which in Eden Satan obtained the victory. The enemy was overcome by Christ in human nature . . . relying upon God for power.¹⁹¹

The reference to vanquishing “Satan in the same nature” (human nature) which was overcome in Eden--frequently used to prove a prefall position¹⁹²--makes no reference to the pre-fall state, stressing only the reality of his human nature and thus the necessity of “relying upon God for power.” That the “seed of David according to human descent,” is essential for Him to be “our example,” points to a post-fall nature. The primary force of all the statements is that divine power can overcome sin even in heretofore defeated human nature.¹⁹³ The necessity for complete biological identity is seen:

[Page 272] Though He had all the strength of passion of “humanity never did He yield to temptation. . . .¹⁹⁴

When Jesus took human nature. . . . He possessed all the human organism.¹⁹⁵

The enticements which Christ resisted were those that we find it so difficult to withstand. They were urged upon Him in as much greater degree as His character is superior to ours.¹⁹⁶

Had he not been fully human, Christ could not have been our substitute. He could not have worked out in humanity that perfection of character which it is the privilege of all to reach. . . . Christ did nothing that human nature may not do if it partakes of the divine nature.¹⁹⁷

[Page 273]

Christ Was Righteous By Faith

The intensity with which temptation was hurled at Christ's human nature and the assurance that He "did nothing that human nature may not do if it partakes of the divine nature," reflects a postfall position. Note the harmony between those references (above) dating shortly after the Baker letter--including *Desire of Ages*--and her pre-1888 statement. That Christ "took upon His sinless nature our sinful nature, that He might know how to succor those that are tempted,"¹⁹⁸ points up a vital paradox which must be preserved. White's entire theology demands that the "very God" become that "very flesh" He came to heal and save.¹⁹⁹ Note:

Christ's work was to reconcile man to God through his human nature, and God to man through his divine nature.²⁰⁰

...(I)f His humanity had not been united with divinity, He would have failed and become discouraged.²⁰¹

[Page 274] He had to walk by faith, as we walk by faith;...²⁰²

As head of the human race, Christ found it necessary to live a righteous life through faith in and submission to His Father.²⁰³ Thus He met all covenant requirements in the same way they must be met by those He came to save.²⁰⁴ As indicated by the Baker letter, however, she neither makes Him "altogether human," (for she exalts His divinity), nor even "such an one as ourselves" on the human level for He was without "a taint of, or inclination to" sin.²⁰⁵ In view of these two vital differences, special attention must be given to White's amazing claim that:

God was manifested in Him that He might be manifested in them. Jesus revealed no qualities, and exercised no powers, that men may not have through faith in Him. His perfect humanity is that which all His followers may possess, if they will be in subjection to God as He was.²⁰⁶

White does not claim Christ had no advantage over fallen man, but that any such advantages are available to man--if he is willing to be in subjection.²⁰⁷ Man enters into Christ's twofold advantage--**[Page 275]** divine-human union and (eventual) sinlessness-by exercising "the faith of Jesus," which he receives as a gift.

The union of the divine with the human nature is one of the most precious and most mysterious truths of the plan of redemption.²⁰⁸

Christ took upon himself human nature, but daily he linked it with the divine nature.²⁰⁹

All this could be, because Christ laid hold of the nature of man, and partook of the divine attributes, and planted His cross between humanity and divinity. . . .

Jesus came to bring moral power to combine with human effort, and in no case are his followers to allow themselves to lose sight of Christ, who is their example in all things.²¹⁰

It is significant that Christ yielded up the independent exercise of His divine powers so completely as to make necessary the daily linking of His human nature with the divine.²¹¹ Only thus could He exemplify the daily partaking of the divine attributes by which fallen man receives "moral power" to "combine with [his] human effort." Moreover, since man can receive this moral power only as he remains in a state of repentance,²¹² Christ likewise exemplified **[Page 276]** the experience of repentance.

He had taken the steps which every sinner must take, in conversion, repentance and baptism. He himself had no sins of which to repent, ...But he was our example. . .²¹³

This concept of total example in divine human relations is the principle behind White's enormous emphasis upon divine-human cooperation which, particularly following Minneapolis, became her dominant theme. It is difficult to know which she referred to more often, "cooperation" or "perfection." These represent the process²¹⁴ and product of union of the human with the divine will. [Page 277]

. . . If we repent of our transgression, and receive Christ as . . . personal saviour, we become one with Him, and our will is brought into harmony with the divine will. We become partakers of the life of Christ, . . . This life is the mystical union and cooperation of the divine with the human.²¹⁵

The MYSTICAL UNION and COOPERATION of the DIVINE with the HUMAN is the nerve of White's understanding of righteousness by faith, as it is of perfection and restoration of the divine image, which also pervade her writings. To overlook the intense concentration upon the Divine-Human Substitute-Exemplar is to fail utterly to grasp her consistency in combining an emphasis upon obedience and the necessity of effort with emphatic warnings against righteousness by one's own works.²¹⁶ The context of the above statement is pregnant with [Page 278] Great Controversy-covenant implications, some of which follow.

He took human nature. He became flesh even as we are. . . . Christ lived a life of complete humanity in order that he might stand as a representative.

Had He not been fully human, Christ could not have been our substitute. He could not have worked out in humanity that perfection of character which it is the privilege of all to reach. . . . Christ did nothing that human nature may not do if it partakes of the divine nature. . . .

. . . (M)an was placed on vantage ground. . . . Through Christ, man was severed from the slavery of the hateful apostate. For all who believe in Christ A victory was gained. They would no longer be counted as sinners, sons of rebellion, but as sons of God, through their acceptance of Christ. . . .

It man will cooperate with God by returning willingly to his loyalty, and obeying the commandments, God will receive him as a son . . . reinstated in God's favor, being made partakers of the divine nature. . . . And the life which Christ offers us is more perfect, more full, and more complete than was the life which Adam forfeited by transgression.²¹⁷

This summary of White's covenant concept, is based on the great Substitute-Exemplar. Two threads predominate: the objective, substitutionary life and death, and the "vantage ground" experience which comes through cooperation with God in the divine-human union made possible by Calvary. Effected only through His daily mediation, declared righteousness is clearly revealed, but reinstatement is subject to acceptance of the covenant conditions.²¹⁸ Most significant is the linking of perfection with a loyalty which is spelled OBEDIENCE,²¹⁹ and comes about through the presence of Christ In the life of the [Page 279] Christian.²²⁰ Thus, it is His righteousness and loyalty which the sinner receives as a gift, through- faith- in the Substitute-Exemplar and by receiving the covenant provisions and accepting its conditions.²²¹

Original Sin and Perfectionism²²²

The role of the doctrine of original sin in initiating the [Page 280] contemporary debate over perfection is indicated by Paxton:

In this phase of the conflict there was a serious recognition of original sin and no uncertain repudiation of perfectionism.²²³

- (1) The reality of original sin became embedded in Adventist theology among such scholars as Heppenstall and Ford.
- (2) The corollary of this position was a clear repudiation of the possibility of moral perfection in this life In these two features there took place a breakthrough into

The Theology Crisis

Reformation theology such as has not been seen in the history of the Adventist church.²²⁴

Thus, the doctrine of original sin, which determines the Reformationist doctrine of righteousness by faith and of the nature of Christ, requires the repudiation of any “possibility of moral perfection in this life.” Note Paxton’s implications:

The awareness of original sin caused Brinsmead to reject the whole idea of reaching a state of perfection in order to be ready for the judgment.²²⁵

1. Brinsmead was forced to accept the position of Heppenstall, Ford, and others on the question of perfection. Although he had taught a *modified* perfectionism (i.e., perfection in the-judgment but not before) . . . Heppenstall and Ford were right: there could be no perfection until Christ returns.

2. Using the Reformation gospel as a canon, Brinsmead and his colleagues came to the conclusion that the traditional Adventist way of treating “righteousness by faith” was in harmony with Roman Catholic theology.²²⁶

The doctrine of original sin--which in an embryonic form caused Brinsmead in the 1960’s to deviate from White on the relation between perfection and the judgment--matured in the early 1970’s to erupt in a wholesale but logical (“forced”) repudiation of perfection, his former central concern.²²⁷ Thus Brinsmead found himself [Page 281] aligned with Reformation theology--Formula of Concord as interpreted by Buchanan--which he used as a “canon” to conclude the traditional SDA view to be papal.²²⁸ That he did not consequently brand White as an arch-heretic can only be explained by his acknowledgment of her prophetic gift which makes heretical error unthinkable (but does not assure him of her theological adequacy).²²⁹

Illogical Arguments

Considerable confusion results from numerous “straw men” [Page 282] introduced into the contemporary dialog on perfection and original sin. Note the following amazing questions:

According to Ellen White, Paul attained the ideal point of a perfect man. . . . Perfect? Was he so beyond this world in nature and life that we would have felt uncomfortable in his presence? Was he so above the world as never to be tossed and stirred by sorrow and trial?²³⁰

Such questions, with their bizarre implications, illustrate the emotional level at which the subject of perfection is often discussed. The following counter-questions reveal the irrationality involved:²³¹ Was Jesus any less perfect because sinners heard Him gladly and felt comfortable “in His presence?” or was He “so above the world as never to be tossed and stirred by sorrow and trial?” If not, how are these questions relevant? Strong personal revulsion against perfection as a symbol of “holier than thou” attitudes may explain the first question,²³² but the second, regarding ‘release from “sorrow and trial,” is incredible. Even the doctrine of perfection of the flesh, against which White strongly warns,²³³--which warnings are used against the moral and spiritual perfection she advocated²³⁴--would hardly provide release from sorrow. Moreover, those identified as perfectionists have no sympathy with any perfection-of-the-flesh concept. Indeed, their arguments concerning “sinful flesh” pointedly deny the holy flesh idea.

Among the numerous caricatures against which Reformationists [Page 283] inveigh with all their might, is that belief in the restoration of the divine image makes believers ‘little Christs.’²³⁵ This constitutes a most serious indictment of White, whose writings are permeated with statements and admonitions regarding restoration of the divine image--central pillar of the Great Controversy concept.²³⁶

By the power of the Holy Spirit the moral image of God is to be perfected in the character. *We are to be wholly transformed into the likeness of Christ.*²³⁷

The Theology Crisis

The knowledge of God as revealed in Christ works transformation of character. His knowledge, received will re-create the soul in the image of God.²³⁸

Note that this is the theme of Desire of Ages.²³⁹

All who received Him would partake of His nature, and be conformed to His character.²⁴⁰

Where this oneness exists, it is evidence that the image of God is being restored in humanity, ...²⁴¹

Perfection Does NOT Mean

Lack of any clear definition of perfection and the considerable variation in how its advocates appear to understand it, contribute to the emergence of “straw men.”²⁴² In White, perfection has no **[Page 284]** “absolute” connotation--either now or after the coming of Christ much less does it imply equality with God or Christ!

And this advancement may not only be continued during this present life, but it may go forward during the eternal ages.²⁴³

With our limited powers we are to be as holy in our sphere as God is holy in his sphere.²⁴⁴

They behold the Saviour, and by beholding become changed into His likeness. . . . We should strive to be perfect in our sphere, as He was perfect in His sphere . . . form[ing] characters that are a reflection of the divine character.²⁴⁵

Thus, perfection involves reflection, having nothing to do with capacities or powers, which vary greatly. Moreover, White clearly, states that none will ever equal the pattern, holding rather to a perfect reflection of that pattern.²⁴⁶ Perfection does not mean lack of weakness, but *victory in weakness*.²⁴⁷ Indeed, the character of Christ is to be restored in our “fallen natures,” not in perfected flesh.²⁴⁸ This is why Christ; took the fallen nature. Neither does **[Page 285]** perfection mean release from conflict and temptation, any more than it meant this to Christ. It means *victory in conflict*.²⁴⁹

Bear in mind that the time will never come when the shadow of Satan will not be cast athwart our pathway to obstruct our faith and eclipse the light coming from the Sun of Righteousness. Our faith must not stagger, . . .²⁵⁰

Just as faith has nothing to do with feeling,²⁵¹ even so, perfection of faith has nothing to do with feeling. None will ever feel that they are perfect.

The Lord does not design that we shall ever feel that we have reached the full measure of the stature of Christ. Throughout all eternity, we are to grow in knowledge of Him who is the head. . . . (W)e must feel our poverty.²⁵²

The nearer we come to Jesus, and the more clearly we discern the purity of His character, the more clearly shall we see the exceeding sinfulness of sin, and the less shall we feel like exalting ourselves. There will be a continual reaching out of the soul after God, a continual, earnest, heartbreaking confession of sin and humbling of the heart before Him.²⁵³

The Theology Crisis

The degree of perfection is determined by the degree of repentance and reaching out for His righteousness.²⁵⁴ Moreover, “The [Page 286] Christian will feel the promptings of sin,” but by looking to Christ, we shall gain the victory as surely as did Jesus. . . .²⁵⁵ Christ continually faced temptation without responding as an example of the ultimate victory He intends to give the believer. Note:

There are thoughts and feelings suggested and aroused by Satan that annoy even the best of men; but if they are not cherished, if they are repulsed as hateful, the soul is not contaminated with guilt, . . .²⁵⁶

But while Satan can solicit, he cannot compel to sin. . . . The tempter can never compel us to do evil. . . . The will must consent, faith must let go its hold . . .²⁵⁷

Perfection thus involves the development of faith relations so complete that the individual ceases to respond to external or internal promptings to sin, which are hated by him.²⁵⁸ Note that this involves repudiation of one’s own righteousness:

Perfection through our own good works we can-never attain. The soul who sees Jesus by faith, repudiates his own righteousness.²⁵⁹

Perfection DOES Mean

Perfection means entire cooperation with Christ in the work of overcoming and counteracting the work of Satan.²⁶⁰ In this [Page 287] cooperation²⁶¹ strenuous effort is called for, but the faculties used, the needed motivation, and the energy all come from Him.²⁶²

Through the grace of God and their own diligent effort, they must be conquerors in the battle with evil.²⁶³

None need fail of attaining, in his sphere, to perfection of Christian character. By the sacrifice of Christ, provision . . . through cooperation with Divinity human beings may obtain complete victory.²⁶⁴

The Spirit’s energy works in the heart, and leads the inclinations toward Jesus. . . -. It is the work of the human agent to cooperate with divine agencies. As soon as we incline our will to harmonize with God’s will, the grace of Christ is supplied to cooperate with our resolve. But it is not to be a substitute to do our work. . . .²⁶⁵

Such cooperative action in response to divine initiative²⁶⁶ requires continual death to self in the denial of one’s own independent will and inclination.²⁶⁷ Indeed, one can only “find energy at the cross of Christ.”²⁶⁸ The cross is thus both objective and subjective,²⁶⁹ [Page 288] for only as the believer unites with Christ in death to self, can he rise, energized to live above sin.

God’s work of refining and purifying must go on until his servants are so humbled so dead to self . . . God brings men over the ground again and again, increasing the pressure until perfect harmony and transformation of character bring them into harmony with Christ.²⁷⁰

Thus, just as “self -exaltation is the key to his rebellion,”²⁷¹ the key to perfection is cooperation accompanied by a humility which instead of making self . . . [the] center,” makes “Christ [the] center,”²⁷² for every thought and action. As total rejection of egotism was the basis of Christ’s condemnation of sin in “sinful flesh,”²⁷³ so perfection of the believer results from a total rejection of egotism, the only force that can resist the divine initiative and power.²⁷⁴ This context gives insight into the next statements;

The Theology Crisis

The expulsion of sin is the act of the soul itself. True, we have no power to free ourselves from Satan's control; but when we desire to be set free . . . the powers of the soul are imbued with the divine energy of the Holy Spirit, and they obey the dictates of the will in fulfilling the [Page 289] will of God.²⁷⁵

Love is the agency through which God works to draw the heart to him. It is the power by which he expels sin from the soul. . . . (H)is plan . . . is dependent upon the cooperation of his human agents.²⁷⁶

Thus, the essence of perfection is the merger of man's will with Christ's in such a manner as to restore the body temple, with its electro-chemical system, to the full and final control of the Holy Spirit,²⁷⁷ who acts through man's own faculties in expelling sin from the soul by the motive power of divine love. Perfection can also be seen as the unbroken exercise of a faith which²⁷⁸ working by love purifies and keeps pure the soul from every stain of sin or disloyalty to God's authority.²⁷⁹

Love to Christ will be the spring of action. . . . (T)hey do not ask for the lowest standard. but aim at perfect conformity to the will of their Redeemer.²⁸⁰

The completeness of Christian character is attained when the impulse -o help and bless others springs constantly from within.²⁸¹

Perfection Before Christ's Coming

Concerning SDA theology, Paxton states:

There emerged a small group of Adventist scholars who acknowledged the original-sin problem and who said it would remain until the coming of Christ.²⁸²

A study of Brinsmead's theology after this turning point reveals a *passionate antagonism* toward the medieval *gratia infusa* (infused grace) and all forms of perfectionism.²⁸³

In 1975, Mrs. Desmond Ford issued a paper . . . [which] majored on three highly contentious areas. (1) It clearly repudiated the doctrine of the sinful nature of Christ. (2) It stated clearly that righteousness by faith is *justification alone*. (3) [It] . . . repudiated the notion of perfection in this life.²⁸⁴

Compare the above statements with White:

Beholding Christ ... he becomes dissatisfied with everything but perfection (M)ore and more earnestly he strives to be like him

The human agent sees what he has to contend with a strange power opposed to the idea of attaining the perfection that Christ holds out.²⁸⁵

[Page 291] Through defects in the character, Satan works to gain control of the whole mind, and . . . he is constantly seeking to deceive the followers of Christ with his fatal sophistry that it is impossible for them to overcome.²⁸⁶

Fear of legalism is legitimate, for it is the basis of all false religion.²⁸⁷ Attempting to avoid it by opposing "all forms of perfection as "perfectionism" and "legalism" corresponds to White's depiction of the work of the enemy of righteousness. Her consistent advocacy of perfection over the years stands as a sublime bulwark; notice the dates of the following quotations:

The Theology Crisis

Both thought and action will be necessary, if you would attain to perfection of character.²⁸⁸ (1879)

We are to love perfection because Jesus is the embodiment of perfection, the great center of attraction.²⁸⁹ (1893)

The Holy Spirit ever abides with him who is seeking for perfection of Christian character. . . . He has borne our sin, in order that through him we might have moral excellence, and attain unto the perfection of Christian character. Our Righteousness is our substitute and surety.²⁹⁰ (1897)

. . . (W)hen we see that it is our privilege to attain Christian perfection, should we not strive to reach the standard?²⁹¹ (1899)

Through sin the whole human organism is deranged. . . .As the sacrifice on our behalf was complete, so our restoration from the defilement of sin is to be complete.²⁹² (1904)

No soul can enter into the heavenly courts who does a not . . . strive to be perfect, even as God is perfect.²⁹³ (1909)

[Page 292] Glorious is the hope before the believer as he advances by faith toward the heights of Christian perfection.²⁹⁴ (1911)

The Great Controversy-covenant context reflected in the above statements which point to perfection through the combined substitutionary-mediatorial role of Christ, gives penetrating significance to White's understanding of "the faith of Jesus," which is ultimately to result in a final demonstration of God's original purpose in creating man.²⁹⁵ Evident over four decades before Minneapolis, this concept was mature by 1858.²⁹⁶ The final major development in her holistic concept with its implications regarding preparation of the whole man for a final demonstration of the character of God came through her health vision in 1863.²⁹⁷ Note the final demonstration of the unmodified continuity of her basic concept in the following 1862 statement and the 1898 quote from that book which Ford and this writer agree represents her most balanced treatment of the nature of Christ and righteousness by faith:²⁹⁸

Jesus sits as refiner and purifier of his people, and when his image is reflected in them perfectly, they are perfect and holy, and prepared for translation.²⁹⁹

The very image of God is to be reproduced in humanity. The honor of God, the honor of Christ, is involved in the perfection of the character of His people.³⁰⁰

¹ An astounding 87 double-column pages in the Comprehensive Index to the Writings Of Ellen G. White relate to Christ, as compared to: Law, 33; Love, 23; Faith, 10 ½; Righteousness, 6½; Sanctification, 3 ½; Justification, 1; Obedience, 4 ½; and Works, 3. Justification and righteousness together comprise three pages less than faith; while all eight items total two pages less than Christ, which reflects her dynamic emphasis upon Him.

² The works of Ford, Brinsmead and Paxton all reveal this same pattern. Moreover righteousness (howbeit always of Christ) is generally in a negative setting of protest against the possibility of measuring Up. A

positive centering upon the cross is never missing but a forensic-only stance dictates a focus upon the history rather than the person and ministry of Christ, which characterizes white.

³ Cf. this study, 142ft.

⁴ Review, SM, 5/26/04; Cf. this study, 140-150, passim.

⁵ Review, 3:615, 10/18/98.

⁶ Selected Messages, 1:389-390, 1893.

⁷ This study, 50.

⁸ Selected Messages, 1:330, 1892.

⁹ See this study., 37, 136, 139n

¹⁰ Present Truth, vol. 3, #5, 14. For his derisive retort to a critic of this statement, see An Answer, 134-136.

¹¹ Review, 4:77, 8/8/99; Cf. Desire of Ages, 486-487, 347; Note: “They do not surrender. . . . (T)he blessing comes when by faith the soul surrenders itself to God.” (Review, 5:471, 11/19/08.)

¹² Signs, 4:140, 8/22/00.

¹³ Ibid., 4:145, 9/12/00; see also this study, 82-83, 90ff.

¹⁴ Signs, 2:382.

¹⁵ This study, 48-50, 53-54, 126, 164, 183-186, 194ff.

¹⁶ Review, 3:13, 1/24/93; Douglass emphasizes the importance of the right use of a right faith, the value of which is determined by its object. (Herbert Douglass, Faith, Saying Yes to God, Nashville, Southern Publishing. Association., 108, 30.) Faith is treated as a divine gift, involving man’s intellect, will ‘and trust, and represents “the whole man saying Yes to God.” (Ibid., 32-34.) Shifting faith from God is distrust, or rebellion. (35-36.) True faith is a loyal response to Christ as Lord, involving the capitulation of the rebel and results in a transfusion of His power to transform the life. (41-47.)

¹⁷ Cf. this study, 54; Steps to Christ, 63-64.; Selected Messages, 1:393-398.

¹⁸ Signs, 2:232, 7/27/88; Note that “faith in Christ is not the work of nature but the work of God, the science of eternal realities,” and involves both justifying, sanctifying power. (Review, 5:86.)

¹⁹ Review, 2:257, 10/30/88.

²⁰ Ibid., 1:521, 5/12/85.

²¹ See White index.

²² Review, 1:446, 7/22/84.

²³ Ibid., 6:329-330, 31/18/13.

²⁴ Signs, 2:402, 8/18/90.

²⁵ This study, 169ff. 0The imitation of the Spirit is the impartation of the life of Christ.” (Review, 5:471.) Note also the relationship to the gospel of Christ, Spirit, and Word as subjectively interpreted: “The Bible contains the science of salvation. Christ’s Word is the bread . . . Christ supplies the life-blood of the heart, and the Holy Spirit gives nerve-power. . . . The Gospel, believed, and lived, means eternal life... . fruits of the Spirit. . . . The disciples of Christ are to bring the perfection of His character into their characters. . . . To those who obey the Word of God is the tree of life.” (Signs, 4;150.) The greatest single weakness in Reformationism is its failure to establish the Word as it interprets itself under the ministry of the Spirit as the primary protection against heresy-rather than a philosophical-theological structure. (See this study, Appendix C.)

²⁶ Review, 5:419., 6/11/08.

²⁷ Desire of Ages, 347; See also this study, 148, 169.

²⁸ Ministry of Healing, 485

²⁹ Ibid., 136, Cf. 84.

³⁰ Review, 5:481, 12/31/08.

³¹ This study, 75ff., 93ff., Ct. 216ff.

³² Steps to Christ, 27.

³³ Review, 2:387, 4/1/90; Cf. Steps to Christ, 26; this study, 148.

³⁴ That “Repentance includes a sorrow for sin and a turning away from it,” (steps to Christ, 23.) reveals the necessity of the subjective element in justification. Even confession, acknowledged as the basis of justification, “will not be acceptable to God without sincere repentance and reformation.” (Ibid. 39.) Though repeatedly acknowledged by Reformationists, they do not seem to see its implications: that to “justify the ungodly” cannot represent a forensic-only transaction. (This study, 194ff.)

³⁵ Signs, 2:507, 8/22/92.

³⁶ Selected Messages, 1:393-394.

³⁷ Signs, 2:409, 11/3/90.

³⁸ This study, 130ff.

³⁹ Ibid., 216ff.

⁴⁰ Review, 3:15, 1/31/93.

⁴¹ Mount of Blessing, 141-142.

⁴² “This valuable treasure of righteousness . . . will not come without sincere and earnest seeking. It is not something that will develop naturally in the human heart. There must be most diligent and persevering efforts put forth by every individual. . . . The merits of Jesus plead for the repentant sinner; and to all who receive the Saviour he will give power to enable them to walk in the paths of righteousness and peace. The Word of God is the directory to Heaven.” (Signs, 2;206.) But note that faith alone, based upon grace alone, is always the only condition of justification. Effort is never a requirement in addition to faith, but represents the internal demand of a conflict of the will over reception and exercise of the gift of faith. Efforts which follow (in sanctification) are essential to salvation, but represent fruits of the Spirit (who motivates to will

and empowers to do) made possible only by continued acceptance of Christ's merits and which reflect only His glory.

⁴³ Christ's Object Lessons, 331

⁴⁴ Desire of Ages, 497-498.

⁴⁵ Cf. this study, 219.

⁴⁶ "Post-Palmdale #1, 14, (_Ford 5 #1).

⁴⁷ Loc. cit.; Cf. "Sin in Believers." 3. (Ford 1 #6).

⁴⁸ This study, 184.

⁴⁹ Cf. Ibid., 153ff., 205ff.

⁵⁰ Review, 1:437, 1/24/84; Cf. 1:523; Testimonies, 5:70. 1882.

⁵¹ This study, 179ff; Note.. "With his own life Christ has bought man, and given him a probation in which to work out his own salvation. . . . He has given his Son that we may reach this standard. He has made every provision necessary. . . . The perfection of character which God requires is the fitting up of the entire being as a temple or the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. . . . Then cultivate the gift of faith. . . . (O)vercome every practice which mars the soul temple." (Review, 4:235-236, 11/6/00.)

⁵² Signs, 1:85, 1/30/79; Cf. this study, 149; Review, 2:175, 1887.

⁵³ Review, loc. cit.

⁵⁴ This study, 169ff.

⁵⁵ Review 1:349, 1/9/83; Note: In a recent interview, Venden points out the danger of a forensic-only concept of justification by faith, for it ignores the meaning of faith, which involves the subjective element. "This is one of Dr. Heppenstall's largest points-there is no such thing as mere forensic 'justification by faith,'" he declares, suggesting the term, "justification by relationship," which he feels might be more acceptable to the various parties involved. ("Venden talks to Insight," Part II, Insight, Review and Herald Publishing., Association., May 15, 1979, 11.) Since, however, Reformationists are not so concerned about terms as preserving their understanding of the purity of the gospel itself, such change of terminology would not resolve the conflict.(Cf. this study, 245, 249, 164ff.)

⁵⁶ Review, 2:436, 11/4/90; Cf. this study, 175.

⁵⁷ Cf. SDA BC, 6:1070-1071, MS 21, 1891; Note that this is the same MS that warns against distinctions between Justification and Sanctification (see this study, 157n). Note also that justification is there equated with adoption, an alternative model to the new birth thus identifying justification with the new birth. (Ibid., 211ff.)

⁵⁸ Signs, 2:495, 6/16/90.

⁵⁹ Desire of Ages, 176.

⁶⁰ Great Controversy, 527.

⁶¹ “The assaults of Satan are fierce and determined, his delusions are terrible; . . . but it is needful for them to be placed in the furnace of fire; their earthliness must be consumed that the image of Christ may be perfectly reflected.” (Ibid., 621.)

⁶² Review, 3:615, 10/18/98.

⁶³ Signs, 4:94, 2/14/00

⁶⁴ Signs, 2,198, 3-23/881 Cf. 2.195.

⁶⁵ Cf. this study 221n.

⁶⁶ Testimonies, 5;741, 1889.

⁶⁷ Review, 2:175, 12/13/87.

⁶⁸ But that this does not preclude a spontaneous life, see this study, 368n.

⁶⁹ Cf. this study, 225ff; Note; “How to exercise faith should be made very plain. To every promise of God there are conditions. . . .Faith that enables us to receive God’s gifts, is itself ‘a gift. It grows as it- is exercised in appropriating the Word of God. In order to strengthen faith. we must often bring it in contact with the Word.” (Review, 5:479, 12/24/98.)

⁷⁰ This study, 151.

⁷¹ Cf. this study, 177ff.

⁷² Signs, 4:65, 10/4/99.

⁷³ John A. Clifford and Russell R, Standish, *Conflicting Concepts of Righteousness by Faith in the Seventh-day Adventist Church: Australasian Division*, hereinafter *Conflicting Concepts*, Victoria, Australia: Published by the authors, 1976, Biblical Research Institute Paper. 117, 127; Cf. this study, 184, 231ff.

⁷⁴ Review, 3:489; Cf. this study, 178.

⁷⁵ This study, 231ff.

⁷⁶ This study, 75ff; Cf. Signs, 3:366, 3/11/97.

⁷⁷ Surrender of the body temple to the Spirit permits a sharing of God’s love. But this is not to be confused with feeling or affection. (See this study, 100-102.)

⁷⁸ Selected Messages, 2:241, L.7, 1892; Cf. this study, 95-96.

⁷⁹ Testimonies, 1:167, 1857.

⁸⁰ Bonhoeffer places in dynamic focus the central point in common between White and Reformationists; “First, the Christian is the man who no longer seeks his salvation, his deliverance, his justification in himself, but in Jesus Christ alone. He knows that God’s Word in Jesus Christ pronounces him guilty, even when he does not feel his guilt, and God’s Word in Jesus Christ pronounces him not guilty and righteous, even when he does not feel that he is righteous at all.”(Dietrich Bonhoeffer. *Life Together*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954, 21-22

⁸¹ Signs, 1:209, 1/13/81.

⁸² Patriarchs & Prophets, 421.

⁸³ Review, 1:413, 4/15/84.

⁸⁴ Ibid., 4:389.

⁸⁵ Desire of Ages, 466

⁸⁶ Signs, 1:442.

⁸⁷ Cf. this study, 179ff.

⁸⁸ Review, 2:381

⁸⁹ Ibid., 2:167, 11/8/87; 2:169, 11/15/87; 2:253, 10/16/88; 4:221, 9/25/00; Signs, 2:268, 3/11/89; 2:43 4, 5/18/91; Patriarchs & Prophets, 85, 1890.

⁹⁰ Review, 1:508, 2/17/85; Cf. Steps to Christ, 65, 29, 1892; Note: Ford's emphasis upon repentance harmonizes with White's conviction that "Our hearts are naturally sinful and slothful in the service of Christ." (Testimonies, 2:710, 1871.) He often quotes: "Repentance is a daily continuous exercise, and must be so until mortality is swallowed up in immortality. Repentance and humiliation, and sorrow of soul must be our daily meat and drink, till we cease to carry with us so many imperfections and failures." (Review, 8/19, 1971; see "Sin in Believers," Ford 1 #6.) But he fails adequately to recognize the paradox involved in White. (Cf. this study. 333ff.)

⁹¹ Review, 5:315; Cf. 249

⁹² Signs, 2:409, 11/3/90.

⁹³ Ministry of Healing, 85; Cf. 65-66; Selected Messages, 1:351.

⁹⁴ SDA BC, 6:1068, MS 28, 1905.

⁹⁵ Signs, 2:268, 3/11/89; 2:434, 5/18/91; Review, 4:221, 9/25/00.

⁹⁶ Review, 3:210, 12/4/94; Security can be claimed only by one "who has fully surrendered," for it is only in relation to Christ that one is secure. The sense of security ("consciousness of Christ's saving power") is not the security itself, but the reward of faith-submission to God's Word. (Cf. this study, 179ff.) Joy is thus "the result of the consciousness of the presence of Christ" which results when "the saving power of Christ's righteousness is rightly understood [through faith] by experimental knowledge."

⁹⁷ Cf. this study, 329, 332, 342ff; Cf. 202-205

⁹⁸ Signs, 1:328.

⁹⁹ Ibid., 4:428.

¹⁰⁰ This study, 169.

¹⁰¹ SDA BC, 6:1111, 1890.

¹⁰² Signs, 4:471, 1/20/09; Cf. 1:389, 11/15/83.

¹⁰³ Documents, 40-41.

¹⁰⁴ Youth's Instructor, February, 1873, v. 21, #2, 12.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., March, 1874, v. 22, 0, 20.

¹⁰⁶ Testimonies, 5:421, 1885.

¹⁰⁷ Selected Messages, 1:322, 12/5/92; Cf. Youth's Instructor, August 11, 18, 1894, and July 20, 1899.

¹⁰⁸ Cf. this study, 143.

¹⁰⁹ Intending to establish the objective (forensic) nature of righteousness and the fallacy of including the subjective, Ford states that "perfect righteousness can be ours only by accepting what Jesus has already done." (See Documents, Passim.) Cf. the findings of McMahon and the Verdict editorial staff, this study, Appendix B.

¹¹⁰ Review, 1:141, 2/24/74; Note that self-discipline, which was to have been central to Adam's revelation of the character of God (see this study, 74.) became central to Christ's demonstration (Ibid., 98ff, 267ff., Cf. Review, 2:151, 9/22/87.) and is a key both to man's salvation and to his reflection of the character of God. So vital is this thought in White that a chronological selection of references is provided showing the consistency of her emphasis: Testimonies, 4:215, 235, 1876; 4:574, 611, 1879; Review, 1:237-238, 6/10/80; 1:515, 4/21/85; 2:33, 4/6/86; Testimonies. 4:488, 1889; Review, 2:513, 8/18/91; 3:235, 3/5/95; 3:357-358, 5/12/96, also 378-380; Desire of Ages, 73, 1898

¹¹¹ Patriarchs & Prophets, 69, 1890.

¹¹² Signs, 3:269, 2/20/96.

¹¹³ Review, 4:187, 6/5/00.

¹¹⁴ Signs, 4:34, 5/10/99.

¹¹⁵ Note her emphasis that 'in His power, humanity can obey.'

¹¹⁶ "That Holy Thing," (Ford 7 #3); Cf. "When Probation closes," passim, (Ford 1 # 1).

¹¹⁷ Documents, 33.

¹¹⁸ Review, 1:143, 7/28/74.

¹¹⁹ "Sinful Nature," 7, (Ford 3 #8).

¹²⁰ Ibid., 3-7. Ford quotes the Review statement as follows: "*When Adam was assailed by the tempter in Eden he was without the taint of sin . . . Christ, in the wilderness of temptation, stood in Adam's place to bear the test he failed to endure.*" (Ibid., 8, emphasis his.) Note his complete reversal of her meaning by setting up a likeness rather than a contrast. The ellipsis removes White's detailed contrast between Adam, whose "organs and faculties" "were equally developed, and harmoniously balanced," and Christ. who after 4,000 years of degeneracy came to earth . . . with the weaknesses of fallen man upon him,..."

¹²¹ Signs, 3:264, 1/16/96.

¹²² Review, 4:293, 5/7/01; Cf. 1:193, 7/28/74.

¹²³ Signs, 4:188, 7/10/01.

¹²⁴ Ibid., 4:253, 7/23/02; Cf. SDA BC, 5:1129-1130, MS 140, 1903.

¹²⁵ Review, 5:120P 3/9/05; Cf. *Ministry of Healing*, 180., 1905.

¹²⁶ Selected Messages, 1:256, 1/9/981 Cf. Spirit of Prophecy, 2:39, 1860; To understand White's concept of Christ's nature requires a serious acceptance of its paradoxical dimensions. A most vital aspect of His uniqueness, in her view, is that the Sinless One (sinless spiritually morally, and in character) did indeed take upon Himself the sinful biological nature (through inheritance) without in any way impairing His sinlessness. The emotional factors surrounding this issue make it virtually impossible even for some who do not hold the historic doctrine of original sin to grasp this paradox (many SDA's who disagree with Reformationists on other points hold the post-fall position to be irreconcilable with a sinless nature and to threaten Christ's purity and perfection); but it is all but impossible for those *who do* to conceive its possibility. Thus, a review of White's response to that doctrine is in order for any who face this impasse (see this study, 102ff). Do not confuse White's view with the popular concept which assumes such involves inherent moral pollution which is just as anathema to White as to those who deny the fallen nature.

¹²⁷ See this study, 249.

¹²⁸ Youth's Instructor, 12/20/00, v. 48, #50, 394.

¹²⁹ Ibid., 7/29/97, V. 45, #29, 234.

¹³⁰ Review, 4:201, 7/17/00.

¹³¹ This argument for a post-fall biological nature thus just as truly argues for a pre-fall spiritual nature, primary characteristic of which is union between the divine and human through the body temple. The post-fall biological nature is focused upon because it alone is contested. Before the 1940's SDA's were agreed upon a post-fall biological nature and a pre-fall spiritual nature. (For a summary of Robert Hancock's history of a theological change in the 1940's and 1950's which denies the former to protect the latter, see this study, Appendix D; Cf. 7-8, 10, with 17-21.)

