

*QUESTIONS ON DOCTRINE: SYMBOL OF
ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL TENSION*

George R. Knight

Fifty years ago what is undoubtedly the most divisive book in Seventh-day Adventist history was released to an eagerly awaiting audience. While *Questions on Doctrine* ushered in a certain level of understanding between Adventists and some evangelicals, it brought about prolonged alienation and separation within the denomination to the Adventist factions that grew up around it.

Reflections on Questions on Doctrine

That latter result is somewhat surprising, given the fact that *Questions on Doctrine* is almost entirely a statement of traditional Adventist beliefs repackaged to speak specifically to a non-Adventist audience with a pronounced bent toward dispensationalism and Calvinism. Given that primary audience, it is remarkable that the book did not seek to avoid or at least soft-pedal such topics as the Adventist understandings of the mark of the beast, Daniel 8, the investigative judgment, the Sabbath, conditional immortality, hell, Babylon, and other topics that could be offensive to conservative evangelicals. The book's standing firm on such topics is absolutely remarkable in a volume designed to gain Adventist recognition as being an evangelical church rather than a cult.

The essentially mainline Adventist approach of *Questions on Doctrine* was recognized by the book's greatest enemies both inside and outside of the denomination. Thus M. L. Andreasen, its foremost opponent inside the church, could write within a few days of its release that while "some may think I repudiate it all," "there are so many good things in the book that may be of real help to many." As of early November 1957 his only concern with the book had to do with "the section on the Atonement which is utterly unacceptable and must be recalled."¹ Put another

way, Andreasen found nearly all of *Questions on Doctrine* to be traditional Adventist theology.

Andreasen's praise for nearly all of the content of the book may shock some who are only familiar with his ongoing warfare with the General Conference over its publication. The truth is that he recognized the volume as generally being a helpful restatement of the denomination's historic theological understanding.

That insight is reinforced by both ex-Adventists and those Protestant leaders who still were aggressively attacking the denomination. One ex-Adventist wrote to the *King's Business* in April 1957 that "the recent articles in *Eternity* have been disgusting to us. . . . They still print [in the *Review and Herald*] the very things *Eternity* says they now deny."²

Even more to the point were the claims of E. B. Jones, an ex-Adventist missionary who had "first-hand fact" regarding "the heretical, deep-rooted, and unalterable nature of SDAism." Jones had a ministry entitled Guardians of the Faith that had the function of "*Specializing in the Distribution of Authoritative, Scripturally-Sound Publications Exposing the Deceptive Teachings and Subtle Propaganda Methods of Seventh-Day Adventism.*"³

In Jones' opinion Donald Grey Barnhouse and Walter Martin had been "thoroughly duped" by the Adventist leaders. In actual fact, he asserted in December 1957, "the SDA system of religion has not in any wise been altered." Adventism was "*not a genuine Evangelical denomination,*" but was rather "a cleverly camouflaged counterfeit."⁴

Speaking specifically of *Questions on Doctrine*, Jones wrote that "in this (on the surface) innocent-appearing volume, which is claimed to reveal 'the *true evangelical nature* of Adventist beliefs and teachings' --here, in this latest shrewdly planned maneuver of the sect, obviously devised by pious schemers to lure uninitiated and easily misguided persons into its soul-entrapping pitfall--we discover SDAism to be precisely that which we have all along maintained it is: FALSE! We find it still to be diametrically opposed to vital truths of genuine Evangelicalism. In no respect is it different from that which it has always been. Despite all

claims to the contrary, SDAism is just as Bible-conflicting and soul-poisoning today as ever it was in the past--indeed, even more deceptive and dangerous. . . . And its current desperate 720-page attempt to ‘clarify’ its doctrines only further confirms the factual, soundly-based charge, that the creed of Adventism is composed of ‘a brood of errors and heresies.’”⁵

And what were the “*still completely unaltered* Scripture-perverting doctrines” set forth in *Questions on Doctrine* that so upset this ex-Adventist missionary? Nothing less, he pointed out, than the volume’s clear statements on Christ’s heavenly sanctuary ministry, the investigative judgment, the contemporary importance of the law and the Sabbath, the Adventist understandings of hell and soul-sleep, the inspiration of Ellen White (“the movement’s mentally ill and unschooled founder”), and its clearly presented expositions on the seal of God and the mark of the beast.⁶

Thus Jones’ perceptive critique of *Questions on Doctrine* demonstrates that far from being a sell-out theologically to the evangelicals, the book was a forceful restatement of traditional Adventist theology, even if some teachings had been worded differently than in the past. That truth was not only seen by ex-Adventists. It was also seen by many of the denomination’s fundamentalist enemies, such as Louis B. Talbot and M. R. DeHann.

DeHann published a critique of *Questions on Doctrine* in March 1958. He had, he wrote, eagerly awaited the book’s publication because he had been firmly and repeatedly assured that “it would be a turn-about-face of the old Seventh-day Adventist position and a repudiation of many of their objectionable doctrines.” DeHann went on to speak of his disappointment when he found in the book that “there had been no *essential* change in the historic stand of the Adventists. . . . The volume is *not* a repudiation by SDAs of any of their previous views, but rather a restatement of them. . . . There is no hint that they ever had any intention to retract, modify, change or repudiate any of their previous doctrines, which have always been considered unscriptural, false and God-dishonoring by evangelicals. It is the same error in new

terminology.”⁷

Even though DeHann is essentially correct in his assessment, a careful reading will discover one truly significant theological shift in the Adventist position. But that shift is largely hidden in an appendix of Ellen White quotations on the human nature of Christ and would not have been especially evident to an evangelical reader.

On the other hand, both Jones and DeHann perceived what Andreasen had missed--that the so-called change on the doctrine of the atonement had been one of “*terminology*” rather than substance.

But on one thing Andreasen, DeHann, and Jones agreed. That is that *Questions on Doctrine* was largely a forthright and insightful restatement of traditional Adventist theology. For Andreasen, of course, that was good, while for DeHann and Jones the continuity was a disaster.

For their part, the authors of the book were quite aware of the fact that they were making a restatement of traditional Adventist beliefs. “The answers in this volume,” they wrote in their introduction, “are an expansion of our doctrinal positions contained in the official statement of Fundamental Beliefs.”⁸

The essentially traditional Adventist position of *Questions on Doctrine* is also reflected upon by the denomination’s General Conference president, R. R. Figuhr, in his published comments on DeHann’s attack. “The point of special interest,” Figuhr wrote, “is his testimony to the fact that the book does not represent any change of Adventist doctrine. . . . What has apparently confused some is the avoidance of certain Adventist phraseology and the employment of ‘terminology currently used in theological circles.’ Adventists through the years have developed a vocabulary of their own that to them means much but does not always convey to non-Adventists the ideas intended. The book endeavors to set forth as clearly as possible a reason for the hope that is ours so that sincere non-Adventist inquirers may understand.”⁹

Well, some may be thinking, if everybody in the Adventist camp and many outside of it recognized *Questions on Doctrine* as traditional Adventist theology, why was it so divisive in Adventist circles? That question brings us to two strong and influential Adventist voices and two somewhat divergent trends in Adventist theological development in the 1940s and early 1950s.