¹³² "This was not done by going out of Himself to another, but by taking humanity unto Himself. Thus Christ gave to humanity an existence out of Himself. To bring humanity into Christ, to bring the fallen race into oneness with divinity is the work of redemption. Christ took human nature..." (Review, 5:228, 4/5/06)

¹³³ See this study, 256n.

¹³⁴ Documents, 25.

¹³⁵ Ibid., 38, author's emphasis.

¹³⁶ See A. Leroy Moore, "Righteousness by, Faith--Is the Adventist Concept Unique?" Part IV, pp. 6-7, unpublished articles, 1975.

¹³⁷ Desire of Ages, 49; See this study, 292, regarding Desire of Ages "setting forth a perfectly balanced position."

¹³⁸ This study, 247.

¹³⁹ Desire of Ages, 116-117, author's emphasis, Note that Christ's Sinless character (spiritual nature) is in paradoxical contrast to the inheritance of a fallen (biological) nature.

¹⁴⁰ Cf. this study, 41, 242ff.

¹⁴¹ Ibid., 243; Cf. 42ff.

¹⁴² By the same token, to hold sanctification to be greatly inferior to justification is to fail to comprehend the true greatness of justification and its organic relation to sanctification. (see this study, 147ff.)

¹⁴³ Documents, 25.

¹⁴⁴ Loc. cit.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid., 34

¹⁴⁶ This study, 251.

¹⁴⁷ Note Jones' 1895 protest against such an "immaculate man": "The great trouble with heathenism was . . . God was so far away. . . full of wrath. . . Then the papacy came in, the very incarnation of that enmity between man and God . . . [which] puts God and Christ so far away that nobody can come near them. . . . (T)he false idea that he is so holy that it would be entirely unbecoming in him to come near to us, and be possessed of such a nature as we have, . . . Mary must be born immaculate. . . then Christ must take his human nature in absolute sinlessness from her. But if he comes no nearer to us than in a sinless nature, that is a long way off; . . . It is true he is holy; he is altogether holy., But his holiness is not that kind that makes him afraid to be in company with people who are not holy, for fear he will get his holiness spoiled." (A.T. Jones, *The Third Angel's Message*, Angwin, California: Pacific Union College Press, 1977, 311; compilation by John and Elora Ford of sermons printed in *General Conference Bulletin*, 1895.) Jones thus places the shoe of Roman Catholic heresy on any who buy the "immaculate conception" concept.

¹⁴⁸ Documents, 32-40.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid., 30; A glaring example of confusion between "weakness and badness" is found in Ford's own work-see this study, 32-33.

¹⁵⁰ I.e., Austen G. Fletcher's response to Waggoner's use of Ps. 51:5 (to show the force of Rom. 1:3—"seed of David according to the flesh") in interpreting "likeness of sinful flesh" to mean flesh identical to fallen man's; Fletcher exclaims: "This use of Ps. 51:5 appalled me. . . . I found myself asking, When did the Lord lay upon Christ the iniquity of us all? When Christ assumed our nature, or on the cross? There is no doubt in Scripture. . . . On the cross! Besides, to associate the concepts of Ps. 51:5 with the circumstances of the birth of Jesus Christ is to suggest that both the Holy Spirit and Mary were involved in an act of sin. . . .", ("His Nature and Mine," Ford 6 #7; Cf. "The Humanity of Jesus," Ford 5 #5). This researcher is appalled that Fletcher could read Waggoner's statement in context and draw such extreme conclusions. He appears to have read into Waggoner the medieval Augustinian concept that original sin is transmitted through sexual intercourse! (Cf. *An Augustinian Reader*, Edited, with an Introduction by John J. Olmeara, Book 1. from *Nine Sermons of St. Augustine*, translated by Edmund Hill, 1958, Garden City, New York: Image Books, A Division of Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1973, 444-446; with "The Theanthropic Nature of Christ," by William Shedd, Ford 6 #5, which establishes the sinless nature on the basis that "there was no union of the sexes, and no sensual appetite.") Waggoner's theology protests this whole concept and its presuppositions. (See this study, 258ff; *The Ministry*, December, 1957, 11.)

Fletcher's long list of texts used to prove that Christ did not have a carnal-nature confirms the post-fall position as fully as it does his own. (For recent works demonstrating that "sinful flesh" does not involve "carnal nature," or a "carnal mind," see Wieland, "Some Vital Issues," 4-18, *passim*; Cf. Documents, 32 ' and Davis, *Was Jesus Really Like Us?* Were it not for such misunderstandings, Reformationists would doubtless recognize convergence at one pole of their thinking, with Jones, Waggoner, Wieland, Short and Douglass.

¹⁵¹ Letter 106, 1896.

¹⁵² Third Angel's message, 332-333.

¹⁵³ To fit the Reformationist position, White would have to state: “flesh, however not sinful flesh, but sinless flesh” which she does not.

¹⁵⁴ Signs, 4.153, 10/17/00; Cf. 4:260, 9/3/02, See this study, Appendix D.

¹⁵⁵ Third Angel’s Message, 332-333.

¹⁵⁶ It is circulated by Ford, together with an analytical study by his former student, Lyell Vernon Heise, who provides strong evidence for dating the letter Feb. 9, 1896 rather than 1895. (“The Christology of EGW Letter.8, 1895.” Ford 3 #5).

¹⁵⁷ SDA BC, 5:1128-1129.

¹⁵⁸ Cf. this study, 169ff, 245, 273-279; Bruno Steinweg devotes a third of his unpublished paper, “The Baker Letter” (N.d.) to examining White’s use of the word “propensity,” illustrating three distinct meanings: a) the appetites, passions, powers, or animal appetites corresponding to the lower faculties which “were divinely appointed when given to man,” (18) but which, designed for man’s good, must be kept under control by the higher faculties. (Cf. this study, 78-79.) b) The natural, hereditary inclinations of those biological powers as a result of Adam’s sin (17-18; Cf. this study, 93.) which can and must be subdued; and c) “Evil,” “sinful,” “selfish,” or “worldly,” dispositions to sin. (Cf. this study, 99.) It is the total absence of type “c” propensities, according to Steinweg, which marks Christ as “different from common humanity,” and of which White refers in her assertion: “Not for a moment was there in Him an evil propensity.” (20) He supports his position that it refers only to the latter class (“c”) by further examination of her use of the term “passions,” which she uses synonymously with propensities. (21-24)

¹⁵⁹ Cf. this study, 242-243

¹⁶⁰ SDA BC, 5:1128-1129.

¹⁶¹ Note, however, that Heise’s evidence, intended to show White deliberately refuted the Post-fall Position, actually supports that Position by explaining that her argument applies to Christ’s personal response to sin, thus not to His genetic inheritance. He correctly equates “corruption with “sin,” rather than with “sinful flesh.” Moreover, after listing the synonymous words and phrases used in the five paragraphs, he states: “From the above study it becomes clear that the term ‘propensities of sin,’ is used in association with words referring to that aspect of human nature which, by the effect of sin and corruption, responds to sin, encouraging Satan’s advances.” (Heise, Op. cit., 32.)

Thus “propensities of sin” are equated with “response to sin” and “corruption,” which is identified with “Sin.” That this is implied in the context can be seen by examining the words emphasized in paragraphs one and five. If “propensities” related to biological inheritance “not for one moment” would be meaningless, for nature does not change from one moment to the next. The full context reveals that White relates her concern to behavior of mind and heart rather than to genetic inheritance. Christ “could have fallen, but not for a moment was there in Him an evil propensity,” or desire (response encouraging Satan’s advance) to sin. When the “Prince of this world” came to Him, there was “nothing to respond to temptation. On not one occasion was there a response. . .” Thus White warns against any approach which even appears to threaten His sinless purity or to compromise His divinity.

¹⁶² Heise, Op. cit., 13-14 (Footnote quoted from Christ and His Righteousness, 26-27.) Heise’s unequivocal, “It cannot be denied,” appears to reflect his former teacher’s convictions rather than the context or Waggoner’s theology. (Cf. this study, 42ff.)

¹⁶³ Reformationists hold that Waggoner’s theology was basically correct at Minneapolis but that he changes almost immediately to “Catholic” theology. One of the best demonstrations of the falsity of this claim and the general error of their methodology is exhibited in a new book, E.J. Waggoner. The Myth and The Man.

(See this study, Appendix B; for a more general ‘discussion of the problems with their methodology, see Appendix C.)

¹⁶⁴ Christ and His Righteousness, 28-30; Note also how Jones differentiates between “sinful flesh” and “carnal mind”: “Adam had the mind of Jesus Christ in the garden; he had the divine mind, the divine And the human were united, sinlessly. . . . Thus man took the mind of Satan. In Jesus the mind of God is brought back once more to the sons of men; and Satan is conquered. . . . (A)ll the tendencies to sin that are in our flesh were in his flesh, drawing upon him to get him to consent to sin. Suppose he had consented to sin with his mind: What then? Then his mind would have been corrupted. . . . (H)e himself would have been entirely enslaved. . . . Satan reaches the mind, through the flesh; God reaches the flesh through the mind. . . . but until the drawing of our flesh is cherished, there is no sin.” (Third Angel’s Message, 227-228; Cf. this study, 102ff.)

In the same series, Jones emphasizes the fact that Satan’s mind “is the mind of self,” and that in “emptying himself, he [Christ] denied the mind of Satan. Though man is unable to empty himself, divinity can. The union of the human with the divine will accomplish the same thing it did in Christ.” Humility and choice are seen to be central here. After extensively quoting White’s “Life of Christ,” Jones states; “You see, we are on firm ground all the way, so that when it is said he took our flesh, but still was not a partaker of our passions [propensities], it is all straight, it is all correct; because his divine mind never consented to sin. And that mind is brought us by the Holy Spirit that is freely given unto us.” (Ibid., 333, 347-362; Cf. this study, 92ff.)

Concerning Reformationist claims, Christensen states: “...(T)heologians fail to distinguish between sinful tendencies and the natural impulses and desires of the body.” (The Faith of Jesus, 8.)

¹⁶⁵ Waggoner’s “never for a moment harbored an evil desire” assertion undermines Heise’s assumptions: a) White echoes almost his exact words; b) it is inconceivable that she would use such well-understood phraseology with a reverse meaning without in any way signalling such; moreover, c) the very structure-“never for a moment harbored”-demands an interpretation relating to mental activity rather than to (static) biological inheritance. (See this study, 260n.)

¹⁶⁶ Heise, Op. cit., 15-16.

¹⁶⁷ An even greater case might be established for White’s influence on Baker, but the fact of influence is hardly evidence that the one influenced faithfully reflects, (or even corresponds to) the ideas of the influencer, as any writer, teacher, or speaker can attest. Had Heise demonstrated what he took for granted, his paper would have some weight. Absence of such evidence causes his argument to backfire.

¹⁶⁸ “An Historical Note on the 1895 Baker Letter,” 1975, by Douglass, substantiates this point by analyzing White’s pattern of relating to Waggoner and other key denominational figures at least some of whom held his view. moreover, Douglass’ focus upon Desire of Ages and other statements written about the same time reveals a very significant pattern of harmony with Waggoner and Jones on the postfall position.

¹⁶⁹ Lyell Heise, “The Christology of E.G. White Letter 80 1895,11 53.

¹⁷⁰ Ibid., 18-20.

¹⁷¹ Review, 3:321.

¹⁷² Heise, Op. cit., 18

¹⁷³ For weaknesses-of methodology, see this work, Appendix C.

¹⁷⁴ Review, 3.421; Forty percent of this article, including all presented here, was printed later in Signs, (4:254) and Review, (5:323) In these repeated reprintings in modified form over a period of eleven years,

White significantly never saw fit to moderate the expression. (See also Medical Ministry. 181) “Sinful nature” is not to be confused with “carnal nature” or “carnal mind,” which involve experience in sin and reflect submission of the higher faculties to the lower. Christ never had a sinful, or “carnal” mind. Note that He took man’s nature “that He might restore to man the original mind which he lost in Eden. . . . Disobedience is not in accordance with the nature God gave to man in Eden.” (SDA BC, 7:926.) In thus taking man’s “sinful nature” (“sinful flesh”) He proposed to restore to man the “original mind,” which was a mind under the continual guidance of the Spirit by which it was able to exercise control over the body (flesh). (Cf. this study, 75ff, 106ff, 161ff.) A striking correlation can be seen between White and Jones. Note especially The Third Angel’s Message, 327-333, 347-353, 1895.

¹⁷⁵ This study, 148.

¹⁷⁶ Ibid., 84ff, 186a

¹⁷⁷ Ibid., 255.

¹⁷⁸ Ibid., 249-250n; The doctrine of original sin-not the clear teachings of the apostle Paul-appears to direct their concept of White.

¹⁷⁹ This study, 30, 46

¹⁸⁰ Ibid., 123ff.

¹⁸¹ Ibid., 231.

¹⁸² Desire of Ages 23.

¹⁸³ Ibid., 88.

¹⁸⁴ Ibid., 123.

¹⁸⁵ Ibid., 161; Though Christ’s pre-incarnate choice surrendered His will safely into the Father’s hands during infancy, the reality of His conflict from early childhood testifies to a conflict over the will, and the necessity of continually reaffirming that pre-incarnate choice, in the same way in which the penitent must struggle. (Desire of Ages, 147, 664; Ministry of Healing, 19.)-Note: “The human will of Christ would not have led him to the wilderness of temptation. . . . His human nature shrank from all these things as decidedly as ours...” (Signs, 3.160.) Christ’s humanity alone could never have endured this test; but his divine power, combined with humanity, gained in behalf of man an infinite victory. (Ibid., through the grace of God that came to him in answer to prayer...(Ibid., 3:53; Cf. this study, 75ff, 84ff, 244n, 272n.)

¹⁸⁶ Desire of Ages, 664.

¹⁸⁷ This study 258ff.

¹⁸⁸ This is the key to Waggoner and Jones’ theology; this study 10.

¹⁸⁹ Review 2:367.

¹⁹⁰ Ibid.1 5:227; Desire of Ages, 24.

¹⁹¹ Youth’s Instructor 4/25/01. V. 49, #17, 130

¹⁹² “Sinful Nature,” (Ford 3 #8.)

¹⁹³ Review 2:367, 2/18/90.

¹⁹⁴ White, MS 73, undated.

¹⁹⁵ SDA BC, 5:1130, L. 32, 1899.

¹⁹⁶ Desire of Ages, 116; Signs, 3:386, 5/27/97; Note that “the enticements which Christ resisted were those that we find it so hard to withstand.” It is clear that the basis for such “enticements” was the heredity of “sinful flesh,” (Cf. Signs, 4:153) however, and not a “carnal mind” (Cf. this study, 267n.) for Christ’s hatred of sin was absolute. (cf. *ibid.*, 242ff, 258ff.) Whatever electro-chemical impulses there may have been met with no response in Christ’s mind. Temptations were, however, “urged upon Him in as much greater degree as His character is superior to ours.” He need not have a craving for alcohol to understand the cravings of the inebriate. Note that His temptation to provide legitimate food to satisfy genuine cravings of appetite represented a struggle greater than that facing indulgent man. (Desire of Ages, 117; Review, 1:43-52.) Since sin represents the use or the desire to use any faculty independent of divine direction (See this study, 79ff.) the indulgence of even the desire for a companion through marriage, since contrary to His Father’s direction, would have violated the principle behind the seventh commandment, as would also permitting the mind to focus upon * the biological forces involved in His developing adolescent body, etc.’ (White, L. 106, 1896.) Note: “Temptation is resisted when man is powerfully influenced to do a wrong action; and knowing he can do it, resists, by faith, with a firm hold upon divine power. This was the ordeal through which Christ passed.” (Youth’s Instructor, 7/20/99, v. 47, #29, 414.) “. . . (B)ut [Satan’s] test for the Son of God was a hundredfold more severe. It was not merely the gnawing pangs of hunger that made Christ’s sufferings so intense; it was the guilt of the sins of the world which pressed so heavily upon Him. He who know no sin was made sin for us,” (*Ibid.*, 12/28/99, v., 47.’ #51, 590.)

¹⁹⁷ Signs, 3:390, 6/17/97; 3:264, 1/16/a6; SDA BC, 7:930, 1892.

¹⁹⁸ *Medical Ministry*, 181, 1902; SDA BC, 5:1131; This argument for a post-fall biological nature just as truly argues for a pre-fall spiritual nature, primary characteristic of which is union between the divine and human through the body temple. The post-fall biological nature is focused upon because it alone is contested (SDA’s unanimously and unequivocally hold a pre-fall spiritual nature concept, Reformationist arguments notwithstanding.). Significantly, opponents of the post-fall nature come as close to acknowledging it. as possible without actually doing so, despite their denials. (See this study, Appendix B, for Hancock’s study of the shift in SDA thinking from a post-fall to a pre-fall position during the 1940’s and 1950’s and the Evangelical influences involved in that change.) Recognizing a strong correlation between perfection and the postfall nature, Hancock suggests that systematic study would reveal a corresponding development of opposition to the doctrine of perfection. Reformationist claims now directly relate these theologically and historically. (See this study. 41.) Findings of this researcher confirm this suggestion but indicate that some have accepted the pre-fall (anti-post-fall) position who still hold to the doctrine of perfection, but their position appears to be inconsistent and does not reflect White.

¹⁹⁹ This study, 251ff.

²⁰⁰ Review, 1:144.

²⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 4:275.

²⁰² Youth’s Instructor, 12/28/99. v. 47, #51, 590.

²⁰³ SDA BC, 7:929 (1892)

²⁰⁴ Review, 5:487; It was the *faith of Jesus that produced the character of Jesus*. The exercise of that same faith (in dependence upon and union with Him) will produce the same character in the believer as it did in Him. For a demonstration of that character, Christ waits. (See this study, 349ff.)

²⁰⁵ This study, 243, 258ff.

²⁰⁶ Desire of Ages, 664.

²⁰⁷ This study, 245, 142-147; Indeed, His-twofold advantage is really man's advantage, for without total union of divinity with humanity there would neither have been the value needed for a perfect atonement nor could He have kept from sinning. (for Ford's position, see this study, 41ff.) thus man's case would be hopeless. This advantage, moreover was offset by a twofold disadvantage: had He failed, all would have been lost, for He had no mediator (Prophets & Kings, 691) and even His divinity posed a liability. Note: "To keep His glory veiled as the child of a fallen race, this was the most severe discipline to which the Prince of life could subject Himself." (SDA BC, 5:1081.) "if Christ had . . . exercised his miraculous power to relieve himself from difficulty, he would have broken the contract made with his Father, to be a probationer in behalf of the race. . . . It was as difficult for him to keep the level of humanity as it is for men to rise above the low level of their depraved natures, and he partakers of the divine nature . . . requiring the strength of all his faculties to resist the inclination when in danger to use his power to deliver himself. . ." (Review, 1:161.)

²⁰⁸ Testimonies, 5:746, 1889.

²⁰⁹ Signs, 3:255 11/21/95.

²¹⁰ Review, 2:539-540, 12/22/91.

²¹¹ Cf. SDA BC, 7:924, Youth's Instructor, 5/25/01.

²¹² See this study 224-225. 239, The post-fall position is repeatedly denied on grounds that it involves dualism. (See this study, 42ff.) This, however, places Reformationists on a two-horned dilemma: virtually branding White as dualistic, they become subject to their own charge. Note: "His spiritual life was a unity, it was in perfect harmony with only one principle-the will (law) of God. But the regenerate man is not yet a unity, but a duality; he has two opposing principles or natures within. . ." ("That Holy Thing," Ford 7 #3, 1-2.) Intended to prove Christ could not have taken "sinful flesh" without assuming a dualistic nature, this statement holds fallen man to be intrinsically and irremediably dualistic. White's body temple concept, in which sin is seen to be incurred only as the higher faculties are submitted to the authority of the lower, (see this study, 98ff) and her understanding that fallen man may return fully to the authority of the Holy Spirit, answers their contention. The "original mind . . . lost in Eden" is to be restored before the second coming, (this study, 267n) according to White, who sees Christ's assumption of "sinful flesh" to be a pledge that He can and will make man "whole" as part of His Great Controversy covenant demonstration.

²¹³ Signs. 2:386, 5/27/97; G.C. Bulletin, 4/4/01, 36.

²¹⁴ The major contribution of Steinweg's thesis was to point out cooperation as the key to White's understanding of righteousness by faith and hence of perfection, restoration of the divine image, etc. (See this study, 13, 206 , 212- 299.) Habitual Reformationist use of Rom. 10:3 to oppose any concept of cooperation in righteousness by faith, by contrasting sanctified effort with "the righteousness of God," is completely at odds with White, who uses this text (See EGW scripture index under Rom. 10.3) and others, such as Phil. 2:12-13, to show the necessity of effort and cooperation to righteousness by faith as well as to perfection. Note these post-1888 statements: "The divine power working with our efforts will result in slaying the old man, and in the renewing of the mind in the image of Him who created it." (Review, 2:287)

“While our salvation is wholly dependent upon Jesus, yet we have a work to do in order to be saved (Phil. 2:12-13) . . . not independent of what God is to do, but in cooperation. . . But the true ground to take is that the human will must be in subjection to the divine will.” (Signs, 3:98; Cf 179, 375, 391.) “Work out your own salvation. . . . The salvation of the soul requires the blending of the divine and human strength. . . Man has a part to act. Humanity must unite and co-operate with divinity.” (Ibid., 4:200.) “But it is not our heavenly Father’s purpose to save us without an effort on our part to cooperate with Christ.” (Ibid., 4:536.)

While they decry inclusion of cooperation in the gospel as legalistic, White insists upon its inclusion as the antidote to legalism: “Had man co-operated with God, there would have been no Cain worshipers.” (Review, 3:635.) Thus, in White the cure of legalism is cooperation with God, with power derived through divine-human relationships, made possible by the cross and mediated by Christ through the Spirit. This harmonizes with her pattern of equating Christ’s “Yoke” with both His “cross,” (Ibid., 2:229) and His presence. (Cf. this study, 232ff.) “We are to bear the yoke of Christ that we may be placed in complete union with Him. . . . We cannot follow Christ without wearing His yoke, without lifting the cross. . . . If our will is not in accord with the divine requirements, we are to deny our inclinations,” (Review, 4:229; Cf. SDA BC, 5:1090-1092.) “The yoke of Christ is the restraint of His Holy Spirit; . . .” (Review, 3:538, Cf. 537; Desire of Ages, 329ff, 416.)

²¹⁵ Signs, 3:390-391; Cf. this study, 189.

²¹⁶ This study, 128ff.

²¹⁷ Signs., 3:390.

²¹⁸ This study, 169ff.

²¹⁹ Cf. this study, 40ff, 140n; An interesting twofold Reformationist contradiction shows their dilemma in arguing against the post-fall (biological) nature of Christ and against the possibility of “last generation perfection,” as held by some fellow SDA’s. (It should be noted that their arguments are circular: the former denial being used to prove the latter, and the latter the former, etc.) White is acknowledged to show “that in accepting the physical law of heredity He came with a lessened capacity, physically, mentally, and morally, and yet without the taint of sin.” (See this study, 243- Although this statement, which reflects White’s own wording, agrees fully with the SDA position charged with heresy, it is intended to support the opposite (pre-fall) position. This incongruity is understandable in the light of their doctrine of original sin (guilt; see this study, 105ff) which makes the obvious position unthinkable together with the emotional elements stirred by overwhelming Evangelical opposition, in the assumption that the doctrine of original sin is inviolate-thus by taking the fallen nature Christ could only be understood to have become infected by the virus of sin.

Such limiting of Christ’s participation in man’s nature to “lessened capacit[ies]—what that limitation might mean, when it includes the moral faculties, is not made clear--exposes a serious problem, however; for they also argue that the Spirit’s return to possess “our” body temple is always “only partial,” because of “the limits of our impaired capacity.” (See this study, 4W Now if the capacities determine man’s potential for perfection, the above statement regarding Christ’s lessened capacities can only be understood to mean that Christ could not have been without sin, since those lessened capacities could not have experienced the full possession by the Spirit of the body temple. Thus, the ultimately unthinkable position--unthinkable to all SDA’s as well as to Reformationists--is implied: that Christ not only took fallen nature, but that He became an active sinner, in the absence of the Spirit’s possession of His body temple as a consequence of His lessened capacities.

Reformationists cannot have it both ways! Either Christ, by bearing “lessened capacities” was, nevertheless, completely sinless, holy and undefiled; or the question of capacities cannot determine the possibility of living a sinless life. If only they could acknowledge the weakness of the Augustinian/Calvinistic doctrine of original sin with its deterministic roots (see this study, 119ff) it would appear there would be complete harmony between ‘them and at least those SDA’s they specifically accuse of teaching heresy (i.e., those mentioned in this study—unless of course, such a position were still found necessary in order to combat the concept of “final generation perfection.” (See below and 124-125.)

²²⁰ This study, 169ff.

²²¹ Ibid., 101ff.

²²² Ibid., 30.

²²³ Shaking, 106.

²²⁴ Ibid., 115.

²²⁵ Ibid. 100.

²²⁶ Ibid., 122, author's emphasis.

²²⁷ Ibid., 98-100; this study 6ff; cf. 338ff; That focus upon the cross which repudiates perfection denies White's identification of character perfection with the cross. (See Ibid., 153ff.) Note: "In the cross all influence centers, and from it all influence goes forth This sacrifice was offered for the purpose of restoring man to his original perfection." Reformationist insistence on forensic-only perfection contradicts her next sentence: "Yea, more, it was offered to give him an entire transformation of character making him more than a conqueror. . . . Christ on the cross is the means that is to move the world.." (SDA BC, 6:1113.) Thus, White's concept of the cross is consistently much broader than that of the Reformationists, including not only what they affirm (objective), but also what they deny as part of the gospel (subjective). (Cf. this study, 149, 176ff.)

²²⁸ Recognizing-in Reformation (Buchanan-Concord) theology a logical extension of the doctrine of original sin, Ford grasped it as the key to unlock the message of righteousness by faith and set about to interpret SDA theology accordingly. Heppenstall, on the other hand, sees in Reformation theology's "forensic-only" concept of the gospel, a threat to the validity of SDA theology. (This is evident in his dialog with Ford at Loma Linda, April 22, 1978.)

²²⁹ Cf. this study, 153ff; Four factors combine to cause Reformationists to identify any serious consideration of perfection with perfectionism; a) Adventism's century-long failure to more effectively grasp the message of righteousness by faith; b) inadequate and frequently conflicting concepts regarding righteousness by faith among SDA spokesmen; c) Growing carelessness in Adventism on the one hand, and legalistic attitudes on the other, inevitable fruits of inadequate insight and experience in divine-human relations which righteousness by faith is ordained to provide; and d) espousal to the doctrine of original sin which, irreconcilable both to perfection and the subjective element, causes Reformationists to attribute all inadequacies to the synthesis of sanctification with justification.

²³⁰ "Paul-Pattern," 1, (Ford 7 #5).

²³¹ For answers given to Ford's questions before he raised them here, see Mervyn Maxwell, "Ready for His Appearing," in *Perfection, the Impossible Possibility*, 165-170.

²³² Cf. *Great Controversy*, 570.

²³³ Cf. this study, 244, ref 2

²³⁴ This study, 33ff.

²³⁵ Ibid., 41ff.

²³⁶ *Ministry of Healing*, 425, 457.

²³⁷ *Steps to Christ*, 89; *Review*, 3:343, 3/2/97.

²³⁸ Ministry of Healing, 425.

²³⁹ This study, 242ff.

²⁴⁰ Desire of Ages, 391.

²⁴¹ Ibid., 678; Cf. 311-312, 671.

²⁴² Douglass contributes to such a definition by distinguishing the Biblical concept of perfection with its dynamic, ever-developing characteristics from the static concept emerging from Greek philosophy which sees perfection as “an absolute point beyond which there can be no further development.” (Perfection, the Impossible Possibility, 13-14; Cf., this study. Appendix C.) Ford’s questions above reveal opposition to this philosophical concept which, unfortunately, is imposed upon his own perspective by his adoption of the static Greek concept of righteousness upon which it is based. Thus his philosophical concept of righteousness, which conflicts with White leads logically to a philosophical concept of perfection, causing him to identify any serious concept of perfection with perfectionism, while he himself, having denied perfection, ends by weakly supporting it.

So long as Greek concepts are imposed upon Scripture and White, confusion will mark SDA dialog. (See this study, 189n; Appendix C.)

²⁴³ Review, 2:75, 9/14/86.

²⁴⁴ Signs, 4:440, 1/2/07.

²⁴⁵ Testimonies, 8:86, 1901.

²⁴⁶ Signs, 2:63, 9/2/86; See Perfection, the Impossible Possibility, 171-174, for Mervyn Maxwell’s treatment of this issue.

²⁴⁷ Signs, 3:104, 3/26/94.

²⁴⁸ Ibid., 2:172, 12/22/87; Physical perfection takes place at the second coming, while restoration of the lost earthly dominion take place at the end of the millennium, according to White. (Great Controversy, 635ff.) Meanwhile, moral and spiritual perfection before Christ at whatever stage involve rejuvenation but not a restoration of the faculties: “New faculties are not supplied, but a thorough change is made in the employment of those faculties. The heart is cleansed . . . and fitted with traits of character that will enable him to do service for God.” (Signs, 3:509, 10/13/98; Cf. Ibid., 3:36.) “Man may stand conqueror of himself, . . . his own inclinations.” (Review, 5:477, 12/17/08.) Thus factors in the character which distort the reflection are removed.

²⁴⁹ Signs, 1:285; Review, 2:137, 5/11/87; 6:315- 2/20/13; Testimonies 8:313-314, 1904.

²⁵⁰ Selected Messages, 2:157, L. 58, 1909.

²⁵¹ This study, 235ff.

²⁵² Signs, 2:488, 5/9/92; Note that even in eternity we are not to feel that we have reached the full measure of the stature of Christ.

²⁵³ Acts of the Apostles, 561, 1911; Cf. Review, 2:253, 10/16/88.

²⁵⁴ This study, 224ff.

²⁵⁵ Review, 2:169, 11/15/87.

²⁵⁶ Ibid., 2:198, 3/27/88.

²⁵⁷ Desire of Ages, 125; Signs, 3:85-1893.

²⁵⁸ Perfection depends neither upon the size nor strength of faith, but upon its source, a gift of Christ made possible by the cross, and its exercise, through the faculty of will as it is empowered by the Holy Spirit. (Cf. this study, 148ff, 87ff, 219ff.)

²⁵⁹ Signs, 2:497, 7/4/92.

²⁶⁰ Review, 3:547, 3/1/98; Cf. this Study, 273ff, 311ff. See M. Maxwell for the place of education and discipline in perfection and its relation to White's concept of "Righteousness by faith and the Great Controversy." (Perfection, the Impossible Possibility, 182-183.) Note also his treatment of the relation of the sanctuary and the Sabbath to perfection. (Ibid., 154-164.)

²⁶¹ Signs, 1:425, 12/4/84.

²⁶² Testimonies, 3:188, 1872; 5:540, 1889; Review, 2:438, 11/11/90.

²⁶³ Great Controversy, 425; Cf. Signs, 2:324, 8/30/89; Review, 2:515.1

²⁶⁴ Acts of the Apostles, 531, 1911.

²⁶⁵ Signs, 3:98, 2/12/94; Cf. Review, 2:191, 3/6/88; Note that perfection, the product of righteousness by faith, involves response to the divine initiative, through faith's claim of divine power.

²⁶⁶ Cf. this study, 189ff.

²⁶⁷ Signs, 3:162, 11/5/94; 4:14, 1/25/99; 1:266 12/8/81.

²⁶⁸ Testimonies, 3:47, 1872.

²⁶⁹ Perfection in White, is both a process and a product, beginning with entry into the covenant and complete only when man has learned how always to relate to temptation and trial in total submission to its conditions and with entire faith in its provisions. (See this study, 172ff.) "Every soul is elected who will work out his own salvation with fear and trembling who will . . . fight the good fight of faith . . . , have faith continually, and who will be ,obedient to every word. . ." (Patriarchs & Prophets, 208, 1890; Cf. Review, 2:97, 12/7/86; 2:169, 11/15-87; Signs, 1:454-455.) In fulfilling the covenant, man's cooperation is with all three great powers of heaven." "Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost." (Signs, 4:186, 6/19/01.) No room here for a dichotomy between the work of Christ and the Spirit. (Cf. signs. 4:399. 8/16/05.) Jesus Himself set the example of cooperation. (Desire of Ages. 535-536.)

²⁷⁰ Testimonies, 4:86, 1876.

²⁷¹ Signs, 2:380, 4/18/90.

²⁷² Ibid., 2:477, 4/14/92; Cf. this study, 80ff, 205f.

²⁷³ This study, 289n.

²⁷⁴ Signs, 2:492, 6/6/92; 4:214, 12/25/01; Review., 5:422, 6/25/08.

²⁷⁵ Desire of Ages, 466; Cf. Review, 1:567; this study, 235ff.

²⁷⁶ Review, 3:59, 6/27/93; Cf. 1:565, 11-17/85.

²⁷⁷ This study, 75ff, 93ff.

²⁷⁸ Gospel Workers, 287; see this study, 87, 273, -79. Cf. “It is the work of God to expel evil from the soul by connecting humanity with divinity,” (Review, 4:187, 6/5/00; this study, 245f.) and “The love which Christ diffuses through the whole being is a vitalizing power.” (Ministry of Healing, 115; see this study, 85.)

²⁷⁹ Selected Messages, 1:227, 1905; Patriarchs & Prophets, .51, 1890; Testimonies, 3:358, 1875; Compare these statements with the Desire of Ages. (this study, 269) portrayal of the perfection of the divine human Exemplar: “But the Son of God was surrendered to the Father’s will, and dependent upon His power, So utterly was Christ emptied of self that He made no plans for Himself.” (Desire of Ages, 208.) “So fully was Jesus surrendered to the will of God that the Father alone appeared in His life. Thus we also are to overcome as Christ overcame.” (Ibid., 389,)”in His life no self-assertion was mingled.” (Ibid. 260; Cf. Signs, 3:525.) The soul must be delivered from all that is opposed to loyalty to God. In the heart of Christ, there reigned perfect harmony with God. . . . He was never elated by applause, nor dejected by censure or disappointment. . . . It is the love of self that brings unrest.” (Desire of Ages, 330-331.) ““Lo, I come: . . . I delight to do thy will, . . .’ He would win back the world to its loyalty to God.” (Ibid., 410.)

²⁸⁰ Steps to Christ, 45.

²⁸¹ Acts of the Apostles, 551.

²⁸² Shaking, 102.

²⁸³ Ibid., 104, emphasis supplied; Cf. this study, 160n, for Reformationist confusion of medieval gratia infusa with totally different contemporary concepts which relate the Holy Spirit’s ministry in the body temple. (See also this study, 308ff.)

²⁸⁴ Shaking 128, author’s emphasis; Cf. Review, 6:315, 2/20/13.

²⁸⁵ Review, 5:29, 3/31/04.

²⁸⁶ Great controversy, 489.

²⁸⁷ This study, 130.

²⁸⁸ Testimonies, 4:568, 1819.

²⁸⁹ Signs, 3:50, 1893.

²⁹⁰ Review, 3:522 11/30/97.

²⁹¹ Signs, 4:47, 7/26/99.

²⁹² Testimonies, 8:312, 1904; Signs, 4:,185, 6/12/01.

²⁹³ Review, 5:499, 2/25/09.

²⁹⁴ Acts of the Apostles, 533, Cf. 565.

²⁹⁵ This study, 70ff.

²⁹⁶ Ibid., 63ff.

²⁹⁷ Ibid., 66.

²⁹⁸ Ibid., 242ff.

²⁹⁹ Review, 1:52, 5/6/62; Cf. Christ's Object Lessons, 69: "When the character of Christ shall be perfectly reproduced in His people, then He will come to claim them as His own."

³⁰⁰ Desire of Ages, 671.

6. BEHOLD YOUR GOD

Conflict over the nature and history of the message of righteousness by faith erupted in the 1950's over three issues:

- 1) Were church historians during the late 1940's right in "correcting" Daniells' claim that the message was never fully accepted or proclaimed?
- 2) Were they justified in ignoring eschatological issues and placing the entire focus upon questions concerning the relations between justification and sanctification?
- 3) Did the message relate primarily to correct theology, or was Daniells right in correlating it primarily with experience and-personal relationships?¹

With Daniells, Reformationists contend that the message has never been accepted, and identify it with the loud cry.² But, with later historians, they see the issues as theological, holding with Froom that this involved clarification of the "verities of the faith."³ With these historians (1940's) they see the relation between justification and sanctification as central, but deny their effort to find the proper balance between the two, insisting that sanctification be entirely removed from the gospel and treated only [Page 294] as a fruit of justification.⁴

Significantly, Daniells is seen not to have transmitted the light of righteousness by faith, but Jones-Waggoner error; thus, together with Andreassen, introducing the "omega" of apostasy, concerning which White warned in 1904.⁵ Considering themselves to be the true proponents-of righteousness by faith, Reformationists hold that Jones and Waggoner, acknowledged 1888 exponents of that message, embedded four heresies in SDA doctrine: rejection of the historic doctrine of original sin. Inclusion of *sanctification* in righteousness by faith; claiming that Christ connected sinful flesh with His own sinless nature; and holding the doctrine of perfection.⁶

White's unusual endorsement of Jones and Waggoner,⁷ whose earliest printed works reflect the above concepts,⁸ requires overwhelming evidence to prove that she recognized their theological errors immediately after Minneapolis, reflecting Roman Catholic heresy.⁹ Developments before, during, and after Minneapolis deny such claims. [Page 295]

Pre-1888 Laodicean Message

More than a decade before the organization of the SDA church, White expressed concern over the spiritual state of the believers:

"Many who profess to be looking for the speedy coming of Christ, are cold and formal. The words expressed to the Laodicean church, describe their present condition perfectly."¹⁰

"Their hearts are not subdued by grace, and they are not dead to self. The principle cause of their trials, is an unsubdued heart, which makes self so sensitive that it is often crossed. Begin to work in good earnest. First die to self, then be instant in prayer, and check every passion of the heart. Give up your self-pattern. Ever keep Jesus in your mind, that he is your example, and you must tread in his footsteps. Look unto Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith; who for the joy that was set before him, endured the cross. Will any complain of the roughness of the way? Would you enter heaven if you could without suffering, and dwell in the presence of Jesus, who suffered so much for us? He for your sins, was once the meek slain lamb. Let us, then, cheerfully suffer something for Jesus' sake, crucify self daily."¹¹

The Theology Crisis

These, her first regular Review articles, set a life-time pattern of applying the Laodicean message to the Advent believers in an effort to stimulate them to overcome by looking to Jesus as both sacrifice and example, “author and finisher” of their faith. Note the warning against seeking a security not based upon sharing His suffering and sacrifice. “Daily” crucifixion of self in a subjective appropriation of the objective benefits of the cross, is the key to overcoming Laodiceanism. Thus, though the objective is given, the subjective is determinative.¹² Note that escape from Laodiceanism is contingent upon beginning “to work in good earnest.”

[Page 296] Thus, cooperation with the “Author and Finisher of our faith” is an absolute requirement of the Laodicean Message.

“I asked the meaning of the shaking I had seen. I was shown that it would be caused by the straight testimony, called forth by the counsel of the True Witness to the Laodiceans. This straight testimony some will not bear. They will rise up against it, and this will cause a shaking among God’s people.

I saw that the testimony of the True Witness has not been half heeded. The solemn testimony upon which the destiny of the church hangs, has been lightly esteemed, if not entirely disregarded. This testimony is to work deep repentance and all that truly receive it, will obey it, and be purified.”¹³

The straight testimony which causes the shaking is the unvarnished truth concerning the Laodicean condition, and contains a threefold divine remedy.¹⁴ Positive response to this divine initiative involves both exalting “the standard” of truth and obedience to it, which results in purifying the believer in preparation for Christ’s coming. A faith activated by man’s own will lays hold of truth by obedience. That faith’s subjective response to the objective gift thus determines one’s security¹⁵ is indicated below:

“The message to the church of the Laodiceans is a startling denunciation, and is applicable to the people of God at the present time.... The Lord here shows us that the message to be borne to his people by ministers whom he has called to warn the people, is not a peace and safety message. It is not merely theoretical, but practical in every particular. The people of God are ...in a **[Page 297]** position of carnal security. They are at ease, believing themselves in an exalted condition.... In a sad deception, yet honest in that deception... (I)t is the True Witness who speaks.”¹⁶

Note the responsibility of ministers to cease preaching “peace and safety” messages and to disturb false, “carnal security” by a faithful Presentation of the straight testimony in confronting self-exaltation and pride. That same year, White insisted that a “state of spiritual blindness” resulted from failure to receive “the pointed testimony that God sends,” declaring:

“Everything worth possessing, even in this world, must be secured by effort, and sometimes by most painful sacrifice. Shall we be less willing to endure conflict and toil, and to make earnest efforts and great sacrifices to obtain a treasure which is of infinite value.

Faith and love are golden treasures, elements that are greatly wanting among God’s people. I have been shown that unbelief in the testimonies is shutting away the light from God’s people....

Very many feel impatient and jealous because they are frequently disturbed with warnings and reproofs, which keep their sins before them. Says the True Witness, “I know thy works.”¹⁷

Laodiceans are not indicted for effort, but for lack of effort and wrong attitudes and motives. Note that their legalistic problem is chargeable to a lack of “faith and love” which makes even the much-too-feeble effort burdensome because it lacks proper motivation. Resistance to the Spirit’s disturbing voice in the Laodicean message reveals an ego-centric will¹⁸ which both justifies self **[Page 298]** and conditions its action with a demand for merit.¹⁹

Double Jeopardy-Rejecting Message/Messenger

Laodiceans are seen to be sincere, but their self-confidence prevents recognition of the appropriateness of the rebuke. A twofold vicious cycle is involved. The greater the need for rebuke to penetrate pride and self-satisfaction, the greater is the subconscious ego-protection against that rebuke. Moreover, that same self-deception also permits one to “unconsciously” accept the prophetic messenger while acting out a “subconscious” rejection of her message of reproof in favor of “reason” which protects the sense of well-being and security. This twofold self-deception would eventually precipitate the Minneapolis debacle. In 1875 White again calls for church members to “shake off this dreadful indifference and stupor” and “heed the voice of warning.” In retrospect, her warning concerning “the sin of rejecting the light of the most solemn message of mercy to the world” is of peculiar significance. Christ’s wilderness example of fasting and resisting temptation is set forth as the example to emulate;²⁰ discipline and harmony of action are called for, then:

The carnal heart must be subdued and transformed. God designs that there shall ever be a living testimony in the church. It will be necessary to reprove and exhort. We hear the plea, Oh, I am so sensitive,... If these persons would state the case correctly they would say, “I am so self-willed, so self-sufficient, so proud spirited, that I will not be dictated to;...”²¹

[Page 299] This introduces the central problem in the Great Controversy-covenant theme-self-will. God will not force the will, but pleads, warns, and waits for compliance before He can carry out His final purpose of self-revelation.²² Note the following keys:

The love of the world and the cares of life separate the soul from God. The water of life must be in us, and flowing out from us, springing up into everlasting life. We must work out what God works in. If the Christian would enjoy the light of life, he must increase his efforts to bring others to the knowledge of the truth. Our happiness will be in proportion to our unselfish works, prompted by the love of Christ. Divine wisdom has appointed, in the plan of salvation, the law of action and reaction.”²³

Caused by separation from God, the Laodicean disease can only be healed by a relationship with Him permitting the water of life to flow through one’s self to others. “The law of action and reaction,” central principle behind cooperation, involves a twofold response to God’s initiative. Cooperation with Him in developing one’s own character must include sharing with others. Thus one works out what He works in, happiness . . . [being] in proportion to our unselfish works, prompted by the love of Christ.” He instills that love-motive which makes His yoke easy and His burden light. “The faith that works by love and purifies the soul” is so deeply embedded in White’s thought as to be seen (directly or indirectly) in all her writings, forming a vital key to understanding righteousness by faith.²⁴ Development of such Faith and Love requires insight, however, concerning that which inhibits its development.

[Page 300] The only hope for the Laodiceans is a clear view of their standing before God, a knowledge of the nature of their disease.... They do not engage thoroughly and heartily in the work of God.... The internal work of grace is wanting in their hearts. Faith and love are the true riches, ...the True Witness counsels the lukewarm to buy.²⁵

White thus combines demand for a repentance-inducing self-knowledge, which would break the self-deception, with an appeal for greater diligence. The answer to the “works” problem is a relationship with God motivating those works of faith which free one from bondage to a self-love that makes effort in Christian lines both inefficient and burdensome. She is forced, however, to acknowledge failure in her mission to arouse the Church to its need.

1882 Portents of Minneapolis

The testimonies of God's word and of his Spirit have alike been disregarded. This is why there is such backsliding among us, so little of the life and power of true godliness.²⁶

"You have not yet resisted unto blood, striving against sin." There must be a revival of the straight testimony. Are we willing to part with self-righteousness?²⁷

Rejection of light is linked with failure to exert the effort of faith needed to grasp God's Word and claim its power. The cause is a self-centeredness which, in perverting effort, tends to paralyze and/or divert it to self-centered purposes. Parting with self-righteousness requires resisting "unto blood," through death to self.²⁸ The entire article from which the above quote was taken is **[Page 301]** significant. Note the Great Controversy-covenant theme:²⁹

"Many have accepted the theory of truth who have no true conversion. There are few who feel true sorrow for sin, who have deep pungent convictions of the depravity of the unregenerate nature. Christ must have the entire management of the will and action. But we must be content to enter into life in the very same way as the chief of sinners. We must renounce our own righteousness and plead for the righteousness of Christ to be imputed to us. We must depend wholly upon Christ for strength. Self must die."

"Genuine faith is followed by love, and love by obedience. All the powers and passions of the converted man are brought under the control of Christ. His Spirit is a-renewing power transforming to the divine image all who will receive it."³⁰

Though written six years before Minneapolis, this article forms a good summary of most of the basic points in righteousness by faith. Note the focus upon experience,³¹ involving: conversion; repentance;³² surrender of the will; genuine faith, love and obedience **[Page 302]** under the renewing power of the Spirit,³³ which transforms "all who will receive it" "to the divine image." This necessitates renunciation of "our own righteousness and plead[s] for the righteousness of Christ to be imputed." A vital key is that "we must depend wholly upon Christ for strength," which requires that "self must die."³⁴ Note the function of faith which, acting through love, produces obedience.³⁵ Moreover, lower faculties are to be held in subjection to the Holy Spirit by a will which is under the entire management of Christ. Most important, "we must be content to enter into life in the very same way as the chief of sinners." This is the bottom line in White's concept of righteousness by faith, for it is the continuing basis of union and communion,³⁶ central nerve in the article:³⁷

[Page 303] There is a wide difference between a pretended union and real connection with Christ by faith. When the intimacy of connection and communion is formed, our sins are laid upon Christ; His righteousness is imputed to us. We have access to God through Him."³⁸

"The permanence of our faith is the condition of our union. But this union costs us something. It is a union of utter dependence, to be entered into by a proud being. All who form this union must feel their need of the atoning blood of Christ. They must submit their own will to the will of God."³⁹

Divine-human union is maintained only by exercise of the same faith by which it was formed. This represents response to "the atoning blood" through sacrifice of self-will and independence. Exercise of self-denying faith--not effortless even for the sinless Savior⁴⁰-- could hardly be effortless with the believing sinner, for it takes sustained effort to repudiate that egocentric desire for merit which, imposing a yoke of bondage, reduces experience to legalism.⁴¹ The integral relation between righteousness by faith and the Laodicean message is that even when egocentricity is finally overcome it must still be resisted. Thus the principle that self is "chief of sinners" and source of sin continues to apply.⁴² **[Page 304]**

Testimonies Slighted

On June 20, 1882, White addressed a testimony to the Battle Creek church, “The Testimonies Slighted,” excerpted below:

...(W)hen I send you a testimony of warning and reproof, many of you declare it to be merely the opinion of Sister White. You have insulted the Spirit of God.... What a great relief it would be to such could they quiet their conscience with the belief that my work is not of God. But your unbelief will not change the facts in the case. You are defective in character... Close your eyes,... but this does not make you one particle more perfect. The only remedy is to wash in the blood of the Lamb.”⁴³

White’s understanding of her role is vital.⁴⁴ Warning against “neglecting the word of God and also despising the testimonies of His Spirit,” she declared three months earlier:

[Page 305] “They do not wish to discover and correct their defects of character. They show their contempt for the light which God has given, by going directly contrary to His instructions. Those at the heart of the work have set the example.”⁴⁵

Considering them to be light directly from God, White sees attitudes toward her testimonies to reflect attitudes toward God. Thus despising them is considered an insult to the Spirit of God.⁴⁶

The pleadings of the Spirit, neglected today, because pleasure or inclination leads in an opposite direction, may be powerless to convince, or even impress, tomorrow.⁴⁷

“You may now be honest in not recognizing and obeying the light; the doubts you have entertained, your neglect to heed the requirements of God, have blinded your perceptions so that darkness is now to you light, and light is darkness. God has bidden you to go forward to perfection.... The cause of God may hold its ground only by great **[Page 306]** exertion and continual sacrifice. Yet it will triumph finally.... Like Jesus we must be made perfect through suffering.... All these solemn admonitions will either make the church better or decidedly worse.”⁴⁸

Subsequent messages and the experience of Minneapolis testify that these strong words fell largely on deaf ears. “Sincerity” cannot replace earnest cooperation in resolving the Laodicean condition. Primary responsibility is placed upon ministers who “with the voice of the false prophet cry, ‘peace, peace,’ when the Lord has not spoken peace.”⁴⁹ Note premonitions of Minneapolis:

“The light has been shining clear and definite upon her [the Church’s] pathway, and the light of 1882 calls her to an account. The knowledge of our state as God views it seems hidden from us. We see, but perceive not; we hear, but do not understand; and we rest as unconcerned as if the pillar of cloud by day, and the pillar of fire by night, rested upon our sanctuary.”⁵⁰

Warnings against Subjectivism

Words of encouragement and positive principles involved in the Laodicean message and righteousness by faith are interspersed throughout the twenty three page communication. Note:

“Our greatest strength is realized when we feel and acknowledge our weakness. The greatest loss... you can suffer is the loss of earnestness and persevering zeal to do the right... Subduing-self and looking to Jesus is an everyday work. The man whom

The Theology Crisis

God is leading will be dissatisfied with himself because the light from the perfect Man shines upon him.... Those light bearers shed forth the purest radiance that are the least conscious of their own brightness.”⁵¹

Effort in “subduing self” is seen in the context of deepening repentance based upon “looking to Jesus” and drawing “light from [Page 307] the perfect man.” With attention fixed upon Jesus, White’s intense subjective emphasis is consistently guarded against a focus upon feelings or experience.⁵²

“Every emotion and desire must be held in subjection to reason and conscience. By faith and prayer all may meet the requirements of the gospel. No man can be forced to transgress. His own consent must first be gained. He knows how strong are the inclinations of the natural heart, and He will help in every time of temptation.”⁵³

Note how White’s Great Controversy concept, which places the lower, emotive faculties under control of Spirit-directed faculties [Page 308] of “reason and conscience,”⁵⁴ resolves the problem of subjectivism. Her paradoxical elements are absolutely mandatory. That man is totally incapable of mastering his own inclinations is balanced by assurance that through-volitional exercise of faith, by the power of the Spirit, and in union with Christ, he can expel all sin from the soul temple.⁵⁵ The body temple (designed to unite the divine and human) reveals the internal relationship between the negative Laodicean message (“let me in”) and a positive righteousness by faith (Christ revealed from within).⁵⁶ And provides the key which unites all objective elements (Christ’s sanctuary mediation as well as His “doing and dying,”) with the subjective in a manner to protect against both subjectivism and objectivism.

Cleansing the Soul

In 1882 White focused sharply upon the relation between the ministry of the Spirit in the body temple (subjective) and the completion of Christ’s work in the heavenly temple (objective), as the cure for the Laodicean syndrome and the key to the latter rain.⁵⁷

[Page 309] “It is left with us to remedy the defects in our characters, to cleanse the soul temple of every defilement. Then the latter rain will fall upon us as the early rain fell.”⁵⁸

“May the Lord help his people to cleanse the soul temple from every defilement, and to maintain such a close connection with him that they may be partakers of the latter rain when it shall be poured out.”⁵⁹

Cleansing of the soul temple, possible only through a close connection with Christ, is prerequisite to receiving the latter rain. Thus a distinct relationship exists between Christ’s work on earth through His Spirit and His ministration in the heavenly sanctuary, where He ministers His blood in a final atonement.

“Will our churches humble themselves before the Lord in this day of atonement? Will they put away the sins which defile their *garments of character and separate them from God?*”⁶⁰

[Page 310] Note that the same elements shown above to be prerequisite to the latter rain are here seen to be required in “this day of atonement” cleansing of the soul temple from “defilement” and “connection with Him.” Moreover, the Spirit holds the key to both “cleansing” and “connection,” which must combine to resolve the Laodicean condition that “separates them from God.” Connection and defilement are mutually exclusive: union with Christ removes sin; but sin prevents union. Thus, exercise of the will is determinative. The choice of “union” with Him must represent a will to separate from all sin.⁶¹ Since defilement involves “garments of character,” cleansing of the soul temple must involve receiving Christ’s robe of righteousness from within.⁶² White continues by referring ominously to the Laodicean plea:

“Says the True Witness. “Behold, I stand at the door and knock.” Every warning,... in the word of God, or through His delegated messengers, is a knock at the door of the heart; it is the voice of Jesus, asking for entrance [into the body temple]. With every knock unheeded, your determination to open becomes weaker and weaker.”⁶³

The cure to Laodicean subjectivism is not in removing the Spirit’s ministry from the gospel but in receiving that Spirit into the body temple.⁶⁴ Caused by self-centering, subjectivism involves **[Page 311]** inability to distinguish one’s own impressions from the voice of the Spirit. Assuming the Spirit is guiding, its entry to cleanse and control the body temple is resisted. Any mental assent to the atonement unaccompanied by surrender of self in submission to the authority of the Word--as interpreted by the Spirit--results in subjectivism.⁶⁵ Refusing to impose His presence, Christ patiently awaits man’s response to the divine initiative by using the key--his own will--in opening the door from within.⁶⁶

“There is nothing Satan fears so much as that the people of God shall clear the way by removing every hindrance, so that the Lord can pour out his Spirit upon a languishing church and an impenitent congregation. When the way is prepared for the Spirit of God, the blessing will come.”⁶⁷

Two Temples Must Be Cleansed

The long delayed work of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary (temple), which began in 1844, can only be completed by cooperation of the human with the divine in heart-searching and soul-cleansing:

We are living in the Great day of atonement, when our sins are, by confession and repentance, to go before hand into judgment....

In 1844 our great High Priest entered the Most Holy place of the heavenly sanctuary, to begin the work of investigative judgment.... In the typical service, **[Page 312]** when the work of atonement as performed... the people were required to afflict their souls before God, and confess their sins that they might be atoned for and blotted out. Will any less be required of us in this antitypical day of atonement, when Christ in the Sanctuary above is pleading in behalf of his people,...⁶⁸

The gravity of the Laodicean condition is that it prevents cooperation with “our great High Priest,” delaying the final atonement, for the “blotting out of sin” must be preceded by a special work of heart searching and confession. Only through human preparation “for the Spirit of God” by surrender of the will, in response to the divine initiative, can the Spirit be poured out.

“The work of our salvation lies between God and our own souls. At the final day, we shall be approved or condemned according to our works... But the professed people of God are asleep... They have their own fate in their hands... There is no election but one’s own by which any may perish. Every person is a free moral agent, deciding his own future by his daily life.....

“Jesus died that through his merits man might be redeemed from the power of sin, and be adopted into the family of God; in view of the great sacrifice which Christ has made for us, we are exhorted to work out our own salvation with fear and trembling.”⁶⁹

Christ’s work in the heavenly temple can never be finished until a prerequisite work is accomplished in the body (soul) temple. The unequivocal conditioning of God’s approval of man “at the final day” upon his own efforts does not, however, represent “another gospel,” for only merits of the cross are involved.⁷⁰ The law of cooperation (“action and reaction”),⁷¹ so deeply engraved in Ellen White’s theology, involves response to the divine initiative. This requires **[Page 313]** a continual battle with previously developed habits, inclinations and self-will in which victory depends not upon the strength of will, but upon its exercise.⁷²

The Theology Crisis

We are free to obey or to disregard the will of God; free to pray or to live without prayer. As God, compels no man to be righteous, so none are compelled to be impenitent and vicious. Human passions may be strong and wayward, but help has been laid upon One who is mighty. While that help will not be forced upon any who despise the gift, it, is freely, gladly given to all who seek it in sincerity... but God will never deliver those who will not strive to free themselves.... The thoughts and feelings must be restrained with a firm hand, lest they lead us into sin.⁷³

The Seal of God

One of White's most urgent 1882 messages is introduced by the Ezekiel 9 portrayal of an angel placing a special mark on the foreheads of those that "sigh and that cry for all the abominations" committed in Jerusalem (the Church). Those without the mark are destroyed. Ellen White then continues:

Jesus is about to leave the mercy seat of the heavenly sanctuary to put on garments of vengeance and pour out His wrath in judgments upon those who have not responded to the light given.... While His mercy is tendered, with calls to repentance, this account will remain open; but when... the ministry of His wrath commences... There is no more pleading of mercy in their behalf.⁷⁴

This sobering chapter contains assurance of the final triumph of the church, but few are seen to escape the judgment threatened:

At the time when the danger and depression of the church are greatest, the little company who are standing in the light will be sighing and crying for the abominations **[Page 314]** that are done in the land. But more especially will their prayers arise in behalf of the church because its members are doing after the manner of the world...⁷⁵

The class who do not feel grieved over their own spiritual declension, nor mourn over the sins of others, will be left without the seal of God.... Thus "peace and safety" is the cry from men who will never again lift up their voice like a trumpet to show God's people their transgressions...⁷⁶

Two groups emerge: a small group whose deep repentance ultimately sunders the bonds of self-satisfaction and self-righteousness, and a much larger group who "try to throw a cloak over the existing evil."⁷⁷ Before "Michael stands up, the great prince which stands for the children of thy people," the elect must be sealed to prepare them for deliverance during the "time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation..."⁷⁸ This necessitates complete victory over sin and results in the "latter rain".⁷⁹

"Not one of us will ever receive the seal of God while our characters have one spot or stain upon them. It is left with us to remedy the defects in our characters to cleanse the soul temple of every defilement. Then the latter rain will fall upon us as the early rain fell upon the disciples on the day of Pentecost."⁸⁰

With such convictions, it seems inevitable that White's lifetime emphasis should be upon cooperation leading to perfection.⁸¹ Note:

"What are you doing brethren, in the work of preparation? Those who are uniting with the world are receiving the worldly mold and preparing for the mark of the beast. Those who are distrustful of self, who are humbling **[Page 315]** their souls before God and purifying their souls by obeying the truth--these are receiving the heavenly mold and preparing for the seal of God in their foreheads. When the decree goes forth and the stamp is impressed, their character will remain pure and spotless for eternity."⁸²

The Theology Crisis

Thus, the law of cooperation is evoked as the only basis for escaping the Laodicean disease of self-centeredness and preparing for the final time of trouble which will clearly expose to view those who have the seal and those who do not.

“Now is the time to prepare. The seal of God will never be placed upon the forehead of an impure man or woman.... All who receive the seal must be without spot before God--candidates for heaven. Go forward, my brethren and sisters. I can only write briefly upon these points at this time, merely calling your attention to the necessity of preparation. Search the Scriptures for yourselves that you may understand the fearful solemnity of the present hour.”⁸³

Health Reform and the Sealing

So long as we choose the easy path of self-indulgence and are frightened at self-denial, our faith will never become firm, and we cannot know the peace of Jesus nor the joy that comes through conscious victory.⁸⁴

This emphatic declaration from “The Seal of God,” indicates the centrality of “self-denial” and victory over “self-indulgence” to reception of the seal. White makes health reform--negative aspect of which is denial of appetites and passions--an integral part of the sealing work. Positively, health reform involves total care of body, mind, and soul, as motivated and facilitated by the divine-human [Page 316] union which re-establishes the body as a temple of the Holy Spirit. Because faculties are regarded as sacred members of the body temple, White opposes any ascetic or repressive approach but does urgently advocate complete control of the lower faculties by the higher, as the only basis upon which we may “discern the value of the atonement and the priceless work of the cleansing blood of Christ,” and thus become “partakers of the divine nature.”⁸⁵

All the passions of man, if properly controlled and rightly directed, will contribute to his physical and moral health, and insure him a great amount of happiness.⁸⁶

As “conscious victory” through “self-denial,” in refusing “the easy path of self-indulgence,” brings “Joy” and “the peace of Jesus,” so health reform insures “a great amount of happiness,” as well as “physical and moral health.” White’s repeated reference to her 1863 vision indicates the importance of health reform and identifies it with-the “third angel’s message,” as “one branch of the great work which is to fit a people for the coming of the Lord.”

“Men and women cannot violate natural law by indulging depraved appetite and lustful passions, and not violate the law of God. Therefore he has permitted the light of health to shine upon us, that we may see our sin in violating the laws which he has established in our being. All our enjoyment or suffering may be traced to obedience or transgression of natural law. To make plain natural law, and urge the obedience of it, is the work that [Page 317] accompanies the third angel’s message, to prepare a people for the coming of the Lord.”⁸⁷

Linking failure to receive the Laodicean message with “neglect of the church to live up to the light upon health reform which God himself has brought to them to fit them for his coming,”⁸⁸ White challenges:

“The health reform is an important part of the third angel’s message; and as a people professing this reform, we should not retrograde, but make continual advancement. I beseech you therefore, brethren. by mercies of God, that you present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God.”⁸⁹

Ellen White considered health reform such an “important part of the third angel’s message” that the relationship is seen to be that of the hand or arm to the body. Transformation of mind as well as of body

is envisioned, because of “the sympathy which exists between the mind and the body”⁹⁰ such that “when one is affected the other responds.”⁹¹ Other factors are: the natural effects of harnessing the mind through “self-government,” and the supernatural results [Page 318] of “subjection to the Spirit of Christ,”⁹² and of studying the Word, the greatest agent for developing and transforming the mind.⁹³ Note the effort involved in bringing the will “into activity”:

“However severe and close the battle to overcome wrong habits, and sinful indulgences, it must be fought and the victory gained. After the power of the will is brought into activity, then there must be a firm reliance upon Christ. When Israel... yielded to sinful murmuring, Christ was to them what he is to us, a compassionate mediator, and he pardoned their transgressions. After man has done what he can to cleanse the soul-temple, then Christ’s blood alone will avail for us, at Christ’s typified blood availed for ancient Israel.”⁹⁴

The context suggests an initial activation of the will through justification, in which it responds to the divine initiative by claiming pardon from “a compassionate mediator.” Outside Justification, man’s will is never free to act according to principles of righteousness, being bound by the lower nature.⁹⁵ Upon its release through the combined power of the cross and the Spirit,⁹⁶ its activity in controlling the lower nature, can be maintained only by “firm reliance upon Christ.”⁹⁷ Moreover, the “blood” which “alone will avail” is available only as man does “what he can to cleanse the soul temple.” [Page 319]

Sabbath, God’s Seal

Central to White’s concept of the “third angel’s message,” which relates to issues of true and false worship,⁹⁸ are the Sabbath and the body temple--temporal and spatial symbols of true worship. The Sabbath (holy when dedicated to God)⁹⁹ involves a divine time appointment and sign of true worship,¹⁰⁰ while the body temple (holy when dedicated to God)¹⁰¹ represents the place of worship. Both are symbols of “loyalty to God,” thus one’s attitudes toward them indicate his relation to Christ and reflect his standing with respect to righteousness by faith.¹⁰² Note the relation of the Sabbath to Christ’s intercessory work in the most holy place:

“As the ministration of Jesus closed in the holy place and He passed into the holiest, and stood before the ark containing the law of God, He sent another mighty angel with a third message to the world.... “Here is the patience of the saints; here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus.” [Rev. 14:12] As he repeated these words, he pointed... to where Jesus stands before the ark, making His final intercession.... After Jesus opened the door of the most holy, the light of the Sabbath was seen, and the people of God were tested to see if they would keep God’s law.”¹⁰³

[Page 320] The Ten Commandment law, placed inside the ark in the typical, earthly sanctuary, is seen to be the central feature in the heavenly sanctuary.¹⁰⁴ As the only command designating relations between creatures and the Creator, the fourth holds special significance.¹⁰⁵ Since all characteristics of an official government seal are imbedded within it,¹⁰⁶ White refers to the Sabbath as the “seal of God.”¹⁰⁷ It is also integrally related to the “sealing work,”¹⁰⁸ the loud cry and the latter rain, during which, “filled with the Holy Ghost,”¹⁰⁹ believers proclaim “the Sabbath more fully.”

Sabbath, sign of the Creator and symbol of His authority, is the focal point in the final warning of the third angel’s message¹¹⁰ and a symbol of God’s pledge to fulfill His covenant promises¹¹¹ to all who honor Him by honoring it.¹¹² But, since the Sabbath cannot be kept holy without surrender of the body temple to the control of its Creator, it is clear that “not all who profess to keep the Sabbath” [Page 321] will receive the final covenant seal.¹¹³ Thus the Sabbath and the body temple both dynamically illustrate Ellen White’s synthesis of the objective and subjective. Note how Desire of Ages draws these elements together in the Sabbath:

“In the beginning the Father and the Son had rested upon the Sabbath after their work of creation.... Now Jesus rested from the work of redemption; and though there was grief among those who loved Him on earth, yet there was joy in heaven. Glorious to the eyes of heavenly beings was the promise of the future. A restored creation, a redeemed race, that having conquered sin could never fall, this, the result to flow from Christ’s completed work, God and angels saw. With this scene the day upon which Jesus rested is forever linked.”¹¹⁴

The crucifixion thus injects new meaning into the Sabbath, which from creation stands as the great symbol of creative power, observance of which is a sign of true worship. The Creator thus endowed the Sabbath as symbol of His finished substitutionary work, making its observance a sign of covenant relations. This involves justification as well as sanctification, for true Sabbath communion can only exist in that union provided through justification.¹¹⁵ The Sabbath therefore becomes a symbol of the entire plan and [Page 322] process of salvation—thus of righteousness by faith.¹¹⁶

Minneapolis-Resistance of the Holy Spirit

Just before the conference, White wrote an article which typifies scores of articles in the few years following Minneapolis.

Two great powers are united. Through living faith, divine influences are combined with human effort it is by this co-operation of man with God, that we become laborers together with him.... Those who put their trust in God, and not in human effort, will be sustained under fierce temptation and trial....

Faith and works must go hand in hand, but either alone is dead. The whole work of God in the human soul is accomplished through cooperation of the divine Spirit with the effort of humanity. “Without me you can do nothing.” There are many Christless sermons preached, which are wholly destitute of the power of the Spirit of God.... It is human pride and self-confidence, mingled with human depravity, that has enfeebled the churches, until they are sickly, and ready to die.... All resistance of God, all departures from virtue and truth, pervert the faith as well as the morals, while conformity to God’s revealed will always increases faith and knowledge. It is the presence of Jesus that is needed in our [Page 323] assemblies to make the preaching of the word effectual to the salvation of souls.... He works as in the presence of Jesus; and out of weakness he is made strong. The word becomes quick and powerful, and, in proportion as faith appreciates the divine presence, and honors it, and trusts it, the preaching is in the demonstration of the Spirit and power.¹¹⁷

Ellen White’s presentations at and after Minneapolis represent a further intensification of an already intense focus upon the urgent need for a divine-human union which would lead to the out-pouring of the Holy Spirit and preparation for Christ’s coming.

A Living Connection With God

White’s first pre-session institute talk is significantly titled, “A Living Connection With God.” After gratefully testifying to divine healing from a sickness which was “nigh unto-death” in answer to prayer for healing so that she could attend the session, White stresses the importance of Bible study and the need to “take the truth God has revealed and weave it into our very life and character,” emphasizing the need for “the power of the Holy Ghost” which was prevented because of a wrong course of action.¹¹⁸ Having Christ [Page 324] “formed within, the hope of glory.” would solve their problem, but this necessitates having “His Holy Spirit . . . resting upon you,” which is impossible “while we are cherishing selfishness.”¹¹⁹

But if we put away all self-exaltation, all self-righteousness, and come into living connection with God, the righteousness of God will be imputed to us.¹²⁰

The Theology Crisis

“Self-exaltation” thus prevents a “living connection with God” which conditions imputation of His righteousness.

Jesus will not take His abode in the heart where sin is enthroned. We want less of self and more of Jesus. We want to learn how to believe-that it is simply taking God at His word-but it is impossible to learn this unless we place ourselves in that position where we will be submissive to God. Our will must be on God’s side, not on the side of Satan. The result of proving the forgiving love of God is to be perfectly reconciled to God’s will. Then the human will and the divine become united. Every faculty must be kept in its place... Working in God’s order, performing His will and purpose.¹²¹

Faith in God’s Word is the determinative factor in a contest over the throne of the heart. This however, necessitates such surrender of the will that in union with the divine, all faculties are brought into cooperation with-God’s will. White continues:

We must put off self-righteousness,...God will direct the soul action if we seek the righteousness of Christ so that God can be pleased with our efforts. We want none of self and all of Jesus. The baptism of the Holy Ghost will come upon us at this meeting if we will have it so.¹²²

White’s burden involved various specifics--the central nerve being that self must be set aside in favor of Jesus. Through **[Page 325]** cooperation with the divine, faith must claim and receive victory through the power of the Holy Spirit. She continues by urging an earnest search for truth and warns against handling “the Word of God deceitfully.” Her second pre-session talk, “Tell of God’s Love and Power,” continues to appeal for search of the Scriptures. The conflict between Christ and Satan is more graphically detailed, with Christ’s incarnation and example central. Reception of the Spirit is the basis for following His example in defeating Satan:

As we yield our minds, our souls, our bodies, and our all to the controlling Spirit of God, it is then that the Spirit of truth is with us and we can become intelligent in regard to the great plan of redemption. Satan’s work was to magnify his power constantly that the children of men should get such an idea of his wonderful work that they would talk of his masterly power. In doing- this he was all the time placing God in a false light . . . that they would have an incorrect view of God.
Satan has come right in and placed himself between God and man.¹²³

The dominant theme in this Great Controversy setting--Satan is a defeated foe. The whole attention should thus be upon Christ, who in defeating him revealed the truth regarding God’s character and power, which the believer is also to reveal.¹²⁴ Vital points in this character-perfection-according-to-the-divine-pattern focus are: “keep the perfect pattern before us;”¹²⁵ “Talk of Jesus, of His love, and tell of His power,” (not that of the devil);¹²⁶ keep the goodness of God in His sacrifice “interwoven into our experience and riveted in our mind” so that “there will be no desire for supremacy;” **[Page 326]** “train and educate the mind”¹²⁷ to focus upon positive things and away from the “disagreeable;”¹²⁸ and “educate your hearts and lips to talk of His power and glory.”¹²⁹ Note the appeal for human response to the divine initiative in focusing upon the righteousness and victory of God and away from the selfishness and defeat of man.

The Need of Advancement

The first two sermons of the regular session focus upon the need for advancement in Christian experience. “The principles of the truth must be interwoven with our character and life,” she insists, and pleads for cherishing “every ray of light that falls upon our pathway.”¹³⁰ Deploing the debating spirit and the measuring of truth by “preconceived opinions,” White questions whether Christ and His Spirit are abiding in the heart.¹³¹ Other emphases are: searching the Word; having Christ, through His Spirit, abide in

The Theology Crisis

the heart by faith; overcoming self-righteousness; and awakening to duty.¹³² The conclusion of her first message is significant:

. . . [Ministers and people] have been far too content to wait for the showers of the latter rain to revive them. We are the people who, like John are to prepare the way of the Lord; and if we are prepared . . . we must work with diligence to prepare others . . . The truth of God must be brought into the soul temple to cleanse and purify it from all defilement. May God help us to search the Scriptures for ourselves . . . that we may hunger and thirst – after righteousness; . . .¹³³

Thus, White's pre-session emphasis continues: that through study [Page 327] of the Scriptures, renunciation of self-will, and cleansing of the soul temple through union with Christ, the way would be open for the pouring out of the Holy Spirit in the latter rain. Touching the same issues, the second sermon gives specific insight concerning her concept of righteousness, and the atonement. After quoting II Peter 1:1-12,¹³⁴ White remarks:

Now mark, it is these graces, this righteousness, [faith, virtue, knowledge, temperance. etc.] that is to be constantly added; . . . Now here is subject matter that we might dwell upon. . . . You cannot be a fruitful Christian . . . unless you are making progress all the time in the divine life.

We hear many excuses: I cannot live up to this or that. What do you mean by this or that? Do you mean that it was an imperfect sacrifice, that there is not sufficient grace and power granted us that we may work away from our own natural defects and tendencies, that it was not a whole Savior that was given? or do you mean to cast reproach upon God?¹³⁵

Righteousness is identified with growth in grace; *those insisting they could not overcome are charged with bringing an accusation against God and of belittling the atoning sacrifice.*¹³⁶ Thus, according to Reformationist theology, White's Minneapolis message is heretical! Discussing the conflict over God's character, she speaks of Christ's appearing "in our world [where] Satan had planted himself, on the throne in order to deliver captives whose bodies and [Page 328] minds "were possessed with demons."¹³⁷ Pointedly warning against resisting the Spirit causing Him to withdraw permitting Satan to hold the mind, she re-emphasizes "connection with the God of wisdom" made possible by the incarnation and through the Holy Spirit. Note:¹³⁸

I ask you what position shall we take that we may be partakers of the divine nature? Why should we not see in that law the righteousness of Jesus Christ? Christ comes in and imputes to me His righteousness ...¹³⁹

Thus White categorically states that imputed righteousness involves Christ's coming in--this in the context of being partakers of the divine nature. She continues:

Here the battle is before us. We see the battle, how Christ contended with the powers of darkness; and we see what He has done. . . . Then what? Man comes to Christ, and God and man are united at the cross,...¹⁴⁰

Note that in identifying the cross as that point of personal union between man and God, White relates it to Christ's atoning ministry in heaven whereby its merits are applied to penitent sinners:

Now Christ is in the heavenly sanctuary. And what is He doing? Making atonement for us, cleansing the sanctuary from the sins of the people. Then we must enter by faith into the sanctuary with Him, we must commence the work in the sanctuary of our souls. We are to cleanse ourselves from all defilement. . . .