Personalities and Trends

The two personalities were LeRoy E. Froom and M. L. Andreasen. Both were strong minded men who had stood at the very forefront of those who had been theologically influential in Adventist circles in the 1940s. Froom had served as the director of the General Conference Ministerial Department from 1941 to 1950, served as editor of *Ministry* magazine for over two decades by 1950, and had begun publishing his massive four volume history of prophetic interpretation entitled *Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers* in 1946.

Andreasen, meanwhile, had been the denomination's most influential theologian in the 1940s and probably the most widely read Adventist theological writer during that decade. Such books as *The Sanctuary Service* (1937, 1947), *The Book of Hebrews* (1948), *The Faith of Jesus* (1939, 1949), and *A Faith to Live By* (1943) had done much to shape Adventist thinking. Especially important was his "Last Generation" theology, which placed Adventism at the apex of history through its teaching that the Second Advent would not take place until God had utilized a final generation of perfected Sabbathkeepers to defeat Satan and vindicate the character of God.¹⁰ That teaching uplifted those aspects of Adventist theology that were distinctive to Adventism.

On the other side of Adventism's theological dynamic during the 1940s were the Froom-led forces that were seeking to demonstrate that Seventh-day Adventists were truly in the mainstream of orthodox evangelicalism. Their emphasis led to the revising of certain current Adventist books to remove anti-trinitarian ideas and statements about Christ having a sinful

human nature and to demonstrate that Adventism was a part of mainline Christianity through such works as Froom's *Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers* and F. D. Nichol's *Midnight Cry*.¹¹

Thus we find a growing but somewhat invisible theological tension developing in Adventism during the 1940s, with Froom and Andreasen at the forefront of the two orientations. It should be pointed out that both orientations were solidly Adventist in their basic understanding of prophecy and Adventist distinctive doctrines, but that they had different emphases.

The developing tensions of the 1940s would reach crisis proportions by the mid 1950s. The decade began with the 74-year-old Andreasen discovering at the 1950 General Conference session that he had been placed on the "retired" list without his knowledge or consent, even though older ministers had been retained as active workers.¹² Next came the influential 1952 Seventh-day Adventist Bible Conference (the first one since 1919) with its list of high powered speakers that included Froom but not Andreasen.¹³ And then 1954 saw the acrimonious struggle between Andreasen and the General Conference leadership over a book on Isaiah that had been requested of the denomination's most popular theological author to accompany the Sabbath School lessons but then strangely rejected after it was completed.¹⁴

By the mid fifties Andreasen had been effectively sidelined even though he was still a vigorous writer and speaker and a very influential minister. With that dynamic in mind, it is not especially surprising to discover that he was not invited to the Adventist/evangelical dialogs that led to the publication of *Questions on Doctrine*, or that he was not the reading committee of 250 Adventist leaders that approved the book for publication.

The Conference and the Book

The book itself is the published product of a series of conferences between certain Adventist spokespersons and a few evangelical leaders in 1955 and 1956. The immediate stimulus to the conferences was the invitation of Donald Grey Barnhouse, the editor of *Eternity*

magazine and a foremost leader of American Protestantism's conservative wing, to cult specialist Walter Martin to write a book on Seventh-day Adventists.

In the spring of 1955, Martin requested "face-to-face contact with representative Seventh-day Adventists." Unlike many in those days who wrote against the Adventists, Martin "declared that he wanted direct access" to authoritative Adventists and Adventist literature so that "he could treat Adventists fairly."¹⁵

As a result, meetings began in March 1955 between LeRoy E. Froom and W. E. Read (a field secretary of the General Conference) on the Adventist side and Martin and George R. Cannon (a professor of theology at Nyack Missionary College in New York). Later R. A. Anderson (who was then serving as the director of the General Conference Ministerial Association) and Barnhouse became involved in the dialogues.¹⁶

"At first," notes Barnhouse, "the two groups looked upon each other with great suspicion." But Martin, who "had read a vast quantity of Adventist literature," presented the Adventist conferees with a series of some 40 questions concerning their theological positions.¹⁷ As they worked through the questions and the Adventist responses across a series of meetings the two sides became more comfortable and began to develop a genuine respect for each other.

Central to the concerns of Martin were four points that were widely held concerning Adventist beliefs: "(1) that the atonement of Christ was not completed upon the cross; (2) that salvation is the result of grace plus the works of the law; (3) that the Lord Jesus Christ was a created being, not from all eternity; (4) and that He partook of man's sinful fallen nature at the incarnation."¹⁸ There were other issues, but those four were crucial since the evangelicals could not consider Adventists to be true Christians unless they were orthodox on them.

As a result, the Adventist leaders put a great deal of effort into explaining their beliefs on those four points. They didn't have too much of a problem in demonstrating that Adventists believed in salvation by grace alone and that the denomination had come to believe both in the

Trinity and that Christ had been one with God from the beginning of eternity. On the other hand, they did have to remove some books from publication that claimed that “Sabbath keeping was a basis for salvation.”¹⁹

The other two issues proved to be more troublesome for the Adventist leaders. An atonement completed on the cross was problematic because Adventists tended to refer to the atonement in terms of the anti-typical Day of Atonement, which they believed had begun in 1844. Froom and his colleagues resolved the confusion between the evangelicals’ use of the word “atonement” and the Adventist terminology by speaking of the atonement “accomplished” on the cross and the atonement that was then currently being “applied” in the heavenly sanctuary. Thus Christ had made a complete sacrifice of atonement on the cross and had been working out the fruits of that atonement in His heavenly ministry. The Adventist conferees believed themselves to be safe in making that verbal adjustment because Ellen White had used the word atonement in a similar fashion.²⁰

The most problematic issue that the Adventists had to deal with was the human nature of Christ. That topic was troublesome because the Calvinistic evangelicals they were dealing with believed that if Christ had a sinful nature, then He of necessity had to be a sinner. And if He was a sinner, then He couldn’t be a savior.