Now brethren and sisters, I want you to see that you must "add to your faith virtue;" . . . Now when you commence to work, Satan is going to work in an opposite

direction.¹⁴¹

While the atoning sacrifice was full and complete upon the cross, **[Page 329]** “making atonement for us” takes place in the sanctuary, where Christ mediates the benefits of His sacrifice. Without the sanctuary mediation, the sacrifice would be in vain.¹⁴² when White speaks of the cross she always has in mind both the sacrifice and its mediation, thus uniting Christ’s work on earth with His ministry in heaven. Note that the final atonement necessitates the active participation of the believers who “must enter by faith into the sanctuary with Him, [and] commence the work in the sanctuary of our souls,” in cleansing body temples of “all defilement.” But how?

. . . (C)an they cleanse themselves by-the righteousness of the law? Jesus Christ came to this world, and there is His righteousness to impart to the children of men who are obeying the law of God. . . . (W)e have a wonderful friend in Jesus, who cam to save His people from the transgression of the law. . . . We can be filled with all the fullness of God. Our lives may measure with the life of God. Then we can press back the powers of darkness.¹⁴³

“Overcoming” is not “in our own strength, but by faith in Him, White assures, adding, “then here is Jesus Christ, who, comes right in and imparts His righteousness to us,”¹⁴⁴ in obvious reference to Christ and Laodiceans. His righteousness, which is received only as He is permitted to enter, is mediated directly through His Own presence.¹⁴⁵

Need for connection with Christ is the most dominant note in subsequent discourses, while earnest Bible study, yoking up with Christ, and putting forth “human effort” in union with “divine power” are seen as conditions for obtaining “eternal life.”¹⁴⁶

[Page 330] “Experimental knowledge’ and “living experience” are urged and delegates are reproved for phariseeism, jesting and joking, flattery, harshness, criticism, and particularly for “stubborn opposition to the light given,”¹⁴⁷ which was not “new light, but O, it is strangely new to many” because “it had not been practiced.” It represented truths of God’s Word “rescued from the companionship of error, and . . . placed in their proper framework.”¹⁴⁸

Call to Deeper Bible Study

The final talk laments: “there has not been a single break so as to let the Spirit of God in.”¹⁴⁹ Reception of righteousness by faith is nothing more nor less than responding to the Laodicean message by letting “the Spirit of God in.”

Now I was saying what was the use of our assembling here together and for our ministering brethren to come in if they are here only to shut out the Spirit of God from His people? We did hope that there would be a turning to the Lord here. . . . I have been talking and pleading with you, but it does not seem to make any difference with you. . . .

I never was more alarmed than at the present time.¹⁵⁰

Assuring the delegates that she would not attend another meeting, but would take the message they despised to the people, she again warns against their debating spirit which involves false theories, statements, and structures, and pleads:

God has given me light and I mean to let it shine. And I have seen that precious souls who would have embraced the truth have been turned away from it because of the manner in which the truth has been handled, because Jesus was not in it. What is the reason the Spirit of **[Page 331]** God does not come into our meetings? . . . Now

The Theology Crisis

we want to get right with what God says: all this terrible feeling I don't believe in...God has given me light, and you have acknowledged it in the past.¹⁵¹

The Issues are clear: delegates had rejected the Spirit of Christ and His "testimonies" in fulfillment of White's 1882 warning regarding attitudes toward the testimonies.¹⁵² In a final message by letter addressed: "Dear Brethren assembled at General Conference," the same warnings are repeated and a strong appeal was made for "deeper Bible study."

That which has been presented harmonizes perfectly with the light which God has been pleased to give me during all the years of my experience. If our ministering brethren should accept the doctrine which has been presented so clearly--the righteousness of Christ in connection with the law--their prejudices would not have a controlling power,...¹⁵³

She explains the statement (from her last talk) that she was not prepared to take a position yet" about a controverted point.

I know it would be dangerous to denounce Dr. Waggoner's position as wholly erroneous. This would please the enemy. I see the beauty of truth in the presentation of the righteousness of Christ in relation to the law. . . . (It is light and truth. . . . Even if the position which we have held upon the two laws is truth, the Spirit of truth will not countenance any such measures to defend it. . . . But if ye have bitter envying and strife in your hearts: glory not, and lie not against the truth.¹⁵⁴

White's question thus involved "The Two Laws," not "the presentation of the righteousness of Christ in relation to the law." In opposition to the traditional ceremonial-law position on Galatians, Waggoner had held that it was solely the moral law.¹⁵⁵ Unequivocally [Page 332] agreeing with Waggoner on righteousness by faith, White identifies it with "the third angel's message,"¹⁵⁶ as understood "during all the years of [her] experience." Rejection of this message represents rejection of the Word, the Spirit, and the "Testimonies." Witness her concern regarding integrity in handling Scripture:

. . . [It is] presumption to put forth mere assertions as conclusive evidence. This is unfair and yet this has often been done by sharp debaters. You should give your authority to the people from God's Word. . . . As soon as this [blocking the avenues of truth] shall be attempted God's Spirit will be quenched for that Spirit, is constantly at work to give fresh and increased light to His people through His word. Let the love of Christ reign in hearts here...¹⁵⁷

Loud Cry of the Third Angel¹⁵⁸

Articles immediately following the conference reveal an unchanged and unbroken continuity of thought:

The church of Christ is the only object on the earth upon which he bestows his supreme regard; yet it has grown feeble and inefficient through selfishness. Christ is the living head . . . [Who] expects that man will be partaker of his divine nature while in the world, and thus convey a large amount of glory from earth to heaven.¹⁵⁹

The Laodicean message is applicable to the people of God at this time. . . . Have you not backslidden upon health reform? . . . There has been a great loss of zeal for the truth, and the light contained in the "Testimonies" has been disregarded. May the Lord help you, my brethren, to come into a position where animal powers will not predominate over the moral and spiritual

[Page 333] O backsliding Israel, return. . . . Unless truth is enthroned in the soul, unless the thoughts and purposes, the aims, and the whole object of life, are brought into the service of Jesus Christ, under the control of His Spirit there cannot be a transformation from darkness to light.¹⁶⁰

Reflection of the glory of God's character is still prevented by disregard of the light given through the "Testimonies," and particularly the failure to submit to "the control of His Spirit," by surrender of the body temple in response to the "health reform" message. Note below how White identifies the Laodicean message with the "precious light." Only when the door of the heart is open to receive the Faithful and True Witness with His proffered gifts does righteousness by faith become a reality.

Laodicean Message and Righteousness by Faith

We thank the Lord with all the heart that we have precious light to present. . . . The glad tidings that Christ is our righteousness has brought relief to many, many souls, and God says to his people, "Go forward." The Laodicean message is applicable to our condition. They have been full of rebellion, ingratitude, and forgetfulness of God; and still he has dealt with them as a loving father. . . . (L)et us heed the counsel of the True Witness.

In every meeting since the General Conference, souls have eagerly accepted the precious message of the righteousness of Christ. . . . If you possess these gifts [gold, white raiment, and eye salve] the temple of the human soul will not be like a desecrated shrine. I call upon you . . . to work where God works.¹⁶¹

White's view of the Laodicean message, including its rebuke, is essentially positive, representing "the glad tidings that Christ is [Page 334] our righteousness." Repudiation of self-righteousness is to be accompanied by a joyous claiming of Christ's righteousness, as based upon His sacrifice but ministered through the Spirit's presence in the body temple. Note that cleansing of the soul temple is designed to prepare the people "to work where God works." Note also that the very purpose of the Laodicean message is to introduce the experience of righteousness by faith-offering to that end the justifying/sanctifying gift of Christ's presence. This necessitates reception of a threefold gift:¹⁶²

The churches may yet obtain the gold of truth, faith, and love, The white raiment is the righteousness of Christ that may be wrought into the character. Purity of heart, purity of motive, will characterize every one who is washing his robe, and making it white in the blood of the lamb. *You may say that you believe in Jesus. . . . when you have an intelligent, understanding faith that his death makes [page 335] it possible for you to cease from sin, and to perfect a righteous character through the grace of God, bestowed upon you as the purchase of Christ's blood.*¹⁶³

Eyesalve, the third factor, represents spiritual discernment.¹⁶⁴ All three, as subjectively defined, represent the ministry of the Spirit through which Christ enters the body temple. This evidence, alone is sufficient to reveal White's inclusion of the subjective element in righteousness and to disprove the Reformationist claim that the robe of Christ's righteousness represents a forensic-only claiming of Christ's merits. Not only is the robe identified with character, but reception of Christ's righteousness is seen in the context of washing one's robe in the blood of the Lamb.¹⁶⁵

Third Angel's Message and Righteousness by Faith

Righteousness, (justification) by faith—a term not commonly used before Minneapolis—reflected in the Laodicean message, is the central concept in the third angel's message. Concerning the new term, which supplemented but did not replace earlier terms, White states:

[Page 337] Several have written to me, inquiring if the message of justification by faith is the third angel's message, and I have answered. "It is the third angel's message in verity."¹⁶⁶

The Theology Crisis

The paragraphs preceding this unequivocal assertion provide insight into White's understanding of righteousness by faith:

God reveals Christ to the sinner. . . . By faith in the work and power of Christ, enmity against sin and Satan is created in the heart. Those whom God pardons are first 'made penitent. . . . [Man] is not to be ' carried as a passive burden-by the Lord, but is to work in harmony with Christ. . . for man can never be saved in disobedience or indolence. If you will find voice and time to pray, God will find time and voice to answer.

Some of our brethren have expressed fears that we shall dwell too much on the subject of justification . . . there is *no danger in presenting this doctrine as it is set forth in the Scriptures.*¹⁶⁷

White's understanding of justification "ad it is set forth in the Scriptures," thus involves not only the "work and power of Christ," but an active faith which works "in harmony with Christ," and which includes both "time and voice."¹⁶⁸

The time of test is just upon us, for the loud cry of the third angel has already begun in the revelation of the righteousness of Christ, the sin-pardoning Redeemer. This Is the beginning of the light of the angel whose glory shall fill the whole earth. For It is the work of everyone to whom the message of warning shall come, to lift up Jesus. . . . Man is privileged to connect with Christ, and **[Page 338]** then the divine and the human combine; and in this union the hope of man must rest alone; for it is as the Spirit of God touches the soul that the powers of the soul are quickened, and man becomes a new creature. . . . Beholding Jesus upon the cross of Calvary arouses the conscience to the heinousness of sin as nothing else can do.¹⁶⁹

"The revelation of the righteousness of Christ" Is thus identified with the "loud cry of the third angel," further evidence of the centrality of the Spirit's involvement. Note that in this divine-human "union the hope of man must rest alone," for in this union man's objective view of Calvary galvanizes the "powers of the soul" in subjective response to the "Spirit of God."¹⁷⁰

The Final Atonement

Yet nothing is more evident than that the doctrines of atonement and Justification stand in essential relation and that the view taken of Christ's work must in the end determine the shape of the doctrine of justification.¹⁷¹

The above principle, stated by James Orr, indicates why White's Justification differs from Reformationist theology. There is a **[Page 339]** clear distinction between their "doctrines of the atonement"! Thus White also differs from Trent.¹⁷² Developed in harmony with the typical sanctuary system,¹⁷³ her doctrine of the atonement is distinguishable from all other concepts, regardless of similarities. For example, while affirming the historical base of the atonement in the doing and dying of Christ, she holds that more than a sacrifice is involved. "In His incarnation He had reached the prescribed limits as sacrifice [substitute], but not as a redeemer [surety]."¹⁷⁴ Note the relation of the Substitute to the covenant:

[Page 340]. . . His atonement for the sins of men had been ample, that through the blood all might gain eternal life. The Father ratified the covenant with Christ, that, He would receive repentant and obedient men that He might impart to them His power and glory.¹⁷⁵

The sacrificial act of atonement was full and sufficient for its purpose to seal the covenant between the Father and Son, making it possible for Christ "to complete His work, and fulfill His pledge," to provide man "another trial."¹⁷⁶ Thus, the "atonement commenced on **[Page 341]** earth" is continued through the

The Theology Crisis

ministry of the atoning blood in heaven.¹⁷⁷ Note the basis of assurance-entering and remaining in covenant relation with the Substitute and Surety.¹⁷⁸

As Jesus was accepted as our substitute and surety, every one of us will be accepted if we stand the test and trial for ourselves. He took our nature . . . and he is our mediator and Intercessor before the Father.¹⁷⁹

Mediator in the Most Holy Place

Moreover, Christ's priestly ministry is seen to involve a special "closing work of atonement" following which His atoning intercession is seen to cease, just before His second advent:

At the termination of the 2300 days, in 1844, Christ entered the most holy place of the heavenly sanctuary to perform the closing work of atonement, preparatory to His coming.¹⁸⁰

Christ had only completed one part of His work as our intercessor to enter upon another portion of the work, and He still pleaded His blood¹⁸¹

Therefore the announcement that the temple of God was opened in heaven,. . . points to the opening of the most holy place of the heavenly sanctuary, In 1844, as Christ entered there to perform the closing work of atonement.¹⁸²

Thus, for nearly two millennia after the sacrificial Lamb was slain, the blood was administered in the holy place of the heavenly sanctuary. But in 1844, "forgiveness of sins was offered to men through the intercession of Christ in the most holy. One part of His ministration had closed, only to give place to another."¹⁸³

[Page 342] "The closing work of atonement" had commenced, which is to prepare for Christ's coming. This involved the judgment and atonement for professed followers only:

. . . (O)nly 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 . . . great day of final atonement and investigative judgment, . . .¹⁸⁴

This harmonizes with White's understanding that the sacrificial atonement provided a second trial for those who entered the covenant, the final decision concerning which would be determined by their covenant loyalty. Note the urgency of understanding and active participation through faith:

The subject of the sanctuary and the investigative judgment should be clearly understood by the people of God. All need a knowledge for, themselves of the position and work of their great High Priest. Otherwise, it will be impossible for the to exercise the faith that is essential at this time.¹⁸⁵

All need to become more intelligent in regard to the work of the atonement, which is going on in the sanctuary above. When this grand truth is seen and understood, those who hold it will work in harmony with Christ to prepare a people to stand in the great day of God and their efforts will be successful. By study, contemplation, and prayer God's people will . . . be brought into harmony with Christ and His great work of cleansing the sanctuary above from the sins of the people.¹⁸⁶

Immediately before and shortly after Minneapolis White stressed **[Page 343]** the imperative necessity of an understanding of the investigative judgment and the corresponding work of atonement in cleansing the

sanctuary. While the sacrificial atonement brings man into the covenant, where, in cooperation with the High Priest, he gains victory over sin,¹⁸⁷ the final atonement requires a clear understanding of the work of Christ in the investigative judgment as the basis for a most mature exercise of faith in cooperation with Him in His final disposition of sin. Thus the urgency of White's pre- and post-1888 emphasis upon character perfection. The following statement printed soon after Minneapolis concerning "cleansing of the sanctuary from all the sins of the people," illustrates the ever present centrality of divine-human cooperation in White's work:

What is our work?--It is our work to be In harmony with the work of Christ. By faith we are to work with him, to be in harmony with him. . . . A people Is to be prepared for the great day of God,...¹⁸⁸

Investigative Judgment

It is impossible to adequately understand White's righteousness by faith concept, with its focus upon the loud cry and the sealing,¹⁸⁹ without a clear grasp of her concept of the investigative judgment.¹⁹⁰ Moreover, an understanding of the cleansing of the sanctuary through the final atonement during the investigative judgment requires **[Page 344]** recognition of, its relation to the cleansing of the body temple from the personal defilement of sin.¹⁹¹ Christ's final work in removing sin from the heavenly sanctuary preparatory to its removal from the universe thus necessitates the closest cooperation of His people on earth. Note:

Let us come into the presence of Christ. He is cleansing the heavenly sanctuary. Let us enter there by faith. Provision has been made for our cleansing. . . . Ask in faith for the graces of God, and you will not ask in vain. Shall we wait till we feel that we are cleansed before we believe It?--No; Christ has promised . . .¹⁹²

Centering the covenant in both substitutionary and mediatorial atonement, White sees cooperation with Christ to evidence covenant loyalty and thus to determine the ultimate fulfillment of the covenant promises. Not feeling but a faith that claims Christ's promises and acts upon them by entering and remaining in His cleansing presence is called for.

We are in the day of atonement, and we are to work in harmony with Christ's work of cleansing the sanctuary from the sins of the people. Let no man who desires to be found with the wedding garment on, resist our Lord in his office work. Those who do not cleanse the soul temple **[Page 345]** of every defilement, but who engage in some enterprise not in harmony with this work, are joining the enemy . . . Are we cooperating with him in his great work above? . . . [willing to] cleanse the temple of God from defilement? . . . (W)e must be in covenant relation with God, and employ every faculty of our being to win souls to Christ.¹⁹³

Every previous finding of this study impinges upon this vital issue, for White's Great Controversy-covenant motif focuses sharply upon the day of atonement and the final eradication of sin, which involves the twofold cleansing of the body temple and the heavenly temple preliminary to a cleansing of the earth.¹⁹⁴ Before the record of sin in the heavenly sanctuary is cleansed, an investigation of the cases of all professed believers affirms before the universe how the destiny and reward of each is determined.¹⁹⁵

Opposite each name in the books of heaven is entered, with terrible exactness, every wrong word, every selfish act, every unfulfilled duty, and every secret sin. . . . names are accepted, names rejected. When any have sins remaining upon the books of record, unrepented of and unforgiven, their names will be blotted out of the book of life. . . . All who have truly repented of sin, and by faith claimed the blood of Christ as their atoning sacrifice, have had pardon entered against their names in the books of heaven; as they have become partakers of the righteousness of Christ, and

The Theology Crisis

their characters are found to be in harmony with the law of God, their sins will be blotted out, and they themselves will be accounted worthy of eternal life.¹⁹⁶

[Page 346] White's concept requires an investigative judgment, for the sacrificial atonement provides a second probation during which the believer demonstrates the validity of his acceptance of covenant provisions by responding, through faith, to its conditions in the development of a righteous character. The heavenly sanctuary has for millenia been defiled by sins received by the High Priest through confession.¹⁹⁷ Subsequent to examination by the heavenly tribunal, the sins of all who truly entered and remained in the covenant will be blotted out; while the names of all others must be removed, thus in this twofold manner cleansing the sanctuary of all defilement.

This investigation is not conducted to satisfy any lack in God's knowledge, but provides a watching universe with complete answers to every Satanic charge of injustice. It provides a panoramic view of every issue in the conflict between sin and righteousness. At stake is nothing less than the eternal security of the universe.¹⁹⁸ Moreover, every charge against the divine character and government must be finally and fully removed before the full responsibility for sin can be placed upon its instigator preparatory to its eradication-together with all whose infection with sin was not removed by the blood and ministry of Christ.¹⁹⁹

Without a Mediator

Those who are living upon the earth when the intercession of Christ shall cease in the sanctuary above, are to stand in the sight of a holy God without a mediator. Their robes **[Page 347]** must be spotless, their characters must be purified from sin by the blood of sprinkling. Through the grace of God and their own diligent effort, they must be conquerors in the battle with evil. While the investigative judgment is going forward in heaven, while the sins of penitent believers are being removed from the sanctuary, there is to be a special work of purification, of putting away of sin, among God's people on earth. This work is more clearly presented in the messages of Revelation 14. When this work shall have been accomplished, the followers of Christ will be ready for His appearing.²⁰⁰

Contrary to claims that reference to Christ's leaving His work of mediating relates primarily to the wicked, White is mainly concerned with believers, whose cases will be hopeless unless they are prepared. It is the saints who "are to stand in the sight of a holy God without a mediator."²⁰¹ They do not stand without the aid of the Holy Spirit, however, for their preparation consists in **[Page 348]** having learned to depend so fully upon the Spirit that the higher faculties always control the lower.²⁰² Preparation involves: divine--human union and cooperation,-- "through the grace of God and their own diligent effort; the purification of robes of character; and dynamic participation in the three angel's messages of Revelation 14," in response to the Laodicean message-reception of which issues in an experience in righteousness by faith. The primary reason for the short delay in Christ's coming, during which there is no mediator, is to dramatize before a wondering universe the reality of God's complete power over sin in the lives of those whose wills are totally and forever united to His own.²⁰³

The necessity for this work of preparation underlies White's **[Page 349]** understanding that Christ has delayed His judgment of the living to give them time to be "sealed" for the judgment. This "final generation" concept does not, however, introduce a different method of salvation. None will be "saved" by "perfection," but when a generation of believers is finally ready to cooperate in God's final demonstration of His character, law, and plan of salvation, He can terminate the reign of sin. Ere the curtain falls on the Great Controversy drama the very people who formerly betrayed their sacred trust by testifying (in character) that it is impossible to obey God's law, will participate in the final demonstration that there is no excuse for sin.

God on Trial

The entire Great Controversy-covenant theme, from God's initial purpose to reveal Himself more fully through the creation of man²⁰⁴ to His final triumphant-at-last exhibition, reveals that, in meeting the rebellion, God placed Himself on trial before the universe.²⁰⁵

[Page 350] The most sublime exhibit in that trial took place through the incarnation, crucifixion, and resurrection,²⁰⁶ when God in sinful flesh demonstrated absolute power over sin and infinite-incomprehensible love for the sinner, matched by uncompromising and unyielding hatred of sin.²⁰⁷ But that demonstration involved the God-man who was never tainted by the infection of sin.²⁰⁸ The loud cry and its relationship to preaching-through-living-righteousness-by-faith is best seen in this context. Note:

At this time a message from God is to be proclaimed, a message illuminating in its influence and saving in its power. His character is to be made known. . . . The last rays of merciful light, the last message of mercy to be given to the world, is a revelation of His character of love. The children of God, are to manifest His glory. in their own life and character they are to reveal what the grace of God has done for them.²⁰⁹

The "last message of mercy," is not a theology but a true-in-life revelation of His character of love."²¹⁰ The sentence preceding the quote identifies the loud cry as, "Behold your God," a cry which makes sense only as the "preached message radiates through a "lived message. It is not that God requires more now than of earlier generations, but that He must wait until a people is ready to **[Page 351]** cooperate with Him in answering Satan's charges by presenting a fuller and final exhibition of His character. God depends on the final generation to bring His own trial to a victorious close.

Christ is waiting with longing desire for the manifestation of Himself in His church. When the character of Christ shall be perfectly reproduced in His people, then He will come to claim them as His own.

It is the privilege of every Christian not only to look for but to hasten the coming of our Lord . . .²¹⁰

For Christ to finish His mediatorial work and begin His kingly reign, the demonstration must be complete; Satan's charges must be refuted in the lives of reclaimed sinners. Then God can remove sin completely from the heavenly records without removing the names of believers on earth who, when fully controlled by the Holy Spirit will no longer pollute the heavenly sanctuary.²¹¹

Soul Searching and Cooperation

While Christ is cleansing the sanctuary, the worshipers on earth should carefully review their life, and compare their character with the standard of righteousness. As they see their defects, they should seek the ' aid of the Spirit of God to enable them . . . to resist the temptations of Satan, and to reach the perfection of the standard. . . . They may be victors over the very temptations which seem too strong for humanity to bear; for the divine power will be combined with their human effort, and Satan cannot overcome them. . . . Those who are finally victorious will have seasons of terrible perplexity and trial. . . . part of their discipline. . . . (I)t is essential in order that all dross may be purged away. . . .God has given . . . his only begotten Son, to uplift, ennoble, and fit us, by putting on us his own perfection of character. . . .²¹²

[Page 352] The number of such strong statements following Minneapolis is significant. Overwhelming testimony for a final generation perfection-fulfilment of which necessitates divine-human cooperation in covenant union--explains Paxton's obvious uneasiness²¹³ in following Ford's and Brinsmead's denial of this concept in White's writings. She states unequivocally:

The Theology Crisis

Now, while our great High Priest is making the atonement for us, we should seek to become perfect In Christ. Not even by a thought could our Saviour be brought to yield to the power of temptation. Satan finds in human hearts some point where he can gain a foothold; some sinful desire. But Christ declared concerning Himself: "The prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing In me." John 14:30. . . . This is the condition in which those must be found who shall stand in the time of trouble. . . . It rests with us to cooperate with the agencies which heaven employs in the work of conforming our characters to the divine model. None can neglect or defer this work but at the most fearful peril to their soul.²¹⁴

The Case of the "Wax Nose"

Insulated by "theological" concepts which determine beforehand what one shall find in his sources. Laodicean eyes appear no more capable of recognizing the "straight testimony" now than were White's contemporaries.²¹⁵ Listening to Paxton's repeated reference, **[Page 353]** during his Washington, D.C. meetings, to the quotation cited below, this researcher was led to raise two questions: 1) Was the quote accurate? ("Don't give a rap" seemed quite out of harmony with White's customary speech patterns; and 2) Did his interpretive use of this quote to prove that White disclaimed any theological authority for her works harmonize with the context?

Lay Sister White to one side; . . . Don't you, ever quote my words again as long as you live, until you can obey the Bible. . . . (M)ake that the elements [sic] of your character, . . . [then] you will know better how to receive some counsel from God. But here is the Word, the precious Word, exalted before you today. And don't you give a rap any more what Sister White said-Sister White said this . . . , that . . . , the other thing." But say, "Thus saith the Lord God **[Page 354]** of Israel," and then do just what the Lord . . . says. . . . I don't want you ever to quote Sister White until you get your vantage ground where you know where you are.²¹⁶

After discovering the same quote used in the same manner by both Brinsmead and Ford, answers to both questions were found at Andrews University. Their reference was to an unofficial transcription of an informal evening meeting held with the leaders just before the 1901 General Conference session. White was calling for complete reorganization and a change of officers. The garbled phrase should read, "Don't you repeat any more," which is much more in character with her avoidance of slang expressions.

Internal and contextual evidence reveals that White was protesting misrepresentation by those who, personally rejecting her counsel, used her statements to support their own ends. A twofold failure to "obey the Bible" involved both false reports and failure to follow the Biblical injunction to "go to your brother" with a grievance. (While accusing her of violating her own counsel, they quoted her in defense of their own non-repentance.) A third violation specifically pointed out was their failure to care for the body temple by living principles of health reform.²¹⁷

Thus the statement unequivocally protests use of her writings in their own support while denying her authority and rejecting all elements conflicting with their position. Moreover, identifying her work as "counsel from God," the statement demands that instead of saying "Sister White says," they recognize the divine Author **[Page 355]** saying "Thus saith the Lord" and act in harmony with His testimony. The messages, she insists, were not her own-she was only a mouthpiece.²¹⁸

Good Advice

I mentioned that Mrs. White wrote voluminously. Those writings took place over a considerable period of time. They took place in specific contexts, and they stood in a definite relationship to each other. To use those writings correctly (so as not to

The Theology Crisis

misrepresent them) requires a great deal more skill than is generally being exhibited. I know for a fact that some scholars within Adventism are very concerned over the superficial and childish use made of Ellen White's writings. She has a wax nose. She is turned this way and then that way, and then this way again. . . .²¹⁹

Paxton's advice begs practice (the principle should also be applied to Paul, Luther, and Calvin). Few have written so voluminously over such a long period of time, often under extreme physical handicap, and/or stress due to the heavy burden carried for others. While the consistency of White's thought during a seven-decade period is remarkable, paradoxical concepts, and ever-changing circumstances demand careful observance of context and the relation of one passage to another, in light of her underlying concepts. 'The consistency of her driving Great Controversy-covenant focus suggests that it is not a "wax nose" that is involved in the contemporary discussion, but the fine art of "plastic surgery." A Laodicean "eye" defect distorts the vision,²²⁰ stimulating skillful "restorative" efforts in behalf of what is considered a pure theology.²²¹

[Page 356] Were White present she might well call attention to statements she wrote before and after 1888 such as follow, which identify her works as "the truth of God," and equate such use as Reformationists give them with the way in which critics treat the Bible.

When the testimonies speak contrary to your ideas you treat them very lightly, . . . [You] have arranged certain Scriptures of great force, and applied them according to your own ideas. . . . much that purports to be a message from Sister White, serves the purpose of misrepresenting Sister White, making her testify in favor of things that are not in accordance with her mind or judgment. . . . No one is called upon to be a mouth piece for Sister White.²²²

This is the way my writings are treated. . . . They turn the truth of God into a lie. in the very same way . . . infidels treat the Bible. They read it according to their desire to pervert . . . [and] willfully wrest the utterances. ...²²³

Satan's Final Deception

The testimonies of the Spirit of God are given to direct men to His word, which has been neglected. Now if their messages are not heeded, the Holy Spirit is shut away from the soul.²²⁴

The very last deception of Satan will be to make of none effect the testimony of the Spirit of God. "Where there **[Page 357]** is no vision, the people perish." (Prov. 29:18). Satan will work ingeniously, in different ways and through different agencies, to unsettle the confidence of God's remnant people in the true testimony.²²⁵

These statements refer specifically to righteousness by faith issues. Denying the human origin of her messages, White indicates the urgency of their acceptance. The enemy attempts to destroy God's people by disrupting this divine-human channel of communication. The Minneapolis rebellion is unquestionably identified as a rejection of the "Testimonies" by those who profess to believe them.

The light which God has given is not light to them, and they wander in darkness. . . . The word of God is not silent in regard to this momentous time, and it will be understood by all who do not resist his Spirit by determining not to hear. . . . The Lord's messages of light have been before us for years; but there have been influences working indirectly to make of no effect the warnings. . . . His blessings have been withdrawn because the *testimonies he has given have not been heeded by*

The Theology Crisis

*those who professed to believe them. . . . (S)elf was not crucified in them. Thus the light has had but little effect upon minds and hearts.*²²⁶

White's role in turning attention to Scripture is verified; but no distinction is made in the source of authority between the Bible and her writings,²²⁷ both being attributed to "His Spirit." Moreover, God's blessings are removed from those who "resist his' Spirit" by refusing to heed "the testimonies he has given." During the critical year 1882 White declared, "if you lost confidence in the testimonies, you will drift away from Bible truth. . . . The testimonies either bear the signet of God or that of Satan."²²⁸

¹ See this study, 3ff, 13ff.

² Documents, 44-49, cf. this study, 4-5; The 1973 Pall Council, representing the world body of SDA's, acknowledged the Church's failure to adequately accept the message. (Review, 12/06/1973).

³ This study, 15.

⁴ Documents, 49-60; Cf. this study, 11-12.

⁵ Documents, 32; Shaking, 70, 75, 140; Cf. Selected Messages, 1:193-208.

⁶ Cf. this study, 40-42.

⁷ Wieland cites 193 White references in which she heartily endorses the positions held by Jones and Waggoner in the 1888 message of righteousness by faith. (Robert J. Wieland, *An Introduction to the 1888 Message Itself*, Baker Publishers, Oregon: The Adventist Forum Association, c. 1977, 111-126.)

⁸ This study, Appendix B, *passim*.

⁹ This study, *in*, 7-9.

¹⁰ Review, 1:18, 6/10/1852; Cf. this study, 66.

¹¹ Review, 1:20, 2/17/1853.

¹² This study, 140.

¹³ Review, 1:32, 10/31/1857; The "straight testimony" of the "True witness" (Christ) to Laodicea (Revelation 3:14-22) is to be faithfully presented to the Church. In her prophetic role White is understood to have a peculiar responsibility to amplify this testimony. "The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy." Revelation 19:10; Cf. 12:17; See P. Gerard Damsteegt. *Foundations of the Seventh-day Adventist message and Mission*, 194-195; hereinafter, *Foundations*. St. Louis: Eerdmans, 1977.)

¹⁴ This study, 334-335.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 205.

¹⁶ Review, 1:131, 9/16/1873.

¹⁷ Testimonies, 3:255, 1873: "The Laodicean Church."

¹⁸ This study, 92, 100-102.

¹⁹ This study, 92ff, 333ff.

²⁰ Testimonies, 3:380.

²¹ Ibid., 360.

²² This study, 148ff, 184ff.

²³ Testimonies, 3:381, 1875.

²⁴ This study, 290.

²⁵ Testimonies, 4:87-88; cf. this study, 92, 100ff.

²⁶ Review, 1:314.

²⁷ Testimonies, 5:222, 1882.

²⁸ This study, 296.

²⁹ See also the preceding three articles, Testimonies, 5:199-216.

³⁰ Ibid., 5:218-219. The last paragraph in the article opens with a statement concerning Christ's taking "upon Himself man's nature, that He might leave a pattern for humanity, complete, perfect;" and closes with reference to reflection of the divine image. (235) Several warnings are given to "watchmen"(Cf. 222, 224-227, 229, 234-235) who were inclined to cry "peace and safety." (233) An article three weeks later indicts "men among us in responsible positions," but implies the faithfulness of some watchmen: "Who knows whether God will not give you up to the deceptions you love? Who knows but that the preachers who are faithful, firm, and true may be the last who shall offer the gospel of peace . . . (79, 77.) Note that the straight testimony of the Laodicean message is considered a "gospel of peace," for it reveals how to find release from the bondage of guilt.

³¹ This study, 241-242, 325-326, 334.

³² This study, 224, 238; White is deeply concerned with correct doctrine for it is essential to an understanding of God's character, His will for man, and how that will can be realized. But Daniells is right regarding righteousness by faith relating more to experience than theory. In White, theory is ever only a means to the end of forming and maintaining relations. "Experience is knowledge derived by experiment. Experimental religion is what is needed now," White states. (241) In her writings, righteousness by faith represents a righteousness formed by experimental faith which releases the power of God in the life and frees man from "the bondage of sin [self-will]." (Testimonies, 5:220)

³³ This study, 218-224.

³⁴ Testimonies, 5:219, 538.

³⁵ This study, 218ff.

³⁶ Note the interchangeability of Christ and the Holy Spirit; "the imparting of the Spirit is the imparting of the life of Christ." (God's Amazing Grace, 212)

³⁷ Hudson also identifies union as the key to White's theology of Righteousness by faith before and after 1888. He outlines her article (see below) and summarizes: "Fourteen times the prophet uses the word 'union' as pertaining to the relationship which does or should exist between Christ and His people. Four times the word is used to represent the relationship which should exist between believers. ("The '1888' Message of White, Waggoner, Jones," section one, part one, n.d.) "It seems impossible to us to produce any more conclusive evidence that Mrs. White was completely true and knowledgeable on the gospel in 1882 and tried to convey this information to Seventh-day Adventism again and again." Note that Hudson clearly

points to 1882 as a crisis year in White's attempt to lead the Church into an experience in righteousness by faith. A second 1882 White article he reviews which emphasizes "union" is "Important Testimony," dealing with an educational "crisis." (See this study, 194).

³⁸ Testimonies, 5:228-229.

³⁹ Ibid., 231.

⁴⁰ Loc. cit.

⁴¹ Loc. cit.

⁴² General failure to adequately elucidate this principle intensifies Reformationist hostility to the subject of Perfection, which they assume can only stimulate the Laodicean syndrome of pride and self-righteousness. Such an idea is far removed from White, who declares: "Our fallen nature must be purified," (Ibid., 235) but insists: "The Christian may not be conscious of the great change; for the more closely he resembles Christ in character the more humble will be his opinion of himself; but it will be seen and felt by all around him. Those who have the deepest experience in the things of God are the furthest removed from pride or self-exaltation. They have the humblest thoughts of self and the most exalted conceptions of the glory and excellence of Christ." (Ibid., 223; Cf. this study, 135ff, 220, 228, 239) White would be aghast at the use of her writings in support of the theory that one must retain some degree of sin in order to remain humble, when sin of any kind or degree represents self-centeredness! To combat perfection on the basis that it instills pride, and to categorize all concepts of perfection as "perfectionism," is to stage a frontal attack upon White and her concept of sin, the cause of "bondage," (self-will characterizes legalism) and the nature of the cross!

⁴³ Testimonies, 5:64-66.

⁴⁴ An 1876 testimony forcibly links failure to receive the divine power made available by His "infinite sacrifice" to "resistance of the testimonies" (Testimonies, 4:32), which is linked to unwillingness to deny the clamors of appetite. The article "Indulgence of Appetite" (Ibid., 28-43) is an excellent summary of the body temple concept. Indulgence of appetite, however, representing subservience of the higher faculties to the lower, interferes with the ability to reason correctly. (Ibid., 31-33) This explains the Laodicean paradox of "sincere" self-deception. (This study, 298, 352n, 393f.) In holding up Christ's example, ("Christ was a perfect overcomer, and we must be perfect.") She states that victory, over "evil hearts" "will cost us strong effort." (Ibid., 39)

⁴⁵ Testimonies, 5:61.

⁴⁶ The key to the 1888 "debacle" is clearly marked in 1882-resistance to the Spirit by resisting His "testimonies." "I am presenting to you that which the Lord has presented to me. *I do not write one article in the paper expressing merely my own ideas. They are ...precious rays of light shining from the throne.*" (Testimonies, 5:67) No difference is seen in authority between the Bible and the "Testimonies" whose author is the same. Rejection of either represents self-exaltation and backsliding from God. (Ibid., 137, 76) "There is a spirit of opposition to the plain word of God, and to the testimony of His Spirit.... [an] exaltation of mere human reason above the revealed wisdom of God. (Ibid., 79; Cf. 76) Two authorities are in competition: God, speaking through the Bible and "testimonies," and human reason, as governed by the lower nature. "My brethren, beware of unbelief. The Word of God is plain in its restrictions;... The testimonies of his Spirit call your attention to the Scriptures, point out your defects,... therefore you do not heed them. And to justify your carnal, ease loving course, *you begin to doubt whether the testimonies are from God. If you obey their teaching, you would be assured of their divine origin...*" White then warns that those who weaken confidence in the testimonies given "for the last thirty-six years are fighting against God." (Ibid., 5:234; Cf. Review, 1:372, and 2:1) Note White's feelings: "I seldom weep, but now I find my eyes blinded with tears; they are falling upon my paper as I write. It may be that ere long all prophecies will be at an end,..." (Testimonies, 5:77)

⁴⁷ Testimonies, 5:69.

⁴⁸ Ibid., 71-72.

⁴⁹ Ibid., 77.

⁵⁰ Ibid., 84.

⁵¹ Ibid., 70, 73, 75.

⁵² Ibid. 133-134, 199-201; Numerous examples could be given showing how central effort is to acceptance of the Laodicean message. It is difficult to imagine how White could more consistently condition acceptance of the Laodicean message and righteousness by, faith upon the deliberate, subjective response to the plaintive appeals of the "Faithful and True Witness," (Cf. Testimonies, 5:45-62). This pattern intensified as 1888 drew near: "But many do not persevere in their efforts long enough to realize the sanctifying influences.... Self examination and secret prayer are neglected. The *only hope* of being partakers of the divine nature, is to escape the corruption...; *This experience cannot be obtained without effort*. Their position requires... earnestness and unabated diligence." (Review, 2:65) It should be noted that White's central theme throughout this time of intensification was divine-human union. (Cf. this study, 300ff.) To enter that union severe struggle in the exercise of faith is involved, as it is to remain in communion. The greatest effort involves the perennial struggle inherent in subduing self-will through death to self. If such merging of the subjective with the objective is the true cause of legalism, then White is the arch-heretic. Indeed, on the basis of Reformationist theology White was directly responsible for the failure at Minneapolis; seldom in the history of the SDA church can a comparable example be found in which the subjective is urged as of paramount importance. Reformationists will eventually be forced to decide-between White and Reformationist theology, for she epitomizes what they reject as heretical. It is understandable that Ford and Brinsmead's belief in her inspiration would hinder this decision. But it is difficult to rationalize Paxton's wholly inconsistent pattern of challenging numerous SDA theologians on grounds which are very weak compared with evidence to be amassed concerning White. (Shaking, passim) Nothing so seriously indicts his scholarship as does this question.

⁵³ Testimonies, 5:177.

⁵⁴ This study, 75.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 236, 246, 290.

⁵⁶ Ibid., 242.

⁵⁷ See Haddock Thesis, 256-258. After quoting two 1885 articles (Signs, 1:493-494; Review, 1:567) calling for cleansing of the "soul-temple" by opening the heart's door to Jesus, who stands knocking, Haddock states: "Here we see a definite correlation of the Laodicean message and the cleansing of the soul temple." (His excellent treatment of the development of White's sanctuary concepts dates the beginning of her introduction of this concept at least three years late, however, for in the critical year, 1882, she presented that concept at least three times. (Cf. Testimonies, 5:72, 92.) The timing of White's emphasis is significant in terms of Reformationist claims regarding Waggoner. McMahon states: "Waggoner pursued his false premise and confused the forgiveness of sins with the actual infusion of righteousness into the heart." "As early as 1889 Waggoner began to lose this important distinction. Waggoner had the mystic's view of the union of the soul with God in which the individuality and personality of the soul disappeared." "At the end of 1890, Waggoner introduced the mystical theory of atonement." (David McMahon, E. J. Waggoner: The Myth and The Man, Fallbrook, California: Verdict Publications, 1979, 96, 127, 98.) These statements all grossly distort Waggoner's teaching, (For an examination of McMahon's evidence and methodology, see this study, Appendix B, passim.) which was an attempt to make practical (not mystical") the spiritual implications of the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary by applying the principles to the cleansing of the

soul temple. His specific language and metaphorical usage were his own, but it can hardly be doubted that he was deeply impressed by White's growing emphasis upon the cleansing of the soul temple as the critical key to the closing ministry of Christ in the heavenly temple and was attempting to portray its urgency. (For a discussion of the effect the Reformationist pattern of following methods peculiar to systematic theology rather than those of Biblical theology has upon their writings, see this study, Appendix C.)

⁵⁸ Testimonies, 5:214, 1882; Cf. 72, 92.

⁵⁹ Review, 2.62, 7/20/1886; Compare "It is left with us to remedy our defects" with "May the Lord help His people," and this study, 225; for definition of Latter Rain, see this study, 12n, 338n.

⁶⁰ Review, 2.89, 11/2/1886.

⁶¹ This study, 178-185.

⁶² Ibid., 231, 252-253n.

⁶³ Loc. cit.

⁶⁴ Any mental acceptance of the atonement unaccompanied by submission to the Spirit, on the authority of the Word, results in some kind of subjectivism-whether an emotional variety or an intellectual anti-subjective type; for any experience not directed by the Spirit-Word is egocentric and thus characterized by subjective interpretation. The Spirit's function, working through the Word, is to correct egocentricity by revealing truth and directing the believer to act on the basis of truly objective reality rather than either feeling or rationalization. (See God's Amazing Grace, 212) Thus it is impossible to correct subjectivism by appealing to forensic-only justification (which even its adherents acknowledge does not exist by insisting that it must be based upon repentance). That justification which is not both the product of the Spirit's initial wooing and of its continued and immediate mediation is a counterfeit which can only intensify the state of self-deception.

⁶⁵ "The imparting of the Spirit is the imparting of the life of Christ." (God's Amazing Grace, 212).

⁶⁶ This study, 75ff, 92ff, 154, 220ff.

⁶⁷ Review, 2:121, 3/22/1887.

⁶⁸ Loc. Cit.

⁶⁹ Ibid., 2:11; this study, 148ff, 191ff, 245f.

⁷⁰ This study, 142ff.

⁷¹ Loc. cit., Cf. 299; Testimonies, 3:381.

⁷² This study, 225-229.

⁷³ Review, 2.11, 1/19/1886.

⁷⁴ Testimonies, 5:207-208; Cf. a similar message (1873) addressed to "The Laodicean Church." Ibid., 3:365ff.

⁷⁵ Testimonies, 5:209-210.

⁷⁶ Ibid., 211.

⁷⁷ Ibid., 210.

⁷⁸ Ibid., 212-213.

⁷⁹ Ibid., 211.

⁸⁰ Ibid., 214.

⁸¹ To use her statements which warn against perversions of the doctrine of perfection to refute the basic concept not only misses the thrust of White's life-work, but forces her to deny convictions so deep and permanent as to demand the most phenomenal outlay of energies over a period of seven decades!

⁸² Testimonies, 5:216.

⁸³ Op. cit., white sees her work as representing a continuum with the writers of Scripture-her mission to elucidate the Word, not to render it opaque, as Ford holds. (Cf. Selected Messages, 1:32, and this study, Appendix C.

⁸⁴ Testimonies, 5:215; Cf. Ibid., 3:30.

⁸⁵ Ibid., 1:228, 3/18/80; How can justification be forensic-only when the atonement and blood cannot even properly valued except through the response to the Spirit involving surrender of the body temple (death to self)? Note: justification is only by faith, which represents man's subjective response to the gift of the spirit. (See this study, 307n, 151ff.)

⁸⁶ Review, 1:88, 3/8/70.

⁸⁷ Testimonies, 3:161, 1872; Cf. Ibid., 6:11-12; this study, 66-68. Speaking of the vision in 1906, (43 years later) White states: "I was instructed that I must ever urge...the necessity of practicing the truth. This means sanctification, and sanctification means the culture and training of every capability for the Lord's service." (Selected Messages, 1:33) Thus faithfulness in health reform, which involves the development and care of the entire body, is a measure of the faithfulness in "practicing truth." Health reform was a symbol of "daily practical Christianity" and involved "surrender of our own ways and will." This necessitates being "often in prayer, holding every emotion and every passion in calm subjection to reason and conscience, *banishing all unholy imaginings*, bringing every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ." (Signs, 1:379)

⁸⁸ Testimonies, 3:71.

⁸⁹ Review, 1:447, 7/29/84; Cf. this study, 94-97.

⁹⁰ This study, 66-68.

⁹¹ Testimonies, 4:60; Cf. 35-36, 86.

⁹² Ibid., 4:235, 1876; Cf. 314.

⁹³ Review, 2:229-230, 7/17/88; Written just before Minneapolis, this article provides a significant summary of White's concept of righteousness by faith. Note the severe effort involved in bringing the will "into activity."

⁹⁴ Signs, 1:152, 4/22/80. Context and consistency of White theology require that "after man has done" be understood in terms of the principles in the study, chapter four, central to which is cooperation. (See this study, 131, 137, 151, 225, 229, 273.)

⁹⁵ This study, 92ff.

⁹⁶ Ibid., 150ff.

⁹⁷ Ibid., 219f, 242ff.

⁹⁸ The first angel's message, a call to worship the Creator, is to be given when "the hour of His judgment is come," (beginning in 1844). The second and third follow with dire warnings against false worship. (Rev XIV: 6-12)

⁹⁹ Both the body temple and Sabbath, created holy but defiled through sin must be sanctified by the Spirit's presence.

¹⁰⁰ Spiritual Gifts, 3:293, 1864.

¹⁰¹ Testimonies, 2:704; Cf. Heb VIII: 1-; Rev XI:19; this study, 84ff, 108ff.

¹⁰² Cf. this study, 308ff; Ellen G. White, Story of Redemption, Washington, D.C: Review & Herald Pub. Assn., 1947, 380 (1884).

¹⁰³ Early Writings, 254, 1858

¹⁰⁴ Cf. Hebrews VIII:1-5; Acts of the Apostles, 33, 246-247; Desire of Ages, 165-166.

¹⁰⁵ Early Writings, 255; Cf. this study, 64.

¹⁰⁶ Office, Territory, and authority to rule; see Exodus XX:8-11.

¹⁰⁷ Great Controversy, 640.

¹⁰⁸ See Damsteegt, op. cit., 210-213.

¹⁰⁹ Early Writings, 33, 1851.

¹¹⁰ Ibid., 64-67, 1851; Cf. 217; Great Controversy, 447-449.

¹¹¹ Testimonies, 6:350, 1900.

¹¹² "The Sabbath is a sign of a relationship... that they honor His law. It distinguishes between His loyal subjects and transgressors....It is a pledge that He will fulfill to them His covenant. Every soul who accepts the sign of God's government places himself under the divine, everlasting covenant." (Testimonies, 6:349-350)

¹¹³ Testimonies, 5: 213, 1882.

¹¹⁴ Desire of Ages, 769; In order to forcefully establish the continuity of White's pre-Minneapolis concepts with her later views, the chapter thus far, with only two exceptions, includes pre-1888 references. The vast majority of White's writing was done after 1888, which marks an acceleration of emphasis upon issues relating to the Laodicean message, the atonement, the loud cry, and the latter rain, as well as the righteousness by faith, which represents all these points of emphasis. In the avalanche of writing upon this broad subject, no significant change is detected. To further dramatize this point, the remainder of this chapter largely cites Minneapolis and post-Minneapolis works, except for the 1888 introduction.

¹¹⁵ This study, 194n

¹¹⁶ Graham Maxwell's *Can God Be Trusted?*, which has been dubbed Abelardian (See this study, 20n), may be faulted for not dealing explicitly with the Substitutionary aspect of the atonement, but his purpose was to expose the underlying principles upon which such vital concepts rest. White's influence is clearly evident at numerous points which cross-section findings reported in this study. For the relation of the Sabbath to creation and the cross; for its reflection of the principle of loyalty in the final conflict between Christ and Satan, and its function as an eternal symbol of God's love and triumph of the cross, see pp. 139-150. Demonstrating man's trust in God, its observance in the final crucial test demonstrates that God can trust man to be loyal in the eternal state of freedom; for the relation between man's trust in God and God's trust in man, see pp. 128-138; for the divine initiative in re-establishing the trust of man in Himself, see pp. 75-89; for God's guarantee of the integrity of man's will in the process of re-establishing his trust, see pp. 75-105; for the manner in which love provides a security which makes both worship and facing the judgment possible without fear, see pp. 107-138. Maxwell's answer to security and the problem of legalism is one: response to Christ's demonstration of God's love by entering divine human relationships based upon trust and which engender ever greater trust.

¹¹⁷ Review, 2:243-244, 9/4/88; The October 16, 23, and 30 Review articles which were printed during the pre-session and session are of particular significance and reveal, with the above, a driving emphasis upon cooperation in union with Christ combined with warnings against subjectivism. Note an 1886 White declaration: "Their only hope of being partakers of the divine nature, is to escape the corruption that is in the world. All need a deep and thorough experience in the things of God. This experience cannot be obtained without effort on the part of all such." (Review, 2:65)

¹¹⁸ See this study, 313ff. Sermons of Jones and Waggoner were not recorded, so it is necessary to determine their content by studying White's sermons and comments regarding them, both during and after the session, together with sermons printed by then after the conference. It is clear that their central focus involved consideration of divine-human relations of righteousness by faith which would prepare the way for the latter rain and the coming of Christ. Acceptance of this concept would break the power of sin over the self-righteous heart. (Cf. Waggoner's *Christ and His Righteousness*, 1890, containing concepts printed in *Signs* during the year following Minneapolis.)

¹¹⁹ A.V. Olson, *Through Crisis to Victory: 1888-1901*, hereinafter, *Crisis*, Washington, D.C.: Review & Herald Pub. Association., 1966, 243-244.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, 223-224.

¹²¹ *Ibid.*, 244.

¹²² *Loc. cit.*

¹²³ *Ibid.*, 245.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, 246-247.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, 248

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, 250.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, 251.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, 253.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, 256.

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, 257.

¹³¹ Loc. Cit

¹³² Ibid., 258-259.

¹³³ Ibid., 260.

¹³⁴ One of White's favorite texts in the years following Minneapolis is this passage containing "Peter's Ladder," (i.e., Acts of the Apostles, 530). A study should be made of her usage of this and others such as Philippians 11:12, 13.

¹³⁵ Olson, Crisis, 261-262.

¹³⁶ Cf. this study, 30-40, 184n.

¹³⁷ Olson, Crisis, 262-263.

¹³⁸ Ibid., 263-265.

¹³⁹ Ibid., 265.

¹⁴⁰ Loc. cit.

¹⁴¹ Ibid., 267 Note reference to Peter's Ladder. (This study, 327n)

¹⁴² This study, 145ff.

¹⁴³ Olson, Crisis, 268.

¹⁴⁴ Loc. Cit.

¹⁴⁵ This study, 307ff.

¹⁴⁶ Crisis, 271; Cf. 269-289.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid., 276-285; Cf. this study, 202-263, 241 334ff

¹⁴⁸ Crisis, 280, 279.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid 290.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid., 290-291,

¹⁵¹ Ibid., 293

¹⁵² This study, 304.

¹⁵³ Crisis, 294-295.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid., 295-296.

¹⁵⁵ White later clarified her position regarding the two laws by holding that both were involved but that the primary issue-the manner of salvation-involved the moral law

¹⁵⁶ Crisis, loc. Cit.

¹⁵⁷ Ibid., 301-302.

¹⁵⁸ Their near-total lack of emphasis on the enabling and perfecting power of the Holy Spirit in the lives of willing believers constitutes what is perhaps the most serious of the “missing links” in Reformationist theology. The latter rain will be more abundant than the former rain at Pentecost. (See A. Leroy Moore, “Laodicea and the Latter Rain, four articles in *The Ministry*, Washington, D.C.: Review & Herald Publishing. Association., v. XLVI, n. 2, 3, 4, 5, February to May, 1973.)

¹⁵⁹ Review, 2:263.

¹⁶⁰ Ibid., 2:273, 12/11/88.

¹⁶¹ Ibid., 2:320, 7/23/89; The people proved more responsive than had the delegates.

¹⁶² Note how the “gift” is treated with specific reference to the “righteousness of Christ”: “The thought that the righteousness of Christ is imputed to us, not because of any merit on our part, but as a free gift from God, seemed a precious thought. The enemy of man and God is not willing that this truth should be clearly presented; for he knows that if the people receive it fully, his power will be broken. . . . That simple faith that takes God at his word should be encouraged. . . our only safety is in continually looking to Jesus. By living faith we must appropriate the precious promises; for every promise and command, necessary for salvation, must become a part of us, that we may become one with Christ. . . . Unless divine power is brought into the experience of the people of God, false theories and erroneous ideas will take minds captive, and Christ and his righteousness will be dropped out of the experience . . . and their faith will be without power or life. Such will not have a daily, living experience of the love of God in the heart, and if they do not zealously repent, they will be among those . . . Laodiceans, who will be spewed out of the mouth of God.” (Review, 2:330, 9/3/89)

Two factors should be noted: a gift (objective) and its reception (subjective). White’s perpetual, overwhelming stress upon reception, which is neither automatic nor without effort, must not be rationalized. This, however, is not at the expense of the objective and/or theological, for sound experience comes only through sound concepts of the cross and Christ’s mediatorial ministry. The urgency of correct theology is seen in Satan’s urgency to prevent the message from being “clearly presented.” Note, however, that it is a theology of divine-human relations. Moreover, it is not understanding but full reception which breaks the enemy’s power through saving covenant relations. Only thus is “the temple of the soul” cleansed from its desecration, making it possible for man “to work where God works.” Note that Christ, “the angel of the covenant,” “works in cooperation with the will and action of the human agent.” (SDA BC, 7:928, L. 97, 1898, MS 3, 1895.)

¹⁶³ Ibid., 2:231, 7/24/88.

¹⁶⁴ SDA BC, 7:964, 1892

¹⁶⁵ Contrast Ford’s approach, qualifying White’s “This robe, woven in the loom of heaven, has in it not one thread of human devising,” (Christ’s Object Lessons, 311), with the phrase, “not even a sanctified stitch,” (this study, 36n) thus making White contradict her numerous statements linking the robe with character and its cleansing. On the same page, White contrasts Christ’s righteousness and the disobedient who “sewed together fig leaves to cover the nakedness caused by transgression. They have worn the garments of their own devising, by works of their own hands they have tried to cover their sins, and make themselves acceptable to God.” Thus, White is dealing with disobedient souls who attempt to hide their sins by good deeds. In this context she denies a single “thread of human devising,” without the slightest suggestion that she contrasts the imputed righteousness of Christ with the work of the Spirit in imparting His righteousness, but gives overwhelming evidence to the contrary. The very next page shows what it means to be clothed with the

garment of His righteousness” Divine-human unity of heart and will, with the mind and thoughts “brought into captivity to Him; we live His life.” After again contrasting this with the fig-leaf garment, White states, “Righteousness is right doing, and it is by their deeds that all will be judged. our characters are revealed by what we do. The works show whether the faith is genuine.” These excerpts from the next six pages leave no doubt: “The truth is to be planted in the heart. It is to control the mind and regulate the affections. . . . [molding] the whole character....He who becomes a partaker of the divine nature will be in harmony. . . . Satan had claimed that it was impossible for man to obey God’s commandments; and in our own strength it is true that we cannot obey them. But Christ came in the form of humanity, and by His perfect obedience He proved that humanity and divinity combined can obey EVERY ONE of God’s precepts... ‘As many as received Him, to them gave He power. . . .’ God requires perfection of His children. . . . (W)hen . . . Christ like in character, Then the Lord can trust them to be of the number. who shall compose the family of heaven. Clothed in the glorious apparel of Christ’s righteousness, they have a place. . . . He expects us to overcome in His name. Those who reject the gift of Christ’s righteousness are rejecting the attributes of character which constitutes them sons and daughters of God. . . . Men will then see that they have fashioned their characters under the deceptive allurements of Satan., The garments they have chosen [fig-leaf] are the badge of their allegiance to the first great apostate. There will be no-future probation in which to prepare for eternity. It is in this life that we are to put on the robe of Christ’s righteousness. This is our only opportunity to form characters. . . .” (Christ’s Object Lessons, 312-317; Cf. In Heavenly Places, 356, 369-370; Cf. 348-349)

To interpret “not one thread of human devising” to mean “not even one sanctified-stitch,” robs White of all freedom to mean what she so clearly says! Only pre-developed theological lenses could possibly produce such an interpretation. The power of theology to transform its sources so as to minimize or even to completely reverse them suggests the desirability of encouraging the priesthood of the believer by subordinating theology to “the word of [our] testimony” (Revelation XII:11) concerning the power and authority of His Word. (Cf. this study, 330, 352-357; Appendix C.) See next page. The Bible with its precious gems of truth was not written for the scholar alone. On the contrary, it was designed for common people; and the interpretation given by the common people, when aided by the Holy Spirit accords best with the truth as it is. in Jesus.(Testimonies, 5:331)

¹⁶⁶ Review, 2.381, 11/1/90; Note that if Righteousness by’ faith is to be considered forensic-only, so must the third angel’s message.

¹⁶⁷ Loc. cit.

¹⁶⁸ Thus, White’s concept of the doctrine of “justification” not only contradicts’ Reformationist theology, but is exactly that which is defined as heretical. (Cf. this study, 50ff.)

¹⁶⁹ Review, 2.615-616.

¹⁷⁰ The loud cry is here specifically identified with “the revelation of the righteousness of Christ,” as well as with the third angel’s message. This statement and the 1850 article quoted from above both refer specifically to the angel of Revelation XVIII:1 which comes down with great power and fills the earth with His glory. That angel, says White, is Christ. (Cf. SDA BC, 7:984-985, 971.) And the loud cry message is a message to behold Christ, the God-man, and to receive His righteousness through a union of “the divine and human,” in which “the hope of nun must rest alone.” The next verse announces the fall of Babylon, which in its broadest spiritual sense rep resents all self-centered religion or religious experience. This is a primary point in righteousness by faith as held by Jones and Waggoner, as well as by White. Note that the cross and the Holy Spirit combine to arouse the conscience and to quicken new life. (See this study, 156ff.)

¹⁷¹ James Orr, The Progress of Dogma, New York: A.C. Armstrong & Son, 1901, 255, 266, (Ford 5 #8). See Appendix E for Ford’s Atonement concept.

¹⁷² Thus the superficiality of identifying inclusion - of the subjective element in justification with the doctrine of Trent while ignoring the respective presuppositions. (See this study, 171n.) Note Orr’s statement immediately preceding the above: “In Roman theology to the present hour justification is hardly

exalted to the dignity of a special article, but is merged in the doctrine of baptism, of which, in strictness, it forms a part.” (Orr Op. cit., 255) To make justification an article of baptism makes it a sacrament, controllable by the church, thus violating all three Protestant principles: the Word of God as sole authority; righteousness by faith in Christ alone; and the priesthood of the believer. For White’s support of Protestant principles and protest of the Catholic approach, see Great Controversy 45, 55, 81, 93, 102, 128, 132, 148, 172, 253 254, 257-258, 571-572, 582, 627. (Cf. Moore, “Righteousness by Faith, Is the Adventist Concept Unique?” five articles, *passim*.).

¹⁷³ Patriarchs & Prophets, 343-373, *passim*.

¹⁷⁴ MS 42, 1901; Cf. this study, 145ff; Identifying the atonement as “At-one-ment. . . an expression of the divine intention to destroy sin that ruptured the universe,” Heppenstall says that the cross was “only one aspect of Christ’s work toward the final at-onement. Reconciliation,” he states, “is effected by the living Christ. It is not something that happened two thousand years ago. At-onement is experienced only as men daily live a life of trust and dependence on Him. . . Both in the triumph at the cross and the work of Christ as priest in heaven are the hope and pledge of final renewal and at-one-ment.” (Our High Priest, 29, 31) For his position on perfection and the cleansing of the body temple. see this study, 5, 19-20.

Frazee harmonizes with White in distinguishing between forgiveness of sin and the final blotting out of sin. In justification, covering means a provisional pardon. Final pardon awaits until the Day of Atonement...God has given us the power of choice, and He respects our exercise of this choice. If we choose to leave our sins in the sanctuary, Jesus will blot them out in the closing work of judgment.” (Ransom and Reunion, 35) Repentant-confession gets “the sins into the sanctuary,” according to Frazee, while the, purpose of the final atonement “is to get them out.” His use of the typical sanctuary with its blood sprinkled in three places (altar, holy place, mercy seat) to illustrate three facets of the atonement harmonizes with White. In the blood sprinkled on the altar (representing the cross and its universal provisions) “the penalty was paid in full for everyone [before as after the cross]. Christ died for all men.”. (Ransom, & Reunion, 84, *auth. emph.*) “But justice says that the blood cannot be applied to anyone’s debt unless and until he surrenders his sin,” Frazee declares, indicating that the blood sprinkled in the holy place speaks of Christ’s ministry of the gift of repentance which when received results in a surrender of sin which permits actual application of the blood provided. “But why,” he asks, “is it necessary to sprinkle the blood in the most holy place? Justice demands the final forgiveness of sin must wait until, the man who has begun to quit sin is completely finished with it. - Someone may say, ‘I don’t like my probation. I want everything settled forever right now!’ Everything is settled as long as you stay under Jesus. . .” (Ibid., 84-85.) He then meets the arguments for finality of the believer’s security upon hearing and receiving the “good news”: “However, the sprinkled blood on the mercy seat tells us that no man’s sins are finally pardoned and blotted out until they are out of his life. . . (S)in is not so much an act as an attitude of rebellion. Our rebellion must be cured before Christ can blot out the record of our transgression in heaven’s books. . . The reason that He finally makes the atonement on the mercy seat, blots out the sins . . . is that the righteous have reached the point where they will remain righteous forever. . . Then comes the period of demonstration, the great time of trouble.” (Ibid., 86-87; Cf. 33-43, 77-79.)

¹⁷⁵ Desire of Ages, 790; Cf. SDA BC, 7:933

¹⁷⁶ Review, 3:451, 2/8/98.

¹⁷⁷ Spirit of Prophecy, 3:261.

¹⁷⁸ This study, 205ff.

¹⁷⁹ Review, 2:401-402, 6/10/90

¹⁸⁰ Great Controversy, 422.

¹⁸¹ Ibid., 329; Cf. Early Writings, 38

¹⁸² Great Controversy, 433.

¹⁸³ Ibid., 430; The forensic-only concept denies the significance of this special work of atonement; and denial of last-generation perfection renders it meaningless. See Appendix E.

¹⁸⁴ Great Controversy, 480.

¹⁸⁵ Ibid., 488; According to White it is necessary to understand the special atonement in order to acquire that faith (Righteousness by Faith) essential to meet the final test.

¹⁸⁶ Testimonies, 5:575, 1889; Note the cooperative element.

¹⁸⁷ This study, 89ff, 194ff.

¹⁸⁸ Review, 2:361, 1/28/90.

¹⁸⁹ Review this study, 313ff, 332ff.

¹⁹⁰ Ford's October 27, 1979 Adventist Forum lecture at Angwin verifies previous indications that he effectually denies White's entire sanctuary and investigative judgment concept. His verbal endorsement of a "pre-advent" judgment by no means supports White's views, notwithstanding his equivocal claim to represent her post-1888 position. For implications see Appendix E.

¹⁹¹ This study, 308ff. As early as 1854, J.N. Loughborough connected "the concepts of the investigative judgment, the cleansing of the sanctuary, and the judgment-hour message," says Douglass. (Why Jesus Waits, 24.) Haskell also clearly taught the cleansing of the body temple (Ibid., 53), and both he and W.W. Prescott taught "the urgency of understanding the significance of Christ's going from the holy place to the most holy, and the necessity of cooperating with Christ in His ministry in the latter. (Ibid., 16-17, 53.) Haskell further identified this with "the wedding garment, which is the righteousness of the saints. We must perfect holiness in the fear of the Lord." (Ibid., 47, from Review, 11/6/1856, 6.) Note also D.T. Bordeau's 1864 contribution to final generation perfection and Prescott's 1903 discussion of "Provision for the forgiveness of, sin," in the final generation. (Ibid., 47-48.)

¹⁹² Review, 2:306, 5/29/89.

¹⁹³ Ibid., 2:359, 1/21/90.

¹⁹⁴ Great Controversy, 622ff; The centrality of the judgment and entering into a cooperative relation with Christ, the High Priest, in White's righteousness by faith concept is revealed by her intensive focus upon this subject immediately before and after 1888. Note that all references quoted in this section, and in those preceding and following, cluster about Minneapolis. For findings regarding White's emphasis upon cooperation during "the period from 1895 to 1900 with respect to connection with "I Cor. III in regard to our being a temple of the Lord," see Haddock thesis, 254.

¹⁹⁵ This study, 70-71.

¹⁹⁶ Great Controversy, 482-483.

¹⁹⁷ See *ibid.*, 418; Thus White, not Andreasen, developed the doctrine of the final generation. (See this study, 41.)

¹⁹⁸ This study, 71ff, 191ff.

¹⁹⁹ Cf. Great Controversy, 419-422.

²⁰⁰ Ibid., 425.

²⁰¹ Arguing that the saints will not be without sin after Christ ceases His sanctuary ministry (Cf. Ford 3 #2), Ford declares: “Many misunderstand the words of Ellen G. White ‘without an intercessor.’ The context (Great Controversy, 614; Cf. Story of Redemption, 401-405.) shows that it is those outside of Christ who are primarily in view. It is too late for them to repent. . . . This being ‘perfect in Christ’ means not absolute sinlessness of nature but the will to be loyal to God in every conscious thought, word, and deed. Regarding a false perfectionism E.G. White warns: ‘If those who speak so freely of perfection of the flesh, . . . (Selected Messages, 2:32) Ford’s argument is unshippable:

a) The focus of the entire chapter of the primary reference is upon the saints, the wicked being secondary. Note: “When He leaves the sanctuary, darkness covers the inhabitants of the earth. In ‘that fearful time the righteous must live in sight of a holy God without an Intercessor.’” (Great Controversy, 614; Cf. 611-625.) Moreover, though the secondary reference does depict the fate of the wicked, White’s reference to the righteous is clear: “In that fearful time, after the close of Jesus’ mediation, the saints were living in the sight of a holy God without an intercessor.” (Story of Redemption, 403; Cf. this study, 313ff.)

b) Ford’s quote with regard to “false perfectionism” has nothing whatsoever to say regarding the saints after probation, but of those at that time who claimed perfection of the flesh.

c) Ford’s preliminary argument reveals a confusion of two entirely different kinds of arguments. His primary argument, against removal of the sinful nature, a position which is foreign to representative SDA thinking, is made to carry the weight of the argument against sinless living following the close of human probation. His insistence that neither Enoch nor Elijah (and by extension, the final generation) were translated as “the automatic result of the development of a sinless nature.” (Ford, Ibid., 5) has no significance to contemporary SDA issues, for those SDA’s Ford addresses oppose the concept of “development of a sinless nature” just as he does. Many claim, with White, that character perfection will occur in spite of the pull of the sinful nature. Falsely assuming perfection of character cannot be achieved without eradication of the sinful nature, Ford automatically reads Brinsmead’s 1960’s position regarding eradication into arguments which deny it. (Cf. this study 32ff, 102ff, 10ff.) Ford’s concept of loyalty is a move in the right direction, but in focusing only upon the conscious and denying transformation of the deeper motivational forces, he inadvertently encourages a legalistic bias and confirms Laodiceanism, which cannot see its inner motivation. (Cf. Ford 5 #2, 13. Note: One does not have to be “purposefully careless” in his experience to be a Laodicean, and hence fail to enter into that experience of righteousness by faith which is intended to result in the loud cry.)

²⁰² See this study, 93, 285ff.

²⁰³ For this demonstration Christ now waits; see this work, 41, 30ff 279ff. Cf. Douglass, Why Jesus Waits, 45-61, passim. Frazee states “The reason He finally makes the atonement on the mercy seat, blots out the sins is that the righteous have reached the point where they will remain righteous forever. . . . Then comes the period of demonstration, the great time of trouble.” (Ransom and Reunion, 87; For parallel treatments see Maxwell, M., Perfection, the Impossible Possibility, 196-200, and Maxwell, G., Can God Be Trusted?, 151-160.)

²⁰⁴ This study, 70ff.

²⁰⁵ See Patriarchs & Prophets, 78-79; In a recent sermon, “The Judgment of God,” Venden stated: “Now in this heavenly court scene, with God on trial, Revelation 12 talks about him, the Dragon. . . . one of his greatest accusations: God is not love. . . . But there are two charges today that I would like to have you consider: The first . . . that God could not forgive the sinner, . . . Well, we all know that a cross on a lonely hill settled the issue, . . . The second-charge was that even if He could forgive the sinner, that God’s law could not be kept--it is impossible to obey. In the book Christ’s Object Lessons, page 314, this charge is specifically given: . . . So let’s not forget Who makes this charge--that is Satan’s claim, . . . And anyone before or since, who claims that it is impossible for man to obey God’s commandments is simply echoing Satan’s original charge. It’s a very significant point.” In his conclusion, Venden explains, “We will never

vindicate God but the evidence is that God will vindicate Himself through us.” This is a good statement of White’s concept.

²⁰⁶ Desire of Ages, 19-26.

²⁰⁷ Great Controversy, 540ff.

²⁰⁸ This study, 243ff.

²⁰⁹ Christ’s Object Lessons, 415f.

²¹⁰ Ibid., 69; Cf. this study, 291-292.

²¹¹ Great Controversy, 419-420, See this study, 308-313.

²¹² Review, 2:383, 4/8/90.

²¹³ He acknowledges: “There is some disagreement over Mrs. White’s position on perfectionism. Yet this writer does not think that one is forced to read perfectionism in her works.” (Shaking, 60) This is an incredible conclusion, since he equates all perfection with perfectionism.

²¹⁴ Great Controversy, 623.

²¹⁵ It is important to note that blind spots may not reflect self deception. Harry Stack Sullivan (Clinical Studies In Psychiatry, New York, W.W. Norton, Inc., 1956, 38-77), in dealing with the phenomenon of “selective inattention,” indicates that the act of focusing on one thing prevents awareness of others. One cannot attend all implications, and what one does note is largely determined by the nature of his focus. The more convinced one is of the validity of his position the less capable he is to accommodate contrary factors. Moreover, psychological and spiritual sanity require certainty on some issues as the basis for both clarity and security needed for examining others. The important principle in White is that the Word (and not some unwitting substitute for the Word be the only fundamental “given” and that everything else be deliberately and deliberately tested by it. ‘The problem with the Laodicean mind is that it has unconsciously set its judgment above that of the “True Witness,” and in the name of that “True Witness” declares its own judgment. Nor should this principle be considered as applying peculiarly to Reformationists, It is a general trait characterizing all mankind, which must be overcome before Christ can exhibit His character through His people. The problem has always harassed even sincere men (such as Abraham, father of the faithful), thus is no proof of dishonesty in the normal sense of the word. It involves a self-deception so closely related to the psychological necessities of human experience as to require time, discipline, and the special guidance of and dependence on the Spirit to overcome. Since it is relatively easy to discern in others and almost impossible to see in one’s self, the “straight testimony.” must be prized and claimed by each for himself, the weaknesses of others being recognized as tools for self-understanding. This is the practical application of the negative aspect of righteousness by faith. Failure here prevents positive application and reduces the theology of righteousness by faith to a perpetuation of Laodicea. Until we look with compassion and understanding upon the failure of the 1888 “rebels” we can never understand the “rebel” within and will most certainly sit in judgment on “rebels” around us who do not reflect our own self-satisfying analyses and verbal pronouncements. (See this study, 387ff.)

²¹⁶ Spalding -Magan collection, 167; in Documents, 42-43.

²¹⁷ This study, 165-168.

²¹⁸ This study, 298, 304-305.

²¹⁹ Shaking, 156.

²²⁰ This study, 297-299

²²¹ Cf. Ibid., Chapter II, passim. A multi-faceted confession is in order: it is very easy for the pot to detect the blackness of the kettle, and for one Laodicean to recognize the blind spots of a fellow Laodicean; recognition of one's own tendencies to self-justification is urgent to its remedy but does not guarantee sufficient recovery to prevent sitting in judgment on others. Serious efforts have been made to restrict judgment to theology and methodology and to understand rather than to criticize the persons involved, but the impossibility of knowing the degree to which this has been effected is openly acknowledged. It is also recognized that to the extent judgment of persons is reflected, that judgment applies most directly to the researcher; for one can never read another's heart nor fully understand his own, but what is read in another's generally reflects one's own deep unconscious attitudes and motives.

²²² Selected messages, 1:43,-MS 21, 1901.

²²³ Ibid., 1:19, 1886.

²²⁴ Ibid., 1:46, MS 1, 1883.

²²⁵ Ibid., 1:48, L12, 1890.

²²⁶ Testimonies, 5:719-720.

²²⁷ Cf. this study, 330.

²²⁸ Testimonies, 5:98.

7. EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

This chapter demonstrates the parallel between White's Great Controversy-covenant concept and her educational views. Establishing the same continuity which characterizes her theology, the following statements from 1882 (pre-1888 crisis year) and 1913 reveal comprehensive theological/educational interpretation.