Here was a genuine problem for the Adventist conferees, since in a recent poll of several Adventist leaders Froom himself had discovered that “nearly all of them” “feel that Christ had our sinful nature.” Beyond that, the 1950 edition of ex-General Conference president W. H. Branson’s *Drama of the Ages* plainly stated that Christ in the incarnation took “upon Himself sinful flesh” and that Christ had to have accepted “man’s sinful nature.” Branson had “corrected” those statements in the 1953 edition of his book, but they, and others like them, were still on record.²¹

Not seeing any way around the problem, it appears that Froom and his colleagues were

less than transparent concerning what most Adventists had come to believe on the topic since the mid 1890s. According to Barnhouse, the Adventist leaders had told him and Martin that “the majority of the denomination has always held” the human nature of Christ “to be sinless, holy, and perfect despite the fact that certain of their writers have occasionally gotten into print with contrary views completely repugnant to the Church at large. They further explained to Mr. Martin that they had among their number certain members of their ‘lunatic fringe’ even as there are similar wild-eyed irresponsibles in every field of fundamental Christianity.”²²

The most positive interpretation of that explanation of the Adventist position on the human nature of Christ is that it is true that all Adventists held that Christ was “sinless, holy, and perfect” in the sense He had never sinned. But that positive interpretation falls far short of exhausting the meaning of the explanation given to Martin. After all, since no Adventists were teaching that Christ had sinned, those “irresponsibles” who were assigned to the “‘lunatic fringe’” must have had what the Adventist conferees viewed as a troublesome perspective on the nature of Christ in His humanity. Froom and his colleagues were undoubtedly referring to the type of human nature that Christ took upon Himself in the incarnation, which had been, in the words of Branson (and many others), “sinful nature.” Suspicion of the Adventist conferees having hedged on the truth of the early twentieth-century Adventist position is seemingly confirmed in the section of the appendix to *Questions on Doctrine* on “Christ’s Nature During the Incarnation.” In that appendix of Ellen White quotations the authors of the book supply a heading stating that Christ “*Took Sinless Human Nature.*” That heading is problematic in that it implies that that was Ellen White’s idea when in fact she was quite emphatic in repeatedly stating that Christ took “our sinful nature” and that “He took upon Himself fallen, suffering human nature, degraded and defiled by sin.”²³

During the conferences themselves, Froom, in writing to the General Conference president about their answers to the evangelicals, acknowledged that “some of the statements are

a bit different from what you might anticipate.” He went on to explain that their answers needed to be considered in the context of who they were dealing with. “If you knew the backgrounds, the attitudes, the setting of it all, you would understand why we stated these things as we have.”²⁴

From those words it is evident that Froom and his colleagues recognized that they needed to use a vocabulary that would be understood by the evangelicals and that the Adventists were dealing with some fairly prejudiced and aggressive fundamentalist leaders. That was certainly true of Barnhouse, who has been described as “merciless with other views, including . . . those who did not share his pre-millennial [dispensational] view of the second coming.”²⁵ Other authors have described him as “fiery,” “fearless and brusque,” and one who was willing to criticize “freely.”²⁶

With those facts in mind it is not difficult to see why the Adventist conferees adjusted their language on the atonement. After all, they could maintain their long-held theological belief on Christ’s ministry even though they needed to express their ideas in a way that would match the vocabulary and understandings of the evangelicals.

On the other hand, it is much more difficult to justify the Adventist conferees’ presentation and manipulation of the data they presented on the human nature of Christ. If the issue of a change of Adventist theology on the atonement can be viewed as semantic, the issue of the change of position on the human nature of Christ was one of substance. Whether Froom and his colleagues were willing to admit it or not, the view of Christ’s human nature that they set forth was a genuine revision of the position held by the majority of the denomination before the publication of *Questions on Doctrine*.

At any rate, Froom, Read, and Anderson managed to convince Barnhouse and Martin that Adventists were indeed orthodox on the essential issues they were concerned with. Thus Barnhouse could write in the summer of 1956 that “the position of the Adventists seems to some of us in certain cases to be a new position” even though “to them it may be merely the position of

the majority group of sane leadership which is determined to put the brakes on any members who seek to hold views divergent from that of the responsible leadership of the denomination.”²⁷

Developing Tensions Related to the Book

Barnhouse published the results of the Adventist/evangelical conferences in *Eternity* magazine in September 1956 in an article titled “Are Seventh-day Adventists Christians?” In speaking of his revised opinion of Adventism, he wrote: “I should like to say that we are delighted to do justice to a much-maligned group of sincere believers, and in our minds and hearts take them out of the group of utter heretics like the Jehovah’s Witnesses, Mormons, and Christian Scientists, to acknowledge them as redeemed brethren and members of the Body of Christ.” The price for that stand was costly for the evangelical conferees. T. E. Unruh notes that “*Eternity* lost one-fourth of its subscribers in protest, and the sale of Martin’s books plummeted.”²⁸

Meanwhile, *Time* magazine in December 1956 heralded the conferences as an event of healing between the fundamentalist wing of evangelicalism and the Adventists. It also indicated that the Adventists had “announced that they would publish--probably next spring--a new, definitive statement of their faith.”²⁹ That book, which didn’t appear until the fall of 1957, would be titled *Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine: An Explanation of Certain Major Aspects of Seventh-day Adventist Belief*.

On the Adventist side of things the General Conference president, in reporting to the Adventist public regarding the dialogues and the articles appearing in *Eternity*, wrote that “it has been very reassuring to note that no objections or questions of any importance have been raised by those of our number who have read the answers” given to the evangelical conferees. “On the contrary, a general chorus of approval and deep appreciation has been the result. These answers have enabled our Christian friends to clearly understand directly from us, and not from our

opponents, what we believe and teach.”³⁰

But that doesn't mean that everyone in the Adventist camp was happy. That was especially true of some who had not “read the answers.” Chief among those becoming disgruntled was M. L. Andreasen who had been left out of the process in both the formulation of the answers and the critiquing of them, even though he had been generally viewed as an authority on several of the disputed points.