To bring man back to harmony with God, to so elevate and ennoble his moral nature that he may again reflect the divine image of the Creator, is the great purpose of all the education and discipline of life. Repentance and faith, the surrender of the will and the consecration of the affections to God are the means appointed to this work. Every faculty, every attribute with which the Creator has endowed the children of men, is to be employed for His glory.¹

"Love, the basis of creation and redemption, is the basis of true education. To love Him, with the whole strength means the highest development of every power. It means that in the whole being--the body, the mind, as well as the soul--the image of God is to be restored. Through unselfish service we receive the highest culture of every faculty. But the law that none "lives to himself" Satan was determined to oppose. He desired to live for self. He sought to make himself a center of influence. It was man's acceptance of this principle that brought sin on earth. Where God's throne should have been, Satan placed his throne.

Looking upon man, God saw his desperate rebellion, and devised a remedy. The Son of God was appointed to come to this earth to take humanity, and by his own example be a great, educating power among men. His experience in man's behalf was to enable men to resist Satan's power. He came to mold character and to give mental power, to shed abroad the beams [Page 359] of true education, that the true aim of life might not be lost sight of. He unfolded principles that struck at the root of selfishness. Can we imagine an education higher than that to be gained in cooperation with Him? Seek for the higher education, for entire conformity to the will of God. [Christ] consented to come [to] give to the human race a power that they could gain by no other means. What was that power? The power to take the teachings of Christ and follow them to the letter. In His resistance of evil and His labors for others, Christ gave to men an example of the highest education. There are many who in dwelling so largely upon theory have lost sight of the living power of the Savior's example. What they need is to behold Jesus."²

Note the stability of thought pattern over nearly a third of a century. Both point to restoration of the divine image and fulfillment of the original purpose of creation as the highest objective. And in harmony with the Great Controversy concept; both reveal a fall which can be rectified only by surrender of the will to God-commitment of every faculty to be developed and "employed for His glory." Moreover, details peculiar to the later statement are clearly expressed prior to Minneapolis. Indeed, "The First Prophecy" printed only one week after the 1882 statement,³ portrays the fall of man and the incarnation, focusing on fulfillment of the promise to put enmity between the believer and Satan. Christ's complete victory over temptation is set forth as an example of God's purpose to separate His people from the authority of the usurper-a Great Controversy concept central to the 1913 article in which higher education represents "cooperation with him" (divine-human union) in "entire conformity" to His will. Love is pitted against self and Christ's "own example" is to be "a great educating power" enabling [Page 360] man "to resist Satan's powers" which confines him to selfishness. This involves "the power to take the teachings of Christ and follow them to the letter."

Harmonious Development of All Faculties

“Our ideas of education take too narrow and too low a range. There is need of a broader scope. a higher aim. True education means more than the pursuing of a certain course of study. It has to do with the whole being, and with the whole period of existence possible to man. It is the harmonious development of the physical, the mental and the spiritual powers. It prepares the student for the joy of service in this world and for the higher joy of wider service in the world to come.”⁴

In White’s thinking, development of “the whole being” for joyful service during “the whole period of existence possible” differs from the Edenic plan of education only in that it takes place in the context of the Great Controversy, and must therefore include correction of the sin problem as well. Thus the goal of education and redemption coincides with that of creation.

“God created man in His own image” (Genesis 1:27), and it was His purpose that the longer man lived the more fully he should reveal this Image-the more fully reflect the glory of the Creator. All his faculties were capable of development; their capacity and vigor were continually to increase. Had he remained loyal. Throughout eternal ages he would have continued to gain new treasures of knowledge, more and more fully have reflected the Creator’s glory. But by disobedience this was forfeited. Yet the race was not left without hope. A life of probation was granted. To restore in man the image of his maker. to bring him back to the, perfection In which he was created, to promote the development of body, mind and soul, that the divine purpose in his creation, might be realized. This is the object of education, the great object of life.”⁵

The second probation was designed to arrest evil and restore the original plan. Even Edenic perfection did not represent a [Page 361] state of complete maturity or absolute development, but one in which the faculties, fully surrendered to the fulfillment of God’s purposes, would continue to develop eternally. Thus, any concept of perfection-before or after Christ’s return-in terms of absolute righteousness or a no-growth point is inconceivable. “The longer man lived, the more fully” he was intended to “reflect the glory of his Creator.” A never-ceasing program of education was to result in a never-ending development of character-not away from sin, which did not then exist-but in the intensity and effectiveness of the reflection of God’s righteousness. Restoration of that kind of perfection necessitates replacement of self-centeredness by Christ-centeredness in which all faculties, whatever their individual capacities or levels of development-are continually at His direction and service. “This object of education, the great object of life,” requires understanding of the Creator’s purpose for the mind and its role in character development.

“Every human being, created in the image of God, is endowed with a power akin to the Creator-individuality, power to think and to do. It is the work of true education to develop this power, to train the youth to be thinkers, and not mere reflectors of other men’s thought. Such an education provides more than mental discipline. It fortifies the mind against evil. Instead of some master passion becoming a power to destroy, every motive and desire are brought into conformity to the great principles of right. As the perfection of [Christ’s] character is dwelt upon, the mind is renewed, and the soul is recreated in the image of God.”⁶

No arbitrary methods could produce “thinkers [who are] not mere reflectors of other men’s thought”; and more is involved [Page 362] than book-learning. Such an education includes but goes far beyond “mental discipline,” it fortifies “the mind against evil” and brings appetites and passions under control by allying “the finite with the infinite.” Compare the following 1872 and 1896 statements:

“The mind, which allies the finite to the infinite, they do not understand. Every organ of the body was made to be servant to the mind. The mind is the capital of the body.”⁷

The Theology Crisis

“The mind controls the whole man. It is the mind that worships God. All the physical organs are the servants of the mind, and the nerves are the messengers that transmit its orders to every part of the body.”⁸

Both statements emphasize the Great Controversy concept of higher faculties ruling over the lower, the latter indicating the role of the nerves in carrying the orders from the higher faculties to the lower. Paradoxically, despite the kingly role of the mental faculties, White places far greater stress upon development of the physical faculties along with the moral and spiritual capacities. “The first study,” she declares, “should be to know themselves and how to keep their bodies in health.” Deploing the predominant emphasis upon book learning, she then adds: “But any effort that exalts intellectual culture above moral training is misdirected.”⁹ The key to this paradox is the necessity that “all the faculties should be called into use that they may be properly developed” as the basis for “well-balanced mind.” Note:

[Page 363] A constant strain upon the brain while the muscles are inactive, enfeebles the nerves, and students have an almost uncontrollable desire for change and exciting amusements. (This would have been greatly alleviated) had there been agricultural and manufacturing establishments connected with our schools.”¹⁰

Allowing any of the faculties “to lie dormant” is to enfeeble all others, “for all the faculties have a bearing and are dependent, in a great measure, upon one another. One cannot be effectively used without the operation of all, that the balance may be carefully preserved.”¹¹ Special stress upon physical education is seen necessary to counteract a traditional, a balance of emphasis upon the intellect. Five years after the above protest she insists:

“All the powers of the mind should be called into use, and developed, in order for men and women to have well balanced minds. The world is full of one-sided men and women because one set of faculties are cultivated, while others are dwarfed from inaction. The constant application to study, as the schools are now conducted, is unfitting youth for practical life. And in order to preserve the balance of mind, labor and study should be united.”¹²

Thus all faculties of both mind and body must be exercised. Note Ellen White’s continued concern as expressed after Minneapolis:

“They should not have a one-sided education, but all their powers should receive equal attention. Every power—physical, mental, and moral—needs to be trained, disciplined, and developed, that it may render its highest service; **[Page 364]** for unless all are equally developed, one faculty cannot do its work thoroughly. The whole body is designed for action, not for inaction. If the physical powers are not equally taxed with the mental, too much strain is brought upon the latter. Natural powers must be governed by natural laws, and the faculties must be educated to work harmoniously, and in accord with these laws.”¹³

Three natural laws are distinguishable in White’s emphasis upon a work-study program: a) the whole body must be active in order to be healthy; b) the balance of the mind depends upon the balanced development of the body; and c) all faculties must “work harmoniously” for any to adequately attain its proper ends. Thus, Ellen White’s educational concepts are consistently governed by her holistic view of the nature of man which recognizes a biological interdependence of body, mind, and spirit.

It was the law of nature, therefore the-law of God that the brain, nerve, and muscle should be in active motion. It is sinful to impair or weaken one of the powers God has given us.

In order for the brain to have clearness and strength of thought, retentive memory and mental power, the muscles of the body should exercise a portion of each day. God did not give us the wonderful machinery of the body to become paralyzed by inaction. The living machinery God designed should be in daily

The Theology Crisis

activity and in this activity or motion of the machinery is its preserving power. Manual labor quickens the circulation of the blood. The blood nourishes the body. The health of the body depends upon the healthful circulation of the blood.¹⁴

[Page 365] This explains the priority given physiology and hygiene.¹⁵ It also fits her understanding that the higher and lower faculties function through an electro-chemical system which is to be kept in balance through the Spirit's activity (through divine-human union resulting from surrender of the body temple). This is the key to her view of higher education.

Highest Education

“The influence of the mind on the body, as well as of the body on the mind, should be emphasized. The electrical power of the brain, promoted by mental activity, vitalizes the whole system, and is thus an invaluable aid in resisting disease. The power of the will and the importance of self-control, should also be shown. Physical inaction lessens not only mental but moral power. The brain nerves that connect with the whole system are the medium through which heaven communicates with man and affects the inmost life. Whatever hinders the circulation of the electric current in the nervous system, thus weakening the vital powers and lessening mental susceptibility, makes it more difficult to arouse the moral nature.”¹⁶

Thus, physical exercise and flow of the blood are directly related to the electrical energies of the brain nerves through which man communicates with God, who imparts knowledge not only through natural means but by direct contact with the human mind. Note:

The true ‘higher education’ is that imparted by Him. Whatever line of investigation we pursue, with a sincere purpose to arrive at truth, we are brought in touch with the unseen mighty intelligence that is working in and **[Page 366]** through all. The wind of man is brought into communion with the mind of God, the finite with the infinite. The effect of such communion on the body and mind and soul is beyond estimate. In this communion is found the highest education.”¹⁷

Proper care of the body and its nervous system thus facilitates communion with God (the basis for the “highest education”) which invigorates all man’s faculties: physical, mental, and spiritual. A significant principle in White’s understanding that men may achieve “the perfect ideal” as revealed in Christ’s own life is that dynamic power is released “through the indwelling of humanity by divinity.”¹⁸ Contrast the futile efforts to-reach even a lesser, human standard in separation from God:

“Having separated from God their only dependence being the power of humanity, their strength was but weakness. Even the standard set up by themselves they were incapable of reaching.”¹⁹

White’s educational counsel is literally saturated with challenges to aim for perfection and assurances that this is possible. Contrary to the Reformationist denial of last-generation perfection, such is clearly evident in every category of her writings. Note how she relates perfection to justification:

“It is my sincere wish for our young people that they find the true meaning of justification by faith, and the perfection of character that will prepare them for eternal life. I have no assurance that my life will last long but I feel that I am accepted of the Lord. He knows how much I have suffered as I have witnessed the low standards of living adapted by so-called Christians.”²⁰

This became, as it were, her “last will and testament.”²¹ Very **[Page 367]** significant to both SDA education and theology. It reveals a fundamental relationship between justification by faith and perfection-

The Theology Crisis

with its divine standard of character. Two decades earlier she had stated: “The great aim of the teacher should be the perfecting of Christian character in himself and in his students.”²² Yet, in harmony with her concept of the purpose of creation and redemption, her educational counsel-to the very end-consistently indicates perfection to be dynamic and progressive even “in the life to come.”

He who cooperates with the divine purpose in imparting to the youth a knowledge of God, and molding the character into harmony with His, does a high and noble work. As he awakens a desire to reach God’s ideal, he presents an education that is as high as heaven and as broad as the universe; an education that cannot be completed in this life, but that will be continued in the life to come....²³

Knowledge of God-key to education and to perfection-represents the product of experience in divine-human relations resulting from earnest study of Scripture and commitment to its principles:

“Higher education is an experimental knowledge of the plan of salvation, and this knowledge is secured by earnest and diligent study of the Scriptures. Such an education will renew the mind and transform the character, restoring the image of God in the soul. To gain the higher education means to follow this word implicitly; it means to walk in the footsteps of Christ, to practice His virtues. It means to give up selfishness, and to devote the life to the service of God...”²⁴

[Page 368] Higher education, experimental knowledge of God, transformation of character, and service, are inseparable elements in White. Though not always mentioned together, those elements not specified are never absent from her thinking. Note:

“A knowledge of God is the foundation of all true education and of all true service. It is the only real safeguard against temptation. It is this alone that can make us like God in character. Transformation of character, purity of life, efficiency in service, adherence to correct principles, all depend upon a right knowledge of God. This knowledge is the essential preparation for both this life and the life to come.”²⁵

Thus, the goal of education is both the reflection of God’s character and service to mankind in fulfillment of the two great commands.²⁶ In this context the responsibility to develop all the **[Page 369]** faculties takes on added meaning:

“Something more is called for than the culture of the intellect. Education is not complete unless the body, the mind, and the heart are equally educated. The character must receive proper discipline for its fullest and highest development. All the faculties of mind and body are to be developed and rightly trained. It is a duty to cultivate and to exercise every power that will render us more efficient workers for God. True education includes the whole being. It teaches the right use of one’s self.”²⁷

And “the right use of one’s self” means “to make the best use **[Page 370]** of brain, bone, and muscle, of body, mind, and heart,” in service for God and one’s fellow men.²⁸ But effective service for both God and man requires “proper discipline.”

Science of Discipline

“There is a science of Christianity to be mastered. The mind is to be disciplined, educated, trained; for men are to do service for God in ways that are not in harmony with inborn inclination. The heart must be educated to become steadfast in God. Old and young are to form habits of thought that will enable them to resist temptation. No other science is equal to that which develops in the life of the student the character of God. Those who become followers of Christ can make advancement

only through conflict. Appetite and passion must be brought under the control of the Holy Spirit.”²⁹

Discipline leading to character development is a central aspect of the “science of Christianity,” compared to which no other science is equal.”³⁰ This harmonizes with White’s understanding regarding the will as central to the “science of faith.”³¹

“Strength of character consists of two things, power of will and power of self control. Many, youth mistake strong, uncontrolled passion for strength of character; but the truth As that he who is mastered by his passions is a weak man.”³²

White’s concept of the place of the will in establishing and maintaining divine-human relations can be seen in countless ways. Here it is seen that the will must be activated through self control in bringing the lower faculties under control of the higher [Page 371] spirit-directed faculties.³³ Note the following statement:

“The greatest want of the world is the want of men-men who will not be bought or sold, men who in their inmost souls are true and honest, men who do not fear to call sin by its right name, men whose conscience is as true to duty as the needle to the pole, men who will stand for the right though the heavens fall.

But such a character is not the result of accident; it is not due to special favors or endowments of providence. A noble character is the result of self-discipline, of the subjection of the lower to the higher nature, the surrender of self for the service of love to God and man.”³⁴

“For the mind and the soul, as well as for the body, it is God’s law that strength Is acquired by effort.”³⁵ Since effective effort demands self-discipline, educators must cooperate with divine agencies in surrounding the youth with the kind of discipline which will foster self-discipline by encouraging them to internalize its principles. And since “the weightier the trust and the higher the service, the closer the test and the more severe the discipline,”³⁶ the gifted child, who is often clever at subverting it, requires special consideration. But proper discipline is not to be identified with punishment, nor reflect anger, harshness, a judgmental spirit or a dictatorial attitude.³⁷ Life itself administers “stern discipline”³⁸ particularly to the undisciplined. The purpose of education is to achieve the desired effects in as gentle a manner as possible.³⁹ A most vital ingredient in discipline is [Page 372] humility based upon continually bearing In mind one’s “own deficiencies,”⁴⁰ and childhood mistakes. The child should be treated as the teacher would want to be treated.⁴¹ His personality and self respect being carefully preserved.⁴² Moreover, the purpose must be to develop the will, not to crush it.⁴³

“To direct the child’s development without hindering it by undue control should be the study of both parent and teacher. Too much management is as bad as too little. The effort to “break the will” of a child is a terrible mistake. The will should be guided and molded, but not ignored or crushed. Save the strength of the will in the battle of life it will be needed.”⁴⁴

Cooperation Versus Self Centered

The key to discipline is cooperation with divine powers in facilitating submission of the youth’s will to the Spirit’s guidance that he may receive the Creator’s power in his conflict with evil.

“Sin not only shuts us away from God but destroys in the human soul both the desire and the capacity for knowing Him. All this work of evil it is Christ’s mission to undo. The faculties of the soul, paralyzed by sin, the perverted will, He has power to invigorate and to restore. There Is in his nature a bent to evil, a force which unaided, he cannot resist. To withstand this force, to attain that ideal he can find help in one power. That power is Christ. Co-operation with that power is man’s greatest need. In all educational effort should not this co-operation be the highest aim?”⁴⁵

The Theology Crisis

Closely related to the science of faith and of discipline, and operating upon the same basic principles (exercise of human will in response to the divine Initiative and in the context of divine-human relations), is a science of cooperation which relates to both **[Page 373]** education and salvation.⁴⁶ This concept is everywhere present in Ellen White, particularly after 1888.⁴⁷ Four aspects are: cooperation in one's own salvation (non-meritorious) through divine-human covenant relations.⁴⁸ Cooperation with God in the salvation of other souls. Cooperation between believers in personal and spiritual relations. And cooperation of parents and teachers in the development of character in children and youth. All relate to the question of salvation, but there need be no fear that any aspect of this issue as White understands it, is liable to focus attention upon self and human merit, for her concept demands fixation of attention upon the cross as the only basis of merit and upon Christ and His Spirit/Word as the only source of motivation and power.⁴⁹ The urgency of her position can be seen in a statement published less than five years after Minneapolis:

[Page 374] "In the work of salvation there is a co-operation of human and divine agencies. The Lord does nothing for the salvation of the soul without the co-operation of man. The Word of God is clear and distinct on this point, and yet when so much depends upon our co-operation with the heavenly agencies, men act as though they could manage spiritual things to suit themselves. But how presumptuous is this to deal thus with that which is most essential, and most easily lost."⁵⁰

A fifth aspect of cooperation involving eternal consequences, is also implied: White's warning against arousing ambition "to win distinction in scholarship"⁵¹ and her identification of sin with self-centered as and love as the basis of education, strongly suggests the need to develop cooperative methods to substitute for the multitudinous competitive techniques which permeate education.⁵²

"To what motive is appeal most often made? To self-seeking. Much of the education given is a perversion of the name. In true education the selfish ambitions find a counterbalance."⁵³

SDA educators can make substantial progress in meeting the aims and objectives White sets before them only as they seriously commit themselves to the development of cooperative principles which will displace the competitive methods now characterizing almost every phase of education. Appealing to "self-seeking," by arousing "selfish ambition," competition involves a "perversion" of true education and militates against its objectives by stimulating the very carnal propensities and self-centeredness it is designed to **[Page 375]** overcome.⁵⁴ White points to higher motivation, involving greater dynamics than competition, which-driven by incentives external to the subject matter-tends to mask (often ineffectively) the dulling effects of "dry theory," which White decries.

"True education is not the forcing of instruction on an unready and unreceptive mind. The mental powers must be awakened, the interest aroused."⁵⁵

None of her suggestions calls for external motivational techniques-as competition always involves. Instead, her methods require adaptation of subject material and presentation tailored to genuine internal needs (not selfish perversions) and present interests and capacities of the students. Educators must "constantly seek for improved methods" of adapting to both interests "and 'the bent of the mind.'"⁵⁶ The teacher should aim at simplicity and effectiveness and teach largely by illustration,⁵⁷ which **[Page 376]** involves living forms of nature where possible, with "object lessons, blackboards, maps, and pictures."⁵⁸ Other vital principles include having students explain the concepts⁵⁹ and "put into practice the theories they have gained."⁶⁰ Thus motivation involves activity of "all the faculties," of "the whole being."

The WORD—Instrument of Creation, Redemption, and Education

"The great motive powers of the soul are faith, hope, and love; and it is to these that Bible study, rightly pursued, appeals."⁶¹

The Theology Crisis

Cooperation of educators as channels of dynamic interaction between God and their students-thus releasing creative energies-is the most vital principle in “Bible study, rightly pursued”:

“Only in such communion-communion of mind with mind and heart with heart, of the human and the divine-can be communicated that vitalizing energy it is the work of true education to impart. It is only life that begets life.”⁶²

The significance of White’s continuous, emphatic, and often plaintive stress on the Bible as the basis for education-seen in any cross-section of her educational writings-to her concept of righteousness by faith must not be overlooked. Scripture, rather than a dichotomy between justification and sanctification, is her answer to legalism. It brings one into the audience chamber of the Creator Himself. Before Him, the inevitable response is, “Woe is me,” followed by, “Here am I, send me,” as the live coal [Page 377] (Spirit) from off the altar of Christ’s own meritorious intercession touches heart and lips.⁶³ Note the will’s role in this dynamic activation:

“The creative energy that called the worlds into existence is in the word of God. This word imparts power; it begets life. Every command is a promise; accepted by the will, received into the soul, it brings with it the life of the infinite one. It transforms the nature and recreates the soul in the Image of God.”⁶⁴

That “every command is a promise,” reveals a synthesis between law and gospel.⁶⁵ Acceptance of the Word “by the will” in an act of cooperation of the human-with the divine releases creative energy to recreate “the soul in the image of God.” Note also that the Bible is the key to discipline and humility-only effective antidote to merit-seeking-as well as of cooperation:

“The Bible gives the true seeker an advanced mental discipline, and he comes from contemplation of divine things with his faculties enriched; self is humbled, while God and His revealed truth are exalted. Unless the sacred word is appreciated, it will not be obeyed as a sure and safe and precious textbook. The Lord will work with your efforts. As finite, sinful man works out his own salvation-with fear and trembling, it is God who works in him. But God will not work without the cooperation of man. He must exercise his powers to the utmost, and as he accepts the grace that is freely offered to him, the presence of Christ in the thoughts and in the heart will give him decision of purpose to lay aside every weight of sin.”⁶⁶

[Page 378] Thus, viewed from this standpoint, genuine cooperation makes clamor for human merit impossible, for submission to the Word (and to the Cross upon which it focuses) disciplines and humbles the believer, causing him to give all glory to the living Word who empowers (through His Spirit) the written Word.⁶⁷ But such results depend upon Bible study being “rightly pursued,” which involves the educator’s “cooperation” in helping students reverently “view the Word as a whole,” by grasping the entire context and relating the concepts to other pertinent portions of Scripture.

The Bible is its own expositor. Scripture is to be compared with Scripture. The student should learn to view the word as a whole, and to see-the relation of its parts. He should gain a knowledge of its grand central theme. God’s original purpose for the world, of the rise of the [Page 379] great controversy, and of the work of redemption. He should understand the nature of the two principles that are contending for supremacy, and should learn to trace their working. He should see how this controversy enters into every phase of human experience. How in every act of life he himself reveals the one or the other of the two antagonistic motives; and how, whether he will or not, he is even now deciding upon which side of the controversy he will be found.⁶⁸

Note carefully the Great Controversy key to be used in harmonizing Scripture. Only such training in Bible study can exalt Scripture as the sole authority, restore a true priest-hood of believers, and provide the basis for an ever-clearer understanding of the principles in 1888 and subsequently aborted the

Minneapolis message; only more adequate training of youth and older believers in the art and discipline of in-depth, committed Bible study gives hope of resolving the present confusion. This is implied in Ellen White's counsel to educators in her day:

“Men professing godliness have despised Christ in the person of His messengers. Like the Jews they reject God's message. Let the work of preparing a people to stand In the day of God's preparation be entered upon by all who believe the word. During the last few years serious work has been done. The time will come when men will be called to give an account for the souls to whom they should have communicated light, but who have not cherished it, so that they have none to impart. Great truths that have lain unheeded and unseen since the day of Pentecost, are to shine from God's word in their native purity.”⁶⁹

Thus, the Word, instrument of creation and of redemption-the basis of all true education, contains the light needed at this time. But that light is only comprehended through a practical experience of surrender to its principles which can take place only at the cross and through complete surrender at “the altar of sacrifice.

“We can receive light only as we come to the cross [objective] and present ourselves at the altar of sacrifice [subjective]. Here man's weakness is manifest; here His strength is revealed. Here men see there is power in Christ. The word of God is the foundation of all true knowledge, and Christ teaches what men must do to be saved.”⁷⁰

¹ Review, 1:327, 07/11/1882.

² Ibid., 6:305-6, 01/16/1913; Cf. Signs, 4:483, 03/21/1909.

³ Review, 1:327-328.

⁴ Education, 13.

⁵ Ibid., 15, 16.

⁶ Ibid., 17, 18.

⁷ Ellen G. White, *Counsels to Parents, Teachers, and Students*, Mountain View, California. Pacific Press Publishing Association., 1913, 78; hereinafter, *Counsels to Teachers*.

⁸ Ellen G. White, *Fundamentals of Christian Education*, Nashville: Southern Publishing. Association, 1945, 426; hereinafter, *Fundamentals*.

⁹ Testimonies, 3:142, 1872.

¹⁰ *Counsels to Teachers*, 288, 1872; Cf. Testimonies, 3:155. After stating in the preceding paragraph that: “In connection with the schools should have been agricultural and manufacturing establishments,” “that teachers and students spend a portion of each day in both physical and mental activity, white asserts. “If schools had been established on the plan we have mentioned, there would not now be so many unbalanced minds.”

¹¹ Testimonies, 3:32-33; Cf. Review, 1:253, 01/25/1881.

¹² Signs, 1:44. 09/06/1877.

¹³ Testimonies, 5:522, 1889; Though there has been continued interest and some serious efforts to provide a balanced work-study program in SDA education, White's unequivocal challenge is far from being met. Adequate response to pleas such as the following would demand a revolution in thought and programming: "Intemperance in study is a species of intoxication, and those who indulge in it like a drunkard, wander from the safe paths, and stumble and fall in the darkness." (Fundamentals, 340, 1895)

¹⁴ Signs, 1:13, 04/29/1875

¹⁵ Education, 195-206.

¹⁶ Ibid., 197, 209; Ellen White continues: "Again, excessive study, by increasing the flow of blood to the brain, creates morbid excitability that tends to lessen the power of self-control. Thus the door is open to impurity. The misuse or nonuse of the powers is largely responsible for the tide of corruption. Teach the students that right living depends on right thinking, and that physical activity is essential to purity of thought."

¹⁷ Education, 14.

¹⁸ Ibid., 73, 74.

¹⁹ Ibid., 74.

²⁰ Fundamentals, 548.

²¹ In harmony with her statement, "I do not think I shall have any more testimonies for our people," White passed away three months later without sending any further personal communication to the Church through the Review.

²² Counsels to Teachers, 68; Review, 6.483, 4/15/1915; Cf. 162.

²³ Education, 19.

²⁴ Counsels to Teachers, 11; The frequency with which White refers to or quotes John 17:3 "This is life eternal that they might know You" is significant. (i.e., Fundamentals, 413, 414, 446.)

²⁵ Ministry of Healing, 409, 1903.

²⁶ Space prevents a systematic development of the relations between service, soul-winning, and righteousness by faith; but these are intimately related in White's thought as to demand at least a foot note: "The whole work of grace is one of continual service of love, of self-sacrificing effort," she asserts. (Desire of Ages, 677) Such effort in "the whole work of grace" denies a forensic-only gospel but affirms, nevertheless, a distinct spontaneity in sanctification which proves that White does not consider effort and spontaneity to be mutually exclusive. The key to this paradox is that Spirit-motivated and empowered effort in death to self (which is merged in Christ) results in a spontaneous response of love. Note: "When self is merged in Christ, love springs forth spontaneously. The completeness of Christian character is attained when the impulse to help and bless others springs constantly from within. (Christ's Object Lessons, 384) But the merging of self in Christ (death to self) involves the greatest battle ever fought. (Steps to Christ, 43)

Service is directly related to the body temple-Great Controversy motif as follows: "Our bodies are given us to use in God's service, and He desires that we shall care for and appreciate them. We are possessed of physical as well as mental faculties, our impulses and passions have their seat in the body, and therefore we must do nothing that would defile this entrusted possession. Our bodies must be kept under the most spiritual influences- in order that we may make the best use of our talents." (Ellen G. White, Counsels on Health, Mountain View, California: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1923, 41.) "Our bodies belong to God. He paid the price of redemption for the body as well as the soul. God is the great caretaker of the human machinery. In the care of our bodies we must cooperate with Him." (Ibid., 586)

Consistent with White's understanding that only through covenant relations does one enter the Great Controversy on the side of Christ, she relates service directly to covenant relations as follows: "God's people are to be distinguished as a people who serve Him fully, wholeheartedly remembering that by a most solemn covenant they have bound themselves to serve the Lord and Him only." (Testimonies, 9:17.) Note also: "Only by self-denial and self sacrifice can we show that we are true disciples of Christ. There must be no withholding on our part, of our service or our means, if we would fulfill our covenant with God. Heart and mind and soul are to be merged in the will of God." (Manuscript 67, 1907, in God's Amazing Grace, 149-150.)

There is not a hint or suggestion that service is meritorious or that God measures our destiny by the amount of service, but rather that service involves a merging of the heart, mind, and will to the will of God. Without this merging it is impossible to enter the covenant. Without continued merger in focusing away from self to God's purpose and the needs of others there is no basis for fulfillment of the covenant provisions. Thus service and restoration of the body temple are not only the highest objectives of education but are integral elements in the covenant relationship, through which alone salvation takes place. These are, moreover, central to a resolution of that Laodicean complex which continues to hinder growth in righteousness by faith. (Cf. this study, 316ff.)

²⁷ Ministry of Healing, 398, 1903; On the next page White speaks of "the faculties of the mind, as the higher powers, that are to rule the kingdom of the body. The natural appetites and passions are to be brought under the control of the conscience and the spiritual affections. Christ stands at the head of humanity, and it is His purpose to lead us, in His service, into high and holy paths of purity." (See also *Ibid.*, 395)

²⁸ *Loc. cit.*; cf. *Counsels to Teachers*, 170; *Fundamentals*, 293.

²⁹ *Counsels to Teachers*, 20.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 45, 49; *Fundamentals*, 258.

³¹ This study, 231ff; *Testimonies*, 5:513-514.

³² *Counsels to Teachers*, 222; Cf. *Fundamentals*, 64-65.

³³ Moreover, it is only through intellectual, moral, and spiritual discipline that the student "will secure the fullest development of his faculties." (*Counsels to Teachers*, 103.)

³⁴ *Education*, 57; Cf. *Testimonies*, 5:513-515.

³⁵ *Education*, 123.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 151.

³⁷ *Fundamentals*, 222, 270.

³⁸ *Education*, 295.

³⁹ *Fundamentals*, 456-466s "The earth teaches us more about ourselves than all the books. Because it resists us. Man discovers himself when he measures himself against the obstacle." (Antoine de Saint Exupery, *Terre des Hommes*, New York: Reynal & Hitchcock, 1939.)

⁴⁰ *Fundamentals*, 525.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 249.

⁴² *Education*, 129, 242, 294.

⁴³ Counsels to Teachers, 116.

⁴⁴ Education, 288-289.

⁴⁵ Ibid., 28-29.

⁴⁶ Ibid., 106-112.

⁴⁷ Along with cooperation is her favorite term, co-worker; “The great principles of education are unchanged for they are the principles of the character of God. To aid the student in comprehending these principles, and in entering into that relation with Christ which will make them a controlling power in the life, should be the teacher’s first effort and his constant aim. The teacher, who accepts this aim is in truth a co-worker with Christ, a laborer together with God. (Education, 30).

⁴⁸ Two aspects of cooperation and an underlying principle follow: “In the preparation of the sanctuary and in its furnishing, all the people were to co-operate. Thus in labor and in giving they were taught to co-operate with God and with one another. And they were to co-operate also in the preparation of the spiritual building-God’s temple in the soul. God was the center of authority and government.” (Education, 37).

⁴⁹ Counsels to Teachers, 22, 23.

⁵⁰ Fundamentals, 217-218.

⁵¹ Ministry of Healing, 403.

⁵² See Education, 86-96.

⁵³ Ibid., 225-226.

⁵⁴ Instead of teaching the child to commit himself to the service and well-being of all others by helping his peers, competition too often pits child against child in the ambition to “succeed” by proving himself superior to the other. Moreover, the child even pits himself against the teacher, whom he manipulates, so far as possible, in the quest for grades, honors, etc. Failure to succeed in such manipulation tends to create an adversary relationship in which the teacher is seen to be an impediment in the path to progress. “From the earliest days of our lives we have been awarded buttons, ribbons, pins, and plaques for doing, saying, singing, distributing, and studying-but for whose glory?” (Sabbath-School Lesson Quarterly, September, 29, 1979, 215.) Until this question is squarely faced there appears to be little hope of significant progress in the discovery of true righteousness by faith. For the competitive method determines worth by comparing and contrasting the performance of individuals within the system, thus demanding Laodicean self-deception on the part of participants to convince themselves that their efforts are for the glory of God.

⁵⁵ Education, 41, Cf. 186-188; Fundamentals, 548.

⁵⁶ Education, 188.

⁵⁷ Counsels to Teachers, 214.

⁵⁸ Education, 186.

⁵⁹ Fundamentals, 390.

⁶⁰ Ibid., 351.

⁶¹ Education, 192.

⁶² White's favorite expression for this concept is, "Laborers together with God." (1 Corinthians 3:9; See Selected Messages, 1:100.)

⁶³ Prophets & Kings, 306-308.

⁶⁴ Education, 126; Cf. Testimonies, 5:74, 1882, and 6:131, 1900.

⁶⁵ When this synthesis is broken in thought and experience, legalism and disobedience ensue.

⁶⁶ Fundamentals, 130, 134. Philippians 2:12, 13 (referred to above) is used hundreds of times following Minneapolis. A Study of all frequently used texts in the years immediately following Minneapolis with their contextual patterns-would be most revealing.

⁶⁷ cf. Testimonies, 5:24, 1882; Note the total lack of meritorious contamination in White's concept of cooperation: "Christ bore the punishment of the sins of the world, that His righteousness might be imputed to sinners. The moment the sinner believes in Christ, he stands in the sight of God uncondemned; for the righteousness of Christ is his. Christ's perfect obedience is imputed to him. But he must co-operate with divine power, and put forth his human effort to subdue sin, and stand complete in Christ. The ransom paid by Christ is sufficient for the salvation of all men; but it will avail only for loyal subjects, Christ's work was to restore man to his original state, to heal him, through divine power, from the wounds and bruises made by sin. Man's part is to lay hold by faith of the merits of Christ, and co-operate with the divine agencies in forming a righteous character; so that God may save the sinner, and yet be just and His righteous law vindicated. The price paid for our redemption lays a great obligation upon every one of us. The educators of youth should realize the obligation resting upon them. They should aim at perfection in their own case, that the students may have a correct model. The true higher education is what makes students acquainted with God and His Word, and fits them for eternal life." (Fundamentals, 429). How could the educational/theological issues be better summarized? The evidence is overwhelming: White simply does not hold a doctrine of original sin which denies perfection and requires a dichotomy between justification and sanctification. Indeed, could greater evidence be reasonably demanded?

⁶⁸ Education, 190; Please note carefully that white-sees the mastery of the Great Controversy concept to be a vital key to the priesthood of the believer in the practical elevation of Scripture as the sole rule and authority for faith and practice.

⁶⁹ Fundamentals, 472.

⁷⁰ Ibid., 184.

8. SUMMARY

With White, Reformationists identify righteousness by faith with the third angel's message, full acceptance of which will result in the loud cry and the latter rain. They also harmonize with White in attributing its rejection to the Laodicean condition, which they believe involves attitudes motivated by pride and self sufficiency that can be remedied only by humility and faith. Contrary to White, they see this problem as being perpetuated by failure to distinguish between the subjective work of the Spirit, which is equated with law (love as well as obedience), and the objective forensic work of Christ which is limited to His historical doing and dying. Thus, instead of White's holistic approach they insist on a dichotomy between the objective and a objective which is excluded from the gospel. Acceptance of this forensic-only gospel is seen to remove all human merit in the recognition that one's righteousness is solely outside himself and contradictory to his own unrighteousness. They affirm the importance of the will and reject Reformation theology's doctrine of predestination but in holding sanctification to be the spontaneous fruit of justification, (in no way effecting salvation or security) they reflect the deep seated influence of predestination roots and deny the determinative function of the will (faith-will) which permeates White's answer to the problem of legalism and self-satisfaction.

[Page 382] White's synthesis of the subjective with the objective is required by her concept of the relation between the Spirit, the cross, and the priestly ministry of Christ, Focusing man's attention upon the cross, the Spirit interprets its substitutionary reality upon his mind, stimulating him to enter justification through a transaction In which he receives all (Christ as well as His merits) and gives all (himself as well as his guilt). In this transaction the sacrifice and priestly ministry unite. Moreover, the Spirit's ministry in the soul temple blends with Christ's intercessory heavenly ministry of His own blood (cross). Man's response to the Spirit, who points to both Sacrifice and Surety, unites him to God by removing his alienation (pride) and instilling-humility and love through communion with Him.

In Reformation theology the Sacrifice alone is determinative of salvation; the Spirit's work in producing fruit, though necessary as evidence of justification, is automatic and non-determinative. In White the all-sufficient Sacrifice provides a second probation to all who by faith enter into covenant relation with Christ; while maintenance of divine-human union by cooperation with Christ and His Spirit determines the outcome of the probation. The ultimate efficacy of the Sacrifice is thus determined by the Surety, whose mediation is conditioned by man's decision either to remain in covenant union or to re-establish the independence of self-will. The High Priest thus assumes full responsibility for the salvation of every soul who chooses to retain covenant relations by continuing to accept both Substitute (which involves death to self), and Surety (which requires cooperation with Him).