Andreasen's discontent had begun to surface with the September 1956 publication in *Eternity*, with its assignment of those who held his position on the sinful human nature of Christ to the “lunatic fringe” of Adventism and Barnhouse's statement that the Adventist leaders no longer believed, “as some of their earlier teachers taught, that Jesus' atoning work was not completed on Calvary.” That smoldering discontent broke out into the open when Froom published a February 1957 *Ministry* article on the atonement. Especially offensive to Andreasen was a sentence referring to Christ's death for every sinner that read: “That is the tremendous scope of the sacrificial act of the cross--a complete, perfect, and final atonement for man's sin.”³¹ What Froom meant by that sentence was that the sacrifice on the cross was a full and complete *sacrifice* (in terms of the sacrificial aspect of the atonement) for sin. But that is not the way Andreasen read it on February 15 when he misunderstood and misquoted Froom's words. Andreasen repeatedly quoted Froom as saying that ““the sacrificial act on the cross (is) a complete, perfect, and final atonement for man's sins.””³² But Andreasen's rendering of Froom's sentence changed his meaning. The word “is” is not in Froom's original sentence. Rather, he followed the word “cross” with a mid-sentence dash, with the words following the dash functioning as an explanatory phrase to the several words that went before. Thus Froom's meaning was that the cross was a *completed sacrifice* (or the sacrificial aspect of the atonement). But Andreasen, in quoting Froom, removed the dash and supplied the word “is” in parentheses. With that one small stroke he changed Froom's meaning from a *completed sacrifice* (or

sacrificial aspect of the atonement) on the cross to a *completed atonement* on the cross. That interpretation, of course, put Froom and his colleagues out of harmony with traditional Adventism, which had often used atonement exclusively to refer to Christ's heavenly, day-of-atonement ministry.

That Froom was not abandoning the traditional Adventist understanding is clear from the context of the controverted statement. Two paragraphs earlier he had written that "the term 'atonement,' which we are considering, obviously has a much broader meaning than has been commonly conceived. Despite the belief of multitudes in the [evangelical] churches about us, it is not, on the one hand, limited just to the sacrificial death of Christ on the cross. On the other hand, neither is it confined to the ministry of our heavenly High Priest in the sanctuary above, on the antitypical day of atonement--or hour of God's judgment--as some of our [Adventist] forefathers first erroneously thought and wrote. Instead, as attested by the Spirit of prophecy, it clearly embraces both--one aspect being incomplete without the other, and each being the indispensable complement of the other."³³

The context following the controverted statement is equally clear. Thus the sentence that follows Froom's statement that the sacrificial act of Christ was complete and final states "that [the sacrificial act on the cross] is not all, nor is it enough. That completed act of atonement on the cross is valueless to any soul unless, and until, it is *applied by Christ our High Priest to, and appropriated by, the individual recipient.*" Thus Froom was not substituting atonement on the cross for atonement in the heavenly sanctuary, but was referring to what he and Anderson would consistently refer to as "atonement provided" at the cross and "atonement applied" in Christ's heavenly ministry during the antitypical day of atonement.³⁴ In conclusion, it can be said that while it is true that Froom believed that Christ's death on the cross was *complete* as a sacrifice of atonement, he did not hold that it represented a *completed* atonement.

In that position Froom and his fellow conferees were in good company. After all, Ellen

White pictured the Father as bowing before the cross “in recognition of its perfection. ‘It is enough,’ He said, ‘The atonement is complete.’” Again she had written that when Christ “offered Himself on the cross, a perfect atonement was made for the sins of the people.”³⁵ She, of course, also used the word “atonement” in dealing with Christ’s heavenly work in the present era. It is also of interest to note that Andreasen had claimed in 1948 that “on the cross Christ finished His work as victim and sacrifice.” Beyond that, Andreasen had never restricted the meaning of atonement to the heavenly ministry of Christ. He perceptively noted that “the atonement is not a single event but a *process*, reaching down through the ages, which will not be finished until time shall be no more.” In fact, Andreasen himself considered the cross to be the conclusion to what he called the “second phase” in “Christ’s work of atonement.”³⁶ Thus, in essence, Andreasen and Ellen White were in harmony with Froom that there had been a completed work on the cross and that there needed to be a heavenly ministry to fully apply the benefits of that completed work of sacrifice, even though they at times used differing words to express their understanding.

But that is not the way that Andreasen saw it in his reaction to *Questions on Doctrine*. From his perspective, the conferees had betrayed historic Adventism. Beginning with a paper he wrote on February 15, 1957, he would hammer home the issue of betrayal until his deathbed.

There was a good reason why Andreasen was especially concerned with the teaching of a completed atonement on the cross. He had set forth that reason in several of his earlier writings. Central to Andreasen’s theology was a three-phase understanding of the atonement. The first phase related to Christ’s living a perfectly sinless life. The second phase was His death on the cross.

Those two phases in the work of atonement were important, but for Andreasen the third phase was absolutely central. “In the third phase,” he wrote, “Christ demonstrates that man can do what He did, with the same help He had. This phase includes His session at the right hand of God, His high priestly ministry, and the final exhibition of His saints in their last struggle with

Satan, and their glorious victory. . . .

“The third phase is now in progress in the sanctuary above and in the church below. Christ broke the power of sin in His lifework on earth. He destroyed sin and Satan by His death. He is now eliminating and destroying sin in His saints on earth. This is part of the cleansing of the true sanctuary.³⁷

It is what Andreasen calls the third phase of the atonement that became the focal point of his theology. Utilizing the widely held concept that Christ had sinful human nature just like Adam possessed after the fall (that is, a sinful nature with tendencies to sin), Andreasen formulated his understanding of “last generation” theology with Christ being an example of what could be accomplished in the lives of His followers. That theology is most clearly set forth in the chapter entitled “The Last Generation” in *The Sanctuary Service* (1937, 1947). That book specifically states that Satan was not defeated at the cross, but would be defeated by the last generation in their demonstration that an entire generation of people could live a sinlessly perfect life. Christ, having taken their human nature with all its problems, had proven that it could be done. They could live the same sinlessly perfect life that He did with the same help as He had had. Through the last generation God “defeats Satan and wins His case,” “in the remnant Satan will meet his defeat,” “through them God will stand vindicated.” At that point Christ can come.³⁸

With that theology in mind, it is easy to understand why Andreasen became upset with the idea of a completed atonement on the cross and the teaching that Christ was not just like other human beings in His human nature.³⁹ A completed atonement would have undermined his understanding of Adventist theology. Thus the passion of his reaction to Froom and the evangelical conferees, which he saw as a betrayal of Adventist theology for evangelical recognition. Such a price was too high. It represented in the eyes of Andreasen nothing less than apostasy.

Andreasen’s misgivings about the view of the atonement espoused by the conferees

during the evangelical conferences soon became fixated on the projected book *Questions on Doctrine*, in which the answers set forth by the Adventists would be put into print. On March 11, 1957, he wrote R. R. Figuhr, president of the General Conference, claiming that “if the book is published there will be repercussions to the ends of the earth that the foundations [of Adventist theology] are being removed.”⁴⁰ On June 21 he wrote to Figuhr again, noting that “if the officers condone the action of these men, if these men are permitted to author or approve of the book to be published, I must protest, and shall feel justified by voice or pen to reveal this conspiracy against God and His people. . . . It is in your hand to split the denomination or heal it.”⁴¹ Two weeks later he wrote again, claiming that he found it “hard to concentrate while Rome is burning, or rather while the enemy is destroying the foundations on which we have built these many years. The very essence of our message, that there is now in the sanctuary above going on a work of judgment, of atonement, is being discarded. Take that away, and you take Adventism away. . . . To me, Brother Figuhr, this is the greatest apostacy [sic] this denomination has ever faced, and it will surely divide the people. It is not one or two men who are advocating this monstrous proposition, but a ‘group’ of General Conference men, plus a number of ‘Bible students’ with whom they are conferring.”⁴²

On the other side of the rapidly developing Adventist fence, *Ministry* magazine in April 1957 trumpeted evangelical recognition as a positive and “thrilling chapter in the history of Adventism.”⁴³ Two months later *Ministry* was “happy to announce that . . . *Questions on Doctrine* is about ready for release.” No book published in the history of the denomination, it was asserted, “has had more careful scrutiny than this one. . . . The manuscript, after being carefully studied by a large group here [at General Conference headquarters], was sent to our leadership in all the world divisions. In addition, it went to the Bible teachers in our senior colleges and the editors of our major journals. Copies were also sent to our union and local conference leaders in North America.”⁴⁴ Altogether the manuscript had been sent to some 250

church leaders and scholars. The one significant person left out of the process seems to have been Andreasen--the denomination's authority on the atonement in the 1940s. Such treatment must have certainly added fuel to his feelings that a conspiracy had been brewing.

On September 12, 1957, Andreasen again wrote Figuhr, this time with an ultimatum that he would be going public in the first week of October with his concerns "unless I receive word from you that you will consider that matter at or before the Autumn Council." He was afraid the General Conference president had not yet "considered the seriousness of the matter." October 15 saw the circulation of Andreasen's "Review and Protest," in which he presented his concerns.⁴⁵

Meanwhile, *Questions on Doctrine* was released with a modest printing of 5,000 copies. Surprisingly, as noted previously, Andreasen was quite favorable to most of the book's content. On November 4 he wrote to Figuhr that "there are so many good things in the book that may be of real help to many; and some may think I repudiate it all, when what I am concerned about is only the section on the Atonement which is utterly unacceptable and must be recalled."⁴⁶

Andreasen's campaign for the recall of *Questions on Doctrine* continued into December. "I am grieved at heart, deeply grieved," he wrote the denomination's president, "at the work your advisers have recommended. The unity of the denomination is being broken up, and still 'Questions on Doctrine' is being circulated and recommended. It must promptly be repudiated and recalled, if the situation is to be saved."⁴⁷

But Figuhr was taking just the opposite course of action. On November 6 he wrote to all the union conference presidents in North America, appealing for group orders that would amount to between 100,000 to 200,000 copies, so that *Questions on Doctrine* could be sold cheaply and have an extremely widespread circulation. By December 27 he was happy to inform the leadership that they had placed an order for a second printing of 50,000 copies, but that was soon increased to 100,000.⁴⁸ The volume would be aggressively circulated to both Adventists and to pastors and leaders of other denominations. By 1965 several thousand copies had been placed in

seminary, university, college, and public libraries. By 1970 Froom estimated that the total circulation had exceeded 138,000 copies. The volume by that time had a worldwide circulation.⁴⁹

Meanwhile, by the end of 1957 the battle between Andreasen and denominational leadership over *Questions on Doctrine* had begun to escalate. On December 16 Figuhr wrote to him claiming that it was extremely difficult to understand his purpose in his continued agitation against the book. Having supplied Andreasen with a battery of quotations from Ellen White on the topic of atonement accomplished and atonement applied, the denomination's chief administrator made yet another appeal: "I deeply regret, Brother Andreasen, that you so incorrectly state what the book teaches. Have you really, seriously, read the book? The book does *not* say, as you insist it does, that 'The atonement was done only on the cross.' This is not correct. To make the book say this, one must twist things badly. It does teach that on the cross *the sacrificial part of the atonement was fully accomplished*. But that there is much more to the atonement than the offering of the perfect sacrifice, is abundantly clear from the Scriptures and the Spirit of Prophecy. This the book clearly sets forth."⁵⁰

But to Andreasen there was no seeing that point or any turning back. "I weep for my people," he wrote on March 9, 1958. "This is the apostacy [sic] foretold long ago. . . . I have counted the cost it will be to me to continue my opposition; but I am trying to save my beloved denomination from committing suicide. I must be true to my God, as I see it, and I must be true to the men that trust me."⁵¹

Andreasen would publish nine widely circulated papers entitled "The Atonement" in late 1957 and early 1958. That series would be followed in 1959 by six "Letters to the Churches" that would later be published as a 100-page booklet by the same title. The letters would focus on both the problem of the atonement and that of the human nature of Christ. Andreasen continued to grieve as he saw what he considered to be the "foundation pillars" of Adventist theology "being destroyed."⁵²

While the Adventists were struggling amongst themselves over the issues raised by *Questions on Doctrine*, Martin and others continued to write of Adventism in favorable ways. By 1960 Martin was ready to publish his response to the Adventist book. In that year Zondervan Publishing House released *The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism*. Barnhouse supplied a foreword to the book in which he wrote: “As the result of our studies of Seventh-day Adventism, Walter Martin and I reached the conclusion that Seventh-day Adventists are a truly Christian group, rather than an antichristian cult. When we published our conclusion in *Eternity Magazine* (September 1956), we were greeted by a storm of protest from people who had not had our opportunity to consider the evidence.

“Let it be understood that we made only one claim; i.e., *that those Seventh-day Adventists who follow the Lord in the same way as their leaders who have interpreted for us the doctrinal position of their church, are to be considered true members of the body of Christ.*”⁵³ Thus all others, including Andreasen and his followers, were still viewed as cultic due to their aberrant beliefs. The book then went on in some detail to outline Martin and Barnhouse’s understanding of Adventism as explained to them in *Questions on Doctrine* and in the evangelical conferences.