[Page 383] Though salvation is conditional upon remaining in the covenant, security is immediate upon justification; for it rests not upon man's inadequate ability to maintain right relations but upon Christ's covenant; faithfulness. That covenant, which is designed to guarantee the freedom of man's will, requires only that man be willing to be made willing. In acknowledging his Inability to choose right and in claiming by faith Christ's covenant promise to keep him, man affirms cooperative relations by subjecting his will to the direction of the Spirit and opening himself to the discipline and correction which in and through the Word, are designed to guide him in righteousness and redirect him when he strays. Man's part in maintaining this relation is to fix his gaze upon Christ and Him crucified, while the Spirit's part is to warn man whenever his attention shifts to himself.

Instead of Reformation theology's almost exclusive focus upon man's security, White's paramount concern is the security of the universe, within which man's security must be found. Their theology centers upon the cross, but she locates the cross within creation. The original "security gap" resulted when doubt concerning God's trustworthiness and an independent attempt to "better" self (work), threatened faith relations upon which the stability of the universe rested. Sin was thus spawned not by absence of faith but by a misdirection of faith. An egocentric will placed trust in the creature rather than the Creator. Misapprehensions of God's nature, in response to false charges regarding His character and government, thus also distorts understanding of the nature of the creature. To correct this confusion, threatening the security of the universe, God chose to create man in His own image, capable of providing a

The Theology Crisis

unique **[Page 384]** finite revelation of His Infinite, self-sacrificing love, but consequently free to respond to God's gifts by self-exaltation-thus making self, rather than the Creator, the center of his affections.

In this decision, the Creator entered an eternal covenant to assume full responsibility for any rebellion which might ensue thus the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. Though ratified at Calvary, the terms of that covenant require that the slain Lamb remain upon the altar of sacrifice (dramatized by the cross), bearing the suffering sin entails until man fulfills the purpose of, his creation in providing a finite revelation of His character.¹

Only then can the curtain be drawn upon the drama of sin in such a way as to eternally guarantee both freedom and faith to every intelligent creature in the universe.

The cross thus unites creation and redemption, within which unity its own significance must be found and the Sabbath holds the key to its understanding. As symbol of a finished creation, from the moment of the fall it also became the promise of the covenant and coming Redeemer which, when ratified at the cross was **[Page 385]** transformed into a symbol of a wholly sufficient Substitute. In His cry 'It is finished' the Lamb declares that sufficiency and thus the complete efficiency of His mediation role as surety. His subsequent Sabbath rest in complete triumph over His enemies assured unlimited authority and power to complete the work of restoration.

The key to breaking the chain of self-deception and self-satisfaction characterizing the Laodicean condition is the intense aware ness that Christ's ministry of His own blood reflects, not only past suffering but continued suffering in the sacrifice of Himself until sin is eradicated. Thus focus upon the living, suffering Christ² who is now wounded by "my" sin, removes egocentricity, freeing "me" to cooperate with Him in bringing sin and suffering to an end. Whereas a focus upon "my" security via an historical event tends only to confirm egocentricity by making Him a means to 'my' end, rather than making "me" a means to His end-the freedom and security of the universe, for which He continues to sacrifice Himself and for which He pleads with "me" to sacrifice "myself." In White's theology, only by losing one's life (death to self) and forgetting his own security can he find both life and security.

[Page 386] In contrast to the Reformationist emphasis upon righteousness as an unattainable standard of perfection, White focuses upon faith in the person of Jesus as both Sacrifice and Surety. (Is not His past taken up within His present?) Communion takes place by the same faith which provides union; the science of faith being the exercise of human will in response to the Spirit and in surrender to the authority of Christ, through His Word. Thus, working through the Word, which inspires and directs faith, the Spirit provides the connecting link between the wholly sufficient Sacrifice and wholly efficient Surety. Since the entire Word provides both authority and power for faith and practice, that entire Word (not a few verses by a single writer) must be acknowledged as the basis for developing a theology of and experience in righteousness by faith.

Reformationist attacks upon SDA concepts-of perfection are doubtless encouraged by the often inadequate understanding and/or articulation of that concept in relation to sin's radical effect upon man's nature and the consequent internal conflict with temptation, which continues until Christ's coming. More significant however, is their adoption of the historic doctrine of original sin, with its categorical denial of the possibility of sinless living in a sinful nature. This also elicits unequivocal denial of Christ's having taken sinful flesh. White is so imperative, however, as to force Reformers into the anomalous position of acknowledging that His incarnation was governed by the great law of heredity, while simultaneously holding to-an immaculate conception theory!

Reformationist charges, all of which Indict White, are best answered in the eschatological dimensions of her Great Controversy-covenant **[Page 387]** concept: A correspondence between the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary and the body temple demands human cooperation. Only by submission to the straight testimony, including the health message, central thrust of which is submission of the body temple to the complete direction of the Holy Spirit, can the sealing take Place and the latter rain fall. It is in connection with the sealing process that the third angel's message (righteousness by faith) swells to a loud cry and is ultimately accompanied by the external signs of the latter rain. The key to the sealing is continual

beholding of Christ through His Word. In her countless references to the consequent assimilation into and reflection of His image, White consistently uses the term perfection unqualified by the term “absolute.” What does appear to be absolute in character transformation is a loyalty and dependence which cannot be shaken. In harmony with the original plan, growth in love, faith, knowledge, and all other graces, continues not only after the close of probation but throughout eternity. Such loyalty and dependence result, however, only from the Spirit’s complete control of the body temple so as to fully restore the lower faculties to the control of the higher in answer to the original purpose that man reveal on a finite level the Creator’s character of self-denying love.

¹ “Those who think of the result of hastening or hindering the gospel think of it in relation to themselves and to the world. Few think of its relation to God. Few give thought to the suffering that sin has caused our Creator. All heaven suffered in Christ’s agony; but that suffering did not begin or end with His manifestation in humanity. The cross is a revelation to our dull senses of the pain that, from its very inception, sin has brought to the heart of God. Every departure from right, every deed of cruelty, every failure of humanity to reach His ideal, brings grief to Him. Our world is a vast sin house, a scene of misery that we dare not allow even our thoughts to dwell upon. Did we realize it as it is, the burden would be too terrible. Yet God feels it all. In order to destroy sin and its results He gave His best Beloved, and He has put it in our power, through cooperation with Him, to bring this scene of misery to an end.” (Education, 163-164, Emphasis supplied.)

² Implanted in creation and actualized by Calvary, White sees the cross as being located in Christ’s person in the most holy place where He ministers the blood. Greatest instrument for revealing His eternal self-sacrificing love, the cross draws everyone who does not resist into His dying to self and living for the Father and for others. Note that both the cross and the Sabbath reveal white’s objective/subjective synthesis: the primary significance of the cross is death to sin, but its ultimate meaning involves the resurrection and its promise of victory; the primary meaning of the Sabbath is creation, but implanted within it is the cross. White’s entire thinking demands a synthesis of the subjective and the objective.

9. PERSONAL REFLECTIONS

The nature of this study and of the researcher's own convictions call for a personal reaction to the issues. An entirely different kind of subjective/objective tension than that represented in chapter four has characterized this study. A three decade involvement with the topic makes an honest claim to strict objectivity out of the question. A serious attempt has been made, however, to understand both Reformationist theology and psychology and to "walk in Ford's-shoes" intellectually and emotionally so as best to "hear" what he is saying and thus to provide him maximum opportunity to influence the researcher and his findings.¹

Wholly unaware of developments in Australia during the 1970's, the researcher first heard of Ford when, as he was leaving Columbia Union College to assume directorship of La Vida Mission someone spoke of him as a very persuasive exponent of a unique view. Due to isolation and demanding duties on the edge of the Navajo reservation far out in the desert, when the decision was made to use Reformationist claims as the basis for pursuing this study, there was still little comprehension of the issues and even less realization of the perplexing challenges ahead.

As sources were studied, Ford's strong positive appeal in behalf of Justification and other issues aroused an affirmative personal response; but his keen penetration only made more bewildering the increasingly evident self-contradictions. Recognizing the natural tendency to assume the validity of one's own logic while blindly denying that with which it conflicts, the question regarding who was confused was not treated lightly. For weeks after his position was defined, writing was delayed while re-examination continued with a determination to find the key, if there was one, which might prove the contradictions to be only apparent. Ultimately, Ford's own strong affirmation of a written analysis of his views (Chapter II), provided assurance to proceed.

Then a new question emerged: How, given severe space limits to deal effectively with strong negations which permeate Reformers thought and yet deal fairly with milder affirmations. The cause of this dilemma can be identified in three related ways; Reformationist theology represents: a) syncretism between Reformation and SDA theology in which the major thrust is to promote the former but a serious attempt is made to be true to the latter. b) Initial denial of what White makes major-followed by its diminished acknowledgment-in an attempt to project as of transcending importance that which she also makes major but whose ultimate significance is found only in relation to the greatness of that which has been diminished. c) failure to deal adequately with genuine paradoxes. Positively affirming both elements of a paradox-i.e., objective vs. subjective; Christ's sinless (pre-fall) spiritual nature vs. His fallen biological nature; man's sinful nature vs. perfection-and holding them together as integral elements of a vital unity, White protests either only when it is out of context with the balancing element. But, seeing in one element a threat to the other Reformers negate the "offensive" element to protect the other. Thus, despite verbal claims to the contrary, they disrupt the internal unity by removing the "offensive" element from its natural context with the other.

Meanwhile, factors facilitating the challenging commitment to objectivity were: a longstanding conviction of the need for renewed study and new insight; observation that discussions are too often made sterile by dogmatism which, preventing participants from learning from each other, also hinders their influence upon one another; sympathy engendered by inadequate arguments and attitudes revealed in some anti-Reformationist materials; and recurring consciousness of how easily this researcher could reflect weaknesses apparent in Ford's methodology-of which he is unaware!

Important to identification was the privilege, during the final stages of research and early stages of writing, to engage in a pleasant personal dialog with Ford during which convergence of convictions was found regarding: human inadequacy; necessity for entire dependence upon Christ for salvation; and concern regarding the growing threat of subjectivism. Though located in opposite parts of the world, we had simultaneously wrestled with the same basic questions in an effort to find answers which had eluded previous generations of SDA's.

Personal relations and points of identity raised another question of subjectivity however, for the closer Ford's works were examined the more evidence accumulated that an honest disclosure of findings would hurt-not a pleasant prospect. On the other hand, evidence also indicated that his theology threatens the integrity of White and that in his zeal, he utilizes methods of charge and misrepresentation which have Impugned other individuals, both dead and alive. Thus objectivity has been constantly tested by a confusing mix of opposing subjective feelings and-personal desires, which includes an additional dimension of

conflict-the belief that the SDA movement is indeed the movement of Destiny which has been specially guided by God-but a conviction regarding our corporate responsibility for the contemporary crisis resulting from inadequate response to that divine guidance.

No Traditional Defense Intended

Several factors motivate this disclaimer: First is the researcher's conviction that the message of righteousness by faith has never been adequately perceived and received by any significant segment of the body largely because of a general feeling that it has already been understood and accepted. Any "all is well" signal thus would betray the primary thrust of this study.

Secondly, findings of this study indicate that righteousness by faith is more an individual experience in divine-human relations than a corporately held theology. This suggests that a tendency to identify with theological explanation rather than to persist in individual, heart-searching examination of spiritual issues is a primary cause of continued failure. The missing key seems not to be theological insight so much as individual assumption of the responsibility implicit in the third article of the Reformation, "the priesthood of the believer." Indeed, failure to take this principle more seriously has encouraged the present appeal to a creed based theology as the cure for a persistent-Laodicean problem. Both the Problem and its ill-advised cure demand that Scripture be made a more prominent part of practical, daily life.

A creed based orthodoxy threatens the supreme authority of Scripture by establishing a statement or formula as norm for resolving doctrinal issues rather than the entire body of Scripture. This is, moreover, accompanied by the assumption that the body of Scripture is expressed in that statement. Thus the priesthood of the believer is discouraged, and individual faith threatened. Rather than a carefully defined "orthodoxy," what is needed is the development of a method of individual study which is channeled into collective participation in humble, earnest search for Scriptural understanding of righteousness by faith as It relates to actual experience, a science of faith. Such growth, which would lead to dynamic transmission of faith by means of personal testimony to Scriptural truth, appears most likely to develop from a plurality of insight, in which the authority of the Word is taken seriously, for "all cannot see in the same line of vision." Only dynamic, individual, and personal guidance by the Spirit, through His Word will provide the spiritual and conceptual basis for coming into unity of faith. Such unity transcends orthodoxy as far as spiritual understanding transcends theological conceptualization.

When "the priesthood of the believer (third article of the Reformation)-including cooperation with the Great High Priest in His final work of cleansing the soul temple is given its proper place together with the primacy of the Scriptures (first article) not only as rule of faith but as central core of thought and life,- then will "righteousness by faith in Christ alone," (second article) cease to be a theological-bone of contention and become a fact of experience revealed In the unity of believers in laboring for souls. While all three Reformation principles stand or fall together, the second peculiarly rests upon the other two-individual responsibility as revealed in the entire Word of God.

Thirdly, the Laodicean condition demands a straight testimony rather than a defense-which already perpetuates the problem. In view of our instinctive self-deception and inability to discern the heavenly indictment and its corresponding remedy this researcher is amazed that theological confusion has not been greater, and sees this as reflecting the effort, through the decades, of many leaders and laymen to confront the Laodicean problem.

Finally, doing injustice to valid Reformers convictions concerning the necessity to re-examine the issues, such a defense would mask the deeper reality that their misdirection reflects the failure of the body. "Their" weakness is "our" weakness which must be recognized as "my" weakness if we are individually to profit by the valuable lesson to be drawn from a sincerity which lacks insight because of defective "I" sight.

The seriousness of the "I" trouble "we" must all confront is illustrated by the anomalous manner in which Ford identifies the subjective element in the gospel as the cause of pride and its removal as guaranteeing humility:

"This upward look accomplishes a thousand-fold more than all the sanctified spiritual navel-watching could, for it lays the glory of man in the dust."²

Such judgmental caricaturization of the experience of those sincerely holding a different view might "make points" with fellow Laodiceans whose ailing vision permits confusing theological concepts

with reality; but its “thankful I am not as the egocentric Traditionalists” attitude illustrates the very pride it seeks to remove.

Only a-theology which grows out of actual experience in humility is likely to break the Laodicean barrier. It is interesting that Ford should identify Reformation theology as “this upward look” while his driving thrust is to enforce a “backward look” by narrowing the gospel to the historic doing and dying of Christ. Indeed, the position identified as “spiritual navel-watching,” because of its inclusion of the subjective element, when properly expressed, truly represents “the upward look.” Grounded in the objective, its focus is upon the living Christ in the most holy place of the heavenly sanctuary.

The most prominent weakness displayed at Minneapolis and subsequently was contention and debate resulting from inability to see themselves, and unwillingness to listen to those bearing the (Laodicean) message of righteousness by faith. When we truly listen to one another and seek to discover in ourselves whatever weaknesses (real or imagined) we, see in others we may then avoid the tendency to substitute theological concepts for reality. Until then theology can only increase our blindness by assuring-us we see. The experience of Pentecost can be ours only when, with the disciples, we actually experience the truth-that “Justification by faith is the work of God in laying the glory of man in the dust.”³

No Offense Against Reformation Theology Intended

Nor is any offense intended against proponents of Reformation theology, which, though failing to express the peculiar insights of Adventism, does challenge the modern trend toward a subjectivism that, among other things, denies Christ’s divinity and substitution any sacrifice. In a society charged with antinomianism, it calls for a return to belief in the law as well as faith in Christ. Attempt to resolve the-opposing problems of antinomianism and legalism, however, focus primarily upon the latter. Though believing their law/gospel dichotomy to be counter-productive, this researcher freely acknowledges both the seriousness of legalism and the importance of focusing on the cross and suggests that “our? Failure to grasp White’s insights is a prime factor in driving some concerned SDA’s to seek answers within Reformation theology.

At the Crossroads

Direct conflict, however, with the third angel’s message and its peculiar insight into righteousness by faith demands a choice between the latter and a theology which, despite positive features, retards progress by denying the legitimacy of any advance beyond its own inadequate interpretation of sixteenth-century Reformation concepts. SDA’s stand at the crossroads of choice between the Great Controversy-covenant views of one acknowledged to be divinely inspired versus the authority of the Formula of Concord⁴ imposed by those who, denying White’s theological competence, subject to it their entire interpretation of the Bible.

Those opting for Reformationist theology thus forfeit any legitimate right to appeal to White for support. At one level, they challenge her theological competence and reliability-but at the same time they attempt to use her testimony to support their own position.

What justification can be claimed for using the very concepts which permeate her thought before and after 1888-concepts which all SDA’s hail as “the third angel’s message in verity” to support an interpretation of that message which vigorously attacks its basic concepts and labels them “papal heresy?”

Does academic integrity permit anyone to reinterpret that message In the face of her forceful affirmation of the theological integrity of Waggoner and Jones for more than seven years after 1888, while claiming that Waggoner-and by implication, Jones-departed from pure gospel preaching within only a few weeks after Minneapolis and reverted to teaching “papal” concepts which are held to have characterized his teaching right up to the conference?⁵

What moral right can be demonstrated for using White’s writings to deny what she proclaimed, or to proclaim what she denied? Notwithstanding numerous similarities between Reformers and White on certain vital issues, these findings testify to the necessity that they thoroughly re-examine their theological and methodological-base. The burden of proof now rests with them to demonstrate-without equivocation or wresting of evidence-that neither their theology nor their methodology brings them under White’s imperative: “Don’t you ever quote my words again as long as you live, until you can obey the Bible.”⁶

Meanwhile, the Reformationist challenge has made important contributions to the SDA dialog. While leaders gain valuable experience in self-restraint as they attempt to maintain an atmosphere of

freedom of inquiry without abdicating their responsibility to foster unity and protect the faith, members, In their confusion over issues they thought they understood, may be stimulated to individual study which could lead to a degree of unity of thought and experience never before realized. Many already acknowledge being challenged to a renewed study of the issues at a deeper level than heretofore. And-at least some recognize the need to place greater emphasis-upon the substitutionary sacrifice of Christ.⁷

Unfortunately however, Reformers themselves diminish the cross by concealing the relationship of the Sacrifice to the Surety in His mediation role as minister of the blood of the covenant and by obscuring the correspondence between Christ's ministry in the heavenly temple and His ministry through the Spirit in the body temple. To lift up Christ and Him crucified demands a focus upon the living Savior who, having died on Calvary, now ministers the atoning blood of the covenant for those choosing to enter and remain in that covenant.

Concluding Acknowledgments

This work is not set forth as a complete portrayal of White's concept. Factors combining to prevent this include: space limitations; the researcher's own inadequacies; specific academic demands of the study. The nature of claims and charges treated which shift the focus in a negative and theoretical direction. The exceeding vastness of the resources (almost everything White wrote during a prodigiously prolific seven decades-private communications as well as materials for publication is pregnant with insights on this subject). And finally, her dynamic relation to this subject (more a relation to a Person than to a topic) cannot be captured by analytical procedures. To her, righteousness by faith means uplifting Jesus as the living God-man whose sacrifice, mediation, and creative power provide every answer to the needs of man and of the universe. In the spontaneity of her expressions of love, gratitude, and adoration, in the simple but dramatic portrayal of His life death, and saving actions, and in the penetrating insights into His teaching are to be found the depth and balance of her understanding of righteousness by faith.⁸

Nor does this work provide systematic portrayal of Reformationist views. Limitations of space and objective (to examine claims and charges so as to focus on contemporary issues in the study of White) prevented even an attempt at this. While procedural demands dictated concentration on conflicting Issues, Reformationist theology and methodology shifted the focus to negations of more traditional SDA understandings. White generally supports their positive positions, conflict centering almost entirely around their negative charges, which their own affirmations tend to refute. Thus, had space and objectives permitted, almost every finding could have been illustrated and supported by Reformationist statements, which will no doubt cause consternation to some.

Appeal is here made to Reformers to re-examine their methodology as a preliminary step to re-examining their theology which, contains vital insights that deserve to be released from their present syncretistic context.

Further Study

Since "all cannot see in the same line of vision."⁹ it is to be expected that some of these findings will be questioned. It is also anticipated that the ensuing testing may expose weaknesses; but it is hoped this will stimulate additional insight concerning issues here treated and those, such as sanctification, which were not systematically treated. Specific issues requiring development are: the distinction between the "old man" ("carnal") and the sinful nature as it relates to the conflict of the Christian following justification and that following the sealing. White's threefold concept of perfection, (involving justification, sanctification, and the sealing). The relationship between justification, character development, and the sealing; the investigative judgment as it relates to prophecy, symbolic ritual, and the heavenly sanctuary; and the relation between the Laodicean and third Angel's messages. All of the above issues should be systematically compared with Scripture and a serious re-evaluation of White's prophetic role is called for, as it relates to hermeneutical principle to be found in Scripture and her writings.

Since the bibliography will be found in footnote entries, we have substituted this index for the bibliography. As a result, pages 401 through 414 are not printed. This is not an error in your book.

¹ It is a Laodicean instinct to brand positions conflicting with one's own as "heresy" and to consider those in disagreement as heretical, without penetrating the issues by listening carefully to what the other is really saying and systematically examining evidence for as well as against.

² "New Testament Gospel," 2, (Ford 2 #3).

³ Testimonies to Ministers, 456.

⁴ See Appendix A for evidence of the "uninspired" nature of Concord.

⁵ See Appendix B for evidence that white's claims and their own need to believe constitute the sole basis for holding that Waggoner and Jones ever preached what they identify as "pure" Protestant theology in contrast to "papal" heresy.

⁶ See this study, 353.

⁷ Venden recently states, "My interest in righteousness by faith has been for most of the past twenty years in the area of sanctification. I confess it. How to live the Christian life. And now I am very anxious to develop a fifty-fifty emphasis at least, as far as public presentation is concerned. I think that's the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy balance. I wouldn't be surprised if God gives different ones of us different emphases." (Morris Venden, Talks to Insight, part 2,} Insight, May 15, 1979, 9.)

⁸ The best sample of this is to be found in Desire Of Ages; others highly recommended are: Christ's Object Lessons, Thoughts from the Mount of Blessing, Steps to Christ, The Ministry of Healing, and The Great Controversy.

⁹ SDA Bible Commentary, 6:1072, MS 21, 1891.

APPENDIX A

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE ARTICLES OF CONCORD

The history of the Formula of Concord Is Instructive, [a.1] as it comes as the climax of a series of conflicts which erupted following Luther's death, involving Intense animosities, exile, Imprisonment, torture and death. Charged with having betrayed the Protestant faith, Melanchthon was accused of Introducing both Romanism and Calvinism, (Wilhelm Moeller, History of the Christian Church, Volume 3, hereinafter Noeller, London: George Allen & Company, Limited, 1912, 297-298) the latter being considered more serious! "The good Lutheran watch-word of that time, 'Rather Catholic than Calvinist,' throws a lurid light upon the mutual hostility which divided the ranks of Evangelicals; . . ." (Ibid., 298) Concord, designed to bring about a unified position, is, according to Schaff: "Both conclusive and exclusive, a Formula of Concord and a Formula of Discord, the end of controversy and the beginning of controversy. It completed the separation of the Lutheran and Reformationist Churches, it contracted the territory and the theology of Lutheranism, and sowed in it the seed of discord by endeavoring to settle too much" and yet leaving unsettled some of the most characteristic dogmas. (Schaff, Volume 1, 338.)

Considering the times and circumstances, It represented a moderate denial of the "Philipists." Chemnitz and Selnecker, two of the three key framers were Melanchthon's students and ex-followers who had moved toward the ultra-Lutheran position but retained varying degrees of respect for him (Ibid., 308-309). Because of the differences among the framers and between them and the extreme positions, It represents both a compromise and contradiction. According to Schaff: "They contain not simply opposite truths to be reconciled by theological science, but contradictory assertions which ought never to be put into one creed. It is Augustinian-yea, hyper-Augustinian . . . and hyper-Calvinistic in the doctrine of human depravity, and anti-Augustinian in the doctrine of the divine predestination. (Ibid. 314.)

It follows Augustine in denying any function in salvation to the action of the will, while denying Augustine's doctrine of predestination which follows from it. (Thus, neither God nor man is responsible?) Note: "The Formula, following Luther, uses stronger terms on the slavery of the will and total depravity than the Calvinistic Confessions. It compares the unconverted man to a column of salt, Lot's wife, a statue without mouth or eyes, a dead stone, black and cold, and denies to him the least spark of spiritual power. (Article 11 #7, In Schaff, 313-314.)

This usage was to deny Melanchthon's position that:

"Conversion is not a mechanical or magical, but a moral process, and is brought about by the Holy Spirit through the Word of God, with the consent, yet without any merit of man. The Spirit of God is primary, the Word of God the secondary or instrumental agent of conversion, and the human will allows this action, and freely yields to it. This is the amount of his synergism, so called by his opponents." (Schaff, 262, emphasis supplied.)

Moeller's statement of Melanchthon's position reflects White:

Since 1527 Melanchthon had abandoned the deterministic bent of the Reformation and supported the idea of a Synergism, which should keep the causality of sin aloof from God and assert the feeling of man's responsibility. Man's salvation can only be accomplished with the aid of a co-operative decision of his own will, without any mention of merit and his part being admissible." (Moeller- 277-278, author's emphasis.)

In his desire for peace and to prevent Protestant martyrdom lowing their defeat in the Smalkald war. Melanchthon participated in drawing up the Leipzig Interim to replace (in Saxony) the Augsburg Interim lapped a few months before (August, 1548) upon the whole empire, which demanded a return to papal doctrine and ritual. Reflecting Melanchthon's purpose to preserve Protestant theology the Leipzig Interim imposed only papal ritual. (Schaff, 298-300) This understandably exposed him to the charge of traitor, but he rationalized that this temporary expedient was not a compromise in essentials and would give time for finding the complete remedy. Melanchthon made two vital breaks from medieval theology which Luther and Calvin, on Augustinian determinism-was unable to make, which placed him closer to White than to either of these two great Reformers.

Schaff's comment concerning the most important controversy and chief occasion of the Formula-"doctrine of consubstantiation," (p. 316) offers a key to the present conflict. "The omnipresence of the

Holy Spirit,” was overlooked, he points out, and in its place “the corporeal presence of Christ” was substituted. (Following Luther, Concord insists upon the literal physical presence of Christ in the Eucharist which is manducated [chewed] by the teeth. Ibid., 328) This failure to grasp the significance of the relation of the Spirit to Christ as His personal Representative, whose function on earth parallels that of Christ in heaven, lies at the bottom of the urgency to “distinguish” (separate?) sharply between the work of Christ (objective) and the Spirit (subjective). Another key follows:

“Yet the second [explanatory] part of the formula quotes Dr. Luther as freely and with at least as much deference to his authority, as Roman Catholics quote the fathers. [See Appendix C] Melancthon is never named, but indirectly condemned; and as to poor Zwingli, he is indeed mentioned, but only to be held up to pious horror for his ‘blasphemous [denial of the literal presence of Christ].’ Thus the supremacy of the Bible is maintained in principle, but Luther is regarded as its regulative and almost infallible expounder.” (page 313)

This characterizes the present Reformationist insistence upon the Bible only, except that the Articles of Concord are themselves elevated with Luther. Schaff states, “During the palmy period of Lutheran Scholasticism the Formula of Concord stood in high regard among Lutherans, and was even regarded as inspired,” (p. 336) concluding significantly, “It closes the productive period of the Lutheran reformation and opens the era of scholastic formalism.” (p. 338)

Schaff and Moeller are but two witnesses concerning a battle over Reformation theology and history which still rages—this researcher makes no claim to expertise in Reformation history, but in any case the adequacy and objectivity of the Articles are subject to serious challenge. Note: the atmosphere of tension and hostility (anti-Calvin and Zwingli as well as Rome) demonstrates a dominant subjectivity and reveals attitudes clearly not directed by the Spirit/Word. Tradition (Luther) determines the outcome of critical doctrinal controversy even as Scripture is theoretically upheld as the sole authority, (note reflection in contemporary conflict); the content and history both testify to the error of a creedal approach to doctrinal controversy. Prophecy (Revelation 3:1-7) interprets this very period, with its theological debate and Creedal formulations which superseded the practical application of the gospel—as one of near extinction of life — “a name that thou lives, and art dead.” (v. 1; Laodiceanism is but an extension of the Protestant Sardian condition—with only a name [Protestant] and apparent life—connected by a brief Philadelphian interlude of individual search of Scripture [Priesthood of believers.] That the progress of true reform was stopped in its infancy, Luther bears some responsibility for, despite his great and unique contribution. Schaff states sympathetically:

“Luther at first more heroic and progressive, became more cautious and conservative; As the reformer of the Roman church, acted in the general interest of evangelical religion, and enjoys the admiration and gratitude of all Protestants; Luther, as the leader of a particular denomination, assumed a hostile attitude towards other churches, even such as rested on the as foundation of the renewed gospel. He was equally hostile to the Pope, whom he hated as the very antichrist, and to Zwingli, whom he regarded as little better than an infidel. (Page 260-261; see SDA Bible Commentary, 7:958-960.)

References

a.1. Philip Schaff, The creeds of Christendom, Volume III, hereinafter Schaff, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1919, 93-180.

APPENDIX B

ELLET JOSEPH WAGGONER: THE MYTH AND THE MAN

The following factors reveal [a.1] the critical significance of this work to the Reformationist cause:

a) In Washington, D.C. (see this study, 8) Paxton’s confident reference to this forthcoming book indicated it would revolutionize SDA understanding of Waggoner’s Minneapolis message and demonstrate that his later fall into pantheism resulted from his adoption of concepts such as now characterize SDA theology.

b) Listing the editorial staff as co-authors speaks of its importance and of teamwork, which undoubtedly involved Brinsmead and possibly Paxton himself. Thus it represents the best and most careful treatment possible and the arguments can be understood to represent the top leadership and reflect its scholarship.

c) In his Sabbath School class, Ford repeatedly makes the identical claims developed by McKahon; three papers he circulates are calculated to prove that Waggoner in 1892 was no longer a Seventh day Adventist.” (Documents, 32)

d) Berbey’s “Alpha and Omega” (Ford 10 #2) parallels Ford’s “Doctrinal Decline of Dr. E. J. Waggoner: Its Relationship to the Omega Apostasy” (Ford 8 #1), which identifies Waggoner as developing the Alpha and contemporary SDA theology, the Omega, of apostasy. Parallels of argument and detail between these articles and McMahon’s book are self-evident; that neither article is listed in the book’s bibliography may indicate later preparation.

e) The validity of Reformationist claims rests upon the twofold argument: that in essence, Waggoner’s Minneapolis message represented their own theology, but that almost immediately Waggoner’s doctrine underwent a demonstrable shift in the direction of that theology which some SDA scholars now mistakenly associate with the Minneapolis message, the logic of which inevitably leads to pantheism:

However, the lack of a complete record of Waggoner’s presentation has made it easy for some to read their own particular view on righteousness by faith into the 1888 conference. (p. 74)

These myths are based on a common fallacy. They look to Waggoner’s subsequent works for evidence of what he taught in 1888. But Waggoner’s writings prior to 1888, and especially his articles written on the verge of the conference, basically represent his presentations at that time. (75)

It is Obvious that what had preoccupied a man up to the time of the conference and what he himself had published one month-after the conference would provide the clue to what he presented at the conference.

Just before the conference of 1888 Waggoner had clearly taught a purely forensic justification. (77)

In this period Waggoner did not express the pantheistic sentiments which appeared soon after his arrival in England. But in 1889-1891 he advanced theological positions which effectively laid the basis for his later pantheism. Before the 1888 conference Waggoner held a Protestant meaning of justification. He believed that justification was a forensic act in which God pronounces the believer righteous on the ground of the imputed righteousness of Christ. Furthermore the Waggoner of 1888 distinguished between justification as a forensic act for the believer and sanctification as an effective, act within the believer. In these articles Waggoner began to adopt an “effective” justification. (93-94)

Comparison of Claims and Evidence, 1884-1887

The claims are unequivocal. It must be determined whether the evidence is also without equivocation: that Waggoner’s pre-1888 theology during and immediately (within a month) after Minneapolis represented a “Protestant meaning of justification” which distinguishes the “forensic act for the believer” from “sanctification as an effective act within the believer.” Does he demonstrate that in a February 4, 1889 article. “Waggoner began to adopt an ‘effective’ justification” (involving the Spirit’s work)? Was there a demonstrable “change,” (“a fatal mistake”) in which Waggoner, who correctly represented Paul and Luther a few weeks earlier, now “blurred their distinction,” (95) and moved to “the Roman Catholic concept” (96) by denying his previously “clearly taught purely forensic justification”? If so, all he need do is to provide a variety of “clear” exhibits historically organized so as to demonstrate the development of his clear teaching and contrast it sharply with the change which took place almost immediately after the Minneapolis meeting (at a time in which he was united with White and Jones in presenting that message to the people). Acknowledging that Waggoner had not yet developed his pantheism, McMahon declares:

But he possessed a logical wind that followed his premises through to their final end. When sanctification is confused with the righteousness of faith, one must logically contend that the righteous acts in the believer’s life are the work of the Creator alone. In this same issue Waggoner presented evidence for his change to the Roman Catholic concept of ‘effective’ justification. He defined ‘to justify’ as ‘to make righteous,’ (96)

All four basic Reformers charges against contemporary SDA 'theology are aimed at the theology Waggoner enunciated in the months following Minneapolis. Thus the evidence provided by McKahon and editors-not verbal gyrations or theological pronouncements-must determine the validity of their claims to being the legitimate theological heirs of the Minneapolis message. The following consecutive statements represent their "evidence" for the entire pre1888 period. (No effort is made to correct theological wrong impressions except as is natural to treatment of claims.

Nevertheless, neither in this article nor in subsequent articles in 1884 did Waggoner have a doctrine of justification by imputation of Christ's life of perfect obedience to the law. His doctrine of justification was therefore vitiated. (32)

On September 11 [1884] Waggoner presented a summary. It reveals that he saw justification as a forensic act of God which deals with the sins of the past. (40)

Although Waggoner presented [1886] the good news of justification at the beginning of the Christian life, his understanding was not fully Reformationist and certainly not fully Pauline. (42)

But he was not clear on the problem of inbred sin-original sin. His inadequate doctrine of sin led him to propose that a believer could stand in the judgment and meet its standard through Inward sanctification. (42)

On April 1 [1886] Waggoner discussed the relation between justification and sanctification. He appeared to make further advancement. He reemphasized both the purely forensic nature of justification and the doctrine of imputed righteousness. (43)

But other statements made in 1886 lean toward perfectionism. Any hope that Waggoner had recovered the true Biblical Protestant faith is frustrated by his article of April 8. He returned to his theme of 1884 that eternal life is given on condition of perfect obedience. (44)

Waggoner failed [1886] to link justification with the gift of eternal life. He failed to see that justification is eschatological, Waggoner takes us to the very borders of the promised land and then turns us back into the old-covenant wilderness. But he was near the great breakthrough. In his Signs article of May 6 he could say, "Having accepted Christ. his righteousness is imputed to us, which makes us clear before the law." (45)

Why did Waggoner not link this perfect righteousness (1886) with a full justification to life eternal? He could not see that far. If only he had understood New Testament justification. It is grasping the verdict of the final judgment in the now by faith. (46)

Waggoner apparently fell into the error (1886) common to traditional Adventism. (47)

As E. J. Waggoner showed evidence of reflecting Luther, [1886] so J. H. Waggoner showed his indebtedness to the Reformation understanding of justification. (49)

E. J. Waggoner had not fully recovered the Protestant message of justification by faith by 1886. Much less had he recovered Paul's message of justification, which is eschatological as well as forensic. It may come as a shock that he taught that eternal life and salvation were based on successful law keeping with God's help of course. If this primitive view of soteriology was light for Adventism [referring to Minneapolis, 1888] how great must have been the legal darkness! Those who compare Waggoner's early groping [with] the best nineteenth century Protestant scholars will be startled and disturbed. (63)

The little "remnant" [referring to the 1888 era] had no great theologians or teachers like Buchanan, Spurgeon or Hodge. The idea that Waggoner had a message of righteousness by faith far in advance of the Reformers or Wesley would be amusing if it were not such a serious aberration. It betrays an Adventist triumphalism nourished on Ignorance and [a] self-made "fool's paradise." (64)

But what has he gained if he then turns to an eschatological salvation by an indwelling righteousness. He has simply begun as a Protestant and ended as a Roman Catholic [reference to Waggoner and SDA's who believe as he did]. This statement by Waggoner [1887] is disappointing. (67f)

These statements reveal deep disappointment in the pre-Minneapolis Waggoner together with valiant attempts to meet the theological demands of tracing a movement from what is seen as a Roman view to a Protestant view. McMahon's hopefulness is supported only by an Inner (subjective) certainty of a "breakthrough" which his convictions require to have taken place. But those convictions constantly conflict with his own historical evidence that such a "breakthrough" did not, in reality, occur. Illusions regarding the significance of Waggoner's view of "forensic justification," (34, 40) dissipate as he later grapples with the fact that the issue is not whether he held a "forensic" concept, but a "forensic only" concept, which is the real issue dividing Reformers from those SDA's they accuse of misrepresenting the Minneapolis Waggoner by reading into his message the theology of his "subsequent works." That the subjective element is present is clearly revealed in his quote: "It matters not to the law that the obedience which it finds in the

life is not really his own; it is counted as his own.” (40) McMahon’s optimistic “He reemphasized the purely forensic nature of justification.” is amazing! He only demonstrates that which is basic to the SDA concept he seeks to refute that Waggoner held a concept of “set to the account of without a single righteous act on our part,”-but nowhere does he provide evidence for - the “purely forensic” concept which he first declares-then denies was held. Wieland, Short, Douglass, and Gane, each of whom are exhibited as misrepresenting the Minneapolis message (8-11, 15, 188-191, Cf. 74-77, 93-94) will no doubt question: “Who misrepresents the Minneapolis Waggoner?” for McMahon et al. clearly demonstrate that the pre-Minneapolis Waggoner taught exactly what is found in the post-Minneapolis Waggoner.