H. W. Lowe, chairman of the General Conference’s Biblical Study and Research Group, replied to Martin’s book in “A Statement” found in the book itself. “We appreciate deeply the kindly Christian attitude displayed throughout this book,” Lowe wrote, “even in those areas where he is in marked disagreement with us.”⁵⁴

Lowe, of course, was not completely happy with the treatment of Adventist doctrine in Martin’s volume. “There are places . . . in this book,” he penned, “where we believe the author has erroneously criticized some features of our early history and our contemporary theological teachings.”⁵⁵ As a result, *Ministry* magazine published a series of articles between June 1960 and July 1961 on points of difference--including the law, the pre-advent judgment, the Sabbath, conditional immortality, the role of Ellen White, the three angels’ messages of Revelation 14,

and the nature of humanity. Those 15 articles were a direct response to Martin's book and were soon compiled into a volume entitled *Doctrinal Discussions*.⁵⁶

Meanwhile, not all in the conservative Protestant camp were happy with either *Questions on Doctrine* or Martin's book. Such authors as Norman F. Douty in his *Another Look at Seventh-day Adventism* (1962) held that Martin and Barnhouse had been too generous and that Adventism had departed from the teachings of God's Word as held by historic Christianity. In a similar fashion, Herbert S. Bird viewed the denomination in his *Theology of Seventh-day Adventism* as a "serious corruption of the gospel."⁵⁷

If there were divisions over Adventism among the conservative Protestants, there were even more serious problems among the Adventists themselves. Andreasen continued his protests throughout 1961. As a result, on April 6 of that year the General Conference in its Spring meeting voted to suspend his ministerial credentials. Andreasen would respond to that action on January 19, 1962, in a circular letter entitled "Shooting the Watchdog."⁵⁸

But the battle between Andreasen and the denomination was almost over. He would pass to his rest on February 19, 1962. Three days before that event, Figuhr and R. R. Bietz (president of the Pacific Union Conference) visited Andreasen and his wife in the Glendale Sanitarium and Hospital. At that meeting Andreasen made peace with the church. In doing so, according to the records, he expressed his regret for the confusion he had caused in the denomination, claimed that he had for the past two years instructed his followers to cease duplicating his letters and pamphlets, and told Figuhr and Bietz that in the future his statements "in regard to his convictions [w]ould be directed only to the Officers of the General Conference or other members of the General Conference Committee."⁵⁹ It should be noted that Andreasen's reconciliation with church leaders did not imply a change in his theology, but rather a transformation of the way he would handle his protest.

A few days after her husband's death, Mrs. Andreasen wrote to Figuhr about the joy in

her husband's heart over their reconciliation. "I am so grateful for your talk with my Dear Husband," she wrote, "and all was made right and cleared up before he died. He said he could not die until it was cleared up. He spent many nights sobbing his heart out. Poor dear, I am so glad he died happy. . . . Thank you so much for your kind letter. I shall keep it and treasure it."⁶⁰

On March 1 the General Conference Committee revoked the action of the previous year in which it had suspended Andreasen's credentials. That December Mrs. Andreasen wrote to W. P. Bradley at General Conference headquarters that she "was so happy to get M. L.'s credentials. I know they are of no special significance now that he is gone but I do know he expected me to get them and was so happy they were to be returned."⁶¹

Even though peace had been established between Andreasen and the church leadership, it was not established between the leadership and those who had followed Andreasen in his reaction to *Questions on Doctrine*. Adventism in 2007 has reached a half century of division over the *Questions on Doctrine* crisis.

Looking back, one can only speculate on the different course of Adventist history *if* Andreasen had been consulted regarding the wording of the Adventist position on the atonement, *if* Froom and his colleagues hadn't been divisive in their handling of issues related to the human nature of Christ, *if* both Froom and Andreasen would have had softer personalities.

But ifs are not the stuff of history. The historical record in this case is that each side contributed to the disharmony that arose in Adventism over *Questions on Doctrine*. And beyond the ranks of the Adventists, the repeatedly aggressive language of the ever-combative Barnhouse undoubtedly did much to create division. Soon after the book's publication, for example, he wrote that *Questions on Doctrine* "is a definitive statement that lops off the writings of Adventists who have been independent of and contradictory to their sound leadership."⁶² That is only one of the many statements made by Barnhouse who appears to have actively sought to create distance between those of Andreasen's persuasion and the "sane leadership which is

determined to put the brakes on any members who seek to hold views divergent from that of the responsible leadership of the denomination.”⁶³ Given the fact that no one likes to be lopped off or to be in opposition to those who are sane, it should be evident that Barnhouse himself did much to exacerbate the internal difficulties among the Adventists.

However, that history is in the past. The current generation needs to re-examine the facts and see if it can heal the breach that has divided the denomination for nearly a half century.

A Personal Perspective

Before closing, I would like to add a note regarding my personal Adventist journey as it relates to the controversy over *Questions on Doctrine*.

I was baptized out of an agnostic background in September 1961 at the height of the crisis. The first Adventist pastor who had a significant impact on me was Vance Ferrell and the evangelist who brought me into the church was Ralph Larson. Both of those men would eventually lose their ministerial credentials in events related to the *Questions on Doctrine* controversy.

Soon after baptism I moved to Mountain View, California, where I associated with a circle of assertive lay people who were involved with the controversy and who “enlightened” me on the topic of sinless perfectionism. As a newly baptized Adventist, I aggressively sided with the Andreasen perspective in the struggle. In fact, within a few weeks of my baptism, recognizing the lack of sinlessly perfect people in the church, I promised God in all sincerity that I would be the first truly perfect person since Christ. It wasn’t all that difficult, I remember thinking, all you have to do is try hard enough.

September of 1962 found me at Pacific Union College in northern California where I enrolled as a theology major. The tension over Andreasen’s theology permeated the atmosphere of the theological faculty, many of whom had been his students at the Seventh-day Adventist

Theological Seminary. My college experience greatly re-enforced my commitment to the Andraesenite perspective on the *Questions on Doctrine* issues.

Following seminary training at Andrews University, I entered the pastoral ministry in September 1967. Eighteen months later, realizing that I was as messed up as ever, I turned in my ministerial credentials and decided to leave the church and return to the peaceful agnosticism of my earlier years. I had struggled for nearly eight years and was no closer to what I had been taught was perfection than I had been when I had begun. In fact, I didn't know anyone who even came close to the type of perfection Andraesen espoused throughout his books, no matter how aggressively they might be advocating his teachings.

The next six years took me through a spiritual desert in which I didn't pray or read my Bible. I had given up on what I thought was Adventism and Christianity. My study during those years focused on philosophy and existential psychology. I was still looking for the answers to life's meaning that I had not found in my Adventist journey. But six years of such study only led me to the conclusion that philosophy was bankrupt in the ultimate meaning realm.

Then in 1975 through a series of events I met Christ as a personal Savior in a way that I had not known Him before. I still saw Him as an example for all Christians to emulate after they had a saving relationship with Him, but as I studied my Bible and the writings of Ellen White and other authors I began to see new dimensions to His saving act on the cross and a new depth of meaning in the biblical concepts of grace, faith, law, and sin. Beyond that, as I studied I began to see that both sides in the human nature of Christ struggle in the 1950s and 1960s had been incorrect; that Christ was not just like Adam either after the fall or before it; that He was a unique Being that had a sinful nature in the sense of His physical infirmities but not in His propensities.⁶⁴ Beyond that, I began to see that the biblical (see, e.g., Matt. 5:43-48; 19:16-22) and Ellen White (see, e.g., *Christ's Object Lessons*, pp. 67-69) conception of perfection centered on mature Christian love rather than absolute sinlessness and that character perfection meant

developing a character like that God who is defined as love (1 John 4:8). My studies eventually led me to see more clearly the relationship of the basic law of love to the Ten Commandments, the integral relationship between law and grace, and faith and sin as basically being ways in which individuals relate to God.

Needless to say, in my post-1975 Christian/Adventist experience I not only moved away from Andreasen's theology, but I actively entered a writing career in which I desired to help those trapped in my pre-1968 experience see a better and more biblically accurate alternative. Such books as *I Used to Be Perfect; The Pharisee's Guide to Perfect Holiness: A Study of Sin and Salvation*; and *My Gripe With God: A Study in Divine Justice and the Problem of the Cross* are the fruits of that endeavor. It was no accident that my book on the atonement centered on providing a Christ-on-the-cross centered alternative to the central theme of Andreasen's final generation theology--the vindication of God.

In conclusion, looking back after 46 years of being an Adventist, I realize that my life has been dominated by the events surrounding the *Questions on Doctrine* controversy. I have lived on both sides of the issues, have appreciated friends today on both sides, and have sympathy for the positive contributions of both sides. My genuine hope for the future is that we might be able as a community to put away some of the heat and passion that have too often distorted our dialog in the past and learn to discuss our differences in an atmosphere of trust and Christlike love, remembering all the time that none of us are 100 per cent wrong and that none of us are 100 per cent correct in our theology.

For years I have taught my seminary students that the eleventh commandment is that "thou shalt not do theology against thy neighbor" and that the twelfth is that "thou shalt never trust a theologian." Rather, one tests the conclusions of theologians on the basis of the Bible. And while neighbor is always a reality in theological discussion, to focus on neighbor as an opponent will distort one's conclusions and force one's theology toward the opposite polar

position. My prayer for this conference is that we might grasp the truth that we can learn from each other if we stop doing theology against one another and come to the inspired Word in the spirit of Christ.⁶⁵

Notes

- ¹ M. L. Andreasen, "The Atonement," mimeographed document, Nov. 4, 1957.
- ² Letter to the editor, *The King's Business*, Apr. 1957, p. 2
- ³ E. B. Jones, circular letter to Dear Friends in Christ, Dec. 10, 1957.
- ⁴ *Ibid.*
- ⁵ *Ibid.*
- ⁶ *Ibid.*
- ⁷ M. R. DeHann, "Questions on Doctrine," *The King's Business*, Mar. 1958, p. 19.
- ⁸ *Questions on Doctrine*, (Washington, DC: Review and Herald, 1957), p. 9.
- ⁹ R. R. Figuhr, "The Pillars of Our Faith Unmoved," *Review and Herald*, Apr. 24, 1958, p. 6.
- ¹⁰ M. L. Andreasen, *The Sanctuary Service* 2d ed. rev. (Washington, DC: Review and Herald, 1947), pp. 299-321.
- ¹¹ See George R. Knight, *A Search for Identity: The Development of Seventh-day Adventist Beliefs* (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 2000), pp. 152-157.
- ¹² Virginia Steinweg, *Without Fear or Favor: The Life of M. L. Andreasen* (Washington, DC: Review and Herald, 1979), pp. 161-163.
- ¹³ See *Our Firm Foundation*, 2 vols. (Washington, DC: Review and Herald, 1953).
- ¹⁴ L. L. Moffitt to M. L. Andreasen, Apr. 16, 1954; M. L. Andreasen to L. L. Moffitt, Apr. 23, 1954; M. L. Andreasen to R. R. Figuhr, Aug. 6, 1954; R. R. Figuhr to M. L. Andreasen, Aug. 11, 1954.
- ¹⁵ T. E. Unruh, "The Seventh-day Adventist Evangelical Conferences of 1955-1956," *Adventist Heritage*, Vol 4, No. 2, 1977, pp. 36, 37.
- ¹⁶ *Ibid.* For the most comprehensive discussion of the conferences, see Juhyeok Nam, "Reactions to the Seventh-day Adventist Evangelical Conferences and *Questions on Doctrine*, 1955-1971," Ph.D. dissertation, Andrews University, 2005. Helpful material is also found in Paul Ernest McGraw, "Born in Zion? The Margins of Fundamentalism and the Definition of Seventh-day Adventism," Ph.D. dissertation, George Washington University, 2004, and A. Leroy Moore, *Questions on Doctrine Revisited! Keys to the Doctrine of Atonement and Experience of At-one-ment* (Ithaca, MI: AB Publishing, 2005).
- ¹⁷ Donald Grey Barnhouse, "Are Seventh-day Adventist Christians? Another Look at Seventh-day Adventism," *Eternity*, Sept. 1956, p. 6.
- ¹⁸ Walter R. Martin, "Seventh-day Adventism Today," *Our Hope*, Nov. 1956, p. 275.
- ¹⁹ Barnhouse, "Are Seventh-day Adventists," p. 6.
- ²⁰ Ellen G. White, "Without Excuse," *Review and Herald*, Sept. 24, 1901, p. 615; Ellen G. White, "The Only True Mediator," *Signs of the Times*, June 28, 1899, p. 1. These statements are also found in *Questions on Doctrine*, p. 663.
- ²¹ L. E. Froom to R. R. Figuhr. May 10, 1955; W. H. Branson, *Drama of the Ages* (Nashville: Southern Publishing Assn., 1950), pp. 81, 101. The corrected sections read "our flesh" and "now is actual nature." See *Drama of the Ages* (Nashville: Southern Publishing Assn., 1953), pp. 69, 89; also see Nam, "Reactions," pp. 66, 67.
- ²² Barnhouse, "Are Seventh-day Adventists," p. 6. The quoted words "lunatic fringe" and the other ideas in this quotation almost certainly came from the Adventist conferees. Unruh later wrote that "in August 1956, Russell Hitt, the managing editor of *Eternity*, came to Washington to go over with us the long-awaited Barnhouse article repudiating his former position on Adventism. Supporting articles by Martin, to follow in *Eternity*, were also gone over. We were given permission to quote or otherwise refer to these articles" (Unruh, "Conferences of 1955-1956," p. 42). Beyond that positive statement from one of the Adventist participants, nowhere do we find the Adventist leaders arguing that the language was not theirs, even though Andreasen had claimed it was theirs in his *Letters to the Churches* (p. 15).