Reference to “evidence of reflecting Luther” is of interest in, view of their own repeated denials, including those immediately before and after. Note the authors’ (McMahon and editors) negative inner feelings regarding even the 1887-1888 Waggoner (63-64). Their own evidence demands unequivocal acknowledgment that Waggoner, even in 1888, retained the concepts they label “Catholic” (67-68), thus could not have “clearly taught a purely forensic justification” (77) at Minneapolis-from which, on February 4, 1889, he “began to adopt an effective justification.” (94) But the dilemma involved is too traumatic to be faced for it demands denial of the validity either of their own theology or of the Minneapolis message, and neither alternative is thinkable. Thus the wish becomes the father of “the fact.”

White’s Testimony Discredited - Relation of Law to Gospel

Their apologetic treatment of White is characteristic of the Reformationist approach. (See this study, 352ff.) Reflecting the position of the Verdict editorial staff, McMahon: a) speaks of “superficial reliance on what Ellen G. White said about [Waggoner]” (15); b) questions White’s encouragement of Waggoner to teach at Emmanuel Missionary College, suggesting this is “a problem for Ellen G. White scholars” (16); c) implies that she opposed J. H. Waggoner on the very point she later so strongly supported for his son, E. J. (86-90); d) indicates that “even what Mrs. White had said before 1888 was insufficient to expose” the false “hope that successful law keeping would enable men to finally stand in judgment and win the verdict of eternal life” (83); and e) speaks of “their rigid view of ‘spiritual gifts,’ [by which] some have virtually de humanized Mrs. White,” and are in danger of “assuming personal in fallibility in all she did” (90-91).

Readers are assured that “Waggoner’s light on the law and the gospel contained the vital ingredients to explode his own errors,” (69). But examination of the “evidence” reveals not even a scrap of support for the conclusion that the “explosion” took place before the Minneapolis meeting-which must be clearly proven in order for Waggoner to be legitimately understood to have represented the “Protestant meaning of justification.” The claim is frequently made that all “good” or “best” Protestant theologians (see 112, 126, 185, 187, et passim) teach that the logical and inevitable result of including the subjective element in justification is a drift toward pantheism. In spite of their claim to represent the Reformation, first principle of which was Sole Scripture, no Scriptural evidence is provided, but great stress is laid on tradition. Repeated reference to Buchanan most quoted and trusted theologian of Ford, Brinsmead and Paxton. (See this study, 47) indicates that “good” Protestant theologians are those who agree with him.

Reference to ‘light an the law and the gospel,’ as the ingredient which would “explode his errors,” only compounds their problems; for on this point McMahon repeatedly holds Waggoner to have been in error before, during, and after 1888. That this is the point which White unqualifiedly endorsed as harmonizing perfectly with her position of more than four decades is most revealing and provides a key which is never touched (see page 9):

“I see the beauty of the truth in the presentation of the righteousness of Christ in relation to the law as the doctor has placed it before us. That which has been presented harmonizes perfectly with the light which God has been pleased to give me all the years of my experience.” (86; quoted from Olson, From Crisis to victory, 294-295; See this study, 331, 172ft, for White’s strong protest against separating law and gospel.)

Claims and Evidence, 1888

The chapter, “Waggoner’s 1888 Message,” quotes four brief Review editorial comments regarding Waggoner’s Minneapolis sermons which confirm the centrality of the relation between the law and the

gospel but the only suggestion regarding his viewpoint comes from the October 18 report, which reveals a focus upon sin as separating man from God and the gospel as providing for a divine human re-union. Smith reports: "Liberty in Christ was always freedom from sin, and that separation from Christ to some other means of justification always brought bondage." (72). Thus, Waggoner's emphasis is seen to parallel White's lifelong focus on the Great Controversy-covenant theme. Her Minneapolis messages, best evidence of Waggoner's Minneapolis theology, are not considered. (See-above and this study, 322ff.)

Discussion of Waggoner's February 24, 1888 article entitled "Different Kinds of Righteousness," is very curious. It is first implied that Waggoner presents the Protestant truth contained in Luther's 1519 treatise by the same title. Then, after readers are cautioned that Luther was still Catholic in thought until 1519 (see this study, 196n) it is admitted that even in 1519 "Luther was not yet able to articulate his doctrine of righteousness by faith in terms of imputed or forensic righteousness. And not everything in his sermon represents the clear Protestant doctrine." This treatise is, nevertheless, declared to be "the Magna Charta of the Reformation." (79) Readers are finally informed: "Waggoner had been moving toward the recovery of Reformation theology since 1884. But his article shows he had not fully penetrated the Reformation position." (79) (Apparently Luther hadn't either.) Pointing to Waggoner's confusion between (you guessed it!) law and gospel, sanctification and justification, he continues:

"Waggoner's February 24 article however, gave conclusive evidence that he was struggling to grasp the light which broke mightily on the world in the sixteenth century. (Which Luther was unable to articulate!) This of course' belies the claim that Waggoner was far in advance of the Reformation." (81) [Itself far in advance of Luther?]

This reviewer is left "struggling to grasp" that "conclusive evidence" which the authors not only fail to provide, but directly deny. Keen disappointment over Waggoner's theological immaturity in further expressed in continued emphasis on his law-gospel confusion and the following assertion:

Even men like Smith, Butler and, yes, Waggoner rested in the hope that successful law keeping would enable men to finally stand in the judgment. (83)

He then deplores the "myth that Waggoner was far in advance of the sixteenth-century Reformation." A footnote virtually holds White herself was not a full-fledged "Protestant" until Minneapolis.

"There is no evidence, however that he ever fully recovered that [Protestant] heritage," (84) frankly declare our authors. Overwhelming evidence demands that this emphatic-testimony be taken at face value: There is simply "no evidence" that Waggoner ever laid hold of the Protestant heritage he is understood to be "struggling to grasp." Thus, he could hardly have reverted later, a fact the authors acknowledge with amazing clarity: "Waggoner was a part of his community. He could not transcend its limitations." (84; This refers to 1888!) Must we conclude that White, whose divine revelations presumably were not sufficient to provide a really clear "Protestant" perspective, was so dynamically impressed by "Roman Catholic" Waggoner's message as to emerge a full-fledged "Protestant"? We are assured that she understood that Waggoner's light at Minneapolis was light on the relation of "the law to the gospel." She commented that this light was to lighten the earth with the glory of God. (85; Revelation 8:1) How truly amazing! In view of the "shocking," "startling," "disturbing," darkness of Waggoner's Minneapolis light (63), how dim must be the glory of God. This obvious clue to Waggoner's 1888 message is strangely left unexamined. How could the authors, who proposed to follow "obvious" clues in determining the real 1888 message, ignore White's concept of the relation between law and gospel, when they declare this to be the key to Waggoner's message and indicate she considered his presentation to be identical with her own view of this subject? (7, Cf. this study, 175ff.)

Reply to Butler-Prime Evidence

The frequency and kind of references (i.e., "We believe this represents some of his finest writings." P. 55) to Waggoner's February 10, 1887 reply to Butler (published "one month after the conference," and reviewed in the chapter, "Waggoner's 188b Message") clearly indicate that it is considered to provide overwhelming proof that the post-Minneapolis Waggoner denies his "Protestant" Minneapolis message. Strange indeed, is the assertion:

It is obvious that what had preoccupied a man up to the time of the conference and what the published one month .after [the 1887 reply to Butler] the conference would provide the clue to what he presented at the conference.

The Theology Crisis

Just before the conference of 1888 Waggoner had clearly taught a purely forensic justification. Such a categorical assertion, in the total absence of supporting evidence, is Incomprehensible! In this final chance to substantiate their claims, the authors simply declare its existence. It is most significant that In the entire six pages devoted to the Butler reply there is not even an attempt to demonstrate a “change” to “Protestant” theology. (86-91.) The primary purpose seems to be to raise questions regarding White.) They are unable to provide a single promising exhibit! Indeed, the document provides overwhelming evidence of continuity of thought between the pre-1888 and the post-1888 Waggoner. Concerning Christ’s nature-which they make primary in their argument against the post-1888 Waggoner-it holds:

“Made of the seed of David according to the flesh.” What was the nature of David, “according to the flesh”? Sinful, was it not? David says: “Behold I was shaped in iniquity and in sin did my mother conceive me.” Psalm 51:5. Don’t start in horrified astonishment; I am not implying that Christ was a sinner. (The Gospel in the Book of Galatians, 61; see this study, 256n, 262n.)

White’s enthusiastic endorsement of Waggoner’s Minneapolis message is understandable in view of the marked parallel between this document and her view, consistently expressed before, during, and after. Both hold the post-fall human (biological) nature and victory over sin to be central to the “loud cry” message. (See this study, 310ff.) Thus, “it is obvious that what had occupied a man up to the time of the conference and what he himself had published one month after the conference . . . [should be recognized as providing] the clue to what he presented at the conference.” (71)

Questions of Logic

Repeated declaration that once he “began to adopt” a concept of effective Justification. Waggoner’s “logical mind” required that he develop his theology along pantheistic lines, reflects an inadequate concept of logic. The authors evidence belief that logic can proceed on no other track than around one or-the other of the arguments circling the two poles they have elected (“forensic only-Justification.” or “Roman Catholic”- “effective justification”) as marking the total scope of theological possibilities, ignoring the danger that in positing opposite poles one represents only the extremes, and that the truth-which always involves a balance of principles-forbids extremes. (Re:-their methodology. See Appendix C)

If their theological, “law” that introduction of the subjective element in justification leads inevitably to pantheism-were really valid, what accounts for the fact that Jones remained free from pantheism? Few would argue that “lawyer-like” Jones was less logical than Waggoner, yet despite initial inability to recognize the danger of his intimate friends, Waggoner and Kellogg, and though he vigorously defended Kellogg, his employer during his conflict with the Church over Pantheism, Jones’ theology remained free from Pantheism. (See Haddock, 300-308.)

Charges that as early as February 4, 1889, Waggoner was heretical must be viewed in light of White’s repeated affirmation of his theological integrity and her strong rebukes, several years later, of those questioning his soundness. Note:

“It is quite possible that “ Elder Jones or Waggoner may be overthrown by the temptations of the enemy; but if they should be, this would not prove that they had no message from God. But should this happen, how many would take this position, and enter into a fatal delusion. (LS-24, 1892; Cf. L O-19, 1892)

It is not the inspiration from heaven that leads one to be suspicious, watching for a chance and greedily seizing upon it to prove that those brethren who differ from us in some interpretations are not sound in the faith [she is referring to Jones and Waggoner]. There is danger that this course of action will produce the very result assumed; and to a great degree the guilt will rest upon those who are watching for evil. (Letter, January 6, 1893)

Contemporary charges clearly become subject to rebuke. A few questions thereby raised are:

Does “logic” permit claims to believe her prophetic ministry, however modified those claims while repudiating her witness-born at the very time in question-concerning issues in which she revealed greater interest and concern than upon any other in her entire ministry? Did two very logical men clearly teach a “Protestant” view (for which the authors provide no record, and for which history provides no clear evidence that Luther ever consistently taught and both forthwith simultaneously eject it and unconsciously begin to teach the “Roman” view (Waggoner in just over two months)?

The Theology Crisis

How are we to believe that one whose “logical mind” requires that he follow an idea through to its “final end” could have presented a message with clarity and power at Minneapolis, and yet-while closely associated with Jones and White, who is understood never to have departed from it-fail so utterly of following it through to its “final end” as to actually repudiate it and that without any of the three being aware of it? (Note furthermore that the repudiation is seen to involve four major doctrinal areas: original sin (107), the nature of Christ [169 et passim], perfection [115 et passim] and justification.)

In the name of logic, can White-who before Minneapolis is considered not yet fully grounded in “Protestant” theology be understood to light her taper from the flames of a theology which-when compared with Buchanan-flickered but very dimly before going out? And is it reasonable to hold that ever after, she was faithful to that theology-but was incapable of recognizing that Waggoner jumped its track almost before the conference closed and was so incapable of expressing it herself as to consistently, “appear” to teach the “heretical” post Minneapolis view?

These questions do not pertain to the author’s sincerity-which seems to be indicated by the repeated acknowledgements which so seriously undermine their premises. It is a call for them to confront the nature of their own logic. Whenever options are sufficiently narrowed to a controllable level and the individuals Involved are sufficiently confident of the correctness of their basic assumptions, logic (In that enforced and artificial frame) can only drive one to conclusions totally and obviously contradictory to reality. Such have no basis for discovering their fault, however, because their a priori rejection of all alternatives but those staked out as correct and unchallengeable prevents open examination of any evidence not supportive of what is “known” to be “truth.”

Truth is not always self-evident; and it is admirable to maintain principles while examining evidence-which may challenge them. The question at issue, however, is one of authority, and involves the first article of the Reformation, Sole Scripture. Is commitment to “every word that proceeds out of the mouth of God,” (Matthew 4:4) in the light of acknowledged (and knowable) evidence?

Or is it to theological pro-suppositions so “logically” expounded by “great theologians” such as Buchanan? (64) The former may demand suspension of judgment but never permits manipulation or distortion of sources of evidence; while the latter consistently make such demands whenever sources do not naturally fit “known” truth as determined by that theology.

Conclusions

After repeated assertions that “the post-1888 Waggoner is today,” clearly alive and well (186-189) the authors conclude:

“But we end on an optimistic note. The Waggoner of 1884-1888 has also been revived and lives in Adventism today. This is the Waggoner who was committed to restoring the Reformation message of justification by the imputed righteousness of Christ.” (194)

It need only be noted that the authors have clearly denied any the Waggoner of 1884-1888, have forever forfeited any logical claim to being among those in whom the Minneapolis Waggoner “lives in Adventism today.”

References

a.1. David P. McMahon and the Editorial Staff of Verdict Publications, Ellet Joseph Waggoner. The Myth and the Man, Fallbrook, California: Verdict Publications, 1979, 238 pages, all emphasis supplied.

APPENDIX C

REFORMATIONIST METHODOLOGY

The quality of one’s theology reflects his methodology; a faulty hermeneutic produces faulty theology. The anomalous pattern of using White’s works out of-and contrary to-context, and a generally defensive attitude toward elements appearing to be contrary to their theology does not, in this researcher’s opinion, reflect Reformationist intent to repudiate her prophetic gift, but does signal a defective

hermeneutic which relates to the Scripture itself, which they repeatedly declare to be their sole authority-in deliberate exclusion of White.

In every conversation with Ford, he cautioned against basing any concept on White, even insisting that she is confusing, and that to avoid confusion the only safe course is to go directly to Scripture, which is always clear-a remarkable claim for one who believes in her prophetic gift, primary purpose of which is to exalt and elucidate Scripture. (Cf. This study, 298ff, 352ff.), That something written two millennia or more ago by representatives of a different culture under different circumstances and in a different language would be easier to understand without confusion than some thing written recently by one divinely ordained to communicate the message of righteousness by faith by amplifying the messages of earlier prophets, is an amazing assumption. Such an attitude suggests either that White was not inspired and does indeed confuse her readers because she never clearly, perceived the message, or that Reformers have absorbed alien concepts which cause them confusion while reading those portions of her works which are not readily drawn into their theological old.

The purpose of this paper is not to test White's reliability, or the validity of Reformationist attitudes toward her, but to demonstrate that such reflects their approach even to Scripture. Their problem lies in dependence upon systematic theology as their basic tool while consistently failing to apply vital principles governing Biblical theology. Assuming that "the etymological background of the words provide the right perspective for a consideration of the concept," they fail to give serious attention to context. (Documents, 14)

Systematic Versus Biblical Theology

Concerning the distinction between systematic and Biblical theological principles, Australian V.R. Christensen writes:

"Biblical theology is an exegetical approach to the Scriptures that confines itself to the material which the Scriptures alone furnish for examination. It is distinguished from systematic theology in that it does not make any extra-canonical interpretation a test of religious orthodoxy. The question which confronts the Biblical theologian is not, how did Luther, Calvin, or Wesley interpret the Scriptures, but rather what did the Scriptures mean to those to whom the Word of God was first addressed?"

Biblical theology is therefore not apologetic in its treatment of 16th century Protestant theology, but rather critical, for it seeks to supply the guidelines by which the orthodoxy of Protestantism may be tested by the orthodoxy of the apostolic church. Systematic theology has distinguished itself as a branch of Christian apologetics concerned almost exclusively with New Testament theology and its historical development. Most systematic theologians take the Reformer's interpretation of the Pauline doctrine of "righteousness by faith" as seriously as they do Paul himself. Thus systematic theology has worked within the framework of religious tradition, and has revealed an inability to escape the strictures that tradition and orthodoxy have imposed. "In systematic theology, while the Scripture supplies the knowledge, some mental scheme, logical or philosophical, is made the mould into which the knowledge is run, so that it comes out bearing the form of the mould." Davidson, "Old Testament Theology, p. 1 (V.R. Christensen, 'The 'Righteousness of God' in Biblical Theology,' nd, 1)

Reflecting the above criteria for systematic theology, Reformers works are characterized by: a) virtually no attempt at exegesis and frequent disregard of context. b) Almost exclusive dependence, not upon the NT as such, but upon Paul, of whose writings only two or three chapters of a single book are considered determinative. c) The assumption that on the doctrine of righteousness by faith the works of the Reformers are unchallengeable, in their understanding of Paul. d) The assumption that the Reformers' interpretation is faithfully and exactly represented by a small group of expositors reflecting Buchanan's version of the Articles of Concord (See Appendix A). e) The assumption that faithfulness to Reformation theology represents faithfulness to Sole Scripture, in disregard of the fact that this principle was established in opposition to dependence upon theological interpretations based on "orthodox" "tradition." And finally, f) the adoption of a "mental scheme, logical [and] philosophical," which provides "the mould into which" Scriptural knowledge must run in order to form the "true gospel," all else being designated as "false gospel." or "Roman Catholic legalism." Christensen quotes G. E. Wright as follows:

"One of the most important tasks of the church today, is to lay hold upon a Biblical-centered theology. To do so means that we must first take the faith of Israel seriously, and by the use of the scholarly tools at our disposal, seek to understand the theology of the Old Testament. But secondly, " Christians, we must also press toward a Biblical theology, in which both testaments are held together in an organic

manner. The New Testament, in and of itself alone, is an insufficient base on which to stand. (Ibid., 2; quoted from “The God Who Stands.” 29-30, Student Christian Movement. Emphasis his.)

Free use of the tools of systematic theology, including its dependence upon “tradition” by consistent-failure to utilize the Biblical principles of Immediate Context and harmonized by the entire Word (Cf. Isaiah 28:9, 10) has encouraged a “logical” (syncretistic) system (See this work, Appendix B) which produces Biblical confusion and claim White’s support even while denying her theological reliability.

Etymology Versus Context

M. Salom delineates the principles which should guide formulation of the doctrine of righteousness by faith:

It is important to notice the etymological background of the words used to express significant concepts in the New Testament. Such backgrounds provide the right perspective for a consideration of the concept. The concept of righteousness has its immediate New Testament background in the *dike* group of words. (Documents, 14)

Note that Salom’s claim, “the etymological background provide[s] the right perspective” for interpretation, and his implication that the concept of righteousness is rooted in the Greek *dike* words contradict Gerhard Hasel’s previously published assertion:

On the basis of linguistic semantics it is recognized that each sentence with its surrounding context is the setting that determines the meaning of a particular word or term, just as each word or term in a sentence defines by its content, grammar, and syntactical structure the meaning of the clause or sentence of which it is a part. This means that a particular term, despite its etymology, can mean different things in different contexts or sentences. The proper determinant for the meaning of a word is the immediate context in its clause or sentence. This contextual priority has a determining function for the meaning of this word, no matter what its root meaning or etymology may be. (A Symposium on Biblical Hermeneutics, Edited by Gordon M. Hyde, Washington, DC: Review & Herald Publishing Association, 1974, 172-173)

It makes a significant difference to the theology one derives whether he honors Hasel’s claim regarding context as “the proper determinant,” or Salom’s counter-claim that etymology provides the “right perspective.” This decision also affects one’s methodology in communicating and defending that theology. Reformationist theology gives clear evidence of having been both formulated and defended on the basis of a systematic theology which focuses upon a tradition oriented etymology and represents a movement away from basic Reformation principles. V. Norokov Olsen, a contributor to the above symposium, speaks of the Reformation as using new exegetical tools by which true biblical theology and Christianity could be restored. In the light of the history of the Christian Church and its theology, which is the story of how the Scriptures were interpreted (a fact that is often overlooked and sadly neglected) the Reformation became a real re-formation and re-orientation in the field of hermeneutics.” (Ibid., 47)

This meant a liberation from “the influence of theology and philosophy” (52) and the development of a “Biblical theology.” (57) (Luther’s life was spent battling the theology of the scholastics but as an Augustinian monk he was never able to fully escape the deterministic influences which penetrated Christianity through Augustine.) (51) It is significant that in their movement away from Biblical theology, Reformers find themselves having to make all kinds of explanations, many of them metaphorical, regarding incongruities. Salom’s partial confession of the failure of the forensic-only theology is significant:

It would appear that Paul also uses *dikaioisune* to characterize the life of the Christian. This is not to invalidate what has been said [concerning] the forensic idea that is so clear in the Old Testament.

However, it must be recognized that Paul allow of a minor application to sanctification. (Documents, 22)

This admission either implies that in a “minor” way Paul’s gospel (righteousness) involved legalism (papal) or the subjective criteria is not a proper means of distinguishing legalism! (See this study, 195, 196). With a hole that big the forensic-only theological bucket simply cannot hold water!

Logical Necessity

Far from establishing that the forensic-only concept is “so clear in the Old Testament,” Salom’s emphatic and correct portrayal of righteousness in terms of relations, and his assertion that the covenant is

“of supreme Importance” to the OT concept of righteousness (Ibid., 17), refutes his claims; for OT covenant relations are interpersonal and covenant based. The methodology used encourages denial of this obvious fact because it does not harmonize with Greek religion-philosophic elements-read into Scripture. Failure, to recognize this etymologically-induced distortion-based on concepts of both God and man which are alien to Hebrew thought, virtually requires repudiation of the subjective, because it is not reconcilable with their static concept of righteousness. (See this study. 335n, 337n; For Augustine’s influence in channeling alien concepts of God and man Into Christian theology, see Moore, “Righteousness by Faith.”) Erwin Gane states:

The-Roman Catholic doctrine is based on the Aristotelian matter-form analysis [note the Influence of Plato’s forms]. Infusion of righteousness is the re-forming of the matter of the immortal soul within man, so that it has intrinsic righteousness. (Gane, “The Scriptural Doctrine of Justification,” paper presented at West Coast Bible Teacher’s Conference, April. 1979, 2)

That Greek philosophy confuses contemporary SDA discussion is indicated by Salom’s assertion:

“The judicial notion which belongs to dikaiosune when it refers to a particular virtue is found in the definition given by Aristotle: “Justice is that virtue by reason of which each has what belongs to him.” (Salom, Ibid., 15, quoted from Rhetoric, 1.1366b) (Sic)

Sir Karl Popper demonstrates that, Plato’s treatment of justice! (Echoed by his illustrious pupil, Aristotle) reflects his own determination to turn back the tide of social political changes taking place in the development of Athenian democracy and to restore to his own city. Athens class rule on the model of Sparta, his ideal The virtue of “each [having] what belongs to him” simply meant that “each class must mind its own business”. “The city is just,” Popper quotes Plato “if each of its three classes attends its own work.”

He then summarizes: “The state Is just if the ruler rules, if the worker works, and if the slave slaves.” (K. Popper, *The Open Society, and its Enemies*, Princeton: Princeton University, 4th. Edition, 1963.) Justice (righteousness) is equated with a static class system, to be maintained by deliberate oppression and dishonesty for the (presumed) good of all. It may shock those who idealize Plato as a “Christian” In a pre-Christian age to learn that his own works indict him as betrayer of Socrates (whose mouth he uses to express his own concepts) and Pericles, (great Athenian democratic leader), by a deliberate dialectical use of words (propaganda) such as “democracy,” “Justice,” and “liberty,” in a manner to subvert their meaning. (Ibid., 199; Cf. 38, 41, 48-55, 83, et. passim) Must SDA theology be forced down this path In the formulation of its doctrine of righteousness by faith? Or will it follows path safe guarded by principles of-Biblical exegesis based on: the primacy of immediate context as interpreted by general Biblical patterns of usage? Appeal to the Word as sole authority which Is actual, not merely verbal and theoretical? And diligence in recognizing and avoiding philosophical speculations which for most of two millenniums have been imposed on Christian thought-by theologians via Greek philosophy (Cf. this study, 283n)? In answering these questions, comment to White’s role as an inspired interpreter of Scripture should be affirmed or denied, but not equivocated. Misuse of her works is more serious than would be the denial of her prophetic role. (See Ibid., 298ff, 352n)

Testimony of Biblical Scholars

The following quotations are selected from sources used by Christensen in “Righteousness in the Old Testament.”

Well wrote A.G. Hebert: “The Protestant churches had not after all found the way of deliverance from the Babylonian Captivity. Protestant Orthodoxy was as legalistic as mediaeval scholasticism, and Christendom was as hopelessly in bondage as before, and wore hopelessly divided. The satisfaction theory and the subjective doctrine both belong to the era of the Church’s ‘Captivity.’” (Christus Victor, Gustaf Aulen, Translator’s preface, xxv)

Oliver C. Quick. “Hellenistic tradition has in one form or another dominated Christian theology almost throughout its history.” (The Gospel of Divine Action, 104)

Norman H. Snaith: “Throughout the centuries the Bible has been interpreted in a Greek context, and even the New Testament has been interpreted on the basis of Plato and Aristotle.” (The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament, 185)

Floyd V. Filson: “We often are led by our traditional creeds and theology to think in terms dictated by Gentile and especially Greek concepts.” (The New Testament Against Its Environment, 265)

Franz Leenhardt: "The Roman tradition was inclined to insist on righteousness as an effectual gift which transformed the nature of the believer; the Reformationist tradition tended to emphasize righteousness as an attribute of God in virtue of which God makes a declaration in favor of the believer who remains in himself what he was before. There is no hope of solving such a conflict between confessional differences. The basic error here is due to the substantial and static mode of thought imposed by Aristotelian philosophic tradition on mediaeval theology and insufficiently rejected by Reformationist theology. (Epistle to the Romans, 56, Lutterworth, E. T. 1961. See also James L. Price, *God's Righteousness Shall Prevail*, Interpretation. Volume 28, 1974)

Walther Eichrodt. "The prophets defined forgiveness as liberation for personal fellowship which far beyond legalistic remission of punishment (Old Testament Theology, Volume 2, page 476). "Where communion with the will of God is grasped as the ultimate goal of all desire for salvation the removal of guilt by forgiveness is understood as something that is not exhausted by remission of punishment, but includes as its most important content readmission to fellowship, with Him." (ibid., 457)

Greek Versus Hebrew

Concerning Salom's failure to distinguish between dynamic and static thinking; the lack of any appreciation of the difference between the Hebrew and Greek use of forensic terminology, and a regrettable misunderstanding of the Old Testament covenant-concept," Christensen states:

"However, Dr. Salom is guilty of nothing more than perpetuating the traditional errors of the founders of Protestantism. Traditional Protestant thought has always worked with the Greek conception of reality. Both Greeks and the Reformers interpreted righteousness in terms of a legal status, and it is this false assumption that salvation is mediated through the process of law that is the root cause of all the errors in traditional Protestant thought relative to the salvation process. The Protestant concept of justification is based upon an imputed sanctification (covenant of works) and the logic of this conception is reduced to the proposition that men are saved by vicarious legalism. Such a concept has no Biblical basis whatsoever, and is merely a modification of the Catholic concept of works of supererogation. (Christensen. op. cit., 41)

After citing Salom's quotation from W. R. Smith that "Righteousness to the Hebrew is not so much a moral quality as a legal status. Christensen replies:

"In this viewpoint, the Old Testament concept of righteousness revolves around the judicial processes of law – an idea which is so unrelated to the real facts that one would need to go back to the last century to find an Old Testament scholar to support it. (It is not supported by at least five of the scholars mentioned in Dr. Salom's Bibliography, namely: Gottlieb. Schrenk, David Hill, Werner Georg Kummel, W. D. Davies and Victor Paul Furnish.) Ibid., 34)

APPENDIX D

From Robert Hancock, "The Humanity of Christ-A Brief-Study of SDA Teachings on the Nature of Christ," unpublished Andrews University paper July, 1962; his Summary, and suggestions for Further Study.

The evidence presented in this study indicates that the SDA Church: (1) has always upheld the Deity of Christ, has believed that Jesus Christ was God in human flesh-fully God and fully man. (2) Has always been in close agreement in regard to the sinlessness of Christ, [Who] was in every sense sinless. Regarding the specific question of Christ's humanity."

"(1) From its earliest days the SDA Church has taught that when God partook of humanity, He took, not the perfect, sinless nature of man before the Fall, but the fallen, sinful, offending, weakened, degenerated nature of man as it existed when He came, (a) that this was interpreted to mean that the inclinations and tendencies to sin that are in fallen man's flesh were in His flesh, but that by complete dependence upon His Father His mind held its integrity and never a shadow of a thought responded to the weaknesses or sinful cravings of the flesh. (b) That this view of Christ's human nature in no way denied or contradicted the Church's stand on the complete Deity and absolute sinlessness of Jesus' Christ. (c) That as

late as 1946 this was the accepted teaching of the Church as presented in denominationally published lesson quarterlies, books, and periodicals.

“(2) That during the fifteen-year period between 1940 and 1955 the words ‘sinful’ and ‘fallen’ (with reference to Christ’s human nature) were largely or completely eliminated from denominationally published materials.

“(3) That since 1952, phrases such as ‘sinless human nature,’ ‘nature of Adam before the fall,’ have taken the place of the former terminology. (a) That these phrases are interpreted to mean that the human nature of Christ was ‘sinful, fallen, or degenerated’ only in the sense of weakness and frailty of the physical organism. (b) That these weaknesses and frailties of the physical organism were not innately and intrinsically a part of Christ’s human body but were only borne vicariously just as man’s sins were borne vicariously.”

“In this study it has been observed that the emphasis upon Christ taking fallen, sinful flesh is closely related to the idea that, because He overcame in the flesh of man as it is since the Fall, it is therefore possible for men today, by His grace, to, overcome as He overcame and to render perfect obedience to the will of God.

“Since it has been concluded that SDA teachings on the humanity of Christ have changed, it is suggested that study be given to the relationship between teachings on the human nature of Christ and teachings on Christian perfection. The object of such a study would be to discover if there has been, along with the change in the former teaching, a corresponding change in the doctrine of Christian perfection.”

APPENDIX E

“THE INVESTIGATIVE JUDGMENT- THEOLOGICAL MILESTONE OR HISTORICAL NECESSITY?”

Desmond Ford delivered his lecture of the above title on Oct. 27 1979 at a meeting of the Angwin, California chapter of the Association of Adventist Forums-at their request.

After first expressing his belief in a pre-advent judgment, and his appreciation for the gift of prophecy in our day through Mrs. White, Ford shared concerns “which have been troubling me for over thirty years.” He outlined the “problems” with the year day principle of interpreting prophecy (indicating that the principle is by no means as clear-cut as some have believed). He also raised the question of when Christ entered the Most Holy Place (he believes, with A. F. Ballenger, that Christ entered there in AD 31, not 1844; this position he supported with Hebrews 9 and 10). Quoting from testimonial letters from former SDA workers, he said that the doctrines of the investigative judgment and the day of atonement have long been a source of embarrassment to many of our ministers, and have been the cause of difficulties which resulted in the loss of several of our leaders-men such as Albion Ballenger (whom he characterizes as “a man of undoubted integrity and spirituality”), and W. W. Fletcher (“Everyone who knew that man thought of him as a man of God-another man of undoubted integrity”)

Signals that such a position “was in the works” were evident in March, 1978, when during his Washington, D.C. lectures, Paxton indicated publicly that Ford and an Australian colleague were in the process of developing a theology that “put 1844 and 31 AD together,” explaining that they had found several White statements showing that Christ entered the most holy ministry immediately after His ascension. The same position is presented in Brinsmead’s most recent book, 1844 Re-examined. Time and space prevent a systematic treatment here, but while Ford and Brinsmead differ in some respects from Ballenger, their position does nevertheless contain the primary elements which were in conflict at the turn of the century-and which called forth White’s strong protest:

“I have been pleading with the Lord for strength and wisdom to reproduce the writings of the witnesses who were confirmed in the faith and in the early history of the message. After the passing of the time in 1844 they received the light and . . . when the men claiming to have new light would come in with their wonderful messages regarding various points of Scripture, we had, through the moving of the Holy Spirit, testimonies right to the point, which cut off the influence of such messages as Elder [Ballenger] has

been devoting his time to presenting. This poor man has been working decidedly against the truth that the Holy Spirit has confirmed.

When the power of God testifies as to what is truth, that truth is to stand forever as truth. No after suppositions contrary to the light God has given are to be entertained. Men will arise with interpretations of scripture which are to them truth, but which are not truth. One will arise and still another with new light which contradicts, the light that God has given under the demonstration of the Holy Spirit.

We are not to receive the words of those who come with a message that contradicts the special points of our faith. They gather together a mass of Scripture, and pile it as proof around their asserted theories. This has been done over and over again during the past fifty years. And while the Scriptures are God's word, and are to be respected, the application of them, if such application moves one pillar from the foundation God has abtained these fifty years, is a great mistake.

Elder [Ballenger's] proofs are not reliable. If received, they would destroy the faith of God's people in the truth that has made us what we are.

We must be decided on this subject; for the points that he is trying to prove by Scripture, are not sound. They do not prove that the past experience of God's people was a fallacy. We are hindered in our work by men who are not converted, who seek their own glory. They wish to be thought originators of new theories, which they present claiming that they are truth. But if these theories are received, they will lead to a denial of the truth that for the past fifty years God has been giving to His people substantiating it by the demonstration of the Holy Spirit. (Selected Messages, 1:160-162, Letter 329, 1905)

Thus while Ford refers approvingly of Ballenger as "a man of undoubted integrity and spirituality" White speaks of him as "this poor man [who] has been working decidedly against the truth that the Holy Spirit has confirmed." In his lecture, Ford takes the very position regarding Christ's ministry in the Most Holy Place as beginning in AD 31 rather than 1844-which White here rebukes Ballenger for, insisting that his Scriptural arguments are not sound. Moreover, while White insists that "No after suppositions contrary to the light God has given are to be entertained," Ford claims that White herself made such changes, indicating that she was unafraid to contradict herself-yet he later claims that she does not contradict earlier messages, but merely expands them. Nevertheless, he plainly does place her in contradiction to her life-long teachings regarding the Investigative Judgment and the Most Holy Place ministry, using Ballenger's arguments to do so. Ford's claims and assertions regarding White, which constitute a significant portion of his lecture, are summarized:

a) Her statement, "The Bible and the Bible only is our standard of doctrine. Every point of doctrine is to come from the Bible, and the Bible is the only true source of doctrine that is unmixed with error." is used to support Ford's position that "Ellen White did not give us a single truth of doctrine," and that her role is "pastoral, not canonical."

b) He announces his purpose to place White and the gift of prophecy in their true light by removing false concepts about them.

c) Her writings are placed in sharp contrast to Scripture and all theological authority is denied.

d) White is portrayed as reflecting-from stage to stage-the Church's understanding at the particular stage regarding theological issues rather than presenting divinely revealed truth.

e) White is pictured as making radical changes in her theology after 1888 (while the pre-Minneapolis Great Controversy clearly places Christ's post-ascension ministry in the Holy Place and shows Him entering the Most Holy in 1844, Ford interprets Acts of the Apostles page 33 so as to directly contradict this understanding); Ford praised God that she is, "the greatest rebel we have ever had among us"

f) In this context, he presents views totally contrary to her own using isolated statements with little reference to immediate context, and in direct conflict with the broader context to establish his "Ballenger" oriented concepts, declaring categorically that he presents not his own views, but White's.

The overwhelming evidence of direct conflict, both in statement and theology, will be documented in a later work. For the present, it is sufficient to note the characteristic Reformationist pattern-claiming to

The Theology Crisis

believe in the prophetic gift while denying its authority, and then authenticating their own position by a misuse and distortion of her words.

The question is not whether Ellen White presented truth not contained in Scripture-but whether God Himself is trustworthy in the administration of the prophetic gift.