²³ See, e.g., Ellen G. White, "The Importance of Obedience," *Review and Herald*, Dec. 15, 1896, p. 789; Ellen G. White, "Christ's Humiliation," *The Youth's Instructor*, Dec. 20, 1900, p. 394. Both of these statements are found in the extended note to page 652 of the annotated edition of *Questions on Doctrine*, George R Knight, ed. (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 2003).

²⁴ L. E. Froom to R. R. Figuhr, April 26, 1955.

²⁵ Oliver R. Barclay, quoted in Timothy Dudley-Smith, *John Stott: The Making of a Leader* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1999), p. 335.

²⁶ Walter A. Elwell, ed., *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1984), s.v. "Barnhouse, Donald Grey," by W. C. Ringenberg; Daniel G. Reid, ed., *Dictionary of Christianity in America* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1990), s.v. "Barnhouse, Donald Grey," by J. A. Carpenter.

²⁷ Barnhouse, "Are Seventh-day Adventists," p. 7.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 45: Unruh, "Conferences of 1955-1956," p. 44.

²⁹ "Peace with the Adventists," *Time*, Dec. 31, 1956, pp. 48-49.

³⁰ R. R. Figuhr, "A Non-Adventist Examines Our Beliefs," *Review and Herald*, Dec. 13, 1956, p. 3.

³¹ Barnhouse, "Are Seventh-day Adventists," pp. 6, 44; LeRoy Edwin Froom, "The Priestly Application of the Atoning Act," *Ministry*, Feb. 1957, p. 10.

³² M. L. Andreasen, "The Atonement," mimeographed document, Feb. 15, 1957. In "A Review and Protest," mimeographed document, Oct. 15, 1957, Andreasen makes his charges against Froom even more explicit.

³³ Froom, "The Priestly Application," p. 9.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 10; *Questions on Doctrine*, pp. 349-355. See also the extensive remarks to that chapter in the annotated edition.

³⁵ E. G. White, "Without Excuse," p. 615; E. G. White, "The Only True Mediator," p. 1. These statements are also found in *Questions on Doctrine*, p. 663.

³⁶ M. L. Andreasen, *The Book of Hebrews* (Washington, DC: Review and Herald, 1948), pp. 53, 59; M. L. Andreasen, "The Atonement V," mimeographed document, Dec. 2, 1957.

³⁷ Andreasen, *Hebrews*, pp. 59, 60, cf. p. 58.

³⁸ Andreasen, *The Sanctuary Service*, pp. 299-321. See also extended note in the annotated edition to p. 349 of *Questions on Doctrine*. For a contextualized critique of Andreasen's theology and the *Questions on Doctrine* crisis, see Knight, *A Search for Identity* pp. 144-152, 167-173.

³⁹ For a critique of the issue of Christ's human nature, see the extended notes to pp. 650, 652, 383 in the annotated edition.

⁴⁰ M. L. Andreasen to R. R. Figuhr, Mar. 11, 1957.

⁴¹ M. L. Andreasen to R. R. Figuhr, June 21, 1957.

⁴² M. L. Andreasen to R. R. Figuhr, July 4, 1957.

⁴³ Louise C. Kleuser, "Adventism's New Milestone," *Ministry*, Apr. 1957, p. 31.

⁴⁴ R. A. Anderson, "Seventh-day Adventists Answer *Questions on Doctrine*," *Ministry*, June 1957, p. 24.

⁴⁵ M. L. Andreasen to R. R. Figuhr, Sept. 12, 1957; M. L. Andreasen, "A Review and a Protest," mimeographed document, Oct. 15, 1957.

⁴⁶ M. L. Andreasen, "The Atonement," mimeographed document, Nov. 4, 1957; see also R. R. Figuhr to M. L. Andreasen, Nov. 14, 1957.

⁴⁷ M. L. Andreasen to R. R. Figuhr, Dec. 3, 1957.

⁴⁸ R. R. Figuhr to Union Presidents, Dec. 6, 1957; R. R. Figuhr to Brethren, Dec. 27, 1957; R. R. Figuhr, "The Pillars of Our Faith Unmoved," *Review and Herald*, Apr. 24, 1958, p. 6.

⁴⁹ LeRoy Edwin Froom, *Movement of Destiny* (Washington, DC: Review and Herald, 1971), pp. 489, 492.

⁵⁰ R. R. Figuhr to M. L. Andreasen, Dec. 16, 1957.

⁵¹ M. L. Andreasen to R. R. Figuhr, Mar. 9, 1958.

⁵² M. L. Andreasen, *Letters to the Churches* (Baker, OR: Hudson Printing, cir. 1959), p. 18.

⁵³ Donald Grey Barnhouse, "Foreword," in Walter R. Martin, *The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1960), p. 7.

⁵⁴ H. W. Lowe, "A Statement," in *ibid.*, p. 15.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

⁵⁶ *Doctrinal Discussions: A Compilation of Articles Originally Appearing in The Ministry, June, 1960--July 1961, in Answer to Walter R. Martin's Book The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism* (Washington, DC: Review and Herald, [cir. 1961]).

⁵⁷ Norman F. Douty, *Another Look at Seventh-day Adventism: With Special Reference to Questions on Doctrine* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1962); Herbert S. Bird, *Theology of Seventh-day Adventism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1961), p. 130.

⁵⁸ "Suspension of Credentials of M. L. Andreasen," an unpublished report of an April 6, 1961, action taken by the Spring Council of the General Conference; W. R. Beach to M. L. Andreasen, April 14, 1961; M. L. Andreasen, "Shooting the Watchdog," mimeographed document, Jan. 19, 1962.

⁵⁹ General Conference Officers Minutes, Feb. 26, 1962; General Conference Committee Minutes, Mar. 1, 1962; R. R. Figuhr to Mrs. M. L. Andreasen, Feb. 22, 1962. A two year moratorium on attacking the leaders of the church is also borne out by the dates on Andreasen's protest documents.

⁶⁰ Mrs. M. L. Andreasen to R. R. Figuhr, Feb. 27, 1962; see also Mrs. M. L. Andreasen to R. R. Figuhr, [Apr. 1963].

⁶¹ General Conference Committee Minutes, Mar. 1, 1962; Mrs. M. L. Andreasen to W. P. Bradley, Dec. 4, 1962.

⁶² Donald Grey Barnhouse, "Postscript on Seventh-day Adventism." *Eternity*, Nov. 1957, p. 22.

⁶³ Barnhouse, "Are Seventh-day Adventists," p. 7.

⁶⁴ See my extended footnotes in the annotated edition of *Questions on Doctrine*, pp. 516-526..

⁶⁵ For a helpful treatment that is in harmony with this suggestion, see Moore, *Questions on Doctrine Revisited!*